PROPERTY OF UNIVERSITY
OF WASHINGTON LIBRARIES
GRADUATE READING ROOM
NON-CIRCULATING

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 97—PART 10

OCTOBER 3, 1951 TO OCTOBER 20, 1951

(PAGES 12501 TO 13842)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1951

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, October 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. William H. Kepler, minister, Northminster Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee that Thou hast called us to positions of leadership and service. Make us careful as we realize how great is our responsibility to our Nation and to Thee. Make us humble as we remember that the eyes of the world are upon us. Make us confident in our firm conviction that Thou art greatly concerned with the things that we do, and Thy wisdom is available to those who ask for it.

Grant now Thy blessing to the Members of this body, and at the close of this day may they know that joy which comes from the knowledge that they have given their best in the service of the Nation we love.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 2, 1951, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may transact routine business, including insertions in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY FORCES

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have been making inquiries to find out whether the North Atlantic Treaty forces commanded by General Eisenhower are actually receiving the weapons and equipment which they need and are supposed to receive.

It is a very great disappointment to be compelled by the fact to announce that the shipments to General Eisenhower's forces are becoming little more than a trickle when compared with what they should be.

The figures are classified as secret, but some rough idea of the shocking inadequacy of these shipments is given when I say that, in my opinion, it is a fair guess that they are currently only about one-fifth as large as they should be.

The main reason for this poor showing is that production has slipped badly in the United States of America. We ask American troops to fight for peace in Korea. We ask American troops to stand guard for peace in the tinder box of Europe. We expect the European allies to contribute manpower on the understanding that we will furnish weapons. But, apparently, we cannot demand of ourselves enough production to support our own troops and preserve our own peace. It is all part of the heavy price we pay because there are too many in high official positions who are following instead of leading.

I have reflected a long time before making this statement. It is a very disagreeable one. I finally decided to speak out because I believe that until there is some public clamor, there will never be corrective action. I suggest further that the Foreign Relations Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, immediately call the responsible officials to find out what the precise facts of the situation are and what steps can be taken to get prompt action to win the peace. I submit herewith a resolution to formalize this suggestion.

I add this word, Mr. President, that I hope the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, or a subcommittee thereof, or any individual Senator, or the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] will look into this matter to find what the trouble is, and to see whether we cannot keep faith with this North Atlantic Treaty obligation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 218), submitted by Mr. LODGE, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas it is reported that shipments of matériel from the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces are currently not as large as they should be: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation to determine the rate at which the United States is furnishing arms and military equipment to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces under the command of General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC AIRPORTS NEAR NATIONAL FORESTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire, construct, operate, and maintain public airports in certain areas and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ANTIGENOCIDE CONVENTION — RESOLUTION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution unanimously adopted by the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs of America at its board meeting held in July at the Edgewater Beach Hotel in Chicago. The resolution endorses favorable action on the Anti-Genocide Convention now pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL CLUBS, INC., AT ITS BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 7 TO 12 AT THE EDGEWATER BEACH HOTEL IN CHICAGO

Whereas the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs has supported the adoption by the United Nations of a convention on the prevention and punishment of crime of genocide, and the ratification on such a convention by the United States, and

Whereas a genocide convention has been ratified by 29 countries Be it

Resolved, That the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., urge the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate to report favorably on the Convention on the Prevention

and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, and urge the Senate to ratify the Convention at the earliest possible date.

CONTROL OF CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS FOR ELECTRIC POWER INDUSTRY—RESOLUTION OF MIDWEST COMMITTEEMEN OF NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received a great many anxious messages from officials and members of the Rural Electric Cooperative System of Wisconsin who are deeply concerned with possible moves which might impair the careful flow of critical materials for REA purposes

I have in my hand a resolution signed by association directors for Wisconsin, Illinois, and Iowa on this matter.

It represents the unanimous views of the delegated representatives who met in regional conference in Chicago on September 27, and who appealed for maintenance of the present system of allocation of materials through the Defense Electric Power Administration.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the present controls and allocations of critical materials used in the construction of electric generation and transmission facilities are operating in a fair and equitable manner for the whole utility industry, and

Whereas any move to disturb the present controls and allocations setup would seriously retard the construction program and would without question work to the very great detriment of the construction program of the rural electric systems, including both the production and distribution of power for essential farm operations; and

Whereas we are reliably informed that a move is afoot to abolish the present controls and allocations program as administered by Defense Electric Power Administration and other agencies and to transfer these functions to the Defense Production Authority; and

Whereas it is believed that certain officials in Defense Production Authority do not look approvingly upon the rural-electrification-construction program and particularly upon the efforts of the farmers to generate some of their own power Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, we, the delegated representatives of the more than 100 rural electric systems of Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin assembled in regional meeting at Chicago this 27th day of September 1951, appeal to Defense Mobilizer Charles Wilson to continue the present methods of control on construction materials for the electric-power industry and not to transfer the functions of DEPA and other agencies to DPA, that we appeal to the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to insist upon the controls remaining as they are, that we appeal to the President to demand that the controls remain as they are, and that we appeal to our Congressmen and Senators to insist that the status quo in controls and allocations of materials used in the electric industry be maintained

INCREASED LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 219), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-second Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946, and Senate Resolution 171, agreed to August 6, 1951.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr LODGE:

S 2205. A bill for the relief of Sonia Sookhdeo Wall, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr IVES

S 2206 A bill for the relief of Dr Ercole Barattucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr KEFAUVER:

S 2207 A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in recognition of the outstanding services of Cordell Hull to this Nation and to the cause of international cooperation and understanding; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr CASE

S 2208 A bill to provide an extension of time within which educational and vocational rehabilitation benefits may be furnished to certain veterans of World War II who later served in the military or naval service before July 25, 1951, to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

S 2209 A bill to provide for the construction of a circumferential highway in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works

By Mr JOHNSON of Colorado:

S 2210 A bill for the relief of Richard A. Seidenberg, to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 2211 (by request). A bill to amend section 221 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to clarify certain requirements relating to the designation of persons upon whom process may be served; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr NIXON:

S 2212 A bill for the relief of Charles Michell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S 2213 A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

By Mr HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr MILLIKIN, Mr GEORGE, Mr. HILL, Mr KNOWLAND, Mr BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr GILLETTE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr JOHNSON of Texas, Mr KEFAUVER, and Mr TAFT):

S 2214 A bill to amend section 709 of title 18 of the United States Code, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—AMENDMENT

Mr CAPEHART (for himself, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and Mr. DIRKSEN) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2170) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EMERGENCY PROFESSIONAL HEALTH TRAINING ACT OF 1951—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946, to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 337, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

PRINTING OF MANUSCRIPT ENTITLED "QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT" (S DOC. NO 74)

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers on Equal Rights Amendment" prepared by the Research Department of the National Woman's Party.

The VICE PRESIDENT Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GEORGE W FOLTA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DIVISION NO. 1, DISTRICT OF ALASKA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, October 10, 1951, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. George W. Folta, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 1, District of Alaska. Judge Folta is now serving in this post under an appointment which expired April 30, 1951. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]; and the Senator from Utah [Mr WATKINS].

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC, PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows.

By Mr SMITH of New Jersey

Address on the Japanese Peace Treaty, delivered by Hon John Foster Dulles at the Governors' conference at Gatlinburg, Tenn, on October 1, 1951

By Mr ELLENDER (on behalf of himself and Mr PASTORE)

Editorial entitled "Senator GREEN: 84," published in the Washington Post of October 3, 1951, paying tribute to Senator GREEN on the eighty-fourth anniversary of his birth

By Mr HILL:

Address delivered on September 21, 1951, by Hon. Wayne Coy, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, at one hundredth anniversary celebration of the first train order by telegraph, at Harriman, N. Y.

By Mr. LANGER:

Address at dedication of Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory, Grand Forks, N. Dak., delivered by Mr. Richard D. Searles, Under Secretary, Department of the Interior, September 29, 1951.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Article entitled "Doctors," written by Dr. Alan Gregg, of the Rockefeller Foundation, and published in the Scientific American for September 1951, regarding America's need for doctors, and a statement by Senator DOUGLAS regarding the article.

By Mr BRICKER:

Article entitled "Suspicion of News Tinkering Overcasts Edict on Secrecy," written by James Reston and published in the New York Times of October 3, 1951.

Article entitled "New Type of Censorship," written by Roscoe Drummond, chief, Washington news bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, published in that newspaper under date of September 27, 1951, and an editorial entitled "Step Toward Tyranny," published in the same newspaper on the same date.

EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK—PROCLAMATION BY GOVERNOR OF NEW YORK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a proclamation of Hon. Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, designating the period October 7 to 13, 1951, as employ-the-physically-handicapped week in the State of New York.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The latest figures of the New York State Employment Service show that there is a shortage of labor in many fields of our State industry essential to the national defense effort. The shortage grows more serious from week to week.

It is, accordingly, all the more important to call attention to a considerable pool of workers available for employment in many factories of different kinds—those who are physically handicapped.

There are many jobs which these people can do quite as efficiently and quickly as those who are uninjured. Many employers have discovered that the physically handicapped are frequently better because they are more cautious and more responsible. They take better care of themselves and of the machines they are called upon to operate. Moreover, there is less absenteeism among the physically handicapped and more punctuality.

It is a fine human act as well as one greatly in the national interest to employ the physically handicapped.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the period of October 7–13, 1951, as employ-the-physically-handicapped week in New York State, and I ask all employers, large and small, within the State, to hire more physically handicapped people, and hire them now.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 21st day of September in the year of our Lord 1951.

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

By the Governor:

JAMES C. HAGERTY,
Secretary to the Governor.

LETTER FROM ERLE COCKE, JR., NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated September 25, 1951, which I have received from Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion. The letter explains in some detail the views of the American Legion on the bill to increase disability benefits for certain veterans, and why it approves of the enactment of the measure the veto of the President notwithstanding. I believe Mr. Cocke's letter sets forth interesting and persuasive arguments for the measure.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
Indianapolis, Ind., September 25, 1951.

Hon ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCFARLAND This is a letter of congratulations and of thanks.

It is intended to convey to you some sense of the appreciation on the part of the 3,000,000 Legionnaires of the important role you played in the enactment over the President's veto of H R. 3193, now Public Law 149.

We believe that you acted not only in the veterans' interest but in the national interest. We are convinced that a very great majority of the American people join us in applauding this action

For some time now, we have noted in the press a strangely belligerent and resentful reaction to anything having to do with maintenance and improvement of veterans' benefits. The attitude is one of impatience bordering on disdain. It is reflected in editorials and articles which all too often emphasize astronomical cost projections rather than basic facts.

Because passage of H R 3193 was greeted in this fashion in many areas, I want to place on your record a brief review of the matter.

The American Legion advocated a reasonable pension for helpless and bedridden war veterans long before the introduction into Congress of the measure which last week became law. Three successive national conventions—in 1948, 1949, and 1950—reiterated the plea. We studied the question, we debated it, and we concluded that it was morally right and economically necessary

The most severe objective scrutiny will disclose the new law to be just that.

The $120 monthly benefit is reserved exclusively for those veterans who are in fact unemployable—who are blind, helpless, or otherwise so disabled as to require the full-time attendance of another person In addition, the beneficiary cannot have more than $1,000 income if single or $2,500 if with dependents

This law will add not a single penny to the tax burden of the American people. I cite this fact merely to refute the outlandish implications of cost that have been used against it. Every veteran who qualifies for the benefit will have already exhausted the last possibility of self-support. The only question, then, is how needed public assistance shall be provided: Whether through county or State taxes or through Federal taxes. It is obviously fair in the case of those who have served all of the people to distribute responsibility for their care among all of the people.

The burden, therefore, rests squarely upon the Federal Government. Public Law 149 recognizes this obligation.

Pension based upon identical principles has been awarded by the Congress to veterans of the War Between the States, the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion. A policy precedent thus has been four times affirmed by different sessions of the Congress in different periods of our history. Fifty-five years elapsed between the end of the War Between the States and provision of this type of benefit for veterans of that conflict. The Eighty-second Congress, by acting now, has assured that the intended beneficiaries of the World Wars and of Korea will have full opportunity to claim their right.

The President in his veto message complained that the measure would grant a special award to veterans "whose disabilities are in no way connected with military service." The complaint is as ill-founded as it is misdirected. Advisers to the President are in a position to know better.

The veterans who will receive the new payment are in large part those who have been and are drawing part III pensions for permanent and total disability. The latest Veterans' Administration hospital census conducted by the VA showed that of 19,632 patients in the general, medical and surgery (nonservice connected) category, 5,532 were receiving part III pensions, and 6,554 had disabilities connected with their war service Who can say that the service disability did not play a big part in bringing about the conditions that made these men permanently and totally disabled on a non-service-connected rating? To assume the contrary is crass speculation.

According to the same VA census, 1,808 patients among the 19,632 rated as nonservice connected were then awaiting the outcome of claims filed for the purpose of establishing service connection. As you can well realize, the margin of human error in the process of adjudicating such claims is great How much greater the error to imply a prejudgment against the claimant.

As of July 31, there were 312,000 veterans drawing pensions for permanent and total disabilities rated as nonservice connected. This included 30,406 World War II veterans Less than 8 percent—or only 8 out of 100—of the total group are expected to qualify for benefits under the new law.

Were they all bedridden and therefore eligible for this new pension, the obligation upon the Government would be just as binding.

The American Legion is concerned about the high cost of government. But the American Legion is equally concerned about the high responsibility of government, and we condemn and deplore the double-standard viewpoint of those who would make cost the all-important index of the merit of veterans' legislation while assigning it only moderate importance in other sectors.

Of all the legislative proposals which come before you, those affecting veterans are the only ones which are consistently presented to the reading public on the basis of cost in the year 2000. Most Americans knew the projected cost of the pension bill by the end of the century before they knew the nature of the bill itself. And the basis of the projection in this instance as in many others remains a highly mysterious question.

The Congress within the week has approved a salary increase for government workers We are in sympathy with your action But so far as we can determine, no voice has been raised to point out that the consequent cost to the taxpayers will be some $25,000,000,000 by the end of the century.

Certain elements of the population long have regarded veterans' benefits as the soft underbelly of government spending Organizations have been formed under varied and attractive aliases for the sole purpose of dulling the public sense of responsibility as regards veterans' rehabilitation We sometimes wonder if individuals who lead such groups consult either their conscience or the realities of human suffering.

Public Law 149 is a good law It is a law to be proud of. And it is to the lasting credit of Members of the United States Congress—a mark of your moral and political

courage—that you resisted the pressures put upon you to forget these needy veterans.

Sincerely,

ERLE COCKE, Jr.,
National Commander.

EMERGENCY PROFESSIONAL HEALTH TRAINING ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946, to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT The Senate has before it Senate bill 337, to which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has reported a complete substitute.

Mr. PASTORE obtained the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

The VICE PRESIDENT Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr SALTONSTALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll

Mr. SALTONSTALL Mr President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE Mr. President, the pending bill is S. 337—a bill designed to provide critically needed financial assistance to those schools on which this Nation depends to train the doctors and nurses so badly needed both by our Armed Forces and by the civilian population of this Nation.

Before discussing the bill in detail, Mr. President, I should like to make four flat statements of fact. I should like to state, first, that this is emergency legislation designed to meet a real and critical emergency situation. Secondly, the objectives sought by this proposed legislation are directly related both to the immediate needs of our Armed Forces and to our civilian defense program. Third, that while this measure calls for an outlay of many millions of dollars—367,000,000 in 5 years, to be a little more exact—this is nonetheless an economy measure. The money involved would represent an investment in the future health of this Nation. Finally, I should like to state that S. 337 is one of the most carefully considered and most soundly drawn measures before the Senate.

These statements, Mr. President, are, I think, thoroughly justified and amply explained in the report which accompanies this bill. That they are justified is also apparent, I believe, to anyone who realizes that this bill is sponsored by the entire membership of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Our committee is comprised in part of men who serve also on the Foreign Relations or the Armed Services Committee, and can be expected to know our emergency needs and to know just which measures are related to defense. These men are cosponsors of this bill. On our committee are also some of the Senate's most sincere and outspoken advocates of Federal economy. These men, too, are cosponsors of S. 337. Finally, our committee contains men whose records as legislators are such as to guarantee that their names would never appear on a bill unless it were soundly drawn. They, too, are cosponsors of S 337 In short, Mr President, our committee, whose members represent every section of the country, as well as both political parties, and which is fully aware of its grave responsibilities in this time of crisis, is unanimous in reporting to the Senate its belief that this bill should receive prompt and favorable action

Mr. President, I should like to talk about the need for such a measure as the one now before the Senate because I agree wholeheartedly with the junior Senator from Illinois when he insists that this Congress should not be concerning itself with legislation, particularly not with legislation involving the expenditure of large sums of money, unless there are immediate, real, and compelling reasons to do so

This bill would provide grants to help our medical, dental, osteopathic, and nursing schools meet their costs of instruction, it would provide funds to aid these schools in expanding their enrollment and their output, it would provide funds for a pilot program of plant expansion, and would provide scholarships in those fields where we do not now have sufficient students.

This bill arose out of four pressing needs: First, the need for additional funds if these schools are to barely maintain their current output of doctors and nurses; second, the Nation's need for a great many more physicians and nurses than our schools are turning out; third, the need for a great increase in the financial support extended these schools if they are to even think of expanding their enrollment; and, finally, a most pressing need to bring about an increase in the number of young women training to be nurses.

As regards the first of these, I should like to point out that all too few people are aware of the fact that the institutions which produced our skilled physicians, dentists, nurses, and public health officers are faced with financial problems so critical and so acute that few can continue even their present programs for long without prompt and large-scaled financial aid. We cannot expand these schools until we have taken steps to keep them in existence. Already no fewer than 33 of our country's medical schools have had to eliminate departments, reduce their faculties, and drop essential courses from the curriculum. A most thorough and authoritative study made public within the last several months shows that our medical schools alone need an additional $40,000,000 a year in current operating funds merely to perform their existing functions adequately. We simply cannot ask our medical schools to expand their enrollment until we first help guarantee their continued existence. S. 337 would do this by granting to each of these schools a sum approximately equal to one-twelfth of the cost of instructing each of its students.

At this juncture, I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the Senate, particularly the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia and the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma, that the committee is perfectly agreeable to shifting some of the emphasis originally placed upon maintenance of existing enrollments over to the aspects of expansion. It was in this spirit of compromise that the committee revised the grants for current enrollments from $500 to $200 in the case of medical schools and made corresponding reductions in the case of other schools under this bill, at the same time raising the grants insofar as they affect the expansion features of this bill.

At this point, for the convenience of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the table of grants, both as to the basic amount and as to the additional incentive amount, under the bill as reported by the committee, and as shown on page 13 of the committee report, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

School	Annual Federal grant per student	
	Basic amount	Additional incentive amount
Medicine, osteopathy	$500	$500
Dentistry	400	400
Dental hygiene	150	150
Nursing		
Degree school (basic training)	200	200
Degree school (advanced training)	400	400
Diploma school	150	100
Practical nursing	100	50
Public health	1,000	1,000

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, does the Senator from Rhode Island desire to finish his statement first, or will he yield for a question?

Mr. PASTORE. I think it would be much more convenient and would add to the clarity of the subject if I finished my statement first

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Very well.

Mr. PASTORE. At this point I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the basic amounts and additional incentive amounts as agreed to by the committee and as covered in an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr HUNT in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 32, line 6, strike out "$500" and insert in lieu thereof "$200"

On page 32, line 8, strike out "$500" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,000."

On page 32, line 12, strike out "$400" and insert in lieu thereof "$160."

On page 32, line 14, strike out "$400" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,600"

On page 32, line 18, strike out "$150" and insert in lieu thereof "$60."

On page 32, line 20, strike out "$150" and insert in lieu thereof "$600."

On page 32, line 25, strike out "$200" and insert in lieu thereof "$100."

On page 33, line 2, strike out "$200" and insert in lieu there "$300."

On page 33, line 6, strike out "$400" and insert in lieu thereof "$200."

On page 33, line 8, strike out "$400" and insert in lieu thereof "$600."

On page 33, line 11, strike out "$150" and insert in lieu thereof "$65."

On page 33, line 13, strike out "$100" and insert in lieu thereof "$185."

On page 33, line 20, strike out "$100" and insert in lieu thereof "$35."

On page 33, line 22, strike out "$50" and insert in lieu thereof "$115."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, turning now to our second great need—that for a vastly increased number of doctors and nurses—I think I can be quite brief. I do not believe that there is a single man on the floor of the Senate who does not agree that even before the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, whole areas of this country were sadly deficient in the number of doctors and nurses needed to render adequate care to our people. Since the outbreak of the war in Korea, thousands of doctors and nurses have been called to serve in our Armed Forces, and the Armed Forces have announced that at the end of this current fiscal year they will need more than 11,000 more physicians to service our 3,500,000-man Army. Obviously, the withdrawal of 11,000 physicians from civilian life will mean that millions of people will lose their doctors and will have to seek service from other doctors already overburdened by their current patient load. Consider, too, the fact that the last report from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs points out that there are enough wards in veterans' hospitals now closed because of inability to recruit medical personnel to make a total equal to 16 average hospitals.

Mr. President, just think of this when you hear talk of economy. Sixteen hospitals, costing millions of dollars, fully built, completely equipped, waiting to go—thousands of patients waiting to enter those hospitals—patients who, if they were restored to health, would once again become wealth-producing, tax-paying members of our society. Yet these 16 hospitals stand empty because they cannot get the necessary medical personnel—because we "economized" on our medical schools.

The same situation, of course, is true as regards many of our privately operated hospitals. Dr. Rusk, chairman of the Health Resources Advisory Committee, has told us that we have got to increase our current output of doctors by some 22,000 by 1954 if we are to meet our Nation's need for additional health personnel. No, I am sure I need not dwell on this point any further. Let me turn instead to the implications of this situation for our schools of medicine, dentistry, and public health.

We are, of course, asking these schools to increase their facilities, expand their faculties, and take in as many additional students as they can properly train. Their acquiescence in our request would be a recognition on their part of the national emergency created by shortages in the health professions. Yet, we cannot simply ask the schools to undertake a program of expansion when we know that for each additional student a school of medicine would take in, it would be assuming an added deficit of more than $1,500.

The average cost to the school, of training a medical student for 1 year is over $2,400. The student pays an average tuition fee of $600. Obviously, with medical schools already going bankrupt, they cannot under these circumstances expand without financial assistance. This bill, S. 337, would offer assistance to the schools in solving that problem. In this connection I would point out to those who have expressed some concern over the quality of training which might be given in an expansion program, that our committee has set up protections against any lowering of standards by not only limiting the total grants for costs of instruction to not to exceed 50 percent of those costs, but we have also stipulated that we will limit the incentive grants made to encourage increased enrollments to not more than 30 percent of the school's average past enrollment. In other words, because a few individuals have suggested that an occasional school might be tempted to overexpand its capacity because of these incentive payments, we have said that if a school had had an enrollment of 100 students in its freshman class during these last few years, we would make incentive payments, but for not more than 30 additional students. I would also point out that no school would be eligible for these grants unless it were accredited, and I am quite sure that we can rely upon the accrediting body of the American Medical Association to refuse to recognize any school which failed to meet its standards.

In the course of these last few remarks, I have explained two methods under which our bill would extend financial assistance: First, through grants to meet part of costs of instruction under present enrollments; and, second, through incentive grants to help meet the increased costs of additional enrollments.

Senate bill 337 would also aid in two other ways: First, by making available not to exceed $10,000,000 a year for construction of new, or expansion or existing training facilities. Since this $10,000,000 would be spread over the five categories of schools covered by the bill, whereas, our medical schools alone could use over $150,000,000 for construction, I think it will be obvious to all that the sum recommended by your committee is a very minor sum, indeed. Our major reason for so drastically limiting construction funds is that we recognize the complexity of the problems involved and, consequently, the desirability of moving forward on this front very slowly—certainly until the National Council on Education in the Health Professions, which is created by the bill, conducts surveys, analyzes the situation, and recommends to the Congress a detailed plan for solving the problem of providing adequate facilities in this field. Under the terms of the bill, the Council must report to the Congress within 2 years.

Finally, the bill would provide for a system of scholarships to be distributed as widely as possible among the States, and to be given only to students who evinced both outstanding ability and economic need, and whose applications had been accepted by accredited schools. Our bill restricts those scholarships to fields in which there are not enough applicants to fill the schools to capacity. Obviously, this is not the case as regards schools of medicine and dentistry. They now have many more applicants than they have room for. Unless this situation were to change radically, and we do not expect it to, the scholarships provided under our bill would go to persons undertaking training in nursing, practical nursing, and perhaps graduate work in public health.

I say to you, Mr. President, that we are confronted with a grave emergency in the field of medical education. We must act promptly in order to save our medical, dental, and nursing schools. If we are not content with merely saving those schools, but also recognize our responsibility for meeting the emergency needs of this Nation for a greatly increased number of doctors and nurses, we must do more. We must enable those schools to expand their capacity on a sound and long-range basis Therefore, your committee has prepared and now recommends to the Senate this emergency measure, the duration of which is limited to not to exceed 5 years, save in the case of practical nursing, and the operation of which is to be reviewed by a National Advisory Council which will report its findings to the Congress within 2 years after the act becomes law.

I have said that the need for the sort of action recommended in this bill is urgent; yet, despite that fact, your committee has taken great pains to see to it that whatever action is taken under the terms of this bill cannot in any way impair the freedom of the schools or their identification with their own local communities. On the latter point we have insisted that schools receiving aid must make every effort to maintain their existing sources of revenue In addition, we have provided that Federal aid in no case shall total more than 50 percent of the school's costs. On the first point, we have not only stated our intention to maintain the traditional freedom of our medical schools in the bill's statement of policy, but we have written into the bill itself specific guaranties that the independence and freedom of our schools will be preserved inviolate. That we have succeeded in these endeavors is, I believe, made manifest by the fact that the bill has received the wholehearted endorsement not only of labor, farm, and other lay groups, but of such guardians of the freedom of our schools from Federal domination as the American Dental Association, the Association of Deans of American Medical Schools, more than 60 individual deans of medical and dental schools, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Legion.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to read from the report of your committee with respect to the bill, as follows:

To summarize the need for action, we would note that even before the outbreak of Soviet-inspired hostilities in the Far East the Senate's Committee on Labor and Public

Welfare, on the basis of its own independent and thorough study of this situation, had come to the unanimous conclusion that legislation along the lines of S. 337 was necessary even if our only concern was to maintain the number and the quality of individuals being trained in the health professions. Subsequently, the President of the United States, having pointed out that "this Eighty-second Congress faces as grave a task as any Congress in the history of our Republic," told us that, in his opinion, one of the 10 subjects on which legislation was imperatively needed to further the Nation's mobilization job concerned "means for increasing the supply of doctors, nurses, and other trained medical personnel critically needed for the defense effort."

Now, having again reviewed the situation, your committee, whose members represent every section of the country, as well as both political parties, and which is fully aware of its grave responsibilities, is unanimous in reporting its belief that, in view of the current situation and in consequence of the intensified manpower problem in the health professions and of the increased costs of training, prompt and favorable action on this measure is essential.

SUPPRESSION OF NEWS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, last week at the time of the issuance of the OPS regulation to suppress news which might be embarrassing to that agency, I spoke on the subject of the Executive, Government-wide order on the classification of information which has the effect of suppressing the news.

In this morning's New York Times, I have noticed an article by James Reston. The article is headlined "Suspicion of news tinkering overcasts edict on secrecy—Approach of the administration to public information likened to a press agent's."

Mr. President, in the article the reporter has taken pains to point out seven specific instances of what is called suppression of the news. I read from the article:

Therefore, at Ottawa—

He was referring to suppression of the news at the recent conference at Ottawa—

a strict security policy was invoked. The following week, however, Premier Alcide de Gasperi of Italy came to Washington, and the Government wanted publicity. So the big information machine was put to work. Background press conferences were held all over the place, communiqués, speeches, statements of approval were issued galore. Officials who wouldn't look at a reporter in Ottawa were suddenly amiable and even loquacious on those aspects of the visit they thought would impress opinion in Italy.

MATTER OF NEWS VALUES

Just why this visit was more newsworthy than the visit of the Canadian Prime Minister Louis S. St. Laurent a few days later was not clear, but in the De Gasperi case the administration decided to make news while on the other visit—during which Mr. St. Laurent made the decidedly newsworthy suggestion that Canada build the St Lawrence seaway herself if necessary—the administration gave him short shift and even sent Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan to the airport to meet him.

In short, there is a widespread suspicion here that the administration tinkers with the news over and above the requirements of security, and partly as a result of the rearmament program, partly in response to Congress' emphasis on security regulations—

That is the only part of this particular article which I do not seem to be able to substantiate. I know of nothing in any congressional act nor do I know of any congressional intent to suppress legitimate news to which the people are entitled. And certainly I know of nothing to suggest that Congress had ever instructed the administration to propagandize any event or incident such as is related in this article—

is now more security-minded than anybody except the Russians.

Of course, the Senator from Michigan has always felt that the question of security should be paramount, but only questions of real security. Continuing with the article, which is very significant, I read:

At Ottawa, the United States Embassy was protected by the marines, who went to elaborate security checks before allowing reporters to enter the building, even in the company of high United States officials. At the Japanese Peace Treaty Conference in San Francisco, the State Department placed steel-helmeted soldiers of the Sixth Army on the stage until the Australians pointed out that, after all, this was a peace conference.

Thus, the new administration security-information order has received the raised-eyebrows treatment, because, regardless of its intent, it must be implemented by many men who have been playing heroes and villains with the news over the last few years.

Mr. President, I think there has been no more important regulation ever made by this Government affecting the people of the United States and their liberties, and the very foundation of this Republic, than the recent order of the President. I am glad that the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] spoke yesterday upon this important matter. The Senator from Michigan had joined with him in sponsoring a bill to set aside this order. Mr. President, I ask that the entire article be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUSPICION OF NEWS TINKERING OVERCASTS EDICT ON SECRECY—APPROACH OF THE ADMINISTRATION TO PUBLIC INFORMATION LIKENED TO A PRESS AGENT'S

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 2.—Several events of the last few weeks indicate why the press and radio have been slightly skeptical of President Truman's recent order authorizing Federal civilian agencies to withhold information from the public for security reasons.

Among these events were the following.

1. At the recent meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Ottawa Secretary of State Dean Acheson not only opposed publication of limited and officially edited summaries of the general debate on the world situation, as proposed by public-relations officers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, but also opposed publication of the agenda of the meeting. Incidentally, the official agenda had already been published when he opposed publication of it.

2. The State Department placed a "restricted" stamp on a catalog of the names and hotel addresses of the delegates at the recent Japanese Peace Treaty Conference in San Francisco. This prevented reporters from getting the list until other delegations, objecting to the ruling, made the list public.

3. The White House recently blocked publication of a report by one of its own top officials because the report was critical of some aspects of the administration's rearmament effort, and presumably because it coincided with the dismissal of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

4. The Treasury Department recently held back news of irregularity in the Internal Revenue Bureau in St. Louis until compelled to acknowledge the problem by disclosure on Capitol Hill.

5. After many weeks of negotiation with the NATO countries on sharing the cost of certain bases in Europe an agreement was signed at Ottawa last month. Not even the principles of this agreement or the percentages of the cost have been made public.

6. State and Defense Departments repeatedly denied reports of differences with General MacArthur over the conduct of policy in the Far East, though these eventually led to a dismissal for which the public was entirely unprepared.

7. The Department of Defense sat on the recent disclosures of the death of two officers of the Office of Strategic Services in the famous Holohan case until forced to release the information by an article in True magazine.

These are all run-of-the-mine cases. They do not compare with the administration's secret deal to bring the Ukraine and Byelo-Russia into the United Nations. Nor do they raise security questions, as did the Kuriles-South Sakhalin-China Railroad deal, which was designed to bring the Soviet Union into the war with Japan.

SUPPRESSIONS OF CONVENIENCE

Most of them were suppressions of convenience, designed to ease the process of negotiation, as in the cost-of-bases deal, or to save the administration embarrassment, as in Nos. 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

President Truman's new order on handling security information was not intended to protect or encourage suppressions of convenience. On the contrary, it specifically condemned such suppression.

Nevertheless, the order created some apprehension here because the administration's approach to public information is very much like a press agent's approach.

That is to say, the administration's tendency is to turn the flow of information on or off in accordance with the tactic of the moment, flooding the wires with news when it wants to put something over, and closing down on information if disclosure might prove embarrassing.

There were some security angles to the Ottawa conference that had to be handled carefully—although it is doubtful if any NATO military scheme can be put into effect in Europe without the Communists, who are part of almost every continental army, knowing all about it—but in the main that conference dealt with several basic criticisms of United States policy, which our officials did not particularly want publicized.

Therefore, at Ottawa, a strict security policy was invoked. The following week, however, Premier Alcide de Gasperi, of Italy, came to Washington, and the Government wanted publicity. So the big information machine was put to work. Background press conferences were held all over the place; communiqués, speeches, statements of approval were issued galore. Officials who wouldn't look at a reporter in Ottawa were suddenly amiable and even loquacious on those aspects of the visit they thought would impress opinion in Italy.

MATTER OF NEWS VALUE

Just why this visit was more newsworthy than the visit of the Canadian Prime Minister Louis S. St. Laurent a few days later was not clear, but in the De Gasperi case the administration decided to make news while on the other visit—during which Mr. St. Laurent made the decidedly newsworthy suggestion that Canada build the St. Law-

rence seaway herself if necessary—the administration gave him short shrift and even sent Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan to the airport to meet him

In short, there is a widespread suspicion here that the administration tinkers with the news over and above the requirements of security, and partly as a result of the rearmament program, partly in response to Congress' emphasis on security regulations, is now more security-minded than anybody except the Russians.

At Ottawa, the United States Embassy was protected by the marines, who went to elaborate security checks before allowing reporters to enter the building, even in the company of high United States officials. At the Japanese Peace Treaty Conference in San Francisco, the State Department placed steel-helmeted soldiers of the Sixth Army on the stage until the Australians pointed out that, after all, this was a peace conference.

Thus, the new administration security-information order has received the raised-eyebrows treatment, because, regardless of its intent, it must be implemented by many men who have been playing heroes and villians with the news over last few years.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, before I talk about Senate bill 337, the emergency professional health training bill, I should like to take the time of the Senate for a few minutes on the subject just discussed by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] who read to the Senate at some length from an article written by the distinguished journalist, Mr. Reston, in this morning's New York Times. Mr. Reston's story deals with the recent NATO conference at Ottawa, and cites seven case illustrations of information withheld from the public by Government officials or agencies.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at the close of my remarks, an editorial from last Friday's New York Times, entitled "Classifying Information."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BENTON. The order, to which Senator FERGUSON referred and which is discussed in this editorial is the President's recent order, which has been so very widely discussed, establishing a uniform system in the Federal Government for safeguarding information considered vital to the national security, information which, in the judgment of Federal officials, should be kept out of unfriendly or enemy hands.

The President's executive order for the protection of defense secrets, however, is only one side of the problem, as the article by Mr. Reston helps point up. The other side of the issue which may be equally or even more important, is the problem of making available to the American people the information they need if they are to make intelligent decisions.

The presumption, Mr. President, should always be on the side of full and prompt public disclosure of all information. Most unhappily that is not always the presumption in practice. Most unhappily, it is all too seldom the presumption in practice, as is disclosed in Mr. Reston's penetrating article.

However, I do not see how anyone can properly quarrel with the principle laid down by the President that the security rules should be uniform in all Government departments. This was the prime purpose of the President's order, and it is a most legitimate purpose. The purpose should not be abandoned, and the order should not be rescinded unless it is to be reissued in some other form.

Not so long ago security secrets were primarily the province of the State Department, the War Department, the Navy Department, and the FBI. Today a great many agencies all over Washington are involved, and all of them should be able to exchange information on the basis of uniform protection and according to a uniform system.

However, in my judgment the President's order designed to develop a uniform system should have been further elaborated so as to include some greatly needed new steps designed to help get information out to the press and the public. The order should now be strengthened, and it should now be greatly strengthened, in my judgment, in the public interest, looking toward more disclosure of more information, and more rapid disclosure.

I had more than 2 years of daily experience, Mr. President, with this problem while I was in the State Department. A part of my job was to help get information through to the public. As an Assistant Secretary I was entitled to see the daily "Top secret summary." I remember how astonished I was in my early weeks in the Department to discover that much of what I read in this top secret summary I had already read in the newspapers, in the news dispatches from abroad, and I may say, far better written and often much more complete than the State Department versions. I was astonished because I had not then learned, Mr. President, the great importance, from the standpoint of the State Department, of protecting their sources of information; and the way this need often forces the classification of seemingly innocent material.

I remember that I was even more astonished to see newspaper clippings coming in from abroad labeled "Restricted"—on the theory that we in the State Department did not even want any foreign agent to know what we were interested in. This seemed absurd to me then as it does now. One result of this system was that, at the end of a day of reading floods of dispatches and memoranda, even a man with a brilliant memory—much more brilliant than I claim to have—could not remember the exact classification of every item of information or where or under what circumstances he had read it. His best course was to keep silent about everything.

Mr. President, that is only one facet of the problem. Another facet is the tendency of people in the sensitive agencies to think that the particular projects they are working on are the most vital in the Government. This naturally makes them tend to overclassify their material. Some of them deliberately overclassify in order to dramatize to their superiors the importance of what they are doing. Others overclassify through fear of going wrong if they do not.

Even more deadening, however, in keeping information from the public, is the fact that the agencies have never had people in top key spots whose job it is to create a presumption in favor of immediate, full disclosure. There is no reward, and often some risk, in recommending disclosure. This is the inducement to the second flight administrators to play it close to the chest. There is no one to make the argument for disclosure, and the decision goes by default. Once a document is classified, then all related documents usually have to bear the same classification; and the system closes down

Within a few weeks after I entered the State Department I asked for a thorough study of this problem. I had decided that the news correspondence had a most legitimate complaint. At any insistence, the Department set up a committee to study the subject of simplifying and improving our classification system. The committee came up with a minor recommendation that was helpful but not nearly adequate. This recommendation was that the classification "top secret" could be used only with the personal approval of an Ambassador, or an Assistant Secretary or higher official; and that the classification "secret" could be used only with the personal approval of an office director or higher. As the matter had stood previously, anyone could attach any label he chose to any subject matter he originated.

My major recommendation was not adopted. That was that a team of five men—enough to cover the entire department—under the leadership of an outstanding man drawn from the newspaper field—should be appointed as Department officers with the job of making the argument in every case for full disclosure, forcing clarification of the reasons for nondisclosure, and with the right of appeal to the Secretary.

This was one of the many fights I lost in the State Department. This highly important fight, I hope, is still going on.

Two years ago, shortly before I entered the Senate, I resurveyed this question, as a member of the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development, and as a member of its subcommittee which prepared its report on National Security and Our Individual Freedom. The CED Committee, under the distinguished chairmanship of Mr. Fred Lazarus, of Cincinnati, worked out a formula not dissimilar to my proposals in the State Department, but at an even higher level and on a Government-wide basis. This proposal, as incorporated in the CED report, called for the appointment of an additional civilian member of the National Security Council whose function would be continuously to advance the presumption of the public right to information; to review the procedures regularly; to argue the case for disclosure instance by instance on important matters; to force a clear statement of the reasons for secrecy; to review the cases of withheld information regularly in order to determine if the need for secrecy had passed; with the right of appeal to the full Security Council in disputed cases.

The actual text of this section of the report follows:

The assignment of one of the proposed full-time members of the National Security Council to be responsible for a more effective flow of information to the public would tend to counteract the present trend toward undue secrecy. This official should study all security regulations and recommend to the President changes designed to provide all possible access to information without sacrifice of basic security. He should examine the practical administration of security regulations with a view to creating an atmosphere favorable to legitimate disclosure. And he should constantly press for the release of information.

There is no more essential job to be done in America than to keep the sources of public opinion as free as possible from blocks and obstacles The naming of a full-time member of the National Security Council to devote himself to this task would be a fitting recognition of its importance.

It will be necessary to keep security regulations under continual study to make sure that the curtain of secrecy is not drawn tighter than necessary Some information must be withheld But we believe that the regulations could be so drawn as to provide the citizen with much more information than he now receives.

More important than the letter of a regulation is the spirit in which it is administered At present, there is one-sided emphasis upon the importance of secrecy in the indoctrination of officers, both military and nonmilitary. A Government official is rarely commended for disclosure. He may, however, be reprimanded or otherwise disciplined for underclassification, that is, for failure to make material confidential or secret Accumulations of overclassified material can be found in many offices A better balance between secrecy and disclosure will give the citizen a sounder basis for exercising responsibility, without impairing the administration of security. Among the administrative practices to which attention needs to be paid is the custom of leaving classification in the hands of subordinates, especially clerks or secretaries. The resulting resistance to disclosure can be overcome only if there is positive pressure to release information.

Mr. President, the American people need today a top-ranking advocate of the people's right to know. He should have a counterpart in the various key Government departments fighting as hard to release information as some officials have been known to fight to suppress it. Such men, with real power, could in my judgment, do even more than correct the present condition which worries so many members of the press and which has been brought to the fore by the President's recent order; they could help provide the people with more information than they have ever had before about the key issues which can mean life or death for millions.

Two final and specific points: The system proposed in the President's directive involves four classes of secret information—top secret, secret, confidential, and restricted. That is the system which was used in the State Department in my day. It is still the system. Far from simplifying it, it is now being expanded to all departments. This calls for at least one classification too many. "Secret," according to the directive, "requires extraordinary protection" Confidential "requires careful protection." Restricted "requires protection." Does restricted material require protection that is less than careful? In my experience the category of "restricted" got handling that was actually careless, and furthermore invited sloppy decisions in marginal cases as to whether information should or should not be withheld. I would urge upon the President and his advisers the elimination of the so-called restricted category. Before expanding this system to all departments, I suggest the need, first, to make this important improvement.

In issuing his Executive order the President has expressed the hope that the policies he has set forth will mean that the American people will receive more, rather than less, information about their Government. All of us can share that hope. But whether that hope will be realized will depend, of course, on how the policies are administered.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to commend the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for his presentation, and ask if he does not agree that there are two things that must be done in this field. The first one is to protect the United States against the release of information which would be of value to an enemy or potential enemy.

The second is to protect the public of the United States against having the public's business kept secret when there is no real reason why it should not be made public.

Mr. BENTON. I agree this comment, coming from the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan, who has had a long and distinguished career as one of our leading journalists, is particularly appropriate.

My criticism of the President's order is that it does not go far enough, that it emphasizes only one side of the coin—

Mr. MOODY. Without considering both sides.

Mr. BENTON. Without emphasizing the other side of the coin, which in my judgment may be potentially the more important side of the coin and the more difficult on which to make progress

Mr MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr MOODY. I am very much interested in the Senator's suggestion of having what he calls a top-ranking advocate of the people's right to know. I think that puts it very well.

I may say to the Senator that yesterday afternoon when I returned to the city I called Joe Short, the President's Secretary, about this question I am, of course, convinced that there was no sinister intent in this order. It is an order which has been under consideration for a long time. I understand that some newspaper editors were consulted about it, but that there was no complete agreement on the question. I suggested to the White House that it might be well—in fact, it should be done, in my judgment—to appoint now a committee of top-ranking newspapermen. That committee should be charged, in my judgment, with the responsibility of reviewing this order. If selected from among editors, the committee could consist of men like Mark Ethridge, of the Louisville Courier-Journal; Lawrence L. Winship, editor of the Boston Globe; and Fred Gaertner, Jr., managing editor of the Detroit News. These and many others would be highly qualified to advise on this issue. It would be even better to assign this advisory responsibility to Washington correspondents like Raymond P. Brandt, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch; Frederick W. Collins, of the Providence Journal; Marquis Childs, the widely known columnist

Mr. President, I have named only a few.

There are many newspaper men who could be counted upon to review this order having in mind the two points I made a few minutes ago; first, the absolute necessity of keeping vital information away from the enemy; and second, the equally absolute necessity of not keeping away from the public anything that would not be of benefit to the enemy.

I should like to have the Senator's view as to whether he thinks it would be wise to call in newspapermen at this point and say, "Go over this order and tell us what is wrong with it. Give us advice as to how you would change it" I think it would be better to have active Washington newspapermen appointed to such a committee if possible.

Mr. BENTON. I very much like the suggestion of securing the views of our leading correspondents and journalists, Mr. President, though I am not sure I would want to take the responsibility, if I were the President, of selecting some newspapermen and excluding others. If the American Society of Newspaper Editors were to establish a committee to do what is being suggested by the junior Senator from Michigan, I believe that the findings of that committee would fall upon most receptive ground. The President in his statement shows that he is very much aware of the problem.

Mr. MOODY. Of course he is aware of it.

Mr. BENTON. The President expresses the hope that the policy he is setting forth will mean that the American people will receive more rather than less information about their Government. Of course, all of us share that hope.

Mr. MOODY. Certainly.

Mr. BENTON. The problem is whether that hope will be realized under the order as it is presently drawn up, and presently operating. I think the present need is to go still further, and I am sure the President will endeavor to go much further, in supplementing his present order, with a new order so as to give greater assurance that the hope which he has expressed can be realized.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to point out that the first sentence of the President's statement expresses his purpose and hope. He says:

I have today signed an Executive order to strengthen our safeguards against divulging to potential enemies information harmful to the security of the United States.

There is nothing wrong with that purpose.

Mr. BENTON. On the contrary, we must have uniform standards throughout the Government agencies. That is one reason why the order should not be repealed as demanded by the senior Senator from Michigan. It ought to be strengthened with other directives, to enhance the chance for the achievement of the hope which he expresses, that the American people will receive more rather than less information about their Government.

Mr. MOODY. I am sure that if there were appointed a committee of the sort I mentioned a few moments ago, either named by the Society of Newspaper Editors or named from the active corps of Washington correspondents, it would constitute a step in the right direction. In my judgment the Washington correspondents know more about this subject than any other group of men in the world. I think they know more than the editors know about it. I think they would do a better job in guiding the Government as to just what should be done in this kind of situation; and they would do an equally responsible job. I should like to see the Washington press corps take this subject in hand, or be given the opportunity of taking it in hand, to work out the sort of system which would protect us against the release of vital information to the enemy, and at the same time would make it perfectly certain, as nearly as any human relationship can be, that there will not be any clogging of the channels of information between the Government and the people.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I very much welcome the interruption of the Senator from Michigan. I trust his suggestions will reach the ears of the officers of the Press Club in Washington, as well as the ears of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and that they will receive the consideration which I feel they deserve.

I am sure it will interest the junior Senator from Michigan to know that serving with me on the subcommittee of the Committee for Economic Development, under the chairmanship of Mr. Lazarus, was Mr. Gardiner Cowles, the distinguished newspaper and magazine editor and publisher. Mr. Cowles had served during the war in the top role with the OWI. His observations as a result of his experience with the OWI coincided with my observations as a result of my experience in the State Department. We agreed that a real attack on the problem of disclosure requires an officer of the Government at the very highest level, with the right of appeal from the secretaries who head the great Government departments, with the constant determination to force an unending review of every case that can be made for disclosure. This cannot be done at a low level through subordinate officers, even officers with the rank of assistant secretary, in any one or all of the Government departments.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not true that while we must constantly bear in mind the obvious necessity of keeping information away from the enemy, we must guard against the use of the power to classify and make information secret for the purpose of covering up errors, or anything else anyone may want to cover up? Is not that the core of what must be gotten at in an amended or revised rule? It may be that the rule can be revised or amended, or it might be better to rescind it and issue a new one. I am not passing on that question now. All I emphasize is that we must not, in the interest of guarding the secrets of the Government, which must be guarded, clog the channels of information and allow officials in the departments to use the stamp for their own personal purposes.

Mr. BENTON. I agree further, the Senator's suggestions are received by me with strong personal feeling growing out of my experience in the State Department, where I had a very large amount of authority and power while serving as Assistant Secretary. The authority which I then exercised is far beyond the authority in the hands of the Assistant Secretaries today. There were fewer of us. We had fewer superiors. I reported directly to Secretary Byrnes, who was out of the country much of the time. For all practical purposes I found myself operating what often seemed to be a virtually independent, though affiliated, Government agency. If I could not get the job done in the State Department at that time, when I had that much authority and power, in my early weeks having about half the officials and employees in the State Department working under me, this should serve to demonstrate how difficult the problem of disclosure is, and why Mr. Cowles and I and others on the CED committee so urgently recommended the appointment of a civilian officer of the Government at the very highest level, with the right of appeal over the heads of the Cabinet officers to the President himself, to force and keep forcing the case for disclosure, and to act as the people's advocate on behalf of us all.

To conclude my statement, Mr President, I first suggest simplifying the four security categories by dropping one, namely, the "restricted" classification, and secondly I urge the adoption of the two recommendations which I have just outlined for the administration of the handling of information. If these recommendations are followed, we can, I think, be much more certain that the hope expressed by the President, that the American people will get more information, will be realized.

Let me urge that only a small and limited list of officers be allowed to classify information as "secret," and even a smaller group as "top secret." The right of the people to know what is going on in Government is classic American doctrine. If we are to face a continuing crisis over a period of years—possibly a 15-year crisis of national security, as suggested by some—this doctrine will be subjected to unprecedented strain. This doctrine so essential to our liberties and our freedoms must therefore be restated and refurbished, not only today and this week, but again and again as we look ahead, and it must be carried out in action. The suggestions I have made today are proposals for positive action which I feel this time of crisis requires.

EXHIBIT 1

CLASSIFYING INFORMATION

The sweeping Presidential order providing for the classification of information throughout all the executive branch of the Government raises serious questions It goes without saying that there are some matters essential to the national defense that need to be kept secret It is also apparent that we would profit by some uniform system of classification and release But after those things are taken into account there is still reason to question the wisdom of the form in which action has been taken

The Presidential order is broad in its powers but vague in its definitions. A striking weakness is the failure to make any provision for systematic and periodic review of how it is being put into use. Vast discretion is placed in the hands of a large number of officials with no adequate check upon how that discretion is exercised The result is that the effect of this order will depend on a considerable number of very fallible human judgments If those judgments are uniformly good the procedure may do little harm. If the judgments are bad the machinery that the President has authorized can be used primarily not to protect national security but to cover up the mistakes of officeholders that ought to be exposed.

Unfortunately, the tendency in the classifying of information is almost invariably to over-classify rather than to under-classify it. It is much safer for an uneasy security officer to stamp a document secret than to authorize its release. Some of the abuses of this tendency in the past have been positively fantastic, and there is reason to be apprehensive over their possible repetition under a system without adequate safeguards.

Thomas Jefferson several times pointed out that the success of real government by consent depended primarily upon the enlightenment of the electorate. A policy that tends to dry up information at the source through the device of classification will work against that enlightenment. We do not want security information to come into the hands of our adversaries if it can be avoided. But we do want all sorts of information in the hands of our public all the time

The President's order will be justified only if it is carried out with supreme skill and intelligence. That puts a heavy burden on a very large number of persons.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 2, 1951, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1786) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions and catastrophes of nature.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. KARL STEFAN, late a Representative

from the State of Nebraska, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S 1183 An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," as amended, and

H J Res 290 Joint resolution providing for the recognition and endorsement of the World Metallurgical Congress.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 3, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1183) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," as amended.

REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC NO 227)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives, p. 12558.)

EMERGENCY PROFESSIONAL HEALTH TRAINING ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946, to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Emergency Health Training Act, S. 337. I address you from many years of experience as a member of the board of one of the great voluntary hospitals in New York City, as well as a trustee of several of our institutions of higher learning. Out of these experiences I can testify that, today, even the maximum support from private givers will not solve the desperate financial plight of our medical, dental, and nursing schools.

As chairman of the Health Subcommittee, I have found the problem of the shortage of doctors and other health personnel confronting us at every turn. Almost every health problem, almost every measure to improve the health of the Nation runs into this same obstacle. And the professional schools which must train these people tell me, and tell my committee, that large-scale expansion of their training program and facilities is impossible without outside help.

As a former Governor of the State of New York, I can support the evidence that has come in from many States that the State legislatures simply cannot find the funds to sustain and enlarge their medical and nursing schools.

The process of training a physician or dentist involves one of the most arduous, detailed, and varied courses of study in our whole educational system today. Consider the complicated process of making out of an intelligent youth the kind of physician capable of dealing day after day with life-and-death matters, using the latest scientific knowledge, and often involving diagnosis of complicated and obscure illnesses. Training a graduate nurse is likewise a process that involves a wide range of learning Both require detailed and skilled supervision. For the very selfish reason that we and our families are the users of these services we would not want anything less than the very best training for doctors and nurses and other medical professionals.

Medical education is the most expensive form of training there is. One of the clearest expositions of why it must be so expensive is contained in a brochure prepared by the National Fund for Medical Education, Inc., of which former President Herbert Hoover is honorary chairman, and which includes on its board of trustees many eminent industrialists, educators, and civic leaders. They say this:

Medical education today is the most expensive field of education because of the special and intricate pedagogic techniques needed to train doctors and the personal relationship among doctors, student, and patient in the clinical years

More specifically, the following factors combine to raise the cost of medical education

1 The public and medical profession insist that every prospective physician undergo an intensive period of individual study in classrooms, laboratories, and hospitals before he can be allowed to assume responsibility for the life and death of his fellowmen

2 The training of doctors involves a large number of highly skilled teachers in proportion to the number of students—teachers who must be paid adequate salaries.

3 Medical education requires extensive laboratory facilities and specialized equipment which are costly to secure and maintain.

The cost of all this education, for each student, runs to over $2,500 a year. It may be even higher, since the last such estimate was made for the school year 1947–48. In subsequent years inflation has forced the budgets of the medical schools up some 40 percent

How are these costs met? Only about 25 percent comes from the tuition paid by the individual student. The remaining $1,875 for each student each year must be furnished by the school. Deans of the medical colleges, and such committees as the Surgeon General's committee on medical school grants and finances agree that tuition cannot be raised further without barring many deserving students.

I should like to call that 25 percent figure to the attention of my colleagues who asked, when this measure first came up on the consent calendar, whether the funds authorized for tuition and living costs for needy individual medical students under the selective service bill would not be sufficient. The reverse is true. Every time you enable an additional student to attend medical school, you are increasing the costs to that school by an average of $1,875 a year. The Congress must recognize that the sections of S. 337 which will enable schools to meet the costs of instructing increasing numbers of students, and the bill's provisions for grants to construct and renovate needed facilities, are an integral part of any plan to increase the number of doctors.

Despite the vast improvements that have been made since the end of World War II, I am sure that Senators will find, even on a quick visit to medical schools in their own States, that physical facilities are generally shabby, overcrowded, and makeshift Even some of our greatest training institutions still must teach and house their students in what can only be described as very distressing conditions.

I also invite attention to the fact that one whole great sector of the medical profession—graduate nurses—is made up almost entirely of women. Right now, according to the six national nursing organizations, there is a critical shortage of nurses For civilian needs alone, there should be 65,000 more professional nurses The Army is trying to recruit 3,000 nurses. I cannot foresee a lessening in the demands from the military authorities for graduate nurses. There is nothing in the Selective Service Act which will do what is proposed in this measure—provide funds for the schools to train additional doctors, dentists, and nurses

The recent report of the Surgeon General's Committee on Medical School Grants and Finances concluded that, simply to continue operating at present levels, the 79 medical schools need an additional $40,000,000 a year in current operating funds, plus another $330,000,000 for construction of facilities. These figures were supplied by the deans of the medical schools. And let me remind the Senate again that these figures were furnished in 1947–48 and now have been forced up 40 percent by inflation. These same men estimate that to put into effect their very laudable plans to increase enrollment by 22 percent would require an additional $18,000,000 for support of operations, and $244,000,000 for construction of facilities.

Surely, Mr. President, in view of the magnitude of the problem of doctor-training institutions alone, the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has proposed a very modest and frugal program. I shall not attempt at this point to give the costs of each category of aid which is proposed to be given to the training of doctors, nurses, and so forth. In each category of that undertaking the figures may be given more expertly by some of my colleagues during the remainder of the debate. I am glad to say, however, that it is estimated that under the bill the potential increases in personnel for 5 years' operation of the program would be 6,000 physicians, 2,900 dentists, and 33,000 graduate nurses, in addition to approximately 53,000 more practical nurses as a result of the institutional program for vocational training of practical nurses.

Mr. President, in my opinion, if there is any criticism of the amounts called for by Senate bill 337, it should be directed at the insufficiency of the sum. The sponsors of the bill may well be asked whether they have raised their sights high enough to enable our professional training centers to do more than stave off impending disaster. But surely, in view of the health needs of our armed forces and civilians, we can do no less and we must do no less than is provided for in Senate bill 337.

Mr. BENTON obtained the floor.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I shall be glad to yield if I do not lose my place on the floor.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, is a cosponsor of the pending measure and is now in the city of Detroit, Mich. He is there because more than 2,000 people have gathered there to pay him honor for the contributions he has made to the health and welfare of our people during his 17 years in the Senate of the United States. He is a student of the subject covered by the bill and has lived with it for more than 3 years. On the basis of that knowledge he has had prepared a telling address urging the Senate to pass the bill. I ask unanimous consent that his address be placed in the RECORD at this point as part of the debate, because I feel that his views are extremely important.

There being no objection, the address prepared by Mr. MURRAY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS PREPARED BY SENATOR MURRAY

Mr President, "Emergency," the first word in the title of the bill before you, conveys the sense of urgency concerning S. 337 which is shared by all members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

That sense of urgency was impressed upon each of us by the testimony of scores of the country's most distinguished educators, by the deans of medical schools, and by spokesmen for medical, dental, nursing, public health, and other professional organizations.

Our unanimous bipartisan sponsorship of this emergency measure attests to the gravity of the country's need for more doctors, nurses, and other health experts.

Our unanimous bipartisan sponsorship of this emergency measure bespeaks how clearly and unequivocally we realize that a financial crisis is undermining the great professional centers which are our only sources of such personnel.

Our unanimous bipartisan sponsorship of this emergency bill declares our conviction that at stake here is the health of every now living American, to say nothing of the health of our children a generation hence.

This is not overstatement to catch the attention of the Senate. I come to the choice of these words reluctantly. But lesser ones will not do. So with all the force and earnestess and conviction that is in me I urge your prompt approval of an emergency bill which will halt—at least temporarily—the deterioration of professional training and which will lessen the mounting shortage of professional personnel in the field of health.

Who among us here is not conscious that our Nation—the richest in the world—does not have enough physicians and dentists and nurses? Ever since 1939, when I first became a member of the Senate committee considering this problem, the statement that we do not have enough trained health personnel to put into effect certain contemplated health programs, however, desirable they may be, has been made by spokesmen of the American Medical Association. I can recall warnings from AMA officers that we do not have enough physicians to meet the increased burden which would be entailed by making the benefits of preventive medicine available to all our people Similarly, when proposals were made involving nothing more drastic than one physical examination a year for each person in the country, we have been told by representatives of the American Medical Association that we simply do not have sufficient trained health personnel to do the job

Those warnings from the American Medical Association, while they undoubtedly were not uttered for that purpose, Mr President, were nonetheless useful in focusing attention on the whole question of the training of health personnel and the adequacy of their numbers for our growing population They are most significant, Mr President, because they were made time and time again by spokesmen of the one organization which, now that we are considering legislation designed to produce more doctors, dares to suggest that perhaps we do have sufficient doctors after all

But I know I need not labor the point. My colleagues have already so established our need for more physicians, dentists, and nurses as to leave no doubt but that it is real and that it presents a most pressing problem To what they have said on this point I will add but one set of figures and two illustrations of that shortage Mr. President, between 1910 and 1940, the population of this country rose 43 percent During that same period the number of lawyers increased 58 percent; dentists, 76 percent; teachers, 86 percent; engineers, 212 percent; and physicians only 30 percent So much for figures.

Now as to whether or not particular localities have enough medical personnel to meet the needs of their people, let us take but two simple illustrations, neither of them extreme; neither of them overdrawn Ordinarily when we think of doctor shortages, we think in terms of rural areas We assume that great industrial States such as Pennsylvania are well provided with medical personnel and that if other areas need doctors, it is from these States that they should be recruited. Well, if this be true, Mr President, then certainly one would expect that in a city like Philadelphia with its great concentration of physicians—about 1 to every 425 inhabitants—we would find the surplus of physicians from which to recruit the medical men needed so badly elsewhere. But it just isn't so, Mr President. Dr Perkins, dean of the Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia, has stated that—and I quote—"even Philadelphia, with all its great medical resources, is none too well manned and has no surplus of physicians."

If Philadelphia, with 1 doctor for each 425 people, has no surplus, what then shall we say of the great State of Virginia where 29 counties have less than 1 doctor for each 3,000 people; where 4 counties have less than 1 doctor for each 10,000 people; and where 1 county has but 1 doctor for each 24,000 people. Or what of the great and well-to-do State of Ohio where in only 11 out of 48 counties is there a doctor for each 1,000 people and where in 12 counties there are more than 2,000 people per doctor? Those figures, Mr. President, were sent me by the Governors of Virginia and Ohio and, out of deference to my colleagues from those States, I hasten to repeat what I have already said—these are not extreme situations. The condition is far more serious in many other counties in many, many more States of the Union.

So much for our need for more medical men.

I shall be even more brief as regards the financial problem in the field of medical education since that too has been so well covered by my colleagues of your Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. First, as to how that problem affects the young men and women who are eager to serve humanity as physicians or surgeons, permit me just one illustration This year the tuition fee at the University of Louisville Medical School has been raised to $800 for Kentucky students and to $1,200 a year for out-of-State students As the Louisville Courier-Journal pointed out in an editorial urging the passage of this legislation, the raising of tuition rates to these awesome heights was forced upon the school by the financial difficulties it faced. But, Mr President, as the Courier-Journal also said—and I quote—"It will make it practically impossible for the son of the average Kentucky family to become a doctor" and "It will not increase enrollment or help to ease Kentucky's doctor shortage" The editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal makes a very cogent plea for the passage of this bill, Mr Fresident. I sincerely hope that in so doing he reflects the thinking of the people of that State and of our distinguished colleagues from Kentucky Certainly, his editorial convincingly sets forth part of the reasoning which forces our committee to urge the passage of S 337

Now, turning from the financial problem of the student to that of the schools, I should like to read in its entirety an article which appeared in the July issue of the Journal of Medical Education. I do this because I know of no more objective, thorough-going, excellently-reasoned presentation of the various alternatives which confront us when we think, as we must, of the financial problems confronting our medical schools—and permit me to say in passing that these problems and these same alternative solutions apply to our schools of dentistry, of nursing, and of public health as well

The article is entitled, "The Financial Problem—A Balanced Solution" It reads as follows.

"A financial crisis faces the Nation's 79 medical schools today It is of such gravity that the very existence of some of these schools is at stake The standards of all of them are in jeopardy.

"At a recent meeting of the National Fund for Medical Education, Herbert Hoover, the honorary chairman of the fund, revealed that one university has deferred for a year a decision to abandon its medical school 'because its deficits are too much of a drag on the whole institution' At another medical school the university authorities have debated, in recent years, the advisability of continuing to operate their school in the face of crippling costs. In both instances, the schools in question are privately operated. Both are parts of prominent universities. These are not examples of freakish economic situations in isolated medical educational communities. On the contrary, they are the end result, or near end result, of a process that has been in operation for some years, one which, sooner or later, will present all private schools and many State schools with insuperable financial problems.

"The present situation reaches a climax at a time when the national defense effort, spurred by the war in Korea, calls for the attaining of ever higher standards in medical education and the production not only of the most competent doctors but increasing numbers of doctors as well Medical schools the Nation over are already practicing rigid economies to keep afloat and to meet the obligations of the hour, yet no dean of a medical school wishes to court the prospect of returning to the pre-Flexner days in medical education.

"No financial wizard has arrived on the scene with an easy answer to the schools'

problem, it is doubtful that there is one A certain amount of reflection, however, will show that there are at least three possible approaches to a solution

"1 Medical schools in financial distress can retrench By continuing to snip away at the teaching program, by reducing equipment and the cost of instruction, it may be possible to bring expenses within hailing distance of current resources. That this would have a devastating effect on the caliber of instruction and thus on the competence of the next generation of medical graduates, no informed person denies At best, this approach—the idea of economizing through the evisceration of the teaching program—represents a foolish saving in money It is an utter extravagance as far as the Nation's health is concerned In the long run we would all pay dearly for such budget-slashing in terms of health standards and the demands of national defense There is no sense in spending needlessly more than one earns, but there is as little sense in turning out a second-rate product, especially when the well-being of the Nation is at stake. American medicine would not be supreme in the world today had our medical schools not viewed, as their primary objective, the production of competent doctors thoroughly trained in the complexities of modern chemical, physical, and biological science.

"2 A second possibility, a far more constructive one than blind budget-cutting, is for the medical schools to band together behind such an organization as the National Fund for Medical Education, a voluntary effort which is seeking its sustenance from a wide variety of interests in the American community. The fund represents a fresh and inspiring approach to a solution of the schools' financial problem The deans have backed it wholeheartedly Many of them have given much time and effort to this organization which, in the long run, may provide an original formula for the solution of the financial problems of higher education. In 2 years of organizational work the fund has collected something over $1,000,000, more than half of this coming from the American Medical Association's American Medical Education Foundation. The association is to be congratulated on its foresighted and constructive efforts in this direction

"3 A third method, and, we think, the most imperative at the moment, is to seek Federal aid to help to meet a mounting disaster before it is too late to take successful remedial action. The deans, therefore, are backing S 337, a bill that has been reported favorably by unanimous vote by the Senate's Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It has the endorsement of the leaders of both major political parties From medicine's viewpoint, S 337 is a good bill and it deserves the support of those who are interested in maintaining the standards of medical education in the United States. This bill is written is a temporary measure to help the schools through the present critical period. As hopeful as the National fund may make us feel about the future of medical education, the fund probably cannot stimulate more than a trickle of funds for the next year or two, or perhaps for the next 5 years. The fund's objective for the first year is $5,000,000, yet the Reed report estimates that the present needs of the 79 schools run to something like $40,000,000 annually in excess of their currently available funds, about $30,000,000 represents money needed by the private schools. Without additional support of this order of magnitude, the medical schools cannot do the job being demanded of them today.

"It goes without saying that the strength and independence of the medical school lies in maintaining a balance between their own unrestricted revenue, principally from private sources, and funds made available through the taxing agencies of Government. It would seem, then, if one views the present problem objectively, that the soundest approach for the medical deans lies in the continued and vigorous appeal for temporary Federal assistance We must continue to practice all sensible economies meanwhile, but we must be ever mindful that our job is to produce doctors worthy of the name, not just individuals who carry the identification 'M. D.' With this approach, we shall be able to weather severe financial storms, which may otherwise wreck our ship, and to sail on to new horizons in medicine"

There, gentlemen, is one of the most lucid and convincing presentations of the role which S 337 can and should play in aiding our schools of medicine to overcome the financial crisis with which they are threatened that I have seen Its logic applies even more strongly to our schools of nursing and of dentistry which cannot even hope for such aid as the national fund may in the future bring to our schools of medicine.

Mr President, I am sure I need say no more concerning either the Nation's need for more doctors and nurses or the need of the schools for financial aid The most important question which remains is whether or not this bill, S 337, provides a sound method of meeting those needs The distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island, in explaining the terms of the bill, has proved beyond question that it does To his remarks, I should like to add the fact that to my knowledge neither in this nor in any other Congress during the 17 years I have served in this body, has our committee reported to the Senate a bill so thoroughly studied or so carefully drafted as the one we are now considering.

We began work on this measure in the spring of 1949, Mr President We took testimony on the broad question of national health needs from a great many civic organizations We found that while there were many and strong differences of opinion on certain proposals, invariably the witnesses agreed first, that there was a most decided need for professional personnel in the health field and, secondly, that the Federal Government had an obligation to help meet that need As illustrative of this attitude let me quote the testimony given a House Committee by Mr Hugh Murray, Jr, speaking as the representative not of any liberal cause group but as the official representative of the conservative National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents. Mr Murray—I assure you he is no relation—said, "The association I represent is categorically opposed to all of the proposed national health insurance programs, as such, when considered in its entirety" Here is no radical, Mr. President. But Mr Murray went on to say, and again I quote, "However, in practically all of the legislation on this subject now pending before your committee and the comparable committee in the Senate, there are contained certain provisions which we heartily endorse as being in the future interest and welfare of this Nation from the standpoint of health and longevity.

"I refer to those provisions for aiding and fostering the education and development of a great number of physicians, dentists, and nurses, and for providing erection of vast numbers of hospitals and clinics throughout the country, both urgently needed.

"We believe in 'first things first.' We don't want the cart before the horse.

"It is an indisputable fact that there is a terrific shortage of doctors, dentists, and nurses in the United States."

Then Mr. Murray went on to say, "We believe that the following legislative actions will solve the basic problems involved:

"(a) By aiding the education and development of a tremendous number of doctors, dentists, and nurses.

"Obviously, no health program can hope to accomplish anything without trained personnel to provide adequate medical attention."

And, Mr. President, permit me to quote from the testimony given us by another organization ordinarily regarded as thoroughly responsible and conservative—the American Farm Bureau Federation. Here is what Mr. H E Slusher, president of the Missouri Farm Bureau Federation and chairman of the health committee of the American Farm Bureau Federation, told our committee:

"We also urge that facilities of medical schools be expanded, and that every effort be made to train more physicians, surgeons, dentists, nurses, technicians, and general practitioners, and public health doctors. We feel there can be no real solution to the health problem until sufficient men and women are available to meet the need"

Those statements, Mr President, are typical of the testimony we received from lay groups But, in addition, Mr President, we took prolonged and carefully analyzed testimony from no less than 18 organizations representing the professional organizations directly concerned with education in the field of health or with practice in that field. They included such organizations as the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association, the Association of American Medical Colleges and the American Council on Education, the National Association of State Universities, and the Catholic Hospital Association. The list is too long to read in its entirety, Mr President, but I have it here and I include it following my remarks.

Mr President, every one of these 18 organizations approved the principles underlying this bill—almost without exception they urged us to take prompt action expressing grave concern over the current situation. And that, Mr. President, was before Korea. Here are some of the things they said

The representative of the American Medical Association, commenting on the fact that medical school budgets had doubled in 15 years, said, and I quote: "Despite this increase, practically all medical schools require additional funds if they are to make maximum use of their present facilities and if they are to offer educational programs that approach the ideal" Asked how much the medical schools needed, the AMA's spokesman expressed himself as uncertain but quoted a study made by the AMA's Council in 1949 in which the schools estimated their need for increased funds for operational purposes alone at from ten to fifteen million dollars a year. And he went on to say, I quote, "I would emphasize a point that has already been emphasized, I think, by each speaker this morning If the quality of medical education is to be preserved, the schools must be provided with sufficient funds to correct deficiencies in their present programs before they undertake to train an increased number of students" Furthermore, Mr President, and this point has since become more important, the American Medical Association representative, when queried about the possibility of Federal interference with the schools, admitted that to the best of his knowledge, the Federal Government has never interfered in the manner in which expansion of hospitals, the establishment of clinics, or the conduct of research in medical schools—all financed in part by the Federal Government—were carried on.

General Simmons, speaking for the Schools of Public Health, pointed out that 80 percent of their graduates work for government—Federal, State, or local. Obviously, it would be most unfair to ask the taxpayers in just a few States to support these schools which meet the needs of the Nation. And it is equally obvious that it would be most absurd and wasteful were each State to finance its own school of public health when, by expanding the 9 schools of public health now in existence or by adding three or four more, we can more than adequately meet those needs. Federal aid was the only an-

swer, he insisted, and as to any consequent Federal control he stated, and I quote, "I have no fear of it."

Such was the type of testimony we received from all the witnesses representing the professional groups. They spoke of critical needs; of acute shortages; of crippling financial problems; and of urgent needs And these were wise, intelligent, sincere, and patriotic men and women holding responsible positions, Mr. President They not only spoke in vigorous, appealing phrases, but they provided example after example of real, concrete cases to sustain their statements. Take, for instance, the dean of Iowa State University's medical school. He represented not only his school but the Association of American Medical Colleges and he spoke for the National Association of State Universities as well Dr Jacobsen told us that at his school, while the student body remained as large and while under great pressure to take in still more students, they had had to delete from the school's budget, one professor, two associate professors, four assistant professors, and two instructors. "In our department of obstetrics," he told us, "the staff has been reduced from five to three—a dangerously low level."

Such was the testimony we received from all these organizations, Mr. President And as their representatives testified, I want the Senate to know, we sedulously inquired of them regarding a major point since raised in opposition to this bill—the fear of Federal control. Mr. President, just 1 of these 18 professional organizations expressed that fear as regards the bill now under consideration. Later, it said the fear was resolved. Now it has changed its mind again. That organization was the American Medical Association One out of eighteen, Mr. President, and that one is the only one which has never had direct experience with Federal aid. The other seventeen have had such experience—some for over 90 years—and these experienced organizations unanimously agreed that as regards this bill, they had no such fear.

It was through such hearings, Mr. President, and because of such testimony that the entire membership of our committee—composed of Republicans and Democrats representing every section of the country—was convinced that this bill was most urgently needed, that it was basically sound, and that we should urge its enactment.

But, Mr. President, we did not stop there in our efforts to perfect the bill. After all the public hearings were over we called in some 38 experts from the schools and universities; from the American Medical Association, and the American Dental Association, and the hospital organizations. In all they represented 40 institutions or associations. We closeted them with our staff, and we asked them to go over the bill line for line, to rewrite it completely so as to be sure it would do the job intended and do it without any untoward effects. That group worked and worked with great thoroughness and deliberation And, Mr. President, before they were through they presented us with a redrafted bill, which as I have said before is one of the most carefully drawn we have ever seen. I have here, Mr. President, the report they made us and on the basis of which, in a whole series of working executive sessions, your committee finally drafted the bill upon which the one now before us is modeled.

Mr. President, I want to read to the Senate just a few pages from that report. But because it proves so conclusively that this measure was soundly conceived and thoroughly thought out, I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the appendix of today's RECORD. Here, Mr. President, is, in part, the report made to us by Dr. Lowell J. Reed, of Johns Hopkins University, who acted as chairman of the group I've referred to. Referring to the general principles which the consultants felt must be carefully considered in any such legislation, Dr. Reed said as follows:

"Even more significant than the agreement on specific provisions which the several professional groups reached is the broad area of agreement on general issues and principles. There was no intention or effort at the start of the series of meetings to try to develop a group of underlying or general principles which would apply to all professional categories, but, as the meetings progressed, each group brought forward a set of prerequisites or essentials to any legislation in its particular field. The significant thing is that there was such an extraordinary degree of similarity in the general principles which were volunteered by each group in turn and which can be said, therefore, to represent agreement on fundamental considerations

"These points of agreement are so straightforward that they require no substantial elaboration or explanation

"1. There is a financial emergency in the schools which train for the health professions that requires emergency action. Pending legislative proposals are intended to deal with this emergency The specific provisions agreed upon as interim measures are subject to the finding of further facts through an intensive study during the first 3 years of operation on which a continuing program can be predicated

"2 There is a recognized need for a definitive study of needs and costs of training for the health professions Enough information is now available upon which to rest a sound program of emergency assistance, but a continuing program will require more complete data on needs and costs This information could be gathered and presented to the Congress within 3 years.

"3. All educators agree that the principle of local support and responsibility for these training institutions is of the highest importance and that any Federal support should be provided under conditions or limitations that recognize this principle. Federal assistance should be in supplementation of existing funds and some method should be found whereby the provision of Federal funds does not result in the withdrawal of funds from existing sources. The Federal contribution should not be more than a fixed proportion of the total institutional budget.

"4. In the determination by the Federal administering authority of accredited schools eligible to receive Federal assistance use should be made of the recognized professional accrediting bodies.

"5 The accrediting bodies which have been established in each of the professions should remain the principal guarantors and protectors of the quality of instruction.

"6. Federal interference with faculty appointments, professional curricula, admission policies, or the internal management of the schools must be avoided.

"7. There are recognized shortages of manpower in the health professions and many schools are already doing all they can to help meet these shortages in their present financial situation. Substantial expansion to meet the needs of the country cannot be expected until some financial stability for present enrollments has been achieved.

"8. Existing private sources of income are not able to meet the large needs of the medical and other schools for increased operating expenses, for necessary improvements and modernization, and for expansion.

"9. Scholarships will be helpful in equalizing educational opportunity for those who desire to get training in the health professions, but they ought to be awarded only to students who have previously been admitted to an accredited school.

"10. Indentured service provisions are contrary to sound educational policy and also unworkable.

"11. The need of the schools for construction is very great both for new space and replacement space. The inclusion of construction funds for replacement in present legislation should be addressed to efforts to relieve manpower shortages. If construction funds are provided there should be a limitation on the total Federal contribution.

"12. Regulations should be established and major administrative policies determined only after obtaining the advice and recommendations of an advisory council representative of the educational institutions and health professions and of the general public.

"13. The advisory council's recommendations on major matters should be reported to the Congress by the Surgeon General and the council should be given the assistance of technical committees of experts in the various fields covered by the program"

Mr. President, every one of those principles formulated by this group of outstanding experts has been incorporated in the bill now before you. It is a needed bill It is a soundly drafted bill. It is a good bill

But, Mr President, this bill is now opposed. At one time when the need was not so urgent this bill had the endorsement of every group concerned with its objectives And at that time this bill passed the Senate without a single dissenting vote But since then, Mr. President, two things have happened. First, the Nation's need for this legislation has increased immeasurably since Korea The second thing that has happened is that one organization—one and only one of the organizations which supported it now opposes the bill The first change, Mr President—the increased need—is one which should weigh heavily upon us, which should compel us to pass the bill without delay. The second change—the double talking of one organization—should be of no concern to us at all. However, since this one organization maintains a $3,000,000 a year lobby capable of flooding the country with half truths and untruths, I feel constrained to comment on its position For since the organizations supporting this measure cannot carry this story to all the people, it should at least be set forth in the record we are making here today.

Now, Mr. President, we know of the groups which support this bill. The American Dental Association is patriotic enough, unselfish enough, intelligent enough to urge us to pass it promptly. And the men who know the most about it, the men and women who manage our medical, dental, and nursing schools—they, too, urge its passage. And the men who would most fervently resist any encroachment on their freedom by the Federal Government—the presidents of our State universities, our land-grant colleges, and our great privately controlled universities. They, too, urge its passage. So, too, do veterans who know that 12 whole hospitals for veterans stand empty because we cannot find the personnel with which to staff them The Legion and the DAV urge you to pass this bill. And the Grange does, and the A. F. of L. and the CIO. So does every conscious, knowledgeable, patriotic, and unselfish group in the country. I shall not attempt to list them all. Reference to most of them has been made by my colleagues.

But, Mr President, we cannot hide the fact that there is one group which today violently opposes this bill to provide the Nation with the kind and the numbers of doctors and nurses we need. The American Medical Association tells you not to pass this bill. The AMA is the one organization which once supported the bill but which now—although nothing has changed save that we need it more than ever—demands that you, too, reverse yourselves and vote it down. The AMA is the only organization which, by its own admission, has wired, and I quote the AMA's own bulletin: "The members of its legislative committee asking them to notify their key men that the medical education bill was

likely to come to the floor of the Senate this week and requested that they get in touch with their Senator."

Well, gentlemen, I assume you have been gotten in touch with. I assume you know that the top command of the AMA wants you to defeat this bill. I assume you know that most of the AMA members, the doctors who are too busy healing the sick to politic, have never studied this bill. I assume that you know that those members of the AMA who know most about the bill—the deans of the medical schools—want it passed. And I assume—rather, I am sure—that despite a lobby spending three millions a year to influence legislation, I am sure you will defy that lobby and in the interests of this Nation and of the States you represent vote overwhelmingly to pass the bill.

I know you will because you know as do I that the AMA's position on this measure is absolutely untenable. You know, as I do, how false, how hollow-sounding, how thoroughly unworthy of credence are the arguments with which the AMA now opposes its passage. But, just so that the record my be clear, permit me to review the following facts.

The AMA testified for this bill. It admitted the need of the schools for more funds and the need of the Nation for more doctors. True, it did not think the need as great as do we. But the secretary of the AMA's council on medical education and hospitals insisted way back in October of 1947, and I quote him, "We are prepared to contend that the maximum deficit that could possibly be forecast for 1960 does not exceed 15,000 physicians", unquote. That's all, gentlemen, nothing serious; just 15,000 physicians short by 1960; just enough to take care of from ten to fifteen million Americans. Those were the AMA's pre-Korea figures, gentlemen. Now they tell us not to worry about this shortage. They tell us not to pass this bill because, one, there may be no shortage; two, Federal aid might mean Federal control; and, three, because although the schools desperately need tens of millions of dollars, voluntary contributions will take care of that need.

Well, gentlemen, I've quoted the AMA itself on the first of these claims. The last I'll come to later. But right now let me just remind you that the AMA once unequivocably supported this bill. I've quoted its testimony given before the bill was in final form. In that testimony it admitted the need of the Nation and of the schools. But it feared the possibility of Federal control of the schools unless adequate protections against that possibility were written into the bill.

Well, Mr. President, those protections were written into the bill as you have been told. And, Mr President, the AMA recognized that fact. In December of 1949, the house of delegates of the AMA approved a report by its council on medical education which said that while it was not entirely satisfied with the bill (primarily because we recognize osteopathic schools as do the States); nonetheless, the bill did contain, and I quote from the journal of the AMA, "safeguards that should protect the medical schools from unwarranted interferences in their affairs by the Federal Government". So much for that argument. That's the AMA speaking, Mr. President, and if it now talks out of the other side of its mouth for no apparent reason, I say to you, Mr. President, that it now talks nonsense. Imagine the Senator from Ohio, [Mr. TAFT], "Mr. Republican" as he is called, sponsoring a bill through which the Federal Government would control State and private universities. You can't imagine it, Mr. President—nor can the American people—nor can the individual doctors of America.

Mr. President, I could but I shall not speculate as to the devious reasoning which led the lay public relations directors of the AMA to counsel its officers to do an abrupt about face and to attack a bill to the support of which the AMA with much fanfare and publicity had publicly committed itself. I shall not guess at the advertising tie-ins, or the political tie-ins, or the future job possibilities which might have been involved. But I do want to say with all the force I can command that the reasons for this about face on the part of the AMA could have had nothing to do with the need for this bill; nothing to do with the objectives of this bill; nothing to do with the content of this bill. And they should have nothing to do with our evaluation of this bill.

And, Mr. President, one more point before I leave this altogether unpalatable but important subject. I think it is important that the Members of the Senate and the members of the press who are here today remember something that occurred in connection with this bill some 2 years ago. On August 22, 1949, the AMA top command and its public relations advisors came here to Washington in order to straighten out the thinking of our newspaper men and, through them, of the American people as regards the political and social position of the AMA. The gentlemen in the Press Gallery may remember the banquet that was served them by the AMA at the Hotel Statler that day And when Mr. Lucey of the Scripps-Howard papers questioned them as regards this bill, Dr. Lull, secretary and general manager of the AMA, said—and I quote from a stenographic transcript of that meeting—"We appeared before Congress in favor of that bill with certain modifications. There is no doubt about it that the medical schools have to have some kind of help. They cannot continue to run under the present financial structure, most of them."

Then, gentlemen, Dr. Henderson, president-elect of the AMA, told the Nation's press, and again I quote, "That is not so much a bill to get more doctors educated; it is simply that the medical schools of this country have a very difficult time financially to get along. They cannot get the private subscriptions that they used to get and it is so much more expensive today to educate doctors than it was say 10 years ago and, going back 50 years ago, there is no comparison. For instance, I know of one school that had applications for many more times more students in the freshman class than they could possibly accommodate. Well, those students pay approximately $500 to a $1,000 a year tuition and the very lowest that they can be educated on is $3,500 per student. The cost of medical education has grown so in the past few years that it is almost prohibitive"—unquote.

Now, Mr. President, just one more quote from that meeting. I believe it most important because it was in reply to a newspaperman's query as to why the AMA never supported anything constructive. Heatedly denying any such allegation, Dr. Lull told the press, and again I quote exactly, "We have approved and appeared for Federal aid to medical education."

Well, gentlemen, I do not want to labor the point. I would just like to say that when the AMA supported this bill, when it wanted to look noble and unselfish and progressive in the eyes of the American people, it called together the entire press of the Nation's Capital and having offered our newspapermen a most sumptuous meal, asked them to tell the Nation that the AMA supported this bill. But, Mr. President, when in some back room in Chicago, the AMA's so-called public relations advisers decided to change the AMA's collective mind, to reverse its position, to attack this so badly needed bill—then, gentlemen, the press was not invited, there were no banquets given, the public wasn't told—the gentlemen of the press might have asked "why?" Instead of that, telegrams were sent keymen—perhaps your personal physician or mine—and they were told to bring pressure on the Congress to defeat this bill. Gentlemen, in the names of the tens of thousands of decent doctors in America, doctors such as you know and I know, I resent this shoddy, indefensible sort of action which was taken in their names. I know we will not allow it to influence our consideration of a bill which means so very much to the welfare of this Nation and of its Armed Forces.

Now, in closing, Mr. President, let me allude to just one more argument sometimes raised against this measure: the argument that although our schools badly need the aid this bill will provide, they should seek it through voluntary contributions.

On this point I want no misunderstanding. I sincerely hope the drive for voluntary funds now being carried on by the National Fund for Medical Education under the direction of Herbert Hoover will meet with every success. I know the passage of this bill will stimulate contributions to that fund just as has been the case whenever we have made evident our recognition of a national need through the appropriation of funds for research on disease.

I am very glad to know that the AMA has contributed a half million of its own money to that fund even though I regret the fact that the AMA, which knew of this need a decade ago, waited until this bill was about to become law before it acted, and even though that contribution will not help schools of dentistry or nursing or public health.

And I am glad that the AMA is urging its members every week to individually contribute a hundred dollars a year to the support of our medical schools. But I am sorry to note that during the first 24 weeks of that campaign less than three one-hundredths of 1 percent of the country's physicians was in sufficient agreement with the AMA's position make such an individual contribution. No, gentlemen, that figure is not an error. For over 6 months the AMA appealed to its members to help solve the critical needs of our medical schools the AMA way. It asked them to do so each week during that period. On August 4, 1951, the Journal of the AMA listed the names of the doctors who had complied. They amounted not to 50 percent of our doctors, gentlemen; not to 5 percent—not to 3 percent; not even 1 percent of the physicians in this country complied. When you add up the list of those who did, you will find that it represents approximately point 003; three one-hundredths of 1 percent of the doctors of America agree with the AMA's leadership as to how that which the AMA itself calls "A Challenge to the Medical Profession" should be met.

But again I say, Mr. President, that I most sincerely hope that the efforts of the National Fund are eventually successful. I would remind you that the first brochure sent out by this excellent organization stated that, and I quote, "We therefore face the immediate necessity of finding an additional $40,000,000 a year for the support of our medical schools," I would remind you that the fund's literature told us and again I quote, "Certainly there can be no objection to the use of Federal funds in aid of the medical schools in the face of an emergency such as exists today." The directors of the fund—and they include such men as Herbert Hoover; S. Sloan Colt, president of the Bankers Trust Co.; Samuel Leidesdorf; Winthrop Aldrich; Winthrop Rockefeller; Owen J. Roberts; and other such eminently outstanding and respectable figures—these men told us that if the Federal Government should appropriate $40,000,000, it would leave approximately twenty-two million dollars to be raised from private sources. Well, gentlemen, the National Fund has been in existence almost 3 years since it made that announcement. Its members have worked arduously, intelligent-

ly, and at great personal cost. Yet the fund has raised—not forty millions, nor twenty-two millions a year, but slightly more than one million in 2½ years—about fifteen thousand dollars for each school; just the cost of training one student in each school.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope the National Fund succeeds in its attempt to raise through voluntary contributions the money needed to support our schools of medicine. As I have told the American Legion, should it so succeed, at any time in the future, I pledge you that I will immediately move to cut out all appropriations made for medical schools under this legislation. But, Mr. President, America cannot wait. America cannot take a chance. It takes years to train a doctor. We cannot stand here today and so vote as to assure Joe Stalin that he can count on a medically unprepared America for still more years.

In closing Mr. President, let me say just this. Since 1949 when the Senate passed this bill without a single objection, our needs for physicians, dentists, nurses, and other trained health experts have risen sharply. The shortage of 1949 has become the crisis of 1951. Because we did not put into motion a Federal aid program, many of our professional schools could not even maintain their standards, let alone expand.

From shortage in 1949 to crisis in 1951—but we must not let the 1951 crisis deteriorate into the calamity of 195X. There is before us the warning of the Task Force on Federal Medical Services of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government·

"The evidence shows that medical manpower is one of the scarcest of the resources essential to the country in war. Its production cannot be increased in response to emergency demands. It cannot be stockpiled "

Among the members of that task force were. Tracy S. Voorhees, chairman; Paul R. Hawley, M D., William C. Menninger, M. D.; Ray Lyman Wilbur, M. D.

Against a somber background of international tension and fear, I would like to stress one further consideration that compels support for this measure. the word "emergency" in the emergency Federal aid for professional schools bill, S 337, has a double meaning. The importance of training more doctors, dentists, and nurses to meet increased military and civil defense needs in this emergency requires no further elaboration before this body.

But I should like to stress the other meaning implicit in the use of the word "emergency" in the bill's title. Were the fear and dread of war to vanish before us tomorrow, we should still face an emergency in the ever-continuing war we wage for longer life and better health. Against diseases and crippling affliction and death, we are always outnumbered Our physicians and dentists and nurses must always fight against overwhelming odds. The least this Congress can do is recognize that our schools must be strengthened, must have funds to train more men and women.

Passage of S. 337 can at least help the schools train new reinforcements in the battle against disease and can prevent the tragedy which might otherwise result, should our people lack for doctors, dentists, nurses, and others. I urge a favorable vote in the Senate.

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS WHICH TESTIFIED ON FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION IN THE HEALTH PROFESSIONS

American Medical Association.
Association of American Medical Colleges.
American Council on Education (Committee on Federal Relations unanimously endorsed).
Association of Schools of Public Health.
National Association of State Universities.
Association of American Universities.
American Hospital Association.
National League of Nursing Education.
American Nurses Association.
Association of Public Health Nursing.
National Association of Public Health Nursing.
Association of Collegiate Schools of Nursing.
American Association of Industrial Nurses.
National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses.
National Association for Practical Nurse Education.
American Association of Medical Social Workers.
Catholic Hospital Association.
Association of American Medical Social Workers.

REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE STAFF OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSING FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION FOR THE HEALTH PROFESSIONS

(By Lowell J. Reed, chairman)

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY,
Baltimore, Md., June 24, 1949

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: In accordance with your request of June 9, 1949, I have served as moderator of a group of meetings at which representatives of educational institutions and professional and administrative organizations in the health professions discussed the details of legislative and administrative provisions that they would find acceptable in a program of Federal aid to education in medicine, dentistry, public health, and nursing My report of these discussions and the conclusions reached is respectfully submitted herewith.

I have been charged by all those who took part in these discussions to convey to you their sincere appreciation of the opportunity you have accorded them to participate in working out the details of legislation which will be of such importance in maintaining and improving the quality of education and assuring the stability of institutions during their current financial emergency.

Sincerely yours,

LOWELL J REED,
Vice President in Charge of Medical Affairs.

INTRODUCTION

Open hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for a week—June 6–10, 1949—giving those who wished to testify an opportunity to present their opinions on the provisions of title I of S 1679 and title VI of S. 1581, which would establish programs of financial aid to education in the health professions. In the impressive body of testimony given by representatives of educational institutions, professional organizations and administrators in the fields of medicine, dentistry, public health, and nursing substantial agreement was expressed on the urgent needs for Federal aid to education and on the objectives of the programs outlined in both bills. It appeared from the testimony, moreover, that with relatively little adjustment of details the provisions of S. 1679 would be acceptable to the educators in the professions concerned. All witnesses were therefore asked if they could hold themselves available during the following week to discuss with the staff of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the changes which they considered necessary to insure endorsement of the bill by the organizations which they represented. All agreed.

Accordingly, during four full days, a series of working sessions with representatives of educational organizations in the respective professions discussed the specific adjustments which would assist the Senate committee in reconciling any differences of opinion on legislative and administrative details of the bill. Dr. Lowell J. Reed, vice president, Johns Hopkins University, served as chairman of the sessions. All meetings were attended by Dr. Carlyle F. Jacobsen, executive dean of the division of health sciences and services of the State University of Iowa, representing the National Association of State Universities; by Mr. William G. Reidy and Mr. Melvin W. Sneed, of the staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and by Dr. W. Palmer Dearing, Deputy Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, and selected members of his staff.

A full day—June 14—was spent on discussion of provisions for dental education, with the following participants:

Dr Basil G. Bibbey, professor of dentistry, University of Rochester; and for Dr. Leonard Carmichael, president of Tufts College, representing the American Council on Education.

Dr. Russell W. Bunting, dean, University of Michigan Dental School.

Dr. John P Burke, dean, Georgetown University Dental School.

Dr. J. Ben Robinson, dean, University of Maryland Dental School and Informal Committee of Deans of Dental Schools.

Two full days (June 15 and 16) were devoted to medical education, with the following participants:

Dr. Donald Anderson, secretary, council on medical education and hospitals, American Medical Association.

Dr. George Berry, associate dean, University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry, Association of American Universities, and executive council, Association of American Medical Colleges.

Dr. Joseph C. Hinsey, dean, Cornell Medical School, and chairman, executive council, Association of American Medical Colleges (second day only).

Dr. Victor Johnson, director, Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research, and council on medical education and hospitals, American Medical Association.

Dr. Joseph S. Lawrence, director, Washington office, American Medical Association.

Mr. A H. Monk, director, Training Facilities Service for Vocational Rehabilitation and Education, Veterans' Administration (second day only).

Dr. William Perkins, dean, Jefferson College of Philadelphia Medical School.

Father William Rooney, professor, Catholic University.

Dr. Dean F. Smiley, secretary, Association of American Medical Colleges.

Mr. E. K Taylor, business manager, College of Medicine, Cornell University (second day only).

Dr. Harvey Stone, council on medical education and hospitals, American Medical Association.

Dr. Herman G. Weiskotten, dean, Syracuse University College of Medicine, and chairman, council on medical education and hospitals, American Medical Association.

Mr. Albert V. Whitehall, secretary, council on Government relations, American Hospital Association.

Discussion of public health education was completed in one-half day (morning of June 17) with the following participants:

Dr. Gaylord Anderson, director, School of Public Health, University of Minnesota, and secretary, Association American Schools of Public health.

Mr. George Brakeley, public relations consultant to Harvard University.

Dr. Thorndyke Saville, dean of engineering, New York University, and vice president, American Society for Engineering Education.

Dr. James S. Simmons, dean, School of Public Health, Harvard University, and president, Association American Schools of Public Health.

One-half day (afternoon of June 17) was given to nursing education with the following participants:

Miss Edith Beattie, executive secretary, Graduate Nurses' Association, Washington, D. C., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Mr. George Bugbee, executive director, American Hospital Association.

Miss Olwen Davies, Associate director, National Organization for Public Health Nurses, New York City, and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Miss Margaret Foley, executive secretary, Association of Catholic Schools of Nursing.

Miss Deborah Jensen, professor of nursing education, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Miss Irene Murchison, director, School of Nursing at Loretta Heights College, Loretta, Colo., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Sister Olivia, dean, School of Nursing, Catholic University, Washington, D. C., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Miss Blanche Pfefferkorn, director of department of studies, the National League of Nursing Education, New York City, and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Mr. Donald Smith, attorney, American Nurses' Association.

Mrs. Eugenia Spaulding, director, division of nursing, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Mr. Albert V. Whitehall, secretary, Council on Governmental Relations, American Hospital Association.

Sister Xavier, director, Mercy Hospital School of Nursing, Grand Rapids, Mich.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Even more significant than the agreement on specific provisions which the several professional groups reached is the broad area of agreement on general issues and principles. There was no intention or effort at the start of the series of meetings to try to develop a group of underlying or general principles which would apply to all professional categories but, as the meetings progressed, each group brought forward a set of prerequisites or essentials to any legislation in its particular field. The significant thing is that there was such an extraordinary degree of similarity in the general principles which were volunteered by each group in turn and which can be said, therefore, to represent agreement on fundamental considerations.

These points of agreement are so straightforward that they require no substantial elaboration or explanation.

1. There is a financial emergency in the schools which train for the health professions that requires emergency action. Pending legislative proposals are intended to deal with this emergency. The specific provisions agreed upon as interim measures are subject to the finding of further facts through an intensive study during the first 3 years of operation on which a continuing program can be predicated.

2. There is a recognized need for a definitive study of needs and costs of training for the health professions. Enough information is now available upon which to rest a sound program of emergency assistance but a continuing program will require more complete data on needs and costs. This information could be gathered and presented to the Congress within 3 years.

3. All educators agree that the principle of local support and responsibility for these training institutions is of the highest importance and that any Federal support should be provided under conditions or limitations that recognize this principle. Federal assistance should be in supplementation of existing funds and some method should be found whereby the provision of Federal funds does not result in the withdrawal of funds from existing sources. The Federal contribution should not be more than a fixed proportion of the total institutional budget.

4. In the determination by the Federal administering authority of accredited schools eligible to receive Federal assistance use should be made of the recognized professional accrediting bodies.

5. The accrediting bodies which have been established in each of the professions should remain the principal guarantors and protectors of the quality of instruction.

6. Federal interference with faculty appointments, professional curricula, admission policies, or the internal management of the schools must be avoided.

7. There are recognized shortages of manpower in the health professions and many schools are already doing all they can to help meet these shortages in their present financial situation. Substantial expansion to meet the needs of the country cannot be expected until some financial stability for present enrollments has been achieved.

8. Existing private sources of income are not able to meet the large needs of the medical and other schools for increased operating expenses, for necessary improvements and modernization, and for expansion.

9 Scholarships will be helpful in equalizing educational opportunity for those who desire to get training in the health professions, but they ought to be awarded only to students who have previously been admitted to an accredited school.

10. Indentured service provisions are contrary to sound educational policy and also unworkable.

11. The need of the schools for construction is very great both for new space and replacement space The inclusion of construction funds for replacement in present legislation should be addressed to efforts to relieve manpower shortages. If construction funds are provided there should be a limitation on the total Federal contribution.

12. Regulations should be established and major administrative policies determined only after obtaining the advice and recommendations of an advisory council representative of the educational institutions and health professions and of the general public.

13. The advisory council's recommendations on major matters should be reported to the Congress by the Surgeon General and the council should be given the assistance of technical committees of experts in the various fields covered by the program.

DENTAL SCHOOLS, INCLUDING SCHOOLS OF DENTAL HYGIENE

In discussing the application of S. 1679 to dental schools and to schools of dental hygiene, the conference considered a digest of the testimony which had previously been given before the subcommittee and this digest formed the basis of the discussions.

Basic grant

The several witnesses who had specifically mentioned the necessity and advisability of making a minimum operating grant to the schools of dentistry and the schools of dental hygiene, had each emphasized the huge backlog of necessary dental work in the general population, the inadequacy of the present annual graduates to approximate the number of dentists needed, the precarious financial situation of many of the present dental schools, and their need for early financial assistance. It was pointed out that many dental schools support themselves in large measure by overloading their clinics in order to augment their incomes. In these schools, the lack of a fiscal deficit is often testimony to an educational deficit resulting from overloaded teaching staff, insufficient facilities and equipment, and concentration on the revenue-producing clinic activities. In others, there is an outright fiscal deficit.

The average cost of educating a dental student is $1,500 per student per year; the average income from tuition and fees is nearly $450. One-fourth of the average annual cost per student would be about $400, as contrasted with a figure of about $500 which represents one-fourth of the average annual costs in medical schools. While the group agreed to accept the per capita grant of $250 per dental student proposed in S. 1679, need was expressed for a closer parity with medical schools.

A differential between the grants for medical schools and dental schools is acceptable to the dental profession only because of the acknowledged fact that the current costs of medical education are greater than the cost of dental education, because the financial situation of the medical schools is more urgent, and because of the general public acceptance of the wisdom of some differential. There was objection to such a differential on principle.

Representatives of the dental profession were anxious that Federal assistance should not be limited to schools operating on a 12-month basis. The basis for all grants should be the academic year of 36 weeks (or other definition established by the academic calendar of each institution) with authority in the proposed Council to provide by regulation for adjustments to schools which operate on other than the 9-month basis.

Incentive grant

A mere recitation of the total dental enrollments in the immediate prewar and in the immediate postwar years shows that a very considerable expansion has already taken place in the dental schools, whereas before World War II the dental schools were operating at only 75 percent capacity, all available places in the schools are now full. This is believed to be largely attributable to the effects of the GI educational bill, and it naturally causes some apprehension about what will happen to enrollments when the present legislation expires within the next few years. In any event, at present all classes are now full, and there is little likelihood of further expansion without additional construction.

The concept of a larger per capita grant for additional students was accepted by the dental representatives as a reasonable device to encourage all possible expansion. In order to prevent unreasonable expansion, without an increase of facilities, at the expense of the quality of instruction, however, there ought to be some limit. It was agreed that there should be a top limit of 10 percent of present average enrollment of each school.

Although the grant proposed in S 1679 (namely, $1,350) for each additional student was finally accepted as a reasonable basis by the group, one or more had expressed themselves as favoring a lesser sum, such as $750 or one-half the average annual cost per student. Others felt that the actual incentive grant figure was not very important during the 3-year period intended to be covered by the bill, because practically all schools are at capacity at present and not very many incentive students can be added.

Scholarships

Every member of the group felt that it was important to clarify at the outset the intent or objective of the scholarship program proposed. (This necessity was also expressed by each subsequent group of witnesses.) Scholarships may have at least two purposes, namely, (1) to equalize educational opportunity or to remove the financial barrier to advanced training, or (2) to stimulate recruitment of additional numbers or a higher quality of applicants seeking advanced training.

The representatives of the dental schools emphasized that scholarships were not

needed now to induce additional students to seek admission to dental schools but that they very likely would be necessary when the GI educational benefits expired. On the understanding that scholarships for dental education were intended at this time primarily as a device to equalize educational opportunity, the dental schools accepted and endorsed a scholarship program

There was an almost unanimous opposition to the provisions requiring a period of obligated service as repayment of a scholarship. It might be retained as an alternative if the Congress insisted, but this whole problem of the future obligation of scholarship holders should be studied at length by whatever study group might be established.

One or more of the conferees expressed the view that scholarships ought not to be so generous that they covered the entire needs of the holders. A necessity to find a portion of his total needs should remain the responsibility of all subsidized students.

Construction

The needs of the dental schools for new plant—both additional and replacement space—are very great, and there must be substantial construction before there can be appreciable expansion Moreover, several schools are in such urgent need for improvement or replacement of their present physical plant they will either have to find ways to get such a new plant or face limiting enrollments or outright closure in the near future.

The proposed 50 percent limit on Federal contribution to any such construction was approved as sound in principle and satisfactory in proportion.

The representatives of the dental schools felt that the main emphasis in the construction provisions was rightly put on new construction and on the expansion and improvement of existing structures with reference to the extension of enrollment capacity.

Administrative provisions

There was an extended discussion of the function of the proposed National Advisory Council, and, although there was at first some discussion in favor of lodging administrative responsibilities for recommending and reviewing programs in the council, the dental schools recognized the legal responsibility of the full-time administrator and the impropriety of control by a part-time group without legal responsibility for the program. They expressed themselves as completely satisfied with the predominant advisory and consultative role but indicated that the functions of the council should be specified more clearly and that the report to Congress should detail the council's recommendations on major issues.

It was also agreed that a council of nearly 25 was too large, that it ought to be cut to perhaps 12 and that each major professional area should be represented (except dental hygiene).

With reference to the prohibition against "unreasonable discrimination" against out-of-State students, there was some discussion around the danger of rigidity or of possibly requiring State institutions to do more than they could The expectancy that, with Federal assistance, the schools should serve more than a purely local function was readily accepted by the schools, but there was some apprehension lest regulations might require a rigid figure or percentage of out-of-State students for all schools. There were no specific suggestions for appropriate safeguards.

Survey

The representatives of the dental schools readily agreed that a careful and thoughtful study of the areas covered by the bills was urgently needed. They made no specific recommendation on what agency should make the study, nor how it should be conducted. The discussion included reference to the likelihood that issues of dental needs and services beyond the scope of the study required by present title I of S. 1679 would surely arise—an issue which was discussed at great length and clarified with representatives of the medical schools and professions (see below)—and it was felt by several that an independent commission should be created for any such task. On the other hand, it was recognized that there was real advantage in having the study of the costs and needs of schools carried on by the operating agency had real merit.

Schools of dental hygiene

The representatives of the dental schools felt that there was urgent need for training additional numbers of dental hygienists and that the training facilities in the country should be very considerably expanded In general, the present provisions of title I of S 1679 were believed to be wholly satisfactory, except that there was little need to have them represented on the proposed council, their interests were said to be adequately represented by dental members. There was general agreement on the lack of adequate information on the required curricula, and some apprehension was expressed over the need for suitable licensing legislation in several States and for an accrediting body to set standards

Participants Dr Basil G Bibbey, professor of dentistry, University of Rochester, and for Dr Leonard Carmichael, president of Tufts College, representing the American Council on Education, Dr Russell W Bunting, dean, University of Michigan Dental School; Dr John P Burke, dean, Georgetown University Dental School, Dr J Ben Robinson, dean, University of Maryland Dental School, and Informal Committee of Deans of Dental Schools

MEDICAL SCHOOLS

In discussing the application of title I of S 1679 to medical schools, the conference began by considering a brief digest of the testimony which had been given before the subcommittee in formal hearings. Each group was asked whether they had any general comment on the problems or further comments on the testimony previously given. The digest was accepted as a working basis for the sessions.

Basic grant

The justification for a basic grant to provide emergency financial assistance at this time is the necessity of maintaining enrollment and restoring and maintaining the quality of medical education in order to provide a sound base for expansion This quality has deteriorated because of (1) the loss of approximately one-third of total income during the depression, (2) the effort to increase output during the war and the failure to develop adequate numbers of young teachers during that time, and (3) the postwar inflation which has cut endowment income to one-half its 1932 value.

To meet the needs of medical schools as presented by the deans, an amount ranging between $100,000 and $200,000 per school would be needed. Financial assistance on a per capita enrollment basis was readily accepted as a satisfactory method, but it was agreed that $300 per student per year was too low. The group agreed on not less than $500 per student per year. This is the minimum per capita sum necessary to do the emergency job. It will provide the medical schools with $11,500,000 to meet known needs of between $10,000,000 and $15,000,000. It would be between 20 and 25 percent of the average cost per student and would be about half the average annual cost of the poorest schools (which need help most).

All conferees agreed that there should be a ceiling on the Federal proportion of a medical school budget. The deans and the representatives of the universities and of the Public Health Service felt that Federal aid should represent as much as 50 percent in order to prevent reducing the basic per capita grant to the poorest schools. The American Medical Association, on philosophic grounds, felt that no school should get more than 30 percent of its income from Federal funds. Incident to this discussion, some conflict of principle arose in the desire to retain the maximum mount of responsibility for local support (keeping the Federal proportion of school budgets at the lowest possible figure) and the desire to avoid an extensive Federal audit of medical school costs which would be necessary if the Federal grant approximated the ceiling (30 percent or 50 percent) fixed in the act The deans and university representatives who would have the problem of meeting the requirements of the detailed audit which any ceiling based on proportion of total costs would entail, stated that they had no fear of such audit, but believed that even the 50 percent ceiling would be approached by only a very few schools, i e., those at the lower end of the scale in financial resources. The representatives of the American Medical Association, on the other hand, held the position that no matter how meager those resources from community or other private support, each school should raise 70 percent of its income from non-Federal sources

A representative of the Veterans' Administration helped the group clarify its thinking on university cost accounting and Federal auditing of such costs by explaining the administration of the law covering GI educational benefits and the practices of the schools

The final majority agreement was that the basic grant should not replace other income, should be $500 per student, and should not be more than 50 percent of the costs of instruction as reported to the Surgeon General, rather than as determined by the Surgeon General

It was also agreed that nothing in the present bill should affect the existing teaching grants of the Public Health Service—in cancer and mental disease—or the authorized teaching grants—in heart and other diseases—to the schools

With respect to the basis of calculating the school enrollment, it was agreed that the school would get $500 per student per academic year in effect in the school and that in counting enrollment only full-time candidates for the doctor of medicine degree would be included. All graduate students in medicine, interns, and residents should be excluded, but the problems of including graduate medical education should be included in the study proposed in subsequent discussions.

Incentive grant

The $1,700 sum proposed for each additional student in S. 1679 was regarded as excessive and a dangerous bait to overexpansion. The conference agreed that $1,000 per additional student would strike at approximately the right level; it would give some encouragement to expansion in those schools which could accept more students and yet it would not be large enough to be a dangerous incentive

Even with the $1,000 per additional student, it was felt that there should be some upper limit beyond which the Federal Government ought not to pay for additional students. The medical educators accepted the formula which had been proposed by the dental representatives, namely, that no school should be permitted to receive an incentive grant for more than 10 percent of the enrollment in any one class.

The lowering of the incentive grant to $1,000 and the imposition of the 10-percent limit was justified not only as a damper on unsound expansion but in recognition that the schools are already doing everything possible to respond to the public pressure for more physicians. The provision of the basic

grant of $500 per student per year was regarded as an equally important incentive to expansion, because it gives some assurance of financial stability to the schools.

It was the consensus of the group that the proposed $850 per student per year for new schools was too high; the figure was defended as being only a rough estimate of the margin of cost of a new school over an established one. There was agreement that a fair adjustment would be for new schools to receive the basic grant of $500 per student up to 90 percent of the enrollment and the incentive grant of $1,000 for the remaining 10 percent of the enrollment.

Scholarships

A scholarship program is not needed at this time to stimulate additional applicants for medical education. The schools now receive several times the number of qualified applicants who can be admitted. Most medical schools now have limited funds for both loans and scholarships with which to help worthy students, especially to keep good students from dropping out of school for financial reasons It is not known how many good students fail to apply to the medical schools because they have no prospect of being able to meet the substantial costs.

There was some discussion of the importance of holding off on scholarships for medical education until there was a broad scholarship program for all higher education but it was agreed that, because scholarships are an important part of the total program for some other of the health professions, particularly public health and nursing, scholarships for medical education ought also to be included. In including them, however, it should be clear that the primary purpose is to equalize educational opportunity and to remove any financial barrier against entering the field of medical education.

The deans and educators who indicated that they had had some experience with scholarships urge that some thought be given to (1) a combination of loans and scholarships, whereby loans up to $2,000 or $2,500 per student could be made interest-free through 2 or 3 years after graduation, and (2) the size of the scholarship, which ought not to be so large that it covered the entire needs of the holder. A responsibility to find part of his support elsewhere should rest on the student

Some preference was expressed for provisions which would make scholarships available to the schools for their administration.

All conferees were in full agreement (1) that scholarships ought to be awarded only to students who had already been admitted to an approved medical school, and (2) that indentured service as a repayment for scholarships was wrong in principle.

Construction grants

The deans and other representatives of educational institutions considered that some provision for construction grants was needed now in order to start planning for the necessary long-range expansion, and to give a basis of experience with Federal aid for construction for observation while construction needs are being studied. They recognized that the construction needs of the schools are so very great, both for new and replacement space, that any prospective appropriation would be only a small fraction of the total needed, that it is not likely that it would ever be possible to help all schools at one time, and, especially, that further delay would unjustifiably put off getting even a small start.

Representatives of the American Medical Association recommended the elimination of any provision for construction grants until after the completion of the study of the need for expansion and the plant needs of the schools. They admitted, however, that many schools have very considerable building and fund-raising programs in progress and have detailed plans ready. Other schools have only general plans in mind and some have specifically held back the development of capital-fund programs until there were assurances of operating funds for the present plant.

The actual amounts needed by the Nation's medical schools is not known. Rough estimates last summer indicated that nearly $200,000,000 in capital funds was needed by 55 schools; if the needs of the remaining schools are included by projection, the total may well exceed $300,000,000.

Any program providing for construction grants should include matching provisions which would limit the Federal proportion to approximately 50 percent. In any construction program the funds should be available for reconstruction and remodeling of existing structures as well as for new construction when such reconstruction and remodeling is essential to the maintenance of quality or expansion.

There was general satisfaction with the proposed ordering of projects in accordance with the contribution which each proposed project would make toward meeting the personnel shortages (i. e. toward increased enrollment).

Administrative provisions

The mechanism and conditions of administration of the proposed bill caused considerable discussion. In general, the representatives of the American Medical Association desired to increase both the powers and the independence of the council with a view to limiting a presumed potential power of the Surgeon General to influence medical education. Generally, the deans and other educators with a background of long-established relations with the Federal Government, showed no such apprenhension. They were willing, however, to accept some of the changes proposed.

With respect to the size and membership of the council, it was agreed that a council of 20 members was too large and probably be unwieldy and that it should be reduced to 12 members. All Federal officials were to be excluded from full voting membership on the council was to be empowered to elect its own chairman. The Surgeon General and the Commissioner of Education were to be ex-officio, nonvoting members; the other Federal officials (representing the Veterans' Administration and the Department of National Defense) were to be dropped from membership but were to be invited to meetings of the council for information and liaison purposes. None of the council members should be full-time employees of the Federal Government.

The participants agreed that at least 6 of the 12 Council members should represent the professions covered by the program. In order to avoid asking a single member of the Council to represent an entire professional field (such as medicine), considerable emphasis was placed on giving each such member a sizable technical committee from the profession to back him up and advise him on technical matters. The language authorizing the creation of special and technical committees should be made mandatory instead of permissive.

It was agreed that the role of the Council would be strengthened without diluting the strict responsibility of the Surgeon General by requiring that regulations might be promulgated only "after obtaining the advice and recommendation of the Council." This language was believed to be stronger than "after consultation" as now written.

Although it was not proposed that some express provision be written into the statute, it was understood that the Council would have authority to initiate recommendations as well as receive them. Moreover, the advice and recommendations of the Council, together with the action taken by the Surgeon General on each, should be reported by the Surgeon General to the Congress so that the Congress would know what advice was given and the extent to which it was accepted.

Considerable discussion of the alleged power that might be exercised by the Surgeon General if he were the sole authority to determine which schools were accredited and eligible for Federal funds led to a recommendation that the statute should specifically require use of a recognized accrediting body or bodies, and that approval of such bodies would be effected by the Surgeon General only after obtaining the advice and recommendation of the Council.

Survey

The deans and representatives of the Association of American Medical Colleges, the Association of American Universities, and the National Association of State Universities, and the Public Health Service strongly stressed their conviction that the conduct of such a study not only was an appropriate function of the Council set up by the bill, but also would be most effective if conducted by or under the auspices of that Council. Special and frequent references were made to the effectiveness of the present study of the impact of Public Health Service grants on medical schools which is being conducted by a special committee established by the Surgeon General on recommendation of the National Advisory Health Council That study might appropriately serve as a pattern for the study proposed by the bill. The representatives of the American Medical Association, however, proposed that the study be made by a committee appointed by the President or Congress, completely independent of the Federal Security Agency and the Public Health Service. They advocated a study group patterned after the Hoover Commission, which has surveyed and recommended changes in the organization of the executive departments. The majority of the participants, however, were in favor of a study under the Council.

The discussion of this study and the kind of agency that should conduct it brought out the fact that the apparent conflict of opinion resulted from some confusion of thought regarding the scope of the study. The American Medical Association felt that a study such as contemplated by part A of title VI of S. 1581 would inescapably get into highly controversial areas, such as the Nation's need for physicians, the care and services available, the method of purchasing such care, etc., and that only a completely independent commission could hope to have wide public acceptance of its findings. The deans and other educators, however, insisted that such a comprehensive study would not be necessary to the purposes of this act nor appropriate to the scope of recommended changes in this bill. Furthermore, they asserted, the objectives of any study of educational costs and needs would be totally obscured if tied in with a broad study of all health problems. It was agreed, therefore, that the study proposed in this bill should be limited in scope to remove any fear of having its purposes obscured An appropriate charge to the study would be "to review the operation of this act and determine to what extent and in what form further support of medical education by the Federal Government should be furnished in order to provide adequately for the health of the people." It was agreed that the bill would be acceptable if changed in accordance with this suggestion.

It was suggested that the broader problem of investigating the Nation's long-range needs for medical personnel in terms of types of services required by the population, the methods of providing and of financing such services, and the facilities required rested upon a different set of considerations. If it should be decided that such a study should

be undertaken, it might well be the responsibility of a separate commission of the type proposed in S 1581, set up under a separate act. That act might alternatively authorize the National Council on Education in the Health Professions to undertake the separate study through an additional committee patterned after that which is conducting the study of the effect of Public Health Service grants on medical schools.

Participants: Dr. Donald Anderson, secretary, council on medical education and hospitals, American Medical Association, Dr. George Berry, associate dean, University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry, Association of American Universities, and executive council, Association of American Medical Colleges, Dr Joseph C Hinsey, dean, Cornell Medical School, and chairman, executive council, Association of American Medical Colleges (second day only), Dr Victor Johnson, director, Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research, and council on medical education and hospitals, American Medical Association; Dr Joseph S Lawrence, director, Washington office, American Medical Association; Mr A H Monk, director, Training Facilities Service for Vocational Rehabilitation and Education, Veterans' Administration (second day only); Dr William Perkins, dean, Jefferson College of Philadelphia Medical School, Father William Rooney, professor, Catholic University, Dr Dean F. Smiley, secretary, Association American Medical Colleges, Mr E K Taylor, business manager, College of Medicine, Cornell University (second day only); Dr Harvey Stone, council on medical education and hospitals, American Medical Association, Dr Herman G Weiskotten, dean, Syracuse University College of Medicine, and chairman, council on medical education and hospitals, American Medical Association, Mr Albert V. Whitehall, secretary, council on government relations, American Hospital Association.

SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH

The conference briefly reviewed a digest of the testimony which had previously been given before the subcommittee and decided to use it as a basis for the discussion of the application of title I of S. 1679 to schools of public health

Basic grant

The conference agreed that there was an urgent need for Federal financial assistance to the schools of public health. Several schools reported very considerable operating deficits this year. To meet this need the schools of public health had suggested a formula similar to that contained in S 1679 except that it provided for a block grant amounting to one-half of the basic cost of operating the accredited program of the schools in addition to the per capita grants. The block grant has the advantage of providing a basic support for the schools regardless of differentials or fluctuations in student enrollment In order to make the formula uniform for all professional schools to receive aid under S 1679, however, the conferees agreed to drop the formula proposed by the schools of public health and retain the formula in the bill, provided the per capita grants set forth in the bill were raised to an adequate amount

The schools of public health suggested that the basic per capita grant should be $1,200 instead of the $350 provided in S. 1679. The justification for the higher amount is that it costs approximately $4,500 per graduate student per year for training in a school of public health. The reasons for the higher costs for public health are outlined in the testimony of the schools. It was emphasized that a basic grant of $1,200 would not enable the schools to increase their enrollment, in fact even $1,200 would not overcome current annual per capita deficits in some of the schools An incentive grant of at least double that amount would be needed to meet the great increase in enrollment in the schools of public health necessary to meet the Nation's need for more trained public health workers.

It was noted that the schools of public health were asking that the Federal Government contribute as a basic per capita grant about one-fourth of the cost of training a graduate student in a school of public health This is the same proportion of Federal assistance to total costs as was requested by the medical schools

The suggestion was made that a limitation be inserted which would prevent Federal funds becoming a substitute for other university funds since university authorities are not anxious for Federal assistance which will discourage or impair State appropriations, endowment drives, and other independent sources of income. The group agreed that such a limitation should not be inserted in the bill but that it should be a statement of intent or a guide to Federal and university officials administering the program

If the basic per capita grant for medical schools were raised to $500, as had been suggested by the conferees on aid to medical schools, then a basic grant of $1,200 would not be a disproportionate (in terms of costs) figure for schools of public health Actually application of the same ratio would result in a figure of about $1,000 basic per capita grant for the schools of public health. The conferees agreed to the application of the same ratio (one-fourth Federal funds to three-fourths non-Federal funds) for all professional schools to be aided under S. 1679 This would mean a basic per capita grant of $1,000 for the schools of public health The schools accepted this with the proviso that it be recognized that $1,000 is too low a figure to overcome current cost per student deficits in the schools of public health.

Incentive grant

The suggestion was made that the incentive grant be limited in order to safeguard quality of instruction in the schools of public health This suggestion had previously been made during the conferences on aid to medical and dental schools, and the schools of public health agreed to the 10-percent limitation those two groups had recommended

The group agreed that the incentive grant for the schools of public health should be in the same proportion (double) to the basic grant as in the case of the medical schools. It was agreed, therefore, that a basic per capita grant of $1,000 and an incentive grant of $2,000 would be acceptable, provided it was recognized that these figures were inadequate to meet either current operating deficits or costs of needed expansion; it was recorded that the schools of public health believed these figures should be $1,200 and $2,400 satisfactorily to meet their needs In effect, therefore, the conferees agreed to the principle that the basic grant should be one-fourth of the total cost of training a graduate student and that the incentive grant should be one-half that cost.

Scholarships

The conferees agreed that a scholarship provision for schools of public health should be retained in the bill Two modifications were suggested (1) A higher stipend and (2) a provision for assistance for field training programs

It was agreed that the amount of the scholarship stipend should be omitted from the bill and left to determination by the council. It was also agreed that because field training was not now very well organized and because of the emergency nature of the bill a provision for aid to field training programs should not be inserted. The group believed, however, that field training should be included in the study authorized in the bill.

Construction grants

The group agreed that construction grant provisions should be retained in the bill. In fact, construction grant provisions were thought by some to be the most important provisions of the bill, at least so far as private institutions were concerned. The schools of public health agreed that the construction aid provision should be given a higher priority than the scholarship provision

The group agreed that the preamble of the bill should state that only minimum necessary funds for current operations and for expansion of facilities should be authorized.

The matter of standards to be applied in the allotment of funds for construction aid were discussed at some length The group concluded that such standards should be left to regulations implementing the construction provisions in the bill.

Administrative provisions

The group generally agreed with the recommendations of the medical schools with respect to the administrative provisions, but accepted the suggestion that the only change to be incorporated in the bill was that requiring the appointment of technical subcommittees to the council

A question was raised with respect to the proper definition of a school of public health as well as how schools of public health became accredited. The schools of public health agreed to the suggestion made previously by the medical schools that S 1679 should be changed to provide that the accrediting body would be approved by the Surgeon General after obtaining the advice and recommendation of the National Council on Education for Health Professions. The accreditation program for schools of public health carried on by the American Public Health Association was described.

Survey

The group discussed the suggestion that the study authorized in the bill should be a comprehensive Hoover Commission type of study that would be completely independent and delve into nearly all aspects of the Nation's health needs The group agreed at the end of this discussion that it would prefer that the council organize and direct the study and that it be limited to a study of the education of health personnel. As a second choice the conferees agreed that the study not be directed by the council but simply made under its auspices.

Other comments

The schools of public health stated that they had no fear of possible infringement of their freedom and integrity if title I of S. 1679 were to become law.

The schools of engineering reported that the Association of Engineering Colleges favored the bill but suggested that aid to engineering be limited to graduate students of sanitary engineering The group endorsed this suggestion

Participants Dr. Gayloid Anderson, director, School of Public Health, University of Minnesota, and secretary, Association American Schools of Public Health; Mr George Brakeley, public-relations consultant to Harvard University; Dr. Thorndyke Saville, dean of engineering, New York University, and vice president, American Society for Engineering Education, Dr James S. Simmons, dean, School of Public Health, Harvard University, and president, Association American Schools of Public Health.

NURSING SCHOOLS

The American Nurses' Association had submitted as part of its testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Health specific and detailed information regarding title I of S. 1679. The most important of these recommendations, together with recommendations regarding Federal aid to schools of nursing made by the American Hospital

Association and the Catholic Hospital Association, had been summarized, and this material was used as an agenda for the meeting.

Before starting on the agenda, the group was asked by the chairman for any general comments that they might have. The American Nurses Association referred to their recommendation regarding nondiscrimination of either sex. It was agreed by all present that the intent of the bill was that there should be no discrimination against sex and that they had felt it was not necessary to specifically state this fact in the bill. The American Nurses' Association pointed out that men nurses were concerned and that their fears would be allayed if the bill specifically stated that there would be no discrimination against sex as well as no discrimination against race, creed, color, or national origin. The group agreed that this could be done.

The very large enrollment in schools of nursing under the Cadet Nurse Corps wartime program raises a problem regarding the years which should be used for calculating the average past enrollment. It was agreed by the conferees that the Surgeon General after obtaining the advice and recommendations of the council should make this determination

The American Nurses' Association recommended that consideration be given to aid for the education of other workers such as dietitians and medical librarians. It was suggested that it would be better to postpone aid to other groups until after the contemplated 3-year study is completed.

The group then proceeded to consider the agenda

DEGREE SCHOOLS

Definition

There are a number of hospital schools of nursing with varying types of affiliation with colleges in addition to the degree programs in nursing For this reason it was felt both by the American Hospital Association and the American Nurses' Association that a clearer definition of the degree school was needed. The latter recommended that the following wording be used in place of the present language referring to degree programs:

"To each university- or college-controlled school of nursing that provides basic or advanced training in nursing for which it grants a baccalaureate or higher degree."

The group agreed that this would clarify the meaning of this section.

There was some discussion as to whether any further definition should be included in the bill. The nursing representatives pointed out that the nursing profession has developed a definition of a basic degree program and has criteria for judging whether a school fits this definition. They are, therefore, in a position to advise the Surgeon General which schools would be eligible for grants under this section. It was agreed not to include any more specific definition of a degree program than that recommended above.

Basic grant

The need for financial aid in university schools of nursing offering both basic and advanced programs is very great at the present time. No one has questioned the need for more nurses prepared in these programs and for more nurses with advanced and special preparation. Cost of education in these programs is high because of the requirement for clinical practice fields and individual type supervision during the clinical practice period.

Financial assistance on a per capita enrollment basis was accepted as a satisfactory method and the American Nurses' Association agreed to the amount of the grant for each student enrolled up to the average past enrollment. It was initially agreed that the sum of $200 per student per annum is probably an acceptable amount. However, when it was learned subsequently that the other groups had adopted a formula by which the basic grant was doubled in the incentive grant, it was decided to change the recommendation from $200 to $300 per student per annum.

Incentive grant

There is need for an incentive grant for these schools in order to assist them to expand their practice fields, to increase their teaching staff, and to offer salaries commensurate with other university salaries so that they can attract well-prepared teaching staffs However, both the American Hospital Association and the American Nurses' Association thought that $1,200 was too large. The latter initially recommended that this amount be reduced to $750 per student; subsequently the recommendation was changed and the group agreed that the incentive grant should be $600 per student per annum.

The chairman reported that the medical group had recommended that the incentive grant be allowed for only an increase of 10 percent of past enrollment. Any increase over that would receive the basic amount. There was considerable discussion of this question and all seemed agreed that this restriction would be unwise if applied to degree schools of nursing Many university schools are very small and need to enlarge to utilize funds most efficiently and diploma schools may become university schools which would produce an immediate large increase.

Scholarships

A scholarship program is very much needed in nursing as recruitment is one of the problems in obtaining enough students in the university schools of nursing. There are very few scholarships available from private sources, and students because of financial need sometimes choose a less good school of nursing where there are small tuition fees in preference to a university school.

The American Nurses' Association recommended that scholarship funds should be given directly to the schools instead of through a State agency. No decision was reached, but it seemed that the committee preferred the method of giving scholarship funds through a State agency as outlined in the bill. Discussion brought out the fact that some States did not wish Federal aid. Students in these States would be penalized. They might go to another State to apply but would be at a disadvantage. The conclusion seemed to be that this inequity could not be avoided

The American Nurses' Association recommended that the requirement that a student receiving a scholarship give service in Government service or areas of shortage be changed to require merely agreement to continue "in the practice of his profession with respect to which said scholarship was granted." Specifically the recommendation reads as follows:

"(b) Agreement by the appointee to serve upon completion of his training (including internships and residencies) in the practice of his profession with respect to which such scholarship was granted, 1 year for each two academic years during which he received the benefits of the scholarship."

Medical science and nursing practice are advancing so rapidly that it is difficult for a person employed outside the large educational centers to keep up to date. It is very important, if our Nation is to continue to get the best health care, that nurses take "refresher" training from time to time. Scholarship aid is needed for this type of training as nursing salaries are still too low to permit the nurse to save for additional study. The American Nurses' Association recommended that scholarship aid for "refresher" courses be included in the bill. The question was not fully discussed by the group and no decision was reached.

Construction grants

The chairman asked the group whether they supported funds for construction. There was no discussion on this point, but there was a unanimous agreement that this would be an essential part of the program if the number of nurses was to be increased.

DIPLOMA SCHOOLS

Definition and eligibility for Federal aid

The American Hospital Association recommended that the bill specify that State licensing bodies should be the "approving or accrediting bodies to be selected by the Surgeon General" The American Nurses' Association wished the language of the bill to remain just as it is. They stated there is now a National Nursing Accrediting Service which, though recently formed, is taking over several services which are well-established and have been accrediting for years (National Organization for Public Health Nursing, Association of Collegiate Schools of Nursing, and the National League of Nursing Euducation. The first-named has approved all the programs in public health nursing in this country which meet their criteria for approval. The last-named has accredited only about (150) 12 percent of the schools, but is experienced in method). The nursing profession is ready to assume the responsibility and does not think it should be treated in this regard differently from the other professions, that is, it wishes the Surgeon General with the advice of the Council to select the approving body or bodies.

The American Hospital Association does not agree that the nursing profession is sufficiently experienced to be used as the accrediting body though they know the work being done at present. They think in view of the fact that hospitals own and administer almost all the diploma schools they should have a voice in which ones to receive Federal aid. They are fearful that too many schools will be closed by the nursing profession It was pointed out that lack of Federal aid in itself should not close a school and it is known that the schools which did not receive Cadet Nurse Corps funds continued to operate. The American Hospital Association was concerned lest patient care should be neglected in the effort to raise nursing standards.

Figures were given regarding the number of schools in the country and the number of students enrolled. While the number of schools has been steadily decreasing the number of students has been increasing. This would indicate that more nurses could and would be produced even if the poorest schools closed.

It was suggested that a hospital administrator be specified as a member of the Council and also that the subcommittee have hospital administrator representation on it. The American Nurses' Association agreed that this would be desirable and, even if it were not specified in the bill, hospital administrators would certainly be included in the subcommittee on nursing as they had been in the past.

The group agreed that if the composition of the council and the subcommittee on nursing was changed as indicated, the language of the bill regarding the approving or accrediting bodies would not be changed for nursing.

Basis for Federal aid

The American Nurses' Association recommended that the same basis be used for diploma schools as for degree schools but with different amounts for basic and incentive grants. They recommended that $150 per annum be granted for each student en-

rolled equal to the average past enrollment and that $400 per annum be granted for each student in excess of average past enrollment.

There was considerable discussion of this proposal and the provision as now written in the bill. However, the points of agreement and disagreement were not clearly defined. Representatives of the nursing group, the American Hospital Association and Catholic Hospital Association were asked to get together later and work out some solution.

Suggested solutions

The conferees initially recommended that section 372 (3) B should be replaced by a provision that each school which provides basic training leading to a diploma in nursing shall receive $250 for each student enrolled in the first year; $100 for each student enrolled in the second year; $50 for each student enrolled in the third year. Not less than 50 percent of this grant should be used in lieu of student tuition, fees, etc. (i e., student payment for tuition, fees, book facilities services, board and lodging must be waived up to at least one-half the amount of the Federal grant for the 3-year period). This would provide in some schools full scholarship to all students, in other schools it would mean waiving part of the charges for all students or all the charges for a few students. No school would lose money by participation in the program, as a few would have under the provision as now written in the bill. All schools would have some funds to be used to improve the program, as the total Federal grant would not merely substitute for previously received tuition and when these proposals were declared unworkable, the conferees subsequently agreed that the American Nurses' Association's original recommendation be adopted, namely $150 as a basic grant per student, with $300 as the incentive grant The conferees strongly advocated that the following provision for scholarship aid be included:

"The funds allotted under this section shall be used for instructional costs and scholarship aid, the scholarship aid to approximate 50 percent of the total allotment."

It was recognized by all concerned that doubling the basic amount for the incentive grant might not be wise in diploma schools of nursing; since each additional student gives additional service to the hospital, the same degree of monetary incentive did not seem necessary or perhaps even desirable.

Practical nursing

Both the American Hospital Association and the Catholic Hospital Association expressed strong objection to having Federal aid limited to public educational institutions. At the present time more than half of the approved schools are operated by private institutions, mainly hospitals. The opinion was expressed that there is no evidence at present that vocational high schools can do the training job better or even as well and that all the funds should not be given to aid this type of practical nurse-education program.

It was pointed out that private institutions could be used for clinical practice and were now being so used. The bill, furthermore, could be amended to provide for contract arrangements with private institutions for conducting the entire course of training.

The American Hospital Association and Catholic Hospital Association did not feel this would be satisfactory as some States prohibit such arrangements and others would not use it freely. Since there was insufficient time to discuss this matter thoroughly, it was discussed later by a smaller group. Additional statements were made to support the view that Federal aid should be given to both private and public institutions. The group agreed that they would prefer to have the Public Health Service administer the money, granting it to individual schools and institutions in the same manner as for other groups in the bill. Part of the money should be given by the Public Health Service to the Office of Education for expansion of the practical nurse program as provided in part B.

It was agreed that Federal aid is definitely needed for this program but the present provisions would be strongly opposed.

Administrative provisions

The chairman presented the recommendations regarding the composition and functions of the health council which had been made by the medical group meeting earlier in the week These recommendations were accepted by this group and, in view of the changes proposed, the American Nurses' Association withdrew its previous recommendations that three members of the council should represent nursing.

The American Nurses' Association recommended that provision be made for the establishment of a State advisory committee for each of the fields which would advise the State agency in the formulation of a plan and assist in the selection of appointees for scholarships. Apparently this recommendation was acceptable to all but no definite decision was reached.

A special subcommittee should be established with adequate representation of hospital administrators and the nursing profession to advise the council with respect to the body or bodies which should be utilized to approve or accredit the diploma schools of nursing eligible for Federal aid.

Participants: Miss Edith Beattie, executive secretary, Graduate Nurses' Association, Washington, D. C, and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association; Mr. George Bugbee, executive director, American Hospital Association; Miss Olwen Davies, associate director, National Organization for Public Health Nurses, New York City, and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association; Miss Margaret Foley, executive secretary, Association of Catholic Schools of Nursing; Miss Deborah Jensen, professor of nursing education, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association; Miss Irene Murchison, director, School of Nursing at Loretta Heights College, Loretta, Colo, and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association; Sister Olivia, dean, School of Nursing, Catholic University, Washington, D. C, and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association; Miss Blanche Pfefferkorn, director of Department of Studies, the National League of Nursing Education, New York City, and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association; Mr. Donald Smith, attorney, American Nurses' Association; Mrs. Eugenia Spaulding, director, Division of Nursing, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind, and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association; Mr. Albert V. Whitehall, secretary, Council on Government Relations, American Hospital Association; Sister Xavier, director, Mercy Hospital School of Nursing, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I should like to add, if I may, that I also consider the bill a very important measure. It is something which we cannot afford to overlook. I hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, few measures come before the Senate which hold forth such promise for the health and life of the American people as S. 337, the Emergency Professional Health Training Act of 1951. This bipartisan measure can help break the bottlenecks in medical education that now confront us.

As we meet the challenge of Communist aggression, the health of every American family takes on ever greater significances. A sick nation cannot man production lines. A hurt people cannot solve with vigor and determination the crises that confront us.

But physicians, dentists, and nurses cannot be stockpiled. Neither do they roll off assembly lines in a few months time. The tooling-up process takes many years. Meanwhile, each passing month aggravates the danger that we shall not have enough doctors to take care of ourselves—our families here at home and our sons in the Armed Forces.

There is scarcely a family in the Nation which is not conscious of the problem. From daily experience, the American people know how harried is the average physician. Many of us have waited in crowded offices for the doctor or the dentist. In some communities, people must travel many, many miles to get professional medical aid. But it is only when these individual cases are translated in national terms that the full extent of our medical crisis appears. Here are the figures submitted by the Nation's foremost professional experts:

Physicians: The Nation needs between 15,000 and 22,000 more doctors. The former figure was submitted by officers of the American Medical Association several years ago. It is a pre-Korea figure. The higher estimate was compiled this year by the Medical Resources Advisory Committee of the National Security Resources Board, headed by Dr. Howard Rusk. Whatever the exact figure, there is general agreement that the deficit must be reckoned in the thousands if not in the tens of thousands.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an excellent article entitled "Dr. Rusk Asks Rise in Physician Total," written by George Eckel, published in the New York Times of February 13, 1951.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, with respect to dentists, we are short at least 9,200 dentists, according to the Medical Resources Advisory Committee. The American Dental Association has devoted much time and energy to calling attention to the need of the dental schools for financial aid if this gap is to be closed.

As to nurses, the shortage is so acute that the major professional nursing associations have taken the lead in publicizing the urgency for national action. The shortage figure agreed to by the six professional nursing organizations is 65,000 for civilian needs alone. The Armed Forces require additional thousands of nurses. All of us should pay tribute to the public-spirited efforts of the nursing profession to arouse the country to this need.

For each section of the American community these shortages of doctors, dentists, and nurses spell needless suffering. Rural areas, for example, have long been pinched for doctors and have measurable poorer health than city dwellers. Unless the American people can now help provide the financial aid our medical schools need in order to maintain

and expand their facilities, rural people will get even fewer replacements in the future than they have in the past for the country doctors who will soon retire.

Nor is the number of physicians in our cities by any means sufficient. In many cities defense plant expansion is attracting additional thousands of workers and their families. The influx is already overtaxing strained medical facilities. The National Fund for Medical Education, headed by Herbert Hoover, points out that, because of this shortage "in at least one wide, new area of medicine—industrial medicine—the enormous gains in recent years will be minimized, if not entirely nullified."

Bernard Baruch tells us, "I think we should have had expanded medical training 4, 5, 6 years ago."

Our veterans also are being hurt by the doctor shortage. The American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, AMVETS, the Jewish War Veterans, the American Veterans Committee, and other groups have warned us that the equivalent of approximately 16 veterans' hospitals have been closed down for lack of medical personnel. Medical authorities point out that 4,000 beds in VA hospitals are unavailable because of shortage of trained personnel. How long can we continue to snatch doctors from VA hospitals, where they are caring for the wounded of the last war, and send them off to care for the wounded in Korea or any other area threatened by Communist imperialism? Surely we must see to it that replacements are trained.

A shortage of thousands of doctors for civilian purposes means cutting down the availability of medical care for millions of people. It means that civil defense needs go unmet. It means that public health measures cannot be taken. It means not only setbacks to the recent development of industrial medicine, but incalculable harm to the new and rewarding field of rehabilitation work. A shortage of medical personnel during this mixed cold and hot war is already a serious national problem. If the war should become an all-out hot war, this problem could become a terrifying national catastrophe.

I urge the Senate not to gloss over the warnings which have been given to us by the National Security Resources Board. I shall quote from the Board:

> An enemy attack on American cities using new technological weapons might introduce some new medical and health problems from such effects as radiation and chemical and bacteriological contamination.

But, continues the report—

> Granted a few minutes warning, casualties could be reduced by over 50 percent through proper organization and training in civil defense. Thorough organization will be necessary to provide adequate professional and technical personnel; and also the supplies, hospitals, and related facilities for the care of the many thousands of casualties which could occur among the civil inhabitants of a large city.

Thus national-defense requirements place both a heavy immediate additional burden on our already heavily loaded doctors, and a potential burden the size of which no man can foresee. Further we cannot solve the present problem by stripping family doctors from inland communities and sending them to defense centers. Not a single responsible person who has ever discussed this problem has suggested that we should ration doctors—ordering them to shortage areas, herding them here or there as new emergencies develop.

Nor can we meet these great needs by juggling statistics. For example, it does not answer the problem to proclaim that the United States has more doctors in proportion to population than any other great nation in the world. With our standard of living and our respect for individual life, we should lead in this respect, as in so many others. Although we have made great strides in medical knowledge, the number of doctors capable of bringing the new knowledge to the people is clearly insufficient. Further, while our medical personnel shortages mount, thousands of splendid young people all over the country lose opportunities which they seek for careers in health work. Most Senators, as I do, must receive tragic and pitiful letters from these young men and women with good college records who cannot get into medical school or dental school or nursing school.

At the turn of the century medical schools sent their graduates forth with the tools of their profession fitting into a small bag. Medical education was hardly more expensive than other professional training. The multi-million-dollar scientific apparatus which today is indispensable to every medical school was largely unknown. Tricked out with a few microscopes and a minimum of laboratory equipment, a host of fly-by-night medical diploma mills could and did operate throughout the country side by side with our leading universities.

But in the intervening years the American Medical Association pioneered in raising the standards of medical schools. During the first two decades of the century, the diploma mills were closed. We witnessed with pride the growth of great privately endowed schools such as Harvard, Yale, Cornell, Chicago, Columbia, and Johns Hopkins. Our public-supported universities developed too, expending the huge sums necessary for the expensive and wonderful technical equipment and clinics that are now an integral part of American medical training. Modern medical education came of age—an expensive but a wonderful baby at that.

The great technological advances of medicine served to send the costs of medical education skyrocketing. In the last decade alone, tuition fees have jumped 148 percent. As parents who contemplate a medical career for a son or daughter know, tuition fees average almost $550 a year. Many medical schools are forced to charge considerably more. This high cost of tuition is a barrier which today prevents many highly qualified students from dedicating themselves to the practice of the healing arts.

If costs worry parents and students, they also terrify medical school deans and university officers. As a former vice president of a great university, I know that the tuition fees are far too low to meet operating expenses. To cover the costs of each student, the University of Chicago during my part-time service with it had to put up approximately three more dollars for each student dollar, even if the student had the money to pay his tuition fee in full. At the University of Chicago, basic operating expenses per student have increased 40 percent in the last 5 years alone. The situation is similar in other privately operated medical schools.

Under these circumstances it is obvious that our medical schools are operating at so great a loss that they cannot possibly contemplate expansion unless further funds are forthcoming. Every additional student increases the deficit, and the deficit can no longer be absorbed. The problem of how to make ends meet harasses the great majority if not all of the Nation's 79 medical schools.

The deans of these schools know from first-hand experience that they are operating further in the red every year. Almost half of them have been forced to cut back on one or more vital programs. To their dismay, the quality of medical education is threatened. Their equipment and physical plants are rapidly deteriorating.

The administrators and trustees of our universities, as well as the medical deans, agree on the need for more funds. The medical schools unfortunately are a severe drain on the finances of the other departments and divisions of our universities. They help boost the tuition fees that must be charged to students in the other divisions.

Many expert bodies likewise agree on the urgency of our medical schools' need for funds. The National Fund for Medical Education, mentioned earlier, declares:

> The situation is so grave that some schools may be forced to close their doors.

The same findings are reported by the Surgeon General's Committee on Medical School Grants and Finances.

Mr. President, I submit that the pending bill is the sound bipartisan answer to the national need in this area. The bill passed the Senate last year without a single objection, but unfortunately the House took no action. At the time the Eighty-second Congress convened, the Korean crisis had become acute and President Truman urged passage of this measure to help meet the national emergency. He listed it in terms of priority comparable to funds required for aircraft, military equipment, and atomic-weapon development. He stated:

> Our chronic shortage of doctors, dentists, and nurses will be aggravated as more of them are called into the Armed Forces. Therefore, we need, more than ever, prompt enactment of legislation that will help to increase enrollment in medical and related schools by assisting them to meet their costs of instruction and to construct additional facilities where needed. Scholarships should be provided to attract larger enrollments in nursing schools and grants should be made to States for vocational training for practical nurses.

In response to that appeal the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare took immediate action. Behind their proposed solution lay years of thought about the problems of financing medical

education, as well as prolonged consultations with the Nation's leading medical-school authorities, educators, and university administrators.

From the careful consideration of the committee, several well-conceived principles emerged:

First, that the national interest required action by the Federal Government to meet this problem.

Second, that every possible source of funds—private sources and endowments, local and State moneys—must first be employed, with Federal funds used only as a last resort.

Third, that if Federal funds are found to be necessary, they should be provided on a limited, emergency basis only, and should be so administered as to safeguard the schools against any kind of Federal interference or control. The principle of Federal aid is approved, I point out, by the Hoover Commission task force on Federal medical services.

With the aid of the Nation's leading medical school deans and of other professional authorities, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare drafted the present bill, S. 337. It provides for Federal assistance to approved professional schools to maintain enrollments, to expand facilities, and to promote professional training.

Mr. President, I congratulate the committee on this bill; and I congratulate, in particular, the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] on the leadership he has taken in developing this bill.

The Federal assistance is to be administered by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service with the help of a 10-member advisory council.

I have studied carefully the provisions of this bill, particularly the safeguards in section 383, reading them as a former university vice president and a present university trustee might be expected to read them, that is, with a critical eye. I was prepared to offer objections if I detected any avenues open to Federal interference with the operation of our private and State educational institutions However, the bill provides in the strongest language against any interference by the Federal Government into the curriculum or administration or the academic freedom of medical schools, educators, and students.

Evidently educators and medical school officers throughout the country have reached the some conclusion I have. The overwhelming majority have gone on record in favor of this measure. This list is too long for me to recite, but I am pleased to note that it includes the School of Public Health and the School of Medicine of Yale University, great national schools located in my State of Connecticut, and also the School of Medicine of the University of Chicago. Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, with whom I served while he was chancelor of the University of Chicago, headed a national committee of university officials in support of this legislation.

Furthermore, this bill has the endorsement of many lay organizations. It is supported also by many professional organizations, including the American Dental Association, American Association of Dental Schools, American Council on Education, the American Public Health Association, Association of American Medical Colleges, the Association of American Universities, Association of Land Grant Colleges, Association of Schools of Public Health, National Dental Association, and the National Health Council.

The bill comes to us with unanimous committee endorsement, and under sponsorship of leading members of both political parties. It is approved by such an outstanding leader of our voluntary health insurance plans as Dr. Charles Garside, president of the Associated Hospital Service of New York, who told the Greater New York Hospital Association last May:

> Quite apart from Blue Cross and its relation to the problem, I very definitely favor Federal grants-in-aid to medical colleges I see no more danger to our liberties in this proposal than I do in the Federal Hospital Construction Act.

The views of Dr. Morris Fishbein, with whom I have been acquainted for more than 20 years, and who long has been the most vocal spokesman of medical organizations in the United States, also appear to coincide with the intent of the bill. His views were reported as follows in the New York Times of June 7, 1951:

> An overwhelming rush of American students to European medical schools was reported yesterday by Dr. Morris Fishbein, former president of the American Medical Association, on his return from a European survey aboard the Cunard liner *Queen Elizabeth*
>
> Dr Fishbein said that the situation represents a need that must be met by extension of medical education facilities in this country, where schools are limited in their admissions by availability of teachers and laboratory facilities.
>
> "I feel that the need for more medical men is so acute," he declared, "that we shall have to find some means of utilizing Government funds without sustaining Government control to advance medical education."

These and other expressions from professional sources, supporting the principle or the text of the measure, should satisfy the most fearful that nothing in this bill gives the slightest encouragement to socialized medicine.

My plea for the passage of Senate bill 337 is also based on the views of Mr. Hoover's voluntary fund-raising group, the national funds for medical education:

> In the pattern that is envisioned for the support of medical and scientific education, business, and industry and other groups in the community, on one hand, would be working in cooperation with Government, on the other. They would be working as partners toward a common objective, each in its own sphere, and fighting it out not with each other but side by side against the greatest enemy of men—disease—including the yet unconquered problem of cancer, mental illness, heart disease, arthritis, poliomyelitis, tuberculosis, and others.
>
> The medical research problem and the educational problem are, in a sense, two different matters. But, in a broader sense, research and education best flourish and complement each other, in an environment allowing wide latitude for original scientific thinking To the extent that the scientific educational environment remains unfettered, the scientific research environment will profit.
>
> The cooperation, at an educational level, between Government and industry will help to insure an atmosphere of research and pedagogy in which man may be able to achieve many things, including one objective close to his heart—the maintaining of useful, productive capacities through the sixth, seventh, and eighth decades of life. There is no mistaking that in an aging society such as America's, the battle lines are being drawn today to conquer the debilitating diseases of the middle and late years.
>
> But this great effort, no matter how well intentioned, will fail utterly unless America makes a greater investment in brains and ability, in human resources, and makes it in such a way that every safeguard is taken to preserve the individual's freedom.

Mr. President, to accomplish our essential goal of maintaining our Nation's health through an adequate supply of physicians, dentists, and nurses, I therefore urge the Senate today to do its part by voting for Senate bill 337 Only by so doing can we complement the voluntary efforts of the National Fund for Medical Education and the American Medical Association. Federal as well as voluntary funds are needed; neither alone can do the job. I point out that after several years of careful, diligent work, the National Fund for Medical Education, together with the AMA, have been able to raise only enough money approximately to enable each medical school to finance the education of one more doctor for the full medical course.

By the most optimistic estimates, these two great private sources cannot raise more than a few million dollars a year. I ask my colleagues in the Senate to measure this against the needs submitted by the medical schools themselves merely to continue graduating 6,000 doctors yearly. I am told that $40,000,000 more is needed yearly to enable the schools to stay out of the red while they maintain high quality of instruction; another $330,000,000 capital investment is needed for new buildings, laboratories, and equipment. To increase enrollment the needed 22 percent—a working goal set by medical-school deans—would cost, in addition to the above amounts, $18,000,000 yearly for increased operations, plus $244,000,000 for construction and equipment. Mr. President, these are merely estimates in regard to our present medical schools. But over and above these schools new medical schools should be built. Our University of Connecticut, near Hartford, has no medical school. The entire area of greater Hartford has no medical school. Most certainly new medical schools need to be established. For my own State, I submit the need for a first-rate medical school in conjunction with the University of Connecticut, in the greater Hartford area.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield. Let me say that I have almost completed my statement.

Mr. PASTORE. At this juncture of the statement which is being made by

the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, I wonder whether he is interested in certain figures which I have before me. Although nothing in this bill will cure the grave situation reflected by these figures, the fact still remains that the bill is a step in the right direction toward working out a solution of the problem confronting the American people.

Did the Senator from Connecticut know that in the fall of 1950, Cornell Medical School took only 80 freshmen out of 2,870 applicants; Columbia University took 120 out of 2,800 applicants; Temple took 125 out of 3,089 applicants; Yale took 65 out of 1,401; Tulane took 128 out of 2,000; Northwestern admitted 128 out of 2,103; and Boston University admitted 72 out of 1,875 applicants.

When we realize that all those applicants have received their premedical education and all of them have hoped and dreamed that one day they might go to medical school and become doctors——

Mr. BENTON. And many of them are the sons of doctors.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; that is correct—we can imagine the frustration of those young men and young women.

There is nothing we can do now to solve this problem completely; but the fact still remains that we need more doctors for our civilian requirements and for our military requirements. Many young persons wish to become doctors, but the medical schools do not have the faculties or the facilities to produce them.

Mr. BENTON. The Senator from Rhode Island is profoundly correct. The figures he has presented should prove most revealing to the public, and I am glad to have them appear in the RECORD at this point. Of course, the figures are well known to medical-school administrators.

Ten years ago, when I was serving as a part-time officer of the University of Chicago, frequently there would be 600 or 800 applications, or more, for only 65 openings in our great medical school; and hundreds of the young men and women who were rejected were brilliantly prepared and brilliantly qualified to take up the career of medicine. It was a terrible responsibility to select the 65 out of such a large group as the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, who has taken such outstanding leadership in this field, of course, realizes.

The medical schools all over the world, outside the United States, are besieged by applicants from the United States, students who are often not only the sons but even the grandsons of doctors, who will go anywhere in order to obtain their medical training. Their applications having been turned down by the schools here, they are forced to go to Beirut or to Italy or any other country in the world where they can secure admittance and where, in turn, they crowd out the students of each particular country in which the need for doctors in all probability is also acute.

Mr. President, the dollar figures I was reading a moment ago are preinflation figures, based on 1947–48 budgets. Costs have risen more than 40 percent since then. Further, let me again emphasize that these needed funds apply only to medical schools; they do not cover the needs of our schools of dentistry, nursing, or public health.

Mr. President, recognizing that one of the legitimate arguments against this bill can be the question whether we can afford it. Out of my own background, I venture to assert that the answer to this argument is that we simply cannot afford not to pass this bill.

I see the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] in the chair at this moment. He is the only Member of the Senate who has a degree in the field of dentistry, and I am sure many of his professional friends have often called his attention to the great shortage in the profession which he chose as a young man, and to which he devoted himself for about 15 years.

S. 337, which we are now debating, will help close the critical gaps, but even at best it would provide about $62,000,000 a year, and this sum only after several years of educational tooling up. Even after the enactment of the bill, there will still be urgent need for additional funds from all other sources, notably from private philanthropies and endowments. It is my hope that such private gifts will be stimulated by the Federal aid proposed here today. This beneficial stimulation has been widely noted by the officers of private institutions which have been receiving Federal or State funds for research purposes.

We cannot afford to allow our system of health education—the foremost in the world—to continue to fall into disrepair. We cannot afford losses due to human suffering, in industrial production, and in national security. We cannot afford to sacrifice the future health of our children. We cannot afford the loss of opportunity for tens of thousands of our capable boys and girls who, without the enactment of this bill, will be unable to train for careers in medical and health work.

I have often been asked whether I favor socialized medicine. The answer is an unqualified "No." I have spent a large part of my life fighting socialism and collectivism in all forms. In my article, the Economics of a Free Society, which was published in Fortune magazine in 1944, and which was written by me as the key policy statement for the Committee for Economic Development, of which I was then the vice chairman, I made my position on socialism in all its forms abundantly clear. I said:

> An economic system based on private enterprise, Americans believe, can better serve the common good, not because it enables some men to enrich themselves, but because it develops a high and rapidly rising level of living. It can best insure the American prosperity to vital world prosperity and to world peace. It can provide the maximum economic opportunity for the largest number of individuals of the community. It can foster the development of the native capacity, ambition, and resourcefulness of the individuals of the community, and protect the personal freedom and well-being of the individual from the dangers inherent in too great a concentration of either private or public power.

Mr. President, I have before me a one-page article from Collier's magazine, headed "Our alarming doctor shortage," which has a most interesting box headed "It's not socialized medicine." I ask unanimous consent that this short article in Collier's be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for a question?

Mr. BENTON. I shall yield only for this one more question, because I am running over the time I predicted to the junior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator agrees with the position I take, that although we are against socialized medicine and have supported the position of the American Medical Association insofar as our opposition to socialized medicine is concerned, many of us believe that the American Medical Association is making a great mistake in taking a position against anything which would, in the long run, mean better health for the people, particularly against having more doctors in order to relieve the shortage of doctors.

Mr. BENTON. I cannot speak authoritatively on this point, but I have frequently observed the great difference between the official views of the officers of many trade and professional associations, on the one hand, and the views and opinions of the membership of the group, on the other. This article in Collier's suggests that a tiny group of well-intentioned men have held back the passage of the bill now pending. The extent to which that is true, as it may relate to the failure of the House to act last year, I cannot attest. I am glad the question of the Senator from Louisiana reminds me to make this statement for the RECORD. For 20 years, notably during my work in education, I have collaborated closely with many members of the medical profession, many of whom I number among my closest friends, and I am sure the majority of the profession cannot fail to agree on the need for greater efforts to bring the best that medical science can provide to all the American people. I hope that answers the question.

Mr. LONG. It does, and I thank the Senator.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I therefore submit to the Senate that it is wholly legitimate for the Government, which represents all the people, to seek to achieve by the enactment of the pending bill the goal I have outlined. All such efforts, however, should be carried forward in close cooperation with the medical profession, which has itself pioneered, and which has done such a magnificant job in the fight to improve the quality and distribution of medical care.

We the people of the United States now stand within reaching distance of major new advances against all the diseases which have decimated man. We can never wholly win the final fight against suffering and disability. But we can go forward—and continue to fight

to go forward—to win for ourselves and our loved ones renewed health and vigor and surcease from pain. Enactment of the bill now before the Senate is essential if we are to maintain and accelerate our progress toward these goals.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, has the Senator from Connecticut yielded the floor?

Mr. BENTON. I now yield the floor. I may add I am most grateful to the Senator from Illinois for his cooperation in permitting me to speak at this time, so that I may resume committee hearings at 2 o'clock, where I am acting as chairman in the hearings of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXHIBIT 1

DR RUSK ASKS RISE IN PHYSICIAN TOTAL—HE WARNS OF SHORTAGES AHEAD AND URGES LARGER CLASSES, WITH SPEEDED COURSES

(By George Eckel)

CHICAGO, February 12 —Unless medical education is expanded and accelerated at once the Nation faces a deficit of 22,000 physicians by 1954, Dr Howard A Rusk, chairman of the national advisory committees on mobilization, said here today The deficit would be undiminished by 1960 in the absence of measures to counteract it, he added.

Even if both recommended measures were begun at once the deficit in 1954 would be 14,500 physicians, but by 1960 it would be reduced to 2,000, he asserted

Any such deficits, he declared, meant "a serious threat to the health and welfare of our people "

He called on the medical profession and the medical schools to undertake the added work load necessary to cope with the situation

Dr Rusk, who is associate editor of the New York Times, addressed the Forty-seventh Annual Congress on Medical Education and Licensure, sponsored by the American Medical Association, the Advisory Board for Medical Specialists and the Federation of State Medical Boards of the United States.

TWO STUDIES SUMMARIZED

His presentation summarized the conclusions reached by two committees which he heads, the Health Resources Advisory Committee to the National Security Resources Board and the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Doctors, Dentists and Allied Specialists to the Selective Service System.

Dr Rusk held, that unless the profession was to fail to meet the mobilization challenge, enrollments in medical schools must be increased by 15 percent and accelerated courses of studies must be instituted to turn out an extra class every 3 years.

Some 178,000 physicians were in active practice today, he stated, and by 1954 there would be a need for 210,600. The expected supply under present conditions would be about 188,600, he added.

The estimate, proceeded, was predicated on Armed Forces of 5,000,000 men by 1954 and continuing at that level through 1960. If the ceiling through 1960 was not raised above the 3,500,000 men in uniform contemplated by the end of this year the deficit could be reduced by 2,000 to 20,000, he said.

Dr. Rusk declared that the studies by the two committees made these assumptions:

1. The emergency state of part or complete mobilization would continue for 10 years.

2. The 1949 ratio of physicians to population in the civilian population was accepted as adequate and was used as a base line.

3. The ratio of physicians to service men and women in the Armed Forces would have settled by 1954 to 2.7 per 1,000, a rate substantially below the World War II rate and below the present rate.

4. The estimate of physicians required for civilian defense must assume the possibility of catastrophe, not only physical but epidemic.

A 15-percent increase in enrollments of medical schools, which now graduate 6,000 physicians a year, would not produce any increase in graduates until June of 1955, or of graduates who have finished a 1-year internship until June 1956, at the earliest, Dr. Rusk stated.

GAIN BY MEASURE ESTIMATED

By 1960 this measure alone, he added, would reduce the prospective deficit of 22,000 by only 5,000. The increase per class in World War II was 12½ percent, he noted.

Acceleration of medical training by running four 9-month school years together and completing them within 36 months, would yield 6,000 additional physicians every 3 years, he said.

By 1954 this would reduce the deficit in active physicians from 22,000 to 14,500 and by 1960 to 10,000, he estimated

After stating that, based on the Armed Forces reaching and keeping a level of 5,000,000, the two measures together would cut the deficit in 1954 to 14,500 and in 1960 to 2,000. He said that if the Armed Forces did not exceed 3,500,000 the two measures together would erase the deficit by 1960.

Physician requirements by category in 1954, if the Armed Forces had 5,000,000 men, were analyzed as follows by Dr Rusk· 183,600 for the civilian population, 3,300 for civilian defense, 1,800 for industry and rehabilitation, 2,800 for public health, 500 for medical schools and 18,500 for the Armed Forces

Dr Rusk defended the measures he recommended, despite the known defects of acceleration, as the only solutions to a situation in which nothing is possible to avoid or even reduce this deficit before 1954

"These plans are flexible, and no permanent oversupply is imposed," he declared. "Any part of the program could be adjusted if the situation eased enough to permit it.

"No account is taken of the increased aging of our population, or of the rehabilitation of the wounded veterans coming back from combat."

He noted that, "we recognize the difficulties of an accelerated program "

"We should, however," he went on, "be able to profit by our experience in the last war. The depletion of teachers can be prevented, internships could be extended rather than curtailed, inasmuch as interns already are performing medical services "

Dr Rusk stated that the present authorized physician ratio in the armed services was 5 per 1,000 men, calling for 17,500 this year in that category alone, but plans called for a tapering off to 3.7 per 1,000 men, as the requirements are less after the formative "shakedown" phase of mobilization.

A panel discussion on problems arising from mobilization following Dr Rusk's presentation showed varying opinions on his recommendations.

Dr Stockton Kimball, dean of the University of Buffalo Medical School and chairman of the Joint Committee on Medical Education in Time of National Emergency, reported that three-fourths of the medical schools in the Association of American Medical Colleges did not favor the principle of acceleration.

"Practically, each of the errors in medical education during the last war we are now asked to repeat," he stated.

Dr. Kimball also produced estimates that for an expansion of 1,000 in enrollments by 1954, approximately the 15 percent recommended by Dr. Rusk, medical schools would require an additional $6,200,000 for operating expenses, an additional $67,000,000 for new school construction and an additional $32,000,000 for hospital construction.

On the question of financial aid to schools, Dr. Rusk said that the Health Resources Advisory Committee would, if necessary, back any reasonable program to provide adequate funds with adequate safeguards.

Dr. Victor Johnson, director of the Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research, Rochester, Minn., raised a question on Dr. Rusk's figures for civilian requirement of physicians.

If the 22,000-physician deficit developed, he said, it would be almost entirely at the expense of the civilian population. On the basis of Dr Rusk's figures, he added, this would reduce the civilian physician ratio only from 1 in 850, the 1949 level, to 1 in 950, whereas during World War II the ratio was 1 to 1,350, admittedly too small. Would so slight a reduction make so much difference? he asked in effect

Dr Rusk replied that we needed the physician ratio we had in 1949, that in World War II we were lucky in having "nothing that even looked like a major epidemic," and that the obstetrical case load was very low because of the absence of 18,000,000 men.

He remarked that many physicians were heavily overworked in the last war.

Col. Richard H Eanes, chief medical officer of the Selective Service System, declared that a draft of physicians might not be necessary because military requirements might be met through the efforts of the profession.

EXHIBIT 2

OUR ALARMING DOCTOR SHORTAGE—WE DESPERATELY NEED PHYSICIANS; YET THE LEADERS OF ORGANIZED MEDICINE WON'T LET CONGRESS ACT

(By Albert Q Maisel)

A tiny group of well-intentioned men has placed your health, and even your chances of atomic-age survival, in the most serious jeopardy. These men mean you no harm. Indeed, they are the leaders of the American Medical Association, an organization sincerely dedicated to fighting disease and saving life

Yet they must shoulder major responsibility for a shortage of medical personnel which is constantly becoming more critical. They are the one big obstacle in the path of congressional efforts to meet that shortage with Federal aid to medical education—a solution which has the backing of most medical school deans, of leading university presidents, of both Republicans and Democrats, and (by a unanimous vote) of the United States Senate

The bill which embodies this solution was drawn up with the advice of AMA representatives; time after time it was modified to meet their objections, and in its present form it represents almost precisely what they wanted in the first place Nevertheless, the American Medical Association's leaders have fought the measure to a dead stop in the House of Representatives.

By so doing, they have made it entirely possible that wounded American soldiers, in the future, will receive some second- or third-rate substitute for the marvelous medical services that saved tens of thousands of lives in World War II. Because of what they have done and what they have prevented from being done, civilian atomic-bomb victims may perish untended. Mothers, lacking a physician's help, may die in childbirth under the ministrations of incompetent midwives. Plagues and epidemics, which we all thought banished forever, may return to claim millions of victims.

These are not the dire and gloomy forebodings of neurotic alarmists or scare-peddling sensationalists. They are rather the considered private predictions of shocked and worried experts who, ever since the end of World War II, have been trying to get

the organized medical profession to take steps to overcome a growing shortage of physicians, nurses, dentists and public health technicians.

Behind this shortage lies the fact that our medical and other health education schools cannot expand for lack of funds. Many of them are so deep in the red that they may even have to fold up entirely.

AMA SECRETARY MAKES A FORECAST

The shortage of physicians has been recognized for years. In May 1945, for example, Dr. Victor Johnson (then secretary of the American Medical Association's council on medical education and hospitals) testified before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs that, while we would need 35,000 more physicians after World War II, our training program was geared to provide us with an increase of less than half this number by 1948.

Despite this warning of a growing shortage of doctors, even for civilian needs, we demobilized our medical schools, along with everything else, when World War II ended. Financial difficulties—and a desire to improve the quality of training—led college after college to cut back its student roster, often by as much as 20 to 30 percent. Instead of training more doctors than ever before, we began to train fewer. Our nursing, dental, and public health schools all moved in the same direction.

In October 1947, Dr. Donald G Anderson, the new secretary of the AMA Council, stated, "We are prepared to contend that the maximum deficit that could possibly be forecast for 1960 does not exceed 15,000 physicians."

Anderson's words were couched in terms designed to minimize the problem. Yet they amounted to a startling admission. For according to the 1950 American Medical Directory, there are about 200,000 physicians for more than 150,000,000 Americans—an average of one doctor for every 750 persons. Since this includes doctors doing research and other work not directly connected with the care of patients, the actual number of persons per general practitioner is estimated to run as high as 1,500. Taking 1,000 as a conservative figure, what Anderson was actually saying was that approximately 1 in every 10 of us would be without doctors in 1960, or that all of us would be averaging 10 percent less medical service than we needed and were willing to pay for.

A similar situation of chronic shortage has been developing in the other health-service professions.

We have only 280,500 professional nurses. Right now, without allowing for the expanding needs of the armed services, 74,000 more are required. But enrollments in our schools of nursing have dropped to less than two-thirds of the wartime peak.

We have 75,000 practicing dentists. By 1960, the United States Public Health Service reports, we will need at least 95,000. But our dental schools can't train enough, unless their capacity is substantially increased. A continuing deficit of at least 5,000 dentists looms.

The same is true for nursing teachers, doctors of public health, sanitary engineers, and all the other groups of specialized health technicians. Far from overcoming these deficits, we have been falling ever farther behind in training new medical personnel.

In 1910, our medical schools graduated 4,440 students, producing one new doctor for every 20,000 of our population. By 1940 the number of graduates had increased to 5,097, but the growth of population had far outstripped the increase in doctors. In that year we produced only one doctor for every 26,000 of our people. In 1950 our physician output mounted to 5,553. But, once again, it did not keep pace with population growth. We produced this year only one new doctor for every 27,000 people.

Worst of all, our schools of medicine, dentistry, nursing, and public health find themselves in a deep and growing financial crisis. Their costs have been mounting, but their income has not nearly kept pace.

This country's 79 medical schools, for example, had a total budget last year of more than $61,000,000. They had to spend an average of $2,577 for every student. But their tuition fees averaged only $548. Income from research grants, endowments, State appropriations and all other sources still left a gap of more than $10,000,000.

More than three-quarters of the 44 privately owned medical schools have been operating at a deficit. Even a number of the tax-supported State schools have been running into the red According to the American Medical Association, only eight schools reported, a year ago, that they did not stand in urgent need of additional operating funds to meet essential costs.

The same situation has been hog-tying our other health education schools. Dental colleges, with an average tuition fee of $500 a year per student, have had to find $2,000 per year to cover the cost of educating each person. The schools of public health, with tuition fees averaging only $440, have actually been spending an average of seven times as much per student.

Even the American Medical Association's council on medical education and hospitals, when it surveyed the sorry situation of the medical schools more than 2 years ago, found that they needed an additional $15,000,000 a year to support their operations and nearly $200,000,000 of capital funds to construct urgently needed facilities.

In the words of Herbert Hoover, "Our medical educational system is woefully inadequate for the conduct of our national defense and our Federal hospitals for veterans and others. And it is doubly inadequate for the needs of the people generally."

In the event of all-out war, no other non-industrial bottleneck will do more to endanger our chances for victory than these shortages of medical personnel. For we shall need more doctors and nurses than ever before in our history.

Our armed services will be compelled to drain the home front of tens of thousands of doctors. But home-front needs will be infinitely greater than they were in the past.

WHEN WAR RAVAGES THE HOME FRONT

Listen, for example, to the carefully weighed words of Dr. P. J. Carroll, dean of the School of Medicine of Creighton University in Omaha. "In the event of another world war," Dr. Carroll warns "we shall not be able to leave the civilian population without adequate medical services as was done during the last war. There was no conflict or even a threat of conflict within our borders. The next war will be different. Our large cities will be enemy targets and a large part of our population will be evacuated. It will be necessary to disperse our civilian population in small concentrations, away from military installations. The greater the dispersion of our people, the greater will be the need for more physicians."

It is this dilemma—the need for more doctors and nurses for the services, coupled with a multiplied need for the same doctors and nurses at home—that is giving sleepless nights to the experts of the National Security Resources Board and the other agencies whose duty it is to prepare for both mobilization and civil defense.

They have no hope of really solving the problem in the sense of having enough doctors and nurses both to meet all military needs and fully to protect civilian health. Our chance to achieve that goal has been frittered away in 5 years of inaction since the end of World War II.

The best they can hope for, today, is to arrive somehow at a formula that will equalize the shortage, a scheme that will go as far as possible toward taking care of military needs without leaving us utterly stripped of medical resources to meet ordinary civilian needs—plus the tremendous medical demands of atomic or bacteriological defense.

The experts have one other hope. Given a few years of even partial peace, the training of large numbers of doctors, dentists, nurses, and technicians might be started if the program got a great shot in the arm.

Faced with this alarming situation, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, bitterly split between proponents of national health insurance and those who fight it as socialized medicine, decided in the spring of 1949 to separate the problem of medical education from its long-stymied omnibus National Health Act. This, the Senators felt, might lead to something they all could agree on to aid the medical and other health education schools.

A bill was drawn up to provide Federal subsidies—$500 per student in the case of medical schools—to help meet current operating deficits. Additional sums were to be available for any school that increased its roster, and to aid the schools in expanding their physical facilities grants of $5,000,000 a year were to be allotted for construction and equipment.

This bill was sponsored not only by such Fair Dealers as Senators James E. Murray, of Montana, and Claude Pepper, of Florida, but also by two outstanding Republicans, Senators Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, and Forrest Donnell, of Missouri. The Hoover Commission backed its principles. President Truman got behind it. The Association of American Medical Colleges anxiously urged its passage. Most of the State-owned medical schools supported it. The privately owned medical schools were almost unanimous in their endorsement.

Nevertheless, anxious to meet all possible objections, the Senate committee followed up its public hearings with a week-long series of conferences with representatives of the American Medical Association and the other health professions.

At these meetings, under the chairmanship of Lowell J. Reed, vice president of Johns Hopkins University, every conceivable objection to the original draft of the bill was freely raised and discussed.

A CONCESSION TO MEDICAL OPINION

The original measure, for example, provided for an advisory council representing the health professions, to be appointed by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator. The representatives of the American Medical Association, however, objected to giving this much influence to Oscar Ewing, the Administrator, whom they deeply mistrusted as a leading advocate of compulsory health insurance. Instead, they asked that the measure provide for Presidential appointment of the advisory council. This change was made.

The early draft of the bill provided a ceiling of 50 percent on the proportion of the budget of any school that might be met by Federal subsidies. This ceiling was designed to preserve local interest in supporting medical education and to prevent the Federal subsidy from dominating the picture. Under the formulas for subsidy, the richer and larger schools would never approach the ceiling. But the representatives of the medical schools and of the universities felt that the 50 percent figure was essential if adequate help were to be given to the most needy schools.

The American Medical Association representatives, extremely fearful of so great a Federal participation in the support of medical education, held out for a ceiling of 30 percent. Ultimately the Senate Committee compromised at 40 percent.

Still wary of Federal influence, the representatives of the AMA asked that the ad-

visory council be granted a veto power over the actions of the Surgeon General in administering and alloting the subsidies. The medical school deans and the other educators, who long have handled research grants administered by the Surgeon General, felt no such apprehensions. But, to keep the peace, they agreed that the bill should be changed to require the Surgeon General to promulgate regulations only "after obtaining the advice and recommendations of the council."

Going even further to allay the AMA representatives' fear of Federal domination, the conferees recommended empowering the advisory council to make reports directly to Congress. This provision was designed to prevent any possibility that a politically motivated administrator might muzzle the council. Any conflicts between the representatives of the medical professions and the administrator would be brought right out into the open. Once again, the safeguards sought by the AMA were written into the Senate bill.

With the sole exception of the 40 percent compromise, every change requested by the representatives of the American Medical Association at these closed-door conferences was incorporated in the committee's final version of the bill—and the bill was sponsored by every Senator on the committee, with a single exception.

To protect the schools against bureaucratic interference with their teaching programs or their methods of operation, the bill contained rigid prohibitions against Federal "direction, supervision, or control * * * with respect to personnel, curriculum, or instruction."

When the measure was reported on the floor of the Senate in August, 1949, a routine objection was raised to its immediate passage by unanimous consent. At this juncture, both Senators Pepper and TAFT, long bitter opponents on most other questions concerning the public health, stood up and urged their colleagues to support the measure. Two weeks later, when the bill again appeared on the calendar, it passed unanimously.

FEARED TACTICS OF LOBBYISTS

The worried deans and directors of the medical, dental, and nursing schools breathed a sigh of relief. For, they figured, if the American Medical Association were opposed to the bill its powerful Washington lobby would have shown its hand in the Senate, would have blocked this measure (as it had blocked many others) in committee or, at a very minimum, would have forced a debate and a counting of noses on the Senate floor.

For the AMA lobby is powerful indeed. It operates through two channels. Officially the AMA is represented by Dr Joseph S. Lawrence, director of its Washington office. But the real power behind the scenes is the California publicity firm of Whitaker & Baxter which, for the last 2 years, has been directing the American Medical Association's well-heeled national educational campaign—aimed at preventing passage of the administration's compulsory health insurance program. Lawrence, Whitaker, and Baxter are registered with Congress as lobbyists.

Many of the medical school deans, unversed in the intricacies of politics, felt so certain that the aid to medical education bill would easily pass the House that they authorized the enrollment of larger classes than their schools had handled at any time since the war. The number of freshmen admitted to medical school jumped, in 1950, by 5.3 percent over the preceding year.

AMENDED TO MEET OBJECTIONS

In the House the Biemiller bill, a duplicate of the Senate measure, again received bipartisan support. Representative HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, former Republican National Committee chairman and longtime opponent of socialized medicine, joined with Democratic Congressman Andrew J. Biemiller, of Wisconsin, in sponsoring amendments to the original House bill to make it meet the AMA objections brought forth in the Lowell Reed conferences. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce promptly reported favorably on the altered bill.

By then, late in the session, it was necessary for the House Rules Committee to speed action on the measure if the whole House was to vote on it without delay. This procedure promised to be routine.

But suddenly the applecart was upset.

A small group of insurgent members of nurses' organizations in Georgia and North Carolina, and the owner of a private hospital in the latter State, got the impression that the measure would somehow set up the American Nursing Association as an accrediting body for all nursing schools—and thus force the closing down, for lack of accreditation, of some of the less qualified schools in the Southern States.

On behalf of this group, Representative ROBERT L. (MULEY) DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, protested to the Rules Committee. The sponsors of the bill offered to amend the measure to overcome this objection. That satisfied DOUGHTON, and he withdrew his protest.

But the Biemiller bill had, by then, been labeled "controversial." The Rules Committee, fearful of setting a precedent that would throw a host of other controversial measures onto the House floor in the last 2 weeks of the session, withheld its approval. The bill was held up till Congress could meet again, in 1950

Even after Congress adjourned, the American Medical Association's opposition had not crystallized. Early in December 1949, the House of Delegates of the AMA met in Washington and approved a report of its council on medical education and hospitals which declared that, "While the council is not entirely satisfied with the bill, it does incorporate several modifications suggested by the council's representatives and it is a distinct improvement over any other bill for Federal aid to medical education that has been introduced"

The report added, "The council is aware that Federal aid to medical education creates definite hazards to the continued freedom and independence of the medical schools. With few exceptions, however, the medical schools and their parent universities have expressed the opinion that, unless additional aid is provided, medical education in this country cannot achieve its full development. The legislation which has been passed by the Senate contains safeguards that should protect the medical schools from unwarranted interference in their affairs by the Federal Government"

SUDDEN CHANGE OF SENTIMENT

Less than 2 months later the AMA completely changed its tune At a conference of its national education campaign, Louis H Bauer, M D, chairman of the board of trustees, stated the AMA's position on pending legislation. The aid to medical education measure was added to the long list of bills which the AMA opposed.

Said Bauer, "As the bill is presently drawn, we feel it would give the Government a foot in the door—in fact, probably 2 feet in the door—for Federal control of medical education. There are certain very drastic amendments which will have to be made to that bill before we can approve it"

The strategy behind this shift in position was explained by Clem Whitaker, head of Whitaker & Baxter, who called the aid to education measure a fringe bill which, he said, masked hidden threats.

"Instead of being confronted with the task of defeating a revolutionary program of Government medicine, embodied in a single proposal, or in companion bills," Whitaker continued, "we are now faced with a series of measures—disarming in language but dangerous in their provisions—some of which must be beaten and some drastically changed or amended."

In the face of this attack, the House sponsors of the aid to medical education bill tried to go even further than did their Senate colleagues in meeting AMA objections. The Senate compromise which set subsidy maximums at 40 percent was dropped and replaced by the figure of 30 percent, which the AMA's representatives had originally asked for.

The clause guaranteeing academic freedom from Federal interference was revised and enlarged, at the suggestion of the AMA's Dr Donald G Anderson, so that every detail of protection could be carefully spelled out in the bill itself.

The provisions governing the promulgation of regulations were altered, again in keeping with earlier AMA suggestions. In the latest version of the bill, the professional advisory council would have to approve any regulation of the Surgeon General before it could take effect.

The AMA's friends on the House subcommittee kept it working over revisions until late last May, in what Representative Biemiller characterized as a "stalling-twisting-turning-conniving policy of compromise-and-then-oppose-the-compromise" Finally, with subcommittee approval won at last the Biemiller bill came before full Interstate Commerce Commitee on June 19—only to be defeated by a one-vote margin.

On June 25, employing a parliamentary device, Biemiller got the matter again before the Commerce Committee in the form of a new bill incorporating all the amendments that had been tacked onto the old one. Once again he lost out by a single vote. The committee decided not to consider the bill until after August 8, when—as it then appeared—Congress would have adjourned and gone home.

But the outbreak of the Korean war did two things It changed plans for adjournment, and it served to highlight the urgency of drastic action to get medical education into high gear. When the North Koreans crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, our armed services had 5,844 physicians on their rolls. They needed about 1,550 more

The Army, whose need was the most desperate, sent out a call to 3,000 Reserve lieutenants and captains in the Medical Corps, requesting their return to service. Only 200 replied, and of these only 15 volunteered.

By mid-August it became apparent that voluntary enlistments of physicians and nurses would never begin to meet the service's needs, even for a limited mobilization. The Defense Department found itself compelled to run to Congress for the hurried passage of a doctors draft bill. First on the list were 7,500 young doctors and dentists who had received their medical education at Government expense while deferred from active military service during World War II. But the draft bill was not limited to these men alone It authorized the President to order a general registration and induction of physicians up to the age of 55 and of dentists through the age of 45.

To meet the needs of a 3,000,000-man force, the armed services will have to drain from civilian life substantially more than 5,000 physicians and proportionately large numbers of dentists, nurses, and technicians.

Thus the initial stages of the crisis anticipated by the proponents of the aid to medical education bills are already upon us.

Any further expansion of the armed services will require additional levies against our already shorthanded civilian health personnel. All-out war, on a global scale, will require well over 42,000 of our youngest and most active physicians.

Facing up to this crisis, Representative Biemiller led a strenuous campaign in Congress all through last July and August to get the aid to medical education measure reported out to the House. Day after day he read into the record endorsements of the bill's passage: by Dean George W. Bakeman, of the Medical College of Virginia, by Dean Murray Kinsman, of the University of Louisville, by Dr. A C Ivy, vice president of the University of Illinois; Dean Willard C. Rappleye, of Columbia University, Chancelor Robert Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, and many others.

HOW MEDICAL SCHOOLS VOTED

Dean Joseph C Hinsey, of Cornell University, chairman of the executive council of the Association of American Medical Colleges, wrote that a poll of its membership showed 47 schools favoring the bill and only 16 opposed. He disavowed the action of the AMA as "taken independently of our association * * * and without a poll of our membership"

The deans of all the schools of medicine, dentistry, and public health in Massachusetts, including Harvard, Tufts, and Boston University, declared, "We are convinced that the present desperate plight of our professional schools, not only in Massachusetts, but throughout the United States, has already interfered with the quality of professional education and is preventing the development of adequate medical and health personnel for the country

"We make this statement," they add, "in full awareness of the position recently taken by the American Medical Association. We vigorously oppose that position."

Despite this campaign, the AMA opposition once again carried the day. On August 16, the Biemiller bill, which President Truman had characterized as "the most vital health legislation before Congress," was tabled in the Interstate Commerce Committee by a 9-to-8 vote.

Protesting this action, Dean James S. Simmons, of Harvard University, called it "a tragic mistake" and "a crippling blow to the Nation's military and civil preparedness program."

Scores of similar protests flooded in upon Congress But, last August 30, the House Interstate Commerce Committee again decided to table the program. Shortly thereafter, Congress recessed.

Despite this tendency on the part of Congress and the AMA to look the other way, the grave problem of medical shortages still exists, and the pressure is mounting for some action to solve it. Among those plugging for such a move is Bernard M. Baruch. "I am not in favor of socialized medicine," the famed adviser to Presidents said recently, "but the medical profession has got to do something to meet the needs of the masses. The first way is to increase the output of doctors."

Thus it appears certain that the next Congress will find itself confronted with the same hot potato—unless some alternative method of enlarging our health training schools can be discovered.

But are there any alternatives?

Dr. Willard C. Rappleye, of Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons, has offered one suggestion: A change in premedical education. If this were eliminated or cut down as a requirement for entering medical schools a few hundred doctors might graduate a year or so sooner—if the schools could find room for them as students. But, since the real bottleneck causing the doctor shortage lies in the medical schools themselves, Dr. Rappleye's proposal does not touch the core of the problem.

SUGGESTS ABOLISHING INTERNS

Dr. William Lee Hart, dean of the University of Texas' Southwestern Medical School, has proposed the abolition of internships and their replacement by a year of apprenticeship under older doctors. This proposal is certain to meet the stiffest opposition from both the American Medical Association and the thousands of hospitals whose entire set-up is dependent upon a continued supply of interns. But even if adopted, it would merely shift young physicians from the hospitals, where they are sorely needed, into doctors' offices.

The most likely alternative to Federal subsidies for medical education is the idea of a voluntary fund to raise money, free from Federal control The American Medical Association has long toyed with this idea. Last January a national fund for medical education was actually incorporated under the honorary chairmanship of Herbert Hoover. Its board of trustees—from Winthrop Aldrich to George Whitney—is diamond-studded with leaders of industry, finance, and banking. Its objective is worthy. Its personnel is top-notch. If ever a fund-raising plan were capable of achieving its full potential, this would appear to be the one.

Yet, what is that potential? In its prospectus, addressed to leading industrialists, the fund detailed the medical schools' need to overcome a $10,000,000 deficit But it proposed to raise, through voluntary subscriptions, only $1,000,000. The balance, the prospectus conceded, would have to come from the Federal Treasury.

TO PRESERVE ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The best the fund could hope for was that private sources for support might be stimulated so that "there will be created a balance under which the academic freedom essential to scientific medical education will be preserved."

Thus, the voluntary fund-raising organization turns out to be, at best, only a partial supplement to Federal aid, a 10-percent counterweight rather than a full-fledged substitute.

There may be still other ways of achieving the necessary expansion of medical and health education. But if there are 5 years of searching by the medical schools themselves and by the American Medical Association have not turned them up.

Thus, Congress, when it meets again, will have the old doctor-shortage headache on its hands once more. To the pressure from the President, from public health officials, from the universities and from almost all of our schools of health education, there will now be added a further tremendous pressure from the Defense Department, made acutely aware, by the Korean crisis, of the weakness in our medical armament.

Whether the American Medical Association can buck this tidal wave remains to be seen.

But one thing is certain. Unless immediate steps are taken to solve our chronic and growing shortage of medical, dental, nursing and public health personnel, your health—and that of your family, your neighbors and your sons in the services—will be jeopardized for years to come.

IT'S NOT "SOCIALIZED MEDICINE"

The article on this page sets forth a serious national problem that, in another all-out war, could become a national catastrophe. Few will bother to deny the present shortage of medical personnel. Few will deny the actual and potential dangers of such a shortage. Few will question its obvious solution. The country's medical schools must have money in order to expand and to reduce the sometimes prohibitive cost of medical education.

There is strong public and professional support for financing an expansion program with Federal funds. But the leaders of the American Medical Association are against the idea. So far they have blocked the passage of legislation which would make such a program possible.

Collier's thinks that their stand is wrong. We appreciate the association's great contributions in maintaining high professional standards and protecting public health and safety. Yet, in this case their attitude seems narrow, and their case weak.

Federal aid to medical education is not "socialized medicine." And as long as the danger of general war and atomic attack against our civilian population exists, the argument that Federal aid may lead to Federal control of medical education is academic, to say the least.

We hope that the AMA leaders will withdraw their opposition. The Senate has already passed a bill which would provide money to end the doctor shortage. If the AMA continues its fight in the new Congress, we trust that the law-makers will have the courage to enact the measure anyway in the interest of urgent necessity.

THE EDITOR.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on occasions like this, when I encounter a bill which has dual sponsorship and contains the names of some very distinguished Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, I feel a good deal like that old picture which may have been painted by Doré long ago, showing the martyrs in the arena, with the legend "morituri te salutamus." Senators who are Latin students will correct me, if I am wrong, but I think that was the legend, which means "we (who are) about to die salute thee." Well, Mr. President, it is not the first time I have died on this legislative battlefield by being defeated, but I find that I would be recreant——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I may say the purpose of this bill is to provide more doctors, so that many people may not die in their early years. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am quite aware of the viewpoint expressed on the proponents' side, but I would feel rather remiss in my duty and in my sense of conviction, Mr. President, did I not oppose the bill.

Mr. President, I propose first to look at the general purposes which are involved.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield for that purpose?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think what the Senator from Illinois is about to say ought to be heard by more Senators. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bennett	Ecton	Jenner
Benton	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Brewster	Ferguson	Johnson, Tex.
Bricker	Frear	Johnston, S C.
Bridges	Fulbright	Kefauver
Butler, Nebr.	George	Kerr
Cain	Gillette	Kilgore
Capehart	Green	Knowland
Carlson	Hayden	Langer
Case	Hendrickson	Lehman
Chavez	Hickenlooper	Lodge
Connally	Hill	Long
Cordon	Hoey	Magnuson
Dirksen	Holland	Malone
Douglas	Humphrey	Maybank
Duff	Hunt	McCarran
Dworshak	Ives	McCarthy

McClellan	O'Conor	Stennis
McFarland	O'Mahoney	Taft
McKellar	Pastore	Thye
McMahon	Robertson	Underwood
Millikin	Russell	Watkins
Monroney	Saltonstall	Welker
Moody	Schoeppel	Wiley
Morse	Smathers	Williams
Mundt	Smith, N. J.	Young
Neely	Smith, N. C.	
Nixon	Sparkman	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as I indicated in my preliminary statement, I am not unmindful of a general interest in the bill, but notwithstanding what its ultimate fate may be, I am opposed to it. I think, therefore, I ought to labor the bill itself, and to point out my objections, and to make clear to those who read the RECORD and to those who may be in the Chamber this afternoon what I think is in the bill and what is objectionable.

Mr. President, the bill has for its general purpose to make available to certain schools a certain amount of Federal funds so that enrollment may be maintained and increased. Those schools include schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, public health, and so forth.

Like so many other bills, the pending bill comes before the Senate containing one of those rather intricate open-end clauses so often found in legislation. I have encountered them a good many times, and how interesting it is to find this language in an authorization bill, "there is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary." Thus, Mr. President, the sky is the limit. Who knows what the bill will cost? But I expect to address myself to the question of cost very directly.

First of all, I desire to indicate why such a bill has been introduced. There is a contention that there is a shortage of doctors in the country. Information on that point has been widespread. I have encountered any number of folders, some of which are not quite accurate statements, from various sources, seeking to emphasize and to point out that there is a shortage of doctors particularly, and that our medical schools do not have the financial capacity to turn out doctors equivalent to the need of the Nation.

Mr. President, in referring to the history of this bill it should be remembered that there was an earlier bill in 1949, which passed the Senate in September of that year, Senate bill 1453. I understand it passed without objection. But that does not carry any weight, because so many bills often find their way to the calendar and out of this Chamber without objection. I have asked the monitors of the calendar from time to time to make sure that when this bill was called up on the calendar, if there was no other objection, then that they object for me. But Senate bill 1453 was passed, and, interestingly enough, it was passed the first time 9 months before Korea.

It cannot be said that this bill had its inception in an emergency, because there was certainly no emergency on the doorstep of the country at that time. It is a good deal like the Spence bill, which became the foundation for the Defense Production Act. I went back to pick up the stitches of the whole history of control, and I have found that the Spence bill, introduced by my old friend, Representative SPENCE, of Kentucky, the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, on which I served years ago, was actually introduced 16 months before Korea. The country at that time was reasonably serene. The country was then at peace. But there is something more than a casual hint in the bill that somebody had in mind a control system for our country. And so here is a bill the lineal parent of which, in the form of Senate bill 1453, went through the Senate 9 months before Korea.

I wish to address myself first of all, Mr. President, to the question of the shortage of doctors, and in doing so I call the attention of the Senate and the country to a rather interesting little folder. The title is "Doctors Wanted." It was published by the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Cooperative Health Federation of America, the Cooperative League of the United States, the Committee for the Nation's Health, and the National Grange.

I quote a few things from this folder. On one page is the statement:

There is a shortage—

That is followed by the following text:

The United States faces these shortages: 65,000 professional nurses, 9,200 dentists, 28,300 professional public health workers.

It is astonishing how precise they can be in their figures. Then they say:

We are short of doctors—

But they give no figures. This is a rather interesting folder dealing with the need. On another page appears this information:

Just to continue graduating 6,000 M. D.'s yearly, $40,000,000 more is needed yearly to stay out of red, maintain high quality of instruction, plus $330,000,000 for new buildings, labs, equipment.

Quoting further:

To increase enrollment 22 percent—working goal set by deans—would cost, in addition to above amounts, $18,000,000 yearly for increased operations plus $244,000,000 for construction and equipment.

I could go through the folder and point out many interesting things. The pages are not numbered. There is a little statement to this effect, under the heading "Key facts about S. 337–H. R. 2770":

It is limited to emergency needs for health personnel. It is a short-term, not a permanent program.

Anyone who has ever been associated with Government and has seen the initiation of a policy like this knows what will finally happen.

Let us get to the question of doctor shortages. I think one of the most revealing things that has come to my attention is an article which was contributed to the Reader's Digest by a man whom I esteem to be probably the best informed layman on medical subjects of whom I have any knowledge. Years ago I read with interest his book The Microbe Hunters. I also read his book entitled "The Hunger Fighters." He has been contributing to medical literature for a long time. His name is Paul de Kruif. This article, which he wrote for the June 1951 issue of the Reader's Digest, is rather interesting. It is so good that I think it ought to be read into the RECORD. This article covers the subject in a way which surpasses any capacity on my part. Paul de Kruif writes:

WHAT ABOUT THIS DOCTOR SHORTAGE?

(By Paul de Kruif)

"Our alarming doctor shortage"—so runs the title of a recent article in a national magazine. This shortage, we are told, is constantly becoming more critical. And the American Medical Association is the one big obstacle in the path of congressional efforts to meet that shortage with Federal aid to medical education.

Such incessant propaganda for socialized medicine, emanating in great part from the Federal Security Agency in Washington, has spread a false idea of the state of medical care in the United States.

"Mothers, lacking a physician's help," says the above-quoted article, "may die in childbirth. * * * Plagues and epidemics * * * may return to claim millions of victims."

Do such perils really lurk in our country whose doctors have made our maternal death rate lowest and our length of life longest of any big country in the world? Is there an alarming Nation-wide doctor shortage?

It depends on what you mean by doctors. It's true that, by going back 30 years, statisticians can prove we have a practically stationary supply of doctors: in 1920 one doctor for every 729 people; in 1950 one for every 730. That looks bad, until you dig down for why. What were those doctors of the good old days? Many thousands of them graduated from diploma-mill medical schools where, on payment of a sum of money and without even seeing a sick person, a boy in a couple of years could get his M. D.

Between 1909 and 1920 the medical profession led a campaign which rid us of rotten medical colleges. Now modern schools—all grade A—are graduating as many students as in the days when a quick M. D. could be bought for dollars. Our present institutions have increased their freshman medical classes during the past decade by an amount equivalent to the opening of 15 new medical schools, reports Dr. Stockton Kimball,

of the Association of American Medical Colleges.

Actually, since 1930 the number of doctors in the United States of America has been increasing proportionately faster than the general population. What is our situation compared to other lands? The United States has more doctors per total population than any country in the world, excepting Israel, overcrowded with refugee doctors from Europe.

Can we judge over-all need for doctors by simply counting doctors' noses? That's the yardstick used by Washington politicians. It's fishy. In World War II, 40 percent of our doctors were called into the armed services, leaving 60 percent of our M. D's to guard the lives of 91 percent of the population What happened? During the war the Nation's health kept on improving, death rates sinking, life expectancy rising

The fortunate fact is that 1 modern doctor can do what 10 couldn't do at all 30 years ago. In those days doctors ran themselves ragged treating diphtheria, immunization has wiped out that drudgery. Inoculations and new wonder drugs have enormously cut down the hours doctors used to have to spend at bedsides of children sick with whooping cough, measles, mastoids, and other childhood ailments. Not long ago pneumonia meant weeks in hospital and day-and-night attendance by doctors; antibiotics have reduced this killer to a minor illness.

It's fantastic how constantly evolving miracles are saving time for doctors. Penicillin was wonderful the way it cut down long-drawn-out and often futile treatment of blood poisoning, peritonities, syphilis, and gonorrhea. But penicillin still had to be injected, often around the clock. Now come antibiotics like aureomycin, chloromycetin and terramycin. Quickly conquering these maladies, and also virus pneumonia, urinary, and other infections untouched by penicillin, they save doctors still more time because they're given by mouth by nurses or members of the family under the doctor's direction.

It has become ridiculous to measure medical care in terms of a doctor per so many patients. Our lives are now guarded by crews of nurses, X-ray and laboratory technicians of which the doctors are the captains. These crews multiply each doctor's hands and brains in every hospital and clinic, speeding up and sharpening diagnosis. Helping doctors to spot diseases earlier, they vastly cut down the time required to treat them

Thus, medical progress in the past 15 years has made statistical estimates of a national doctor shortage meaningless. Yet here is a grim fact. Many cities are overdoctored, in some rural regions the shortage is severe

But this problem can be met—and is being met—by local action. Not many years ago young Dr. George F Bond came to Bat Cave, N C., to 500 square miles of mountain country most of whose 6,000 people had no medical care at all Bond bumped about 175 miles a day by jeep, often working 20 hours out of 24. Dog-tired, treating people in their homes without hospital facilities, he was practicing bad medicine and knew it.

To do something about this, Dr. Bond and a board of mountain men got together In Bat Cave there was next to no money. Some gave rocks, others lumber, others hardware, all of them manpower. In 9 months they had transformed an abandoned school into a 12-bed modern hospital.

In the past 2 years this little hospital has had 10,000 outpatient visits; has seen 600 accidents treated and 500 operations. In it 270 live babies have been born with no maternal deaths, and the newborn deaths are at the phenomenal low of 15 per 1,000 live births. Its surgical, medical and pediatric death rates compare favorably with those of any large hospital in the United States of America.

Dr. Bond's story is a striking example of the way communities all over the country are tackling their own medical problems.

Merrillan, Wis, population 600, raised money for a doctor's home and clinic, bought an auto and put money in the bank subject to check till a practice would make expenses. Merrillan got its doctor. Fabius, N. Y., population 600, including surrounding farm families, remodeled a building into a home and clinic and gave it rent-free for a year. Got its doctor. Elk Horn, Iowa, less than 500 people, formed a community association, raised money for a little medical center. Got its doctor, who could purchase the center, if he chose, within a year. Fairfax, Mo., 800, raised $105,000 in 3 weeks for a hospital. Before its completion, a doctor was attracted by the town's progressive action.

To Kansas in the past 2 years, 67 physicians have come to locate in towns of 2,500 or less. Dean Franklin Murphy, of the Kansas University School of Medicine, reports that a substantial number of these were attracted by the new community technique of building offices and clinics for their doctors.

By such methods, local shortages of doctors can be and are being relieved. And at present there is no serious national shortage Yet from the Federal Security Agency comes a clamor that there will be such a shortage by 1960 unless medical schools increase their output of doctors by 50 to 100 percent.

But medical schools aren't mills into which the Federal Government can put dollars at one end and get highly trained doctors out the other. You can't expand medical schools by putting more chairs at the back of bigger rooms and having the professors talk a little louder. It takes 10 years of grueling medical education to turn out a modern doctor It takes one teacher—and a good one—to every 15 or 20 students in the laboratory; in the clinics, one instructor for five students or ten. Where does the FSA expect to get the competent medical professors that would be needed to double the medical schools' output in 10 years?

Washington politicians have introduced a bill for Federal money to train doctors, and doctors representing some of the medical societies have fought this bill. That doesn't mean that they are against the sound expansion our medical schools need. Indeed, they are ready to go along with a law (like the Hill-Burton Act to help build hospitals) that will make Federal money available for new school facilities. But, having reason to dread bureaucratic control from Washington they want such funds to be one-time grants, controlled locally.

And they have started to back doctor-training with their own money In December 1950 the American Medical Association announced its contribution of $500,000 to the newly established American Medical Education Foundation. From doctors and other sources it is hoped that $5,000,000 will be raised this year, to be given without strings to our medical schools.

The untapped sources for voluntary support of medical schools are numerous. The pharmaceutical and chemical industries make millions from the new drugs used by our doctors. By high pay they're taking the cream of the young teaching investigators out of medical schools. That way they endanger the seed corn of medical education. When they lure bright men from the colleges they ought to be willing to contribute the money to put new ones back.

In getting itself desperately needed new doctors, Mississippi, the poorest State in the Union, is putting all the rest of us to shame. It offers its college boys medical fellowships, $5,000, to go to any medical school on condition they'll practice 5 years, after their internships, in doctorless areas of Mississippi of their own choosing. Already 30 of these are practicing in small towns; 40 plan to enter rural practice this summer; 200 others, now enrolled in 24 medical schools, will follow them.

Even in Illinois, one of our richest States, there are rural regions short of doctors. Without Federal or State help, the Illinois State Medical Society and the Illinois Agricultural Association have formed a $100,000 medical scholarship fund. Farmer-doctor committees pick promising boys from needy areas; 11 already are in medical school; during the next 5 years 15 will start medical training yearly. All will return to their home counties to practice

By such local enterprise the plight of doctorless communities everywhere can be alleviated without the inefficiency and wastefulness of Federal dictation. Those who are crying for Federal help would do well to remember these words of Dr. A. C. Sudan, famed general practitioner of Colorado: "When a dollar stays in your community it's still a dollar, but when it first goes to Washington, it's diluted and trimmed, coming back to the community as a mighty small piece of change."

The continuing threat of socialized medicine has served one wholesome purpose It has aroused State and local governments, civic and medical societies, to correct by local effort the deficiencies in our medical service. As a result, we are going to have plenty of good modern doctors. By 1954, medical graduates will have increased by 22 percent over 1940. By 1960, the year of the alarming shortage feared by Washington politicians, we'll have more doctors in proportion to population—and better ones—than we have today, and we already have more and better than any great nation has ever had before

Mr. President, I wish to amplify a statement made by the author of this article. He says:

And at present there is no serious national shortage. Yet from the Federal Security Agency comes a clamor that there will be such a shortage by 1960 unless medical schools increase their output of doctors by 50 to 100 percent.

But medical schools are not mills into which the Federal Government can put dollars at one end and get highly trained doctors out of the other

I believe that Paul de Kruif writes more authoritatively upon this subject than anyone else I know. He has examined it from stem to stern; and what he sets forth here is quite in line with the statement which was made recently by Dr. Anderson, which I shall subsequently place in the RECORD, and which also bears out pretty well the statement that there is no emergency shortage at the present time.

So, Mr. President, unless we are going to take the undiluted propaganda from the Federal Security Agency, there is much testimony and much authority, when we look realistically at the picture today, to the effect that there is no actual acute doctor shortage.

What we really have is a situation similar to that which once existed in the State of Kansas, where there was maldistribution of doctors. Dean Murphy, of the Kansas Medical School, adressed himself to that question long ago. Today Kansas is almost in the forefront in securing a better distribution of doctors as between metropolitan centers and rural areas. It has become a pioneer in that field. When the mal-

distribution of doctors was cured, much of the alleged shortage disappeared.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the fact that the Senator from Illinois mentions the State of Kansas and its fine program of rural health, as well as the expansion of its medical program within the State. I believe that the credit is due entirely to Dr. Franklin Murphy, who was dean of the medical school at that time, and who at present is chancelor of Kansas University, as well as to the Kansas Legislature, which took a very prominent part in supporting additional funds and appropriations which built for Kansas a greatly expanded medical program. I would recommend it to the other States of the Union. It is a program which can be carried out, and I think it is important, in view of the proposed legislation which is before the Senate at this time.

Mr DIRKSEN. What the Senator from Kansas says is quite consonant with what my examination of that situation adduces. I am grateful for his contribution to the discussion.

Mr CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr DIRKSEN. Yes

Mr. CARLSON. I believe there is one provision in the pending bill which should receive some consideration I believe it follows along the line of a bill which was introduced in the House by Representative BOLTON, of Ohio, to increase the expansion of the nursing profession It is one of the difficulties we are facing in Kansas. It may be true that we have in some areas a shortage of doctors as well, but I believe we have taken care of that situation. It is the nursing field which is entitled to serious consideration. I hope we may have an opportunity in the future to consider legislation along that line.

Mr. DIRKSEN I shall want to make some observations on that point as I go along.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to say to my distinguished friend the Senator from Illinois that the history of the development of the medical services in the State of Kansas, as my colleague from Kansas has mentioned, has been due largely to Dr. Murphy's far-reaching attitude and understanding. I believe it is well to point out that Dr. Murphy saw the necessity of appearing before various groups in the State of Kansas, such as parent-teachers' associations, medical associations, county units, and various legislative groups, and selling the people on the idea that it was a local responsibility, and that the local communities ought to take action of a very positive character about the medical and health problems. It was through that approach that the enlarged medical program was developed. It was in that way that the communities in the State of Kansas got behind the program. In other words, it was put upon a State-based structure.

I believe it is most wholesome when communities and States realize their responsibilities. If the problem were presented to them we would find that there would not be need for this type of legislation, which, to my way of thinking, is the first step toward a socialized medical program I think that Dr. Murphy has pointed the way, and I am very glad that the Senator from Illinois has made reference to the Kansas situation.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. In a moment I shall be glad to yield. I should like to read what Paul de Kruif had to say about the Kansas situation. He said:

To Kansas in the past 2 years 67 physicians have come to locate in towns of 2,500 or less. Dean Franklin Murphy, of the Kansas University School of Medicine, reports that a substantial number of these were attracted by the new community technique of building offices and clinics for their doctors

I desire to point out also what he stated about the Illinois situation.

Even in Illinois, one of our richest States, there are rural regions short of doctors. Without Federal or State help, the Illinois State Medical Society and the Illinois Agricultural Association have formed a $100,000 medical scholarship fund Farmer-doctor committees pick promising boys from needy areas, 11 already are in medical school; during the next 5 years 15 will start medical training yearly All will return to their home counties to practice

Mr PASTORE. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield

Mr. PASTORE. Would the Senator from Illinois permit me to make an observation by reading an article which was written by Franklin D. Murphy, M D., of the School of Medicine, University of Kansas, under the title, "We Need More Doctors"?

Mr. DIRKSEN I have the article before me. If people were to talk to Dr. Murphy, I wonder if it would not be disclosed that in spite of the article he does not have some other ideas about it.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not say that Dr. Murphy has endorsed this particular bill, but he has pointed out that there is a shortage of doctors. Would the Senator mind my reading into the RECORD two short paragraphs from the article?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is quite all right for the Senator from Rhode Island to do so, because I have his article before me. It is from the Saturday Evening Post, I believe.

Mr. PASTORE. That is right. Dr. Murphy said:

The realization that our medical needs are growing faster than our medical manpower has been bothering many of us for several years. How big the deficit really is depends on who makes the estimate. The Medical Association, until recently, has denied the existence of a shortage and suggested we might be in for a surplus instead. Others have said it was simply a matter of uneven distribution of physicians.

Certainly poor distribution is part of the shortage problem, but it is not the whole problem. Nor is it necessarily the easiest part to solve. While some of the wealthier metropolitan areas undoubtedly have more doctors than they need and many rural regions don't have enough, you cannot order city doctors into the country or coax them there by telling them about the birds and the trees. You must, as Minneola did, and as many other Kansas towns have done in the last 2 years did, add certain economic and professional elements to the atmosphere.

But over and above this faulty distribution there is, in the opinion of many medical educators, an absolute and substantial numerical shortage of trained medical personnel.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well. How many did Dr. Murphy say there were? He said it was a substantial number of doctors, and I started this discussion by saying that there has been an overemphasis of that point. I have before me a propaganda folder, which fixes the doctor shortage at from 15,000 to 22,000, according to the report made by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, chairman, Health Resources Advisory Committee of the NSRB. These figures are grabbed out of thin air in some agency in Washington. There is not any substance for any figures of that kind. It is a part of the overemphasis of the doctor shortage. I never said there was not a shortage. I said there was an amazing overemphasis on the question of the shortage, which does not stand up in the light of day.

Mr BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I believe the discussion revolves around the question of Federal subsidies and scholarships.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator from Illinois know of any shortage of applicants to medical colleges throughout the country?

Mr DIRKSEN. I am prepared to say that there are plenty of applicants, and that the situation can be taken care of by the medical schools.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. I have had some personal relationship with some of the medical colleges of the country, particularly the one in my own State. I know there are from 6 to 8 applicants for every available place in our medical college. There may be some duplication, of course. Those who apply to our school may also apply to other medical colleges. So the ratio in the over-all may not be that high. Only last week I was informed about a boy who was accepted for medical education by Ohio State University. I have been informed by the dean of the medical school that the boy had enlisted in the Army, and the Army refused to release him, on the ground that he was more valuable as a private in the Army than taking a medical course in Ohio State University.

During World War II thousands of boys were educated at Government expense. In the judgment of the Senator from Ohio—and I believe the junior Senator from Illinois agrees with me—we do not need any aid to the applicants, because there are plenty of applicants. What we need is increased educational facilities and increased enrollments in our medical colleges. We have increased our enrollments in the State of

Ohio from 35 to 150 for the freshman class, and ultimately it will reach 200. I think that is the answer to the problem, rather than the proposal being made in the bill which is now before the Senate.

As to the need for doctors throughout the country, I believe we should increase the educational opportunities in our colleges to the point where they can accept more students in the freshman class and have a little more Government cooperation in letting the boys get their own education, instead of trying to subsidize them.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. If I may answer the observation made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, I would say that that is exactly what the bill would do. It is not a grant to the student. It is merely a grant to the college, predicated on the number of students and also upon the number of students over and above the average for the past 3 years, so that they may increase their facilities and opportunities for more students to be admitttd.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is subsidized education.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course it is. I do not deny it.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator agree with me that the Federal Government is absolutely bankrupt at the present time and that the States are still solvent?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. I want to get to that point.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was interested in the comments about the reference to subsidy. Am I to conclude from the observation made by the Senator from Illinois that he is opposed to the Federal Government in any way subsidizing education at the college level or at any other level?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am opposed whenever it is hooked up with authority and power which will give the Surgeon General of the United States and someone in the Security Agency authority to determine the program and finally move in with control in any field of education, whether it is at the secondary or at the primary level.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois be willing at this point to tell us a little about the land-grant colleges and the authority the Federal Government exercises in connection with them and in connection with the extension services of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes; but let me say to my naive friend from Minnesota that that has no relationship whatsoever to a social program to be carried out by the Government, in connection with which the President himself has gone down the line in the direction of socialized medicine, and in the budget for the fiscal year 1952 has requested a modicum of money in order to initiate that program. The land-grant colleges and extension services have no relationship whatsoever to that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator from Illinois saying, then, that the deans of the medical colleges and the prominent doctors and prominent members of the American Medical Association and many highly skilled practitioners are endorsing a program of socialized medicine in this bill, which they have endorsed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I say that if a bill on any conceivable subject is introduced, in 2 hours' time I will be able to go out of the Capitol Building and obtain a list as long as the Senator's arm of persons who endorse that bill—any kind of a bill which may come along.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course the Senator from Illinois is aware that the State universities, which are supported by the taxpayers' funds, receive a subsidy from the American people. Does the Senator say he is opposed to having the taxpayers contribute to education?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I say that in that case the control lies in the States and in the local governments, and that is an entirely different thing.

My friend the Senator from Minnesota should read the whole delegation of power to the Surgeon General, beginning at page 38 of the bill, if the Senator from Minnesota has not refreshed himself about that point.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I wish to continue with my remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that I am a cosponsor of the bill, and certainly I read the delegation provision. I not only read it, but I helped prepare it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, that is good; but of course on that point we disagree. [Manifestations of applause by the occupants of the galleries.]

Mr SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The increase in the number of students has been mentioned. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Illinois is familiar—I am sure he is—with the fact that as late as September 8, of this year, one of the very reputable medical journals has stated that the 1950–51 freshman class totaled 7,182 students, that in 1951–52 there will be approximately 7,400 freshmen students, and that the total student enrollment of 26,191 presented in 1950–51 exceeded the 1949–50 enrollment by 1,088, or 4.1 percent, and exceeded the 1940–41 enrollment by 22 percent, or 4,812, the equivalent of the establishment of 15 new medical schools; and that the graduating class of 1951 was 6,135, the largest number in any year except in 1947, when under the accelerated war program several schools graduated two classes.

I ask the Senator if those figures show that there is an increase in the student load and that very quickly the schools which wish to accept their responsibility will pick up the lag and make it unnecessary to have the pending proposal put into effect?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; and I point out that that has been done on a sure, steady basis, and it assures the American people competency when someone hangs out a shingle with "M. D." on it—and that is rather important, when "old sawbones" starts to stick some kind of a scalpel into one.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to point out that in my State we built a medical school and had it begin to function with approximately $15,000,000 or $18,000,000; and we did not have to borrow or turn to the Federal Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure that was done under the great Commonwealth of Ohio. [Manifestations of applause by the occupants of the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to admonish the occupants of the galleries that the rules forbid demonstrations of any kind. Those who are in the galleries are here as the guests of the Senate, and the Chair must request them to abide by the rules of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I reaffirm my first objection to the bill, namely, that the shortage which has been referred to has been overemphasized in the face of all the testimony. By following the normal course, the needs, whatever they may be, can be supplied.

My second objection is that here, again, it is proposed to expend Federal funds, at a time when there is such a tremendous burden upon the Federal budget—a debt of $257,000,000,000, a spending budget this year in excess of $71,000,000,000, and estimates for the spending budget next year of well over $80,000,000,000.

Only last week we had the spectacle of having this body conclude its labors on the tax bill, on which the fight went back and forth across the aisle, and in regard to which some Members of the Senate felt that we were going to break the economic back of the country by putting such a burden upon our people, and, therefore, those Senators attempted to reduce the size of the tax bill, while other Senators, on the other hand, tried to increase the size of the tax bill from $5,900,000,000, as reported by the Senate committee, to approximately $9,000,000,000.

Now, we are asked to go blithely along and to put additional loads upon the budget and upon the backs of the people.

Mr. President, some months ago Senate bill 445 was under consideration in the Senate. I resisted it as best I could. I was defeated in that endeavor. I may be defeated in this one, but I intend to point out, insofar as I can, that, desirable though the programs may be, these constant accretions to the governmental burden are going to lead in the direction of national insolvency.

There is such a thing as taxing the solvency of the country, and the result of

such a program will be to take us down the dismal road down which Britain has gone.

Some have alleged that the program recommended by means of this bill is required by the increasing need for professional skills and the increasing cost of educating doctors, and it is claimed that similar factors have been the reasons for the developments we have witnessed in Great Britain. However, nothing could be further from the truth, as a matter of fact, because the British difficulties of today stem from the fact that within the British Government long ago the forces were set in motion, and today they have placed their feet in a dismal place, as they have socialized the productivity of their country, including their medical facilities. What has happened? A man like Cripps, when he became ill, went to Switzerland for medical treatment. I am not going to have that kind of thing happen to my own country.

So that is the sure and almost inevitable way of placing our country under wraps and under controls, which is just another name for socialism, because the very essence of socialism is control. It is done by the suicide route, which is the fiscal route.

So the question is, What is the cost? I have directed an inquiry along that line to the Bureau of the Budget, and the Bureau of the Budget has stated that the cost for the first year will be approximately $60,000,000 or $65,000,000. I have before me the break-down sheets which indicate what will be the cost of the program under this bill for a 5-year period. The total for the 5 years will be $367,456,000. The total for the fiscal year 1952 will be $60,932,000; the total for the fiscal year 1953 will be $67,213,000; the total for the fiscal year 1954 will be $74,233,000; the total for the fiscal year 1955 will be $80,688,000; and the total for the fiscal year 1956 will be $84,390,000.

How interestingly these amounts have an uncanny way of climbing and increasing until they become a real burden upon the country.

So there is the cost of this program—in the face of the fact that the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee stated on this floor some days ago that we were scraping the bottom of the barrel for taxes. However, now some are looking for new sources of taxation. Already we hear whispers. In addition to all the present burdens upon the American people, some persons are going to suggest that there be a Federal sales tax. Of course, the sales-tax field was almost exclusively the domain of the States in the days when the relief burden was heavy. Yet now some persons talk about a Federal sales tax. If it is imposed, it will not be in substitution for or in lieu of all the taxes which already are placed upon the people but it will be in addition to those taxes.

So the burden may be increased by means of every bill of this kind which comes before the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The question is whether we can afford it, even admitting that it might be desirable.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me at this point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois a question. This bill proposes an approach for a 5-year period.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The Senator from Illinois has just pointed out the cost factor each year for the 5 years. Does the Senator from Illinois have any idea or opinion to express as to what will happen at the end of the 5 years and what we shall do at that point after we have set in motion the machinery for this type of aid and assistance to be given to all the various institutions which would receive funds under the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I come to that now. First, Mr. President, let me recapitulate by saying that I am opposed to the pending measure because it rests upon an alleged shortage which has been definitely overemphasized. Secondly, it involves an over-all cost which becomes an added burden upon the country at a time when Members of the Senate who serve on the Senate Finance Committee are talking in terms of a $20,000,000,000 or perhaps a $10,000,000,000 deficit in the Federal budget in fiscal 1953.

I point out to my friend from Kansas that the third reason why I am opposed to the bill is that this program, like every other program of which I have had any knowledge, will grow. Such programs have an interesting way of snowballing. In this instance, while there is an estimate for 6,000 doctors a year, it will be observed that the figure will be built up, and there will be demands for additional funds for schools, additional funds for construction, and additional funds for equipment, as we go along.

Increased enrollment, according to the folder from which I have been quoting, was supposed to cost an extra $18,000,000 over and above the $40,000,000 estimated for the normal requirements under the program. There was an estimate of $330,000,000 for buildings, and then it became larger. The propaganda folder which was issued says that to take care of this increased enrollment of 22 percent another $244,000,000 will be required. All of that, Mr. President, mind you, is on the basis of preinflation figures. It is a good deal like some of the engineering estimates we get. I remember well that when I was a Member of the House, and I believe my esteemed friend the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] was also a Member, the Interior appropriation estimates for Hungry Horse Dam were sent to Congress. Does the Senator remember the Hungry Horse? What a Hungry Horse it was, because the estimate for the completion of the dam was $6,500,000, and when we got through, Hungry Horse cost the Government $91,000,000; and even the Hoover task report will verify that figure. So there will be more demands, other things to be thought of, and this program will grow and grow and grow.

The next reason for my opposition, Mr. President, is that there is present capacity for qualified students. I think Dr. Anderson, who has done a great deal of work in this field, has pointed that out, and so, as the medical schools come to consider the student applications, I am confident they will be able to take care of them.

I desire to read a few excerpts from a statement made by Donald G. Anderson, M. D., secretary of the council on medical education and hospitals of the American Medical Association, formerly dean of the Boston University School of Medicine. This is in elaboration of what my friend from Kansas said a moment ago. Dr. Anderson says:

> The average size of the freshman class in medicine in the 10 years preceding the recent war was 6,016. In 1948, 6,688 freshmen were admitted, the largest freshman class on record. The most recent estimate for 1949–50 indicates that the freshman class is slightly in excess of 7,000 students
>
> As a result of the increase in enrollment it is expected that the physician population of the United States will continue, as it has continued since 1929, to increase relatively more rapidly than the general population. In 1929 there were 125 licensed physicians per 100,000 persons in the United States. By 1948 the ratio was 137 licensed physicians for every 100,000 persons.

Mr. President, from all I have been able to put my finger on in connection with the proposals which are before the Senate in the pending bill, in my judgment there is every indication that there is present capacity, and that there will be normal enlargement from various sources and various funds, under the auspices of the States, so that the load can be taken care of.

Mr. President, there is one thing which has intrigued me about this subject. When all is said and done, we cannot put up buildings and admit extra students because there is a little subsidy to urge them to go forward and turn out doctors. There is something lacking. One of the things which is lacking of course is competent teachers, and there is a shortage of medical instructors at the present time. Medical students cannot be trained and qualified overnight. It is a rather happy idea that we can stick a freshman with a freshman cap on his head into a mill at this end and he automatically comes out as a competent physician. Nothing can be further from the truth, for there has to be sitting in front some one of professional rank, who has the capacity and the ability to make a good doctor out of the student.

Before too much is said about what is in the bill at the present time, perhaps a little more attention should be directed to that field.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does it occur to the Senator that one of the reasons why we have a shortage of faculty may be that there has been a tendency toward decline, a tendency toward closing up these departments, because of the difference between the cost of the tuition and the actual cost of the instruction? To me that would be indicative of an argument exactly contrary to that which is advanced by the distinguished Senator

from Illinois. If the medical schools have been keeping up with the progress of the time, if they have been developing their facilities and have been expanding, as the distinguished Senator from Kansas has pointed out, why then is it that we have a shortage of teachers?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Can my friend from Rhode Island find me a single shred of authority to fortify his conclusion that something in this bill is going to take care of it?

Mr. PASTORE. Of course it is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, I submit it is not.

Mr. PASTORE. It will take care of it because the minute we allow these schools to get a little more financial stability, so that they can afford to pay their teachers a little more money and attract more men into a profession from which possibly they have been drifting away, they may develop their faculties and thus make it possible to fill up any vacuum which may have been created over the years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the old story of the hen and the egg, and the question of which comes first

Mr. PASTORE. Of course it is

Mr. DIRKSEN. So there will be a long lag during which it will not be possible to take care of the situation.

Mr. PASTORE. That is all right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why not start at the other end? Why not begin under State auspices, and let the deans about whom my friend from Rhode Island talks give some attention to that problem? And when we get around to it, probably the problems of inflation inherent in this bill will by that time have been taken care of.

Mr. PASTORE. Is not that to play Rip Van Winkle and go to sleep for 20 years, and to forget this big problem?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed not, and no one is forgetting it. Certainly the medical associations in the various States, the State universities, and the 77 medical schools in the country are not forgetting it. They are more alert to it at this time than they have ever been before, and as a matter of fact, they are just as alert as any one of the specialists or experts in the Federal Security Agency, which has been doing so much for this bill, or in the Public Health Service of the United States.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not a fact that practically all of the representatives of the 79 schools have come here to say that unless they get this help they cannot do the things they want to do?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is rather interesting to me that all these citizen groups and professional groups in this folder are very careful and very restrained in the kind of endorsement they make. They say they support the principle of Federal aid to train more medical personnel. That is one thing, but do they go so far as it is proposed to go in this bill at the present time?

Mr. PASTORE. Would the Senator accept Dr. Conant, of Harvard, as an authority on it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know that I would or that I would not. Having noticed what Dr. Conant has had to say about various Federal programs in the past, including universal military training, I doubt whether I would accept him as an authority on it.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. CARLSON. I merely am wondering whether the distinguished Senator from Illinois would agree with me that even to increase the number of doctors in this way would not care for a situation which has developed in the Nation, namely, the difficulty of securing the services of physicians and doctors in rural areas. Something more will be required than simply additional doctors. I think we must have a program such as Dr. Murphy inaugurated in Kansas, of giving to young doctors as they graduate from school some assistance in the way of clinics, hospitals, and offices, to encourage them to practice in the rural areas. We have demonstrated in the State of Kansas that that can be done. It is not so much a question of scarcity of doctors as it is a question of local assistance to induce doctors to go to the rural areas.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to answer my friend from Rhode Island with respect to the capacity and willingness of States to do the job.

The State University of New York announces plans for two new science centers, one at Brooklyn and one at Syracuse The Brooklyn structure will cost $10,500,000, and the Syracuse structure will cost $4,500,000, plus large sums for equipment.

The Nebraska University voted increased funds for the Nebraska Medical School so that service might be restored.

In Washington legislation for Federal aid for medical schools has been introduced, but objection has been raised three times when efforts have been made to act upon it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. In the State of Rhode Island there is no medical school.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator's State is so conveniently located to the Empire State and to the whole Atlantic seaboard, that even though Rhode Island is a small State, there should be plenty of doctors and there should be no difficulty in getting doctors into the State.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Illinois says that too easily. The fact still remains that it has been possible to place in medical schools less than 5 percent of those who have received a premedical education.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then let me ask, What is the matter with the people of Rhode Island?

Mr. PASTORE. Nothing is the matter with the people of Rhode Island.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I begin to doubt it.

Mr. PASTORE. The fact of the matter is that we do not have a medical school and we cannot build one, with costs as they are today. The people of the State of Rhode Island pay $215,000,000 in Federal taxes and receive only $8,000,000 in grants.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is progress in every other State in the Union, including the State of Mississippi, which is the lowest taxpayer in the country, I believe. The State of Mississippi has made excellent progress in recent years. It is a confession of weakness back home to throw upon the Federal Government the task of providing the educational facilities sought by the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. I am not throwing it on the Federal Government. When the Senator cites the fact that facilities are being constructed in New York, that might not mean anything to someone in California or in Illinois. Even in States where there are medical schools they do not have the facilities to take care of all the young men and young women who desire to attend medical school. In 1918 4,100 medical students were graduated, and today approximately 5,700 are graduated. We have not kept up with the demands of the times.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is, to me, a rather baffling argument. Nearly every State in the Union takes care of the need. My friend says that the State of Rhode Island pays $215,000,000 to the Federal Government in taxes. Where is the will of the people of Rhode Island? Why bring the problem here?

Mr. PASTORE. This bill does not solve the Rhode Island problem. It is a national problem, which cannot be confined to a particular State.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, my next objection to the bill is that it puts too much power into the hands of the Surgeon General of the United States. The bill speaks for itself I think that is one of the alarming features of the measure.

On page 38, under the heading "Authorization of appropriations for grants for construction and equipment," section 373 provides, in part, as follows:

> There are also authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1956, $10,000,000, to enable the Surgeon General to make grants.

I read further:

> The Surgeon General, after obtaining the advice and recommendation of the Council, shall make such grants in the order of the estimated importance or value of the construction and equipment in alleviating the shortage of personnel adequately trained in the medical, osteopathic, nursing (other than practical nursing), dental, dental hygiene, and public-health fields: *Provided, however,* That the Surgeon General shall give priority to areas in which facilities are either nonexistent or inadequate

That is where the delegation of authority to the Surgeon General starts.

I invite attention to the language on page 40 of the bill, in section 374:

> SEC. 374. (a) No payments from appropriations pursuant to section 372 for any fiscal year may be made to any school unless such school has filed an application therefor for such year which contains adequate assurance, as determined by the Surgeon General, that—
>
> (1) such school provides and will provide reasonable opportunity for the admission of out-of-State students.

There are 15 universities or medical schools which in the school year 1950–51 did not admit a single nonresident

student, yet it is proposed to give the Surgeon General power to say, "Look, I am authorized to withhold any aid from you unless you follow the regulation or directive or ukase in a way consonant with what I say about the admission of nonresident students."

Incidentally, Mr. President, those schools include the Medical College of Alabama, the University of Arkansas, the Medical College of Georgia, the University of Mississippi School of Medicine, the University of Missouri School of Medicine, the University of North Carolina School of Medicine, the Ohio State University School of Medicine, the University of Oklahoma School of Medicine, the Medical College of South Carolina, the University of Tennessee College of Medicine, the Southwestern Medical School of the University of Texas, the University of Texas School of Medicine, and the University of West Virginia School of Medicine.

Let us consider the language on page 41 of the bill. Among the other powers the Surgeon General will have in pursuance to delegation of power under this bill is this:

> Such school will submit from time to time such reports as the Surgeon General may reasonably require to carry out the purposes of this part.

There is something fancy about that word "reasonably." When we get into a difficulty we stick in the word "reasonably," and it seems to cover a multitude of sins.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Will not the very point which the Senator is making build up such dependence upon Washington for financial support that there will be an anxiety on the part of those in charge of the schools to please Washington authorities, and we shall certainly lose the intellectual independence and freedom which belong in those institutions? Does the Senator agree with me on that point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if it would not be a good thing for the Surgeon General to have authority to require the admission of a certain number of out-of-State students. The thought occurred to me because in my own State we have two very good and long-established medical schools, while in the State of Mississippi there is only one medical school, an institution which has not been in existence nearly so long as ours, and which does not have anything like the facilities possessed by our schools.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that if he will examine the bill, starting with page 33, and spell out the powers vested in the Surgeon General, he will see that we give him many powers.

Finally, the school must be approved by a recognized body, and the Surgeon General will approve the body that does the approving. So, when we consider the total of the authority and power delegated, we find we are asked to hand to the Surgeon General a large chunk of authority over the medical schools of the country.

Mr. President, I wish to add one further statement. What is proposed to be done by the bill will be permanent; let no one fool himself about that. The camel gets his nose under the tent, and then, of course, as time goes on, the demands increase tremendously. I have seen that follow, and all other Members of this body have seen it, at one time or another.

I discover on reading the report issued by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or issued at its instance, which relates to Federal scholarships, Federal programs, and other Government aids to institutions, that there is envisaged an ultimate permanent Federal-aid program, and when it is integrated, when it has dug in, it will be here for all time to come

Mr. President, I remember the nursing program we set up during the war, when I was a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives When the time came to liquidate the program I thought those in charge of it would tear out the heart of every member of the Appropriations Committee. Telegrams rolled in from my State by the hundreds. Those in charge had done a masterly job of propagandizing the thing, and were fairly threatening our political lives unless we went down the line and agreed to continue the program and to continue in power those in charge of it.

Let me prove to the Senate that the program is going to be permanent and that the demand for its continuation will be with us. Here is an interesting pamphlet, an effective hunk of propaganda: "Emergency doctors wanted." Who signs it? The American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Cooperative Health Federation of America, the Cooperative League of the United States, the Committee for the Nation's Health.

Let 5 years go by, and let the appropriation of money under this program terminate, and those in charge will be here just as strong as ever, demanding that the program not only be continued, but that it be enlarged.

Mr. President, probably out of your experience you can testify to the accuracy of the statement I am about to make. It runs in my mind that when Senator Smoot, of Utah, was a Member of this body he once said, long ago, that there is never a recession from the higher spending plateau to the lower. It is always onward, upward, forward. It is always more and more, and in greater quanties. So once this program has been bottomed up, it will be simply the springboard for greater and greater demands for this field, including larger slices of authority in a Federal bureaucracy as it articulates its power, coupled with money. And, oh, what a lure there is to come with their tin cups even as suppliant nations from abroad come to this country for gratuities, loans, and hand-outs.

Mr. President, when I think of the need of this measure, my mind goes back to Senate bill 445, which was debated on the floor of the Senate some months ago. It was finally passed by a few votes. But as I go back and think about it, I recall what was involved in that case. There were statements made on the floor of the Senate that it would cost—"Oh, only fifteen or twenty million dollars." I had to read the RECORD, because it had become a little vague in the minds of some of the Members of the Senate, that the estimate was $80,000,000 for the Federal Treasury and $160,000,000 for the State and local treasuries for that bill, a total of $240,000,000. But voices were raised on the floor of the Senate that it would only cost fifteen or twenty million dollars. It was said, "After all, in a sixty-billion-, seventy-billion-, or eighty-billion-dollar budget, what is that? It is a mere bagatelle."

What was being asked for under that bill? Three thousand public-health physicians, 30,000 public-health nurses, 7,500 sanitarians. That is a new word. In response to questions asked by Senator Pepper, of Florida, I think Dr. Scheele—it may have been someone else—said, "Well, it is only for some service. This country should have more. Maybe 60,000 or maybe 70,000 persons." Where does this business stop finally, I should like to know?

So here we have a program the estimates for which run up to well over $300,000,000 for a 5-year period, of what will become a permanent program. Is it not time, in view of the fiscal situation that confronts the country, to stop, look, and listen? I think the sensible thing to do with the bill is to send it back to the committee. If some construction funds have to be voted, let them be thinking about it. But let us be careful with respect to the kind of authority we delegate, because bureaucracy has moved pretty far in this field, and has frightened many who have had to go back to the people for the suffrage that returns them to this and to other elective bodies.

That is all I have to say, Mr. President, except to reassert that even if this program were desirable, it contains so many objectionable features that it ought to be looked at pretty carefully before we go any further down the road it opens up. Nursing bills, public health bills, aid to schools—put them all together, draw the line, and add up, and the result is a little more steady progress down the road that Britain traversed, the road of free teeth and nothing to bite with them when the people get those teeth, free wigs, free medicine, and all that goes with it, on a level and on a basis that compelled their own Prime Minister to go to Switzerland in order to find the kind of medical service that he thought was consonant with his rather critical condition.

Mr. President, I shall not wittingly add my voice or my vote to a single proposition that is going to take my country in that direction.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, this particular bill has been so much commented upon today, both pro and con, that there is not a great deal left to be said that has not heretofore been expressed. But

I start out in my discussion, Mr. President, with the statement that last year 20,000 young men in the United States could not take courses in medicine or dentistry for the reason that there was no room in the schools to accommodate them I reiterate the statement that the schools are crowded now. They would take more students today if they had the available faculty, if they had the available laboratory space, if they had the increased facilities. Let me say that there is no desire on the part of any medical or any dental school or any school of nursing in the United States to attempt to keep young people from studying those professions; but many young people are prevented from doing so simply because the schools are crowded, and they cannot take any additional students.

Mr. President, here is another startling statement. In 1905—and that was 46 years ago—512 more physicians were graduated in the United States than were graduated in 1949, 512 more physicians in 1905 than in 1949.

Here is another statement, Mr. President. We have in the United States today approximately between 75 and 78 less medical schools than we had in 1905. I happen to be one of those who are pleased that a great many of those medical schools have passed out of the picture, for they were simply diploma mills. It is good for the practice of medicine and dentistry that they were closed when the survey was made, I believe in 1910.

I have spoken of the number of graduates as of 1905 and as of 1949. At the same time I call attention to the fact that the population of the United States has doubled in that time. Carrying these statistics just a little further, in 1905 there were 2,677 more medical students than there were in 1949. In 1949 there were 2,677 fewer students in the United States taking medicine than there were in 1905, although our population had doubled. Today the population of the United States is increasing at the rate of between 6,500 and 7,000 persons a day. That is approximately 2,500,000 people a year. So there must be, and is, a terrific load on our medical schools to produce the number of physicians, the number of dentists, and the number of nurses which are absolutely essential in order to meet the needs of the increased population.

Something has been said today about the fact that at present 1,600 hospital beds under the Veterans' Administration are vacant because there are not enough physicians and medical technicians to supply the services for those beds, so that they might be utilized by our servicemen. I am wondering if it is surprising to Senators when I say that in perhaps one of the best hospitals in the city of Washington half of the surgical ward is closed today, and has been closed for some time, because of lack of medical and technical personnel and nurses to supply that particular ward.

There is another item which enters into the increased need for medical education. Today people realize more than ever before the value of medical care. Today people have more of the necessary finances to take advantage of medical assistance and medical care than they have ever had before in the history of the United States. So we find a situation in which the services of professional people, physicians, dentists, and nurses, are in greater demand than they have ever been before in the United States. Ten years ago 7,000,000 people in the United States availed themselves of the use of hospital beds. Last year nearly 18,000,000 were patients in our various hospitals.

Another situation facing us today is the fact that a great many physicians, dentists, and nurses are going into the Armed Forces. For the first time in the history of the country it was necessary to resort to the draft of professional personnel, physicians and dentists, in order to obtain a sufficient number to take care of the members of the armed services. In some ways I have no criticism of either a physician or a dentist who does not care to avail himself of an appointment as first lieutenant After he has put in 4 years in high school, 4 years in college, and then 4 years in medical school or dental school, and in the case of a physician, at least 1 year of postgraduate work, he is offered a first lieutenancy. Of course he should not be called upon to accept appointment to such a low rank in the armed services. The money he has spent and the time he has put in entitle him to a far better classification than that of first lieutenant or captain in the armed services.

I should like to cite an incident which happened year before last A friend of mine telephoned me in an attempt to get his boy into Georgetown University Medical School. I telephoned the school, and this is what I was told: "Senator, we would like to help you We can take only 125 students. We have 3,600 applications."

That situation does not prevail exclusively with Georgetown University It holds true throughout all the United States. I am interested in the situation because of the deplorable condition in my own State. We do not happen to be sufficiently fortunate to have a medical school or a dental school In fact, the 10 Rocky Mountain States do not have a dental college. From the Canadian border to the Mexican boundary 10 States, with a population of 10,000,000 people, have no dental school. They have two medical schools, one rather large one and one rather small one. So the people of that Rocky Mountain area must depend on the charity of other States in taking students from the Rocky Mountain area.

The great need for this bill, as I see it, lies primarily in the lack of well-trained faculties of instructors. There was a time in medical education when it was considered a great honor, and was considered helpful in practice building, to be a professor in a university, to be a dean, or be the head of one of the departments of a medical school or dental college. Today, however, the schools are not in a position to pay anything near the amount of money which a physician or doctor can earn in private practice. Therefore physicians and dentists do not respond to the requests of the dental and medical schools to give of their time and talent in teaching. At the present time I am in the process of attempting to get a Japanese dentist to come to the city of Baltimore and accept a position in the dental college in that city, simply because sufficient personnel cannot be obtained in the city of Baltimore or in the State.

Another great need—and this bill is not adequate in that direction—is the need for new structures. As I stated at the beginning of my remarks, the schools cannot take any additional students today. They simply do not have room for them. So this bill makes $10,000,000 available each year for a period of 5 years, to be allocated to various schools to increase their physical facilities.

The yearly average deficit of our medical and dental schools today is $40,000,000. That is, the income from student fees is $40,000,000 less than the expense of educating the students. I hear various statements with reference to the cost of medical education a year, ranging all the way from $2,000 up to $3,500. I believe that an accurate figure is somewhere near $3,000 Since the student pays a $600 fee for tuition, naturally there is a deficit created by each and every student; and the more students there are the greater the deficit.

Mr. President, without a doubt we in the United States have the best schools in the world. The medical and dental profession and the nursing profession in the United States are far ahead of those in any other country. There was a time when it was considered necessary to go to Vienna to complete one's education in medicine and surgery. But such is not the case now. Our schools are looked upon as the very best in the world.

Mr. President, I have before me a memorandum with reference to the pending bill, which I believe came to me from the American Medical Association. It is entitled "Problems Involved in Considering the Support of S 337."

I wish to make brief references to the various statements contained in the memorandum.

First, it states the fear that when medical schools are financed by Federal funds, the independence and intellectual freedom of medical schools may be threatened. In other words, "He who pays the piper, calls the tune."

I understand the apprehension of the American Medical Association along that line, and I know, too, that they feel that this may be the first step toward socialized medicine. There is no Member of this body who is more opposed to socialized medicine as is the junior Senator from Wyoming. I do not believe that this bill is at all a step in the direction of socialized medicine.

I know that another fear of the medical profession is that the passage of the bill would give some control to a Federal bureau over the curriculum, over the course of study, and over the naming of students.

Since 1878 we have been contributing funds directly from the Federal Treasury to land-grant colleges. To the best of my knowledge the Federal Govern-

ment has not attempted to dictate to the schools throughout the United States what they shall teach or who the pupils shall be.

Another situation was referred to on the floor of the Senate the other day. Congress willingly contributes to the support of agricultural schools. Oh, yes, Mr. President, we are willing to contribute toward teaching a farmer how to raise wheat, how to produce better livestock, how to treat the conditions of his livestock, and how to take care of his livestock, but again when it comes to the human being, there are those who oppose our making like contributions toward taking care of the health of the people of the Nation.

I note another reason why the AMA is disturbed about this bill. It states that the basic operating expenses of the medical schools vary so much that possible economies might be considered in some of the medical schools.

Of course some of the medical schools could operate on lower expenditures, but I contend that when we start to cut the expenses of the medical schools we immediately reduce the standards of those schools. That is something that none of us wants to see happen, namely, a cutting of the standards of instruction and practices of the profession.

The next objection seems to be that financial assistance for the medical schools either should come from the States or from private funds, thus leaving the schools with less centralized Federal control. Campaigns for raising such funds are being conducted at present.

The American Medical Association is right. President Hoover is trying to raise a fund to assist medical schools, and I understand the fund is to be $5,000,000. However, I ask, what is $5,000,000 toward a $40,000,000 annual deficit?

The American Medical Association has made a gesture toward raising a fund to help medical schools. They talk about raising a half million dollars. I do not believe they mean to raise that much each year. I ask again, what is a half million dollars as against a $40,000,000 annual deficit?

Something has been said today with reference to the increased number of students graduating from medical schools. There has been reported a 22-percent increase between 1941 and 1948. I know that the medical profession and especially the medical schools are doing everything they can to increase the output of physicians; but, with an increase in population of about two and a half million each year, and taking into consideration the doctors who are forced out of the profession by reason of health, death, retirement, and for other reasons, the number is not sufficient to take care of the load.

The bill does provide subsidies. I know of no other way in which the Federal Government can help.

Then the argument is presented that although there is a time limitation of five years specified in the proposed legislation, it is improbable that this will terminate the program as subsidies once started are difficult to stop.

With that statement I am in complete agreement. I am inclined to think that if we start subsidizing medical schools, in all probability we shall continue to do so.

Certainly I know of no worthier activity that taxpayers could subsidize than our medical schools.

Mr. President, I am thinking of the GI bill of rights. For some 6 years now the Federal Government has been subsidizing our colleges and universities in order to take care of the ex-serviceman, so that his education could be completed. I do not know of any instance in which the Federal Government has attempted to dictate to the schools what they shall teach, how they shall teach, or who should receive the instruction.

I should like to say for the RECORD that this bill has the strong endorsement of the American Dental Association.

I have in my files a letter from the Secretary of the National Association of Deans of Medical Colleges, stating that the medical colleges strongly support this bill.

I feel that Congress has an obligation to the young men and young women of the country. I feel very keenly that a young man who wants to take medicine or dentistry in the United States should have that right, just as we make it possible for any young man to take law, education, agriculture, or any other study he may care to take. I know of no type of instruction today which is not available to all of our young people, with the exception of medicine and dentistry.

I am very hopeful, Mr. President, that this bill will receive favorable action by the Senate.

THE WAR IN KOREA

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington wishes to talk about the war in Korea.

In the press of last night, I found a comment by General Omar Bradley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which ought to be made a part of the record and called to the attention of the Nation by every possible means. This is what was said:

> WITH UNITED STATES THIRD DIVISION IN KOREA, Tuesday, October 2.—Gen. Omar N. Bradley said today the United Nations could bring the Korean war to a successful "military conclusion" if the suspended truce talks break off completely.
>
> He did not elaborate on what was implied in the phrase "military conclusion."

Mr. President, I take it for granted that General Bradley thought that any elaboration of the phrase "military conclusion" was unnecessary. He must have considered the meaning of the phrase to be obvious. All he could have meant was that the United Nations forces are prepared and will be determined, if the cease fire talks are called off, to unify Korea by military means. What else could General Bradley have meant? Everybody has known for months that a "military conclusion" could never be achieved by having the opposing forces kill each other on or about the thirty-eighth parallel. That procedure can pile up casualties and might result in reaching an agreement to temporarily stop fighting, but it could never lead to a "military conclusion" or decision by ourselves or the enemy.

General Bradley said yesterday what nobody else in authority has even intimated for almost a year. He implied in his phrase "military conclusion" that we are prepared to exercise sufficient pressure to make the enemy lay down his arms and withdraw from North Korea. Mr. President, can any other possible construction be given to General Bradley's comment of yesterday?

I do not know, of course, by what authority General Bradley spoke. Perhaps he meant only to provide the officers and troops of the Third Division, fighting now in Korea, with some encouragement. It might be that General Bradley did not intend to have his comment made public in the United States. I can only hope that General Bradley meant what he said, and that he was authorized by the United Nations to make his comment.

Because of what General Bradley has said could and would be undertaken if the truce talks fail, our Nation should be advised of what is likely to happen in the near future.

If the truce talks fail completely, one great and inspiring thing is certain to follow: We shall have heard the last of Operation Killer. We shall be given an opportunity to support, for a change, Operation Victory.

The Korean war has been characterized for months as being Operation Killer. The Senator from Washington resents and resists that slogan today as much as he has since first he heard it several months ago. War's only objective is victory—not death, destruction, and bloodletting. There is no justification for any war which does not have victory as its primary purpose. Operation Killer implies that we Americans and our allied associates are engaged in an effort which is not designed to carry out our political objective in Korea by military means, but is designed to kill as many North Koreans and Red Chinese as we can. This concept of war is repugnant to those who think, and is a complete contradiction of the convictions and faith by which Christians live and die.

Operation Killer is a slogan which is being used by the enemy's propaganda corps to do the cause of freedom grievous injury everywhere. It could have been selected only because our military people have been led to believe that no plan for victory in Korea had been agreed to or designed by the United Nations, including the United States. The crying need of the present, Mr. President, is for an Operation Victory. I hope we initiate such a plan, and do it soon. If the free world, as represented by a limited number of allied nations now fighting in Korea, is unable to collectively agree on how victory can be achieved in Korea, then those nations, if common sense and consideration for those who now are fighting and bleeding in Korea mean anything at all, ought to get out of Korea. No good purpose is being served

by letting blood run thick on and about the thirty-eighth parallel.

Gen. Omar Bradley is apparently convinced that the United Nations must decisively defeat the enemy if that enemy will not promptly agree to a cease fire. Gen. Matthew Ridgway, the Allied Supreme Commander, has stated that the Eighth Army is ready and poised "to strike and strike hard." We lay persons ought to appreciate what these statements by our leading military authorities really mean. What they must mean is that at long last the free nations of the world are getting ready to support and carry out what they said they meant to accomplish in Korea more than 15 months ago. It likewise means that young Americans and their counterparts from other allied nations will be given a chance to live and die in pursuit of a worth-while mission. It means that the agony coming out of frustration and futility and a lack of purpose or objective in Korea may soon be over and done with. It means that the forces of freedom will try again to regain their self-respect. It means that these free forces will seek to be deserving once again of the admiration and confidence of the unfortunate victims of Communist despotism everywhere.

If the cease-fire talks break down completely—and that might happen tomorrow or this afternoon—it must naturally follow that enemy bases in his Manchurian sanctuary will be attacked and destroyed. It must follow also that allied forces in sufficient number will be committed on the ground to force the enemy to retire north of the Yalu River. It must also follow that consideration is being given now in allied high councils to increasing the effectiveness of economic sanctions and to establishing for the first time, 15 months after the war began, a naval blockade against Red China. General Bradley, a distinguished soldier and a man possessed of a thinking brain, and everybody else who knows anything about war, fully understand that all of these means must be employed if a successful military conclusion is to be reached in Korea.

For a long time, Mr. President, my impression has been that the pattern of the war in Korea has not changed since the Joint Chiefs of Staff advised General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, in late December of last year, that his primary mission was Japan, not Korea; that he could expect no reinforcements from the United States or from our allies; that the enemy would be permitted to do as he liked from the security of his Manchurian bases; and that no use could be intended for the Chinese Nationalist troops on Formosa. Until General Bradley spoke out yesterday, none of us had been given, in recent months, any possible reason to believe that we had any other plan or intention in mind than Operation Killer.

That our political management of the war in Korea has violated every sound military doctrine developed in all of history, is well known to everybody; and no witness can be produced on the face of the earth to say otherwise. There is nothing very much that any of us can do about past blunders and political mismanagement. All we can pray for is that General Bradley knows what he is talking about, and that we are shortly, if honorable cease-fire terms are not agreed to, to forget the mistakes of the past, in favor of going forward until a true and valid peace has been restored to all of Korea.

Mr. President, as we prepare ourselves for the changes which are likely to take place soon in Korea, and to be imposed upon our Nation, there are some facts we ought to think about and bear in mind. During the long-drawn-out weeks of the cease-fire negotiations, the casualty rates have been skyrocketing. We are inclined to be so impressed with published enemy casualty losses that we are too unmindful that in war you do not kill the enemy without suffering important losses of your own. In the last several weeks the casualties in Korea have been comparable to the highest weekly casualties suffered since the Korean war began over 15 bloody months ago. Every American who has thus far been led to believe that Operation Killer is worth while ought to cry out in holy horror over the bloody fact that we have suffered more casualties in the first 15 months of the administration's police action than we suffered during the first 15 months in World War II.

Mr President, we ought to learn again how to become indignant In World War II our casualties for the first 15 months were 80,620, with 6,860 grand, young, gallant Americans dead on foreign battlefields. In the Korean war—to which I have never from the beginning referred as a police action—casualties for a like period were 85,469 Americans, with 14,280 killed in action. In an undeclared war, in 15 months there have been killed more than twice the number who died in a comparable period in a war which at least was recognized for what it was by the administration and by the Congress of the United States

If this knowledge does not make the living flesh of every American crawl, as it makes my own hair stand on end, then from my point of view that individual has no right to call himself an American, for he is possessed of neither heart nor soul nor conscience.

Unless an honorable cease-fire is agreed to, or unless the United States will forget Operation Killer in favor of demanding and supporting "Operation Victory," let someone else tell me what I do not see, for I see no conceivable end in sight of the war in Korea. The war there has already lasted longer than American participation in actual combat in World War I. The Korean war is now headed straight into its second winter. I must believe that General Bradley, who has a heart and, I think, a conscience, and others in authority will not permit Operation Killer to be the only hope and the only goal to be offered to the allied forces in the winter to come.

All of us know that arms and equipment and the instruments for making war are being sent in vast quantities to areas of the world where there is no war. We have all realized for a long time that equipment and personnel strength in the quantity required for success have been held back from the only and actual war in which Americans are dying and have suffered so grievously. Small wonder that the Senator from Washington must conclude that General Bradley means that there is to be an end to these diversions if the cease-fire talks are broken off permanently in Korea.

The President talks to our Nation about new and fantastic weapons. I think him ill-advised to talk about instruments which are mostly on the drawing boards; but he talks, too, on many occasions about atomic weapons. We are told that they are being stockpiled in great numbers. We have been led to believe that they are superweapons in themselves. Yet not a single bomb from our stockpile has been employed as a tactical weapon in Korea, where more than 14,000 Americans will never again be given a chance to come home to this land of the free and the home of the brave, because they are dead. It is for the dead that I do my best to speak this afternoon. In his phrase "military conclusion" Gen. Omar N Bradley must have included a consideration of employing atomic energy for tactical reasons if we soon get rid of Operation Killer in favor of Operation Victory.

I remember, Mr. President, when the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of State and the President of the United States last January, which was 9 months ago, decided that the time had come to pursue attacking enemy aircraft to where those aircraft had taken off from their sanctuary in Manchuria, and destroy them Those who read the newspapers of that day and who listened to the radio will remember when that decision was made. But that decision was not made effective, and there are those who have never been told why That decision was not made effective because some of our allies opposed our intention, and because our Secretary of State—and I make no possible reference to him as a person, but I refer to him as one of the most powerful officials on the face of the earth was singularly ineffective in his lukewarm effort to convince our allies of the righteousness of our intention and positive need for such action. During the hearings held by the Joint Committee on the Military Situation in the Far East, some of us sought a logical answer as to why military necessity and common sense did not demand that the enemy's aircraft be destroyed I learned in those hearings, Mr. President, that the war in Korea was, and is to this minute, being managed not by military but by political leaders. I do not waste any time in castigating our Secretary of State. I am simply against him, and I believe that he ought to be removed, not for any personal reasons, for I hold him to be cultured and well-mannered, gracious and considerate. Those considerations are unimportant. But I think the Secretary of State ought to be removed because of the testimony he gave under oath in the hearings on the question of hot pursuit and other military matters. When we consider that the Secretary of State has largely dictated the course of action which we have followed in Korea, other Senators may be as shocked and disappointed as I was by some of his

observations about the question of hot pursuit.

I asked him first:

Can you suggest a single logical military reason why enemy aircraft whose sole mission is to destroy and hinder allied operations should not be shot out of the air wherever they are found?

The Secretary of State responded:

Well, I can suggest the reasons which were given at the time of this proposal was brought up for believing that it might be more of a disadvantage than it is an advantage, and that is that if by pursuing an airplane across the border you bring in the air on the other side against your whole operation you may have lost more than you have gained.

I pursued this question with the Secretary of State a little further by saying this to him:

That was not the thinking, however, of the Military Establishment and the Joint Chiefs of Staff as of the time last January when you, after agreeing with their contentions, were directed to inform our allied members of what the intention of the military people in the United States was.

Secretary ACHESON. You did not ask me that. You asked me if I could think of any reason——

Senator CAIN. Yes, sir.

Secretary ACHESON (continuing). And I was trying to think of a reason, in answer to your question.

Senator CAIN. Mr. Secretary, in the name of continuity and in the name of just common sense, I want the record to support in a limited way my contention that there is every possible military reason for hot pursuit of enemy aircraft in any war in which America finds itself engaged. I use three brief references from military witnesses.

On page 28, General MacArthur said:

"I know that the air wished from the very beginning to pursue an attacking enemy plane to the death, whether it was over the border or not. The directives forbade that. The question was raised at the very beginning whether we could pursue an attacking plane to a conclusion in an air fight."

On page 807 General Marshall, Secretary of Defense, said with reference to hot pursuit:

"I had urgently recommended it and it was concurred in by the Secretary of State and the President."

On page 2300, General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said this:

"From a military point of view we thought it was desirable because it would be tough for a man in a dogfight to keep one eye on the Yalu River and stop the minute he gets there. It is very difficult."

The Secretary of State and others highly placed in the administration have endeavored to make us forget the monstrous political mismanagement of the war in Korea by turning our attention to other things.

At least we have not heard that anyone representing the administration has dared to take the floor of the Senate, or the floor of the House of Representatives, and say a solitary favorable thing about the political management of the war in Korea which began in June 1950, for a statement of that kind is impossible.

I am reminded of what the President said about the Secretary of State immediately after the Japanese Peace Treaty had been signed in San Francisco. The President said that the Secretary of State, by his superb conduct as a chairman at the peace conference and as a designer of an agenda which had already been agreed to before the conference was convened, had proved himself to be smarter than all of his critics combined. If this be true, Mr. President, all of us have the greatest possible reason for concern about the future.

The Secretary of State is that individual who, in the face of sound military judgments advanced by those in military authority, failed to get an acceptance 9 months ago of our military decision to destroy the enemy's aircraft in their lairs. The Secretary of State will long be dead and buried before history renders its decision that, because of his unwillingness to press for the acceptance of an imperative military requirement, many an American and many an allied serviceman has died unnecessarily. I will not apologize for or forgive the blood of others which is on his hands by joining those who pretend that what was accomplished in San Francisco is adequate reason for overlooking and forgiving and forgetting the monumental failures and errors in judgment in Korea.

Nine long and dismal months have passed in Korea since the military were denied the right to properly and adequately protect themselves against attacking enemy aircraft. What has taken place in this period? A year ago our aircraft had complete control of the air in Korea. Our bombers then could roam at will through the skies. That freedom of action is no longer possible. Our bombers must be protected wherever they go today over North Korea. We have lost some of our largest bombers and are certain to lose more.

I do not mind so much the loss of the physical things that go into the making of a bomber, a B–36, for example, but I think of its crew, the pilots and navigators, the bombardiers, being crushed by the impact with the land, because of our utter unwillingness to do what was necessary in an attempt to give those kids a fair sort of chance to come home again.

In the past year, the enemy has built more and larger air bases in Manchuria from which to send over an ever-increasing number of attacking aircraft. We read only of the enemy aircraft we shoot down. We are seldom advised of our own losses. The jet air war which now prevails in Korea is accurately described as being the largest and greatest in history. Yet in the face of an ever-increasing build-up of enemy air strength, we have done literally nothing to destroy the enemy's ability to seriously injure us.

In May the Secretary of State said it would be unwise for us to pursue enemy aircraft to their lairs if by so doing we brought enemy air strength in against our operation. How completely unintelligible can a political war manager become? Do any of my colleagues believe that if we attacked enemy air bases in Korea the situation would be much more dangerous than is the case today?

I think the situation has been and is about like this. In January the enemy had a very limited air strength and air potential in Manchuria. By attacking his bases then, we could have destroyed what he had and prevented him from substantially increasing his strength. By reason of what we failed to do, the enemy has had nine full months in which to prepare to launch several thousand aircraft against the allied forces. With the passage of each day during which we fail to take the air war to the enemy in Manchuria, we are enabling the enemy to better prepare himself to defend his installations and to destroy ours.

The case in favor of attacking enemy air bases in Manchuria can be supported in many ways.

War is largely a measure of one capability against another. In the construction of aircraft, all capabilities are not attained simultaneously. The constant struggle of designers is to balance range against speed and maneuverability. The best information I have is that the Reds are using jet aircraft which exceed American jets in both speed and maneuverability. It is said that at 40,000 feet enemy aircraft can run circles around our aircraft.

We must assume it to be a fact that we have thus far been very successful in combating enemy aircraft. A pretty sound reason for this is that we have our first team fighting the aerial war in Korea. Probably a majority of our pilots are combat veterans who gained their experience and skill through many combat missions in the last war.

In the beginning of the Korean air war it was obvious that many of the enemy's pilots were poorly trained and were sent into battle to gain experience. No such opportunity was ever previously available to any military force. If the Red invader lived through a pass or two at our aircraft, he was able to break off the engagement at his choice and fly away to complete safety across the Yalu River. The enemy pilot of today, however, is generally acknowledged to be reasonably able and getting better every day.

What seems clear to me is that the air-power battle in Korea is not likely to be won by aerial combat by our forces. As the battle grows in size and intensity, as I notice with complete interest it is growing every day, I should think that the air war itself can only be won by destroying enemy aircraft on the ground. Should the Allied forces destroy enemy air bases in the Manchurian sanctuary, there is reason to believe that the enemy would not be able to fly jet aircraft missions into Korea and out again because of the range limitation of the jet aircraft now employed against us. We might effectively and completely force the aerial battle in Korea to cease by destroying the jet bases in Manchuria. Speed would be of no avail to the enemy if he did not have enough range to reach his target and return. If the enemy's sanctuary is put out of business he would be required to employ bases elsewhere and these of necessity would be much further away from his present target.

Need we be reminded that it has now been more than 3 months since Jacob Malik first put out a peace feeler. In the many weeks which have gone by, we have been trying to negotiate with the Communist forces at Kaesong and have gotten nowhere. For 44 days, between

July 10 and August 23, the Reds used the talks as a screen behind which they moved fresh troops, more aircraft, a large quantity of artillery, and many modern tanks into the line and in reserve. That is where they are now, waiting to go against us. This build-up has been continuing during the weeks which have followed the breaking off of the cease-fire talks in late August. General Bradley is aware of all of these factors. He knows that unless an honorable cease fire is agreed to without delay—and I take this to mean within the next few days—the Allied forces must do one of two things. We must either take the initiative and go forward or the enemy appears to have sufficient forces to drive us backward. I do not know whether the enemy has such a force or not, but I know that he is going to try to drive us backward with the forces at his disposal if we attempt much longer to stand still. The least anyone can say is that his power is considerable. The one thing which my Nation must now appreciate fully is that the Allied forces, whatever their managers' wishes might be, will not find it possible, if the cease-fire talks fail, to remain much longer where they are If Operation Killer ever was justified, it is rapidly becoming outmoded and impossible to maintain. The spilling of blood on a stationary line is an unsatisfactory and unacceptable solution for the challenge which the free nations undertook to meet in June of 1950

As I speak, gallant young Americans are dying and being torn to shreds in Korea. My heart and conscience are directed to providing a purpose which will justify the sacrifices which so many have made so uncomplainingly. Before this day is over other Americans will die in Korea. Many more will die before the fighting is finished either by a cease-fire agreement or the successful conclusion of "Operation Victory" When one's nation is in trouble and war results, it follows that men, and women, too, must die. If they do so in pursuit of a military conclusion—to use the words spoken by General Bradley yesterday—which leads to the restoration of peace, their sacrifices are understandable and are justified before God and man. What is totally inexcusable is for men to remain involved in a war which is not headed for victory.

Gen. Omar Bradley said yesterday to those in the field who do the fighting, while we do the talking, that the time is soon to be here when the fighting must be called off now or we must and shall go forward until the enemy has been driven from Korea. Could any leader say anything less to the last best hope we have—the youth of our land?

EMERGENCY PROFESSIONAL HEALTH TRAINING ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946, to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues in urging the prompt passage by the Senate of S. 337, a bill which, while it may not be of such nature as to provoke great emotionalism or to warrant banner headlines, nonetheless, in my considered opinion, is of great importance. It is important to the success of our Armed Forces. It is vitally necessary if we are to create an effective civilian defense mechanism throughout the country, and it is essential to the physical well-being of the civilian population upon whose continued productivity we must rely to more than counterbalance the apparently inexhaustible supply of manpower now under the control of the Kremlin.

I realize that those are strong words with which to characterize a legislative measure in the field of health. But, Mr. President, I believe the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has already made it clear that they are justified. I am confident, too, that when the Senate listens to the arguments of his colleagues on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, who—Republicans as well as Democrats—are as one in urging the immediate passage of this bill, the Senate, too, will agree that it would be difficult to overemphasize the importance of S 337 to the future strength and welfare of this Nation.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to recapitulate the telling reasons for supporting the bill which have been so ably put forth by the Senator from Rhode Island in his fine presentation earlier today Permit me instead briefly to call attention to those phases of the testimony given us which, in the light of my past experiences in the Congress, were most persuasive with me

It has been my privilege in years past to serve as chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs and, on coming to the Senate, first on the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and later on the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

Throughout World War II, I was unable to escape a constant awareness of the severe strain which military necessity was placing on the capacity of our medical profession to meet civilian needs. As I know very well and as I believe every Member of the Senate knows, the physicians, dentists, and nurses of this country during those trying years, by an expenditure of almost superhuman effort and through sacrifices well out of proportion to those most of us not in military service were called upon to bear, managed to meet the Nation's needs. But as we also know, seldom during those years were we ever seriously concerned with the prospect of unheralded, airborne atomic and bacteriological invasion. Had we then been forced to deploy our medical manpower to meet the sort of threat which now hovers over our centers of production, the result might well have been catastrophic. Can anyone among us here today take the responsibility for saying that we shall be as fortunate tomorrow or next month or next year? I think not. In the 2 years since the Senate, after the war and in a time of apparent peace, passed a bill which to all intents and purposes was identical with the one now before us, aggression which began with a swift surprise attack, has taken place in Korea

If this measure deserved and won the support of the Senate of the United States in 1949, as it did, then, Mr. President, since the events of June 1950 it is many times more deserving of our wholehearted support today.

I need not discuss in any detail what the events in Korea and all that they imply mean in terms of our national economy and the life of our people. But they do mean that now and for an indefinite time in the future, this Nation is committed to the maintenance of an armed force totaling at least 3,500,000 men And they do mean that for that same indefinite period, we are committed to such a mobilization of our economy as will guarantee those Armed Forces the weapons, the supplies, and the medical and other services which will enable them to halt in their tracks the forces of evil now enlisted under the banner of Communist aggression

To these two things, Mr. President, the Congress and the people of the United States are committed· Armed Forces at peak strength and composed of men and women in the best possible physical condition; and a civilian population so organized and served as to be able to supply our Armed Forces under whatever conditions of stress or strain or catastrophe may occur. Both pillars of our defense, Mr President, rest in fact on one thing—the health and strength of our people. And they in turn rest upon the adequacy and capability of the health services of the Nation available to both the Armed Forces and our civilian population. If those services were inadequately manned in 1949, if the schools upon which we must rely to train health services personnel were inadequately staffed, housed, and supported in 1949—and they were, Mr President—then certainly the situation is immeasurably more critical today. To meet the needs of a three-and-one-half-million-man force, the Department of Defense—which, incidentally, urges us to pass this bill—is having to take from civilian life some 11,000 more physicians than it needed a year ago. A year ago, there was not a community in America which felt that it had a surplus of doctors, yet 11,000 have been or are being withdrawn from those communities. When we realize that the average nonspecialist physician must serve at least a thousand laymen, that means that some 11,000,000 of our people are losing their doctors, and will have to seek such care as they need from already overburdened men of medicine. Despite this, Mr. President, a subcommittee of this body presided over by the able and distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who now presides with such distinction over the Senate, has repeatedly told us that our Armed Forces do not yet have proper health services. I have not had the opportunity, Mr. President, to study with care all the excellent reports made to us by the Preparedness

Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. But I have read three of the reports issued by that subcommittee which has done such a splendid job under the chairmanship of our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. Apparently, since it is not otherwise indicated, those reports reflect the unanimous conclusions of Senators KEFAUVER, BRIDGES, HUNT, SALTONSTALL, STENNIS, and MORSE, who are serving so well on that subcommittee. Mr. President, permit me to read just a few brief excerpts from the reports which these able colleagues of ours have made on the conditions they found to exist on our military bases.

At Camp Roberts, Calif., they found:

There was a shortage of doctors and nurses.

At Fort Riley, Kans., they found that—

In order to give adequate care of the patients, medical personnel are required to work unusually long hours.

The post surgeon at Fort Riley felt that 30 doctors were needed but only 20 had been assigned. And, again quoting from the report of this distinguished subcommittee:

Additional doctors had been requested but were not available.

And this, Mr President, is what our colleagues had to say in their report on the Sheppard Air Force Base in Texas:

The number of doctors and nurses assigned to the hospital was considered inadequate in view of the military population at the base, and although additional doctors and nurses were authorized, they were not available.

Further on in that same report, the subcommittee told us

The great amount of dental care needed by recruits places an excessive burden on the dentists assigned and as a result approximately 35 percent of the recruits leave the base still in need of dental work.

In view of such findings, Mr. President, it certainly is no surprise that since Korea, the American Legion and the Disabled American Veterans, who know how important proper medical care is to the efficient functioning of a fighting force, have joined with the American Dental Association, with the deans of our medical schools, and with a host of other organizations in urging us promptly to pass this bill. They know, as we must know, that it takes years to train doctors and nurses and ancillary health service personnel. They know that when Congress failed to pass this bill 2 years ago, we gave notice to Stalin that he could count on two more years of a medically unprepared America. We cannot recapture these lost years. But we can and we must see to it that this bill passes now: That, before another academic year goes by, our schools can undertake the first steps toward providing the 22,000 additional doctors and the tens of thousands of additional nurses which the National Security Resources Board found we will need by 1954.

I am sure I need not take up the time of the Senate to relate in any greater detail the relationship between this bill and the needs of our Armed Forces. But permit me a few brief comments on another related and not unimportant subject. As a result of the last war, we now have more than 18,000,000 veterans to whom this Nation and the Congress owe many obligations, some of them in the field of medical care. Although the Congress beyond any shadow of a doubt has sincerely meant to discharge those obligations in all good faith, we have not done so. We have tried. We have conscientiously considered, planned and legislated. We have appropriated the hundreds of millions of dollars needed to build the hospitals and to pay for the medical care to which we and the people of this Nation believe our veterans are entitled We have actually built the hospitals. But we are not providing the care.

Why not? For the very reason that we must pass this bill Because this country does not have enough doctors and nurses to meet the needs of its people; because perfectly planned and fully equipped buildings called veterans' hospitals do not in themselves mean medical care for veterans; and because dollars appropriated to pay for the services of doctors and nurses do not mean medical care for veterans. Hospital buildings are mockeries, hospital equipment is useless, and dollars for doctors might just as well be doughnuts if we cannot find the doctors or the nurses to staff the buildings, use the equipment, and provide the care And that is the position in which we now find ourselves. As of today, in veterans' hospitals throughout the country, there are enough wards closed because of lack of medical personnel to provide the equivalent of 11 hospitals of 200 beds capacity apiece. Think of it, Mr. President, we have used the taxpayers' money; we have built these hospitals because they were needed; we have equipped them completely. But today, although thousands of veterans need the care which could be given in these institutions, they stand empty, mute witnesses to our failure to support and strengthen the schools which could train the men and women needed to make them meaningful, they stand empty and in so doing show how erroneous is any statement that we have no shortage of medical personnel

It is to high light this situation, Mr. President, that I have introduced and will shortly call up an amendment to the pending bill. It is an amendment which merely adds on line 4, page 30, after the word "Forces," the words "and the Veterans' Administration" We must realize that it would be better for us to have highly trained personnel—skilled in the art of healing—with no hospitals at all than to have the hospitals without the medical men and women needed to staff them. We must realize that our veterans are not getting the care which we said they needed when we built these hospitals. We must realize that, in the considered and unanimous opinion of your full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the only feasible way to assure the supply of personnel needed to give that care, is through the passage of this bill.

Mr. President, I have spoken of S. 237 as it relates to our Armed Forces and our veterans I know I need say no more about its bearing on civilian defense than to point out that today every comprehensive program of civilian defense rests on one assumption—that there will be available, wherever needed, in the event of enemy attack, teams of highly trained doctors and medical technicians.

In World War II, our civilian defense leaders had to be experts in administration. Now, we are told, our top civilian defense men should be doctors, and highly trained doctors, who can instantly recognize the nature of the attack, analyze the chances of saving lives, and by the orders they give to the civilian defense corps contain within a limited area the havoc wrought by radioactivity and contagious disease Never before have we had to prepare ourselves against the type of attack that could within minutes make a flaming holocaust of any American town or city or which, through the utilization of deadly bacteria, lead to the wholesale destruction of men, women, and children We do now But we cannot so prepare And we cannot because we just do not have the trained people needed to plan and to administer the necessary defense programs For this job alone, the National Security Resources Board found that we need a minimum of 3,300 more doctors by 1954 We do not have them now, Mr. President, and we will not have them then. But, Mr President, we can have them a year or two later if we promptly pass this bill God grant that they will not be needed for such work, but God grant that should the need arise, we will have had the wisdom and the foresight to have seen that the need was met

Let me now turn, Mr President, away from talk of war and death and destruction I believe it was necessary talk, Mr President, considered and sincere talk. I believe that anyone who considers the content and objectives of the pending bill in the light of world conditions today will agree that the picture I have drawn was not overdrawn But I should like to turn now, at least for a moment, to the kind of thought in which the Congress engaged after the last war when we talked of peace instead of war, when we planned in terms of construction rather than of destruction, when we thought in terms of healing rather than of maiming or of being maimed. At that time, in 1946, Mr. President, the Congress passed the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, the so-called Hill-Burton Act. Under its provisions, with the States and local communities in charge and with the aid of Federal funds and the skilled and devoted assistance of United States Public Health Service personnel, we surveyed and plotted the Nation's need for civilian hospitals. With the surveys completed and priorities assigned in terms of need, the Congress year after year appropriated funds for construction. I see on the floor the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. He sits as a member of a

subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which handles appropriations for hospital construction. He knows how we have struggled to secure the construction of hospitals and how Congress has responded and provided the money with which to build them.

That the program is really needed, soundly planned, wisely administered, and a source of continuous gratification to the people and their Congress is, I believe, proved by our recent action in approving the appropriation of $82,500,000 for further construction under the act. The hospitals which will be built with those funds are really needed, badly needed, and they will be used. But, I think we are bound to agree that just as in the case of the veterans' hospitals, I discussed earlier, although every single one of these hospital beds is required and though each of the hospitals will be utilized, they must have doctors and nurses. We must continue to build these hospitals as they are absolutely necessary. But we know that right now, in a number of cities, even here in Washington, whole wards in existing hospitals stand vacant because they cannot be staffed. Can we who talk and try to practice sound economy and consistency and common sense continue to permit such a condition to obtain? Or will we as a body do what that committee which you charged with the responsibility of studying these problems in minute detail unanimously recommends? Let us do the whole job. We have undertaken to build the hospitals. Now let us make sure that staffs will be available to man them. It can be done through the enactment of the bill which is now before us.

And while we are thinking in terms of the Hospital Construction Act, Mr. President, permit me to point out a few analogies between that measure which has worked so very well and the bill to provide similarly limited Federal aid to education in the health professions. The committee was determined that in this instance any program of Federal aid must be carried out in accordance with our best traditions in this field of education. Therefore, just as in the case of the Hill-Burton Act, we determined to build on what already existed and to make the fullest use of the knowledge, the experience, and the spirit which have led to such great advances in medical, dental, and nursing education. It was for this reason that we included private, nonprofit, or voluntary schools as they are usually known along with State-supported institutions; for example, the hospital schools of nursing which exist in every State as well as the university schools of nursing which exist in but a few.

And, as has been pointed out, we have endeavored to limit the power of the Federal Government over the program to the minimum degree necessary to a reasonable check upon the expenditures of Federal appropriations. In order to protect the Surgeon General from pressure groups in administering the program and to give him and ourselves the benefit of their experience and wisdom we have, as in the case of the Hospital Construction Act, provided the Surgeon General with a carefully balanced council, which is to report directly to the Congress within 2 years, on how the act is working and on how we might perfect it. Of course, the council will consider all problems. It will consider the question whether there is any need to tighten further the provision limiting Federal authority. I believe the committee has tightened that provision as much as it can be done, and still have assurance that the money will be expended as the bill provides.

Again, as in the case of the Hill-Burton Act, Mr. President, this bill has been carefully designed to preserve and to stimulate maximum effort at self-support on the part of recipient institutions. We have provided in the first place that the proposed grants must be to supplement and not to replace existing sources of income; we have further provided that in no case can the total instructional grants exceed 50 percent of the costs of instruction and then, within that framework we have set up a carefully calculated schedule of grants which in effect will mean that only the poorer schools will come anywhere close to receiving 50 percent of their costs while those better off will receive approximately 20 to 25 percent of their costs. In short, Mr. President, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in drafting this bill has drawn heavily upon its wealth of experience in related fields and we are unanimous in our belief that we here offer you a soundly conceived measure.

Mr. President, before closing these remarks, permit me to say that my part of the country is justifiably proud of the way our medical, dental, and nursing schools, both public and private, nonprofit, have grown and improved their facilities in recent years. Even a brief glance at the statistics will show that our schools are training more doctors, in proportion to population, than are schools in any other part of the Nation. This is as it should be, for our need for physicians, especially in the rural areas, is very great.

Despite these great advances by southern universities, however, I want to read to you just a few sentences from the telegrams which have reached me from medical school deans, since word reached them that S. 337 was to be debated on the floor of the Senate.

From my own alma mater, the University of Alabama, President John M. Gallalee, and the acting dean, Tinsley R. Harrison of the medical college, warn that the present level of medical education is in grave jeopardy here because of insufficient funds to meet expanding costs. Our medical school, like all others, is in desperate need of additional funds for maintenance of present program and projected plan for training increased medical personnel.

From Emory University, a great institution in our neighboring State of Georgia, I have a message from Dr. R. Hugh Wood, dean of its medical school, saying very frankly that he regrets the necessity of Federal support to medical education, but going on to assert that Emory University School of Medicine supports S. 337 because it seems clear that Federal support will be necessary.

Dr. D. S. Pankratz, of the School of Medicine at the University of Mississippi, writes that "we are in the process of converting a 2-year school into a 4-year medical school with more students." He put his school's situation very bluntly: "We need aid now." Certainly a school such as this will be a valuable addition to our roster of medical institutions, and it will be tragic if it comes so close to success only to fail for lack of funds. The State of Mississippi needs the doctors who can be trained at her university.

I have seen messages from virtually every school, public or private, in the South urging passage of S. 337. President Gordon Gray, of the University of North Carolina, urges passage of the bill. Dean Youmans, of Vanderbilt University School of Medicine in Nashville; Dean Kinsman, at Louisville School of Medicine; President Kenneth M. Lynch, of the Medical College of South Carolina; and Acting Dean R. L. Pullen, at Tulane University Medical School, in New Orleans—all have made it clear that their schools will be in difficult straits unless the Congress passes the Emergency Professional Health Training Act.

These are the views of the men entrusted with the responsibility of running our southern medical schools. I need not tell you, Mr. President, that not only are they men of integrity who choose their words well and carefully but they are also men who would be the first to denounce any program which could conceivably lead to Federal intervention in the institutions which they head. They support this bill.

But, Mr. President, I fear that in speaking so much of medical schools we may overlook the needs of our schools of nursing; needs which differ somewhat in character but not at all in intensity or in their importance to the Nation's health.

At this moment there is not a single locality in the Nation which is not woefully short of nurses. Our civilian hospitals need them; our veterans' hospitals need many, many more; even our Armed Forces cannot come near to filling their quotas. Representative BOLTON, of Ohio, who is perhaps better informed on nursing needs than any of us, estimates conservatively that we face a shortage of at least 49,000 nurses by 1954. Normal population growth alone will create a demand for 10,000 additional nurses in the next 3 years. And it takes 3 years to educate a professional nurse.

The Health Resources Advisory Committee of the Office of Defense Mobilization has stated in no uncertain terms:

First. The present nurse shortage is critical.

Second. Immediate Federal aid to nursing education is essential.

Third. A broad recruitment program is essential.

Mr. President, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, unanimously came to these same conclusions as a result of its own independent survey. And, with the aid of our hospital associations, our nursing educators, and our associations of nurses engaged in the practice of their profession, we have written into this bill provisions calculated to solve these problems. Let us remember, that

we are dealing with an interrelated problem involving schools of medicine, of dentistry, of nursing, and of public health. To think or to act in terms of any of those problems alone would be to lose perspective and further the imbalance which now exists. The bill before us deals with those problems on the basis of their interrelationship and proposes their common solution. In this connection, let me say that the members of your committee are unanimous in recommending this solution as the best available and have taken pains to provide in the bill for a mechanism through which the Congress is assured that any flaws in the program will be reported to the Congress promptly for correction.

In closing, Mr. President, permit me to make one thing crystal clear. That is that in my opinion and, I believe, in the opinion of every member of the committee, the proposal we now urge the Senate to adopt does not in any sense represent an invasion by the Federal Government of local fields of responsibility, and that it does not represent an assumption on the part of the Federal Government of local or State responsibilities. On the contrary, it represents but a partial assumption by the Federal Government of a responsibility which should have been recognized as ours long ago; a recognition by us of a national obligation growing out of national needs. We have too long and I believe unfairly allowed to devolve on certain of the States and on a few private institutions—a burden much of which should have been our own and which has now grown far too heavy for them to carry alone.

I say this, Mr. President, because the nature of the schools with which we are here concerned is such that not one of them now exists or ever has existed to serve its own immediate community or to meet only the needs of those who have shouldered its financial burden. These schools turn out dentists, physicians, surgeons, nurses, and their highly skilled coworkers who serve to restore health and to save life, not just in the areas where the schools are located but to save lives and to serve humanity throughout the entire country. This is as it should be. This is what we must sustain. The alternative—and, Mr. President, it is shaping up far too rapidly and far too menacingly—is that those who have carried the full financial burden thus far and who are now being asked to take on greatly expanded programs as a direct result of a national need—find themselves unable to do so; unable to see why they should carry the load alone even if they could; and quite rightly growing restive under the refusal of the rest of us to do our part. Our failure to give help will convert these institutions into provincial schools hedged about with even further restrictions on admission, binding their graduates in advance to certain types of service in certain localities regardless of individual capabilities or of the broader public interest. The process, Mr. President, is already under way. Allowed to continue it can only mean a widespread deterioration in the quality of our medical men. It will force attempts at unwise, unnecessary, and extremely wasteful duplication of institutions and facilities, all of them of far less stature or value than those which would continue and those which would come into being under the terms of S. 337. The total cost in direct outlay by individual taxpayers for such a sorry substitute for the well-planned, soundly based expansion of education in the health professions which we propose, would be immeasurably greater than that entailed by the present bill.

Mr. President, these schools exist to serve the needs of the Nation. As a matter of cold fact, the Federal Government—to meet only in part the needs of our Army, Navy, Air Force, Public Health Service, and Veterans' Administration—is by far the largest user of their output. It is time, Mr. President, that the Nation, through the Federal Government assumed its share of the burden they have been carrying for all of us. Not only is it time we did, but the time has come when we must, Mr. President, because these schools cannot and are not doing the job today. No longer can they carry this burden. The only way the job can be done is by having the Federal Government assume its part of the responsibility, through the enactment of this bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, with all the earnestness I can command I urge my colleagues to pass this bill promptly, in the vital interest of the people they represent and in the interest of the entire Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks, a list of organizations which have endorsed S. 337.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS WHICH HAVE ENDORSED SENATE BILL 337

VETERAN GROUPS

The American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, Regular Veterans' Association, Jewish War Veterans.

PROFESSIONAL GROUPS

American Dental Association, American Association of Dental Schools, American Council on Education, American Public Health Association, Association of American Medical Colleges, Association of American Universities, Association of Land Grant Colleges, Association of Schools of Public Health, National Dental Association, National Health Council.

CITIZEN GROUPS

National Grange; Cooperative Health Federation of America; National Council of Jewish Women; American Federation of Labor; Congress of Industrial Organizations; Indiana State Industrial Union Council; International Association of Machinists; United Auto Workers, A. F. of L.; United Auto Workers, CIO; National Farmers Union; Montana Farmers Union; Cooperative League of the United States of America.

PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS

Alabama: Tinsley R. Harrison, acting dean, Medical College of Alabama, Birmingham; John M. Callalee, president, University of Alabama, Birmingham.

California: Francis Smyth, dean, University of California School of Medicine, San Francisco; Ernest G. Sloman, dean, College of Physicians and Surgeons, School of Dentistry, San Francisco.

Colorado: Robert L. Lewis, dean, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Denver.

District of Columbia: Hunter Guthrie, S. J., president, Georgetown University; Joseph L Johnson, dean Howard University College of Medicine; Russell A. Dixon, dean, Howard University College of Dentistry

Georgia: Dr R Hugh Wood, dean, School of Medicine, Emory University, Atlanta; John E. Buhler, dean, Emory University School of Dentistry, Atlanta.

Illinois: L. T. Coggeshall, dean, University of Chicago School of Medicine, Chicago; John J. Sheinin, Ph. D., M. D., dean, The Chicago Medical School, Chicago, Dr John F. Shehan, dean, Loyola University, Stritch School of Medicine, Chicago; Dr. A R Baralt, Jr, dean, School of Dentistry, Loyola University, Chicago; Gladys Kiniery, R N., dean, School of Nursing, Loyola University, Chicago

Indiana: Maynard K. Hine, dean, Indiana University School of Dentistry, Indianapolis.

Kentucky J Murry Kinsman, dean, Louisville School of Medicine, Louisville.

Louisiana: William W Frye, M. D, dean, Louisiana State University School of Medicine, New Orleans, R. L Pullen, acting dean, Tulane University, New Orleans, Frank J. Houghton, D D S, dean, Loyola Dental School, New Orleans

Maryland Alan M. Chesney, M D., dean, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore

Michigan: Henry F Vaughn, dean, University of Michigan School of Public Health, Ann Arbor, Dr. Rene Rochon, dean, Dental School, University of Detroit, Detroit, C J. Steiner, S J., president, University of Detroit, Detroit.

Minnesota: Dr. Harold S. Diehl, dean of medical sciences, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Mississippi: D S Pankratz, dean, University of Mississippi School of Medicine, Oxford.

Missouri: Robert A Moore, dean, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Melvin A Casberg, M. D, dean, St. Louis University School of Medicine, St. Louis; L. R Main, dean, School of Dentistry, St Louis University, St Louis

Nebraska: P. J Carroll, M D, dean, Creighton University School of Medicine, Omaha; James H Pence, D D. S, dean, Creighton University School of Dentistry, Omaha; Dean Bert L Hooper, College of Dentistry, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

New England. William S. Carlson, president, University of Vermont, Burlington; James Stevens Simmons, M. D., brigadier general United States Army (retired), Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, Dr. Dwight O'Hara, dean, Tufts College Medical School, Boston; C. M. H. Long, dean, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, Conn., James M Faulkner, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston; Ira V Hiscock, chairman, Yale University School of Public Health, New Haven; C D. Marshall-Day, dean, Tufts College Dental School, Boston, James Bryant Conant, president, Harvard University School of Dental Medicine, Boston; George Packer Berry, dean, Harvard Medical School, Boston; Leonard Carmichel, president, Tufts College, Medford, Mass.; James M. Dunning, dean, Harvard School of Dental Medicine, Boston.

New York: Stockton Kimball, M. D., dean, University of Buffalo School of Medicine, Buffalo; Carlyle F. Jacobsen, executive dean of medical education, State University of New York (medical schools at Syracuse and New York City), Albany, G. H. Whipple, dean, University of Rochester, Rochester;

Dr. R S. Cunningham, dean, Albany Medical College, Albany; Willard C. Rappleye, M. D., vice president in charge of medical affairs, Columbia University, New York; Currier McEwen, M. D., dean, New York University College of Medicine, New York; Leon J. Gauchat, dean, University of Buffalo School of Dentistry, Buffalo.

North Carolina: Gordon Gray, president, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; John C. Brauer, dean, school of dentistry, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

North Dakota: W F. Potter, M D, dean, school of medicine, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks.

Ohio: Charles A. Doan, M D., dean, Ohio State University, College of Medicine, Columbus; Stanley Dorst, dean, faculty of medicine, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati

Pennsylvania: J. M. Mitchell, dean, University of Pennsylvania, School of Medicine, Philadelpia; J. L. T. Appleton, dean, University of Pennsylvania School of Dentistry, Philadelphia, Marion Fay, dean, Women's Medical College of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

South Carolina· Kenneth M Lynch, president, Medical College of South Carolina, Charleston.

Tennessee: John B Youmans, M D, dean, Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, Nashville, O. W Hyman, vice president, University of Tennessee, Memphis; W H Allen, dean and director of dental education, Meharry Medical College, Nashville

Utah: John Z Bowers, dean, college of medicine, University of Utah, Salt Lake City.

Wisconsin: John S Hirschboeck, M. D, dean, Marquette University School of Medicine, Milwaukee; O M Dresen, D D S, dean, Marquette University School of Dentistry, Milwaukee.

Mr HILL Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement listing the members of the Health Resources Advisory Committee, Office of Defense Mobilization.

There being no objection the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMBERS OF THE HEALTH RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE, OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, chairman; chairman, department of physical medicine and rehabilitation, New York University, Bellevue Medical Center, New York City, also associate editor of New York Times.

Dr. Alan Gregg, vice president, Rockefeller Foundation, New York City.

Dr. James C Sargent, professor of urology, Marquette University School of Medicine, Milwaukee, Wis., also chairman of council on national emergency medical care of the American Medical Association.

Dr. Harold S Diehl, dean of medical sciences, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Dr Leo J Schoenny, D. D S., private practice, New Orleans, La., also past chairman of council on dental health, American Dental Association.

Mrs. Ruth Kuehn, dean, School of Nursing, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., also member National Committee for Improvement of Nursing Services.

Dr. William P. Sheppard, professor of public health, Stanford University, San Francisco, Calif., also vice president, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.

Dr. John B. Pastore (deceased), executive director of the Hospital Council of Greater New York, also member of Council of Government Relations of the American Hospital Association.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I call up the amendments which were proposed by me on behalf of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendments.

The legislative clerk read the amendments, as follows:

On page 32, line 6, strike out "$500" and insert in lieu thereof "$200"

On page 32, line 8, strike out "$500" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,000"

On page 32, line 12, strike out "$400" and insert in lieu thereof "$160"

On page 32, line 14, strike out "$400" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,600."

On page 32, line 18, strike out "$150" and insert in lieu thereof "$60"

On page 32, line 20, strike out "$150" and insert in lieu thereof "$600."

On page 32, line 25, strike out "$200" and insert in lieu thereof "$100."

On page 33, line 2, strike out "$200" and insert in lieu thereof "$300"

On page 33, line 6, strike out "$400" and insert in lieu thereof "$200"

On page 33, line 8, strike out "$400" and insert in lieu thereof "$600"

On page 33, line 11, strike out "$150" and insert in lieu thereof "$65"

On page 33, line 13, strike out "$100" and insert in lieu thereof "$185"

On page 33, line 20, strike out "$100" and insert in lieu thereof "$35"

On page 33, line 22, strike out "$50" and insert in lieu thereof "$115"

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I understood the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island was going to speak on the amendments.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have considered the changes in S. 337 which would result from the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr RUSSELL] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. The bill as reported by the committee placed about equal emphasis on two things, each of which we think important; one, was maintenance of existing schools; the second involved providing a stimulus to expansion. The Senators from Georgia and Oklahoma apparently agree that both things are important, but they feel it imperative that we place much more emphasis on expansion than on maintenance. Our committee is, of course, sympathetic to the objectives of the Russell-Kerr amendment. The committee felt, however, that only after the act is in operation for a year or two will we have sufficient experience to develop thoroughly adequate knowledge as to the exact distinctions which must be made as to the differences between schools and types of schools and between incentive and maintenance grants. Therefore, we gave relatively equal emphasis to both and provided for a council to analyze operations under the bill and to report back to the Congress as to any change in emphasis which might be needed. Of course, should we now change the relative emphasis on expansion as against maintenance, the council will still function to advise us whether the ratios arrived at are proved by experience to be proper and effective or whether they are not. And, of course, we do know that we do need more doctors and nurses.

However, we also know that there is one basic difference between two categories of schools involved. On the one hand we have the medical and dental schools badly in need of financial aid but confronted with a surplus of potential students—many thousands of applicants more than they can accept. On the other hand we have the schools of nursing and of public health which, while equally in need of financial aid, ave a shortage of applicants. It is for this reason that your committee so worded the scholarship provisions of this bill that unless the situation changes very radically, those funds will go to attract students to schools of nursing and of public health

The differences between categories of schools and between the kind of problems which confront these schools were discussed in detail with the Senators from Georgia and Oklahoma, and as a result of those discussions a compromise amendment has been drafted which I believe is acceptable to both the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Oklahoma, and which has been adopted by formal action of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I might say at this juncture, in order to keep the record straight and clear, that there were seven members present, and there were seven who voted for it. I make that statement in order to draw a contrast with the statement I made earlier, that the original action was the unanimous action of the committee.

In effect, what this committee amendment does is to put much greater emphasis on the incentives offered medical, dental, and nursing schools to increase the size of their student bodies while, at the same time, recognizing the basic difference in the problems confronting them. The grants to schools of public health remain the same as in the bill that was reported to the Senate, inasmuch as their problems are of a completely different nature because of the unique composition of their student bodies and the unique form of the teaching methods they must follow.

The best estimates available to us—and we believe they are quite accurate—indicate that while the adoption of this committee amendment should result in an even greater interest in the output of trained health personnel, costs under the bill will be reduced by approximately $72,000,000 over the life of the measure.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Georgia whether he will withdraw his amendment, in order that we may call up and act upon the amendment which has been proposed on the part of the committee; or I might address that question to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that while the Senator from

Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] had submitted an amendment for himself and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], it had been ordered to lie on the table and be printed. It has not been actually proposed to the bill, and, therefore, is not pending before the Senate.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, speaking for the Senator from Georgia and myself, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that we should be very glad to see the committee amendment adopted, and upon that having been done, would not call up our amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that we are considering an amendment to Senate bill 337, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bennett	Hill	Monroney
Benton	Hoey	Moody
Brewster	Holland	Morse
Bricker	Humphrey	Mundt
Bridges	Hunt	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Nixon
Cain	Jenner	O'Conor
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Johnson, Tex	Pastore
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kefauver	Russell
Connally	Kerr	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Knowland	Smathers
Douglas	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Lodge	Sparkman
Ecton	Long	Stennis
Ellender	Magnuson	Taft
Ferguson	Malone	Thye
Frear	Maybank	Underwood
Fulbright	McCarran	Watkins
George	McCarthy	Welker
Gillette	McClellan	Wiley
Green	McFarland	Williams
Hayden	McKellar	Young
Hendrickson	McMahon	
Hickenlooper	Millikin	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I certainly must oppose the amendment. Whereas the original bill provided that the medical schools should receive $500 for every current student, and $1,000 for every additional student over and above the number they had previously trained, the pending amendment provides that the medical schools shall receive $200 for each current student and $2,200 for every additional student.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Am I correct in my understanding that the power of accepting a student lies within the jurisdiction of the medical college or the university? In other words, the bill is not so written, is it, that it would be within the power of the Government to direct a university or a medical college to accept a student?

Mr. TAFT. My impression is that there is a provision in the bill to the effect that medical colleges or universities can not make distinctions on the basis of residence. It is my understanding that there is such a provision now in the bill. Of course, there are many State institutions which admit no students from outside the State. There are a number of others which admit a very few.

Mr. THYE. But there is no authority within the Government to direct a medical college or a university to accept a student unless the university or medical college is willing to accept him. If the pending bill became law the Federal Government could not dictate to a college or to a medical institution that it had to accept a student, could it?

Mr. TAFT. I do not believe they could be directed to take any particular students, but there is a provision to the effect that they cannot discriminate against students from outside the State. It seems to me that provision ought to be eliminated. In my opinion, it is a direct beginning of interference with the control by States over the education of their own students.

As to the particular amendment now pending, it seems to me very clear that it would certainly result in a lowering of the standards of all medical schools, because there would be a constant incentive simply to crowd the schools with students.

When the Senate was considering this subject 2 years ago, it was said the total cost of educating a student was $1,750 a year. The Pastore amendment would give the schools $2,200 per student. Probably the average cost today is fairly close to $2,200. But certainly most schools charge tuition fees of $500 or $600. So with the figure used in the amendment the schools would make a profit on every new student, as I see it.

Not only that, but if the schools did not increase their facilities it would be almost impossible to increase the number of students without lowering the standard of education, because there seem to be available neither additional teachers nor additional buildings and facilities.

Mr. President, I think it would be a great mistake to adopt the amendment. I do not want the impression gained that I oppose the amendment with the understanding that if it is rejected I shall vote for the bill, because I intend to oppose the bill and make a speech on the bill itself. But regardless of that, I believe it would be a great mistake to adopt the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Has the Senator from Ohio estimated what the so-called Pastore amendment would cost?

Mr. TAFT. Its cost would be somewhat less than that of the committee bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I mean the over-all cost.

Mr. TAFT. I understand. Perhaps the Senator from Rhode Island has the figures of the relative over-all cost.

Mr. PASTORE. The amendment would reduce the cost by $72,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Over the 5-year period?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; over the period of 5 years. Under the bill as it has been reported by the committee, the cost over the 5-year period would be $367,000,000. Under the amendment the cost would be $295,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. The figures the Senator from Rhode Island has given are much higher than the figures I have; but I am quite willing to accept his figures.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The fact of the matter is that the Kerr-Russell amendment goes even farther than the compromise amendment. We believe that the whole purpose behind our amendment is to expand the facilities of the medical schools. Of course, it can well be argued that not much of an adequate expansion can be made unless the current enrollment in the professional schools is maintained. In the first place, I think the Kerr-Russell amendment provided that the amount be reduced to $100 per student. The pending amendment raises the amount of $200, which, of course, maintains a high figure for expansion purposes.

The fact is that these are all accredited schools. I do not see the occasion for the alarm which the Senator from Ohio expresses. The purpose of the legislation is to expand the facilities of the schools, and I think the incentive ought to be attractive enough to realize that objective.

Mr. TAFT. Dean Berry, who is dean of the Harvard Medical School and chairman of the executive committee of the Association of American Medical Schools, says that he personally will not support the bill if it is so amended. He is speaking for the association. They would rather have no aid at all than to have the bill as amended by the Russell-Kerr amendment. That is also the view of the dean of the Yale Medical School and the dean of the Cornell Medical School. I should say that it is the view of the best medical educators in the country. Certainly if they do not want the assistance, this is no time to force it upon them.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Is it entirely possible that what they are trying to compel the Congress to do is to give them a subsidy for their present enrollment, rather than to have enacted legislation which would result in increased enrollment?

Mr. TAFT. They want also the increased enrollment. But the testimony before our committee, from schools like Johns Hopkins and others, was to the effect that they could not go on under present conditions, that they all had incurred such tremendous deficits in the operation of the schools that it was impossible for them to continue, or to find the money with which to continue medical schools.

Of course, if we are going to increase the number of students enrolled, we shall be obliged to have a very much larger

contribution for the building of additional facilities. There are two great limiting factors on the number of students who can be educated. The first is the number of teachers available to teach medical science. That in itself is an extremely difficult problem today. The other factor deals with the facilities, which must be quite elaborate, for hospitals, research, and laboratories. Without the expansion of those facilities we cannot hope for a very fast expansion in the number of students, unless the standard of medical education is to be reduced

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma

Mr. KERR. Does not the Senator from Ohio take the position that what we should do is to enact a law which would cover the deficit of the present operations of the medical schools, rather than to enact a law—at which the amendment referred to is aimed—which would provide an incentive for the increased enrollment of medical and dental students, and increase the number of doctors and dentists graduated by the medical schools of the country?

Mr TAFT. The bill as originally proposed by the committee provided $500 for each existing student and $1,000 for each additional student. There is an incentive to enlarge facilities as fast as they can be expanded, keeping in mind sound medical education. I see no reason for changing that provision. It was originally adopted after long consideration. Mr. Oscar Ewing recommended $300 for existing students and $1,700 for other students.

Mr. KERR Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. The committee deliberately turned down that proposal 2 years ago, and adopted the proposal contained in the bill, and adopted the same proposal this year, when the bill was introduced.

I now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. As I understand, the Senator from Ohio has just told us that the medical schools of the country, on their present basis of income and expenses, are operating at a deficit.

Mr. TAFT. I think most of them are. I know that those with which I am familiar are operating at a deficit. They scrape up the money somehow, but some of them have encroached on their endowment funds to a very considerable extent.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator aware that, over and above the tuition, the cost in the average medical school to provide the education which is now being provided is $1,850 per student?

Mr. TAFT. The figures which we had at the time we first started consideration of this proposal 3 or 4 years ago were to the effect that it cost about $1,750 per student a year.

Mr. KERR. Over and above tuition.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; over and above tuition. The total cost was $2,500 a year. That was the over-all cost. An over-all cost of $2,500 a year means a cost to the Federal Government of $10,000 to educate a student. The highest tuition in the country—and it varies—is about $700 or $750. That would make a net cost of $1,750.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, may I ask a question at this point?

Mr. TAFT. Colleges have had difficulty with their endowment funds. Of course, the State colleges which are being benefited receive money from the State treasury. So this proposal would relieve the State treasury of a burden.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question at that point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr KERR Is it not a fact that if it costs from $1,750 to $1 850 a year for each student over and above the tuition which the student pays, if we enact a bill providing only $1,000 a year for each additional student enrolled, we shall be seeking to induce the schools to increase their deficit, rather than seeking to enact legislation which would make it possible for them to increase their enrollment on a basis which would not increase their deficit, but on a basis which would make them whole and give them some leeway with respect to the increased enrollment?

Mr. TAFT. They will increase their enrollment, because they will have more money in general. But what the Senator is proposing to do is this: Although their deficit is only $1,700 a year, he wants to give them $2,200 for every additional student.

Mr. KERR Not at all.

Mr TAFT. The Senator wants to create a situation in which every school will make a profit from additional students and will have every incentive to admit them as fast as possible, regardless of the character of education the school is able to give them. That is my objection to the Senator's proposal.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KERR If Senators have it in mind to provide an incentive for increased enrollment, is not that an effective answer to the Senator's objection?

Mr. TAFT. No. After all, this bill, at best, is only a stopgap. The bill admits that we do not know what ought to be done about medical education. I invite attention to the provisions on pages 49, 50, and 51. It will be seen that it is proposed to establish a National Council on Education for Health Professions. The duty of the National Council, as set forth on page 51, is as follows:

(5) Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Council shall transmit to the Congress its recommendations concerning the extent and nature of support of education of professional and other health personnel (including practical nurses) which should be made available by the Federal Government in order to provide adequate health personnel to meet the health needs of the people. For such purpose, the Council shall conduct such surveys and studies as it deems appropriate, including studies of the financial condition of schools providing education in the health professions, and the relationship of their financial condition to their capacity to maintain and expand student enrollment, studies of the educational costs of such schools and of feasible means of calculating such costs on a uniform or comparable basis, and studies of the extent to which equal opportunity to gain an education in the health professions is afforded all properly qualified students.

In other words, we set up a council or commission to study these problems, and before we know what it is going to decide, we pass a temporary bill to fill in the emergency. Originally the bill was for only 3 years. The National Council is given 2 years to make its survey. If we are really going to improve medical education and increase the number of doctors, a very much larger construction program will be required. Such a program will require the determination of the question as to whether we are going to encourage every State to have a new medical school, and how many new medical schools there ought to be, as well as the question of the extent to which the Federal Government is to subsidize the construction of such schools, or what percentage it will subsidize. Those are the things to be determined by the survey.

If we are to rush ahead and pay the medical schools a profit before the survey is completed, and before the facilities exist, and if the schools are to rush out and enroll twice as many students because they can make a profit out of them, certainly that is not the purpose of the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I invite the Senator's attention to page 35 of the bill The Senator will admit that, in the first place, there cannot be an expansion beyond a 30-percent increase over the average of the past 3 years, so far as the first-year class is concerned. Beyond that, the expansion cannot be in excess of the average over the past 3 years, but no greater number than the number enrolled the previous year. So there cannot be an indiscriminate increase in the size of student bodies.

Mr. TAFT. There can be a 30-percent increase.

Mr. PASTORE. Only in the first year; but beyond that, the class cannot be larger than the class of the previous year.

Mr. TAFT. There can be a 30-percent increase in every class.

Mr. PASTORE. There can be a 30-percent increase only in the first-year class.

Mr. TAFT. The next first-year class can be increased by another 30 percent, and in the following year the first-year class can again be increased by 30 percent.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct; but the Senator said the enrollment would be doubled.

Mr. TAFT. I did not say that it would be doubled. Perhaps I used the term in a general sense. Certainly there is an incentive to make an increase up to the limit, without the necessary additional facilities, and without adequate teaching staffs.

The Senator says that these are all accredited schools. They are accredited schools, but we cannot catch up to their standards for at least 2 or 3 years from this time. I believe the proposal is unfortunate. I believe it is opposed by the Association of Medical Schools. The

fact that they wanted it enacted was the main reason I was in favor of it. If they are against it, I shall vote against it.

Mr. President, very briefly I should like to make a general statement as to why I am opposed to this bill. Although I joined in the introduction of the bill, it seems to me that the conditions have entirely changed since the bill was drawn 3 years ago. The bill would add approximately $50,000,000 or $60,000,000 a year to the budget of the Government for the next 5 years.

So far as I am concerned, I believe we have reached a point in the mobilization program where we cannot afford to undertake any new program unless its emergency character can be shown beyond any question of doubt.

Last year we spent $45,000,000,000. In fiscal 1952 it is estimated that we will spend $68,000,000,000. Although we spent only $45,000,000,000 in the last fiscal year, we are spending now, based on this quarter, at the rate of $60,000,000,000 a year. The Bureau of the Budget estimates that in fiscal 1953 the Federal Government will spend $85,000,000,000.

According to this morning's newspaper—

President Truman's National Security Council yesterday started work on a new strategic war plan calling for a big boost in air power and atomic weapons and only a relatively slight expansion of ground and sea power.

The newspaper article continues:

The plan was presented to the President by Defense Secretary Lovett. It has to be approved by the Council and the President before the defense budget for the fiscal year starting next July 1 can be fashioned. It reportedly calls for an outlay of approximately $50,000,000,000 and provides for an Air Force of some 138 combat wings, an army of 27 divisions, a navy of 1,300 ships, and a Marine Corps of 3 divisions.

Omitting one paragraph, the article continues:

"No 68" was the defense plan developed a year ago as the foundation for the current rearmament program.

* * * * *

The old plan called for a total military strength of nearly 3,500,000 men. The new plan provides for approximately 3,900,000 men.

In other words, the plan calls for an increase of 400,000 men in the Armed Forces during the next 3 or 4 years. 400,000 men would amount to an addition of $4,000,000,000 to the current expense for the maintenance of the Armed Forces.

Probably another four billion or five billion dollars would be added for construction during the next 2 or 3 years. Therefore, I believe it is fair to say that the program we are facing will bring Federal expenditures to $95,000,000,000. I believe that program is unwise.

The appropriation bill on which the $85,000,000,000 estimate is based has already been passed by the Senate. With the addition I have mentioned it will be $95,000,000,000. I believe that is too high. I believe it is beyond the economic capacity of the country. However, we have passed the bill. We have adopted the $85,000,000,000 figure. Going to that point endangers the economic strength of the United States. However, if it is necessary to do so, I believe everything else must be curtailed. We must undertake to tighten our belts.

Conferees are meeting today on the new tax bill, which proposes to increase the tax of every individual in the United States. It would cut down the salaries of Senators by $1,000, leaving them that much less to spend.

In all private fields we are asking for economy. I believe that in the field of domestic legislation we will have to take the same position no matter how meritorious a project may be from a domestic standpoint, unless there is a direct relation to the defense program.

The Budget Bureau estimates that in 1954 the defense program expenditures will drop from $85,000,000,000 to $75,000,000,000, and in 1955 to $65,000,000,000. In other words, there is a hump there. I rather doubt that the figure will come down. As I see it, we will go along at the same level until probably 1954 or 1955. There is a hump where the economic security of the country, it seems to me, is in danger.

I do not believe that we can tax more than we are proposing to tax in the bill which is now in conference without doing great injury to the country. That bill will produce approximately $67,000,000,000 of revenue when it goes into full operation. Perhaps we can go a little higher than that, but there is certainly a point at which the over-all taxes will do more harm than they will do good.

I believe that the taxes will be passed along in the prices charged, and therefore the standard of living will be reduced, economic instability will be brought about, and demands for increased wages will be made, which is time will have to be met. Thus we shall have a spiral of inflation, resulting from the tax itself, over and above a certain point.

The alternative is to borrow money. We are getting very rapidly toward the point of borrowing, in fiscal 1953 and fiscal 1954, from $20,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000. If that is so, we face the problem of inflation in the United States regardless of controls of any kind.

So long as that condition exists, I do not believe we ought to start on any new domestic program, no matter how meritorious it may be.

It is claimed that the program outlined in the bill is an emergency program. Every domestic expenditure is claimed to be for an emergency program. I do not see that it is. We are providing for a study for 2 years, to determine what the medical education should be, and whether the Federal Government should take this step into a permanent subsidy of medical education.

The only emergency I can see is that more doctors are needed for the armed services. Any persons who start their education now will not be doctors for 6 years, so for the immediate emergency program this bill could be of no avail.

It seems to me that the proper thing to do is to pass a bill setting up a commission and to make a study, but to postpone the inauguration of the program until a report of the study has been made and we have gotten over the hump of military expenditures.

There are other provisions in this bill which should be noted. There is a provision for scholarships for doctors, nurses, and dentists. There is not the slightest emergency requirement for scholarships for doctors. There are more applications for entrance to medical schools than the schools can handle. There is no need for a scholarship program for doctors. There is no need for a scholarship program for dentists at the present time.

Perhaps the nursing problem ought to be studied more completely, and there may be some necessity for a scholarship program for nurses. There is an entirely separate nurse bill now pending in the House of Representatives. There is also a provision to encourage the emergency education of nurses in a bill which we recently passed.

So far as construction is concerned, I cannot see any more emergency in that regard than in the case of any other construction. In fact, there is every good reason why at the present time, with the tremendous demand of the military for every kind of construction, we should not encourage the construction of other kinds.

Therefore, I do not feel that there is anything in this bill which justifies the contention that it provides for an emergency which is related to the immediate building up of our mobilization strength against Russia. I cannot see the basis, therefore, for claiming that it is an emergency bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator from Ohio is a member of the important Committee on Finance. He has made a study of the tax bill. Do I understand that he feels, if we pass the pending bill and appropriate the money involved, that it would add to the public debt?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I myself feel very confident that we are not going to balance the budget in 1953 or 1954. If we obligate ourselves to spend the amount of money called for by this bill, the result will simply be to increase what we shall have to borrow from the American people, and therefore to cause the inflation which will be brought about by such a procedure.

The taxes will be substantial. I was just figuring that for an income of $15,000, we are now required to pay $4,448. Under the Senate bill, which is milder than the House bill, there will be an additional tax of $500 on every individual; and even then we shall be $25,000,000,000 short of balancing the budget, and I do not think we shall be able to increase taxes in 1953 sufficiently to meet any such military program as is in process, apart from any civilian program.

So it seems to me that we should strike out all of the bill except the part creating a committee to study the entire problem of medical education.

Unless that is done, I shall oppose the bill and shall vote against it.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Ohio was a

joint author of the bill in January of this year. I gathered from what he just said that at that time he was under the impression that the medical schools were in favor of the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator know of any large medical school in the South, aside from Duke Medical School, that is not State-supported?

Mr. KERR. I have just been told that there is one in Georgia and one in Louisiana and one in Tennessee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In the spring I received from doctors and from the two medical schools in Virginia letters endorsing the bill. The medical schools wanted the bill enacted.

I have never been very strongly in favor of any type of Federal aid for education, as the Senator from Oklahoma knows. However, I recognize that medical schools are in an acute situation with respect to the education of doctors. During the debate it has been pointed out that today fewer doctors are being graduated than were graduated 45 years ago.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Virginia is eminently correct in that statement.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have been watching the applications of the State schools for increases in their budgets. Their new budgets run 50 percent, 60 percent, or 65 percent over their last budgets. I know they are not going to get the increased funds their budgets call for.

It would appear to me that in the case of the two State-supported medical schools in Virginia, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Georgia would enable them to have a smaller amount for their students than they have now, but to receive larger benefits if they enlarge their output. I believe that such an arrangement would be well calculated to reach our objective of educating more doctors. That would be the only excuse I would have for supporting Federal aid to education.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, as I began to say a moment ago, during his remarks the Senator from Ohio said that when he introduced the bill, he thought the medical schools were for it, and he was for it; but now he thinks that in its present form the medical schools are against the bill, and he is against it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to point out that on the first of January we had no reason whatever to expect the mobilization programs which call for the amount of expenditures now requested. In December, the Army had requested 2,700,000 men. Their estimates, so far as we could get them, were very vague and indefinite. The President had in his budget a figure of $40,000,000,000 which was taken out of the air; and no one knew what the budget would be.

The military budget was not presented at all to the Congress until April or May. Certainly we had no resonable ground to suspect that the total appropriations for the Government would exceed $60,000,000,000 by so much that it could not reasonably be covered by taxation.

Now we have gone into a period of deficit financing.

Can the Senator tell me any way in which we can balance $85,000,000,000 of expenditures in the fiscal year 1953? Can he state the taxes which can be levied to produce that amount of money?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have a number of things to say about that. I am discussing the amendment and the bill, not a figure which the Senator from Ohio thinks will be a deficit in a year which has not arrived.

I would say that if our country is confronted with an emergency in the fall of 1951, an emergency which the Senator from Ohio himself recognized in January 1951, I am not a defeatist to the extent that I am going to dodge the responsibility of that emergency on the basis of what someone says will be a deficit 18 months or 2 years from now.

Mr. President, I did not misquote the Senator from Ohio when I said that he stated that when he introduced the bill he understood the medical schools were for it, but now he understands they are against it, and therefore he is against it.

Mr. President, I wish to say that my support of the amendment which the committee in my opinion has wisely accepted to this bill is on the basis of the welfare of my country and the need of my country and on the basis of what I believe will be wholesome and beneficial today; and I support it because I think it is right, not because I think some group may be either for it or against it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to supplement the record the Senator from Oklahoma is now building by quoting from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 12, 1951, from a colloquy which occurred between the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. If the Senator from Oklahoma will permit me to do so, I should like to read part of that colloquy at this time.

Mr. KERR. I am willing to yield for that purpose, if I may have unanimous consent to do so without losing my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Oklahoma may yield for that purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio said at that time:

> I quite agree that this bill is of such importance that it should not be passed during the call of the calendar.

That was at a time when the calendar was being called.

The Senator from Ohio also said:

> It is entirely proper that objection should be made to consideration of the bill during the call of the calendar, but I think the bill should be brought before the Senate at the earliest possible moment by the majority leader.
>
> Of course, the problem in connection with the availability of doctors is entirely one of cost. The difficulty is that today, so it is estimated, the annual cost per student in a medical school averages approximately $2,500, whereas the highest tuition is $700 a year. The expense is so great that private schools have stopped increasing their facilities for the education of doctors; and unless someone undertakes to provide the facilities with which to educate more doctors, there will not be any increase over the number of doctors we have today, and thus the expansion of medical educational facilities will come to an end. That is why the bill is of such great importance.
>
> So far as the last election is concerned—

The Senator from Ohio continued—

> I may say that in nearly every speech I made in Ohio, I advocated the passage of this bill, consequently, I do not regard my own election, at least, as a repudiation of a bill which I supported in the last Congress.

Mr. President, all I say is that that statement was made by the Senator from Ohio on March 12. If we did not know there was an emergency in this country on March 12, 1951, we are going to have to wait an extremely long time to be convinced that an emergency is upon us, because that was in the darkest days of Korea; it was following the great retreat, the disaster in Korea. It was at a time when we had the great debate in the Senate on the question of sending American troops to Europe. The whole world was falling down around us then. To say that there was not at that time an emergency which should at least have made some impression in regard to the desirability of supporting or not supporting a bill of this sort, is beyond my ability to understand.

Of course, there was an emergency, and of course the Senator from Ohio was for the bill. I may say that there is no reason why he should not be for the bill now, because the condition existing today is no worse than the condition which existed in March of this year.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I will yield to the Senator from Ohio in a moment.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota; but I wish to remind him that I can understand the position of the Senator from Ohio. He said that when the medical schools were for the bill he was for it; and that now, when the medical schools are against the bill, he is against it. I do not agree with such a position, but I can understand it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me? That is not what I said.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am sure that my friend the Senator from Ohio will be in the Senate for a number of years, and I am sure that he is not interested in any other campaign for a number of years, and therefore I am sure that what would cause the Senator from Ohio to arrive at that conclusion is a general philosophy on his part rather than a consideration of any approaching election.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The difference between the situation on March 12 of this year and the situation at this time is only approximately $20,000,000,000 in Federal expenditures; that is all. On March 12 we had no warning whatever that we were going to have a program under which we would have to spend $85,000,000,000 in a single year. I know of no estimate at that time that the expenditures would exceed $65,000,000,000.

The increased demands have developed in the last 3 months, and it is the reason why I oppose the bill.

If the Senator changes the bill so as to provide for the $2,000 which he has mentioned, I would oppose the bill anyway, because from the very beginning we have fought over the problem of how much incentive was wise and how much incentive was not wise. If the medical schools feel that this incentive is not wise, I think their opinion is the best one.

Therefore, if they oppose the bill after the Senator's amendment is adopted, that is another reason why I shall vote against it. But I shall vote against it, even if the provisions for the $500 and the $1,000 payments are retained, because, under present financial conditions, I feel that it is perfectly clear that we cannot possibly carry out the provisions of the bill without borrowing money, in view of the program to which the administration has now committed us in the mobilization of the Armed Forces.

Mr HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. Let me address myself for one moment to the remarks of the Senator from Ohio. I think his position on the amendment is of little significance because he would not favor its adoption, even if he approved it, unless the medical schools were for it; and he would not favor the passage of the bill, amended or unamended. So I would think that those who are interested in bringing about a condition in which more doctors would be educated and made available to the American people would not be persuaded by any argument by my good friend from Ohio, impressive as it may be, because until the medical schools change their position, he is not going to vote for the bill, whether we amend it with the pending amendment or with some other amendment, or whether it is not amended, until the——

Mr. HUMPHREY Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was impressed by the argument made by the Senator from Ohio that at the time he was for this bill we did not have before us the present over-all picture of the defense expenditures. I recall that he referred to the budget, and I desire to call his attention to the budget message, which I have in my hands. It is the budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952. On page M-14 it has listed military services expenditures—not appropriations, but expenditures—for fiscal 1952. They are estimated at $40,000,000,000 for 1952.

I should like to ask any Senator, is not that about what we estimate the expenditures for the military establishment will be in fiscal 1952? That is the expenditure on which we are working. Now we are making greater appropriations, but they cannot all be expended in fiscal 1952, so the argument that there was no fiscal situation before us which was as terrible as the present situation simply does not hold true, according to the record which was presented to the Congress for consideration by its committees.

Mr. KERR. I appreciate the Senator's statement in that regard, and I submit, in addition, that if this country encounters an emergency with reference to a need for more doctors, I would not sell the United States of America short, and imply that she could not raise $300,000,000 within a period of 5 years in order to meet the emergency.

Mr TAFT Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wanted to answer the Senator's remarks about the budget, because that is the key to the argument on the amendment. The Senator points out that in March we contemplated an expenditure of $40,000,000,000 for defense purposes. Yes, that was about my idea of what the military program was, and I felt at the time that we could probably go along with any meritorious domestic program. But the estimate of expenditure for next year is $60,000,000,000, and in all probability the expenditures will amount to $70,000,000,000 for the military alone, plus about $25,000,000,000 of other expenditures. So the situation has completely changed, and I say that under the present threat we have no justification for starting any new program, unless it is directly related to the mobilization of the American Armed Forces.

Mr. KERR Mr President, I submit that nothing is more directly related to the mobilization effort than the provision of an adequate number of doctors, dentists, and nurses, not only for the military forces, but also for the civilian population

The Senator from Ohio says this is a proposal to provide more doctors for war. Well, Mr President, according to what he himself now says, there is greater imminence of war today than there was when he introduced the bill. But further than that, I call attention to the fact that the increase in the population of the country is just as much a factor in making necessary the supplying of more doctors and the personnel that would provide the opportunity for adequate medical attention and care, as is the rise in requirements of the military forces.

Actually fewer doctors are graduated today, by several hundred, than were graduated 50 years ago, and the population of our country today is probably two and one-half times, or nearly two and one-half times, what it was 45 or 50 years ago, when more doctors were being graduated than is the case today.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. For a question?

Mr. HUNT. For a question.

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUNT Does the Senator from Oklahoma realize that our population is increasing daily between 6,500 and 7,000?

Mr KERR. It is increasing at the rate of about 3,000,000 a year, and if I had a little time, and unanimous consent, I could figure out how much that was a day.

Mr. HUNT. Does the Senator realize that in 1905, 46 years ago, 512 more physicians were graduated than in the year 1949?

Mr. KERR. That is the information which the Senator from Oklahoma has, and to which he has just referred, and he appreciates his friends calling it to the attention of the Senate in specific detail.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. With an annual deficit in medical education of $40,000,000, is not a $10,000,000-a-year contribution, compared with the total capital investment, rather a small and meager start?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is not so well informed as he would like to be as to the actual deficit, or as to the actual ability of the various medical schools to meet a part or all of their own deficits. On the basis of what the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has said, certainly it is a small enough start; certainly it is not an excessive or extravagant start

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question at that point?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr HUMPHREY. I wonder whether the Senator is familiar with the fact that, in view of the remarks by the Senator from Ohio about the budget, the budget message carried a forewarning to the Congress that the President of the United States and the executive agencies were going to ask for obligational authority in the amount of $94,402,000,000? That was pointed out on page M-7 of the budget message, and the date of that was at the time of the President's message, in January. I think it was the 7th or 9th. At any rate, it was in the first week of January.

Mr. KERR Does the Senator from Minnesota expect the Senator from Ohio to have a full realization of March 12 of what is in the January message?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would certainly expect that he would have some general idea what was in the budget. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In view of the remarks of the Senator from Ohio, I wonder whether the Senator from Oklahoma is aware of the fact that we were uncertain in January and March as to what our armed services strength would be. If I recall, the Senator from Ohio said it was something around 2,500,000 men at that time, and that on the date of March 9, 1951, the United States Senate,

following a debate which was fully participated in by the Senator from Ohio, passed the Universal Military Training and Selective Service Act, which set the strength of the armed services at 3,500,000 men, and which, placed no ceiling on the membership of the armed services in the event of world war.

I conclude by asking the Senator this question: Is there any secret about what the budget or what the military strength were supposed to be?

Mr. KERR. There was no secret as to what the actual, proposed, or suggested budget would be, and, certainly, information with reference to the provisions of the manpower bill was available to the Senate, the Nation, and the world. There was an effort on the part of some Members of the Senate to limit the size of the Armed Forces to 3,500,000 men, which, as I recollect, failed, and I believe the limitation then was fixed at 4,000,000. Then, following the conference on the bill, the limitation appeared at 5,000,000 men. So I would think that sometime between that date and now Senators received the information that the Armed Forces would likely exceed 2,500,000 or 2,700,000 men.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Just one final question. Would it be fair to state, in view of this information, which is a matter of record, that the membership of the United States Senate knew by March 12, 1951, first, that the selective service and universal training bill provided for manpower to the extent of at least three and a half million or more; and, second, that the budget message of the President projected expenditures for the fiscal year 1952 of over $70,000,000,000? Would it be fair to say that every Member of the Senate knew that?

Mr. KERR. I indulge the presumption that every Senator has as much information as is available to the rank and file of the people of the Nation. I would resolve every doubt on the assumption that Senators do know what the facts are, and I shall indulge that presumption until Senators themselves disclaim all knowledge of that which has been so apparent.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is there any provision in the bill which places any military obligation upon anyone after he has obtained the advantage of the education which is provided by the bill?

Mr. KERR. There is none.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does not the Senator feel that there should be? We are going to spend I do not know how many billion dollars——

Mr. KERR. A contemplated $300,000,000 in 5 years, as a result of the enactment of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. For military purposes we will spend next year, as I have heard it stated, $65,000,000,000, or some such figure. How can we operate the Army without men trained in the practice of medicine? Yet we are not making any provision whatever for educating men along those lines.

Mr. KERR. I say to my good friend from Colorado, in the first place, that we have laws which make these men subject to the draft.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Oh, yes.

Mr. KERR. We do have such laws.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They are past their draft days when they get out of medical school.

Mr. KERR. Whatever their age, they are eligible for the call of the military service when and as needed. I remind my good friend that the military cannot call a doctor who does not exist.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; of course it cannot.

Mr. KERR. I remind him, further, that, if I properly understand the law, the military can call any doctor who does exist.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Any doctor of any age.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. Having handled the physicians and dentists portion of the bill in the Armed Services Committee, I should like to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that the bill simply provides for the deferment of a medical or dental student until he has completed his course, but it does not exempt him in any sense of the word from service, regardless of age, when he finishes his schooling.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is the Senator from Oklahoma correct when he says that any doctor of any age can be drafted?

Mr. HUNT. Up to the age of 50 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is that true also of nurses?

Mr. HUNT. I have forgotten the age beyond which nurses cannot be drafted; I think it is 40 years.

Mr. KERR. I do not believe Congress should take a position that would establish the fact that any woman is 50 years of age.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think the Senator's observation is timely and important.

Mr. HUNT. Under the act we passed, any physician or any dentist in the United States, if he is physically fit, can be drafted until he reaches the age of 50 years.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to know the Senator's view as to what the fiscal situation in 1953 will be. Does the Senator think we can possibly balance the budget which is now presented to us, based on the expenditures and appropriations we have already made?

Mr. KERR. I do not blame my friend for chasing that rabbit.

Mr. TAFT. That is the whole point; it is the entire issue. I do not question the merits of the bill, so long as it does not contain the Senator's amendment. I think it is an extremely meritorious bill. But how can we afford to pass even a meritorious bill when we face the possibility of a deficit next year of $25,000,000,000?

Mr. KERR. How can the Senator possibly say that the budget of 1953 is the predominant question, when he has already told the Senate that he introduced the bill when the medical colleges were in favor of it, and that when he found that they had changed their position and were against it, he also was against it?

Mr. TAFT. I did not say that. I said if it were amended as the Senator proposes to amend it, and the colleges would be against it, I would be against it for the same reason, because it involves a technical point. But the real reason for opposing the bill is the fact that it means we will have to borrow so much more money, and there is no possible way I can see to meet the fiscal situation next year without serious danger to the country, either through more taxes or through borrowing money. I have not heard the Senator say that he believes there will be a deficit of $25,000,000,000 next year.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma does not believe there is going to be a $25,000,000,000 deficit next year. Let me say further to my good friend from Ohio, that if such a situation develops that the welfare of the country demand that we borrow money over and above the amount we derive from taxation, the Senator from Oklahoma would make it very clear that he believes that the danger of not borrowing the money to meet our national requirements would be far greater than the danger we would face by borrowing the additional amount of money.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not logical to say that if the whole argument is to be that there is a deficit, then the same argument can be used as to the preparation of our national defense, because that is also part of the deficit?

Mr. KERR. That is the deficit.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. So, if the argument is that there is a deficit, it amounts to saying that in 1953 we are going to cut back our military program and not worry about what international communism is doing, for we shall have to balance the budget, regardless of whether the Russians take this country and the rest of the world.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his very pertinent observation.

I desire to say, further, that when a man needs a doctor, whether he is going to have a cash income 2 years later to meet his physical requirements or will have to borrow the money is a question certainly of academic interest, and certainly of some considerable concern——

Mr. HUMPHREY. And seldom discussed.

Mr. KERR. But it certainly is not a compelling consideration. I should hate to pass up the benefit I thought a doctor might give me, if I thought I would die without it, because of the fact that I did not know whether I was going to be able to meet the running expenses of my

household 2 years from now. Who knows? There might not be as many persons in the household 2 years from now if I did not have the doctor this year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Would the Senator be opposed to an amendment to the bill to have whatever contributions the Federal Government makes deducted from the military expenditures of the Nation?

Mr. KERR. I would not, because I do not know of any more important element in the military-preparedness program of the country than making provision for adequate medical, dental, and nurse personnel. We are confronted with this absolute reality. We know that the Armed Forces are going to obtain the required medical personnel and the required dental personnel. We know that the population of the country is increasing at the rate of 3,000,000 a year. We know then, both from the standpoint of the military forces drawing more of the too few doctors we already have, and the number of our people increasing, whereby the needs of the civilian population are going to be greater, that we are just ignoring realities when we fail to do that which will begin to make some adequate provision for the possibility of meeting the increasing requirements of the rank and file of our citizens to have available to them medical, technical, dental, and health personnel.

Mr HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows that in the Office of Defense Mobilization, which, of course, is the organization set up by Congress to plan and mobilize the strength of our country for its defense, we have there the Health Resources Advisory Committee. In speaking of preparations to defend the country, we are told by that committee that unless we take some action now, there will be a deficit of 22,000 doctors by 1954, and that if we are going to have the doctors needed for the national defense, we must take steps such as the committee proposes in the pending bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oklahoma will yield, let me ask if the Senator from Alabama is aware of the fact——

Mr. KERR. I will yield to the Senator from Ohio in a moment. I want to thank the Senator from Alabama, and to say in response to his question that I cannot conceive that Senators should feel that we should be constrained, by consideration of the possibility of a financial deficit, to fail to do that without which we face the certainty of a deficit of 22,000 doctors, dentists, and so forth.

Mr. HILL. It is 22,000 doctors alone. It does not include dentists.

Mr. KERR. Twenty-two thousand doctors alone.

Mr. HILL. It is 22,000 doctors alone. And may I call the Senator's attention—

Mr. KERR. Just one moment, I have confidence that the Government, the Congress, and the Nation can meet our financial commitments and requirements through processes available to us and through operations with which we are familiar, and with respect to which we are experienced, but nothing short of some such provision as this, or omnipotent intervention, with reference to which I do not believe we can have too great confidence—to meet the requirements for the doctors we will have to have 3 years from now, when that time comes no amount of ingenuity will be of avail to us.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I shall yield to the Senator from Alabama if he has another question, since he is on his feet.

Mr. HILL. The Senator, I am sure, realizes that during the past year the Armed Forces have called or drafted into the service, away from the civilian population, 11,000 doctors. The estimate is that one nonspecialist physician takes care of about a thousand laymen. In other words, we have taken already this year 11,000 doctors, which means 11,000,000 people must turn to already overburdened doctors for their medical care.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, now will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Yes, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator says we will be 22,000 short of doctors in 1954. Under the bill, if passed, we will still be short 22,000 doctors, because this bill will not produce a doctor for 5 years from the time the program starts. The chance of the House passing it before 1952 is exceedingly remote, and it will certainly be 1957 before the doctors will be available, at which time presumably, the emergency will be over. At least the expenditures of the Government, I hope, will be very much reduced long before 1957. So I point out that this is not a bill to deal with the present emergency in meeting the Russian attack.

Mr. KERR. What the Senator from Ohio says would be in favor of an expanded bill. It could not be against the bill and the amendment, because they are calculated at least to begin to overcome the shortage. They are calculated at least to make a start toward reducing the deficit.

My good friend the Senator from Ohio would say that if he has a pain now, and the doctor is not going to cure the pain entirely, he does not want to have anything to do with him, no matter how much he might help, because probably after he has had the doctor, he will still have some pain anyway. I think that is a defeatist attitude which does not rest gracefully on the shoulders of my friend from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to make my position on this matter clear. A budget of $90,000,000,000 can only be justified by one single danger, and that is an attack on the liberty of the people of the United States during the next 2 years. That is all. That is the emergency we face. In order to face that emergency successfully, apparently we have to undertake extreme spending and deficit financing. I say that we can let every other emergency go until that emergency is met. If we get through the 2 years, then I think the Commission proposed to be created will know a great deal more about what a medical education ought to be than it does now.

Mr. KERR. But do not Senators realize that we are already in the presence of a deficit of doctors and that as the months go by the shortage will become more acute? I do not need any board of professors or anybody else to tell me that I know that in Oklahoma there are areas in which a considerable percentage of new-born babies come into this world without having a doctor available to help take care either of the mother or the child.

I know that in considerable areas in Oklahoma—and I am persuaded that it is true throughout the length and breadth of the Nation—there are areas as large as some of the States of the Union, in which there is not a hospital bed, and in which there is not one doctor available to 15,000 people. I say to the Senator from Ohio that that condition prevails in vast areas, and will continue until the number of doctors is sufficient to supply the rural areas as well as the great centers of population.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator will recall, too, that the Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, so ably headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has submitted a report in which the attention of the Senate is called to a number of instances where officers and men of the Armed Forces on military bases and reservations do not have the doctors and the dentists they need and that they should have.

Does the Senator realize that today veterans' hospitals are closed, and beds in veterans' hospitals are unoccupied because the Government cannot get the doctors, the nurses, and the medical technicians needed to operate those facilities?

Mr. KERR. I appreciate the question of the Senator from Alabama. I will say to him that I am aware of those conditions. I am aware of those facts as a part of the basis for the position which I take in this matter.

Mr. President, I think we have adequate doctors and nurses in Korea; but I do not know when there may be another or greater Korea. I hope that my country never again will be faced with the tragedy and the requirements of all-out war. But I would be blind if I did not realize the possibility that it could materialize. I think I would be blind and derelict in the proper consideration of facts if I did not know that one of the respects in which our country is now least prepared to meet such a situation is the lack of adequate numbers of doctors, dentists, nurses, and health technicians. Should that awful day come when bombs are dropped on our cities, I say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that I would not want to live with

myself at that time if I had been instrumental in helping to prevent the enactment of a law which would at least start this country in the direction of preparing to meet the requirements of that hour with reference to adequate doctors, nurses, dentists, and technicians.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Senator recalls that according to all the studies and all the plans of our Civil Defense Administrator, the key man in such a situation as the Senator has pictured will be the doctor. During the past war the key man in civil defense was the Administrator. Now the whole situation has changed. If atomic bombs, with their radioactive properties and their bacteriological destruction should be dropped on our cities, the key man in the situation must be and will be the doctor.

Mr. KERR. I appreciate that statement from the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I will yield in a moment.

With reference to adequate doctors, dentists, nurses, and health technicians, Mr. President, we are poverty-stricken; even without the requirements of the military forces, we are poverty-stricken in that regard with reference to the present requirements of the civilian population. We are utterly proverty-stricken with reference to the enormous increase in population which is taking place. If the awful tragedy to which we have referred, the bombing of our cities, were to occur, then we would be face to face with indescribable tragedy, one of the most horrible features of which would be total inadequacy of the necessary personnel of doctors, dentists, nurses, and medical technicians.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oklahoma has been making a very fine reply to the argument of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I ask the Senator if he does not recall that the Senator from Ohio pointed out that another reason we ought not to pass the bill, according to his logic, is that it will be some time before we realize any accomplishment. In other words, it will require quite a little time before conception results in fruition. It will be some time before the end product, namely, the doctor, is available. I wonder whether the Senator from Oklahoma has given consideration to the fact that the very same argument which the Senator from Ohio uses as to the time lag between initiating the program and the time when we shall have more doctors could be used with respect to the program for guided missiles, or the program for airplane construction, or the program for the hydrogen bomb. Would it not apply to almost any such program? According to the evidence which I have heard, anywhere from 12 to 24 months are required before a new design for an airplane is on the assembly line. Our argument has been that we must project our program into the future, and not delay, for fear that we may have a period of time in which we shall have no new equipment. Does not the same logic apply to the present argument?

Mr. KERR. It certainly does. Furthermore, that argument would prevent our moving to develop the armies of General Eisenhower in Europe. It would prevent every effort we make in the military preparedness program. Furthermore, if Abraham and his wonderful wife had been persuaded by any such argument as that, there would not be any "God's chosen people" today. They had gone along for a considerable time without having made some provision for posterity. If the fact that they had not already started had been a conclusive argument with them, it would have been an unthinkable tragedy. I thank God for a people who are not dismayed by the lack of provision of elements today, but who have the faith and the courage to move on to acquire what is not yet a reality, undismayed by the fact that the reality is not present with us.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. It was most appropriate for the distiguished Senator from Oklahoma to point out that in large sections of the country there are no medical facilities and no hospital facilities. That situation has been demonstrated to me very graphically in the past few weeks. The health subcommittee, of which I am chairman, is now considering a Senate bill. We have received thousands of letters from all over the country with regard to the bill. The writers of the great majority of letters point out, from their own knowledge and experience, that the sections of the country in which the writers live are completely devoid of either doctors, nurses, or hospitals.

There is another thing to remember, if I may ask the Senator to yield further. I know from personal experience that in the cities the lack of doctors and nurses presents a desperate situation. There is not a single hospital in the great city of New York, either public or private, which today does not have wards or wings shut down because of inability to obtain the required number of nurses.

Let me say to my friend the Senator from Oklahoma and to my colleague from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that the situation is desperate throughout the country. If we add the peacetime or quasi-peacetime needs to that situation, because of the danger which the Senator from Oklahoma has pointed out, of attack from the air by atomic weapons, I think we are running a risk in allowing ourselves to go along complacently without making every attempt to train additional doctors and nurses. I very much hope that the Senate will see the situation in the proper light, and will vote for this bill.

Mr. KERR. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from New York.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Mr President, I believe that the Congress has a responsibility. I believe that it is confronted with a reality, and not a theory. I believe that it is confronted with a situation which challenges the exercise of its responsibility on the basis of what the country needs, and not on the basis of what some medical school might want or might not want.

Mr. President, I have very great respect for the medical schools. I have the highest esteem and respect for the great medical college in my State. But, Mr. President, this country needs more doctors, more nurses, more dentists, and more health technicians. The Congress knows that to be so. We have too long delayed a start in the direction of meeting the need. I do not believe that we are going to be dismayed by what someone says about what the budget or the deficit will be 2 years from now.

What would the father of a child who needed a doctor do in the presence of an emergency? Would he have a caucus with his wife and say, "Do you think we are going to make enough cotton 2 years from now to pay the expense of the next arrival in our family? Must we be certain that we are going to be able to have what we need 2 or 3 years from now before we send for a doctor to take care of the child, who might not live if we do not do so?" I do not believe that the Senate will be controlled by that kind of argument.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. If I remember correctly, the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from New York served as governors of their respective States. I am certain that they have great influence in their States. My recommendation to them would be that they recommend to the States of New York and Oklahoma that they look after the doctors and nurses and look after the State universities, because that is exactly what we are doing in Indiana, and we are getting along splendidly. I recommend that the Senators, who have great influence, having been governors of their respective States, see to it that the States increase the number of students in medical schools and that the States increase the medical facilities and hospitals. To my mind that is the way to handle the problem.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. In a moment. I appreciate the remarks of the very able Senator from Indiana. I will say that if I were against this bill, I would probably be using the same line of ineffective argument. I call to the attention of the Senator from Indiana the fact that Northwestern University, which is not too far away from his State, in 1950 had 2,103 applications for admission to their medical school, and were able to accept only 128; that Cornell Medical School admitted 80 freshmen from 2,870 applicants; that Columbia admitted 120 from 2,800 applicants; that Temple admitted 125 from 3,089 applicants; that Yale, which is the alma mater of my dis-

tinguished friend from Ohio—and I want to say that I never had the benefit of a Yale education and neither have I ever been limited or bound by one—admitted 65 out of 1,401 applicants. Tulane took 128 out of 2,000; Boston took 72 out of 1,875.

I make the statement based on my conviction and belief that there is not a medical school in this country which is not today turning away from 4 to 10 times as many students as it accepts into its freshman classes. I believe, Mr. President, that we would do well to give most favorable consideration to the passage of this bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. In connection with the statement which the Senator from Oklahoma has made, which is entirely correct, that every medical school now functioning in the United States has a much greater number of applicants than it can possibly receive into its medical schools, I ask the distinguished Senator if that does not show that there is a great pool of young men and women who have completed premedical and predental training, which perhaps has cost them a great deal of money, the expenditure of a great deal of energy, and which has shown their desire to serve mankind as doctors or dentists or as specialists of one kind or another; and that it is a pity to have all that partly trained manpower and womanpower turned away, as is being done under the present situation?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Florida is eminently and unquestionably correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. For a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to reply to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. KERR I should like to yield the floor. Then the Senator from New York may make his reply.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from Oklahoma will not agree that what is now happening is that the States are compelled to take over many medical schools, a development which has been bitterly opposed by the American Medical Association? The State of New York has had to take over two great medical schools, the Medical School of Long Island University and the Medical School of Syracuse University. The State took them over because those two great institutions, which have been operating for generations and which have been graduating doctors who are practicing all over the country—not only in New York, but Indiana, Arizona, Oklahoma, and California—were unable to continue.

Mr. KERR. The situation is acute, not only with reference to schools that cannot accept any applicants, but with reference to all schools that can take a greater enrollment under present conditions. As the Senator from Florida has pointed out, the students who have been trained for either dental or medical courses not only have had such training at cost to them in time and money, but also in cost to their States and to the taxpayers of the States which support the schools in which they received their training.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUNT. Is the Senator from Oklahoma aware of the fact that in my area of the United States, in the Rocky Mountain States, there are 10 States without a single dental school, which means that there are 10,000,000 people without a dental school?

Mr. KERR. I was not aware of that fact, but it further illustrates the crisis that exists today. As I see it, if we are not moved and influenced by it, it could only be because we refuse to recognize its significance.

Mr HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. HUNT. Does not the Senator from Oklahoma realize that it is necessary that most schools limit their enrollment at least up to 90 percent of students from their home State?

Mr. KERR. Generally that is true.

Mr. HUNT. Boys from States not having medical or dental schools hardly ever have a chance of getting a medical or dental education?

Mr KERR. That is correct. In that regard, information which I have before me indicates that a majority even of the students who come as medical students from outside a State, after having been educated, remain in the State where they get their education.

Mr. HUNT. Does not the Senator agree with me that society owes an obligation to the people of the United States who wish to pursue the study of medicine or dentistry to afford them the opportunity by providing facilities, just as is done for agriculture, education, or any other course of study, excepting medicine and dentistry?

Mr. KERR. I fully agree with the Senator from Wyoming, and I say further, that while I support every appropriation my Government has made to improve the health and breeding of livestock and the development of finer strains of livestock, I have the feeling that the matter of making it possible for the country and the people to have an adequate number of doctors and dentists and nurses available is of almost comparable importance to the other things to which I have referred.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. HUNT. Do we hear any criticism at all of the appropriations we have made since 1878 to the land-grant colleges to promote what the Senator has just stated, namely, the study of agriculture, the breeding of livestock, the diseases of livestock, and similar subjects? We make the appropriations every year. Apparently we take a different view when it comes to a proposal to take care of human beings.

Mr. KERR. We find Senators who because medical schools are opposed to it cannot support the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not wish to detain the Senator any longer, but I should like to commend him on the very fine speech which he has made this afternoon. He spoke eloquently about Abraham and his wife. I hope he will close his speech with the words: "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for that appropriate conclusion.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor, unless other Senators wish to ask me questions.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, before we get ready to take a recess, I wish to state that I desire to compliment the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] on the speech he has just made.

I am one who does not believe that we can measure health in terms of dollars. If we expect to keep our country strong, we had better keep strong physically; and we cannot do that unless we have a proper number of doctors available.

Mr. President, it is evident that we cannot complete action on the bill this evening.

Therefore, I now ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, debate on the amendments and the bill be limited as follows: On the amendments, 20 minutes to a side, with the time to be controlled by the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], respectively, in the event that he is opposed to the amendment, or, if he is not, then by the acting minority leader or any Senator whom he may designate; that debate on motions and appeals be limited likewise; and that debate on the bill be limited to 30 minutes to a side, to be controlled by the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the acting minority leader or any Senator whom he may designate, respectively; and that all amendments to the bill must be germane.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I have checked so far as I can among Senators on this side of the aisle, and I believe the proposed arrangement is satisfactory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the proposed agreement? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That during the further consideration of Senate bill 337, the Emergency Professional Health Training Act of 1951, debate upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) shall be limited to not exceeding 40 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the proposer of any such amendment or motion and Mr. PASTORE. *Provided*, That if Mr. PASTORE is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the acting minority leader or someone designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment or motion that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That debate upon the question of the final passage of the bill shall

be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. PASTORE and the acting minority leader or someone designated by him.

THE CICERO RIOTS AND THEIR AFTERMATH

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, these are days of testing. The great principles of individual freedom under which our Republic has developed are clashing with the methods of the police state. By our acts, we show whether or not we really believe in the American ideal of equality of opportunity and of equal justice under the law.

It is easy to uphold these principles in the abstract or when they are threatened elsewhere by others. All this costs nothing; but it is not worth much, for no one disagrees.

The test is whether one is willing to apply these principles close at home in situations where it hurts and in which one is directly or indirectly involved.

In times past I have criticized situations in the southern States which I have felt showed a general refusal to treat black men and women as possessing human dignity. While I have pointed out that the North as well as the South had similar faults, I know that since the incidents complained of occurred in the South, my brethren there have naturally felt that the criticisms cost me nothing, for the South was far away from my home. Similarly, I have criticized the gross denial of human liberties behind the iron curtain and the terrible injustices of the Russian police state. This criticism has been true, but it also has cost me nothing.

I have been and am proud of my own State of Illinois, which has given to the country and to the ages the consummate expressions of pity, compassion, and brotherly love in the persons of Abraham Lincoln and Jane Addams. I feel that these two, who sprang from our prairies, represent what the people of Illinois love and hunger for in the deepest recesses of their souls.

But events in my own State and in my own county during these last 3 months have so developed that I cannot in good conscience keep silent any longer, and on the floor of this august body I must quite briefly relate a shameful story of events and take my stand about them.

In early June of this year a Negro family rented an apartment in a flat building in Cicero, a hitherto all-white city lying close to Chicago. I know this city well. Its homes are well kept and its lawns trim. I would have trusted my own life with the kindly families who live there. But when the first move was made by the Negro family to enter their new home law-enforcement officials themselves were known to have interposed threats and resistance. Then, when a Federal court injunction removed this obstacle, a huge mob of at least 6,000 people quickly gathered to prevent the Negro family from moving in. They gutted the building by incendiary flares, by bricks and home-made hand grenades, and by other weapons. Neither the police nor the sheriff's deputies made any real effort to protect the attacked or to restrain the crowd. Finally, after nearly 3 days, the National Guard was called out and a semblance of order was restored.

This was incredible enough, but what followed was just as startling. A grand jury was called to hear the case. While it indicted the local chief of police, it did not indict any other of the lax enforcement officials or rioters or those who directly or indirectly incited the mob action. It indicted instead the woman who had rented her building to Negroes, the real estate firm which had negotiated the leases, and the Negro lawyer, Mr. George Leighton, who had obtained the Federal injunction in the court of Judge John P. Barnes restraining the Cicero police from preventing the Negro family from moving in. In all this the grand jury seemed to follow the cynical maxim that "not the murderer, but the murdered is guilty."

I am confident that this action of the grand jury was against the desires of my close personal friend and my longtime political associate, State's Attorney, John S. Boyle, whom I know to be a kind and tolerant man. I believe that it does not represent the true feelings of the responsible and fair citizens of Cicero itself, who, after an opportunity for calmer reflection on the whole incident, must share the regret and shame which we all feel over the tragic outbreak.

But this action of the jury, taken in cold blood, is a denial of every principle of American decency. It violates our basic regard for justice and human dignity. Coming at a time when we are seeking the friendship of the darker-skinned peoples of Asia and Africa, it will inevitably be used against us by the masters of the Kremlin.

Of course, the Cicero riots and the action of the grand jury are not typical of the people of Illinois or of Cook County. We are people of many racial stocks and of diverse cultural and religious ties, who have in the main learned to live and work together and to respect each other.

Even with all the abuses which mar our lives, this is still the country where men lead a far better life than in any other country on the globe, and where, under freedom, the opportunities for further advancement are greatest. But we need constantly to make it better, and it is by that effort that we shall more nearly achieve the ideals of equality of opportunity and of justice which we profess, and at the same time give the real answer to the exaggerated propaganda of the Communists.

Because of the situation created by the events in Cicero and by the indictments handed down by the first grand jury, we need now to turn to affirmative action.

I believe we should rejoice, therefore, that Attorney General J. Howard McGrath has decided to investigate the case to determine whether Federal laws have been violated, as I believe they have been, and whether Federal officials can properly assist in dealing with the problem. This appears to be another case where cooperation by all levels of government is desirable and necessary in order to maintain order and to mete out justice. If there was a criminal conspiracy, if the riot was organized and planned, if the law enforcement officials aided and abetted the rioters and denied equal protection of the law to the Negro family and the property where they hoped to live, then such people would seem to be the fittest subjects for prosecution, rather than laying vindictive penalties upon those, many of them youngsters, who were duped into a mob action which they must now regret. I do not presume to try to influence the courts in the pending cases or any future grand jury. But all of us must join in urging that a thorough and fair investigation be carried through, which will be directed at the real wrong-doers and at preventing any recurrence of mob action.

Beyond this, however, and perhaps even more important, I hope that efforts may be made in Cicero and in the entire Chicago community to get at the underlying causes of this outbreak. We must strive to remove the fears and misunderstandings of the various groups involved. City and State officials and private builders will, I hope, renew their drive to relieve the desperate housing shortage; and the denials of equal opportunity in education, in employment, and in other aspects of community life must be ended. Meanwhile, the task of reconciliation must be carried forward at an increasing pace.

What we need in this country, my own State included, is a greater realization that the interests which all of us have in common are far greater than the points of difference between us. This is true for Democrats, Republicans, and independents; for the native-born and the foreign stock; for the Catholics, Protestants, and Jews; for northerners, southerners, and westerners; and for the black and white, as well. All of us are inheritors of our American traditions. There are many real differences and conflicts of interests. We cannot ignore these. But I ask that we meet them with understanding, not with hate; with orderly procedures, not with mob violence. Let us not tear up the foundations of civil society, but, instead, labor in friendship to deal with our common problems. Perhaps something of the spirit of the old Greek dramatist, who wrote over 2,300 years ago, would help us all:

What else is wisdom? What of man's endeavor
Or God's high grace, so lovely and so great?
To stand from fear set free, to breathe and wait;
To hold a hand uplifted over hate;
And shall not loveliness be loved forever?

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. What bill will the Senate consider after we finish the bill for Federal aid for medical education?

Mr. McFARLAND. We shall consider the proposed modification of the socalled Capehart amendment to the economic controls bill, Senate bill 2170, to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask several questions of the majority leader, for the RECORD: Do I correctly understand that the executive calendar which contains the name of the Ambassador to India will go over until next week?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I shall try to inform the Senator in advance when we shall take it up.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It will not be taken up before the first of next week. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. It will not be taken up on tomorrow or on Friday.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Can the Senator from Arizona inform me whether he has made up his mind whether there will be a session on Friday?

Mr. McFARLAND. I have not made up my mind to the contrary.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Arizona has some hopes that there may not be a session on Friday. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know. We shall have the amendment of the controls act before us. I have not given any thought to not having a session on Friday. If we could have completed action on the amendment to the controls act and could have made more progress, perhaps we would have deserved a day off. However, I shall be glad to think about it and to talk with other Senators.

Of course, I am trying to have the Congress get away; as for myself, I should like to get some Arizona sunshine.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be happy to have the Senator from Arizona do so.

Mr McFARLAND. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HOLLAND was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate tomorrow and Friday.

REPORT BY ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE ON INTERNATIONAL LOAD LINE CONVENTION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive Q, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a report by the Acting Secretary of State setting forth the texts of a proposal by the Government of Canada and a proposal by the Government of Australia relating to changes in the delimitation of certain of the seasonal zones established in Annex II of the International Load Line Convention, signed at London on July 5, 1930. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the report, and the report, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
October 3, 1951.

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Acting Secretary of State setting forth the texts of a proposal by the Government of Canada and a proposal by the Government of Australia relating to changes in the delimitation of certain of the seasonal zones established in Annex II of the International Load Line Convention, signed at London on July 5, 1930.

In accordance with the recommendation made in the Acting Secretary's report, I request that the Senate give its advice and consent to acceptance by the United States of America of the two proposed modifications of the convention.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nominations of two postmasters, which nominating messages were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Howard E. Fleischer, and sundry other candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George L Robertson, of Missouri, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri vice Drake Watson, term expired,

Charles S Vigil, of Colorado, to be United States attorney for the district of Colorado vice Max M. Bulkeley, term expired; and

Lucius Marshall Walker, Jr , of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Virginia, vice Robert L. Ailworth, retired.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

A report (Ex. Rept. No 2) on the nomination of Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Nepal, heretofore reported from that committee.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE KARL STEFAN, OF NEBRASKA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives (H. Res. 444), which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
October 3, 1951.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon KARL STEFAN, a Representative from the State of Nebraska.

Resolved, That a committee of 11 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, the sudden passing of the Honorable KARL STEFAN, my very close friend, came as a real shock to me and to all other Members of Congress, especially to those of the Nebraska delegation. On behalf of myself and my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], I wish to say a few words with reference to this sad event.

KARL STEFAN was the dean of our Nebraska delegation. He had been in Congress since 1935, and had advanced in the House of Representatives to a position of real influence and stature. He was highly respected by the leaders of both political parties, and he entered into the councils of the leaders of both parties.

KARL STEFAN was not born in this country; he was born in Bohemia, or what is now, I believe, a part of Czechoslovakia. He came to the United States in early life.

I think he never lost a feeling of gratitude and wonder that he, an immigrant boy, should attain a position in the Congress of the United States, the most powerful legislative body in the world.

I know there was no more sterling patriot than KARL STEFAN. Perhaps that was partly because he was not born here, and therefore he realized even more fully than do some of us how priceless is the possession of our American citizenship.

He was a faithful servant of the people of Nebraska and the people of the Nation.

All of us will miss him greatly.

He was known as one of the hardest working Members of the House of Representatives and of the House Appropriations Committee. He was always on the job. Undoubtedly the hard work he has done over the years contributed to his untimely passing.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, KARL STEFAN was one of the closest friends I had in the House of Representatives. I served with him during the entire 14 years I was in the House of Representatives. During 12 of those 14 years I sat by his side on the House Appropriations Committee. During eight of those years our offices were next door to each other. Our congressional districts were contiguous. The northern boundary of his district was the northern line of Nebraska, and the southern boundary of my district was the same line, namely, the boundary line between Nebraska and South Dakota.

Members who have served with another Member for many years, and who have had offices next door to each other, well understand what I mean when I say that the death of KARL STEFAN was a very personal loss to me.

The last time I saw Karl was on the floor of the Senate, not very many days ago, when he came here to ask about some matter, and sat with me a while and visited with me.

KARL STEFAN was a man of world viewpoint. He was born in Bohemia. He came to the United States in his

mother's arms when he was less than 1 year of age.

He came to love this land, though, more than any other land in all the world.

KARL STEFAN had a tremendous grip on the people of his district. There are many persons in the southern part of my own congressional district who knew KARL STEFAN well. They regarded him as their champion because they, too, had been born in Bohemia, or what is now Czechoslovakia.

The people of Nebraska regarded KARL STEFAN as their champion.

Our distinguished colleague, the minority leader [Mr. WHERRY], and I were visiting this morning at the hospital, where the junior Senator from Nebraska is temporarily staying for his own health. I think it probably is not out of place for me to say here that Senator WHERRY said to me this morning, "KARL STEFAN could have been elected in Nebraska on any ticket."

Mr. President, the people of KARL STEFAN'S district, regardless of their political affiliation, had faith in him. He was a tower of strength to good government in Nebraska. The large vote he repeatedly received was evidence of the confidence the people had in him. He was regarded, not merely as a champion of the people of Nebraska in the House of Representatives, but also as a champion of the interests of the Czechs, who looked upon him as one of the great people of their nationality.

He was also regarded as a champion by the people of the Philippines, for during the Spanish-American War he served in the National Guard in the Philippines; and, as a result of his service there, he came to take a great deal of interest in the Philippines and in the various legislative proposals affecting the Philippines. So it was that he was awarded medals by the Philippine Government, those medals being presented to him by Mr. Carlos Romulo, in behalf of the people of the Philippines.

KARL STEFAN served for many years as ranking minority member of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the District of Columbia; and during the Eightieth Congress he served as its chairman. Because of that, he took a deep interest in the affairs of the District of Columbia. The tributes which have been paid to KARL STEFAN by the Washington newspapers last night and today are evidence of the fact that he was loved not only by the people of Nebraska, not only by the people of the Philippines, not only by the people of Czechoslovakia, but also by the people of the District of Columbia.

Those of us who worked closely with KARL STEFAN know something of the reason for that.

He was, as the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] has said, a hard-working man. He was conscientious. No breath of scandal ever came anywhere near his door. He did what he thought was right and for the good of his country.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate, I met KARL STEFAN. I know of no man who commanded greater respect among those with whom he worked. Everyone who knew KARL STEFAN loved him. He was a man of ability and integrity. His death means a great loss to our country. I wish to extend my deep sympathy to his widow and family. I am sorry that a great man, a great American, has been prematurely taken from us.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words of tribute to the deceased Representative STEFAN, of Nebraska. I did not serve with him in the House, but I had a high regard for him. I have been on social terms with him, and we have discussed public questions together. I think that Representative STEFAN, having been a native of Bohemia, and having come to this country and become a great American citizen and having served for 17 years in the Congress, may justly be said to have achieved a great success, and I desire to pay tribute to his memory.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I had the privilege of serving with Representative STEFAN in the House of Representatives for a number of years. There were few men in the House of Representatives who were better liked or more highly respected by Members on both sides of the aisle than he. He was a very busy Member of Congress, but he always had time to listen to the problems of any other Representative and, as has been stated, he truly had a national and an international view. As a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, he was as much interested in the projects of the South, the East, and the West, as he was in those of his own section. Congress has, unfortunately, has lost one of its best Members.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, while I served as Assistant Secretary of State, I had the privilege of working very closely with Representative STEFAN, during his tenure as chairman of the State Department Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, and I subscribe fully to everything which has been said by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who by his remarks shows how intimately he was acquainted with the late Representative.

Mr. President, I never knew a man who gave me more evidence of loving his country, in the best sense of that phrase, than did KARL STEFAN. He would meet me at any hour of the day or night, at early breakfast or late at night, to help resolve any kind of problem which might have a bearing on his responsibilities in connection with State Department appropriation bills. He approached these matters without partisanship, and solely from the standpoint of his desire to do the best he could for the people of the United States. I may say that I found him a fine friend, willing to take a stand courageously when need be on certain difficult questions, often when he found few supporters.

Mr. President, I may say I never met anyone in the State Department who knew as much about certain factors of the Department's operations as did Representative STEFAN. He had studied them, I believe, over a period of perhaps as much as 15 or 20 years, during his service on the Committee on Appropriations.

We have lost one of our finest colleagues in Congress. I am glad to join this spontaneous expression of respect for his memory, and to have had my sympathies so well expressed by the majority leader for his wife and his daughter, with whom I had often corresponded, and for his grandchildren, with whom I became acquainted through my friendship with Representative STEFAN.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I wish to thank Senators for the kind words they have had to say with reference to our friend from Nebraska, the late Representative KARL STEFAN. I regret exceedingly that the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], is not present today to join in these tributes, but I have spoken for him in anything I have had to say, I think it would be perfectly proper for the acting minority leader to say a few words at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am confident that on this occasion the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], would be much more adequate to express the feelings of the members of the minority regarding Representative STEFAN than I can possibly be. I am sure that if he were present he would fittingly pay tribute to the late Representative, not only as the leader of the minority in the Senate, but also as a personal friend.

As an expression of my own personal feelings, I may say that my contacts with Representative STEFAN on conference committees, on the floor of the House, and on the floor of the Senate, were such that I grew to have great respect and admiration for him, and I know how much the citizens of Nebraska and all of us will miss his wise counsel.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which I ask to have read and immediately considered.

The resolution (S. Res. 220) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. KARL STEFAN, late a Representative from the State of Nebraska.

Resolved, That a committee of five Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Texas in the chair). The Chair will name the committee provided for in the second resolving clause at a later date.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 48 minutes

p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, October 4, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, October 3 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Jack Gorrie, of Washington, to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, without specification of branch, arm, or service:

Lt Col Gerald Joseph Greeve, O29576, Judge Advocate General's Corps, United States Army

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States:

Maj William May Myers, O32160, United States Army.

Maj John William Gorn, O22200, United States Army

Maj James Franklin Bishop, O22231, United States Army.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate, October 3 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

POSTMASTERS

Ralph J McDonald, Berthoud, Colo
Guy V Kingrec, Smoketown, Pa

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer.

O Thou, who art always calling us to be partners with Thee in a holy alliance and in establishing peace and good will among men, we penitently confess that mankind is often so divided against itself and frequently so far astray from Thee.

Grant that all the members of the human family may be inspired with a more earnest quest for a closer union with one another and a more intimate fellowship with Thee

We beseech Thee that in the realm of human relationships we may not be merely satisfied with cultivating and practicing the spirit of tolerance but may we strive to widen the areas of cooperation and helpfulness, with none seeking its own selfish advantage and welfare.

We pray that in spite of the many reverses and obstacles, which we are encountering, we may have the patience and courage to believe and hope that our troubled world is moving toward a new synthesis, when there will be further and more lasting reconciliations and agreements among the nations of the earth.

We thank Thee for the noble life and character of Thy servant who gave himself so wholeheartedly to this ministry of peace and reconciliation. Thou hast called him into Thy nearer presence. His sun went down while it was yet day only to rise again in eternal glory. May the members of his bereaved family receive the consolation of Thy grace. Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles.

On September 28, 1951:

H R. 4914 An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; and

H J. Res. 335 Joint resolution amending an act making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

On October 1, 1951·

H. J. Res 333 Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S 97. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee,

S 466 An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Army certain property in St Louis, Mo;

S 582 An act for the relief of Emma Burr;

S 590. An act for the relief of Francesco Gaber,

S 606 An act for the relief of Fede Vita Guzzardi,

S 634 An act for the relief of Stela S Ransier,

S. 635 An act for the relief of Hans Lenk;

S. 659. An act for the relief of Ritsuko Chojin;

S 702. An act for the relief of Joseph Emanuel Winger;

S 715. An act for the relief of Ana Cobo Alonso,

S. 781. An act to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Army and the United States Air Force,

S 905 An act for the relief of Margaret A. Ushkova-Rosanoff;

S. 970 An act for the relief of Esther V. Worley;

S. 1048. An act for the relief of Myrtle Harding;

S. 1158. An act for the relief of Takako Kitamura Dalluge;

S 1177 An act for the relief of Misako Konoshita;

S. 1199. An act for the relief of Julie Nicola Frangou;

S 1274. An act for the relief of Vera Oumancoff;

S. 1283. An act to remove the limitation on the numerical strength of the White House Police force;

S. 1342. An act to amend acts relating to garagekeepers and liverymen's liens and the enforcement thereof in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1411. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to issue duplicate checks without requiring bond when such checks of the Post Office Department are lost while in the custody of the United States or lost without fault of owner or holder;

S. 1415. An act to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948;

S. 1421. An act for the relief of Masako Sugiyama,

S 1450 An act to provide for the exchange of certain lands owned by the United States of America for certain privately owned lands;

S 1464 An act for the relief of Peter Therkelsen Kliwan and Ernest O'Gorman Kirwan;

S 1499. An act for the relief of Georgette Sato,

S 1517. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1897, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes," as amended, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to sell without advertisement national forest timber in amounts not exceeding $2,000 in appraised value,

S. 1541. An act for the relief of Dr Francis S N Kowk;

S 1629 An act to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, to permit the interstate movement, for immediate slaughter, of domestic animals which have reacted to a test for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test for brucellosis; and for other purposes,

S 1640. An act for the relief of Cathy Dana Besser;

S. 1686 An act for the relief of Albert Goldman, postmaster at New York, N. Y.;

S 1800 An act for the relief of Dr. Jacob Griffel;

S 1899 An act to further define the national transportation policy,

S 1952 An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes,

S 1956 An act to amend section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 and sections 6 and 14 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, and for other purposes,

S 1967. An act to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes,

S 1970 An act for the relief of Louis E. Gabel,

S. 1994 An act to authorize the use of the incompleted submarine *Ulua* as a target for explosive tests, and for other purposes,

S 2007. An act for the relief of Sharon A. Gates,

S 2025 An act to amend section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat 785), to increase the amount available as an emergency relief fund for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges damaged by floods or other catastrophes;

S. 2027 An act for the relief of Leo Kleve;

S. 2079 An act to authorize the contribution of $12,000,000 to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund;

S. 2080. An act for the relief of Inooka Kazumi,

S 2085. An act to further amend section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to underwriting and dealing in securities issued by the Central Bank for Cooperatives;

S. 2091. An act to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to repeal the provisions therein for additional subscriptions on behalf of the United States to the capital stock of the Federal land banks;

S. 2128. An act to provide for the merger of two or more national banking associations and for the merger of State banks with national banking associations, and for other purposes;

S. 2158. An act for the relief of Michiyo Chiba; and

S. J. Res. 104. An act to assist in the rehabilitation of the economy of South Korea, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5113) entitled "An act to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 52–8.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1952

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KENNEDY, until November 15, on account of official business.

THIRTY-SECOND REPORT TO CONGRESS ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 227)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the thirty-second report to Congress on lend-lease operations, for the period from April 1, 1950, to March 31, 1951, inclusive.

During the period covered by this report, a supplement to the lend-lease settlement arrangement of April 15, 1948, was signed with Brazil and final settlement commitments were signed with Colombia, Costa Rica, and Mexico, while Bolivia, Ecuador, and El Salvador liquidated the amounts which were outstanding on their lend-lease accounts incurred within the terms of their respective lend-lease agreements.

The major development in lend-lease activities during this period was the resumption on January 15, 1951, of formal across-the-table negotiations with representatives of the U. S. S. R. In preparation for these negotiations, the Secretary of State discussed with me the major points involved and I approved his recommendations, the objectives of which are just and reasonable conpensation to the United States for the civilian-type lend-lease supplies remaining on hand in the Soviet Union at the end of the war; the return to the United States, pursuant to a request submitted in accordance with the provisions of the master lend-lease agreement, of those defense articles transferred to the U. S. S. R. under lend-lease procedures which I have determined to be useful to our Government; and the payment by the U. S. S. R. of satisfactory compensation to United States owners of patented processes which are being used in the U. S. S. R. in oil refineries supplied under the lend-lease program. Despite the continued efforts of the United States negotiators to reach a satisfactory settlement, no substantial agreement on several of the major issues has yet been achieved. These negotiations are described more fully in the report itself.

Other lend-lease activities during the period covered by this report include negotiations for settlements with other countries and, also, the management of fiscal, administrative, and policy matters arising from and related to the lend-lease settlements which already have been concluded with certain of our allies of World War II.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 3, 1951.*

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S 97. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 466. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Army certain property in St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 582. An act for the relief of Emma Burr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 590. An act for the relief of Francesco Gaber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 606. An act for the relief of Fede Vita Guzzardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 634. An act for the relief of Stela S. Ransier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 635. An act for the relief of Hans Lenk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 659. An act for the relief of Ritsuko Chojin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 702. An act for the relief of Joseph Emanuel Winger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 715. An act for the relief of Ana Cobo Alonso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 781. An act to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Army and the United States Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 905. An act for the relief of Margaret A. Ushkova-Rosanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 970. An act for the relief of Esther V. Worley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1048. An act for the relief of Myrtle Harding; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1158. An act for the relief of Takako Kitamura Dalluge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1177. An act for the relief of Misako Konoshita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1199. An act for the relief of Julie Nicola Frangou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1274. An act for the relief of Vera Oumancoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1283. An act to remove the limitation on the numerical strength of the White House Police force; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1342. An act to amend acts relating to garagekeepers and liverymen's liens and the enforcement thereof in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1411. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to issue duplicate checks without requiring bond when such checks of the Post Office Department are lost while in the custody of the United States or lost without fault of owner or holder; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1415 An act to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1421. An act for the relief of Masako Sugiyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1450. An act to provide for the exchange of certain lands owned by the United States of America for certain privately owned lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1464. An act for the relief of Peter Therkelsen Kirwan and Ernest O'Gorman Kirwan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1517. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1897, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes," as amended, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to sell without advertisement national-forest timber in amounts not exceeding $2,000 in appraised value; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1541. An act for the relief of Dr. Francis S. N. Kowk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1629. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, to permit the interstate movement, for immediate slaughter, of domestic animals which have reacted to a test for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test for brucellosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1640. An act for the relief of Cathy Dana Besser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1686. An act for the relief of Albert Goldman, postmaster at New York, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1800. An act for the relief of Dr. Jacob Griffel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1899. An act to further define the national transportation policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1952. An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 1967 An act to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 1970. An act for the relief of Louis E. Gabel, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 2007 An act for the relief of Sharon A. Gates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 2025 An act to amend section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), to increase the amount available as an emergency relief fund for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges damaged by floods or other catastrophes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S 2027 An act for the relief of Leo Kieve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 2079 An act to authorize the contribution of $12,000,000 to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

S 2091 An act to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to repeal the provisions therein for additional subscriptions on behalf of the United States to the capital stock of the Federal land banks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S 2128 An act to provide for the merger of two or more national banking associations and for the merger of State banks with national banking associations, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S 2158 An act for the relief of Michiyo Chiba, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S J Res 104 Joint resolution to assist in the rehabilitation of the economy of South Korea, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H J Res. 290 Joint resolution providing for the recognition and endorsement of the World Metallurgical Congress.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S 1183 An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," as amended.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On October 2, 1951.

H R 579. An act for the relief of Hendryk Kempski;

H R 580. An act for the relief of Kwang Myeng Chu;

H. R 662. An act for the relief of William O. Stevens;

H R 676 An act for the relief of Mrs. Aimee Hoyningen-Huene;

H R 710 An act for the relief of Mrs. Suzanne Chow Hsia and her son, Sven Erik Hsia;

H R 711. An act for the relief of George Lukes,

H. R. 744. An act for the relief of Wladimir Peter Lewicki; Mrs. Heedwige Lewicki, and George Wladimir Lewicki;

H R 804 An act for the relief of Sisters Maria DeRubertis, Agnese Cerina, Marianna Bonifacio, Dina Bonini, and Edvige Gasparini;

H R 901. An act to provide for the admission of Janet and Daisy Wong to the United States;

H R. 1102. An act for the relief of Emilio Torres;

H R 1128 An act for the relief of Harvey McFarland and Laurence Anthony Warnock.

H R. 1136. An act for the relief of Sister Natalie (Marie Palagyi) and Sister Alice (Elizabeth Slachta);

H R 1203 An act to authorize officers designated by the Secretary of the Air Force to take action on reports of survey and vouchers pertaining to Government property,

H R 1253. An act for the relief of Jack A Witham;

H R 1420 An act for the relief of Dr. Eugen Jose Singer and Mrs. Frieda Singer;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of David Lee Harrigan,

H R 1598 An act for the relief of Hanoh Sarapanovschi (also known as Hanoh Charat), Gizela (Gizele) Sarapanovschi (nee Levy) and Philippe Sarapanovischi;

H. R 1816 An act for the relief of Shoemon Takano;

H R 1818 An act for the relief of Hego Fuchino,

H R 2165 An act for the relief of Matthew Terry;

H R 2444 An act for the relief of James A Vines;

H R. 2459 An act for the relief of Ollie O Evans, Jr ,

H R 2498 An act for the relief of Marianne and Michel Speelman;

H R. 2562 An act amending section 437 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code,

H R 2621 An act for the relief of Mrs. Giulia Di Gaetano Coccia;

H R 2745. An act to amend section 2801 (c) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R 2807. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Poborski,

H R 2916 An act for the relief of Shizu Terauchi Parks,

H R 3026 An act for the relief of Joseph A Ferrari;

H R 3128. An act for the relief of Elaine Dovico,

H R. 3436. An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport grain between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1951,

H R 3585 An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy certain property located at Decatur, Ill ;

H R 3818. An act for the relief of Yutaka Nakaeda;

H R. 3895. An act for the relief of Ethel Cristeta Berner;

H R 3932. An act to provide vocational rehabilitation training for veterans with compensable service-connected disabilities who served on or after June 27, 1950;

H R 3965. An act for the relief of five sisters of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary;

H. R 4121. An act for the relief of Rafael Alemany;

H R 4127. An act for the relief of Mrs. Doris Ellen Young;

H R 4463 An act for the relief of Nadine Carol Heslip;

H R 4688 An act for the relief of Cecelia Wahls; and

H R. 4756 An act for the relief of George Francis Hammers.

On October 3, 1951:

H. R 5013. An act to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea; and

H J. Res 290. Joint resolution providing for the recognition and endorsement of the World Metallurgical Congress.

THE LATE HON. KARL STEFAN

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Giver of all life has placed His hand on one of our number and has said: Come here, my son, your labors are over. Enter into the reward that I have prepared for you.

His passing from our midst has torn our hearts with grief and we miss him greatly. He was such a gentle, kindly, loyal, and good man. It is difficult to announce that the Honorable KARL STEFAN died at the George Washington Hospital in the city of Washington on Tuesday afternoon, October 2, 1951.

The rise of KARL STEFAN and his election to Congress is an inspiring story of what can happen in this Republic. He was born on March 1, 1884, on a farm near Zebrakov, Bohemia, and immigrated to the United States in 1885. His parents settled in Omaha, Nebr., where Karl attended the public schools. Later he went to night school. He was successful in all his many undertakings including that of telegraph operator, news writer, reporter, editor, radio news commentator, and businessman.

KARL STEFAN was a resident of Norfolk, Nebr. There he lived a full life, and faithfully served his fine family, his church, his community, his State, and his Nation.

From 1904 to 1906, KARL STEFAN served in the Philippine Constabulary. He served in the Illinois National Guard and later was a lieutenant in the Nebraska National Guard. During World War I, he served his country as a radio code instructor. In World War II, he as a Member of this House not only carried the heavy responsibilities of a Representative but gave effective help in the prosecution of the war, particularly in reference to the Philippine Islands.

Mr. STEFAN was indeed a great citizen, soldier, and statesman, but more than that he was an exemplary husband and father and a Christian gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, to enumerate the contributions that KARL STEFAN has made as a Member of this body would take much time for it is spread on many pages of the RECORD through the years that he served here. He will be remembered for his regular attendance, his detailed knowledge, his clear understanding, and his great ability as a legislator. He was the master of many languages and was a world traveler. These fitted him for the task to which he was assigned. He was a helpful consultant to the Government of the United States in the formation of the United Nations, in the recent Japanese Peace Conference, and on many other occasions. He expressed his love for his country by rendering able and distinguished service for it. Of him can truthfully be said:

Statesman, yet a friend of truth. Of soul sincere,
In action faithful, and in honor clear;
Who broke no promise, served no private ends.

KARL STEFAN is survived by his wife, Mrs. Ida Stefan, and their two children, Dr. Karl Franklin Stefan and Mrs. Ida Mae Askren. To them we extend our deepest sympathy and point them to the words of the Master, "Let not your heart be troubled, ye believe."

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed difficult for me to say the things that I would like to say about our departed friend and colleague, KARL STEFAN. Yesterday the book of life's activities for KARL STEFAN was closed. He passed beyond that veil that holds the answers to many mysteries of life. He has crossed the stage of life and disappeared behind the dark and mysterious curtain of eternal night. Yes, he has set forth to that mysterious land from "whence no traveler returneth."

Yesterday I stood at his bedside. There was a deathless silence filling the room. I could not help but feel that there was someone else in that room. I have had this feeling before because, as a physician, I have frequently been called upon to close the eyelids in death. I have seen people die that I thought should live and I have seen people live whom I surely thought would die. I know someone had them by the hand besides this physician.

The story of KARL STEFAN'S life is one of a humble beginning, of hard work which brought him success seldom equaled by other men. He was born in Zebrakov, Bohemia, March 1, 1884. His parents came to this country a year later. They had a humble beginning that could only be found in America. His parents came to escape some of the evils of the Old World.

KARL STEFAN was educated in the public schools of Omaha; attended night school; took a correspondence course; and was an instructor in the Morse and Continental codes. As a young boy he was a messenger for the Western Union Telegraph Co., and he delivered papers to add his bit to the family purse.

As KARL STEFAN grew to manhood he became interested in newspaper work. He was a reporter, city editor, and later became a radio news commentator. He was active in civic life; he was a member of several organizations. He was honored by the Philippire Government for his services with the Scouts.

KARL STEFAN was a great American who actually died in the harness. I guess that is the way he would have wanted it to be. He made a contribution to his State, the Nation, and the world, which was far beyond that of the average individual. He gave of himself unstintingly He was honest, he had a strong character, and a high moral plane of integrity. You had to know KARL STEFAN to know the man. He was as friendly as a puppy and yet he had steel in his moral backbone that never wavered when he thought he was right.

He was a sincere and tireless worker for the American people. His broad knowledge of international affairs—and he spoke several foreign languages fluently—made him a valuable Member of the Congress and the Appropriations Committee.

He understood thoroughly the American philosophy of government. I am sure his parents, who were immigrants, instilled in their son an understanding of the principles of freedom and the love of God which gave him a fine and strong character.

He was a man with an understanding heart. His mind and character were enriched because he got wisdom in the school of hard knocks.

Karl and I had many intimate and confidential discussions not only about small but about the big things of life. It was just last Friday that we had one of those confidential talks. I learned to depend upon him. His counsel and advice were seldom wrong.

Mr. Speaker, a mighty oak of the forest has fallen. A noble soul has gone to his reward. The silver cord is loosened. The golden bowl is broken. The picture has been dashed to pieces. He has left indelible footprints on the sands of time that should serve as a proper marker for those who are to follow.

KARL STEFAN had many friends. It seems that one can truly say that the measure of a man's soul is in his capacity for making friends. He realized that the finest flower growing along the highway of life is that of fellowship and friendship with his fellowman.

KARL STEFAN realized that the greatest business in the world was that of making friends, and no investment on the street paid him larger dividends.

Karl realized that life was a great investment and that no one lived in vain who guards a hundred friendships as a miser guards his gain.

Karl has lived and hoped that no mortgages would ever foreclose his many partnerships of friends.

Mr. Speaker, Nebraska, the Nation, and the world has lost a sincere Christian man. My profound sympathy goes out to his wife and family.

I will miss him very much and hesitate to bid a fond but lasting farewell to a man who was my friend. I think Kipling had someone like Karl in mind when he composed his When Earth's Last Picture Is Painted:

When earth's last picture is painted, and the tubes are twisted and dried,
When the oldest colors have faded, and the youngest critic has died,
We shall rest, and faith, we shall need it—lie down for an aeon or two,
Till the Master of all good workmen shall put us to work anew.

And those that were good shall be happy; they shall sit in a golden chair;
They shall splash on a 10-league canvas with brushes of comet's hair.
They shall find real saints to draw from—Magdalene, Peter, and Paul;
They shall work for an age at a sitting and never be tired at all.

And only the Master shall praise us, and only the Master shall blame;
And no one shall work for money, and no one shall work for fame,
But each for the joy of working, and each, in his separate star,
Shall draw the thing as he sees it for the God of things as they are!

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, in the sudden passing of KARL STEFAN, Congress and the Nation have lost a wise and steadfast public servant. Nebraska has lost one of its most distinguished citizens. I have lost a valued friend and kind counselor.

KARL STEFAN'S career was a story of what can be achieved in America by individual ability and industrious effort. He had energy and talents that have served the country well during his many years in this House.

His fatherly guidance and heartwarming friendship will be sorely missed by many of us. The memory of his presence and his achievements will serve as an inspiration to Nebraskans for long years to come.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, life with all its thrills and joys is crowded with many sad moments—and no moment is sadder than when we pause to honor the passing of a beloved friend.

Today such a friend has gone, KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska, unexpectedly has received the call all must some day receive.

It is hard to believe Karl is dead. He was with us only a few short days ago. As he chatted with me I could not help but think he looked unusually healthy and appeared to be in excellent spirits. Now he is dead.

Born in Bohemia, coming to Nebraska a babe in his mother's arms, a Western Union messenger, a telegraph operator, a news reporter and editor, radio commentator, soldier in the Philippines, 17 years a Member of Congress, a student of Government finances, and an expert on foreign affairs.

What a career. What a service this Bohemian-born citizen gave to his adopted country—the country he placed first in his loyalty and his allegiance. It is a career that must be an inspiration to every boy—either immigrant or native. It is a career that could not be emulated in any country other than the United States.

KARL STEFAN was a hard worker; his death was unquestionably hastened by the long hours he devoted every day to his congressional career. Speaking six different languages and conversant with every country in the world and with world conditions, his death is a great loss to us in these days of world strife and unrest.

Everyone loved KARL STEFAN. He was a man without an enemy. In my long association with him, his friendship was one I highly prized. I never heard him speak an unkind word of anyone. His was a constructive mind.

We have all lost a real friend, a truly great legislator. Nebraska has been deprived of a fine public servant and America of a patriotic and constructive Congressman.

To his good wife and his family go our deepest sympathy in this hour of bereavement. To all it is comforting to recall that while we will miss his kindly greetings and presence, his good deeds and good work will ever be an inspiration to all of us.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a sad moment for the membership of the House of Representatives to hear officially of the death of our dear and beloved friend and colleague. I

thoroughly agree with the well prepared and well thought out remarks of my colleagues who have preceded me in eulogizing this noble-minded gentleman, this gentleman of noble and lovable character. KARL STEFAN was loved by everyone who knew him. I know of no Member of the House who was more respected and loved by his colleagues than KARL STEFAN, a kindly man, understanding in his associations with his fellow men, a man of real charity, a man who never expressed an unkind thought in the years I have been associated with him in this body, a man of restraint in his views and expressions with reference to others, a man who had as complete control over himself as any human being possibly could have.

I speak not only as JOHN MCCORMACK losing a valued friend, but also as majority leader I speak for this side of the House, and I join with my Republican colleagues in expressing to you our deep sorrow in the passing of this great American, and this outstanding member of your party.

As Members of the House, we all join with each other in our kindly feelings, incapable of adequate expression, at the passing of this great man. As Members have said, his life's story is a real story of the Horatio Alger we used to read as youngsters, a stimulating story that brought thoughts of nobility into our minds. He was truly a great man; great, not because he was a Member of Congress, but because he was possessed of those noble attributes which make up a great and good man, a kindly man, and a noble man. No matter where men may live, in my opinion these things make a great man. KARL STEFAN was a great man in his own right in every sense of the word. The fact that he came to Congress and in this arena was able to evidence his greatness to the people of the country proves that fact.

I join with the Members of this House in expressing to his family my great sorrow. I express to my Republican colleagues the sympathy of this side in your great sorrow, and particularly to the Nebraska delegation, more particularly to the people of Nebraska and to the people of this great congressional district that he so ably and effectively represented.

For myself, I express my regret that I have lost not only a dear friend, but a friend whom I sincerely admired and respected.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, fine, sincere words are being spoken in the Chamber of the House of Representatives, a Chamber until recently graced by the presence of a great American, a great father and husband, KARL STEFAN. They are being spoken in memory of Mr. STEFAN by his colleagues; yes, and by his friends who loved him and admired him and respected him.

Sincere words, I said, and so they are. May those of his family and friends not privileged to be present to hear these words spoken, know from us that they are sincere. These words come from the very bottoms of the hearts of the people here who have worked with KARL STEFAN through the years he served so ably and so honorably as a Member of the House of Representatives. May they take comfort in the knowledge that they are sincere words, words spoken so that everyone may understand how deeply we mourn the loss of our great friend.

It seems but yesterday, that day in 1935, when, with KARL STEFAN, I came here as a fledgling Member of the House of Representatives. Those of us who have served through these troublesome times well understand that even though it seems only a day ago, yet we have seen the constantly increasing burden of problems and difficulties with which we have had to contend. These problems and difficulties become at times so intense as to result, undoubtedly, in the sad situation which sees a man much too young to die sacrificing himself in noble, unselfish service to his country.

I would characterize KARL STEFAN as a man of strong convictions but a man always willing to listen to reason; strong, but always gentle; firm, but not unbending; typifying the highest type of congressional service. KARL STEFAN was a man who became a specialist in that particular field that was assigned to him in the work of the House of Representatives, yet remained always a servant of the people he was privileged and honored to represent, always mindful of the problems peculiar to them, making their attitudes, their needs, and their desires heard in the Hall of the House of Representatives. Finally, I would characterize KARL STEFAN, as not only the able Representative of a great district from the great State of Nebraska, but as Representative of the people of the United States and of the people of the world, for whom he had the utmost love and affection and of whom he had the deepest understanding. It is tragic that he has left this Chamber and his work here. We shall miss him, but may it not well be said that having known him and having been privileged to witness his example each one of us will be a better man or woman, better able to represent our great country in this time of danger and strife?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, KARL STEFAN came on the Appropriations Committee very soon after he became a Member of this House. There, by his industry, faithfulness, sincere strong character, his ability to size up situations and to work them out he became a very valuable Member.

I think KARL STEFAN had about as wide a range of knowledge and understanding as any man whom I have known in this House, and his service was of tremendous value to the people he represented, to the State, and to the country as a whole; and, I might say that perhaps it got beyond that into the world. We are going to miss him; we are going to miss his fine spirit; we are going to miss the things that he could do better than some of the rest of us; but, we must all be glad, we must all be proud that such a fine character has been with us.

To his family, one of the most devoted I know, I give and extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, one of the many compensations of membership in the House of Representatives is the opportunity to develop personal friendships with the exceptional men and women with whom we are here associated. And one of the inexplicable features of our service here in the House is the suddenness with which that friendship is too often abruptly broken—as it has been broken today in the death of our friend and colleague, KARL STEFAN.

If anyone had asked me yesterday who of all our colleagues was probably the next to be called, KARL STEFAN would have been one of the last brought to my mind. If anyone had asked who of all our colleagues in the House we could least afford to lose, certainly he would have been among the first to be mentioned.

His death removes from the House and from a busy and hard-pressed committee one of its most indispensable members at a critical time in the work of the committee and in the relations of our Government abroad. For his particular section of the committee is directly concerned with international relations and world problems at a time when our Nation has, willingly or unwillingly, been thrust into a position of world leadership. For a decade, either as chairman or as minority ranking member of the subcommittee, he has devoted his great talents to this important work with singular success.

He was especially fitted for this particular work. His calm judicial temperment, his poise, his fluent knowledge of European languages and the historic background of European politics and culture, his deep interest in the current problems not only of our own country but of world humanity, made him one of the most useful members of one of the most responsible subcommittees of the House. Regardless of all considerations of sentiment and affection we can ill afford to lose him in these trying times.

But it is not of his talents, his service, his value to his country that we are thinking this morning. We are thinking today of a friend, of a comrade, of a loved associate who has labored with us through these trying years and who has passed on ahead of us into that undiscovered country from which no word has ever come back to us. And his sudden passing brings back to us again the old question which has been asked in every generation since the beginning of time. You will recall the answer of Ion to that question in the drama of Euripides. As the devoted youth stepped into the garlanded procession on its way to the amphitheater where he was to give up his life as a sacrifice for his country, his companion by his side asked the old, old question: "Shall we meet again?"

And the youth, pausing for an instant's meditation, answered as if by sudden inspiration:

I have asked that dreadful question of the hills that are eternal, of the clear streams that flow forever, of the stars amidst whose azure depths my raised spirits have walked in glory, yet they are dumb. But when I look into thy living, loving face I see that which, mantling through its rich beauty, tells me it can never die.

We shall meet again.

Life is eternal. Love is immortal. Friendship is deathless.

We shall meet again.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I feel a sense of deep personal loss in the passing of our good friend and colleague, KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska. I shall miss him greatly.

Born overseas some 67 years ago, and coming to this country in the first year of his life, he was destined to lead a career that began as a messenger boy for the Western Union and that culminated in 17 years of distinguished service as a Member of the Congress.

His experience in the National Guard, his experience in the Philippine Constabulary, his experience on the various rungs of the ladder in the publishing field, gave him not only many friends in every walk of life but a broad understanding of human nature.

His ability as a linguist, with a capacity to speak fluently a number of languages, his wide travels throughout the principal countries of the world, gave him a grasp of world conditions which was invaluable to him in this day in which we live.

To read his record is to appreciate what a wide, varied, and successful life KARL STEFAN had.

The decorations which he received, the honorary degree of doctor of laws conferred upon him, bear witness to some extent of the appreciation of his success in life.

Mr. Speaker, I knew KARL STEFAN intimately over the years.

I worked with him closely as a member of the Appropriations Committee, to the work of which he contributed so splendidly, particularly as chairman and as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee to which he was assigned, having jurisdiction over appropriations for four of the major divisions of the Federal Government.

Anyone who heard his major speech this year on the bill making appropriations for the State Department, the Department of Justice, the Commerce Department and the Judiciary and who was present at the ovation which he received at its conclusion, will appreciate the grasp which he had in the field in which he had specialized.

I not only worked with him closely in the Congress, I had many good times with him out of Congress. One of the happiest memories I have in this connection is of a trip which we both made to Europe as delegates to a meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in 1939, a meeting which terminated just a day or two before the forces of Hitler marched into Poland.

Mr. Speaker, KARL STEFAN was a man of high character, of great ability, with a real understanding of human nature, and with a temperate and balanced judgment.

It was his privilege to make a great contribution during his lifetime to his State and to the Nation.

We can ill afford to lose him at this difficult time.

I join with all those who have spoken in extending heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Stefan, to the other members of his family and to all those close to him.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, again Old Glory drops to half-mast as a mark of respect to a great American. A dear and beloved colleague has left us. This time it is Hon. KARL STEFAN, one of the ablest Representatives who has served in the House of Representatives in our time.

The public service rendered by our dear colleague will ever be a yardstick by which to measure exceptional and outstanding congressional representation.

Whenever I shall think of Hon. KARL STEFAN and his able and patriotic service to his country I shall recall these words:

That which raises a country, that which strengthens a country, and that which dignifies a country, that which spreads her power, creates her moral influence, and makes her respected and submitted to, bends the hearts of millions, and bows down the pride of nations to her—the instrument of obedience, the fountain of supremacy, the true throne, crown, and scepter of a nation is not an aristocracy of blood, not an aristocracy of fashion, not an aristocracy of talent only; it is an aristocracy of character. This is the true heraldry of man.

Mrs. Reed joins with me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Stefan and her family in this time of their great bereavement.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I am one of those who, on a sad and solemn occasion such as this, cannot command such brilliant language and oratory as we have heard here in this Chamber this afternoon. My heart is too heavy. I simply and humbly say that the State of Nebraska has lost one of its ablest Representatives, this House one of its most respected Members, and our Nation a great American. I have lost an esteemed and close friend. I have had the pleasure and the benefit of serving with KARL STEFAN on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and the Federal Judiciary day by day, week by week, month by month, and year by year for over 6 years. Never in all that time did I hear KARL STEFAN express an unpleasant or unkind word. Yet KARL STEFAN was a man of strength and firmness. KARL STEFAN was a man possessed of great principles, and a man who despised smallness or sham wherever he found it. KARL STEFAN was one of the ablest members of the great House Committee on Appropriations. I appreciated then, and do today appreciate the many things I learned from him with regard to the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary. I learned much about civil aviation, and the aviation industry and the State Department from KARL STEFAN, and about such important bureaus as the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in both of which he always expressed such a keen interest. But beyond all this, I had the great pleasure of knowing him intimately outside the halls of Congress. It is only about 3 weeks ago that I attended the Japanese Peace Conference at San Francisco with Karl and his lovely wife, and his son, Dr. Karl Stefan, and daughter-in-law. We had a most pleasant week together. It was only last Thursday evening that Karl, apparently in the best of health, was with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr PRESTON], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], and some others of us, at a pleasant soiree here in Chevy Chase at the home of Phillips Moore, Director of the Office of Airports of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and we had a very pleasant few hours together. Little did we think on that evening that we would be here today lamenting his passing.

Mr. Speaker, may I conclude by saying that we have all suffered an irreparable loss. I shall miss Karl, but shall treasure forever my friendship and association with him. Mrs. Stefan, his son, and daughter have my deepest sympathy upon their loss of a devoted husband and fine father who has left them the consolation and heritage of a respected name and the exemplary record of many years devoted to public service.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, fate has a strange way of doing things. KARL STEFAN and I came to Nebraska the very same year. He came in his mother's arms from Bohemia, and I arrived in the conventional manner in the same State. As I think of the boyhood days that he and I both spent in that State of magnificent distances—why between the little ranch where I was born and Norfolk, there was not an object which would obstruct your vision if your eyes could see that far—I never dreamed that the last several years of his life would be spent in such intimate contact as I have had with KARL STEFAN. You know yesterday, he and I were the only Members of our party on the subcommittee, and during the years of intimate association with Karl I have grown to appreciate him and love him as I love one of my brothers.

No one could be kinder. No one could be stronger nor more inflexible when principle was concerned than KARL STEFAN. It has been said he was a citizen of the world. He was. But he preserved something that most Americans lose when they become citizens of the

world. That is, his first love for his adopted country. A boy who was born in Nebraska never loved that soil a particle more than did the little immigrant boy from Bohemia whose mother carried him there. KARL STEFAN never lost that love of his duty and his respect for this Republic. That cannot be said of many others who have served in this body and in the other body of this Congress. There were no other gods before his God when it came to his reverence for deity. There was no other country ahead of his own adopted country. I have seen him suffer when the Government of Bohemia was destroyed and his friend was killed. I have seen those things that have added to his suffering, because I sat next to him and I have been very, very close to him. Some of you missed a friend. I just do not believe any of you can measure my loneliness this day and this hour, when after we have paid our last respects to KARL STEFAN I will probably have to move over into his chair. There is one thing that I pray, that the spirit that guided KARL STEFAN will guide me and help me through these lonesome hours. I miss him more than anyone can tell.

Mr CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have known KARL STEFAN longer than any other Member of this House. I knew him long before he came to Congress. I knew his people. I always recognized in him those qualities of nobility, honesty, loyalty, and godliness we all hope to find in real Americans.

I, too, was born in Bohemia, as KARL STEFAN was. Consequently we became very close friends. We lived in the same place here in Washington for many, many years. He was a wonderful soul. He loved to utilize some of the linguistic powers which were his. Every chance he had to try me out to speak, whether it was Bohemian, whether it was German, whether it was Slavic, or other languages of which he had a knowledge, it gave him a great deal of pleasure to do so I know he enjoyed it Consequently I learned to admire and to love him, because his views were my views.

Only a few months ago we both broadcast messages to our native land, Bohemia, through the facilities of the Voice of America, in an effort to strengthen the minds and the will of the people behind the iron curtain who are bravely fighting again for freedom and independence. He expressed the wish that some day soon the little country of Czechoslovakia, into which Bohemia was incorporated, that had made such great progress as an independent nation through our efforts following World War I, would again attain that freedom and independence so dear to the hearts of her countrymen. Unfortunately, he did not live long enough to see that wish come true, but I earnestly hope that his wish and his prayer will be fulfilled in the very near future.

It is indeed gratifying and pleasing to me to hear these many kind remarks about KARL STEFAN, the boy that came from Bohemia. There are many others in that great State of Nebraska who came from the same stock. They have contributed magnificently to the growth and development of his home State of Nebraska and I hope they will continue to love and work for the interests of their adopted country above everything else. And why should they not do so? Where else could KARL STEFAN or myself, or anyone coming from a foreign land attain membership in such a great body as this, legislating in the interest of the greatest Nation in the world, a Nation which I hope will continue to be the greatest, most liberal, and the richest country on the globe.

He will not be with us any more. In him this House loses a great legislator, a great humane gentleman, an outstanding and loyal American.

There is nothing that I can add to the words that have been so splendidly uttered about his past and about his record in this House. I, too, join with my colleagues in expressing to his lovely and devoted wife, to his son, and to his daughter my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN]

Mr HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of my very good friend, KARL STEFAN, comes as a great shock to me. I sought him out when I first came to Congress almost 10 years ago in that his congressional district in Nebraska adjoined my district in Iowa, only the Missouri River separating us I knew we would have many interests in common and throughout the years we freely exchanged ideas on matters related to our respective agricultural districts and the common welfare of our people.

KARL STEFAN was a great American. He worked zealously at his job as a Representative. He fought valiantly for the American way of life and our system of free enterprise. Through hard work and devotion to duty he gained a position of prominence in the House of Representatives as a member of the great Committee on Appropriations He came to be recognized as an authority on all matters pertaining to appropriations for the State Department and the Diplomatic Service. He leaves an empty void which will be hard to fill

KARL STEFAN loved America He came to this, his adopted country, with his parents from Bohemia when only 1 year old He came up the hard way in this great land of opportunity Beginning as a messenger boy, he successfully became a telegraph operator, news writer, reporter, city editor, and a radio news commentator before being elected to Congress. In these halls he has served with honor and distinction for almost 17 years.

In the passing of KARL STEFAN I have lost a dear friend. I shall miss him very much in the days to come The House of Representatives has lost one of its most valued Members, the Third Congressional District of Nebraska has lost an able and conscientious Representative, and the State of Nebraska and the Nation have lost a great patriot and citizen

My deepest sympathy goes out to Mrs. Stefan and members of the family. May God give them strength and courage in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I attempt to pay a tribute to our devoted friend and to one of the most outstanding Members of this body for more than 20 years. He was brought to the United States when he was 1 year old—he knew but scant information of his native birthplace until he became one of the first citizens of this great Republic He would have been a great man had he never come to the United States. God endowed him with characteristics which would have been great and important in any intelligent nation.

During his congressional life, in my opinion, no Member of this body ever adhered more intuitively and consistently to the highest standards of conduct. KARL STEFAN was successful in whatever he undertook to accomplish, he had the confidence of his fellow man and those who knew him best did not hesitate to join in matters he advocated and follow him with complacency. He was loyal to his party but never hesitated to disagree with those he conceived to be wrong. He was above reproach in his record and commanded the respect of all even when few were in agreement with him.

His great State, Nebraska, has lost a great citizen who sought always to fulfill the duties assigned to him This Nation will always be great when Representatives of KARL STEFAN's type fulfill the duties assigned to them.

May God bless and keep his loved ones. I cannot appraise his friendship and I shall cherish his friendship until we meet in that "city which has foundations whose builder and maker is God"

Mr CURTIS of Nebraska Mr Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr HOPE].

Mr HOPE Mr Speaker, it was a great shock when late yesterday I heard of the death of my dear friend, KARL STEFAN I remember well when he first came to Congress I was anxious to meet him at that time because his election had been something of a political upset, and I wondered what manner of man he was. And I also wanted to welcome him as one coming from a neighboring State and from a district with problems similar to those of the one which I represent. It was easy to become acquainted with KARL STEFAN. He was a friendly person, and I can readily understand why he was so popular then and since with his Nebraska constitutents.

KARL STEFAN had such a sweet, gentle, and lovable personality that it was impossible to be his acquaintance without being his friend. He came to Congress after a wide experience in working with people in all walks of life not only in this country but in other parts of the world. He was a self-made man in the very best sense of the word, and his life could very well be cited as exemplifying the opportunities which exist in America. It is a great success story and should be an inspiration to every boy and girl and young man and young woman in America today.

KARL STEFAN came to Congress at a time when great economic and political problems were confronting this country and the world. He played a conspicuous part in dealing with those problems. I think it is fortunate that during these years we have had a man with the temperament, the ability, and the experience of KARL STEFAN occupying important positions here in the Congress He was active in many lines, but I am thinking particularly of his work on the Committee on Appropriations, and as chairman and ranking minority member of the subcommittee dealing with appropriations for the State Department. This was a position for which his wide experience, broad outlook, and keen intelligence peculiarly fitted him.

K RL STEFAN was a man with a great heart He had a genuine love for humanity, and his every thought and action demonstrated this. I feel that the Nation and the Congress have benefited tremendously because of his service, and as an individual I am better for having known him during these years. Although he is gone his work will live on; and much as we shall miss him, all of us who have had the privilege of being associated with him will treasure many happy memories

To his wife and children I extend my most sincere sympathy and the hope that they will be given the strength to carry their heavy burden.

Mr CURTIS of Nebraska Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr Speaker, KARL STEFAN'S passing has brought deep sorrow to all of us. Knowing him has enriched the lives of all of his colleagues in this House

His was a great and a lovely soul. An immigrant lad, the doors of opportunity opened to him This is truly a land of opportunity for all, that is why we love this country so.

I shall miss him always, and to his devoted family I offer my very deepest sympathies.

Mr MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in mourning the passing of KARL STEFAN and in paying tribute to his memory. I had a special affection for him He and I were in that group of 100 new Members of Congress who were first elected to the House of Representatives in November 1934. KARL STEFAN was a Republican, but I soon learned that he had little time for and little interest in strictly party matters. He was an American in every sense of the word and the welfare of the country was his consuming and paramount interest.

After a time Karl and I were appointed to the House Appropriations Committee and we served together for a period as members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia. KARL STEFAN was a great friend of the people of the District of Columbia and he deserves the praise of the people of the District for his fine and unselfish service in matters involving the District.

KARL STEFAN was a statesman. He served well, and with unceasing industry, the people of his home district in Nebraska But his interests were worldwide He was greatly interested in the cause of world understanding and peace. He had traveled widely in Asia and Europe. He had a grasp of world conditions which marked him as a leader in this field in the Congress

KARL STEFAN was much beloved for his fine personal qualities He was gentle and kind. He was thoughtful and tolerant He was friendly and of an understanding nature He was a good companion. I join with my colleagues in expressing deepest sympathy to Mrs. Stefan and their two children

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep personal regret and sorrow that I learn of the passing from our midst of our honored and respected colleague, KARL STEFAN.

KARL STEFAN, was a man of strong convictions. His sincerity of purpose was recognized by all who have served with him in the House of Representatives. At no time, was he willing to compromise his allegiance to any cause where a fundamental principle was involved He was careful to ascertain all pertinent facts that had a bearing upon any subject before the Congress His opinion upon matters of legislation was respected for the reason that his decision was always the result of studied judgment. It was based upon facts. Once his mind was made up he followed the course his judgment dictated to the end. The great influence he exerted in the House was due to the knowledge upon the part of the Members that he was well informed on the facts of the issue under consideration, and was sincere in the conclusions he reached His service to the country, his State, and the Third Congressional District of Nebraska has been able, sincere, and distinguished.

It is also appropriate to make reference to the deep love he had for this country, its free institutions and its people. His patriotism was of a high order. It was a part of his heart and soul

Throughout the years that our colleague has served with us we have observed the close and happy relationship that has existed between Karl and his good wife. We can readily understand the deep sense of loss she feels in the sudden passing away of her faithful and considerate husband. We extend to her and other members of the family our deep and sincere sympathy.

Mr AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to express in words my feelings about KARL STEFAN which, perhaps, is due to the suddenness of his death that has shocked us all, and also because I have always felt that his was a character somewhat set apart from the rest of us. I do not mean by this that he was aloof from his colleagues, because he was a most approachable and thoughtful person, but his nobility of character created a feeling that made him different from others. I have seldom known a man with more intense feelings and convictions, backed by a matchless courage. He was an inspiration to all who knew him

Although not a native-born American, he brought to our citizenry a tremendous desire to be of service to the cause of freedom and he continually resented any encroachments which might abridge the free rights of any citizen His long record of public service and active participation in many activities having to do with the promotion of civil liberty and constitutional rights made him honored, respected, and beloved by a host of men and women who will miss his counsel and his kind heart.

KARL STEFAN was the type of American that we need more of in these days for by his example of Christian service and devotion to high ideals, all who knew him recognized him as a leader and honored him as a friend.

Mr HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, one of the first Members of the House of Representatives I had the pleasure of meeting in 1945, when I first came to Congress, was the Honorable KARL STEFAN. That friendship existed between us since that time It was my privilege to serve on the Appropriations Committee of the House with Congressman STEFAN, and I had the opportunity to observe his ability and integrity, his sincere attitude toward his duties and his Government. Mrs Hedrick and I had the good fortune to live in the adjoining apartment to Congressman and Mrs. Stefan at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington for about 4 years. I can truthfully say that I have never known a more neighborly or a more cooperative individual in my whole life. He was an excellent neighbor.

It was a great shock to me, as well as to all the Members of the House of Representatives, especially the members of the Appropriations Committee who knew him so well, to learn of the illness and death of this distinguished American. It is extremely unfortunate that our country has to lose the knowledge and ability of this gentleman in these trying times. The State of Nebraska has lost an able Representative, the Nation has lost a real statesman.

I join with all the other Members of the House in extending sincere sympathy to the family, especially to Mrs Stefan who was so close and who cooperated so beautifully with her husband.

HON KARL STEFAN, PATRIOT AND STATESMAN

Mr SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives cannot afford to lose men like KARL STEFAN. His outstanding service in this House is known to very Member His passing is a personal loss to me Just last week he came to me with a statement of his impressions to events at the San Francisco Peace Conference. He carefully read each line to me, and I told him that it was an excellent statement; in fact, it is the best I have seen. It appears in the RECORD for last Thursday.

At the San Francisco Conference it was the happy privilege of Mrs. Smith and myself to see Karl and his wife, his son, Dr Karl Stefan, Jr., and his wife quite often. They were constantly interested in our welfare, and we shall never forget the many courtesies they extended to us. The devotion of KARL

STEFAN to his fine wife and family will always remain a pleasant memory to us.

Mr. Speaker, KARL STEFAN was a self-made man. As a young man he worked his way to prominence in the field of communications, starting at the bottom He often spoke of his trips from Chicago to Racine, my own city, on excursion boats that plied between the two cities Later he turned to newspaper work and then to radio, and subsequently he was elected to this distinguished body. Honest, hard work brought KARL STEFAN to the top in his chosen work

Mr Speaker, as a member of the Appropriations Committee it was his responsibility to pass upon State Department appropriations He became an expert in this field I often talked with him about the Department's requests, and very patiently he would acquaint me with all of the details

Mr Speaker, KARL STEFAN expressed great concern about our global spending and our present foreign policies. Yet he stanchly defended the Department in its basic policies On the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1951 KARL STEFAN made one of the best statements that was made in the course of that debate. His knowledge of the State Department was evident in that speech

KARL STEFAN was a kindly and considerate soul. He had no enemies in this House, and he was loved by his colleagues who worked with him on his subcommittee He was particularly fond of the gentleman from New York [JOHN ROONEY]. These two men never permitted partisan politics to mar their personal friendship.

Mr. Speaker, here was a man, a patriot, and a statesman This country could ill afford to lose him at this time. All of us shall miss him My deep sympathy to his fine wife, Mrs Stefan, and to his family

Mr EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the many words spoken in tribute to KARL STEFAN were an attempt to portray a really great character, but in my opinion the English language does not contain words which would adequately express the nobleness and the gentleness of our colleague who passed away so suddenly.

I have a deep feeling of grief and personal loss, as I considered him as one of the best friends I had in the House. From the first days of my service here, he immediately appealed to me as a man of great breadth of vision and wisdom, and I am sure that he impressed everyone with whom he came in contact with his tolerance and kindliness.

His life was a shining example to every Member serving in this body now, and will also be a shining example to those who will hereafter serve in this body; and I say this because there are so many times when grave differences of opinion and judgment make it quite difficult to maintain a real spirit of tolerance for the views and opinions of those with whom we differ.

His services in the cause of the people of his district, of his State, and of the Nation, will be sorely missed.

As was said by one of the previous speakers, no man of nobler stature will ever in the future serve in these Halls, and there will be but few in the future of equal stature who will serve May all of us keep his memory fresh in our minds, and endeavor to the best of our talents to emulate him.

Mr. JOHNSON Mr. Speaker, I received a distinct shock when I learned of the death of KARL STEFAN During the past 5 years I had come to know and admire Mr. STEFAN. He was a true gentleman in every sense of the word. He and I became fast friends and on the last day in which he sat in the House we talked about a contemplated trip we were proposing to make to Latin America.

His life should be an inspiration to young Americans His record is a typical American success story He was born in Bohemia and came to America as a child. He worked at all kinds of jobs while climbing the ladder of success. Mr. STEFAN was a great linguist, speaking six languages. He was familiar with many parts of the world, having traveled widely, both before and after becoming a Member of the House of Representatives.

Karl STEFAN was a tolerant man. He was wise enough to know that the viewpoints on the great public problems facing our country, do not stand out in bold relief in black or white There is a great twilight area and while he had firm convictions and took his stand courageously on the problems which Congress must consider, he had no rancor or hatred for those who differed with him.

He was a great admirer and supporter of the foreign service This attitude was developed by extensive study and much travel to all parts of the world, visiting foreign service offices and talking with the personnel in them. KARL STEFAN took a broad dispassionate view of our grave national problems. In his approach to the solution of our perplexing problems of the troubled world of today, Mr. STEFAN exhibited the traits of a statesman. He considered them on the basis of how can these proposed solutions solve the problems before us, rather than from the standpoint of who is sponsoring them or how will they effect the fortunes of any political party. We hope that God will send us more men of the Stefan type.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the death of KARL STEFAN came as a great shock to me. He was a real friend and we members of the Appropriations Committee particularly will miss our close association with him. Our country has lost one of its finest legislators He was a true American and a great patriot KARL STEFAN and I had many common interests and the similarity of the problems in our districts brought us together often for conference where I profited by his keen understanding and sage advice.

I join my colleagues in extending deepest sympathy to Mrs. Stefan and their children

Mr. MACK of Washington Mr. Speaker, the large number of Members who have spoken so eloquently today in tribute to our colleague, KARL STEFAN, testifies to the high esteem and deep affection in which he was held by every Member of this House.

The Congress has never had a man who fought with greater courage and resolution for the things in which he believed than KARL STEFAN Yet, there was in him a kindliness and understanding that won the hearts even of those who disagreed with him on some particular piece of legislation. No one ever doubted KARL STEFAN's sincerity. Everyone respected his ability. All loved him for his personal attributes.

We, his colleagues, who have been in daily associations with him over many years, all, unanimously, acclaimed his ability and his character There could be no finer tribute to any man than that so many who knew him so intimately over so many years should be so unanimous in speaking so earnestly of his fine qualities of statesmanship and of personality

KARL STEFAN loved the House of Representatives and the House of Representatives loved him His name always will be enshrined high on the list of those who, as lawmakers, have served their country with fearlessness and fidelity

Mr O'HARA Mr Speaker, KARL STEFAN is dead. It does not seem that it can be so It seems that as the years go by "the milestones into headstones change, 'neath every one a friend" So recently, I have lost two very dear friends, in Congressman Frank Fellows, of Maine, and now KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska.

To those protagonists who seek to change our form of government from what it is to something else, KARL STEFAN's life and accomplishments are the greatest answer Karl was born in Bohemia Obviously he had to earn his education, and he began his career as a messenger boy for the Western Union and worked his way up from there. He had a tremendous background in everyday life, and that experience became invaluable to him as a Member of Congress. Whatever his work was, he was obtaining knowledge constantly. The problems of the people of every walk of life were his problems. He thought, he lived, and he legislated that way

KARL STEFAN made friends wherever he was He was an invaluable Member of the House because of his ability and his industry and his rich background of experience.

With all the burdens imposed upon him as one of the ranking members of the Appropriations Committee and the constant demands that were made upon him, he was always anxious and willing to be of help to his colleagues who had problems which Karl could be helpful in solving I am personally indebted to him for his kindness to me in this regard.

Not only am I indebted to him but so are others in this country by reason of his great heart and helpfulness. KARL STEFAN was indeed a sweet, kindly Christian gentleman. That did not mean that he was not firm in his judements and convictions, but in his firmness he was never bitter As an immigrant boy he knew and loved this country He put the interest of the United States above all else.

With his gentleness and his understanding, he was a wonderful husband. My deepest sympathy goes to his beloved

wife and his family in their hour of great sadness.

My sympathy also goes to the great State of Nebraska, and particularly to those of his congressional district. With all due respect to whomever his successor may be, no one could exceed KARL STEFAN as their Representative.

The beautiful tributes that have been paid to Karl are richly deserved. It is but a recognition of his ability, his industry, his patriotism, and his character, and we of this House are poorer indeed to have lost this good and fine man, able legislator, and intense patriot.

Reverently I say, "Eternal rest grant unto him, O Lord."

Mr CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I shall always remember KARL STEFAN for his great love of country, his constant anxiety for world peace, his inimitable way of putting his thoughts right on the line, and his friendliness to others, particularly his colleagues in the Congress. He was especially kind to me, dating back to those days when I was a congressional secretary privileged to pal with his efficient aide, Ray Nedrow, who stood by his chief through thick and thin these last 18 years

Occasionally, back home in my district, it has been my privilege to address groups of those from foreign lands just acquiring the rights of American citizenship. It was always a delight to feature the Horatio Alger story of KARL STEFAN who came to America's shores from Bohemia when he was just 1 year old, began work as a messenger boy, became a newspaper editor, served as a Philippines volunteer, was elected to Congress and acted as sort of a one-man Voice of America during World Wars I and II. I doubt that Ray Nedrow knows the number of languages his chief could speak.

The two last speeches made by KARL STEFAN still ring in my ears--one a plea that we correct immediately the mistake made by our Government in not commemorating properly on grave markers the services of our dead in Korea and the other a warning to the Czech Government that it be sensible and release Bill Oatis, of the Associated Press, from his prison cell

KARL STEFAN gave his all to his congressional assignment and everyone on the House Appropriations Committee knew that he was our No 1 authority on funds required by the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments.

Early this year our colleague suffered from an attack of pneumonia It was during the hearings being held by his subcommittee and he refused to stay at home, relax, and build up When he came back on December 19 from his services as a congressional observer at the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty at San Francisco he sat alongside of me in the House and asked if I had realized any rest during the House recess When I told him I had enjoyed 10 days away from the grind he said that he regretted he had not done likewise. "I feel the need of such," he repeated.

I think today of KARL STEFAN's widow, his son and his daughter I wish I had been privileged to know them While my heart goes out to them, I am sure that they will derive some comfort from the heartfelt tributes being uttered on the House floor today by so many colleagues that knew and loved him who has been called away And I think of Secretary Ray Nedrow who felt his chief had no peer. His life has been changed so suddenly I hope I shall be able to express myself adequately when I next see him.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas Mr Speaker, my heart is heavy today, for the loss of our friend, the gentleman from Nebraska, brings genuine and lasting sorrow to every Member of the House On these occasions when we offer our tributes to departed colleagues, memories of past associations are revived and the most recent of them flash before us. I recall, for example, the words of KARL STEFAN in our last conversation As I left him, he turned with a smile and said, "Brooks, you really believe, don't you, that your friend Lum is secure?" That question had no significance to anyone else, and I understood it only because of an earlier conversation we had had with other Members in one of the informal talks that mean so much in the building of friendships here.

We were speaking of our favorite hymns, and he was interested in the fact that one of my favorites is The Ninety and Nine. I would like to share this with the House today because of KARL STEFAN's special interest in the story which explained my preference As a boy I held in deepest respect and admiration a man of our community whose theological views were held by some to be somewhat unorthodox, and it created fears as to this neighbor's destiny It concerned me as a boy because, with my interest in matters of religious faith, I decided I did not want to go to heaven unless my friend, whom I called Mr Lum, were going too. I told KARL STEFAN how my anxieties were soothed by an intelligent young minister who explained to me without doing violence to theological principles that Mr Lum was going to be saved. After I was sure that this good man had been brought into the fold I identified my feeling of relief with the song they often sang in the little congregation that I knew and loved as a boy. That song was The Ninety and Nine, for as it reached the climax of the interesting little drama the shepherd said, "I have found my sheep." For me, that recovered sheep was the one who had been left out of the community's calculations, Mr Lum

All who knew KARL STEFAN will understand my meaning in making reference to this simple little story and his particular delight in sharing my reactions. He was interested in the Good Shepherd's quest. His occasional pleasantry, "Do you think Lum was saved?" touched deep sentiments

Mr Speaker, if I am sure of any man's eternal destiny, I am sure about the gentleman from Nebraska. He was indeed a man of faith. In notable ways he was also a man of good deeds. We knew the warmth of his friendship and the kindliness that only a man with a heart and soul as large as his could exhibit. He leaves an influence in the Congress of the United States that will be felt perceptibly long after our legislative careers are closed

> Green be the turf above thee,
> Friend of my better days,
> None knew thee but to love thee,
> None named thee but to praise.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of deep personal loss that I have had the word of the death of KARL STEFAN, whom I have come to cherish not only as a distinguished Member of this House, but also as a fine Christian gentleman.

His calmness in debate and his dedication to sound principles of government have marked him as a great public servant, and certainly the country can ill afford to lose his services at a time when demagoguery all too often passes for statesmanship.

Coursing through the veins of our late colleague was the blood of fighting Czech patriots, and it was from them that he brought to the American scene that great love of liberty which continues to motivate the Czech people at a time when they are feeling the heel of the Communist oppressor. And no one will deny that the cause of freedom throughout the world has never had an abler champion than was found in KARL STEFAN

As we mourn the loss of this God-fearing brother, let us raise our prayers in behalf of those bereaved ones who have been so grievously touched by his going away May an all-wise Providence ease for them the pain of this parting, and may they take consolation in the memorial to him which will ever remain in the hearts of all who knew him and appreciated his worth as a stalwart apostle of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man

Mr HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the death this week of one of our most distinguished colleagues in the House of Representatives has deprived the American people of an outstanding legislator whose long service was always marked by faithful attention to the needs of his district and the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

Congressman KARL STEFAN was one of the many outstanding Americans of Czech ancestry who has made a lasting contribution to our Republic That he remained busily engaged with his many official tasks until the very end of his life was only what those who knew him would expect.

He was born in Bohemia 67 years ago and came to this country with his parents when only 1 year old. He acquired the habit of hard work in early boyhood, and it continued to be his guiding principle throughout a long and active career both in Congress and in private life. He managed to combine the administrative ability of the successful business executive with the far-seeing legislative vision of a conscientious public servant. It was typical of his concept of citizenship that he served his country voluntarily as a member of the National Guard in the troubled times that followed the Spanish-American War. He was the type of man who shouldered civic burdens cheerfully and who never asked another to perform what he himself saw as his own duty.

In 18 years of service with the House of Representatives he had shown himself capable of statesmanlike vision whose results were always based on honest analysis of every problem and hard work in its solution. He leaves to his devoted wife and to his son and daughter a high heritage that should be of lasting comfort in their hour of grief.

It was not my privilege to be one of KARL STEFAN's intimate associates, but from my contacts with him and my observation of the man and his work I am proud to have had the opportunity of being one of his colleagues in the Congress of the United States. I join all those others here today in their sense of loss.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it was just 24 hours ago that in this very spot I brought to the attention of the House that my very dear friend and my neighbor here in Washington for these many years was seriously ill. I reached my office and was only there a few minutes when word came that he had passed on.

You have heard here today eloquent and glowing tributes paid by the Representatives of the great people of this great Nation; tributes that painted word pictures of KARL STEFAN that his family and friends back home and future generations will love and cherish.

These were great men who spoke here today, distinguished Americans, high in the councils of their own States and of these hallowed Chambers.

Let me tell you, however, of the tribute that I saw yesterday and last night. Since KARL STEFAN has been in town he has had an apartment at the Mayflower Hotel. Since I have been here my apartment has been near his. While entering that building I saw the bell boys, the two elevator operators in the apartment section, the two girls on the desks, all of them with tears, all of them asking me what had happened, and last night the two colored girls on that floor, both of them crying to know that STEFAN was gone. That is the kind of tribute and that is the kind of feeling that you distinguished Members have been giving voice to here today, but if there was any doubt in your hearts that what you heard was true, I bring you these sentiments from these little people who knew STEFAN to be one of them.

I represent a district where there are dozens of thousands of people of the Latin and the Slav races. I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that this entire ceremony, all these words, can be placed on the Voice of America tonight, because in the well of this House you have heard, sir, the true voice of America pouring out its love, its regard, its admiration, its star of faith, of hope, and of charity, to all those everywhere who see in that star what America has been to the world, what America will always mean to the poor, the suffering, and the downtrodden, the peasants, the little people.

We have had a lot of good times together. You would not think of STEFAN as a humorist or a great storyteller, would you? Let me tell you who think you are professional humorists and who pride yourselves here and off the floor on your storytelling, that you could not hold a candle to him, I know.

Yes, he had several languages. He served in the Philippines. His Spanish was not so good. We used to call it "bamboo Spanish." He learned it as a telegrapher with the Philippine Scouts.

There was not a time, Mr. Speaker, when I passed up this aisle in a division of this House as he would sit back there where generally my distinguished colleagues from Pennsylvania on the Republican side sit, and they are still there now, and as I have walked up that aisle I would say to him, "Cómo esta usted, Teniente?" He was a lieutenant in the Philippine Constabulary. He would garble at me some of the most outrageous Spanish you ever heard. But he liked that. He liked friendliness and good fellowship, and he had it in this House.

Mr. Speaker, to go much further with my tribute would be to gild this lily that you have presented to his memory today. Let me say that you heard words from as diversified a group, as different in personality, background, and outlook, the members of this subcommittee of the great Committee on Appropriations, as you would ever gather in the history of this House ROONEY, of New York; ROONEY, of Brooklyn, I should say, smart, tough, eager scrapper from the sidewalks of New York—and his heart in his throat when he paid a tribute to this man who sat alongside him year after year, and who taught him and me and all of us the ins and outs of the labyrinth of the budgets of these great Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce. I never admired and respected good, old CLEVENGER, of Ohio, more than when we listened to him today, from the wide plains of the farming West, broken, sad, crying—tears that men cry when a friend has gone. You hear my words now from the mountains and coal mines of Pennsylvania I see before me the distinguished gentleman from Georgia—south of the border—STEFAN would like that. You will hear his tribute to Karl from the cotton fields of the South. You cannot sit in a subcommittee like that down in the salt mines, in the basement of this Capitol, in that little room where we sit day after day, month after month, and year after year, without knowing each other. This is the test of fire. And here we are, our sympathies pouring out, and you will never hear more sincerity, we loved the man. Mrs. Flood joins me in sympathy for his beloved wife and family.

The great and sovereign State of Nebraska, Mr. Speaker, has sent many distinguished sons to this historic Chamber, but she will never send one who will exceed, and she will send very, very few who can equal the loyalty, the hard work, the determination, and the patriotism of her distinguished son whom we now return to her soil, the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. STEFAN.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we are met here at a moment of deep sorrow because there has gone from our midst a man whom we love—gone so unexpectedly and so suddenly. I am reminded that the deeper sorrow carves into your being, the more joy you can contain.

Karl and his beloved wife, his adored wife, who devoted herself to him in ways that only those who knew them intimately know, came many times to my home for music and such conversation as develops when the heart is tuned by music to broader, deeper, higher vision and understanding.

I would like to read to you what Karl and I read together one night. We had been talking about life and death, wondering about it as all humans do:

You would know the secret of death?
But how shall you find it unless you seek it in the heart of life?
If you would indeed behold the spirit of death, open your heart wide unto the body of life

I ask you: Was there anyone who did that more truly than KARL STEFAN?

For life and death are one, even as the river and the sea are one.
And like seeds dreaming beneath the snow, your heart dreams of spring.
Trust the dreams, for in them is hidden the gate to eternity
For what is it to die but to stand naked in the wind and to melt into the sun?
And what is it to cease breathing but to free the breath from its restless tides, that it may rise and expand and seek God unencumbered?
Only when you drink from the river of silence shall you indeed sing
And when you have reached the mountain top, then you shall begin to climb
And when the earth shall claim your limbs, then shall you truly dance.

We spoke of those things, and we spoke of a very ancient word in regard to death.

First must each several element
That joined to form the living frame
Flit to the region whence it came
And with its parent source be blent
Thine eyes shall see the solar orb,
Thy life-breath to the wind shall fly,
Thy part eternal to the sky,
Thine earthly part shall earth absorb.

Music and KARL STEFAN; life and death; they are all close to us all. I think there is no bond closer than the bond of this House. What affects one touches all. Today we are close to each other as we join in sending to his family our love and our deep understanding of their loneliness.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, if the untimely death of KARL STEFAN leads our people, young and old, to read his life story, and to ponder the things that have been said about him today in this House, then he will have made, in his sudden passing and its dramatization of his life and career, one of the greatest of the many contributions he has made to his country during the years of his extraordinary service.

We are living in a time when so much doubt is being cast in many quarters on the integrity or industry or character or ability or usefulness of men in public office, and particularly in elective office. It would be worth so much to our people

and their confidence in their Government and in the possibilities for advancement and noble service in this free Republic to consider what has been accomplished by this man, who in many ways was so plain and simple and in no way a spectacular star, but who used to the full his God-given capacities and the opportunities and privileges offered by his beloved country.

KARL STEFAN was for some years my Congressman. Perhaps I am the only Member of the House who can say that, for until we moved to Minnesota in 1941 I retained, during the years we were abroad, our residence in my home town in Nebraska in the district he represented so long and faithfully. He was a good friend of my father. When I was a boy the Swedes moved in on the west of our strip of township, and the Bohemians moved in on the east. At first a good many of the old settlers sort of felt they were being crowded, and there was some opposition at times on the part of some of the old-timers to the newcomers, especially to the Bohemians. But they got jobs as hired hands, worked long and hard, saved their money, soon were buying land themselves and became as much a part of the country as the first homesteader. When I came home from abroad in the late 1930's, I remember asking my father, "Who is our Congressman now?" He told me KARL STEFAN, and said he thought Karl looked after things better than any Congressman we had had in the 60 years he had lived there. He said, "He is a good Bohemian," which was a tribute to Karl and to the people of his ancestry. My father appreciated the fact that Karl always stopped to see him in that little wide place in the road, and especially after I had come to Congress, too.

So when I first came here in 1941, knowing of his friendship with my father, I sought him out. I soon learned that he had, as almost every Member here today has testified, a unique capacity for friendship. No matter how great the variance in our personalities or interests or backgrounds of education, KARL STEFAN had a special chamber in his heart for each. He revealed to each the special facet that was suited to the special characteristics of the individual in question. He was always interested in the Far East and gave wise counsel and support to me in the point of view regarding its importance to ourselves which I have tried to get adopted. So our friendship ripened and deepened, and I join all here in inability to express adequately our sadness over the loss to our country and to ourselves of this truly great and good man.

I must say another word. Years ago I heard Dr. Will Mayo discussing with a group of young doctors the qualities necessary for a good surgeon. We were aspiring to that profession and most of us, like the general public, were inclined to think that great surgery depended mostly on skill with the hands. That is the way the magazine articles generally portray it, Dr. Will said, "We have trained thousands of doctors in the clinic; one-quarter of all the graduates from medical schools in the country apply here each year, so we can take our choice. On the basis of our experience we rate the essentials in this order and these are the things we look for in our applicants. The first requirement for becoming a good surgeon is character. The second is industry. The third is a certain amount of native ability. And the fourth, manual dexterity. Surely those first three apply to greatness in any field. KARL STEFAN exemplified them. First of all, character; that is the thing we loved and respected most in him. He never failed anybody. It shone out in his patriotism. I do not think any man in American can love this country more than he did. At the same time he had so large a place in his heart for other countries. He never forgot his birthplace, Czechoslovakia. He never forgot the Philippines. Many of you know how he worked to help them in their difficulties. He never forgot the people of any of a dozen countries where he had lived or traveled or for whose freedom and welfare he had worked. He loved America not less because he loved them, and he loved them not less because he was so unswervingly, undividedly loyal to this country.

What an inspiration to all in his devotion to country and duty

What a lesson for our youth in his industry, the indefatigable capacity to labor day after day with hard, dry, complicated figures and details until he knew and could tell you anything you wanted to know about any of the agencies for whose affairs he had responsibility.

Nobody was more determined for example to eliminate those elements, in the State Department which had brought disloyalty or discredit to it in some respect; and nobody fought more fiercely and tenaciously against any attempts to weaken it or destroy the Foreign Service because of the misbehavior, incompetence, or other unsuitability of some of its members.

The balance of the man. The steadiness. The quiet friendliness of the genuine, not the glad-handedness of the professional. Nobody ever heard him raise his voice, and yet he made such an imprint on everything he touched through sheer character and industry, and the wide variety of knowledge and talents which he had developed. How kindly and gentle along with his rock-like firmness. How mature and truly civilized a human being.

I cannot add anything to what has been said by so many. I merely want to join in extending my sympathy and affectionate regards to his family. He was out in San Francisco last month with his beloved wife and his son, a doctor. How often he had talked to me with such great pride about that doctor son. How rich will be their memories, as are ours. We love our country more and will be able to serve her better because of men like KARL STEFAN.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine sadness that I say a few words about KARL STEFAN. I knew him when he first came to this Chamber some 17 years ago. I learned to have an affectionate regard for him. We know of his kindliness, his humility, his keen sense of justice. And now, alas, he is in the iron grasp of sleep.

In this life we are prone to worry; the days come and they go; we watch them pass sometimes with happiness, sometimes with sadness, and then we are concerned for tomorrow; we query, "What will the morrow bring forth?" But Karl need no longer worry or be concerned for the morrow, for death keeps no calendar, has no almanac.

Karl and I had several things in common; we both loved music; he played the violin and I, too, have played tolerably well that instrument; and ofttimes in the hotel we spent evenings together in discussions of music, we would discuss the music of the spheres and the music of human values. He often said that he loved the violin above any other instrument, for its tones were more like the human voice than any other instrument; that it was far more preeminent than the instruments of percussion, or the woods, or the brasses. He often said, and I wholly agreed with him, that there was a profoundity of softness and kindliness as well as sadness and sweetness in the tones of the violin. I am sure that if we try to search for the reasons of the understanding heart of KARL STEFAN, if we try to fathom why he knew the soft, sad music of humanity we might well find that it was a bit because of his knowledge of the harmony of the violin and his intimacy with music. We often discussed together the songs and dances of his native Bohemia, and it was very instructive and refreshing to hear his views.

It is well to say that if death did not exist it would be necessary to invent it. We cannot live forever; the end must come. But it always comes so suddenly, it always comes too soon. So it is with KARL STEFAN; his death has come too soon.

The event of the funeral of Browning caused a poet to utter the following, which we might say on the occasion of Karl's death:

Be not afraid, ye waiting hearts that weep,
For God still "giveth his beloved sleep"
And if an endless sleep He wills, so best.

Karl's death, I am sure you will agree, is an awful mystery, but I can hear Karl saying at the end, "Good-by my friends, good-by my colleagues, good-by to all; it is God's will."

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, when news came to me yesterday that KARL STEFAN had passed on, I was profoundly shocked. It was only last Friday that I met Karl over at the House radio recording facility. We talked for some time. We reminisced about several years ago when I spent several days in his district meeting many of his constituents. We talked about mutual friends. I know from having been in his district that his constituents and his people loved, admired, and respected

him as much as did any Member of this House.

He seemed on that occasion last Friday to be in excellent spirits and buoyant health. Later in the evening of the same day I attended a Civil Aeronautics dinner at the Mayflower along with several of my colleagues from the House. As we walked down the corridor of the hotel we met Karl. He was in tuxedo. We were not. He was going our way. So we became concerned because we thought maybe we had misunderstood the invitation. We asked him about this and he said: "No. You are dressed properly where you are going. I dress this way every evening I dine with my family."

I have thought of that many times since, that mark of respect to his wife and his family. Somehow it tells us of the character of KARL STEFAN.

You know he represented that great neighboring State to the west of Iowa. His loss will be severely felt by the people of his district, his State, and the Nation, but his loss is also Iowa's loss. He was our friend. Those of us who knew him loved him.

You know, there was something about Karl that you could not forget. He was one of those rare individuals that the first time you met him you had the feeling you had known him always. He had that something about his personality which made you feel that he was your friend and always had been your friend from the moment you first met him. He could not have been that way had he not had in his heart that warmth of feeling for his fellow man that only those can have who give out the same feeling when they meet one another.

My heart goes out to his wife and family as well as to the members of his loyal office force so deeply devoted to him.

Yes, we all feel his loss deeply. His body is gone, Mr. Speaker, but his ideals, his memory and all that he stood for, which means so much to each and every one of us, will be with us always.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, we pay a high tribute today to a great American. I think it is entirely fitting and proper that we do so and that we should keep the memory of that individual bright because in so doing we may give some measure of comfort, some measure of solace perhaps to those in his family, his wife, Mrs. Stefan, his son, Dr. Karl Stefan, who is a resident of the State of Washington, and his daughter.

But I am thinking particularly of something that KARL STEFAN, a native of Bohemia, left to me as one who had served on a subcommittee wth him.

I have already heard my colleague from New York [Mr. ROONEY], my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], and my colleague from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER], and I see here my colleague from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], and my colleague from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], and many others in this body who have had the privilege of serving on a subcommittee of which KARL STEFAN was the bone and sinew.

He was a foreigner by birth, yet he meant a tremendous amount to the American way of life and to the spirit and the mechanisms of our Republic. We sit here as legislators and adopt policies and enact statutes, which we expect to be administered. Every year those American policies come before the appropriate subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations for review. Down through the years, for the last 10 years, at least, of our most troublous times in this world, with questions hanging fire all over the globe, the policies developing day by day, the one person in this Congress who probably held it together more than any other was KARL STEFAN.

It is indeed heart-warming to me to see those of us who have had the privilege of serving with him on such an important subcommittee on appropriations rise here and speak as we have. It shows to me, at least, that this American system of ours will work if we have the right men in the right places. KARL STEFAN was such a man.

So today I grieve with his family, with the people of the State of Nebraska, and with the citizens of this Republic; and since the citizens of this Republic and their way of Government mean something to the world, I grieve with all those to whom America is a bright light. But in grieving, I am happy that he lived and that his influence was felt among us. I hold that his example means something to those who would appreciate the greatness of this Nation.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, KARL STEFAN and I came to Congress together. By the natural processes of the House our lots were cast together. We went on the Appropriations Committee about a year after coming here, in 1935 and served together for about 10 years. We learned together the things that have been spoken about here so ably in connection with his knowledge of affairs. We often sat together and in a hard way studied the many problems of the Departments of State, Commerce and Justice, and the Federal Judiciary, the Bureau of Prisons, the FBI, later the United Nations, and earlier the Department of Labor and the Department of Social Security when that agency was born.

I could not help but think yesterday of the intimacy of our lot when I heard the sad news of his death. Truly, those words came to me that we so often hear but so seldom take the full significance of, "I will come like a thief in the night."

He was just snatched from life to give an account of his stewardship, for now he will be a steward no longer. KARL STEFAN died in the harness, died with his boots on, died devoted to the country that he loved and the people that he served. Many beautiful things have been said about him here today, for many have spoken of the friendships in the House. But to those who knew him as intimately as I did, the splendid friendship between his wife, Ida, and himself was something to marvel at. If he so endeared himself to us, no one could help but appreciate her grief at his sudden passing. With those who have spoken before me, I extend to his son, his daughter, and his dear wife, the condolences that every Member of this House feels on this sad occasion. I shall not forget him in my prayers. I shall pray for the repose of his soul, and I hope that the God of all wisdom and all charity will send the soothing graces of consolation to his family.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I was at my home in Georgia yesterday when my office telephoned to advise me of KARL STEFAN'S passing. The news came to me with a shocking impact for it had been only on Thursday of last week that I had sought him out on the floor of the House and had asked his consent that I might be allowed to give my proxy to my committee chairman in order that I might go home for the week end and Monday and Tuesday of this week. Karl, in his usual gracious manner, said "Of course, you must go home. Take advantage of every opportunity to go home. How I wish I could go home, too." Had Karl gone home on last Thursday, he probably would have died at home where, I am sure, he would have wanted to spend his last moments.

A few months ago, I made the observation at the annual memorial services which we hold for our departed colleagues that generations develop their own peculiar customs, and that one of them is to wait until after death takes our friends from our midst to express our thoughts about their lives and to pay tribute to them. I sometimes wonder if that is not a very bad custom, for I know that KARL STEFAN would be happy today if in life he could have heard the wonderful tributes that have been paid to him on the floor of the House. Unlike so many occasions where mellowness sometimes prevails, I am convinced that today there has not been uttered one single expression of exaggeration about this great man. I believe that everything that has been said of him today has come from hearts full of sincerity. What has been said here today can truly serve as a great lesson to younger men. I have felt very keenly as I sat here listening for 2 hours to these wonderful talks about KARL STEFAN—how fine it is that some men live lives which set examples for others, for it is such a life as Karl's that gives the example for younger men to emulate. It answers the question—is it worth while to cling to fine ideals? Is it worth the price we must pay to live lives of morality based on high principles and fine religious concepts? Today, we have here the answer. Unquestionably, it is. Not only have I gained a lesson from what has been said here today, but I have learned a great lesson as I served with Karl on the subcommittee for these many months. One lesson I learned from him, which is so important, and I hope I shall never forget this lesson, as I watched him interrogate witnesses day after day down in that small room beneath the dome of the Capitol, I concluded that truly here is a man who has learned to keep within bounds the passion of expression.

How prone we are to speak with carelessness and do harm with a tongue that can never be healed.

KARL STEFAN taught me that it was greater to keep within proper bounds the passion of expression. I shall always be grateful to him for this valuable lesson that I learned through service with him.

I shall not prolong the hour. Surely I can add nothing to what has been said. In closing, I would only call to your attention the fact that death is no respecter of persons. We know not when it shall strike again, but it does behoove us all to live as KARL STEFAN lived, so that when death strikes we shall be prepared to die as Karl was prepared to die. For truly, when the Angel of Death brushed his black wings against the eyes of KARL STEFAN, it took from our midst one of the great men of all ages who have served in the halls of Congress.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my last sad tribute of respect to my beloved friend and colleague, KARL STEFAN. He was a great soul. Of him it may be truly said that he walked with his head in the clouds and his feet on the ground.

I had the privilege of serving as a member of the State, Commerce, Justice, and the Federal Judiciary Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee when he was chairman of that subcommittee. He was a great chairman. Karl was an indefatigable worker. He was conscientious, sincere, capable, and courageous. He treated every member of his committee with absolute fairness and was kind and considerate of witnesses.

I stand today, Mr. Speaker, with bowed head, among his great host of friends and admirers, and share the sorrow of his wife and family as he passes on in glory to that land from whence no traveler returns.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE].

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a true American and a real friend of the Middle West. I speak of our colleague, the last KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska, who lapsed into eternal sleep yesterday afternoon. I know of no man who has given more to his country and State than Karl. Others have recorded the many and varied accomplishments of this fine man, but I want to express another side of this public servant that is little known.

KARL STEFAN was the finest friend a newcomer to the halls of Congress could have. Early in my congressional career I found a most sympathetic and helpful person is Karl. He went out of his way to assist those of us who were new and his knowledge gained from long-time service was made freely available to us.

Personally, I owe an everlasting debt of gratitude to our departed friend and colleague. His memory will live forever. It was with deepest regret that I head the news of his death. I was shocked. The people of Nebraska and the United States have lost a fine man and a true American.

I want to join my colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Stefan and the members of the family.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we know that our dear beloved just departed colleague dined with kings and presidents and the great, and he dined with the humble and the poor, and he never lost the common touch. And I could fill a book with the deeds and talents and accomplishments of this noble gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when Gen. Douglas MacArthur spoke to the Congress. KARL STEFAN and I were sitting in the double seats just beyond the table there. After Gen. Douglas MacArthur finished speaking Karl said to me: "Is not it the greatest speech you have ever heard? Was it not a wonderful tribute to his fighting men?" And then he turned and said: "Edith, you are crying"; and I said: "Karl, so are you; you have tears in your eyes." Little did he realize that today Members would be crying inwardly if not outwardly over his passing, the passing of a great American, crying because of our loss, but rejoicing because of his life, the glory of his life, the Christianity in his life, his courage and sympathy for all in distress. I believe he had a happy life, but he had sadness in his life because of what had happened to the land where he was born, Bohemia. We had many talks about Bohemia and Bohemians and their desire for freedom, and his anxiety to have them free. He asked me many, many times if I could suggest anything to help.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the words of love and admiration that have been spoken today will be broadcast to Bohemia and to the nations of the world behind the iron curtain. He was greatly interested in having a broadcast go out to tell the people in the world what we in America stand for. His life and how he fought from the time he was a child to improve not only himself but also his country; think what a life, what an example it is. If every school in the country could have the history of KARL STEFAN'S life, think what it would mean particularly to those just coming to our country from abroad, those growing up of foreign strains.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not speak of KARL STEFAN'S great interest in our veterans. It was, I might say, one of the patterns of his life to see that they were cared for properly. Also, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not speak of what KARL STEFAN did to help us. I am afraid many of us do not listen when people ask our advice, do not listen when they ask us to take up and vote for measures of vital interest to them and which they consider of vital interest for the country. KARL STEFAN in his great kindliness and wisdom always listened and always helped whenever he could.

And think, Mr. Speaker, what a happy united couple he and his wife, Ida, were; what a united family was KARL STEFAN'S, how they worked together as a family should, not for themselves but for their country. Our warmest sympathy goes to them in their bereavement. We all have lost a great friend.

KARL STEFAN, Mr. Speaker, has not died; he lives on in our minds and hearts and in the history of America.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I [illegible] in tender tribute to KARL STEFAN.

The Stefans came in contact with this House when we did, at the beginning of the Seventy-fourth Congress; and from that moment forward he has been a stirring example of what an American in public office should be. Throughout the years it has been my privilege to work with him here; to know him on the city streets; to walk with him down the lanes of Europe; to know him as he worked on the Appropriations Committee; to question him when I needed help. Always there was in him quiet courage, high principle, and conviction. I cannot bear to think that he is gone. There seems so little that one can say about a wife like Ida Stefan. But I could not speak at a moment like this without once again reiterating my own faith that there is no death and that nothing of the good, nor of the greatness, nor of the strength, nor of the power, the spiritual force, that was brought forth in KARL STEFAN, could ever be taken from her or the country that he served.

When I arrived here very new in January, KARL STEFAN came over and sat down by my side and said: "Now, you know, I do not want to offer a lot of advice, but I would like to say to you that if ever you need anything just remember that I am here."

I rather think that that was the way KARL STEFAN walked through all of his life, that not only his friends but strangers whom he touched knew that if they were in need he would be there to help.

Then he pointed out to me that wonderful saying above the rostrum:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all of its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

His own memorable performance will stand as a perpetual monument to KARL STEFAN. What he gave to his family, to his friends, and to his country can never be measured nor questioned, nor can it ever die. I am proud to call myself his friend and there is no one who will be able in all the paths in which he walked to fill his place.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, these days seem to come so very often. It was less than a month ago that I was standing in the well of the House speaking about a colleague from my own State. Now I have lost another friend.

KARL STEFAN came from the heart of old Europe and went to live in the heart of the new America. He certainly was completely American. There was nothing hyphenated about his Americanism, but he did bring from the Old World a

comprehension, an understanding, and a knowledge which was valuable to us and which admirably illustrates, I think, the capacity which many have shown to make the transition from a home in the Old World to a home in the new.

I think there is a great deal of wisdom in the suggestion made by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that the tributes to KARL STEFAN should be made known to those who are still living in his old country. Many of you here were thrown into more intimate contact with KARL STEFAN than was I, but I always felt very strongly that whenever an appropriation bill was before the House I depended and relied necessarily on the members of the Appropriations Committee that had studied and handled that particular bill. Whenever that bill was a bill which came from KARL STEFAN'S subcommittee I had an added confidence in my own judgment if it rested upon his, because he was a faithful, careful, prudent man, a conscientious and devoted legislator. To his qualities as a legislator he added the human attributes of a singularly sweet and gentle nature.

Somehow the music of Smetama's Moldau will always make me think of the man who came from that country to this and gave such fine service in this body.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SITTLER].

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, I speak from the further reaches of the overflow of KARL STEFAN'S personality, to testify to the influence of a few of his many unremembered acts of friendship, for I am but a freshman in this House, and he was kind to me.

I did not know him intimately as have many who have spoken here today, but to the extent and for the brief time that I did know him he influenced me tremendously. The constant association with his memory will make me a better Member of this House. I therefore could not refrain from saying so at this solemn hour.

In my district there are many citizens whose roots of family and tradition are set in Bohemia, and whose love of America is like Karl's. They are intensely proud of the achievement that he made as one of their fellows. They are a great people, and they are proud of him. In their behalf, I express sympathy to his family, and offer to them and to us all this thought so well expressed by a poet whose name I do not now recall:

WHEN LIFE SEEMS ENDED ALL TOO SOON

Life held you fast,
And how you loved it, too!
You loved to touch and see and smell the
things of earth;
But came a day, when life with wistful fingers, beckoned you away.
You did not halt, nor fear nor fail,
But straightway answered that strange lead
Into a land so beautiful, so new,
That could we call you back with one quick
word,
We would keep silent,
Yours is the gain, and ours the blessing too.

The world of things unfelt, unseen, unheard,
Is strangely friendly now,
Because you walk where we have never trod.
And sing the songs, the melodies of God.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, the late KARL STEFAN was a kindly man, willing to go out of his way to be helpful to a colleague or friend. I recall that my first meeting with him was on my visit to his office around 7 years ago, when I was working on an article concerning the Indian reservations. His greeting to me was "I shall be glad to help you in any way." As a result of his helpfulness, I visited an Indian reservation in his district, and obtained much valuable information.

Since coming to this body as a new Member last January, I took occasion to ask his suggestions and advice on several occasions. It will be remembered by my colleagues here that some weeks ago, on the occasion of consideration of the appropriation for the State Department, Mr. STEFAN made a most eloquent and thoughtful speech concerning the history and work of this Department, with statesmanlike suggestions as to the improvement of its functioning at home and abroad. Particularly was he interested in bringing all the activities of our Government in foreign lands under the supervision of the State Department. I joined with many Members of this House in congratulating him on this masterful address, and he thanked me heartily.

At the Japanese Peace Treaty conference in San Francisco recently, Mr. STEFAN was a most attentive member of the official delegation. At one of the recess periods during the conference, I again mentioned to him the effectiveness of his speech concerning the State Department, and told him that I would like to get from him some additional material to go into a study of the question of the functioning of the State Department which I am making. Again I heard his cheery words, "I shall be glad to help you in any way."

I join my colleagues of the House in this tribute to a great American, a great statesman, who has now been called to his reward. I shall always remember him as I knew him before I became a Member of this body and since, as a man who wanted always to be helpful to his fellow men.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, an intimate friend of Mr. STEFAN and a native of Nebraska, Mr. Sam Davenport, who is now employed by the House, has written a brief eulogy, which I ask unanimous consent be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

KARL STEFAN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 1884–1951

KARL STEFAN lived 67 years?

He would have lived 67 years if he had been an ordinary man.

But KARL STEFAN was not an ordinary man.

Born in Bohemia, he saw the land of his birth win freedom from Austrian slavery, live for a brief span as an independent republic, only to pass under the yoke of Communist serfdom.

As a member of the Philippine Constabulary, he saw the brave followers of Jose Rizal—lately liberated from Spanish servitude—prove their right to liberty under American guidance, and emerge as the free Republic of the Philippines.

As a Nebraskan, he saw his State grow from infant sovereignty into a solvent, prosperous and necessary component of the United States of America.

As an American, he served his people in Congress. He served no other people. He sought, as a Member of the House Committee on Appropriations, to save money for Americans. With the Constitution as his guide, he strove to hold in check the cost of Government so that the Nation's debt might not weigh down the least of his countrymen.

He loved the United States. His words and deeds are admired by all true Americans. He loved Nebraska. All true Nebraskans revere his memory He loved his friends There is a niche in their hearts which none other may fill. He loved his wife, his daughter, his son. They love him

A great man has gone to meet his God.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 444).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. KARL STEFAN, a Representative from the State of Nebraska.

Resolved, That a committee of 11 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee on the part of the House Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska, Mr. CLEVENGER, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. PRESTON, Mr. SMITH of Kansas, Mr. FLOOD Mr. WERDEL, and Mr. BUFFETT.

The Clerk will report the further resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 4, 1951, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

846. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved February 17, 1923"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

847. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by

certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 340. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1952, without amendment (Rept. No. 1091). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. NORRELL: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 341. Joint resolution making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1092). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BECKWORTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report pursuant to House Resolution 116, Eighty-second Congress, first session. Resolution to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate actual and contemplated action affecting production or consumption of newsprint, or affecting certain other matters (Rept No. 1093). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr CELLER:

H. R 5573. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 and to abolish the Appeal Board of the Office of Contract Settlement, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr CRUMPACKER:

H. R 5574. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended by the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, to provide for the release from active duty of certain inactive and volunteer reservists; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H R 5575. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans for the construction of newsprint plants; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R 5576 A bill relating to the spending and quarterly payment of appropriations for the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H R 5577 A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Inc., of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Con Res. 166. Concurrent resolution setting aside the Charter of the United Nations as approved by the Senate under alleged treaty powers, which approval was unconstitutional and void; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H R 5578 A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr DOLLIVER:

H. R. 5579. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Christ Lagos, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 5580. A bill for the relief of Berta Gomes Leite; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

H R 5581. A bill for the relief of Yusuf (Uash) Lazar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr McDONOUGH:

H R 5582 A bill for the relief of Mrs Wong Ah May; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H R 5583. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Latifi Assad Hid (also known as Latify Shaker and Latify Mtanous); to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H R 5584. A bill for the relief of Iris Eskinazi Kabbani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H R 5585. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carolyn Elizabeth Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H R. 5586 A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carolyn Elizabeth Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R 5587. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carolyn Elizabeth Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H R 5588. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carolyn Elizabeth Schmidt, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H R 5589. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carolyn Elizabeth Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R 5590. A bill for the relief of Marc Stelen Alexenko, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. RODINO:

H R 5591. A bill for the relief of Sister Angelantonia Diana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENWOOD:

H. R 5592 A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nathalie Illine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, October 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. George A. Taylor, rector, St. David's Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, ruler of men and nations, we invoke Thy blessing this day upon the United States of America. Enable us to keep intact the priceless liberties and freedoms that have been our heritage from the beginning.

Sustain and guide the Members of this body, the United States Senate. Give them wisdom and strength to uphold good government. Support those who strive to do their duty in the best interests of our country and of their constituents; and in these arduous days let them not be taxed beyond the bounds of their physical strength and endurance.

Upon the entire free world let Thy favor rest, we pray Thee. May we be drawn closer together by Thy holy spirit, that we may reveal to the world the divine intention of peace and good will among men, and the might and power of Thy strong right arm.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 3, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 3, 1951, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2006) to increase the lending authority of Export-Import Bank of Washington and to extend the period within which the bank may make loans.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4496) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 32, 33, 36, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 52, 53, and 54, to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H R. 990. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased; and

H R. 3504. An act for the relief of Nison Miller.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H R 3205 An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 3 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service-connected; and

H. R 5102. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval and Marine Corps installations and defense production plants in such area.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con Res. 111) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

The message further announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J Res. 340) making an appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1952, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FULBRIGHT was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HICKENLOOPER was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to transact routine business, without debate, and without the time so consumed being charged to either side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DISPLACED PERSONS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated November 16, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States of certain displaced persons (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of George Filippos Poulakis or Arna Otakis from a report relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on April 2, 1951; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. 2042. A bill to extend certain privileges to representatives of member States on the Council of the Organization of American States; without amendment (Rept No. 888).

By Mr GILLETTE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S Con Res 36 Concurrent resolution authorizing the appointment of 14 Members of Congress to participate in a public discussion of problems of common interest with representatives of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, with an amendment (Rept No. 889) and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and

S Res 215. Resolution to appoint a committee to discuss problems of common interest with the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe; without amendment (Rept No 889) and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and

By Mr DOUGLAS, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 1347. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes, with amendments (Rept. No 890).

JOINT COMMITTEE ON RAILROAD RETIREMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. DOUGLAS, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 51), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Congressional Committee on Railroad Retirement Legislation, hereinafter called the joint committee, to be composed of three members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and to be appointed by the chairman of that committee, and three members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and to be appointed by the chairman of that committee. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filed in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee, and it is hereby authorized and directed, to make a full and complete factfinding study and investigation of the Railroad Retirement Act, and of such related problems as it may deem proper, with a view toward ascertaining what changes should be made in such act. The joint committee shall determine the scope of such study and investigation, without limitation thereon, and the following shall be given consideration:

1 The character and amount of present benefits and the estimated cost of providing such benefits.

2 The existing relationships between the system established by the Railroad Retirement Act and the old-age and survivors insurance system

3 The changes that should be made in the character and amount of benefits to be provided workers subject to the Railroad Retirement Act and the estimated cost of providing such benefits.

4 Any changes that should be made in the existing relationships between the system established by the Railroad Retirement Act and the old-age and survivors insurance system with a view to simplifying administration, eliminating inequities and anomalies as regards benefits to workers whose earnings are included in whole or in part under either system, and strengthening the financial base for benefits to be provided under one system without impairing the financial base underlying benefits provided under the other system.

SEC. 3 For the purposes of this resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-second Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

SEC 4 (a) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-second Congress, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical and other assistants as it deems advisable and, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

(b) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

S 2215 A bill for the relief of Andor Mathe, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S 2216 A bill for the relief of Fedele Miranda, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S 2217 A bill consenting to the inclusion within the corporate limits of the city of Glen Ullin, N Dak, of certain lands owned by the United States, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S 2218. A bill for the relief of Irene Kramer and Otto Kramer; and

S. 2219. A bill for the relief of George and Irene Panoras, and their daughter, Maria Panoras, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr DOUGLAS:

S. 2220 A bill for the relief of Michiko Ihara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S 2221 A bill to extend the time within which certain veterans who are in the active service on the basic limiting date may initiate and receive education or training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr MAYBANK:

S 2222. A bill to amend the provisions of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, relative to the management of the Export-Import Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency

(See the remarks of Mr MAYBANK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading)

By Mr SMITH of New Jersey.

S 2223 A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy the Government-owned magnesium foundry at Peterboro, N. J.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. O'CONOR

S. 2224. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to replace the crosses and Stars of David which until recently marked the graves at the National Memorial Cemetery in Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. O'CONOR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading)

REPLACEMENT OF CROSSES AND STARS OF DAVID AT NATIONAL MEMORIAL CEMETERY OF THE PACIFIC

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to replace the crosses and stars of David which until recently marked the graves at the National Memorial Cemetery in Hawaii. I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to me by James A. O'Brien, Director of the Territorial Council on Veterans Affairs of the Territory of Hawaii, at Honolulu, T H, and an editorial entitled "They Await the

Verdict," from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of September 29, 1951, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter and editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2224) to direct the Secretary of the Army to replace the crosses and stars of David which until recently marked the graves at the National Memorial Cemetery in Hawaii, introduced by Mr. O'CONOR, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter and editorial are as follows:

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
TERRITORIAL COUNCIL ON
VETERANS AFFAIRS,
Honolulu, T H., October 4, 1951.

Senator HERBERT R O'CONOR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR O'CONOR: Many men from your State who made the supreme sacrifice during World War II have found their last resting place in the National Cemetery of the Pacific. Because of this we feel that you are close to us in our efforts to have permanent crosses decorate the graves of those who gave their lives so that others might live.

As you know, until recently the 13,000 graves were decorated with wooden crosses. The wooden crosses were installed by the Army as a temporary measure pending the complete installation of surface marble markers throughout the cemetery. Recently, the installation was completed, and the Army carried out its previously announced orders of removing and destroying the crosses.

However, during the tenure of the crosses they bore into the hearts of the people of Hawaii and to the many, many relatives of the men buried there who came from the mainland to visit the resting place of their son, husband, or brother.

The cemetery now, without the row upon row of white crosses and stars of David, looks bare and forlorn It was a distinct shock to the people who visited the cemetery after the crosses were destroyed. To them, the crosses have become an integral part of the cemetery

May we enlist your assistance in securing a permanent type cross, either of concrete or of some other lasting material, so that the cemetery may be restored to its former beauty and symbolism.

This we know necessitates congressional action The veterans' organizations and the people of the Territory, and we know the relatives of the mainland men buried here, would appreciate anything that you can do.

We are enclosing an editorial from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of September 29 that expresses some of the feeling of the people of the Territory.

Very truly yours,
JAMES A. O'BRIEN,
Director.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of September 29, 1951]

THEY AWAIT THE VERDICT

The mute white crosses have been taken from the graves of the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific—but protests may restore them.

It took only 2 hours for the energetic task force of the Army to remove from Punchbowl more than 13,000 little wooden crosses. It will require more time to restore them—if they are to be restored.

But there is time for this task of this restoration—those who sleep beneath the green turf in the ancient crater have no need for haste. They will wait, in patience, for the verdict.

All the hurry, all the ordered speed and discipline of their training, all the furious urgency of their attacks on the battlelines, all the sudden anguish of their mortal wounds before they fell, are of the past.

For them the suns will rise and will set over that dedicated hill of sacrifice in long, unhurried procession. The gentle winds and the stars will keep them company, even if in a burst of organized effort as well timed and precise as the burst from a machinegun, the 13,000 white crosses came down in one unexpected afternoon.

In Washington, D. C., Delegate FARRINGTON has appropriately said that the wishes of the families of the men who lie in the Punchbowl graves should be consulted

That can be done, and should be done. It should have been done, and thoroughly, sympathetically, before the order was given that tore the crosses from the ground.

To do it rightly, the families should have a clear picture of the alternatives—the graves with crosses and also with the flat stone marker or the graves with only that flat, inconspicious, and unimpressive headstone.

And the families should know—many of them know already—that in our military cemeteries abroad, the white crosses still stand

And these next of kin should feel that it is not a question of economy—our doing fitting honor to those who are buried in Punchbowl.

It is a question of giving to these heroes of our country the greatest possible evidence of respect and devotion we can give them.

It is a question also of developing this National Memorial cemetery as one of our Nation's most impressive, most distinctive burial places

It is a question of maintaining the physical facilities so that each Memorial Day the people of Hawaii can pay their distinctive tribute of leis and garlands, appropriately wheathed above the graves.

Yes, those who lie asleep in Punchbowl can await the verdict.

For them, all mortal haste is ended They lie quietly in the ultimate discipline of death, relying upon a grateful country to do them justice.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 340) making an appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1952, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr YOUNG:

Address delivered by Senator TAFT at the dedication of the new steam plant of the Minnkota Power Cooperative, at Grand Forks, N Dak., on September 21, 1951, and an editorial entitled "TAFT'S Visit Shows His Strength," published in the Bismarck Tribune of September 29, 1951.

By Mr SALTONSTALL:

Editorial entitled "Small Business Gets Smaller," published in the Boston Traveler of October 1, 1951.

By Mr LANGER:

Article entitled "The Federal Youth Corrections Program," written by James V. Bennett, Director of the United States Bureau of Prisons, and published in the January-February 1951 edition of the Prison World.

Article entitled "Save the Tidelands," written by Harold L. Ickes, and published in the magazine Frontier.

By Mr WILLIAMS:

Editorial entitled "One Improvement," published in the News and Observer of Raleigh, N. C, on October 1, 1951, relating to the Williams amendment to the revenue bill repealing the provision for tax exemptions to certain Government officials.

By Mr. THYE:

Article relating to the charge by Harold Stassen regarding Owen Lattimore and the far eastern policy, written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Star of October 3, 1951.

Article entitled "Acheson-Stassen Conflict," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Star of October 3, 1951.

Editorial entitled "We Must Speak of Peace, Peace, Peace," published in the Minneapolis Star of October 1, 1951.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Editorial entitled "Migration Conference," published in the Washington Post of October 3, 1951, referring to the refugees of Western Europe.

By Mr MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "Ye Old Tollgate," published in the Washington (Pa) Reporter of September 29, 1951

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

Letter from Manuel Lujan to the Honorable Oscar Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, regarding regulations governing attorneys' contracts with Indian tribes.

By Mr. BENTON:

Article entitled "Bowles Fills the Bill," written by Marquis Childs, and published in the Washington Post of last Saturday.

Address by Nellie Tayloe Ross, Director of the Mint, on Democratic Women's Day, September 27, 1951.

By Mr KEFAUVER:

Article entitled "How To Save Your Life," written by William Lindsay Gresham, and published in a recent issue of Red Book magazine, giving advice about what to do if a bomb falls.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article entitled "The Place of the Paper Industry in the United States Economy," written by Dr Louis T. Stevenson, and published in the July 14, 1951, issue of the Paper Mill News.

MISSOURI-ARKANSAS BASINS FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may read a telegram into the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CARLSON. The telegram is addressed to me under date of October 3, 1951, and is as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., *October 3, 1951.*

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C.

District 12 of Missouri-Arkansas Basins Flood Control Association, running from Topeka to Junction City, met today and adopted following resolution:

"Whereas the basin of the Kansas River has recently suffered the most disastrous flood in its history, and

"Whereas an appropriation bill is now pending in Congress providing funds to be applied on the construction of a dam known as the Tuttle Creek Dam, which will form a retention reservoir which will materially help to alleviate future flood damage in the Kansas and Missouri River Basins; and

"Whereas the present residents in the area to be submerged by the reservoir will be fairly compensated for their land and property used their influence 10 years ago, at the request of the residents in the area to be submerged to defeat an appropriation for the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam in order to

give time for the United States Army to make further investigation for smaller dams nearer the headwaters; and

"Whereas due to the failure to make an appropriation at that time, nothing has been done on the Tuttle Creek Dam to date and the present disaster has occurred; and

"Whereas the headwater reservoirs must of necessity be more shallow than the Tuttle Creek Reservoir, they would inundate many times the area of valley land and cause a large number of persons to be displaced;

"Whereas the construction of the Tuttle Creek Dam is the key flood project that will secure a measure of relief to all persons and property in the Kansas and Missouri River Valleys below the proposed dam: Be it

"Resolved, That district 12, containing the Kansas River and its tributaries from Topeka to Junction City being a part of the Missouri-Arkansas Basins Flood Control Association hereby petitions Congress to pass the pending appropriation for construction work on the Tuttle Creek Dam."

Understand conference committee meeting on this today. Think this resolution should be guided to committee.

CONANT WAIT,
Secretary, District 12, Missouri-Arkansas Flood Control Association.

ELECTION OF C. FRANCIS COCKE, OF ROANOKE, AS PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to make a brief statement concerning the new president of the American Bankers Association, who was elected to that office on October 3.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Virginia may proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, along with all other Virginians I am proud of the election of Mr. C. Francis Cocke, of Roanoke, as president of the American Bankers Association.

It is not only the highest honor that can come to any banker but is a position of tremendous power and responsibility. In any socialistic or communistic state one of the first moves is to control the banking and issuance of currency. Those who are not familiar with the vital part which private bankers play in the maintenance of the American system of free, competitive enterprise and of economic freedom as a handmaiden of political freedom do not fully appreciate the wisdom of Woodrow Wilson and of Carter Glass in the establishment of the Federal Reserve System. Many private bankers opposed that legislation when it was first presented, but without it there is doubt as to whether the private banking system of America could have survived the last depression, or a future depression, which will be inevitable if a firm check is not placed on future deficit financing.

It has been my pleasure during recent years, as chairman of the Federal Reserve Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, to work with Francis Cocke on numerous bills affecting the Federal Reserve Board and the private banks of the country. He has exhibited a commendable grasp of the banking and economic problems confronting us. His views are fundamentally sound and his pleasing personality facilitated his task of reconciling conflicting views.

REMOVAL OF CROSSES FROM GRAVES IN GOVERNMENT CEMETERIES IN HAWAII

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Maryland may proceed.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, millions of Americans were shocked, I am convinced, by the report from Hawaii that United States Army authorities had decided to remove the wooden crosses from the graves of fallen American fighting men interred in Government cemeteries there. To many a bereaved parent removal of the crosses, the symbol of that faith which is the ultimate consolation of those whose loved ones have been taken from them by war, seems a needless and unjustifiable intrusion upon the rights of both the living and the dead.

I can understand the indignation and the sincere regret with which Americans throughout the country received the news of this decision by the Army authorities. So drastic a departure is it from the accepted policies of the past that I rise to protest the implementation of the announced policy, both for myself, for numbers of my constituents who have expressed their feelings to me, and for those countless other Americans whose faith in God and whose concepts of their duty as a defense of our free civilization against a Godless foe have thus been so ruthlessly shaken.

Among the messages which have come to me is one from Bishop Noble C Powell, bishop of the Episcopal Church in the diocese of Maryland, and it seems particularly pertinent in view of the very touching and very persuasive invocation just delivered by the acting chaplain It reads as follows:

Hon HERBERT R O'CONOR:

On behalf of the department of business administration comprising representative citizens and Episcopalians in the diocese of Maryland and on behalf of host of our membership and personally and officially as bishop I emphatically protest the removal of the Christian cross from the graves of fallen Americans who gave their lives for their country and who lie in foreign soil. To remove the symbol of that faith for which expressed in American life they gave their lives is most deplorable to countless citizens and the reason assigned, economy, is wholly unconvincing in the light of the vast expenditures made for far less important evidences of our American life. We most strongly urge the restoration of the crosses marking the graves.

NOBLE C. POWELL,
Bishop of Maryland.

Removal of the crosses which so definitely consigned to the care of divine providence those who had died in the service of mankind is particularly inappropriate now when our country and the world is threatened with destruction by a Godless foe which would remove the crosses, the symbol of Christian faith and hope from the entire world. Mothers and fathers, wives and children have taken consolation from the thought that their departed loved ones, dead in the defense of their country, were thus consigned to the arms of their Maker for their last long sleep. Removal of these crosses now is to me unthinkable. It is breaking faith with those who have died. This action will be poorly received likewise by countless other members of our fighting forces who are going forth willingly to battle for the right but who value their priceless possessions of faith as symbolized by the cross. Such men and women, if they are called upon to die, will want to sleep under the cross which has been the traditional symbol of the faith of a people who realize that life on this earth is but a temporary existence leading to eternity.

EMERGENCY PROFESSIONAL HEALTH TRAINING ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946, to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes.

Mr PASTORE obtained the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield for a quorum call? There being so few Senators present, I should like to ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call, the time for debate to start when a quorum is declared to be present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield for that purpose?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield, with the understanding that the time consumed by the quorum call is not to be taken from the time of either side.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my request. I ask that the time for debate shall start when a quorum is declared to be present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the Chair's understanding.

The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] on behalf of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. On this amendment, 40 minutes of debate are allowed, 20 minutes to each side.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I allot 10 minutes to myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 10 minutes

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in my opinion, in the discussion and consideration of S. 337, we must address ourselves to four fundamental questions:

First. Have we now and will we have in the immediate future a sufficient number of doctors and a sufficient number of professional personnel to take care of the needs of our civilian population

and the medical needs of our Armed Forces?

Second. If we do not have a sufficient number of doctors, can we produce more doctors in the immediate future without the expansion of the facilities which are at present available for the training of professional men?

Third. If this is necessary, can these facilities be expanded without some Federal aid to the institutions which provide the training?

Fourth. Is the bill which we are now considering adequate to give the relief that is required now and in the immediate future?

Mr. President, I know that when it comes to citing authorities it is always easy to find an authority which supports one's own contention. However, here we have a very unusual situation. I believe that by far the greater weight of authority supports the position of those who contend that we do not have a sufficient number of doctors now and will not have a sufficient number of doctors in the immediate future, and that there is in fact at the present time a tremendous shortage of doctors in these United States of America.

In support of that contention, I should like to read into the RECORD a statement made by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, Chairman of the Health Resources Advisory Committee and now of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Dr. Rusk told the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association this winter that we face a shortage of 22,000 physicians by 1954. He said:

> It is at once apparent that a substantial deficit in medical manpower is already upon us, and this deficit is steadily increasing. Without acceleration and increased enrollment, our supply of physicians by 1954 will be short by 22,000.

Yesterday afternoon, in several of the colloquies which occurred on the floor of the Senate, the name of Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, dean of the School of Medicine of the University of Kansas, was brought up, and his statement was cited as authority that we do not have a shortage of doctors.

The contrary is true. I submit to the Members of the Senate what Dr. Murphy wrote in an article entitled "We Need More Doctors," which appeared in one of our national weekly magazines:

> Over and above this faulty distribution there is, in the opinion of many medical educators, an absolute and substantial numerical shortage of trained medical personnel. I believe this was true even before the Korean crisis, and the situation will become more critical as additional thousands of doctors are called into uniform.

Mr. President, if we do have this shortage, it becomes necessary to consider how we can meet the situation. Are our medical schools presently sufficiently endowed? Are they receiving sufficient money through customary channels to meet the costs of professional education? The answer, of course, is in the negative, because it has been shown that currently the medical schools of our colleges and universities are operating under an annual deficit of $40,000,000; that the incomes which customarily might have accrued to them have fallen short of the mark; and, according to the testimony at the hearings, unless some kind of help is given on the Federal level, not only will this deficit continue to the tremendous detriment of the American people and their general health, but many medical departments will have to close, their faculties will have to be curtailed, and I suppose their enrollments will have to be restricted.

The bill as originally reported by the committee provided for a grant of $500 in the case of each medical student already enrolled in a medical school, and also provided for an incentive grant of $1,000 for each enrollment above the general average for the past 3 years. Personally, I feel that the bill as reported by the committee represented a very practical and realistic approach.

However, many Members of the Senate felt that we were placing too much emphasis on the grants for maintenance, as against the grants for expansion. Because of that, an amendment was submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], which, in effect, placed almost complete emphasis upon the expansion aspects of the program rather than upon the maintenance aspects.

After several discussions with those two honorable Members of this body, the committee reached a compromise. On behalf of the committee, I have submitted to the committee amendment the amendment which now is pending.

The effect of this amendment is, in fact, to shift the emphasis to the expansion feature of this program; and, instead of providing for a grant of $500 to the medical schools for each student enrolled, it provides a grant of $200; and instead of providing a grant of $1,000 on the incentive plan, for each student above the general average in the past, it provides $2,200.

I know Senators can argue one way or the other; but the opinion of the committee was that we were confronted with the necessity of reaching a compromise. The question was a serious one, namely, there should the emphasis be placed? A majority of the members of the committee felt that the compromise now before the Senate in the form of the pending amendment to the committee amendment was a practical one, a wholesome one, and a very realistic one. That compromise is the pending amendment, which now is at the desk, and on which this body will vote in a few minutes.

Mr. President, I feel that the Senate should approve this amendment. Although it may not be wholly satisfactory in every respect, the fact remains that it constitutes a very realistic and a very important approach to this great problem. We need more doctors. We need more doctors now, and also in the immediate future.

Of course, the argument is made on this floor that the training of a doctor requires 5, 6, or 7 years. We understand that completely. However, even though an appreciable amount of time is required for the training of a doctor, the fact of the matter is that unless we show some interest in and give some financial support to these institutions, their enrollments will decline and decline, and more and more of their medical departments will close, to the point that a smaller number of doctors than the number now being trained will be educated and made available for service.

After all, Mr. President, this problem is a very important one. It involves the health of the people of the United States. At the present time there are in our veterans' hospitals 4,000 beds which are not being used, simply because sufficient professional personnel is not available to care for the patients who might be comforted or treated there. To my mind, Mr. President, that fact constitutes the most powerful and the most impressive argument which can be made on the question of whether we have a sufficient number of doctors, because if we did have a sufficient number of doctors in the United States today, we would not be confronted with the situation of having the equivalent of 16 well equipped hospitals absolutely empty because sufficient professional personnel is not available to care there for the veterans, to whom we have said, "We will give you this medical care." After we have said that, we find ourselves in the position of having built the hospitals and having provided the beds, but not having sufficient doctors and nurses to care for the patients. What greater proof do we need to demonstrate that there is a shortage of doctors in the United States today?

Why is it that organizations such as the Disabled American Veterans and the American Legion have endorsed this program? They have endorsed it only because they have first-hand, intimate knowledge of the shortage of doctors and the shortage of other professional medical personnel in the United States today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if any other Senator desires to speak on the amendment, I shall be only too glad to yield time to him within the 10 minutes remaining

The VICE PRESIDENT. If no more time is to be used on the amendment, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the acting minority leader yield time to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF GOV. LEM JORDAN, OF IDAHO

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to take a minute of my time to present to the Senate the Governor of a great Western State, Gov. Lem Jordan, of Idaho.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is very glad to welcome the Governor of Idaho to the Senate Chamber.

EMERGENCY PROFESSIONAL HEALTH TRAINING ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 337) to amend the

Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946, to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment urged by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island was discussed at some length yesterday. Under the bill as introduced, a subsidy is provided for the medical schools. The subsidy is to last for 5 years, pending the making of a complete survey by a commission which is set up under section 3 of the bill.

When this bill was first brought up and when I became interested in it, the main feature of the bill was the establishment of a commission. In the bill the commission is given 2 years in which to make a study of medical education, a subject which has not been subjected to the study it should receive. This very bill admits that, because it sets up a commission and provides what the commission shall do. The bill provides that the commission shall study the whole question. However, thereafter the bill proceeds to legislate on the problem for 5 years.

Mr. President, yesterday I stated the principal ground of my opposition to the bill, which is that since the bill was introduced last year, the military program and military expenditures have grown to an extent which threatens the economic security of the United States. If that military program is necessary and if we have to spend from $80,000,000,000 to $90,000,000,000 a year on the military program for the next 2 years, then it seems to me we must abandon many of the other major programs we have contemplated. We cannot add to the present burdens by beginning other programs, no matter how meritorious they may be.

I say frankly that this program is generally a meritorious one. So far as I am concerned, I am in favor of it; and I am also in favor of giving help to the medical schools because of the tremendous cost of a medical education today, amounting to $2,500 a year more than can be paid by tuition; and apparently that additional amount cannot be provided permanently, at least, by funds from private contributions, as has been done in the past.

In the pending amendment, however, the proposal is that, instead of giving the medical schools $500 for each regular student and $1,000 for each additional student, they shall be given $200 for every existing student, plus $2,000 for each additional student, or a total of $2,200 for every student over and above the average number they have had in the past.

Since all these institutions have stretched to the limit their acceptance of students—up to this time they have taken as many students as they thought they could handle and properly educate—it is perfectly obvious that they are going to have to do some very strenuous work in order to increase the number. I think some incentive in that direction is proper, but to pay them $2,200 seems to me completely ridiculous. The cost of educating a student is about $2,500. The tuition throughout the country runs from $500 to $700. If the medical schools get a $700 tuition and a $2,200 payment from the Government, they are going to make a profit of $400 or $500 on every one of the additional students. It is an incentive and a prize offered to these institutions to undertake to accept more students than they can handle properly, and to reduce the general standard of medical education—and the Federal Government would pay them to do that. It seems to me it is a great mistake.

I may say that throughout I have worked with the deans of the medical schools. I was willing to support a temporary subsidy, before the greatly expanded military program was undertaken We worked out the amounts and the relative subsidy for current and for additional students. I may say that the committee of deans of the medical schools who worked on this matter throughout are opposed to the bill, if the Pastore amendment is to be adopted.

Mr. THYE Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, yesterday, because of my deep concern regarding the question on the pending amendment, I telegraphed Dr. Harold S. Diehl, dean of medical sciences of the University of Minnesota, to ask his opinion concerning the amendment. This is the reply which I received from Dr. Diehl:

> Believe original S. 337 much sounder and preferable to Kerr amendment as to rates of aid to medical school.
>
> Harold S Diehl.

It was only yesterday that I sent the telegram to Dr. Diehl. If I may, I should like to insert in the body of the RECORD my telegram to Dr. Diehl, the reply to which I have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 3, 1951.

Dr. HAROLD S. DIEHL,
Dean of Medical Sciences,
University of Minnesota,
Minneapolis, Minn.

S 337 for Federal aid in professional health education pending for action in Senate this afternoon. Please wire your views, especially as to proposed compromise on basic grants and incentive payments to students For medical students this would be $200 basic and $2,000 incentive, as against $500 each in bill as introduced. Others in similar proportions. Ratio in compromise like Russell-Kerr amendment which you opposed, but basic payments are higher. Would appreciate immediate reply.

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator.

Mr. TAFT. I may say that I also received a communication yesterday from Dean Berry, of the Harvard Medical School, who was chairman of the executive committee of the Association of American Medical Schools. He personally, and speaking also for the deans, does not and will not support the bill if amended by adoption of the Pastore amendment. He would rather not have any bill.

Mr. President, I shall speak later. I myself am going to offer an amendment to strike out all of the bill except the provision for setting up a commission to make a study of the subject, and I shall present a substitute bill providing for such a commission to study the whole subject of medical education.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield me 3 minutes?

Mr PASTORE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have already spoken twice on this bill, yesterday, and I pointed out the need of an increased number of doctors, dentists, and nurses I shall not again pursue that phase of the bill which relates to doctors, because it seems to me that the need of additional doctors has been demonstrated clearly.

I do, however, wish to read two paragraphs from a letter which I have received from the director of the Mount Sinai Hospital in New York, one of the great hospitals of the country. He writes to me as follows:

> The shortage of nurses throughout the country must by now be so well known that it hardly needs further statistical emphasis. The situation in New York and at our hospital is a critical one. We have a 25-percent vacancy in our nursing staff and as a result we find that we are barely able to provide minimal nursing service. In an acute general hospital this means that critically ill patients as well as others acutely ill are on occasion deprived of the nursing service which they must have.
>
> Each hospital in each area does what it can to attract nurses but the plain fact is that there simply are not enough to go around, and the just as plain answer is that we must not neglect any measure which would increase the number of young women who enter nursing. Congress * * * can help; among other ways, by providing financial aid to make training less expensive to the student and, therefore, more attractive, and by providing financial aid to the overburdened hospital schools of nursing so that they might be able to increase the size of their classes.

This is a statement from the director of a great hospital in the city of New York. There is no doubt that the large urban centers are in a better position to obtain doctors and nurses than are the rural sections, but when the evidence is presented showing conditions in a great medical center in the largest city in the country, we can readily realize what the situation must be in other parts of the country. I very much hope that the amendment will prevail.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

Mr. TAFT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, have the opponents to the amendment exhausted all their time?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it

Mr. SALTONSTALL. How much time remains to the opponents?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The opponents have used only 7 minutes, and have 13 minutes remaining, if they desire to use the time. The proponents have 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. TAFT. Neither side has exhausted its time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Both sides have a little time left if they want to use it, but there was such a silence in the Senate Chamber that the Chair thought he ought to make a noise like a vote.

Mr KERR. Mr. President, I think it would be wonderful if the Chair could not only make a noise like a vote but could actually materialize it. Do the opponents expect to use more time?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I know of no one else on this side of the aisle who wishes to speak at this moment, and I have had no requests for further time.

Mr. TAFT subsequently said: Mr. President, had Senate bill 337 not been recommitted, I had intended to offer an amendment as a substitute for the bill. I ask unanimous consent now to have it appear in the RECORD during consideration of the bill, and before the vote on the Pastore amendment, as a substitute amendment intended to be offered by me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. TAFT is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"COMMISSION ON MANPOWER IN THE HEALTH PROFESSIONS

"SEC 2. (a) There is hereby established a Commission on Manpower in the Health Professions, hereinafter called the 'Commission'

"(b) The Commission shall consist of 16 Commissioners, including the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, the Commissioner of Education, the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and a representative of the medical services of the National Military Establishment (to be designated by the Secretary of National Defense), who shall serve ex officio, and 12 Commissioners to be appointed by the President on or before October 1, 1949, who shall be persons not otherwise in the employ of the Federal Government. At least 8 of the 12 appointed Commissioners shall be persons outstanding in the fields of medicine, dentistry, nursing, public health, or higher education who are familiar with the problems of manpower in the health professions

"(c) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its membership. Nine Commissioners shall constitute a quorum. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"(d) The Commission shall continue in existence until 90 days after completion of the submission of its report as provided in section 2. Each of the 12 appointed Commissioners, while attending meetings of the Commission or while otherwise serving pursuant to this part, shall be entitled to receive 50 per diem, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while so serving away from his place of residence.

"STUDY OF NEEDS FOR HEALTH PERSONNEL

"SEC 3 It shall be the duty of the Commission to make a thorough study of the present and long-range needs for medical, dental, nursing, public-health, and other professional health personnel in the United States, and of the numbers and manner (including facilities) in which such personnel are and ought to be trained, distributed, and utilized, in order to best meet the health needs of the Nation; and to submit to Congress one or more reports containing its findings and recommendations based on such study. Such report or reports shall be submitted on or before January 15, 1954.

"POWERS OF COMMISSION

"SEC 4. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems necessary, in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

"(b) The Commission may, in its discretion, enter into contracts with private individuals, nonprofit educational or research organizations, organizations of the health professions, or non-Federal public agencies, for the performance of research which it deems necessary.

"(c) The Commission, or any member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this part, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such member may deem advisable Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such member

"(d) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this part, and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC 5 There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act"

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. The yeas and nays have been ordered and the Secretary will call the roll

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FREAR (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If he were present, he would vote "yea" If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. GEORGE (when his name was called). I have a pair on this vote with my colleague [Mr. RUSSELL]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. O'CONOR (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. CAPEHART (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. McFARLAND of Arizona. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I announce that on this vote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr HENNINGS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—23

Benton	Kefauver	Monroney
Douglas	Kerr	Moody
Green	Kilgore	Morse
Hayden	Langer	Pastore
Hill	Lehman	Robertson
Humphrey	Long	Sparkman
Hunt	McFarland	Stennis
Ives	McMahon	

NAYS—42

Bennett	Dirksen	Hendrickson
Brewster	Dworshak	Hoey
Bricker	Ecton	Jenner
Butler, Nebr.	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Carlson	Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.
Case	Flanders	Knowland
Connally	Gillette	Lodge

Malone	Millikin	Taft
Martin	Mundt	Thye
Maybank	Nixon	Watkins
McCarran	Saltonstall	Welker
McCarthy	Schoeppel	Wiley
McClellan	Smith, N J.	Williams
McKellar	Smith, N C.	Young

NOT VOTING—31

Aiken	Eastland	Neely
Anderson	Frear	O'Conor
Bridges	Fulbright	O'Mahoney
Butler, Md.	George	Russell
Byrd	Hennings	Smathers
Cain	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Holland	Tobey
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Underwood
Clements	Kem	Wherry
Cordon	Magnuson	
Duff	Murray	

So Mr. PASTORE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move at this time that Senate bill 337 be recommitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the junior Senator from Rhode Island to recommit the bill. [Putting the question.]

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2170, Calendar No. 752.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2170) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 402 (d) (4) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows

"(4) After the enactment of this paragraph no ceiling price regulation applicable to the sales of manufacturers or processors of any materials or the charges for industrial services shall be become effective which establishes a level of prices for such sales or charges below the lower of (A) the level prevailing for such sales or charges just before the date of issuance of the regulation, or (B) the level prevailing for such sales or charges during the period January 25, 1951, to February 24, 1951, inclusive Nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit the establishment or maintenance of a ceiling price regulation applicable to the sales of manufacturers or processors or the charges for industrial services which (1) reflects the highest level of prices prevailing during a representative base period between January 1, 1950, and June 24, 1950, inclusive, adjusted for increases or decreases in costs between such period and July 26, 1951, or (2) is established under a regulation issued prior to the enactment of this paragraph. The adjustment for increases or decreases in costs prescribed in said clause (1) above shall include adjustment for changes in necessary and unavoidable costs, including all labor, material and transportation costs and a reasonable allowance, as determined by the President, for changes in all other necessary and unavoidable costs, including selling, advertising, office and all other production, distribution and administration costs, which he finds are properly allocable to the production and sale of the materials sold by the manufacturers and processors or the charges for industrial services. The President shall make appropriate provision for adjustment for any such manufacturer or processor or seller of industrial services whose ceiling prices result in financial hardship to such manufacturer, or processor or seller of industrial services. Such adjustment shall be made in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) above to the extent necessary to relieve such hardship."

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has suggested the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAYBANK. I withdraw that request for the present, Mr. President, and yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

APPROPRIATION FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, 1952

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably, without amendment, House Joint Resolution 340, making an appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1952, and I submit a report (No. 887) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the joint resolution be immediately considered.

The joint resolution appropriates $5,000,000 for payment of liabilities under the Service Indemnity Act of 1951. I hand the joint resolution to the acting minority leader so he may examine it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H J. Res. 340) making an appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1952.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the joint resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, so far as I can see from a quick examination this is a joint resolution to appropriate immediately $5,000,000 to the Veterans' Administration to take care of beneficiaries of men who lost their lives in Korea

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. The action was taken on the basis of a letter from Gen. Carl Gray, the head of the Veterans Bureau, saying he has no money to pay any of these beneficiaries; and for that reason it is necessary to pass this joint resolution, and not wait for the supplemental deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And the amount involved is $5,000,000?

Mr. McKELLAR. The amount involved is $5,000,000. The Committee on Appropriations on yesterday directed that the joint resolution be reported to the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 340) making an appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1952, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for yielding to me for this purpose.

EMERGENCY PROFESSIONAL HEALTH TRAINING ACT OF 1951—PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to make a comment in reference to the action taken a few moments ago to recommit Senate bill 337. I merely want my position to be perfectly clear, because I have very strong feelings about this measure.

I recognize the need for recommitting the bill, in order to keep the bill within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and at the proper time I trust the committee will report appropriate legislation. However, I do not favor recommittal. I am for the passage of this bill. I feel it is one of the most vital measures to our national security and national defense that has been before this body. The argument has been well made, that insofar as the strength of the civil economy is concerned, insofar as the strength of our own civilian defense is concerned, insofar as the health and welfare of our economy is concerned, this measure has priority status and should have received that kind of recognition by the Senate.

Mr President, I desire to have the RECORD show clearly those who were opposed to this measure, because many people in my section of the country have written to me about the shortage of doctors, nurses, dentists, and technicians, and many people from other parts of America have written to me as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and as a cosponsor of the measure. I have suggested to those persons that in view of the action of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, when the Senate passed a similar bill unanimously, it was inconceivable to me that the Senate would fail to take favorable action upon Senate bill 337.

Mr. THYE Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is perfectly obvious that we did not have the votes to pass this measure, and it is for that reason that its recommittal was recommended. But, Mr. President, I want it quite clear that the burden for this action rests upon the other side of the aisle.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall not yield at this moment. I want it made quite clear that the burden for this action rests upon those who have ignored the glaring facts of a shortage of medical technicians, doctors, and dentists and nurses. The bill is a vital one. It has been recommended by the Secretary of Defense. It has been recommended by the National Security Resources Board Advisory Council on Medical Care. It has the support of one of the most honored and respected men in this country, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, who has been the

Chairman of the National Security Resources Board Advisory Committee. I suggest that the action taken by the Senate in rejecting the Pastore amendment will be interpreted in only one way, namely, that we do not feel at this time that we ought to proceed to implement and to strengthen the health facilities of the country.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point in his remarks?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. THYE. I desire to inform my colleague and the Senate why I voted against the amendment that was offered for the committee I inquired of Dr. Harold S. Diehl, dean of medical sciences at the University of Minnesota, the State which the Senator and I both represent, relative to the amendment. I placed my telegram to him in the RECORD, as well as his reply. I sent him by telegram a question concerning the bill we had before us. Dr. Diehl telegraphed me a reply yesterday, October 3, and stated that he preferred the bill as it was originally drafted, Senate bill 337, and that he opposed the amendment which was pending and upon which the Senate voted a few moments ago. I voted against the amendment, and I want to say to my colleague from Minnesota that had the bill been permitted to come before the Senate for a vote I should have voted "yea" on its final passage.

So do not say that it is Senators on this side of the aisle who blocked the enactment of the proposed legislation. Many of us on this side of the aisle were willing to vote "yea" on the final passage of the bill. We voted "nay" on the amendment which was before the Senate. I am as much exercised and as much disappointed as my colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota, over the fact that the bill was recommitted to the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am fully aware of the observations of the dean of the Medical School of the University of Minnesota. For months the dean has been advising with me as a member of the committee, on the bill. I likewise am aware of his general attitude toward the amendment proposed as a committee amendment I also know that the amendment was offered in the hope that some of the differences over the bill could be reconciled. To be sure, the amendment was not as desired by the northern medical schools which have large medical enrollments. I know that. But the amendment was primarily designed for those areas of the country and those schools that do not have a large medical school enrollment. The bill as originally written would have been of great benefit to the medical schools in my State. But the amendment was designed to increase enrollment in smaller colleges, and to give some opportunity for expansion of medical facilities.

Since there are Senators who apparently feel that they would like to have an opportunity to vote upon Senate bill 337 as originally introduced, it is my intention at the appropriate time to make a motion to reconsider. Then we shall see how many votes we get.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the action by which the Senate recommitted the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit my motion.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I understand, the business before the Senate at the present time is the control bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota has the right to move to reconsider, but not the right to have his motion considered at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move that the vote by which the bill was recommitted to the committee be reconsidered.

Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. FLANDERS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to find out the status of the unfinished business. As I understand, the Senator from Minnesota has made a motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 337 was recommitted to the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I now move to reconsider the action by which the Senate recommitted the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand the Vice President to rule that the motion cannot be taken up at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The entering of such a motion is a privileged matter. That does not mean that the motion will receive consideration at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask for immediate consideration of my motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business before the Senate is Senate bill 2170.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Rhode Island if the Senator from Minnesota will yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President——

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me for just a moment, with the understanding that he shall not lose the floor?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I merely wish to place myself on record as having voted against the amendment, but as having been prepared to vote for the bill. I committed myself to this bill many weeks ago, and I am still of the same mind as I was then. I do not wish to be under the implication which the Senator from Minnesota has raised.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to find out the status of the bill now before the Senate. I have no objection to the present consideration of the motion of the Senator from Minnesota. I have sent word to some members of the staff who are on the way over here. It is my understanding that the next order of business in the Senate will be reconsideration of the action just taken. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Did I correctly understand the Chair to state that the unfinished business before the Senate at the present time is Senate bill 2170?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And that the next order of business would be the motion to reconsider?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. The Senator misunderstood the Chair. The Senator from Minnesota has the privilege at this time of entering a motion which he may move to consider at an appropriate time.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not so understand. I understood the Senator from Minnesota to say that he was making the motion now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is the point I wished to clear up.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I ask for immediate consideration of my motion.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota has the privilege of entering his motion at this time.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Minnesota. To me the temporary defeat—and it is only a temporary defeat—of this bill comes as a tremendous disappointment. We are postponing action on a bill the benefits of which are greatly needed in this country.

I very much hope that the motion of the Senator from Minnesota to reconsider the action which has just been taken will prevail. If by unhappy chance it should not prevail, I assure the Senate that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will proceed to report the bill again just as quickly as it possibly can, and will make every possible effort to have the bill enacted in the interests of all the people of the United States.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, now that the action which I took in moving the recommittal of the bill has caused so much confusion, I think perhaps I should explain the motive for the action, and my reasons for taking the action which I took. I am still in favor of Senate bill 337. I believe in this type of legislation, and I have always believed in it. I have never been too much impressed with the arguments which have been

made on the floor, to the effect that this bill involves an expenditure of $300,000,000 over a period of 5 years, particularly when the bill concerns itself so much and so intimately with the well-being and the general health of the American people.

Furthermore, in my humble opinion, the argument that it is contrary to the economy-mindedness of the country falls short of its mark. Only 2 or 3 weeks ago the same Senators from whose lips flowed the arguments for economy voted a subsidy of millions of dollars annually to the sugar industry of the county. Only 2 or 3 weeks ago we extended for 14 months, before the act expired, the sugar subsidy, amounting to millions of dollars a year. There were only four votes in this body against the bill, and I am proud to say that mine was one of the four.

Originally Senate bill 337 came to the floor of the Senate as Senate bill 1453. The present bill is substantially the same bill. It was the bill which was passed unanimously by all the Members of the United States Senate.

I was not a Member of Congress when Senate bill 1453 came to the floor of the Senate. I was not a Member of Congress when the hearings were held. I was not a member of the subcommittee which guided Senate bill 337 during its consideration in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. However, I was entrusted by the committee with the management of that bill on the floor. I was led to believe that it had the unanimous approval and sponsorship of every member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. But when we came to the floor we were told very bluntly and clearly yesterday by Members of the Senate, after a policy meeting of the Republican Party, that they had voted to oppose Senate bill 337.

Here I am. I was entrusted by the unanimous expression of the committee with the management of the bill on the floor of the Senate, yet at the last moment I find myself abandoned by those who participated in the hearings, and by those who had to do with the drafting of the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. Not at this point.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator has made a misstatement.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island declines to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the very men who have been clamoring for economy, the very men who voted millions of dollars annually in sugar subsidies, now stand up and say that we cannot protect the health and welfare of our people because $300,000,000 over a period of 5 years is really too much money.

So my motive and reason for moving to recommit the bill was to send it back for further instructions, to the same men who gave it to me to manage.

Mr. THYE and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The Senator recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am a member of the policy committee, and I must say to the junior Senator from Rhode Island that if he was informed as he has stated, as to the action of the policy committee, he was certainly misinformed. I want the Senator from Rhode Island to look at me when I tell him that if he was quoting anyone as to what took place in the Republican policy committee, he was misinformed.

Mr. PASTORE. I am quoting what appeared on the teletype ticker yesterday afternoon with reference to a statement made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. It stated that after a meeting of the policy committee he said he would not vote for this bill, even though he was a cosponsor of it.

Mr. TAFT. That is not what I said. I said I would not vote for the bill. I did not say what the policy committee would do. The policy committee took no action. The bill was not considered by the policy committee. I believe I told the press that it was one of several subjects discussed, but that no action was taken with reference to it. There was no action taken on it by the policy committee.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. I merely wish to say: "Mr. Republican, I am not that naive."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. THYE. Let me say to the junior Senator from Rhode Island that I am a member of the Republican policy committee, and as one member of the policy committee I certainly did not vote on the bill in committee. I can also say to the Senator from Rhode Island that no other members of the policy committee voted that they would reject the bill when it came up for consideration.

Mr. TAFT. It was not submitted to the policy committee.

Mr. THYE. I was surprised at the action of the Senator from Rhode Island in moving to recommit.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I will yield the floor, because I have stated my position. I stated it previously also. I have stated that I was surprised by the Senator from Rhode Island moving to recommit the bill, because many of us who voted on the amendment had the conviction to support the final bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I will be just as courteous as a gentleman should be. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that he will certainly get his chance to support the bill.

Mr. THYE. I am very happy to hear it. In reply to that statement I will say that I have as deep a conviction as anyone that there is need to pass S. 337. I likewise have a deep conviction that the amendments which were offered were wrong. The dean of the school of medicine of the great University of Minnesota said those amendments were wrong. I inserted his telegram in the RECORD as part of my remarks this afternoon.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE There is nothing in the statement of the Senator from Rhode Island which in any way reflects on the attitude, thinking, or impression which the Senator from Minnesota has with reference to the bill. All I said was that there was a teletype report on the teletype machine to the effect that after a meeting of the Republican policy committee in the Senate yesterday the Senator from Ohio made a statement to the effect that he no longer could go along with the bill. He may justify his statement on the ground that it is only his personal opinion.

Mr. THYE. I may say to the Senator from Rhode Island that that was not what he said in his first statement. He said that the Republican policy committee had met and had voted unanimously to reject the bill. It was that statement of the Senator from Rhode Island to which I objected. When I asked the Senator from Rhode Island if he would yield, he did not see fit to yield. On my own time I told the Senator from Rhode Island that he was wrong, and that as a member of the policy committee I did not vote "no"; nor did I enter into any agreement with other Senators to reject the bill. We did not vote on the bill in the meeting of the policy committee. Whatever the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] may have said about it he said as an individual stating his individual conviction, and not as chairman of the Republican policy committee.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. That may be perfectly so. I did not say that the matter was judged at the meeting of the policy committee

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Rhode Island did say so.

Mr. PASTORE. I said that after the meeting——

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Rhode Island did say so, and that is what I objected to. The RECORD can be read.

Mr. PASTORE. If I said it, I am sorry, but I believe I said——

Mr. THYE. Now I am happy. All I wanted to do was to not have the Senator from Rhode Island hang the statement on the Republican policy committee. Now that the Senator from Rhode Island has made a proper apology, I accept it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senate get on with its business, but I would like to make one observation. It looks to me as though the able Senator from Rhode Island got caught in his own trap. Being caught in his own trap he wants to lay the blame on someone else. He made a motion to recommit, and it was carried. He has all sorts of alibis for having made his motion to recommit. I appreciate the fact that he is new in the Senate and possibly did not realize what he was doing.

Mr. PASTORE. I am not caught in any trap. I explained my position. I am not apologizing to anyone. I said that I asked that the bill be recommitted so as to give the cosponsors of the bill an opportunity to decide what they want to do about it. I believe I have made my position abundantly clear, and I am not apologizing to the Senator from Indiana or any other Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. I understood the able Senator from Rhode Island to say that he asked that the bill be recommitted because the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] had decided to be against it, and because other Senators had also decided to be against it. That is what I heard the Senator from Rhode Island say, if my ears are still hearing, and if I understand what I hear. In other words, it looks to me as though he is offering an alibi for his own defeat.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. As I understood the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, it was that the amendment was proposed in order to get the votes of the South. When it was defeated he no longer had the votes of the southern Senators, and therefore he moved to recommit the bill to committee. That is the implication I drew from the presentation which he made. I am willing to take responsibility for opposing the bill. But, as I understand, my opposition was not the motive of the Senator from Rhode Island. It was that he did not believe he had the votes, when the amendment was defeated because he had offered it in order to get the votes of some of the southern Senators. That is what I understood him to say.

Mr. PASTORE I did not use the word "southern" at all.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Rhode Island referred to the southern schools wanting it one way and the northern schools wanting it another way.

Mr. PASTORE. I did not say that. The Senator from Minnesota said that.

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. SMITH of North Carolina addressed the Chair.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from North Carolina

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, evidently the junior Senator from Illinois is the one who is most content with the outcome of this matter. I was opposed to the bill. I assailed it as vigorously as I could. I was opposed to the amendment. I believe the Senate showed great prudence and rare judgment in voting to recommit the bill to the committee. I trust it will remain there serenely and peacefully for some time to come.

Mr. CAPEHART. I now yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, I have been a little surprised by the heated discussion on both sides. I have always taken it for granted that Republicans got sick just as often as Democrats got sick. Therefore I thought they needed medical attention and hospitalization just as much as Democrats did. I do not see any occasion for any great excitement or viciousness on either side of the question. I myself resent a little bit the inference that some few of the Senators on my side of the aisle consider everything as wrong unless they can have their own way.

I am interested in medical education. For more than 25 years I have been a trustee of the largest medical school in the South, Duke Medical School. I have been chairman of the board for 6 or 7 years. I have had close contact with medical education, and I am as much interested in medical schools as any other Member of the Senate.

I was in favor of the bill, with one or two exceptions. One of the exceptions was that I did not want any bureaucrat in Washington to get control of the medical profession or any of the medical schools. With that provision taken out of the bill I had expected to support it.

I was opposed to—not in favor of, as has been reported—the Pastore amendment. I am one of the southern Senators in the Senate who at first was in favor of it. However, after I had carefully studied the amendment I became convinced that I should not vote for it. I felt that we should not set up fly-by-night medical schools, and build them all over the country, to catch government dollars, as was the case after the last war, when we attempted to help veterans with their educational processes.

I expected to support the bill when the amendment had been eliminated. Assuming that we could secure the deletion of the control provision of the bill, I would be in favor of it. I am not in favor of anyone in Washington, no matter who he may be, controlling medical education. I am not in favor of controlling the North Carolina situation in that way.

I am proud to say that my State of North Carolina has done a good job. We started 26 years ago with the Duke Medical School. I think it is one of the largest in all America. Certainly it is the largest in the South. About 50 or 60 percent of the students in the medical school come from the North and East. We want to help those sections take care of their health also.

The Bowman-Gray School of Medicine of Wake Forest College is a great institution. It has recently been enlarged, and it is building a great plant in Winston-Salem. The President of the United States has seen fit to say that he would go there on the 15th of October to dedicate some new buildings. So that is a great medical school.

Neither of our medical schools has ever made any distinction between students, no matter where they have come from.

Furthermore, the State of North Carolina now is spending between $5,000,000 and $6,000,000 to enlarge its medical school. Although it does make some distinction in regard to the admission of students, in respect to requiring some of its students to come from North Carolina, yet to some extent it is opening its doors to others from outside the State.

This morning I talked to the man in charge of admissions to the University of North Carolina; and he is in favor of the bill as originally planned, assuming that the restrictions which might be placed on the admission of students would be removed. However, he and others in my State have said that unless they can have a bill which treats every school and everyone fairly and in the same way; unless they can have a bill which does not place restrictions upon the States; then they would prefer not to have any bill at all.

It is not fair to say that the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] was trying to bait the southern Senators, for if the vote is studied it will be found that most of the southern Senators voted differently from the way some said.

So, Mr. President, if the Senator from Rhode Island is able to bring back from the committee a bill which does not contain the features which I consider to be obnoxious, I believe such a bill should be passed.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I realize the importance of this matter, and I realize the force of the arguments which have been made regarding the bill. This subject is important to those of us who come from Ohio, because in our State we have three medical schools.

Mr. President, my concern about this subject is that by means of such a bill, even though it contains a prohibition against Federal control, ultimately Federal control will follow the dollar.

I wonder whether the Senator from North Carolina is as concerned as I am about constant vigilance to keep Federal control out of the medical field.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I do have that fear. When I first read the bill, I was not too much concerned on that point, until I read the paragraph at the top of page 41, in large print. However, in small print we find the following in the committee report:

> LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL CONTROL
>
> Section 383 specifically prohibits Federal interference with or control over the curriculum or administration of any school or the admission of applicants thereto, except—

And the exception is what prompted me to say that I wished an amendment made to the bill—

> in the few instances in which the bill carries specific requirements on this score.

Then the report proceeds to name them. That statement in the report prompted me to say that I would want the bill amended before I would vote for it. Certainly we do not want the Federal Government to control who shall attend these medical schools.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to add a word to what the Senator from North Carolina has said.

In South Carolina there is a close association between the Duke Foundation and other funds going to the charitable institutions of our State. They are most generous in their provisions for hospitals and otherwise.

The city from which I come, Charleston, has the oldest medical college in the South, and one of the oldest in America.

That medical college has been rated class A for generations.

I would favor the bill, provided certain amendments are made to it; but certainly I do not intend to have this medical college which has been supported by the taxpayers of our State for more than 100 years, turned over to the control of someone who would determine who would attend it and who would not attend it.

My colleague the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and I have in the past served as chairmen of the board of that college. However, while serving in that position, we did not determine who should be admitted. That determination was made by the board of trustees; and the college has been well conducted and well managed.

This school has a wonderful history and enjoys an excellent standing among the medical schools of the Nation. Its faculty, under excellent management and direction, has served the State and the Nation in peace and in war. Graduates have gone forth and taken their places in the medical profession where they have served and will continue to serve with honor and distinction. I do not want to see this changed, Mr. President.

To permit someone in Washington to determine who would attend and who would not attend that school would be wrong; it would be a disservice to this and other honorable institutions; and it never will be done by means of my vote.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2170) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I submit the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, it is proposed to strike out all after line 5 over to and including line 3 on page 3, and insert the following:

(4) After the enactment of this paragraph no individual or industrywide ceiling price on any material (other than an agricultural commodity) or on any industrial service shall become effective which is below the lower of (A) the price prevailing just before the date of issuance of the regulation or order establishing such ceiling price, or (B) the price prevailing during the period January 25, 1951, to February 24, 1951, inclusive. Nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit the establishment or maintenance of an individual or industrywide ceiling price with respect to any material (other than an agricultural commodity) or industrial service which (1) is based upon the highest price (or in the case of industrywide ceilings, the highest level of prices) between January 1, 1950, and June 24, 1950, inclusive, if such ceiling price reflects adjustments for increases or decreases in costs occurring subsequent to the date on which such highest price or level of price was received and prior to July 26, 1951, or (2) is established under a regulation issued prior to the enactment of this paragraph. Upon application and a proper showing of his prices and costs (or the prices and costs of the industry in case of an industrywide ceiling) by any person or persons subject to a ceiling price, the President shall adjust such ceiling price in the manner prescribed in clause (1) of the preceding sentence. For the purposes of this paragraph the term "costs" includes material, indirect and direct labor, factory, selling, advertising, office and all other production, distribution, transportation, and administration costs, except such as the President may determine to be unreasonable and excessive.

Mr MAYBANK. Mr President, the mere fact that I rise at this time to urge that the so-called Capehart amendment to the original Defense Production Act of 1950 be amended should be convincing proof to my colleagues that it must be urgent and important that we do so. I, as much as the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] share full responsibility for section 402 (d) (4). I was chairman of the conference committee and a member of the subcommittee of the conference that drafted it You can be certain, Mr. President, that unless I was convinced beyond all doubt that the conference amendment was not workable and inflationary, I would not urge that it be amended. You can be equally certain that I would not detain the Congress in its efforts to complete its work and adjourn unless I was convinced that the failure of Congress to amend section 402 (a) (4) would to a large extent nullify the good work that has finally gotten underway and which Congress can claim credit for instituting and, in some cases, forcing

The American people are a rather optimistic and hopeful people We have a tendency to forget that we are economically preparing for war, if we are not actually at war. We are sharply transforming our economy from its peacetime ways to an economy capable of supporting the most tremendous war machine ever conceived by man. Because we are not face to face with an all-out war and because our economy is still enjoying peacetime prosperity, it is difficult to gear our thinking and our economic concepts to a controlled economy. If we approach our task realistically and with a full realization of the implications of what we are attempting to do when we try to control inflation, I think there will be little dispute about what we should do about section 402 (d) (4).

Without going into the details, I should like to say, Mr. President, that the objective of the conferees in drafting the conference amendment was to provide a means by which the Office of Price Stabilization could roll back industrial prices which were out of line, and at the same time provide fair and reasonable treatment to industry as a whole. In an effort to provide the proper safeguards against roll-backs that might cripple industry, we ended up with an amendment that careful scrutiny has revealed it is not possible to administer unless we are ready to accept a much higher level of prices than would otherwise be the case. The purpose of the Millikin amendment, which the Senate sent to conference, was to permit roll-backs below the freeze date, but with proper safeguards for cost increases. Neither the Millikin amendment nor the House language provided, nor did the conferees intend, that the so-called roll-back amendment would in practice be used as a means of securing roll-forwards, regardless of whether the industry or the company concerned needed them I repeat that the Congress did not intend that.

Neither the distinguished Senators from Indiana and Virginia nor, as I recall, Representatives PATMAN, SPENCE, and WOLCOTT, had any intention of doing something which would have made roll-forwards possible. Yet as the committee report irrefutably points out, section 402 (d) (4) would give every individual company a right to get a ceiling price on a single material that would cover every cost increase up to July 26, above the highest price for that material during the period January 1 to June 24, 1950, whether the price was rolled back or not The OPS would be forced to accept whatever allocation of overhead costs to a single material a particular company made so long as it followed one of the possible 17 acceptable methods of allocating the overhead cost. The OPS would have to accept the proper allocation of overhead costs regardless of whether it increased the price 10 cents or 50 cents. Naturally the company would tend to pick the cost system that would be more profitable than less profitable, and that could only mean higher prices.

Physically it would be impossible to administer such a provision, and the practical effect would be that every individual seller would set his own ceiling for his own material, unless OPS set a general ceiling price for that material sufficiently high to take care of the most inefficient producer who took the most generous type of overhead cost allocation for a particular material.

Your committee heard testimony requesting the outright repeal of this section, thus giving OPS broad discretion to fix ceilings. Those who advocated this method, it seemed to your committee, Mr. President, expected industry to absorb far too much of its cost increases.

I again want to remind the Senate and to state for the RECORD that the Banking and Currency Committee did not report a provision to repeal the so-called Capehart amendment and to return to the previously existing legislation, because we thought that would be unfair to industry We had before us several bills which had been introduced by Senators, and we had the request of the President. We endeavored to change the amendment written into the law by the conferees to make it more workable.

Your committee, on the other hand, heard testimony advocating the retention of the conference amendment or something similar to it.

Your committee took the middle way. Our amendment provides protection to industry against drastic future roll-backs. It provides protection to every individual producer against financial hardship, whether from roll-backs or otherwise. It removes the unworkable features of section 402 (d) (4) and

permits the manufacturers' ceiling program of OPS to go forward, subject to congressional safeguards for individual cases. It permits OPS to issue regulations, such as uniform dollars and cents price ceilings, which will be fair to both producer and consumer, and which the public can help to enforce because the public will know what it can legally be charged for the things it buys. It allows the continuation of existing regulations, but individual companies suffering a hardship under them may get their price ceiling adjusted under the formula in clause (1) of the amendment to the extent necessary to remove the hardship.

The fact that the minority members have accepted in part the clarifying amendments in the committee bill is a tribute, to be sure, to themselves, but even more so it is a recognition, although not a full recognition, of the logic of the majority's views.

As I believe the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] so ably pointed out in the RECORD more than a week ago, the Capehart substitute would for all practical purposes be the same as the conference amendment, since it would be physically impossible during the whole life of the act, no less within 60 days as provided in the substitute, to make the surveys necessary to set price ceilings for every industry on the basis of the formula set forth in the amendment. One unworkable provision would be substituted by another just as unworkable.

I am referring to S. 2155 which I understood the Senator from Indiana would offer as a substitute for the committee bill, but since that time the Senator from Indiana has sent to the desk a new amendment in the nature of a substitute. Senate bill 2155, was presented last week by the Senator from Indiana on behalf of the minority. So what I have just been saying about the Capehart substitute does not apply to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana in the nature of a substitute, numbered 10–2–51—A, which I have not had an opportunity to study. I am just informed that the Senator from Indiana has also offered as an amendment in the form of a substitute the language of S. 2155. It is numbered 10–3–51—A, and that is the amendment to which I am referring.

In addition to the unworkability of the amendment, it would compel roll-backs, perhaps on an industry suffering depressed prices in the first half of 1950, whether the application of the roll-back were fair or not. Also, it would prohibit generous treatment for certain industries which needed the additional incentive to maximize production, like the machine-tool industry.

Allowing increased labor costs beyond July 26 to be reflected in higher ceiling prices, as the conference amendment proposes, would be unfair to industries with low labor-cost ratios, as opposed to those with high labor-cost ratios. And since one industry's labor costs are another industry's material costs, it would play all kinds of havoc with our ability to maintain a stable and reasonably well-balanced economy. It would be an invitation to break down our wage-stabilization program. What we must do is to hold prices from going up any further, so that we can, in turn, hold wages from going up. We must at some point stop the vicious cycle of higher prices and higher wages, and the profit statements of industry indicate that stabilizing at about the present levels will be stabilizing at just short of the most profitable period in industry's history. In other words, we stabilize at a little less than the levels of the most profitable periods business has ever had.

There are newspaper ads and talk about industry profits being off 20 percent. The comparison is presumably between the post-Communist invasion, Christmas-period fourth quarter of 1950, and the post-freeze let-down second quarter of 1951. Is the implication that we should fix price ceilings at a period during which inflationary profiteering was so great that we in Congress demanded that controls be put into effect?

I again want to remind the Senate that it was the Congress which demanded that these controls be put into effect. We passed the bill last September. It was not put into effect until after many appeals had been made on the part of the Congress. It was not put into effect until January or February of this year.

If we look at manufacturers' profits, which the amendment we are considering mainly deals with, the decline in profits, even after taxes, was not 20 percent, but only 4 to 6 percent.

There is talk about the discrimination in favor of farmers and workers. What are the facts? Wages and salaries, including salaries and bonuses of corporation executives, were up 58 percent, and farm incomes, before taxes, were up about half of what corporation profits were before taxes in the second quarter of 1951, as compared to the first half of 1950.

How can anyone fear that our present high profit rate does not provide ample incentive to produce. With record profits, in addition to the Government encouragement through tax amortization, loans, long term purchase contracts, Government orders and other assistance, we can have all the investment that our economy can support without an intolerable burden of inflationary pressures. It almost seems that we have too much investment. We simply do not have the steel, the copper, the aluminum, the machine tool capacity to build the plants and machines that industry wants.

One of the best examples of that is in the present military defense bill. The Air Force was unable to show the Committee on Armed Services where and when they could use the money.

Let me conclude by saying that we listened to Mr. Wilson, Mr. Johnston and Mr. DiSalle explain their pricing standards and policies and their philosophy and standards as to profits, much of their testimony being directed by our questioning. They repeatedly stated that no industry will have to absorb cost increases to such an extent as to prevent it from making excess profits. On the contrary, an industry which falls out of the excess profits bracket is entitled at once to a price increase which will bring it up to the excess profits bracket. To guarantee that ceilings will not put an industry below the excess profits bracket is hardly placing a severe squeeze on industrial earnings. The base period for the excess profits tax constitutes one of the most profitable periods in the history of American enterprise. No industry's prices, Mr. President, will be reduced simply because its profits exceed this standard. But its prices will be increased if the profits fall below it.

I am satisfied that your committee, in not doing all that the representatives of industry wanted us to do, and, on the other hand, in not doing all that the representatives of labor wanted us to do, but instead by recommending a fair, reasonable and workable amendment, is doing what the majority of all the people want us to do. And they want us to make it possible to control inflation and make ourselves economically strong.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to comment that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has provided some real leadership, in my judgment, in working out changes in what are certainly very serious loopholes in the bill which Congress passed on that memorable evening in September last.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate what the Senator says, but I assure him that it was the committee that did the work and not the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. MOODY. I am very conscious of the fact that the committee as a whole worked on this matter, but I think the Senator from South Carolina should be commended for the leadership he provided.

I had intended to speak on the subject, but I think I shall not do other than to participate in the discussion. I think there is no member of the committee, though there may be one or two, who does not feel that the law should be changed and should be strengthened. I believe it is the sense of the Senate that there should not be inflation in America, and that we must not, in the process of making ourselves strong enough so that any attack on us by aggressors would be tantamount to suicide for them, permit our economy to be destroyed from within.

I hope the Senate will act promptly on the bill and send it to the House, so that Congress can adjourn after having done a good job on the inflation question. I think a great deal more might be done when we return in January, for in my opinion, the law is not entirely adequate. As Mr. Wilson and Mr. Johnston have said, other changes may be needed later. The changes which are now proposed are in the nature of emergency alterations, and there can be no question that they should be written into the law.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind remarks of the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I had hoped that we would not have to amend the law. I thought at the time the De-

fense Productior Act was passed in September that it would be workable, but circumstances have made it necessary to amend it. It is certainly the intention of the watchdog committee to make certain that a most careful check is made during the recess of the Congress to see how the law works and what recommendations may be necessary.

Mr. MOODY. I believe an unfortunate situation would result if we did not correct the language of the law.

Mr. MAYBANK. I think the Senator is correct, because there are not enough accountants in America to make proper enforcement of the present law possible.

Mr. MOODY. Nor do we want to have a vast army of accountants going over the books of American business. It seems to me it is imperative that we hold the line against inflation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I merely wish to endorse the splendid statement made by the chairman of the committee, and to point out that in order to save time the junior Senator from Virginia, on two occasions, inserted statements in the RECORD expressing his views about the bill which is now before the Senate and about the two Capehart amendments. We now have before us a third Capehart amendment. As the Senator from South Carolina has pointed out, none of the amendments was workable. In the opinion of the junior Senator from Virginia, we should make an adequate approach to the problem. If we do not want controls, we should vote to repeal all controls. We should not insist on an unworkable control bill and then point later to the fact that it is unworkable and ask for repeal.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Virginia, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and I were all together in the conference. We worked long and hard. We held hearings for months, and when we finally wrote the original bill last September we thought it was workable. I am now convinced, and I regret to say so, that it is not workable.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the able Senator tell us wherein it is unworkable?

Mr. MAYBANK. My thought would be that there are hardly a sufficient number of accountants in America to check three or four thousand items of a firm such as du Pont or a firm such as the General Electric Co., and let them have a rise in price on each item.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not agree with the able Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is all right.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thought it was workable; but that is a debatable point. The substitute which I have offered, and which is now before the Senate, completely clears up that situation.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have not yet had an opportunity to study it.

Mr. CAPEHART. The amendment gives business the right to set prices industry-wide, to set average prices, and it completely eliminates the setting of individual prices. That is what the substitute which is now before the Senate provides.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who was the chairman of the subcommittee, desires to speak for a few minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from South Carolina another question. While it is true, as he stated, that, late one night, we agreed to the so-called Capehart amendment in conference, and we did not know whether it was workable or not, is it not also true that we did agree to a statement prepared by the junior Senator from Virginia declaring what our intention was?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct. As a matter of fact, the conference amendment was the result of the intent of the Senator from Virginia, who is opposed to inflation and who wanted to stop inflation, and who said—I think I remember his exact words, and if I do not quote them properly the Senator will correct me—"We want to do something that will catch the gougers and the crooks and protect honest businessmen." That was transformed into more elegant language in the report. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Is it not also true that when we were holding hearings on the Presidential request for some modification of, or change in, or complete elimination of the Capehart amendment, the junior Senator from Virginia asked Mr. Wilson to send us suggestions?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And on the basis of those suggestions the Senator from South Carolina introduced the plan as proposed by Mr. Wilson.

Mr. MAYBANK That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And he designated the junior Senator from Virginia to conduct hearings.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am very thankful to the Senator from Virginia for conducting the hearings. I may say that while he was conducting them the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] was conducting hearings on the subject of fats and oils, and hearings were also being conducted on the subject of meat slaughtering. That was done in order that we might place on the calendar a bill which was workable. The bill we have placed on the calendar is a compromise between what the executive branch wanted and what business may have wanted and what labor may have wanted. We worked out that compromise ourselves.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that in those hearings the junior Senator from Virginia came to the conclusion that the amendment proposed by Mr. Wilson to the original Capehart amendment did not go quite far enough?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is quite right, and the Senator himself suggested an amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I suggested an amendment designed to provide a reasonable and fair profit for manufacturers and processors, and included industrial services, but did not carry into the pending bill, which was reported from the committee by a vote of 9 to 4, the unworkable feature of the original Capehart amendment that every price had to be individually fixed, and that allowance had to be made for all costs, direct and indirect, since the Korean war started.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It provided though for the allowance of all direct labor and material costs, and transportation, and a reasonable allowance for all indirect costs, generally referred to as overhead.

Mr MAYBANK. And an allowance for all unavoidable costs.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And an allowance for all unavoidable costs. Is it not true that it also, in the last paragraph, carried a provision that where a manufacturer or processor could show financial hardship he should get relief under the very same formula that would be used in a general price fixing?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has asked the Senator from South Carolina in what respect the third amendment he proposed is unworkable, and I shall be glad to answer. It is unworkable because it seeks to go back as far as possible to the first Capehart amendment, and carries in it the unworkable feature of the first Capehart amendment, that the OPS must individually process thousands of individual applications for price ceilings, and that the OPS must assume the administratively impossible task of assignment and allocation of overhead in making all those individual ceiling prices. In that respect it is just as unworkable as the first Capehart amendment, and in the opinion of the Senator from Virginia, is not so good as the second Capehart amendment, and that was not good enough to secure the support of the majority of our committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest the absence of a quorum, because I think we are going to have a debate at which more Senators should be present.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request for a moment so I may offer an amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in behalf of myself only to the substitute amendment which was offered a moment ago on behalf of myself, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the substitute amendment, on page 3, after line 3, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC 2. The last sentence of section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 as amended, is amended to read as follows: "No restrictions, quotas, or other limitations, upon the slaughter of livestock shall be maintained which would limit the quantity of

livestock slaughtered by processors to less than 100 per centum of the total quantity of livestock offered for sale to all such processors for slaughter. Whenever the number of livestock offered for sale in a particular area for slaughter exceeds the quotes previously established for the period upon the basis of anticipated marketings, the President shall promptly adjust quotas to permit the marketing of all such livestock. Whenever the President invokes the power given him in this title to provide for the distribution of a species of livestock among the slaughterers of such species, he shall also provide for the allocation of the product of such species in such manner as to assure nonslaughtering processors and wholesalers thereof in the normal channels of distribution their normal share of the available civilian supply."

SEC. 3 The fourth sentence of section 402 (d) (3) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That no ceilings or compliance prices shall be established on any grade of beef cattle below the level of the ceilings or compliance prices for that grade in effect on July 31, 1951."

Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. MOODY, and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator from Indiana so that he might offer an amendment. He has done so, and I now move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. CAPEHART. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names.

Bricker	Hayden	Monroney
Bridges	Hendrickson	Moody
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Mundt
Capehart	Ives	Neely
Carlson	Johnson, Colo	Pastore
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Douglas	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Ellender	Langer	Smith, N J
Ferguson	Martin	Smith, N C.
Flanders	Maybank	Stennis
Frear	McCarran	Thye
George	McFarland	Williams
Gillette	McKellar	
Green	McMahon	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BENTON, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CASE, Mr. ECTON, Mr. HILL, Mr HOEY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Indiana to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Indiana for himself and other Senators.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the pending question on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Indiana for himself and other Senators.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, do I correctly understand that the pending question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendment on slaughtering quotas, which I offered to the amendment submitted by me, on behalf of myself and other Senators?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia will state it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is the Capehart amendment to the Capehart substitute for S. 2170 the same provision for the establishment of quotas as is contained in the committee bill on quotas which is scheduled to come up for action after the Senate completes action on S. 2170?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, let me say that the suggestion made by the Senator from Virginia is 100-percent correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Indiana to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Indiana on behalf of himself and other Senators.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASE (when his name was called). Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: I understand that this vote is on the question of laying on the table the Capehart amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. I vote "yea."

Mr. CONNALLY (when his name was called). Mr. President, is this vote being taken on the Capehart amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina to lay on the table an amendment to the so-called Capehart amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY and Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—49

Benton	Humphrey	Monroney
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Moody
Carlson	Ives	Mundt
Case	Johnson, Colo	Neely
Connally	Johnston, S. C	O'Conor
Douglas	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Dworshak	Kerr	Pastore
Ecton	Kilgore	Robertson
Ellender	Langer	Saltonstall
Frear	Lehman	Schoeppel
George	Lodge	Smith, N J.
Gillette	Long	Smith, N. C.
Green	Malone	Sparkman
Hayden	Maybank	Stennis
Hendrickson	McFarland	Welker
Hill	McKellar	
Hoey	McMahon	

NAYS—16

Bennett	Flanders	Thye
Bricker	Jenner	Watkins
Bridges	Knowland	Williams
Cain	Martin	Young
Capehart	McCarran	
Ferguson	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—31

Aiken	Fulbright	Nixon
Anderson	Hennings	Russell
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Smathers
Butler, Md.	Holland	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Taft
Chavez	Kem	Tobey
Clements	Magnuson	Underwood
Cordon	McCarthy	Wherry
Dirksen	McClellan	Wiley
Duff	Morse	
Eastland	Murray	

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to state that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Indiana to the substitute amendment was the so-called meat-slaughter provision contained in Senate bill 2180, which is on the calendar and which can be brought up separately. Regardless of how any Senator voted on the question, I made the motion to table the amendment so it would not be confused with the proposal to repeal the so-called Capehart amedment to the Defense Production Act of 1950.

Mr CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK Mr President, I have the floor, if the Senator does not mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The Senator from South Carolina declines to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not want anyone to misunderstand why the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee wanted to have the amendment tabled. The motion to table was made for the reason that we set up three subcommittees, one, on the so-called repeal of the Capehart amendment which is on the calendar; the second on the meat-slaughter provision which is contained in Senate bill 2180, and the third on fats and oils, of which the Senator from Arkansas was chairman. We made that arrangement in order that we might expedite the business of the Senate, as we hoped it would, and to facilitate adjournment. I want to make it clear to the Senate that Senate bill 2180, which, of course, is the meat-slaughter amendment, is on the calendar and can be called up and voted upon

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I promised to yield first to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], after which I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

IRREGULARITIES IN DETROIT OFFICE OF THE BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Mr. MOODY. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I have been serving as chairman of a subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business, which has been investigating certain phases of the mobilization effort in the city of Detroit and elsewhere. We have been checking into the gray market in steel, and in the course of that investigation the investigators for the committee have found certain irregularities in the intelligence unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in that city.

The committee investigators have been checking into this situation for more than a month, and have now compiled a rather extensive report, which is somewhat in the nature of the unevaluated files of the FBI. We had an affidavit, we had charges, we had allegations made, and we checked into as many of those as we could.

The five members of the subcommittee, consisting of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and myself, are today sending their report to Mr. Dunlap, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. I believe it is quite clear that, in view of the nature of certain of the allegations which were unfounded and unsubstantiated, the entire report should not be made public at this time. However, I have before me a summary of those portions of the report in which our investigators, headed by Mr. Charles M. Noone, a former agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, were able to nail down specifically certain matters. We limited our inquiry principally to the phases of this question which had to do with the subject of our committee investigation, namely, the gray market in steel.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MOODY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL Just a moment.

Mr MOODY. Mr President, I want only one more minute.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not know what the Senator from Michigan was going to bring up I thought it was something else. But I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for the purpose of his addressing a question to the Senator from Michigan, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

My question is directed to the Senator from Michigan. I have read the statement of the investigator, and I desire to inquire whether it is not true that the investigator's report was made to the subcommittee. The subcommittee, as such, has not looked into the matter in any way, has it?

Mr. MOODY. The subcommittee is merely transmitting the investigator's report to General Dunlap.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. MOODY. And at the same time I have written to General Dunlap a covering letter, in which I have explained what this is about, and I have also had the investigator, Mr. Noone, draft a summary of those points in his report which he was able to nail down definitely. In the letter, I may say for the information of the Senate—the Senator from Massachusetts knows about it already—we are advising Mr. Dunlap that the uncompleted phases of this inquiry are being referred to the permanent Senate investigating committee, headed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], who I am sure will take any action that may be pertinent. In this letter I have suggested that Mr. Dunlap take whatever action he deems appropriate in regard to the intelligence unit at Detroit. The purpose of this, of course, is to see that anything which may be wrong in Detroit is immediately corrected.

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. DIRKSEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MOODY. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is taking this action, and he has so reported it to the other members of the subcommittee, because it is obvious that if there is falsifying and graft taking place in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, it is entirely outside the province of our subcommittee. Is not that correct?

Mr. MOODY. I may say to the Senator that, as he knows, the inquiry is not into the activities of the Internal Revenue Bureau. This inquiry has to do with the mobilization effort.

The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr BENTON] came to Detroit and sat in on the committee hearings. In the course of following up some of the leads uncovered, a piece of information came to me personally which indicated that there was irregularity in the intelligence unit of the internal revenue office in Detroit. I put our chief investigator to work on it immediately. He received assistance from other Government agencies, and I believe he has done an excellent job However, I felt that some of the leads disclosed in the confidential report were outside the purview of our committee, and for that reason I felt they should be referred to the permanent investigating committee of the Senate. I felt that it was within the jurisdiction of our committee to nail down any connection with the gray market in steel, and I also felt that the committee should report definitely any other irregularities which we were able definitely to establish as a by-product of the investigation.

Those particular points are included in a summary which I am about to offer for the RECORD, together with my letter to Hon. John B Dunlap, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, referring the other report, which is in the nature of an unevaluated file, similar to the FBI files, to the committee of which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] is chairman, for whatever action it may see fit to take.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOODY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has shown me his report, and with what he has done I am in accord.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, I should like to yield to the senior Senator from Michigan to make a statement

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to have the floor at this particular time.

Mr MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have the floor Much as I should like to yield to my distinguished friend, I cannot do so, because I have assured other Senators that I would yield to them.

Mr MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me in order that I may make an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD my letter to Mr. Dunlap and the summary of the investigation which I have just described.

There being no objection, the letter and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 4, 1951.

The Honorable JOHN B DUNLAP,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Bureau of Internal Revenue,
Washington, D C

MY DEAR COMMISSIONER: You will recall that I spoke to you previously about certain allegations received by me concerning Henry R Sunball, special agent in charge of the intelligence unit at Detroit, and Joseph J. Weyn, a special agent in Mr. Sunball's office You will also recall that Mr. Charles M Noone, special counsel to this committee, called on you at my request on August 22 and gave you and Mr Harry Woolf, chief of the intelligence unit, the details as to the original allegations You agreed that the allegations were sufficiently serious to require a thorough investigation and offered the full cooperation of your staff to Mr. Noone in conducting such an investigation.

I am enclosing a copy of a report which sets forth the results of Mr Noone's investigation at Detroit The report, although negative in many particulars, has been prepared in detail in order that you may have the full benefit of the investigation and may follow up on any points which you feel might require further attention

There is one aspect of this matter which gives me considerable concern As you know, the subcommittee of which I am the chairman has been studying the steel situation throughout the country and particularly in the Detroit area. We have received complaints from several small users of steel to the effect that they cannot get steel except through gray-market operators and that they have to pay high prices for steel or go out of business. The intelligence unit, backed by the income-tax laws, is in the best position to ferret out these gray-market operators and put them out of business.

Under present conditions, however, I doubt seriously that the Detroit office of the intelligence unit is in a position to deal effectively with these people. It is my understanding that Special Agent Weyn has handled all of the important steel cases in the Detroit office for the past several years, and that until very recently he was the only agent investigating these cases. It is apparent from the information contained in the attached report that Agent Weyn has a close personal relationship with many people in the steel business, some of them of questionable background. Despite his protestations to the contrary, it is doubtful that he could deal objectively with these people if he were called upon to investigate them. Certainly it is improper for him to have steel cases under his jurisdiction. I therefore strongly recommend that Agent Weyn be replaced by another agent or agents in the investigation of steel cases.

It is also apparent that the morale in the Detroit office is poor and that Mr Sunball's handling of the personnel is in some degree responsible for that condition. While I would be most reluctant to damage the career of a veteran employee such as Mr. Sunball, I strongly recommend that you take steps to see to it that the situation outlined in the report is corrected

You will note that the report iself is labeled "confidential" This is because it would be unfair to many persons mentioned in the report, which recounts numerous unsubstantiated and probably unfounded allegations, to make the entire report public. In a sense this document is analogous to the unevaluated files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which are not made public for the same reason.

However, I believe several of the allegations made in the Noone report merit further investigation by you. I am familiar with your efforts to remove any questionable practice from the Bureau and hope you will deal vigorously with this situation. Publication of unsubstantiated charges would serve merely as a smear. The tendency to careless allegations damaging personal reputation is one that any responsible official of Government or Member of Congress should reject

In view of the obvious leaks and the prevalence of rumors in the Detroit office of the intelligence unit, I urge that you not allow any of the personnel of the Detroit office to read this report I suggest that the report be made available only to Mr Woolf and such of his top assistants as may have an official interest in it

You will also note that the identities of some of the sources quoted in this report have not been disclosed You will recognize the need for this. According to Mr. Noone, Mr. Sunball on several occasions indicated that he knew the identities of some of the agents who supplied Mr Noone with derogatory information Mr Sunball made it clear that he was going to see to it that these men were called to account. In one instance Mr Sunball told another agent, the latter declared, that he was going to get one of the agents "If it is the last thing I do" I believe you should caution Mr Sunball against any such action No agent in Mr Sunball's office should be disciplined because of information which he furnished to Mr Noone during his investigation.

In my opinion, certain of the information contained in the report is of such a nature as to deserve the attention of the general public Accordingly, I have had Mr Noone prepare a summary of the investigation and I am taking steps to have the summary and this letter incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I am also making a copy of the full letter available to the permanent Senate investigating committee, headed by Senator HOEY.

I want you to know that our whole purpose in going into this matter was to get at the truth. Mr Noone, a former investigator for the FBI, who wrote the report, has done an objective and constructive job. It is my sincere hope that our efforts will prove of value to you and to the entire service. The intelligence unit has enjoyed the confidence of the public for many years, and I hope that our inquiry into this matter will serve to enable the unit to continue to enjoy that confidence.

Mr. Noone has advised me that you and Mr. Woolf and the members of your staff have been most cooperative throughout the investigation. I want to thank you sincerely for that help.

With best wishes and kind regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

BLAIR MOODY,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION

A subcommittee of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, headed by Senator BLAIR MOODY, held hearings on the steel situation at Detroit on July 14, and 16, 1951. During the hearings the subcommittee heard testimony from witnesses who stated that there was a flourishing grey market in steel and other metals.

Following the close of the hearings, Senator MOODY received a report from Detroit alleging that personnel of the Intelligence Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue at Detroit were in effect fostering the grey market in steel by engaging in steel transactions and otherwise protecting persons in the steel business

Feeling that the intelligence unit, backed by the income-tax laws, should be in the forefront of the fight against grey market steel operators, Senator MOODY ordered a full investigation of the charges

The investigation, which has now been completed, disclosed that Joseph J. Weyn and Frank Cashman, special agents of the intelligence unit, netted $1,120 apiece on a steel transaction which occurred in 1948. Cashman located 100 tons of waster steel in a tool shop in Hamtramck, Mich. Weyn spoke to Herman Golanty, a steel dealer, about the steel and Golanty agreed to pay Weyn and Cashman a finder's fee for it Golanty sold the steel and paid Weyn $2,240. Weyn split this amount with Cashman

Herman Golanty maintains an office and residence at 1859 Detroit Leland Hotel, Detroit, Mich. He was a defendant in an action brought by the Government in Federal court at Detroit in 1947 to recover overcharges allegedly received by Golanty on steel transactions in the amount of $50,506 60 during the period from June 11, 1946, to October 11, 1946. The Government suit sought treble damages under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942. The action was dismissed on January 6, 1950, after Golanty and Government attorneys agreed on a settlement

According to Weyn, Golanty is a friend of Moe Dalitz, an individual who figured prominently in the Kefauver committee hearings; Weyn stated that he met Dalitz in Golanty's apartment in the Detroit Leland Hotel on one occasion and added that it is his understanding that Dalitz asked Golanty to be a witness to Dalitz's will

Dalitz is described in reports of the Kefauver committee as having been among the top of Cleveland's bootleggers during the prohibition era and as having an interest now in some of the country's largest gambling establishments. Dalitz evaded the service of a Kefauver committee subpena during hearings held by that committee in Cleveland

Weyn admitted a close personal friendship for Golanty, describing him as one of the two closest friends he has in Detroit. Herman Golanty was questioned by the Macy committee early in 1948. The Macy committee, which was headed by former Congressman W. Kingsland Macy of New York, was a subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works Weyn admitted that he met with Golanty prior to the latter's appearance before the Macy committee and outlined to him the form in which he should prepare his records for presentation to the committee. The records of the Macy committee do not indicate what action was taken by the committee with respect to Golanty.

Weyn admitted that he borrowed $2,900 from Golanty, interest free, in 1950, in order to purchase his present residence at 1010 North Melborn, Dearborn, Mich. He also admitted that Golanty paid him a $400 commission on the sale of Golanty's Cadillac early this year. He stated that he frequently dines with Golanty as the latter's guest and that he sends gifts to Golanty on the latter's birthday and at Christmastime in order to repay in part Golanty's hospitality

Weyn also admitted a close personal friendship for Sol Eisenberg, president of the Kenwal Products Co., a steel concern at 9300 Central, Detroit. He stated that his relations with Eisenberg are similar to his relations with Golanty and that the two are the closest friends he has in Detroit. He said that he has arranged for the purchase of automobiles for friends of Eisenberg The investigation failed to indicate that Weyn profited through these automobile transactions

The investigation did disclose that Weyn gave his 1950 Mercury plus $100 to officials of Production Steel Coil, Inc., 20001 Sherwood, Detroit, in January 1951, in exchange for a Chrysler Newport and thereby netted approximately $300 based on the value of the cars

The investigation disclosed that Weyn handles all important steel investigations coming to the attention of the Detroit office of the intelligence unit, and that until recently Weyn was the only agent in the office assigned to this type of case The records of the intelligence unit do not indicate that any investigation has ever been conducted by that office with regard to Herman Golanty, Sol Eisenberg or Production Steel Coil, Inc

Henry R Sunball, who became special agent in charge of the Detroit office of the intelligence unit on July 1, 1951, stated that he and his predecessor, Albert C Grunewald, learned of the 1948 steel transaction of Weyn and Cashman following its completion and warned them against any repetition of this type of activity No other action was taken with respect to this transaction Regulations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue prohibit outside employment by personnel without the approval of the special agent in charge

Sunball admitted that he obtained a new automobile early in 1951 through the efforts of a Detroit attorney who is representing a company which is currently under investigation by the intelligence unit for tax fraud. He also admitted that he recommended against criminal prosecution of the officers of the company in a conference held in his office and attended by the same attorney. Sunball stated that the attorney merely enabled him to get delivery on his new car ahead of schedule and denied that the attorney's help had any bearing on his handling of the case involving the attorney's client He also denied that he was aware of the fact that the attorney was representing the company at the time of the automobile transaction although records of the intelligence unit show that the attorney was retained by the company as attorney of record in February 1950

Sunball also admitted that he purchased a deepfreeze through Herman Golanty in May 1951. The purchase was arranged by Weyn. Sunball made out a check to Golanty for $129 78. Investigation disclosed that the least expensive comparable model deepfreeze sells at list price at $219 95 and that the price to a dealer on such a unit is $148 24. Sunball denied, however, that he was aware of the amount he had saved on purchasing the unit through Golanty.

The investigation failed to disclose that personnel of the intelligence unit engaged in any steel transactions other than the one in which Weyn and Cashman participated in 1948. Nor did the investigation establish any evidence of collusion between personnel of the intelligence unit and alleged gray-market steel operators.

In view of the highly questionable activities of some of the personnel of that office a full report of the investigation has been turned over to John B. Dunlap, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, for his information and appropriate action. The full report, recounting all charges made and their investigation, is not being made public since it contains numerous unsubstantiated and probably unfounded allegations, which properly should be checked by Mr Dunlap. In addition the report sets forth the names of several individuals who would not properly be subject to censure The result of publication might be to smear without serving any public interest. The report also contains information of a purely administrative nature relating to the operation of the Detroit office, information which properly should not be publicized but which should receive the personal attention of Mr Dunlap.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S 283 An act for the relief of Akiko Mitsuhata,

S 617 An act for the relief of Pascal Nemoto Yutaka,

S 1013 An act for the relief of Sister Monica Grant,

S. 1277 An act for the relief of John R. Willoughby,

S 1437 An act for the relief of Maiku Suzuki,

S 1464 An act for the relief of Peter Therkelsen Kirwan and Ernest O'Gorman Kirwan,

S 1499 An act for the relief of Georgette Sato,

S 1713 An act for the relief of Charles Cooper,

S 1718 An act for the relief of Elizabeth Bozsik,

S 1775 An act for the relief of Heinz Harald Patterson, and

S 1994. An act to authorize the use of the incompleted submarine *Ulua* as a target for explosive tests, and for other purposes

The message also announced that the House has passed a joint resolution (H. J Res. 341) making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S Con Res 41) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J Res. 341) making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2170) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], to make a statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from South Carolina yielding to the Senator from Indiana for the purpose indicated? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Indiana may proceed.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, now that we have voted down the slaughtering quota amendment, I should like to ask the able majority leader and the able chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee when the slaughtering-quota bill will be taken up on the floor of the Senate

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, we did not vote down slaughtering quotas. The bill dealing with that subject is Senate bill 2180. The Banking and Currency Committee, of which my distinguished friend from Indiana is a member, believed that because of the shortness of time we should divide the three so-called amendments to the price-control bill introduced by the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from California into three parts so that we might hold hearings. We have had 60 witnesses before the committee since the President's message came to the Congress We did not report what the President asked for

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr MAYBANK. I yield

Mr CAPEHART. If I remember correctly, the President asked us to repeal the Capehart amendment, to restore slaughtering quotas, and to repeal the provisions of the bill on fats and oils. The Banking and Currency Committee acted on all three subjects in separate bills All that I was endeavoring to do this afternoon was to get them all into one bill so that we could get quick action—either vote them up or vote them down. I failed because the Senate voted against me and, as I have said, voted down slaughtering quotas. The question is, when will we take up the fats and oils bill and when will we take up slaughtering quotas? I intend to offer a slaughtering-quota amendment to the pending bill. Let us quit kidding ourselves and quit kidding the country. Let us get this price-control business settled I am ready to vote upon it, but I want to vote on all three bills I do not want to have the Senator pick out the Capehart amendment and amend it or repeal it and find that 3 weeks from now we are going to adjourn and that nothing has been done on slaughtering quotas or on fats and oils.

My question is to the majority leader: When are we going to take up the slaughtering-quota bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Indiana to permit him to ask questions of the majority leader?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I would not undertake at this time to say when we shall take up the slaughtering-quota bill. We have announced our program. I thought possibly we would take up next the second of the amendments to the Defense Production Act, Senate bill 2104 dealing with o and fat imports, but the Senator from Nevada [Mr.

McCARRAN] has given us sufficient reasons for taking up his judgeship bill next. Thereafter we shall have the supplemental appropriation bill, H. R. 5215, to consider, and then I anticipate conference reports. We shall take up the bills which are on the calendar just as rapidly as we can. When they will be considered, and what disposition will be made of them, I cannot say at this time. The slaughtering-quota bill has nothing to do with the bill which is now before the Senate. Let us dispose of the bills one at a time, and we shall give consideration to other bills when the time comes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am hopeful, because this bill is imperative, as are all the other bills which have been mentioned, that the Senate might remain in session tonight and finish the consideration of the bill now pending, and then take up the bill of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to speak about 10 or 15 minutes on my substitute bill, and then I shall be ready to vote upon it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that we vote on the pending measure at 6 o'clock this evening, and that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] have 1 hour and that I have 1 hour. I suppose I really have no right to make the proposal——

Mr. McFARLAND. That is perfectly all right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not understand the request.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask the majority leader if he will make the request that we vote on the pending bill at 6 o'clock this evening, the time from 3:30 on to be divided between the majority leader and the acting minority leader, that no amendment not germane to the subject be received, and that there be 10 minutes on each amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I see no reason why we cannot vote on the bill well before 6 o'clock this evening. If we have a limitation of debate on amendments, I do not see any reason why the Senate cannot recess by 5 o'clock.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I would respectfully say to the majority leader that if he or the Senator from South Carolina would amend the request so as to put a time limit on debate on each amendment and on the bill, we could get through before 6 o'clock.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well, Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the debate be limited as follows: 30 minutes on each amendment, 15 minutes to each side, the time of those favoring the amendment to be controlled by the proponent of the amendment, and the time of those in opposition by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] in the event he is against the amendment; if he is in favor of the amendment, then by the acting minority leader; that all amendments must be germane, and that the debate on the bill be limited to 1 hour, 30 minutes to each side, to be controlled by the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Indiana, and that the limitation apply to motions and appeals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yielded to the majority leader to make a unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thought the Senator from South Carolina yielded the floor, and recognized the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, just a moment. Let me see if I understand the situation. The parliamentary situation, as I understand, is that we have now entered into a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate to 30 minutes on each amendment, 15 minutes to each side. The pending amendment is the substitute offered by me to the bill, on which I have 15 minutes and the opponents have 15 minutes. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan with the understanding that the time consumed by him will not be taken out of my time, and that he will not exceed 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot control any such thing. The Chair is bound by the unanimous-consent agreement as to limitation. He cannot recognize other Senators unless they are yielded to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me so I may make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do I understand that the senior Senator from Michigan, who was attempting to get the floor, has been cut off from any debate unless he obtains consent from the Senator from Indiana or the minority leader?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is practically correct. The time is controlled now by unanimous consent.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will Senators suspend and let the Chair state the situation. The Chair cannot recognize Senators promiscuously for any purpose. They must have time allotted to them by Senators in control of the time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to submit a unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be given the period of 10 minutes to speak upon the matter the junior Senator from Michigan has just spoken on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. At what time?

Mr. FERGUSON. At the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does that mean that the Senator will speak for 10 minutes, after which the unanimous-consent agreement will become effective?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the object of the request; that the time consumed not be taken out of the time allotted under the unanimous-consent agreement. Is there objection?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

IRREGULARITIES IN THE DETROIT INTERNAL REVENUE OFFICE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Michigan was consulted by the junior Senator from Michigan in relation to the matter that was brought up by the junior Senator in relation to the alleged irregularities in the Detroit internal revenue office, and is glad to join in the suggestion that the Senate investigations subcommittee proceeded to make a full investigation.

Mr. President, rumors and evidence have come to the attention of the press in the city of Detroit, that things were not well in the internal revenue office of that city. I hope this matter will not end where the Small Business Committee left it. Naturally it is within the province of the Small Business Committee to investigate steel and to see whether the proceedings with respect to the delivery of steel and the allotment of steel are being interfered with. Now it appears that the special agent in charge of the internal revenue intelligence unit at Detroit had something to do with the delivery and allotment of steel. I will ask my colleague if that is correct? That is, there was an investigation, was there not?

Mr. MOODY. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I am sure the senior Senator from Michigan has not had time to read the letter and the statement, because I told him about it only a little while ago. I will say for his benefit that the connection of the internal revenue office at Detroit with people in the steel market was through one of the special agents there. The report will show the relationship of the head of that unit to the situation. He was not directly dealing in any steel himself, but one of his principal agents, as a matter of fact, two of the agents, did complete a transaction in steel.

I am very glad the senior Senator from Michigan approved the action of our committee. We ran across this thing in the course of investigating the gray market, and we felt that if any further investigation should be made it should be made by the Hoey committee.

However I should like to point out to the senior Senator from Michigan that we did put Mr. Noone, a former FBI investigator, and now connected with the committee, on this matter, and he made a very thorough check of it. All the information which related to the steel situation, and any information he was able definitely to establish in connection therewith we nailed down and included in the summary. The confidential report is a lengthy document. I

should be glad to make it available if the Senator would like it.

Mr. FERGUSON. The senior Senator from Michigan would like to see it.

Going on, Mr. President, the letter and the report indicate that the men mentioned therein at least were in a position to look into the matter of income tax and revenue matters in the city of Detroit, and to determine that if unreported excessive profits, or any unreported profits at all, were made out of the handling of steel or the manipulation of orders on steel, those accounts could be and properly should be investigated by the Internal Revenue Bureau.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr MOODY. Not only that, but there is evidence to indicate that there was a close friendship existing between at least one agent and certain people who were dealing in the steel market, and there was an interrelationship of friendship between one of these steel people and a Cleveland man who was described as one of the top bootleggers in Cleveland, who was subpenaed by the Kefauver committee I believe, and who did not appear before that committee. So, in general I felt, of course, that this was something which should not be overlooked. I am sure the senior Senator from Michigan realizes that General Dunlap, who has just taken over the Internal Revenue Bureau, is making an effort to clean out just this sort of thing. I felt that he ought to be given an opportunity to take any action he sees fit to take in regard to these people I appreciate the support of the senior Senator from my State in cleaning up this situation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, that is just what I wanted to call to the attention of the Senate. Mr. Dunlap should be given this opportunity, because if we have bad apples in the barrel, the good apples are always in danger of being contaminated. While the Hoey committee is conducting its investigation, I urge Mr. Dunlap to look into this matter personally so that he may clean out the bad apples that are in this barrel in Michigan, so that when the investigation is made by the Hoey committee—and that is what I want to urge now—there be a fair examination of the whole Internal Revenue Office in the city of Detroit.

Mr. MOODY. I may point out to the Senator that that is precisely what we have suggested.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that

Mr. MOODY. In the full report, which goes to the nature of some of the charges, we suggest to the Hoey committee that it go into the subject and we hope they will go into it.

I may add that in a preliminary way we made a very vigorous effort to get all the information we could obtain of this nature. We felt that in general this was a subject for the general investigating committee of the Senate rather than for the Small Business Committee.

Mr. FERGUSON The senior Senator from Michigan, having been formerly the chairman of that committee of the Senate, feels that it can do this job if it will direct its efforts to this particular task. That is why I wish at this time to urge upon the Senate that this be done.

Let us look at the Internal Revenue Bureau. It has the task of collecting some $66,000,000,000 taxes from the people of the United States. Every person who files an income-tax return or pays revenue to the United States Government places such revenue in the hands of the Internal Revenue office There is not a place in the United States Government where there is greater opportunity for shake-downs, for corruption, or for favors, than in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

I say the time has come for action. The scandal has hit four major offices, one of which was the office in San Francisco. Certain employees were discharged there on the ground that they were not competent That does not describe what was going on. There was misconduct

We find similar situations at Boston, and in New York; and now it is revealed in the city of Detroit The people of the United States will not be satisfied until there has been a complete and thorough examination of these offices. The fact that the previous Commissioner of Internal Revenue has resigned, and that we have a new one should not satisfy the people that everything will be all right. If there was wrongdoing under the old Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the men who were in the jobs will remain there, and there will be no house cleaning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. One more sentence. I urge the committee, when it investigates job selling in Michigan, to investigate the office of Collector of Internal Revenue. It is now indicated that there is strong evidence of real corruption in this very fundamental agency of the United States involving the collection of money from the citizen.

Mr MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. My time has expired.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2170) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended

Mr CAPEHART. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have 15 minutes to talk about something which affects the life of every American. It affects price and wage controls in the United States for at least the next 9 months

As Senators know, on last September 8, 1950, Congress enacted a law known as the 1950 Defense Production Act. The President placed that act in effect by freezing prices on January 25 this year.

A few weeks ago Congress amended the 1950 act. The President of the United States objected very vigorously to three phases of that act. One he called the Capehart amendment, to which he objected most vigorously. He objected to the fact that Congress failed to give him the right to establish slaughtering quotas; and he objected to the fact that Congress wrote limitations in respect to fats and oils.

A bill was introduced by the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] to repeal all three of those amendments.

Individual bills were also introduced to cover those three subjects, namely, the so-called Capehart amendment, the fats-and-oils amendment, and slaughtering quotas. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee held hearings on all three of those subjects. It reported to the Senate three separate bills, one to repeal the fats-and-oils amendment, the second to amend the Capehart amendment, and the third to restore to the administration the right to establish slaughtering quotas.

The bill before us is Senate bill 2170. It was reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency by a vote of 9 to 4 I voted against it. I have offered to that bill an amendment in the nature of a complete substitute. I wish to tell the Senate exactly what Senate bill 2170 does. It is the committee bill which is now under consideration.

Senate bill 2170 is the outgrowth of a bill written by Mr. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization. The bill does not compel the President of the United States to do a single thing which he does not have the right to do under the 1950 act, with one exception, and that is that it gives every individual seller in the United States the right to make an individual application for what is known as a financial-hardship classification A regulation has already been issued setting forth what is meant by financial hardship. A concern or a seller who has been losing money for at least 30 days, or can prove that he will lose money in the future, may file an individual application. Senate bill 2170 makes it mandatory upon the President to receive any such financial-hardship applications and to act upon them under a formula stipulated in the bill.

Aside from that, the bill is absolutely meaningless. It does not force the President to do anything. He does not have to roll back a single price if he does not wish to do so. He does not have to permit a single price to be rolled forward. The bill does provide, as did the Capehart amendment, that if prices are rolled back they must be rolled back under the formula written in the bill.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I will not yield, because I have only 15 minutes. The Senator may then have 15 minutes.

That is all the bill does. The weakness of the bill, and the thing which we have tried to correct in the substitute, is that it does not protect the individual sellers of America I for one will never vote for any piece of legislation which

denies to any citizen of the United States, whether he be a wage earner, whether he be in business, whether he be a big-business man, or a little-business man, the right to petition his Government for relief. That was the strength of the original Capehart amendment, and therein lies the strength of the substitute on which we shall vote in a few minutes.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. The big argument against the original Capehart amendment—and I admit that there was room for argument about it—was that it was hard to administer, for the reason that it dealt with the highest and lowest prices. It said nothing about the level of prices. It said nothing about industry-wide prices. The argument was that it tied the hands of the administration and denied the flexibility which was necessary to administer the law.

I have always recognized that there was some merit to that argument. Therefore, in the substitute which I have offered for Senate bill 2170, in my opinion and in the opinion of many others, we correct that situation 100 percent. The original Capehart amendment dealt with the lowest or the highest price. The proposed substitute deals with industry-wide prices. In other words, we give the Administrator and the President the right to set industry-wide prices. In other words, we give them the right to make rules and regulations to set prices industrywise, individually, or in any way they care to do so. But we retain a provision, which I believe should be included in every piece of legislation, giving every American the right to petition his Government if he feels that his own Government, by regulation or rules, has injured him. I shall never vote for a piece of legislation which takes that right away from an American.

The pending bill, S. 2170, takes that right away from him, except when he is losing money, and then he must prove that he has been losing for 30 days, or he must prove that he will lose money in the future.

I hope the Senate will accept the substitute. I have been disappointed that the managers of Senate bill 2170 have not themselves accepted my substitute, because I know that the regulations which the Price Administrator has been preparing to put into effect the Capehart amendment have been written along the lines outlined in my substitute.

I hope the Senate will accept the substitute, because it protects the individual seller. We started out in the Capehart amendment to give the President the right to roll back the price of the gouger, and to permit the individual seller to increase his prices under a formula.

He has that right under either the bill S. 2170 or my substitute. The President has the right to permit an individual to do so. However, there is nothing mandatory in the bill which requires the President to do it one way or another. Under the substitute there is still nothing mandatory about it, except that if he sets any price for any industry, group, or individual in the United States which is working a hardship on them—and I am not thinking of the individual hardship feature which is in the bill—such industry, group, or individual have the right to petition their Government. They must do so under a formula. Then the President has the right to require the petitioner, in making his application, to make it under an industrywide schedule of costs, rather than on an individual price basis.

How much time do I have remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Four minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I relinquish the floor, and I reserve the 4 minutes for a later time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr MAYBANK] is in control of the time for the opposition.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], asked the Senator from Virginia to control the time if the Senator from South Carolina did not return before the Senator from Indiana had completed his remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I shall not take much time of the Senate. The original Capehart amendment, as I understand the Senator from Indiana now admits, was unworkable. So would this Capehart amendment be unworkable. I should like to read the language in the substitute which I believe is the key language of the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana. It says:

Upon application and a proper showing of his prices and costs—

And so on—

the President shall adjust such ceiling price in the manner prescribed—

And so on.

Under that wording it is entirely mandatory upon the President to do so. He has no discretion whatever. The Senator from Indiana has said that every American should have the right to petition his Government and to make application. Of course, every American has the right to petition and to make application. There is nothing in the Maybank amendment which would prevent it. If the Senate wants a workable price-control bill—and I believe the Senate does want one—it must reject the substitute amendment. Under the substitute amendment all that an applicant would have to do would be to file an application and make a showing, and then the President would be forced to increase the price of the ceiling and change it in accordance with the application.

There were two or three things fatally wrong with the Capehart amendment as it is now in the law. This provision was one of them, and the substitute would keep that provision in the law. It would vitiate entirely what the Senate is trying to do, namely, to provide a workable law.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. MOODY. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not also a fact that the substitute amendment would permit a pyramiding of all types of costs, regardless of their essentiality, while the Maybank amendment would limit the accounting of costs to those which are absolutely essential?

Mr. MOODY. That is precisely correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Under the Capehart amendment any manufacturer could build his costs up to whatever point he desired to do so, by means of administration, excessive advertising, distribution, or transportation? In other words, he could fly an article which normally would move by freight. Thus he could pyramid his costs under the formula in the substitute amendment.

Mr MOODY. That is correct. I may say that if he then applied—merely applied, Mr. President—and showed what his costs were, it would be mandatory upon the President of the United States, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Johnston, Mr DiSalle, or whoever was administering the law, to increase the prices charged by him. If we want to build inflation into this law, if we want higher prices or if we want to subject the economy of America to the burning out that inflation would bring, we should adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana. However, if we want to have a law which will protect the American consumer and American businessman—and the American farmer, I may add—from the disaster which would come to everyone from an inflationary spiral, the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana must be rejected and the committee amendment must be adopted.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The junior Senator from Virginia was chairman of the subcommittee which had the pending bill, S. 2170, under consideration. He has done his best to view the Capehart substitute through the Capehart glasses, but he has been unable to do so.

The junior Senator from Virginia will briefly point out why he cannot do so.

On page 1, line 2, of the Capehart substitute in lieu of "level of prices" the words "individual or industrywide ceiling price" has been substituted. The purpose of that change, in effect, therefore is to require individual pricing not only for every manufacturer but possibly for every item in his line. That makes the amendment utterly unworkable and impossible. We could not possibly assemble in Washington a staff large enough to examine all the books of every manufacturer and go into the fullest detail with respect to every element of manufacturer's costs.

The same language is found on page 2, line 3. Instead of "the highest level of prices," which is the language contained in the bill, the Capehart substitute still

carries the words "is based upon the highest price." This means the individual highest price. That makes the amendment unworkable.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one second?

Mr. ROBERTSON. In my own time or in the time of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Make it in my time. Why does not the Senator from Virginia read all of the language? The amendment goes on to say: "or in the case of industry-wide ceilings, the highest level of prices." Why does the Senator from Virginia read only half of the sentence?

Mr. ROBERTSON Because the Senator from Indiana adds to the language of the bill as it refers to industry-wide ceilings, and gives the manufacturer the privilege of setting individual prices. That is the reason why the Senator from Indiana inserted the words "highest price." Otherwise the Senator from Indiana would not have added "highest price," but would have let it read "level of prices."

Mr. CAPEHART. "In the case of industry-wide ceilings, the highest level of prices." Why does not the Senator from Virginia read that language?

Mr. ROBERTSON Because that language is not pertinent to my criticism. It is the language of the committee bill that I want the Senate to adopt. The Senator from Indiana wishes to set aside that language. He adds the words "highest price." He does it for good and sufficient reasons. It is to give an opportunity to every individual to come forward and say, "I claim a higher price. Look over my books. You cannot deny me a higher price." The amendment is highly inflationary and will force up the general level of prices.

In addition to what is carried in the committee bill, to the effect that a manufacturer would be allowed all necessary and unavoidable costs, including selling, advertising, office and all other production, distribution and administration costs, the Capehart substitute says, in effect, "Yes; and all indirect costs and all overhead costs; and we shall have the privilege of allocating those; and catch us if you can" Mr. President, there are not two economists in the Nation who, if at the head of some great industrial empire, would agree on how to allocate costs.

Mr CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, either in his time or in my time?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr CAPEHART. I read from page 2 of the Senator's own bill; the bill of which the Senator from Virginia is a cosponsor, "reflects the highest level of prices."

Evidently the Senator from Virginia has not read Senate bill 2170, because it talks about "the highest level of prices."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, evidently the Senator from Indiana has not been listening to what I have been saying. I have repeatedly said that the bill of which I am a cosponsor provides for "the highest level of prices," but not "the highest price." The latter is injected by the substitute about which I have been complaining.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I yield myself one additional minute, because I have yielded some time to the Senator from Indiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for one more minute.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to make this very definite statement: In my humble opinion, a vote in favor of the adoption of the substitute will be a vote to push up the general level of prices, regardless of how much the increased volume of production may increase net profits above a fair and reasonable level. Under the substitute, every manufacturer can force the OPS to allow every penny of indirect costs as well as every penny of direct costs, and can refuse to absorb anything, regardless of how excessive his net profits may be. The provision which will bring that about is to be found in the last sentence on page 2 of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, and it departs from the very wise provision contained in the bill reported by the committee, in that the amendment in the nature of a substitute allows no discretion whatsoever to the OPS with respect to the absorption of some portion of the indirect costs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the able junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to take only a minute or two in which to call attention to the fact that this is a poor way to legislate in regard to what is a most important and vital matter. Not more than 8 or 10 Senators are now on the floor, and very few of them are among those who attended the committee hearings and understand the pending bill Those of us who are in the Chamber at this time are merely campaigning among ourselves. A matter of such great importance should never be handled in this way.

Let me state that I favor the Capehart amendment as it now appears in the law. If it is to be amended, I am in favor of the Capehart amendment in the nature of a substitute for the pending bill.

I am opposed to the committee's recommendation for the reason that it would not give any person in the United States the right to appeal, except in hardship cases, and the OPS will not consider hardship cases unless there has been an actual monetary loss. If there are monetary losses on the part of business in the United States, no money will come to the Government in the form of taxes from those businesses. However, the Government must have money with which to pay the costs of conducting the war, and in order to have the implements of war produced by our domestic economy we must make it possible for the marginal producer as well as the low-cost producer to operate.

There must be ample production of materials if we are to prevent inflation. Furthermore, as I have just said, if the industries of the United States are unable to make profits, the Government will not be able to obtain from them in taxes the funds with which to conduct the war. Moreover, if industry is unable to make a profit, industry will not operate, and then there will be a failure to produce the needed implements of war, although the original purpose of the Defense Production Act was to increase the production of the needed implements of war.

Mr President, the pending measure is not fundamentally a control measure. Fundamentally, it is an anti-inflation measure and a measure to secure production. The quickest way to defeat production is for us to adopt the committee amendment and to deny to a person or to a firm which is engaged in production the right to go to the Government and to arrange for the allowance of a fair profit from the business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, submitted by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], for himself and other Senators.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair assumes that the suggestion of the absence of a quorum is made on the assumption that debate on this matter has concluded.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, Mr. President; I have finished.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum is suggested, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bennett	Hayden	McFarland
Benton	Hendrickson	McKellar
Brewster	Hill	Millikin
Bricker	Hoey	Monroney
Bridges	Humphrey	Moody
Butler, Nebr	Hunt	Mundt
Capehart	Ives	Neely
Carlson	Jenner	Nixon
Case	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnston, S C.	Pastore
Connally	Kefauver	Robertson
Cordon	Kerr	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N J.
Duff	Langer	Smith, N C.
Dworshak	Lehman	Sparkman
Ecton	Lodge	Stennis
Ellender	Long	Taft
Ferguson	Malone	Thye
Flanders	Martin	Watkins
Frear	Maybank	Welker
George	McCarran	Wiley
Gillette	McCarthy	Williams
Green	McClellan	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. CAPEHART and other Senators requested the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr President, I understand I have a few minutes left.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Strictly speaking, the quorum call took up all the time.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to make a statement, and I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 1 minute

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss the amendment, because I have already done so, but I have talked with the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I do not know what other amendments will be presented, but it was our understanding that if we could vote on this amendment we would not take the time allotted to us for further debate. If Senators will remain here, we can vote on the amendment, have a yea-and-nay vote on the bill, and then the majority leader can advise the Senate of anything further he would like to have the Senate do this afternoon or later. I do not know of any other amendment to be offered.

A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Have any other amendments been submitted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Other amendments have been printed and lie on the desk

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that the Senator from Indiana will not bring up any further amendment. Regardless of what the Senate does with the pending amendment, I hope we can have a yea-and-nay vote on the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. On what is the Senate about to vote?

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the substitute offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr ANDERSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr HENNINGS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Montana [Mr MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea" and the Senator from Maine would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—28

Bennett	Dworshak	Millikin
Brewster	Ecton	Mundt
Bricker	Ferguson	Schoeppel
Bridges	Flanders	Taft
Butler, Nebr.	Gillette	Watkins
Capehart	Hendrickson	Welker
Carlson	Jenner	Wiley
Case	Malone	Williams
Dirksen	Martin	
Duff	McCarthy	

NAYS—44

Benton	Johnson, Colo.	Monroney
Chavez	Johnston, S C	Moody
Connally	Kefauver	Neely
Cordon	Kerr	Nixon
Douglas	Kilgore	O'Conor
Ellender	Knowland	Pastore
Frear	Langer	Robertson
George	Lehman	Saltonstall
Green	Lodge	Smith, N J
Hayden	Long	Smith, N C.
Hill	Maybank	Sparkman
Hoey	McCarran	Stennis
Humphrey	McClellan	Thye
Hunt	McFarland	Young
Ives	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—24

Aiken	Hennings	Murray
Anderson	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Butler Md.	Holland	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Cain	Kem	Smith, Maine
Clements	Magnuson	Tobey
Eastland	McMahon	Underwood
Fulbright	Morse	Wherry

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. CAPEHART for himself and other Senators was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2170) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. CAPEHART, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 21, as follows:

YEAS—49

Benton	Hunt	Neely
Brewster	Ives	Nixon
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Connally	Johnston, S. C	Pastore
Cordon	Kefauver	Robertson
Douglas	Kerr	Saltonstall
Ellender	Kilgore	Smith, N J.
Ferguson	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Frear	Lehman	Sparkman
George	Long	Stennis
Gillette	Maybank	Thye
Green	McCarran	Watkins
Hayden	McClellan	Welker
Hendrickson	McFarland	Wiley
Hill	McKellar	Young
Hoey	Monroney	
Humphrey	Moody	

NAYS—21

Bennett	Dirksen	Martin
Bricker	Dworshak	McCarthy
Bridges	Ecton	Millikin
Butler, Nebr.	Flanders	Mundt
Capehart	Jenner	Schoeppel
Carlson	Knowland	Taft
Case	Malone	Williams

NOT VOTING—26

Aiken	Hennings	Murray
Anderson	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Butler, Md.	Holland	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Cain	Kem	Smith, Maine
Clements	Lodge	Tobey
Duff	Magnuson	Underwood
Eastland	McMahon	Wherry
Fulbright	Morse	

So the bill (S. 2170) was passed.

AMENDMENT OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT OF 1945, AS AMENDED

Mr. MAYBANK Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to introduce and send to the desk a bill which is an amendment to the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended. The bill I am now introducing relates to the management of that bank, and is also for other purposes.

I am introducing the bill because the conference report on the Mutual Security Act, which was agreed to by the Senate the day before yesterday, contained a provision which would have made the Director for Mutual Security a member of the board of directors of the Export-Import Bank. I discussed that matter at some length at that time. The bill I am now introducing would have the effect of repealing that provision if it should become law.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2222) to amend the provisions of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, relative to the management of the Export-Import Bank, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk for immediate attention the conference report on——

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the submission of the conference report for a moment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO SUBMIT REPORT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Appropriations Committee may file a report on House bill 5215, the supplemental appropriation bill for 1952, during the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1203.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels that the conference report should come first.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thought the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] withheld the submission of the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. I simply yielded to the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will wait. I merely wanted Senators to know what we were going to do.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4496) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see page 12606, House proceedings, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 4, 1951.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 4496, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
October 4, 1951.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 32, 33, 36, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, to the bill (H. R. 4496) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 65 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Not to exceed 10 positions in the Library of Congress may be exempt from the provisions of the section of the chapter entitled 'General Provisions' of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, concerning the employment of aliens, but the Librarian shall not make any appointment to any such position until he has ascertained that he cannot secure for such appointment a person in any of the three categories specified in such section who possesses the special qualifications for the particular position and also otherwise meets the general requirements for employment in the Library of Congress."

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 65.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The motion was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1203.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1203) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "Senate", to strike out:

Two additional circuit judges for the ninth circuit In order that the table contained in section 44 (a) of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this section in the number of circuit judges for the ninth circuit, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to said circuit:

"Circuits	*Number of judges*
* * * * *	
Ninth	9
* * * * *	

And in lieu thereof to insert:

One additional circuit judge for the fifth circuit In order that the table contained in section 44 (a) of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this section in the number of circuit judges for the fifth circuit, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to said circuit:

"Circuits:	*Number of judges*
* * * * *	
Fifth	Seven
* * * * *	

On page 2, line 15, after the name "Colorado", to strike out "one additional district judge for the district of Connecticut,"; in line 17, after the name "Delaware", to strike out "two" and insert "one"; in line 18, after the word "district", where it occurs the first time, to strike out "judges" and insert "judge"; in line 22, after the name "Nevada", to strike out "three additional district judges for the southern district of New York," and insert "one district judge for the eastern, middle, and western districts of North Carolina", on page 3, line 1, after the name "Ohio", to insert "one additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania"; in line 3, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "one additional district judge for the middle district of", and insert "one district judge for the middle and western districts of"; in line 7, after the word "and", to strike out "two" and insert "one"; in the same line, after the word "district", where it occurs the second time, to strike out "judges" and insert "judge"; in line 13, after "(56 Stat. 1083)", to insert "the existing judgeship for the southern district of Texas created by section 2 (d) of the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges and for other purposes," approved August 3, 1949 (63 Stat. 495)"; on page 4, after line 10, to strike out:

Connecticut	3
* * * * *	

In line 17, after the word "Southern", to strike out "5" and insert "4"; on page 5, after line 8, to strike out:

New York:	
* * * * *	
Southern	10
* * * * *	

After line 12, to insert:

North Carolina:	
* * * * *	
Eastern, Middle, and Western	1
* * * * *	

After line 19, to insert:

Pennsylvania:	
Eastern	8
* * * * *	

On page 6, after line 2, to strike out:

Middle	2
* * * * *	

After line 4, to insert:

Middle and Western	1

After line 8, to insert:

Southern	4
* * * * *	

In line 16, after "Western", to strike out "4" and insert "3."

After line 21, to insert:

(b) (1) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the district of Arizona. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filed.

On page 7, line 3, to renumber the subsection from "(b) (1)" to "(2)"; in line 8, to change the subsection number from "(2)" to "(3)"; after line 13, to insert:

(4) Subsection (c) (6) of section 90 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the word "Washington", so that the subsection will read as follows:

"(6) The Swainsboro Division comprises the counties of Bullock, Candler, Emanuel, Jefferson, Jenkins, and Toombs.

"Court for the Swainsboro Division shall be held at Swainsboro."

In line 22, to change the subsection number from "(3)" to "(5)"; on page 8, line 3, to change the subsection number from "(4)" to "(6)"; in line 8, to change the subsection number from "(5)" to "(7)"; after line 14, to insert:

(8) The present incumbent of the judgeship for the southern district of Texas created by section 2 (d) of the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes," approved August 3, 1949 (63 Stat. 495), shall henceforth hold such office under section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by this act.

In line 22, to change the subsection number from "(6)" to "(9)"; on page 9, line 3, after the word "while", to strike out "such" and insert "the present"; after line 7, to strike out:

(7) The existing judgeship for the eastern and western districts of Washington is abolished. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this paragraph, the portion thereof relating to Washington is amended by striking out "Eastern and western ---------- 1."

On page 10, after line 16, to strike out:

SEC. 5. The first sentence of the fourth paragraph of section 371 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "Whenever any circuit or district judge eligible to resign under this section or to retire under this section or section 372 does neither, and the President finds that such judge is unable to discharge efficiently all the duties of his office by reason of permanent mental or physical disability and that the appointment of an additional judge is necessary for the efficient dispatch of business, the President may make such appointment by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 5. Section 371 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 371. Resignation or retirement for age; substitute judge on failure to retire.

"(a) Any justice or judge of the United States appointed to hold office during good behavior who resigns after attaining the age of 70 years and after serving at least 10 years continuously or otherwise shall, during the remainder of his lifetime, continue to receive the salary which he was receiving when he resigned.

"(b) Any justice or judge of the United States appointed to hold office during good behavior may retain his office but retire from regular active service after attaining the age of 70 years and after serving at least 10 years, continuously or otherwise. He shall, during the remainder of his lifetime, continue to receive the salary of the office.

"The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a successor to a justice or judge who retires.

"(c) Whenever any circuit or district judge eligible to resign under this section or to retire under this section or section 372 does neither, and the President finds that such judge is unable to discharge efficiently all the duties of his office by reason of permanent mental or physical disability and the appointment of an additional judge is necessary for the efficient dispatch of business, the President may make such appointment by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. If such additional judge is appointed, the vacancy subsequently caused by the death, resignation, or retirement of the disabled judge shall not be filled.

"Any circuit or district judge whose disability causes the appointment of an additional judge, shall, for purposes of precedence, service as chief judge, or temporary performance of the duties of that office, be treated as junior in commission to the other judges of the circuit or district."

On page 12, after line 14, to insert:

SEC. 6 (a) The first sentence of section 26 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, as amended (48 U. S. C. 1405y), is amended to read as follows:

"The President shall, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint a judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands who shall hold office for the term of 8 years and until his successor is chosen and qualified unless sooner removed by the President for cause, and a district attorney who shall hold office for the term of 4 years and until his successor is chosen and qualified unless sooner removed by the President for cause."

(b) This section shall take effect upon its approval but shall not affect the term of any incumbent whose term has not yet expired.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc, That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional circuit judge for the fifth circuit. In order that the table contained in section 44 (a) of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this section in the number of circuit judges for the fifth circuit, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to said circuit:

"Circuits	*Number of judges*
* * * * *	
Fifth	Seven
* * * * *	

SEC. 2. (a) (1) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the southern district of California, one additional district judge for the district of Colorado, one additional district judge for the district of Delaware, one additional district judge for the southern district of Florida, one additional district judge for the northern district of Georgia, one district judge for the northern and southern districts of Indiana, one additional district judge for the district of Nevada, one district judge for the eastern, middle, and western districts of North Carolina, one additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio, one additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, one district judge for the middle and western districts of Tennessee, one additional district judge for the eastern district of Texas, one additional district judge for the eastern district of Virginia, and one additional district judge for the western district of Washington.

(2) The existing judgeship for the eastern and western districts of Missouri, created by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1083), the existing judgeship for the southern district of Texas created by section 2 (d) of the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges and for other purposes," approved August 3, 1949 (63 Stat 495), and the existing judgeship for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia, created by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia," approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1805), shall be permanent judgeships.

(3) In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the changes made by this subsection in the number of permanent judgeships for certain districts, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to said districts:

"Districts	*Judges*
* * * * *	
California:	
* * * * *	
Southern	11
* * * * *	
Colorado	2
* * * * *	
Delaware	3
* * * * *	
Florida:	
* * * * *	
Southern	4
* * * * *	
Georgia:	
Northern	3
* * * * *	
Indiana:	
* * * * *	
Northern and Southern	1
* * * * *	
Missouri:	
* * * * *	
Eastern and Western	2
* * * * *	
Nevada	2
* * * * *	
North Carolina:	
* * * * *	
Eastern, Middle, and Western	1
* * * * *	
Ohio:	
Northern	5
* * * * *	

Pennsylvania:	
Eastern	8
* * * * *	
Tennessee:	
* * * * *	
Middle and Western	1
Texas:	
* * * * *	
Eastern	2
Southern	4
* * * * *	
Virginia:	
Eastern	3
* * * * *	
Washington:	
* * * * *	
Western	3
* * * * *	
West Virginia:	
* * * * *	
Northern and Southern	1
* * * * *"	

(b) (1) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the district of Arizona. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

(2) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional district judges for the southern district of New York. The first two vacancies occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

(3) The second sentence of section 89 (b) of title 28 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows: "Court for the Southern District shall be held at Fernandina, Fort Myers, Fort Pierce, Jacksonville, Key West, Miami, Ocala, Orlando, Tampa, and West Palm Beach."

(4) Subsection (c) (6) of section 90 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the word "Washington", so that the subsection will read as follows:

"(6) The Swainsboro Division comprises the counties of Bullock, Candler, Emanuel, Jefferson, Jenkins, and Toombs.

"Court for the Swainsboro Division shall be held at Swainsboro."

(5) The second sentence of section 102 (a) (2) of title 28 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows: "Court for the northern division shall be held at Bay City, Port Huron, and Flint."

(6) The last sentence of section 128 (b) (2) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows: "Court for the southern division shall be held at Tacoma and at one other place in such division to be designated by the district judges for the western district of Washington."

(7) The present incumbent of the judgeship created by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri", approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1083), shall henceforth hold such office under section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by this act.

(8) The present incumbent of the judgeship for the southern district of Texas created by section 2 (d) of the act entitled "an act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes," approved August 3, 1949 (63 Stat 495), shall henceforth hold such office under section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by this act.

(9) The present incumbent of the judgeship created by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia", approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1805), shall henceforth hold such office under section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by this act. If, while the present incumbent is holding such office, a vacancy arises in the office of district judge for the northern district of West Virginia, such incumbent shall thereupon become a district judge for the northern district of West Virginia.

SEC. 3. The first paragraph of section 4 of the Act approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; title 48, U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"There is established a district court for the District of Alaska with the jurisdiction of district courts of the United States and with general jurisdiction in civil, criminal, equity, and admiralty causes; and five district judges shall be appointed for the district, each at an annual salary of $15,000. The court shall consist of four divisions, which shall also be recording divisions. Two of the judges of the court shall be assigned by the President to the third division and one each shall be assigned by the President to the first, second, and fourth divisions. During the terms of office these judges shall reside in the divisions of their district to which they may be respectively assigned."

SEC. 4. That the act entitled "An act to clarify the law relating to the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, and to provide for the appointment of an additional United States district judge for the eastern, middle, and western district of Pennsylvania", approved July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 654), is amended by adding at the end of section 2 a new sentence to read as follows: "If a vacancy arises in the office of district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania while the judge appointed pursuant to this section is holding the office created by this section, such judge shall thereafter be a district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania."

SEC. 5. Section 371 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 371 Resignation or retirement for age; substitute judge on failure to retire

"(a) Any justice or judge of the United States appointed to hold office during good behavior who resigns after attaining the age of 70 years and after serving at least 10 years continuously or otherwise shall, during the remainder of his lifetime, continue to receive the salary which he was receiving when he resigned.

"(b) Any justice or judge of the United States appointed to hold office during good behavior may retain his office but retire from regular active service after attaining the age of 70 years and after serving at least 10 years, continuously or otherwise. He shall, during the remainder of his lifetime, continue to receive the salary of the office.

"The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a successor to a justice or judge who retires.

"(c) Whenever any circuit or district judge eligible to resign under this section or to retire under this section or section 372 does neither, and the President finds that such judge is unable to discharge efficiently all the duties of his office by reason of permanent mental or physical disability and the appointment of an additional judge is necessary for the efficient dispatch of business, the President may make such appointment by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. If such additional judge is appointed, the vacancy subsequently caused by the death, resignation, or retirement of the disabled judge shall not be filled.

"Any circuit or district judge whose disability causes the appointment of an additional judge, shall, for purposes of precedence, service as chief judge, or temporary performance of the duties of that office, be treated as junior in commission to the other judges of the circuit or district."

SEC. 6. (a) The first sentence of section 26 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, as amended (48 U. S. C. 1405y), is amended to read as follows:

"The President shall, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint a judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands who shall hold office for the term of 8 years and until his successor is chosen and qualified unless soon removed by the President for cause, and a district attorney who shall hold office for the term of 4 years and until his successor is chosen and qualified unless sooner removed by the President for cause."

(b) This section shall take effect upon its approval but shall not affect the term of any incumbent whose term has not yet expired.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it is my intention, after Senators have had an opportunity to make insertions in the RECORD or to make such remarks as they wish to make, to move that the Senate take a recess until Monday so as to give members of the Appropriations Committee every opportunity to complete work on the appropriation bill, and also to permit conferees on other bills an opportunity to meet without interruption to facilitate their reaching agreements.

I want it understood that if the supplemental appropriation bill, H. R. 5215, is ready on Monday we shall temporarily lay aside the unfinished business and begin immediate consideration of it. We want to dispose of appropriation bills as rapidly as we can.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The unfinished business is the bill providing for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges. The Senator from Arizona has mentioned the supplemental appropriation bill Can the Senator give us any idea as to what the program is for the further consideration of bills after those two bills?

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall make an announcement on Monday. We must dispose of the Bowles nomination. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is anxious to have Senate bill 2104, concerning fats and oils, which is an amendment to the Defense Production Act, considered promptly. The program for the remainder of next week will depend on the status of conference reports and appropriation bills and how we get along, but Senators should be ready to consider the judgeship bill, the Bowles nomination, the fats and oils amendment, and whatever other pending matters possible next week.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, the Senator proposes to take up the other two control bills which are on the calendar sometime next week, when, as, and if reached.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will not say that both remaining control amendments will be considered next week, but I want Senators to be prepared to take them up. Our first order of business is conference reports and appropriation bills. What we consider depends on how much progress we make. We must dispose of the Bowles nomination. We have one bill before us now, the bill providing for the appointment of additional judges, which may take a day. I do not know how

long the supplemental appropriation bill will require.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator still feel that he will get to Arizona by October 21?

Mr. McFARLAND. I hope so; I believe that when the two Houses dispose of the appropriation bills, including, of course, the conference reports on them, and the conference report on the tax bill, we shall be ready to adjourn almost any time. We shall do the best we can to dispose of other pending legislation, but the measures to which I have referred represent the "must" legislation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No. I wish to ask the Senator from Arizona a question.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I hold in my hand a copy of the Executive Calendar. Probably there will be some objection to one nomination, but there are also some routine nominations on the Executive Calendar. Would it be possible to have an executive session now to consider routine nominations on the Executive Calendar?

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly. Probably we can dispose of all the nominations this evening, except the Bowles nomination.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I know of no objection to the nominations other than to the Bowles nomination.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona said something about waiting on appropriation bills. We are up on all appropriation bills with one exception, and that exception is in the House of Representatives. The Senate is not behind with its appropriation bills. All appropriation bills can be disposed of during the next week without any trouble at all except for the one which is in the House of Representatives. We shall first have to get it from the House. I wanted to make that explanation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr BRIDGES. I wonder whether the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has in mind another bill also. There is a supplemental appropriation bill pending in committee, but in addition to that there are two appropriation bills, if I am not mistaken. One is an appropriation bill for military construction, on which we have had no hearings, and the other is an appropriation bill for foreign aid.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are both in the House. I thought there was only one bill. If there are two bills, the House is behind on them. It is not the Senate which is behind. We are essentially up with our bills.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am happy to know that the committee is making progress.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I wonder if the distinguished majority leader will inform the Senate whether there will be another and final call of the calendar before Congress adjourns.

Mr. McFARLAND. I believe we should have at least another call of the calendar before Congress adjourns.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE STEFAN—COMMITTEE TO ATTEND FUNERAL

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the resolution adopted yesterday regarding the funeral of Representative STEFAN, of Nebraska, it is provided that the Chair appoint a committee of five Senators. The Chair makes three appointments at the moment, and he will appoint the other Members later. The Chair appoints the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

THE WATER SHORTAGE IN THE COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, the people of my State at this time are very vitally concerned as to whether or not a water shortage in fact exists in the Columbia River Basin, thus reducing the electrical energy production to the point that the defense mobilization program is being curtailed. Idahoans are concerned to the extent of being alarmed, because of the fact that just recently we have had statements from Dr. Paul Raver, of the Bonneville Power Administration, and certain other individuals connected with the Department of the Interior, including Oscar Chapman, the Secretary, to the effect that the Columbia River, Snake River, and tributary rivers in the basin are at the lowest ebb in history. I do not believe that they are at the lowest ebb in history. It is my opinion that there has been some tremendous pressure and lobbying put on the people of the Northwest to try to convince them that the river is low and that it will mean the building of new and greater dams throughout the country. They seem to forget that these proposed dams, if authorized, will take 5 to 7 years to construct and there may be delays because of critical material shortages.

Without discussing the merits of any dam proposed or the question of private power as against public power, I believe without doubt that the Department of the Interior and the Bonneville Power Administration owe a duty to the people of the Northwest to explain to them certain broad publicity that has been given as to whether or not a water shortage actually exists. They have omitted to tell the people of the Northwest that any water shortage is caused by the storing of water in Grand Coulee and Hungry Horse Dams. If it does exist, why has the Harvey Machine Co., of Torrance, Calif., been approved by the Secretary of the Interior and the Defense Production Administration for a loan of $46,000,000 to erect a new aluminum plant within the State of Montana, which would make it the fourth largest aluminum plant in the United States? This company would use the much-needed power from the Columbia River Basin through the Hungry Horse Dam, thus lessening the power at some other critical production point.

In view of recent disclosures of influence peddling and high-pressure lobbying the people of my State, whether for or against more Government dams, want a fair, true, and complete disclosure of one Jebby Davidson, former Assistant Secretary of the Interior, who resigned last spring to enter private practice in Portland, Oreg. Mr. Davidson's principal client was the public power people called the Bonneville Power Administration, who handles the power under his old boss, the Secretary of the Interior. Now our people are informed he has a new client in the name of Harvey Machine Co., of Torrance, Calif., which recently, and after Davidson was appointed as their attorney, had a loan of the Taxpayers' money in the amount of $46,000,000, approved by Davidson's old employer, the Department of the Interior, and also by the Defense Production Administration. My people, both public and power people, are concerned that the foregoing facts smell of some more influence peddling and contract work. The people of Idaho demand and will receive a full accounting of this whole picture. I have asked the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], a fair and able procurer of facts, to assist me in getting the simple truth for the people of the Northwest who can smell fraud and high pressure for a long distance.

Mr. President, over 2 weeks ago Representative BUDGE, of Idaho, wrote to Secretary Chapman demanding a full disclosure of Davidson's connection with the Department of the Interior, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Harvey Machine Co. Although this letter was written over 2 weeks ago the Secretary, up to now, has remained mute to his requests. Now, Mr. President, the people of the Northwest want an explanation. They, of all groups and factions, do not want to be pressurized and above all, they will not be a party to any activity that might tend to mislead, and play for a sucker our pioneer people in the West.

A very enlightening article, to which I invite the attention of my colleagues, was written by John Corlett, and published in the Boise (Idaho) Daily Statesman of Sunday morning, September 30, 1951. Mr. Corlett is one of the leading political and economic writers of the West, writing in Idaho's oldest newspaper, the Idaho Daily Statesman.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICALLY SPEAKING

(By John Corlett)

No one in Government spent as much time in furthering a Columbia Valley administration than C. Girard "Jebby" Davidson, until early this year an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Davidson was the "father" of the Columbia Valley Administration. He had a major hand in drafting of legislation creating a CVA and in drafting of President Truman's special message of April 1949, asking Congress to create such an authority.

Davidson was a CVA booster long before that date and there is no reason to believe he since has changed his mind.

When he resigned as Assistant Secretary of the Interior in December 1950, he was kept on as a special consultant and was given a specific job by his boss, Oscar Chapman.

Davidson came out to the Pacific Northwest armed with the following letters from Chapman and Mr. Truman. Both letters were addressed to "Dear Jebby," and Chapman signed his "Oscar."

Wrote Oscar on December 19, 1950, in part:

"I realize that your generous offer of continued service to the Department involves some further interference with your plans. But since I know that the offer is sincerely made out of your characteristic sense of duty, I intend to take you up on it immediately. We are faced with an urgent problem which you, because of your experience as general counsel for the Bonneville Power Administration and of your responsibility for Pacific Northwest matters here in the Department for several years, are peculiarly well qualified to handle.

"Defense industry desperately needs the large blocks of cheap hydroelectric power that can be developed from the Columbia River system. While everyone in the region would like to see that latent power developed, there is as yet no large body of opinion united behind a single program for accomplishing this I am asking you, therefore, to consult with the public and private agencies and other individuals in the region, and to recommend to me as soon as possible a unified plan which will result in the quickest and most effective development of the great power resources of the area for defense purposes."

On December 21, 1950, President Truman wrote to "Jebby" in part:

"You have made a splendid record during your years of Government service as you have advanced from one post to another on the basis of merit and ability. I am especially appreciative of the fine work you have done over the last several years as Assistant Secretary of the Interior. You have been imaginative in approaching the duties of your office, and untiring in working for sound and progressive policies in the field with which you have been associated. You should feel particularly proud of the work you have done in helping to build a better and stronger America through the wise development and use of our natural resources.

"I am very glad to know that you are not severing your connection with the Government completely, and that you will be advising Secretary Chapman in the near future on the proper basis for proceeding with Federal power development in the Northwest in the light of the present emergency. I know he will be asking for your judgment from time to time on other matters as well. I, too, shall expect to call on you in the future for your help."

Davidson came into the Northwest intent on doing his job. He met with all the governors of the northwest States and representatives of both public and private agencies.

As far as is known, he made only one stop in Idaho, and that was in Boise in February.

He made his report to Chapman but it has never been made public.

No one, even among his friends, has been able to figure out exactly why he was given the special consultant job. Some think it merely gave him a chance to contact the right people and pick up clients for the private practice of law he was to enter.

It would, however, be interesting to learn what plan Davidson evolved for the development of the great power resources of the Northwest. Has he, for example, veered away from the CVA type of development?

Perhaps his report never will be made public.

The report completed, Davidson was ready to really start practicing law. And so it came about that the man who knew the interior of Interior like no other man of top position, became the legal counsel for the Harvey Machine Co., of Torrance, Calif.

He began lobbying to get the firm a $46,000,000 loan to open an aluminum reduction plant at Kalispell, Mont., an alumina plant at Everett, Wash, and to buy ore boats to ship the raw bauxite from Arkansas and the Gulf States.

This reporter is too far from the scene to dig into the dates when Harvey first was proposed for the loan and when Interior men themselves began pushing it into the No. 4 spot among the Nation's aluminum producers

Perhaps Davidson was pushing the Harvey Co. forward before he quit his post as assistant secretary.

Dr. Paul J. Raver, Bonneville power administrator, was doing it.

In the September 19 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Representative MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, seeking to extricate himself from any inference that he was a party to an "inside" deal in getting the Harvey loan, said:

"On July 18, 1950, I asked Dr Paul Raver, administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, the following question·

"'What is your opinion of the Harvey outfit?'

"Dr Raver answered·

"'I have been sizing them up * * * they are a typical small business As I see it, I think we ought to do everything we can to encourage this company to keep its head above water and I think they have a whale of a lot of initiative'"

One would infer from Raver's remarks that the company was not in good financial condition and he said it was necessary to keep its head above water.

Five months before Davidson left Interior, Dr. Raver was on the Harvey bandwagon. Was Davidson on the same bandwagon?

The question then becomes:

Where does influence begin and where does it end?

Should persons holding top position in the department which initiates such huge loans as proposed for Harvey, be working in behalf of that specific firm?

Is a firm that would be virtually given all the wherewithal to establish itself as a titan in industry, just picked out of thin air?

There are a lot of questions When and where did the Harvey brothers enter the picture? When did their influence begin?

Drew Pearson alleged the Harvey brothers "bulldozed" their way into the top rungs of the Democratic Party.

Yet the company could not meet the $7,000,000 condition of the $46,000,000 loan and Chapman came to the rescue by approving a proposal to cut the conditioning sum in half. And part of the half—who knows how much—could be raised by Harvey in "equipment, land, and engineering."

Perhaps the current congressional investigations can bring up the answers.

Just as an interesting aside at this point, the September 24 issue of Western Advertising carries this item:

"The Harvey aluminum division of the Harvey Machine Co., Inc., Torrance, Calif., has named Tilds and Cantz, Hollywood advertising agency, to handle advertising. The agency handles other advertising for Harvey. The company recently received a $46,000,000 Government loan for development of its aluminum division."

The loan, of course, is being held up, pending further investigation.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in the hope that it may expedite the consideration of the so-called judgeship bill, S. 1203, particularly with reference to the dispute as to whether or not a district judge in Tennessee should be appointed exclusively for the middle district or whether a roving judge should be appointed to serve the middle and western districts, and in the hope of shortening the debate on that issue, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a resolution adopted by the Dyer County Bar Association; a resolution adopted by the Lake County Bar Association; a resolution of the Weakley County Bar Association; an editorial entitled "A Thoughtless Answer," published on September 6, 1951, in the Memphis Press-Scimitar, the largest daily newspaper in west Tennessee; an editorial entitled "A Roving Judge If Any," published in the Commercial Appeal of September 16, 1951; an editorial entitled "Logic Demands a Roving Judge," published on October 4, 1951, in the Nashville Tennessean, the largest daily newspaper in middle Tennessee; and several telegrams and letters from prominent lawyers in west Tennessee.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has come to the attention of the Dyer County Bar Association that the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, through his efforts as Senator and a member of the Judiciary Committee an additional judgeship for the State of Tennessee; and

Whereas the Dyer County Bar Association recognizes the necessity of an additional Federal judgeship for the State of Tennessee to relieve the congested dockets of the various courts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Dyer County Bar Association, met in a special called meeting on this the 24th day of August 1951, That said bar association extend its thanks to the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER and commend his actions in this matter; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Dyer County Bar Association be instructed to forward this resolution to the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER.

Adopted·

GEORGE W. PIGUE,
President.
GRANGER LATTA,
Secretary.

Whereas the United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee now convenes in Memphis and Jackson; and

Whereas the distance from these two cities to points in those counties situated in the northwestern section of Tennessee including the counties of Dyer, Lake, Obion, Weakley, Lauderdale, and others, results in great, and at times, prohibitive expense and inconvenience to litigants, witnesses and jurors alike attending this court; and

Whereas the city of Dyersburg in Dyer County, Tenn., is centrally located in said northwestern section of the State and is conveniently accessible to all points in said section; and

Whereas the public convenience and necessity of this area would best be served by having the United States district court also convene in said city of Dyersburg in regular session: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Lake County Bar Association met in a special called meeting on this 27th day of August 1951, That it favors the designation of Dyersburg as an additional point for the establishment of a regular session of the United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee, and that said bar association take all reasonable measures to bring about the establishment of such a court in Dyersburg; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of said Lake County Bar Association be instructed to forward copies of this resolution to Senator K. D MCKELLAR, to Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, and to Representative JERE COOPER.

Adopted:

H. O. DONALDSON,
President,
JOHN L. WEST,
Acting Secretary.

WEAKLEY COUNTY,
Dresden, Tenn., August 27, 1951

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR At a recent meeting of the Weakley County Bar Association held in Dresden, Tenn , a resolution was unanimously passed appointing the undersigned as a committee to communicate with you and memoralize you to support the bill to create a roving Federal judgeship as reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee for middle and west Tennessee It is an evident fact that more and more litigation is being filed in the Federal district courts, and we think these courts should be made as geographically available as is possible, not only from the standpoint of the convenience of the litigants, but from the standpoint of members of the bar. Due to the increase in litigation in the Federal courts, it is our understanding that, while the docket in west Tennessee is fairly current, it has become very difficult for it to be kept that way, and we believe that it is only a question of time until there will be a positive necessity of an additional judge in west Tennessee We especially urge you to lend your support to designate Dresden as the place where said court will be held in the northern part of west Tennessee

About April of last year, Weakley County completed the construction of an $800,000 courthouse exclusive of equipment), which is located in Dresden, the county seat of Weakley County. This courthouse is modern in every respect and has all modern facilities and conveniences. This courthouse has four stories, including a basement and has installed therein a modern elevator service. There are three well equipped courtrooms, and all of said courtrooms and the entire building are well furnished. While there may be larger courthouses in the State of Tennessee, there are none better equipped or appointed than this courthouse building. We have discussed this matter with the county judge of Weakley County and satisfactory arrangements can be made for the holding of the United States district court in the building and space will be made available for all court officials.

The undersigned further state that Dresden is the logical place for the holding of said court from a geographical standpoint and without question will be the most convenient place for the northern counties of west Tennessee. We further call your attention to the fact that Dresden is 11 miles from the Henry County line and 21 miles from Paris, the county seat of Henry County; that Dresden is 15 miles from the Carroll County line and 25 miles from Huntingdon, the county seat of Carroll County; that Dresden is 35 miles from the Benton County line and 42 miles to Camden, the county seat of Benton County; that Dresden is 15 miles from the Gibson County line and 27 miles from Trenton, the county seat of Gibson County; that Dresden is 13 miles from the Obion County line and 21 miles from Union City, the county seat of Obion County; that Dresden is approximately 42 miles from the Lake County line and 45 miles to Tiptonville, the county seat of Lake County. This court would serve practically all of the Ninth Congressional District and serve counties in the Eighth Congressional District. The present location of the District Federal Court is a considerable distance from the northern tier of counties in west Tennessee and incurs burdensome expense to the lawyers and litigants in attending said court.

We earnestly request that you use your influence in having the court to set at Dresden in the event the bill is passed creating a roving judgeship for this territory.

Respectfully submitted.

HARRY E JONES,
Dresden, Tenn.
HOMER BRADBERRY,
Dresden, Tenn.
R. E. L. GALLIMORE,
Martin, Tenn.

A THOUGTHLESS ANSWER

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER'S proposal that a new Federal judge for middle Tennessee be given authority to "rove" in west Tennessee, if needed, is a sensible one.

The Memphis-Shelby County Bar Association's reply to Kefauver's query on the advisability of that matter didn't show much thought.

KEFAUVER introduced an amendment to a bill providing for the new middle Tennessee judge to extend jurisdiction to west Tennessee, then asked the bar association what it thought.

The bar association replied that Judge Marion Boyd was handling his west Tennessee docket speedily and that there was no need for services of a roving judge in west Tennessee.

As Senator KEFAUVER carefully pointed out in his letter to the bar association, circumstances could change.

Judge Boyd has been doing a good job—but Judge Boyd could become ill, as did the middle Tennessee judge recently. Or there could be a trial running for many weeks

West Tennessee could be confronted with a whopping docket and a sick judge, either separately or together.

The simple provision of additional jurisdiction for the new middle Tennessee judge is a look into an unpredictable future.

It is preparing for rainy days.

Abruptly deciding that things are fine right now and assuming they always will be is looking at the end of your nose and no farther.

We believe the statesmanlike forethought of Senator KEFAUVER in this judge matter is commendable.

We are not proud of our local bar association for acting something like the ostrich, and without much grace, either.

A ROVING JUDGE, IF ANY

A proposal by Senator MCKELLAR was that an additional Federal judgeship be created in Tennessee to serve the middle portion of the State exclusively. When this proposition reached the Senate Judiciary Committee of which Senator KEFAUVER is a member, he suggested that the bill be amended to provide that the new judge divide his time between west and middle Tennessee. There is far more involved than a contest between our junior and senior Senators.

At the present time the docket in middle Tennessee is badly congested due to the extended illness of Judge Elmer Davies. At the same time, Judge Marion Boyd, in this area, has his work well up to date. It is easily conceivable, however, that both of these conditions are temporary and certainly provision should be made on the assumption that they will change.

If a judge qualified to serve in both middle and west Tennessee were now available the congestion in Judge Davies' court would be speedily cleared up. There is no reason to believe that enough business would remain in that district to keep two men busy regularly.

It seems to us that Judge Boyd has done and is doing a good job, but that very fact dictates against overtaxing him and his court Memphis is growing more rapidly than any other section of Tennessee. The greater the population the greater the load for the Federal court. Another highly pertinent item is that Memphis' growth involves constant additions to the sizable and substantial commercial and industrial facilities of the city and section. This state of affairs will also inevitably enlarge the duties and responsibilities of the court.

If there were a roving Federal judge available for middle and west Tennessee, Federal court could be held at locations other than Memphis and Jackson and this would mean a material convenience for lawyers, jurors, witnesses and persons concerned in legal actions Presumably the people in a number of middle Tennessee communities would be similarly favored by a judge with what we believe the lawyers call concurrent jurisdiction.

All the circumstances seem to put logic on the side of creating a roving judgeship if there is to be any new one at all.

LOGIC DEMANDS A ROVING JUDGE

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER has done well to abstain from personalities in support of the Tennessee Federal judgeship bill which is now ready for a vote in the Senate In defense of his proposal for a roving judge to serve both middle and west Tennessee, rather than one who will operate in the mid-State alone, he has relied upon logic and an array of convincing facts.

From every standpoint, it is unfortunate that this bill should have become a matter of controversy, with Senator KENNETH D MCKELLAR leading a determined fight against the measure as approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee. The issue does not seem important enough to germinate such heat

The Senate membership, it is to be hoped, will view the matter on its merits and provide for the existing and future judicial needs in our State.

Tennessee is entitled to one additional judge, and in view of the past illness of Judge Elmer Davies, of the middle Tennessee district, it is conceded that the new jurist should lend a hand to ease the present load. Although Judge Davies' health is reportedly improved, he is entitled to this assistance.

The important questions are whether there would be sufficient business for two full-time Federal judges in the middle district, and whether the new judge could not better serve by helping to care for the case load in two districts. Senator KEFAUVER insists that two judges would be superfluous in the middle district, but that a roving judge for the middle and west districts would serve an important purpose.

By dint of arduous work, Federal Judge Boyd in west Tennessee has kept his docket current, but since his is a rapidly growing section the case load is almost certain to increase. For reasons of illness or a trial running many weeks, it is pointed out, the west Tennessee docket could as easily become overcrowded as that in middle Tennessee.

Among the lawyers of the northern part of west Tennessee there is strong support for Senator KEFAUVER'S amendment which is coupled with the expressed desire that the roving judge be permitted to hold court in that thickly populated area because of the in-

convenience to lawyers and litigants now required to attend court in Memphis or Jackson. The Dyer and Weakley County Bar Associations have so gone on record, and many lawyers in adjoining counties have given enthusiastic support to the plan.

Both of Memphis' daily newspapers have given strong editorial support to the roving judge measure, although the bar association in that city has taken an opposite stand.

Senator KEFAUVER has summed it all up in a letter to his colleagues, a letter, by the way, which is a restrained answer to one previously written by Senator MCKELLAR. He says:

"West Tennessee has a larger population and is growing more rapidly than middle Tennessee; the case load is heavier; west Tennessee has more lawyers; a roving judge in west Tennessee would make it possible for court to be held at Dyersburg or some other suitable place in the northwest section for the convenience of lawyers and litigants of those areas; the time of the judge would be fully utilized if he sat in both districts."

That is a concise and convincing summation which justifies the concluding statement that "the facts sustain the present provisions of the bill in question, and it would be illogical to change it."

Middle Tennesseans have a direct interest in relief for Judge Davies, but in their minds there is no sectional or political issue involved. In the light of facts, the institution of a roving judge for service in two districts is both practical and advisable. The layman has been impressed by Senator KEFAUVER'S declaration that he would be entirely willing for a middle Tennessean to be appointed to the post, in agreement with his protesting colleague.

By deciding the judgeship controversy on its merits, the Senate has the opportunity of meeting the judicial needs of two Tennessee districts, instead of establishing two judges in one district. A vote to this desirable end would be a public service.

UNION CITY, TENN., *September 18, 1951.*

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned members of Union City and Obion County bar association earnestly urge passage of roving judgeship bill for middle and west Tennessee. The site of the present court in Memphis and Jackson works a handicap to lawyers and litigants in our part of west Tennessee. We believe that a roving judge would be desirable in view of the large increase in population in west Tennessee and rapid industrialization in this and surrounding sections.

Paul G. Hudgins, Tom Elam, Robert Fry, Sam C. Nailling, E. H. (Tito) Lannon, David G Caldwell, Hardy M. Gramham, Chas. B Fields, W. E. Hudgins, W. M. Miles, C. W. Miles 3d, George Cloys, Fenner Heathcock.

MILAN, TENN., *September 18, 1951.*

Hon ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Undersigned members of Gibson County bar strongly urge passage of amendment to bill creating additional judgeship in Tennessee, so as to make such judgeship cover west Tennessee. Site and present court sittings work great handicap to lawyers and litigants in this portion of west Tennessee. Due to increase of Federal practice, increase of population and rapid industrialization, we feel definite need of roving judge.

Z. D. Atkins, Hal Holmes, W R. Kenton, W. R. Kenton, Jr., Curry Drake, L. L. Harrell, A. H. Schoonover, Ralph R. Lawler.

DYERSBURG, TENN.,
August 28, 1951.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senator from Tennessee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: Enclosed herewith is a resolution adopted by the Lake County Bar Association, which resolution is self-explanatory. This resolution is an endorsement of the resolution by the Dyer County Bar Association forwarded to you on August 25, 1951. We would appreciate your earnest consideration of this matter.

Yours very truly,
DYER COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION,
By GRANGER LATTA, *Secretary.*

MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE,
August 21, 1951

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR: As a practicing attorney at the Memphis bar, and in the United States court in the western district of Tennessee, I am interested in the bill pending in the Congress to provide a new Federal judge. My information is that there is some question as to whether the jurisdiction of this new judge is to be extended to the western district of Tennessee.

I am strongly in favor of the extension of jurisdiction of the proposed new judge to cover west Tennessee. The work in Federal court here has grown tremendously in the last several years, due largely to—first, the increase in the population of the city of Memphis, and, second, the extension of the Federal jurisdiction by congressional legislation. This increase is calculated to be much more substantial during the next 4 or 5 years. Cases are likely to be brought in the Federal court, here, which will take as much as 30 to 60 days to try. I know of such cases now existing in neighboring districts. In such event the docket would very quickly get beyond control of one judge. Already the present judge has a docket which calls for heavy work at this hands.

In my opinion, 90 percent of the west Tennessee lawyers would, unless controlled by political considerations, be favorable to west Tennessee being included in the jurisdiction of the proposed new judge.

You know how closely I feel toward you, and I believe you know I am sincere in the beliefs expressed above.

Your friend,
R. GARLAND DRAPER.

MEMPHIS, TENN ,
September 26, 1951.

Hon ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: I note from the papers that Mr. Charles Morgan, secretary of the Memphis and Shelby County Bar Association, has written you in regard to the creation of a new Federal judgeship, stating that the bar association does not approve your proposal of the roving judge.

As a member of the Memphis and Shelby County Bar Association in good standing, I would like to go on record in saying that I have never been afforded the opportunity to vote on this matter, and as a member I feel that is my right; I certainly do not like the idea of someone speaking for me without authority.

I have heard the matter discussed very intelligently, and wish to say that I think you are 100 percent correct in proposing the roving Federal judge, and hope you are successful in your endeavor.

You are at liberty to use this letter in any manner you see fit if it will help your cause in any way.

With best regards to you and Dick, I am

Yours truly,
GEORGE A. MCCORMICK.

TAYLOR & TAYLOR,
Memphis, Tenn., September 27, 1951.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am of the opinion that your stand on the judgeship issue has met general approval throughout west Tennessee Most of the lawyers in Memphis that I have heard speak of it have approved your stand. I was up in Gibson County and talked to the lawyers and the laymen there and I talked to them in several other counties, and the opinion is the same everywhere that I went or have heard from. I have been very friendly to Senator MCKELLAR but I think this is the worst mistake he ever made and it is hurting him very badly. I have not heard anyone either in Memphis or outside criticize your stand and so far as I know it has the general approval of the public.

I am very fond of Judge Boyd and I do not feel that your action is any reflection on him whatever. Some of the lawyers here and elsewhere are making a bitter fight on him, however. But I see no reason for it.

I just thought I would write you what the real situation is in west Tennessee.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,
HILLSMAN TAYLOR.

MEMPHIS, TENN.,
September 21, 1951.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ESTES: This letter is to inform you that I am wholeheartedly behind you in your efforts to secure the roving Federal judgeship for Tennessee.

I can think of no logical reason for Senator MCKELLAR'S position in the matter and I believe that most of the lawyers in Memphis feel the same way as I. The mere fact that Judge Boyd's calendar is up to date is no argument against confering jurisdiction over west Tennessee on the new office

With the kindest regards to you and the members of your family, I am

Sincerely yours,
HAM PATTERSON.

MEMPHIS, TENN.,
September 20, 1951.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SIR. I am behind you in your fight to secure the roving Federal judgeship for Tennessee. Senator MCKELLAR'S position is inexplicable.

Respectfully your,
A WEEKS.

MEMPHIS, TENN ,
September 20, 1951.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C

DEAR ESTES: I would like to give you my support on the position you have taken with reference to the proposed new judgeship for Tennessee. I can see no reason for anyone to feel personally affronted by your proposal which seems very definitely to be the best plan.

Though the final decision should not rest with lawyers in a matter of this kind, I believe you have a very strong support in the lawyers in west Tennessee, including Memphis. I feel sure that the sentiment of the

members of the Memphis bar have not been properly communicated to you, except by what individual letters you have received.

I would suggest that if you think it feasible an inquiry be sent to the members of the bar in west Tennessee inquiring of their position in the matter.

At any rate, I desired that you should know how I feel about it.

Very truly yours,

HOMER L. ARMSTRONG.

MEMPHIS, TENN.,
September 7, 1951.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have read with interest in the newspapers of Memphis, Tenn., your proposal to have the President appoint a roving Federal judge for middle and west Tennessee.

I understand it is your idea that such a judge would sit and hold court in either middle or west Tennessee when and as needed, and probably hold court in sections where Federal court is not now held, thus affording great convenience to litigants and lawyers in those sections.

If your purpose and intent are as indicated above, I want to say that I am heartily in favor of your proposal, and to wish you success in your endeavors.

Incidentally, the newspapers here gave the impression, I think, that all of the lawyers in Memphis and Shelby County are opposed to your plan, in stating that the Memphis and Shelby County Bar Association opposed it. I am a member of the bar association and have been for many years, and wish to state to you that I knew nothing about the position and attitude to be taken by the bar association until I read the newspaper accounts. To my knowledge, there was no meeting of the bar association held to determine the wishes of its members, and, to my knowledge, the rank and file of the lawyers were not consulted.

I speak only for myself, but I am sure there are many lawyers here who feel the same way I do about your proposal, although some of them would doubtless hesitate to say so or to take any part in the controversy.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD M. BARBER

HALLS, TENN., *September 12, 1951.*

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been requested to write you in regard to establishing a branch of the Federal court for west Tennessee, at Dyersburg, for the convenience of those counties lying in the northwest corner of the State, and being a member of that part of the bar naturally I would be glad to see this done.

If it is not too burdensome on the finances and you could support such a bill in the Senate if and when it reaches the Senate floor, I would like to know that you would support this bill.

I am yours truly,

W. C. PATTON.

PARIS, TENN., *August 17, 1951.*

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your usual good sense appears to be in evidence to your Federal judgeship bill. It seems to be conceded that such a judge should be available for necessary work in west Tennessee, but some make the strange insistence that the judge must be a middle Tennessee judge and a resident of that part of the State. Nothing could be more obviously fair than that the west Tennessee lawyers should now and in the future be eligible for the judgeship that serves them.

It is true that our friend, Judge Boyd, is young, able and commendably industrious, with the result that west Tennessee work is being well taken care of. He must be doing more than his share, however, and should not be expected to continue that load indefinitely.

I am sure west Tennesseans appreciate your position.

Yours truly,

FISHER NEAL.

DRESDEN, TENN., *August 27, 1951.*

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR. You no doubt have received a copy of the resolutions adopted by the Weakley County Bar Association, which is self-explanatory

The bar has asked me to write you further regarding this roving judgeship, and as you will note from the resolutions, geographically, Dresden should be the logical place to hold Federal Court.

Anything you can do, I assure you will be greatly appreciated by me and the Weakley County Bar Association.

Very truly yours,

MALCOLM R DUKE

DYERSBURG, TENN., *August 25, 1951*

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ESTES Yesterday the Dyer County Bar Association passed two resolutions regarding the Federal courts—one endorsing the idea of the creation of an additional judgeship in support of your position in the matter, and the other favoring the establishing of a regular session of the Federal district court in Dyer County These resolutions are being forwarded to you by the secretary of our bar association.

Concerning the resolution about establishing a court session at Dyersburg, we are taking steps to enlist the support of the bars in the surrounding counties that would be served and benefited by the court, and we hope to have them forward to you endorsements of this plan at a very early date

I am enclosing herewith a newspaper clipping from today's Commercial Appeal explaining the action of our bar association We will appreciate your continued efforts to establish the additional judgeship for middle and west Tennessee, and to give serious consideration to the location of a session of the United States district court at Dyersburg.

With kindest personal regards.

Yours very truly,

BARRET ASHLEY.

MEMPHIS, TENN.,
August 27, 1951.

HON ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ESTES: Press releases in the Memphis daily newspapers state that the board of directors of the Memphis and Shelby County Bar Association are opposing your efforts to secure the appointment of a roving judge to serve the middle and western divisions of the United States Court in Tennessee.

In my opinion, this action by the Memphis and Shelby County Bar Association is purely political in nature and does not reflect the views of the rank and file of lawyers of the local bar.

So far as I know, there was nothing to prevent the officials of the local bar association from calling a special meeting for the purpose of ascertaining the views of the members of the bar.

Memphis is one of the fastest growing cities in the United States, and certainly the western district of Tennessee, on a geographical basis, is far more populous than either of the other grand divisions of the State. This must necessarily increase the workload of our district court. The Congress is continually adding to the jurisdiction of Federal courts, and it would be to the manifest interest and advantage of the citizenry and the practitioners to have a judge available in case the workload became too heavy under any circumstances for the judge sitting in this division.

I respectfully urge that you continue your efforts to secure the appointment of a roving judge for the State of Tennessee.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. TILLMAN.

MEMPHIS, TENN.,
August 27, 1951.

HON ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D .C.

DEAR ESTES: I see from the press that you and Senator MCKELLAR are having differences with respect to the appointment of an additional Federal judge

I think the Western District of Tennessee should have the services of this new judge available. I can see no argument whatsoever against it. Why should middle Tennessee have the exclusive services of an additional Federal judge, when at the same time west Tennessee might be given his services also when it became necessary?

It is not a question of the heavy workload or the condition of the docket of Judge Boyd in this district We do not know when the work might become a burden, so why not have the services of an additional judge available when they are needed

Memphis is growing, west Tennessee is growing, and Congress is passing laws adding to the jurisdiction of the Federal courts· I am for you in your efforts and hope you will continue them to give the western district the services of the additional judge.

I do not know and have not tried to find out the processes brought into action in the movement of the directors of the bar association here I do not regard it as significant one way or the other I am looking at the matter from the standpoint of merit only.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

GROVER MCCORMICK.

HARSH, PIERCE, COCHRAN,
RICKEY & CAREY,
Memphis, Tenn., August 23, 1951.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: Lucius Burch has mentioned the matter of the Federal judgeship in Tennessee to me, and has given me a copy of his letter to you of August 20, and I am in accord with his opinion.

With reference to the condition of Judge Boyd's docket, I think this is due to two things: one is Judge Boyd's unusual efficiency in handling his cases; and, second, the purely accidental circumstance that there has been no lengthly litigation in his court of the type mentioned by Mr. Burch in which Mr. Walter Armstrong has been involved in another district. There was an antitrust case here that would have required a long time to try, and would have left Judge Boyd's docket in a crowded condition, set for trial a couple of years ago, which was settled before trial, and to the best of my knowledge no single case tried by Judge Boyd recently has required more than a week, which I believe is unusual.

I certainly cannot understand what objection any one would have to the availability

of the services of an extra judge in this district should they be needed.

With personal regards, I am

Cordially yours,

ALBERT C. RICKEY.

MEMPHIS, TENN., *August 21, 1951.*

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: It is my understanding that the roving judge for the United States courts in Tennessee may extend to the western district which is very pleasing to hear and this is to request that you exert your efforts in this direction. Being a member of the local bar and having some Federal practice, I am personally interested and feel that quite a number of lawyers here are likewise interested. However, under the political set-up in Shelby County, some of the lawyers may be reluctant to express their views in this matter.

There has been a very remarkable growth in the population of Memphis during the last several years, consequently the volume of work has increased and will steadily increase in the Federal court as the city continues to grow. Also the jurisdiction of Federal courts has been increasing and will continue to increase in the future. Unquestionably in my judgment, there is need for another judge in this jurisdiction which need will be more urgent in the future.

Best regards to you.

SAM F. COLE.

MEMPHIS, TENN., *August 21, 1951.*

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D C.

DEAR ESTES: As a member of the Memphis and Shelby County Bar Association, the Bar Association of the State of Tennessee, and of the American Bar Association, I would like to express my desire of having a roving judge appointed to hold court in the United States District Court for the Western Division of the Western District of Tennessee In my opinion, there is a great need for such a judge.

Memphis is a rapidly growing metropolis. There will be increasing business and litigation in this court, and one judge cannot physically take care of the work.

Very truly yours,

HUNTER LANE.

MEMPHIS, TENN., *August 22, 1951.*

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: Mr. Lucius Burch of the Memphis bar has suggested I write you and tell you what I think of your proposal that, if an additional Federal judgeship is created in Tennessee, the new judge should have jurisdiction both in middle and west Tennessee and should try cases in both districts where and as needed.

While the committee appointed by the board of directors of the Memphis and Shelby County Bar Association to investigate this proposal has found "western Tennessee does not need a new roving Federal judge because the record shows the docket of Judge Boyd's court is in better shape than any other in the United States," no one can foresee that Judge Boyd or his successor may not become ill and the court docket become congested because of the judge's illness. I believe the newly created judgeship's jurisdiction should include both the middle and western districts of Tennessee.

Kindest personal regards.

Yours very truly,

THOMAS C. RHEM.

MEMPHIS, TENN., *August 21, 1951.*

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: With reference to the appointment of a roving Federal judge for the State of Tennessee, it seems there is some doubt as to the limits of this judge's jurisdiction. As a member of the Memphis and Shelby County Bar, I am interested in the western division of the western district of Tennessee. At the present time this court is handling a large volume of business due to the increased criminal and civil jurisdiction by recent congressional enactments and I think that the new judge should have jurisdiction in the western division of the western district. I respectfully urge you to sincerely consider this matter. With the kindest regards, I beg to remain,

J. E. MADDEN.

TRENTON, TENN., *August 14, 1951.*

The Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER,
The United States Senate,
Washington D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It has come to my attention through newspaper reports that you have been successful in amending the omnibus judicial bill in the Senate Judiciary Committee to provide that an additional United States district judge of Tennessee be a roving jurist in the middle and western districts.

I wish to endorse this bill wholeheartedly, and to advise you that I believe that all the members of the bar in Gibson County heartily endorse this type of district judge.

Sincerely,

GAYLE I. MALONE.

BOLIVAR, TENN., *August 14, 1951.*

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: I have been glad to learn of your success in amending the omnibus judicial bill in the Judiciary Committee to provide that any additional United States district judge for Tennessee would be a roving jurist in the middle and western districts.

I am convinced that this is a much better plan than to have an additional judge for the middle district. I am glad to recommend this plan and will ask other members of the local bar to express their approval to you.

Very truly yours,

EWING J. HARRIS.

BURCH, PORTER & JOHNSON,
Memphis, Tenn., August 20, 1951.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: On Saturday Mr. Wallace, your administrative assistant, called to inquire the sentiment of the local bar regarding your proposal that, if an additional Federal judgeship is created in Tennessee, the new judge should have jurisdiction both in middle and west Tennessee and should try cases in both divisions where and as needed.

As I understand it, there are really two questions involved—first, whether any additional judgeship is needed. The directors of the Memphis and Shelby County Bar Association made a study of the matter and, after talking with Judge Martin and Judge Boyd, concluded there was no present need for any additional Federal judgeship in west Tennessee. My own observation is in accord with that conclusion. Judge Boyd is current with his docket, and if west Tennessee alone were to be considered it would seem a useless burden on the taxpayers to saddle them with an additional judicial salary.

However, as I understand the matter, the condition of the docket is very bad in middle Tennessee because of the illness of Judge Davies and the case load of both judges is such, in the opinion of the Judiciary Committee, as to justify the creation of a new judgeship. If a new judgeship is to be created, it seems to me plain that it would be better for the judge to have jurisdiction to hear cases in both divisions where and as needed. It is true that Judge Boyd is presently current with his docket but he, as well as Judge Davies or any other man, may become ill. At the moment Mr. Walter Armstrong, Jr, of this bar is trying a case in the United States district court at Vicksburg which has been on trial for several months and seems likely to continue for several months more. Similar cases may be tried here at any time, and it can be imagined what such a case will do to the docket of any court. If the Judiciary Committee has decided upon the creation of an additional judgeship, I would be in favor of a proposal to allow us to get maximum service from the new judge and not confine his jurisdiction to a small area which temporarily has a congested docket because of the illness of the district judge.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Yours very truly,

LUCIUS E. BURCH, Jr.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a few days ago reference was made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to my not answering a letter from Mr. Charles G. Morgan, secretary of the Memphis and Shelby County Bar Association. The letter was answered under date of August 28. I ask unanimous consent that my reply also be printed in the body of the RECORD

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 28, 1951.

MR. CHARLES G MORGAN,
Secretary, Memphis and Shelby County Bar Association, Memphis, Tenn

DEAR MR. MORGAN: Thank you for your letter of August 18 advising me that the board of directors of your association feels that there is no need for an additional United States judge for the Western District of Tennessee at this time. I am glad to have the opinion of your association that Judge Boyd is current in his district and does not presently need any help. That is exactly in line with all of the information I have received. Everyone speaks well of Judge Boyd's ability to keep his docket current. Indeed, if only Judge Boyd's court were considered, the question of the additional judgeship would not have arisen at this time.

The question about which I wish your association would advise me is, If an additional judgeship is created should the additional judge have jurisdiction in both middle and west Tennessee?

As you know, the docket in middle Tennessee is very badly congested, largely because of an extended illness of Judge Davies. Since the case load in both middle and west Tennessee is higher than the national average, it was the opinion of the Judiciary Committee that an additional judgeship was warranted to serve both jurisdictions. It seemed to me that if such a judgeship was created it should be upon a basis where the litigants and the lawyers would get maximum service from the additional judge, and I thought it would be well for the judge to have jurisdiction in both middle and west Tennessee rather than confine his jurisdiction solely to middle Tennessee. My reasons for this are as follows:

First. The congested docket in middle Tennessee is due to the illness of the trial judge. Undoubtedly two judges will clear this up

quickly, and then there will not be sufficient business in that one district to occupy two judges, in my opinion. While Judge Boyd is in excellent health, and we hope he will remain so, he, like all of us, is subject to the ills of the flesh and may himself be indisposed, in which event the additional judge would be available to lighten his load.

Second. The population of Memphis is growing more rapidly than any other section of the State and the increase in population will naturally result in a heavier case load. (As you know, the eastern district already is split with two divisions.)

Third. The growth of industrial and commercial activity in the Memphis area exceeds that of any other section of the State. Commercial and industrial disputes result in long litigation and a series of extended lawsuits can wreck any judge's docket. A member of your bar is presently engaged in a litigation in Vicksburg that has been on trial for several months and may continue for several months more. It is reasonably to be expected that Memphis might be the forum of such a suit or, indeed, several of them at any time. It would be a great convenience to the jurors, witnesses, litigants, and lawyers in other parts of west Tennessee if court might be held elsewhere than at Memphis and Jackson. There is considerable interest in this throughout west Tennessee, and I have resolutions from other bar associations in west Tennessee supporting the roving judge, undoubtedly, with the idea that other places of holding court will be established.

In short, it seems to me that Judge Boyd is working to capacity right now and that it would be a good thing to create a judicial reserve, so to speak, that might be drawn on as the need arises.

Judgeships with concurrent jurisdiction are quite common in the Federal judiciary and elsewhere. The best example of their usefulness that I know of is to be found right in Shelby County, where you have four circuit judges of concurrent jurisdiction and two chancellors.

I would be glad to have the ideas of your association on the specific question, "If an additional Federal judgeship is to be created, should jurisdiction extend to west Tennessee?"

Thanking you for your help in this matter, I remain

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona. [Putting the question.]

On this question, the result of a vote is a tie; and the Chair votes in favor of the motion. [Laughter.]

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, does that carry the motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes, that carries it; and the Senate is now in executive session.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Chair.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Francis Xavier Chapados, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 4, District of Alaska, vice Frank Barr, resigned, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Maj. Gen. George Anthony Horkan, United States Army, for appointment as the Quartermaster General, United States Army;

Lt. Gen. Stephen J. Chamberlin, commanding general, Fifth Army (major general, U. S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. James George Christiansen, and sundry other officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Alfred O. Heidobler, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Robert Walker Robinson, and sundry other officers for promotion in the United States Air Force;

Lt. Gen. Richard Emmel Nugent, Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, United States Air Force (major general, U. S Air Force), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. Reginald Carl Harmon (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, for appointment in the permanent grade of major general in the Regular Air Force;

Maj. Gen. Bryant LeMaire Boatner and sundry other officers for appointment in the United States Air Force,

Brig Gen Alfred August Kessler and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the Air Force of the United States;

Bernt Balchen and sundry other persons for appointment in the United States Air Force,

Rear Adm Murrey L. Royar, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy;

Rear Adm. Charles W Fox, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving under a Presidential designation as Chief of Naval Material;

Eugene H Pillsbury and Spencer A Barrow, officers of the Supply Corps of the Navy for permanent appointment as ensign in the line of the Navy;

Gordan A Anderson, and sundry other line officers of the Navy for permanent appointment as ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy;

Gordon A. Anderson, for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy;

James A. Stuart, for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general, in the Marine Corps; and

Homer L. Litzenberg, Jr, for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles S. Vigil, of Colorado, to be United States attorney for the district of Colorado.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George L. Robertson, of Missouri, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lucius Marshall Walker, Jr., of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Virgina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations of nominations.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AUTHORIZATION FOR VICE PRESIDENT TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS DURING THE RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills during the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, October 8, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate October 4 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Francis Xavier Chapados, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No 4, district of Alaska, vice Frank Barr, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 4 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Charles S Vigil to be United States attorney for the district of Colorado.

George L Robertson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Lucius Marshall Walker, Jr., to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Virginia.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be senior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Howard E. Fleischer
Edwin W. Bohrer
Victor F. Serino
Richard F. Bolte
Allums F. Smith

To be senior assistant scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Colvin L. Gibson
Kelsey C. Milner
Robert Holdenried

To be senior assistant sanitarians (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Louis J. Ogden
George R. Hayes, Jr.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1951

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we again beseech Thee to grant Thy infallible and unerring wisdom and counsel unto all the Members of the Congress who, during these perilous days, are bearing the responsibility and anguish of making decisions which are of momentous and far-reaching significance.

We know that the soul of man is not able and sufficient to be its own guide. May we accept the gracious overtures of Thy divine spirit to bring our finite minds into harmony with Thy supreme intelligence which controls and directs the stately order of the vast universe of which we are only an infinitesimal part.

We pray that we may never live on those low levels of deceit and duplicity, of hypocrisy and dishonesty to which our baser self would drag us down, but may we be true to our better self and aspire to reach those loftier heights of truth and righteousness, of heroic endeavor and noble achievement, and of moral beauty and spiritual loveliness.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order today for the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar to be called, and also that it may be in order to consider bills under suspension of the rules, with the understanding as it was heretofore announced, that it is with reference to the consideration of one bill under suspension of the rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATION FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 340) making appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1952.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this resolution briefly?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. As the gentleman knows, this is a resolution reported out of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations. It is a unanimous request for $5,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration to pay indemnities to dependents of veterans, most of whom are victims of the Korean war. There were some 12,000 of these cases pending, and perhaps 15,000 by now. This item passed the House in August, and is a part of the first supplemental appropriation for this fiscal year. It is pending in the other body, but the situation is so urgent that the Veterans' Administration has asked that it be taken up out of order and passed immediately as a separate item.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, I, of course, have no objection and withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. This measure provides automatic insurance for the men who are killed in Korea, which the Committee on Veterans' Affairs asked for, does it not?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc, That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, the following sum:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITIES

For payment of liabilities under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, $5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WATER FACILITIES FOR THE SAN DIEGO, CALIF., AREA

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5102) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval and Marine Corps installations and defense production plants in such area, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, subject to the provisions of section 3 of this act, the Secretary of the Navy, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized and directed to provide for—

"(1) such enlargement of the existing adequate extending from the west end of the San Jacinto tunnel of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California to the San Vicente Reservoir in San Diego County, Calif., as may be necessary to increase the rated capacity of such existing aqueduct from 85 cubic feet per second to not less than 165 cubic feet per second, or

"(2) the construction of a new aqueduct paralleling such existing aqueduct and having a rated capacity of not less than 80 cubic feet per second.

"SEC. 2. The use of all water diverted through said works from the Colorado River shall be subject to and controlled by the Colorado River Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the California Self-Limitation Statute and the Mexican Water Treaty and shall be included within and shall in no way increase the total quantity of water to the use of which the State of California is entitled and limited by said compact, statutes, and treaty.

"SEC 3. No construction shall be undertaken under the authority of section 1 of this act and no funds shall be expended for the preparation of plans or specifications for any such construction unless and until the Secretary of the Navy has entered into a contract with the San Diego County Water Authority amending the contract (NOy-13300) of October 17, 1945 (providing for the completion of such existing aqueduct), to provide—

"(1) for the computation of the true cost of the work performed under the authority of section 1 of this act in the same manner as provided for determining true cost in such contract of October 17, 1945;

"(2) for the repayment of the true cost of the work performed under the authority of section 1 of this act, together with interest on such amount computed at the rate certified by the Secretary of the Treasury to be the average rate paid by United States on its long-term loans, within a period of 40 years after the completion and delivery to the San Diego County Water Authority of possession of the works constructed under the authority of this act: *Provided*, That repayment shall be made in annual installments of not less than one-fortieth of the true cost due when computed as herein prescribed plus annually accrued interest;

"(3) that the use of all water diverted through said works from the Colorado River shall be subject to and controlled by the Colorado River Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the California Self-Limitation Statute and the Mexican Water Treaty and shall be included within and shall in no way increase the total quantity of water to the use of which the State of California is entitled and limited by the said compact, treaty, and statutes,

"(4) for the conveyance by the United States to the San Diego County Water Authority of title to the works constructed (including all rights-of-way and other interests in land used in connection with such works) under such contract of October 17, 1945, together with the works constructed under the authority of section 1 of this act, upon repayment of the true cost of such works, including interest, computed as hereinabove set forth, and

"(5) that after the effective date of this contract the member agencies of the San Diego County Water Authority, their successors or assigns as the distributors of the water, shall furnish to the Government on a preferential basis and at a rate no higher than that charged other users of comparable quantities of water, a quantity of water sufficient to meet the requirements of Government activities located and to be located in the area served by such agencies.

"SEC 4. For the purpose of enabling him to carry out the provisions of the first section of this act, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to acquire lands and rights pertaining thereto, or other interests therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation,

purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise.

"SEC. 5. The United States and the San Diego County Water Authority and their respective permittees, licensees, and contractees and all users and appropriators of water of the Colorado River diverted or delivered through the existing aqueduct and the enlargement or addition thereto shall observe and be subject to the Colorado River Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the California Self-Limitation Statute and the Mexican Water Treaty in the diversion, delivery, and use of water of the Colorado River, anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, and such condition and covenant shall attach as a matter of law whether or not set out or referred to in the instrument evidencing such permit, license, or contract and shall be deemed to be for the benefit of and be available to the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming and the users of water therein or thereunder by way of suit, defense, or otherwise in any litigation respecting the waters of the Colorado River.

"SEC. 6 The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to provide for the construction of the whole or any part of the work authorized by the first section of this act (1) by contract, (2) by the use of facilities and personnel of the Navy Department, or (3) by the use of the facilities and personnel of any other department or agency of the United States with which an agreement may be entered into to perform or to have performed the whole or any part of such work.

"SEC 7. The appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act is hereby authorized.

"SEC 8. This act and all works constructed hereunder shall be subject to and controlled by the Colorado River Compact dated November 24, 1922, and proclaimed effective by the President June 25, 1929; the Boulder Canyon Project Act approved December 21, 1928; the California Limitation Act approved by the Governor of California March 4, 1929; and no right or claim of right to the use of the waters of the Colorado River shall be aided or prejudiced hereby."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval installations and defense production plants in such area.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand this amendment is simply changing the phraseology of the bill.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman is correct. It is the bill that passed the House. There are certain corrections in the language which do not change the intent or purpose of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And it has the unanimous approval of the committee?

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE BILL S. 1864

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill S. 1864.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

THREE-YEAR PRESUMPTIVE PERIOD FOR VETERANS DEVELOPING MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3205) to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10-percent-or-more degree of disability within 3 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service-connected, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That the second last proviso of subparagraph (c) of paragraph I, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after the words '3 years' the words ', or multiple sclerosis developing a 10-percent degree of disability or more within 2 years'."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10-percent-or-more degree of disability within 2 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service-connected."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the Senate amendments for the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H. R. 3205.

As passed by the House, this bill would provide a 3-year presumptive period for veterans developing the disease of multiple sclerosis. The Senate amendment reduces this period to 2 years.

The amendment of the Senate is acceptable to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], and I have polled the committee, and a majority of the members say they favor concurrence in the Senate amendment rather than to further delay this legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Personally, I would extend this presumptive period, as we did for World War I veterans. But this is the best we can get under the circumstances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4496) making appropriations for the legislative branch, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HORAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report from our conference, is it not?

Mr. McGRATH. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1088)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4496) making appropriations for the legislative branch, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 60 and 66

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40, 47, 48, 51, 55, 56, 57, 58, 61, 62, and 64, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$800,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$80,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 32, 33, 36, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, and 65.

CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
WALT HORAN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4496) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

SENATE

Amendments Nos. 1–46: Provide appropriations for the Senate which were not included in the bill as passed by the House. Of such amendments, those numbered 10,

12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 32, 33, 36, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, and 46 would have been subject to points of order if considered originally in the House, and therefore are reported in disagreement. The conference report recommends that the House recede and concur with the remainder of such amendments.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Office of the Clerk

Amendment No. 47—Office of the Clerk: Appropriates $593,843 as proposed by the Senate instead of $580,460 as proposed by the House.

Office of the Sergeant at Arms

Amendment No. 48—Office of the Sergeant at Arms: Appropriates $348,406 as proposed by the Senate instead of $331,605 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 49: Reported in disagreement, since this provision would have been subject to a point of order if considered originally in the House.

Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures

Amendment No. 50, providing for the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures, would have been subject to a point of order if considered originally in the House, therefore is reported in disagreement.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Amendment No. 51—Capitol Buildings: Appropriates $741,332 as proposed by the Senate instead of $731,400 as proposed by the House

Amendment No. 52—Subway transportation, Capitol and Senate Office Buildings: Reported in disagreement, inasmuch as this item would have been subject to a point of order if considered originally in the House.

Amendment No. 53—Senate Office Building: Reported in disagreement since the item would have been subject to a point of order if considered originally in the House.

Amendment No. 54—Senate restaurants: Reported in disagreement since the item would have been subject to a point of order if considered originally in the House.

Amendment No. 55—House Office Buildings: Appropriates $961,564 as proposed by the Senate instead of $941,700 as proposed by the House.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Amendment No. 56—Salaries, Library proper: Appropriates $3,124,204 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,044,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 57—Copyright Office: Appropriates $914,510 as proposed by the Senate instead of $890,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 58—Legislative Reference Service: Inserts the words "printing and binding" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59—Legislative Reference Service, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $800,000 instead of $700,000 as proposed by the House and $810,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60 reinserts the provision of the House to prohibit use of Legislative Reference Service appropriations for publication or preparation of material (except the Digest of General Public Bills) to be issued by the Library of Congress.

Amendment No. 61—Distribution of catalog cards: Appropriates $566,891 as proposed by the Senate instead of $522,100 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 62—Union Catalogs: Appropriates $79,430 as proposed by the Senate instead of $77,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 63—Miscellaneous expenses of the Library: Appropriates $80,000 instead of $75,000 as proposed by the House and $85,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64—Library Buildings: Appropriates $711,625 as proposed by the Senate instead of $698,680 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 65: Reported in disagreement.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 66: Strikes out a provision inserted in section 107 by the Senate.

CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
WALT HORAN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration en bloc of the following amendments in disagreement: 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 32, 33, 36, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 52, 53, and 54.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 2, line 20, insert the following:

"For clerical assistance to the Vice President, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him in multiples of $5 per month, $50,370."

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 12, line 1, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"For office of the Secretary, $367,706, including the following positions: Chief Clerk, $7,500 in lieu of Chief Clerk, who shall perform the duties of reading clerk, $7,500; bill clerk, $4,500 in lieu of principal clerk, $4,500; engineer, Joint Recording Facility, $2,280; secretary, $4,100 in lieu of clerk, $4,100; assistant secretary, $3,380 in lieu of clerk, $3,380; assistant superintendent of document room, $4,000 in lieu of clerk, $4,000; clerk of enrolled bills, $3,900 in lieu of clerk, $3,900; first assistant in document room, $3,420 in lieu of clerk, $3,420; secretary to Parliamentarian, $3,180 in lieu of clerk, $3,180; custodian of records, $3,180 in lieu of clerk, $3,180; assistant executive clerk, $3,000 in lieu of clerk, $2,000; assistant keeper of stationery, $2,880 in lieu of clerk, $2,880; reference assistant, $2,700 in lieu of clerk, $2,700; stockroom clerk, $2,460 in lieu of clerk, $2,400; reference assistant, $2,460 in lieu of clerk, $2,400; journal index clerk, $2,460 in lieu of clerk, $2,400; second assistant in document room, $2,460 in lieu of clerk, $2,400; reference assistant, $1,980 in lieu of clerk, $1,740; clerks—two at $2,040 each in lieu of $1,860; two at $1,980 each in lieu of $1,740; reference assistant, $2,640 in lieu of first assistant in document room, $2,640; clerk, $2,220 in lieu of second assistant in document room, $2,040; special officers—two at $2,520 each in lieu of $2,460; assistants in document room—four at $2,220 each in lieu of $2,040; chief messenger in document room, $1,980 in lieu of skilled laborer, $1,740; assistant librarian, $3,120 in lieu of first assistant librarian, $3,180; secretary in library, $2,220 in lieu of assistant in library, $2,100; legislative analyst, $2,220 in lieu of assistant in library, $2,100; chief messenger in Secretry's office, $2,400 in lieu of laborer, $2,280; messenger, $1,980 in lieu of laborer in Secretary's office, $1,740; messengers—four at $1,980 each in lieu of four laborers at $1,740 each; chief messenger in disbursing office, $1,920 in lieu of laborer, $1,680; chief of library stacks, $1,860 in lieu of laborer, $1,620; reference assistant, $1,800 in lieu of laborer, $1,500; messenger, $1,800 in lieu of laborer, $1,500; chief messenger in library, $1,740 in lieu of laborer, $1,440; messenger, $1,620 in lieu of laborer, $1,320; messenger, $1,620 in lieu of $1,320; press liaison, $2,880 in lieu of assistant at press door, $2,520; assistant at press door, $2,160 in lieu of $2,000; aide to the Vice President, $2,460 in lieu of $2,400 "

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 4, line 21, insert the following:

"COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

"For professional and clerical assistance to standing committees, and the Select Committee on Small Business, $1,579,685."

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 5, line 1, insert the following:

"Conference committees "

Senate amendment No. 15: Page 5, line 2, insert the following:

"For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Majority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $30,280."

Senate amendment No. 16 Page 5, line 5, insert the following:

"For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Minority at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $30,280 "

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 5, line 12, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

"For office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, $1,130,628, including the following positions: Messengers acting as assistant doorkeepers—3 at $2,580 each in lieu of $2,560; messengers—25 at $2,100 each in lieu of $1,900; messengers for the minority—chief, $2,400 and 3 at $2,100 each in lieu of 4 at $1,900 each, messengers—4 at $1,980 each in lieu of $1,780; messengers for service to press correspondents—2 at $1,800 each in lieu of $1,500; clerks—1, $3,480 in lieu of $2,700; 1, $2,580 in lieu of $2,500; 1, $2,460 in lieu of $2,400, 1, $2,400 in lieu of $2,280; 1, $2,280 in lieu of $2,160; 4 at $2,160 each in lieu of $1,980; 1, $2,160 in lieu of $1,950; cabinetmakers—2 at $2,520 each in lieu of $2,460; finisher, $2,520 in lieu of $2,460; upholsterer, $2,520 in lieu of $2,460; assistant chief janitor, $2,220 in lieu of $2,100; night foreman, $1,920 in lieu of $1,680; assistant chief telephone operators—3 at $2,460 each in lieu of $2,400; telephone operators—33 at $1,980 each plus longevity increases as authorized by law in lieu of $1,800 plus such longevity increases; skilled laborers—5 at $1,920 each in lieu of $1,680; laborer in charge of private passage, $2,400 in lieu of $2,280; female attendants, ladies' retiring rooms, 2 at $1,800 each in lieu of $1,560; laborers—3 at $1,920 each in lieu of $1,700; 30 at $1,620 each in lieu of $1,320; 4 at $600 each in lieu of $540; wagon master, $2,520 in lieu of $2,480, assistant wagon master, $2,100 in lieu of $1,940; mail carriers—26 at $2,100 each in lieu of $1,940; clerk in folding room—1, $2,460 in lieu of $2,400; 1, $1,980 in lieu of $1,740; chief folder, $2,460 in lieu of $2,040; folders—13 at $1,740 each in lieu of $1,440; lieutenants, police force—2 at $2,340 each in lieu of $2,200; special officers, police force—2 at $2,340 each in lieu of $2,200; sergeants, police force—4 at $2,280 each in lieu of $2,120; privates, police force—75 at $2,160 each in lieu of $2,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the pay of pages shall begin not more than 5 days before the convening or reconvening of a session of the Congress or of the Senate, and shall continue until the end of the

month during which the Congress or the Senate adjourns or recesses, or the fourteenth day after such adjournment or recess, whichever is the later date."

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 7, line 11, insert the following:

"Legislative reorganization: For salaries and expenses, legislative reorganization, including the objects specified in Public Law 663, Seventy-ninth Congress, $100,000."

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 7, line 21, insert the following.

"Joint Committee on Atomic Energy For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, including the objects specified in Public Law 20, Eightieth Congress, $160,135 "

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 8, line 1, insert the following.

"Joint Committee on Printing: For salaries for the Joint Committee on Printing at rates to be fixed by the committee, $35,633; for expenses of compiling, preparing, and indexing the Congressional Directory, $1,600; for compiling, preparing, and indexing material for the biographical directory, $1,600, said sum, or any part thereof, in the discretion of the chairman or vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, may be paid as additional compensation to any employee of the United States, and for travel and subsistence expenses at rates provided by law for Senate committees, $4,500, in all, $13,333 "

Senate amendment No. 32: Page 9, line 5, insert the following:

"Inquiries and investigations: For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate or conducted pursuant to section 134 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, including compensation for stenographic assistance of committees at such rates and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, but not exceeding the rate of 25 cents per 100 words for the original transcript of reported matter, and including $100,000 for the Committee on Appropriations, to be available also for the purposes mentioned in Senate Resolution Numbered 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, and Public Law 20, Eightieth Congress, $882,000 *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for per diem and subsistence expenses (as defined in the Travel Expense Act of 1949) at rates in excess of $9 per day except that higher rates may be established by the Committee on Rules and Administration in the case of travel beyond the limits of the continental United States "

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 10, line 1, insert the following

"Folding documents For folding speeches and pamphlets at a gross rate not exceeding $2 per thousand, $28,875."

Senate amendment No. 36: Page 10, line 6, insert the following:

"Senate restaurants: For repairs, improvements, equipment, and supplies for Senate kitchens and restaurants, Capitol Building and Senate Office Building, including personal and other services to be expended under the supervision of the Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, $42,500 "

Senate amendment No. 38: Page 10, line 15, insert the following:

"Miscellaneous items: For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, $786,895: *Provided*, That the following Senate resolutions are amended as indicated: No. 453, agreed to February 26, 1931, by inserting $1,560 in lieu of $1,260; No. 340, agreed to December 3, 1930, by inserting $1,740 in lieu of $1,440; No. 204, agreed to June 16, 1938, by inserting $1,500 in lieu of $1,200; No. 372, agreed to December 18, 1930, by inserting $1,980 in lieu of $1,800; No. 175, agreed to July 7, 1943, by inserting $2,460 in lieu of $2,400; No 419, agreed to January 28, 1931, by inserting $2,460 in lieu of $2,400; No. 230, agreed to March 16, 1942, by inserting $2,340 in lieu of $2,220; No. 62, agreed to December 15, 1931, by inserting $1,740 in lieu of $1,440; No. 83, agreed to December 17, 1931, by inserting $1,740 in lieu of $1,440; No. 428, agreed to February 17, 1931, by inserting $1,800 in lieu of $1,560."

Senate amendment No. 41: Page 11, line 11, insert the following.

"Air-mail and special-delivery stamps. For air-mail and special-delivery stamps for Senators and the President of the Senate, as authorized by law $12,815, and the maximum allowance per capita of $105 66 is increased to $132.07 for the fiscal year 1952 and thereafter "

Senate amendment No. 42. Page 11, line 16, insert the following:

"Stationery: For stationery for Senators and for the President of the Senate, including $10,000 for stationery for committees and officers of the Senate, $87,600: *Provided*, That commencing with the fiscal year 1952 the allowance for stationery for each Senator and for the President of the Senate shall be at the rate of $800 per annum "

Senate amendment No. 43 Page 11, line 22, insert the following:

"The Sergeant at Arms is authorized and directed to secure suitable office space in post office or other Federal buildings in the State of each Senator for the use of such Senator and in the city to be designated by him: *Provided*, That in the event suitable space is not available in such buildings and a Senator leases or rents office space elsewhere, the Sergeant at Arms is authorized to approve for payment, from the contingent fund of the Senate, vouchers covering bona fide statements of rentals due in an amount not exceeding $900 per annum for each Senator "

Senate amendment No 44 Page 12, line 7, insert the following

"The Secretary of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms are authorized and directed to protect the funds of their respective offices by purchasing insurance in an amount necessary to protect said funds against loss. Premiums on such insurance shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration "

Senate amendment No 45 Page 12, line 14, insert the following:

"Salaries or wages paid out of the foregoing items under 'Contingent expense of the Senate' shall be computed at basic rates as authorized by law, plus increase and additional compensation as provided by the 'Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945,' as amended, and the 'Second Supplemental Appropriation act, 1950'."

Senate amendment No 46: Page 12, line 20, insert the following:

"Changes made herein relating to the title or rate of compensation of any position under the Secretary of the Senate or the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper shall take effect on the first day of the first month following enactment of this act "

Senate amendment No 49, Page 19, line 3, insert the following:

"The rates of compensation for telephone operators and members of the police force under the House of Representatives are hereby revised to correspond with changes made herein relating to similar positions under the Senate."

Senate amendment No 50: Page 21, line 8, insert the following:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

"For an amount to enable the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures to carry out the duties imposed upon it by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 726), to remain available during the existence of the committee, $20,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate."

Senate amendment No. 52: Page 24, line 16, insert the following:

"Subway transportation, Capitol and Senate Office Buildings: For maintenance, repairs, and rebuilding of the subway transportation system connecting the Senate Office Building with the Capitol, including personal and other services, $2,600."

Senate amendment No. 53 Page 24, line 21, insert the following.

"Senate Office Building: For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof; for purchase of waterproof wearing apparel and for personal and other services; including five female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms at $1,800 each, for the care and operation of the Senate Office Building, to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol; in all, $733,572 "

Senate amendment No 54: Page 25, line 5, insert the following:

"Senate Restaurants: For repairs, improvements, furnishings, equipment, labor and materials, and all necessary incidental expenses, to provide additional restaurant facilities in the Senate Office Building, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, $18,500 "

Mr. McGRATH Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 32, 33, 36, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 52, 53, and 54, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to

The SPEAKER The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows.

Senate amendment No 65. Page 33, line 5, insert the following

"Not to exceed ten positions in the Library of Congress may be exempt from the provisions of section 1302 of chapter XIII of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, but the Librarian shall not make any appointment to any such position until he has ascertained that he cannot secure for such appointment a person in any of the three categories specified in such section 1302 who possesses the special quaifications for the particular position and also otherwise meets the general requirements for employment in the Library of Congress "

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr McGRATH moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows. In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "Not to exceed 10 positions in the Library of Congress may be exempt from the provisions of the section of the chapter entitled 'General Provisions' of the 'Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952," concerning the employment of aliens, but the Librarian shall not make any appointment to any such position until he has ascertained that he cannot secure for such appointment a person in any of the three categories specified in such section who possesses the special qualifications for the particular position and also otherwise meets the general requirements for employment in the Library of Congress."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

PRESTON L. WATSON

Mr. CELLER Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H R 990) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 3, line 3, after "parties" insert "Enactment of this act shall not be construed to raise any implication of liability by the United States"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does this amendment do?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, this bill refers to the Court of Claims a private claim against the Government and gives the Court of Claims the right to render judgment. The Senate amendment is as follows:

Enactment of this act shall not be construed to raise any implication of liability by the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table

THE CASTLE ISLAND TERMINAL FACILITY AT SOUTH BOSTON

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4049) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts certain lands and improvements comprising the Castle Island Terminal Facility at South Boston in exchange for certain other lands.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is land that was formerly owned by the State of Massachusetts, that the Government wants to acquire the same and have it available for the Federal Government in the event of any emergency?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman is correct. Originally this land belonged to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. It was transferred to the Federal Government. In 1948 the War Department turned it over to the War Assets Administration for sale. The Navy Department then expressed a desire to have it in the event of any emergency. At the present time the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is using it. This bill does provide, in the event this transaction takes place, that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts must keep this property in such condition that in the event of war the Navy Department may take it over. As a consequence it will save the Federal Government the expense of maintaining this property during the interim period.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Also the Commonwealth has to transfer certain lands adjacent thereto which the Federal Government needs and wants very badly in connection with naval or other activities in the future.

Mr BATES of Massachusetts May I say further that in the event this transaction did not take place the Navy Department has already expressed the desire and intent to purchase the other land, including the land on which the receiving station there is now located.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have been persuaded by my two colleagues and withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to convey to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, subject to the terms and conditions hereinafter expressly stated and to such other terms and conditions as the said Secretary of the Navy shall deem to be in the public interest, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property known as Castle Island Terminal Facility in South Boston, Mass., including Government-owned land and improvements thereon and all Government improvements constructed on lands of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts or the city of Boston, being the same property transferred to the Navy Department by the War Assets Administration on April 13, 1949, in consideration of the conveyance by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to the United States of America, free of all encumbrances the following lands together with any improvements thereon: (a) An area one hundred and forty-two feet by one hundred and sixty feet occupied by the United States under permit 4112 issued by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; (b) an area of approximately four hundred and eighty thousand square feet occupied by the United States under permit 4113 issued by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and (c) an area of approximately four hundred and forty thousand square feet adjacent to lands occupied under said permit 4113, this area being a part of the Reserve Channel and being occupied and filled by the United States pursuant to informal permission of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

SEC 2. The conveyance to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts hereinabove authorized shall be made subject to the following express conditions: (a) That the Commonwealth, at its own expense, will preserve and maintain in a condition suitable for terminal purposes the improvements now existing on said property and those which may hereafter be constructed thereon; (b) that in time of war or national emergency the United States shall have the right of the free and unlimited use of all said property including any improvements which may be erected by the grantee; and (c) that the property shall not be used for any purpose other than as a terminal except with the prior consent in writing of the Secretary of the Navy.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Small Business Committee No. 3 may sit today during general debate. We scheduled a hearing for 10 o'clock this morning and have witnesses here from distant points.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WHEELER asked and was given permission to address the House today for 30 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES SHOULD HELP THE WAR EFFORT BY DISGORGING SURPLUS SCRAP

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson made a strong speech recently calling upon members of the so-called scrap mobilization committee and scrap dealers generally to use every known and new method to get scrap materials for our mobilization program. His exact words were, "Get that scrap out—use ways you never used before."

Mr. Wilson's aims in making such a speech were, no doubt, admirable, but his suggestions were naturally greeted with some reservations on the part of the listeners, since the chief laggards in this respect are the Government agencies. We have all seen abandoned Government material in various supply dumps throughout the country. Reports of tons of such scrap in navy yards, army depots, and Government warehouses are not only rife in the industry, but are the constant source of legitimate gripes in congressional mail from taxpayers far and wide

This is another striking instance where Government leadership and initiative would be a thousand times more effective than strong words. When all the Government departments—including especially the Defense Department—and not just the Office of Defense Mobilization take the scrap steel shortage seriously and review their own potential sources of scrap, Mr. Wilson's urgent warnings and pleas will be received with greater enthusiasm.

In order to locate and assemble the 36,000,000 tons of purchased scrap which are needed to achieve the announced goal of 112,000,000 ingot tons of steel in 1952, the Government has planned a vast campaign. Mines, railroads, junk yards, and even farm yards are being combed for stray scrap. Until the Government takes its own dire warnings and directives to heart, however, and exerts some earnest effort itself, one cannot help feeling that the wrong people are being alerted. If the various Government officials would go in a huddle and let each other know what is going on, they might come up with an answer to this problem—and many others.

IMMEDIATE ACTION NECESSARY TO AID ESSENTIAL CONSTRUCTION OF URGENTLY NEEDED SCHOOL FACILITIES

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, construction of urgently needed school buildings and necessary additions to existing school buildings has practically come to a standstill because of the lack of steel and certain other necessary building materials. This situation exists apparently because the National Production Authority does not realize the importance of allocating sufficient building materials to the Office of Education to meet the absolutely essential and minimum requirements for school building construction. There are additions to schools, which additions are partially completed, but construction work has come to an end because the required materials cannot be procured.

It seems to me that this is a matter of the utmost importance and urgency. The proper education of our youth is an essential part of adequate long-term national defense. I have called this matter to the attention of the President of the United States, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and to Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK, chairman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production. I have urged that immediate and necessary action be taken without delay to reevaluate this situation and make reasonable and proper provision for the materials to meet necessary school construction.

I urge here today that other Members of the House who may have this same problem in their districts make full use of every means available to them in order to focus sufficient attention upon this critical situation, to secure a remedy.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the legislative program and any other special orders heretofore entered, on October 11, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may have control of a period of 1 hour for himself and other Members to pay their respects and express their feelings in relation to the contributions of Gen. Casimir Pulaski to the cause of freedom and to the cause of the independence of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. MITCHELL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 436), (Rept. No. 1094), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (d) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, after the comma, insert the following: "including, but not limited to, the insuring and guaranteeing of loans for private housing by any department or agency of the United States in order to determine to what extent the insurance or guaranty of such loans has been granted in the case of housing which is defective with respect to construction, drainage, sanitary conditions, and other features, and to what extent the practices and procedures followed by any such agency or department, and any acts of omission or commission of officers and employees thereof, have facilitated or made possible the insuring or guaranteeing of loans for defective housing"

NISON MILLER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3504) for the relief of Nison Miller, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 6, after "act" insert ": *Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Nison Miller becoming a public charge."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 111) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 11, after line 10, insert:
"A-8767539, Nowak, Henry or Henryk Nowak or Novak"

Page 11, after line 10, insert:
"A-6729857, Tkaczyk, Feliks, John."

Page 11, after line 10, insert:
"A-6729858, Tkaczyk, Irene Alecandria."

Page 11, after line 10, insert:
"A-7491039, Witkowicki, Michal."

Page 11, after line 10, insert:
"A-6958736, Boldyreff, Constantin Wassilievich."

Page 11, after line 10, insert:
"A-6846518, Abrams, Maria Frank"

Page 11, after line 10, insert:
"A-7052335, Kolde, Endel Jakob."

Page 11, after line 10, insert:
"A-6985790, Malinowska, Casimira Maria or Mother M. Laetitia"

Page 11, after line 10, insert:
"A-7095716, Pella, Vespasien Vespasian."

Page 11, after line 10, insert:
"A-7095717, Pella, Margareta."

Page 11, after line 10, insert:
"A-7125242, Nadler, Salomon"

Page 11, after line 10, insert:
"A-6655111, Nadler, Vera (nee Miloslavsky)."

Page 11, after line 10, insert:
"A-7125243, Nadler, Robert"

Page 11, after line 10, insert:
"A-7125244, Nadler, Daniel."

Page 11, after line 10, insert:
"A-6460878, Ileana Maria Kerciu."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GRAHAM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do this only for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Pennsylvania to explain the concurrent resolution and the Senate amendments.

Mr. WALTER. The Senate amended the House concurrent resolution authorizing the attorney general to adjust the status of certain aliens by adding five names when the resolution was under discussion on the floor of the Senate. These are names of people who have been investigated by both Committees on the Judiciary, and would be included in a later resolution that we would report.

Mr. GRAHAM. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 285) to authorize appropriate participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Messrs. FORD, H. CARL ANDERSEN, and HOFFMAN of Michigan objected, and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

AUTHORIZING PARTICIPATION OF MILITARY PERSONNEL IN OLYMPIC GAMES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1184) to authorize the training for, attendance at, and participation in Olympic games by military personnel and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. Will someone on the Committee on Armed Services give us more information in reference to this particular legislation?

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize members of the armed services to participate in the Olympic games, and provide for elimination contests and things of that kind. In the past, there has always been legislation on this subject as each one of the Olympic games came up. This will permit such eliminations and so forth to be done on a permanent basis, subject of course to the appropriations being made for that purpose.

Mr. FORD. At the present time, without any authorizing legislation of this sort a number of athletes from all branches of the armed services participate in all kinds of athletic events. Why do you now need authorizing legislation for the participation in Olympic games?

Mr. KILDAY. These are the Olympic games. Of course, you have all types of athletic contests in the services and between the services. This is to set up a permanent system of eliminations which will be held for the military personnel so that they may participate in the Olympic games, and so that the military personnel would be chosen every year on a regular and permanent basis.

Mr. FORD. Why do you need $50,000 for each service? I understand that there are various welfare funds and other funds available for athletic contests and participants of all kinds. Why do you need an extra $50,000 for each branch of the service?

Mr. KILDAY. As I understand it, and, of course, I could be mistaken, in the past there has been separate legislation and separate appropriations for this purpose. I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] is personally familiar with the situation.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In the past, the armed services have waited until the Olympic year, before assembling and training their personnel for try-outs with the hope that some will go into the Olympic games as participants This program makes possible a continuous program of assembling and training a team that will do a much better job in try-outs and in the final games. In other words, this provides for a continuous program instead of waiting until the Olympic year to get a team together.

Mr. FORD. May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether our men go into the armed services to prepare for the Olympic games, or whether they go in to participate in military activities?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I can reply by saying that athletics is a part of the recreational program of the armed services, and annually at the various military installations, as well as on board ship, they hold championship contests, and from those championship contests they pick their best men and send them to the Olympic try-outs. The program is a great morale builder.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. Does not the gentleman from Pennsylvania agree that nothing promotes morale in the armed services to a greater extent than competition in athletics, and does he not also agree that, of course, the ultimate degree of success in athletic contests would be participation in the Olympic games? I think here for a very small appropriation, we are doing a great deal to promote morale in the armed services. This program will be a great health builder as well as morale builder within these services.

Mr. FORD. How do the various athletes in the Army, Navy, and Air Force now compete throughout the country in the various athletic meets and other similar functions? Where do they get the money to participate in such an event?

Mr. KILDAY. I will have to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to answer that inquiry.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Very few military personnel take part in open athletic meets unless they are stationed in the immediate vicinity of the meet. Then they use the transportation facilities of the local military installation to travel to and from the athletic field.

Mr. FORD. I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania as well as the gentleman from Texas both know that I am extremely interested in competitive athletics, but I just do not see the reason for an authorization for $50,000 for each service for the preparation of athletes for the Olympic games. In the first place, there are funds which are available. As far as the particular Olympic contestants are concerned, when they qualify as an American team participant they have all their expenses paid for by the Olympic Committee.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think I should remind the gentleman that the usual program of athletics in our military does not contain all the Olympic events. Therefore, in order to prepare for a team to participate, they have to go beyond their usual program of events and train personnel for all Olympic events. They must buy additional equipment and hire special coaches for the purpose of training those who will participate in these events.

Mr. FORD. At this stage of the game, I do not think it wise to authorize this much money for this particular purpose.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 304 OF THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2574) to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there as been a great deal of controversy over this particular legislation, and I wonder if the author of the bill would tell me what his understanding of its present status is.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, the first time this bill came up it was objected to by members of the Ways and Means Committee. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] and I had considerable discussion about it. Since that time those objections have been completely cleared up. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] asked me if I would make a comment about the relationship of this bill to renegotiation. I want to assure the gentleman first of all that this bill in no manner affects the finality of renegotiation settlements. The sole purpose of the bill is to enable the Comptroller General to make effective audits along the lines and under the jurisdiction conferred upon the General Accounting Office by law. This is merely to give him the tools with which to work.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to cooperate personally in every way in the gentleman's objective, as evidenced by the purpose outlined in this bill; but there has been a considerable amount of controversy over this particular bill. I do not know whether it has been adjusted or not. I know we have all received mail from one source or another, pro and con, and it seems to me that the proper way to resolve this question would be through a

rule and some consideration by the House itself, rather than passing it on the Consent Calendar.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am going to object.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. ARENDS objected, and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

TO AMEND MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT OF 1945

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 404) to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That the Secretary of War, and such other officer or officers as he may designate for such purposes and under such regulations as he may prescribe, are hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, settle, and pay any claim against the United States, including claims not heretofore satisfied arising on or after December 7, 1939, of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army, when such claim is substantiated, and the property determined to be reasonable, useful, necessary, or proper under the attendant circumstances, in such manner as the Secretary of War may by regulation prescribe, for lamage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service, or to replace such personal property in kind: *Provided,* That the damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of property shall not have been caused in whole or in part by any negligence or wrongful act on the part of the claimant, his agent, or employee, and shall not have occurred at quarters occupied by the claimant within continental United States (excluding Alaska) which are not assigned to him or otherwise provided in kind by the Government No claim shall be settled under this act unless presented in writing within 5 years after the accident or incident out of which such claim arises shall have occurred· *Provided further,* That if such accident or incident occurs in time of war, or if war intervenes within 2 years after its occurrence, any claim may, on good cause shown, be presented within 1 year after peace is established. Any such settlement made by the Secretary of War, or his designee, under the authority of this act and such regulations as he may prescribe hereunder, shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary.

SEC. 2. Such appropriations as may be required for the settlement of claims under the provisions of this act are hereby authorized. Appropriations available to the War Department for the settlement of claims under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1885 (23 Stat. 350), as amended, shall be available for the settlement of claims under the provisions of this act.

SEC 3. Sections 3483-3488 of the Revised Statutes (31 U S. C 209-214), and the act of March 3, 1885 (23 Stat. 350), as amended by the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 880), and by the act of March 4, 1921 (41 Stat. 1436; 31 U S. C. 218-222), and by section 6 of the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 374; 31 U. S. C. 222a, 222b), are hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. That portion of section 1 of the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat 372; 31 U S. C. 223b), reading as follows: "The provisions of this act shall not be applicable to claims arising in foreign countries or possessions thereof which are cognizable under the provisions of the act of January 2, 1942 (55 Stat. 880; 31 U. S. C. 224d), as amended, or to claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property of military personnel or civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army, or for personal injury or death of such persons, if such damage, loss, destruction, injury, or death occurs incident to their service" is hereby amended, effective as of the date of approval of said act, to read as follows: "The provisions of this act shall not be applicable to claims arising in foreign countries or possessions thereof which are cognizable under the provisions of the act of January 2, 1942 (55 Stat. 880; 31 U. S. C. 224d), as amended, or to claims for personal injury or death of military personnel or civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army if such injury or death occurs incident to their service."

SEC. 5. This act may be cited as the "Military Personnel Claims Act of 1951."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 1 of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, approved May 29, 1945 (59 Stat. 225), be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 1. (a) That the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, and such other officer or officers as they may designate for such purposes and under such regulations as they, respectively, may prescribe, are hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, settle, and pay any claim against the United States, including claims not heretofore satisfied, arising on or after December 7, 1939, of military personnel and civilian employees of the Department of the Army or of the Army, and including civilian employees of the War Department during its existence, of military personnel and civilian employees of the Department of the Navy or of the Navy, and of military personnel and civilian employees of Department of the Air Force or of the Air Force, when such claim is substantiated, and the property determined to be reasonable, useful, necessary, or proper under the attendant circumstances, in such manner as the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, as to the military personnel and civilian employees of their respective departments and services, may by regulation prescribe, for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service, or to replace such personal property in kind: *Provided,* That the damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of property shall not have been caused in whole or in part by any negligent or wrongful act on the part of the claimant, his agent, or employee, and shall not have occurred at quarters occupied by the claimant within the continental United States (excluding Alaska) which are not assigned to him or otherwise provided in kind by the Government· *And provided further,* That the Secretary of Defense, and such other officer or officers as he may designate for the purpose, and under such regulations as he may prescribe, are hereby authorized to exercise with respect to claims of civilian employees of the Department of Defense not hereinbefore enumerated, arising on or after July 25, 1947, for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service, powers similar to those conferred upon the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force and their designees by this act with respect to claims of military personnel and civilian employees of their departments.

"'(b) The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Secretary of Defense, and their designees, respectively, in the event of the death of any person among the military personnel or civilian employees enumerated in subsection (a), are hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, settle, and pay any claim, otherwise cognizable under this act, presented by the survivor of such person for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of the personal property of such person, regardless of whether such damage, loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment occurred concurrently with or subsequent to such death.

"'(c) As used in this act, the term "survivor" means surviving spouse, child or children, father and/or mother, or brothers and/or sisters of the decedent, and claims by survivors shall be settled and paid in that order of precedence.

"'(d) Every claim cognizable under this act shall be forever barred unless presented in writing within 2 years after such claim accrues or within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act, whichever is later: *Provided,* That if a claim accrues in time of war, or if war intervenes within 2 years after the date of accrual, it may, on good cause shown, be presented within 2 years after such good cause ceases to exist, but not later than 2 years after peace is established: *And provided further,* That any claim cognizable under this act which has not heretofore been presented for consideration, or has been presented for consideration and disapproved for the reason that the claimant did not file such claim within the time authorized by law, or any claim cognizable hereunder of any survivor which has not heretofore been presented for consideration, or has been presented for consideration and disapproved for the reason that heretofore such survivor acquired no right of recovery under this act, may, at the written request of the claimant made within 1 year from the date of the enactment of this amendatory act, be considered or reconsidered and settled in accordance with the provisions hereof.

"'(e) Any settlement made by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of Defense, or their designees, under the authority of this act and such regulations as they, respectively, may prescribe hereunder, shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary.'

"SEC 2 That section 2 of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC 2. Such appropriations as may be required for the settlement of claims under the provisions of this act are hereby authorized. Appropriations now available to the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force for the settlement of claims under the provisions of the act of May 29, 1945 (59 Stat. 225), and to the Department of the Navy for the settlement of claims under the provisions of the act of December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 662), shall be available for the settlement of claims under the provisions of this act.'

"SEC. 3. That section 2 of the act of December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 662), is hereby repealed."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM FOR THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4027) to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

HISTORIC MONUMENTS IN THE BOSTON, MASS., AREA

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 254) to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM WITH REGARD TO HAWAII AND ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1732) to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii and Alaska.

Mr BYRNES of Wisconsin Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice. I might state that there are no departmental reports accompanying this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ADJUSTMENT OF LAND TITLES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3981) to amend the act of July 8, 1943 (57 Stat. 388), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved July 8, 1943 (57 Stat 388), is hereby amended by striking out the words "within 10 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "within 20 years."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, insert "and inserting in lieu thereof 'within 20 years'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 606 (C) OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 (ELECTROMAGNETIC RADIATIONS)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 537) to further amend the Communications Act of 1934.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if some member of the committee could tell us the implications of this bill and what it is proposed to do and what it does?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported favorably by our committee. It is an important bill to the defense of the country. I feel that we should try to call it to the attention of the House and that we should act on it now.

The reason for the bill arises out of the fact that there are certain types of equipment that emit electric signals other than what might be termed radio signals; in other words, the committee was told that around certain types of installations such as perhaps is found in hospitals there might be instruments that could emit electromagnetic radiations Since that is true, and since that type of installation could emit a signal for a distance greater than 5 miles, according to our bill, and since it would have to, by the terms of the bill, be useful for navigational purposes before it would come within the scope of this legislation, it is felt that the President should have the power to step in at any moment if necessary to close down that kind of thing in order that in case of a very quick, rapid attack we could protect our country.

The bill has passed the Senate; it has been endorsed by the Federal Communications Commission, by the Office of Civil Defense, and by the Air Corps. After considerable consideration in our committee where we did make some modifications, we voted it out unanimously.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In other words, the purpose of this bill is to make the Communications Act of 1934 conform with the real intent of Congress at the time of passing it as far as radio communication facilities are concerned; is that correct?

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is right, and it is completely protective in nature.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 606 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended to read as follows.

"(c) Upon proclamation by the President that there exists war or a threat of war, or a state of public peril or disaster or other national emergency, or in order to preserve the neutrality of the United States, the President, if he deems it necessary in the interest of national security or defense, may suspend or amend, for such time as he may see fit, the rules and regulations applicable to any or all stations or devices capable of emitting electromagnetic radiations within the jurisdiction of the United States as prescribed by the Commission, and may cause the closing of any station for radio communication, or any device capable of emitting electromagnetic radiations between 10 kilocycles and 100,000 megacycles, which is suitable for use as a navigational aid beyond 5 miles, and the removal therefrom of its apparatus and equipment, or he may authorize the use or control of any such station or device and/or its apparatus and equipment, by any department of the Government under such regulations as he may prescribe upon just compensation to the owners"

SEC 2 Section 606 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(h) Any person who willfully and knowingly does or causes or suffers to be done any act, matter, or thing prohibited or declared to be unlawful pursuant to the exercise of the President's powers and authority under this section, or who willfully and knowingly omits or fails to do any act, matter, or thing which he is required to do pursuant to exercise of the President's powers and authority under this section, or who willfully and knowingly causes or suffers such omission or failure shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished for such offense by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for a term of not more than 1 year, or both, and, if a firm, partnership, association, or corporation, be fined not more than $5,000"

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 12, afte. the period and before the quotation marks, insert the following sentence "The authority granted to the President, under this subsection, to cause the closing of any station or device and the removal therefrom of its apparatus and equipment, or to authorize the use or control of any station or device and/or its apparatus and equipment, may be exercised in the Canal Zone"

Page 2, strike out line 15 and all that follows through line 4, on page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following

"(h) Any person who willfully does or causes or suffers to be done any act prohibited pursuant to the exercise of the President's authority under this section, or who willfully fails to do any act which he is required to do pursuant to the exercise of the President's authority under this section, or who willfully causes or suffers such failure, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished for such offense by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both, and, if a firm, partnership, association, or corporation, by fine of not more than $5,000, except that any person who commits such an offense with intent to injure the United States or with intent to secure an advantage to any foreign nation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $20,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VERMEJO RECLAMATION PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2398) to amend Public Law 848, Eighty-first Congress, second session.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act of September 27, 1950, Public Law 848,

Eighty-first Congress, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Construction of the Vermejo reclamation project shall not be commenced until the President shall have approved a project report and there shall have been established, pursuant to the laws of the State of New Mexico, an organization with powers satisfactory to the Secretary, including the power to tax real property within its boundaries (which boundaries shall include the lands to be benefited by the project works) and the power to enter into a contract or contracts with the United States for payment or return, as the case may be, of the reimbursable costs of the project and such contract or contracts shall have been duly executed."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WITHHOLDING OF CERTAIN PATENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4687) to provide for the withholding of certain patents that might be detrimental to the national security, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever publication or disclosure by the grant of a patent on an invention in which the Government has a property interest might, in the opinion of the head of the interested Government agency, be detrimental to the national security, the Secretary of Commerce upon being so notified shall order that such invention be kept secret and shall withhold the grant of a patent therefor under the conditions set forth hereinafter.

Whenever the publication or disclosure of an invention by the granting of a patent, within categories prescribed by the President and in which the Government does not have a property interest, might, in the opinion of the Secretary of Commerce, be detrimental to the national security, he shall make the application for patent in which such invention is disclosed available for inspection to the Atomic Energy Commission, the Secretary of Defense, and the chief officer of any other department or agency of the Government designated by the President as a defense agency of the United States; and each individual to whom the application is disclosed shall sign a dated acknowledgment thereof, which acknowledgment shall be entered in the file of the application. If, in the opinion of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Secretary of Defense, or the chief officer of such other department or agency so designated, the publication or disclosure of such invention by the granting of a patent therefor would be detrimental to the national security, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Secretary of Defense, or such other chief officer shall notify the Secretary of Commerce to that effect, and the Secretary of Commerce, upon being so notified, shall order that such invention be kept secret and shall withhold the grant of a patent therefor for such period or periods as the national interest requires and upon proper showing by the head of any department or agency, who caused such secrecy order to be issued, that the examination of the application might jeopardize the national interest, then the Secretary of Commerce shall immediately seal such application. The owner of a patent application which has been placed under a secrecy order shall have a right to appeal from such order to such agency and under such rules as may be prescribed by the President. No invention shall be ordered kept secret and the grant of a patent withheld for a period of more than 1 year: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Commerce shall renew any such order at the end thereof, or at the end of any renewal period, for additional periods of 1 year upon notification by the head of the department or the chief officer of the agency who caused the order to be issued that an affirmative determination has been made that the national interest continues so to require, excepting, however, that any such order in effect, or issued, during a time when the United States is at war, shall be and remain in effect for the duration of hostilities and a period of 1 year following cessation of hostilities unless sooner specifically rescinded. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to rescind any order upon notification by the heads of all departments and the chief officers of all agencies who caused the order to be issued that the publication or disclosure of the invention is no longer deemed to be detrimental to the national security.

SEC. 2. The invention disclosed in an application for patent subject to an order made pursuant to section 1 hereof may be held abandoned upon its being established before or by the Secretary of Commerce that in violation of said order said invention has been published or disclosed or that an application for a patent therefor has been filed in a foreign country by the inventor, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, or anyone in privity with him or them, without the consent or approval of the Secretary of Commerce, and any such abandonment shall be held to have occurred as of the time of such violation: *Provided,* That in no case shall the consent or approval of the Secretary of Commerce be given without the concurrence of the heads of all departments and the chief officers of all agencies who caused the order to be issued. Any such holding of abandonment shall constitute forfeiture by the applicant, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, or anyone in privity with him or them, of all claims against the United States based upon such invention.

SEC. 3 Any applicant, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, whose patent is withheld as herein provided, shall, if the order of the Secretary of Commerce above referred to shall have been faithfully obeyed, have the right, during a period beginning at the date the applicant is notified that, except for such order, his application is otherwise in condition for allowance, or beginning at the effective date of this act, whichever is later, and ending 2 years after the date a patent is issued on such application, to apply for compensation for the damage accruing by reason of the order of secrecy and/or for the use, if any, of the invention by the Government, if the Government's use resulted from the applicant's disclosure; such right to compensation for use to begin from the date of the first use of the invention by the Government. The head of any department or agency who caused the order to be issued is authorized, if any such claim is presented within the periods above specified, to enter into an agreement with said applicant, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, in full settlement and compromise for such damage and/or use, if any, and any such settlement agreement entered into shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary. If full compromise and settlement of any such claim cannot be effected, the head of any department or agency who caused the order to be issued, may, in his discretion, administratively award and pay to such applicant, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, a sum not exceeding 75 percent of the maximum sum, if any, which in the opinion of the head of such department or agency would constitute fair and just compensation for such damage and/or use, if any. Within 2 years after issuance of a patent, any claimant who fails to secure an award satisfactory to him shall have the right to bring suit against the United States in the Court of Claims for such amount which, when added to such award, if any, shall constitute fair and just compensation for the damage and/or use, if any, of the invention by the Government. The owner of any patent issued upon an application that was subject to a secrecy order issued pursuant to section 1 hereof, and who faithfully obeyed the order, who did not apply for compensation as above provided, shall have the right, within 2 years after the date of issuance of such patent, to bring suit in the Court of Claims for fair and just compensation for the damage accruing to him by reason of the order of secrecy and/or use by the Government of the patented invention, such right to compensation for use, provided such use resulted from the applicant's disclosure, to begin at the first date of such use. If any suit under the provisions of this section, and in any negotiations concerning settlement and compromise of any such claim, the United States may avail itself of any and all defenses that may be pleaded by it in an action under title 28, United States Code, section 1498, as amended. This section shall not confer a right of action on anyone or his successor or assignee who, when he makes such a claim, is in the employment or service of the United States, or who, while in the employment or service of the United States, discovered, invented, or developed the invention on which such claim is based.

SEC. 4. No person shall file or cause or authorize to be filed in any foreign country an application for patent or for the registration of a utility model, industrial design, or model in respect of any invention made in the United States prior to 90 days after filing in the United States an application covering such invention except when authorized in each case by a license obtained from the Secretary of Commerce under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe: *Provided,* That no such license shall be granted with respect to any invention which is the subject matter of a subsisting order issued by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to section 1 hereof without the concurrence of the heads of all departments or the chief officers of all agencies who caused the order to be issued. Such license may be granted retroactively in case of inadvertence except in the case of inventions falling within the categories of invention prescribed under section 1 hereof.

The term "application" when used in this act include applications, and any modifications, amendments, or supplements thereto, or divisions thereof.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 4886 and 4887 of the Revised Statutes (35 U. S. C., secs. 31 and 32), any person, and the successors, assigns, or legal representatives of any such persons, shall be debarred from receiving a United States patent for an invention if such person, or such successors, assigns, or legal representatives shall, without procuring the authorization prescribed in section 4 hereof, have made, or consented to or assisted another's making, application in a foreign country for a patent or for the registration of a utility model, industrial design, or model in respect of such invention where authorization for such application is required by the provisions of section 4 hereof, and any such United States patent actually issued to any such person, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives so debarred or becoming debarred shall be invalid.

SEC. 6. Whoever, during the period or periods of time an invention has been ordered to be kept secret and the grant of a patent thereon withheld pursuant to section 1 hereof, shall, with knowledge of such order and without due authorization, willfully publish or disclose or authorize or cause to be published or disclosed such invention, or any material information with respect thereto, or whoever, in violation of the provisions of section 4 hereof, shall file or cause or authorize to be filed in any foreign country an

application for patent or for the registration of a utility model, industrial design, or model in respect of any invention made in the United States, shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 2 years, or both.

SEC. 7 The prohibitions and penalties of this act shall not apply to any officer or agent of the United States acting within the scope of his authority, nor to any person acting upon the written instructions of, or in reliance on the written permission or advice of, any such officers or agent.

SEC. 8 The Atomic Energy Commission, the Secretary of Defense, the chief officer of any other department or agency of the Government designated by the President as a defense agency of the United States, and the Secretary of Commerce, may separately issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to enable the respective department or agency to carry out the provisions of this act, and in addition are authorized, under such rules and regulations as each may prescribe, to delegate and provide for the redelegation within their respective departments or agencies of any power or authority conferred by this act to such responsible officers, boards, agents, or persons as each may designate or appoint.

SEC. 9. If any provision of this act or of any section hereof or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act and of such section and application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

SEC 10 The acts of Congress approved October 6, 1917 (ch 95, 40 Stat 394); July 1, 1940 (ch 501, 54 Stat. 710), August 21, 1941 (ch 393, 55 Stat 657); and June 16, 1942 (ch 415; 56 Stat. 370) (U. S C., title 35, secs. 42 and 42a to 42f) are repealed, but such repeal shall not affect any rights or liabilities existing on the date of this act Any order of secrecy heretofore issued under said repealed acts, and subsisting on the date of the approval of this act, shall be considered as an order issued pursuant to this act and shall continue in force and effect for a period of 1 year from the effective date of this act unless sooner rescinded as provided herein. Any claim arising under said repealed acts and unsettled as of the effective date of this act, the provisions of any other act or acts to the contrary notwithtsanding, may be presented and determined pursuant to the provisions of section 3 hereof.

SEC 11. Nothing in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, revoke, repeal, or otherwise affect the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 755), as amended.

SEC. 12. This act may be cited as "The Patent Secrecy Act of 1951."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That whenever publication or disclosure by the grant of a patent on an invention in which the Government has a property interest might, in the opinion of the head of the interested Government agency, be detrimental to the national security the Secretary of Commerce upon being so notified shall order that the invention be kept secret and shall withhold the grant of a patent therefor under the conditions set forth hereinafter.

"Whenever the publication or disclosure of an invention by the granting of a patent, in which the Government does not have a property interest, might, in the opinion of the Secretary of Commerce, be detrimental to the national security, he shall make the application for patent in which such invention is disclosed available for inspection to the Atomic Energy Commission, the Secretary of Defense, and the chief officer of any other department or agency of the Government designated by the President as a defense agency of the United States.

"Each individual to whom the application is disclosed shall sign a dated acknowledgment thereof, which acknowledgment shall be entered in the file of the application If, in the opinion of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Secretary of a Defense Department, or the chief officer of another department or agency so designated, the publication or disclosure of the invention by the granting of a patent therefor would be detrimental to the national security, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Secretary of a Defense Department, or such other chief officer shall notify the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Commerce shall order that the invention be kept secret and shall withhold the grant of a patent for such period as the national interest requires, and notify the applicant thereof. Upon proper showing by the head of the department or agency who caused the secrecy order to be issued that the examination of the application might jeopardize the national interest, the Secretary of Commerce shall thereupon maintain the application in a sealed condition and notify the applicant thereof The owner of an application which has been placed under a secrecy order shall have a right to appeal from the order to the Secretary of Commerce under rules prescribed by him

"An invention shall not be ordered kept secret and the grant of a patent withheld for a period of not more than 1 year The Secretary of Commerce shall renew the order at the end thereof, or at the end of any renewal period, for additional periods of 1 year upon notification by the head of the department or the chief officer of the agency who caused the order to be issued that an affirmative determination has been made that the national interest continues so to require An order in effect, or issued, during a time when the United States is at war, shall remain in effect for the duration of hostilities and 1 year following cessation of hostilities An order in effect, or issued, during a national emergency declared by the President shall remain in effect for the duration of the national emergency and 6 months thereafter. The Secretary of Commerce may rescind any order upon notification by the heads of the departments and the chief officers of the agencies who cause the order to be issued that the publication or disclosure of the invention is no longer deemed detrimental to the national security.

"SEC 2 The invention disclosed in an application for patent subject to an order made pursuant to section 1 hereof may be held abandoned upon its being established by the Secretary of Commerce that in violation of said order the invention has been published or disclosed or that an application for a patent therefor has been filed in a foreign country by the inventor, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, or anyone in privity with him or them, without the consent of the Secretary of Commerce The abandonment shall be held to have occurred as of the time of violation. The consent of the Secretary of Commerce shall not be given without the concurrence of the heads of the departments and the chief officers of the agencies who caused the order to be issued. A holding of abandonment shall constitute forfeiture by the applicant, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, or anyone in privity with him or them, of all claims against the United States based upon such invention.

"SEC 3. An applicant, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, whose patent is withheld as herein provided, shall have the right, beginning at the date the applicant is notified that, except for such order, his application is otherwise in condition for allowance, or the effective date of this act, whichever is later, and ending 6 years after a patent is issued thereon, to apply to the head of any department or agency who caused the order to be issued for compensation for the damage caused by the order of secrecy and/or for the use of the invention by the Government, resulting from his disclosure. The right to compensation for use shall begin on the date of the first use of the invention by the Government The head of the department or agency is authorized, upon the presentation of a claim, to enter into an agreement with the applicant, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, in full settlement for the damage and/or use. This settlement agreement shall be conclusive for all purposes notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary. If full settlement of the claim cannot be effected, the head of the department or agency may award and pay to such applicant, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, a sum not exceeding 75 percent of the sum which the head of the department or agency considers just compensation for the damage and/or use. A claimant may bring suit against the United States in the Court of Claims for an amount which when added to the award shall constitute just compensation for the damage and/or use of the invention by the Government The owner of any patent issued upon an application that was subject to a secrecy order issued pursuant to section 1 hereof, who did not apply for compensation as above provided, shall have the right, after the date of issuance of such patent, to bring suit in the Court of Claims for just compensation for the damage caused by reason of the order of secrecy and/or use by the Government of the invention resulting from his disclosure The right to compensation for use shall begin on the date of the first use of the invention by the Government In a suit under the provisions of this section, and in negotiations concerning settlement of a claim, the United States may avail itself of all defenses it may plead in an action under title 28, United States Code, section 1498, as amended This section shall not confer a right of action on anyone or his successors, assigns, or legal representatives who, when he makes a claim, is in the employment or service of the United States, or who, while in the employment or service of the United States, discovered, invented, or developed the invention on which the claim is based

"SEC. 4. Except when authorized by a license obtained from the Secretary of Commerce a person shall not file or cause or authorize to be filed in any foreign country prior to 6 months after filing in the United States an application for patent or for the registration of a utility model, industrial design, or model in respect of an invention made in this country. A license shall not be granted with respect to an invention subject to an order issued by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to section 1 hereof without the concurrence of the head of the departments and the chief officers of the agencies who caused the order to be issued The license may be granted retroactively where an application has been inadvertently filed abroad and the application does not disclose an invention within the categories prescribed under section 1 hereof.

"The term 'application' when used in this act includes applications, and any modifications, amendments, or supplements thereto, or divisions thereof.

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law any person, and his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, shall not receive a United States patent for an invention if that person, or his successors, assigns, or legal representatives shall, without procuring the license prescribed in section 4 hereof, have made, or consented to or assisted another's making, application in a foreign country for a patent or for the registration of a utility model, industrial design, or model in respect of the invention. A United States patent issued to such person,

his successors, assigns, or legal representatives shall be invalid.

"SEC. 6. Whoever, during the period or periods of time an invention has been ordered to be kept secret and the grant of a patent thereon withheld pursuant to section 1 hereof, shall, with knowledge of such order and without due authorization, willfully publish or disclose or authorize or cause to be published or disclosed the invention, or material information with respect thereto, or whoever, in violation of the provisions of section 4 hereof, shall file or cause or authorize to be filed in any foreign country an application for patent or for the registration of a utility model, industrial design, or model in respect of any invention made in the United States, shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 2 years, or both.

"SEC. 7. The prohibitions and penalties of this act shall not apply to any officer or agent of the United States acting within the scope of his authority, nor to any person acting upon his written instructions or permission.

"SEC. 8. The Atomic Energy Commission, the Secretary of a Defense Department, the chief officer of any other department or agency of the Government designated by the President as a defense agency of the United States, and the Secretary of Commerce, may separately issue rules and regulations to enable the respective departments or agency to carry out the provisions of this act, and may delegate any power conferred by this act

"SEC. 9. If any provision of this act or of any section hereof shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 10. The acts of Congress approved October 6, 1917 (ch. 95, 40 Stat. 394); July 1, 1940 (ch. 501, 54 Stat. 710); August 21, 1941 (ch. 393, 55 Stat. 657); and June 16, 1942 (ch. 415, 56 Stat. 370) (U. S. C., title 35, secs. 42 and 42a to 42f), are repealed, but such repeal shall not affect any rights or liabilities existing on the date of approval of this act. An order of secrecy issued under the repealed acts, and in effect on the date of the approval of this act, shall be considered an order issued pursuant to this act. A claim arising under the repealed acts and unsettled as of the effective date of this act, may be presented and determined pursuant to the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 11. Nothing in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, revoke, repeal, or otherwise affect the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 755), as amended.

"SEC. 12. This act may be cited as 'The Invention Secrecy Act of 1951'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERMS OF COURT TO BE HELD AT WEST PALM BEACH AND AT FORT MYERS, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 948) to provide for terms of court to be held at West Palm Beach, and at Fort Myers, in the southern district of Florida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of section 89 (b) of title 28, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows: "Court for the southern district shall be held at Fernandina, Fort Myers, Fort Pierce, Jacksonville, Key West, Miami, Ocala, Orlando, Tampa, and West Palm Beach."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENDING APPLICATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS WITH RESPECT TO ATTORNEYS EMPLOYED BY HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 326 to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the House Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That service or employment of John F. Woog as an attorney on a temporary basis to assist the House Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284, of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of service, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "of", insert "John Paul Stevens, E. Ernest Goldstein, and."

Page 1, line 4, strike out "an attorney" and insert "attorneys."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "person" and insert "persons."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read "Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to certain attorneys employed by the House Committee on the Judiciary."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOARD OF WATER SUPPLY OF HONOLULU (HAWAII) AND HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION ACT, 1921

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4197) to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii that certain Hawaiian homelands required for the use of the Board of Water Supply of the City and County of Honolulu for the location of a water shaft, pump station, and tunnel, and to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, so as to confer upon certain lands of Auwaiolimu, Kewalo-Uka, and Kalawahine, on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, the status of Hawaiian homelands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of section 203 (4) of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, as designates the land hereinafter described as available lands within the meaning of that act, is hereby repealed and the land is hereby restored to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii. On the island of Oahu:

(III) Portion of the land of Kalawahine situate mauka or northeast of Roosevelt High School, Honolulu, Oahu.

Being portion of L. C. award 11215, Apana 2, to Keliahonui conveyed by W. M. Giffard to the Territory of Hawaii by deed dated February 1, 1907, and recorded in liber 291, page 1.

(Being portion of the lands set aside for the Hawaiian Homes Commission by the Seventy-third Congress by act No. 227, approved May 16, 1934.)

Beginning at the south corner of this parcel of land near the east corner of Roosevelt High School lot, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Punchbowl," being twenty-five and two one-hundredths feet south and four thousand one hundred seventeen and thirty-nine hundredths feet east as shown on Government Survey registered map No. 2985 and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south;

1. One hundred and twenty-eight degrees fifty-four minutes seven hundred and six and thirteen one-hundredths feet along Roosevelt High School lot, and passing over a pipe at six hundred eight-four and thirteen one-hundredths feet;

2. Thence up along the middle of stream in all its turns and winding along the land of Kewalo-uka to the south corner of Hawaiian Home Land (Presidential Executive Order No. 5561), the direct azimuth and distance being two hundred and thirteen degrees forty-eight minutes forty seconds one thousand one hundred twelve and twenty one-hundredths feet;

3. Thence continuing up along the middle of stream in all its turns and windings along the land of Kewalo-uka (Presidential Executive Ordered No. 5561) to the south side of Tantalus Drive realinement, the direct azimuth and distance being two hundred and twenty-eight degrees twenty-nine minutes ten seconds one thousand three hundred and ninety-one feet;

4. There on a curve to the right with a radius of one hundred twenty and seventy-eight one hundredths feet along the southerly side of Tantalus Drive realinement (sixty feet wide), the direct azimuth and distance being three hundred and fifty-eight degrees twenty-one minutes one hundred ninety-three and eighty one-hundredths feet;

5. Fifty-one degrees forty-two minutes one hundred ninety-three and thirty-five one-hundredths feet along the southerly side of Tantalus Drive realinement;

6 Thence on a curve to the left with a radius of three hundred and thirty feet, along same, the direct azimuth and distance being twenty-five degrees twenty-three minutes ten seconds two hundred ninety-two and fifty-eight one-hundredths feet;

7. Twenty-two degrees fifty-three minutes two hundred ninety-one and ninety-three one-hundredths feet along the southerly side of Tantalus Drive realinement and along the west side of Kalawahine Slope lots;

8. Thence on a curve to the left with a radius of three hundred five and sixty one-hundredths feet along the west side of the Kalawahine Slope lots, the direct azimuth and distance being six degrees twenty-one minutes thirty second one hundred seventy-three and eighty-five one hundreds feet;

9. Three hundred and forty-nine degrees fifty minutes forty-seven feet along the west side of the Kalawahine Slope lots;

10. Thence on a curve to the right with a radius of five hundred and twenty feet along same and along Territorial land, the direct azimuth and distance being seventeen degrees thirty-one minutes four hundred eighty-three and eighteen one hundred feet;

11. Three hundred and fifteen degrees twelve minutes seventy-five feet along Territorial land;

12. Forty-five degrees twelve minutes six hundred eleven and two one-hundredths feet along the northwest side of a twenty-foot road reserve;

13. Thirty-four degrees four minutes thirty seconds three hundred thirty-six and ninety-six one-hundredths feet along same to the point of beginning and containing an area of thirty-one and sixty one-hundredths acres.

SEC. 2. Section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding to subparagraph (4) thereof relating to available lands on the island of Oahu, the following subsections to be numbered "(VI)" and "(VII)" respectively, and to read as follows:

"(VI) Being a portion of Government land of Auwaiolimu, situated on the northeast side of Hawaiian home land of Auwaiolimu and adjacent to the land of Kewalo-Uka at Pauoa Valley, Honolulu, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii. Beginning at a pipe in concrete at the south corner of this parcel of land, being also the east corner of Hawaiian home land, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Punchbowl," being two thousand twelve and seventy-five one-hundredths feet south and three thousand six hundred forty-seven and eighty-seven one-hundredths feet east, and thence running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south·

"1. One hundred and forty-one degrees twelve minutes six hundred and ninety-three feet along Hawaiian home land;

"2 Thence along middle of stone wall along L. C Aw 1356 to Kekuanoni, Grant 5147, Apana 1 to C W. Booth, L C Aw. 1351 to Kamakainau, L C. Aw. 1602 to Kahawai, Grant 4197 to Keaulao, L. C. Aw 5235 to Kaapuiki and Grant 2587 to Haalelea;

"3. Two hundred and ninety-five degrees thirty minutes three hundred and twenty feet along the remainder of Government land of Auwaiolimu;

"4 Twenty-four degrees sixteen minutes thirty seconds one thousand five hundred seventy-nine and thirty-six one-hundredths feet along the remainder of Government land of Auwaiolimu;

"5. Thence along middle of ridge along the land of Kewalo-Uka to a point called 'Puu Iole' (pipe in concrete monument), the direct azimuth and distance being fifty-six degrees no minutes eight hundred and thirty feet;

"6 Fifty-two degrees twelve minutes five hundred fifty-two and sixty one-hundredths feet along the land of Kawalo-Uka to the point of beginning and containing an area of thirty-three and eighty-eight one-hundredths acres, more or less.

"(VII) Being portions of Government lands of Kewalo-Uka and Kalawahine situated on the east side of Tantalus Drive at Pauoa Valley, Honolulu, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii Beginning at the west corner of this parcel of land, the true azimuth and distance to a point called "Puu Ea" (pipe in concrete monument) being one hundred and seventy-four degrees thirty minutes four hundred one and ninety-nine one-hundredths feet, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Punchbowl" being two thousand eight hundred fifty-five and ten one-hundredths feet north and five thousand two hundred eighty-two and twenty-five one-hundredths feet east and thence running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

"1. Two hundred and forty-eight degrees nineteen minutes forty seconds eight hundred fifty and fifty-four one-hundredths feet along the land of Kewalo-Uka;

"2. Sixteen degrees thirty minutes five hundred feet along the land of Kewalo-Uka, along the land of Kalawahine;

"3. Thirty-five degrees no minutes three hundred and twenty feet along the land of Kalawhine;

"4. Thirty-five degrees no minutes three hundred and twenty feet along the land of Kalawahine;

"5. Fifty degrees forty-six minutes ninety-six and seventy one-hundredths feet along Makiki Forest Ridge lots;

"6 Seventy-three degrees twenty minutes two hundred fifty-five and ninety one-hundredths feet along Makiki Forest Ridge lots;

"7 Eighty-six degrees thirty-two minutes one hundred sixty-three and forty one-hundredths feet along Makiki Forest Ridge lots;

"8 Thence along the south side of Tantalus Drive on a curve to the right with a radius of two hundred and seventy feet, the direct azimuth and distance being two hundred and twenty-one degrees twelve minutes nineteen seconds ninety-eight and thirty-six one-hundredths feet;

"9. Two hundred and thirty-one degrees forty-two minutes one hundred ninety-three and thirty-five one-hundredths feet along the south side of Tantalus Drive;

10 Still along Tantalus Drive on a curve to the left with a radius of one hundred eighty and seventy-eight one-hundredths feet, the direct azimuth and distance being one hundred and eighty-one degrees forty-five minutes fifty-five seconds two hundred seventy-six and seventy-two one-hundredths feet;

"11 Two hundred and forty-two degrees fifteen minutes sixty-two and thirty-two one-hundredths feet along the land of Kewalo-Uka;

"12 One hundred and seventy-four degrees thirty minutes five hundred twenty-eight and one one-hundredths feet along the land of Kewalo-Uka to the point of beginning and containing an area of five hundred and seventy-four thousand seven hundred and thirty square feet or thirteen and one hundred ninety-four one-thousandths acres."

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on and after the date of its approval.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, strike the word "Keliahonui" and in ert in lieu thereof the word "Kelilahonui"

Page 3, line 1, strike the word "winding" and insert in lieu thereof the word "windings"

Page 3, line 14, strike the "There" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Thence"

Page 9, line 4, strike all of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3 Section 3 of the act of May 16, 1934 (48 Stat 777, 779; 48 U. S. C. 1946 ed., sec. 704a), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, as amended, limiting the leasing of lands to native Hawaiians, persons, whether or not native Hawaiians as defined by said act, as amended, who, on May 16, 1934, were residing on the lands of Auwaiolimu, Kewalo-Uka, and Kalawahine on the island of Oahu, described by this act shall be given first opportunity to lease, in the case of said Auwaiolimu and Kewalo-Uka lands, the lands on which they reside, and, in the case of said Kalawahine lands, other similar lands under the control of the Hawaiian Homes Commission'."

Page 9, following section 3, add the following new section:

"SEC. 4. The first proviso of section 209 (1) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920 (42 Stat. 108, 111), as amended (48 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 703 (1)), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"'*Provided*, That Hawaiian blood requirements shall not apply to the descendants of those who are not native Hawaiians but who were entitled to the leased land under the provisions of section 3 of the act of May 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 777, 779) as amended'."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian homelands required for the use of the Board of Water Supply of the City and County of Honolulu for the location of a water shaft, pump station, and tunnel, and to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, so as to confer upon certain lands of Auwaiolimu, Kewalo-Uka, and Kalawahine, on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, the status of Hawaiian homelands."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4409) to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for public or private lands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That section 204 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, be further amended by adding a new subparagraph thereto, designated subparagraph "(4)", and to read as follows:

"(4) The commission may, with the approval of the Governor and the Secretary of the Interior, in order to consolidate its holdings or to better effectuate the purposes of this act, exchange the title to available lands for land, publicly or privately owned, of an equal value. All land so acquired by the commission shall assume the status of available lands as though the same were originally designated as such under section 203 hereof, and all land so conveyed by the commission shall assume the status of the land for which it was exchanged. The limitations imposed by section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act and the land laws of Hawaii as to the area and value of land that may be conveyed by way of exchange shall not apply to exchanges made pursuant hereto."

SEC 2. This act shall take effect upon its approval.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1638) to facilitate the management of the national park system and miscellaneous areas administered in connection with that system, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to facilitate the administration of the National Park System and miscellaneous areas administered in connection therewith, the Secretary of the

Interior is hereby authorized, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, to carry out the following activities, and he may use applicable appropriations for the aforesaid system and miscellaneous areas for the following purposes:

1. Rendering of emergency rescue, fire fighting, and cooperative assistance to nearby law enforcement and fire prevention agencies and for related purposes outside of the aforesaid areas.

2. The acquisition of leases, easements, and rights-of-way outside of the National Park System and miscellaneous areas administered by the National Park Service, and the acquisition, construction, and maintenance of utilities and general administrative facilities thereon, or on other federally owned or controlled lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, when the aforesaid are necessary for the management, protection, maintenance, or operation of such system or areas.

3. Transportation to and from work, outside of regular working hours, of employees of Carlsbad Caverns National Park, residing in or near the city of Carlsbad, N. Mex., such transportation to be between the park and the city, or intervening points.

4. Furnishing, on a reimbursement of appropriation basis, all types of utility services to concessioners, contractors, permittees, or other users of such services, whenever necessary to insure adequate and uninterrupted service to the public: *Provided*, That reimbursements for cost of such utility services may be credited to the appropriation current at the time reimbursements are received.

5. Contracting, under such terms and conditions as the said Secretary considers to be in the interest of the Federal Government, for the sale, operation, maintenance, repair, or relocation of Government-owned electric and telephone lines and other facilities used for the administration and protection of the National Park System and miscellaneous areas, regardless of whether such lines and facilities are located within or outside said system and areas.

6. Acquiring such rights-of-way as may be necessary to construct, improve, and maintain roads within the authorized boundaries of any area of the said National Park System and miscellaneous areas, and the acquisition also of land and interests in land adjacent to such rights-of-way, when deemed necessary by the Secretary, to provide adequate protection of natural features or to avoid traffic and other hazards resulting from private road access connections, or when the acquisition of adjacent residual tracts, which otherwise would remain after acquiring such rights-of-way, would be in the public interest.

7. The operation, repair, maintenance, and replacement of motor and other equipment on a reimbursable basis when such equipment is used on projects of the said National Park System and miscellaneous areas, chargeable to other appropriations, or on work of other Federal agencies, when requested by such agencies. Reimbursement shall be made from appropriations applicable to the work on which the equipment is used at rental rates established by the Secretary, based on actual or estimated cost of operation, repair, maintenance, depreciation, and equipment management control, and credited to appropriations currently available at the time adjustment is effected, and the Secretary may also rent equipment for fire control purposes to State, county, private, or other non-Federal agencies that cooperate with the Secretary in the administration of the said National Park System and other areas in fire control, such rental to be under the terms of written cooperative agreements, the amount collected for such rentals to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time payment is received.

SEC. 2. (a) The term "National Park System" means all federally owned or controlled lands which are administered under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended, and which are grouped into the following descriptive categories: (1) National parks, (2) national monuments, (3) national historical parks, (4) national memorials, (5) national parkways, and (6) national capital parks.

(b) The term "miscellaneous areas" includes lands under the administrative jurisdiction of another Federal agency, or lands in private ownership, and over which the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to cooperative agreement exercises supervision for recreational, historical, or other related purposes, and also any lands under the care and custody of the National Park Service other than those heretofore described in this section.

SEC. 3. Hereafter applicable appropriations of the National Park Service shall be available for the objects and purposes specified in the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 885).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, lines 4 to 12, inclusive, strike all of subsection 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"2. The erection and maintenance of fire protection facilities, water lines, telephone lines, electric lines, and other utilities adjacent to areas administered by the National Park Service, where necessary, in the administration of such areas."

Page 2, line 17, strike the period, insert a comma in lieu thereof, and add the following: "at reasonable rates to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior taking into consideration, among other factors, comparable rates charged by transportation companies in the locality for similar services, the amounts collected for such transportation to be credited to the appropriation current at the time payment is received."

Page 3, line 4, insert the word "utility" after the word "other."

Page 3, line 21, insert the word "Federal" after the word on."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BEAR LAKE FISH CULTURAL STATION (UTAH)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3368) providing for the conveyance of the Bear Lake Fish Cultural Station to the Fish and Game Commission of the State of Utah.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to convey, subject to such conditions and reservations as he deems needful to protect the interests of the United States, to the Fish and Game Commission of the State of Utah all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those lands and improvements thereon designated as the Bear Lake Fish Cultural Station, described as follows: Beginning at a point south thirty-three degrees forty-one minutes west two thousand three hundred and eighty feet from the northeast corner of section 4, township 12 north, range 5 east, Salt Lake meridian; thence south one thousand two hundred and ninety-seven and eight-tenths feet to a point two rods south of the south bank of the Upper Round Valley Canal; thence north eighty degrees ten minutes west seven hundred three and seven-tenths feet to a point two rods south of the south bank of said canal; thence north five hundred seventeen and five-tenths feet; thence east two hundred ninety-seven and four-tenths feet; thence north six hundred and sixty feet; thence east three hundred and ninety-six feet to the point of beginning, containing fifteen and nineteen one-hundredths acres, together with a strip of land two and five-tenths rods wide, being one and twenty-five one-hundredths rods on each side of the center line described as beginning at a point south thirty-three degrees forty-one minutes west two thousand three hundred and eighty feet and west one hundred and seventy-nine feet from the northeast corner of section 4, township 12 north, range 5 east, Salt Lake meridian; thence following along the center line of road north five degrees forty-three minutes west five hundred and thirty-nine feet; thence north seventeen degrees six minutes east and four hundred and eighteen feet; thence north fifty-two degrees forty-seven minutes east ninety-three and nine-tenths feet; thence north seventy-eight degrees nineteen minutes east four hundred and eighty-one and six-tenths feet; thence south eighty-six degrees thirty-two minutes east five hundred and eighty-five and five-tenths feet; thence south eighty-six degrees fifty-one minutes east two hundred and ninety-nine and four-tenths feet, more or less, to the east boundary of said section 4, at a point nine hundred and forty-two feet south of the northeast corner of said section 4; thence south eighty-six degrees fifty-one minutes east two hundred forty-nine and one-tenth feet; thence north sixty-six degrees four minutes east two hundred and ninety-one and two-tenths feet to the center line of a county road bearing northwest and southeast and being seventy-five feet wide at this point, containing in all seventeen and seventy-six one-hundredths acres, more or less.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEA ISLAND NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, N. C.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4808) to provide for the granting of an easement for a public road through the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge in Dare County, N. C.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to the State of North Carolina a permanent easement for the construction of a public road (together with rights for such other uses as may be customary or necessary in connection with the construction or operation of such a road) through the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge in Dare County, N. C.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, after the words "or necessary" insert the words "in the State of North Carolina."

On page 1, line 9, after the words "North Carolina" insert a comma and add the words: "and to accept in return therefor the conveyance of any rights-of-way, easements, or other rights in or claims to land owned by the State of North Carolina not needed for use in the construction or operation of such road."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE SUBMARINE "ULUA"

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5067) to authorize the use of the incompleted submarine *Ulua* as a target for explosive tests, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if someone will explain why this submarine was never completed? Is it a modern submarine?

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] who is now engaged in a committee meeting. I was not a member of the subcommittee handling the matter and, therefore, I am not fully informed as to the particular situation. There were a number of submarines and other vessels which were in the course of construction at the termination of the war and were not completed. Whether this is one of those or not, I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PAYMENTS FOR CARE GIVEN CERTAIN MILITARY PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3548) to provide that payments to States and Territories for care given to certain disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States shall be effective from the date such care commenced.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last proviso to section 2 of the act entitled "An act to increase temporarily the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States," approved May 18, 1948, is hereby amended to read as follows: *"Provided further*, That no such payment to a State or Territory shall be made until the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs determines that the veteran, on whose account such payment is requested, is eligible for such care in a Veterans' Administration facility, and after such determination of eligibility such payment shall be made."

SEC 2. The amendment made by this act shall apply to payments with respect to care given to disabled soldiers and sailors on and after the first day of the month next following the month during which this act is enacted.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "effective from the date such care commenced" and insert "covering the period of eligibility from the date such care commenced, except that no such payment shall be made effective prior to the date of receipt by the Veterans' Administration of an appropriate request for determination of eligibility in the case of any eligible veteran with respect to whom such request is not received within 10 days following the date such care commenced."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING PUBLIC LAW 351, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5405) to amend section 207 (a) of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 207 (a) of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC 207. (a) Members of the uniformed services who enlist under the conditions set forth in subsection (b) of this section within 3 months from the date of their discharge or separation, or within such lesser period of time as the Secretary concerned may determine from time to time, shall be paid a lump-sum reenlistment bonus of $40, $90, $160, $250, or $360 upon enlistment for a period of 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 years, respectively; and, upon enlistment for an unspecified period of time amounting to more than 6 years a lump sum reenlistment bonus of $360 shall be paid, and, upon the completion of 6 years' enlisted service in such enlistment, for each year thereafter a lump sum payment of $60 shall be made in advance, subject to the limitation that the total amount paid shall not exceed $1,440: *Provided*, That persons in an enlistment for an unspecified period of time, entered into prior to October 1, 1949, shall be paid $110 upon the first anniversary date of such enlistment subsequent to September 30, 1949, and $60 upon each anniversary date thereafter, subject to the limitations that the total amount paid after October 1, 1949, shall not exceed $1,440: *Provided further*, That no payment shall be made for any period subsequent to the completion of 30 years' service No reenlistment bonus shall be paid for more than four enlistments entered into after the effective date of this section: *Provided further*, That the bonus to be paid in the case of a person reenlisting for a period which would extend the length of his active Federal service beyond 30 years shall be computed as if said reenlistment were for the minimum number of years necessary to permit such persons to complete 30 years' active Federal service: *And provided further*, That after the enactment of this amendment and under such regulations as may be approved by the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to Coast Guard personnel any person to whom a reenlistment bonus is paid as herein provided, and who voluntarily or as the result of his own misconduct, does not complete the term of enlistment for which the bonus was paid, shall be liable to refund such part of such bonus as the unexpired part of such enlistment bears to the total enlistment period for which such bonus was paid, less any amount paid in Federal or State income taxes on such refundable part.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 1, after "Defense," insert "or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to Coast Guard personnel"

Page 3, line 10, strike out "part." and insert "part." "

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPACT CONCERNING BRIDGE ACROSS THE DELAWARE RIVER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5131) granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike System and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the compact or agreement set forth below, and to each and every term and provision thereof: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to affect, impair, or diminish any right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States or of any court, department, board, bureau, officer, or official of the United States, over or in regard to any navigable waters, or any commerce between the States or with foreign countries, or any bridge, railroad, highway, pier, wharf, or other facility or improvement, or any other person, matter, or thing, forming the subject matter of the aforesaid compact or agreement or otherwise affected by the terms thereof:

Compact between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey authorizing the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission and the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, acting alone or in conjunction with each other, to construct, finance, operate, and maintain a bridge across the Delaware River

Whereas, in order to facilitate vehicular traffic between the eastern and western sections of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, heretofore created by the provisions of the Act of Assembly approved the twenty-first day of May, 1937 (Pamphlet Laws 774), has been authorized and empowered by the provisions of said act and of the supplements and amendments thereto to construct, operate, and maintain a turnpike from a point on the western boundary line of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to a point at the city of Philadelphia, and pursuant thereto is engaged in the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Pennsylvania Turnpike System to carry vehicular traffic from the Pennsylvania-Ohio State line across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to a point at King of Prussia in Montgomery County, Pa., and has been further authorized and empowered by an Act of Assembly to construct, operate, and maintain an extension of the Pennsylvania Turnpike System to carry such vehicular traffic to a point on or near the Delaware River between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey and there to construct, operate, and maintain, either alone or in conjunction with the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, or to contract with the New Jersey Turnpike Authority for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a bridge across the Delaware River, pursuant to such compact as may be entered into between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey; and

Whereas, the New Jersey Turnpike Authority heretofore created by the New Jersey Turnpike Authority Act of 1948 (ch. 454, P. L. 1948), has been authorized to construct and is constructing a turnpike project across the State of New Jersey from a point at State Highway Route No 6 approximately 3 miles westerly from the westerly end of the George Washington Bridge to a point in the county of Salem at or near Deepwater to a connection with a new bridge across the Delaware River now under construction, and has been further authorized and empowered to construct, operate, and maintain an extension to a point on or near the Delaware River, between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and there to construct, operate, and maintain, either alone or in conjunction with the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission or to contract

with the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a bridge across the Delaware River, to connect with the Pennsylvania Turnpike System, pursuant to such compact as may be entered into between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and

Whereas, it is necessary that a bridge be provided across the Delaware River in order to form a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike System and the New Jersey turnpike and that provision be made for the financing, construction, operation, and maintenance of said bridge under such agreement or agreements as may be entered into between the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission and the New Jersey Turnpike Authority;

Now, therefore, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey do hereby solemnly covenant and agree with each other, as follows:

ARTICLE I

The Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission and the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, acting in cooperation with each other, are hereby authorized and empowered, in accordance with such agreement or agreements as shall be entered into pursuant to article II hereof to select the location for, and to prepare the necessary plans for the financing, construction, administration, operation and maintenance of, and to finance, construct, operate, and maintain such bridge across the Delaware River as the commission and the authority may deem feasible and expedient to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike System and the New Jersey turnpike to advance the interests of both States and to facilitate public travel.

ARTICLE II

The Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission and the New Jersey Turnpike Authority shall be and are hereby authorized and empowered to enter into an agreement or agreements, not in conflict or inconsistent with the provisions of article I and III hereof, setting forth in detail the location for such bridge and by whom and in what manner the bridge shall be financed, constructed, operated and maintained, including the manner of fixing and collecting tolls, and providing for joint action by said commission and authority where such joint action is deemed by them to be necessary or advisable and setting forth the manner in which any such joint action may be effected.

ARTICLE III

This compact shall be construed as granting supplemental and additional powers to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission and to the New Jersey Turnpike Authority and shall not be construed as being in derogation of any other powers of the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission and New Jersey Turnpike Authority; provided, however, that (a) all acts and proceedings of said commission with respect to such bridge and its location, construction, financing, operation and maintenance shall not be in conflict or inconsistent with statutes of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania creating or granting powers to said commission; (b) all acts and proceedings of said authority with respect to such bridge and its location, construction, financing, operation and maintenance shall not be in conflict or inconsistent with statutes of the State of New Jersey creating or granting powers to said authority; and (c) the construction of a bridge at the location selected shall not be in contravention of any applicable provision of any compact or agreement entered into by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey which shall be in force and effect at the time of the construction of such bridge.

ARTICLE IV

1. This compact shall enter into force and become effective and binding between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey when (a) it has been adopted and enacted into law by the respective legislatures of said Commonwealth and State, and (b) it has been signed by the respective Governors of the said Commonwealth and State, after authorization therefor by their respective Legislatures, and has been attested by the respective Secretaries of State of the said Commonwealth and State and the respective seals of the said Commonwealth and State have been affixed thereto, and (c) the Congress of the United States of America has consented thereto.

2. This compact shall be signed, attested, and sealed in five originals, one each of said originals to be forwarded to the Governors of the said Commonwealth and State for filing in accordance with the laws of the said Commonwealth and State, one each of said originals to be deposited in the office of the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission and the office of the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, and one of said originals to be deposited with the Secretary of State of the United States of America.

In witness whereof, and in evidence of the adoption and enactment into law of this compact by the Legislatures of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, the Governors of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey do hereby in accordance with authority conferred by the Legislatures of their respective States, sign this compact in five originals, as attested by the respective Secretaries of State of the said Commonwealth and State, and have caused the respective seals of the said Commonwealth and State to be hereunto affixed, this 11th day of July, 1951.

JOHN S. FINE,
John S. Fine

[SEAL]
Governor Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

Attest:

GENE D. SMITH
Gene D. Smith
Secretary of the Commonwealth

ALFRED E. DRISCOLL
Alfred E. Driscoll
[SEAL] Governor, State of New Jersey

Attest:

LLOYD B. MARSH
Lloyd B. Marsh
Secretary of State

SEC. 2. The Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission is hereby authorized to construct the bridge across the Delaware River which is referred to in the compact set forth above in section 1 of this act, either acting alone in accordance with the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or acting jointly with the New Jersey Turnpike Authority in accordance with the provisions of said compact, and the New Jersey Turnpike Authority is hereby authorized to construct said bridge, either acting alone in accordance with the laws of the State of New Jersey or acting jointly with the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission in accordance with the provisions of said compact.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of the General Bridge Act of 1946, as amended, if the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission shall finance the construction of all or a part of said bridge, said commission is hereby authorized to combine said bridge or such part with the Pennsylvania Turnpike System or any part thereof for financing purposes and to fix, charge, and collect tolls for the use of said bridge and to pledge such tolls in accordance with the provisions of the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which relate to said commission or to said Pennsylvania Turnpike System, or if the New Jersey Turnpike Authority shall finance the construction of all or a part of said bridge, said authority is hereby authorized to combine said bridge for such part with the New Jersey Turnpike for financing purposes and to fix, charge, and collect tolls for the use of said bridge and to pledge such tolls in accordance with the provisions of the laws of the State of New Jersey which relate to said authority or said New Jersey Turnpike.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 9, line 11, strike out "Notwithstanding any of the provisions of the General Bridge Act of 1946, as amended, if" and insert "If."

Page 10, line 3, after "Turnpike" insert: ": *Provided*, That the collection of tolls for the use of such bridge shall cease after forty years from the date of completion of such bridge, and such bridge thereafter shall be maintained and operated free of tolls."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EAST PASS CHANNEL INTO CHOCTAWHATCHEE BAY, FLA.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2322) to authorize the improvement of East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is a measure that has been sought by the Army for defense purposes?

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is exactly right, and that is the reason for its presence on this calendar. The Air Force requested that the measure be passed at this time, because they need a deeper channel in order to get the crash boats into the Gulf of Mexico to protect the exercises that are being carried on by the Air Force in the Gulf. It only involves $20,000 a year in new money.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. This bill was fully discussed before our committee. I can say to the House that it came out of our committee with a unanimous report. The National Defense is seriously involved in this matter. It is one of the greatest testing and experimental fields we have in this country.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of National Defense through the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army is au-

thorized to provide a channel 12 feet deep and 180 feet wide from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay via the existing East Pass and to provide maintenance of a 6- by 100-foot channel from East Pass Channel to the harbor at Destin, Fla., generally in accordance with the plan of the district engineer and with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable, at an estimated cost to the United States of $30,000 annually, for restoring and maintaining the project, including $1,000 annually for the 6- by 100-foot channel to Destin.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "National Defense" and insert "the Army."

Page 1, line 10, after "with the" strike out the balance of the line down to and including the word "Destin" on page 2, line 5, and insert "plans and subject to the conditions in House Document No. 470, Eighty-first Congress."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND SECTION 9 OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5257) to amend section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), to increase the amount available as an emergency relief fund for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges damaged by floods or other catastrophes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object. This is a bill that came out of not only the Public Works Committee, but the subcommittee on roads, and it simply increases the amount of money available as an emergency fund that can be used for the repair of highways and bridges, damaged by floods. This legislation should be passed immediately. It comes from Public Works Committee with unanimous vote.

Mr. FALLON. That is right. Most of this money will be used in Kansas and Missouri. The balance, which will be in the neighborhood of $6,000,000, will be available until next year, when other money will be appropriated to take care of any emergency throughout the Nation.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. HAGEN. In the case of the floods of last year and in the case where the road is still damaged and needs repair, will some of these funds be made available for those areas?

Mr. FALLON. The money is available to repair any roads damaged by floods, but it refers only to Federal-aid highways.

Mr. HAGEN. Even though it may have happened last year and the year before?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785), is hereby amended by striking out the figure "$5,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$15,000,000."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF ACCESS ROADS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5504) to amend section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 to increase the amount available for the construction of access roads certified as essential to the national defense.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. McGREGOR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is another bill that has come from the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works by unanimous vote. It authorizes appropriations, as requested by the Department of Defense and changes the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 and authorizes a change from $10,000,000 to $45,000,000. Twenty million dollars of the sum authorized is made available for contracts immediately. It also provides $5,000,000 of funds appropriated under the act may be used in areas certified by the Secretary of Defense as maneuver areas for such reconstruction, maintenance, and repair work as may be necessary to keep the roads therein which have been, or may be, used for training of the Armed Forces in suitable condition for such training purposes, and for repairing damage caused to such roads by the operations of men and equipment in such training.

Mr. FALLON. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785), is hereby amended by striking out "$10,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$45,000,000", and by striking out "$2,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000,000", and by adding at the end thereof the following additional proviso: *"And provided further*, That not exceeding $5,000,000 of any funds appropriated under this authorization may be used by the Secretary of Commerce in areas certified to him by the Secretary of Defense as maneuver areas, for such reconstruction, maintenance, and repair work as may be necessary to keep the roads therein which have been or may be used for training of the Armed Forces in suitable condition for such training purposes, and for repairing the damage caused to such roads by the operations of men and equipment in such training."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

OCTOBER 4, 1951.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I submit herewith my resignation as a member of the Committee on House Administration, effective immediately.

Very truly yours,
EDWARD L. SITTLER, JR.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 445), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, that EDWARD L. SITTLER, JR., of Pennsylvania be, and he is hereby elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Veterans' Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FOR FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R 5118) to amend the Social Security Act to provide unemployment insurance for Federal civilian employees, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding after title XIV thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XV—UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 1501 When used in this title—

"(a) The term 'Federal service' means any service performed after 1949 in the employ of the United States or any instrumentality thereof which is wholly owned by the United States, except that the term shall not include (1) service performed by an elective officer in the executive or legislative branch of the Government of the United States, (2) service performed as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, (3) service performed by foreign service personnel for whom special separation allowances are provided by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999), (4) service performed prior to January 1, 1952, for the Bonneville Power Administrator if such service constitutes employment under section 1607 (m) of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, or (5) service performed outside the United States by an individual who is not a citizen of the United States. For the purpose of clause (5) of this subsection, the term 'United States' when used in a geographical sense

means the States, Alaska, Hawaii, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

"(b) The term 'Federal wages' means all remuneration for Federal service, including cash allowances and remuneration in any medium other than cash.

"(c) The term 'Federal employee' means an individual who has performed Federal service.

"(d) The term 'compensation' means cash benefits payable to individuals with respect to their unemployment (including any portion thereof payable with respect to dependents).

"(e) The term 'benefit year' means the benefit year as defined in the applicable State unemployment compensation law; except that, if such State law does not define a benefit year, then such term means the period prescribed in the agreement under this title with such State or, in the absence of an agreement, the period prescribed by the Secretary.

"(f) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Labor.

"COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES UNDER STATE AGREEMENTS

"SEC. 1502. (a) The Secretary is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into an agreement with any State, or with the agency administering the unemployment compensation law of such State, under which such State agency (1) will make, as agent of the United States, payments of compensation, on the basis provided in subsection (b) of this section, to Federal employees, and (2) will otherwise cooperate with the Secretary and with other State agencies in making payments of compensation under this title.

"(b) Any such agreement shall provide that compensation will be paid by the State to any Federal employee, with respect to unemployment after December 31, 1951, in the same amount, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions as the compensation which would be payable to such employee under the unemployment compensation law of the State if the Federal service and Federal wages of such employee assigned to such State under section 1504 had been included as employment and wages under such law.

"(c) Any determination by a State agency with respect to entitlement to compensation pursuant to an agreement under this section shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment compensation law, and only in such manner and to such extent.

"(d) Each agreement shall provide the terms and conditions upon which the agreement may be amended or terminated.

"COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES IN ABSENCE OF STATE AGREEMENT

"SEC. 1503. (a) In the case of a Federal employee whose Federal service and Federal wages are assigned under section 1504 to a State which does not have an agreement under this title with the Secretary, the Secretary, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, shall, upon the filing by such employee of a claim for compensation under this subsection, make payments of compensation to him with respect to unemployment after December 31, 1951, in the same amounts, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions as would be paid to him under the unemployment compensation law of such State if such employee's Federal service and Federal wages had been included as employment and wages under such law, except that if such employee, without regard to his Federal service and Federal wages, has employment or wages sufficient to qualify for any compensation during the benefit year under the law of such State, then payments of compensation under this subsection shall be made only on the basis of his Federal service and Federal wages.

"(b) In the case of a Federal employee whose Federal service and Federal wages are assigned under section 1504 to Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands, the Secretary, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, shall, upon the filing by such employee of a claim for compensation under this subsection, make payments of compensation to him with respect to unemployment after December 31, 1951, in the same amounts, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions as would be paid to him under the unemployment compensation law of the District of Columbia if such employee's Federal service and Federal wages had been included as employment and wages under such law, except that if such employee, without regard to his Federal service and Federal wages, has employment or wages sufficient to qualify for any compensation during the benefit year under such law, then payments of compensation under this subsection shall be made only on the basis of his Federal service and Federal wages.

"(c) Any Federal employee whose claim for compensation under subsection (a) or (b) of this section has been denied shall be entitled to a fair hearing in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. Any final determination by the Secretary with respect to entitlement to compensation under this section shall be subject to review by the courts in the same manner and to the same extent as is provided in section 205 (g) of title II with respect to final decisions of the Administrator under such title.

"(d) The Secretary may utilize for the purposes of this section the personnel and facilities of the agencies in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands cooperating with the United States Employment Service under the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended. For the purpose of payments made to such agencies under such act, the furnishing of such personnel and facilities shall be deemed to be a part of the administration of the public employment offices of such agencies.

"STATE TO WHICH FEDERAL SERVICE AND WAGES ARE ASSIGNABLE

"SEC. 1504. In accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, the Federal service and Federal wages of an employee shall be assigned to the State in which he had his last official station in Federal service prior to the filing of his first claim for compensation for the benefit year, except that—

"(1) if, at the time of the filing of such first claim, he resides in another State in which he performed, after the termination of such Federal service, service covered under the unemployment compensation law of such other State, such Federal service and Federal wages shall be assigned to such other State;

"(2) if his last official station in Federal service, prior to the filing of such first claim, was outside the United States, such Federal service and Federal wages shall be assigned to the State where he resides at the time he files such first claim; and

"(3) if such first claim is filed while he is residing in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands, such Federal service and Federal wages shall be assigned to Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.

"TREATMENT OF ACCRUED ANNUAL LEAVE

"SEC. 1505. For the purposes of this title, in the case of a Federal employee who is performing Federal service at the time of his separation from employment by the United States or any instrumentality thereof, (1) the Federal service of such employee shall be considered as continuing during the period, subsequent to such separation, with respect to which he is considered as having received payment of accumulated and current annual or vacation leave pursuant to any Federal law, and (2) subject to regulations of the Secretary concerning allocation over the period, such payment shall constitute Federal wages.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 1506. (a) Each State shall be entitled to be paid by the United States an amount equal to the additional cost to the State of payments of compensation made under and in accordance with an agreement under this title which would not have been incurred by the State but for the agreement.

"(b) In making payments pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, there shall be paid to the State, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, such sum as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this title for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that his estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State Such estimates may be made upon the basis of such statistical, sampling, or other method as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency.

"(c) The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State sums payable to such State under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment to the State in accordance with such certification, from the funds for carrying out the purposes of this title.

"(d) All money paid a State under this title shall be used solely for the purposes for which it is paid; and any money so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned, at the time specified in the agreement under this title, to the Treasury and credited to current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts from which payments to States under this title may be made

"(e) An agreement under this title may require any officer or employee of the State certifying payments or disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement, or otherwise participating in its performance, to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Secretary may deem necessary, and may provide for the payment of the cost of such bond from funds for carrying out the purposes of this title.

"(f) No person designated by the Secretary, or designated pursuant to an agreement under this title, as a certifying officer, shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any compensation certified by him under this title.

"(g) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this title if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated as provided in subsection (f) of this section.

"(h) For the purpose of payments made to a State under title III, administration by the State agency of such State pursuant to an agreement under this title shall be deemed to be a part of the administration of the State unemployment compensation law.

"INFORMATION

"SEC. 1507. (a) All Federal departments, agencies, and wholly owned instrumentalities of the United States are directed to make available to State agencies which have agreements under this title or to the Secretary, as the case may be, such information with respect to the Federal service and Federal wages of any Federal employee as the Secretary may find practicable and necessary for the determination of such employee's entitlement to compensation under this title.

"(b) The agency administering the unemployment compensation law of any State shall furnish to the Secretary such information as the Secretary may find necessary or appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this title, and such information shall be deemed reports required by the Secretary for the purposes of paragraph (6) of subsection (a) of section 303.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 1508. Whoever makes a false statement or representation of a material fact knowing it to be false, or knowingly fails to disclose a material fact, to obtain or increase for himself or for any other individual any payment authorized to be paid under this title or under an agreement thereunder shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"REGULATIONS

"SEC. 1509. The Secretary is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. The Secretary shall insofar as practicable consult with representatives of the State unemployment compensation agencies before prescribing any rules or regulations which may affect the performance by such agencies of functions pursuant to agreements under this title.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC 1510 There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this title"

SEC 2. Section 1606 (e) and section 1607 (m) of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act are each hereby amended by inserting after "December 31, 1945," the following. "and prior to January 1, 1952,".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] will be recognized for 20 minutes. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FORAND. I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 5118, now under consideration, provides for unemployment insurance for Federal civilian workers, with minor exceptions, who are employed in the United States, including Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and elsewhere, if citizens of the United States.

Unemployment compensation will be payable to such Federal workers who are unemployed after December 31, 1951. A Federal worker's right to benefits are to be determined under the unemployment-compensation law of the State to which his Federal services and wages are assigned. Usually this will be the State in which the worker had his official station when he became unemployed, or if he has been in foreign service, the State in which he resides when he files his claim Compensation will not be paid for the period with respect to which accrued annual leave is paid upon separation.

Under this bill the Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into agreements with each State, under which the State unemployment-compensation agency will make benefit payments as agent for the United States. The States will be reimbursed by the United States for any additional costs of such payments.

If a State does not make such an agreement, the Secretary will make the unemployment-compensation payments and will apply the benefits' standards under the law of such State.

Unemployed workers filing a claim in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands will be paid according to the benefits' standards under the unemployment compensation law of the District of Columbia. This bill comes to the floor with an unanimous report of the Subcommittee on Unemployment Insurance and practically with the unanimous report of the Ways and Means Committee.

Public hearings were held on an earlier bill on the same subject, H. R. 3393. At the hearings before the Subcommittee on Unemployment Insurance of the Committee on Ways and Means which were held on July 18, 19, and 20, 1951, there appeared representatives of the Department of Labor, the Department of Defense, the Federal Security Agency, the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies—representing the State Unemployment Compensation Administrators—organizations of Government employees, and the national labor organizations—American Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the International Association of Machinists—and of industry. In addition, statements were received from the Bureau of the Budget and the United States Civil Service Commission.

Although ample public notice was given of the fact that these hearings were to be held, no one appeared in opposition and not a single witness took issue with the premise of need of Federal civilian workers for unemployment insurance protection.

That there is need for this type of legislation is apparent, whether the stability of Federal employment is considered by itself or is compared with that in private employment now covered by unemployment insurance.

In spite of general impressions to the contrary, many workers are separated from Federal employment each year. The record shows that in 1949 nearly one-half million Federal employees were separated and in 1950 the number is in excess of 450,000. Nearly 45 percent of these separations were involuntary, caused by reductions in force and terminations of temporary appointments. In fact, although Federal employment was rising rapidly during the last 6 months of 1950, there were, nevertheless, 75,000 involuntary separations during that period.

Information presented to the subcommittee indicated that the average individual now in Federal employment does not have long years of service to his credit—further evidence of Government turn-over. In connection with leave studies, Civil Service Commission data shows that only about 167,000 Federal workers have 15 years of Federal employment. The workers who requested retirement refunds in 1949 had an average of only 2 years' service—and almost every separated worker who was entitled to a refund requested it.

In the past, separated Federal workers have had two partial substitutes for unemployment insurance—accumulated annual leave and the retirement refunds. Neither of these should, of course, be regarded as a true substitute for unemployment insurance, since using them in that way represents a distortion of their intended purpose.

The fact remains, however, that workers have been forced to use them as sources of income after separation, since there is no provision for unemployment compensation for Federal workers under existing law.

The situation with respect to these two programs has changed recently, however, so that they no longer can be regarded in any way as taking the place of, or reducing the need for, a program of unemployment insurance.

Because of the present policy of hiring Federal workers as temporary and thus not eligible to build up a retirement fund, these temporary workers are now being covered under the Social Security System. It is estimated that by the end of this calendar year about 750,000 Federal workers will be under the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Program. This, of course, provides no benefits to the worker while he is unemployed unless he has reached the age of retirement and being in temporary employment simply means that once he is separated, he has to be strictly on his own. It is for that reason that your committee believe that these people who work for Uncle Sam should be given the same type of unemployment compensation coverage as is extended to those in private employment.

While your committee believes that services of employees of the District of Columbia should be covered for unemployment purposes, it was considered preferable to achieve such coverage through an appropriate amendment to the unemployment compensation law of the District of Columbia. For that reason they were not included in this bill.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in a nutshell, the problem that is presented by this bill to this House is simply this: Under legislation passed by the Congress, Uncle Sam now requires private employers to hand over money to pay for unemployment insurance when their employees are divorced from the payroll. That is now the law. Uncle Sam requires it. This bill simply says that Uncle Sam, himself, for his own employees, shall do exactly that same thing, and set an example at least to the private employers of the Nation. In a nutshell that is the situation.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan

Mr. FORD. Are we not going to have this problem if this legislation is enacted into law? When Congress attempts to get reductions in the Federal budget, the argument will be used that to cut appropriations, thereby reducing the number of employees, the Congress

will be adding additional financial burdens by the cost of unemployment compensation. In other words, you might save some by cutting the regular appropriations but you have got to pay out of the other pocket under the Unemployment Insurance Act.

Mr. MASON. Yes, that argument will be used, but it is not a valid argument. If I cut a man off the payroll and he is getting $3,500 a year, I am Uncle Sam now, and I have to pay, as a result of that divorcement, for 26 weeks or 20 weeks or 15 weeks, as is the law in some States, unemployment compensation, I am still ahead of the game, and the argument loses its force when Uncle Sam compels private employers to do that.

Mr. FORD. One further question. In many cases the argument has been used that the vacation and sick leave benefits for Federal employees has been, in effect, unemployment compensation. There is legislation in conference to provide a graduated vacation plan. Would it not be better to wait on this bill until we see what happens to the graduated vacation proposal?

Mr. MASON. Yes. That argument has been used, too. It is also not valid, in my opinion, because vacation pay has been given to private employees in their various contracts in late years. Leave pay for Federal employees is in the same category as vacation pay for private employees; but when I, as a Federal employee, get leave pay, and when I am divorced from the Federal payroll, then for the period that I am getting leave pay I am still considered, under this bill, as being employed by the Federal Government, and I cannot collect unemployment compensation for that same time that I receive leave pay. So there is no double pay in this bill.

Mr. FORD. But do you not run into this point: that if a person has 90 days accumulated leave, and he leaves active Federal employment, he extends his unemployment benefits by the amount of the accumulated leave.

Mr. MASON. Oh, no. This accumulated leave that he has will keep him on the Federal payroll until that time is up. Then he can apply for unemployment compensation if he has not found a job in the meantime.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. In the State of Connecticut we assess the employer a percentage of his payroll to pay unemployment insurance to divorced employees.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. MORANO. How does the Federal Government propose to raise the money to pay the Federal Government employees?

Mr. MASON. The Federal Government will take it out of the general fund of the Federal Government that comes out of general taxes.

Mr. MORANO. Has it been estimated how much it will cost?

Mr. MASON. Yes; it has. It will cost anywhere from ten million to thirty million dollars, depending on the number separated each year

Mr. MORANO. Will the respective States administer the law?

Mr. MASON. The respective States will administer the law, and a Federal employee who is working in the State of Connecticut will receive compensation on the basis of the standards and requirements of the Connecticut unemployment-insurance law.

Mr. MORANO. We have a limitation on the fund; we have a ceiling and a floor in the State of Connecticut. How do you propose to work that out for the Federal Treasury?

Mr. MASON. The ceiling and the floor apply to your private employees in Connecticut, but do not apply to Federal employees who are working in the State of Connecticut. The standards of the length of time, the amount that will be paid, whether it is 26 weeks, 20 weeks, and the qualifications required will apply to the Federal employee as well as the State employee.

Mr. MORANO. Have you put any limitation on the amount the General Treasury will have to spend?

Mr. MASON. There is no limitation; it will depend upon the amount each State allows. Some States have 26 weeks, some have 15, and others a different length of time. That really was the big problem in connection with this bill, to see to it that the Federal Government would not insist upon uniform standards all over the United States for their Federal employees, because that would mean controversy and jealousy between the private employees in your State and the Federal employees in your State; so the bill provides that they must be paid and they must qualify according to the standards of the State in which they have been working.

Mr. MORANO. But in our State, should we have a severe economic crisis which would remove a great many people from the payroll it would deplete the fund and we would have to make an assessment against the employers.

Mr. MASON. This has nothing to do with that.

Mr. MORANO. It will have an effect on the General Treasury, though.

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. MORANO. If there is a big divorcement of employees from the Federal Government payroll——

Mr. MASON. As we hope there will be.

Mr. MORANO. Will the General Treasury benefit by such a reduction?

Mr. MASON. The General Treasury will benefit to the extent that if there is a divorcement, say, of 500,000 employees from the Federal payroll next year that would mean a saving of about $2,000,000,000 for the Federal Treasury, and this would mean a paying out of $30,000,000.

Mr. MORANO. Under those circumstances I am inclined to favor the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in disagreement with the Committee on Ways and Means over this measure. I do not want to draw an inference unfair to worthy workers who might need some compensation. In the first place, this is going to cost from 10 to 30 millions a year. We do not have the money. But there is a basic philosophy involved here; unemployment compensation is provided in industry to encourage industry to keep full employment the year around, to encourage them not to let their employees go. In most States it is to the advantage of the employers to keep full employment, in that they pay a lesser unemployment tax. Certainly that is not the position in regard to Government employees; Government employees may not get every consideration that private employees get, but they get some advantages that private employees do not.

I shall not support the bill.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to address to the gentleman from Illinois or to the author of the bill with reference to the provisions of section 1509 on page 11. There are three words in that section I just do not like, three words we find appearing constantly in legislation where Federal aid is being extended to a State-administered program.

The Secretary of Labor here is authorized very properly and necessarily to draw up rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of the act. Then it provides, and I feel sure it was the intention of the committee to make it mandatory, that the Secretary shall consult with the representatives of the State unemployment-compensation agencies before prescribing any rules or regulations. In other words, as the gentleman from Illinois pointed out, it was intended that the Federal Government should not force the States to enter into uniform Nationwide provisions, but those words "insofar as practicable" which appear in line 23 are the words which give the Secretary the out. Unless these words are stricken or unless we make it absolutely clear that we do not intend this phraseology to be employed by the Secretary as an excuse for him to go all around the country and try to dictate to each of the States just how they shall administer their programs. I regret that those three words, which might seem harmless, are in this bill. In my judgment, they contain the seeds of abuse in the hands of a Secretary enthused over the desirability of having Washington run the entire country.

I hope that the discussion on the floor today will indicate beyond any doubt that it is intended the Secretary of Labor shall not cram down the throats of the various State agencies his own ideas, but that, rather, before taking any step to draw up or to amend the rules and regulations governing this unemployment-insurance program he will consult seriously and sincerely with the various State authorities charged with administrative responsibilities.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. May I say that, so far as I am concerned, I would just as soon the words "insofar as practicable" were stricken from the bill.

Mr. KEATING. Knowing the general philosophy of the gentleman, I would rather imagine he would prefer to see them stricken from the bill. May I inquire of the other side? It is very possible that by unanimous consent they may be stricken from the bill.

Mr. FORAND. I doubt that they can be stricken. The truth of the matter is that is the usual language used in practically all bills.

Mr KEATING That is the trouble. In the past those same words have at times led to thwarting congressional intent.

Mr FORAND. The truth of the matter is also that the Secretary of Labor knows what our committee means, he knows what this Congress means, and he also knows that if he oversteps we will be on him immediately.

Mr. KEATING. I am glad to have that assurance from the author of the measure.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Does the gentleman understand this applies to temporary employees as well?

Mr KEATING. I assume it applies to all employees

Mr. COLMER. Even those who are receiving temporary employment?

Mr. KEATING. I assume so But I would rather have a member of the committee reporting the bill give the gentleman final assurance on that point.

Mr. COLMER. I understand that is true

Mr KEATING. Just one word more. I expect to support this bill which has come from the Committee on Ways and Means by unanimous report. Nevertheless, I am opposed to the consideration of important and complicated measures like this under a suspension of the rules, which permits only such limited debate and does not allow the submission of amendments. I feel sure many Members share this view.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Is it a fact that the purpose of this bill is to put Federal employees on the same basis as those in private employment, who are largely covered by unemployment insurance?

Mr. FORAND. Absolutely. We want to take care of the Federal employees who will be thrown out of work.

Mr. JAVITS. Just the same as if they were in private employment?

Mr. FORAND. The intent of the bill is to take care of Federal employees who are either thrown out of a job or for some reason or other have to leave and are left high and dry. It is not generally known, but it was given to me, in fact this information was given to our committee in executive session, by one of the outstanding men of this country that following World War I one of the great philanthropists of this country paid out of his own pocket $250,000 to pay the transportation home of Federal workers who were discharged following World War I. We anticipated the same thing might happen after World War II, but fortunately it did not. We have no way of knowing, however, when the situation will arise that a large number of Federal employees will be thrown out of employment.

Following World War II we had an example right in my own State at the Naval Torpedo Station in Newport where the normal complement of men was 1,000. The personnel increased so that it reached a figure in excess of 13,000 during the war. Immediately following World War II there was a cutback down to 600 employees. Most of these people were people who had civil service credit and who would not withdraw their funds from the retirement system because of the law. They had no coverage under unemployment compensation They were stranded, they were left without income.

It caused a real hardship This is an effort to prevent a repetition of that situation.

Mr. JAVITS. Does not the gentleman feel that this bears on the capability of persons entering Government employment, that is, if they feel they are being treated ratably with private employment, they will seek service with the Government and we will get people of equal skill and capability?

Mr. FORAND. That is right.

Mr MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Is there a limitation on the annual income before a person is eligible?

Mr. FORAND. The same thing applies to any person employed in private industry. It is not a case of how much income they receive; it is a case of their being out of employment and they meet the requirements of the State as to eligibility for unemployment compensation.

Mr. MORANO. But there are limitations in the State?

Mr. FORAND. Every State has its own limitations and requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FORAND) there were—ayes 70, noes 44.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 197, nays 140, not voting 91, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

YEAS—197

Adair	Fulton	Miller, N. Y.
Addonizio	Furcolo	Mills
Albert	Garmatz	Mitchell
Allen, Calif.	Gavin	Morano
Allen, Ill.	Gordon	Morgan
Anfuso	Gore	Morris
Angell	Granahan	Morton
Aspinall	Granger	Multer
Auchincloss	Green	Murdock
Ayres	Greenwood	Norblad
Bakewell	Hagen	Norrell
Baring	Hall,	O'Brien, Ill.
Beall	Edwin Arthur	O'Brien, Mich.
Beamer	Halleck	O'Neill
Beckworth	Harden	O'Toole
Bender	Harris	Patman
Bennett, Mich.	Hart	Patterson
Bishop	Havenner	Philbin
Blackney	Hays, Ark.	Poage
Boggs, Del.	Hays, Ohio	Polk
Bolling	Heller	Potter
Bolton	Herter	Price
Bosone	Heselton	Priest
Boykin	Holmes	Prouty
Bray	Horan	Rabaut
Brehm	Hull	Radwan
Buchanan	Hunter	Reams
Buckley	Ikard	Reed, N. Y.
Burdick	Irving	Rees, Kans.
Burnside	Jackson, Wash.	Rhodes
Butler	Javits	Ribicoff
Byrne, N. Y.	Jenkins	Riehlman
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson	Rogers, Colo.
Canfield	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Mass.
Cannon	Judd	Rooney
Carnahan	Karsten, Mo.	Sasscer
Case	Kean	Saylor
Chudoff	Keating	Secrest
Clemente	Kee	Seely-Brown
Cole, Kans.	Kelley, Pa.	Sieminski
Combs	Kelly, N. Y.	Simpson, Pa.
Cooley	Kerr	Sittler
Cooper	Kersten, Wis.	Springer
Corbett	King	Steed
Crosser	Kirwan	Stigler
Cunningham	Klein	Sutton
Davis, Ga.	Kluczynski	Tackett
Davis, Tenn.	Lane	Thomas
Davis, Wis.	Lanham	Thornberry
Dawson	Lesinski	Tollefson
Dempsey	Lind	Trimble
Devereux	McConnell	Van Zandt
Dingell	McGrath	Walter
Donohue	McGuire	Weichel
Doughton	McKinnon	Welch
Doyle	Machrowicz	Wickersham
Eaton	Mack, Wash.	Wier
Elliott	Madden	Williams, N. Y.
Engle	Magee	Wilson, Ind.
Evins	Mahon	Withrow
Fallon	Mansfield	Wolcott
Feighan	Marshall	Wolverton
Fenton	Martin, Iowa	Woodruff
Flood	Martin, Mass.	Yates
Fogarty	Mason	Yorty
Forand	Merrow	Zablocki

NAYS—140

Aandahl	Church	Grant
Abbitt	Clevenger	Gross
Abernethy	Colmer	Hale
Andersen, H. Carl	Cotton	Hall, Leonard W.
Anderson, Calif.	Coudert	Hardy
Andresen, August H.	Crumpacker	Harrison, Wyo.
Andrews	Curtis, Mo.	Harvey
Arends	Curtis, Nebr.	Herlong
Armstrong	Dague	Hill
Bates, Mass.	Denny	Hillings
Belcher	D'Ewart	Hinshaw
Bennett, Fla.	Dolliver	Hoeven
Bentsen	Dondero	Hoffman, Ill.
Betts	Dorn	Hoffman, Mich.
Bonner	Ellsworth	Hope
Bow	Elston	James
Bramblett	Fernandez	Jenison
Brown, Ga.	Fisher	Jensen
Brownson	Ford	Jonas
Bryson	Forrester	Jones, Ala.
Buffett	Frazier	Jones, Hamilton C.
Burton	Fugate	Jones, Woodrow W.
Bush	Gary	Kearns
Carlyle	Gathings	Kilday
Chenoweth	George	Lanham
Chiperfield	Golden	
	Goodwin	
	Graham	

Lantaff	Rains	Smith, Wis.
LeCompte	Rankin	Stanley
Lovre	Reece, Tenn.	Taber
Lyle	Reed, Ill.	Talle
McDonough	Regan	Teague
McGregor	Richards	Thompson,
McMillan	Riley	Mich.
McMullen	Roberts	Vail
McVey	Robeson	Van Pelt
Meader	Rogers, Fla.	Vorys
Miller, Md.	Rogers, Tex.	Vursell
Miller, Nebr.	St. George	Werdel
Mumma	Schwabe	Wharton
Murray, Tenn.	Scrivner	Wheeler
Nelson	Shafer	Whitten
Nicholson	Sheehan	Widnall
Passman	Sikes	Wigglesworth
Patten	Simpson, Ill.	Wilson, Tex.
Pickett	Smith, Kans.	Wood, Ga
Poulson	Smith, Miss.	Wood, Idaho
Preston	Smith, Va.	

NOT VOTING—91

Allen, La.	Gamble	Perkins
Bailey	Gregory	Phillips
Baker	Gwinn	Powell
Barden	Hand	Quinn
Barrett	Harrison, Va.	Ramsay
Bates, Ky.	Hébert	Redden
Battle	Hedrick	Rivers
Berry	Heffernan	Rodino
Blatnik	Hess	Roosevelt
Boggs, La.	Holifield	Sabath
Brooks	Howell	Sadlak
Brown, Ohio	Jackson, Calif.	Scott, Hardie
Budge	Jarman	Scott,
Burleson	Kearney	Hugh D., Jr.
Busbey	Kennedy	Scudder
Camp	Keogh	Shelley
Celler	Kilburn	Sheppard
Chatham	Latham	Short
Chelf	Lucas	Spence
Cole, N. Y.	McCarthy	Staggers
Cox	McCormack	Stockman
Crawford	McCulloch	Taylor
Deane	Mack, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
DeGraffenried	Miller, Calif.	Velde
Delaney	Morrison	Vinson
Denton	Moulder	Watts
Dollinger	Murphy	Whitaker
Donovan	Murray, Wis.	Williams, Miss.
Durham	O'Hara	Willis
Eberharter	O'Konski	Winstead
Fine	Ostertag	

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the House refused to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hand and Mr. McCormack for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Ostertag.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Quinn with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Velde.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Short.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Scudder.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Battle with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Busbey.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Phillips of California.
Mr. Fine with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Budge.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 220):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. KARL STEFAN, late a Representative from the State of Nebraska.

Resolved, That a committee of five Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1952.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4496) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes," and agrees to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 65.

THE SUBMARINE "ULUA"

Mr. BATES of Massachuetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5067) to authorize the use of the incompleted submarine *Ulua* as a target for explosive tests, and for other purposes, which was on the consent calendar today, No. 187, and which was objected to by by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this bill would authorize the use of the incompleted submarine *Ulua* as a target for a test which is of great significance to the military security of our country. Since the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] objected to the bill, I have had an opportunity to discuss the matter with him in full, and he informs me that he has removed his objections.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 1994, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the proviso of title III of the Second Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act, 1946, under the heading "Increase and replacement of naval vessels, emergency construction" (60 Stat. 227), the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to employ the incompleted submarine *Ulua* (SS-428) as a target for explosive tests in order to gather research data for new weapon and submarine design.

SEC. 2. Upon conclusion of the explosive tests, the Secretary of the Navy may, in his discretion, sink the *Ulua* if considered unseaworthy, or retain the *Ulua* and make such repairs as will equip the *Ulua* for further tests and experimentation, or dispose of her in accordance with other provisions of law.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 5067) was laid on the table.

AMENDING TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 446, Rept. No. 1095), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H R. 5505) to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

COL. HARRY F. CUNNINGHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 625) for the relief of Col. Harry F. Cunningham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to treat the claim of Col. Harry F. Cunningham against the German Government, which was filed with the office of the Alien Property Custodian on September 26, 1947 (claim No. 16,224) under section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (50 U. S. C., App 32), as though the architectural services on which such claim is based gave rise to a lien interest in the property in connection with which such services were performed and such interest was the basis for a valid title claim under such section of such act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF VICTOR HELFENBEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 814) for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Victor Helfenbein, the sum of $15,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for fatal injuries sustained by him in a collision involving a United States Army ambulance from Fort Hamilton on August 12, 1944, in Brooklyn, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this bill in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or directed to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$15,000" and insert "$3,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERNARD R NOVAK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R 1964) for the relief of Bernard R. Novak.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bernard R. Novak, San Luis Obispo, Calif., the sum of $15,000. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Bernard R. Novak against the United States for personal injuries, loss of earnings, and medical and hospital expenses sustained by him as a result of a collision which occurred on January 15, 1943, when a United States Coast Guard truck struck the rear of a truck operated by the said Bernard R Novak which he had stopped at a toll house on the bridge between Duluth, Minn., and Superior, Wis., in order to pay toll: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Central Division of the Southern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Bernard R. Novak, of San Luis Obispo, Calif., for personal injuries and expenses incident thereto, sustained as a result of the collision which occurred on January 15, 1943, when a United States Coast Guard truck struck the rear of the truck operated by the said Bernard R. Novak, at a toll house on the bridge between Duluth, Minn., and Superior, Wis

"SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitation. Proceedings for the determination of such claims, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 1346 of title 28 of the United States Code."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Central Division of the Southern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Bernard R. Novak."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

O. L OSTEEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3137) for the relief of O. L. Osteen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to O L. Osteen the sum of $176 28, which sum represents the amount paid by him out of his own funds to satisfy a claim against him for damages to a privately owned vehicle when it was involved in a collision with the Government car he was driving in the course of performance of his official duties in Aerdenhout, Holland: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction therof shall be fined in the sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MASTER SGT. ORVAL BENNETT

The Clerk called the bill (H R 3946) for the relief of Master Sgt. Orval Bennett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Orval Bennett, master sergeant, United States Air Force (AF 6251506), Fort Worth, Tex., the sum of $1,150 90 The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Orval Bennett against the United States for reimbursement of amounts collected from him by the United States during the period beginning March 1, 1950, and ending August 31, 1950, on account of certain overpayments which were made by the United States pursuant to a class E allotment: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GERTRUDE O. YERXA ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R 5267) for the relief of Gertrude O. Yerxa, Mrs. G. Olive Yerxa, and Dr. Charles W. Yerxa

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gertrude O Yerxa, Arcadia, Calif., the sum of $1,175 39; to Mrs G. Olive Yerxa, Arcadia, Calif., the sum of $500, and to Dr. Charles W Yerxa, Arcadia, Calif., the sum of $500 The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Gertrude O Yerxa, the said Mrs G Olive Yerxa, and the said Dr. Charles W Yerxa, respectively, against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained, and medical and hospital expenses incurred, as a result of a collision on May 30, 1945, on Riverside Drive, Los Angeles, Calif., involving an automobile owned and operated by the said Gertrude O. Yerxa and a United States Army vehicle This claim is not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act *Provided*, That no part of any sum appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim satisfied by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1 000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AKIKO MITSUHATA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 283) for the relief of Akiko Mitsuhata.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Akiko Mitsuhata, Yokohama, Japan, the Japanese fiancée of Douglas Dean Whitney, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that Akiko Mitsuhata shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Akiko Mitsuhata is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Douglas Whitney, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Akiko Mitsuhata, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156).

In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Akiko Mitsuhata, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Akiko Mitsuhata as of the date of payment by her of the required visa fee and head taxes.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAVORING THE SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (S. Con. Res. 39) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

A-5624348, Nakaguchi, Shigeki, or Robert Nakaguchi

A-3652320, Buhl, Christain Nielsen.

A 3100694, Csech, John, or Janos Csech.

A-7127706, Klimek, Henryk.

A-4401725, Magaddino, Giuseppa (nee Iracani, Concetta Catanzaro).

A-1041814, Manilowitz, David, or Mendel Hodak

A-4696810, Masala, Luigi, or Louis Marsorla or Luigi Mazala or Masorala or Masola.

A-5212628, Pelli, Dante.

A-3779276, Schaefer, Hans Johannes

A-1725376, Brenmer, Edmund Oscar Heinrich, or Edmund Oscar Heinrich Sturm

A-5970656, Juliano, Mary, or Mary McKinnon McDonald Clark McCulloch, or McDonald (nee McCulloch) or Bernice Vernon or May Vernon, or Bernice Sullivan.

A-5151789, Van Paassen, Cornelia Machelina (nee Sizoo), or Cornelie Machelina Van Paassen or Cornelia M Van Paassen or Cornalie Van Paassen, and so forth.

A-7036879, Van Paassen, Hugo Lodewijk Laurusse, or Hugo Lodewik Van Paassen or Hugo L. Van Paassen

A-4332761, McNally, Nellie Elena (nee Zrum).

A-4862381, Volk, Christina May (nee Mackenzie)

A-4655709, Sgro, Vito, or Vito Sgrol.

A-4101085, Tsoulemelekis, Nicolas, or Nicholas or Tselomelekis alias Nick Makki or Nick Mekis.

A-2808666, Luder, Karl Frank

A-9550171, Aimala, Tauno Pellervo, or Taumo Pellervo

A-7197944, Hartog, Josef Jacob.

A-6178102, Hartog, Ada Frederika.

A-2691539, Kallinikos, Miltiadis, or James Callas.

A-7445627, Diamandopoulos, Antonis Emmanuel

A-7125018, Lowinger, Mor Maurice, or Mor Lowinger or Mor (Moritz) Lovinger.

A-7125145, Lowinger, Edith nee Welcz or Edit (Edith) Welsz.

A-7469035, Bernier, Maudy Eleonore Frieereke

A-7463944, Bernier, Carlotta, or Deubner-Bernier.

A-2787564, Djang, Stephen T., also Sung Tsing Djang.

A-6137973, Haynal, Helen May Babienco.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, after line 8, insert the following registration numbers and names:

"A-7130337, Bach, Nathan.

"A-7130336, Bach, Lena, nee Winerlock.

"A-5950016, Diakatos, Androioannis.

"A-7190920, Yatrakis, Thekla George, nee Vardakas

"A-7190919, Yatrakis, George Petros

"A-6474461, Zwick, Samuel, or Wick.

"A-7184995, Iny, Frank Jacob.

"A-7184996, Iny, Muzli Masri.

"A-6811549, Heidmeier, Elfriede.

"A-6698695, Berlonghi, Ercole

"A 6698706, Berlonghi, Agnese nee Brambilla"

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr WALTER: On page 3, line 19, insert the registration numbers and names:

"A-7392825, Easterling, Ilda Marie Chislaine nee Finet

"A-3686108, Hu, Seng-Chiu"

The amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con Res. 41) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring, That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months

A-6479486, Abernethy, Richard John or Richard John Fowler or "Mickey"

A-6539701, Adams, Muriel Emily (nee Briggs)

A-7140100, Alaniz-Cavazos, Fidel.

A-5882375, Armadillo, Pedro.

A-4870915, Baker, Mary Agnes Julia (nee Bourque)

A 7222788, Barone, Maurio or Mario.

A-7908682, Beltran-Garcia, Adolfo, or Julio Velazques-Quesada or Julio V. Quesada.

A-7050329, Bourke, Lesandre, Helen.

A 7284857, Bradley, Amelia Mary.

A-7118532, Braschel, Erich

A-7469506, Carlson, Else Solveig or Else Solveig Huttel

A-4744210, Del Greco, Gino

A 5567596, De Reyes, Amada Morales.

A-2043792, De Estrada, Concepcion Contreras.

A-4510833, Devany, Margaret Jane or Anne or Annie Devany.

A-6261641, Dimitriou (Demitry or Demetriou), Olympia (nee Hassos).

A-5751220, Di Paola, Castrenze or Costrenze or Castrenzo or John Di Paola.

A-4673025, Di Vito, Carmen Francesco or Carmen Francisco Di Vito

A-7189232, Donovan, Daniel Millington.

A-4746581, Drysdale, Katherine Mercia.

A-4757727, Eckstein, Renee or Regina (nee Semo).

A-6707812, Ekmekjian, Lucie Sona (nee Takvorian).

A-5229491, Embiricos, Michael Andre.

A-4310620, End, Hillebrand Van Den.

A-7975636, Enman, Marta Magdalena (nee Marta Magdalena Zenk y Acuna).

A-4387785, Feiler, Sam or Solomon Feiler or Salamon Feiler.

A-4039884, Florich, Nicola Luciano.

A-3647798, Francescut, Angela Catterina Vidoni

A-1774672, Frankild, Erhardt Alexander or Dan Frankild.

A-7286278, Garcia, Samuel.

A-2347329, Garcia-Lozada, Benigno or Manuel Montesino.

A-9114236, Golonka, Jan.

A 5070150, Gonzales, Albert Fernandez or Alberto Fernandez G. or Alberto Fernandez Gonzalez.

A-1152048, Guglielmetti, Giuseppe Settembrino or Joseph S. Williams.

A-2410518, Hara, Miho.

A-3792301, Hayano, Kow Watanabe.

A-7040197, Hebenstreit, Lottie or Lott Heberstreit.

A-2756914, Helou, Maurice Barakat or Maurice Barakat

A-4462374, Hiraoka, Inosuke or Sadanobu Ueno or Uyeno or Yamamoto

A-6293696, Hirsch, Helga Maria.

A-4350758, Hodder, John.

A-4350329, Hoelzel, Alex.

A-3201950, Inada, Shoichiro.

A 3774948, Incamicia, Carlo.

A-6387039, Jin, Wong Siu Lin or Mrs. Job Jen or Milcar Jen.

A-6790865, Kaandorp, Jacques.

A-9798327, Kakavogiannis, George (Georgios Athanasios or George A. Giannis)

A-6163572, Kendryna, Catherine Emilia (ne Baran).

A-3816993, Kinjo, Shinkichi.

A-7209756, Koltschinska, Raisa.

A-2044142, Krikorian, Taman or Taman Antaramian formely Shagian and Ogasapian (nee Ganjoian)

A-7290624, Labrador, Aurea Quizol.

A-1801834, Lengyel, Nicholas

A-7975632, Leone, Zita Zeledon Sevilla.

A 6291541, Macias-Lopez, Jesus

A-3140066, Matsubayashi, Haruye or Harumi or Jean Matsubayashi (nee Okada).

A-3329106, Matsubayashi, Kokichi or Harry Matsubayashi.

A-6162247, Matsuda, Tomiji.

A-7427249, Mawson, Fred.

A-5728807, McGillivray, Marie Bertile.

A-6791277, Medina, Barbara Cecelia.

A-7423114, Mendoza, Armando.

A-6089889, Menschenfreund, Frances or Franzik Menschenfreund (nee Hittman Zipporah) or Fani or Fanny Hittman.

A-7821101, Mills, Yolande Myriam (nee Nahon)

A-4430897, Miyagishima, Hiro.

A-4138709, Moenert, Henry Julien.

A-7975633, Monteiro, Izabel Pires.

A-7230504, Morales de Garcia, Alejandra

A-3986896, Moreno, Guadalupe Gonzalez or Guadalupe Moreno Gonzalez.

A-1152432, Morua-Puga, Canuto.

A-4443408, Nilson, Emilie Borghild (nee Andreassen).

A-5548464, Oliveira, Domingos Tavaris.

A-7450929, Orozco, Maria Loreto.

A-5539163, Paxinos, Demetrios or James Paxinos or Dimitri Paxinos.

A-7270998, Perez, Juan Manuel Banda.

A-7070409, Perry, Gerald Frances.

A-7070408, Perry, Alice.

A-7982348, Peterson, Mary (nee Langseth).

A-6916495, Placencia-Guerrero, Manuel.

A-4436218, Popp, Cecilia Mary (nee Eisenheimer).

A-7863348, Porpat, Augusto.

A-7247480, Pritchard, Pauline Marcia (nee St. Pierre) or Pauline Murphy.

A-7079669, Querin, Margaret Louise.

A-4784107, Rea, Harry J.

A-5757147, Reichel, Sophie (nee Sophie Wirs) or Vircz.

A-7049745, Reyes, Fortunato.

A-7049746, Reyes, Maris Del Carmen.

A-7387473, Reyes-Mendez, Patrocinio.

A-9765212, Riquelme-Aranedo, Edmundo Roberto or Edmund Riquelme or Edmund Araneda.

A-5739756, Roberts, George Charles William.

A-1455649, Rohrberg, Friedrich August.

A-5695749, Romaniello, Ilda.

A-7862063, Rood, Alberta Elizabeth.

A-1054980, Rowe, George Edward or Shorty Rowe.

A-6989005, Sanchez-Rodriguez, Carlos or Carlo Sanchs.

A-7140876, Saralegui, Enrique Rodriguez.

A-6716184, Schepper, Carl Ernest or Frank Percy Ford.
A-5718591, Schmidt, Anna Agnes.
A-7469057, Schuster, Christl Karin.
A-4386444, Smith, Jeannette Coy or Jeanette Theresa Coy originally Jeanette Theresa Trollope.
A-7095725, Spencer, Giancarlo or Giancarlo Schulz Spencer or Giancarlo Schulz.
A-2946917, Stoner, Marie Lea or Mary Lea Stoner or Lea Roy.
A-4412831, Swango, Ruth or Ruth B. Swango.
A-7982349, Swartz, Frederick.
A-6885360, Tilley, Jonelda Bruno.
A-7802714, Todd, Neil Edward.
A-5474582, Tsurudome, Shigenori.
A-3954443, Valsamakis, Georgiou or George.
A-6975023, Viglino, Anna Ferraris.
A-5987318, Villela, Jesus.
A-7203913, Villela, Maria Antonia.
A-3873647, Vogt, Erwin Adolf or Erwin Vogt.
A-7203024, Wesierski, Gaston Alfred.
A-4406049, White, Ernest Octavias or Samule White or Ernest White.
A-4335287, Whitmore, John.
A-3169039, Yee, Tang Shee or Yee Shee Tang or Oi Mee.
A-1308582, Yenovkian, Zaven.
A-5198599, Allah, Karm or Ali Mohammed or Karm Ullo Nathu or Nathu Abdullah.
A-5395113, Anagnostopoulos, Miltiades George.
A-5416112, Antonioli, Carlo Thomaso or Mario Martini.
A-2353980, Banfield, Egbert Fitz.
A-1559067, Barabas, Joseph.
A-5582678, Barna, Gregor Harry.
A-1060875, Bassan, Lucian.
A-7415702, Bassano, Guglielmo Parisi.
A-3913479, Basso, Giambatista alias John Basso.
A-1457364, Beck, Theresa.
A-2972887, Benvenuti, Florestano Renato or Renato Benvenuti.
A-4683821, Bernauer, Katharina (nee Schneblinger).
A-7035748, Biron, Marion Lorice (nee Hall).
A-5225852, Bishop, Vera Stitham (nee Vera Stitham).
A-7828637, Blunck, Lawrence Kenneth.
A-6969977, Booch, Ruth Rosa alias Ruth Kroessinger or Ruth Mueller.
A-3694502, Bosich, Anton or Antonio Bosich.
A-4484581, Branker, James Egbert.
A-7145474, Breznicki, George.
A-5461214, Bullils, Trinidad Apsay or Trinidad Apsay Mante.
A-6248874, Calogeros, Themelina.
A-5095578, Castro de Hernandez, Josefa.
A-7450445, Cecilia, Januarius Circumsicio.
A-4395244, Chighine, Salvatore.
A-4135247, Choy, Lee or Lee Shee.
A-6075424, Christie, Amaya de Amechazurra.
A-5026593, Colombo, Enrichetta or Sister Artidora.
A-5398900, Cooke, Celia Maria or Celia Maria Brechi.
A-6352581, Cortez-Moreno, Manuela
A-6610810, Croucher, Dominic Avion Patrick Fletcher alias Dominic Sillman.
A-7802204, Delisi, Vincenzo.
A-6860902, Derbedrosian, Khatoun (nee Salibian).
A-4184428, De Souza, Eugene or Gene Cassamine.
A-2454690, Donolan, Anna (Anna Donolan Avakian) (Anna Chamamian).
A-6980314, Duff, Maria Victoria, alias Maria Victoria Abrahams, alias Maria Victoria Abrahams-Lavergneau.
A-4127255, Eliassen, Karl Olav or Olaf Eliassen.
A-7240666, Ekelund, Karin Regina Ellenberger.
A-6067225, Evans, Steven Walter or Sami Silvan Eskenazi.
A-2386896, Falanga, Vincenzo.
A-7119150, Fernandez, Emma Elia.
A-7363002,, Fernandez, Jose Ferreira.
A-7119198, Fernandez, Miguel.
A-457203, Fineman, Gertrude (nee Gertrude Fradkin).
A-3022250, Fioroni, Teresa Rosa (nee Pirola).
A-6465195, Frisco, Jeannine Maria Louise, formerly Jeannine Brol (nee Jeannnine Breistroffer).
A-6553589, Fronteras, Edgardo Mario.
A-5453759, Garcia, Josefina (nee Josefina Aguiano), alias Consuelo Garcia.
A-5575735, Garcia, Philip Newbold, alias Allen Payne.
A-6534003, Gaughan, Margaret Theresa (nee Olah).
A-1942341, Georgu, Pandelis Kozman or Pete Kozma or Pandelis Kozma.
A-7483019, Gerstner, Dietwald.
A-5475823, Gilmore, William Henry.
A-7070293, Goldberg, Anczel or Anshel Goldberg.
A-7199923, Gonzales-Gonzalez, Guadalupe.
A-3841539, Goodwin, Minira Elizabeth.
A-7691621, Gosch, Agnes Marie.
A-7450443, Gray, Constance C.
A-4697096, Grecianu, Mike or Michael Grecano or Bressianu.
A-5317099, Gueli, Salvatore or Sam Gueli.
A-6112204, Guevera-Perez, Genaro alias Mauro G. Perez.
A-7284968, Haines, York Max formerly Jorg Max Pagemeister.
A-5789505, Hall, Amelia or Amelia (Minnie) Kosieris.
A-2365538, Hamaguchi, Shinobu.
A-7457061, Hanel, Igo Reginald.
A-6479517, Harkness, Judith Laurel.
A-5381698, Harrer, Alajos, alias Louis Hauser.
A-1192033, Hatanelas, Evridike.
A-2486560, Headley, Caphas McDonald.
A-5838419, Hedglen, Pauline formerly Pauline Kline
A-5957613, Hesto, Henry Georg.
A-3329732, Horst, George.
A-7127308, Infante, Ofelia de la Caridad Castellanos or Ofelia de la Caridad Castellanos Tamayo alias Ofelia Castellanos Infante, Ofelia Castellanos, Ofelia Infante and Ofelia Castellanos Tamayo.
A-7985768, Jacobs, Visvaldi T. now (Visvaldis Edward Jacob).
A-7414967, Jamshidi, Shahla or Charlotte Jamshidi or Charlotte Gangel.
A-5160076, Jeffery, Roy Benjamin.
A-2931566, Johansson, August Emanuel alias August Johnson
A-4087501, John, Claudius or John Claudius.
A-7127988, Jones, Therese Marie or Theresa Marie Alves.
A-6426209, Juchter, Cornelia Petronella.
A-6426210, Juchter, Marijke Sophia
A-6491718, Juraszek, Maria formerly Maria Duty (nee Kuc).
A-1951549, Kackloudis, Anastasia Malatanti or Tessie Kackloudis.
A-5097052, Karagianes, George Nicholas alias Karametgas or Karamitsios.
A-3779472, Kawasaki, Sanroku.
A-3779471, Kawasaki, Kiyo
A-6929829, Kergel, Monika Brigitte.
A-7037817, Kim, Robert Roland.
A-1806802, Kinney, Jennie Robertson.
A-5968206, Koyanagi, Yasukichi.
A-9623678, Kunttu, Johannes alias Johannes Kuntteu, Johannes Kuntu, Johannas Kunttu.
A-5085258, Kusuda, Asakichi.
A-5742695, Kvile, Leif Davidson.
A-7142244, Lapensee, Adelord Joseph.
A-3817223, Leu, Fook Pyn or Hok Wei Leu or Jimmie Fook Leu or Fook Pyn Leo.
A-5251799, Lopez, Francisco, Flores.
A-3057413, Louie, James or Louie Hong Ming.
A-726/748, Lueck, Betty (nee Olga Grbanusic) alias Betty or Elizabeth Weston.
A-5066943, Lukas, Jeanne Marie formerly Jeanne Marie Duncan.
A-7399597, Lutz, Rosemarie.
A-6177334, Magnusson, Bjarni.
A-3771824, Malinos, Stefan Christoff or Malinoff or Steve Christ or Stefanou Christon.
A-2175203, Manley, Aiko Kouda.
A-6314542, Martinez, Ana Isabel (nee Abreu Balderas or Ana I. Arbeu).
A-6173836, Martinez-Borrego, Benito.
A-4180579, Masters, Marjorie.
A 7130528, Meng, Woo Chai.
A-3001288, Menga, Antonio or Toni Menga.
A-3066483, Miladowski, Edward.
A-5603329, Mohammed, Mir.
A-5843527, Moller, Antonius Friedrich.
A-7890496, Morales, Andrea.
A-7269637, Morales-Reyna, Arturo Adan.
A-2418834, Moy, Chan Shee (nee Chan Him) alias Chan Moy Shee or Mary Moy.
A-2779177, Mukai, Tokisaburo or Thomas T. Mukai.
A-2779178, Mukai, Hifuko (nee Hifuko Wada).
A-2883988, Nacinovich, Mario.
A-6851221, Oresco-Orosco, Alfredo
A-6035668, Palomino, Heriberto Heridia Y or Heribito Heridia or Heriberto Heridia Palomino or Richard Pita.
A-7495028, Papanek, Vera Dalmira.
A-6880217, Paul, Maria Panglotis (nee Stath).
A-6989973, Perey, Emilio Guevarra.
A-7119144, Perry, Jean Marie.
A-7297155, Pinon, Tomas.
A-7178062, Pontikos, Michael Spirros.
A-7140350, Preston, Frances Rae or Lazarus or Israel.
A-5595147, Pugnato, Stefano.
A-4288460, Ramos, Nicolasa (nee Del Muro).
A-5985586, Ramos, Helen Amelia.
A-3702936, Recesel, Katalin.
A-3772162, Reihl, Wilhelmina alias Minnie Reihl.
A-6773060, Reinheimer, Yvette Jacqueline or Yvette Reinheimer.
A-2098737, Rios, Laura Leon vda de or Laura Leon de Liston or Laura Leon Liston-Rios.
A 5861237, Ripley, Jane Ann.
A-7420185, Roberts, Therese Marie (nee Robilland).
A-6777807, Robinson, Catherine Olwyn or Waters (nee Snook).
A-9765046, Rodriguez, Artur Concalves or Arthur Goncalves Rodrigues.
A-3077541, Roed, Oskar Sigvard or Oscar Paulsen.
A-7945604, Rojas-Sanchez, Antonio.
A-2809639, Rolli Maria.
A-3416991, Rosen, Mendel or Max Rosen.
A-3464397, Rosen, Jean or Jenny Rosen (nee Leibowitz).
A-6878084, Ruesch, Dorothea.
A-3360266, Sakihara, Genjiro or Haihichiro Tamaki.
A-3550752, Satomi, Ichimatsu
A-6669626, Scaletta, Grazia Giacone alias Grace Scaletta.
A-2715684, Scheibling, Sussana alias Susan Scheibling (nee Mayer) formerly Mussar.
A-5814780, Schmidt, Lloyd David.
A-6394416, Schneider, Adam.
A-7037354, Schwab, Norman Maurice.
A-4573920, Shangraw, Earl Melvin (Mel, Melford, Wilfred, or Channy).
A-5081504, Shee, Lum or Lum Shee Jung or Mamie Jung or Lum Hong Chew.
A-3712461, Sheong, Kong Fee or George Gee Shang Gong or George Gong.
A-7360882, Shunnarah, Huda Jamil.
A-9825345, Skaltsiotis, Demetrios.
A-1755533, Soares, Antonio Joze or Antonio Jose Soares or Antonio Jose Graca or Antonio J. Graca or Antonio J. Braca
A-5737605, Soelsepp, Martha Louise (Martha Louise Sepp).
A-7476966, Solano, Ceferino Toy.
A-7138212, Spear, Maria Panagiotis (nee Dalekos).
A-6874291, Spence, Georgina May (nee Bailey).
A-7197989, Spinosa, Giuseppa formerly Cabras (nee Carloni).

A-6870415, Stamulakis, Alexandra Athanasios (nee Gilla).
A-2613782, Stein, Max alias Max Silverstein.
A-7381385, Stoddart, Harold.
A-7351180, Sullivan, Paulina formerly Kavanagh (nee Dowdall).
A-7394779, Swider, Stefania (nee Lupiniak).
A-9769595, Syropoulos, Athanasios or Athanase Syropoulos.
A-3987587, Takata, Saneo.
A-5534917, Talas, Kalman alias Coleman Talas
A-2371217, Taormina, Grace or Gladys Taormina
A-2352237, Tatuska, Albert or Albert Taler.
A-6991783, Tawil, Yvonne Kendi.
A-7379192, Thierauf, Rosemarie Elfriede or Rosemarie Elfriede Holmgren
A-7351109, Thomas, Klaus Peter Thomas, formerly Klaus Peter Edelhoff
A-7351110, Thomas, Harold, formerly Harold Edelhoff.
A-4532328, Tobo, Teikichi.
A-1010674, Topel, August Kaarl, alias Alfred V. Topil
A-6301499, Trueba, Enrique, alias Enrique Trueba Rosas or Carlos Vega.
A-5471983, Vitale, Nicolantonio or Nicola Vitale
A-5564535, Walsh, Mary Margaret.
A-6078015, Williams, Juana Sapida.
A-6077495, Wyss, Bert Arnold or Beat Arnold Wyss
A-3994005, Yamaguchi, Naoakira or Nowakada Yamaguchi or Tams Yamaguchi.
A-7091334, Yates, Kerry Gayna or Kerry Gayna McTaggart.
A-6628433, Yogel, Pesia Rojtenberg or Pesia Dwojra Rojtenberg
A-1970678, Yu, Tchen Dian.
A-3679045, Zupanic, Grga or Frank Zupanic.
A-6848521, Lu, John.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KIKUE UCHIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 980) for the relief of Kikue Uchida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Kikue Uchida, the Japanese fiancée of Shigeki Kimura, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and the said Kikue Uchida shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Kikue Uchida is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Shigeki Kimura, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Kikue Uchida, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S C. title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Kikue Uchida, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Kikue Uchida as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SISTER MONICA GRANT

The Clerk called the bill (H R. 1135) for the relief of Sister Monica Grant.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that a similar Senate bill (S. 1013) is on the Speaker's table. Is there objection to the consideration of the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Monica Grant shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1135) was laid on the table.

ARK PING JEE NONG (NGON)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1851) for the relief of Ark Ping Jee Nong (Ngon).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of existing immigration laws, Ark Ping Jee Nong (Ngon), born May 2, 1943, at Hoysun, Canton, China, the daughter of Jee Tung Nong (Ngon), who is a citizen of the United States, shall be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant if he is admissible for permanent residence under the provisions of the immigration laws other than the annual quota limitations.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following. "That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of section 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall be held to be applicable to the alien, Ark Ping Jee Nong (Ngon), the minor unmarried child of Jee Tung Nong (Ngon), a citizen of the United States"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MASUNARI SAITO AND ISAO SAITO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2506) for the relief of Masunari Saito and Isao Saito.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall not apply to Masunari Saito and Isao Saito, minor stepchildren of Gerald E. Ewing, a member of the Armed Forces of the United States and a United States citizen. For the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Masunari Saito and Isao Saito shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of the said Gerald E. Ewing.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YOSHIKO ITO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2547) for the relief of Yoshiko Ito.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That, in the administration of the immigration laws, section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall not apply to Yoshiko Ito, Japanese minor child in the care of Sergeant and Mrs Ray Wilson, citizens of the United States. For the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Yoshiko Ito shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of the said Sergeant and Mrs. Ray Wilson.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOR MATILDE SOTELO FERNANDEZ AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H R. 2589) for the relief of Sor Matilde Sotelo Fernandez, Sor Virtudes Garcia Garcia, Sor Elisa Perez Tejeiro, and Sor Amalia Gonzalez Gonzalez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sor Matilde Sotelo Fernandez, Sor Virtudes Garcia Garcia, Sor Elisa Perez Tejeiro, and Sor Amalia Gonzalez Gonzalez, from San Juan, P R., shall be held and considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence on January 18, 1950, the date of their actual entry into the island of Puerto Rico, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax

SEC. 2. Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct four numbers from the quota for Spain for the first year that said quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert. "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws Sor Matilde Sotelo Fernandez, Sor Virtudes Garcia Garcia, and Sor Amalia Gonzalez Gonzalez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Sor Matilde Sotelo Fernandez, Sor Virtudes Garcia Garcia, and Sor Amalia Gonzalez Gonzalez."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSE M. THOMASA-SANCHEZ AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2590) for the relief of Jose M. Thomasa-Sanchez, his wife Adela Duran Cuevas de Thomasa, and his child, Jose Maria Thomasa Duran.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws José M. Thomasa-Sánchez, his wife Adela Durán Cuevas de Thomasa, and his child, Jose Maria Thomasa Duran, from Río Piedras, P. R., shall be held and considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence on August 9, 1949, the date of their actual entry into the island of Puerto Rico, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

SEC 2 Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the quota for Spain for the first year that said quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Jose M. Thomasa-Sanchez, his wife Adela Duran Cuevas de Thomasa, and his child, Jose Maria Thomasa Duran, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIGNA ANGELA MAINO CRISTALLO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3153) for the relief of Signa Angela Maino Cristallo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Signa Angela Maino Cristallo, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr and Mrs. Paolo Cristallo, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INOOKA KAZUMI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4583) for the relief of Inooka Kazumi.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Inooka Kazumi, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Frazer Harris, Jr., citizens of the United States.

That notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Inooka Kabumi may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 2080) be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the gentleman that the Senate bill is not identical with the House bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. It is a similar bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is the difference between the two bills?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read the paragraph that is included in the House bill that is not included in the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 8: "That notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Inooka Kazumi may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the Senate bill in lieu of the House bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I object to the substitution, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the House bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARK PAUL CROWLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4671) for the relief of Mark Paul Crowley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Mark Paul Crowley, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Capt. and Mrs. Amos M. Crowley, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATRICIA ANN EDDINGS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4922) for the relief of Patricia Ann Eddings.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provision of law excluding from admission to the United States persons of race ineligible to citizenship, the alien Patricia Ann Eddings, a minor child under the care of First Lt and Mrs. James C Eddings, Jr., both citizens of the United States residing temporarily in Japan, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of the First Lt. and Mrs. James C Eddings, Jr.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MICHAEL BERNARD (CERVERA)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4929) for the relief of Michael Bernard (Cervera).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That, in the administration of the immigration laws, section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall not apply to Michael Bernard (Cervera) (Bernard Sugiyama Tadao), Japanese minor child in the care of Master Sgt. and Mrs Carmen J. Cervera For the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Michael Bernard (Cervera) (Bernard Sugiyama Tadao) shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of the said Master Sgt and Mr. Carmen J Cervera.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES H. CRAFT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R 4930) for the relief of Charles H Craft.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Charles H Craft, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt and Mrs. George Robert Craft, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUZIE BALLARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4940) for the relief of Suzie Ballard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provision of section 13 (c) of that act, the minor child, Suzie Ballard, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born child of Edward Marshall Welke and Lillian Mabel Welke, husband and wife, citizens of the United States, residing temporarily in Japan.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSA YUKIKO THOMASON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4969) for the relief of Susa Yukiko Thomason.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purposes of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Susa Yukiko Thomason, a minor Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Henry A Thomason, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. INGE L CURTIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R 5104) for the relief of Mrs. Inge L Curtis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That, notwithstanding the provision of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Mrs Inge L Curtis may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGETTE SATO

The Clerk called the bill (H R. 4920) for the relief of Georgette Sato

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill (S. 1499) for the relief of Georgette Sato, a bill identical to the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the Chair state that this is an identical bill?

Mr. WALTER. The bill introduced in the other body by Senator TAFT, and which passed the other body on Monday is identical with the bill introduced in the House.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection, and withdraw my reservation of objection

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill (S. 1499) as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Georgette Sato, a minor half-Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Sergeant and Mrs. John H. Williams, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4920) was laid on the table.

JOHN R. WILLOUGHBY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1277) for the relief of John R. Willoughby.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That nothwithstanding the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, John R. Willoughby may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIZABETH BOZSIK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1718) for the relief of Elizabeth Bozsik.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Elizabeth Bozsik shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEINZ HARALD PATTERSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1775) for the relief of Heinz Harald Patterson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Heinz Harald Patterson, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt and Mrs. Arnold D. Patterson, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IVO CERNE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 654) for the relief of Ivo Cerne.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Ivo Cerne shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 50 U. S C. App. 1953).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY IZUMI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 850) for the relief of Mary Izumi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall not apply to Mary Izumi and the said Mary Izumi shall be held and considered to be the alien natural-born child of Harry A. DeWire, a United States citizen.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "and," insert "for the purpose of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the said act,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROY SAKAI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4567) for the relief of Roy Sakai.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wish to inform the House that most of the immigration bills that have been considered on this calendar are bills for the relief of minor children who have been adopted by our servicemen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that debate under reservation of objection is not permitted on this calendar.

Mr. WALTER. I thought inasmuch as a point of order had not been raised, this would be a good time to let the House know what we are doing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair assumes the gentleman wishes to comply with the rules.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of such act, the minor child, Roy Sakai, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Corp Roy F. Wilson, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLUMBIA HOSPITAL, RICHLAND COUNTY, S. C.

The Clerk called the next business (H. Res. 404) for the relief of the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R 4162) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title

28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House ,at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to infrom the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was agreed to.

MERING BICHARA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 773) for the relief of Mering Bichara.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any amount in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $83,615.88 to Mering Bichara, of Washington, D. C, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for money and supplies furnished and distributed by her to American Prisoners of War in the Philippines during World War II.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out $83,615.88" and insert "25,000."

Page 1, line 10, after "World War II" insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD C. BRUNETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1131) for the relief of Edward C. Brunett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of all laws relating to the granting of rights, benefits, and privileges to persons employed in the competitive classified civil service, Edward C. Brunett, San Antonio, Tex, shall be held and considered to have been placed in grade CAF-5 as of May 1, 1943 (the date he entered the military service).

SEC. 2. The Attorney General of the United States is authorized and directed to pay in a lump sum to the said Edward C Brunett an amount equal to the amount he would have received (less such amount as he has received) during the period beginning November 5, 1945 (the date he returned to the Department of Justice Immigration and Naturalization Service from the military service), and ending on the date of the enactment of this act, had he been placed in grade CAF-5 as of May 1, 1943.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,071.28 to Edward C. Brunett, of San Antonio, Tex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of his loss of compensation which resulted from his placement in grade CAF-3 instead of grade CAF-5 upon return to the Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, from military service on November 5, 1945. The Department of Justice subsequently held that he should have been placed in grade CAF-5 and he was accordingly placed in such grade: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WANDA R. BARNETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1962) for the relief of Wanda R Barnett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Wanda R. Barnett, Michigantown, Ind., the sum of $365 19. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Wanda R Barnett, postmaster of the United States post office at Michigantown, Ind., against the United States for reimbursement of the amount which she was required to pay to the United States as the result of the theft of certain funds from such post office on May 24, 1949: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEREMIAH COLEMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2072) for the relief of Jeremiah Coleman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jeremiah Coleman, of Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $300, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses incurred in connection with the emergency appendectomy performed on his son John F. Coleman 2271643, United States Navy, on the evening of December 25, 1949; *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. HOMER G. HAMILTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2169) for the relief of Lt. Col. Homer G. Hamilton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Homer G Hamilton, lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department, United States Army, the sum of $———. Such sum represents compensation to the said Homer G Hamilton for his outstanding service to the United States as the result of his pioneer work in the development of the one-quarter-ton Army truck, commonly referred to as the "jeep", which has made such an important contribution to the war effort. A statement of the military characteristics, appearance, and general specifications of the jeep, together with a drawing of the proposed military vehicle, were prepared by the said Homer G Hamilton early in 1935 and incorporated by him in an article entitled "A Light Cross Country Car" which appeared in the Cavalry Journal for May-June 1935. The plans and specifications for a motor vehicle which resulted in the manufacture of many hundreds of thousands of jeeps were prepared by the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, under date of July 2, 1940, and were almost identical with the specifications and drawing appearing in such article. The said Homer G Hamilton has not at any time been assigned to military duties requiring the preparations of plans or statement of characteristics of any motor vehicle. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Lt. Col. Homer G. Hamilton for compensation for his outstanding service to the United States as a result of his pioneer work in the development of the one-quarter-ton truck commonly referred to as the "jeep."

"SEC 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 1346 of title 28 of the United States Code."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTONIO CORRAO CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3006) for the relief of the Antonio Corrao Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Antonio Corrao Corp, Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $6,000, together with interest on such sum computed at the rate of 4 percent per annum from January 19, 1950, to the date of the enactment of this act. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such corporation against the United States for refund of the fine which was imposed by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York on January 19, 1950, in the case of the *United States of America* v. *Antonio Carrao Corporation and Antonio Corrao* Such court, on December 28, 1950, ordered the refund of such fine to such corporation, but such refund could not be made because the money paid on account of such fine had been covered into the Treasury: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the figures "$6,000", strike out ", together with interest on such sum computed at the rate of 4 percent per annum from January 19, 1950, to the date of the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMERCE TRUST CO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3060) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Commerce Trust Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Commerce Trust Co., of Kansas City, Mo, against the United States arising out of the exaction of certain deficit royalties by the United States with respect to coal-mining leases on certain lands in LeFlore County, Okla. Suit upon such claims may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations; and proceedings for the determination of such claims shall be in the same manner as in the case of actions regularly filed under the provisions of section 1346 (a) (2) of title 28, United States Code.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLEN W. SPANGLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4318) for the relief of Allen W. Spangler and the Great American Indemnity Co. of New York.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to relieve Allen W. Spangler and the Great American Indemnity Co. of New York in the amount of $500 as a security bond for Patricia Anne Spangler nee Gaynor which was declared forfeited April 11, 1951.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500 to Allen W. Spangler, of Mansfield, Ohio, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as a refund for a security bond posted for Patricia Anne Spangler, nee Gaynor, which was declared forfeited April 11, 1951: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be find in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Allen W. Spangler."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARGUERITE A. BRUMELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4645) for the relief of Mrs. Marguerite A. Brumell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $50,000 to Mrs. Marguerite Brumell, of 228 East Eighty-first Street, New York, N. Y., for personal injuries sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States vehicle on the Army post, Fort Greeley, Kodiak, Alaska, on March 30, 1944.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 5, strike out "$50,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$15,000."

At the end of bill strike out the period and insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE H. WHIKE CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R 5317) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the George H. Whike Construction Co., of Canton, Ohio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon, notwithstanding any law to the contrary, the claim of the George H. Whike Construction Co, of Canton, Ohio, against the Government of the United States on account of losses sustained in performing a construction contract between the claimant and the Federal Public Housing Authority, said construction contract being No OH 33037 on Jackson Park homes project in the city of Canton, Ohio. The loss resulted from the operation of Executive Order 9301 changing the workweek from 40 hours to 48 hours The contract was let on a 40-hour workweek, and the Executive order was made effective in the Canton, Ohio, area several months after the work had been started. The claim is for the actual loss incurred by said contractor for overtime, taxes, and insurance directly resulting from the change in said workweek from 40 hours to 48 hours by reason of said Executive order. Such court shall determine the amount due said contractor and render judgment in favor of the George H Whike Construction Co., of Canton, Ohio, and against the United States for the amount which said court may find and adjudge to have been lawfully due under said contract The court shall have such jurisdiction if suit is instituted within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

C E HEANEY

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 438) for the relief of C. E. Heaney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 2772) entitled "A bill for the relief of C. E. Heaney," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The House resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MITSUO ARITA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3478) for the relief of Mitsuo Arita.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mitsuo Arita, of Hakalau, Territory of Hawaii, the sum of $4,580.53. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mitsuo Arita against the United States on account of losses suffered when four airplanes which he owned were taken over by the United States Army Air Forces, at Honolulu, on or about January 21, 1942, and retained until April 14, 1945, during which time they were improperly cared for, which resulted in the loss of the foregoing amount.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mitsuo Arita, of Hakalau, Territory of Hawaii, for losses suffered when four airplanes which he owned were taken over by the United States Army Air Force at Honolulu on or about January 21, 1942, and retained until April 14, 1945.

"SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within one year after the enactment of this Act, not withstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 1346 of title 28 of the United States Code."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOROTHY KILMER NICKERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3666) for the relief of Dorothy Kilmer Nickerson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Dorothy Kilmer Nickerson, of Washington, D. C., the sum of $20,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for injuries received on July 29, 1948, when she was struck by a bullet negligently discharged from the revolver of a District of Columbia policeman, not acting within the scope of his authority, as a result of which she will be paralyzed for life: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "of", strike out everything through the word "appropriated" and substitute in lieu thereof: "funds of the District of Columbia."

Line 6, strike out "$20,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$15,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES COOPER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1713) for the relief of Charles Cooper.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles Cooper, of Winslow, Ariz., the sum of $1,748.75, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for crop loss and for reimbursement of funds expended in the improvement of a reclamation homestead entry in the Yuma reclamation project, which entry was allowed by the Department of the Interior on April 8, 1948, but subsequently canceled on April 22, 1949, because entry of the land could be made only by a qualified veteran and the entryman was not a qualified veteran *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIDNEY F. MASHBIR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2604) to authorize the appointment of Sidney F. Mashbir, colonel, Army of the United States, to the permanent grade of colonel in the Regular Army.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Whereas Sidney F. Mashbir served as a commissioned officer in the Regular Army during the period beginning prior to November 12, 1918, and ending May 7, 1923, the date of his resignation from the Regular Army;

Whereas the said Sidney F. Mashbir, presently serving in the grade of colonel, Army of the United States, resigned from the Regular Army on May 7, 1923, under honorable conditions and at a time when existing law authorized his reappointment; and

Whereas the said Sidney F. Mashbir resigned in order to carry out a secret and hazardous military mission at his own expense, no public funds being legally available for such purpose;

Whereas the said Sidney F. Mashbir resigned in the belief that he could be reappointed to his former grade in the Regular Army upon completion of such military mission;

Whereas the said Sidney F. Mashbir applied for such reappointment to the Regular Army on September 14, 1923, after the earthquake of September 1, 1923, destroyed his ability to finance such military mission, but was denied such reappointment by reason of an administrative ruling theretofore unknown to him and not published to the Army at large;

Whereas the said Sidney F. Mashbir has performed faithful and honorable service for more than 30 years in the Army of the United States, including more than 7 years' active service in World War II in the grade of colonel, and has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal and other decorations in recognition of his outstanding service; and

Whereas the foregoing facts have been established by unimpeachable and unchallenged evidence submitted before the Army personnel board of five general officers appointed under existing law in accordance with instructions issued on September 30, 1948, by the Chief of Staff, United States Army. Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized and requested to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Sidney F. Mashbir, Army serial number O-191029, colonel, Army of the United States, to the permanent grade of colonel in the Adjutant General's Department in the Regular Army. The said Sidney F. Mashbir shall not be included, by reason of such appointment, in the authorized number of colonels on the active list of the Regular Army in the administration of any provision of law limiting the number of such colonels. No permanent increase in the authorized number of colonels on the active list of the Regular Army shall be held to be authorized by reason of the enactment of this act. No back pay or allowances shall accrue to the said Sidney F. Mashbir by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, line 3, strike out the word "Department" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Corps."

On page 3, immediately following line 13, add the following sentence: "Upon retirement the said Sidney F. Mashbir shall receive the same amount of retired pay as a Reserve officer of the Army of the United States with the same service as the said Sidney F. Mashbir would be entitled to receive under the provisions of title III of the act of June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1081), as amended."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PASCAL NEMOTO YUTAKA

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 617) for the relief of Pascal Nemoto Yutaka.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this bill cleared the House?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, this is the same bill to which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] objected last week, the same bill I discussed with the gentleman and which met with his approval.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is an immigration bill?

Mr. FEIGHAN. It is an immigration bill involving a 2-year-old adopted infant.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races, ineligible to citizenship, Pascal Nemoto Yutaka, a minor half-Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Lt. and Mrs. James R. Evans, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAIKU SUZUKI

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1437) for the relief of Maiku Suzuki.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, the minor child, Maiku Suzuki, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Captain and Mrs Andrew A. Miller, citizens oi the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETER THERKELSEN KIRWAN AND ERNEST O'GORMAN KIRWAN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1464) for the relief of Peter Therkelsen Kirwan and Ernest O'Gorman Kirwan.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Peter Therkelsen Kirwan and Ernest O'Gorman Kirwan, British subjects who were born in India of an American mother and British father, shall be deemed to have been born in Great Britain.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 189]

Abernethy	Fine	Murray, Wis.
Allen, La.	Fisher	O'Hara
Bailey	Gore	O'Konski
Baker	Granger	Ostertag
Barden	Hand	Perkins
Bates, Ky.	Hébert	Phillips
Battle	Hedrick	Poulson
Berry	Heffernan	Powell
Blatnik	Hess	Price
Brooks	Holifield	Quinn
Brown, Ohio	Howell	Redden
Burleson	Ikard	Rivers
Busbey	Jackson, Calif.	Rodino
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson	Roosevelt
Camp	Kearney	Sabath
Celler	Kennedy	Sadlak
Chatham	Keogh	Scudder
Chelf	Kersten, Mo.	Shelley
Cole, N Y	Kilburn	Short
Cox	Latham	Spence
Crawford	Lucas	Staggers
Crosser	McCarthy	Stockman
Deane	McCulloch	Taylor
DeGraffenried	Mack, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Delaney	Meader	Velde
Denton	Miller, Calif.	Vinson
Dollinger	Morrison	Watts
Durham	Moulder	Willis
Eaton	Murdock	
Eberharter	Murphy	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 340 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REHABILITATION OF FLOOD-STRICKEN AREAS

Mr. NORRELL Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 341 making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes, and that general debate be limited to 1 hour to be equally controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] and myself.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, that will be satisfactory.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 341, making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 341, with Mr. COLMER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the previous order of the House general debate will be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in the beginning may I say that my colleagues on the subcommittee which have handled this budget request, composed of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER], and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], have done a magnificent job. I wish time would permit me to tell you how we went into this matter, how honestly we tried to discharge our duties without politics, in an effort to do what is right for the flood-stricken people of the Midwest and also the taxpayers and citizens of the United States. May I also at this time pay tribute to our colleagues from the Midwestern States, both Democrats and Republicans, who have been very alert, able, and conscientious in trying to do their job as statesmen should. They have done the best they could for their constituents. The staff has also done a magnificent job.

We bring to you today a bill dealing with a very difficult problem, but we bring to you a bill that has come out of the subcommittee by unanimous vote.

The first job this committee had to do was to determine something about the extent of the damages suffered in Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Illinois. We went into that thoroughly. We heard witnesses from the several States, the Government agencies, and our colleagues here in the House.

Mr. Chairman, there is no argument about the damages to property and financial loss. In addition to the financial angle there has been great physical pain, mental anguish and, yes, there has been death, although surprisingly small.

The July floods in the Midwest were the worst ever recorded in this country. Stream flow in central Kansas, for example, was 70 times normal in July. While appraisals of loss are still incomplete, it is estimated that total damages sustained in the area will exced $2,500,000,000. It is estimated that some 34,000 farms were totally or partially covered by floodwaters, that about 30,000 farm buildings, including homes, were destroyed or badly damaged, and that a quarter of a billion dollars' worth of crops were destroyed. It appears that nearly 6,000 business concerns ranging from large assembly plants and packing plants to small grocery stores and drug stores were destroyed or seriously damaged. In addition to this the railroads and utilities in the area suffered substantial losses. According to the latest information more than 40,000 families were driven from their homes, 10,000 of which were washed away or almost entirely destroyed.

It is probable that losses to agriculture will exceed half a billion dollars. Damage to commercial property will run around $1,500,000,000. Damage to public property, including such things as streets, highways, bridges, schools, and hospitals, will exceed one-quarter of a billion dollars and loss to private families will exceed $60,000,000.

Now, if they have been damaged to this extent, the second question to arise necessarily would be, what have we done about it? We wanted to know that before we made additional appropriations.

Briefly, what are we doing about the $2,500,000,000 in damages?

Earlier this year we made available for this area $25,000,000. I think you are entitled to know what has become of that money. Your subcommittee learned it has been expended in this way: One million dollars has gone to the Commodity Credit Corporation for feed and livestock; about $7,000,000 has gone to the State of Kansas to provide for general clean-up and emergency rehabilitation. They needed it. Two million five hundred thousand dollars has gone to the State of Missouri for the same purpose. Oklahoma has received a lesser amount, about $250,000, because the damage was not so great in that State. Emergency housing has cost in excess of $4,000,000, and public health matters through the Federal Security Agency have required $228,000. They have expended, in other words, about $15,500,000 of that money; and when we started our hearings they had a balance of $10,500,000 unallocated. But applications had been made, which, when allowed, would consume the balance of the money in that fund.

Now then, we went into what other agencies of the Government are doing. And I think you will be interested in this. We found that financial aid of around $150,000,000 is already available to this area from regular Federal agencies. For instance, the Farmers Home Administration has about $13,000,000 in one fund, and in another, $14,000,000, for aid to the midwestern area. In the Farm Credit Administration, debts of farmers have already been extended to the tune of $6,500,000, and additional loans have been made in the amount of $2,000,000. In addition, around 7,000 farmers in the area will collect under crop insurance. It is estimated that they will collect about $2,500,000. The Red Cross has done a wonderful job, and you will be interested in knowing that they have, so they say, expended somewhere between $6,000,000 and $10,000,000 for relief in this area. The Salvation Army and others have done, of course, a good job. Then the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has $35,000,000 to be used throughout the country, and they can channel a sizable sum of that money into this area.

About a month ago you passed a bill authorizing $200,000,000 for advance commitments by the Federal National Mortgage Association for the purchase of FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages on housing Of this amount $50 000,000 has been set up for this area, and more is available if needed. Now then, that is not the whole story. Other agencies that have been doing a great work are the Corps of Engineers, the Soil Conservation Service, the Extension Service, the Bureau of Animal Industry, and Bureau of Public Roads. A total of 61 Federal agencies have been providing assistance in the area. A complete list of the agencies is as follows:

Department of Agriculture: Production and Marketing Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation, Farmers Home Administration, Farm Credit Administration, Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, Production Credit Associations, Federal Land Bank Association, Banks for Cooperatives, Intermediate Credit Banks, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Soil Conservation Service, Extension Service, Agricultural Research Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Agricultural Mobilization Committees.

Atomic Energy Commission.

Civil Service Commission.

Department of Commerce: National Production Authority, Bureau of Public Roads, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Weather Bureau.

Comptroller General of the United States.

Defense Production Administration.

Defense Transport Administration.

Department of Defense: Munitions Board (Armed Forces Regional Council), Department of the Army—Corps of Engineers, Department of the Navy, Department of the Air Force—Air Matériel Command.

Economic Stabilization Agency: Office of Price Stabilization, Wage Stabilization Board, Salary Stabilization Board, Office of Rent Stabilization (formerly the Housing Expediter).

Federal Civil Defense Administration.

Federal Communications Commission.

Federal Reserve System, Board of Governors.

Federal Security Agency: Public Health Service, Food and Drug Administration, Office of Education.

General Services Administration

Housing and Home Finance Agency Community Facilities Service, Home Loan Bank Board, Federal Housing Administration, Public Housing Administration, National Housing Council.

Department of the Interior: Defense Electric Power Administration, Defense Minerals Administration, Defense Solid Fuels Administration, Defense Fisheries Administration, Geological Survey, Petroleum Administration for Defense, Bureau of Mines, Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Department of Labor: Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, Bureau of Employment Security, Defense Manpower Administration.

Office of Defense Mobilization: Committee on Defense Transportation Storage.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Department of the Treasury: United States Coast Guard

Veterans' Administration.

Now then, when we got that information, we decided that a liberal people and benevolent Government, had been trying to do its utmost for a gracious and kind and noble citizenry of the flood area.

We come now to the budget estimate. What did it contain? We can divide it into three sections:

The first proposal was for an indemnity program. It recommended that we appropriate $190,000,000 to start with to indemnify the people in this area for flood losses.

The second thing the budget estimate proposed was to provide loans on a more liberal basis, if possible, to the tune of about $160,000,000 through a Director of a Flood Disaster Administration.

The third thing included was the flood insurance fund, and in the estimate they had $50,000,000, which would constitute a beginning.

What did the committee do? May I say that when this committee entered on this job we realized that it would be a difficult problem. I entered it with mingled feelings of sorrow and joy—sorrow because of the great losses out there among good, conscientious American citizens and joy because I was going to be in position to try to do something for those people that needed assistance and help.

What did we do? The committee recommended approval of a few of these items. One recommendation was that $18,440,000 of additional funds be appropriated not to the Director of Relief but to the Department of Agriculture, not under any new formula but under existing law, to be carried out like the program now being carried on under the Department of Agriculture.

Then we recommended the appropriation of $30,000,000 to the disaster loan revolving fund of the Farmers Home Administration. There is already $13,000,000 available from this fund and $14,000,000 available from the regular lending program in this agency.

The third thing we did was to increase the $25,000,000 we allowed earlier this year by $5,000,000. That is authorized. It is not a new program.

Then we increased the ceiling on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation disaster loans so that they can borrow more money to provide loans, not gifts, not indemnities, but loans that can be made up to 100 percent in certain circumstances on household goods and houses or anything the people need to buy.

These additional funds, together with funds already available to these agencies, will provide adequate funds to enable business and home owners to reestablish themselves. There is no doubt about that.

We turned down the budget estimate as submitted, because there was no legislative authority for it. I happen to be a man who believes that the Committee on Appropriations is not a policy-making committee. That is the job of the legislative committees. We appropriated this money, not as requested, but according to the law.

I want to touch on the indemnity program for a minute. We did not go along with that. It was not authorized. It is a new policy which, Mr. Chairman, could involve a sum of money in the future that is so staggering that the mortal mind cannot comprehend it. The Committee on Appropriations ought not to start it. If we want to start it, we ought to do it through the Legislative Committee in the usual legislative way.

The other thing which I want to discuss in my remaining time is the insurance feature. We had the best experts we could get come down here and advise us because, while it was not authorized, and while it was a new policy, we did want to give the matter serious, careful, friendly, and sympathetic consideration. So they appeared before the committee. These men said, representing the insurance industry of the Nation, "Back in 1944, we conducted an investigation to see if such a plan was economically feasible, and decided after a long study that it was not, and we abandoned it. Recently, we have started another study and we are now trying to determine if the matter is feasible." They said that the total assets of the insurance companies are about $2,500,000,000 and if

the insurance companies should attempt to write flood insurance, they thought that in a few years the losses would be enough to liquidate them entirely.

In conclusion, I want to say we have done what I believe to be a good job. Every segment of society in this area is well cared for and can get along. There is no doubt about that at all. We have done as much as a grateful people would want us to do. If this subcommittee can be criticized in any way, Mr. Chairman, it can be criticized for doing too much. But God knows, if on one side there are those who are able to take care of themselves, and on the other are people who are prostrate and cannot take care of themselves, I want to err on the side of the prostrate So we bring to you a bill that appropriates under existing law about $53,440,000, and raises the ceiling of the RFC $60,000,000. We think it is a good bill, Mr. Chairman, and we hope the people in the great midwestern area of this country will agree with us, and we know they will.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of this subcommittee has beautifully stated this matter. To repeat what he has said would only make his remarks less effective.

I know that you all realize we operate in a very difficult situation. At a time when our Ways and Means Committee is down to the bottom of the barrel, looking for something new to tax, at a time when our Government, wisely or unwisely—and in my opinion it has been unwise—has scattered billions of dollars of our money all over the world and is still doing so, it makes a very difficult operation for an honest Committee on Appropriations to withhold what seems to tell you that you would love to give, yet which we had no legal right to give.

The chairman has well said that what we have done, we have done in accordance with existing law. We can replace furniture with a loan on just a personal note, that will allow a man to earn it and to own it and to leave with him his independence, and not replace that with a feeling of dependence, and that he is pauperizing himself in accepting it.

We have properly put into the hands of the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture the program of opening up these closed channels and streams, and to start on the reclamation of the area in the regular way, under the guidance of local committees.

We have left with public housing the restoration of permanent housing by virtue of loans to those who cannot build it themselves. We have furnished some 1,400 portable houses for those who had to have housing at once. These have been good trailer homes with facilities that are adequate. The best thing about this is that there has been no epidemic. There has been no great loss of life; no conditions of disease; no unusual condition following the inundation of this great area.

It is not a condition of receiving this aid but it is the recommendation of this part of that committee, and I so made it in the hearing, that it is the duty of municipal and county officials in this area that has so greatly encroached upon the bed of the Missouri River at this critical point, that proper zoning be had. I know it will be a hot political issue, but it is one that local governments must have to face. They have to realize that by the grace of God 9,000 houses were washed out and yet only a very, very few lives were lost. They should not be permitted to rebuild in this exposed area. Of course the automobile had something to do with that, because it enabled those people to get out and to take out their neighbors. The all-important thing about this bill, and the reason I would like to see it enacted just as quickly as possible, is that these people are already on the field. They are already organized. There is no organization of any superduper committee which we might not be able to control. Every one of these agencies is already there.

I have no desire to add longer to the delay in getting this relief started to these people that they may rehabilitate themselves. So I am only taking these few minutes of your time. I have had the pleasure of working with these gentlemen before. Let me tell you that in the men on this committee on the majority side, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr NORRELL], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO], and my colleague the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], you would have to search long to find men whose sympathies are greater, whose desire to operate as far as the law would allow them to go in alleviating this suffering is greater. I have grown to admire each and every one of these men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we are dealing here, not with a local or State problem, but with a national problem.

The area that has been inundated by this record-breaking flood, vast as it is, is small in comparison with the area of the country which produced this flood and dumped this water down upon helpless and defenseless valleys. It is a national catastrophe and only the Nation is in a position to compensate this area and these people for this appalling disaster over which they had no control and no power to avert. The very fact that the natural course of the river has been diverted and its channel choked by dikes and dams and piling and revetment, which retarded the flow of the water and sent it out over the banks and into the towns and cities in a volume never known before, is all the more reason why the Government which filled the river with these obstructions should make amends and as nearly as possible restore property and compensate for the damages for which it is responsible. Of course money cannot compensate for loss of life and ruined health and broken family circles driven permanently from homes and lands whose productivity has been washed away or buried beneath deserts of sterile sand.

Nor is the loss merely a local loss, confined to the community and locality or even the States in the path of the deluge which swept down from the watersheds of the continent. It too is essentially national. The amount of the immediate damage to the farms and cities which have been washed away is small in comparison with the economic loss to the Nation as a whole. Every class and industry and individual has, to a greater or lesser degree, depended for some part of its income on the wealth and business produced and distributed by these devastated areas. It has been estimated that every dollar's worth of commodities produced by these inundated plants and factories and fields has produced $10 worth of business in the country at large and has been integrated with the income of every business and locality in the entire Nation. It is not a local problem either geographically or economically, and we must approach it from that point of view.

It is not necessary here to recount the scope of the incomprehensible destruction wrought by this Government-accelerated flood. The newspapers of the country characterize it as the most destructive flood in the history of the Nation. After a careful screening, the committee estimates the loss at approximately $2,500,000,000. When the cost of recovery is included and the years of patient and unrequited efforts to bring it back to where it was before the deluge struck, that is undoubtedly a conservative estimate. Even at that it is so vast as to be beyond the capacity of the finite mind of man to comprehend.

Here in the House we took immediate and urgent steps to meet the situation. Before the crest had passed the mouth of the Kaw, acting on the personal request of the President, we appropriated $25,000,000 for emergency relief. And we made prompt preparation to act on the President's budget message asking for this bill. Hearings were delayed by failure to receive the justifications required by law but we started on them as soon as received and in a comprehensive processing the committee heard every individual and agency and reported out the bill in record time.

We are particularly fortunate in the personnel of the committee which has had charge of the bill. Chairman NORRELL is from an area in the heart of the Mississippi Basin and is one of the outstanding Members of the House. Mr. WHITTEN, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture and is one of the ablest members of the Committee on Appropriations has long experience and familiarity with the agricultural features of the problem. Mr. FURCOLO is from an urban area and in position to pass on those phases pertaining to urban and industrial questions. Mr. CLEVENGER and Mr. COTTON, the minority representatives, are among the ablest members of the Committee on Appropriations, and have rendered exceptional and invaluable service in the handling of the bill. A more competent and better qualified committee could not have been assembled.

The earnestness and industry with which the committee pushed the consid-

eration of the hearings and the fairness and impartiality with which they heard all witnesses is emphasized by the concluding statement of Col. A. E. Howse, in charge of the presentation of the evidence who, though subject to strictures because of delay in submitting data, said:

I would like to make a comment on the record. In the 10 years I have been in and out of the Government, I have never been accorded more courtesy, or a fairer or a more impartial hearing in all my experience.

I will say this to you very candidly. I honestly do not see how this committee could have been more cooperative than they have been.

Of course the size of the bill and the contribution by the Government should be commensurate with the size of the flood and the amount of the damage. Government responsibility for the maximum destructiveness of the flood through artificial constriction of the natural channel of the river would warrant compensation for all damage in excess of the damage which would have been suffered from normal floods such as the valleys experienced before the channel was filled with obstacles and barriers. But as the committee points out, this is impossible due to the size of the totals involved and the lack of law authorizing such appropriations. As an alternative the committee provides relief for every case through the enlistment of existing Government agencies and provides:

An additional $18,440,000 for the Agriculture Department to use in the restoration of farms.

An additional $30,000,000 for the Farmers Home Administration to be loaned to farmers for repair of homes and facilities.

An additional $5,000,000 for the President's emergency disaster fund.

An increase from $40,000,000 to $100,000,000 in the amount the RFC may loan to rehabilitate businesses and homes.

An extension from 10 to 20 years in the time limit on loans for acquisition or construction of housing.

Such funds are to be used for the repair or replacement of buildings, replacement of machinery or household goods, replacement and feeding of livestock, for clothing and operating expenses and any other items necessary to get farmers back on their feet and farms back into normal production.

In other words, this bill goes further in the alleviation of distress and loss occasioned by the flood than any similar law has ever gone in the legislation of the Nation, and the relief provided by the bill does all that the Federal Government can do under the Federal statutes. It does not do all I would like to see done but it is as far as the Congress or the Government can go.

There are those who oppose this bill because of the huge amounts involved, who insist that the Government is not responsible, who object to contributing money to help those unfortunate families whom the flood has placed in a position where they cannot help themselves.

But the amounts provided by this bill are not gifts or contributions. They are not gratuitous expenditures from the Federal Treasury. They are amounts due. They are investments in humanity, investments in the future, which will pay vast dividends to the Nation by returning barren wastes to productivity. They are essential to the national defense and will provide food for our armies and our allies. They are a part of our American way of life.

Time is the essence. Every day, every hour, adds to the problem and decreases the prospect of complete rehabilitation. He gives twice who gives promptly. I trust the bill can be passed without reduction and transmitted to the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, these five gentlemen who served as the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the consideration of these matters are five of the finest, most able, honest, and conscientious Members of the House of Representatives. When they tell you they feel they have done a good job, in their hearts I believe they think that very thing. They have done all right as far as things have gone. But, Mr. Chairman, this does not help those who need help the most; the families of those workers who lived in the flood areas and worked in the packing plants, the steel mills, the grain elevators, the railroad yards, soap factories, and other industrial plants. These are families who were left with nothing when the flood hit there without warning, because the radio told them they were safe behind the dikes which the engineers said would hold. These men had nothing but their jobs, their families, their furniture, their clothes, and maybe an old jalopy. When the floods hit they were lucky to get themselves and their families out with the clothes they had on their backs.

It is not going to do them any good to get a loan merely to heap another debt upon their heads. Most of them are already in debt, undoubtedly partly for furniture and belongings which they had at the time of the flood. Some of them were newlyweds just getting started. Many are elderly people. How are you helping them by adding another burden of debt and putting it on their backs?

Put a load of debt upon them, which they can never pay, and say you are helping them? Why, if it were not so tragic, it would be laughable. Help? Oh, I know, we are told that these loans will be liberalized; but instead of loans many of these people are getting nothing more or less than a run-around.

I could tell you case after case. My mail is filled with letters reciting "brush offs." For instance, let us take the case of Mike Sambol, a man who built up a very good independent packing business of his own. He did it the hard way, working 18 to 20 hours a day, saving his money and investing it in his business. He was flooded out. He tried to get a loan from the RFC, a liberalized loan. What did they tell him? "Why, you only have an eighth-grade education. We cannot lend you money." He had already made a success of the business that the flood wiped out. What did education have to do with his ability. Yet in that same period of time they could lend $50,000 to rehabilitate a race track, they could lend $500,000 to another packing firm, but they could not help Mike.

I could tell you of the elderly widow who had two houses. She lived in one and got rent from the other, together with a little pension. Now both of these houses are gone, the furniture is gone. She is 82 years old. Do you say a loan is going to help her?

I can tell you of independent businessman after independent businessman who had put everything they had saved in their whole lives into that area. It is gone. They are not going to get help in this proposal here.

The owners perhaps can get and pay off a loan. The farmers? They say there will be money for these tenant farmers who lost all of their machinery and everything else. Come back here a year from now and see how much help they got out of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, these folks in the Midwest have been independent. They have come out of storms, droughts and floods before. But this is a bigger and more devastating flood than any that ever hit this Nation. I know. The Second District of Kansas got the impact of the flood and the full force of it, not only on the Kansas River but on the Neosho and Marais des Cygnes as well, where it wiped out home after home and farm after farm and business after business. There is no direct grant here in this measure. It provides nothing but loans—debts, if you please. It may help some but it will not help those who need it most and need it now.

People say, all right, you are from the great independent Middle West, why are you coming to Uncle Sam crying for help? We are coming to Uncle Sam because this is the only place we can get it. In all these other flood years Uncle Sam was not draining off a half-billion dollars of taxes. We then had money left in our own pockets to take care of our own troubles, but Uncle Sam has it all now. This is the only place we can come to get the help we want so much for these people, a return of but a small part of the billions we have sent here via the tax collector.

There is a liability on the part of the Government. If there had been adequate warning of this danger coming to these people they could have got most of their stuff out. They went to bed with the radio in their ears, with the engineers saying that the dikes will hold; but come midnight and 3 o'clock in the morning, the dikes had not held and in the Argentine and Armourdale districts of my home town of Kansas City, Kans., there were walls of water 14 feet high sweeping everything before them. These people were lucky to get out with their lives, their clothes, and their families. That is all they have left. Yet all you are offering them is a chance to go into debt for the rest of their lives. If they are only 25 now these loans will still not be paid out when these debt-ridden refugees die.

The committee raised the warning that we have got to be concerned about the magnitude of our public debt. I have been worrying about that, too; I have

been raising a warning, too. No one seemed to heed me when I protested against drain off of our wealth to send it overseas. Why is it raised now when we want to help these people while in the last 6 years you have been spending billions upon billions of dollars aiding war refugees? Now you worry about the effect on the public debt of a few million dollars for the refugees from these ravaging floodwaters.

If this great Nation can break precedents as it has been breaking them for the last 20 years, certainly it could break a precedent here to help people who now cannot help themselves. The greatest of all flood disasters did not stop because it was breaking a precedent.

The logical way for this to be handled was for the legislative committee to have handled it, first, enacting if they saw fit, a law under which money could be spent. The Committee on Appropriations is not a legislative committee. One of the most strictly enforced rules of the House—and I suppose it will be enforced against me—is that there cannot be any legislation in an appropriation measure. My colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] introduced a bill aimed to give some of the various types relief. It was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. A hearing was started; at least, I assume it was started. The papers said there had been a hearing, that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] appeared in support of the legislation, and that there was a statement made. My district, the most heavily hit, was not informed of any such hearing. For some reason I was not notified there was going to be a hearing. That bill is still before that committee and nothing has been done since. The second Bolling bill was introduced, and was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Oh, there have been a lot of funny things going on about this. The people out home have been told by the officials from Washington that there would be a direct grant in aid. You remember that committee after committee, flying out there from Washington in Government planes, at Government expense, looked over the scene and the damage, reporting how dreadful the tragedy was. The visitors repeatedly told them how they are going to help. But these Washington visitors did not tell them that all they were doing to give these folks was a chance to go in debt for the rest of their lives. These Washington visitors did not mean what they said when they told these flood victims out there that Washington was going to do it by direct grants.

Look at page 35 of the hearings and you will see where Mr. Howse, the big mogul of all of this proposal, said in these words—regardless of what the flood sufferers were told out there in the newspapers. These Washington sightseers played up their hopes that they were going to reestablish the mud-covered homes, supply them with furniture and clothes and whatnot—I am quoting from page 35 of the hearings before the subcommittee, and this is Mr. Howse speaking:

> It is not intended to reimburse the homeowner for household goods, furniture, or personal possessions.

These unfortunates that I am talking about are not homeowners. They cannot afford to buy a home. They are renters. They are tenants. They have no land for security. All they have is their name and their future as a pledge for any debt. I am going to propose an amendment which will take care of this group of people. It is the working man that needs it the most. This proposal only provides $300 to a maximum of $3,000 for the indemnity for personal belongings, furniture and clothes, household goods, and things like that. Grants would go only to those who canot quality for these proposed loans. It will be administered by the local boards, working without pay as public service. It applies only to this disaster and all claims must be filed by July 1, 1952. I trust that there will not be a parliamentary question of a point of order raised to it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I was under the impression that the $5,000,000 for disaster relief was to supplement a certain sum—I do not have it here, but over $25,000,000 that had been previously appropriated.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes; there is an additional $5,000,000, but that goes to the States, and then the States, in turn, reallocate it to the various communities to help rehabilitate the community Not one single penny goes to the individuals I have been talking about for the procurement of clothes or furniture.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I was under the impression it went to the individual.

Mr. SCRIVNER. It goes to rehabilitate the communities. These areas throughout the States have tons of mud and dirty, stinking muck and slime. In some cases it will cost individuals $2,000 to clear their property, but none of this $5,000,000 will go to these as individuals.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, before discussing the request before us, I want to pay tribute to all the members of the subcommittee handling this appropriation, and particularly the chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas. He not only gave every witness every opportunity to testify fully, but he also tried to get additional evidence and, with it all, did everything possible to expedite the matter.

Last week, immediately after the testimony had been heard, I prepared a statement that summarized my viewpoint on this matter, and I now offer it for the consideration of the Congress.

The Congress is asked to appropriate $400,000,000 to finance a program that falls roughly into three phases: First, direct aid, indemnification, or grants not intended to be repaid; second, loans; third, flood insurance.

The evidence presented to the committee gives a clear and accurate picture of the damage in the disaster area and of the need for help. However, to answer the question of "What to do about it?" the committee has merely a mass of testimony that is contradictory, unconvincing, and unsatisfactory.

The evidence indicates clearly that the Government has no detailed or carefully thought out program or policy for distributing the funds either by loan, grant, insurance, or any other method or combination of methods. That is not offered in adverse criticism because the evidence also establishes the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of advancing any hard and fast program or policy of any kind. It may not be practicable to have more than a policy framework with the details to be filled in by trial and error techniques. That is admittedly dangerous and unsatisfactory but failure to get the stricken area back on its feet may be even more dangerous and unsatisfactory.

The evidence establishes beyond question a disaster of unprecedented magnitude. Its toll in human misery and private loss is almost indescribable. Its impact on our domestic economy is obvious and the Office of Defense Mobilization evidence also clearly indicates that the disaster has seriously impeded our war effort.

Although not spelled out in detail for individual cities, towns, and villages, it is also apparent that many communities cannot recover, rehabilitate, and resume normal life without outside help. Whether the States in the disaster area have or have not given full measure in self-help, it nevertheless still remains true that additional assistance must be forthcoming from sources beyond the borders of the States directly affected.

Four hundred million dollars has been requested. The committee has decided that approximately $150,000,000 will be channeled into the area, either by direct appropriation of the committee or by funds already made available to existing agencies after the President's request and before the date of this report.

The committee has granted approximately all the money requested for loans but has denied all the money requested for flood insurance and for outright grants or indemnification to individuals for loss of property. It has increased the disaster relief fund by $5,000,000.

On the evidence presented to the committee, the flood insurance phase of the program cannot be put into effect. Apparently private insurance companies either cannot or will not undertake a program of such magnitude where the risk is well-nigh incalculable.

As far as any form of Government insurance is concerned, no feasible program was advanced by anyone. The evidence presented was insufficient to be the basis for any opinion except that the whole matter should be the subject of an exhaustive and detailed study that was not possible in a speedy hearing on an emergency program.

On the scanty and insufficient evidence presented, I think any reasonable person would conclude that any wide scale and all-inclusive program of flood insurance is out of the question. However, in order to prevent mass unemployment due to any wholesale uprooting of industry—if evidence adduced should indicate such a probability—it might be possible

to inaugurate some selective insurance program through the cooperation of private insurance companies with premiums paid for a brief period—for example, 10 years—by the joint contribution of the Federal Government, the State or local government, and the industry itself. Every possible solution should be thoroughly explored.

It is possible that some thought should also be given to granting tax concessions as an inducement to damaged industry to relocate in the area, assuming it is essential that it remain there.

On the question of grants or direct aid to individuals who need assistance but cannot qualify for loans, the Government has no practical solution that is ascertainable from the evidence. The committee has recommended a very liberalized loan policy plus the amount of $5,000,000 in direct aid—in addition to the $25,800,000 already appropriated for direct aid. While I do not think any member of the committee regards that as a complete solution, I think we all believe it is at least better than nothing.

I am supporting the committee recommendation for a liberalized loan policy. I also do not disagree with the committee recommendation of $5,000,000 for flood relief. I shall not only support that recommendation but shall also support any recommendation of many times that amount for direct aid or grants not intended to be repaid if such aid is conditioned upon reasonable standards and if adequate safeguards or precautionary measures are adopted.

For example, it might well be that before any outright grant should be made to any individual he would have to establish that:

First. His family's need is extreme.

Second. There are so many similar cases that the local community or State is unable to provide all the needed assistance.

Third. A local citizens' committee or some organization similar to the Red Cross recommends the grant.

Fourth. The community or State is willing to contribute a fraction of the grant.

I believe there is a need for direct aid or outright grants and that, in addition to whatever safeguards we may establish, we are also going to be compelled to rely on the discretion, judgment, and honesty of those who will administer the program.

Of course in any such program the danger of abuse is great, but the need is even greater, in my opinion.

If the hearings established anything conclusively, it is the utter lack of any planned course of action on the part of the Federal Government in disasters of this magnitude. The testimony repeatedly emphasized the need for speed in getting a program into high gear. Yet those who have the responsibility for rehabilitation of the striken area are virtually helpless in their attempts to outline an effective program when it is not known how far, if at all, the Congress is willing to go in granting assistance. Certainly it should not be left to the last minute decision of an Appropriations Subcommittee that has not had either sufficient time or authorization to decide a matter of such tremendous scope and far-reaching implications. This disaster has caught us unprepared but that must never happen again. Let us at least benefit by our knowledge that we must decide how far we want to go in such disasters.

The Congress should immediately undertake a full-scale investigation of the entire matter of major disasters. The proper legislative committee should hold long and complete hearings, an over-all policy should be formulated, the Nation should scrutinize it, and then the Congress should by legislation specify just how far the Federal Government will go in assisting disaster victims. Let no one criticize any program or lack of program until the Congress itself has met its own responsibility of providing the framework for a program.

In any large scale disaster there are certain criteria that may determine whether or not Federal assistance should be forthcoming. One or more of the following stages or situations may exist after any disaster. Let the proper legislative committee examine them—and others—and then draw the line at that point where Federal aid should be advanced, whether by loan or grants or any other method.

After any disaster there may be one or more of the following situations where the question is, Shall Federal assistance be given if?—

First. Immediate emergency aid is essential: This would include rescue of victims; medical aid to prevent disease; providing food, clothing, shelter, and so forth, to prevent starvation and exposure; and other emergency measures connected with "drying off" the victims of a flood.

Second. The war effort is seriously impeded and it is imperative to restore as quickly as possible the status quo before the disaster.

Third. The war effort is not seriously impeded—or there is no war effort, in time of peace—but local or State help alone is not sufficient to enable the community to "dig itself out" and resume its place in the domestic economy of the Nation. This is a situation where it affects the community as a whole and directly.

Fourth. The individual cannot be rehabilitated or resume his former productive status without assistance and he is unable to obtain sufficient local or State assistance because there are too many other individuals in the same classification. This category is one affecting individuals directly but not the community as a whole.

Fifth. There is nothing to justify assistance except sympathy: This is the "compassionate case" where there may be no productive capacity or any basis for help other than the Golden Rule.

Sixth. Indemnification for losses is asked, even though there is no need of help for rehabilitation purposes. Here the individual has suffered loss of personal possessions, and so forth, and asks the Federal Government to reimburse him. This looks to the past, for the most part, and is not primarily concerned with the present or the future.

Seventh. Assistance is probably necessary to protect the individual against future disasters: This preventive category looks to the future, for the most part. However, it may also play a role in the present—for example, on the question of whether or not an industry is going to leave a certain area if there be no insurance or other guarantee against future loss.

There probably are many other phases or situations or criteria. I have merely suggested a few to indicate the scope of the question. Where the line is to be drawn is something for the Congress to decide only after long and careful study.

For the purposes of the case now before us for attention, I think I am safe in saying that the evidence very clearly indicates that most of the help requested falls within criteria first, second, and third. I believe that the Congress is willing to advance Federal aid when at least such justification exists.

We cannot now tell where exhaustive study will indicate the line should be drawn; however, it seems to me that in any event it will not be drawn to exclude criteria first, second, and third.

We must be very careful not to establish a precedent that will return to haunt the Congress or bankrupt the Treasury. In full recognition of the need for such caution, it nevertheless seems that Federal assistance must be given in any case where failure to aid will seriously impede the war effort. What other decision can be made if the choice is between establishing a precedent or risking the security of the Nation?

Not quite so clear a case is the situation where the war effort is not impeded but only the peacetime economy of the Nation is damaged by the inability of a community to "dig itself out" with just local or State help. But will not any Congress in all probability be willing to help in such a situation?

The danger of establishing a precedent under such conditions is more demote than the danger of failing to act. Perhaps we are willing to go even further but it is not necessary in the case at hand. The most we need to say to justify assistance here is: The Federal Government will give aid and where failure to act seriously impedes the war effort, or hurts the Nation's domestic economy, and State help alone is not sufficient to remedy the condition. Is that a dangerous precedent?

Let me mention one other point briefly: The Treasury Department says it will lose about $250,000,000 in income tax receipts from that area this year because of the loss of income from business. Granted that at least part of that will be "made up" elsewhere, the fact still remains that, if rehabilitated, the area probably will pour back into the Treasury in taxes at least every cent that is poured into it now.

This report should not be concluded without stating that the evidence also clearly indicates that governmental departments and agencies that have sought to help the stricken area have done an outstanding and, in fact, a remarkable job up to the present time. Tribune should also be paid to the people of the

States, the Armed Forces, the Red Cross and similar agencies, and to all who helped in the first stages of the disaster. However, I single out the Federal governmental bodies not because their contribution was greater but only because some or all of such departments and agencies will be concerned in administering the proposed program. The Congress may want to know their record and experience. I think I am safe in saying that the evidence indicates clearly that the governmental departments and agencies have performed an extremely fine and creditable work in the disaster area.

Lastly, if the situation is even half as serious as the chief witness for the Government contended in his testimony, then Congress must act first and talk about it later.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr COLE].

Mr COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, a flood which devastates an area is different, perhaps, from any other catastrophe that occurs. It is different because a man sitting in his farmyard or in his home or standing in his place of business finds himself faced with the futility of ever being able to do anything about the situation.

After the flood has passed away and the muck and the mire have covered his home, his business, or his farm or scoured hundreds of acres so that there is not a living creature or crop left thereon, he looks at the sky again and wonders whether it will occur exactly in the same place, in exactly the same situation, tomorrow. He wonders if it will occur again next month or next year.

Man has attempted to devise certain things which will prevent floods but they will not prevent disaster from occurring even though all of the man-made programs and plans are finally put into effect. Floods will still continue. We have hurricanes, we have earthquakes, and we have fires. But none of them compare with floods because, though you may be able to indemnify yourself by insurance against these other catastrophes, you cannot indemnify yourself against floods. It is said lightning never strikes twice—but floods strike the same area year after year. Fires, droughts, earthquakes, are almost never repeated, but floods are always recurring in the same areas.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have a precedent here which can be considered by this Congress. This Congress has enacted appropriation measures amounting to billions of dollars for the control of floods, so the problem of floods has been considered heretofore by the Congress as a national problem, one with which the Federal Government should deal.

In the passage of time and with the limitations of appropriations it is not possible for the Congress immediately to put into effect all the flood control projects necessary. We must pick and choose among certain areas. But we recognize the responsibility. Now we choose a certain area in which we put a flood-control project. Therefore, we leave another area unprotected. That other area, unprotected, deserves the consideration of this Congress.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is my judgment that we here owe a responsibility and a duty to the people who have suffered this great loss to see to it that they are rehabilitated. It is not, Mr. Chairman, because it is charity, but because it is a national problem, a national problem involving the economic security of this Nation. Congress has that responsibility.

The President has declared that this flood was a major national catastrophe. That is true, and it is our job to see to it that the people are given this help because it will benefit the Nation as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, billions of dollars have been sent by the Congress and by the Government to foreign countries to aid stricken areas. We have appropriated direct grants to foreign countries for flood relief. In view of this precedent, Mr. Chairman, how can we deny aid to our own stricken people?

The bill offered by the committee merely extends further borrowing powers. These people, this area, cannot be rehabilitated by crushing, burdensome debts, no matter how liberal are the terms. What they need is assistance through grants, and they need it now.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to a member of the committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE]

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to this worthy committee for the most commendable job they have done under the greatest difficulty and handicap. It is always difficult to go against sympathy or the sympathy racket that can be engendered as a result of a great catastrophe. It takes men of fiber—men of the type who are on this committee to stand up against the persuasions that are prompted to influence them. I want to agree with the chairman that if anything is wrong with this bill it is that the committee leaned backward to be considerate, tolerant, and merciful to suffering humanity. That is the only error they made so far as I can see.

Mr. Chairman, I say that because I represent perhaps the second most hard-hit district of any Member of Congress, the northeastern district of Oklahoma, Congressional District 1. We suffered tremendously from the floods that came out of southeastern Kansas. The streams do not rise in my district, but they rise in Kansas, and as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said awhile ago, the water was dumped upon us from another State, but that does not relieve us from a liability and a responsibility here. In my humble opinion, if we had taken the precaution in the past that should have been taken, we would not have had any floods in Oklahoma that were so devastating as these were. Year after year, almost annually, we suffer from severe floods on what we call the Grand River, which is the projection of the Neosho River after it leaves Kansas and comes across the line into Oklahoma. And we suffer floods on the Verdigris River, which with its tributaries rise in Kansas, and the Verdigris flows down through my district, near Nowata and Claremore, and through that part of the country, and from the Caney River, which comes out of Kansas. We have suffered year after year because we have not had flood prevention at the sources of those rivers, where they rise in Kansas. The dams that have been authorized by Congress, and approved by the Army engineers, to be located in Kansas, have not been built, except in one instance. If they had been built, we would not have suffered, as we have, such disastrous results in Miami or near Claremore or Nowata this year. But I suggest to you that this approach through the recognized agencies of Government, which have been doing a good job down there, is the proper approach rather than the direct or indemnity relief program which was suggested. The insurance program is not practical. These programs suggest unchartered courses, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], chairman of the subcommittee, have suggested, and such a proposal should come from the legislative committees, if they are to be considered by this Congress. This committee has done all that a Committee on Appropriations is warranted or justified in doing. In my district hundreds of people have suffered severe losses, all they had, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] says. It is just as bad as it is for the people of his district, except that they are not so many in number. That is the only difference. It is a difference in magnitude and numerical strength, rather than in principle.

I have had very few letters from the people in my district. Those that I have received have said. "You know we have had these floods before. We know how to take care of ourselves. We still have that western spirit which will give us the urge to go forward and to do as we have in the past, and not come to Uncle Sam every time we have a devastating flood. We are not going to do it in this instance."

Notice in the report we received only $225,000, and we are not complaining.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING].

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, the members of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations have recommended to the House legislation which, according to my understanding, represents the most generous treatment of any flood disaster in the history of the United States. I know that they labored hard and conscientiously on this piece of legislation. I disagree flatly with their conclusions. Their recommendations contained in this resolution are not good enough. This program of loans, although the most generous in our history, is not adequate to do the job at hand.

Something has been said of other floods and of precedent. This flood is so completely unprecedented that no other flood can be compared with it. In other floods individual human beings

have been hurt as badly but in no other flood have so many been hurt to so great an extent.

I believe as I believed on the 1st of August, when I first introduced a bill providing for indemnification, as did the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], that in order to get this area back on its feet we must have an indemnification program. I believe that we must have flood insurance. All other natural disasters, fire, windstorm, and hailstorm are covered by private insurance, everything except floods. Floods fall in the class of war-risk insurance. No private insurance company is capable, at a reasonable premium rate, of handling flood insurance in the area affected. It seems to me that if we are going to use the natural resources and the industrial capacity that we now have, we must take some action to protect the individuals in those areas through a system of reinsurance.

I remain convinced today, as I was on the 21st of July, when I walked and drove through and flew over these areas, that we must have the things proposed in my bill, H. R. 5022, which I introduced on August 1 and all those things contained in the President's proposal of August 20 and in my bill H. R. 5259 of the same date.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 3 minutes.

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr BAKEWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my voice to those who have said that they will support House Joint Resolution 341. I believe, as does my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], that this bill is inadequate. The Government of the United States is not an insurer against personal loss. But, Mr. Chairman, where thousands of our fellow Americans are deprived of their property, their homes, and their means of livelihood as a result of an act of God and through no fault of their own, we should properly concern ourselves.

We have been most generous in giving aid to the peoples of Europe and of Asia and of Africa. By and large, I think that program has been wise but, Mr. Chairman, I could not in good conscience ever again vote $1 for foreign aid if we fail at this time to take care of our countrymen in their hour of need.

This bill provides for loans. I do not think we should pass this legislation as loans if at some future time we intend to cancel, reduce, or otherwise alter the agreement to repay. That sort of procedure makes the Government appear to be two-faced. It is the type of approach that is unrealistic. I believe, as does my colleague from Kansas and my colleagues from the flood-devastated sections of Missouri, that there should be limited direct assistance to the flood victims.

Mr. Chairman, residents have sent me photographs of their farms taken before and after the recent floods. In one photograph you see a thriving farm, a fine two-story house, an imposing barn, a silo, and a substantial tool shed. In the other photograph not one of the buildings is standing. Some have been completely swept away, torn from the ground and irretrievably lost. Other buildings have crumpled or are twisted, torn, misshapen humps of rubble, useless for any purpose save salvage of material. Not only has the farmer in question lost his physical assets, but also his crops, his livestock, and his machinery have been destroyed. In truth, his very means of sustenance have been taken from him. He has been deprived of the ability to feed his family and to earn his daily bread. He has no alternative but to go and seek employment where it is available either as a farmhand in some nondevastated area or as a laborer in industry. For this man and all like him, Mr. Chairman, I say that we should in good conscience provide an outright grant of assistance. If the law is properly drawn, wisely and honestly administered, none of this money will miscarry in the channels where it does not belong. If properly handled, none of this money will go to undeserving chiselers.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this bill is inadequate, but as amendments proposed providing for direct grants have been defeated, I have no alternative but to support the bill in its present form. Again I say that we cannot in good conscience refuse to come to the aid and assistance of our fellow countrymen while at the same time we pour billions of dollars into foreign relief.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time the gentleman from Arkansas has remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Four minutes.

Mr COTTON. I thank the Chairman. I should like to be notified when I have consumed 4 minutes because I wish to yield a minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] in order that he may have a full 5 minutes to conclude for the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to make sure that the RECORD is straight as to who is actually helping those in the flood area who need help so much.

Between the time that the President of the United States sent his message to the Congress in August, and the time that those who were charged with the administration of flood relief came before your subcommittee, there was a complete change of policy on the part of those administering relief. That is brought out on pages 111 and 112 of the hearings. On that page we were inquiring from Colonel Howse, who was designated by Mr. Wilson, who was in turn designated by the President to have charge of the administration of this program. Interrogating Mr. Howse we referred to the President's message in which the President made his appeal for this program on two grounds: The first, humanitarian; and the second, to restore production in this area for the war effort. So we asked Colonel Howse if those two principles were to be followed in the administering of these indemnities. Remember, they were asking $190,000,000 for direct indemnification. Mr. Howse replied on page 111:

Mr COTTON. I would say to you that the second principle is not present in this presentation at all insofar as we are concerned.

When he said "second principle" he meant the humanitarian principle.

I then called to his attention the fact that the President of the United States named that as the first reason; that the man who had nothing but his job, who had lost the shirt from his back, all his household furniture from his rented home, needed help. Colonel Howse replied:

Mr HOWSE Mr. COTTON, I would say to you, at the risk of being repetitious—and I say this very respectfully—this is an emergency program insofar as we are concerned. Of necessity, the program is developed as we progress

Now, the President's message went to the Congress on the 20th of August, if I recall correctly. This is nearly a month later, and during that period of time we have learned by some experience in the area, and we have had a chance to develop our own thinking in this respect, and we have eliminated—and I do not want to seem to be in the position of second-guessing the President by any means—but we have eliminated from our thinking the items that I mentioned yesterday and this morning the receivables, the inventory, the crops, the livestock, the household goods, the personal possessions, and in that elimination my personal view is that we have pretty well eliminated the humanitarian point of view also.

So if your committee had recommended giving to these gentlemen $190,000,000 for direct indemnity and thus open the floodgates so that every time in the future when we have a flood or windstorm in this country every man on this floor would be besieged by his constituents to get him a cash indemnification from the Treasury—if we had given it to them it would not have gone to the poor fellow who needed it most, but would have gone to the plants and the industries to restore production. That should be borne in mind, and your committee I think in resorting to every means that we have legally at our disposal in the way of loans and direct relief went farther and did more for the flood-stricken areas than these gentlemen representing the President proposed to do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas yields 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from New Hampshire yields one-half minute to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in public service we frequently are called on to do most unpleasant tasks. I believe that in the 20 years I have been in public office this is the hardest job I have been called on to perform. That is, in the face of tragedy and disaster to

stand firm for the orderly processes of Government and to do those things which we can do in law. Your committee appreciated the tremendous disaster that has occurred. The committee has done everything that it can do under the laws of the United States of America—everything.

Under the Disaster Loan Act when this disaster occurred 61 Federal agencies and bureaus were in there to save human lives, to prevent human suffering, to coordinate and do the thousand and one things that might help and to prevent it from being any worse than it was. They did this without regard to where the money was going to come from, they took it from their regular appropriations. They did that and the testimony shows that they did a fine job. The Congress appropriated $25,000,000 which was added to that to do everything to alleviate and relieve and prevent and to reestablish the people and the area on a temporary basis so that we could take stock and set out to bring about a restoration on a permanent basis. That has been done. But this committee, perchance, being afraid that in the over-all, in some of the towns and cities there might be some things that are of an emergency nature that must be done, has added an additional five million. For this disaster the Congress has given approximately three times as much in that way as has ever been given in any disaster in the Nation's history for this immediate relief.

In addition to that, this committee has provided in this bill all that it is authorized to do under the law. It has raised the loan authorization to the Farmers' Home Administration, which means a man who has lost his home or has suffered damage to his farm can go in and on his own signature, even if he has no security, borrow 100 percent of what it takes to get reestablished. We have raised the loan authorization of the RFC so that it can make 100-percent loans, even if the individual has no security, in order to get the people reestablished. We have raised the limits on the amount of loans which the Federal Housing Administration can insure residential buildings so that they can make available homes for the man who had a home and an apartment for the man who rented an apartment, and make it possible for him to go ahead.

If the FHA should not fully meet the needs of housing, and there is no reason it should not, the RFC can step in. If the Farmers Home Administration fails to fully meet the needs for the farmers, the RFC can take it up. So to the extent that we can we met the important, direct problem here, when the flood was going on. In this bill we have provided for restoration to the fullest extent that there is any authority for the committee to do.

Now there was another program that was asked of us. I would like to say first that every witness agreed that if your desire was to restore and to reestablish the area, it could come nearer being done by the lending of money where you could control its use and see that it went to restoration as against giving an indemnity check which could be used to move to California or to some other State. I opposed the British loan on the basis of even on a loan basis, providing the money to spend as they liked and wherever they liked. I thought we should only have provided credit so we could control the use and see to it that they resulted in real restoration. But insofar as restoration is concerned in the area of this disaster the witnesses said that they could bring about restoration better if they controlled the use of the money that is made available which can be done under the loan program here provided.

The official request before this committee, however, was for indemnification. We were asked to provide a blank check to the administrator; for him to go into the area and give everybody 80 percent of up to $20,000 that they had lost. Under the proposal, it made no difference if the individual had a billion dollars left or if that was all he had. Of course, we wish that were possible but there is a grave question as to the wisdom of the Government embarking on such a policy, and if it were wise there is presently no legislative authority to do it. As I have said, we have no authority to do it. If you give indemnification to one, you have to do it through a general act, and then each individual in the Nation who suffers such loss would be just as much entitled to indemnification as an individual here. There would be no limit and in my judgment there is no way to provide enough money for such a general policy. Certainly I know there should be thorough study of any such program before it is begun. In the meantime, we do provide here the funds; we provide them through the regular agencies where they can see that the funds are used for restoration of the area.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, the following sums:

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLLING: Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for expenses necessary to enable the President, through such agencies of the Government (including new agencies which the President is hereby authorized to create) as he may direct, and under such regulations as he may approve, to provide for and to take such measures as he may deem necessary for relief and rehabilitation in the areas declared by the President during July and August 1951, to be disaster areas because of floods, including (a) partial indemnification for physical loss of, or damage to, such tangible real or personal property as may be deemed administratively feasible, but such indemnification (1) shall not exceed $20,000 for all claims of any one person and shall in no case exceed 80 percent of an amount equal to the cost of replacing, rehabilitating, repairing, or reconstructing such property (less depreciation), (2) may be required to be contingent upon financial participation of State and/or local governments and compromise of creditors' claims (including claims of Federal agencies which are hereby authorized to be compromised without consideration), and (3) shall be adjusted on account of any assistance, compensation, insurance, or other reimbursement received or due on account of such loss or damage; (b) loans to State and local governments, on such terms and conditions as may be deemed necessary, to enable financial participation by such governments in the indemnification program authorized herein; (c) direct loans, or the guaranteeing of loans made by any public or private financing institution, upon such terms and conditions as may be deemed necessary, for rehabilitation of houses, farms, and private businesses; (d) conservation and land restoration measures; (e) personal services, without regard to the civil-service laws; (f) hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; (g) advance of funds under section 11 of the act of August 2, 1946 (41 U. S. C. 529); (h) expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; and (i) services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U S C 55a); $400,000,000 to remain available until June 30, 1952: *Provided*, That prior to the payment of any indemnity, or the granting or guaranteeing of any loan under this act, the recipient thereof, or the cognizant State or local government, may be required to provide reasonable assurance of the relocation, reconstruction, replacement, rehabilitation, or repair of the damaged property so as to provide reasonable protection against the recurrence of flood loss or damage to such property, or the indiscriminate redevelopment thereof, and for these purposes there may be acquired by purchase, donation, other means of transfer, or condemnation, and without regard to section 355 of the Revised Statutes (40 U. S. C. 255), land which is subject to recurrent flooding, and such land may be utilized or disposed of in such a manner as to reduce the likelihood of further serious flood damage: *Provided further*, That any indemnification made pursuant to the provisions of this appropriation shall be final and conclusive for all purposes: *Provided further*, That the authority conferred by this appropriation and the funds provided herein shall be supplementary to, and not in substitution for, nor in limitation of, any other authority conferred or funds provided under any other law: *And provided further*, That the functions and duties exercised under this act shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedures Act (60 Stat 237), except as to the requirements of section 3 thereof.

"FLOOD INSURANCE REVOLVING FUND

"SEC. 2. There is hereby created the 'Flood insurance revolving fund,' which shall be available, without fiscal year limitation, for all expenses necessary for the establishment and operation of a Federal flood insurance program to provide insurance and reinsurance (when not otherwise available at reasonable rates and upon reasonable conditions from private sources) against damage to, or loss of, private property (including that owned by State or local governments) from floods occurring within the United States or its Territories, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of said funds; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); advance of funds under section 11 of said act of August 2, 1946 (31 U. S. C. 529); and purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles. Said program shall be administered by such agency of the Government (including new agencies which the President is hereby authorized to create) as the President may direct, and shall be operated under such

regulations as he may approve. For the foregoing purposes, there may be transferred to said fund, from the appropriation for 'Rehabilitation of midwestern flood-stricken area,' such amounts as the President shall determine to be necessary which shall remain available without regard to the limits of disaster areas. In addition, said fund shall be credited with all net receipts from insurance premiums, salvage, or other recoveries from insurance activities thereunder, and there are authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts as may be required: *Provided*, That any insurance or reinsurance issued under said fund shall be based, insofar as practicable, upon consideration of the risk involved, and said program shall utilize to the maximum extent possible the facilities of private insurance companies. *Provided further*, That reinsurance shall not be provided under said fund at rates less than, nor obtained under said fund at rates more than, the rates established by the Government on the same or similar risks or the rates charged by the insurance carrier for the insurance so reinsured, whichever is most advantageous to the Government, except that there may be made to the insurance carrier such allowances for expenses on account of the cost of services rendered or facilities furnished as may be deemed reasonably to accord with good business practice, but such allowance to the carrier shall not provide for any payment by the carrier on account of solicitation for or stimulation of insurance business *And provided further*, That such program of insurance shall be so administered as not to serve as an inducement for indiscriminate investments in facilities in areas which are subject to recurring floods."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order against the amendment

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. NORRELL. If I may do so without waiving any of my parliamentary rights, I will be glad to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOLLING. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his courtesy in reserving the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment in the nature of a substitute is the bill I introduced immediately after the receipt of the President's proposal. It contains, as you have noted, a provision for indemnification, a provision for guaranteed and insured loans, and a provision for flood insurance.

I had hoped that no point of order would be raised against this so that the House as a whole could act on the merits of the case as a whole. It is clear that the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations found against that case. The reason given is that it contains legislation on an appropriation bill. That, also, is the point of order. My experience in the House is shorter than that of many Members. However, it is more than sufficient to know that this is only an evasion of the issue. There have been innumerable cases of legislation on appropriation bills during the past 3 years. The Appropriations Committee can and does do what it pleases in that regard. It could have—it should have—faced this issue squarely and not hidden behind an excuse.

As I have said earlier, I respect good faith of every member of the subcommittee and the full committee. I believe, however, that they approach this problem looking to the past, not to the present or to the future. This flood—the great flood—is the greatest natural disaster in the history of the United States. It is a completely unprecedented flood. It has injured our defense production. More important to me, it has injured the lives of thousands and thousands of human beings.

The first bill I introduced on this subject was designed, and is now designed, to take care of people I am concerned about the defense production of the United States because in the long run our survival as a nation depends on that, but I am primarily concerned about the human beings then affected and now affected, and, if all they get is loans, who will be affected for generations, by the failure of Congress to look forward. The future, not the past, is our concern.

I think it very clear that loans piled on top of debts will not do the job. As I said, I appreciate the generosity of the committee in going further than the Congress has ever gone in such a situation. I reiterate that I do not think that is enough from a humanitarian point of view or from a national defense point of view.

It is said that we cannot set the precedent of indemnification. It is said that we cannot have flood insurance because it is impractical. It is said that the proposal should have gone to a legislative committee and not to the Appropriations Committee.

Having already pointed out that there are innumerable examples of the Appropriations Committee's recommending and securing the passage of appropriations bills which contained legislation, which established new policies, let me point out why the Appropriations Committee was the right place for the proposal to go. There is urgent necessity for the fastest congressional action possible. It is obvious that one-committee action is faster than two. It is obvious that the likelihood of the Congress adjourning without any action at all would be greater if authorizing legislation were first considered by a legislative committee of the House, then by the House as a whole, then by a legislative committee of the Senate, then by the Senate as a whole, then by a joint committee of conference, then once more by each body and then the whole laborious process repeated to obtain the appropriations authorized in the first place.

In this matter there was and is an urgent necessity for speed of action. There can be no evasion of the issue. The oft-repeated excuse is not sound. The Appropriations Committee and the House cannot duck the fact that they are deciding the questions of indemnification and flood insurance when they pass on House Joint Resolution 341.

Now, what of partial indemnification? Unprecedented disaster requires unprecedented measures. There have been many terrible floods, many terrible fires, many terrible windstorms. There has never been a flood or other natural disaster in our Nation's history as great as the Kansas-Missouri flood of 1951. The great flood affected not only thousands of individuals but hundreds of towns and cities, disrupted the communications of great parts of whole States. The great flood has had an enormous impact on our Nation's defense mobilization effort. The great flood may have seriously damaged the world's food supply. The great flood is the greatest of all our natural disasters.

In the past the capacities of individuals, cities, counties, States, and national organizations, such as the American Red Cross and the Salvation Army, have been sufficient to restore individuals and areas to economic and social health. They are not sufficient to do that job today. I came to this conclusion in late July after personally viewing the aftermath of disaster, not only from the perspective of an airplane but also from the ground where on foot and by car I saw and smelled and heard what the uncontrolled waters had done to business and industry and always to people. Nothing that has happened since has changed my judgment. More recent events have only strengthened my conviction that a program of Federal grants-in-aid is essential if this great food and industrial production area is to be restored to its full capacity to produce in behalf of freedom.

Unprecedented, yes, although we can point to the similar program of the Philippine War Damage Commission, unprecedented, yes, but so was this flood and so in its times was the Constitution of the United States. This area represents an important part of the strength of the United States, of the free world. We have broken many precedents in recent years to strengthen the free world.

Surely the precedent is not the point. Getting the job done is the point—getting the job done for our own people in our own country.

Let us examine flood insurance. Private insurance companies find themselves unable to adequately spread the risk so that their premiums will not be prohibitive for flood insurance in areas like the area recently stricken Can we as a nation afford to let any part of those areas be abandoned, those areas which produce so much of agricultural and industrial goods, at a time when we are mobilizing all our resources in defense of our freedom? I think not. I think we must face up realistically to this problem. Some system of Federal flood insurance, probable reinsurance, is essential if we are to use all our valuable human and material resources in these difficult and dangerous times.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the point of order will not be pressed. I urge that we get this job done now, that the House of Representatives approve the substitute amendment which I now offer—the substitute which appropriates $400,000,000 and provides for partial indemnification, generous loans, and flood insurance.

The CHAIRMAN The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlemen may proceed.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri provides for indemnification and would provide for the creation of an insurance company to insure against future floods. Indemnification means that the Government could, and would, go out and pay in any place in the United States, losses sustained by floods; how about fire, lightning, frost with citrus, and so forth An individual in any area of the United States who lost his home, or lost everything he had, would be suffering the same damage as an individual might suffer who happened to be the victim of a disaster where many people were involved. So far as insurance is concerned, you cannot set up an insurance company just by passing a law. You must provide funds with which to pay the claims. The testimony before our committee showed that the loss in the Missouri Valley alone was greater than the net value of all the insurance companies that handle property insurance was less than that. There is no conceivable way of raising money with which to provide the backing for such an insurance company. We tried it with crop insurance, and it failed, because only those in high-risk areas were interested. We have that on an experimental basis now, but to start out to indemnify an individual for his losses was recognized by the people of those two States as being fraught with danger because the constitutions of those two States prohibit the issuance of State checks to individuals on this kind of basis. The intent here is good and goodness knows we wish to help But this would create a dangerous precedent. In the South during the reconstruction days we had legislative bodies who assumed this power. They issued checks to their friends and even to themselves. That is not what Colonel Howse intends in this area, but how about the future? Colonel Howse wants to go there with the checks and to give them to the people for what they have lost. But the next Congress might be confronted with a different situation, and it might be done on a different basis. I do not care who you send out there, but on this basis, presented to this committee, you would have him given the sole discretion of deciding to whom he would give the checks. I say that is a dangerous course for the Government to start on regardless of how bad and how serious the present situation may be. Now this amendment does not intend to go quite that far but that is what the proponents for this course of action told our committee it would provide for.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment is clearly legislation offered to an appropriation bill. Not only that but it is not germane and would provide what constitutes a complete departure from the existing principles of government.

If the time has come to embark on any such program as that, you should not ask the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations to bring in this proposal when the very witnesses before us said, "We do not have any plan, we do not know what we want to do. We talked to one man about this insurance program, but he has not yet made his report and at this time we would not wish to use his name."

Colonel Howse, who attempted to justify the request for the $50,000,000 for insurance, said, "We have talked to one insurance expert, but he has not given us a report, and I am not at liberty to give you his name." This amendment would set up such an insurance company on that kind of showing. In effect it would provide for indemnification for past losses and through this insurance approach for indemnification for future losses—all with payments out of the Federal Treasury. It is clearly different from anything known under our present law, and goes far beyond the authority of this committee, and certainly is not pertinent to anything in the bill which we are now considering.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment because it is not germane to House Joint Resolution 341, which is now before the Committee. It sets up legislation, a rather extensive program of indemnifying flood-control insurance; and there is not anything, not one paragraph or one sentence or one word in the pending resolution on either one of those subjects.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COLMER). The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment which is offered in the nature of a substitute authorizes the President to create new agencies of Government, and to approve regulations for their operations, and it authorizes the payment of indemnities for damage to private property. The amendment also would create a new program of Federal flood-damage insurance and provide for its administration.

While it appears that the general purposes of the amendment to assist flood-stricken areas is somewhat similar to the general purposes of the resolution, such similarity does not constitute germaneness under the many precedents of the House.

The amendment introduces propositions and subjects entirely different from, beyond the scope of, unrelated to, and new to the pending joint resolution. Therefore the amendment is not germane to the resolution, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, while I recognize the parliamentary situation, I would not want the impression to prevail in the Committee at this time that there is not some other method whereby we may approach properly and legally the problem that is presented by this amendment that has just been held to be out of order.

Certainly a sovereign—and of course our Government is a sovereign—has the inherent right to defend, protect, and save itself; of course we can imagine a tragedy being even greater than this tragedy that has brought about this proposed legislation; and our Government, as a sovereign, has the right, in my judgment, to make grants and to make loans which it may find necessary to protect and save itself or some portion of itself. When the matter is properly presented before some legislative committee, certainly it would be proper for us to consider that legislation, and it would be in due order.

In addition to that, I call your attention to the interstate commerce section of our Constitution. Most, if not all, of the streams that are so devastating are either main streams that flow across State boundaries or are tributaries of main streams that flow across State boundaries. Certainly, under the interstate commerce clause of our Constitution, we would have the legal right to make reasonable grants to people who have lost their all in such a disaster as this. Also we would have a right to make loans that are so reasonable that people could effectively rehabilitate themselves and pay the money back over a long period of years. Most certainly, if there ever was a situation in our great country that demands our action along that line, I believe it is that growing out of these flood disasters.

As we all know, we have spent billions of dollars in foreign countries for similar matters. Surely we ought to be liberal with our own people along that line. A man works hard during his life and saves up a little nest egg and has that wiped out overnight by conditions over which he has and can have no control, and then to say that a benevolent government, a strong, powerful government like ours should not come to his rescue is to say that government has failed, to some extent, in my opinion. I think if we are to do justice and equity to these people, we must recognize the tragedy that is theirs, and we must do something in addition to that proposed in this resolution, along that line.

In my concluding remarks I want to compliment this great subcommittee and this great Committee on Appropriations for doing this much. Although I do not believe this is nearly enough, I want to say, God bless you for giving us at least this much. You have felt that under your jurisdiction and under your prerogatives this is about all you could do at this time.

I respect your opinions and your views, but I say that there are other parliamentary procedures that we can and should take to do more than this. I do want you to know, however, that I express from the depths of my heart my appreciation and thanks for what you have done.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment to make an inquiry of the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], who is handling this bill. I note beginning on the first page of the bill under the heading "Department of Agriculture":

Conservation and use of agricultural land resources: For an additional amount, $16,480,000, including the furnishing of services, materials, and payments for conservation and land restoration measures, to enable the Secretary to carry out flood assistance and rehabilitation in agricultural areas, damaged

by excessive rains, runoff, and floodwaters, designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as—

And so forth. My question is: Is the language in this bill broad enough to include the disastrous flood condition that has existed for years, and still exists along the Missouri River from Sioux City to Kansas City, where thousands upon thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of acres of land have been flooded, much of which is yet inundated and almost all of which is out of production for this year and will be next year unless something is done to get the flood water off that land and keep it off—is the language in this bill broad enough to include the Missouri River and its tributaries from Sioux City to Kansas City?

Mr. NORRELL. I think I can answer the question adequately for the gentleman, but the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is, as the gentleman from Iowa knows, chairman of the Agriculture subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and with the gentleman's permission I shall yield to the gentleman from Mississippi to answer the question.

Mr. JENSEN. I shall be pleased to hear from the able gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa that the agricultural items in here are under the regular program of the Department authorized by law; that is true not only here but elsewhere. In the particular instance, this money is provided under the regular law but would be limited to the areas designated by the Secretary as disaster areas under Public Law No. 38. I personally am not familiar with just what that territory is that has been declared to be a disaster area. But if the damage is of such proportion as to meet the requirements of the law the Secretary could add such areas as came in that category and make this fund available for that section; but he would have to first declare it a disaster area under the terms of Public Law No. 38 passed April 6, 1949.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure he has already done that; most of the counties, if not all of the counties in Iowa from Sioux City to the Missouri State line have been declared a disaster area. The people in those counties are eligible under that declaration for disaster loans; so they must be in the disaster area covered by this bill.

Mr. WHITTEN That is the only limitation, that these funds are made available to meet the regular agricultural programs due to the disasters in areas declared to be disaster areas under that law. If he has not already done so and if it is actually in such disaster area, it strikes me he could cover it by so declaring.

Mr. JENSEN. I think everyone must admit that the flood conditions which now prevail from Kansas City to Sioux City play a very great part in the disaster that happened farther down the stream. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. Since the area I have mentioned has been declared a disaster area, or at least those counties which the Secretary of Agriculture has already declared a disaster area, clearly come within the provisions of this bill.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: On page 1, line 6, add a new section entitled "Federal Flood Claims Commission," and the following:

"There is hereby created a Federal Flood Claims Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, to be composed of the Director of Defense Mobilization, the Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, to direct and supervise under such regulations as it may adopt, the payment of claims for losses of tangible personal property suffered by individuals whose property was damaged by the floods of July 1951 in areas designated by the President as disaster flood areas; and local Federal flood claim boards in each county in such designated disaster flood areas, to receive and process such claims.

"The said Commission shall have an executive director, who shall be selected by the Commission from an existing Federal agency, and whose duties shall be in addition to those presently exercised by him.

"The President is hereby authorized to request the Governors of States in which disaster flood areas exist to name a Federal flood claims board in each county within the designated disaster flood area of their respective States, to consist of not more than five members, to be selected from each of the two major political parties, said board members to serve as a civic duty and without compensation.

"The Executive Director of the Commission is authorized to requisition from existing agencies, on behalf of the Commission, and to assign, such clerical staffs as may be deemed necessary for both the office of the commission and of the board offices in the several counties.

"No claim shall be considered for a minimum of less than $300, and the maximum allowable to any one claimant shall be $3,000; no claim shall be entertained from individuals found to be eligible to relief under any other of the provisions of this act; and there shall be deducted from the total amount found to be allowable the amount of any cash relief benefits and/or insurance already received by the claimant from any agency, public or private, on account of loss suffered in the July 1951 flood. All claims must be filed with the appropriate local county board, on or before June 30, 1952

"The local board in each county shall receive and process claims, shall, according to rules and regulations of the Commission, require the admission of proof of loss and of the actual value of property lost, and shall determine the fact and the extent of loss suffered Upon a finding that a claim is allowable the board shall certify the claim and the amount allowed to the commission, which shall thereupon make immediate payment direct to the claimant.

"The right to claim shall vest only in the person who suffered the loss, or (1) the widow or widower, or (2) if there be no surviving widow or widower, then the surviving children.

"For the implementation of the provisions of this section there is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated the sum of $100,000,000.

"Any person found guilty of making a false or fraudulent claim, or assisting in the presentation of false or fraudulent claims, shall be deemed guilty of a felony and shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not to exceed $10,000, or be imprisoned not more than 3 years in a Federal penitentiary, or both.

"No part of any amount allowed under this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with claims hereunder, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating this provision shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order against the amendment just offered.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. NORRELL. I will be glad to, without waiving any parliamentary rights to make the point of order later on.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which I have proposed does not have some of the objectionable features upon which the Chair ruled a few moments ago. It has no matter of flood insurance; it relates only to this one disastrous flood for which we are called upon to provide funds.

My amendment does provide for direct grants of a minimum of $300 to a maximum of $3,000 to the people in this particular flood area, this particular disaster, who cannot get relief under the other provisions of law as implemented by these appropriations today. In other words, it says in so many words that no claim shall be considered from any individual who is eligible for relief under any of these other provisions. As I said earlier today, loans are not of any help to these workingmen, who have nothing left but his job, if he is lucky, and his family, whether he is young or old, because all that is offered here is a chance to add to an already great burden of debt a still greater burden.

My amendment provides that the heads of the three agencies already existing shall make up a flood commission. The President shall request the Governors to name a board of five members in each one of the affected counties to be made up of members of both political parties to receive the claims and process them without pay. The clerical help is to be provided by already existing agencies. And then the local board is to pass upon these applications for grants. They know these people, they know the situation; they know pretty well whether the man is lying or not. This amendment provides that they shall claim only the actual value of the property lost, not the cost of replacement, but the actual value of the property at the time it was lost. If a claimant does put in a fraudulent claim he faces a charge of felony and upon conviction he could be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 3 years. That Mr. Chairman, is the amendment simply stated.

I set $300 as a minimum because if the loss was not more than $300 in any of these cases, whether a workman or not, whether a widow or not, certainly any loss less than $300 can be absorbed by that person. I fix a maximum of $3,000 because if the loss was greater than $3,000 it is apparent that the person who owned that much is not in the group of

people I am trying to help here by this particular language.

If time permitted, I could show you case after case of these people, many of them just getting a good start, many of them veterans, some of them just completed school, they just got started. All they have now is a big debt, a growing family, with no chance to ever get out from under except by some aid similar to that proposed in this amendment.

Something was said about precedent. Well, precedents have gone by the boards so rapidly in the last 20 years that it is almost laughable to discuss precedent. A precedent exists today that is costing you many, many billions when the total cost is paid. That precedent, the placing of thousands of our troops, in time of peace, in many countries in the world. When did you ever do that before? Never, and nobody complained about shattering precedent then. But here is a small request to help some little people to the tune of $300 up to $3,000, and somebody says, "Yes, but you are establishing a precedent." This flood was a precedent. Never in all the history did you have a flood like it. We had dikes, we had levees that would have taken care of any anticipated flood, any flood that had occurred up to July 13, 1951. Since this flood itself broke precedent and came down in far greater torrents than ever before then, of course, as has been said, it does call for a precedent in legislative action. To be sure that it is not an all-time encompassing proposal I have limited this to the losses sustained in the July 1951 flood in the areas already designated by the President as disaster areas. In order that it will not hang on and on and on, I have provided that all claims must be filed on or before June 30, 1952, so that there is about a 7-month deadline, and if they cannot decide how much they have lost by that time, certainly they have not been hurt very much.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the point of order will be withdrawn so we can provide this needed help now.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to further reserve my point of order if I do not waive anything by permitting the gentleman from Mississippi to discuss the amendment. I do not want to do anything that will imperil my parliamentary status at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not the practice of the House to reserve a point of order and then debate another amendment. Does the gentleman desire to press his point of order?

Mr. NORRELL. Yes; I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Will the gentleman yield to me for the purpose of addressing myself to the point of order?

Mr. NORRELL. If I do not waive any parliamentary rights, I will yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the Chair will recognize either gentleman, the gentleman from Arkansas or the gentleman from Mississippi, whoever wants to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. NORRELL. I would like to be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHITTEN. I, too, Mr. Chairman desire to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order and then yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] to be heard on the point of order, if that is satisfactory to the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. NORRELL. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment is not germane to the pending House joint resolution; that it sets up a Claims Commission and establishes an indemnification for flood-control damages, and the House joint resolution does not do that. It is not germane to the pending resolution; either the paragraph or the entire resolution. There is nothing in it with reference to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not care to be heard now, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say this in connection with the point of order. The committee appreciates the position of our colleagues the gentlemen from Kansas and Missouri, but there is an orderly procedure. The Committee on Appropriations is not a policy-making committee. The amendment is not germane, and I am compelled to insist on the point of order to that effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas would set up a new commission. The general purposes of the amendment would be to bring about the payment of indemnities, a matter beyond the scope of the pending bill. Therefore, the point of order against this amendment would have to be sustained, as was the previous one, and largely for the same reason.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Missouri-Kansas-Oklahoma flood was as great a disaster to the country as would be any adversity on the field of battle. The floods caused great havoc. There is no question but that they held up the defense effort to the extent that millions upon millions of man-hours were lost, and thousands upon thousands of lives which could have been devoted to the defense effort were jeopardized so that they just could not function.

Strangely enough—or not strangely enough either, because the people of my district are generous and charitable and sympathetic to all sections of the country—I have received more mail on this Kansas flood situation than on almost any other subject, right from my own district in the past few weeks. The people are exercised, and they are very much concerned that this disastrous flood which has wrought so much havoc in the Middle West might visit itself on some other sections. Sooner or later, the people on the Susquehanna and Chenango Rivers in the Northeast will have to face the same catastrophe.

My point is this: I believe the time has come to get at the cause and to correct that before we try to effect a cure on these over-all flood catastrophes. If we create a great slush fund we can remedy overnight the flood disasters which may hit in the Mississippi Valley, in the Middle West, or in the Northeast, or anywhere else, so that we can make it a policy of this Nation to come in and assist the people, with the travail and the labors they have suffered; we could rescue them from these catastrophes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wonder if the gentleman would not like to change that term to "reserve fund"?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That came into my mind because we are talking about floods. "Reserve" would be more appropriate.

I endorse some sort of program which will eliminate these catastrophes, insofar as we are able to. In my particular section we have been faced with these major problems ever since I can remember. Thousands upon thousands of people, year after year, are in the same position of catastrophe that they are out there now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What are you going to do for my constituents? We had an early frost up there, and we had a rainy season. Their tomato crop and several other crops are all gone. What are you going to do about them?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not know what is going to be done for the gentleman's constituents or for my constituents either, but it is my understanding that this week we are going to vote billions of dollars for people in other parts of the world, rightly or wrongly, I am not quarreling about that at the moment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You are going to vote for that?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. But they will certainly not have to do what the average American has to do in order to get assistance or relief—they will not have to take a pauper's oath and they will not have to show extreme need as the people here in this country have had to do for the past 20 or 25 years in order to get any public assistance whatsoever.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman comes from the great State of New York, which is represented by that fighting warrior, Tom Dewey, who has been advocating giving us away. Where are you going to stand on Tom? What are you going to do about him?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will tell you after the next congressional reapportionment. I do not know what plans they have for me.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You mean you will tell us, if you are here?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman mean to say he is not in on this reapportionment?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. So they tell me. All I get is what I hear from the rumor train which comes down from Albany.

Mr. ROONEY. I guess we are in the same boat.

Mr EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That would mean that one of the best Members in the House is to be removed. Certainly, the time has come to clarify this whole issue of control and flood disaster. These folks out in Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma deserve the very best treatment that we can possibly give to them because such disasters will visit other sections of the country in years to come, and they have the right to expect decent treatment from the rest of the country, just as we in New York State, frustrated as we are—I am speaking of flood control. We ought to do something to help them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I am not worrying the Members of the House by taking the floor so much on this subject, but I think you have seen some examples here of what makes it so difficult to serve on this subcommittee. The feelings of those from the section of the country affected, and who know these people personally, and who realize this disaster for what it is—and it is a major disaster, is pretty hard to stand up against. I do want to repeat here, that this committee has done everything possible under the law of the United States. It has gone further than we have ever gone before in history. All the witnesses testified insofar as rehabilitation and restoration were concerned, that you could do it better under the program which we have brought to you than under the kind of program advocated, for which there is no authority in the law.

With regard to the insurance law program, I would like to point this out. There is no authority for it. Secondly, Colonel Howse who advocated it told us "We do not have any plan." He said he had talked to one insurance man, a man connected with some underwriters organization. He said he was not at liberty to give us his name. He said this man had not yet reported back to him. I said, "Do you mean you want us to give you $50,000,000, not only without authority, but at a time when you do not have any plan, and when the only man you have talked to has not even given you a report, and you cannot give us his name?" He said "That is what I mean." Is that sound? Now, if you were to, by legislation, provide this insurance, it will be paying after another flood happens. Is that what you should do in an area like this, or should you go in there with some flood control program and try to prevent the disasters before they happen?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. The point I made in my original statement in connection with flood control was this: That limitations of time and appropriations require the Congress to select certain sites upon which flood-control projects shall be placed. Some sites will be left unprotected. Those sites and the people at those sites, in my judgment, have a right to have the same sort of consideration that these people living at the sites which have been protected have You say why do we not go in and have flood control—yes, that is wonderful, but we are not going to get it.

Mr. WHITTEN. I say this, although flood control would be slow and might be late, eventually it would do some good But insurance, if the Government were to write it, does not prevent anything, it just provides for a payment after the disaster occurs. I have pointed out to you here that the proponents have no plan and they have talked to only one insurance man. He has not given them a report; they are not at liberty to give us his name. The committee called the insurance people before us. They said they could not conceive of any approach under which you could get a broad enough base to get enough money to support any such program; that if you had any such program that it would amount to an indemnification, that is, a promise to indemnify a man if it happened some time again in the future, that is if by legislation you sought to provide some such program There is none now. Let me give you a homely illustration that will illustrate what we on this committee were called upon to do. It was our view that we are trustees of the people of this Nation, and that we are supposed to operate under the law The chief witness of one of these agencies who appeared before us was formerly the head of a bank in Chicago which had $32,000,000 deposits. I asked him this question:

> You as president of that bank were a trustee for the safekeeping of the depositors' money, you said you have $32,000,000 of depositors' funds in your bank and under your care If one of your depositors had the misfortune of losing everything he had in the world and he came to you for help and you said, "We sympathize with you, we will lend you whatever you need from the funds we have here to put you back on your feet and if you are indeed wiped out, all we will require will be your own signature."

I said:

> If after that you told him that his friend in Congress or elsewhere had come to you and said you were not being fair, that you should not treat it as a loan, you should give it to him as a gift out of the funds you held, what would you, as president of that institution and trustee of that $32,000,000, say of a proposition like that?

He said:

> I would say it was silly.

I asked him then:

> Suppose that while you were out the vice president came in and he, learning of your action, said that your offer was not enough, and the vice president gave him the money; but then this customer's friend came to you and said, "We got the money from the vice president, the money wasn't his but he just gave it to us; but now that isn't fair because the customer might lose everything he has again and we want you to set aside in insurance an equal amount so if it does happen again we won't have to depend upon the vice president but can get the money from the insurance fund"; what would you say?

He said:

> I would say he was silly.

We are trustees of all the people when we represent them in the Government of the United States. We have gone the whole way, all the way, under the authority that we have under the law that provides loans even without security, if need be, and now we are asked not only to give our unfortunate fellow citizens substantially what he lost up to $16,000, but to guarantee him should it ever happen again; we will have money for the second loss already set aside.

I know I may get credit for being unsympathetic by taking this stand, but I believe it to be the only one we in the Congress can take.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr CANFIELD. In the gentleman's original presentation on the floor this afternoon he indicated that there were 61 Federal agencies engaged in relief in these disaster areas. I am astonished that there are so many agencies engaged in relief; and, consequently, I wonder if there may not be considerable overlapping; there must be a great deal of overlapping. Would the gentleman care to discuss that question?

Mr. WHITTEN. I said 61 agencies. I believe that is what was told our committee, but the testimony was later corrected to 61 bureaus and agencies. At any rate there were 61 different Government divisions which made their facilities and people available for this relief work. This was provided under the disaster-relief law, under which the whole Government can go out and do what they can without regard to whose money was being spent at time of disaster to help prevent suffering, loss of life and property. For this they have authority of law. The gentleman may be right, we may have more than enough agencies. But were we to adopt a policy under which we paid everybody for everything which they lost—that is a sufficient departure from what I understand to be the right principles of Government—that certainly you ought to have full and adequate hearings to see where it will end, for it will reach across the country; it will reach into every creek bottom, into every home, in every county in every State, and in every Territory. The annual demands would far exceed the ability of the Nation to meet them.

We do feel that we have done here all the law permits us to do. The record shows that what we have provided will restore the area more quickly than would indemnification. Let us proceed with this restoration.

If we are to embark on indemnification, let us at least do it after full and

adequate soundings as to where it would lead us.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Conservation and use of agricultural land resources: For an additional amount, $16,480,000, including the furnishing of services, materials, and payments for conservation and land-restoration measures, to enable the Secretary to carry out flood assistance and rehabilitation in agricultural areas, damaged by excessive rains, runoff, and floodwaters, designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as disaster areas under Public Law 38, approved April 6, 1949: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be expended without regard to the adjustments required under section 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U. S. C. 590h) and may be distributed among States without regard to other provisions of law: *Provided further*, That the administrative expense limitations provided under this appropriation item in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1952, may be increased by not more than $1,780,000, of which not more than $180,000 may be made available to State extension services to provide assistance through the Cooperative Agriculture Extension Service

Soil Conservation Service: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, $1,960,000, for emergency restoration of channel capacity in tributary stream channels and waterways, and related measures, affecting more than individual farms, in agricultural areas, damaged by excessive rains, runoff, and floodwaters, designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as disaster areas under Public Law 38, approved April 6, 1949.

Farmers Home Administration. For an additional amount for the Disaster Loan Revolving Fund established under Public Law 38, approved April 6, 1949, $30,000,000.

DISASTER RELIEF

For an additional amount for disaster relief, $5,000,000.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Disaster loans Section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "$40,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$100,000,000". *Provided*, That any loan, including renewal or extension thereof, under section 4 (a) (4) of such act for acquisition or construction (including acquisition of site therefor) of housing for the personal occupancy of the applicant, may be made for a period of not to exceed 20 years.

Administrative expenses: The amount authorized for administrative expenses of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as set forth in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, is hereby increased to $17,750,000

SEC. 102 This act may be cited as the "Flood Rehabilitation Act, 1952."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the House joint resolution back to the House without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COLMER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 341, making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the House joint resolution to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the House joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the House joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AND THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 428 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R 3669) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of H. R. 3669, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act. The bill proposes sorely needed increases in pensions and annuities for retired railroad employees. In asking for a rule on the bill the committee pointed out that there has been no raise in the payment to annuitants since 1948, and no raise in payments to survivors since 1946. The cost of living increase since these dates has been tremendous. The lag between retirement payments and costs is great and emphasizes the desperate need of those retiring after long years of railroad service.

The bill reported by the committee majority, provides briefly a 15-percent increase in annuities and pensions for retired employees, and a 33⅓-percent increase in each of the survivors benefit. The committee, at the same time it granted the rule on the measure, reported out a resolution brought to the committee by members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which provides for further study of the whole problem. It provides for committee appointment of an advisory council composed of representatives of the interested Federal agencies which handle the retirement acts, railroad labor unions, and informed disinterested individuals.

There is no controversy on the need for increased pensions but because there is controversy in this technical and difficult field, this rule provides for 2 hours' debate after which the bill is open for amendment so that the committee can work its will. The bill to be considered, of course, strikes out the Crosser bill and substitutes the Hall bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. As I understand, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], who has charge of the rule, has just stated that at the same time of reporting a rule making this bill in order the Committee on Rules reported a resolution providing for further study on certain basic issues involved.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand then it is the intention, under the announced program, for the gentleman or some other member of the Committee on Rules to call up this resolution immediately following the consideration of this bill?

Mr. MITCHELL. That is the understanding. I do not think any definite agreement or arrangement was made, but that is the understanding.

Mr. HARRIS. That was the understanding in the Committee on Rules in reporting the legislation?

Mr. MITCHELL. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. The majority leader, I believe, in making the statement last week on the program for this week, which is included in the RECORD of Thursday, stated the resolution would be called up immediately after the consideration of this bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is correct.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, there was no understanding of that kind with me, and I was there during the discussion.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to say to my very distinguished chairman that I did not imply or intend to imply that he agreed to any such procedure or program, but I am merely relating what happened in connection with the legislation.

Mr. MITCHELL. Of course, that is a decision the House will have to make when the resolution comes up.

I have no further requests for time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3669, as reported in the House, amends the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide an immediate across-the-board increase of 15 percent to all annuitants subject to it; and an increase of 33⅓ percent in survivors' annuities. These increases are to be accomplished without raising the railroad retirement tax, already embodied in the act, above the maximum of 6¼ percent, effective January 1, 1952.

The committee amendment proposes no changes in the act itself except the stated increases. It leaves to the future

any amendments to the classes of beneficiaries, or any correlation of the Railroad Retirement Act with the Social Security Act.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS

An average increase of 15 percent is made in the retirement annuities by increasing the percentages for computing the amount as follows: 2 76—now 2.40—percent of the first $100 of compensation, 2.07—now 1.80—percent of the second $100, and 1.38—now 1.20—of the third $100. This increase applies also to minimum retirement annuities for those having more than 5 years of service.

SURVIVORS' ANNUITIES

A 33⅓ percent increase is made in the survivors' annuities payable, first, to widows over 65 years of age; and, second, widows not of that age but having a dependent child in their care. These latter have previously received three-fourths the employee's basic amount; and will now receive an amount equal to his basic amount.

A 25 percent increase is made in insurance lump sums of employees who die leaving no one immediately entitled to a monthly annuity by setting the sum payable to the survivor at 10 times the employee's basic amount—now eight times.

For those employees who are separated from railroad service with benefits transferable to social security, the benefits paid their survivors shall be those provided for by the Social Security Act amendments of 1950.

ANNUITY TOTALS

A perfecting amendment is made to the section controlling minimum and maximum survivor annuity totals to increase the minimum to $14—now $10; and the maximum to $160—now $120. This increase averages 40 percent and 33⅓ percent, respectively.

EFFECTIVE DATES

First. The increase of 15 percent in currently payable retirement annuities, pensions, that is, private pension amounts taken over and incorporated in the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937—and joint and survivor annuities, shall be effective with respect to amounts due the first calendar month after enactment.

Second. The increase of 33⅓ percent in currently payable survivors' annuities shall be effective as of the same date.

Third. The use of the new formulas for computing retirement benefits and survivors' annuities shall be effective (a) after the last day of the month when the bill is enacted, and (b) with respect to deaths occurring after enactment, respectively.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3669) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3669, with Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, our committee spent a good many hours trying to work out legislation which would aid our railroad employees as much as possible. We had a unanimous objective in mind; that is, to raise the amount which annuitants, pensioners, and survivors currently receive from the railroad retirement fund. Many competent witnesses came before us representing each of the points of view. The committee worked diligently, and in my opinion, many of the some twenty-odd brotherhoods worked diligently to try to arrive at what might be termed a unanimous decision as to what is the proper answer to this problem.

After all of the efforts made by the various brotherhoods and by the various members of our commitee, on both the Democratic and Republican sides of the aisle, we failed to agree as to what is the best method to meet what we all recognize as a real problem; to wit, the raising of the benefits of these people.

We all know it is very much apparent that those who receive pensions and annuities and survivors' benefits are having greater difficulties than ever before in paying for the necessities of life. I personally do not question the motives of any of those on our committee with whom I happen to find myself in disagreement concerning this bill. Both bills have some merit, undeniably that is true. The Hall bill, which is in the form of an amendment to the Crosser bill, definitely would undertake to raise by 15 percent all of those who receive annuities and pensions. It would undertake to raise by 33⅓ percent survivors' benefits. No one can dispute the fact that that objective is a laudable one. The Hall bill is a simple bill, there is no question about that. The Crosser bill, on the other hand, approaches this problem from a different standpoint. It is a more involved bill. But, again, the Crosser bill has for its objective the same worthy purposes, although to be arrived at in a different way, than the Hall bill has.

This fact must be borne in mind definitely when we consider retirement systems that the Government backs. In the case of social security, you find that your legislation is written in a manner that is weighted in favor of those who receive the lesser incomes and those who have worked shorter periods of years. On the contrary, the railroad-retirement legislation is weighted more in favor of those who receive the larger incomes and those who have worked a longer period of time. That fundamental difference exists between these two Government-backed retirement systems.

Consequently, we find that those who are receiving the least amount now in the railroad-retirement system naturally are in far greater need than those who receive a lot more. That stands to reason. What the Crosser bill is trying to do, in my opinion, through its provisions, is to bring about some adjustment that will enable those who need help the most to get more help. It is that simple, in my opinion.

It stands to reason that if a fellow is getting $20 a month as a pension or an annuity and you raise him 15 percent you raise him about $3. You certainly have helped him some; you have helped him $3 worth. On the other hand, if a fellow is getting $150 a month, and you raise him 15 percent, you have helped him more.

One of the primary objectives, I repeat, and one of the fundamental differences is that we are undertaking to bring about some adjustments that will give the greatest benefit to those who need help the most As I said originally, the railroad brotherhoods are not together on this. Naturally, any time you draw a line, any time you make a fundamental change, there are some who are not as favorably affected as others. In this instance undeniably there are some who are not as favorably affected as others. All annuitants, pensioners, and survivors are favorably affected by the Hall and Crosser bills. The ones in my opinion who are most favorably affected by the Crosser amendments are the ones who need the help the most, such as survivors and particularly pensioners and annuitants who are receiving the least. I have given you the kind of illustration which I think makes that clear. The Hall bill, as I say, raises by 15 percent the pensioners and annuitants. It raises by about 33⅓ percent, those who obtain benefits as survivors. The Crosser bill undertakes to raise by 60 to 80 percent approximately, the benefits that survivors receive, and roughly by about 29 percent the pensioners and annuitants. In order to do that, however, the Crosser bill has some innovations and some changes that have themselves been points of controversy. For example—and of course I realize there is a place for argument with reference to this provision which I shall mention—there is a provision which says that if a man receives a pension or an annuity, he will be allowed to earn no more than $50 per month. I do not necessarily like this provision; however, the Social Security Act has it; the Congress approved the Social Security Act, of course. Naturally, that brings up controversy. It was discussed at length in our committee, and, of course, voted upon. Anybody can question it who wishes to, but the purpose of the sponsors of this provision is very clear. The purpose is to try to keep people working longer—incidentally statistics show that they have been working longer without it, and I want the committee to get that—they have been working longer recently, and the purpose is to keep them working longer and paying in longer, and therefore getting greater benefits instead of drawing

from the funds. This provision if enacted is a net gain for the fund as I understand. Of course, it is needed in order to bear part of the burden we have been told.

Then we have another provision in the Crosser bill, which I feel is meritorious although controversial, and that is with reference to bringing up to what might be termed the social-security standard all recipients of pensions and annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act. That may be unsound, but it was felt by several members of the committee that that objective at least is one that we should be interested in attaining. So, we have written a piece of legislation—the Crosser bill—which seeks to attain that very objective.

Still another objective which we have had is to try to give the annuitants and pensioners more by approaching it from the direction of helping the spouse, and giving the spouse one-half that which the annuitants or pensioners receive up to an amount of $50 a month. True enough, that will not give some people very much, but it will again aid those who, in the opinion of us who support the Crosser bill, most need aid.

Let us take a few examples that relate to what the two bills, the Hall bill and Crosser bill, do.

A man who is now receiving $72 a month under the Railroad Retirement Act would receive from the Crosser bill a total annuity of $92.88. The Hall substitute would give that same man $82.80, or $10 a month less.

A man now receiving $90 a month under the Crosser bill would be increased to $116.10, an increase of $26. Under the Hall substitute the man would receive $103.50, or $13 less than under the Crosser bill.

These are actual statistics I am bringing to you in order that you may know as you decide this issue what you are doing. I am not one who is coming here trying to tell you that this is an open and shut case; it is naturally a controversial case, and the membership, irrespective of what group of railroad employees or employers favor one thing or another, the membership should try to decide this on the basis of what you yourselves wish to do with reference to those who need help, and they all do need help.

A man who is now receiving $144 a month would be given $185.76 by the Crosser bill, or an increase of $41.76. Under the Hall substitute this man would receive $165.60, or $20 less than under the Crosser bill.

These three illustrations represent a relatively low paid annuitant, an average annuitant, and a high level annuitant. Let us now take three examples from among the lower class of survivors' widows and children. These examples are even more startling because they demonstrate that railroad widows and children are being asked by the supporters of the Hall substitute to accept less than is given the people under social security, as I pointed out a moment ago.

A widow without any children now receiving $34.11 would be given $45.48 a month if the Hall bill were enacted. As I told you a moment ago, the Hall bill does raise this group 33⅓ percent, approximately. The Social Security Act, and that is the standard we seek to reach by the Crosser bill, would provide this same woman with an annuity of $48.75. Therefore this widow is being offered less than we are now giving people under the Social Security Act. The Crosser bill undertakes to recognize that fact and to bring up to the social-security standard that widow and those who survive with her. The Crosser bill, on the other hand, would give the widow a total of $57 a month.

A widow with one dependent child who is now receiving $43.43, under the Hall substitute would receive $57.97; and, yet, this same woman under social security would receive $75 a month. The Crosser bill provides a total annuity for such a widow and child of $94 a month, almost doubling her present annuity.

Let us take another illustration, that of a widow and two dependent children, who are now receiving $56.85, under the Hall substitute would receive $75.80. The social security would provide this same woman $97. Under the Crosser bill she would receive a total annuity of $114.

I have tried to point out some examples of just exactly what the operation will be under the Hall bill, under the Crosser bill, and what the operation actually is under the Social Security Act. I want to say again what I said originally, that in the opinion of those who support the Crosser bill we are trying as best we can to give more aid where more help is needed; we are trying to give the greatest benefits where the greatest need exists. Also we are definitely trying to help them all. I personally like all our railroad people. I simply wish to do what is right and sound not only in regard to the employees, but also in regard to the employers who participate, I might add also.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. What would the widow receive who had three children?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I do not happen to have those figures but I would say that we are trying not only to take care of that type of family you mention but we are also trying to take care of the families I have just mentioned. I did not try in collecting the figures I have referred to, to go into too much detail because of the shortness of time, but I will try to get the information for the gentleman quickly.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. May I take advantage of the opportunity to express a deserved and richly merited tribute of appreciation to the Great Commoner from Ohio, the chairman of the committee, and the author of more beneficial labor legislation than any other man who has ever sat in the American Congress.

It is said that history is made up of the biographies of great men. Certainly when the biography of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] is written it will constitute one of the most important chapters in the history of progressive legislation ever written by any government on the globe. He has in his more than a third of a century of service in the House sponsored and supported measures which have changed the course of American life and American standards of living and brought health and happiness and prosperity to millions of families who, from children to grandsires, today rise up to call him blessed.

And here in the House among his colleagues who know him best, there is none whom we, in the Biblical language of the book of Esther, more delight to honor.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman from Ohio for 15 years has worked diligently on this problem. I have had occasion to work on this type of legislation with him and others on the committee for a number of years and I say that he as well as others has done a constructive piece of work unquestionably and undeniably. There is no question about that. In my opinion, he is not undertaking to mislead those of us who are working with him on this bill nor the House when he undertakes to say what he is trying to do in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL].

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, we spent weeks and really months working on this bill. I agree with the gentleman from Texas that on at least one thing we were unanimous. Every member of our committee desired to increase the benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act.

There was quite a bit of controversy, however, during all of the hearings. The first thing we learned was that the Federal Security Administration said it could not support the bill. The Budget advised us by letter that the bill—and when I speak of the bill I mean the original Crosser bill—had a number of defects and that there should be a real study of the whole situation.

I offered my substitute at the end of the hearings in executive session. It provides a 15 percent increase for pensioners and annuitants, a 33⅓ percent for survivors and a 25 percent increase in lump-sum survivorship cases. I want to make it clear at the outset that the substitute was not offered by me and was not supported by other members of the committee with any understanding that it was going to remain permanent law. We feel, however, that something should be done immediately to help these poor people who are not getting very much in the way of pensions and annuities. We intend the committee bill to be stopgap legislation to be followed by a study which you will have a chance to vote on tomorrow, setting up a committee to report back here on February 15, 1952, as to what we can do for the annuitants, the pensioners, and the survivors under the Railroad Retirement Act and at the same time keep the retirement fund solvent.

Of course, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] has told you of some of those provisions of the Crosser bill

which seem very attractive when you just mention them. He mentions, for instance, the benefit that the living spouse gets of $50 a month under the Crosser bill. Mr. Chairman, I think that is nothing more than bait for other provisions of the bill.

Let us look at that provision for the sponse in connection with the $50 work clause in the Crosser bill. Think of it. A man on retirement under the Railroad Retirement Act amended as the Crosser bill would have it amended if he makes $50 a month, he loses his retirement pension and his spouse would not get the $50 a month that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] talked about. So I claim that is just bait. Congressmen pay no more money into the pension fund than do the railroad workers who today pay 6 percent into that fund. Next year they will pay 6¼ percent. We as Congressmen pay 6 percent. Have we any work clause in our pension law? Have any of the Army and Navy people any work clause in their pension law? Has any civil servant of the Government any work clause in his retirement law? Of course not. Once we retire, once an Army or Navy individual retires, once a civil servant of the Government retires, he can go out and make as much as he wants. Are we going to say to railroad workers: You can pay as much into your fund as Congressmen do but if you quit and take your pension and make $50 a month, we are going to take you off the pension rolls? Those who voted for my substitute for the Crosser bill felt that would not be fair.

Now, of course, when you give new benefits you must have more money. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] passed over this very quickly. One of the places where they are going to get extra money is by raising the wage base from $300 to $400 a month, the base that will be taxed. We are told by those in charge of the Crosser bill that it will raise $80,000,000. Now where does that $80,000,000 come from?

That $80,000,000 comes from two sources. First, The railroad workers will be assessed or taxed $40,000,000 more if the Crosser bill is enacted into law. The railroad workers will have to pay, those making $400 a month, $6 a month on top of the additional income tax which will be required by the new tax bill that we passed. Second, The other $40,000,000 will come from the railroad companies. And, Mr. Chairman, where will the companies get the $40,000,000? That amount of money is figured in their rate base, and if we pass the Crosser bill the railroads can go before the Interstate Commerce Commission and ask for new rates to take care of the payment of that $40,000,000.

Yes there is great controversy about this bill. When the brotherhoods themselves are split, when you have government bureaus and commissions opposed to this bill, when you even have our great committee split into three groups, I think it is time that we very carefully consider it. I think we, who supported the substitute, took the simple, the best and the fairest course. We said, "Yes, we agree with you that these annuitants and pensioners need more money" I say to you frankly that the quickest way to give them that relief is to vote for the committee bill. If you do that they can begin to get relief in the month of November. If we pass the Crosser bill, no one here today can tell us when they will receive any benefits whatsoever.

So, in conclusion, let me say this: First, the committee bill is nothing but a stopgap bill; we admit that. We want to study the situation, and when we come back next year with the result of that study, we hope we can give these pensioners and annuitants even more money. But until we have that study I do not think we should attempt to amend the splendid railroad retirement law in any broad scale fashion as is attempted by the Crosser bill.

Mr. KEATING Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Did the Federal Security Agency and the Bureau of the Budget review and take any position in regard to the substitute?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. They did not, because my substitute was offered at the last session of the committee. But I will say this, that a member of the Railroad Retirement Board wrote in and said that the committee bill was the better bill.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr LEONARD W. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Notwithstanding the fact that the bill introduced by the gentleman from New York was not presented to the various agencies of Government, yet a reading of the report of the Bureau of the Budget and the Federal Security Administration shows that they are in entire accord with the approach made by the gentleman from New York in the bill reported by a majority of the committee. In fact, the majority of the committee has followed the recommendations that were made by both of these bureaus.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Those reports indicate that they would approve the provisions of the committee bill.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to take a position opposed to that of my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL] who has just spoken. But I believe, for one thing, if you will look into the sponsorship of the Crosser bill, who was the author of the original Railroad Retirement Act, and who has devoted a substantial part of his life to the betterment of conditions of railroad employees, you will realize that this is not a hodgepodge as stated by the gentleman from New York, but is the result of intensive study over many, many years. As a matter of fact, if we use the term "hodgepodge" it seems to me, as a member of this committee, that that language might well be applied to the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York. He admits his amendment was offered on the last day of our deliberations, and was never submitted to any of the departments or to the brotherhoods themselves, and therefore we never really had any indication of how they would feel about it.

Mr. Chairman, along with 11 other members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I am urging the House to adopt the original Crosser bill in place of the Hall substitute which has been reported out of our committee. The Crosser bill represents many months of painstaking study on the part of the most competent experts in the field of railroad retirement. The Railroad Retirement Board has endorsed this legislation as well as a majority of the employees who are affected, as well as the A. F. of L. and 80 percent of the railroad brotherhoods.

There is a sharp difference in the approach of the Crosser bill to the retirement problems that we face and the approach of the so-called Hall substitute. The Hall substitute is meager in that it gives inadequate benefit increases to those who are most in need. In addition, it leaves these needy people, for the greater part surviving widows and children, in a position of receiving less benefits than they would receive if covered by social security.

That is very significant. Why should these employees of the railroads be treated any differently from other employees in industry? In many cases the railroad employees have paid more into the system, yet they will be receiving less.

Mr HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that under the committee amendment as reported, the retired annuitants and pensioners will receive a 15-percent increase, and under the original bill which was introduced by our distinguished chairman, the retired annuitants and pensioners will receive an increase of 13.8 percent?

Mr KLEIN. That may be true, but it is only a half truth, because there are other benefits which they would receive under the Crosser bill which they will not receive under the Hall substitute. As a matter of fact, taking into consideration the other benefits to the railroad workers in the Crosser bill, the increase is about 30 percent.

There is no defense for such an action. The simple issue is whether we want to vote railroad men adequate benefits in the form of the Crosser bill or inadequate benefits in the form of the Hall substitute.

Probably in no area is there a sharper difference between these two bills than in the treatment of aged wives of retired railroad men. Under the present law no benefit is given to a man who is retired and who has the responsibility of supporting his wife. In every conceivable governmental policy we have recognized the added responsibility of a man who has a family to support. For example, in the Internal Revenue Code, the Congress, for many years, has recognized the problem by giving to an employee added deductions to compensate him for the care of a wife, or any other dependent. There is a reason for this.

Obviously, a man who has a wife to support has more basic responsibilities and is under a greater financial burden than one who is single and with no dependents.

In the social security laws we have recognized this burden on the aged annuitants and pensioners and made provision for a spouse's benefit. Under the Social Security Act a retired employee whose wife is 65 years of age or more is given a benefit up to a maximum of $40. There again we find clear expression on the part of Congress in recognizing the greater need of those with wives to support, in comparison with those who have none.

The Crosser bill, which we are now considering and which I hope we will pass, provides a spouse's benefit. This benefit amounts to one-half the retired employee's annuity with a maximum of $50. There can be no question as to the valid need of this benefit. That old maxim about two being able to live as cheaply as one more often than not is feminine propaganda which proves very effective at the age of 20. By the time these railroad men, or for that matter any individual, have reached the age of 65 the wisdom and maturity of age prove that two cannot live as cheaply as one. A man with a wife to support is deserving of great consideration. Such a benefit as is proposed in the Crosser bill is entirely in keeping with our American concept of the home and the family. It recognizes marriage as an institution and also the basic fact of life that a retired employee who has a family is under a greater financial burden than a single one.

There are some who say that single men should not be taxed to support the wives of those railroad men who are employed. This is a ridiculous statement. It is just as ridiculous to say this as it would be to say that healthy railroad men should not be taxed to support disabled railroad men as is presently the case. It is just as nonsensical to say that people who have no children should not be required to pay taxes for the upkeep of schools. The fact is that of those who are now retired, almost 50 percent have wives who would immediately begin to draw this spouse's benefit. In addition, almost 70 percent of all retired employees have wives who at one time or another will enjoy this provision. The inclusion of this spouse's benefit on the retirement benefits proposed in the Crosser bill bring the average payments to all retired employees up to a point which represents a general increase of about 30 percent. This increase for retired employees of 30 percent coupled with the increases provided for survivors of more than 75 percent make the Crosser bill, by all odds, the best possible bill for railroad employees. I urge all of the Members of the House to support our chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], and his original bill. BOB CROSSER is making this appeal on behalf of the rank-and-file railroad employees. I have never seen nor heard of a Congressman having regretted adopting the advice of BOB CROSSER in a railroad retirement matter. His advice has always been sound and completely safe in this field. I urge all Members to support the original Crosser bill.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, retired railroad workers and the survivors of those who are deceased are in need of immediate relief. The need for increasing the amount of monthly benefits paid to them under the Railroad Retirement Act is urgent. It demands immediate action upon the part of Congress. Relief must be given at the earliest possible day.

For several years now the scale of the benefits to retired railway workers and their survivors has lagged far behind the steadily rising cost of living. This has produced a situation that cannot and should not be ignored any longer. The condition of some of these retired workers and their families, whom we seek to aid by increased benefits, is desperate. In many instances, it is pathetic. They all need help and they need it now without further delay.

The bill which we have reported goes to the very heart of the matter by eliminating all controversial issues raised by the bill being supported by a minority of the committee and does the all-important thing, namely, increases benefits to all beneficiaries now under the railroad retirement system and thereby grants immediate relief to enable them to live more in accord with what they are entitled to have as a result of long years of service and the high rate of taxes that have been paid into the retirement fund.

The bill we support provides the additional aid in an easy and effectual way by making a straight increase of 15 percent to all retired workers and 33⅓ percent to their survivors, over and above the amounts they now receive. These increases would be effective immediately upon the enactment of the bill. The increase provided by this bill for retired workers is larger than that provided in the bill supported by the minority for this class of beneficiaries and the amount of increase provided by the bill for survivors is far in excess of the average paid under social security to this class of beneficiaries. Furthermore, it is hoped that as a result of the study of the retirement act, as provided in a special resolution introduced on behalf of the majority of the committee by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], and which we seek to have adopted in connection with this bill, that it will be possible to find ways and means of still further increasing benefits and improving the stability of the retirement fund.

MINORITY (CROSSER) BILL

The committee did not consider it advisable to accept H. R. 3669 as originally introduced, and, voted upon in the committee, for two basic reasons. First, it was so involved and complex that it would have taken many months, and, in the opinion of some even more than a year, before the necessary records could be completed to provide the information on the basis of which the benefits could be paid. In contrast to this the committee bill now before you, and, which represents the views of a majority of the committee, has removed all technicalities and makes it possible for the increased benefits payable within 1 month after enactment. All that it will require is one letter to the Treasury Department to increase the present benefits of retired workers by 15 percent and survivors of deceased workers by 33⅓ percent. It would be just as easy as that. We recognized that there was need for immediate relief. Our bill gives it.

The second reason the committee selected the more simple and easy approach in preference to the involved and controversial provisions of H. R. 3669, was because it introduced new principles into the Railroad Retirement Act, that were foreign to, and, in conflict with, the fundamental principles that formed the basis of the Railroad Retirement Act.

A short summary of some of these provisions is as follows:

(a) Transfer from railroad retirement to social security all railroad employees having less than 10 years of service. Under this provision of the minority—Crosser bill—the railroad retirement fund would be entirely relieved of the payment of benefits to persons who have had less than 10 years of service in the railroad industry, and all such would be transferred to the social security system. This would affect approximately 5,000,000 individuals now having the right to benefits, either present or future, under the Railroad Retirement Act. All of these individuals have paid into the retirement fund four times greater than that paid under social security, and, yet they are stricken from railroad retirement rolls and put under social security without any compensation for the additional tax they have paid and which under the minority bill would be forfeited. There are many who believe that a system can be devised that will correlate the railroad retirement benefits with those of social security, but, everyone almost without exception, including Murray Latimer, recognized today, as the outstanding pension economist in this country, Social Security Administration, Bureau of the Budget, are all of the opinion that the method provided in the so-called Crosser bill would be inequitable, unjust, and, fall far short of accomplishing the benefits claimed for it, and in fact would prove a great detriment to stability of the railroad retirement fund, and would weaken rather than strengthen the fund.

(b) Fifty - dollar - work - limitation clause: The minority sponsored Crosser bill—H. R. 3669—provides what is termed a $50-work-limitation clause. This would deny a retired worker the right to earn more than $50 monthly in employment covered by the Social Security Act without losing his pension or annuity. At present there is no such limitation in the law.

Under the present Railroad Retirement Act the only work restriction imposed upon retired employees provides that while receiving an annuity, they must not be employed by a common carrier railroad recognized under the Railroad Retirement Act or by their last regular employer prior to going on pension.

Benefits under social security are not restricted in any way if annuitants are

employed on the railroads or in any other employment except that covered under the Social Security Act. The retired Government employee is not restricted as to earnings because of employment in any other field except employment in the Federal Government. It is only reasonable and fair that railroad employees, who will pay a higher tax rate than either of the above-mentioned groups, beginning January 1, 1952, be given the same privilege to supplement their fixed retirement incomes in other fields.

One of the provisions of the present Railroad Retirement Act provides that an employee who has attained age 60 and has 30 years of service may retire on a reduced annuity. Each year a number of employees who have been disqualified for work by the railroads and who do not meet the Railroad Retirement Board's disability test, as well as many others who meet the requirements for a reduced annuity before age 65, retire on such a reduced railroad retirement annuity and they obtain work outside the railroad industry to supplement their retirement benefits. This $50-work-restriction clause will create a great hardship upon the disqualified employee who did not qualify for a disability annuity, and of course it would discourage others from retiring on a reduced annuity. It would practically nullify the reduced annuity provision in the present act.

The only argument that has been made in favor of the $50-work restriction contained in the minority bill is that such a provision will provide additional funds with which to finance the increases and new provisions, such as the spouse's annuity, proposed by the minority bill.

Although the present Railroad Retirement Act provides for retirement at age 65 the average retirement age is about 68 years, which means that there has been a saving in the railroad retirement fund in two respects: First, no annuities have been paid for the 3 years from 65 to 68; second, taxes have been received during the same 3 years from these employees who could have been receiving annuities.

Of course the $50 work restriction is intended to create further savings by discouraging retirement even at age 68. The Railroad Retirement Board has estimated that the $50 a month work restriction will save the Railroad Retirement Fund $50,000,000 a year. When you consider that the average annuity paid each year is about $1,000, then such a $50,000,000 a year saving would mean approximately 50,000 employees who are ready for retirement will not retire because of the $50 limitation on earnings. Thus, the minority—Crossser—bill changes the Retirement Act into a compulsory work act.

The Railroad Retirement Act as enacted by Congress was intended to make it possible for men to retire, rather than to be restrictive legislation. That is, it proposed to provide benefits and encourage retirement of railroad employees at age 65, instead of imposing restrictions upon the aged employee to discourage his retirement at age 65.

Another feature overlooked in the $50-work-restriction clause is the administrative problem, which will mean the policing of some 200,000 retirement claims each month by a corps of new employees.

The Railroad Retirement Board's experience with respect to the policing once every 6 months of the present work-restriction clause as applied to the disabled employee, should certainly provide sufficient evidence as to the amount of extra work that can be expected if a monthly check is necessary. All of this is so unfair to retired workers that it is inconceivable that anyone would recommend its adoption.

(c) Increased tax base from present monthly wage of $300 to $400: The minority bill—H. R. 3669—seeks additional revenue by providing that the present payroll tax rate be applied to all wages up to $400 per month instead of $300 as under the present law.

This increase of the tax base was vigorously opposed by the representatives of the operating brotherhoods and others coming within that classification on the basis that in many cases it would result in increasing the individual's tax from the present $18 to $24 per month, an increase of 33⅓ percent.

There are many other controversial provisions of the minority sponsored bill that might be enumerated and enlarged upon if the available time had not been limited to 2 hours of debate. It is inconceivable that debate on a bill of this importance should be limited to such a brief period. When it is considered that this bill affects the welfare of thousands of aged people sufficient time should have been allotted to enable the fullest discussion to be had.

Before closing, however, I do wish to emphasize that the committee in reporting a bill that leaves out all the controversial features that would delay passage, create dissension, and delay the payment of increased benefits, has acted wisely and in the best interests of these needy retired railroad workers and their survivors.

In this connection I direct your attention to the hearings that were held by the committee. They demonstrate that the sponsors of the proposed Crosser bill—H. R. 3669—are the only supporters of the bill. In contrast we find that the Social Security Agency, the Bureau of the Budget, and, practically every actuary either opposed the bill—H. R. 3669—as introduced, or, withheld approval. In making this statement I do not wish to reflect on the sincerity of those who worked long and hard in seeking to find a complete solution of all the problems inherent to the legislation, but, the fact remains that H. R. 3669 is not the answer. Its provisions call for further study and additional information before approval can be given. I favor the adoption of the resolution that will provide such a study, but, in the meantime it is imperative that we provide immediate aid to the retired railroad workers and survivors of deceased workers. This is what our bill does.

ALL EXPERTS, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, AND BUREAU OF BUDGET OPPOSE MINORITY BILL

Before voting on either the majority or minority bill, I recommend that the Members of the House read the reports received from the Bureau of the Budget, Social Security Administration, the Squire report dissenting from Railroad Retirement Board report, the testimony of Murray Latimer, the most outstanding pension economist in this country today, together with the testimony given by all the actuaries who testified in the Senate hearings but were not called to testify in the House hearings, and, you will find that all of them disapproved of the changes sought to be made by the minority report in the basic principles of the present Railroad Retirement Act or testified that the plan submitted would be highly detrimental to the stability of the retirement fund.

BUREAU OF BUDGET OBJECTS TO MINORITY BILL

The Bureau of the Budget in a clear, logical and forceful manner opposes the adoption of the minority bill—Crosser—H. R. 3669, and, recommends only a reasonable increase in present benefits to be followed by a study of a plan that would make the railroad retirement system supplementary or additional to social security old-age benefits. This would give immediate relief to retired workers and their families without delay and then a study with a report at an early date of the possibilities of increasing benefits under a combination of railroad retirement and social-security benefits. This is exactly the position taken by the majority of the committee They believe in giving immediate aid by increasing benefits at once and then a study as to ways and means of increasing them, with a report to be made by February 15, 1951.

The following is the report of the Bureau of the Budget appearing on pages 40 and 41 of the committee report:

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., May 22, 1951.

Hon ROBERT CROSSER,
Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D C.

MY DEAR MR CROSSER. In response to an oral request from your committee the Bureau of the Budget hereby submits a report on H R 3669, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes.

This bill would liberalize employee retirement benefits by roughly 15 percent, would add spouse's benefits paterned after the old-age and survivors insurance system, and would raise considerably the level of survivor benefits. It would raise the taxable wage base from $300 to $400 a month It would not raise railroad retirement tax rates Instead the bill proposes to meet in part the cost of these benefit increases by shifting to the OASI system the full responsibility for paying benefits to short-term workers (those with less than 10 years of railroad service). The bill would not require any transfers of money between the trust funds but would merely call for a joint Federal Security Agency-Railroad Retirement Board report by 1956 recommending such legislative changes as would be necessary to place the Federal OASI trust fund in the same position in which it would have been

if railroad employment had been covered under OASI since 1936.

At the outset it should be made clear that the principle of making the OASI system the basic form of protection for all employed people, would carry out the President's recommendation made in his 1952 budget message, to the effect that:

"Our aim should be to establish for all employed people a minimum protection that each person takes with him wherever he works. Pension and insurance plans for special groups should supplement social-security benefits as industry pensions already do for several million workers."

This principle was also the recommendation of the Advisory Council on Social Security of the Senate Committee on Finance which reported as follows on April 20, 1948:

"Railroad employees: The Congress should direct the Social Security Administration and the Railroad Retirement Board to undertake a study to determine the most practicable and equitable method of making the railroad retirement system supplementary to the basic old-age and survivors insurance program Benefits and contributions of the railroad retirement system should be adjusted to supplement the basic protection afforded by old-age and survivors insurance, so that the combined protection of the two programs would at least equal that under the Railroad Retirement Act"

H. R 3669, although it appears to move in the direction of interrelation, has a number of serious defects.

1. The workers with less than 10 years' service in the railroad industry—and these make up a very large percentage of the total—would get virtually all of their benefits from the OASI system and nothing from the railroad retirement system; yes under the bill they would pay for the same OASI benefits four times as much taxes as nonrailroad workers pay currently. In a sense, the short-term employees would be forced to subsidize the longer-term employees—a situation that might result in considerable discontent.

2 Any breaking point between programs, such as the 10-year limit, produces glaring inequities. For example, under the bill, the total retirement benefits at age 65 for a man with earnings of $300 a month and with 9 years of railroad service and 11 years under social security, would be reduced from $103 a month to $80 The total benefit for a man with 10 years of service under each system would rise from $105 50 to $112 50 a month.

3. The principle set forth to govern the joint report on financial adjustment, if implemented by law, would establish a very questionable precedent, i. e., the favorable tax rate and slower accumulation of reserves under OASI would be made available to another, separate program with limited coverage. In effect, it puts the OASI system in the position of paying benefits to another system for the use and advantage of that system, rather than directly to the individual workers. Such a precedent might be used to obtain for other special programs with limited coverage the advantage of favorable OASI financing without actual participation in that system. The strength of a comprehensive social-security program depends on wide coverage with its pooling of high-cost and low-cost risks; the proposed arrangement would weaken the system.

4. Because of the extreme complexity of the proposed interrelations between the two systems, those persons who are covered under both would be thoroughly confused as to their rights, benefits, and equities. This complexity would also give rise to delays in adjudicating claims and to heavy administrative expenses to both systems.

5. According to the estimates submitted to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by the Railroad Retirement Board, the cost of the benefits of the railroad retirement system would exceed the combined employer-employee tax rate by 1.6 percent of payroll, which, on a level-premium basis, is approximately $80,000,000 a year. The estimates of the Board show that in the absence of additional financing the trust fund would be exhausted within the next 50 years. Moreover, according to the testimony which the Federal Security Agency has presented to the Senate committee, the division of cost between the railroad retirement program and the old-age and survivors insurance program would call for transfers in the opposite direction from that indicated by the Railroad Retirement Board, and in this event the inadequacy of the railroad tax rate would be even more than indicated above. Because of the great importance of this to the financial soundness of both systems, this question should not be left unresolved.

6. An increase of $1,500,000,000 in the unfunded liability of the railroad retirement fund would result under H. R. 3669, largely from credits to be given to older workers for their service prior to the establishment of the system This presents a serious question of financial policy for a system with limited coverage.

7. The Federal Government has appropriated $330,000,000 for military service credits of railroad workers. Most of this amount is attributable to the military service of individuals whose benefits would, under the bill, become a responsibility of the old-age and survivors insurance system. The bill fails to require the railroad retirement fund to make a refund to the Treasury to reflect this transfer of liability.

8. The absence of authority for financial adjustments means that the OASI trust fund would actually pay benefits to short-term workers until 1956, with no legislative assurance of a subsequent settlement from the Railroad Retirement Board. This lack of assurance may well cause considerable apprehension on the part of the workers and their families who are relying on old-age and survivors insurance for their basic economic security.

Any need to provide higher and more varied benefits for railroad workers toward which the bill is pointed should and can be met in a simpler and more equitable way, consistent with broad national interests and long-range objectives. Better dollar-for-dollar value can be given by providing coverage for all railroad workers under the old-age and survivors insurance system, with the railroad retirement program retained to supplement the old-age and survivors insurance benefits. This would carry out the recommendations of both the President and the Senate Advisory Council on Social Security.

The railroad workers would get more benefits for less money if OASI benefits were made available to all railroad workers, with the Railroad Retirement Board paying the difference between OASI benefits and the present railroad retirement benefits. That is, the workers would get the more advantageous OASI survivors protection and, at the same time, the present 12 percent railroad retirement tax rate could be lowered to a combined OASI-railroad retirement rate which has been estimated roughly at 8.5 percent. As the OASI rate rises over the years, the combined rate would, of course, rise also, but it would not reach its peak of about 12 percent until 1970, whereas the railroad retirement rate is 12 percent now and will rise to 12.5 percent next January. Alternatively, railroad retirement benefits might be increased with less of a tax decrease.

We shall be glad to arrange for elaboration of the points made in this letter should your committee so desire.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION OBJECTS TO MINORITY BILL

The following are extracts from the social-security report recommending against adoption of H. R. 3669 in its present form:

While the Federal Security Agency strongly recommends the coordination of the railroad system with the old-age and survivors insurance program, we believe that the method of coordination proposed in H R. 3669 has serious defects. In the opinion of this agency the provisions of the bill would cause misunderstanding and confusion among those affected by it, and the financial arrangements proposed in the bill might have adverse effects.

The provisions of H. R 3669 which govern the coordination of payments by the two programs are inconsistent and difficult to understand and to explain. The general principles on which they are based apparently are that old-age and survivors insurance should pay the short-term railroad worker and his survivors, and the railroad program should pay the long-term worker and his survivors, and that wage credits under the two programs should be combined. However, these principles are not consistently carried out in the coordination provisions and as a consequence many inequitable and anomalous situations would arise.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

In view of the above considerations the Federal Security Agency cannot recommend the adoption of H. R. 3669 or H. R. 3755. As indicated, though, we are convinced that a satisfactory method of coordination can be developed. This should not be excessively time consuming. However, we recognize that there is a problem which must be solved immediately. This problem, of course, is that of the railroad workers who are already retired and about to retire, as well as the survivors of those workers who have died, or will die within the near future. These people are faced now with rising living costs and inadequate benefits There is no need to postpone alleviating this problem until a coordination plan has been developed.

It would be possible, of course, simply to provide a flat increase or a percentage increase in the benefits payable to these beneficiaries. Alternatively, the committee might wish to consider a solution to the problem similar to that which was adopted for old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries who were on the rolls at the time of the 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act.

While the above is sufficient to show the opposition of the Social Security Administration to H. R. 3669 as originally introduced, yet, a reading of the whole report will prove most helpful in determining the wisdom of the majority of the committee in striking out of H. R. 3669 the controversial features and leaving a straight increase of 15 percent to retired workers and 33⅓ percent to survivors with a study as advised by the Social Security Administration, as well as the Budget Bureau, to be conducted immediately.

MURRAY W. LATIMER, OFTEN REFERRED TO AS THE FATHER OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT SYSTEM, IS OPPOSED TO H. R. 3669

In testifying before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on S. 1347, a bill identical with H. R. 3669, and confirmed by similar testimony before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce qualified himself to an extraordinary degree as an expert

on all matters pertaining to old-age pensions, and, with particular reference to railroad retirement legislation.

He said:

My name is Murray W. Latimer. I am now a consultant on pension, insurance, and other employee benefit plans with offices at 1625 K Street NW., in Washington. I have asked for the privilege of appearing before you today out of a sense of civic duty, because I have had unusual opportunity, through the years, to study this type of legislation From July 1934 to January 1946 I was Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board. It was my duty to present to the committees of Congress, on behalf of the Railroad Retirement Board, proposals for the major part of the railroad retirement legislation as it now appears on the statute books. By the enactment of S. 1347 you would throw into the discard certain principles which I had thought basic to the railroad retirement system, or for that matter to any other system providing social insurance against the hazards of age. I feel a deep personal concern about what happens to those principles in the railroad retirement system.

Second, I have devoted more than 25 years to the promotion of old-age security. I am the author of several intensive studies of industrial pension plans. Before there was a Railroad Retirement Act I was in charge of the studies made by the office of the Federal Coordinator of Transportation, Joseph B Eastman, which formed the basis for the original cost estimates of the railroad retirement system.

I was the Chairman of the Technical Board of the Committee on Economic Security and Chairman of the Old-Age Security Committee of that Board, and as such I was in charge of the studies which preceded the old-age parts of the Social Security Act, and I was the first Director of the Bureau of the Social Security Board which administers the old-age insurance title of the Social Security Act.

During the past 4 years I have represented the labor organization which is the bargaining agent for about 90 percent of the workers in the basic steel industry in the formulation and revision of retirement plans applicable to more than 600,000 men in the steel industry. I am currently serving as pension consultant to employers in the automobile manufacturing, telephone, and distilling industries, to unions in the newspaper, the paper manufacturing and lithographic industries, and to joint trustees representing management and labor in the hosiery industry in relation to problems having to do, among other things, with the coordination between private pensions and the Social Security Act What I have to say, therefore, is predicated not only on my 11½ years of experience with the railroad retirement system but also on similar experience with title II of the Social Security Act and with a variety of private pension systems covering more than 1,000,000 workers in other industries.

This background of experience gives added weight to the testimony he gave against the provisions of H. R. 3966—Crosser bill. It is only by a full reading of his testimony that the full significance of the dangers involved can be understood and appreciated. I, however, in part, said:

Now I have a number of objections to H R. 3669 First of all, it would result in a tax levy on the vast majority of railroad workers from now on in perpetuity, and in return for which it is not proposed to give equivalent value.

Second, it would produce a forfeiture of annuity rights for an unknown but undoubtedly large number—when I say "large" I mean in the millions—of former railroad workers with no adequate offsetting value, and frequently no offsetting value at all.

Third, it would have the effect of reducing some annuities immediately and many others within the next 2 or 3 years. This is far from a bill to increase annuities.

Fourth, it would introduce inequities and anomalies on a staggering scale, and that also in perpetuity.

Fifth, it would worsen labor relations on the railroads, already in rather substantial need of improvement, to the great detriment of the national interest.

Sixth, it would adopt policies for the railroad retirement systems which, if applied to a private pension plan intended to supplement the Social Security Act, would preclude an employer from getting credit as a cost of operation for his contributions to that pension fund. That is a matter on which I am particularly concerned.

Seventh, it would permit the railroad retirement account to retain all the appropriations on account of military service, without any justification. It would amount to a Government subsidy of about a quarter of a billion dollars.

Eighth, it would make impossible the adoption by Congress of a uniform national policy on social security

And finally, in my judgment, it would lead with certainty to the creation of a Government subsidy for this system, not disguised in the form of an end subsidy, not disguised in the form of a Government subsidy, but a plan, outright, unequivocal, unadulterated subsidy.

With reference to the injustice incident to transferring railroad workers with less than 10 years of railroad service from Railroad Retirement to Social Security, in part, he said:

The next valuation of the liabilities under the railroad-retirement system, and I pass on to the second point, Mr. Chairman, would, I suppose, indicate some 5,600,000 or 5,700,000 persons who have been under the railroad-retirement system since January 1, 1937, and who in 1950 were not under the system. Everyone of these has paid a tax rate at a rate higher than he would have paid under social security, and everyone of those who has less than 10 years of service will have his railroad retirement annuity wiped out. He paid a tax on what I think he had a right to assume was a promise of the Government of the United States to pay him an annuity. The Government now says it will not do so if it passes H R. 3669. Now that wipes out probably $350,000,000 or $400,000,000 right off the books That may be exaggeration.

I feel a rather keen personal interest on that point because I have perjured myself numerous times, involuntarily, but nevertheless I have told many people things which just are not so. So I feel somewhat keenly about it, and I would feel nonetheless so if it could be shown that my estimate is grossly exaggerated, but it is not.

I do not think that I have ever seen another legislative proposal by a serious group of people who advocated a plain, outright, point-blank repudiation of Government obligation. That is exactly what it is.

The impression has been that the bill H R. 3669, Mr. Chairman, is a bill to increase annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act. That is one of its purposes. It also has another purpose which is to reduce a good many thousand annuities which are now being paid. Section 7 provides precisely that. There is to be coordination after this bill is passed by which those persons who have in all good faith taken social-security employment, thereby acquired the right to benefits, primary insurance amounts under the Social Security Act, will have their benefits with respect to prior service under the Railroad Retirement Act reduced for that reason. I do not know and neither does anybody else know how many annuities that would reduce, but I would guess that it is in the neighborhood of 20,000 to 25,000.

In concluding his testimony, Mr. Latimer points out a method which could in his opinion get desired results to the benefit of those under the Railroad Retirement Act. He said:

I make this statement advisedly. You can do this some other way and you will come back eventually to doing it in the way that is the one sensible way of doing it, which is to accept the principle of the universality of the social-security system, and build on top of that for the railroad retirement people.

Now they ought to have a system over and above social security In particular the disability annuities are very, very desirable. It would be unfortunate in the extreme to take them out Larger annuities than those under the Social Security Act are needed. It would be unfortunate in the extreme to suggest that they be reduced, but to increase them by taking it out of the hides of the short-service people and to increase them by reducing 20,000 or 25,000 of the present annuitants and to increase them by taking away the annuities which 5,000,000 people have had the right to think they had is surely not the way to do it.

There is a way to do it, there is a better way to do it, and it will get more—I say this all advisedly—it will get more for the long-service railroad employees whom this bill benefits to a great degree, it will get more for them than H R 3669 will give them. And you would get rid of the anomalies and the inequities, you would get rid of the instabilities that H R 3669 would introduce because of its very great dependence on the rate of forfeiture, and you would introduce equity where now you have chaos.

That concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I want to make it distinct and clear: There is no dissension within the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in its desire to give increased benefits to retired railroad workers and their survivors. The controversy that has arisen and that has undoubtedly become apparent to the Members of the House is the result of provisions that are contained in the Crosser bill which, in the opinion of a majority of the committee, would change the basic principles upon which the original Railroad Retirement Act was passed. A large majority of the members of the committee were of the opinion that the primary thing to be done at this time is to give immediate relief to retired railroad workers and their survivors. The stories that have come to us are pathetic. They show that an urgent condition resulting from the present high cost of living makes it imperative that relief be given at the earliest possible moment to these retired workers. The committee bill went to the very heart of the matter. We eliminated all the controversial questions that were contained in the Crosser bill, and went to the very heart of the matter by saying we will at once give to retired workers, a 15 percent increase and to the survivors a 33⅓ percent increase, which raises their benefits above the social security allowance, and is in a larger amount because 2 years ago we raised

the pensioners but did not raise the survivors. This is an endeavor to correct that situation. If that is done, I call your attention that all that is necessary for these retired workers and survivors to get the increase, is for the Railroad Retirement Board to write a letter to the Treasury and say "increase pensioners and annuitants by 15 percent and survivors by 33⅓ percent." And in the next month's mail, they will have their increase.

What would happen under the Crosser bill? If past experience can be any guide to us in this matter, there is no doubt whatsoever in my mind, that it would be, as some have testified, as much as a year and maybe more before all those who would seek to benefit under that bill would receive their increased benefits.

The majority of the committee adopted the substitute, with no desire other than to do something, do it quickly, do it easily, and in a way which would be helpful until we could study the more controversial features which are contained in the Crosser bill, H. R. 3669.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Very briefly, if the gentleman please.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman tell us about the impact on the fund?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I will. Every actuary who testified in the other body, testified that the Crosser bill would deplete the fund within 50 years, and that at the time the fund would be depleted, there would be $16,200,000,000 of unpaid liabilities on the books to which the railroad workers would be entitled with no money in the fund to pay them a single dollar.

That is too serious a situation, in my opinion, for those who are interested in retired railroad workers to adopt a plan without any testimony of actuaries to support it. None were called for that purpose. All who did appear testified against the Crosser bill as being unsound and detrimental to the stability of the retirement fund. Bear in mind that not an actuary from either the Security Administration or the Railroad Retirement Board, or the Bureau of the Budget was ever called before our committee to give any testimony whatsoever, probably due to the fact that when they did testify in the other body, they testified against the Crosser bill in that particular.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman tell us the impact of the Hall bill on the fund as compared to the Crosser bill?

Mr. WOLVERTON. The impact of the Hall bill, if you read the testimony, is such that in time—in perpetuity—it would affect the fund, but it would not do it immediately, nor anywhere near the extent that the Crosser bill would affect the soundness of the fund. The Hall bill would not do it within the time that we propose to make this study and report back to the Congress.

Let me tell you what is in the offing. I think you will agree with me that there is a great deal of sense to it. I have not committed myself to the proposition as yet, but to show you the advantages that might come from a study, toward increasing all the benefits to railroad workers and their survivors without raising either the tax rate or the tax base, is a suggestion which has been made by the Bureau of the Budget, the Social Security Board, and Mr. Latimer, who is above all others, the father of railroad legislation.

They say, and it is true, that railroad workers are paying four times as much in the way of taxes as are paid by those under social security, yet retired railroad workers or their survivors are not receiving comparative benefits based on the amount they pay. The suggestion is made by the agencies I have referred to, that the Railroad Retirement Board could purchase from the Social Security Administration for all retired railroad workers all benefits under the social-security system at the 3-percent rate the amount now being paid by employers and employees under the social-security system. That would leave 9 percent difference between the 3 percent now being paid by workers under social security and the 12 percent being paid by railroad workers. This method would provide retired railroad workers increased benefits to a considerable amount. I take it there is a lot of real sense in that. It deserves consideration to say the least.

When you talk about sincerity of interest in behalf of the retired railroad workers it does not begin or end with any one individual in this House. I have been in this House for 25 years. There has never been a retirement bill that I have not supported with my vote. There is no one in this House, I care not what his name may be, who has had and now has a more sincere desire to be helpful to the railroad workers than I have; and I propose to do what I think is in their interest and I will not be deterred from doing that.

In conclusion permit me to suggest this to the membership: Read the report of the Bureau of the Budget; read the report of the Social Security Administration; read the testimony of Mr. Squire, the dissenting member of the Railroad Retirement Board; read the testimony of Mr. Latimer, and I am just as certain as that I stand here that you will agree that the majority of the committee have acted wisely and well in saying that we will give immediate relief to those who are in need, and make a complete study between now and February of next year under the resolution that is pending to see what further help can be given. We ask you to support our program by supporting the Hall bill and the Harris resolution for an immediate study as to ways and means of further increasing benefits and strengthening the stability of the retirement fund.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I hope we can get the import and purpose of the report as made by a majority of your committee. We are bringing in here a bill which gives relief, temporary relief, needed relief, until a constructive bill can be worked out under which we can get the brotherhoods to agree. I wish you would go back and study the history of the Railroad Retirement Act. When it first started there was a fight between the railroads and labor and the act was held unconstitutional. Then they got together in a friendly manner and agreed on a bill and it was passed and no question of constitutionality was raised. In 1948 we gave a 20-percent increase in benefits. Now they want more. Surely they are entitled to some further relief, and that is what your committee has provided. That is what your committee has done. There appeared before your committee four brotherhoods one way, some brotherhoods the other way—a divided approach.

Even your committee is divided. Look at the report. We have been 2 or 3 months considering this question and we differ on what to bring in. We have three reports filed here. We have a majority report, we have one minority report and an additional minority report. If we cannot arrive at something good or worth while in that length of time, how in the name of heaven can we call upon you to exercise the privilege and function that you have to legislate on this very important matter?

It is important, Mr. Chairman, something should be done, and we ought to do it in unison instead of coming in here and fighting and fighting and fighting. That is what we are doing. This is an opportunity to get together.

The Bureau of the Budget has said it cannot recommend at this time the Crosser bill. The Social Security Administration came in with a report saying that it does not favor the Crosser bill. If you were to take the Crosser bill you would have three changes from present law.

First. It would integrate the railroad retirement system into the social security law. It would tie up the Railroad Retirement Act with social security. The Railroad Retirement Act has been outstanding legislation within itself to take care of railroad men. Now, they come in here and try to tie it in to the social security system. The Bureau of the Budget says that should not be done without further study and they say in reference to the feasibility of integrating this system into the social security system that they could not give their endorsement to such a program.

Second. Increase taxes to be paid by railroad workers.

Third. It prevents an annuitant or pensioner from earning more than $50 after retirement unless he wants to lose his retirement pay.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Is it not a fact that that provision under the Crosser bill that would transfer workers with less than 10 years of service on the railroads to social security would affect approximately 5,000,000 previous and present workers?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I think that is correct

Let me tell you what they are trying to do further than that. Your Ways and Means Committee is the father of the social-security legislation. That committee has not been consulted and its members do not know anything about the provisions of this Crosser bill. They ought to have an opportunity to come in here and say to this House: Before we let you ruin a system that we put into force and effect we want to study it some, we want a further investigation.

It is not fair for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to impose upon the functions of the great Ways and Means Committee, that has jurisdiction of social-security legislation.

This is all we are asking you to do: Just give these railroad people immediate relief. They need it. But while we are doing that let us make a study. Let us get the Social Security Board, the Railroad Retirement Board and the Ways and Means Committee together before we integrate and tie it up with the social-security system. Let us not take apart such legislation in effect until we know what we are going to do. Let the committee have further study on this legislation.

We went through very active hearings and we heard evidence. We came to the conclusion that the thing to do is to give some temporary relief to these people until we could work out a good bill. That will not be long and there will not be any further expense.

The bill, as reported by the committee, provides for an increase of 15 percent in annuities and pensions and provides, in general, for a 33⅓-percent increase in survivor benefits.

The need for increasing the amount of monthly benefits paid to the retired railroad employees and to the survivors of deceased railroad employees is urgent. For several years now, the scale of benefits to railroad workers and their families has lagged far behind the steadily rising cost of living and wage rates. The standard railway-labor organizations and many Members of Congress have been seriously concerned with the inadequacy of these benefits in view of the steadily rising price level. When the formula for computing retirement annuities was adopted, 14 years ago, annuities bore a reasonable relationship to the cost of living at that time and to the wage income that employees were accustomed to receive prior to their retirement. However, the relationships of retirement income to living costs and wage rates which existed in 1937 have no validity whatsoever today.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. On the very thing the gentleman is talking about, what evidence or testimony or any other proof does the gentleman have that it will take such a long time to put into effect the provisions of the Crosser bill? I am not talking about stating it but the evidence or proof.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I say to the gentleman that the Bureau of the Budget said that it wanted more study, I want to say to the gentleman further that the Social Security Administration, the acting chairman of the Social Security Administration, said that they cannot recommend the adoption of H. R. 3369. In the Crosser bill they have a provision that these fellows who have paid their security tax, who have been with the railroads for 30 or 40 years, and when they get 65 years old and want to retire—and they have a vested right in that—if they do retire and get more than $50 through self-employment or through working for anybody else they lose their retirement benefits. The enactment of this provision would be unconstitutional on the ground of impairment of contract.

Does that appeal to you as being fair? If it does, let us attach an amendment here that the Congressmen who have taken advantage of the retirement pay, when they quit this House, cannot go out and secure employment or be hired by anybody else and make more than $50. If you do that, all right, but if you are not willing to do that, let us not adopt the Crosser bill. Now, the Crosser bill will increase the tax base, thus increasing the tax on employees as well as on employers.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I have said to a number of railroad men who talked to me in recent times, particularly during the recess, that I thought they were entitled to an increase in their pension and the pensions of their widows, and I wanted to vote for it. Would I be fulfilling that obligation if I voted for the committee bill?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I do not think there is any doubt about it, because it provides for a 15-percent increase for all pensioners and all annuitants plus 33⅓ percent for survivors.

Mr. HALLECK. One further question. What assurance can the gentleman give us as to whether or not we could expect reasonably quick action and compliance with the provisions of the bill if it is adopted?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I will say to the gentleman there is a provision in the committee amendment to take care of that.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. A month from the enactment of the bill the checks increasing the annuities will go to the beneficiaries.

Mr. HALLECK. That is what I was getting at, because I was impressed with the urgency of action by many of the men who talked to me.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. They will immediately get it.

I hold here a report that is signed by Mr. Shields, grand chief engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; D. B. Robertson, president, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; R. O. Hughes, president, Order of Railway Conductors; and W. P. Kennedy, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. In other words, here are four brotherhoods that come here and point out the defects in the Crosser bill, and they say this:

We earnestly favor the passage of this majority bill. It will accomplish four things:

1. Increase pensions and annuities 15 percent.
2. Increase survivor annuities 33⅓ percent.
3. Increase lump-sum death benefits 25 percent.
4. Provide for a thorough study of the railroad retirement system in order to determine what further benefits may be provided without jeopardizing the fund.

That is what we want to do. We want just a little more time to get all these brotherhoods and agencies together if you are not in too big a hurry.

The report goes on to say:

We oppose the minority bill (the original Crosser bill) because.

1. It proposes a tie-in with social security which will reduce the annuities of thousands of retired railroad workers.
2. It increases the taxes to be paid by railroad workers
3. It limits to $50 a month the amount that can be earned by a pensioner or annuitant.
4. According to every actuary who testified, it will bankrupt the railroad retirement fund.

Are we going to let them do that? Is it not to the interest of this Government and to the interest of the brotherhoods to give us a little time to study this bill more thoroughly? That is all the committee amendment seeks to do. Let us endeavor to get unity and harmony among all classes of railroad employees before passing a bill under the terms of which all employees will have to abide.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I realize that it is completely impossible to try to discuss fully the reasons why I support, with three of my colleagues on my side of the aisle, the provisions of the original bill, H. R. 3669. We have submitted very brief additional minority views of only three pages at the end of the committee report which we hope will be helpful. But I do want to touch briefly, if I may, on certain points made by my colleagues on my own side whose complete sincerity I recognize and appreciate.

Something has been made of the proposition that if you adopt the committee substitute there will be immediate relief. There is no reason to be concerned about that whatsoever. The provision of H. R. 3669, in section 27 (a), specifies that the relief under that bill shall go into effect after the last day of the month in which that bill is enacted. The formulas for computation and recomputation of benefits are all prepared and could be applied immediately. You cannot get any faster action under the Hall substitute than you can under the original bill.

I want to agree that there are two major principles upon which the entire committee was in accord. First, there is obviously great need for assistance for the beneficiaries under the Railroad

Retirement Act. There is the greatest need, however, for the beneficiaries who are receiving the least, and under the committee bill as reported those people will suffer most in terms of being deprived of the benefits they need and which we could provide under the original H. R. 3669.

Let me give you two simple illustrations: This flat percentage increase to the surviving widow would increase her benefit from $29.68 a month to $39.57. That is under the committee bill. It constitutes no relief.

For the average dependent child that receives $17 1⁄2 a month now, an increase to only $22.90 under the Hall substitute can hardly be described as adequate relief.

However, under H. R. 3669, as it was originally introduced, by reason of the guaranty that these beneficiaries would receive at least a minimum of what they otherwise would be receiving under Social Security, you would increase these benefits up to between 60 and more than 75 percent, to people who desperately need that assistance.

Let me give you two further specific examples Where the average monthly pay was $150, under the present act a widow receives $30.10 monthly. Under the committee bill, she would receive only $40 1⁄3; a widow under similar circumstances under the present Social Security Act receives $43.13; under H. R. 3669, as originally introduced, she would receive $52.

In the case of a widow with one dependent child where the average monthly pay was $150, under the present act she receives $50.17. Under the committee bill she would receive only $66.88; a widow under similar circumstances under the present Social Security Act receives $86 26, under H. R. 3669, as originally introduced, she would receive $104.

In the second place, I think we are all agreed upon the principle that in trying to provide this relief we must not jeopardize this fund. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] asked a question a few minutes ago as to the possibility of jeopardizing the fund. In our additional minority views we have taken the report of the Railroad Retirement Board on the cost of the Hall substitute It is covered in the fourth and fifth paragraphs. We have tried to translate that in terms of dollars.

The result is the estimated annual cost of the committee bill would be $720,790,000. The estimated annual income under a $4,900,000,000 payroll, the payroll they originally started with, would be $612,500,000. So you have an estimated deficit annually of $108,290,000.

My colleagues and friends have indicated to you their conviction that something further must be done, but I say to you when we are confronted with a proposition that can and, I assert, would result in the complete insolvency of this fund in a little over 22 years, it would be a most serious step for you to take.

What would be the result if we pass the original H. R. 3669? Through the savings involved and the additional revenue provided, you would be assured that you would not jeopardize the solvency of the retirement fund. The total estimated annual savings and increased revenue would be approximately $230,000,000. The committee received a responsible and, I think, reliable estimate that the end result would be an increase of the reserve to approximately $7,600,000,000 in between 15 to 20 years and from that the fund would be stabilized at a level of approximately $7,500,000,000.

The original H. R. 3669 has been described as a hodgepodge. Let me say to you that it is the work of a responsible committee of 18 standard railroad labor organizations over a period of more than a year. They are not coming in here with an overnight draft of legislation and asking you to accept it. They recognize what these changes will mean to them and to the people whom they represent.

It is true that the four operating brotherhoods are opposed to the original H. R. 3669, and I recognize their sincerity. But I suggest to you that when you weigh all the evidence and arguments in reaching your final decision you should take into consideration that the people who have been working sincerely and intelligently on this bill for this long period of time and who have supported it and defended it ably and successfully before the committees of both the House and the Senate are people who have the best interests of all railroad workers at heart. We have a right to rely upon their integrity, their honesty, their intelligence, and their knowledge of the matters which they place before the committee and before this House.

May I now briefly touch upon a few of the major differences between the original H. R. 3669 and the committee bill

H. R 3669 would provide increases for annuitants and pensioners and benefits for aged wives of a total of 29 percent.

The committee bill would provide increases for annuitants and pensioners of only 15 percent and provides no benefits for aged wives.

H. R. 3669 provides increases for survivors ranging from 60 percent to more than 75 percent.

The committee bill would provide increases for survivors of only 33⅓ percent and the end result would be a very large number receiving lower benefits than if the workers had been covered by social security.

H. R. 3669 provides a fundamentally vital guaranty that no beneficiary would receive less than if the worker had been under the social-security system.

The committee bill contains no such guaranty.

H. R. 3669 establishes, as our minority views attempt to explain, a sound system of financing these necessary increased benefits.

The committee bill is entirely silent on the matter of additional financing but proposes to take the necessary funds from the existing reserve, although it has been asserted that the existing reserve itself is very close to the danger point under the present system of benefits.

I recognize that in some quarters there is considerable opposition to any increase in the tax-rate base. But I would like to point out that this increase is not only one so far as taxes are concerned but that it also would provide increased benefits of itself since those benefits would be based upon that same increase so far as computation is concerned.

There is one incidental but very important provision in the original H. R. 3669. It has already been stated that a great many railroad workers continue work beyond the age 65 and that the average age of retirement is approximately 68. Under existing law, such an individual does not get any credit in the computation of his annuity for any service he renders after the end of the year in which he becomes 65. He continues to pay the same taxes on his earnings as persons under 65 pay but receives no credit for that service. This seems to me to be completely unjustifiable and the original H. R 3669 does provide that any such individual will receive the same credit for service after 65 that he now receives up to 65. The committee bill does nothing about this.

In conclusion, I would like to call your attention to a letter which has been delivered to all our offices today. It is possible that it has escaped the attention of many. Consequently, and because it is a concise and strong statement with reference to the two proposals before us, under the permission I received in the House, I wish to insert it at this point:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., October 3, 1951.

To All Members of Congress:

I am advised that amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act will be offered on the House of Representatives on Thursday and Friday of this week.

As you know, a majority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported the Hall substitute for the original Crosser bill, H R 669. This substitute seriously reduces the benefits provided in the original Crosser bill The Crosser bill was carefully prepared by the best experts in this particular field, in cooperation with the 18 standard railway labor organizations affiliated with the A F. of L. and with Members of Congress who are recognized as having comprehensive knowledge of railroad retirement matters.

The American Federation of Labor has officially endorsed the original Crosser bill, H. R 3669, which provides the minimum benefits necessary to meet the absolute needs of railroad workers, their wives, widows and survivors, and at the same time maintain the financial soundness of the railroad retirement fund. Conversely, the Hall substitute reported by a majority of the committee fails in many important respects to provide necessary benefits. Neither does the substitute proposal provide the savings and additional revenue required to maintain the retirement fund in a sound financial condition.

Therefore, in behalf of the 8,000,000 members of the A. F. of L. and particularly the 1,200,000 railroad workers who are members of the A. F. of L. and an additional 2,000,000 A F. of L. members who have had railroad service and who have contributed to railroad retirement, I sincerely urge that each Member of Congress support Congressman CROSSER in his efforts to restore the original provisions of H. R. 3669 when this matter comes before the House.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

WM. GREEN,
President.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I think by this time every Member of the House is impressed with the fact that our committee wants to do something constructive for the retired railroad people and their survivors. Indeed they need it.

But when you get to looking this situation over, and regardless of all of the ins and outs you may hear on the floor, you get down to some very queer deals that are contained in this Crosser bill before us. That is what troubles our committee. We find these queer things and we do not know what to do about them because we cannot find anybody that agrees upon what can and should be done. Nobody seems to agree, in or out of the Government, as to what ought to be done permanently. That is why we want to make a further study of it and learn the true facts. Numerous important witnesses appeared before the Senate committee that were not permitted to testify before our committee.

Let me point out to you one thing. Perhaps this may seem right or wrong to you as you may see things, and you can decide that for yourselves. You have the Railroad Retirement Act that provides that the men must pay in 6 percent of their income to the fund and the railroads pay in 6 percent of payroll to the fund. It is proposed in the bill introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]—and God love him, he is a great fellow—that at the time of retirement if a person has not served 10 years in railroad employment his retirement business shall automatically be transferred from under the Railroad Retirement Act to the Social Security Act. Provision is made for the transfer of funds by the Railroad Retirement Board to the Social Security Agency on the basis of 1½ percent, of course, because that is the social-security tax rate, so 1½ percent of that worker's income for whatever time he work on a railroad—less than 10 years—goes from the railroad-retirement fund to the social-security fund. Meantime, that worker has paid a tax of 6 percent on his salary or wages. I would like to ask you what happens to the other 4½ percent which he has contributed to the railroad-retirement fund. Under Government civil-service retirement procedure, within a given length of time, I think it is 20 years, he gets a chance to get that money back, if he asks for it. But you do not get it back out of this deal, not by the Crosser bill, because that extra 4½ percent he has paid in is retained in the railroad-retirement fund for the benefit of those who stay longer than 10 years in the railroad service or their survivors. In other words, under Mr. Crosser's bill if you are a railroad man who worked 9 years and 11 months for the railroad before retiring, you will have made an outright gift of 4½ percent of your salary, not for the benefit of yourself or your own beneficiaries, but for the benefit of those who will benefit ultimately under the Railroad Retirement Act, because they worked for a railroad more than 10 years. That seems to me to be wholly unfair. It is estimated that 5,000,000 workers are so affected.

Then comes this business of the $50 work clause. We have always thought that railroad employees who contribute such a high proportion of their income to their own retirement fund should be free agents when they retire, as they are now. After all, they contribute just as much of their salaries as a Member of Congress contributes to his own retirement. They contribute 6 percent, which is four times the social security tax rate. There is nothing that restricts a Member of Congress as to what he may do after he retires. He can do anything, and make any money he may. But under the Crosser bill when a railroader reaches age 65, and retires after having served more than 10 years in railroad employment, if he earns more than $50 a month on the side, then he automatically goes off the pension rolls. Why is that? That is for the purpose of forcing those old railroaders to stay on the job as long as they can stand up in order to provide another forty or fifty million dollars, or whatever the figure is, for these new Crosser benefits. If the old railhead keeps on working on the railroad after he is 65 then, of course, he is not drawing his pension. When he does not draw his pension that money is not paid out of the fund, of course, so it becomes a saving to help pay for the new Crosser benefits. That seems to be wholly unfair to the oldster.

One of the real objectives of the Railroad Retirement Act, in my humble opinion, is to get these old people retired after they reach age 65 and not to keep them at work on the railroad, and that is just what this bill will do.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I would like to emphasize the argument that the gentleman is making at the present time, which in my mind is a very effective one. It is alleged by the sponsors of the Crosser bill that this work clause would result in a saving of $50,000,000 to the fund. If you figure that out, it means this—considering that the average annuitant or pensioner receives $1,000 a year—that is about the average—it would mean that 50,000 railroad workers would have to continue at work beyond the retirement age in order to make this saving of $50,000,000.

Mr. HINSHAW. Of course, and from my own observation, it is in the interest of public safety and welfare, particularly, to have the operating men retired when they reach age 65. We do not want old engine men falling asleep in the cab, and we do not want trainmen slipping because their aged limbs cannot lift them up over the rungs of the ladders. We want such people to retire. That is what the act is for. We do not want to keep them at railroad work. This bill will keep them at work.

Mr. Chairman, one more thing—there are several more things, but there is one I want to mention at this time to show you how cockeyed this whole deal is. In 1948, we passed an act which brought the veterans who had railroad employment under the Railroad Retirement Act, giving them credit for railroad service while they were in the military service. Many veterans came back and took railroad employment, believing of course that the contributions, made in conjunction with the time that they were in the service, would add up and benefit them. Most of these veterans did not stay in the railroad service. Many of them have left for better jobs after a year or 2 years of service with the railroads. But, under the act, which we passed here a while back, $300,000,000 has been appropriated by Congress to the Railroad Retirement Act, and another $60,000,000 is due to be appropriated as a contribution to the fund on behalf of these veterans for the time they spent in military service. Most of these people are not any longer in the service of the railroads, and unless they actually work for 10 years for the railroads, they will not come under the Railroad Retirement Act under the Crosser bill amendments. Hence, there are $300,000,000 or $360,000,000, most of which will become a straight contribution of the Congress, without any credit whatsoever to the side of the social security fund on their behalf, so the act of Congress intended to benefit them will be a farce.

Those are some of the things we have had to consider. That is why the majority of the committee—I think 18 members because there were 10 against it, the majority of the committee, and the division is across the aisle, there is no division in the committee down the middle—thoroughly believe that we need another 5 or 6 months to get the proper reports from the various agencies of the Government, and to get these union organizations together, and get everybody together on a program which will really work, and which will be right and honest while maintaining the solvency of the fund.

Mr. Chairman, I hear people say that under the Crosser bill there is no increase in the tax rate, and that is true—but that does not mean that there is no increase in tax under the Crosser bill. In fact the Crosser bill does increase taxes on the railroad worker by increasing the tax base. Heretofore, the railroad worker has been taxed 6 percent on his salary up to $300 per month. Under the Crosser bill he would pay 6 percent on his salary up to $400 per month. If that is not an increase in taxes I would like to know what you call it. It is an increase of $6 tax per month if he earns $400 or more. The railroad workers that I know about do not want any increase in their taxes, but they will get an increase if the Crosser bill is adopted.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I think it might be well to bring to the attention of the committee that at no time did the committee have before it anybody representing either actuarily or otherwise the Budget Bureau or the Social Security Administration, or the actuary of the Railroad Retirement Board.

Mr. HINSHAW. The list of witnesses brought before the committee was indeed quite strange; they mostly appeared, as far as I can tell, in favor of the Crosser bill; the opponents apparently were not invited to testify, and among those were the Government agencies like the Social Security Administration and the Bureau of the Budget. It is also strange that the operating brotherhoods were not permitted to even take a look at the Crosser bill before it was introduced. Perhaps that was because those who wrote the bill knew very well that the operating brotherhoods would have to be against it—and they are.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. WOLVERTON Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr Chairman, I think by now everyone who has listened to this debate has become convinced that it is a rather complex problem; that, certainly, is my opinion about it. But there are certain elements that can be simplified and certain fundamental facts about this which I hope we can all bear in mind as this debate continues. Some of these fundamental things have already been alluded to in the debate One, for instance, is that everybody wants to do something for the retired railroad man. I think that is the unanimous feeling of the committee and probably of the House

One other thing to which I wish to call your attention is that the money which we are proposing to disburse through this bill is not public money; it is money that belongs to the railroad men, the railroad employees, and the railroad retirement bill not only affects the men who are operating the trains and who take care of the yards and who work in the offices, but it also includes everybody clear up to the president of the road; every employee of a railroad is included in this act; so it is their money that is being disposed of here in this proposed legislation.

The third thing that is very, very unfortunate about this whole situation is that there is a division among the railroad brotherhoods themselves as to what ought to be done. On the one hand the operating brotherhoods, that is, the men who actually operate the trains, as I understand, take a position against the Crosser bill; the nonoperating brotherhoods are strongly behind the Crosser bill. Had it been possible for the brotherhoods to come here with a unanimously supported bill we would not be engaged in this debate today, I dare say, because anything that would have been unanimously recommended by the men who work for the railroads would be accepted, I think, by the House, since this is their money. It is up to us to make a decision as to what ought to be done. That being the case what I propose to do in the very short time that has been allotted to me is to state my credo about it.

I listened to the hearings on this bill literally for weeks on end, and I think I attended most, if not all, of the executive sessions of the committee. We have had some very difficult problems to meet and to solve.

The Crosser bill came to us supported by, shall I say, some of the most expert testimony I have ever listened to in connection with this kind of legislation. Its proponents were well-prepared; they knew the answers to the questions which were propounded to them for days on end by the members of the committee. Mr Chairman, as I have reviewed in my own mind and gone over the results of those witnesses' testimony I have come to the clear conclusion that the Crosser bill, if enacted, will be good legislation. There are certain elements in it, to be sure, which have been pointed out by its opponents that may be objectionable, that do not fit into the conceptions of all of us; and perhaps that is true of any kind of legislation—I do not know But I say that as a whole the Crosser bill, if enacted into law, will accomplish the purpose which we all seek; namely, to benefit these retired railroad workers and put the whole system on a little more equitable basis than now exists. May I say just one word in that connection that if the Crosser bill in the process of enactment is emasculated, then it should not be enacted into law; we should go to the Hall-Wolverton version of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr CROSSER Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I also yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, the railroad retirement beneficiaries in a typical city numbering 2,550 who receive $223,000 aggregate monthly benefits under the present bill would receive $257,000 under the committee bill and $255,000 estimated benefits under the Crosser bill. However, there are 995 spouses in this category who will receive nothing under existing benefits or under the committee bill and would receive $45,000 under the Crosser bill. The benefits paid under the Crosser bill to 700 widows and parents and the 275 children are likewise greater under the Crosser bill than under the present or committee bill, and the total increase in benefits under the committee bill in this city amount to $42,900 and under the Crosser bill $98,400.

I want to address myself, however, principally to the $50 work clause.

Mr. Chairman, although retirement is permissible at age 65, the average retirement age at present is around 68 years. This has resulted in savings to the railroad retirement account in two respects: (i) No annuities have been paid for the 3 years during which annuities would be payable under the law, and (ii) taxes have been received during the same 3 years from the same persons who could have received annuities instead. These savings are in danger of being lost if the $50 work clause were not adopted.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman mentions the fact that the average retirement age is 68. That certainly is beyond 65 and is done voluntarily. So there is evidence that the men want to and do work longer.

One other thing I think is important at this particular point. We hear a lot about opposition to the $50 per month worker clause. That is in the Social Security Act, which act, so I understand, covers some 30,000,000 people. That which obtains today with reference to 30,000,000 would not be so different, we are compelled to admit, with reference to about another million and a half, if it be adopted.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I agree with the gentleman. I think he is quite right.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr WOLVERTON. In connection with what the gentleman from Texas has said, it must be borne in mind that under social security they only paid one-fourth of what the workers under the Railroad Retirement Act paid.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Many of them get much less and we are trying to get them up to social security That is exactly what we are trying to do.

Mr. HUGH D SCOTT, JR. There is much good in the contributions of both gentlemen. Now if I may, I should like to proceed.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr LEONARD W. HALL. I am wondering whether the gentleman from Texas wants them to go up to social security or down to social security?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Up to social security because many of them are not up there and the gentleman well knows that.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate the generosity of the gentleman and I want to contribute to this colloquy. No one in any of the railroad brotherhoods wants any part of the railroad retirement system to be transferred to and taken over by social security; is that right or not?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I think the gentleman is stating something on which there is unanimous agreement.

Mr. Chairman, there is at present no prohibition against an annuitant's working in social security employment—other than a last person employer. Considering the incentives now offered by the 1950 Social Security Act—under which a person in advanced years could be eligible for a maximum old-age insurance benefit of $80, or $120 if he has an eligible wife, if he worked only 1½ years earning $300 a month—many railroad em-

ployees are likely to find it profitable to retire, not only at age 65—and thus wipe out the savings above described—but those with 30 years of service would retire in the early sixties. This would place additional burdens on the railroad retirement account. Obviously, this should be avoided. The savings described above should be used to increase benefits without increasing taxes rather than to keep benefits at the present inadequate rates and forego the savings. The $50 work clause is, of course, a limitation; but this is part of the price for substantial benefits. It really comes down to this choice. Either there will be substantial benefits for everybody with the $50 work clause for everybody, or there will be insubstantial benefits for everybody without that clause in order to provide a windfall for the group that can secure coverage under the Social Security Act. Aside from the fact that substantial benefits are obviously preferable to insubstantial benefits, the beneficiaries cannot afford the losses, described above, which we would incur in the absence of the $50 work clause.

The $50 work clause will not apply to services not covered under the Social Security Act, such as employment by the Federal Government or services otherwise excluded from the Social Security Act. This is so because, first, the Social Security Act itself does not prohibit the payment of benefits to anyone while engaged in such excluded services, and we did not want to discriminate against railroad employees in this respect. Second, the coverage under the Social Security Act is now so wide, and the excluded services so specialized that the number of persons who, after retirement, could secure employment in such services is very small indeed. Finally, the policing of work in the excluded services would be extremely difficult since the earnings from such service are not reported to the Social Security Administration.

Available information indicates that less than 10 percent of the employees now retired on old age annuities are employed in any service which pays them as much as $50 per month. It would be manifestly unfair to deprive 90 percent of the retired employees of an increase in their annuities of approximately 10 percent to take care of the 10 percent or less who work and earn more than $50 per month in outside employment following their retirement.

The $50 work clause will not apply to persons who retired before the enactment date of the bill and who on such date were engaged in service that is now permissible employment, that is, service in which an annuitant can now engage without forfeiting the annuity. The reason for this is that many annuitants now on the rolls may have decided to retire when they did relying on the provisions of the present law permitting them to engage in employment other than for an employer under the act or for the last person by whom they were employed before their annuities began. Accordingly, an applicant for a retirement annuity had reason to assume that he would have a source of income in addition to the annuity, and he may have made plans for his old age on this basis.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HELLER].

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] for their fair and excellent presentation of the salient points of the bill under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, desire to be recorded in favor of the Crosser bill. I shall vote to restore the original purposes of that bill and oppose the so-called Hall substitute. I am aware that there is a division among the labor groups. Similarly, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, is divided in its views. But the fact remains, as a number of Members have already indicated, that the pensioners are desperately and urgently in need of relief. Evidently, some of us are not aware that people are actually going hungry while Members here ask for further study. Who, may I ask, will feed them in the meantime?

The railroad workers in my district are desirous of obtaining the best bill possible with the most benefits. The Crosser bill is just that kind of a bill. If you reject the Crosser bill, you will be rejecting substantial increases and benefits for retired people and survivors. Let's face the facts squarely. You will be recorded in favor of the Association of American Railroads and the representatives of only 20 percent of the railroad employees, if you support the Hall substitute.

Among the advertising hucksters who cater to the soap-opera trade there is an old stand-by slogan—beware of substitutes. Never was that slogan more apropos than it is in this case. The House should beware of the Hall substitute. This bill will leave thousands of retired railroad men getting less than social security would provide for them. The Hall substitute also leaves a majority of the widows and children of railroad men in worse shape than under social security.

Why are the supporters of this substitute measure so anxious that the benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act should not be superior to social security? Is it mere coincidence that everyone who favors a merger of the social-security system and the railroad-retirement system is also favoring the Hall bill? The railroad system was started with benefits superior to social security. Why, then, is it so wrong to aspire to restore that position to the railroad man? Why should the people who contribute more of their wages toward their retirement not be entitled to greater benefits?

Some Members claim they cannot support the Crosser bill because of the $50 work clause. This point was raised by my distinguished friends and colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON]. Concern is felt that this measure in some way takes away a vested right on the part of retired people. I do not agree with this view. To begin with, less than 10 percent of all persons now retired under the Railroad Retirement Act are presently employed. Therefore, even if this were an injustice, which I certainly deny, it would affect only 10 percent of the retired employees as against the other 90 percent, whom it would favor.

Let us examine this section a little closer. Social security, as was just so ably explained by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], contains this provision, known as the $50 work clause, which was put into the act by this body. Tens of millions of people now come under social security. If the $50 work clause is wrong for railroad retirement, then it is just as wrong for social security. But this section is not wrong. Annuities under this retirement system are not meant to supplement wages. This is not a funded insurance plan. This plan contemplates that everyone should contribute a share of his earnings in order to assure decent retirement upon reaching the retirement age. If this were an insurance plan, the people on the rolls now and for the last 14 years would be getting very little each month because they have paid practically nothing into the fund.

Men who are now retiring will draw about 10 times as much from the system as they paid into it. Those who have retired in past years have paid in even less. Why is it, then, that we pay these people such benefits? Is it to enable them to continue working? Do the younger men enable these people to draw pensions so they can go on working? Of course not.

The question in connection with the work clause boils down to this: Shall we have high benefits for everyone by adopting the work clause or low benefits for all in order to permit less than 10 percent of the people to continue to work? I think the answer is obvious.

In connection with the work clause there is another important fact. The law now prevents people from working in the railroad industry after they retire; consequently, those who are working do so outside the industry after their retirement. With the exception of some management people, others in the railroad industry are permitted to work as long as they are able to do so. Therefore, an employee is not forced to retire if he feels he cannot get along on his annuity. If this be the case, is not this man better off to stay in railroad work where he is more valuable, rather than go off into another work? Our country is in a difficult situation, and we need skilled manpower in the railroad field. If this work clause is not adopted we are encouraging able-bodied people past 65 who want to work to leave the industry where they are most valuable and seek other pursuits.

In summarizing, I want to make it clear that if a railroad man feels he wants to work after 65, we should make it possible for him to continue to work in the railroad industry. If he desires to retire, he should be able to do so and enjoy the benefits which this work clause will make possible.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr Chairman, like all of you, I have been the recipient of

personal calls and printed material setting forth the arguments for and against pending amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

I can truthfully say that those who contacted me did so in a cooperative manner, thus convincing me of their sincerity of purpose. Without doubt, the information furnished me has been very helpful in my study of this subject.

As many of you know, I am a railroad man on furlough while a Member of Congress. I come from a railroad family and represent a congressional district that has, without doubt, on a percentage basis, the greatest number of active and retired railroad employees in the United States. I mention this to assure you that my interest in the Railroad Retirement Act is not seasonal because the subject is one that has been with me since the law was enacted in 1935.

I have introduced over a score of bills during my congressional career designed to liberalize the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act. These bills were introduced because of the need for increased benefits to those retired and to surviving widows and children. They also provided for structural changes in the act regarding the age of retirement, the years of service required, and would have amended other provisions of the law.

To get action on these bills, I was constantly in touch with the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to such an extent that I know at times my tenacity must have exhausted the patience of the chairman and the professional staff. This resoluteness on my part was not confined to the House of Representatives, because I was equally active in Senate circles.

Ever since the Eightieth Congress increased benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act by 20 percent to annuitants and pensioners, the only replies I received to my repeated requests for action on my bills were that no consideration could be given any railroad retirement amendments until actuarial studies could be completed, revealing the financial condition of the railroad retirement fund and the impact such amendments would have on it.

Speaking frankly, the repeated statements that nothing could be done until the actuarial reports were available, were accepted by me as an exhibition of sound judgment, because the future of the Railroad Retirement Act depends upon maintaining the solvency of the railroad retirement fund. In short, those who have retired and those who will retire must be able to look forward to receiving their monthly retirement checks with absolute certainty and without any interruption.

Therefore, any vote I cast on railroad retirement amendments will depend upon their relationship in maintaining the solvency of the retirement fund. In other words, can the fund stand the additional cost of proposed amendments, or will such amendments so impair the fund that their approval will threaten the future of the Railroad Retirement Act by making it financially impossible to fulfill its obligations to its beneficiaries?

Another basic factor that I intend to keep in mind during our consideration of this legislation is that it is generally agreed that retired employees and survivors of deceased employees must have immediate relief. I know it will not surprise many of you to learn that I have retired railroad employees and survivors of deceased employees in my congressional district who are actually hungry and living under conditions that you and I would find repugnant to the American way of life. These people are the victims of a frozen income over which they have no control and Congress, as custodian of the railroad retirement fund, is obligated to provide relief to these people through sound amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

According to the Railroad Retirement Board, the average age of the disabled and retired annuitant is 70.3 years and the pensioner 83.2 years; while the average of the widow is 73.1 years. The average monthly benefit received by the annuitant is $82.75 monthly; the pensioner $79.79 monthly; and the widow $29.62 monthly.

Keeping in mind the present scale of benefits, it may be well to look at the cost of living figures as furnished by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor. As of July 15, 1951, or about 3 months ago, the cost of living had increased 82.7 percent over the cost of living in 1937, the year the Railroad Retirement Act became effective.

For an illustration, food had increased 114 8 percent; wearing apparel, 98.3 percent; rent, 34.9 percent; fuel, electricity, and so forth, 45.3 percent; house furnishings, 103.6 percent; and miscellaneous, 63.5 percent. As I stated, prices of everyday commodities have increased during that period.

While these increases in the cost of living were mounting during the period from 1937 to 1951 the recipients of railroad retirement benefits received but one increase—the 20 percent granted by the Eightieth Congress. The widows, however, received no increase.

It may be well for me to remind you at this point that the 1937 or 1939 dollar is not the same dollar in value that these retired railroaders or their survivors receive today. It can truthfully be said that they are the victims of not only the high cost of living, but of the inflated dollar. For that reason, they need assistance and they need it immediately.

It is to the credit of the advocates and opponents of the proposed legislation that they are in agreement on the fact that those already retired and the survivors of deceased employees must have immediate relief.

Another factor that I cannot ignore is one which concerns the railroad man of today who will be the retired man of tomorrow. He definitely is in favor of structural changes in the Railroad Retirement Act, that involve the reduction of the retirement age from 65 to age 60 and he desires the option of retiring on a full annuity after 30 years of service, regardless of age. In addition, he also wants an increase in present benefits without any increase in payroll taxes. Above all, he wants nothing to do in any way, shape, or form with the Railroad Retirement Act becoming related to the Social Security Act.

It is unfortunate that we have so much difference of opinion with respect to the proposed amendments. For example, members of the Railroad Retirement Board are divided, actuarial experts cannot agree in their opinions, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is divided and railway labor groups have opposite views. Among the thousands of railroad employees, you find the same state of confusion exists regarding the provisions of these proposed amendments. Frankly, from my conversations with railroad employees, there is no doubt that there is favorable sentiment for liberalizing the Railroad Retirement Act, but, as many employees have warned, all amendments should be sound and should not impair the financial stability of the railroad retirement fund.

In my great desire to protect the interest of active and retired railroad employees and the survivors of deceased employees, I have spent hours in diligently studying not only the many bills introduced in Congress but also the printed hearings in the Senate and House of Representatives, together with the viewpoints of various railway labor organizations.

In addition, I have studied the majority and minority reports issued by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

At this point I should like to discuss House bill 3669 as originally introduced and which is commonly referred to as the minority or Crosser bill.

The original House bill 3669 provides that retirement annuities shall be increased on an average of 13.8 percent, pensions to be increased by 15 percent, survivor benefits to be increased from 60 to 100 percent, and in addition to provide for a spouse's annuity. The report on the bill states that—

> These substantial increases provided in the original bill, H. R 3669, are made possible only because said bill makes certain of the adequate financing by assuring certain savings to the railroad retirement fund and by providing additional income for the fund The Railroad Retirement Board estimated that the combined yield of such savings and additional revenue would amount to about $230,000,000 annually.

It might be well at this time to discuss the source of these savings and additional revenue from which the proposed increases and new benefits are to be financed. Let us first discuss the $50-work-restriction clause.

The Crosser bill provides that annuitants and pensioners are prohibited from earning in excess of $50 a month unless they forfeit their monthly benefit for such month. This same provision is in the present Social Security Act and has been the basis of bitter and widespread criticism.

Under the present Railroad Retirement Act, the only work restriction im-

posed upon retired employees provides that while receiving an annuity, they must not be employed by a common carrier railroad recognized under the Railroad Retirement Act or by their last regular employer prior to going on pension.

Benefits under social security are not restricted in any way if annuitants are employed on the railroads or in any other employment except that covered under the Social Security Act. The retired Government employee is not restricted as to earnings because of employment in any other field except employment in the Federal Government. It is only reasonable and fair that railroad employees who will pay a higher tax rate than either of the above-mentioned groups, beginning January 1, 1952, be given the same privilege to supplement their fixed retirement incomes in other fields.

One of the provisions of the present Railroad Retirement Act provides that an employee who has attained age 60 and has 30 years of service may retire on a reduced annuity. Each year a number of employees who have been disqualified for work by the railroads and who do not meet the Railroad Retirement Board's disability test, as well as many others who meet the requirements for a reduced annuity before age 65, retire on such a reduced railroad retirement annuity and they obtain work outside the railroad industry to supplement their retirement benefits. This $50-work-restriction clause will create a great hardship upon the disqualified employee who did not qualfiy for a disability annuity, and, of course it would discourage others from retiring on a reduced annuity. It would practically nullify the reduced annuity provision in the present act.

The only argument that has been made in favor of the $50-work restriction contained in the Crosser bill and which has been borrowed from the Social Security Act, is that such a provision will provide additional funds with which to finance the increases and new provisions sponsored by the Crosser bill.

Although the present Railroad Retirement Act provides for retirement at age 65, the average retirement age is about 68 years, which means that there has been a saving in the railroad retirement fund in two respects: First, no annuities have been paid for the 3 years from 65 to 68; second, taxes have been received during the same 3 years from these employees who could have been receiving annuities.

Of course the $50-work restriction is intended to create further savings by discouraging retirement even at age 68. The Railroad Retirement Board has estimated that the $50-a-month work restriction will save the railroad retirement fund $50,000,000 in a year. When you consider that the average annuity paid each year is about $1,000, then such a $50,000,000-a-year saving would mean approximately 50,000 employees who are ready for retirement will not retire because of the $50 limitation on earnings.

The Railroad Retirement Act as enacted by Congress was intended to make it possible for men to retire, rather than to retire by restrictive legislation. That is, it proposed to provide benefits and encourage retirement of railroad employees at age 65, instead of imposing restrictions upon the aged employee to discourage his retirement at age 65.

Another feature overlooked in the $50-work-restriction clause is the administrative problem, which will mean the policing of some 200,000 retirement claims each month by a corps of new employees.

The Railroad Retirement Board's experience with respect to the policing once every 6 months of the present work-restriction clause as applied to the disabled employee, should certainly provide sufficient evidence as to the amount of extra work that can be expected if a monthly check is necessary.

Also included in the $230,000,000 savings and additional revenue mentioned in the minority report is the $100,000,000 savings estimated to be provided for in the financial adjustment between the railroad retirement and social security systems.

The Railroad Retirement Board's actuaries have estimated that approximately $40,000,000 of this saving would be realized through the transfer to social security of railroad employees with less than 10 years of service, and the remaining $60,000,000 savings would be the result of future contemplated legislation, which is to be recommended jointly by the Railroad Retirement Board and the Federal Security Administrator by June 1, 1956.

Under this proposal, railroad service after 1936 is to be considered employment under the Social Security Act—see section 23 of original bill, H R 3669. It might be well to point out at this time that the Railroad Retirement Board actuaries have estimated that the cost of the Crosser bill would be 14.12 percent of a $5,200 000 000 annual payroll. However, this cost estimate is based upon the financial adjustments between the railroad retirement and social security systems which include the so-called $60,000,000 contemplated savings for which no legislation has been introduced or recommended.

The Railroad Retirement Board's actuaries have also estimated the cost of the Crosser bill without the $60,000,000 contemplated savings would be 15.32 percent of a $5,200,000,000 annual payroll.

With respect to the adequate financing claimed of the Crosser bill, Mr. Musher, chief actuary for the Railroad Retirement Board, in his testimony before the Senate committee, introduced a table—see page 238 of Senate hearings—which showed that, under the Crosser bill, the railroad retirement fund would be entirely exhaused by the year 2000. Mr. Musher in his appearance before the Senate committee also testified that to continue the railroad retirement system after the reserve was exhausted would require a pay roll tax rate of approximately 20 percent. Also, according to exhibit on page 429 of the House hearings, which was prepared by the Railroad Retirement Board's actuarial staff, there would be an outstanding liability of $16,200,000,000 when the railroad retirement fund became exhausted in the year 2000 under H. R. 3669, as originally introduced and commonly known as the Crosser bill.

Mr. Robert D. Holran, a member of the Railroad Retirement Board's actuarial advisory committee, also appeared before the Senate committee and testified that in his opinion Mr. Musher's cost estimates were on the low side. Mr. Donald M. Overholser, an associate of Mr. George D. Buck, labor's member, on the Board's actuarial advisory committee, in his testimony before the Senate committee, said that the plan embodied in S. 1347, which is identical to the Crosser bill, "would go on the rocks. That is definite." He further stated that if he were a member of the railroad unions he would "be scared about this plan."

Mr. Murray W. Latimer in his prepared statement on S. 1347—which is identical to the Crosser bill—stated that under that bill that—

> Either the railroad retirement system will collapse or there will be a Government subsidy He further characterized the bill, from the standpoint of financial soundness as the extreme of recklessness.

Mr. Meyer, Chief Actuary for the social security system, was in complete disagreement with Mr. Musher as to the amount of possible savings that could be realized by adjustments with the social security trust fund under the Crosser bill. According to Mr. Meyer's statements the savings would be only about $50,000,000 instead of $100,000,000

Under the Crosser bill there is a new eligibility requirement which provides that a railroad employee must have completed at least 120 months of compensated service in order to receive any benefits himself under the Railroad Retirement Act. The so-called residual lump sum benefit is a death benefit that may be payable to survivors.

The bill provides that upon retirement or death of an employee who has completed less than 10 years of service, benefits to him or his spouse, or his survivors, will be payable under the Social Security Act. However on the other hand there is also a minimum service requirement provided in the Social Security Act before benefits can be paid under that act. According to the amended Social Security Act of 1950, generally speaking, any individual who attains age 65 after 1970 must have completed 40 quarters of coverage—calendar quarters—in order to receive any benefits for himself, his spouse, or survivors under the Social Security Act.

Briefly this would mean that a railroad employee after performing less than 10 years of compensated service on which compensation he paid a tax three to four times higher than paid under social security, would not be entitled to any benefits at all under the Railroad Retirement Act, and if he attained age 65 after 1970, then he also would not qualify under the Social Security Act for any old age and survivor insurance benefits.

Under the present Railroad Retirement Act an employee who has a current connection with the railroad industry,

and who has less than 10 years of service and has attained age 60, is entitled to a monthly disability annuity provided he has been disqualified for work in his regular occupation. An employee who is totally disabled and who has less than 10 years of service is entitled to a disability annuity provided he has attained age 60.

Under the 10-year provision of the Crosser bill, such disabled employees would not be entitled to any benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act. However, if such employee had completed sufficient service to meet the requirements of the Social Security Act, he would qualify under that act at age 65. According to the Board's statistics there were 453 disability claims awarded in 1949 to disabled employees at age 60 who had less than 10 years of service.

According to the Railroad Retirement Board's annual report for the year 1949 there were 4,811,700 former railroad employees with less than 10 years of service, of which some 4,000,000 had less than 1 year of railroad service. The Crosser bill proposes to forfeit the annuity rights of such former employees and transfer them to the social security rolls. To begin with, none of these 4,000,000 former employees with less than 1 year of service would qualify for benefits under the Social Security Act unless they had performed additional employment covered under social security. It is reasonable to assume that practically 90 percent of these 4,000,000 employees with less than 1 year of railroad service did engage in and are still engaged in social security employment. This being the case, and because of the new effective date of January 1, 1951 of the Social Security Act, the crediting of service and compensation earned before that date will not increase the old age insurance benefits payable to such former railroad employees.

The statement has been made by the supporters of the Crosser bill that the transfer of employees with less than 10 years of service to social security will provide higher benefits than under the present Railroad Retirement Act There is no doubt that if a study is made of these 4,811,770 cases of former employees with less than 10 years of service, it would reveal that in at least 90 percent of the cases the employee would receive higher benefits under the present dual system of paying both railroad retirement and social security benefits.

The Bureau of the Budget in response to a request from the House committee has the following to say with respect to the section of the Crosser bill providing for the transfer of the less than 10-year men to social security:

1. The workers with less than 10 years' service in the railroad industry—and these make up a very large percentage of the total—would get virtually all of their benefits from the old-age and survivors' insurance system and nothing from the railroad retirement system; yet under the bill they would pay for the same OASI benefits four times as much taxes as nonrailroad workers pay currently. In a sense, the short-term employees would be forced to subsidize the longer-term employees, a situation that might result in considerable discontent.

The Crosser bill provides that the retirement annuity or pension of an individual shall be reduced beginning with the month in which such individual is receiving or is entitled to receive an old-age insurance benefit under the Social Security Act.

To give an example: Take the case of a former railroad employee who retired in 1941 on 30 years of service at age 65 on an annuity amounting to $90 a month. Assume further that during the war he had social-security-covered employment from 1942 through 1946, and applied for and received a social-security benefit of $20 a month, which was later increased to $40 under the social-security amendments of 1950.

By the operation of the Crosser bill the railroad retirement annuity of $90 would be increased to $102 a month. However, under the above provision, where the retired employee in this case was receiving $40 a month under social security, his railroad retirement annuity would be reduced from $102 a month to $62 a month, which would mean that instead of this retired worker receiving higher total benefits, he would suffer a reduction of $28 a month in his total railroad-retirement and social-security benefits, from $130 to $102 a month.

The impression has been given that the Crosser bill is to provide increases in all retirement annuities and pensions payable under the Railroad Retirement Act. That is one of its purposes. It has another purpose, and that is to reduce many thousand annuities which are now being paid to individuals who have acquired rights for benefits under both the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Acts

Mr. Lester Schoene, counsel for the Railway Labor Executives' Association before the House committee in support of the original H. R. 3669, which is now the Crosser bill, when asked by Congressman BENNETT if, under the present act, an individual could draw benefits under both the railroad retirement and social security, he stated, "That is true under the present law, yes." Then, in answer to Congressman BENNETT'S question, "Is that happening in a good many cases?" Mr. Schoene answered, "I do not know in how many cases it happens, but I would say in a substantial number; yes"—see page 542 of House hearings.

Mr. Murray W. Latimer, in his testimony before the House Committee—page 278—in reference to the number of cases in which retirement annuities now being paid would be reduced under this provision of the Crosser bill stated:

I do not know and neither does anybody else know how many annuities would be reduced, but I would guess it is in the neighborhood of 20,000 or 25,000.

Of course, this is another of the proposed savings provisions to provide additional income to finance the increased and new benefits of the Crosser bill. It sounds more like robbing Peter to pay Paul.

The additional income listed as part of the $230,000,000 made possible under the Crosser bill to finance the increases and new benefits of the bill is provided by increasing the taxable compensation from $300 to $400 a month. The House report on the Crosser bill states that "by increasing the limit from $300 to $400, additional revenues of $80,000,000 per year would be provided."

However, of the $80,000,000 additional taxes obtained by raising the maximum taxable and creditable compensation from $300 to $400, only a fraction would be available to finance the new increases and benefits proposed in the Crosser bill. The greater part of this additional revenue would be used to meet the increase in benefits that would result from the use of creditable compensation up to $400 a month in calculating employee and survivor benefits.

The proponents of the Crosser bill and other proposals, as well as the House Committee, were unanimous on one point and that was in view of the rising cost of living, which substantially reduces the standard of living of retired workers and the survivors, who are on a fixed income, the first problem to be met was the urgent necessity for increasing the amount of the monthly benefits payable to retired workers and survivors who are now on the current retirement rolls.

In order to meet this need, it will be necessary to enact legislation that will not require any administrative difficulties. There are some 400,000 retirement and survivor claims in current status; therefore, there should not be any legislation enacted at this time that will require a reexamination of such claims before any increased benefits can be paid Such a delay is an absolute certainty under the Crosser bill.

As an illustration, under the 1946 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act 200,000 claims had to be reexamined in order to determine if and how much increased benefits would be payable on each claim. It required over 1 year to complete the reexamination of those 200,000 cases, and of course, that meant considerable delay in paying increased benefits as provided under the 1946 amendments.

The Crosser bill proposes many changes which will require considerable correspondence and handling before a claim can be certified for additional benefits

For example, the spouse's annuity. This is a new benefit which is payable to the spouse and will require the filing of an application and evidence to establish the date of marriage and age of the spouse.

The Railroad Retirement Board does not even have a record of employees who have a spouse, let alone the necessary evidence to establish the date of birth and marital status of such spouse. In addition, the Board will have to hire and train additional employees to process these cases. The present employees of the Railroad Retirement Board that are trained to handle cases under the Crosser bill will be busy handling the current new claims.

On the other hand, we have before us for consideration the Hall bill which provides for a 15 percent increase to all annuitants and pensioners, and a 33⅓-percent increase to widows and surviv-

ing children. This bill has been referred to as stop-gap legislation because it does not contain any of the controversial features of the Crosser bill, but does provide an immediate increase to retired employees and to widows and surviving children.

My study of the so-called Hall bill reveals there is a difference of opinion as to its cost. Some say it will completely wreck the railroad retirement fund in some 20 years; while others are of the opinion that it is the only sound approach to amending the Railroad Retirement Act without increasing the payroll tax or adding to the cost of administering the existing law.

Advocates of the Hall bill support their position by stating that the increases are reasonable and will not impair the railroad retirement fund. They also point to the fact that the 1948 amendments granting a 20 percent increase did not cost as much as originally estimated, due to increased wages, with the result that the railroad retirement fund is in a healthy condition today.

I recognize the honest differences of opinion that exist between advocates of the Crosser and Hall bills.

After detailed study and serious reflection, I am convinced that there is only one position I can take to guarantee the solvency of the railroad retirement fund and to grant immediate relief to retired employees and to widows and surviving children and that is to support the bill reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and referred to as the Hall bill.

In my support of the Hall bill, I realize it is stopgap legislation, yet it provides immediate relief to those in need of assistance, and that is the crying need of the hour.

On the other hand, I am in favor of many of the provisions of the Crosser bill, if it can be shown after further study on the part of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that these new benefits will not endanger the financial condition of the railroad retirement fund and that the relationship between the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Administration, proposed in the Crosser bill, is not one that will eventually result in having the railroad retirement system absorbed by social security.

In supporting the Hall bill I am doing so with the understanding that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will be charged, as the result of a House resolution, with the responsibility of conducting a complete review of all the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act for the purpose of liberalizing them if it is deemed possible to do so.

To guarantee action by Congress on the recommendations of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the committee is instructed to report to the House of Representatives in the form of a bill not later than February 1952. In my opinion such procedure is a sane and practical manner of liberalizing the Railroad Retirement Act.

In conclusion, by approval of the Hall bill we will furnish immediate relief to retired employees and to the surviving widows and children. Next February we can complete the task of liberalizing provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act in general.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. McGUIRE].

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, in case there is any false impression here today about any strife in our committee, I want to have you know that a grander group of fellows could not sit around a table than the Republicans and Democrats on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] said he comes from a district which has the most railroad men. I want you to know that I come from the center of culture, which is noted for Yale. I went to Dartmouth so I am not trying to give them a plug. We have Herman Hickman who is not only a great football coach, but is practically omniscient on television. Thirdly, we have the New Haven Railroad, which has the finest passenger equipment on wheels, and they were awarded a plaque for this from the American Railroad Association. I ride on the railroads every single week. I was home Monday, came back Tuesday morning, and I went back home yesterday morning, and then came back this morning. I always insist on riding the New Haven cars because they are so good. Somebody has mentioned here that it is a terrible thing about having this $50 work clause. Are we aware of the fact that over 30,000,000 workers who are under social security have that same thing, and are subjected to that $50 work clause?

I rise in support of the Crosser bill as originally introduced. This is the bill that a majority of the railroad workers want passed. A minority of the organizations of railroad employees and the Association of American Railroads are supporting the so-called Hall substitute. The issues here are clear. There is no doubt as to where all the interested parties stand in this matter. We are faced with a bill on one hand sponsored by BOB CROSSER that will put railroad retirement benefits back to the position they occupied for many years and at the same time pay for those benefits. On the other hand the substitute of the railroad companies leaves thousands of retired employees and a majority of the survivors worse off than they would be under social security.

Much has been made of the fact that the railroad organizations have not been able to achieve a united front on this matter. Because I am on the committee and because I have an interest in this problem, I want to make my views clear. First, let me say that an overwhelming majority of the employees—about 80 percent—are supporting the Crosser bill. At the same time I want to say as emphatically as I can that the Hall substitute is being supported by the Association of American Railroads. No Member of the House need assume that this is a dispute between the two labor groups. A majority of labor is for Crosser. Management is backing the Hall bill.

Ever since the Railroad Retirement Act was first passed, the railroad companies have been reluctant to agree to liberalizing it. Each time the matter has come before the House, the battle cry that the railroad lobby has raised has been "Let us have an investigation. Then we can determine what we want to do." Once again the people who are against the increases in the Railroad Retirement Act are saying, with an appropriate amount of accompanying crocodile tears, "We want to increase the benefits for these people, but, let us take about 6 months to study the matter." The railroad men who are interested in this have been studying it for 2 years. The Crosser bill is the result. This talk about another study is just a sham; a delaying tactic that the House has heard since 1935 when the original act was passed.

I do not like the fact that the unions are not united on this any better than the rest of the House. I have friends in both camps the same as every other Congressman. At the same time, I want to assure the House that I will not let this division deter me from making the best possible decision under the circumstances. I am the fellow that must answer to the retired employees in my district and I want to be able to say that I supported the best bill. I want to be able to prove that the maximum possible benefits will be made available to retired people, their wives, and their survivors.

All kinds of misunderstandings seem to be running through the House. Some have said that the operating unions represent a majority of the employees. As a matter of fact, the operating unions according to their own testimony before our committee represent 22 percent of the railroad employees. Others have said that if the Crosser bill is passed, the benefits will not be placed in effect for several months. This is a misrepresentation of fact. The Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board has stated that within 30 days his organization will be making payments under any bill that the Congress passes. Others are saying that everyone is in agreement that we should pay 15-percent increases for retired people and 33⅓ percent for survivors now and let the rest of the program wait until the study is made. I am opposed to this procedure, Chairman CROSSER is opposed to this approach, and the Railway Labor Executives Association, which speaks for 80 percent of the affected employees, is opposed to it.

There is little good to be gained from talking at length from the floor about this matter. Right-thinking Members of the House are faced with a problem. The man who wrote the original Railroad Retirement Act has introduced several amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. This same man has been responsible for every amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act since it was passed. The House now has the choice of following the advice of this expert, BOB CROSSER, or not. There is no question as to what the employees want:

They want the Crosser bill and I will vote for it.

As I told you before, I get home to my district every single week, and some times two or three times a week. The American people are sick and tired of stalling I do not want any more stalling when it comes to making improvements in railroad retirement.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one half minute to correct a statement which I understand was made by the preceding speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. McGUIRE] that the Railroad Retirement Act and the amendments thereto since 1935 were due entirely to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. While I do not wish to take any credit away from the gentleman from Ohio, I think with pardonable pride I am justified in referring to the fact that during a portion of the time there was a Republican Congress. I had the honor of being chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during that session. I introduced legislation to increase benefits. The committee reported favorably a bill that increased benefits. It was passed by the House and Senate. It was approved by the President.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. I just want to suggest to the gentleman from Connecticut that he has not ridden on the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe on the Super Chief.

Mr. Chairman, the approval of this legislation would, in my opinion, be an act of simple justice. Only recently Congress approved legislation liberalizing and increasing coverage under the Social Security Act. Congress also provided for increases in benefits for those retired from Government service. Liberalization for other groups has also been approved. The reason for such action, of course, was largely because of the mounting increased cost of living.

There have been little changes or amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act since 1937, except a slight increase that was granted 5 years ago. I think I should add right here that Congress has seen fit to approve increased pensions or benefits for other groups where the entire increases came from Federal funds. I mention this only to indicate a policy that has been pretty well followed by Congress in dealing with the question of retirement benefits.

The railroad retirement system is the only one I know of where contributions are of sufficient amount by the employer and employee to make it actuarily sound and without contributions from the Federal Government.

Comparing the program and benefits of the Railroad Retirement Act with the Social Security Act, it is observed that social security in some respects is more liberal than railroad retirement, especially as it applies to the average worker who has a wife and two or three or four children. There are other things to be considered, however, that are more favorable to the Railroad Retirement Act, among which are the very important disability benefits.

I want to commend the great organization of railroad employees, numbering approximately a million and a half people, who occupy such an important place in the business and industry of this country, for the conservative and careful manner in which they have guarded the funds of this organization to make sure it is solvent, so there may be no question of its ability to meet payments to those who are dependent upon its benefits for a living after retiring from active service.

I had hoped the commitee would recommend more liberal increases to the recipients under this legislation. Of course I do not want to impair the fund. I do think, however, the fund would not be impaired if the benefits to the retired employees were increased 25 percent, instead of 15 percent, and the payments to dependents increased 50 percent instead of 33⅓ percent.

In support of that statement I would like to make a few brief observations. The fund during recent years has been accumulating in considerable amounts, and rightly so. As of of June 1 this year the fund amounted to $1,419,261,626 according to the committee report. It is $356,000,000 more than the year before. During the present year, according to the report, the increase will be even greater, due to increases in wages and increases in taxes collected for this fund. I might add that the proceeds of the fund are invested in Government securities and the returns in that respect are to that extent increased. Personally, I feel there could be some savings in administration expenses Applications could be processed through the railway organizations and thereby save some of so-called red tape. Burden against the fund should be lighter because of a lesser number of retired employees who had retired when the Retirement Act was enacted. Let me further quote from the report of this committee:

> Furthermore, it should be remembered that with the adoption of the present benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act in 1946, the actuaries at the time overestimated the cost of the additional benefits then proposed and underestimated the funds to be available from tax collections In fact, the estimates were conservative enough at that time to permit within 2 years, 1948, an increase of 20 percent for pensioners and annuitants without affecting the solvency of the fund. Also, since the increase in benefits, the fund has continuously progressed beyond the estimates of the actuaries, both in 1946 and in 1948. The major reason is that payrolls have been constantly increasing. Therefore, the committee is convinced from the testimony as a whole that the benefits to be increased under the committee substitute can be provided without immediately affecting the solvency of the fund.

Mr. Chairman, the present need of so many people who are recipients under the terms of this act is such that relief ought to be granted. When the railroad retirement bill was passed, it was certainly expected there would be sufficient funds that recipients would be reasonably well taken care of. Now because of increased cost of living and other expenses, their benefits are reduced by more than 50 percent. The situation is imperative. It was certainly not anticipated these older people would be required to use up their accumulated savings, if they had any, as they are doing now, or to adjust themselves to a far-below-normal class of living.

Here is a group of thousands of highly respected American citizens, nearly all of whom have given their lives to a highly important and responsible business, that of handling the transportation of this country. They constitute a big segment of the leadership of real American citizens. They are the people who have had so much to do with the building and developing of American life.

It is not right that this group of American citizens should be neglected because of the failure of Congress to take action in their behalf. After all, the funds upon which they are dependent do not come from the Federal Treasury, but from their own wages and allocations from their employers, such allocations being contributed as a part of the compensation of the workers I hope the House will see fit to approve this legislation

I observe that the Bureau of the Budget in commenting on this proposed legislation calls attention to certain defects, and recommends a study of the railroad-retirement system. This is a recommendation long past due. I hope this Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, together with representatives of the various railway employees, and representatives of the railroads of this country, will at the earliest possible time proceed to examine and study this important problem and then make recommendation to Congress with respect to further needed legislation.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, if it is in order to do so, having in mind the limited time at the disposal of the chairman and myself, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given the privilege of extending their remarks on the bill in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, this will be a good day in the lives of the men and women who work for the railroad companies in this country, who have over years past made their monthly contributions from their wages to the railroad retirement fund. These employees of this tremendously important American industry have waited a long time for the Congress of the United States to amend and improve the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act.

We Members of Congress who have for such a long time struggled and worked toward economy and who have steadfastly tried to protect the overburdened taxpayers, can support this legislation wholeheartedly without any pangs of conscience.

From 1937, when the Railroad Retirement Act was created, the railroad companies and the railroad employees have paid their own money into this fund until the accumulated surplus in the fund, over and above all pensions, annuities, and expenses paid out of the fund, has reached the gigantic sum of in excess of $2,300,000,000. This sum repre-

sents the savings for security that came out of the wages of the railroad employees and the earnings of the railroad companies; none of it came out of the pockets of the taxpayers. Therefore, we all can support fair and reasonable improvements and amendments to this Railroad Retirement Act and know that we are justly returning to these men and women who have served the railroad company and who are serving it, their own money.

Under the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act, the Congress of the United States has the power and the right to enact legislation, to regulate and govern the pensions and annuities that are paid out of this fund.

I suppose that every Member of Congress has a large number of citizens in their home districts that have been and are employees of some railroad company. As their representatives, we have the obligation and duty to first see that this fund that they have provided for their own security, shall be and remain solvent. This is the best service we can render to them. On the other hand, and in view of the tremendous rise in the cost of living over the past few years, and in view of the further fact that the pensions and annuities being paid under the present Railroad Retirement Act falls so far short of giving to these men and women the sort of protection and security that is necessary for them to live in decency and to maintain their standard of living, it is up to the Members of Congress and the great committee that has jurisdiction over the Railroad Retirement Act, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to enact amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act that will give to all of the participants of this fund just as large benefits as can be justified by the present size of the fund and the enormous intake of wages and earnings that is flowing into the fund each month, having in mind that our constituents want us to be sure that we maintain the soundness and solvency of their fund and that we, as Members of Congress, give a good account of our trusteeship in managing this fund for them.

I represent a large number of citizens in my home district who have made railroading their life's work. It is my considered opinion that considered as a whole and as a group, the railroad employees over the Nation constitute as substantial a group of citizens as could be found anywhere in the United States. Most of these men and women have chosen the railroad industry for their life's work; many hundreds of thousands of them have been in this employment for long periods of years; a large percent own their own homes; they are vitally interested in the stability and progress of their country; they are loyal American citizens; and they deserve at our hands the most careful consideration that this committee and each Member of Congress can give to them in dealing with this trust fund that they have created out of their labors and that we administer for them.

Realizing as I did when I first came to Congress, that I had the honor of representing a congressional district that had a very large percentage of railroad employees in it, I felt it was my duty to acquaint myself with the Railroad Retirement Act from its very beginning to the present time. I have made an exhaustive study of the history of the Railroad Retirement Act, of the provisions and amendments that have heretofore been enacted by the Congress and I have studied the financial structure of this fund and its administration from the beginning up to the present time. During my first term of Congress, I prepared and introduced a new Railroad Retirement Act; during my second term, I prepared and introduced a second bill, providing the four amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. I have heretofore spoken in Congress, trying to represent my people, urging the Members to enact a new and improved Railroad Retirement Act at the present session of Congress. I had the honor and privilege of appearing before this great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce while it was considering this much needed and improved legislation and I gave to them such help and assistance as I could from my study of this situation.

I said a moment ago that I felt that this would be a glad day for our railroad people here in the United States. We have waited far too long to grant to them improvements and amendments that would afford larger payments of annuities and pensions to the railroad employees, those who have retired and those who will retire, and to their dependents. It is my earnest hope that we may complete and enact into law at the present session of this Congress a much improved railroad retirement bill that will afford to all of our railroad constituents the very best possible increases in payments to them from this fund.

There are two things which I regret very deeply. Those two things are these: The members of this committee are not agreed among themselves as to the kind of bill that we should enact. One group of Members favors the committee bill; another group favors the Crosser substitute It is to be regretted that this great committee could not have agreed upon one bill, but I think I know that each member of this committee is sincere in the position he is taking, and it is right and proper under our form of Government that we should bring these bills before the Congress for public debate so that each man on the committee can give to us the facts as he sees them and the reasons for his position.

The other things which I deeply regret is that the large groups of railroad employees represented by the many different brotherhoods who are so vitally interested in this legislation could not agree among themselves.

This committee was in session for a long time and it gave opportunity to representatives of the various brotherhoods to bring their experts before the committee and advocate their views. However, we are here today confronted with the fact that one large group of railroad employees favor the committee bill and another large group of railroad employees favor the Crosser substitute.

It is my belief that every Member of Congress has constituents in his home district that are members of these various railroad brotherhoods. It is perfectly apparent with the committee divided and the brotherhoods divided, that we will not be able as Members of Congress to enact a new bill that will be entirely pleasing and satisfactory to everybody. Under these circumstances, it is up to every Member of Congress to let his conscience be his guide and to do the very best he can for his people under these trying and difficult circumstances. There is one good thing about it, the committee bill brings larger pensions and annuities to these men and women, and the Crosser substitute likewise brings added benefits and payments of annuities and pensions to these men and women who are entitled to same.

While the bill which we will presently enact is not perfect, we can enjoy with all of the railroad men and women of this country the fact that either one of these bills is far better than the present law that falls so far short in meeting the high cost of living with which these people whom we represent have to contend. Even if we cannot bring out a bill that everybody agrees upon, it is vital and necessary that we do pass some amendments that will give to these worthy and needy people all of the benefits that the fund can afford, and that we do it now at the present session of Congress, without any further delay.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, constituents in my congressional district, who are receiving railroad retirement pensions, annuities, widow's and survivor's benefits, have written to me for aid in having a law passed to increase the benefits they are now receiving which are much too meager to enable them to live in a decent manner.

I am advised that railroad labor organizations representing only 22 percent of the railway workers are opposing this legislation, notwithstanding the dire need for these increases and the fact that there are other provisions in the bill which will effect savings and make up the money needed to pay for these much-needed benefits and insure the financial soundness and solvency of the Railroad Retirement Fund.

I seriously ask, "Is it fair for these railroad organizations, representing a small minority of the railway workers, to deprive, by their actions, these worthy retired railroad workers, their beloved wives, and the widows and children of deceased railroad workers, of the increased benefits provided in the Crosser bill which are so sorely needed at this time?"

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee bill.

I think it would be a great misfortune to adopt the Crosser substitute; because, after all, the committee bill is the committee bill and any other measure which may be offered in opposition to the committee bill would be in the nature of a substitute.

The committee bill is what you might call a "quickie"; it gives quick relief across the board. It is a short bill and

it is an intelligible bill. If you will look at it you will find that it consists of but three pages; you can read it and it is readily intelligible. The original H. R. 3369 takes up 24 pages; its provisions are extremely complicated and anything but intelligible on a superficial reading. It is very difficult to understand after you have studied it a long time. The most serious complication in the Crosser bill is the attempt to transfer the railway employee with less than 10 years of service to the social security system.

My own point of view is that social-security legislation should be made applicable to everybody in the United States and that the privileges of the Railroad Retirement Act and the burdens of the Railroad Retirement Act should be superimposed upon the social-security legislation. That is not what the Crosser bill does. Let me read to you what the Federal Security Administrator has to say about the Crosser bill:

> The provisions of H. R. 3669 which govern the coordination of payments by the two programs are inconsistent and difficult to understand and to explain. The general principles on which they are based apparently are that old-age and survivors insurance should pay the short-term railroad worker and his survivors, and the railroad program should pay the long-term worker and his survivors, and that wage credits under the two programs should be combined However, these principles are not consistently carried out in the coordination provisions and as a consequence many inequitable and anomalous situations would arise.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It is very difficult to justify the inconsistency of these provisions on any basis other than a historical one, and it would be almost impossible to secure a clear understanding among the noncareer railroad workers and their families as to what program they should look to for benefits, or what protection they are actually afforded.

I would also call attention very particularly to the testimony, and I wish I had time to read it, because it is most impressive, of Mr. Murray W. Latimer, who was for 11 years a member of the Railroad Retirement Board. If you will read a summary of his objections to the Crosser bill on pages 274 and 275 of the hearings I think you cannot fail to be very deeply impressed.

Mr. Chairman, I would also call particular attention to the language used by the Bureau of the Budget at page 325 of the hearings.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENNY].

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Chairman, there are several compelling reasons why I am very strongly in favor of the committee bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act.

First. The first consideration is the immediate increase in annuities payable to the retired railroad employees. This is the great necessity because of the increased cost of living and because the previous payments to the men have been less in many cases than under Social Security.

Second. This bill provides a material increase in the payment to widows. This is an essential, because of the fact that, to my personal knowledge, widows of railroad employees in my District are being paid less than widows who obtain their pension from Social Security. This bill completely corrects this disparity.

Third. The tax deducted from the employee's payroll is not increased under this bill to the extent that it would have been increased under H. R. 3669. In the latter, in some cases, the tax deduction would have amounted to one-third more.

Fourth. There is no possibility, according to the best actuarial authorities, of the benefits and pensions under this bill endangering in any way the principal fund under the railroad retirement system, and the same authorities agree that it would have been in jeopardy under the original bill.

It is true that there are several controversial features that are not covered by this bill, but it is the purpose of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House and the express purpose of the Senate Committee to immediately initiate studies in order that in the year 1952 what might be termed an ideal pension bill may be drawn in simple terms readily understandable with the intention of covering all of these controversial matters. The committee firmly believes that a sound and equitable pension plan can be drawn based on actuarial principles which will include the three basic conditions of a good bill, First, the benefit of the pensioner; Second, the benefit of his survivors; and third, the security of the principal fund. This will require considerable study for the reason that there was such a great difference of opinion between the railroad brotherhoods, the railroad executives, the operators and the members of the committee. This is a consummation devoutly to be wished. I can assure you that it will have the earnest effort of every member of our committee.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I also yield the gentleman 2½ minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the position we are in with reference to time for discussing this very important bill. When I appeared before the Committee on Rules I asked the committee to give us a minimum of 3 hours anyhow. In its wisdom it reported the rule providing 2 hours for general debate.

Mr. Chairman, I could not undertake to say what I would like to say to explain to Members of the House in 5 minutes this involved problem. I appreciate very much the position of the chairman of our committee, but 2½ minutes is very little time. I regret exceedingly that I find myself, as other members of the committee, on the other side of this discussion from that of the very fine, able, and distinguished chairman of the committee. He is an outstanding Member of this House. I have the highest regard for him. He has had great interest in railroad employees as well as all other people of the United States. He is to be highly commended for his active and conscientious efforts over the period of years in this Congress.

In reference to the merits of the bill, I merely want to say, Mr. Chairman, that when we get into the 5-minute rule, it will be my intention to ask for 5 minutes and perhaps an additional 5 minutes under the circumstances, at which time I expect to try to outline to you briefly some of my own thoughts regarding this railroad retirement bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the provisions of the committee substitute. It was reported by our committee after lengthy hearings and long and careful consideration. The reason for my position is this: The Social Security Administration is opposed to both bills which were originally introduced by the chairman of our committee, one bill sponsored by the nonoperating employees and the other sponsored by the operating employees of the railroads. They gave their reasons for opposing both bills, but said: There is a way that immediate relief can be given by a simple increase in percentages and give it now. I intend to undertake to explain some of the things that the Social Security Administration recommended to our committee, which caused me, among other things, to form my own opinion in this matter. The Bureau of the Budget is opposed to the bill as introduced by our fine and distinguished chairman, and they set out, I believe, some 10 or 11 reasons why they were opposed to it. The Railroad Retirement Board is divided on it, one to two; two members of the board taking one viewpoint and the other member taking another viewpoint. The railroad employees are at variance, sharply divided. Mr. Chairman, I want to say the attitude of the members of this committee to me clearly illustrates what I think is the attitude of most members; that we regret to find ourselves in the middle, and we are going to have to pass on something where there is such wide diversion of views among those most vitally affected. So consequently, because of all of these involvements and the five major policies, I intend to draw to your attention the fundamental issues when we get under the 5-minute rule.

I say to you we need to give the immediate relief now that can be given without affecting the soundness of the fund, without becoming involved with all the frills of the social security integration with railroad retirement, and then adopt the resolution the Committee on Rules reported calling for an immediate study that will bring together all these elements that are in dissension. Let us do what we can now and treat these employees, who are paying 6 percent now and 6¼ percent beginning January 1, a total of 12½ percent going to the fund, fair, and see what should be done for them after further study on these highly controversal points that they may get what they are entitled to have.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the generosity of the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee in yielding me these 5 minutes. Obviously I cannot go into all of the details of this rather complicated legislation in that time, but as the

gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] suggested, I intend to get time under the 5-minute rule to explain fully why I believe that the wisest policy of the House of Representatives at this time is to adopt the substitute bill reported by the majority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. There are some very impelling and compelling reasons why I believe that this should be done at this time. Most of them already have been mentioned but there are a few angles that I think deserve further consideration.

I now want to make reference to one statement made by my very distinguished and good friend from New York [Mr. HELLER] in the remarks he made to the House. He intimated that those who are supporting the so-called Hall bill are those who want to bring about a merger of social security and the railroad retirement system.

I have made a pledge time after time to the railroad people in my district, and I have three railroads that center in Nashville, Tenn., that I would unalterably oppose the merger of the social-security system with the railroad retirement system. I told some of the nonoperating men of that district last week that if we adopt this 10-year provision in the Crosser bill, taking men with less than 10 years service and placing them under social security this year, next year we will be taking the 15-year men and the next year the 20-year men. Make no mistake about it. If you are opposed to merger of social security with the railroad retirement system, you are beginning that thing right now if you adopt that provision. I have always been opposed to it and I am opposed to it still.

Let me emphasize also that, as other members of the committee have stated, there is no great dissension among members of the committee on what we want to do. Everybody wants to do a job at this time, and do a good job for the beneficiaries of the railroad retirement system.

I do want to mention also this one thing, because it has been brought up time after time. I am unalterably opposed on moral grounds, if no other grounds, to this so-called $50 work clause. I was opposed to it in social security and I am now having prepared an amendment that I shall introduce in the House of Representatives to repeal that part of the Social Security Act. I believe it is morally wrong, it is ethically wrong, and I do not believe it is sound Americanism to say to an American citizen who works 30 years for a railroad, or however many years he might work, and pays 6 percent into a retirement fund, "When you retire you cannot make more than $50 in a month."

I know of a case in my district of a man who has worked for the N. C. & St. L. Railroad 37 years. He has a little workshop in his basement and does upholstery work. I asked this question of a witness: "If this man in any month takes in 10 chairs at $6 apiece and finishes those 10 chairs earning $60 in that month, would he lose the $92 annuity for that month?" The answer was, "Yes, if this provision is adopted." Is there anything sound, is there anything moral in that sort of situation?

Mr. Chairman, the majority of the commmittee has shown in this bill what we believe can be done now to afford quick relief. We propose to bring up as soon as this bill is passed a resolution providing for study to clarify a lot of these provisions that have created so much confusion among so many different segment of our economy and agencies of the Government that are interested in this situation. It is my opinion that the best thing we can do is pass the substitute, the committee bill, and then engage in that study and report back to the Congress later.

The bill reported by the committee does not represent hasty action on the part of the committee. On the contrary, it is the result of action taken only after extended hearings and numerous executive sessions at which painstaking consideration was given to a great variety of proposals for a liberalization of benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act. The hearings covered some thirty-odd bills, but the testimony was directed largely to two bills, one, H. R. 3669, sponsored by the nonoperating group of employees, and the other, H. R. 3755, sponsored by the operating group. These bills were strikingly different in their proposals, but I do not have the time to go into details with respect to that. What I wish to emphasize right now is the extent to which there was agreement on the part of all interests represented at the hearings.

Two matters on which there was virtually complete unanimity on the part of all who appeared at the hearings were, first, the importance of preserving the solvency of the retirement system, and, second the undesirability of any increase in the present tax rate on employers and employees for the support of the system. The rate is now 6 percent on each and next year will reach its final level of 6¼ percent on each. In striking contrast, the rate for the support of the social security system of old-age and survivors insurance is only 1½ percent each on employers and employees and is scheduled to go up gradually until it reaches a final level of 3¼ percent on each in 1970. In other words, the tax on employers and employees covered by the railroad retirement system is now exactly four times that paid by employers and employees covered by the social security system. As the two sets of taxes are now scheduled, this difference will gradually decrease until 1970 and thereafter the railroad tax will be only slightly less than twice the social security tax.

The problem with which the committee was confronted in considering this proposed legislation, therefore, was that of determining what, if any, increases could be made in the benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act without seriously endangering the solvency of the system and without increasing the rate of tax now imposed on employers and employees for the support of the system. The bill reported by the committee represents the best judgment of the majority as to the maximum extent to which present benefits may be increased within these two limitations.

Under the bill as reported by the committee, all retirement annuities and pensions are to be increased 15 percent, all survivor annuities are to be increased 33⅓ percent and all lump-sum death payments are to be increased 25 percent. These increases are both substantial and generous. According to estimates made by the actuaries of the Railroad Retirement Board, the increases proposed in the bill would add more than $100,000,000 a year to the present cost of the railroad-retirement system, raising the cost from 12.60 percent of the estimated level payroll of $4,900,000,000 to 14.71 percent of such payroll. When it is remembered that the present total payroll tax for the support of the system is 12 percent, to be increased next year to the final figure of 12.5 percent, it is obvious that such an increase in benefits would carry a serious threat to the solvency of the system in the absence of some way of offsetting it through savings or otherwise. In recognition of that fact, the committee has accompanied its report on the bill with a recommendation for a prompt study of the possibility of relating the railroad retirement system to the social-security system in some such way as to bring about savings to the railroad retirement system sufficient to offset, or at least largely to offset, the cost of the increases in benefits for which the reported bill provides.

The liberality of the increases provided for in the bill as reported by the committee is evident when the resulting benefits are compared with the corresponding ones paid under the Social Security Act, bearing in mind that one of the principal reasons for the demand by railroad employees for an increase in benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act was the action taken by Congress last year greatly liberalizing the benefits payable under the Social Security Act.

The basic benefit under both the railroad retirement system and the social security system is the monthly benefit payable to an employee upon his retirement, which, although paid monthly, is commonly referred to as a retirement annuity. This is unquestionably the benefit with which all employees are primarily concerned. With respect to this paramount benefit, the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended by the committee bill, would be far more than twice as liberal as the Social Security Act.

As a result of the 1950 amendments, the maximum old-age-retirement annuity now payable under the Social Security Act is $68.50 per month. Within the next few years, however, when the new-start provisions of that act become operative, the maximum will be $80 per month. Without further amendment of the statute, it will never exceed that amount. Moreover, that maximum of $80 is far more theoretical than real. Only a comparatively few workers will ever receive that much because of the method prescribed in the Social Security Act for determining the amount of the annuity. The act fixes it at 50 percent of the first $100 of the average monthly

wage not in excess of $300, plus 15 percent of the balance. The average monthly wage, however, is determined by dividing a man's total earnings while in covered employment, not in excess of $3,600 in any calendar year, not by the number of months during which he was actually at work, but by the total number of months elapsing between December 31, 1950, or the date he reached the age of 22, whichever is later, and the date he reached age 65. The result is that in order for anyone who reached age 22 after 1950 to have an average monthly wage of $300, when he comes up for retirement, he must have worked steadily in employment covered by the act from age 22 to age 65 and earned as much as $3,600 in each of those 43 years. As I have said, only a relatively few can be expected to meet that requirement.

Under the Railroad Retirement Act, the amount of the annuity depends upon the number of years of railroad service and the actual average monthly earnings during such period of service, not in excess of $300 in any calendar month. An employee is entitled to credit for all railroad service up to age 65, including service prior to 1937, the year the present system was established, up to the point where it does not result in a total of more than 30 years of service. Because of that limitation, the maximum annuity under the present act is now $144, and will remain at that figure until after 1967. Thereafter an employee may obtain an annuity based upon as much as 45 or more years of service. Under the present act, the maximum for that length of service would be $216 Under the bill as reported by the committee, the maximum annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act would be raised immediately to $165.60, as compared with the present maximum under Social Security of $68.50, and the ultimate maximum under the bill would be about $250, as compared with the ultimate maximum under Social Security of $80 per month.

So much for the maximum retirement annuities under the two systems. What is of greater immediate interest, I think, is the results of the actual operations of the two systems. According to statistics regularly compiled by the Federal Security Agency and the Railroad Retirement Board, the average of all old-age retirement annuities now being paid under the Social Security Act is about $43 per month, while the average under Railroad Retirement is about $83 per month. Under the bill as reported by the committee, the latter figure would immediately be raised to over $95, thus making the average payment under railroad retirement well over twice the average under social security.

Another important fact to be taken into consideration in comparing the retirement annuities under the two systems is that the Social Security Act provides only for old-age retirement annuities. It does not recognize disability as a basis for a retirement annuity. A man covered by that act who becomes totally disabled at any age under 65 must wait until he reaches that age before he can obtain a retirement annuity and then his annuity will be based on an average monthly wage arrived at by including in the divisor all the months elapsing between the date he became disabled and the date he reached 65. The railroad retirement system, however, provides for annuities in full amount in case of total disability after 10 years of railroad service, regardless of a man's age, or at age 60, regardless of his years of service. Even in case of disability which merely incapacitates the employee from engaging in his regular occupation, it provides for full payment after 20 years of service or at age 60. Disability annuities now being paid under the railroad retirement system average $81.50 per month, and, under the bill reported by the committee, would be raised to about $94.

With respect to benefits to survivors of deceased employees, the situation under the two systems is quite different. Prior to the 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act, the survivor annuities payable under the Railroad Retirement Act were more liberal than those payable under social security. As a result of the 1950 amendments, however, such benefits under social security now average about 25 percent higher than those under railroad retirement. The increase of 33⅓ percent in such benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, which is proposed in the bill as reported by the committee, would again place such benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act above those payable under social security. For example, statistics contained in the Social Security Bulletin for August 1951, show that the average of all survivor annuities under the Social Security Act which were in current payment status during the month of May 1951, was $30.55 Corresponding statistics given in the Monthly Review of the Railroad Retirement Board for July 1951, show that all survivor annuities awarded under the Railroad Retirement Act which were in current payment status during the month of May 1951, averaged $25.26. Under the committee bill, the latter figure would be increased to $33.68, which would be slightly over 10 percent higher than the average payment under the Social Security Act. These figures are sufficient to refute any claim that the increase of 33⅓ percent in survivor annuities for which the committee bill provides would leave such annuities still below those now payable under social security. It is true that in some instances such benefits under the committee bill would be somewhat lower than those payable under social security, but, in general and on the average, they would be considerably higher.

In addition to what is disclosed by the comparison of the survivor annuities actually being paid under the two systems, there was other evidence before the committee which showed quite clearly that an increase of 33⅓ percent in all survivor annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act would result in raising them considerably above those payable under the Social Security Act. The committee received a report from the Railroad Retirement Board on a bill which proposed to place all survivor benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act on exactly the same basis as those now payable under the Social Security Act. The report of the board was that, according to its actuaries, this would result in increasing the cost of such benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act to the extent of 0.63 percent of the payroll, raising the total cost from 2.38 percent of the payroll to 3.01 percent. That would represent an increase of about 26½ percent. Obviously, if it would require an increase of only 26½ percent in survivor benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act to place them an on exact parity with those payable under social security, an increase of 33⅓ percent would raise them substantially above the social security level.

As I have said, the increases in benefits proposed in the bill as reported by the committee are substantial and generous. To go beyond what is there proposed would be to proceed in reckless disregard of the solvency of the railroad retirement system, as to the importance of which all interests profess to be in agreement.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. WOLVERTON. May I be informed as to the number of minutes remaining to the chairman of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Nine minutes.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLVERTON. In view of the fact that the majority of the committee favor the Hall bill, does that give the majority of the committee the right to close the debate or does it remain with the chairman of the committee, notwithstanding the fact that he does not represent the majority of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes that the gentleman from Ohio should now use time. He has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. CROSSER. Does the Chair state that I may not close the debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], the chairman of the committee for 9 minutes.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, the tone of much of the opposition's discussion today is very familiar to my ear. It is now more than 20 years since I began to promote railroad retirement legislation. I can recall how at first I was ridiculed by some Members of the House at that time, and was told that I had no more chance of passing a railroad retirement bill than there would be likelihood of my flying to the moon. I said then that there was at least nothing to prevent me from trying. It was not very long—in fact in 1934, I introduced the bill, the first bill that passed the House after a considerable struggle. We again passed a bill in 1935, with pretty much the same chatter that we have heard here today in opposition. Again in 1937, we passed another bill. In 1946. we had a measure, which I think was the target for more bitterness and hostility on the part of the opposition than was experienced by the supporters of the measure

in connection with the discussion of any previous retirement measure.

They, first of all, do everything possible to destroy the measure. They have developed a familiar style of histrionics with which they "view with alarm," wailingly announce "awful surprise," dramatically indicate "terrible shock" and in short leave no doubt that we sponsors of the measure have aroused "consternation," "astonishment," and "dismay" in the guileless opposition to our diabolical efforts to destroy our railroad retirement system. My friends, I have tried hard to present a measure at this time, which would be in keeping with the high order of legislation heretofore enacted in regard to the railroad-retirement system.

You will, I am sure, remember some of the tactics and performances of the opposition, to which, the 1946 amendments were subjected. For months and months dilatory tactics of one kind and another were employed to harass the supporters of the 1946 bill in the hope of defeating the measure in the committee. On the floor of the House it was asserted that our bill would destroy the railroad retirement system. That 1946 bill passed the House, however, with practically no change in the provisions of the bill as it was originally introduced. As a result widows, orphans and others receive benefits who under the previous law received none. From many old railroaders have come to me expressions of gratitude because our 1946 amendments have assured their loyal life partners, their wives, that they will have incomes if their husbands depart this life before them. Every conceivable objection was made to the 1946 bill. One of the great howls that was set up was that we had to have a 3 percent increase in the tax to keep the reserve fund in balance.

They said we must increase the taxes by 3 percent, otherwise they howl that the system would collapse and would no longer be financially sound. Our experts, for the labor groups said that 1½ percent would be sufficient; that 1½ percent would be all that was necessary. Way back at the beginning of the system, the economists and actuaries whom our committee heard, said that in projecting a system like this for 10 years into the future, if you could come within 1½ percent of having the reserve fund on an absolute level you would be doing a perfect job. We found the reserve fund with 1½ percent plus after the 1946 act had been in effect a short time, yet we were urged to provide for an increase of 3 percent in the tax in order to balance the reserve fund. Not only did the 1½ percent increase suffice, but in 1948 by a measure, which I introduced providing for a 20-percent increase in benefits, there was enough money in the reserve fund, to pay the increased benefits.

Those are some of the things that I can not just forget over night. I remember also the tearful pleas for investigation that were made at the very beginning It was almost pathetic to hear the bigwigs pleading: "Oh, we must have an investigation. We must have a thorough study of this proposal before we can take the great risk of passing a railroad retirement bill." That was our experience prior to the enactment of the first railroad retirement bill. It was the cry prior to the enactment of the second bill, and the third, and finally prior to the 1946 amendments. They all pleaded for more investigation, and more study. Why, people who have any experience at all in legislation know that in controversial matters when the opposition has a bad case, they always begin to plead tearfully: "Give us more investigation. We would like to study some more."

As to the dissent of several brotherhood officials I wish to say: They are all friends of mine or at any rate I am their friend, I assure them of that. Some of my good friends come to me and say, "Tell the so-and-sos to go and agree, tell them that you are not going to be the goat." I was not sent to Congress to represent officials of the bankers associations, the spokesmen of the agricultural groups, or the officials of other groups of people, but the rank and file of the people who make them officials. So while I have great respect for and devotion to officials of labor organizations, yet nevertheless my primary duty is to keep secure justice for those who labor to support their families, even though their officials differ among themselves. Much as I would like to be able to have them all say "Hurrah for CROSSER!" I am more concerned in seeing that sound helpful legislation is put through for the benefit of the rank and file of the workers of the United States.

My answer to anyone who thinks that I must be unfriendly to him because I cannot agree with him on some subject, is to be found in four lines which Edwin Edmund Markham shortly before he departed this life, gave me in his own handwriting. These are the lines.

> He drew a circle that shut me out,
> Heretic, rebel, a thing to flout,
> But Love and I had the wit to win,
> We drew a circle that took him in

That is the way I like to feel toward any one who is displeased with me. I hope to serve well the rank and file, the noble people whom union officials and Congressmen try to represent. That is what I have tried to do.

When you hear this measure discussed in more detail under the 5-minute rule you will agree with me I feel sure, unless partisanship should play a much bigger part than I expect. Nothing is perfect. I should like to see a civilization where we needed no retirement system, needed no pensions; we could have an economic system which would assure real justice in the distribution of the joint product of the natural resources, labor and capital.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] is recognized for 3 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Although my time is very limited I should be pleased to yield a minute to the gentleman from Ohio if he has any additional thought he would like to express.

Mr. CROSSER. It would take me more than a minute to get started and that would waste the gentleman's time. I am indebted to my colleague.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, my interest in the railroad-retirement-pension fund stems from a long relationship in connection with railway employees. I know many of these railroad men and count some of them as my closest personal friends over a long period of years.

As a member of the House of Representatives of the Indiana General Assembly in 1949, the record will indicate that I voted 100 percent in favor of legislation that was supported by the railroad brotherhoods. As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have felt the same keen interest in these railroad employees that I have felt throughout my previous years.

My first interest has been to increase benefits that are due to the retired railroad employees to the greatest possible extent without jeopardizing the fund of which they are very rightfully jealous.

I listened carefully to the evidence that was presented in the hearings and also attempted to read additional evidence that was presented in the Senate hearings on the same subject which was not available in our House committee

It was disappointing to me that all of the railroad brotherhoods were not in agreement on all of the details of the pension plans. It also was alarming when there was a conflict of opinion on the part of the actuaries and also on the part of members of the Railroad Retirement Board.

For my part, I have always felt that it was wise to work on the conservative side rather than place their retirement fund in jeopardy Even though our Federal Government for the past number of years has followed an unsound fiscal policy, I felt that the railroad-retirement pension fund should be protected from such a procedure.

Not only one but several actuaries pointed out that the original provisions of H. R 3669, as presented to our committee, would jeopardize this fund, and an actuary employed by the Board, in the Senate hearings, even indicated the possibility that the fund could be depleted by the year 2000 if all of the original provisions of H. R. 3669 were adopted. For this reason only, I felt that it was the better part of caution to protect the fund which has been and should be continued on a sound actuarial basis.

There were extensive and ofttimes delayed hearings, and during some of these delays I sent questionnaires to a large group of railroad employees in the Fifth Indiana District that I have the honor to represent. These three questions were asked:

First. Do you want to protect the pension fund from a possible eventual depletion?

Second. Do you want the railroad-retirement fund united with the social-security fund?

Third. Do you want to be restricted to earning not more than $50 per month from outside sources after retirement?

All of the answers received, that were written by the railroad men themselves, in reply to these questions, indicated that these employees would not want at least these three provisions which were contained in the original H. R. 3669.

This indicates that at the grass-roots level the men are thinking for themselves rather than blindly accepting the dictates and recommendations of some of the heads of their respective organizations. In fact, some of the letters even indicated that this was the condition, and they wanted to express themselves personally, which I felt they did very effectively in this particular case.

I want to just mention briefly one provision which was contained in the bill as originally introduced, and that is the so-called post-retirement work clause. Under this provision any railroad employee who retired in the future would be deprived of his annuity for each and every month during which he earned as much as $50. Here again I want to say that none of the communications I have received urged this provision, and I am inclined to believe that the great majority of railroad employees today, as well as those who are presently retired, are not in favor of such a restrictive provision, nor did they know that the bill as introduced contained such a provision. To forfeit annuity rights already paid for at a high tax rate over a great many years does not seem just nor consistent with the purpose of the bill.

And speaking of the high tax rate—presently 6 percent on the railroads and 6 percent on the employees—while I have been receiving a large amount of mail asking for increased pensions and annuities, and urging passage of H. R. 3669, I have not received a single letter from a railroad employee asking that his taxes for the support of the railroad retirement system be increased—and, if any Member of the House has received any such letter, I would like to hear about it. I think the general feeling among all railroad employees is that the present tax rate and the base on which it is applied is high enough.

As a result of the differences of opinion which prevailed between the brotherhoods, and because the majority of our committee felt that all of the retired railroad men were entitled to immediate increases, the committee reported out this bill by a vote of approximately 2 to 1—and it is a good bill.

The committee bill does not increase the tax rate nor the base. Furthermore, it is simple in its operation because it immediately increases benefits and annuities 15 percent, it immediately increases survivors' annuities 33⅓ percent, it immediately increases the lump-sum death benefits 25 percent, and it does not increase the tax. The Railroad Retirement Board can apply the principle of the committee bill and the very next check after the passage of this bill can include these increased benefits. Thus, there will be no further unnecessary delay.

For my part, I feel that if any additional benefits are available without any additional cost to the members, then they are entitled to these additional benefits.

However, again it seems the better part of wisdom to have authoritative study made in order that not only the committee and the Congress, but also all of the members of the railroad brotherhoods might be definitely certain that these benefits would be available without impairing their fund.

I hope that when this committee has completed its work, which should not require too much time, that it will be possible to further increase benefit payments to all. If the committee finds that this is possible, I certainly shall support it.

This railroad-retirement pension bill is one that is nonpartisan and should continue on that basis. It affects approximately 8,000,000 people who have rights in this fund, even though perhaps one-half of these people had perhaps less than 1 year's service with the railroads.

The cost is approximately $660,000,000 yearly and it represents money that has been contributed by the employees and the management instead of a contribution by the taxpayers. For all of this effort, I feel that the railroad employees and railroad management are to be congratulated. I further sincerely hope that they will continue to wisely spend their money for themselves, and continue to remember the other railroad employees who in future years will be retired and who will be expecting a pension in their later years.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee bill, as I believe this bill has the support of the railroad men of this country.

I have the honor of representing a large number of railroad workers who live in my district. Five railroads have division points in my district, located in five cities. I try to keep in touch with the sentiment of these railroad employees. When I was home recently I talked to a number of these workers and I believe I know pretty well what their attitude is on this legislation which we are now considering.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in providing increased benefits for our retired railroad employees and their survivors. I am indeed happy to be a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that has jurisdiction of this legislation. This legislation is close to my heart. I worked for a railroad in my home town for some time, and I am proud to number some of these railroad men among my very best friends. I am anxious to faithfully represent them in this House, and I have taken special pains to find out just what they are thinking about on these railroad retirement bills.

It is my firm conviction that the railroad employees, not alone of my district in Colorado, but throughout the country, would express themselves as follows if allowed to speak on this floor on this bill:

First. They want an increase in benefits.

Second. They want this increase now.

Third. They are opposed to any increase in taxes.

Fourth. They are opposed to any restriction on earnings.

Fifth. They do not want to be joined with social security.

Mr. Chairman, if each Member of this House wants to find out just what the railroad men in his district are thinking, he should go down to the railroad yards and talk to the workers. Let him visit the yard office, the roundhouse, the rip track, the storehouse, as well as the passenger and freight depots. Let him talk to the train dispatchers, the yard clerks, the switchmen, the train inspectors, the machinists, boilermakers, and all groups, including section hands. If you had that opportunity I feel confident you would find that the overwhelming sentiment would be for the five points I have just mentioned.

We should be thinking about the welfare of the railroad men when we discuss this legislation. They are the ones who have paid in their money over the years, having contributed half of the fund now on hand, the railroad companies having contributed the other half. I fully realize there has been a most unfortunate and bitter controversy between certain railroad groups over this legislation. I regret exceedingly that this is the case. However, let us not become involved in this dispute, but go down to the men themselves and find out what they want.

I have been receiving letters, just as you have, urging me to support H. R. 3669, the original Crosser bill. It is obvious that these letters have been inspired by railroad labor leaders in Washington. I am absolutely convinced that most of the men working for the railroads have no idea what is contained in H. R. 3669, as introduced, and that they are opposed to certain provisions of the same.

In answering these letters requesting my support of the so-called Crosser bill, I have pointed out briefly just what is contained in the bill, and why many railroad organizations are opposed to the same. I always mention the restriction of $50 on the amount any retired railroad worker can earn and still be eligible for a pension under the Railroad Retirement Act. I also mention the fact that under the Crosser bill railroad workers earning more than $300 per month must pay increased taxes.

Without exception, when informed of the work-restriction clause, the railroad employee has indicated his opposition to this provision and has urged me to oppose the same. I wish to quote from the following letter which just reached my desk today and is from a retired railroad worker living in my district:

I am not fully informed on the entire provisions of the Crosser bill as against the Hall substitute, but since my monthly annuity payments are only $86 06 I am definitely against the work clause. It is not possible to live on $136 06 per month under present conditions. Furthermore, I feel the principle involved is all wrong. There are certain fields not necessarily in competition with the labor market where we oldsters may still do our part, and I for one, do not relish the prospect of a mere existence and sitting down while waiting for the end to come.

I have always had the greatest admiration for Congressman BOB CROSSER, but I cannot agree with him on the work clause.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident this retired railroad worker has expressed the attitude of the railroad workers of America. They are unalterably opposed to being told they can earn only $50 a month after retiring. They want to be active as long as their health permits. They have paid for their pension, and Congress has no right to tell them how to live, or what they shall do, after they retire. It is unconscionable that we should even consider such a proposal. I am frankly surprised that such a restriction would have the support of any labor leader, as I am sure it is wholly unacceptable to the rank and file of railroad men in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I want to see our retired railroad employees receive the highest possible payments under the Railroad Retirement Act. The committee bill provides for an immediate increase of 15 percent, and 33⅓ percent to survivors Personally, I am willing to go even further and vote for larger increases. There is now a balance in the fund of almost $3,000,000,000 I think the fund will stand larger benefits, although I do not want to do anything which would impair the solvency of the fund.

I believe that railroad workers today are paying enough for the benefits they are receiving. Under the present law they will pay more starting next January, when their contribution will be 6¼ percent, to be matched with a similar contribution by the railroad company, or a total payment each month of 12½ percent This is a pretty substantial payment to make each month. I don't think the men want to pay any more.

I strongly feel that a study should be made as proposed in a pending resolution, which I hope will be passed by this House tomorrow. Under the committee bill we will give immediate increases to pensioners and survivors. The proposed study can be completed by February, and we can then determine if further increases can be put into effect without jeopardizing the fund. This seems to be the logical and sensible approach to this very complicated and highly technical problem. I am disappointed that we have not passed a bill providing for these increased benefits months ago. Our committee has been working diligently since May on this legislation. I proposed at the beginning of the hearings that we should provide immediate increases, and then make a more thorough examination into the whole matter. I regret this was not done. Let us not delay any longer what should have been done 6 months ago.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time remaining to me to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I am glad this bill to increase pensions and annuities for railroad employees and to increase survivors' benefits has finally come before the House for consideration. Frankly I think it should, and could have been brought before the House months ago if the administration's leadership who has the responsibility of programing and directing legislation had expressed and exerted the proper interest in this legislation.

I have realized for the past 2 years that due to the increased cost of living that the retirement benefits should be increased. I introduced a bill in the Eighty-first Congress seeking to increase railroad pensions, annuity, and survivor benefits. The administration showed no interest in the legislation.

At the opening of this Congress, I reintroduced the bill and testified before the committee during the hearings in support of the general principle carried in the bill before us. I mailed copies and an analysis of the bill to a majority of the railroad men in my district and explained the purpose of the legislation was to increase pensions, annuities, and survivor benefits as much as the trust fund would stand and still remain sound.

I urged in my testimony before the committee the necessity of passing legislation at the earliest possible moment because of the hardship being brought about by reason of the constant increase in the cost of living.

The railway workers should know consideration of this legislation has also been delayed because of disagreement on the legislation which developed between the operating groups of railroad employees, and the nonoperating groups.

After 3 weeks of hearings and testimony, a majority of the committee, realizing the extreme need of the railway employees for an increase to meet the high cost of living, reported out the bill which is now before us to increase pensions and annuities by 15 percent and to increase survivor benefits by 33⅓ percent.

Mr Chairman, the operating crafts and many Members of the Congress are supporting this bill because it will give immediate increases to the railway employees as soon as the bill clears the House, is approved by the Senate, and is signed by the President.

Many members and labor officials fear that unless the compromise bill is passed, that no legislation is likely to result because this session of Congress is speedily coming to a close. That would be a tragic mistake if it should happen.

They feel that the controversial issues raised in the Crosser bill should be further considered by the committee, the Railroad Retirement Board, the Federal Security Administration, and the Bureau of the Budget who are generally opposed to the Crosser bill in its present form, and this committee bring in legislation in the succeeding session that will find the right answers to these controversial issues and then be enacted into the present bill by amendments.

Here are some of the objections to the Crosser bill:

First, it would stop the pension on any retirement benefit of a retired railway employee for any month, or months, he earns over $50 a month after he leaves the service. I am opposed to this provision of the Crosser bill for two reasons. First, the pensioner and the management under the Railway Retirement Act has paid for this pension. It belongs to the railway pensioner and we do not have a right to change the law and take it away from him. To me it is unfair and unthinkable.

Secondly, this provision in the Crosser bill tends to encourage him to continue to work beyond his retirement age which in fact prevents younger men from being promoted, and helps to freeze the older men in their jobs to the disadvantage of the younger men. In fact it makes less jobs, when one of the purposes of the retirement act was to make more jobs for younger men in the service.

Another provision of the Crosser bill would put all men now employed on railroads with less than 10 years' service under social security, yet so long as they held their railroad jobs would have to pay 6 percent of their salary into the railroad retirement fund, while all social-security workers in other lines of employment would have to pay in only 1½ percent of their salary or wages. This seems unfair to me and I think should have more study before such a drastic step is taken.

Mr. Chairman, the Crosser bill would broaden the social security base by raising the taxable earnings from $300 a month to $400 a month which would take $6 a month more out of the wages of all employees who earn $400 a month. This would penalize this group and would work a special injustice on the unmarried man who would be making a forced contribution for a surviving wife when he has none.

A number of other objections have been raised to the very confusing and complex provisions of the Crosser bill which time will not permit me to point out

MUST KEEP RETIREMENT FUND SOUND

Many railroad men for long years have paid a heavy contribution to their railroad retirement fund relying on it to help tide them over their years of retirement They do not want this fund weakened and endangered. They want it to remain sound. That is the reason the operating brotherhood officials and the members of the committee at this time, and in this legislation, have held the increase of annuities and pensions down to 15 percent increase and the survivor increase down to about 33⅓-percent increase They believe we should pass this compromise bill now which will give them this much relief, and hold over these new and controversial matters for further and careful study.

GOVERNMENT EXPERTS OPPOSE CROSSER BILL

F. C. Squire of the Railroad Retirement Board testified as follows:

In my opinion, the bill as amended—

The compromise bill before us—

is much preferred over the original bill—

Meaning the Crosser bill—

which contemplates savings from a partial coordination with social security and contains other defects. The study of accounting called for to be reported in 1956 in my opinion would be too long deferred. Moreover, it provides for increases in benefits far in excess of the most optimistic estimates of savings to be realized through any or all the methods provided for or contemplated in the bill and would have the effect of making the Railroad Retirement System unsound.

Mr. Squire, one of the ablest members of the Railroad Retirement Board, gave a clear explanation, pointing out the many defects of the Crosser bill and in closing his testimony, said:

In conclusion, I should repeat that in my judgment the enactment of the Crosser bill in its original form would gravely endanger the solvency of the railroad retirement system. This was also the opinion of the insurance actuaries who testified at the hearings Further, he said, "I think the bill as amended (the present bill) goes as far in the way of liberalization as reasonable prudence and safety will permit."

Mr. Chairman, these are statements from F. C. Squire, one of the ablest members of the Railroad Retirement Board, and the opinion in substance of its actuaries. I am not willing to go against their judgment and take a chance on destroying the trust fund to the great loss of the railway employees who have sacrificed from their wages to build it up.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Security Agency which should know more about this type of legislation than probably any other agency of Government testified before the committee in detail and at great length in opposition to the Crosser bill. I will quote only a few lines of the testimony given by its representative, John L. Thurston, Acting Administrator. In discussing the social-security proposal in the Crosser bill, he said:

The provisions of the Crosser bill which govern the coordination payments by the two programs are inconsistent and difficult to understand and to explain. It is difficult to justify the inconsistency of these provisions on any basis other than a historical one, and almost impossible to secure a clear understanding among the noncareer railroad workers and their families as to what program they should look to for benefits, or what protection they are actually afforded.

Mr. Chairman, again in his testimony, Mr. Thurston said:

We do not believe that the basis provided in the bill for the financial arrangements with the old-age and survivors insurance program is a sound one.

Further he testified:

It would appear that the coordination provisions of the bill would be cumbersome and expensive from an administration standpoint as a result of the increases in record keeping, transfers of records, and interagency clearances which would be involved.

Mr. Chairman, it appears that the railroad employee when mixed up in this red tape bureaucracy under the Crosser bill could never be sure of his status, and would never know what he had coming, when, or from what agency of Government. It is an unfair position to put the railroad men in when it is so unnecessary.

In closing his testimony on behalf of the Federal Security Agency, Mr. Thurston said:

The Federal Security Agency cannot recommend the enactment of the Crosser bill.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of the Budget, when asked for a report on the Crosser bill, pointed out many defects in the bill, and in its analysis at one point said:

An increase of $1,500,000,000 unfunded liability of the railroad retirement fund would result under the bill largely for credits to be given to older workers for their service prior to the establishment of the system, which presents a serious financial problem.

And again the Bureau of the Budget reports that—

The estimates of the Railroad Retirement Board show that in the absence of additional financing under the Crosser bill the trust fund would be completely exhausted in 50 years.

Mr. Chairman, now I want to quote briefly from the greatest authority in the United States who was the father of the Railroad Retirement Act, former Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, and who has helped to work out pension-retirement funds for the biggest organizations in America during the past 25 years of his constant study of this subject, Mr. Murray W. Latimer, who testified in opposition to the provisions of the original Crosser bill at the hearings recently held by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The printed hearings contain page upon page of his testimony. However, I will quote in substance, for brevity, just a few of his remarks.

Mr. Latimer at one point in opening his testimony before the committee said in substance, "I think there are ways to deal with this problem. Those ways are not in the bill"—the original Crosser bill—"to which I want particularly to address myself financially and otherwise."

Further discussing the original Crosser bill he said:

There were 3 basic principles included in the Railroad Retirement System. The first was, there was to be no forfeiture to the right of an old age annuity on which a tax had been paid. The Railroad Retirement Act said they would pay him an annuity when he became 65 and left his employment. I had assumed that that was a pledge of the Government of the United States which was to be kept.

Referring to the original Crosser bill, he said:

This bill proposes to repudiate that pledge.

He also said.

Now I have a number of objections to the original Crosser bill.

First. It would result in a tax levy on the vast majority of railroad workers from now on in perpetuity and in return for which it is not proposed to give equivalent value.

Second. It would produce a forfeiture of annuity rights for millions of former railroad workers with no adequate offsetting value and frequently no offsetting value at all.

Third It would have the effect of reducing some annuities immediately and many others within the next 2 or 3 years This is far from a bill to increase annuities.

Fourth. It would introduce inequities on a staggering scale and that also in perpetuity.

Mr. Latimer said:

This bill is not going to help labor relations and it is going to make labor relations worse and I think I have a right after 25 years in this field to say so.

Summing up, he said:

I do not think that I have ever seen another legislative proposal by a serious group of people who advocated plain, outright, point-blank repudiation of Government obligations. That is exactly what this bill does.

Mr. Chairman, when one reads the testimony given before the committee and observes that the ablest men in Government and elsewhere who testified are practically unanimous in their opposition to the original Crosser bill and that practically all of them favor the bill before us, I think we must come to the conclusion that the best service we can render at the present time to the millions of fine railroad employees is to pass the committee bill, try to rush it through the Congress and to the President as quickly as possible before this session of Congress recesses.

This bill will increase annuities, pensions, and survivor benefits now, as much as competent experts think the trust fund will stand. They need this relief now. We should pass this legislation today and put the increases into immediate effect.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3669) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ARMED SERVICES BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the armed services bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

A LONG-RANGE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which I consider vital to a strong, healthy, expanding national economy. Without fear of contradiction, I categorically state that we cannot have a strong, healthy, expanding national economy without a healthy and prosperous agriculture. We well remember what happened to agriculture in the thirties and the near fatal results on our national economy. This must not be permitted to happen again.

The price support program instituted by Congress has helped to assure the farmer a fairer price for his products. But, it is inadequate. The farmer must have full 100 percent parity price for his produce.

Mr. Speaker, the present support program operates through loans and direct Government purchases. Under the loan program, farmers receive a loan on their crop. Then they can do one of two things.

First. Sell the crop at going market prices, which may be higher than the support price, and pay off the loan with the proceeds.

Second. Let the loan lapse—if market prices are down—and turn the crop over to the Government.

Under the direct purchase program, the Government supports prices by buying crops when necessary.

It is true that this program has resulted in losses. I am informed that support losses for the fiscal year ending June 20 were approximately $345,000,000. The Government lost $249,000,000 in fiscal 1950: $254,000,000 in 1949; $125,000,000 in 1948; $71,000,000 in 1947; and a yearly average of $125,000,000 from 1941 to 1946. Because of these losses, the farmer and the support program have been severely criticized and maligned.

This criticism is not justified. The support program was never intended to be self-liquidating. Its purpose was to provide the farmer a fairer price for his products in relation to the cost of the items he must buy. As a result of this program the purchasing power of the farmer has been expanded and the entire economy has benefited. It must be pointed out, however, that this program is not and has not been considered as a long range program. It is stopgap legislation at its best

Mr. Speaker, I was born and reared in a farm community and have lived in a rural community all my life. I know farmers and I know that not a single one of them wants something for nothing. They are self-reliant and all they ask is a fair chance They do not want subsidies at the taxpayer's expense. All they ask is a fair price at the marketplace for their produce. They want a farm program that will be operated and controlled by the farmers themselves and not from Washington.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was first introduced on May 15, 1950, during the Eighty-first Congress. Into this bill has gone the sound, solid advice of thousands of South Dakota and upper Midwest farmers Before the bill was introduced in 1950, I invited 85,000 farmers to some 32 grass-roots meetings in my district. From these meetings, which were nothing more than frank, down-to-earth forums on the needs and desires of agriculture, came many of the provisions of this farm bill. Since this series of meetings, I have had the opportunity to travel throughout my district. Again I talked over this plan, its provisions and its potentialities with grass-roots farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the people of my district are behind this plan.

We know that the dramatic, threatening world situation which has grown increasingly worse during the past year has demanded more and more from the American farmer. Mobilization and the international situation have created a new, increased and sudden demand for agricultural commodities. This new demand comes at a time when our American farmers are producing on just about every available acre of farm land. The products of the most scientific and productive agriculture in the world can lead us to victory in war and victory in peace.

We dare not continue to let the American farmer down. We must see that our American farmers get a fair return on investment, time, money, and effort with a minimum of controls and without expense to the Treasury.

There are some who say we don't need a farm program. They try to place the blame for the high cost of living and inflation on the American farmer.

I say such a viewpoint is merely the part of a giant conspiracy to smear our farmers, and I, for one, hold no brief for such arguments. There is one answer to such an argument against which none of the smear campaigners have ever found a defense, and it is that our farmers are the only businessmen who do not place a price tag on their products. The farmer hauls his produce to market and is forced to accept the price the processor or consumer offers.

The manufacturer, on the other hand, takes into consideration the cost of his materials, the cost of his labor, and other factory expenses including a fair margin of profit. Then he sets the price on his articles and offers them for sale.

The manufacturer is in reality offering his articles at parity. He wants, deserves, and gets a price for his products which takes into consideration his expenses and a fair profit. Congress certainly can't deny this same break to the farmers of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, a few examples prove that the farmer is not getting a fair break

The same two-bottom tractor plow, which cost the farmer $139 in 1946, sold for $230 in 1950 and last March was selling for $256, an increase of 84 percent over the 1946 price.

A side-delivery rake, which sold for $96 in 1946, cost $190 in 1950 and the price had risen to $225 in March of this year, an increase of 135 percent.

A grain drill priced at $194 in 1946 had risen to $404 in 1950 and in March of this year was selling at $455 or an increase of 135 percent

Two-row corn planters, which sold at $108 in 1946, cost the farmer $202 in 1950 and in March of this year were selling at $234, an increase of 117 percent.

These are typical examples of how the prices of the things the farmer needs and buys have gone up and up. Now, let us look at the price of the things the farmer sells.

Highest postwar price for wheat was $2.81 a bushel in January 1948. On August 15, 1951, wheat was $2.05 while parity was $2.41.

Postwar peak for corn was January 1948 at $2.46 a bushel. August 15 price was $1 65 and parity $1.75.

Potatoes reached a postwar peak in April 1948 at $2.07 a bushel. On August 15 they were $1.17 a bushel and parity was $1.80.

Postwar peak of 58.7 cents a dozen for eggs was reached on December 1947. August 15 price was 48.3 per dozen while parity was 52.8 cents per dozen.

April 1951 saw the postwar peak of $30.20 a hundred for beef cattle. On August 15 beef cattle were $29.10 while parity stood at $19.80. This is one of the few exceptions where farm produce is over full parity.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this bill points the way to a long-range farm program that must be adopted by Congress. Such a program will protect the farmers against low prices and a return to the economy of the thirties. Such a program is essential if we are to have a healthy, prosperous, and growing national economy.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Agriculture Committee, of which I am a member, will conduct hearings on this plan or some similar plan which has the following objectives:

First. A farmer-controlled plan: The program would operate from the bottom up rather than from the top down as at present. Farmers themselves would manage the program through elected county committees and State and national boards. The program would become operative only after a two-thirds affirmative vote in a national referendum.

Second. Self-financing: Marketing quotas allocated on over-all normal United States domestic requirements would regulate sales instead of acreage controls regulating production. In the event of surplus, the producer thereof could sell it only after purchase of additional marketing certificates from his county committee Proceeds from sales of additional marketing quota certificates would finance disposal of surplus and the administration of the program. The self-financing feature assures an agriculture that stands on its own feet with its head high without dependence upon Government doles or subsidies.

Third. Full parity to farmers: The plan recognizes that less than full parity of the farmer means loss in gross farm income and a resulting seven-times drop in national income. Producers would be assured of full parity on their share of normal domestic consumption. The national board would maintain price through purchases and loans financed by sale of surplus marketing quota certificates.

Fourth. Protection for the consumer: The consumer's grocery bill would not skyrocket because the bill authorizes the National Board to sell on the domestic market when prices reach 105 percent of parity.

Fifth. Two-price system: The plan would be based on the same principle used in every busines today—sell bulk at parity price; dispose of surplus at sale price. The farmer would receive one price—full parity—for his share of domestic consumption at the market place. If he produced surplus and decided to dispose of it he would net a lower price on that part of production. The price differential would be used to finance disposal of surplus.

Sixth. Orderly disposal of surpluses: With money collected from the sale of

surplus marketing quota certificates, the National Board would dispose of surpluses by, first, a food stamp or school-lunch plan; second, exports consistent with United States commitments—United States might trade food to foreign nations for strategic materials such as rubber, uranium, magnesium, and so forth; third, developments of new chemurgic uses for farm products such as plastics, medicine, fuels—this field has hardly been explored.

Seventh. Protection for family-sized farmer: The plan recognizes that 6,000,000 out of the 10,000,000 business units in America are independently owned and operated farms. Thus, any long-range program must be based around the family-sized farmer. In the prosperity of the small operator, the backbone of America's productive and consumptive capacity, rests this Nation's strength or weakness. One section of the bill spells out protection for the family-type farmer.

Eighth. Coordinated soil-conservation program: Recognizing that soil conservation is vital to progressive, prosperous agriculture, the plan contemplates a comprehensive, Government-encouraged program to protect the Nation's most valuable resource—the fertility of the topsoil.

The bill I have reintroduced is a long-range farm program and not stop-gap legislation. The farmers themselves must adopt the program before the provisions go into effect. This is not a mandatory program, but is discretional with the farmers. It is designed to give the farmer full parity at the market place without Government subsidies. It is operated by the farmers themselves. This program is an orderly marketing program designed to give the farmer a fair price for his products at the market place.

I hope that all Members of Congress will have the opportunity to study this legislation. It embodies the principle which will eventually have to be included in any long-range farm program. It takes the farmers' problems out of the Department of Agriculture and politics. It places the problems of the farmers in the hands of the farmers themselves. It is designed to give the farmer full parity without Government assistance. It is a plan that the farmers can put into operation themselves if and when necessary. It represents a sincere desire to help the basic industry of our country right at the farm level.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to use this time today, and ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, about 18 years ago the Congress of the United States, under the pressure of great problems engendered by the depression, started giving to the executive department of the Government more and more power and it has continued to surrender more and more power as the years have passed until we have now reached the place where the Executive exercises much more power than was ever envisioned by the framers of this form of government. The very genius of our American system found its fruition in the concept which held that there was to be an equal distribution of governing power between the legislative, the judiciary, and the executive branches of the Government; each exercising a check on the other in such a way as to guarantee the citizenry against the usurpation of too much power by either of the other two.

Caught in the throes of a horrible depression which came to this country as part of the economic backlash of World War I, the Congress desperately sought means by which to set our economy on the right road to recovery. Lashed with a feeling of urgency engendered by long bread lines and the cries of hungry men, women, and children, expediency became the order of the day. Harassed on every hand by job-seekers who were seeking from Government that which a sick economy was not in position to offer, the Congress of 18 years ago, in the grievous urgency of the pressing moment, became prone to seek the apparently easy way out of the dilemma facing it. This easy way was offered by the Executive who, in effect, said: "Give to me and my executive department the authority and the money with which to implement the authority and I will solve all the problems for you. I, along with my many bureaus, departments, commissions, and so forth, will do the job in such a way as to relieve you of the responsibility." In its desperation the Congress did that which was suggested by the Executive and since that day it has continued to surrender more and more of its constitutional prerogatives to the executive department that has grown more and more insatiable in its lust for power as the ensuing years have passed.

It has been well said by some wise man that "following the pathway of least resistance causes both rivers and men to become crooked." Taking the easy way by the Congress of the United States has not necessarily meant that those who have composed the Congress have become crooked in the usual meaning of the word but it does mean that the legislative branch of the Government has lost its sense of direction. It has reached the place where too often it is content to meekly follow the lead of the Executive instead of boldly charting a course of its own. Fear that some pet project of individual Members will not receive Presidential blessing or fear that petty patronage will be withheld, has worked to hold Congress in acquiescent deference to the Executive.

It would be foolish to charge that all the various programs and plans that have been proposed by the Executive in the last 18 years have been bad but the fact remains that responsibility that should rest on the Congress has been gradually shifted to the Executive. This shift has not always been the result of coercion by the Executive but has been all too often welcomed by the Congress. As the shift has been made the Executive has come to be increasingly jealous of the powers given him and more and more loath to surrender them when the expediencies of the moment have gone.

In almost every case the surrender of constitutional authority by the Congress to the Executive has been attended by some sort of an emergency. In too many cases these emergencies, both real and fancied, have been used as an excuse for the surrender of authority instead of as a real reason for so doing. Finding that the Congress, though reluctant to do so under normal circumstances, was willing to grant extraordinary powers to the Executive when an emergency could be used as an excuse for doing so, the Executive has become very adept at the art of creating one emergency after another; some being real and some purely within the realm of fantasy.

The latest emergency in which we find ourselves is the Korean war. In spite of the fact that our recognized military leaders had testified as to the untenability of any proposed position we might propose to assume in Korea militarily and had definitely stated that Korea was beyond the periphery of our proposed defense line in the Pacific, a little over 15 months ago the President of the United States did order American troops into Korea.

There are those who hold that the President did not have the constitutional authority to order troops into Korea On the contrary, until war is actually and technically declared; actual declaration of war being still the prerogative of the Congress, the President does have the authority under the provisions of the instrument which made us a member of the United Nations Organization to take the action he took in ordering troops into Korea. The instrument to which I refer was duly ratified by the other body of this Congress and the responsibility for actions taken in its implementation must of necessity be shared by the ratifying body.

Although I happen to be one of those who felt in June of last year, and so publicly stated, that the ordering of troops into Korea was a mistake, and am even more confirmed in my belief today, the fact remains that our troops are there and are being sent in ever-increasing numbers to die for no apparent good purpose in that there seems to be no real goal toward which they are being ordered to fight.

In an effort to absolve themselves of the guilt implied by having moved our troops into a position which our military leaders had testified to be untenable, the

proponents of the Korean war have said that by stopping the aggressor in his tracks we could gain at least a psychological victory. This assumption on their part has been conclusively denied by that which has transpired. After the sacrifice of approximately 100,000 casualties in a theater outside and beyond our proposed defense line in the Pacific, we now find our proud and capable fighting men placed in the ignoble position of attending so-called truce talks in the role of the vanquished.

Although I have already said that much of the authority that has been transferred by the Congress to the Executive has been without any coercion on the part of the Executive, there have been many instances where the Executive has used emergencies of one kind or another to place Congress in such position as to be almost forced to take certain actions. A case in point of this is found certainly in the present Korean crisis where the Congress has been forced to enact legislation authorizing various kinds of controls and providing for increased taxes.

In speaking of taxes, it can safely be said that the people of this country are now being taxed almost to the point where the law of diminishing returns will be reached. And as if the very burden of taxes were not enough to ruin our economy, the Government continues to compete with private enterprise in such a way as to destroy whatever incentive might be left after the payment of exorbitant taxes.

Of course, the Korean crisis is only a part of the over-all dilemma in which we find ourselves today. The one good purpose the Korean adventure has served has been to emphasize the fact that we are living in a dangerous world. No normally prudent man can deny that we have a dangerous adversary in the form of communistic Russia, and none who are prudent would gainsay the wisdom of doing all that is humanly possible to prepare ourselves against this sworn enemy. However, evidence grows on every hand that we are dissipating our energies, our manpower, our material, and our money in a most stupid and unbusinesslike way.

We are playing Russia's game in that we are either letting her call the shots as to where issues are to be joined or we initiate the joining of action on our own part in some sector which our military leaders have testified is untenable. We are even so gullible and adherent to some sort of befuddled theoretical concept that has been cooked up by the United Nations theorists who keep their heads in the clouds of fantasy, as to even, once the issues has been joined with the adversary in an untenable theater, fight in accordance with rules laid down by the enemy. An example of this foolish procedure is found without parallel in the way we have conducted our adventure in Korea. If the fighting of the war in Korea in such way as to leave at least some small hope for victory could be said to hasten the possibility of all-out war, then our every entrance into the fray can be indicted on the same ground.

All that can be said as to the wisdom or lack of it evidenced by our action in Korea does not alter the fact that we are presently there in great numbers and are committed to the sending of untold additional men and material into this conflict. While we are pursuing this commitment under the misguided direction of a policy of expediency, we are concurrently attempting to build our defenses here at home to impregnable proportions. While we are engaged in this herculean task we are calling on the American people to make sacrifices on top of sacrifices; calling on them for more and more taxes; calling on them to buy more bonds; and calling on them to send their sons into various forms of the military service, both for immediate service on the many fronts of our far-flung commitments and for training for service in the future.

In face of the communistic threat, the American people do not object to paying higher taxes nor do they object to loaning the Government money by buying bonds as long as they know that this money is being spent wisely in providing them with security against the enemy. They do, and with just cause, bitterly object to paying higher taxes and buying more bonds only to see the money grossly wasted by those who are charged with the responsibility of spending it wisely.

Americans serve in the military establishment willingly as long as they are convinced it is necessary. They do not object to making all kinds of sacrifice even to the point of wearing the uniform on far-flung battlefronts of the world as long as the service has some real objective and as long as certain selfish pressure groups at home are not allowed to take advantage of the situation. They do not mind fighting for freedom abroad as long as it is not destroyed at home by those who think more of money and power than they do of the freedom for which these others are fighting. If freedom must be bought on foreign fields at the price of human blood then the very least we can do is preserve it here at home. This we are not doing, for, in deference to certain politically powerful pressure groups, we are allowing Americans to be forced to pay tribute to labor union racketeers before they are allowed to work even on defense projects. Not only are we allowing men to be forced to pay for the privilege of working on defense projects but we are allowing featherbedding of the worst sort to take place on these projects. At the very best we can do, our defense program is going to cost billions of dollars that must be eventually paid by the taxpayers of this country. The load will be heavy enough when we have exercised all the care we can and have reduced waste to an absolute minimum but the burden will become unbearable if we continue to allow conditions to exist such as that which I personally witnessed on last August 28 at the Savannah River H-bomb project located on the Savannah River near Augusta, Ga.

While at my home earlier this summer I heard repeated stories about how hundreds of men were being allowed to loaf on the Savannah River project. I also heard that labor racketeers were fleecing workers by requiring them to pay exorbitant fees for the privilege of working. Recalling that the same sort of thing was tolerated in this country during World War II, I was loath to believe that we had not profited by our mistakes to the point of allowing a repetition of these World War II practices. So loath was I to believe those stories that I decided to visit the project and see for myself what the conditions were.

On the morning of August 28 I, along with my secretary, John Ellis, went to the Savannah River project. Knowing that official investigators are sometimes shown that which those who are being investigated want them to see, I put on my overalls, khaki shirt and brogan shoes so that I would be mistaken for an average man seeking employment. Upon presenting myself for employment at the employment office I was told very quickly that I would be required to go back to Augusta, 25 miles away, and get cleared with the union before I could even be considered for employment I was told that if I got my name on the union list I would have a chance for employment; that when workers were needed on the project the union was called to send out the required number and type of workers.

Upon making inquiry of those who had been through the required procedure, I was told that the union in Augusta would charge me $50 as an initiation fee to work as a carpenter and $108 to work as a metal worker. Then I heard lots of testimony to the effect that these sums did not actually pay the initiation fee to work as a carpenter and $108 to work as a metal worker. I heard lots of testimony to the effect that these sums did not actually pay the initiation fee sufficiently as to secure the issuance of a regular union card but that these sums simply paid for a worker's permit which has no real union status since it can be taken from a worker on almost any pretext so that it can then be issued to another worker after the initiation fee has been collected from the one to whom it was first issued. Many others testified that those who were collecting these so-called initiation fees were not required to make any accounting to anyone as to the disposition of the funds. It is common talk around the project that those who are collecting tribute in the name of organized labor are getting very wealthy as a result of their racketeering practices. Instead of making such a fuss about investigating sports which people are not required to patronize, it would serve a much more useful purpose if these racketeering practices were investigated as is proposed by House Resolution 418, which I introduced here in the House shortly after my investigation of the conditions at the Savannah River project.

After I found that I could not even be considered for employment until I had first paid tribute to some labor union racketeer, Mr. Ellis and I spent the rest of the day going from place to place over the project in an effort to see whether men were working or merely making time as had been charged. During our day of watching the activity, or lack of it, I feel perfectly safe in charging that manpower was being wasted on

that project on that particular day at a ratio of at least 3 to 1. In other words, it appeared evident that 3 men were employed to do the work of 1 man in the areas I observed. Of course, I did not see all the activity that was supposed to be going on at the project. I can only testify as to that which I saw and heard in the areas where I had time to go.

If I had been allowed into the areas where the technical work was being done, I would not have been qualified to say whether manpower was being wasted since I am not a technician of the type employed there. I do, however, feel qualified to say within reasonable bounds of creditability that the digging of a simple hole in the ground approximately 3 feet square should not require the employment of 14 men with 3 foremen and 2 traffic directors. I did see this example of waste along with too many other examples to mention here and I left the project convinced that the law was being violated by the imposition of the closed-shop and the employment of the hiring-hall technique. I also left with the clear impression that literally millions of dollars were being wasted on this project along with the waste of millions of man-hours labor. Feeling that conditions prevailing at the Savannah River project were and are not confined to this project alone, I am convinced that it is high time that the Congress begin to place first things first by officially looking into the manner in which tax money is being spent in our gigantic defense program. Instead of wasting the time of the Congress on a lot of incidental side issues, we should busy ourselves with the job of saving money and manpower in such way as to get the maximum result from our expenditure of manpower and money, to say nothing of safeguarding the freedom of American citizens to work without being required to pay tribute to some labor union racketeer.

Many of those who were employed at the Savannah River project frankly stated that they wanted to work in such way as to really earn that which they were being paid but said that the work was either not provided or they were under orders to make it last as long as possible. Conditions such as this should not be tolerated and the sooner they are corrected the better it will be for everyone concerned. Unless this Congress does bestir itself to do something about such conditions as I have brought to your attention it will be seriously remiss on its duty and cannot absolve itself of blame by simply saying that the building of such projects is the province of the executive department.

It appears that we are drifting from day to day following a policy of expediency in the hope that some miracle will save us from our folly. We seem to have no real objective in Korea nor does there seem to be any answer forthcoming as to what our foreign policy will be when and if the Korean mess is settled. It may appear satisfactory for officials here in Washington to adopt an air of complacency about the outcome of hostilities in Korea; an attitude which holds that everything will work out so long as the emergency is kept alive for one reason or another; an attitude of drifting from day to day in the fond hope that something will happen to solve our problems for us. But while this sort of thinking prevails in Washington, what of the men who are dying to no real objective purpose in Korea?

It may be a police action to some befuddled politicians in Washington and to a President concerned with international politics but to those boys on the rugged hills of Korea, facing another bleak and bloody winter, it is war in all its fury, its frustration, its uselessness, its waste, its dying, and its crushing loneliness.

A police action, they say. Can you not just hear some young American in Korea as he struggles up one more of the uncounted hills, after having been shot in the throat with a Red bullet that was bought by the Reds from one of our so-called allies, trying to talk as the blood wells into his throat—trying—with his dying blood-drenched whisper to ask how much more he must be expected to give in order for it to be classified as war. Mr. President, how long, oh my, how long must this senseless slaughter of human life continue while you hide your head in the sand by calling the Korean war a police action.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FREIGHT RATE DISCRIMINATIONS AND THE DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, increased activities and expansions in our Nation's defense program have turned southward. Unprecedented changes are taking place below the Mason-Dixon line. As might be expected, the fullest cooperation is being given by our people. We are demonstrating to hostile forces around the world that democracies are not as soft and decadent as thought.

I desire to discuss the continuing problem of freight rate discrimination, as related to national defense.

Another important step has recently been taken in the long struggle to achieve greater uniformity of freight rates on rail traffic moving at class rates. In two reports adopted unanimously on July 26, 1951, the Interstate Commerce Commission ordered the railroads—Docket No. 28310—to file within 4 months a new and uniform classification of freight for Nation-wide application, and in the companion case—Docket No. 28300—it found as just and reasonable a scale of class rates graduated with distance up to 3,000 miles, for application in the territory roughly described as east of the Rocky Mountains when the new classification has been approved and put into effect. It is intended that these two measures, the uniform classification and the class-rate scale, shall be made effective simultaneously after the remaining problems and procedural steps have been worked out. The existing class rates in Mountain Pacific territory are under investigation by the Commission in a separate proceeding.

Thus, although some months may yet be required, it is evident that the long-sought objective of a uniform and equitable class rate structure is moving close to realization. Because of the wide scope and the effects upon highly competitive commercial and sectional interests, the proceedings in this complex matter have been strongly litigated and solutions in the interest of the Nation as a whole have been most difficult to reach.

An understanding of this problem and its difficulties requires some reference to how freight rate structures have developed over the years in the several parts of the country, and also an explanation of how freight classifications and class rates are related to each other. If they are to be helpful to the layman not familiar with the intricacies of freight rates, such explanations must be in as simple terms as the circumstances will permit.

In brief, it is the purpose of a freight classification to assign all of the various goods which may be shipped into a relatively few categories for similar rate treatment of those things which are placed in the same group. In that way it is not necessary to have a specific rate set independently for each of the thousands upon thousands of different commodities because those having like transportation and other characteristics can be grouped together as analogous articles. As one example, owing to their fragile nature and considerable value, fancy china and glassware might be classified together. The uniform classification toward which the Interstate Commerce Commission is aiming would provide a total of 30 such classes for traffic expected to move at class rates. Then for each of these classes a rate must be determined, appropriately scaled in relation to the others according to some standard and range of variation as to distance. Such rates, collectively, constitute what is called the class rate scale or structure. Consequently, the transportation charge to be paid on any given article will depend upon two things: The class to which it is assigned and the rate which is determined for that particular class.

That is where the trouble came with respect to nonuniformity and discriminations. Each major area of the country developed its own freight classification, known as the official—eastern—southern and western, and in addition the Illinois classification had a limited interstate application. These different classifications were not unified with each other and they have been applied in conjunction with scales of class rates which also are dissimilar in important respects. Not only have these separate class-rate systems resulted in unequal charges and discriminations with respect to movements of the same commodities within the several territories, but special difficulties and complications are encountered in choosing between them or forming blended rates on interregional traffic which moves from one territory to another. Adding to the complexities, there have been many departures from these territorial rate systems in the form of numerous exceptions to the classifica-

tions and of key-point rates designed to accommodate competitive traffic conditions. As stated by the Interstate Commerce Commission in its recent report in Docket No. 28300, "the effectiveness of the classifications has been greatly impaired by the use of numerous exceptions and special ratings superimposed on scales of exception-class-rate structures."

The great diversity of the classifications and class rate structures has made sound rate comparisons extremely difficult and technical, and in these circumstances sectional interests and strong controversies have been aroused. Particular examples of discriminatory situations have been cited back and forth as evidence that freight rates in general obstruct the economic development of one area and its industries as compared with another. These complexities and diversities also have hampered efforts to work out a uniform classification and class rate system, inasmuch as both shippers and carriers were concerned that the uniform ratings and rates which might be settled upon would affect them adversely as compared with those presently established in the rate structures of their particular regions. Along with that apprehension, there has persisted the strong conviction in some quarters that no single uniform structure of class rates could successfully be applied over the length and breadth of the whole United States in view of the significantly different economic and resource conditions and transportation characteristics which prevail as between the several regions of the country.

It was in this setting that the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1939 undertook its comprehensive class rate investigation to determine whether and how these conditions as to class rates might be improved. After extensive hearings and analysis of the issues presented in this proceeding, conducted during the war period, the Commission in its original decision in 1945—262 Interstate Commerce Commission, page 447—found that the existing widely different freight classifications and the applicable class rates caused unjust discrimination forbidden by the Interstate Commerce Act and that this condition should be corrected by applying to a new Nation-wide uniform classification a uniform class rate scale within the official, southern, western trunkline and southwestern rate territories. As mentioned before, rates in the Mountain-Pacific group and on transcontinental traffic were not covered in the docket No. 28,300 class rate case, but are now under investigation by the Commission in another proceeding. Recognizing that the formulation of the new classification and class rate scale would take time, the Commission in its 1945 decision made an interim adjustment to alleviate the existing discriminations between the territories, providing for a 10-percent increase of class rates in official—eastern—territory and a 10-percent decrease in southern, western trunk line, and southwestern territories.

This interim adjustment was attacked by injunction suits brought by the State of New York and other Northern States and by the western railroads. The United States Supreme Court on May 12, 1947, on appeal, sustained the decree of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, holding that the Commission's findings as to unjust discrimination were abundantly sustained. The interim adjustment then went into effect on August 22, 1947, and the respondent railroads were given a reasonable opportunity by the Commission to initiate the development of a uniform classification by their own collective action. For this purpose the railroads set up a committee of experts which held numerous hearings with shippers and public bodies. The Commission's recent order of July 26, 1951, directing the railroads to file a new and uniform classification of freight within 4 months, indicates that this task is nearing completion.

The Commission in its report of July 26, 1951, noted that the disparities in rate levels, found in the original 1945 decision to be unduly disadvantageous to the southern and western districts, have been much lessened by the interim adjustments made effective in 1947 and also by the general freight-rate increases since the end of World War II, which have been greater in the official territory than elsewhere. It was further concluded, however, that—

> There still exist many marked differences in the class-rate structure within and between the several rate territories, despite a closer approach to uniformity that has been brought about in the process of changes with time.

There is no reason now to change the original decision made in 1945, the Commission goes on to say, because the present rates still give undue and unreasonable preference and advantage to official and Illinois territories and continue to subject southern, southwestern, and western trunk-line territories to undue and unreasonable prejudice and disadvantage in violation of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Referring to the removal of "man-made trade barriers which have been imposed upon the country" in consequence of different levels and gradations of class rates, the Commission concluded that conditions "demand a more homogeneous rate structure than existed when we approached this problem originally, or than resulted from our interim adjustment." Since this cannot be achieved without a basic unity in classification ratings throughout the country, the Commission has pressed upon the carriers the necessity to complete rapidly their preparation of and to file a new and uniform classification before November 26 so that they will be "in the position of no longer being violators of the provisions of the act that condemn the undue and unjust prejudices and disadvantages that we have found inherent in the existing classifications." In setting up a new scale of class rates to apply along with the prospective uniform classification, the Commission followed generally the proposal submitted by the southern railroads, extended out to 3,000 miles. The new uniform classification and class rate scale are intended to be put into effect simultaneously upon not less than 30 days' notice to the Commission and the public after the new classification has been filed, but it will be subject to possible suspension and further investigation, in whole or in part, if such action is found to be necessary by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. Accordingly, it is not possible at this time to say exactly when a uniform classification and rate scale may become effective, but it does not seem likely to be long delayed.

It is essential to recognize, also, that this proceeding before the Commission in Docket Nos. 28300 and 28310 is concerned only with freight traffic which moves on class rates Specific commodity rates, which exist in great variety and under which the great bulk of freight traffic is transported by the railroads, are not considered. Neither are the so-called column rates within its scope, nor the exceptions ratings and rates which, according to the Commission, are almost innumerable and the tariffs for which verge on incomprehensibility.

Consequently, the proposed systematization of the class rates proper will affect only a relatively small segment of the total freight rate structure and of the aggregate volume of rail freight traffic. While much of the traffic which moves on class rates consists of manufactured goods, it is likewise true that many manufactured articles in each of the territories are transported at other than class rates. According to a recent study by the Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics of the Interstate Commerce Commission, based upon a systematic sample analysis of waybills, in the year 1949 only about 2 percent of the total tonnage of rail freight traffic, carload and less-than-carload, was class-rate traffic. The Commission also has found that in 1949, over the country as a whole, the revenues from freight traffic taking class rates accounted for less than 8.6 percent of the total rail freight revenues, and that most of this percentage is attributable to less-than-carload traffic.

Such data indicate the extent to which the class rate systems have deteriorated as a factor in the actual movement of freight traffic in volume. As the Commission has pointed out—report in Docket No. 28300, July 26, 1951, page 125—a generally uniform classification does not preclude exceptions rating and rates where they are shown to be proper and necessary to assure the movement of traffic and to meet competition conditions. Establishment of a uniform freight classification and class-rate scale may, nevertheless, serve as a base upon which a more generally systematic freight rate structure of wider scope and greater coherence can, in time and with further effort, be developed.

On January 30, 1939, in the form of H. R. 3369, I introduced my first piece of legislation in this House, continuing my efforts to solve the complex and difficult subject of freight rates. It is pleasing to know that some progress has been made for which we are very grateful. With full cooperation on the part of all concerned, it is hoped that in the not distant future it cannot be truthfully

said that any section of our great country is being discriminated against in the matter of freight rates.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MANSFIELD in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD and to include an editorial.

Mr. ADDONIZIO and to include a letter and a newspaper article.

Mr. FURCOLO in two instances.

Mr. WICKERSHAM in six instances and to include articles on soil conservation.

Mr. ROBERTS and to include an address he delivered on October 1, 1951, at a meeting of the Alabama Club.

Mr. MADDEN and to include an editorial appearing in the Gary Post-Tribune.

Mr. GORDON and to include an article appearing in the Washington Star.

Mr. GATHINGS in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts in two instances and to include telegrams, letters, editorials, and a letter from the AMVETS.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware and to include an editorial.

Mrs. BOLTON and to include five editorials.

Mr. BOW and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARVEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENISON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAGUE and to include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. MORTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BERRY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JAVITS in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HORAN and to include an article.

Mr. BENDER in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include an address.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. HERTER in two instances and to include certain articles.

Mr. POULSON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILLIPS (at the request of Mr. POULSON) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include tables and other extraneous matter.

Mr. HINSHAW to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include tables and other extraneous matter.

Mr. MORANO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HESELTON to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MEADER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts).

Mr. BROWNSON (at the request of Mr. HARVEY).

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include two newspaper articles.

Mrs. HARDEN and to include an address by Mrs. ST. GEORGE, of New York, and also an address by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WERDEL.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include a statement recently made by Mr. Paul Strachan.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa and to include an editorial.

Mr. BOYKIN and to include a statement.

Mr. CARNAHAN and to include an editorial.

Mr. RABAUT and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2085. An act to further amend section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to underwriting and dealing in securities issued by the Central Bank for Cooperatives; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4496. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res 340. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1952.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DOLLINGER (at the request of Mr. KLEIN), for Thursday, October 4, 1951, on account of illness.

Mr. CRAWFORD (at the request of Mr. POULSON), on account of official duties in connection with important committee work.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinite leave, on account of official business on assignment.

Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinite leave, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 5, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

848. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting a letter relative to the case of George Filippos Poulakis or Arna Otakis, file No. A-2946254 CR 29777, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

849. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated November 16, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United State of displaced persons, who, upon arrival in possession of appropriate immigration visas, are found to be excludable as persons within the classes enumerated in section 1 (2) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

850. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Security Council, Executive Office of the President, transmitting National Security Council Determination No. 21, pursuant to section 1302, Public Law 45 (Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951), to the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MITCHELL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 436. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 1094). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 446. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5505, a bill to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept No. 1095). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LARCADE: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 5218. A bill for improvement of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet and the Mobile to New Orleans Intracoastal Waterway; with amendment (Rept. No. 1096). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. H. R. 5054. A bill making appropriations for the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1097). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TEAGUE: Committee of conference. S. 1864. An act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans who served during World War II, and persons who served in the military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1098). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COMBS:

H. R 5593 A bill authorizing the Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority, hereby created, and its successors, to construct, maintain, and operate bridges over Sabine Lake, at or near Port Arthur, Tex.; to construct, maintain, and operate all causeways, approaches, and appurtenances pertaining thereto; and to finance said objects by the issuance of bonds secured by the said properties and income and revenues; and for other purposes, to the Committee on Public Works

By Mr. KILDAY:

H R 5594. A bill to provide benefits for survivors of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H R 5595. A bill to provide for a national agricultural policy to be carried out on a self-sustaining basis, and to promote conservation and development of the Nation's soil resources, to the Committee on Agriculture

By Mr. MASON:

H R 5596 A bill to stop inflation and stabilize prices on a lower level by taxing the national income, the rate adjusted automatically each year in response to price trends to balance the budget, retire the debt, and restore and maintain the purchasing power of the dollar and the honor and credit of the United States, to the Committee on Ways and Means

By Mr. WICKERSHAM

H R 5597 A bill authorizing flood-control works in the Washita Valley by the Department of Agriculture, to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs BOSONE:

H R 5598 A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a parcel of land to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association, Salt Lake City, Utah; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr ABBITT:

H R 5599 A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Centre Hill Mansion, Petersburg, Va., to the Petersburg Battlefield Museum Corp., and for other purposes, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

By Mr SCRIVNER·

H R 5600 A bill for the relief of flood sufferers in designated flood disaster areas for losses of tangible personal property suffered in the July 1951 floods, to the Committee on Appropriations

By Mr. ABBITT:

H R 5601. A bill relating to the disposition of certain former recreational demonstration project lands by the Commonwealth of Virginia to the School Board of Mecklenburg County, Va; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H R 5602 A bill to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Frenchtown irrigation district, the Malta irrigation district, the Glasgow irrigation district, and the irrigation districts comprising the Owyhee Federal reclamation project, to authorize their execution by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY.

H R 5603. A bill to clarify the status of certain officers heretofore retired and granted retirement pay, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 5604 A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to authorize the extension of Federal old-age and survivors insurance to employees of institutions of higher education who are covered by State or local government retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H R. 5605. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy the Government-owned magnesium foundry at Teterboro, N J; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H R 5606. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to exempt persons engaged in overseas or foreign air commerce from certain requirements, including the requirement as to the payment of overtime compensation to customs employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means

By Mr MULTER·

H R 5607 A bill to provide income-tax exemptions for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr TALLE.

H R 5608 A bill to amend section 709 of title 18 of the United States Code, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee·

H R 5609 A bill to amend section 1716 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the transmission of poisons in the mails to persons or concerns having scientific use therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr FALLON

H J Res 342 Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of the Army to replace the crosses and other religious symbols which formerly marked the graves at the National Memorial Cemetery in Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORD

H Con. Res. 167 Concurrent resolution relative to courtesies and privileges extended to citizens of foreign countries, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY (by request)·

H Res 447 Resolution to extend the authority of the Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Food Products into the field of cosmetics, to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr WHEELER

H Res 448 Resolution authorizing payment of salaries of 50 pages of the House during recess or adjournment of the Eighty-second Congress, to the Committee on House Administration

H Res 449 Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 418; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr HOFFMAN of Michigan·

H Res 450 Resolution to amend rule XI (2) (f) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, to the Committee on Rules

H Res 451 Resolution to amend rule XI (2) (f) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, to the Committee on Rules

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature memorializing Congress to pass legislation providing for a shipbuilding program; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass legislation providing for a shipbuilding program; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to pass legislation providing for a shipbuilding program; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr ARMSTRONG:

H R 5610 A bill for the relief of Olaf Harburg and Maria Gerbothe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr BERRY·

H R. 5611 A bill authorizing the issuance of patents in fee to Oliver P Livermont; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

By Mr HINSHAW:

H R 5612 A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie J. Barry, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H R 5613 A bill to provide for the extension of certain United States letters patent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H R 5614 A bill for the relief of Tomaso Vitale, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H R 5615 A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Bossio, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr McDONOUGH·

H R 5616 A bill for the relief of Hugh L Mann, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr MORANO:

H R 5617 A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carmena Pizzarello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr MULTER:

H R 5618 A bill for the relief of Young Wai Kit, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr O'TOOLE (by request):

H R 5619 A bill for the relief of Joaquim Henriques, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr POULSON·

H R 5620. A bill for the relief of Helena Lubke, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr REECE of Tennessee

H R 5621. A bill for the relief of John Emory Oliver, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R 5622 A bill for the relief of Antoinette Di Cicco Macerollo; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr SMITH of Virginia (by request)·

H R 5623 A bill for the relief of Enrichetta F C Meda-Novara, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr TEAGUE·

H. R 5624. A bill for the relief of Tokusaburo Imamura Glasscock, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. VAIL:

H R 5625 A bill for the relief of Ng Low Gene and Ng Len Go; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr WOLVERTON:

H. R. 5626 A bill for the relief of Samuel, Agnes, and Sonya Lieberman, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

448 Mr. BOGGS of Delaware presented a resolution of Wilmington Aerie No. 74, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Wilmington, Del; relative to requesting unceasing efforts to secure the release and freedom of William N Oatis, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, our Father, whose heart always opens with love in response to those who truly seek Thee, inspire us now with a greater faith in prayer and may we never set any limits to its efficacy and its possibilities.

Grant that daily we may yield ourselves in a glad and willing obedience to the mind of our blessed Lord for we are desperately in need of His spirit to give us hope and courage and to restrain us from harboring those feelings of cynicism and doubt which so often storm the citadel of our souls.

May we be eager to have a larger part in hastening the dawning of that better day when out of this world's tragedies and tyrannies, its hatred and bitterness, its bigotry and prejudice, its selfishness and sin, there shall emerge a social order that has in it the Master's spirit of good-will and kindness and love.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S 2170 An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT NO. 1097)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 53, 55, and 56.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 34, 35, 44, 47, 51, and 52, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That no part of such sum shall be used to pay the retired or retirement pay of any commissioned member of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force who is voluntarily retired after the date of enactment of this Act, unless such member was retired because of (1) being unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating by reason of a physical disability incurred in line of duty, or (2) achieving the age at which retirement is required by law, or (3) whose application is approved in writing by the Secretary of Defense stating that the retirement is in the best interests of the service, or, is required to avoid cases of individual hardship"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"EXPANSION OF UNITED STATES AIR POWER

"For the purpose of providing continuous expansion of United States air power by providing additional construction of aircraft and related procurement, Department of the Navy, $333,000,000; and by providing additional aircraft and related procurement, Department of the Air Force, $667,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, That until July 1, 1952, further collection by the Comptroller General of the United States or government accountable officers shall not be made on account of payments for accrued leave to enlisted members discharged for the purpose of immediate reenlistment"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act, and none of the property procured therewith, shall be available for transfer to any working capital fund under clothing and equipage in the Department of the Army under section 405 (d) of the National Security Act, as amended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$193,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided*, That expenditures of appropriations contained in this Act for public informational activities of the Department of Defense shall not exceed $10,950,000 including pay and allowances of military personnel assigned to such activities: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for expenditure in connection with recruitment advertising including sponsorship of radio and television shows by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy or the Department of the Air Force"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,076,056,430"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,775,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For the continuation of the construction of four projects authorized by Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress, approved January 6, 1951, and Public Law 43, Eighty-second Congress, approved May 31, 1951, to remain available until expended, $187,300,000 of which $85,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this heading to enter into contracts."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$19,043,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows.

"(b) No part of any appropriation contained in this Act for 'Pay and allowances' of military personnel shall be expended for the pay or allowances, accruing after November 30, 1951, of any enlisted member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served on active duty for a period of twelve months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending September 2, 1945, if such member shall have served on active duty for a period of sixteen months or more after June 26, 1950, unless such member shall have voluntarily consented to remain on active duty."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided*, That no appropriation contained in this Act, and no funds available from prior appropriations to component departments and agencies of the Department of Defense, shall be used to pay tuition or to make other payments to educational institutions in connection with the instruction or training of file clerks, stenographers, and typists receiving, or prospective file clerks, stenographers, and typists who will receive compensation at a rate below the minimum rate of pay for positions allocated to grade GS–5 under the Classification Act

of 1949, as amended; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 628 No appropriation contained in this Act shall be available on and after January 1, 1952, in connection with the operation of commissary stores of the agencies of the Department of Defense for the cost of purchase (including commercial transportation in the United States to the place of sale but excluding all transportation outside the United States) and maintenance of operating equipment and supplies and for the actual or estimated cost of utilities as may be furnished by the Government and of shrinkage, spoilage, and pilferage of merchandise under the control of such commissary stores, except as authorized under regulations promulgated by the Secretaries of the military departments concerned, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, which regulations shall provide for reimbursement therefor to the appropriations concerned and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall provide for the adjustment of the sales prices in such commissary stores to the extent necessary to furnish sufficient gross revenue from sales of commissary stores to make such reimbursement: *Provided, however,* That under such regulations as may be issued pursuant to this section all utilities may be furnished without cost to the commissary stores outside the continental United States and in Alaska"

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 54 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC 633. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for the payment of flight pay to personnel whose actual assigned duties do not involve operational or training flights"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figures inserted by said amendment insert "634"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 50.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L F. SIKES,
JOHN J. RILEY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
R B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B RUSSELL,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
HOMER FERGUSON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
KENNETH S WHERRY,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Amendment No 1, relating to salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary of Defense: Appropriates $14,100,000 instead of $13,800,000 as proposed by the House and $14,450,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 2, relating to retired pay: Limits the provisions of the amendment to "commissioned" members of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force who are "voluntarily" retired, or to those whose application for retirement is approved in writing by the Secretary of Defense in the best interest of the service, or to avoid cases of individual hardship, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3, relating to an emergency fund for the construction of aircraft and related procurement· Provides funds in the amount of $333,000,000 for transfer to the appropriation "Construction of aircraft and related procurement," Department of the Navy, and $667,000,000 for transfer to the appropriation "Aircraft and related procurement," Department of the Air Force, as proposed by the House.

The purpose of this amendment is to provide an additional fund for the procurement of aircraft and related procurement in order that there will be sufficient funds to place orders for long lead time procurement. This amount should be sufficient to enable the departments concerned to make any necessary procurements for the next few months, when proper presentations can be made to the Congress for further consideration of the entire procurement problem.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Amendment No. 4, relating to pay of the Army Prohibits until July 1, 1952, the further collection of payments for accrued leave that have been made to enlisted members discharged for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for an indefinite period, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No 5, relating to clothing and equipage· Appropriates $1,506,681,000 as proposed by the House instead of $1,639,081,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6, relating to clothing and equipage. Prohibits use of funds in this act for working capital funds under clothing and equipage in the Department of the Army

The committee desires that a complete report be made under all working capital funds in the different services to the Committees on Appropriation of the House of Representatives and the Senate semiannually, and so directs.

Amendment No 7, relating to incidental expenses of the Army. Appropriates $193,000,000 instead of $187,914,000 as proposed by the House and $194,514,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8, relating to incidental expenses of the Army· Prohibits the use of funds appropriated in this act for expenditures for recruitment advertising, including radio and television shows. Examination of this matter will be the subject of further consideration.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10, relating to Transportation Service, Army: Appropriates $968,515,000 as proposed by the House instead of "$938,515,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter during 1953 and $30,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 for the purposes authorized in this paragraph," as proposed by the Senate.

The bill as passed by the House included funds in several instances for procurements in excess of the procurements that might be made during fiscal year 1952 This was done for the purpose of providing authority to the departments to enter into long lead time procurements, a portion of which would not be delivered and require payment therefor until after the end of fiscal year 1952. The Senate proposed to separate the amounts required for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 from those that would be required thereafter in order to make clear that the total sum appropriated would not flow into the stream of purchasing power during fiscal year 1952. That purpose, we think, has been clearly established in the publicity that has been given the matter. The Senate concurs in the proposal to return to the House position.

Amendments Nos. 11 and 12, relating to the Signal Service of the Army· Appropriates $1,213,707,000 as proposed by the House instead of $817,931,000 and $400,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendments Nos. 13 and 14, relating to Medical and Hospital Department· Appropriates $269,580,000 as proposed by the House instead of $259,580,000 and $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16, relating to Engineer Service, Army: Appropriates $1,166,049,000 as proposed by the House instead of $1,126,049,000 and $40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos 9 and 10 above

Amendments Nos 17 and 18, relating to Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army: Appropriates $8,307,500,000 as proposed by the House instead of $3,332,082,'30 and $4,743,974,000 as proposed by the Senate with explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20, relating to Chemical Service, Army: Appropriates $122,560,000 as proposed by the House instead of $102,560,000 and $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos 9 and 10 above.

Amendment No 21, relating to salaries, Office of the Secretary of the Army: Appropriates $3,723,400 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,625,000 as proposed by the House

Amendment No 22, relating to salaries, Office of the Judge Advocate General· Appropriates $743,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $700,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No 23, relating to salaries, Office of the Quartermaster General· Appropriates $9,875,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $9,625,000 as proposed by the House

Amendment No 24, relating to salaries, Office of the Chief of Transportation· Appropriates $4,024,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,800,000 as proposed by the House

Amendment No. 25, relating to salaries, Office of Chief of Ordnance Appropriates $6,750,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26, relating to salaries, Department of the Army: Limits the expenditures for salaries, Department of the Army, to 95 percent of the amount appropriated in the specific items for salaries.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Amendments Nos. 27, 28, and 29, relating to construction of aircraft and related procurement: Appropriates $4,000,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $1,050,000,000 and $2,950,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above

Amendments Nos. 30 and 31, relating to shipbuilding and conversion: Appropriates

$1,343,297,000 as proposed by the House instead of $245,040,000 and $1,098,257,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendments Nos. 32 and 33, relating to ordnance for shipbuilding and conversion: Appropriates $431,390,000 as proposed by the House instead of $75,000,000 and $356,390,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendment No. 34, relating to public works: Appropriates $51,657,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $50,414,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendent No. 35, relating to public works: Provides that $1,243,000 of the appropriation mentioned above in amendment No. 34 be used for construction at Newport, R. I., as proposed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Amendments Nos. 36, 37, and 38, relating to aircraft and related procurement: Appropriates $11,215,800,000 as proposed by the House instead of $3,215,800,000 and $8,000,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with explanation the same as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendments Nos. 39 and and 40, relative to major procurement other than aircraft: Appropriates $1,775,000,000 instead of $1,750,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,000,000,000 and $800,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, with explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10, above.

Amendment No. 41, relating to acquisition and construction of real property: Appropriates $187,300,000, of which $102,300,000 is for four projects authorized by Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress, as proposed by the Senate instead of $85,000,000 as proposed by the House; and eliminates the word "classified", as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 42 and 43, relating to research and development: Appropriates $425,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $225,000,000 and $200,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendment No. 44, relating to Reserve personnel requirements: Includes language "or on duty under section 5, National Defense Act, as authorized by law", as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45, relating to Reserve personnel requirements: Appropriates $19,043,000 instead of $17,543,000 as proposed by the House and $19,843,000 as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No 46, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Provides that enlisted members of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserves who served at least 12 months in World War II and who have served on active duty for a period of 16 months or more after June 26, 1950, shall be discharged unless such member voluntarily consents to remain on active duty.

Amendment No 47, relating to general provisions of the bill: Provides that appropriations for "instruction and training, including tuition," shall be "specifically approved by the Secretary of the Department concerned," as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 48, relating to general provisions of the bill: Prohibits use of appropriation to pay tuition or to make other payments to educational institutions in connection with the instruction or training of file clerks, stenographers, and typists receiving, or prospective file clerks, stenographers, and typists who will receive, compensation below the grade GS-5 under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No 49, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Provides for the adjustment of the sales prices at commissary stores necessary to make reimbursements to appropriations to cover overhead or administrative costs, with certain exceptions such as transportation costs outside the United States.

Amendment No. 50, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Provides for 10 temporary positions in grades GS-17 and GS-18, of which not more than 5 shall be in grade GS-18, and not more than 4 positions shall be filled by promotion as proposed by the House instead of 15 temporary positions in the above-mentioned grades of which not more than 8 shall be in grade GS-18 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Prohibits gratuities to any officer or employee of the Government by contractors or their representatives, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Limits the number of full-time graded civilian employees to not more than 500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Deletes proposed reduction equal to 2½ percent of the amounts appropriated in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Corrects the section number to 633 and provides that no part of the appropriation shall be available for the payment of flight pay to personnel whose actual assigned duties do not involve operational or training flights.

It is the intention of the conferees to make certain that officers and airmen shall not be permitted to draw flight pay except for flights on specific orders for operational or training flights, including such flights as are necessary to maintain the proficiency of administrative personnel.

Amendment No. 55, relating to the general provisions of the bill. Eliminates a proposed Senate amendment proposing a reduction of $70,000,000 in research and development funds, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No 56, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Eliminates a proposed Senate amendment providing that "No part of any appropriations made by this Act shall be available to reimburse any person for expenses of travel in any amount in excess of the amount of the expenses actually incurred by such person in such travel," as proposed by the House.

Amendment No 57, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Inserts the figures "634" instead of the figures "630" (section number) as proposed by the House and the figures "637" as proposed by the Senate.

AMENDMENT REPORTED IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendment is reported in disagreement:

Amendment No. 50, relating to the general provisions of the bill providing for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, 10 temporary positions in grades GS-17 and GS-18, of which not to exceed 5 shall be in grade GS-18, and not more than 4 shall be filled by promotion. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
JOHN J. RILEY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, peace must be actively and affirmatively sought after just like victory in war requires aggressive and affirmative effort. The military-appropriation measure which is before us today in the form of the conference report is not a war measure; it is a peace measure. This is a part of the peace offensive of the United States.

We are not attempting to rattle the saber, to threaten and intimidate, or to instill fear in the hears of peace-loving people. On the contrary, by affirmative action, we seek to give hope to free people, to give some greater degree of security to our own Nation and to give discouragement to totalitarianism and aggression. The conference report, the final version of the bill as agreed upon by the conferees, is substantially what the bill contained when it passed the House.

The conference report provides $56,900,000,000 for the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the current fiscal year. Of this amount $19,888,032,030 is for the Army, $15,877,891,000 for the Navy and Marine Corps, and $20,642,785,000 for the Air Force. The sum of $529,100,000 is provided for the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

It will be understood that when the current fiscal year began the Department of Defense had on hand about $37,000,000,000 from fiscal years 1950 and 1951 which had not been expended. Most of this money had been obligated, and much of it was not made available until late in the fiscal year 1951. The money made it possible for the Department of Defense to make firm contracts with industry for the procurement of tanks, ships, aircraft, and other weapons of war. Actually, much of the money will not be spent for a couple of years because of the long lead time required by industry for the actual delivery of certain items of procurement.

When we add the $56,900,000,000 which will be made available in the current measure to the $37,000,000,000 carry-over from previous fiscal years we will have a total available for expenditure by the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year of approximately $94,000,000,000. The Army, Navy, and Air Force expect to actually expend during the current fiscal year $40,000,000,000. Hence, the projected carry-over of funds into the next fiscal year will be about $54,000,000,000. This money is required, however, in order that the Defense Establishment can make firm contracts with industry for long-lead-time items such as airplanes, electronics equipment, ships, tanks, guided missiles, research and development programs, and expenditures of this general type. Of course, contract authorizations rather than actual appropriations could have been resorted to, but the contract-authorization procedure is confusing and more difficult of administration, and the contract-authorization procedure does not save any money directly or indirectly. It rather increases the costs of the defense program.

I think most of you know, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force spent during the last fiscal year about $20,000,000,000, or something over $19,000,000,000. During the current fiscal year, it is expected that while we are appropriating here $56,000,000,000, only $40,000,000,000 will be expended, and the other money will be obligated for the long lead time items.

The most important change which was made in the bill by the other body was the placing in the bill of a $5,000,000,000 national emergency fund, which was labeled for air power. There were hardly any strings attached to the $5,000,000,000. It was a sort of blank-check affair. In conference, and I think I violate no confidence, the Senate did not feel that the $5,000,000,000 was justified under the circumstances. No budget estimate had been submitted, and no sufficiently definite declaration was made to us as to precisely how the money would be spent. However, certain estimates were submitted but no complete and authoritative picture of the situation was presented. The Department of Defense was not ready for final action. We all agreed, and I think we are now agreed, and I think the House agrees, that additional funds are going to be necessary this year for air power in the United States Air Force, and in the Navy. But, since the program has not been fully set and crystallized, it was thought that $5,000,000,000 should not be provided at this time. However, the conference report does include the sum of $1,000,000,000 in addition, and above the budget requests, for the acceleration of our air power, so that we can move more rapidly from the 95-group program to a higher figure This money will be available for obligation for long lead time items such as aircraft and more particularly, electronic devices and so forth which are so critical and so difficult of procurement.

The $1,000,000,000 will provide for an immediate acceleration of Air Force objectives beyond 95 wings. Of course, this will only be a first step. January is not far away and when Congress reconvenes in January, Congress can provide new additional funds which will be necessary. By that time, Department of Defense officials will have finalized their program and will be in a position to outline in detail the new program to Congress. I personally have no doubt about the urgent necessity for a further implementation of our Air Force program. Many of us have advocated such an accelerated program for some time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 190]

Allen, La	Dawson	Jackson, Calif.
Anfuso	Deane	Kearney
Auchincloss	Delaney	Kennedy
Baker	Dempsey	Keogh
Bates, Ky.	Denton	Kilburn
Boggs, La	Dollinger	King
Bolton	Durham	Latham
Bramblett	Fernandez	Lucas
Brooks	Gamble	McCulloch
Brown, Ohio	Gregory	McMillan
Busbey	Hébert	McMullen
Celler	Heffernan	Marshall
Chelf	Hess	Miller, Calif.
Cole, N. Y	Holifield	Morrison
Crawford	Howell	Murphy
Murray, Wis.	Rivers	Staggers
O'Konski	Roosevelt	Stanley
Perkins	Sabath	Thompson, Tex.
Phillips	Sadlak	Velde
Powell	Scudder	Vinson
Price	Shafer	Watts
Prouty	Sheehan	Whitaker
Quinn	Short	Willis
Radwan	Sittler	Wilson, Ind.
Ramsay	Smith, Va.	
Redden	Spence	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 352 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has the floor.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, when the quorum call began I was discussing the accelerated program for air power and explaining that in the $56,000,000,000 military appropriation bill we had included $1,000,000,000 above and beyond the budget request which would be available to the United States Air Force and to the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy—one-third to the Navy and two-thirds to the Air Force—for the procurement of long lead time items, procurement which would be very helpful in expediting the movement from 95 wings to a higher level. That was the $1,000,000,000.

Each year, about October or November, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Department of Defense determine what their recommendations will be for the program for the succeeding fiscal year.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have unanimously agreed on the accelerated air-power program, but I am not at liberty to give the details of the agreement. The proposed accelerated program has not yet been approved by the Secretary of Defense, the President, and the National Security Council. After all, before final approval can be given the accelerated program, it is necessary to consider whether or not industry and labor can provide the materials and the construction essential to the program of expansion. Of course, there are also very grave fiscal considerations which must be weighed carefully by the executive branch of the Government and the Congress before a final decision can be reached on the exact magnitude of the new air-power program.

As I have said, I personally feel, and have felt for a long time, that we must increase the Air Force beyond the 95-wing program, and I am pleased to say that indications are that the Air Force will be increased in a series of steps from the present 95-wing structure to about 140 wings.

In my judgment, a supplemental appropriation bill will be required for the current fiscal year within the range of five to ten billion dollars for augmentation of our air power and for costs incident to the Korean war. These supplemental requests could be submitted to Congress in January.

Much has been said in recent weeks about certain new weapons. This is no time for a discussion of the subject, but I think one sentence would be appropriate at the moment: Those fantastic statements about fantastics weapons are entirely too fantastic. No right thinking person is going to be misled by all this superman talk or push-button warfare. There is no easy and inexpensive road to victory in war. Happily our objective is not war but peace.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, the amount of revenue that will be required to balance the fiscal year 1952 budget will to a large extent hinge upon the rate of expenditure, I think, as the gentleman will agree, on this military appropriation bill. I think you mentioned in the course of your remarks the projected amount of spending during the fiscal year 1952 of this total appropriation. I wonder if the gentleman would elaborate and reassert the estimates that he gave us.

Mr. MAHON. During the last fiscal year, the military, that is, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force expended about $20,000,000,000. During the current fiscal year, they will expend about $40,000,000,000, according to the best estimates of the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. They will have available, however, that is the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, the total sum of something like $95,000,000,000 for expenditures, but only about $40,000,000,000 of the whole sum can be expended. The other money is required for long lead time items, which will not be delivered and, therefore, will not be paid for during the current fiscal year.

Mr HARVEY. In other words, in addition to this appropriation here, there are are additional funds which are not presently obligated, or if obligated, items are not sufficiently near completion to be spent, so that out of the total appropriations, the unspent funds plus this amount that you estimate, only about $40,000,000,000 will be spent during the current fiscal year of 1952?

Mr. MAHON. That is right. The carry over from the last fiscal year is about $37,000,000,000.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, we are now into the sixteenth month of the so-called police action or undeclared war in Korea. As our casualty lists mount and an apparent stalemate continues while our enemies regroup and build up their reserves of men and material, our people are becoming increasingly restive and impatient, as well they might.

Many of our newspapers are reflecting that growing concern in their editorials, and the El Paso Times, largest and most influential newspaper in my district, the Sixteenth in Texas, has been carrying a most pointed series of editorials reflecting the views of so many of our people which I felt more than worthy of the attention of all the Members of Congress, and I quote one of the most recent editorials by the able editor of this newspaper, Mr. W. J. Hooten, whom many of you know:

WHY KOREA?

How many Americans are paying close attention to press dispatches telling of the bloody fighting going on in Korea?

It is possible that too many of us take one look at headlines about Korea and turn to something else.

"That is old stuff," we may feel inclined to say to ourselves.

Is it?

The Times recommends that every one of its readers again peruse the dispatches telling of the heartbreaking battle on Heartbreak Ridge which was described in Monday's Times.

Only three exhausted American infantrymen, remnants of a platoon, made it to the crest in the final drive at sunset. They were followed by reinforcements. Then, within 24 hours, North Koreans drove them off again.

Those are American boys, our boys, who are fighting and dying in far-off Korea. They are being called upon to give their lives in a so-called police action, which has developed into an undeclared war.

Those boys were sent into action by the President of the United States without Congress having a word to say about it

The feeling today, both in Congress and among the people, is that "We are stuck with it; what can we do about it?"

Last April it was hoped that the fighting would be localized in Korea, that it would peter out around the thirty-eighth parallel. Then came the truce talks Today, fighting as heavy as any that has taken place in Korea in several months again is raging with American boys being killed or maimed.

Let's insist that Congress either declare war and that we go all out in support of our young men in Korea or that we demand, and get, an explanation of what it is all about.

If we do not get either, it will be time to insist that we do an about-face and get out of Korea altogether.

That may seem to be drastic. What of it?

It may be said that we need no explanation of what is going on in Korea; that it is obvious: we are trying to stop aggression.

We were not attacked.

The Times reiterates the American people are entitled to an explanation of what it is all about. If we have reason, we ought to declare war formally and then win it as quickly as possible.

I would also like to add a short story appearing on the front page of a Washington paper, Tuesday, October 2:

U. N CAN END WAR WITH SUCCESS, BRADLEY SAYS

WITH UNITED STATES THIRD DIVISION IN KOREA (Tuesday), October 2.—Gen. Omar N. Bradley said today the United Nations could bring the Korean war to a successful "military conclusion" if the suspended truce talks break off completely.

He did not elaborate on what was implied in the phrase "military conclusion."

Is there a Member of Congress who would not like to see that "military conclusion" accomplished at once? I think not.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes back to the House with an increase of approximately $900,000,000 above the bill as it passed the House. It calls for a total of $56,939,568,030. We have reached a compromise upon a great many of the items. There was an item of $5,000,000,000 put in by the Senate for expansion of air power, but when we came to get down to it and try to find out what it was all about the President refused to send any budget estimate, and the justifications submitted did not support the request. We have, however, agreed with the other body upon the amount that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], referred to $1,000,000,000, two-thirds to go to the Air Force for airplane construction and one-third to the Navy for airplane construction.

We believe that there is a serious question as to whether they can effectively and efficiently obligate that amount during the time between now and the 30th of next June.

The other items of a major character that were in disagreement were those relating to retirement which we have worked out on a basis very largely along the line of the House language which was submitted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman to yield. I wonder if this is an opportune time to do so.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman may do that now.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I trust that some of the members of the Ways and Means Committee are present in the Chamber. Here we are dealing with an appropriation of billions and billions of dollars for national defense. We are making this appropriation because we are requested to do it for the security of the country. We all recognize that these great appropriations that we are making are straining our economy to the utmost. That means that we should be looking every place we can on the home front for opportunities to save money. One place where we can save money was clearly and forcefully pointed out to us by the unanimous action of the governors of the 48 States this week in Tennessee. In their conference the governors unanimously asked the Congress to return to the States, as was originally intended, under the act, the right to handle welfare operations. The governors have in substance asked the Congress to do away with the compulsory secrecy clause enacted in 1938. They have in effect said to this Congress: "You do this and we will save money not only for ourselves but we will also save money for you." My State in its wisdom undertook to act, but notwithstanding the obligations the law provides in that direction, Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing erroneously has taken from Indiana the money it is entitled to receive. It is obvious that action should be taken by the Congress. This is a matter which should not be delayed for weeks or for months. The time is now for this House of Representatives, through its conferees on the various bills now in conference, to accept the Senate amendment which would return to the States the right to handle this matter in a manner that the States—and the citizens of those States—believe it can best be handled.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the action of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in yielding to me because here is one place where we unquestionably can save money, and we can do it also as we go along with the other appropriation bills upon which we are required to act. Why should we, perhaps because of some hoped-for political advantage, stand in the way of action taken in the other body? Three times that body has voted for this provision to let the States handle this matter. This amendment should be kept in conference by agreement of our conferees and it should be approved by the membership of the House of Representatives.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has agreed to the major part of the House language in connection with another amendment, No. 46, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] who is entitled to a great deal of credit for having offered this amendment. It has been changed so that now the amendment is limited to the enlisted personnel and it has also been changed so that the period of service shall be 16 months instead of 12. This is necessary because at the time the amendment was adopted, practically 2 months ago, conditions were different and it is now necessary to do something of this kind. As I stated, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] is entitled to a great deal of credit for that.

The amendment on the flight pay proposition, which was agreed to, limits the flight pay to personnel whose actually assigned duties involve operational or training flights. This allows the Air Force and the Navy to operate and give this flight pay to those who are legitimately entitled to it and will prevent a great many abuses which have occurred up to the present time.

Mr. Speaker, under all the circumstances I think we should support the conference report as it has been presented.

Mr MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, at this late day in a long and hard session, a little levity might not be out of order. I serve on a subcommittee which is presided over by a Texan, a great Texan among the many great Texans whom it is our privilege to know. And appreciating them for their work as we do, I call attention to an item which appeared in the morning paper.

Incidentally, I had always thought when Texans die they hope to spend paradise in Florida but this article states:

A Texan passed away, and upon arriving at the gates of his eternal home remarked: "Gee, I never thought that heaven was so much like Texas." The man at the gate said sadly: "Son, this ain't heaven."

Now back to the conference report., I think I may as well repeat what has been said many times on this floor. If war should come in the near future we are not appropriating enough money for the security we need. If war does not come we are appropriating too much money. Only the Kremlin knows. None of us can know that we are right in the action we now recommend, but we do know from long and bitter experience that a strong defense is the only real security this Nation now has and the only security the free world now has.

In this report we are proud of the fact that we have been able to save below the figure in the Senate bill about enough money to pay for the military construc-

tion bill which we still must bring to the floor. We have secured a reduction of about four billions. We think that is something of an accomplishment. We have corrected a number of weaknesses in military practices that have been costly and we think that too represents something of an accomplishment. We have insured a little more humane consideration for the enlisted reservists, many of whom already had given long years of service in World War II.

Frankly, we would like to save a lot more money than we have been able to save in the Military Establishment. The House has shown time and again its interest in savings. It has made a commendable record in budget reductions this year on virtually all appropriation bills. Military funds are harder to cut. No one wants to take a chance on jeopardizing national defense. Yet our subcommittee has made cuts. It has dug out and eliminated every unjustified dollar it possibly could in the time allotted to it, and with the staff available to it we have made every reasonable effort we could to save while at the same time we strengthened the military machine. If there are other places where savings can properly and safely be made, I will welcome that information from anyone at any time and I will cooperate to see that those savings are made. I do feel that this unanimous report represents the best effort we can achieve at this time.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. In furtherance of the colloquy that I had with the gentleman from Texas, as I understood about $37,000,000,000 of prior appropriations remain to be spent.

Mr. SIKES. It is obligated but has not been spent because delivery has not been made on some of the articles ordered. Many of the articles that we are buying now are so complicated that it takes months and even years to build them or in some cases tool up and expand production in order to build them.

Mr. HARVEY. I understand. Further, that the estimate is that about $40,000,000,000 will be spent during 1952.

Mr. SIKES. That is the estimate that we have.

Mr. HARVEY. So actually the total cash expenditure contemplated out of this appropriation during current fiscal 1952 will, as now estimated, be approximately $3,000,000,000; is that about correct?

Mr. SIKES. No; I cannot say that I follow that. You are confusing 2 years appropriations for all purposes. Remember that we have pay and allowances, food, gas, oil, ammunition, and all the other things that go into the current operations of the service. We are appropriating $57,000,000,000 in fiscal 1952. Of that amount $37,000,000,000 is for hardware. The remainder is primarily for housekeeping, pay, and operations. What the gentleman is thinking of is money in procurement itself. I believe a total of about $40,000,000,000 is to be spent in fiscal 1952. The remainder will be obligated but not actually spent.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. For example, we are appropriating money to pay and feed and clothe the Military Establishment of 3,500,000 men and that will cost well over $10,000,000,000 itself This money that is carried over will be used on this long-time procurement and of the money appropriated a very considerable sum will be used this year.

Mr. SIKES. About $8,000,000,000 will go for pay itself. This is a part of the $20,000,000,000 housekeeping and operations fund which I described.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr Speaker, I think in all fairness, with maybe a little bit of pride, we can justifiably say that this group of seven men on the military subcommittee on appropriations are entitled to a great deal of credit for the work they have done. We have been in session in a little cubby hole down here under the House almost continuously since the 15th of December, day in and day out, starting early in the morning and working as late as we could get reporters in the evening. That was true of holidays; that was true of Saturdays. After all those months of work we reported a bill here which the House adopted unanimously. Then the bill went over to the other body, and for some reason or other they had heard some tall tales about some fantastic weapon, and then they came out with what might be termed a fantastic addition to the appropriations that we already made available, namely, $5,000,000,000, for which there was no justification. We asked the Air Force what they told the other body what they had not told us, and they said absolutely nothing, so if they had not told them any different from what we had heard, we did not feel that the $5,000,000,000 was necessary or could be properly and wisely used. Personally, I would have favored not giving them any additional money over that given by the House at all, but as you gentlemen know, conferences are matters of compromise. You have to work out your differences some way, somehow, the best way you can, in order that a bill can be passed so that these funds will be available. It has been too long delayed now for many reasons, for which the House cannot be chargeable. So the result was that individual views had to give way to the views of the majority, and an additional billion dollars was granted to the Army, to the Air Force and the Navy for the procurement of airplanes. It takes from 16 to 18, 20, and 22 months to obtain a new modern plane with all its electronics and radar on it, so that it will probably be 2 years before any of this billion dollars actually brings results in the way of a finished product. Now what will happen in that 2 years, nobody knows. If somebody could tell me that there would not be any major world war within the next 2 years or 3 years, we could have very safely cut many of these items. We are gambling; we are taking out some insurance for the security of the United States. If war does not come, much of this money appropriated will not be used; it will be for items used in peacetime training or used in Korea or any place where our troops are now serving.

So, I think on the whole the House can feel assured the conferees have done a good job. There was one item where I again had to let my own personal views give way to the views of the majority of the conferees, namely, the release of veteran reservists at the end of a year's service. I feel that a year was proper. These men have served all the way from a year to, some of them, five and a half or 6 years during World War II. Their lives have been disrupted. Everything has been changed. They have been called back to serve again, while literally hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of Americans have not served a single solitary day. So I felt as others have felt, that once they have served overseas, served during World War II, and then were called in again, 1 year's service was enough, especially for enlisted men, who do not get very many good breaks in any man's army.

There again, personal views, personal desires, had to give way to the wishes of the majority in order to bring to this body a conference report.

As I said a moment ago, this is a hard-working committee. I think it is an exceptionally fine committee.

All the way through, I believe we have done a good job. I think we could have done without this extra billion but again who knows, the majority said we should have it, and we hope it will be spent wisely. I hope this conference report will receive unanimous support from the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 46, which is contained in the conference report, represents a compromise on the part of the conferees of both Houses. I appreciate the difficulties that confronted the conferees but I am not satisfied with the 16-month provision. It represents nothing more than window dressing.

To refresh the memories of the Members of the House, my original amendment provided that where a veteran of World War II was a member of the volunteer or inactive Reserves and was called up against his own wishes, if he had more than 12 months' service in World War II and had served 12 months in the Korean war, then beginning November 30, 1951, he would be separated from service because no money would be available to pay his monthly wages.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Here is the thing that was pointed out, and it had quite a bit of merit to it; namely, that many of these men about whom the gentleman and I are concerned have already been in 12 months or more Some of them,

went in late in July, some early in August, and some in September. The language of the bill as written is that if they have served over 12 months that would prohibit the use of any of this money for paying them. If this is adopted right away, it will take 2 weeks or 3 weeks or a month to process many of these men for immediate discharge. Therefore, taking all of those things into consideration, the gentleman and I would not want them to be deprived of their pay just because they have been in 12 months; would we?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. They would not be deprived of their pay because under my amendment they are not eligible for separation until after November 30, which is approximately 8 weeks from this date.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes, they would, because none of this money could be used for the payment for their services after the expiration of 12 months. Seeing that picture, and while things went on in conference that may not be made public, I am not going to make any bones about the fact that I did not like the 12-month provision. I went up to a figure a trifle higher. This was the best we could do. It will take a few days to get this through. Let us say it becomes effective the 1st of November. Then, by the 30th of November, by the time most of them will be processed out, it will be close to 15 months.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I repeat that under my amendment an inactive or volunteer reservist to be eligible for discharge after November 30 he must have 12 months' service in World War II and 12 months in the Korean war.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thought all the way through that really was the best we could do.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I appreciate what the gentleman says he tried to do in conference, but, frankly, here is the situation. Under existing law, the volunteer and inactive reservists can be discharged after 17 months of service unless the need for his rank or rate is considered critical by the Secretary. The compromise offered us eliminates the officers entirely and provides that the 17 months under existing law is reduced 30 days and made applicable only to enlisted personnel. In short, the so-called compromise is a delusion and a snare.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is what is happening in so many cases. When they try to get their release, their category is always needed.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is right.

Mr. SCRIVNER. This provision is necessary if the majority of these veterans of World War II are going to be out any time soon.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is right.

I want to remind you that your mail as well as mine has been full of criticism from members of the armed services who are volunteer and inactive reservists. You know the story of their treatment. I want to remind you that Mrs. Rosenberg admitted before the House Committee on Armed Services that inactive and volunteer reservists have been shamefully treated. Therefore, as a Member of this Congress, I shall not support any so-called compromise because to do so it is simply condoning the shabby treatment accorded Reserve personnel. It is interesting to note that the armed services cried that my amendment would destroy the services and hamper their combat efficiency. As a result of this outburst from the Pentagon I did a little research myself. What did I find? I found that in the Senate, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON'S manpower committee had studied the manpower utilization as far as the military is concerned. What do you suppose that committee said about the surplus of military manpower? Let me read from the report of this Senate committee:

> The officers and enlisted men assigned to "permanent post" status at the 16 installations and performing some type of overhead function total 95,784. This is well over five divisions of men, most of whom are presumably physically and mentally fit for full military duty.

There alone you have enough surplus personnel to replace many of the inactive and volunteer reservists that would be affected by my amendment.

Let us see what a newspaperman has to say about the treatment accorded Reserves. The Globe Boston Traveler of Wednesday, August 8, 1951, in an article by Hal Clancy, said:

> One reason frankly admitted was because the United States was caught short, and the mobilizers just grabbed the cards of men who were not assigned to organized units.

Then he went on to say, and he is quoting an Army officer:

"Give them the business—give them the business" That is an accurate quote.

Hal Clancy said:

> Those words were said to me by one Army official in an off-the-record discussion.

That is the attitude of some of the Regular Establishment toward our inactive volunteer Reserve.

Then, let me read to you from a letter received by an officer from Korea. Here is what he has to say:

> There are 7 major airfields in Japan which have a complement averaging 3,500 men each. These airfields merely contain an average of 150 personnel engaged in actual flying. Nonflying personnel on the basis of World War II standards for these type airfields should never exceed 2,000 men.
>
> The staff officers to command such airfields during World War II usually consisted of a colonel and about 20 field grade officers. Currently, the same organization has a brigadier general, 4 colonels, and about 30 field grade officers.
>
> These airfields contained an average of about 30 fighter-bomber-type aircraft. During World War II airfields of this type were handling three times this quantity of aircraft with smaller personnel. This obviously means that in Japan the Air Force has twice the amount of airfields they actually need.
>
> In addition to these facts, the internal administration of Air Force bases are broken down into matériel, personnel, inspection comptroller, special service, legal, intelligence, communications, and public information. I have personally seen the operations of these administrative functions and I would conservatively estimate that each section was overstaffed five times the amount of military personnel required to do the job. This waste of manpower nevertheless is the standard organization set-up for every air base in both the United States and abroad, as put out by Air Force General Vandenberg.
>
> Each of these airfields in Japan are saturated with social clubs for this overstuffed personnel, including officers clubs, non-commissioned officers clubs, airmen's clubs, and a service club. The personnel on these airfields are occupying their time in Government-operated golf courses. One of these golf courses is maintained by 90 Japanese at Government expense. In short, the military personnel in Japan are living like playboys and are furnished a Government home rent free, and are having their families and American cars sent over at Government expense. Each home is given a Japanese house boy and a maid.

Now, let me read what a soldier said at Fort Eustis, Va., who is an instructor in a military school:

> Since the middle of July, there have been no students to instruct. We have merely been reporting to work every day, and since that time we have been just sitting around waiting for 5 o'clock so we can go home.

Mr. Speaker, there is plenty of surplus manpower in our Armed Forces and with some efficient handling of personnel, replacement of all inactive and volunteer Reserves can be accomplished without any ill effect on the armed services.

As I said in the beginning this so-called compromise is nothing but a delusion and a snare and I cannot conscientiously stand here and support it. Furthermore I would be nothing less than a hypocrite to urge support of any recommendation of any conference committee of this Congress which would in effect place the stamp of approval on the shameful manner by which the inactive volunteer reservists of this country have been treated.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, all members of the committee were most anxious to do everything possible for the reservists. I think all members recognize that the services did a poor job in many respects, in calling up the reserves. We are assured that these men will now be discharged as soon as may reasonably be possible. We urged that they be released as soon as possible. The Air Force and the Army will have no difficulty meeting the schedule. The Navy has had a little more difficulty with respect to some of their personnel.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following letter from Mrs. Anna Rosenberg with respect to the program for the release of the reservists:

> ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
> *Washington, D. C., October 5, 1951.*
>
> Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON,
> *House of Representatives.*
>
> DEAR MR. MAHON: In accordance with our conversation of this morning, and your request, I will try to outline in this letter what the Department of Defense is doing regarding the release of inactive and volunteer reservists who saw service in World War II. The Department is making every effort to return these men to civilian life at the earliest possible moment consistent with national security.
>
> The Army will release from active duty all enlisted men called to duty from the inactive or volunteer Reserves by December 20, 1951. Previously, the Army had announced that all such men would be released no later than

January 1, 1952. But, by a careful reworking of Army plans, and with the objective of having these men home with their families for Christmas, this new goal has been set and, barring any major change in the international situation, will be met. This letter to you represents our first announcement of the new release date.

Army officers in this category will generally be required to serve the maximum period of 17 months permitted under Public Law No. 51. As you can appreciate, it is not feasible to release officers and noncommissioned officers simultaneously and, thus, weaken the Army's leadership all in one stroke.

The Air Force will release all of its enlisted men ordered to duty from the volunteer Reserve after 12 months of service. But, again, the need for trained officers, particularly pilots and other trained crew officer personnel, makes it necessary to keep officers in this category for all, or almost all, of the 17 months permitted under law.

The Navy is releasing its enlisted men in this category after an average of about 15 months duty. Some will serve less than this period and others will be required to serve the maximum allowable under law. The Navy needs every month of service it can get from its officer personnel but, because of phasing-out problems, etc, even some of these men may serve less than the full 17-month period.

The Marine Corps has a relatively simple plan for the release of its volunteer and inactive Reserves, both enlisted and officer. All such men assigned to active duty prior to June 30, 1951, will be returned to inactive duty, on a staggered basis, by June 1952. The average service of these enlisted Marine personnel will be approximately 14 months.

Thus, as you can see, even though the Military Departments have been authorized by law to retain the so-called inactive reservists for a period of 17 months, our plans call for the release of many men in this category before the expiration of their full period of obligated service. We have treated the 17-month period as a maximum, not as a maximum and minimum combined.

Reservists of veteran status were recalled to duty with the greatest reluctance. The advent of Korea brought with it an urgent need for trained men. The only major additional source of trained men was our Reserve veterans. The training of new recruits would have taken many months. We could not wait. We had to have combatwise troops at once to reinforce the gallant but thinly spread lines in Korea.

The magnificent way in which our reservists and National Guard units responded is well known to all of us. Almost 800,000 Reserves have met the call to duty. The decisive role of our Reserve was dramatically demonstrated in the case of the First Marine Division when it made its victorious landing at Inchon. Five thousand of the men in this division were Reserves. They were men who had left their homes less than 2 months before. They had left their wives, their children, and their loved ones to take up arms for the second time in less than a decade.

Our debt to these men is enormous. The hardships and disruptions in family life and business caused by the rapid mobilization of our Reserve Forces were necessary, but this necessity did not make the sacrifices any less real. We must not permit these hardships and disruptions to occur again.

I would be the last to deny that mistakes were made in the hasty program of recalling reservists during the past year. We are doing everything we can to correct and relieve the inequities and hardships that resulted, but even more importantly, we are directing our every effort to preventing this from happening again. I am convinced that the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as enacted by the Congress, and a new vital reserve system along the lines of the reserve legislation now under consideration by the Congress are the necessary and complementary cornerstones of our military security. They are parts of a program designed to bring stability and certainty into the lives of the men who have defended our country in the past and those who may be called upon to defend it in the future. Under this program, a man will know how much service is required of him and approximately when he must give that service. And, what is most important, he will know that everyone will do his share. Every young American will do his part on a fair and equitable basis.

With deep appreciation for your understanding cooperation in the problems faced by the Department and with all good wishes,

Sincerely yours,

ANNA M ROSENBERG.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I was very much impressed by the talk of the gentleman from Indiana about the condition they are in in that State due to the directive from Washington that they cannot put on the welfare roll the amount of money they are spending. The same thing is true in the State of Massachusetts, and it is true in every other State in the union. Well, we pay 100 percent and the State, town and cities pay 50 percent, and the Federal Government steps in and says, "You cannot do this, and you cannot do that." It seems to me that it gets away from the fundamental principles of democracy when the Federal Government can step in and tell my town or my State what they may do in relation to these welfare points. The local officials in my town tell the people where their money is going and who gets it. I can find no fault with it. We are taxed for it just the same as we are for roads and everything else, and it goes in our town meeting report showing how much was spent for this, how much was spent for that, and who got it. So I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Indiana and the State of Indiana for having courage enough to insist that if they are going to spend $15,000,000 a year or $100,000,000 a year they have the right to know who is getting it and where it is going.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] has raised a question as to how this money would be spent and when. Of the $56,000,000,000, $29,000,000,000, more than half of it, goes for procurement of aircraft, ships, combat vehicles, ammunition, and so on, things referred to generally as military hardware.

For operation and maintenance there will be $12,000,000,000 that will be spent this year.

Personnel calls for $10,000,000,000 to be spent this year.

In order that this matter may be clarified I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time. I desired it for the reason that I am sure the rest of you want to know how much of the appropriations we are considering in this conference report will in fact be spent during the fiscal year 1952. The greatest confusion has existed in my own mind and I am sure in the minds of others also as to what the actual projected cash expenditures of our Government will be in the fiscal year 1952. I would very much appreciate it if I might have an answer to that question, because it hinges largely upon the amount of these military appropriations that are actually to be spent; so I would appreciate it if the gentleman would give me an estimate of what the actual cash expenditures for the Federal Government will be for the fiscal year 1952.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget contains a full statement and his letter of transmittal contains a full statement as to what the anticipated expenditures of the Government will be. For the military it is estimated to be $40,000,000,000, and including military assistance abroad, $44,000,000,000.

And of the appropriation bill which is now pending, about $30,000,000,000 is for military procurement. Most of that will not be spent; it will simply be obligated. So about half of this money will actually be spent for maintenance, operation, personnel, and things of that kind. Much of it will be carried over. The total expenditure will be $40,000,000,000 this year, according to best estimates.

Mr. HARVEY. Is it contemplated, that of the ninety-some-odd billions of money that we have appropriated or are appropriating, what number of billions of dollars—sixty, seventy, or eighty billions—will actually be spent?

Mr. MAHON. Of the total amounts appropriated in 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952, $94,000,000,000 will be available for expenditure during the current year; and of the whole amount $40,000,000,000 will be spent, leaving about $54,000,000,000 unexpended of all the sums for this and previous years.

Mr. HARVEY. That applies only to the military. I wonder if the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] would now supplement that with an additional estimate as to the other expenditures of the Government to give us a total of the expenditures for fiscal 1952, I mean actual cash outlay.

Mr. TABER. The latest figures I have, going through my own figures or the President's statement and all I have gotten from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue, is an estimate of about $28,000,000,000 besides the $40,000,000,000 for the military. Some of the things we have done have contributed to cut down the nonmilitary expenditures.

Mr. HARVEY. In other words, an estimated $68,000,000,000 will be the total cash outlay during the fiscal year 1952?

Mr. TABER. I would think that would be a fairly good estimate unless military conditions get worse.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 50:

Page 70, line 21, insert:

"SEC 630. In order more effectively to administer the programs and functions of the Department of Defense, the President, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in the interest of national defense, may authorize within the Office of the Secretary of Defense 15 temporary positions for the fiscal year 1952 to be placed in grades GS–17 and GS–18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 in accordance with the procedures and standards of that act. Not more than 8 of these positions shall be in grade GS–18. Such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that act."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows. In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC 630 In order more effectively to administer the programs and functions of the Department of Defense, the President, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in the interest of national defense, may authorize within the Office of the Secretary of Defense 10 temporary positions for the fiscal year 1952 to be placed in grades GS-17 and GS–18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 in accordance with the procedures and standards of that act. Not more than five of these positions shall be in grade GS–18. Such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that act, and not more than four of these positions may be filled by promotion."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the conference report may have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4475) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 17, after "Act", insert "The increase in acreage under this subsection shall not be considered in establishing future State or farm acreage allotments."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain to the House the changes that were made by the Senate amendment?

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the bill simply applies to tobacco and allows the Secretary to increase any type of dark tobacco in short supply. The Senate amendment provides that such increase shall be on a year-to-year basis and shall not figure in the regular allotments of the State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF EXPERIMENTAL SUBMARINES

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1227) to amend further the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947, as amended, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 8, strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$49,000,000"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would appreciate it if the gentleman would explain to the House the Senate amendment.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, briefly this reduces the amount as passed by the House $50,000,000. The amendment, if concurred in, would reduce the amount authorized by the House bill $1,000,000.

The bill is directed to the construction of experimental submarines. The Department said it needed an increase of approximately $9,000,000, which would have brought the total up to $49,000,000. The House felt that due to the fluctuation of prices it should put in $50,000,000, but the Senate cut that back. The Navy Department feels it can do the necessary construction work for $49,000,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO APPOINT RETIRED OFFICERS

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5062) to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would appreciate it if the gentleman from Texas would explain the purpose of the bill.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, for 5 years the Veterans' Administration has had authority for the employment of retired members of the armed services without affecting their retired status. However, that 5-year period has expired and this bill extends it for an additional 5 years without any change in the other provisions of the law. As a matter of fact, this has been used very sparingly by the Veterans' Administration, and then, primarily for the purpose of employing medical personnel which is badly needed. At the present time, the Director of the Medical Service of the Veterans' Administration is Admiral Boone, known to many of us because of his long and excellent service with the Navy. It should be pointed out that this does not affect in any way the dual compensation law so that persons employed will not be in a position to receive both their retired pay and pay in their active position. It costs nothing to the Government, and gives it an opportunity to employ personnel badly needed, primarily medical personnel.

Mr. ARENDS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of Public Law 718, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 10, 1946 (60 Stat. 978), is hereby amended by striking the word "five" preceding the word "years" and substituting therefor the word "ten."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the majority leader whether he is in a position to give the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. The bill amending the Railroad Retirement Act will go over to the week after next, by agreement of the parties. I announce that so that the Members may govern themselves accordingly.

After the announcement of the program I will ask unanimous consent that the Speaker may declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair, the bells to be rung 15 minutes before the House reconvenes, because of the ECA conference report coming up. There may be another conference report that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] is interested in.

As to the program for next week, on Monday there will be House Resolution 436, giving investigatory power to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and S. 1335, adjusting weights and size, fourth-class postal service.

On Tuesday we will take up H. R. 5505, Customs Simplification Act of 1951, and H. R. 5426, the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, if a rule is reported out.

On Wednesday the military construction appropriation bill will come up. If there is any roll call demanded, I hope, with the permission of the House, that it will go over until Thursday, because Wednesday is a very important Jewish holy day, and we respect the holy days and holidays of all organized religions. After the military construction appropriation bill, if a rule is reported out, we will take up H. R. 5118, the Social Security Act, which was called up under suspension yesterday, and following that H. R. 5411, amendment to the School Act, critical defense housing areas.

Any further program will be announced later. Of course, conference reports may be brought up at any time if they are in order.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. H. R. 5411, the bill to take care of defense housing, I understand, was on the schedule for today. Now, it looks like from that schedule that that is put over until the tail end of next week. That is a very important piece of legislation that the Senate is very much interested in, and the Committee on Education and Labor definitely committed itself to bring that bill into the House for its consideration. I would hate very much to see it continually carried over from one week to the other this near the end of the session. It looks to me like if it was scheduled for today that we could reasonably count on it coming up in its normal place beginning next week.

Mr McCORMACK. It was scheduled for today dependent upon, of course, other legislation. I made that statement last week. I think if the gentleman will look my remarks over the gentleman will see that while it was put on the program it was with the understanding that other legislation ahead of it was completed, and that does not necessarily mean that it will follow in this program next week.

The customs simplification bill is a very important bill that we have to get through. It is in order now, and I think it should take priority next week. The Armed Forces Reserve bill is one in which everybody is interested, and if a rule is reported out on it, it certainly should take priority. Also, the appropriation bill should take priority.

Mr. BARDEN. Is that rule reported out now?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; but if it is reported out it should take priority.

Mr. BARDEN. I cannot understand why a piece of legislation the House and the country and the departments and the President and everybody else are definitely interested in getting through should be shoved over beyond a bill for which a rule is not even granted. It just does not add up.

Mr. McCORMACK. In making the program, if a rule were out on the Armed Forces Reserve bill, I would consider that as having priority status. I put it down on the program in case a rule is reported. If a rule does not come out, then, of course, that means that other bills on the program are stepped up.

Mr. BARDEN. May I say to the gentleman that when the House and Senate conferees were in session they sent for me. I went over there and they asked me if I would take that matter up before the Committee on Education and Labor and report its action to the House at once. I committed myself and the committee to that extent. The committee went to work and reported it out. A rule has been granted, and it has been on the program of the House I am doing all I can to bring it up. If somebody else wants to assume responsibility for its not passing, that is their responsibility.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is always willing to take his responsibility. The gentleman has made a program, and despite any thoughts of the gentleman from North Carolina, whose views I respect, the gentleman from Massachusetts is making a program which is consistent with the probable program of next week in relation to priorities. This bill is on the program for next week. This week it could not be reached. The other legislation here, with the possible exception of the social-security bill, is legislation which would take priority over the bill to which the gentleman refers. As far as I am concerned, I have no objection to putting the bill H. R. 5411 ahead of the bill H. R. 5118

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Will the House meet on Friday, Columbus Day?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am hopeful that arrangements can be made so that Columbus Day may be properly recognized, as always.

RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess of the House at any time today, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1951

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5113) to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy, and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the conference report, but I will be glad to reserve the point of order if the chairman desires me to do so.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is satisfactory to me.

The SPEAKER Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr SPENCE], reserve his point of order?

Mr. SPENCE Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. RICHARDS (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with, and that the same be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, of course, the gentleman will explain the conference report thoroughly?

Mr. RICHARDS. I would like to say to the distinguished minority leader that that is my intention before the matter is finally disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1090)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5113) to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Mutual Security Act of 1951'.

"SEC 2. The Congress declares it to be the purpose of the Act to maintain the security and to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing military, economic, and technical assistance to friendly countries to strengthen the mutual security and individual and collective defenses of the free world, to develop their resources in the interest of their security and independence and the national interest of the United States and to facilitate the effective participation of those countries in the United Nations system for collective security. The purposes of

the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1571–1604), the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501–1522), and the Act for International Development (22 U. S. C. 1557) shall hereafter be deemed to include this purpose.

"TITLE I—EUROPE

"SEC 101. (a) In order to support the freedom of Europe through assistance which will further the carrying out of the plans for defense of the North Atlantic area, while at the same time maintaining the economic stability of the countries of the area so that they may meet their responsibilities for defense, and to further encourage the economic unification and the political federation of Europe, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1952 for carrying out the provisions and accomplishing the policies and purpose of this Act—

"(1) not to exceed $5,028,000,000 for assistance pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U S C 1571–1604), for countries which are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and for any country of Europe (other than a country covered by another title of this Act), which the President determines to be of direct importance to the defense of the North Atlantic area and whose increased ability to defend itself the President determines is important to the preservation of the peace and security of the North Atlantic area and to the security of the United States (any such determination to be reported forthwith to the Committtee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives), and not to exceed $100,000,000 of such appropriation for any selected persons who are residing in or escapees from the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, or the Communist dominated or Communist occupied areas of Germany and Austria, and any other countries absorbed by the Soviet Union either to form such persons into elements of the military forces supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or for other purposes, when it is similarly determined by the President that such assistance will contribute to the defense of the North Atlantic area and to the security of the United States. In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the purposes of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, through assistance to any of the countries covered by this paragraph are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this paragraph Section 408 (c) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U S. C 1579), is hereby repealed.

"(2) not to exceed $1,022,000,000 for assistance pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501–1522) (including assistance to further European military production), for any country of Europe covered by paragraph (1) of this subsection and for any other country covered by section 103 (a) of the said Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended. In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this paragraph: Provided, That not to exceed $10,000,000 of the funds made available pursuant to this paragraph may be utilized to effectuate the principles set forth in section 115 (e) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

"(b) Not to exceed 10 per centum of the total of the appropriations granted pursuant to this section may be transferred, when determined by the President to be necessary for the purpose of this act, between appropriations granted pursuant to either paragraph of subsection (a): *Provided*, That the amount herein authorized to be transferred shall be determined without reference to any balances of prior appropriations continued available pursuant to this section: *Provided further*, That, whenever the President makes any such determination, he shall forthwith notify the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

"TITLE II—NEAR EAST AND AFRICA

"SEC. 201. In order to further the purpose of this Act by continuing to provide military assistance to Greece, Turkey, and Iran, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $396,250,000 for furnishing assistance to Greece and Turkey pursuant to the provisions of the Act of May 22, 1947, as amended (22 U S C. 1401–1410), and for furnishing assistance to Iran, pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U S C 1571–1604). In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for assistance to Greece and Turkey, available for the fiscal year 1951, pursuant to the Act of May 22, 1947, as amended, and for assistance to Iran pursuant to the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section.

"SEC 202. Whenever the President determines that such action is essential for the purpose of this Act, he may provide assistance, pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, to any country of the Near East area (other than those covered by section 201) and may utilize not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount made available (excluding balances of prior appropriations continued available) pursuant to section 201 of this Act: *Provided*, That any such assistance may be furnished only upon determination by the President that (1) the strategic location of the recipient country makes it of direct importance to the defense of the Near East area, (2) such assistance is of critical importance to the defense of the free nations, and (3) the immediately increased ability of the recipient country to defend itself is important to the preservation of the peace and security of the area and to the security of the United States

"SEC 203. In order to further the purpose of this Act in Africa and the Near East, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $160,000,000 for economic and technical assistance in Africa and the Near East in areas other than those covered by section 103 (a) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U S C. 1502). Funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available under the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U S C 1501–1522), and of the Act for International Development (22 U S. C 1557).

"SEC. 204. Not to exceed $50,000,000 of the funds authorized under section 203 hereof may be contributed to the United Nations during the fiscal year 1952, for the purposes, and under the provisions, of the United Nations Palestine Refuge Aid Act of 1950 (22 U S. C 1556): *Provided*, That, whenever the President shall determine that it would more effectively contribute to the purposes of the said United Nations Palestine Refugee Aid Act of 1950, he may allocate any part of such funds to any agency of the United States Government to be ultilized in furtherance of the purposes of said Act and any amount so allocated shall be a part of the United States contribution to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and shall be so credited by said Agency.

"SEC 205. In order to assist in the relief of refugees coming into Israel, not to exceed $50,000,000 of the funds authorized under section 203 hereof may be utilized during the fiscal year 1952, under such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe, for specific refugee relief and resettlement projects in Israel.

"TITLE III—ASIA AND PACIFIC

"SEC 301. In order to carry out in the general area of China (including the Republic of the Philippines and the Republic of Korea) the provisions of subsection (a) of section 303 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U S C 1604 (a)), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $535,250,000 In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the provisions of title III of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U S C 1602–1604), are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section Not to exceed $50,000,000 of funds appropriated pursuant to this section (excluding balances of appropriations continued available) may be accounted for as provided in subsection (a) of said section 303.

"SEC 302 (a) In order to further the purpose of this Act through the strengthening of the area covered in section 301 of this Act (but not including the Republic of Korea), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $237,500,000 for economic and technical assistance in those portions of such area which the President deems to be not under Communist control. Funds appropriated pursuant to authority of this section shall be available under the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S C. 1501-1522), and of the Act for International Development (22 U S C 1557) In addition, unexpended balances of funds heretofore made available for carrying out the purposes of the China Area Aid Act of 1950 (22 U S C 1547), are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section

"(b) The third proviso of section 202 of the China Area Aid Act of 1950 is amended by inserting 'and of Korea' after 'selected citizens of China' the first time it appears therein.

"SEC. 303 (a) In order to provide for a United States contribution to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, established by the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations of December 1, 1950, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $45,000,000. In addition, unobligated balances of the appropriations heretofore made, and available during the fiscal year 1951, for assistance to Korea under authority of the Far Eastern Economic Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (22 U S C 1543, 1551, 1552), are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section Not to exceed 50 per centum of the total of the appropriations authorized by this section may, when determined by the President to be necessary for the purpose of this Act, be transferred to and

consolidated with the appropriation authorized by paragraph 302 (a).

"(b) The sums made available pursuant to subsection (a) may be contributed from time to time on behalf of the United States in such amounts as the President determines to be appropriate to support those functions of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency which the military situation in Korea permits the Agency to undertake pursuant to arrangements between the Agency and the United Nations Unified Command. The aggregate amount which may be contributed on behalf of the United States pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be reduced by the value of goods and services made available to Korea by any department or agency of the United States for relief and economic assistance after the assumption of responsibility for relief and rehabilitation operations in Korea by the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency.

"(c) The provisions of subsections 304 (a) and (b) of the United Nations Palestine Refugee Aid Act of 1950 (22 U. S. C. 1556 (b)) are hereby made applicable with respect to Korean assistance furnished under this section.

"(d) Unencumbered balances of sums heretofore or hereafter deposited in the special account established pursuant to paragraph (2) of article V of the agreement of December 10, 1948, between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea (62 Stat., part 3, 3788) shall be used in Korea for such purposes as the President determines to be consistent with United Nations programs for assistance to Korea and as may be agreed to between the Government of the United States and the Republic of Korea.

"(e) The functions of the Administrator for Economic Cooperation under the provisions of section 3 of the Far Eastern Economic Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (22 U. S C 1551), shall hereafter be performed by such departments or agencies of the Government as the President shall direct.

"TITLE IV—AMERICAN REPUBLICS

"SEC. 401. In order to further the purpose of this Act through the furnishing of military assistance to the other American Republics, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $38,150,000 for carrying out the purposes of this section under the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended: *Provided*, That such assistance may be furnished only in accordance with defense plans which are found by the President to require the recipient country to participate in missions important to the defense of the Western Hemisphere. Any such assistance shall be subject to agreements, as provided herein and as required by section 402 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1573), designed to assure that the assistance will be used to promote the defense of the Western Hemisphere; and after agreement by the Government of the United States and the country concerned with respect to such missions, military assistance hereunder shall be furnished only in accordance with such agreement.

"SEC 402. In order to further the purpose of this Act among the peoples of the American Republics through the furnishing of technical assistance, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $21,250,000 for assistance under the provisions of the Act for International Development (22 U. S. C. 1557) and of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act, as amended (22 U. S. C. 281).

"TITLE V—ORGANIZATION AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Unified direction of program

"SEC. 501. (a) In order that the programs of military, economic, and technical assistance authorized by this Act may be administered as parts of a unified program in accordance with the intent of Congress and to fix responsibility for the coordination and supervision of these programs in a single person, the President is authorized to appoint in the Executive Office of the President a Director for Mutual Security. The Director, on behalf of the President and subject to his direction, shall have primary responsibility for—

"(1) continuous supervision and general direction of the assistance programs under this Act to the end that such programs shall be (A) effectively integrated both at home and abroad, and (B) administered so as to assure that the defensive strength of the free nations of the world shall be built as quickly as possible on the basis of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid;

"(2) preparation and presentation to the Congress of such programs of foreign military, economic, and technical assistance as may be required in the interest of the security of the United States;

"(3) preparation for the President of the report to the Congress required by section 518 of this Act.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided by this Act, the Director shall not hold any other office or employment under the United States and shall not have any other responsibilities except those directly related to the coordination, supervision, and direction, of the programs covered by this Act or otherwise conferred upon him by law

"(c) The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum.

"(d) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, the President is authorized to utilize the positions created in subsection 406 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended. No person may serve in any such position under this subsection while at the same time he is an officer or employee of any other department or agency of the Government

"(e) (1) The fourth paragraph of section 101 (a) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (50 U S C, 402 (a)), is amended by inserting after clause (4) the following:

"'(5) the Director for Mutual Security;'

and by renumbering clauses (5) and (6) thereof as clauses (6) and (7), respectively.

"(2) Section 4 (a) of Public Law 171, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended (59 Stat. 512), is amended by striking out 'Economic Cooperation Administration' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Mutual Security Agency' and by striking out 'Administrator for Economic Cooperation' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Director for Mutual Security'.

"(3) Paragraph (1) of section 3 (a) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended (12 U. S. C. 635a (a) (1)), is amended by inserting after the words 'Secretary of State,' where they appear in the first sentence thereof the words 'the Director for Mutual Security,' and by striking out the last sentence of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'To the extent he deems it advisable the Secretary of State or the Director for Mutual Security, as the case may be, may designate to act for him in the discharge of his duties as a member of the Board of Directors any officer of his Department or Agency who shall have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director for Mutual Security shall not be considered to be a member of the Board of Directors for the purposes of the first sentence of paragraph (3) of this subsection or for the purposes of subsection (b).'

"Mutual Security Agency"

"SEC. 502. (a) The Economic Cooperation Administration and the offices of Administrator for Economic Cooperation, Deputy Administrator, United States Special Representative in Europe, and Deputy Special Representative are hereby abolished.

"(b) To assist in carrying out the purpose of this Act—

"(1) there is hereby established, with its principal office at the seat of the government, a Mutual Security Agency, hereinafter referred to as the Agency, which shall be headed by the Director for Mutual Security; and

"(2) there shall be transferred to the Director the powers, functions, and responsibilities conferred upon the Administrator for Economic Cooperation by the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and by any other law, but no such powers, functions, and responsibilities shall be exercised after June 30, 1952, except as provided in subsection (c) of this section

"(c) Not later than April 1, 1952, the President shall inform the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives which of the powers, functions, and responsibilities transferred to the Director by subsection (b) (2) are found by the President to be necessary to enable the Director after June 30, 1952, to carry out the duties conferred upon him by section 503. The termination provisions of section 122 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, shall come into effect on June 30, 1952, and none of the powers, functions, and responsibilities conferred by that Act shall be exercised after that date, except those powers, functions, and responsibilities found necessary to enable the Director to carry out the duties conferred on him by section 503 of this Act, which powers, functions, and responsibilities unless otherwise provided by law shall continue in effect until June 30, 1954

"Additional duties of Director for Mutual Security

"SEC 503 After June 30, 1952, the Director, on behalf of the President and subject to his direction, shall, in consultation with the Secretaries of State and Defense, continue to have primary responsibility for—

"(a) the development and administration of programs of assistance designed to sustain and increase military effort, including production, construction, equipment and materiel in each country or in groups of countries which receive United States military assistance,

"(b) the provision of such equipment, materials, commodities, services, financial, or other assistance as he finds to be necessary for carrying out mutual defense programs; and

"(c) the provision of limited economic assistance to foreign nations for which the United States has responsibility as a result of participation in joint control arrangements when the President finds that the provision of such economic assistance is in the interest of the security of the United States.

"Appointment and transfer of personnel

"SEC. 504. (a) To carry out the functions conferred by sections 502 and 503 of this Act, there shall be in the Agency a Deputy Director, a Special Representative in Europe, and a Deputy Special Representative in Europe, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall have status and receive compensation comparable to the equivalent positions under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

"(b) Any personnel of the Economic Cooperation Administration, upon the certification of the Director for Mutual Security and with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that such personnel are necessary to carry out the functions of the Director for Mutual Security, and all records and property of such Administration which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines are used primarily in the administration of the powers and functions

transferred to the Director for Mutual Security by this Act, shall be transferred to the Mutual Security Agency.

"(c) Of the personnel transferred to or employed by the Mutual Security Agency, not to exceed fifty may be compensated at rates higher than those provided for grade 15 of the general schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and of these, not to exceed fifteen may be compensated at a rate in excess of the highest rate provided for grades of such general schedule but not in excess of $15,000 per annum. Such positions shall be in addition to the number authorized by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(d) On and after January 1, 1952, the number of United States citizens employed by the Mutual Security Agency shall be at least 10 per centum less than the number employed by the Economic Cooperation Administration on August 31, 1951 *Provided*, That the Director for Mutual Security shall cause studies to be made from time to time for the purpose of determining whether further reductions in personnel are feasible and consistent with the accomplishment of the purposes of this Act.

"The Secretary of State

"SEC 505. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to infringe upon the powers or functions of the Secretary of State.

"The Secretary of Defense

"SEC 506 (a) In the case of aid under this Act for military end items and related technical assistance and advice, the Secretary of Defense shall have primary responsibility and authority for—

"(1) the determination of military end-item requirements,

"(2) the procurement of military equipment in a manner which permits its integration with service programs;

"(3) the supervision of end-item use by the recipient countries;

"(4) the supervision of the training of foreign military personnel, and

"(5) the movement and delivery of military end items.

"(b) The establishment of priorities in the procurement, delivery, and allocation of military equipment shall be determined by the Secretary of Defense. The apportionment of funds between countries shall be determined by the President.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the fiscal year 1952 the Secretary of Defense may furnish (subject to reimbursement from funds appropriated pursuant to this Act) military assistance out of the materials of war whose production in the United States shall have been authorized for, and appropriated to, the Department of Defense: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this Act shall authorize the furnishing of military items under this subsection in excess of $1,000,000,000 in value. For the purposes of this subsection (1) 'value' shall be determined in accordance with section 402 (c) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, and (2) the term 'materials of war' means those goods, commonly known as military items, which are required for the performance of their missions by armed forces of a nation, including weapons, military vehicles, ships of war under fifteen hundred tons, aircraft, military communications equipment, ammunition, maintenance parts and spares, and military hardware.

"Overseas coordination

"SEC. 507. The President shall prescribe appropriate procedures to assure coordination among representatives of the United States Government in each country, under the leadership of the Chief of the United States Diplomatic Mission.

"Relationship to Technical Cooperation Administration and Institute of Inter-American Affairs

"SEC. 508. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to modify the provisions of section 412 of the Act for International Development or the provisions of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act.

"Detail of personnel to foreign governments and international organizations

"SEC. 509. Whenever the President determines it to be consistent with and in furtherance of the purpose of this Act, the head of any Government agency is authorized to—

"(a) detail or assign any officer or employee of his agency to any office or position to which no compensation is attached with any foreign government or foreign government agency. *Provided*, That such acceptance of office shall in no case involve the taking of an oath of allegiance to another government; and

"(b) detail, assign, or otherwise make available to any international organization in which the United States participates, any officer or employee of his agency to serve with or as a member of the international staff of such organizations

"Any such officer or employee, while so assigned or detailed, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his privileges, rights, seniority, or other benefits as such, an officer or employee of the Government of the United States and of the Government agency from which assigned or detailed, and he shall continue to receive compensation, allowances, and benefits from funds made available to that agency out of funds authorized under this Act.

"Security clearance

"SEC 510. No citizen or resident of the United States may be employed, or if already employed, may be assigned to duties by the Director or the Secretary of State under this Act or the Act for International Development for a period to exceed three months unless (a) such individual has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report thereon has been made to the Director or the Secretary of State, as the case may be, and until the Director or the Secretary of State has certified in writing (and filed copies thereof with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs) that, after full consideration of such report, he believes such individual is loyal to the United States, its Constitution, and form of government, and is not now and has never been a member of any organization advocating contrary views; or (b) such individual has been investigated by a military intelligence agency and the Secretary of Defense has certified in writing that he believes such individual is loyal to the United States and filed copies thereof with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. This section shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, nor shall it apply in the case of any person already employed under programs covered by this Act who has been previously investigated in connection with such employment.

"Eligibility for assistance

"SEC. 511. (a) No military, economic, or technical assistance authorized pursuant to this Act (other than assistance provided under section 408 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended) shall be supplied to any nation in order to further military effort unless the President finds that the supplying of such assistance will strengthen the security of the United States and unless the recipient country has agreed to—

"(1) join in promoting international understanding and good will, and maintaining world peace;

"(2) take such action as may be mutually agreed upon to eliminate causes of international tension;

"(3) fulfill the military obligations which it has assumed under multilateral or bilateral agreements or treaties to which the United States is a party;

"(4) make, consistent with its political and economic stability, the full contribution permitted by its manpower, resources, facilities, and general economic condition to the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world;

"(5) take all reasonable measures which may be needed to develop its defense capacities; and

"(6) take appropriate steps to insure the effective utilization of the economic and military assistance provided by the United States.

"(b) No economic or technical assistance shall be supplied to any other nation unless the President finds that the supplying of such assistance will strengthen the security of the United States and promote world peace, and unless the recipient country has agreed to join in promoting international understanding and good will, and in maintaining world peace, and to take such action as may be mutually agreed upon to eliminate causes of international tension.

"Future authorizations

"SEC 512 In order to carry out the purpose of this Act, with respect to those countries eligible to receive assistance as provided herein, funds shall be available as authorized and appropriated to the President each fiscal year.

"Transferability between titles

"SEC 513 Whenever the President determines it to be necessary for the purpose of this Act, not to exceed 10 per centum of the funds made available under any title of this Act may be transferred to and consolidated with funds made available under any other title of this Act in order to furnish, to a different area, assistance of the kind for which such funds were available before transfer. Whenever the President makes any such determination, he shall forthwith notify the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. In the case of the transfer of funds available for military purposes, he shall also forthwith notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

"Strategic materials

"SEC 514. In order to promote the increased production, in areas covered by this Act, of materials in which the United States is deficient, not to exceed $55,000,000 of the funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to section 101 (a) (2) of this Act may be used pursuant to the authority contained in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501–1522).

"Protection against attachment

"SEC. 515. All countries participating in any United States aid program or in any international organization receiving United States aid shall be required to so deposit, segregate, or assure title to all funds allocated to or derived from any program so that the same shall not be subject to garnishment, attachment, seizure, or other legal process by any person, firm, agency, corporation, organization, or government when in the opinion of the Director any such action

would interfere with the attainment of the objectives of this Act.

"Encouragement of free enterprise

"SEC. 516. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that this Act shall be administered in such a way as (1) to eliminate the barriers to, and provide the incentives for, a steadily increased participation of free private enterprise in developing the resources of foreign countries consistent with the policies of this Act, (2) to the extent that it is feasible and does not interfere with the achievement of the purposes set forth in this Act, to discourage the cartel and monopolistic business practices prevailing in certain countries receiving aid under this Act which result in restricting production and increasing prices, and to encourage where suitable competition and productivity, and (3) to encourage where suitable the development and strengthening of the free labor union movements as the collective bargaining agencies of labor within such countries

"Patents and technical information

"SEC. 517. (a) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'invention' means an invention or discovery covered by a patent issued by the United States, and

"(2) the term 'information' means information originated by or peculiarly within the knowledge of the owner thereof and those in privity with him, which is not available to the public and is subject to protection as property under recognized legal principles

"(b) Whenever, in connection with the furnishing of any assistance in furtherance of the purpose of this Act—

"(1) use within the United States, without authorization by the owner, shall be made of an invention, or

"(2) damage to the owner shall result from the disclosure of information by reason of acts of the United States or its officers or employees,

the exclusive remedy of the owner of such invention or information shall be by suit against the United States in the Court of Claims or in the District Court of the United States for the district in which such owner is a resident for reasonable and entire compensation for unauthorized use or disclosure. In any such suit the United States may avail itself of any and all defenses, general or special, that might be pleaded by any defendant in a like action.

"(c) Before such suit against the United States has been instituted, the head of the appropriate department or agency of the Government, which has furnished any assistance in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, is authorized and empowered to enter into an agreement with the claimant, in full settlement and compromise of any claim against the United States hereunder

"(d) The provisions of the last sentence of section 1498 of Title 28 of the United States Code shall apply to inventions and information covered by this section

"(e) Except as otherwise provided by law, no recovery shall be had for any infringement of a patent committed more than six years prior to the filing of the complaint or counterclaim for infringement in the action, except that the period between the date of receipt by the Government of a written claim under subsection (c) above for compensation for infringement of a patent and the date of mailing by the Government of a notice to the claimant that his claim has been denied shall not be counted as part of the six years, unless suit is brought before the last-mentioned date.

"Reports

"SEC. 518. The President, from time to time while funds appropriated for the purpose of this Act continue to be available for obligation, shall transmit to the Congress, in lieu of any reports otherwise required by laws continued in effect by this Act, reports covering each six months of operations in furtherance of the purpose of this Act, except information the disclosure of which he deems incompatible with the security of the United States. The first such report shall cover the six-month period commencing on the date this Act becomes effective. Reports provided for under this section shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, if the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, is not in session.

"Local currency

"SEC 519 (a) Upon a determination by the Director that it will further the purpose of this Act, not to exceed $10,000,000 of the funds made available pursuant to section 203 of this Act and not to exceed $25,000,000 of funds made available pursuant to section 302 of this Act may be advanced to countries covered by said sections in return for equivalent amounts of the currency of such countries being made available to meet local currency needs of the aid programs in such countries pursuant to agreements made in advance with the United States: *Provided*, That except when otherwise prescribed by the Director as necessary to the effective accomplishment of the aid programs in such countries, all funds so advanced shall be held under procedures set out in such agreements until used to pay for goods and services approved by the United States or until repaid to the United States for reimbursement to the appropriation from which drawn

"(b) In order to assist in carrying out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, not to exceed $50,000,000 of funds made available under the authority of this Act for assistance pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U S C 1501–1522), may be used to acquire local currency for the purpose of increasing the production of materials in which the United States is deficient.

"Guaranties

"SEC 520 Funds realized from the sales of notes pursuant to section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, shall be available for making guaranties of investments in accordance with the applicable provisions of sections 111 (b) (3) and 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act, as amended, in any area in which assistance is authorized by this Act.

"Administrative expenses

"SEC 521 Funds made available for carrying out the provisions of title I of this Act shall be available for United States participation in the acquisition or construction of facilities in foreign countries for collective defense: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be expended for rental or purchase of land or for payment of taxes. Such funds shall also be available for the administrative expenses of carrying out the purposes of all of the titles of this Act, including expenses incident to United States participation in international security organizations and expenses in the United States in connection with programs authorized under the Act for International Development Any currency of any nation received by the United States for its own use in connection with assistance furnished by the United States may be used by any agency of the Government without reimbursement from any appropriation for the administrative and operating expenses of carrying out the purposes of this Act. Funds made available for carrying out the purposes of this Act in the Federal Republic of Germany may, as authorized in subsection 114 (h) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1512 (h)), be transferred by the President to any department or agency for the expenses necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in the Federal Republic of Germany.

"Loans

"SEC. 522. Section 111 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U S. C 1501–1522), is hereby amended by adding a new paragraph as follows.

"'(3) Of the assistance provided under the applicable provisions of this Act with funds made available under the authority of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as great an amount (in no event less than 10 per centum) as possible shall be provided on credit terms'

"Use of counterpart

"SEC. 523. Section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1513 (b) (6)), is hereby amended by—

"(a) inserting in the second proviso thereof after 'wealth' the following: 'for the encouragement of emigration pursuant to subsection (e) of this section';

"(b) adding in the last clause of the second proviso 'and operating' after 'administrative';

"(c) striking from the last clause of the second proviso 'within such country';

"(d) substituting in the fourth proviso the words 'upon termination of assistance to such country under this Act' in place of the words 'on June 30, 1952', and

"(e) adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: 'The Administrator shall exercise the power granted to him by this paragraph to make agreements with respect to the use of the funds deposited in the special accounts of "participating countries" (as defined in section 103 (a) hereof) and any other countries receiving assistance under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, in such a manner that the equivalent of not less than $500,000,000 of such funds shall be used exclusively for military production, construction, equipment, and matériel in such countries The amount to be devoted from each such special account for such use shall be agreed upon by the Administrator and the country or countries concerned.'.

"Return of equipment

"SEC 524 The President shall make appropriate arrangements with each nation receiving equipment or material under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (other than equipment or material furnished under terms requiring the nation to reimburse the United States in full therefor), for the return to the United States (1) for salvage or scrap, or (2) for such other disposition as the President shall deem to be in the interest of mutual security, of any such equipment or material as is no longer required for the purposes for which originally made available.

"Reimbursable aid

"SEC. 525. Section 408 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S C. 1580), is hereby amended by adding in the first proviso thereof, after the words 'of which it is a part,' the words 'or in United Nations collective security arrangements and measures,' and by changing the figure at the end of such section 408 (e) to '$500,000,000'.

"Excess equipment

"SEC. 526 The proviso in the first sentence of section 403 (d) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S C. 1574 (d)), is hereby amended to read as follows *'Provided*, That after June 30, 1950, such limitation shall be increased by $250,000,000 and after June 30, 1951, by an additional $500,000,000'.

"Congressional committee expenses

"SEC 527. Section 115 (h) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1513 (h)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'including local currency requirements of appropriate committees of the Congress engaged in carrying out their duties under section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946'.

"United Nations technical assistance

"SEC. 528. The Act for International Development is amended—

"(a) By adding before the period at the end of section 404 (b) the following: ': *Provided*, That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, such contributions from funds made available under authority of sections 101 (a) (2), 203, 302, and 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 shall not exceed in the aggregate $13,000,000, and the use of such contributions shall not be limited to the area covered by the section of the Act from which the funds are drawn'

"(b) By adding at the end of section 407 a new paragraph:

"'(d) Participating countries shall be encouraged to establish fair labor standards of wages and working conditions and management-labor relations.'

"(c) By repealing section 414.

"Termination of assistance by President

"SEC. 529 If the President determines that the furnishing of assistance to any nation—

"(a) is no longer consistent with the national interest or security of the United States or the policies and purpose of this Act; or

"(b) would contravene a decision of the Security Council of the United Nations; or

"(c) would be inconsistent with the principle that members of the United Nations should refrain from giving assistance to any nation against which the Security Council or the General Assembly has recommended measures in case of a threat to, or breach of, the peace, or act of aggression,

he shall terminate all or part of any assistance furnished pursuant to this Act. The function conferred herein shall be in addition to all other functions heretofore conferred with respect to the termination of military, economic, or technical assistance.

"Expiration of program

"SEC. 530. (a) After June 30, 1954, or after the date of the passage of a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of Congress before such date, none of the authority conferred by this Act or by the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U S. C. 1571–1604) may be exercised; except that during the twelve months following such date equipment, materials, commodities, and services with respect to which procurement for, shipment to, or delivery in a recipient country had been authorized prior to such date, may be transferred to such country, and funds appropriated under authority of this Act may be obligated during such twelve-month period for the necessary expenses of procurement, shipment, delivery, and other activities essential to such transfer and shall remain available during such period for the necessary expenses of liquidating operations under this Act.

"(b) At such time as the President shall find appropriate after such date, and prior to the expiration of the twelve months following such date, the powers, duties, and authority conferred by this Act and by the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, may be transferred for the purpose of liquidation to such other departments, agencies, or establishments of the Government as the President shall specify, and the relevant funds, records, property and personnel may be transferred to the departments, agencies, or establishments to which the related functions are transferred.

"Effective date

"SEC. 531. Sections 502 (a), (b) (2), and section 504 (b) of this Act shall take effect on such date or dates as the President shall specify, but in no event later than sixty days after the date the Director first appointed takes office. Section 511 shall take effect ninety days after enactment of this Act. All other provisions of this Act shall take effect upon the date of its enactment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

J P. RICHARDS,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
THOMAS E. MORGAN,
JOHN M. VORYS,
FRANCES P BOLTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

TOM CONNALLY,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
BRIEN MCMAHON,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R 5113) to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference has agreed to a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment Except for clarifying, clerical, and necessary conforming changes, the differences are noted below:

THE FUND AUTHORIZATIONS

(a) Totals

The total amount authorized in the House bill was $7,498,750,000 The amount authorized by the Senate amendment was $7,286,250,000, or a total of $212,500,000 less.

The committee of conference has agreed on a total of $7,483,400,000. This amount is $15,350,000 less than the total authorized by the House, $197,150,000 more than the total authorized by the Senate, and $1,016,600,000 or 11 96 percent less than the $8,500,000,000 requested by the President

The agreement provides for all titles a total of $5,997,650,000 for military assistance and a total of $1,485,750,000 for economic assistance. In totals, the military assistance funds are $15,350,000 less than the total in the House bill, and the economic assistance funds are the same as the amounts approved by the House.

The distribution between titles represents the adjustment made by the committee of conference. In no case does any authorization in the conference agreement exceed a figure authorized by either the House bill or the Senate amendment.

Generally speaking, the agreement restored funds for Europe and Asia, leaving the amounts for the Near East and the American Republics the same as those approved by the Senate. In the opinion of the committee of conference, Europe and Asia are the areas where the present need for assistance is most urgent.

(b) Title I—Europe (sec. 101)

The amounts agreed upon are $5,028,000,000 for military assistance and $1,022,000,000 for economic assistance.

The amount of military assistance funds is the amount authorized by the House and $21,650,000 more than the Senate amount.

The amount authorized for economic assistance is $18,000,000 less than the House amount when calculated on the base comparable to that on which the Senate amount is calculated. The amount agreed upon is $141,500,000 more than the Senate amount.

At first glance, the agreed amount appears to be more than that authorized by the House. The apparent discrepancy is in the different base used for calculation by House and Senate. The Senate amount was $880,500,000, including the $55,000,000 for strategic materials. On this basis, the House amount would be $1,040,000,000, consisting of $985,000,000 for Europe and $55,000,000 for strategic-material development contained in a separate authorization in title VI of the House bill. Since the conference agreement provided that funds for strategic materials are to come from title I funds, the amount agreed upon is calculated in relation to comparable House and Senate figures. On this basis, the agreed amount is actually $18,000,000 less than the comparable House amount.

The committee of conference was fully convinced that the threat in Europe, and the necessity for all possible speed and utmost effort to get the European economies converted to military production, gave this area special emphasis in any agreement on funds In view of General Eisenhower's message to Chairman James P. Richards emphasizing this point, and the urgency of getting European production to the point where United States end-item assistance can be reduced, the committee of conference felt justified in authorizing funds for Europe at the expense of some other areas.

Title II—Near East and Africa (secs. 201 and 203)

The amounts agreed upon are $396,250,000 for military assistance and $160,000,000 for economic assistance. These are the amounts approved by the Senate. The military funds are $18,750,000 less than the House amount, and the economic funds are $15,000,000 less. The authorizations to use $50,000,000 for Palestine refugees and $50,000,000 for Israel refugees have not been changed.

Title III—Asia and Pacific (secs. 301–303)

The amounts agreed upon are $535,250,000 for military assistance, and $282,500,000 for economic assistance The economic assistance funds consist of $237,500,000 for general economic assistance and $45,000,000 for Korean rehabilitation work

The $535,250,000 for military assistance is the amount the Senate approved, and is $5,250,000 more than the House-approved amount The committee of conference felt that the critical situation in Indochina and other areas of Asia made the higher amount necessary

The $237,500,000 for general economic assistance is the amount approved by the House.

The $45,000,000 for Korean rehabilitation represents a compromise between the token amount of $11,250,000 voted by the House and $69,750,000 voted by the Senate. The committee of conference agreed that although Korean rehabilitation cannot proceed at once, the amount available should be sufficient to enable planning and financial operations to go forward.

It is recognized, however, that the requirements for Korean rehabilitation cannot at this time be fixed with any precision. Undoubtedly, the United States will be called upon in the future to assist in this matter. The amount agreed upon does not foreclose further requests; neither is it an assurance that this country will in the future shoulder the major burden of resolving this problem.

The conference agreement contains a provision permitting the transfer of up to 50 percent ($22,500,000) of the funds for Korea to general economic and technical assistance in those parts of the region not under Com-

munist control. The importance of strengthening the region against the encroachment of Communist aggression on many fronts made this provision desirable.

Title IV—American Republics (secs. 401–402)

The amounts agreed upon are $38,150,000 for military assistance and $21,250,000 for economic assistance. These are the Senate-approved amounts, a total of $2,600,000 less than the amount approved by the House.

The following tables show the breakdown of the agreed amounts:

TABLE I.—*Authorizations, by title*

Title I—Europe:	
Military	$5,028,000,000
Economic	1,022,000,000
Total	6,050,000,000
Title II—Near East and Africa:	
Military	$396,250,000
Economic	160,000,000
Total	556,250,000
Title III—Asia and Pacific:	
Military	535,250,000
Economic:	
All but Korea	237,500,000
Korea	45,000,000
Subtotal (economic)	282,500,000
Total	817,750,000
Title IV—American Republics:	
Military	$38,150,000
Economic	21,250,000
Total	59,400,000
Grand total	7,483,400,000

TABLE II.—*Authorizations, by type*

	Military	Economic	Total
Title I	$5,028,000,000	$1,022,000,000	$6,050,000,000
Title II	396,250,000	160,000,000	556,250,000
Title III	535,250,000	282,500,000	817,750,000
Title IV	38,150,000	21,250,000	59,400,000
Total	5,997,650,000	1,485,750,000	7,483,400,000

TABLE III.—*Authorizations, by comparisons*

Item	President's request	House amounts	Senate amounts	Conference agreement	Conference agreement differences: More or less than request, Amount	More or less than request, Percent	More or less than House bill, Amount	More or less than House bill, Percent	More or less than Senate amendment, Amount	More or less than Senate amendment, Percent
Title I—Europe:										
Military	$5,293,000,000	$5,028,000,000	$5,006,350,000	$5,028,000,000	$265,000,000 less	5.00 less	None	------	$21,650,000 more	0.43 more
Economic	1,675,000,000	1 1,040,000,000	1 880,500,000	1,022,000,000	653,000,000 less	38.98 less	$18,000,000 less	1.73 less	141,500,000 more	16.07 more
Total	6,968,000,000	6,068,000,000	5,886,850,000	6,050,000,000	918,000,000 less	13.17 less	18,000,000 less	.25 less	163,150,000 more	2.77 more
Title II—Near East and Africa:										
Military	415,000,000	415,000,000	396,250,000	396,250,000	18,750,000 less	4.51 less	18,750,000 less	4.61 less	None	-----
Economic	125,000,000	175,000,000	160,000,000	160,000,000	35,000,000 more	28.00 more	15,000,000 less	8.57 less	None	-----
Total	540,000,000	590,000,000	556,250,000	556,250,000	16,250,000 more	3.00 more	33,750,000 less	5.72 less	None	-----
Title III—Asia and Pacific:										
Military	555,000,000	530,000,000	535,250,000	535,250,000	19,750,000 less	3.55 less	5,250,000 more	.99 more	None	-----
Economic:										
All but Korea	262,500,000	237,500,000	178,750,000	237,500,000	25,000,000 less	9.52 less	None	------	58,750,000 more	32.86 more
Korea	112,500,000	11,250,000	69,750,000	45,000,000	67,500,000 less	60.00 less	33,750,000 more	300.00 more	24,750,000 less	35.48 less
Subtotal (economic)	375,000,000	248,750,000	248,500,000	282,500,000	92,500,000 less	24.66 less	33,750,000 more	13.56 more	34,000,000 more	13.68 more
Total	930,000,000	778,750,000	783,750,000	817,750,000	112,500,000 less	12.06 less	39,000,000 more	5.00 more	34,000,000 more	4.33 more
Title IV—American Republics:										
Military	40,000,000	40,000,000	38,150,000	38,150,000	1,850,000 less	4.62 less	1,850,000 less	4.62 less	None	-----
Economic	22,000,000	22,000,000	21,250,000	21,250,000	750,000 less	3.40 less	750,000 less	3.40 less	None	-----
Total	62,000,000	62,000,000	59,400,000	59,400,000	2,600,000 less	4.19 less	2,600,000 less	4.19 less	None	-----
Grand total	8,500,000,000	7,498,750,000	7,286,250,000	7,483,400,000	1,016,600,000 less	11.96 less	15,350,000 less	0.20 less	197,150,000 more	2.70 more

[1] Includes authorizations for strategic material development.

Transfer of funds under title I (sec. 101 (a) (1)): The conference agreement repeals section 408 (c) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, as amended. That section permitted the President to transfer not more than 10 percent of funds made available under that act to a non-NATO country when certain conditions are met—

(1) "A development seriously affecting the security of the North Atlantic Treaty area for the purpose of providing military assistance to any other European nation whose strategic location makes it of direct importance to the defense" of this area;

(2) The President finds, after consultation with the other North Atlantic parties, that the immediately increased ability of that nation to defend itself "contributes to the preservation of the peace and security of the North Atlantic area"; and

(3) That such action "is vital to the security of the United States."

The language of section 101 (a) (1) changes the conditions of assistance to non-NATO countries in Europe. Consultation with other NATO members is not required and the criteria of our aid is whether the country is "important" to the security of the United States rather than "vital." This makes the language of section 408 (c) unnecessary.

Notification to legislative committees (sec. 101 (a) (1)): The inclusion of this language assures notification of the appropriate legislative committees whenever the President uses funds authorized under this section for military assistance to a European country not a party to the North Atlantic Treaty.

Emigration of surplus manpower (sec. 101 (a) (2)): The House bill (proviso to sec. 101 (a) (2)) set a ceiling of $30,000,000 to be utilized for the emigration of surplus manpower. The Senate amendment set the amount at $10,000,000. The conference agreement follows the Senate version. The committee of conference wishes to make clear its intent that none of the funds made available pursuant to the proviso should be allocated to any international organization which has in its membership any Communist, Communist-dominated or Communist-controlled country, to any subsidiary thereof or to any agency created by or stemming from such organization. It is vital to the security of the United States and to the success of the surplus manpower emigration program that no international body with Communist influence receive any United States assistance for the purpose of such program. It is the expectation of the committee of conference that steps will be taken as quickly as possible to get the program moving and that the funds made available will be used.

Transfer of funds within title I (Europe) (sec. 101 (b)): The committee of conference agreed to change from 5 to 10 percent the amount of the appropriations in title I that may be transferred between economic and military sums in that title. In view of the reductions in amounts and of the uncertain international situation, this increased flexibility was deemed desirable. It will permit greater leeway in making the most effective use of the money authorized under this section.

Contributions to United Nations for Palestine refugee work (sec. 204): Both the House bill and the Senate amendment contained the principle that any contribution made directly by an agency of the United ment to further the purpose of the United States Government to further the purposes of the United Nations Palestine Refugee Aid Act of 1950 can only be made if the United Nations credits such contribution as part of the United States contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.

The difference between the House bill and the Senate amendment on this point was one of method and not of principle. The conference agreement clarifies the point and makes clear that the United States is not required to obtain United Nations approval in advance before making such a direct contribution.

Transfer of functions under Far Eastern Economic Assistance Act (sec. 303 (e)): The Senate amendment provided that the functions of the Administrator for Economic

Cooperation under section 3 of the Far Eastern Economic Assistance Act, as amended, be performed by such agencies as the President directs. The House bill contained no such provision. The conference agreement follows the Senate language, which accords with the facts of the situation. Soon after hostilities in Korea began, ECA operations were terminated. The responsibility for the recovery program for Korea has now been given to the United Nations, and ECA operations will not be resumed.

Such functions and funds as remain are now being administered by the Army. No purpose is served by retaining them in the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Title V—Organization and general provisions

The House bill and the Senate amendment made divergent provisions for the organization of the Mutual Security Program and the provision to be made for carrying on the economic support for military production in foreign nations beyond the termination of the Economic Cooperation Administration on June 30, 1952.

The House bill provided for a single Administrator to be the head of a new Mutual Security Agency which would take over the functions of the Economic Cooperation Administration. The Administrator was to be responsible for the administration of the program subject to the direction of the President. The Senate amendment provided for the continuation of the present division of responsibilities among the Department of Defense, the ECA, and the Department of State with an over-all coordination function to be performed in the Executive Office of the President either by an individual or board to be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The House bill provided that a new Mutual Security Agency would carry on the functions of the Economic Cooperation Administration until the termination of the ECA Act on June 30, 1952. The new Agency would not have been able to carry on any economic assistance after that date without specific legislation for that purpose subsequent to this act. The Senate bill required the President to submit to the Congress before March 30, 1952, a reorganization plan under the Reorganization Act of 1949 abolishing the Economic Cooperation Administration and transferring such powers and duties of the Administrator of ECA as might be necessary to carry out the purpose of the Mutual Security Act to an appropriate agency of the Government.

The committee of conference agreed upon a substitute for the provisions of the House bill and Senate amendment dealing with organization.

The conference agreement reflects the dissatisfaction of the Congress with the present method of coordination of our foreign-aid programs through the International Security Affairs Committee (ISAC), an interagency committee headed by an official of the Department of State.

The responsibility for the coordination and supervision of the military, economic, and technical assistance programs authorized by the conference agreement is vested in a single person so that the act may be administered as a unified program. The President is authorized to appoint a Director for Mutual Security in the Executive Office of the President at the salary received by a member of the Cabinet.

A Mutual Security Agency is established which immediately takes over the functions of the ECA and will continue to provide until June 30, 1954, limited economic assistance essential to the defense program.

The Director for Mutual Security is made responsible for administering this new Agency. He is also required to provide overall supervision and general direction of the Mutual Security Program. The Director will administer the new Mutual Security Agency but the administration of the military end-item program is definitely placed in the Department of Defense (sec. 506). It is intended that the Director shall perform primarily integrating and coordinating functions with regard to the operations of the Departments of State and Defense in the Mutual Security Program. The Director is to act on behalf of and subject to the direction of the President.

In accepting the solution finally agreed upon, the committee of conference was guided largely by the fundamental doctrine that under the Constitution ultimate responsibility for effective operation of the Mutual Security Program lies with the President.

The Director is given primary responsibility for preparing and presenting to Congress programs for assistance which may be required in the interest of the security of the United States. The President is authorized to transfer to the Director three positions with salaries of $15,000 per year and one position with a salary of $16,000 a year as authorized by section 406 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949. Neither the Director nor any persons appointed to these positions may hold a job at the same time in any other Government agency.

The conference agreement provides that the Director shall become a member of the National Security Council and of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems.

The conference agreement also includes a provision (sec. 501 (e) (3)) placing the Director for Mutual Security on the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank. This was done to facilitate the effective operation of the provision requiring that as large a proportion as possible of the funds authorized be provided on credit terms, in no event less than 10 percent. The administration of such loans is handled by the Export-Import Bank under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act, although the Director for Mutual Security will specify the terms in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems.

The task of the Director will be a big one. The committee of conference was of the view that a person should be appointed with commensurate ability.

MUTUAL SECURITY AGENCY

The conference agreement provides for the termination of the Economic Cooperation Administration and the principal offices of that agency. A new Mutual Security Agency is established and the functions of the Economic Cooperation Administration are transferred to it. Only those powers and responsibilities provided by the Economic Cooperation Administration Act are permitted to extend beyond June 30, 1952, which the President determines are necessary to carry on the purposes of the Mutual Security Act. The President is required to notify the appropriate committees of Congress before April 1, 1952, which of these powers are to be extended. All other ECA powers terminate June 30, 1952.

The primary responsibilities of the new Agency are three:

1. The development and administration of programs of assistance designed to sustain and increase military effort, including production, construction, equipment and matériel in each country or in groups of countries which receive United States military assistance.

2. The provision of equipment, financial and other assistance to countries for carrying out mutual defense programs.

3. The provision of limited economic assistance to countries for which the United States has special responsibilities as a result of its participation in joint control arrangements (such as Austria) when the President finds provision of such assistance in the interest of the security of the United States.

After June 30, 1952, the new Agency cannot provide assistance for any purpose except the three mentioned in section 503. No economic assistance can be provided to any country for "recovery" purposes; and, except in "joint control" countries, none can be provided for programs other than "mutual defense programs" which are defined in subsection (a) of section 503.

The Point Four program is entirely independent of the Mutual Security Agency, and the Act for International Development continues to be administered as the President directs.

Appointment and transfer of personnel: A Deputy Director for the Agency is established as well as a special representative in Europe and a deputy in Europe. These positions are equivalent to similar ones provided in the Economic Cooperation Administration Act and are subject to confirmation by the Senate.

In this connection, the committee of conference was aware that unless the United States representation in NATO were closely coordinated with the activities of the Mutual Security Agency in Europe, the effectiveness of the program would be impeded. Duplication of staffs in the office of the United States deputy to the North Atlantic Council (USDEP) and in the regional office of the Mutual Security Agency should be avoided. Wherever possible, USDEP should utilize the special skills and talents of the Mutual Security Agency personnel and not set up duplicate staffs.

Personnel (sec. 504 (c)) may be transferred from the Economic Cooperation Administration to the Mutual Security Agency after a double screening. The new Director for Mutual Security must certify that he needs the persons transferred to carry out his duties, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget must make a similar certification. This is in conformity with the House version (sec. 502 (c)).

Provision is made for reducing the number of "super grade" positions within the continental limits of the United States from 100 authorized by the ECA Act to 50, of which 15 (the ECA Act permits 25) are permitted to receive salaries of $15,000 per year. These positions are in addition to those now authorized by section 406 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act and provided for in section 501 (d) of the conference agreement.

The conference agreement also requires a reduction in personnel. By January 1, 1952, the total United States personnel of the Mutual Security Agency—at home and abroad—must be at least 10 percent below the number employed by the Economic Cooperation Administration on August 31, 1951.

Preserving the foreign policy powers or functions of the Secretary of State (secs. 505 and 507). The conference agreement contains two provisions which preserve the powers or functions of the Secretary of State in the field of foreign policy. Under section 507 (which retains the Senate language) the President is to assure coordination of the Mutual Security Program abroad, under the leadership of the chief of the United States diplomatic mission in the recipient country, while section 505 (which retains the House language) states that nothing in the Mutual Security Act shall be construed to infringe upon the powers or functions of the Secretary of State. The purpose of these provisions is to assure that the operations of the Mutual Security Program will be consistent with the foreign policy objectives of the United States and that the Secretary of State's traditional powers in this respect are not abridged.

Responsibilities of Secretary of Defense (sec. 506 (a) and (b)): The committee of conference was agreed that the military end-item program and related programs were matters to be handled by the Department of Defense. This section spells out the re-

sponsibilities and authority for these programs that are entrusted to the Secretary of Defense. These include the determination of priorities in procurement and deliveries, the allocation of military equipment, and the apportionment of funds between services. In the case of the apportionment of funds between countries, however, political and economic judgments as well as military considerations are important. This function was entrusted to the President to whom the funds are authorized to be appropriated under this act.

Transfer of military end items by Secretary of Defense (sec. 506 (c)): The committee of conference is of the opinion that expeditious despatch of military equipment to friendly nations is essential in the interests of United States security. It may be desirable to ship such items made under funds appropriated to the Department of Defense. Under existing law the Secretary of Defense cannot transfer military end items the procurement of which was appropriated for under another act.

The language of the conference agreement permits the transfer of such items up to $1 billion in value. In such cases the Secretary of Defense will be reimbursed from funds allocated to the President under the authorization of this act. No additional appropriation is involved.

Point Four program (sec. 508): The organizational arrangements in the conference agreement make little reference to the Point Four program. The committee of conference is fully aware that the Point Four program will be subject to coordination and supervision if "unified direction and control" is to have meaning. However, it is the clear intent of the committee of conference that the administration of the Point Four program shall remain in and under the control of the Department of State. This includes the activities carried on under the Act for International Development and under the Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act.

Security clearance (sec. 510): The conference agreement contains amendments to section 501 (h) of the House version to make the language specifically cover the security clearance of personnel employed under the Act for International Development. The House version had originally included Point Four personnel since the administration of the Act for International Development had been transferred to the Mutual Security Administrator in the House bill.

Under the Act for International Development no person can be assigned to duty until an investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been completed. The Economic Cooperation Act permits a 3-month appointment pending completion of the FBI investigation. The committee of conference agreed that the same provision should apply to Point Four employees as to those of the Mutual Security Agency so that the House version was amended to include Act for International Development personnel.

Eligibility for assistance (sec. 511): The differences between the House bill and the Senate amendment on this point were minor. The conference agreement follows the Senate version which clarifies and perfects the language. It is now clear that the standards for eligibility for assistance established in this section apply only to assistance authorized pursuant to this act. Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) has been broadened to include the promotion of international understanding and good will in addition to maintaining world peace. Paragraph (4) of the same subsection added the words "and economic" to the requirement for making a full contribution consistent with political stability.

Strategic materials (sec. 514): The House bill provided a separate authorization for strategic-materials development. The Senate amendment authorized the function but directed that the funds be utilized from those made available for Title I—Europe. The conference agreement follows the Senate version. The committee of conference fully agreed that increased attention should be given to this problem. The only issue was the method of financing. In the absence of any program for increased production the Senate version was considered preferable. The language will permit the diversion of money up to $55,000,000 as the program is developed, rather than earmark a sum that could be used only for that purpose.

The committee of conference noted that under sections 303 and 304 of Executive Order 10161, as amended by section 201 of Executive Order 10281, the Defense Materials Procurement Administrator is given authority to make provision for the development of the production of strategic materials. Sections 115 (i) and 117 (a) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, direct the Administrator to assist the appropriate agencies of the United States Government in procuring and stimulating increased production in participating countries of materials in short supply in the United States. Although some doubt was expressed as to the effectiveness of the Economic Cooperation Administration in discharging this responsibility, the committee of conference agreed that instead of transferring this responsibility to the President or to the Defense Materials Administrator, the ECA Administrator and his successor, the Director for Mutual Security, should be urged to do their utmost to cooperate with and to assist the Defense Materials Administrator to discharge his responsibilities.

Protection against attachment (sec. 515): Under section 604 of the House bill all countries receiving United States assistance are required to take steps to protect aid program funds and property from court attachment or seizure in connection with other matters, as in the Belgian case. The Senate amendment contained no such provision.

The conference agreement contains the House language with modifications. The original House language might have been interpreted to mean that a farmer with an ECA tractor could not be sued by a creditor for failure to pay for the tractor.

This was not the intention of the House language; the provision was designed to prevent diversion of assistance funds for other purposes. The conference agreement assures this principle.

Encouragement of free enterprise (sec. 516): The conference agreement (sec. 516) combines the major provisions of section 2 (b) of the Senate amendment and section 605 (b) of the House bill. These sections direct that the Mutual Security Program be administered so as to encourage free private enterprise, discourage cartels and monopolies, and encourage the free labor movement. The language agreed upon is in accordance with principles enumerated by the House on numerous occasions in the past. At the same time it is so drafted that these longer-range directives can be gradually merged with the immediate and urgent objective of the program.

Patents and technical information (sec. 517 (d)): As regards suits for compensation for unauthorized use or disclosure of patents and of technical information, the House version (sec. 606 (d)) provided that no right of action was conferred on anyone who is employed by the United States at the time he makes his claim, or who was so employed at the time he made the invention or discovery. The Senate version omitted this language.

The conference agreement makes applicable the last sentence of section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, which is substantially the language of the House version. It was the view of the committee of conference that the existing patent law should not be changed by the committee of conference, except insofar as it should be made clear that section 1498 applies to situations covered by this act.

Administrative expenses (sec. 521): During the conference the question was raised as to whether either the House or Senate versions of the bill had made clear that funds could be used for the acquisition or construction of facilities in Europe for collective defense. The committee of conference decided to make this authorization explicit, at the same time making equally explicit the prohibition of the use of our funds for rental or purchase of real estate, or for payment of taxes.

The new language inserted in section 521 is as follows: "and for participation in the acquisition or construction of facilities in foreign countries for collective defense: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be expended for rental or purchase of land or for payment of taxes."

The committee of conference considered prohibiting direct or indirect payment of taxes. They realized, however, that taxes go into the price structure of everything that is purchased in Europe or the United States, and therefore that it would be impossible, administratively if not literally, to buy anything or hire anyone on a basis that would preclude the possibility of having part of the funds going ultimately for taxes. The conference also learned that direct taxes are never paid by our authorities and that negotiations are in progress to eliminate "twilight zone" transactions. Therefore, it was felt that the limitation against the use of funds for payment of taxes was sufficient.

Loans to recipient countries (sec. 522): The House bill provided that not less than 20 percent of the assistance might be available from new funds. The committee of conference agreed that not less than 10 percent of the assistance made available from new funds (not including carry-over funds) under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act, as amended, must be in the form of assistance on credit. "The conference agreement provides that 'as great an amount (in no event less than 10 per centum) as possible shall be provided on credit terms.'" The Director will be a member of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. This body passes upon the terms of the loan agreements. It may find that a particular country is so heavily burdened that the imposition of a loan is practically impossible. On the other hand, another country may be capable of increasing its debt burden. Thus, some countries may receive grants, others loans, and some may receive both. The only absolute requirement is that at least 10 percent of the total sum be on credit terms.

The 10 percent provision is a minimum, not a maximum. It is expected that the responsible officials will make strenuous efforts to advance more than 10 percent of the authorized sums in the form of loans rather than grants.

Use of counterpart (sec. 523):

(a) Disposition of unencumbered balances of counterpart funds: The Senate version amends section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act to permit disposition of unencumbered balances of the counterpart in any country upon termination of assistance under the act rather than on the date June 30, 1952.

The House bill contained no such provision. The conference agreement follows the Senate language. Since the conference agreement now provides for some assistance programs involving counterpart funds beyond June 30, 1952, no purpose is served in preserving the date. Disposition of counterpart funds in those countries where programs may be terminated next year will be made as expeditiously under the language

the conference agreement as under a given date.

(b) Use of counterpart funds for military purposes: The House bill provided that not less than $500,000,000 of the counterpart funds in ECA countries be used for military production The Senate amendment included additional countries—those receiving aid under the Mutual Defense Assistance Program—and broadened the uses of the counterpart funds. The conference agreement retains both the House and Senate provisions. Under the conference agreement, the requirement now applies to all countries where United States assistance involves counterpart funds. It assures that a substantial amount of counterpart funds will be devoted to the immediate objectives of the Mutual Security Program The conference agreement also preserves flexibility of administration. Those in charge of the program can select the countries and the amounts in any way they see fit so long as the minimum amount is earmarked for the purposes provided

Return of used material and equipment (sec. 524) · The difference between House and Senate versions on this point was small. The conference agreement follows the Senate language, expressing more clearly the intent of the section originally passed by the House.

Transfer of excess equipment (sec 526): The Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 authorized the transfer to other countries of not more than $450,000,000 on value of used and obsolete equipment In 1950 the ceiling was raised to $700,000,000.

The committee of conference felt that the evidence on this in both Houses was unsatisfactory. Raising the ceiling to the sum requested by the executive branch might encourage the armed services to declare excess equipment that was capable of further use. In this connection it was noted that our own forces are in urgent need of additional equipment for training and reserve purposes. The conference agreement authorizes the transfer of not more than $300,000,000 of additional excess equipment.

Congressional committee expenses (sec. 527): The House bill (sec. 616) contained provisions implementing the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 by providing for the appointment of additional staff for the Committee on Foreign Affairs and for the use of counterpart funds for expenses incurred by the committee and staff when on committee business abroad. These provisions were omitted in the Senate version The conference agreement retains the authority to use counterpart funds and extends it to include other appropriate committees and staffs of the Congress concerned with the Mutual Security Program, without charge to the appropriations made for such committees

Encouraging fair labor standards and management-labor relations (sec 528 (b)): The House version (sec. 617 (a) (2)) amended the Act for International Development by requiring the encouragement of participating countries in the technical assistance program "to negotiate agreements with the United Nations and its specialized agencies, or otherwise, to establish fair labor standards of wages and working conditions and management-labor relations." The Senate amendment contained no such provision. The conference agreement follows the House language, omitting the phrase "with the United Nations and its specialized agencies, or otherwise." It was the view of the committee of conference that the channel through which such agreements are negotiated should not be restricted.

Expiration of assistance (sec. 530): The conference agreement retains the basic language of the House version (sec 510), with respect to the expiration of the Mutual Security Program (with the exception of the Act for International Development), with certain clarifying amendments and the elimination of the proviso in section 510 (a) of the House version. The termination of the ECA contained in the proviso is specifically provided for in section 502 of the conference agreement.

Effective date (sec. 531): The Mutual Security Act will go into effect on the date of its enactment except for designated sections which will require time to accomplish. The abolition of the ECA, any transfer of personnel, the abolition of the senior ECA jobs and the creation of the jobs specified in the new Agency may occur at the discretion of the President, but not later than 60 days after the Director takes office. Section 511 which requires agreements from nations in order for them to be eligible for assistance will take effect 90 days after the enactment of the act in order to allow time for the negotiation of necessary agreements.

J P. RICHARDS,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
THOMAS E. MORGAN,
JOHN M VORYS,
FRANCES P. BOLTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against section 501 (e) (3) of the conference report on the ground that that section was neither in the bill in the other body or in the House bill. Section 501 (e) (3) is as follows:

(3) Paragraph (1) of section 3 (a) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended (12 U S C 635a (a) (1)), is amended by inserting after the words "Secretary of State," where they appear in the first sentence thereof the words "the Director for Mutual Security," and by striking out the last sentence of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof the following· "To the extent he deems it advisable the Secretary of State or the Director for Mutual Security, as the case may be, may designate to act for him in the discharge of his duties as a member of the Board of Directors any officer of his Department or Agency who shall have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director for Mutual Security shall not be considered to be a member of the Board of Directors for the purposes of the first sentence of paragraph (3) of this subsection or for the purposes of subsection (b)."

It amends the Export-Import Bank Act, and provides that the Director for Mutual Security shall be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the point of order be sustained. The conferees went beyond the scope of their authority in placing this provision in the conference report, a provision which had not been considered by either the House or the other body, and which provision amends an act which was not under consideration. I am heartily in favor of the objectives desired to be achieved by this act. I feel confident that the point of order will be sustained, and that the House will have an opportunity to vote on the conference report, and I shall support it and vote for it.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from South Carolina desire to be heard?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard briefly on the point of order?

When this bill went to conference, the situation confronting the conferees was this: The Senate in its consideration of the bill as an amendment struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted a new bill. According to some of the old precedents, and to a rule in force at one time, it was my understanding that this type of parliamentary situation would open the bill wide with the sky as the limit. It will be remembered that under the Reorganization Act of 1946, the rule was changed to provide that any conference report must be confined to the subject matter committed to the conference or to germane modifications of it. In this particular case we had in practical effect two bills before the conferees.

In view of the fact that the original ECA Act—still the law and will be if this conference report is adopted—directed the Export-Import Bank to perform certain functions in making loans where ECA assistance is given on credit. The conferees on both sides felt that the provision objected to here and against which a point of order has been raised was well within the subject matter of the bills under consideration. I realize, of course, Mr. Speaker, that this is a debatable question. However, I wish to assure the House, that there was neither motive nor attempt upon the part of any conferee from either body to evade the spirit of the bills passed by the two Houses. It is the definite opinion of the conferees on this side that the provision referred to and objected to is well within the subject matter under consideration by the conference committee.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. VORYS. The point of order as I understand it, is that the conferees were without authority to amend the Export-Import Bank Act by providing that the Director of Mutual Security shall be a member of the board of directors of the bank.

I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that section 612 of the House bill amended the ECA law, section 111 (c) by requiring that 20 percent of the funds to be administered by the new Administrator should be in the form of loans. Section 111 (c) of the ECA Act amended the Export-Import Bank Act by providing for loans under ECA, on terms specified by the Administrator in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Fiscal Problems. It provided that the loans should be administered by the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The Senate had no provision for loans and, therefore, no provision, of course, for administering the loans The conferees provided in section 522 of the conference report that as great an amount as possible but in no event less than 10 percent of the economic aid furnished should be on credit terms thereby amending existing law and adding to the duties of the Export-Import Bank just as had been provided in the House bill.

What the conferees did was to make a further amendment to the Export-Import Bank Act which had already been

amended in the House by providing that this new Director of Mutual Security in addition to being a member of the National Advisory Council on Monetary and Fiscal Affairs should be a member of the board of the bank that was to administer these loans which, if appropriations are in line with the authorizations, may amount to more than $140,000,000. So that, in view of the history of the House bill which amended the ECA law which in itself amended the Export-Import Bank law, it is clear to me, and it was clear to the conferees, that this came squarely under the provisions of section 135 (a) of the Reorganization Act, which says of the conferees:

They may, however, include in their report matter which is a germane modification of the subjects in disagreement.

The whole question of the administration of loans was in disagreement. The conferees made a germane modification of that subject, amending the Export-Import Bank law which had been amended by the House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the point of order should be overruled.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, section 135 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which is a section applicable to both Houses of Congress, reads as follows:

In any case in which a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been referred to conferees, it shall be in order for the conferees to report a substitute on the same subject matter, but they may not include in the report matter not committed by either House. They may, however, include in their report in such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement.

(b) In any case in which the conferees violate subsection (a), the conferees' report shall be subject to a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, when the bill, H. R. 5113, was considered in the Senate, all after the enacting clause was stricken and a new bill was substituted, which constitutes, of course, an amendment in the nature of a substitute coming within the language of section 135 which I have just read. It is true that the Export-Import Bank under section 111 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 has been functioning as the agent—not as a prime mover—of the Administrator of ECA but without any degree of latitude in respect to the conditions or quantity of the loan. It acts merely as the agent of the Administrator, as he is called in the act, in administration of loans.

The forepart of section (2) of section 111 (c) of the Foreign Assistance Act reads as follows:

When it is determined that assistance should be extended under the provisions of this title on credit terms, the Administrator—

Not the Export-Import Bank but the Administrator of ECA—

shall allocate funds for the purpose to the Export-Import Bank of Washington, which shall, notwithstanding the provisions of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945—

The Export-Import Act is not amended by this language but notwithstanding the provisions of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, it may—

administer the credit on terms specified by the Administrator in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems.

Therefore, the charter of the Export-Import Bank, under which was created a board of five directors, was not in disagreement before the conferees.

When the conferees in respect to H. R. 5113 amended the charter law of the export-import law and filed its report in this House, it reported on a matter which was not committed to them by either House.

Neither is it a matter which is germane to the subject matter for the reason that the Mutual Security Act of 1951 does not vest in the board of directors of the Export-Import Bank any discretion in respect to the making of loans. It authorizes them only to administer the loans in the manner laid down under regulations of the Director of the Mutual Security Act.

This amendment not only gives the Director a voice on the board with respect to the administration of moneys raised by the Director by requisition on the Treasury of the United States, notwithstanding any other action which the board of directors of the Bank might take, but it gives him authority to act as a member of the board of directors of the Export-Import Bank on all matters coming before that board, domestic and foreign.

It is true that many of the loans made by the Export-Import Bank, as a matter of fact almost all of them, are foreign loans, but the Export-Import Bank of Washington as set up and chartered by this Congress is authorized to do a general banking business, domestic as well as foreign. In the first place, to put the Director of the Mutual Security Act on the board of directors throws the board out of balance, because it creates an even number; it creates a board of six members, and in addition to that it overbalances the board in connection with the use of the Export-Import Bank in respect to our foreign policy.

Now, there was a very distinct purpose behind this rule. It was to prevent either House of the Congress being taken by surprise by the conferees assuming to have jurisdiction over matters which had not been committed to them by either House of the Congress. I might say, speaking for myself, that I was completely surprised because it has been only within the past week that we had a matter before the House in which the borrowing authority of the Export-Import Bank was increased by a billion dollars, and I remember very distinctly that I very sincerely made the statement on the floor of this House that there was no indication from the reports of the Export-Import Bank, no indication from the testimony which we had had with respect to the increase of capital or borrowing authority, that the Export-Import Bank had been unduly pressured into making foreign loans which were not sound loans, in keeping with whatever foreign policy might be evolved.

I might say that this House is taken by surprise, because were this matter before the House in the form of a bill today, with the same thing which the conferees did, it would be subject to almost interminable debate on the fundamental question as to whether we would want to use the Export-Import Bank of Washington in furtherance of any foreign policy, no matter how we might agree with that foreign policy.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. How much does this increase the cost?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know as it increases the cost at all because I do not understand that as a member of the board the Director gets any additional salary; at least, I do not understand that he does.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I contend that the point of order made by the gentleman from Kentucky should be sustained.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair appreciates the fact that both the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Michigan called the attention of the Chair to the fact that they were going to object to this provision in the conference report and that, if necessary, they would make a point of order against the whole conference report on the ground that the conferees had exceeded their authority.

Many of these questions are very close, and I might say that in the reference of bills the Speaker's parliamentary adviser and he many times have some difficulty in determining exactly what committee has jurisdiction, or which committee has the most jurisdiction, the Chair might say.

It has always been the thought of the Chair that the conferees should be allowed as wide leeway as possible as long as they stayed within the rules of the House, but the jurisdiction of committees must be guarded and the limitations put upon the conferees also must be guarded.

The jurisdiction of conferees with reference to amendments in the nature of a substitute, as we have before us, is covered by section 135 (a) of part 3 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. This provision, which appears as section 947 of the House Rules and Manual, does not change the precedents, but merely codifies the long-standing practice of the House.

The provision is as follows:

SEC. 135. (a) In any case in which a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been referred to conferees, it shall be in order for the conferees to report a substitute on the same subject matter; but they may not include in the report matter not committed to them by either House. They may, however, include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of the subjects in disagreement.

(b) In any case in which the conferees violate subsection (a), the conference report shall be subject to a point of order.

While the rule authorizes conferees to report a substitute on the same subject matter, it also restricts them to matter committed to them by one of the Houses. In the case before us neither House committed to the conferees a provision for making the Mutual Security Director a member of the board of the Export-Import Bank. And while the rule permits germane modifications of the matter in disagreement, such alteration of the board of directors of the Export-Import Bank is an expansion and not a modification of the matter in disagreement.

The Chair thinks the point of order is good and, therefore, sustains the point of order.

The Senate amendment is now before the House for further consideration.

The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That this act may be cited as the 'Mutual Security Act of 1951'

"SEC 2 (a) The Congress declares it to be the purpose of this act to maintain the security and to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing military, economic, and technical assistance to friendly countries to strengthen the mutual security and individual and collective defenses of the free world, to develop their resources in the interest of their security and independence and the national interest of the United States and to facilitate the effective participation of those countries in the United Nations system for collective security The purposes of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S C 1571–1604), the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U S C. 1501–1522), and the Act for International Development (22 U S. C. 1557) shall hereafter be deemed to include this purpose.

"(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress, that, to the extent that it is readily feasible and does not interfere with the achievement of the purposes set forth in subsection (a), the assistance authorized by title I of this act shall be provided in such a way as (1) to discourage the cartel and monopolistic practices prevailing in European business which result in restricting production and increasing prices, and to encourage where suitable competition and productivity, and (2) to encourage where suitable the development and strengthening of the free labor union movements of Europe as the collective bargaining agencies of European labor.

"TITLE I—EUROPE

"SEC. 101. (a) In order to support the freedom of Europe through assistance which will further the carrying out of the plans for defense of the North Atlantic area, while at the same time maintaining the economic stability of the countries of the area so that they may meet their responsibilities for defense, and to further encourage the economic unification and the political federation of Europe, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1952 for carrying out the provisions and accomplishing the policies and purpose of this act—

"(1) not to exceed $5,006,350,000 for assistance pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1571–1604), for countries which are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and for any country of Europe (other than a country covered by another title of this act), which the President determines to be of direct importance to the defense of the North Atlantic area and whose increased ability to defend itself the President determines is important to the preservation of the peace and security of the North Atlantic area and to the security of the United States and not to exceed $100,000,000 of such appropriation for any selected persons who are residing in or escapees from the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, or the Communist dominated or occupied areas of Germany and Austria, and any other countries absorbed by the Soviet Union either to form such persons into elements of the military forces supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or for other purposes, when it is similarly determined by the President that such assistance will contribute to the defense of the North Atlantic area and to the security of the United States In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the purposes of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, through assistance to any of the countries covered by this paragraph, are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this paragraph. The amount of funds made available pursuant to this paragraph which may be utilized for purposes other than assistance to countries which are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty shall not exceed 10 percent of the amount made available (excluding balances of prior appropriations continued available) under this paragraph

"(2) not to exceed $830,500,000 for assistance pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U S C. 1501–1522) (including assistance to further European military production), for any country of Europe covered by paragraph (1) of this subsection and for any other country covered by section 103 (a) of the said Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this paragraph: *Provided*, That not to exceed $10,000,000 of the funds made available pursuant to this paragraph may be utilized to effectuate the purposes of section 115 (e) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

"(b) Not to exceed 5 percent of the total of the appropriations granted pursuant to this section may be transferred, when determined by the President to be necessary for the purpose of this act, between appropriations granted pursuant to either paragraph of subsection (a): *Provided*, That the amount herein authorized to be transferred shall be determined without reference to any balances of prior appropriations continued available pursuant to this section: *Provided further*, That, whenever the President makes any such determination, he shall forthwith notify the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

"TITLE II—NEAR EAST AND AFRICA

"SEC. 201. In order to further the purpose of this act by continuing to provide military assistance to Greece, Turkey, and Iran, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1952 not to exceed $396,250,000 for furnishing assistance to Greece and Turkey pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 22, 1947, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1401–1410), and for furnishing assistance to Iran pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1571–1604). In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for assistance to Greece and Turkey, available for the fiscal year 1951, pursuant to the act of May 22, 1947, as amended, and for assistance to Iran pursuant to the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section.

"SEC. 202. Whenever the President determines that such action is essential for the purpose of this act, he may provide assistance, pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, to any country of the Near East area (other than those covered by section 201) and may utilize not to exceed 10 percent of the amount made available (excluding balances of prior appropriations continued available) pursuant to section 201 of this act *Provided*, That any such assistance may be furnished only upon determination by the President that (1) the strategic location of the recipient country makes it of direct importance to the defense of the Near East area, (2) such assistance is of critical importance to the defense of the free nations, and (3) the immediately increased ability of the recipient country to defend itself is important to the preservation of the peace and security of the area and to the security of the United States.

"SEC 203 In order to further the purpose of this act in Africa and the Near East, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $160,000,000 for economic and technical assistance in Africa and the Near East in areas other than those covered by section 103 (a) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U S. C. 1502) Funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available under the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S C. 1501–1522), and of the Act for International Development (22 U. S. C. 1557).

"SEC 204 Not to exceed $50,000,000 of the funds authorized under section 203 hereof may be contributed to the United Nations during the fiscal year 1952, for the purposes, and under the provisions, of the United Nations Palestine Refugee Aid Act of 1950 (22 U S C 1556). *Provided*, That, whenever the President shall determine that it would more effectively contribute to the purposes of the said United Nations Palestine Refugee Aid Act of 1950, he may allocate any part of such funds to any agency of the United States Government to be utilized in furtherance of the purposes of said act, and any amount so allocated shall be a part of the United States contribution to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.

"SEC. 205. In order to assist in the relief of refugees coming into Israel, not to exceed $50,000,000 of the funds authorized under section 203 hereof may be utilized during the fiscal year 1952, under such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe, for specific refugee relief and resettlement projects in Israel.

"TITLE III—ASIA AND PACIFIC

"SEC. 301. In order to carry out in the general area of China (including the Republic of the Philippines and the Republic of Korea) the provisions of subsection (a) of section 303 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1604 (a)), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1952 not to exceed $535,250,000. In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the provisions of title III of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1602–1604), are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section. Not to exceed $50,000,000 of funds appropriated pur-

suant to this section (excluding balances of appropriations continued available) may be accounted for as provided in subsection (a) of said section 303.

"SEC. 302. (a) In order to further the purpose of this act through the strengthening of the area covered in section 301 of this act (but not including the Republic of Korea), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $178,750,000 for economic and technical assistance in those portions of such area which the President deems to be not under Communist control. Funds appropriated pursuant to authority of this section shall be available under the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501-1522), and of the Act for International Development (22 U. S. C. 1557). In addition, unexpended balances of funds heretofore made available for carrying out the purposes of the China Area Aid Act of 1950 (22 U. S. C. 1547), are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section.

"(b) The third proviso of section 202 of the China Area Aid Act of 1950 is amended by inserting 'and of Korea' after 'selected citizens of China' the first time it appears therein.

"SEC. 303. (a) In order to provide for a United States contribution to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, established by the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations of December 1, 1950, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $69,750,000. In addition, unobligated balances of the appropriations heretofore made, and available during the fiscal year 1951, for assistance to Korea under authority of the Far Eastern Economic Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1543, 1551, 1552), are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section. Not to exceed 50 percent of the total of the appropriations authorized by this section may, when determined by the President to be necessary for the purposes of this act, be transferred to and consolidated with the appropriation authorized by paragraph 302 (a).

"(b) The sums made available pursuant to subsection (a) may be contributed from time to time on behalf of the United States in such amounts as the President determines to be appropriate to support those functions of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency which the military situation in Korea permits the Agency to undertake pursuant to arrangements between the Agency and the United Nations Unified Command. The aggregate amount which may be contributed on behalf of the United States pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be reduced by the value of goods and services made available to Korea by any department or agency of the United States for relief and economic assistance after the assumption of responsibility for relief and rehabilitation operations in Korea by the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency.

"(c) The provisions of subsections 304 (a) and (b) of the United Nations Palestine Refugee Aid Act of 1950 (22 U. S. C. 1556 (b)) are hereby made applicable with respect to Korean assistance furnished under this section.

"(d) Unencumbered balances of sums heretofore or hereafter deposited in the special account established pursuant to paragraph (2) of article V of the agreement of December 10, 1948, between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea (62 Stat., part 3, 3788) shall be used in Korea for such purposes as the President determines to be consistent with United Nations programs for assistance to Korea and as may be agreed to between the Government of the United States and the Republic of Korea.

"(e) The functions of the Administrator for Economic Cooperation under the provisions of section 3 of the Far Eastern Economic Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1551), shall hereafter be performed by such departments or agencies of the Government as the President shall direct.

"TITLE IV—AMERICAN REPUBLICS

"SEC. 401. In order to further the purpose of this act through the furnishing of military assistance to the other American Republics, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $38,150,000 for carrying out the purposes of this section under the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended. *Provided*, That such assistance may be furnished only in accordance with defense plans which are found by the President to require the recipient country to participate in missions important to the defense of the Western Hemisphere. Any such assistance shall be subject to agreements, as provided herein and as required by section 402 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1573), designed to assure that the assistance will be used to promote the defense of the Western Hemisphere; and after agreement by the Government of the United States and the country concerned with respect to such missions, military assistance hereunder shall be furnished only in accordance with such agreement.

"SEC. 402. In order to further the purpose of this act among the peoples of the American Republics through the furnishing of technical assistance, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $21,250,000 for assistance under the provisions of the act for International Development (22 U. S. C. 1557) and of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act, as amended (22 U. S. C. 281).

"TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 501. (a) Responsibility for the coordination of activities of, or resolution of conflicts among, the various departments and agencies of the Government exercising functions under this act shall be in the Executive Office of the President. No person may serve in any office, or on any board established for the purpose of advising the President on such matters while at the same time he is an officer or employee of any other department or agency of the Government. Any person or persons appointed to such office or to serve as a member of such board shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section the President is authorized to utilize the positions created in subsection 406 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended.

"SEC. 502. The President shall prescribe appropriate procedures to assure coordination among representatives of the United States Government in each country, under the leadership of the Chief of the United States Diplomatic Mission.

"ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 503. (a) No military, economic, or technical assistance authorized pursuant to this act (other than assistance provided under section 408 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended) shall be supplied to any nation in order to further military effort unless the President finds that the supplying of such assistance will strengthen the security of the United States and unless the recipient country has agreed to—

"(1) join in promoting international understanding and good will, and maintaining world peace;

"(2) take such action as may be mutually agreed upon to eliminate causes of international tension;

"(3) fulfill the military obligations which it has assumed under multilateral or bilateral agreements or treaties to which the United States is a party;

"(4) make, consistent with its political and economic stability, the full contribution permitted by its manpower, resources, facilities, and general economic condition to the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world;

"(5) take all reasonable measures which may be needed to develop its defense capacities; and

"(6) take appropriate steps to insure the effective utilization of the economic and military assistance provided by the United States.

"(b) No economic or technical assistance shall be supplied to any other nation unless the President finds that the supplying of such assistance will strengthen the security of the United States and promote world peace, and unless the recipient country has agreed to join in promoting international understanding and good will, and in maintaining world peace, and to take such action as may be mutually agreed upon to eliminate causes of international tension.

"RESPONSIBILITIES OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

"SEC. 504. In the case of aid under this act for military items and related technical assistance and advice, the Secretary of Defense shall have primary responsibility and authority for—

"(a) the determination of military end-item requirements;

"(b) the procurement of military equipment in a manner which permits its integration with service programs;

"(c) establishment of priorities in procurement and deliveries, the allocation of military equipment and the apportionment of funds between services and countries within each area specified in the act,

"(d) the supervision of end-item use by the recipient countries;

"(e) the supervision of the training of foreign military personnel; and

"(f) the movement and delivery of military end items.

"TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 505. (a) After June 30, 1954, or after the date of the passage of a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of Congress before such date, none of the authority conferred by the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1571-1604) may be exercised, except that during the 12 months following such date equipment, materials, commodities, and services with respect to which procurement for, shipment to, or delivery in a recipient country had been authorized prior to such date, may be transferred to such country, and funds appropriated under authority of this act may be obligated during such 12-month period for the necessary expenses of procurement, shipment, delivery, and other activities essential to such transfer and shall remain available during such period for the necessary expenses of liquidating operations under this act.

"(b) At such time as the President shall find appropriate after such date, and prior to the expiration of the 12 months following such date, the powers, duties, and authority conferred by the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, may be transferred for the purpose of liquidation to such other departments, agencies, or establishments of the Government as the President shall specify, and the relevant funds, records, property and personnel may be transferred to the departments, agencies, or establishments to which the related functions are transferred.

"(c) On or before March 30, 1952, the President shall submit to the Congress a reorganization plan under the Reorganization Act of 1949 (5 U. S. C. 133z) abolishing the Economic Cooperation Administration and transferring such of the powers and functions conferred upon the Administrator by the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, as are necessary to carry out the purposes of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, to such other agency, or agencies, of the Government, as appropriate, and the powers and functions so transferred shall notwithstanding the provisions of section 122 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, continue until July 1, 1954, unless terminated earlier by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress. The liquidation provisions of section 122 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, shall become effective on July 1, 1954, or the effective date of such concurrent resolution, whichever is earlier, and be administered by the agency or agencies to which any such power or function is transferred.

"TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE BY PRESIDENT

"SEC. 506. The President shall terminate all or part of any assistance furnished pursuant to this act under any of the following circumstances:

"(a) If requested by any nation to which assistance is being rendered;

"(b) If the President determines that the furnishing of assistance to any nation is no longer consistent with the national interest or security of the United States or the policies and purposes of this act; or

"(c) If the President determines that provisions of assistance would contravene any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, or if the President otherwise determines that provision of assistance to any nation would be inconsistent with the obligation of the United States under the Charter of the United Nations to refrain from giving assistance to any nation against which the United Nations is taking preventative or enforcement action or in respect of which the General Assembly finds the continuance of such assistance is undesirable.

The function conferred herein shall be in addition to all other functions heretofore conferred with respect to the termination of military, economic, or technical assistance.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 507. All provisions of this act except section 503 shall take effect upon the date of its enactment. Such section shall take effect 90 days thereafter.

"SEC. 509. In order to promote the increased production, in areas covered by this act, of materials in which the United States is deficient, not to exceed $55,000,000 of the funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to section 101 (a) (2) of this act may be used pursuant to the authority contained in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501–1522).

"SEC. 510. (a) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'invention' means an invention or discovery covered by a patent issued by the United States and

"(2) the term 'information' means information originated by or peculiarly within the knowledge of the owner thereof and those in privity with him, which is not available to the public and is subject to protection as property under recognized legal principles.

"(b) Whenever, in connection with the furnishing of any assistance in furtherance of the purpose of this act—

"(1) use within the United States, without authorization by the owner, shall be made of an invention, or

"(2) damage to the owner shall result from the disclosure of information by reason of acts of the United States or its officers or employees,

the exclusive remedy of the owner of such invention or information shall be by suit against the United States in the Court of Claims or in the District Court of the United States for the district in which such owner is a resident for reasonable and entire compensation for unauthorized use or disclosure. In any such suit the United States may avail itself of any and all defenses, general or special, that might be pleaded by any defendant in a like action.

"(c) Before such suit against the United States has been instituted, the head of the appropriate department or agency of the Government, which has furnished any assistance in furtherance of the purpose of this act, is authorized and empowered to enter into an agreement with the claimart, in full settlement and compromise of any claim against the United States hereunder.

"(d) Except as otherwise provided by law, no recovery shall be had for any infringement of a patent committed more than 6 years prior to the filing of the complaint or counterclaim for infringement in the action, except that the period between the date of receipt by the Government of a written claim under subsection (c) above for compensation for infringement of a patent and the date of mailing by the Government of a notice to the claimant that his claim has been denied shall not be counted as part of the 6 years, unless suit is brought before the last-mentioned date.

"SEC. 511. The President, from time to time while funds appropriated for the purpose of this act continue to be available for obligation, shall transmit to the Congress, in lieu of any reports otherwise required by laws continued in effect by this act, reports covering each 6 months of operations in furtherance of the purpose of this act, except information the disclosure of which he deems incompatible with the security of the United States. The first such report shall cover the 6-month period commencing on the date this act becomes effective. Reports provided for under this section shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, if the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, is not in session.

"SEC. 512. (a) Upon a determination by the President that it will further the purpose of this act, not to exceed $10,000,000 of the funds made available pursuant to section 203 of this act and not to exceed $25,000,000 of funds made available pursuant to section 302 of this act may be advanced to countries covered by said sections in return for equivalent amounts of the currency of such countries being made available to meet local currency needs of the aid programs in such countries pursuant to agreements made in advance with the United States; *Provided*, That except when otherwise prescribed by the President as necessary to the effective accomplishment of the aid programs in such countries, all funds so advanced shall be held under procedures set out in such agreements until used to pay for goods and services approved by the United States or until repaid to the United States for reimbursement to the appropriation from which drawn.

"(b) In order to assist in carrying out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, not to exceed $50,000,000 of funds made available under the authority of this act for assistance pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501–1522), may be used to acquire local currency for the purpose of increasing the production of materials in which the United States is deficient.

"SEC. 513. Funds realized from the sales of notes pursuant to section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, shall be available for making guaranties of investments in accordance with the applicable provisions of sections 111 (b) (3) and 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act, as amended, in any area in which assistance is authorized by this act.

"SEC. 514. Funds made available for carrying out the provisions of title I of this act shall be available for the administrative expenses of carrying out the purposes of all of the titles of this act, including expenses incident to United States participation in international security organizations and expenses in the United States in connection with programs authorized under the Act for International Development. Any currency of any nation received by the United States for its own use in connection with assistance furnished by the United States may be used by any agency of the Government without reimbursement from any appropriation for the administrative and operating expenses of carrying out the purpose of this act. Funds made available for carrying out the purpose of this act in the Federal Republic of Germany may, as authorized in subsection 114 (h) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1512 (h)), be transferred by the President to any department or agency for the expenses necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in the Federal Republic of Germany.

"SEC. 515. Section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1513 (b) (6)), is hereby amended by—

"(a) inserting in the second proviso thereof after 'wealth' the following. 'for the encouragement of emigration pursuant to subsection (e) of this section';

"(b) adding in the last clause of the second proviso 'and operating' after 'administrative';

"(c) striking from the last clause of the second proviso 'within such country';

"(d) substituting in the fourth proviso the words 'upon termination of assistance to such country under this act' in place of the words 'on June 80, 1952'; and

"(e) adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: 'The Administrator shall exercise the power granted to him by this paragraph to make agreements with respect to the use of the funds deposited in the special accounts of the countries receiving assistance under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, in such a manner that the equivalent of not less than $500,000,000 of such funds shall be used exclusively for military production, construction, equipment, and matériel in such countries. The amount to be devoted from each such special account for such use shall be agreed upon by the Administrator and the country or countries concerned.'

"SEC. 516. (a) The President shall make appropriate arrangements with each nation receiving equipment or material under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (other than equipment or material furnished under terms requiring the nation to reimburse the United States in full therefor), for the return to the United States (1) for salvage or scrap, or (2) for such other disposition as the President shall deem to be in the interest of mutual security, of any of such equipment or material as is no longer required for the purposes for which originally made available.

"(b) Section 408 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1580), is hereby amended by adding in the first proviso thereof, after the words 'of which it is a part', the words 'or in United Nations collective security arrangements and measures', and by changing the figure at the end of such section 408 (e) to '$500,000,000.'

"SEC. 517. The proviso in the first sentence of section 403 (d) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1574 (d)), is hereby amended to read as follows: '*Provided*, That after June 30, 1950, such limitation shall be increased

by $250,000,000 and after June 30, 1951, by an additional $150,000,000.'

"SEC. 518. (a) The Act for International Development is amended by adding before the period at the end of section 404 (b) the following: ': *Provided*, That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, such contributions from funds made available under authority of section 101 (a) (2), 203, 302, and 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 shall not exceed in the aggregate $13,000,000, and the use of such contributions shall not be limited to the area covered by the section of the act from which the funds are drawn.'

"(b) Section 414 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 414. No citizen or resident of the United States, whether or not now in the employ of the Government, may be employed or assigned to duties by the Government under this act for a period to exceed 3 months until such individual has been investigated by the Civil Service Commission and a report has been made to the Secretary of State: *Provided, however*, That in the event the Civil Service Commission discovers evidence of disloyalty or that the individual may be a security risk the matter will then be referred to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a full field investigation: *Provided further*, That no such individual may be employed or assigned to duties by the Government under this act until the Civil Service Commission has made a name check of the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report thereon has been made to the Secretary of State: *Provided further*, That, prior to the receipt of a report of the Civil Service Commission, persons may be given temporary employment without acquiring any civil-service status, exclusively for purposes of job training within the United States not involving access to any classified information: *Provided further*, That any present employee of the Government, pending the report as to such employee by the Civil Service Commission, may be employed or assigned to duties under this act for the period of 3 months from the date of its enactment. This section shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate'."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RICHARDS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed in the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Mutual Security Act of 1951.'

"SEC 2. The Congress declares it to be the purpose of this act to maintain the security and to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing military, economic, and technical assistance to friendly countries to strengthen the mutual security and individual and collective defenses of the free world, to develop their resources in the interest of their security and independence and the national interest of the United States and to facilitate the effective participation of those countries in the United Nations system for collective security. The purposes of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1571–1604), the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S C 1501–1522), and the Act for International Development (22 U. S. C. 1557) shall hereafter be deemed to include this purpose.

"TITLE I—EUROPE

"SEC. 101. (a) In order to support the freedom of Europe through assistance which will further the carrying out of the plans for defense of the North Atlantic area, while at the same time maintaining the economic stability of the countries of the area so that they may meet their responsibilities for defense, and to further encourage the economic unification and the political federation of Europe, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1952 for carrying out the provisions and accomplishing the policies and purpose of this act—

"(1) not to exceed $5,028,000,000 for assistance pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1571–1604), for countries which are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and for any country of Europe (other than a country covered by another title of this Act), which the President determines to be of direct importance to the defense of the North Atlantic area and whose increased ability to defend itself the President determines is important to the preservation of the peace and security of the North Atlantic area and to the security of the United States (any such determination to be reported forthwith to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives), and not to exceed $100,000,000 of such appropriation for any selected persons who are residing in or escapees from the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, or the Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied areas of Germany and Austria, and any other countries absorbed by the Soviet Union either to form such persons into elements of the military forces supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or for other purposes, when it is similarly determined by the President that such assistance will contribute to the defense of the North Atlantic area and to the security of the United States. In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the purposes of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, through assistance to any of the countries covered by this paragraph are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this paragraph. Section 408 (c) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1579), is hereby repealed.

"(2) not to exceed $1,022,000,000 for assistance pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501–1522) (including assistance to further European military production), for any country of Europe covered by paragraph (1) of this subsection and for any other country covered by section 103 (a) of the said Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended. In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this paragraph: *Provided*, That not to exceed $10,000,000 of the funds made available pursuant to this paragraph may be utilized to effectuate the principles set forth in section 115 (e) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

"(b) Not to exceed 10 percent of the total of the appropriations granted pursuant to this section may be transferred, when determined by the President to be necessary for the purpose of this act, between appropriations granted pursuant to either paragraph of subsection (a): *Provided*, That the amount herein authorized to be transferred shall be determined without reference to any balances of prior appropriations continued available pursuant to this section: *Provided further*, That, whenever the President makes any such determination, he shall forthwith notify the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

"TITLE II—NEAR EAST AND AFRICA

"SEC. 201. In order to further the purpose of this act by continuing to provide military assistance to Greece, Turkey, and Iran, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $396,250,000 for furnishing assistance to Greece and Turkey pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 22, 1947, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1401–1410), and for furnishing assistance to Iran pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1571–1604). In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for assistance to Greece and Turkey, available for the fiscal year 1951, pursuant to the act of May 22, 1947, as amended, and for assistance to Iran pursuant to the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section.

"SEC. 202. Whenever the President determines that such action is essential for the purpose of this act, he may provide assistance, pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, to any country of the Near East area (other than those covered by section 201) and may utilize not to exceed 10 percent of the amount made available (excluding balances of prior appropriations continued available) pursuant to section 201 of this act: *Provided*, That any such assistance may be furnished only upon determination by the President that (1) the strategic location of the recipient country makes it of direct importance to the defense of the Near East area, (2) such assistance is of critical importance to the defense of the free nations, and (3) the immediately increased ability of the recipient country to defend itself is important to the preservation of the peace and security of the area and to the security of the United States.

"SEC. 203. In order to further the purpose of this act in Africa and the Near East, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $160,000,000 for economic and technical assistance in Africa and the Near East in areas other than those covered by section 103 (a) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C 1502). Funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available under the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501–1522), and of the Act for International Development (22 U. S. C. 1557).

"SEC. 204. Not to exceed $50,000,000 of the funds authorized under section 203 hereof may be contributed to the United Nations during the fiscal year 1952, for the purposes, and under the provisions, of the United Nations Palestine Refugee Aid Act of 1950 (22 U. S. C. 1556): *Provided*, That, whenever the President shall determine that it would more effectively contribute to the purposes of the said United Nations Palestine Refugee Aid Act of 1950, he may allocate any part of such funds to any agency of the United States Government to be utilized in furtherance of the purposes of said act and any amount so allocated shall be a part of the United States contribution to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and shall be so credited by said Agency.

"SEC. 205. In order to assist in the relief of refugees coming into Israel, not to exceed $50,000,000 of the funds authorized under section 203 hereof may be utilized during the fiscal year 1952, under such terms and

conditions as the President may prescribe, for specific refugee relief and resettlement projects in Israel.

"TITLE III—ASIA AND PACIFIC

"SEC. 301. In order to carry out in the general area of China (including the Republic of the Philippines and the Republic of Korea) the provisions of subsection (a) of section 303 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1604 (a)), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $535,250,000. In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the provisions of title III of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1602–1604), are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section. Not to exceed $50,000,000 of funds appropriated pursuant to this section (excluding balances of appropriations continued available) may be accounted for as provided in subsection (a) of said section 303.

"SEC 302. (a) In order to further the purpose of this act through the strengthening of the area covered in section 301 of this act (but not including the Republic of Korea), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $237,500,000 for economic and technical assistance in those portions of such area which the President deems to be not under Communist control. Funds appropriated pursuant to authority of this section shall be available under the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S C. 1501–1522), and of the Act for International Development (22 U. S C. 1557). In addition, unexpended balances of funds heretofore made available for carrying out the purposes of the China Area Aid Act of 1950 (22 U S C. 1547), are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section.

"(b) The third proviso of section 202 of the China Area Aid Act of 1950 is amended by inserting 'and of Korea' after 'selected citizens of China' the first time it appears therein.

"SEC. 303. (a) In order to provide for a United States contribution to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, established by the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations of December 1, 1950, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $45,000,000. In addition, unobligated balances of the appropriations heretofore made, and available during the fiscal year 1951, for assistance to Korea under authority of the Far Eastern Economic Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1543, 1551, 1552), are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section. Not to exceed 50 percent of the total of the appropriations authorized by this section may, when determined by the President to be necessary for the purpose of this act, be transferred to and consolidated with the appropriation authorized by paragraph 302 (a).

"(b) The sums made available pursuant to subsection (a) may be contributed from time to time on behalf of the United States in such amounts as the President determines to be appropriate to support those functions of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency which the military situation in Korea permits the agency to undertake pursuant to arrangements between the agency and the United Nations Unified Command The aggregate amount which may be contributed on behalf of the United States pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be reduced by the value of goods and services made available to Korea by any department or agency of the United States for relief and economic assistance after the assumption of responsibility for relief and rehabilitation operations in Korea by the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency.

"(c) The provisions of subsections 304 (a) and (b) of the United Nations Palestine Refugee Aid Act of 1950 (22 U. S. C. 1556 (b)) are hereby made applicable with respect to Korean assistance furnished under this section.

"(d) Unencumbered balances of sums heretofore or hereafter deposited in the special account established pursuant to paragraph (2) of article V of the agreement of December 10, 1948, between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea (62 Stat., pt. 3, 3788) shall be used in Korea for such purposes as the President determines to be consistent with United Nations programs for assistance to Korea and as may be agreed to between the Government of the United States and the Republic of Koren.

"(e) The function of the Administrator for Economic Cooperation under the provisions of section 3 of the Far Eastern Economic Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (22 U S. C 1551), shall hereafter be performed by such departments or agencies of the Government as the President shall direct.

"TITLE IV—AMERICAN REPUBLICS

"SEC. 401. In order to further the purpose of this act through the furnishing of military assistance to the other American Republics, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $38,150,000 for carrying out the purpose of this section under the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended: *Provided*, That such assistance may be furnished only in accordance with defense plans which are found by the President to require the recipient country to participate in missions important to the defense of the Western Hemisphere. Any such assistance shall be subject to agreements, as provided herein and as required by section 402 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1940, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1673), designed to assure that the assistance will be used to promote the defense of the Western Hemisphere, and after agreement by the Government of the United States and the country concerned with respect to such missions, military assistance hereunder shall be furnished only in accordance with such agreement.

"SEC. 402. In order to further the purpose of this act among the peoples of the American Republics through the furnishing of technical assistance, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $21,250,000 for assistance under the provisions of the Act for International Development (22 U. S. C. 1557) and of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act, as amended (22 U. S. C. 281).

"TITLE V—ORGANIZATION AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

"UNIFIED DIRECTION OF PROGRAM

"SEC 501. (a) In order that the programs of military, economic, and technical assistance authorized by this act may be administered as parts of a unified program in accordance with the intent of Congress and to fix responsibility for the coordination and supervision of these programs in a single person, the President is authorized to appoint in the Executive Office of the President a Director for Mutual Security. The Director, on behalf of the President and subject to his direction, shall have primary responsibility for—

"(1) continuous supervision and general direction of the assistance programs under this act to the end that such programs shall be (A) effectively integrated both at home and abroad, and (B) administered so as to assure that the defensive strength of the free nations of the world shall be built as quickly as possible on the basis of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid;

"(2) preparation and presentation to the Congress of such programs of foreign military, economic, and technical assistance as may be required in the interest of the security of the United States;

"(3) preparation for the President of the report to the Congress required by section 518 of this act.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided by this act, the Director shall not hold any other office or employment under the United States and shall not have any other responsibilities except those directly related to the coordination, supervision, and direction of the programs covered by this act or otherwise conferred upon him by law.

"(c) The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum.

"(d) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, the President is authorized to utilize the positions created in subsection 406 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended. No person may serve in any such position under this subsection while at the same time he is an officer or employee of any other department or agency of the Government.

"(e) (1) The fourth paragraph of section 101 (a) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (50 U. S. C. 402 (a)), is amended by inserting after clause (4) the following:

"'(5) the Director for Mutual Security;' and by renumbering clauses (5) and (6) thereof as clauses (6) and (7), respectively.

"(2) Section 4 (a) of Public Law 171, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended (59 Stat. 512), is amended by striking out 'Economic Cooperation Administration' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Mutual Security Agency' and by striking out 'Administrator for Economic Cooperation' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Director for Mutual Security.'

"MUTUAL SECURITY AGENCY

"SEC. 502. (a) The Economic Cooperation Administration and the offices of Administrator for Economic Cooperation, Deputy Administrator, United States special representative in Europe, and deputy special representative are hereby abolished.

"(b) To assist in carrying out the purpose of this act—

"(1) there is hereby established, with its principal office at the seat of the Government, a Mutual Security Agency, hereinafter referred to as the Agency, which shall be headed by the Director for Mutual Security; and

"(2) there shall be transferred to the Director the powers, functions, and responsibilities conferred upon the Administrator for Economic Cooperation by the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and by any other law, but no such powers, functions, and responsibilities shall be exercised after June 30, 1952, except as provided in subsection (c) of this section.

"(c) Not later than April 1, 1952, the President shall inform the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives which of the powers, functions, and responsibilities transferred to the Director by subsection (b) (2) are found by the President to be necessary to enable the Director after June 30, 1952, to carry out the duties conferred upon him by section 503. The termination provisions of section 122 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, shall come into effect on June 30, 1952, and none of the powers, functions, and responsibilities conferred by that act

shall be exercised after that date, except those powers, functions, and responsibilities found necessary to enable the Director to carry out the duties conferred on him by section 503 of this act, which powers, functions, and responsibilities unless otherwise provided by law shall continue in effect until June 30, 1954.

"ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF DIRECTOR FOR MUTUAL SECURITY

"SEC. 503. After June 30, 1952, the Director, on behalf of the President and subject to his direction, shall, in consultation with the Secretaries of State and Defense, continue to have primary responsibility for—

"(a) the development and administration of programs of assistance designed to sustain and increase military effort, including production, construction, equipment and materiel in each country or in groups of countries which receive United States military assistance;

"(b) the provision of such equipment, materials, commodities, services, financial, or other assistance as he finds to be necessary for carrying out mutual defense programs, and

"(c) the provision of limited economic assistance to foreign nations for which the United States has responsibility as a result of participation in joint control arrangements when the President finds that the provision of such economic assistance is in the interest of the security of the United States.

"APPOINTMENT AND TRANSFER OF PERSONNEL

"SEC 504 (a) To carry out the functions conferred by sections 502 and 503 of this act, there shall be in the Agency a Deputy Director, a special representative in Europe, and a deputy special representative in Europe, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall have status and receive compensation comparable to the equivalent positions under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

"(b) Any personnel of the Economic Cooperation Administration, upon the certification of the Director for Mutual Security and with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that such personnel are necessary to carry out the functions of the Director for Mutual Security, and all records and property of such administration which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines are used primarily in the administration of the powers and functions transferred to the Director for Mutual Security by this act, shall be transferred to the Mutual Security Agency.

"(c) Of the personnel transferred to or employed by the Mutual Security Agency, not to exceed 50 may be compensated at rates higher than those provided for grade 15 of the general schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and of these, not to exceed 15 may be compensated at a rate in excess of the highest rate provided for grades of such general schedule but not in excess of $15,000 per annum Such positions shall be in addition to the number authorized by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(d) On and after January 1, 1952, the number of United States citizens employed by the Mutual Security Agency shall be at least 10 percent less than the number employed by the Economic Cooperation Administration on August 31, 1951: *Provided*, That the Director for Mutual Security shall cause studies to be made from time to time for the purpose of determining whether further reductions in personnel are feasible and consistent with the accomplishment of the purposes of this act.

"THE SECRETARY OF STATE

"SEC. 505. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to infringe upon the powers or functions of the Secretary of State.

"THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

"SEC. 506. (a) In the case of aid under this act for military end items and related technical assistance and advice, the Secretary of Defense shall have primary responsibility and authority for—

"(1) the determination of military end-item requirements;

"(2) the procurement of military equipment in a manner which permits its integration with service programs;

"(3) the supervision of end-item use by the recipient countries;

"(4) the supervision of the training of foreign military personnel; and

"(5) the movement and delivery of military end items.

"(b) The establishment of priorities in the procurement, delivery, and allocation of military equipment shall be determined by the Secretary of Defense The apportionment of funds between countries shall be determined by the President

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the fiscal year 1952 the Secretary of Defense may furnish (subject to reimbursement from funds appropriated pursuant to this act) military assistance out of the materials of war whose production in the United States shall have been authorized for, and appropriated to, the Department of Defense *Provided, however*, That nothing in this act shall authorize the furnishing of military items under this subsection in excess of $1,000,000,000 in value. For the purposes of this subsection (1) 'value' shall be determined in accordance with section 402 (c) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, and (2) the term 'materials of war' means those goods, commonly known as military items, which are required for the performance of their missions by armed forces of a nation, including weapons, military vehicles, ships of war under 1,500 tons, aircraft, military communications equipment, ammunition, maintenance parts and spares, and military hardware.

"OVERSEAS COORDINATION

"SEC 507 The President shall prescribe appropriate procedures to assure coordination among representatives of the United States Government in each country, under the leadership of the Chief of the United States Diplomatic Mission.

"RELATIONSHIP TO TECHNICAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION AND INSTITUTE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

"SEC 508 Nothing in this act shall be construed to modify the provisions of section 412 of the act for international development or the provisions of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act.

"DETAILS OF PERSONNEL TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 509. Whenever the President determines it to be consistent with and in furtherance of the purpose of this act, the head of any Government agency is authorized to—

"(a) detail or assign any officer or employee of his agency to any office or position to which no compensation is attached with any foreign government or foreign government agency: *Provided*, That such acceptance of office shall in no case involve the taking of an oath of allegiance to another government; and

"(b) detail, assign, or otherwise make available to any international organization in which the United States participates, any officer or employee of his agency to serve with or as a member of the international staff of such organizations.

Any such officer or employee, while so assigned or detailed, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his privileges, rights, seniority, or other benefits as such, an officer or employee of the Government of the United States and of the Government agency from which assigned or detailed, and he shall continue to receive compensation, allowances, and benefits from funds made available to that agency out of funds authorized under this act.

"SECURITY CLEARANCE

"SEC 510. No citizen or resident of the United States may be employed, or if already employed, may be assigned to duties by the Director or the Secretary of State under this act or the act for international development for a period to exceed 3 months unless (a) such individual has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report thereon has been made to the Director or the Secretary of State, as the case may be, and until the Director or the Secretary of State has certified in writing (and filed copies thereof with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs) that, after full consideration of such report, he believes such individual is loyal to the United States, its Constitution, and form of government, and is not now and has never been a member of any organization advocating contrary views; or (b) such individual has been investigated by a military intelligence agency and the Secretary of Defense has certified in writing that he believes such individual is loyal to the United States and filed copies thereof with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. This section shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, nor shall it apply in the case of any person already employed under programs covered by this act who has been previously investigated in connection with such employment.

"ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE

"SEC 511. (a) No military, economic, or technical assistance authorized pursuant to this act (other than assistance provided under section 408 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended) shall be supplied to any nation in order to further military effort unless the President finds that the supplying of such assistance will strengthen the security of the United States and unless the recipient country has agreed to—

"(1) join in promoting international understanding and good will, and maintaining world peace;

"(2) take such action as may be mutually agreed upon to eliminate causes of international tension,

"(3) fulfill the military obligations which it has assumed under multilateral or bilateral agreements or treaties to which the United States is a party,

"(4) make, consistent with its political and economic stability, the full contribution permitted by its manpower, resources, facilities, and general economic condition to the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world;

"(5) take all reasonable measures which may be needed to develop its defense capacities; and

"(6) take appropriate steps to insure the effective utilization of the economic and military assistance provided by the United States.

"(b) No economic or technical assistance shall be supplied to any other nation unless the President finds that the supplying of such assistance will strengthen the security of the United States and promote world peace, and unless the recipient country has agreed to join in promoting international understanding and good will, and in maintaining world peace, and to take such action

as may be mutually agreed upon to eliminate causes of international tension.

"FUTURE AUTHORIZATIONS

"SEC. 512. In order to carry out the purpose of this act, with respect to those countries eligible to receive assistance as provided herein, funds shall be available as authorized and appropriated to the President each fiscal year.

"TRANSPORTATION BETWEEN TITLES

"SEC. 513. Whenever the President determines it to be necessary for the purpose of this act, not to exceed 10 percent of the funds made available under any title of this act may be transferred to and consolidated with funds made available under any other title of this act in order to furnish, to a different area, assistance of the kind for which such funds were available before transfer. Whenever the President makes any such determination, he shall forthwith notify the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. In the case of the transfer of funds available for military purposes, he shall also forthwith notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

"STRATEGIC MATERIALS

"SEC. 514. In order to promote the increased production, in areas covered by this act, of materials in which the United States is deficient, not to exceed $55,000,000 of the funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to section 101 (a) (2) of this act may be used pursuant to the authority contained in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501–1522).

"PROTECTION AGAINST ATTACHMENT

"SEC. 515. All countries participating in any United States aid program or in any international organization receiving United States aid shall be required to so deposit, segregate, or assure title to all funds allocated to or derived from any program so that the same shall not be subject to garnishment, attachment, seizure, or other legal process by any person, firm, agency, corporation, organization, or government when in the opinion of the Director any such action would interfere with the attainment of the objectives of this act.

"ENCOURAGEMENT OF FREE ENTERPRISE

"SEC. 516. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that this act shall be administered in such a way as (1) to eliminate the barriers to, and provide the incentives for, a steadily increased participation of free private enterprise in developing the resources of foreign countries consistent with the policies of this act, (2) to the extent that it is feasible and does not interfere wtih the achievement of the purposes set forth in this act, to discourage the cartel and monopolistic business practices prevailing in certain countries receiving aid under this act which result in restricting production and increasing prices, and to encourage where suitable competition and productivity, and (3) to encourage where suitable the development and strengthening of the free labor union movements as the collective bargaining agencies of labor within such countries.

"PATENTS AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION

"SEC. 517. (a) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'invention' means an invention or discovery covered by a patent issued by the United States, and

"(2) the term 'information' means information originated by or peculiarly within the knowledge of the owner thereof and those in privity with him, which is not available to the public and is subject to protection as property under recognized legal principles.

"(b) Whenever, in connection with the furnishing of any assistance in furtherance of the purpose of this act—

"(1) use within the United States, without authorization by the owner, shall be made of an invention, or

"(2) damage to the owner shall result from the disclosure of information by reason of acts of the United States or its officers or employees,

the exclusive remedy of the owner of such invention or information shall be by suit against the United States in the Court of Claims or in the district court of the United States for the district in which such owner is a resident for reasonable and entire compensation for unauthorized use or disclosure. In any such suit the United States may avail itself of any and all defenses, general or special, that might be pleaded by any defendant in a like action.

"(c) Before such suit against the United States has been instituted, the head of the appropriate department or agency of the Government, which has furnished any assistance in furtherance of the purpose of this act, is authorized and empowered to enter into an agreement with the claimant, in full settlement and compromise of any claim against the United States hereunder.

"(d) The provisions of the last sentence of section 1498 of title 28 of the United States Code shall apply to inventions and information covered by this section.

"(e) Except as otherwise provided by law, no recovery shall be had for any infringement of a patent committed more than 6 years prior to the filing of the complaint or counterclaim for infringement in the action, except that the period between the date of receipt by the Government of a written claim under subsection (c) above for compensation for infringement of a patent and the date of mailing by the Government of a notice to the claimant that his claim has been denied shall not be counted as part of the 6 years, unless suit is brought before the last-mentioned date.

"REPORTS

"SEC. 518. The President, from time to time while funds appropriated for the purpose of this act continue to be available for obligation, shall transmit to the Congress, in lieu of any reports otherwise required by laws continued in effect by this act, reports covering each 6 months of operations in furtherance of the purpose of this act, except information the disclosure of which he deems incompatible with the security of the United States. The first such report shall cover the 6-month period commencing on the date this act becomes effective. Reports provided for under this section shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, if the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, is not in session.

"LOCAL CURRENCY

"SEC. 519. (a) Upon a determination by the Director that it will further the purpose of this act, not to exceed $10,000,000 of the funds made available pursuant to section 203 of this act and not to exceed $25,000,000 of funds made available pursuant to section 302 of this act may be advanced to countries covered by said sections in return for equivalent amounts of the currency of such countries being made available to meet local currency needs of the aid programs in such countries pursuant to agreements made in advance with the United States: *Provided*, That except when otherwise prescribed by the Director as necessary to the effective accomplishment of the aid programs in such countries, all funds so advanced shall be held under procedures set out in such agreements until used to pay for goods and services approved by the United States or until repaid to the United States for reimbursement to the appropriation from which drawn.

"(b) In order to assist in carrying out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, not to exceed $50,000,000 of funds made available under the authority of this act for assistance pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501–1522), may be used to acquire local currency for the purpose of increasing the production of materials in which the United States is deficient.

"GUARANTIES

"SEC. 520. Funds realized from the sales of notes pursuant to section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, shall be available for making guaranties of investments in accordance with the applicable provisions of sections 111 (b) (3) and 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act, as amended, in any area in which assistance is authorized by this act.

"ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

"SEC. 521. Funds made available for carrying out the provisions of title I of this act shall be available for United States participation in the acquisition or construction of facilities in foreign countries for collective defense: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be expended for rental or purchase of land or for payment of taxes. Such funds shall also be available for the administrative expenses of carrying out the purposes of all of the titles of this act, including expenses incident to United States participation in international security organizations and expenses in the United States in connection with programs authorized under the Act for International Development. Any currency of any nation received by the United States for its own use in connection with assistance furnished by the United States may be used by any agency of the Government without reimbursement from any appropriation for the administrative and operating expenses of carrying out the purpose of this act. Funds made available for carrying out the purpose of this act in the Federal Republic of Germany may, as authorized in subsection 114 (h) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1512 (h)), be transferred by the President to any department or agency for the expenses necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in the Federal Republic of Germany.

"LOANS

"SEC. 522. Section 111 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501–1522), is hereby amended by adding a new paragraph as follows:

"'(3) Of the assistance provided under the applicable provisions of this act with funds made available under the authority of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as great an amount (in no event less than 10 percent) as possible shall be provided on credit terms.'

"USE OF COUNTERPART

"SEC. 523 Section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1513 (b) (6)), is hereby amended by—

"(a) inserting in the second proviso thereof after 'wealth' the following: 'for the encouragement of emigration pursuant to subsection (e) of this section';

"(b) adding in the last clause of the second proviso 'and operating' after 'administrative';

"(c) striking from the last clause of the second proviso 'within such country';

"(d) substituting in the fourth proviso the words 'upon termination of assistance

to such country under this act' in place of the words 'on June 30, 1952'; and

"(e) adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: 'The Administrator shall exercise the power granted to him by this paragraph to make agreements with respect to the use of the funds deposited in the special accounts of "participating countries" (as defined in sec. 103 (a) hereof) and any other countries receiving assistance under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, in such a manner that the equivalent of not less than $500,000,000 of such funds shall be used exclusively for military production, construction, equipment, and matériel in such countries. The amount to be devoted from each such special account for such use shall be agreed upon by the Administrator and the country or countries concerned'.

"RETURN OF EQUIPMENT

"SEC 524. 'The President shall make appropriate arrangements with each nation receiving equipment or material under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (other than equipment or material furnished under terms requiring the nation to reimburse the United States in full therefor), for the return to the United States (1) for salvage or scrap, or (2) for such other disposition as the President shall deem to be in the interest of mutual security, of any such equipment or material as is no longer required for the purposes for which originally made available.

"REIMBURSABLE AID

"SEC 525 Section 408 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U S C. 1580), is hereby amended by adding in the first proviso thereof, after the words 'of which it is a part', the words 'or in United Nations collective security arrangements and measures', and by changing the figure at the end of such section 408 (e) to '$500,000,000.'

"EXCESS EQUIPMENT

"SEC 526 The proviso in the first sentence of section 403 (d) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1574 (d)), is hereby amended to read as follows: '*Provided*, That after June 30, 1950, such limitation shall be increased by $250,000,000 and after June 30, 1951, by an additional $300,000,000'

"CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE EXPENSES

"SEC 527. Section 115 (h) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C 1513 (h)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'including local currency requirements of appropriate committees of the Congress engaged in carrying out their duties under section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946'

"UNITED NATIONS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC 528 The Act for International Development is amended—

"(a) by adding before the period at the end of section 404 (b) the following: ' *Provided*, That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, such contributions from funds made available under authority of sections 101 (a) (2), 203, 302, and 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 shall not exceed in the aggregate $13,000,000, and the use of such contributions shall not be limited to the area covered by the section of the act from which the funds are drawn.'

"(b) by adding at the end of section 407 a new paragraph:

"'(d) Participating countries shall be encouraged to establish fair labor standards of wages and working conditions and management-labor relations'

"(c) by repealing section 414.

"TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE BY PRESIDENT

"SEC 529. If the President determines that the furnishing of assistance to any nation—

"(a) is no longer consistent with the national interest or security of the United States or the policies and purpose of this act; or

"(b) would contravene a decision of the Security Council of the United Nations; or

"(c) would be inconsistent with the principle that members of the United Nations should refrain from giving assistance to any nation against which the Security Council or the General Assembly has recommended measures in case of a threat to, or breach of, the peace, or act of aggression,

he shall terminate all or part of any assistance furnished pursuant to this act. The function conferred herein shall be in addition to all other functions heretofore conferred with respect to the termination of military, economic, or technical assistance.

"EXPIRATION OF PROGRAM

"SEC 530 (a) After June 30, 1954, or after the date of the passage of a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of Congress before such date, none of the authority conferred by this act or by the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C 1571–1604) may be exercised; except that during the 12 months following such date equipment, materials, commodities, and services with respect to which procurement for, shipment to, or delivery in a recipient country had been authorized prior to such date, may be transferred to such country, and funds appropriated under authority of this act may be obligated during such 12-month period for the necessary expenses of procurement, shipment, delivery, and other activities essential to such transfer and shall remain available during such period for the necessary expenses of liquidating operations under this act

"(b) At such time as the President shall find appropriate after such date, and prior to the expiration of the 12 months following such date, the powers, duties, and authority conferred by this act and by the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, may be transferred for the purpose of liquidation to such other departments, agencies, or establishments of the Government as the President shall specify, and the relevant funds, records, property, and personnel may be transferred to the departments, agencies, or establishments to which the related functions are transferred.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC 531. Sections 502 (a), (b) (2), and section 504 (b) of this act shall take effect on such date or dates as the President shall specify, but in no event later than 60 days after the date the Director first appointed takes office Section 511 shall take effect 90 days after enactment of this act All other provisions of this act shall take effect upon the date of its enactment."

Mr. RICHARDS (interrupting the reading of the motion). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the motion be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, we would like to know the contents of the amendment. This is a very vital proposition, and I think the amendment ought to be read.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may state that the amendment is the conference report with the deletion of the matter objected to by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. RANKIN. Does it provide for the insertion of the very material which was knocked out on a point of order a while ago?

The SPEAKER. Not at all. The gentleman from South Carolina has offered a motion to concur in the Senate amendment, with an amendment, which is the conference report with this matter deleted.

Does the Chair properly state the situation?

Mr RICHARDS. That is right.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as we understand it, the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina contains everything in the conference report known as the Senate amendment except subparagraph (3) having to do with the Director of Mutual Security going on the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank. This is contained on page 7 of the conference report. Is that correct?

Mr RICHARDS. That is a correct statement. The amendment includes in essence the conference report except for section 501 (e) (3), shown on page 7 of the conference report, which is the provision that was just eliminated by a point of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection

Mr RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think the House conferees may justly take pride in this conference report. It may not include all that some may expect of the bill passed by the House, but it does include in essence its major provisions. Our desire was to adjust the differences between the two Houses without injury to the primary purposes of the House bill. To say the least we have succeeded in that purpose.

Let me say that although the conference was lengthy, it deliberated throughout in a spirit of friendly frankness on both sides, without bitterness or rancor, with both sides seeking common ground that would yield an agreement acceptable to both Houses. I also want to compliment my colleagues, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]. We worked as a team. Their confidence and backing made my task easier Their ability and high purpose evident everywhere in the deliberations has my highest admiration; and I am sure the House shares these sentiments.

A conference of the type just concluded was not one where each side tried to get a victory over the other. The nature of the disagreement did not permit that. Although I believe the House bill was a good bill and would have made a good statute had the other body accepted it, I must say in all frankness that the version passed by the other body had a number of essential ideas that could not

be ignored. The conference agreement embodies the best features of both versions of this bill. It certainly contains the essential principles of the House bill.

The relatively small matters were cleared away early. There is no need to detain the House with a recital of these differences and how they were resolved. I want to confine my remarks, in the main, to two of the major features of the agreement: the amounts and the organizational features.

The total amount in the conference agreement is $15,350,000 less than the amount of the House bill. The total amount for military assistance is $5,997,650,000 or $15,350,000 less than the House had voted. The total amount for economic assistance is the same as that voted by the House. Although the totals are nearly the same as those approved by the House, the distribution between titles represents the adjustment made by the committee of conference. In no case does any authorization in the conference agreement exceed a figure authorized by either the House bill or the Senate amendment.

Generally speaking, the agreement restored funds for Europe and Asia, leaving the amounts for the Near East and the American Republics the same as those approved by the Senate. In the opinion of the committee of conference, Europe and Asia are the areas where the present need for assistance is most urgent.

At first glance the agreed amount appears to be more than that authorized by the House. The apparent discrepancy is in the different base used for calculation by House and Senate. The Senate amount was $880,500,000, including the $55,000,000 for strategic materials. On this basis the House amount would be $1,040,000,000, consisting of $985,000,000 for Europe and $55,000,000 for strategic-material development contained in a separate authorization in title VI of the House bill. Since the conference agreement provided that funds for strategic materials are to come from title I funds, the amount agreed upon is calculated in relation to comparable House and Senate figures. On this basis the agreed amount is actually $18,000,000 less than the comparable House amount.

The House conferees were fully aware of the directive given to them by the House. With this in mind the conferees adjusted the amounts so as not to exceed the amount voted by the House.

Members may well ask why we restored funds to Europe at the expense of other regions of the world. We had to make a choice: Where are the funds needed most? In order to be sure of my ground, both in conference and here in the House, I cabled General Eisenhower to ask his judgment about the European scene. I believe the House would like to know what General Eisenhower said. Here are the principal parts of his reply to my cable:

When the committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives were here in connection with the mutual security program of fiscal 1952 * * * I indicated * * * that the proposed program of military aid was, in my judgment, a sound one from the standpoint of the rapid buildup of European military forces and of gain in terms of United States security. Also that an essential component in this over-all effort was the related program of economic aid for the support of national economies upon which the military buildup depends. Military and economic developments here since that time have merely emphasized the obvious conclusion that economic and military strength are inseparable.

It should be understood that no recommendation of mine is intended to urge upon the interested committees any expenditure that is beyond the United States capability to support during the critical years during which the current tensions may logically be expected to persist. Within these limits I believe that it is to our interest to accomplish the total buildup quickly and in a limited period of time, rather than risk the dangers and costs of dragging it out. The United States role is to provide the initial impetus to the program through assistance in the equipping of forces, with maintenance, replacement and other future outlays shouldered by the European nations at the earliest practicable time. I am keenly aware of the heavy burden being borne by the United States during this rearmament period, and of our necessary expenditures in the Far East where a critical phase of the global struggle against communism is in progress. We here clearly appreciate the necessity of careful congressional judgment in balancing the scale of aid against United States capacity. Nevertheless, any serious cuts in the end item program or of materials required for increased industrial production in Europe will delay completion of our buildup program and, in my judgment, increase therefore the total cost. I have pressed, and will continue to press, our European allies to accelerate and expand, rather than retard and curtail their military effort It is of great importance to our country's announced aims that nothing be done during the coming months to halt the growth of the military forces of the European countries. As an essential corollary, we must guard with greatest care against the threat of inflation and downward spiralling in the European strength and morale. Therefore, just as I stress the need for the maintenance of American solvency, I urge the importance of adequate provision for the support of the industrial foundation required to carry out successfully the increase of forces now scheduled during fiscal year 1952. * * * In short, my attitude toward and my interest in the economic side is measured exclusively by its inescapable effect upon the over-all defense program. Therefore, I recommend that when final consideration is given to fixing the amount of military and economic aid from the United States under the fiscal year 1952 program, everything practicable be done to set the amount at a level which will adequately support the military build-up program as presented to the committee during their visit to Europe. With the complexity of this whole situation, it is obviously impossible to calculate the exact financial and economic requirements of Europe at this military headquarters. * * * Nevertheless, the relationship is so clear that, at the very least, a considerable degree of flexibility should be permitted in the administration of the funds provided.

General Eisenhower's cable convinced the conferees that within the limits allowed to them, Europe was a first priority—for economic as well as military assistance funds. This is why the title I amounts are very close to what the House voted. I am sure the House will agree that this is a judgment in the best interests of the United States

The conference agreement also gives particular attention to Asia and the Pacific area.

The amounts agreed upon for this area—title III—are $535,250,000 for military assistance, and $282,500,000 for economic assistance. The economic assistance funds consist of $237,500,000 for general economic assistance and $45,000,000 for Korean rehabilitation work.

The $535,250,000 for military assistance is the amount the Senate approved, and is $5,250,000 more than the House-approved amount. The committee of conference felt that the critical situation in Indochina and other areas of Asia made the higher amount necessary.

The $237,500,000 for general economic assistance is the amount approved by the House.

The $45,000,000 for Korean rehabilitation represents a compromise between the token amount of $11,250,000 voted by the House and $69,750,000 voted by the Senate. The committee of conference agreed that although Korean rehabilitation cannot proceed at once, the amount available should be sufficient to enable planning and financial operations to go forward.

We recognized, however, that the requirements for Korean rehabilitation cannot at this time be fixed with any precision. Undoubtedly, the United States will be called upon in the future to assist in this matter. The amount agreed upon does not foreclose further requests; neither is it an assurance that this country will in the future shoulder the major burden of resolving this problem.

The conference agreement contains a provision permitting the transfer of up to 50 percent—$22,500,000—of the funds for Korea to general economic and technical assistance in those parts of the region not under Communist control. The importance of strengthening the region against the encroachment of Communist aggression on many fronts made this provision desirable.

The other major question before the conferees was organization. On this point, I believe the conference agreement embodies the essential principles that were in the House bill. These are:

First. Unified direction and control of and centralized responsibility for the mutual-security program.

Second. Termination of ECA as an agency forthwith and creation of a new agency to carry on any further activities.

Third. Completion of the European recovery program on schedule on June 30, 1952; and continuation of a military program until 1954.

The conference agreement provides an organization based on these principles.

On the first point—unified direction and control, and centralization of responsibility—the conference agreement creates a Director of Mutual Security, who will be in the executive office of the President, and whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the Senate. This officer, on behalf of the President and subject to his direction, has primary responsibility for continuous supervision and general direction of the assistance programs under this act. He also has primary responsibility for prep-

aration and presentation of assistance programs to the Congress. The Director of Mutual Security is not required to make every day-to-day decision; indeed, he should not. His task is to pull together, and keep together, the various aspects of the mutual-security program. He will have the power of decision where conflicts of policy occur; he will be responsible to the President and to the Congress for the efficient operation of the mutual-security program.

The Director also has another major responsibility. He is the head of the new Mutual Security Agency—the successor to ECA. In this position he is directly responsible for the operation of all economic programs under this act except the point 4 program which remains in the Department of State.

The operating responsibility for the military-assistance program is in the Secretary of Defense. This is vital to the success of the program. The arrangement puts the Defense Department in charge of those activities it should control; but the Defense Department is subject to the continuous supervision and general direction of the Director in the White House, to assure unified direction and control.

On the second point—termination of ECA forthwith and creation of a successor agency—the conference agreement does just that. The important point here is that if we wait until 1952 to resolve the organization problem, the agency hangs suspended in midair, personnel leaves for other more certain fields, and the agency cannot do its job

The new agency is the Mutual Security Agency, and is organized along the lines of ECA

Members may say, "This is a sham—it only continues ECA under another name." If we did nothing about the law under which the agency operates, this charge would be true. It is not, because we have clearly indicated—now—the course of policy as far as it can be determined at this time

The ECA Act—the recovery program—has one more year to run. The new agency will operate under the existing ECA Act, but only until June 30, 1952.

After June 30, 1952, the new agency cannot provide economic assistance to any country for recovery purposes; and, except in joint control countries like Austria, Trieste, and Germany, none can be provided for programs other than mutual defense programs. These are defined as programs "designed to sustain and increase military effort, including—but not limited to—production, construction, equipment, and material in each country or groups of countries receiving United States military assistance.

This means a much more limited type of assistance; of the economic support for defense type and not just general economic assistance. And even this type of assistance will terminate on June 30, 1954.

Between now and June 30, 1952, the President can, of course, propose a broader policy of assistance than that provided in this act. That is his privilege. But, of course, the Congress can decide as it sees fit on the President's recommendations.

In my opinion, these provisions will carry out the mandate of the House to end the recovery program and thereafter confine our assistance to the support of the military effort so necessary to the free world.

The point 4 program has been left in the State Department where it now is. Although the House bill took it out of the State Department, the conference agreement does not violate the principle of the House bill.

The House bill established unified direction and control by putting the point 4 program in the new agency. The conference agreement preserves this principle by providing unified direction and control through the Director in the White House. He will not run the point 4 program—he is not expected to. He will coordinate it through the Secretary of State with the other assistance programs under this act.

This arrangement makes good sense. It preserves a long-term program, yet it assures that this program will be properly coordinated with other United States aid programs.

Mr Speaker, on behalf of the House conferees I bring this report to the House confident that the House can and will accept it as a good bill, eminently workable, and wisely drawn in the interests of the United States. I urge its adoption

Mr KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman for the fine leadership he has shown in connection with this very important measure which might well mean the beginning of the end of communistic aggression throughout the world

Mr. RICHARDS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement very much.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, before I go into any of the details of the conference report, I want to remind you what this is all about This is not a struggle between the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Banking and Currency Committee; it is not a struggle between the House and Senate. This bill involves a program for carrying on the struggle of the free peoples of the world against the grim and deadly threat of godless, ruthless communism. That is what this is all about, and it may be your last chance, I surmise, at this session of the Congress to vote your convictions on what we ought to do in this struggle.

This conference report is the culmination of a gigantic labor of constructive legislative statesmanship by the House committee and by the conferees. I want to pay my tribute to our able and independent chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], to the House committee and staff for the work they have done in the past 3 months, and to the conferees from both Houses for the work they did in this long conference.

The organizational structure set up in this conference report is home-made on Capitol Hill. It did not come from the administration, it was not dictated by any outside organization. It was an attempt by Members of Congress to set up a structure that could best carry on an effective program of mutual security.

The administration came down with a suggestion that ECA be continued indefinitely and that the mutual security program be run by a thing called ISAC (International Security Affairs Committee), headed up by a man three layers down in the State Department. Instead of that, the conference report provides that ECA goes out on next June 30, as we provided it would when we first authorized it in the Eightieth Congress, and a new mutual security agency is set up with a director in the Executive Office of the President who is to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate He is given authority to pick his own help, provided the Budget Bureau approves. There is no way for the entire ECA payroll or any other payroll to be blanketed wholesale into this new organization. Restrictions as to the number of personnel, in the higher brackets and all the way down, are contained in this conference report because we want to see a cut in the personnel, both the superdupers at the top and the others farther down, as this program goes ahead.

After June 30, 1952, when ECA winds up, assistance is to be confined to programs designed to sustain and increase military effort, and mutual defense programs, with the exception of necessary support where we have joint control arrangements, as in Austria, Trieste, and in Germany. So that not only is this program more than a billion dollars below the amount presented by the Executive, but, if it is carried out effectively, this program may be smaller next year.

We provided definitely for the duties of the departments involved, and in this I think the conferees sharpened up the language even of the House bill. We provided definitely in section 506 for what the Secretary of Defense is to do. He is to attend to the determination, the procuring, delivery, and supervision of military end items, and the training of foreign military personnel. We provided in sections 505 and 507 that the Secretary of State is still to be the chief adviser on foreign-policy questions. We provided in section 501 and 503 what the duties of the Mutual Security Director are to be. We provided that half a billion dollars of the counterpart funds must be devoted exclusively to military purposes. We provided that as great an amount as possible, in no event less than 10 percent of economic aid, shall be by way of loans. This loan matter has come up earlier this afternoon. The fact that this Director is not to be put on the Board of the Export-Import Bank does not change the conference provision that he is required to make at least 10,

percent of any economic aid in the form of loans. We are going to start again to get some money back on all of this.

There are detailed authorizations for each of the four areas covered by the bill and separate authorizations in each area for economic and military purposes, but then there are five provisions for flexibility because we recognize that in a critical period like this changes may be needed that cannot now be foreseen. There can be a 10-percent transferability between the four titles. In title I, which is Europe, there can be a 10-percent transferability between economic and military aid, because we became convinced that the wise use of additional economic aid devoted to military purposes might be an economy for the United States. Increased procurement and production abroad can result in both economic and military aid to those countries by a single expenditure of dollars. There can be a 50-percent transfer of the amount provided for Korean aid to other areas in Asia and there can be a 10-percent transfer of military weapons in title II in the Near East if that is found in our security interest.

We have provided good legislative machinery. It is up to the Executive to make it work. We have the plans spelled out on paper in this law, but no law can require or guarantee good administration. Good men must be appointed and guided to make any organization work well.

This program comes to you on an important day. We voted, by voice vote, a few moments ago, $56,935,000,000 in defense appropriations. Why are we appropriating that amount? As the distinguished members of your committee of conference on that bill on both sides of the aisle told you, we are doing this because of this threat of a grim and deadly struggle with Communist Russia that may break out at any time into world war III. If there is no such danger we are not justified in appropriating any such gigantic sum.

In acting on this conference report we are voting to authorize up to $7,400,000,000, of which over $7,000,000,000 is clearly for direct military purposes, $5,997,000,000 is for military hardware, and all but about $300,000,000 of the rest is directly for economic aid to increase the military effort in other countries. For what purpose? Because of the same grim and deadly threat that is involved in this $56,000,000,000 appropriation we passed, the threat of communism.

Now there are those here who intend to balance their personal voting budgets by saying that they voted for the $56,000,000,000 for our own forces but voted against the $7,000,000,000 for other forces. I think you ought to think that over before you cast such a vote. A great many members voted against military aid authorizations in 1949 but after Korea, a final vote authorizing military aid in July, 1950 there was only one House Member who voted against it, and that was Marcantonio. He is not here any more. There was not a single member of the other body who voted against it. That was because we all realized how important it was to have others besides United States troops, American boys, fighting our common enemy. If you voted for this vast military appropriation today and now vote against this conference report you may have to answer the question to your constituents and to your own conscience, in case war breaks out, as to why you voted to have American boys doing all the fighting, and voted against any arms at all for other nations willing to fight in our cause.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I say first to the gentleman that I intend to support this magnificent conference report. However, I should like to ask a question in the light of the last major address made by our distinguished and recently deceased colleague, the Honorable Karl Stefan, when he called attention to the fact that in our programs which we have set up under ECA and other agencies our ambassadors in foreign countries had declined to a status below that of the chief representative in those countries of our own country of ECA and other agencies, because these other people were dealing direct with those governments and hence our ambassadors were no longer in effect the chiefs of missions, although they still were so in title. I should like to have the gentleman comment on that.

Mr. VORYS. The conferees adopted a provision which was in the Senate bill and it appears on page 9 of the conference report, as follows:

SEC. 507. The President shall prescribe appropriate procedure to assure coordination among representatives of the United States Government in each country, under the leadership of the Chief of the United States Diplomatic Mission.

Therefore the criticism of our beloved departed friend is specifically answered in the conference report.

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope he has been able to read and understand this report.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I do not consider this a magnificent conference report, and I do not intend to vote for it. I should like to ask the gentleman this question: He spoke about the situation a year ago. May I ask the gentleman how many more people are fighting in this war today with the United States than were fighting with us a year ago?

Mr. VORYS. Considerably more; but not enough. The gentleman is going to vote to cut off any possibility of having others fight on our side, and that is his right if he wants to, but I want to say that I regret that there are not more from other nations fighting beside us in Korea, whoever they are. Only about 10 percent are from the other United Nations. I think there should be far more than that. I am willing to arm them and bring more of our boys home. If there is a struggle in Europe or if the struggle in Asia increases, I want to see the other United Nations come in and fight beside us, and I want to make them able to fight.

In addition to saving American lives, I want to point out the economy involved in this. In the bill we passed earlier this afternoon there was $19,800,000,000 to equip and maintain an American Army of a million and a half. For around one-third of that amount, or about $7,000,000,000 under the present conference report, we hope to secure, equip, arm, and put into the field about 3,000,000 ground forces in other nations.

Under the bill before you now, because of the savings that can be made due to the fact that we do not pay, we do not clothe, we do not house these foreign troops, although we do furnish them a part of their arms, we obtain for the common cause twice the number of ground forces for a third of the money spent in putting American forces in the field.

Will they fight, these foreign troops? I think so. I know this, that the people in those countries over there under the guns of the Communists are not going to fight if they do not have arms and a plan. If we furnish arms and a plan, and I think we have a good plan, I believe they will stand up.

There are those who feel that the way to resist communism is to pick up our marbles all over the world and come home and wait until the Communists come here. I think if we did that the Communists would be on our borders soon. We know that there are countries to the south of us that are infested with communism. I think that if Europe fell and Asia fell to the Communists we would be in trouble soon. Having seen the devastated countries of Europe during and after World War II, I believe that we ought to arrange our foreign policy so that, if possible, our wars, if they must come, shall be fought away from home. When we make our plans and our policies to do that, we are not merely being selfish. We give those in other lands a chance for their freedom when we give them a chance to fight for their homelands. When we do that, and attempt to keep war away from our shores, we are following, I think, an enlightened policy for our own security.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Does not this resolve itself down to the simple proposition of whether or not we are willing to place weapons in the hands of the people of Europe and elsewhere so that they can defend themselves against this aggression which now threatens them?

Mr. VORYS. That is right.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. How long has this ECA been going on? How many years?

Mr. VORYS. It will be 4½ years up to next June 30, and then it will be wound up. This bill provides that the whole mutual security agency shall wind up on June 30, 1954.

Mr. MASON. We are just now circumscribing, pin pointing, and specify-

ing the rules under which ECA shall operate, and we are 4½ years late on that.

Mr. VORYS. No; the whole purpose of the ECA has been changed by Soviet aggression so that European recovery, which is almost completed now, were it not for the military threat, has to turn into mutual security in the face of the common danger.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. As I understand it, with reference to the strategic and critical materials, the plan here is to set aside or allow the diversion rather than the earmarking specifically of not exceeding $55,000,000 for such materials, and that is for developmental work rather than outright purchase.

Mr. VORYS. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. And that is to be done supplementing the work of the ECA Administrator by the Director of Mutual Security working with the head of the Defense Materials Procurement Agency.

Mr. VORYS. That is right. It is my fervent hope that the Mutual Security Director will do a better job than the ECA has ever done on strategic and critical materials.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. And it is not intended to take over any of his functions?

Mr. VORYS. No; but he is to work in cooperation with Defense Materials Procurement Agency. There is a reference to that in the conference report.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The gentleman made reference to keeping war away from our shores There is one war going on away from our shores now in Korea. I want to ask the gentleman whether there is anything in this bill which contemplates using our allies in the United Nations, the free Chinese, who would like to get into that war to help us to win it.

Mr .VORYS. There is sufficient authorization of military funds for that purpose.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is that in this bill?

Mr. VORYS. Yes; in this bill. I might say that within any geographic area the amounts allocated to an individual country for military purposes are secret, and I think perhaps wisely so, but there are funds available for the purpose which the gentleman mentioned.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this conference report, but I must record my disappointment that the conferees on the part of the House were not able to persuade the conferees from the other body, to go along with the administrative set-up which was in the House bill. You will recall that when ECA legislation was before us in 1948, our committee worked out a system whereby the direction of its activities and the coordination of the many agencies dealing with parts of it were centered in an independent administration with the status of a department, and the one man who was the head of it was given the rank of a Cabinet member. The law itself spelled out the procedures by which his work was to be coordinated with other departments and agencies, particularly the State Department, and the procedures by which any disagreements or conflicts were to be settled. The Economic Cooperation Administrator knew what his powers and functions were and what they were not. He could go right to work without endless months of jockeying or bickering with other agencies to determine jurisdictions and responsibilities.

Why has ECA cost only about $12,000,000,000 instead of $17,000,000,000 which the administration asked as a minimum, and most people predicted would not be enough? The major reason was the organizational set-up which the committee established in the statute, and which has worked better than I think anybody had a right to expect. Why in the world should that set-up be abandoned now?

May I digress for a moment to comment on the question just raised here: "Have we not had ECA for almost 4 years now, and the job is still with us?" I would like to state that it was the magnificent success of the economic recovery program and not its failure that lead to the necessity for this military aid or mutual security program. The Soviet Union is determined to conquer the free world. It uses two main strategies—internal aggression and external aggression. Naturally it prefers the former where possible. In 1948, it was in the process of winning these European countries by internal aggression and subversion, aggravating and then exploiting unemployment and hunger and unhappiness and unrest. Twenty-five percent of the people in some of the countries were voting the Communist ticket. The ECA was set up to help restore their economies so that people would have work, and production of commodities they needed and wanted, and stabilized currencies—something to fight for, and some hope to stimulate them to resist the efforts of the Communists within their borders. It succeeded. There is no substantial internal threat in any of those countries today. That success led inevitably to another threat. When the Kremlin could not win them over by subversion and by capitalizing on bad internal conditions, it had to turn to the threat or use of external aggression. I warned on this floor in March 1948 when we had the original ECA bill before us that the economic recovery program was not an alternative to a military program as it had originally been represented as being—it was already too late. Rather, it was in support of a military defense program. I repeat, it was the success and not the failure of the economic recovery program, which forced us in 1949 to start building up the military strength of these countries in order to give them the capacity to resist pressures from without as well as to overcome despair, unrest, and subversion from within.

But when the military-aid program was instituted 2 years ago a quite different pattern of administration, centered in the State Department, was used. It has not worked well. When it had to be stepped up this year to a $7,000,000,000 program and the military features given dominance over the economy, the Government agencies involved were not able to agree on what kind of an administrative set-up to recommend. They quarreled among themselves during the first 5 months of this year. As you know, it was not until the last of May that the President finally sent up their suggestions to us and we had to try to settle what the agencies had not been able to resolve. That is why the bill is just now getting through at so late a date.

We worked out for our whole foreign-aid program, including military aid, economic aid in support thereof, and technical (point 4) assistance—essentially the same pattern of a single independent mutual security administration as had been successful beyond anyone's expectation under ECA. Every independent commission or agency like the Brookings Institution had recommended substantially that plan of organization. Paul Hoffman testified that the key to his success in doing the economic job successfully in a year's less time than had been anticipated and for twelve instead of seventeen billion dollars, was the administrative set-up prescribed in the law which gave him equal status with Cabinet members and the right to go to the President in case of unresolvable disagreement with the Secretary of State, the same as the latter could go to the President if unable to settle differences or conflicts or overlapping, after conference with the ECA Administrator. As a matter of fact, not once did either have to go to the President due to the fact that the right was there in the statute. Of course another reason for the success of ECA was the superb job done by the men appointed as the Administrator, Paul Hoffman, followed by William Foster.

Now, contrast the immediate efficiency of ECA, with the flounderings and internal disputes and inefficiency which has characterized this MDAP—the Mutual Defense Assistance Program for 2 years. A year ago last June when our committee was studying the bill for the second year of its operation, a high officer of one of the three branches of the armed services came to me off-duty at night in civilian clothes to report how badly it was bogged down. He was working with the program and was worried because the delays and disputes were losing precious months of time. He said, "The whole thing stinks; the administrative lines are so confused that we cannot get the program going in high gear."

I brought it up in committee meetings a day or two later when General Bradley was before us. The officer called me at home a few nights later to tell me a man hunt was going on in the Pentagon, not to find out who there or elsewhere was fouling the program up, but who had talked to Judd.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is 16 months later and the program is still not going as it should. Let me read what a Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] said in the Senate 2 days ago:

> It is a very great disappointment to be compelled by the facts to announce that the shipments to General Eisenhower's forces are becoming little more than a trickle when compared with what they should be.
>
> The figures are classified as secret, but some rough idea of the shocking inadequacy of these shipments is given when I say that, in my opinion, it is a fair guess that they are currently only about one-fifth as large as they should be. I hope the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, or a subcommittee thereof, or any individual Senator, or the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] will look into this matter to find what the trouble is, and to see whether we cannot keep faith with this North Atlantic Treaty obligation.

General Eisenhower and his staff and many of the people in Europe are doing a magnificent job, but they are being handicapped by administrative confusion here in Washington. I regret exceedingly that the system that worked so successfully under ECA, and which was in the House bill, was entirely scrapped in the Senate bill; and the conference report, while much nearer our bill than the Senate's, is still a hodgepodge that establishes not an independent Mutual Security Administration, but a Mutual Security Agency with a Director down about the third layer in the Executive Office of the President. I shall be surprised if it does not prove to be about the same as the present ISAC—International Security Affairs Coordinator—down about the third layer in the State Department and probably with most of the same people. The conference report bill authorizes the President to "prescribe appropriate procedures to assure coordination" That is, the bill continues much of the same system that is not working, instead of the ECA type of organization which did work. It is disappointing and, in my opinion, is likely to prove far more damaging to the program's successful operation than the 12-percent cut in funds.

Mr. Speaker, I profoundly hope I am wrong. I know our conferees did all they could and I have great confidence in the judgment of my chairman the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], and the others. They seem to believe this thing will work. I hope they are right and that my fears will prove unjustified. I must vote for the conference report, because to do nothing is disaster. The point I have discussed is vital not just because of the money involved but because the speedy success of the program is so essential to our security; and speedy success depends upon good administration. I hope the President will appoint the best man in the country as Director and give him the same kind of authority as the ECA Administrator had under the ECA Act so the all-important objectives can be accomplished.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] who just preceded me, I, too, feel that the conferees have done an excellent job. With him, however, I regret the impossibility of securing the administrative set-up that the House had provided. Further, however, I think that the conferees, considering the type of administration that the Senate had provided, have certainly come out very much better off. However, in the bill now before us what I particularly wanted to comment on are the changes made in the wording of one paragraph in which I personally was tremendously interested. This is section 509 of the House bill which allowed the military to make provision for the end items that are called for in this bill if they see fit to do so, using the appropriations made for end items during the last 3 years which up to now have totaled about $56,000,000,000. That was eliminated. I had hoped if that particular paragraph could be left in the bill the Appropriations Committee could determine from the military authorities the amount of goods in the form of end items that were going to be coming off their production lines. But as it stands I am afraid as far as appropriations are concerned it is going to prove a more expensive set of appropriations this year. I am hopeful that next year we can work it out so that what the foreign nations are doing in the way of arming themselves will be an integral part of our own security program and not just a further foreign-aid program.

Another thing: The language adopted by the conferees in section 506 (c) is subject to some misinterpretation. I am sure it is intended to grant greater flexibility to military authorities than they previously had under the old Mutual Assistance Act, but some people might read it to mean that they were hampered in the flexibility they previously had had. I think, however, I am correct in my interpretation that it was the intent of the conferees that greater flexibility was intended rather than lesser flexibility.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who did such good work himself in writing this bill and who proposed the amendment that was adopted by the House he has just been discussing, that as I construe it, the purpose of the section is to do the very thing that the gentleman from Massachusetts said—give greater flexibility to provide military assistance in furtherance of the purposes of the Mutual Security Act in that field. I want to say to the House, too, that the figure of $1,000,000,000 in this subsection was the direct result of what the gentleman from Massachusetts proposed to the House.

Mr. HERTER. I thank the gentleman very much. I think it is important that that flexibility be maintained so that there will be no misconstruction of the language as it now appears.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS].

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I returned from a trip of more than 11,000 miles which took me through the countries of Western Europe and behind the iron curtain into the Communist zone of Germany. The trip took place while the House of Representatives was in a brief summer recess and was not made at the taxpayers' expense. My purpose was to study at first hand the conditions in Europe and the operation of our multi-billion dollar foreign aid program.

In the course of the trip I interviewed private citizens as well as officials of foreign governments such as Konrad Adenauer, Chancellor of the German Republic, Rene Pleven, Prime Minister of France, and many others. I also talked with American Ambassadors, ECA officials, consuls, and military commanders, and I had a particularly interesting discussion with General Eisenhower at SHAPE headquarters outside of Paris.

It would be impossible to discuss all of my observations and experiences in this brief report. However, I should like to report at this time some general comments on conditions in Europe and the operation of the foreign aid program:

First. The stories of widespread starvation and hunger in Western Europe cannot be substantiated. The average western European does not have the wide variety and quantity of food available to the average American, but there is no more real starvation in Western Europe than might be found in the United States itself.

The people of Germany, who lost the war, are eating better than the people of England, who won the war. The British food situation is worse than that in any other country. The tight rationing and control imposed by the Socialist government forces the average family to rely on potatoes and other starches to make up the daily diet. Many Englishmen told me that more meat, eggs and other foods would be available if it were not for the fact that so much is being spent under the Labor Government for various socialistic services such as subsidies and government medicine. Incidentally, everyone I met in Britain, including members of the Labor Party, predicted that the Conservative Party under Churchill would win the next election, now scheduled for October 25.

Second. The billions of dollars the American taxpayers have pumped into Europe by way of economic aid have helped in stimulating postwar recovery.

However, my study of European economic conditions convinces me that the total effect of our aid has been misrepresented by the State Department. Actually, much of the money we have sent to Europe has been wasted. For example, I found that some ECA money has been used to build hotels in European cities which would not directly benefit the economic situation. In Italy a road was built at tremendous cost with United States funds but led to nowhere and was abandoned. We obviously gave the Eu-

ropeans far more money than was actually necessary to stimulate the recovery of Europe. Perhaps the greatest factor of all in European recovery has been the amazing ability of the human race to readjust itself after a disaster. This human quality was probably the most important factor in the increase in present day production in France, Italy and Germany.

The average man in Europe today is not aware of the great sacrifices made by the American people to stimulate economic recovery abroad. Very few Europeans express gratitude or appreciation for American help. One of the reasons for this situation is the fact that the total amount of American aid has not been widely publicized. ECA officials told me that it would not be wise to explain the sacrifices of the United States taxpayers because the Europeans might resent the fact that some appreciation for our gifts was expected.

It is my conclusion that the time has come to curtail or drastically reduce future economic aid to Europe. Any further economic assistance can only be justified on the grounds of practical military necessity which would be needed directly in the military defense of Western Europe.

Third. There is no question but what our economic aid program has helped to strengthen Socialist governments in Europe, particularly in England. The British Labor Government would have long since fallen had it not been for the gifts of American dollars and equipment through the ECA. While I was in London, Prime Minister Attlee delivered a speech in which he quoted certain United States officials praising the "great accomplishments" he said the British Socialist regime had attained. By helping to keep socialism in power in England we have virtually destroyed free enterprise and individual freedom in that nation. This has been a tragic result of what Americans have looked upon as a humanitarian effort to aid British economic recovery.

Fourth. Life behind the iron curtain is drab and dreary. In the Soviet zone of Germany I saw large numbers of Russian troops, all of them carrying rifles or machine guns and riding in vehicles of American manufacture. Most of the Red soldiers were youngsters in their teens. Huge pictures of Stalin and Lenin were everywhere along with signs and slogans proclaiming "peace and freedom under communism." The East German people look hungry and shabby by comparison with those in West Germany, and very few of the bombed-out buildings have been replaced. Many people are losing hope that they will ever be freed from Soviet tyranny.

Fifth. Do the Europeans possess the will to resist? The British people, although handicapped by a weakened economy under their Socialist government, can be counted on to stand with us in the defense of the West. The French have a defeatist attitude fanned by the fact that almost one-fourth of the people voted Communist in the last elections. However, the situation is improving as General Eisenhower's defense program begins to take its effect. Italy has the largest Communist Party element in Western Europe and most Italians are not eager to prepare to fight the Reds. The prospect of a change in the Italian Peace Treaty to allow more independence may help to obtain more cooperation from these people.

Germans in West Berlin are fiercely anti-Communist and probably would fight. Germans in other areas of Western Germany have not made up their minds on the question of rearmament however. They cannot be counted upon to join the fight against Red aggression unless they are given an equal status and responsibility in the European defense program. We need German troops and industry if we are to resist the Russians. To obtain this help we will have to replace the present occupation statute with a new contract provision granting greater independence to the Federal Republic.

Much can be done to minimize the risk of a return to Prussian militarism by rearming Germany. German divisions should be integrated in the new European army of General Eisenhower where they would have military equality but not control of defense plans. Armament industry should be dispersed among the European nations in such a way that Germany will not possess all of the armament industry necessary to sustain a complete war machine. The German industrial contribution, however, can help to ease the burden on the supply of military equipment now being carried by American industry and American taxpayers.

The United States must encourage European unity and help to supply military equipment to General Eisenhower's forces. At the same time, we must develop a "get tough" policy and demand that the European nations do more to help themselves. Too many people in Europe are shirking their responsibilities and relying on America.

Only the people of Europe themselves can supply the "will to resist." We cannot buy friends with dollars.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, we have under consideration today legislation to provide for the expenditure of millions and billions of dollars for the rehabilitation of people in Europe. I would like to call your attention to a situation dealing with this problem that is at least interesting, and I think of considerable importance, to the American people.

A metropolitan newspaper under date of Monday, October 1, and under a New York headline, reports that an exodus of 3,000,000 people from Europe is planned under the Marshall plan, ERC, and the ECA.

It says that our Government has made it clear it is going to do everything possible to see that migration gets started. This article further states that the President told Premier de Gasperi of Italy that such plan would be carried out. The article says among other things that the United Nations will move hundreds of thousands of people from Western Europe to Canada, Australia, and Latin America. The principal reason given for such migration is because of unemployment.

Now I call your attention to a further statement that appears in the same paper on the same date and on the same page: It is entitled "Offers a Labor Pool." The date line is Ottawa, Canada, September 30.

This statement says:

Canada has asked the United States Immigration Service for permission to export hundreds of jobless Canadians to Cleveland, Buffalo, and Detroit, the Labor Department here disclosed.

The statement further says that most Canadians would enter the United States from Ontario and that 3,000 registered unemployed would be included in the group. So it appears in short that the United States is going to help migrate people from Italy to Canada under an agreement already made by those countries, and then in turn, under an agreement with Canada, we permit thousands of unemployed to enter the United States. It looks like a back-door policy. What do you think about it? Both statements are included herewith:

EXODUS OF 3,000,000 PLANNED—WORKERS FROM WESTERN EUROPE MAY GO TO NATIONS WHERE THEY ARE NEEDED

NEW YORK, September 30.—Three million workers in Western Europe will go on the world's bargain counter this week in Naples. There, October 2, will open a momentous international conference of 30 democratic countries which hope to initiate a vast migration program from free Europe's overpopulated areas to lands where workers are needed desperately

If this program succeeds in evacuating Europe's wasted population, moth-balled since the war, it may mean, within a few years, real prosperity for Western Europe, a new and better life for Europe's chronic unemployed, and, not least, a concomitant whopping reduction in America's annual tax bill.

The conference is under the auspices of the International Labor Organization, whose matchmaking assignment from the United Nations is to do something about moving hundreds of thousands of people in Western Europe immediately to Canada, Australia, and Latin America, where they are assured of a real chance to build new lives for themselves and their families.

Simply put, Europe can't prosper unless it exports, during the next 5 years, at least 3,000,000 workers Italy, Greece, the Netherlands, Austria, and Western Germany are being strangled by people they can't feed, clothe, or house, let alone, gainfully employ. The Marshall plan, ERP, ECA, European economic integration—all these are aspirin tablets for Europe's surplus population headache.

President Truman and Congress have made it clear that our Government is going to do everything possible to see to it that migration gets started. That, for example, is what the President told Premier Alcide de Gasperi of Italy, on his recent Washington visit. The shrewd De Gasperi may fret publicly about Trieste's disposition, or declaim about the Italian Peace Treaty revision, but privately he pleaded in Washington for help and speed in getting rid of several hundred thousand unwanted countrymen.

OFFERS A LABOR POOL—UNITED STATES WOULD BE SENT HUNDREDS OF JOBLESS MEN BY CANADA

OTTAWA, CANADA, September 30.—Canada has asked the United States Immigration Service for permission to export hundreds of jobless Canadians to Cleveland, Buffalo, and Detroit, the Labor Department here disclosed.

Most of the Canadians would enter the United States from Windsor, Ontario. Canada's motor city, which has 3,000 registered unemployed because of cut-backs in car production

Arthur MacNamara, Canadian Deputy Labor Minister, said he had no idea of the number of Canadians who could be absorbed into American industries, which reportedly are short of men because of the draft in the United States

Canada, concentrating its defense effort on production, has no draft.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is possible under this bill to do many things. In particular do I now call attention to one needed thing. Iran is now closed to British influence, but that does not mean Iran is ready to cast her lot with the Communists. Iran is not closed to American influence. She respects this Nation, wants to work with us

Iran desperately needs her oil industry. She would, I believe, welcome American help in its operation. More than a key industry is involved here. Also involved is a key nation in a key area in the struggle between democracy and communism.

We can step into the vacuum left by the departing British. If we fail, or if we delay, Russia surely will move in. But if the free world loses Iran's friendship—and her oil—it will be by default, not by Iran's choice.

The leadership should be taken by our Government. This bill can provide the means if means are needed.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will approve this conference report for the fundamental reason it shows to especially our allies of Europe, who are trying to rally their forces under General Eisenhower, that we want allies and that we will not go it alone and that that is the answer to those who would have us go it alone.

This is a new program and they are undertaking a new program. We are saying to them that we will back it up.

In answer to those who spoke about Korea, and about which I feel exactly as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], may I say that we are not buying friends. Those who come here and tell us that people do not like us miss the main point. We are not buying friends. We are trying to arm people who are for free institutions so that they are independent, economically strong, and able to defend themselves. That is what will defend the great areas of the world against communism. When they get to that point I feel, and those who have been backing this program feel, they are better able to make their contribution to the resistance of aggression in places like Korea. That is the fundamental basis for this program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

(Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have not changed my position on this measure. I voted against it when it was before the House, and I expect to vote against this conference report. This is a long step in the inflation of the currency of this country through the Federal Reserve System.

As I said the other day, every great economist on earth will tell you that prices in a free economy are governed by two things, the volume of the Nation's currency multiplied by the velocity of its circulation.

It is absolutely useless to try to stabilize prices and at the same time continue to permit, and encourage, the inflation of the Nation's currency in this way. At the peak of high prices in 1920 we had only $5,698,214,612 in circulation. On August 30, 1950, a little more than a year ago, we had $27,119,914,381 in circulation, of which $22,769,722,870 was in Federal Reserve notes. On August 31, 1951, we had $28,154,897,504 in circulation, of which $23,816,716,705 was in Federal Reserve notes. In other words, the currency had been inflated more than $1,000,000,000, through the issuance of Federal Reserve notes.

This measure will inflate it at least another billion, or maybe several billion dollars more. It is dangerous legislation that may result in direful consequences.

It is absolutely useless to try to fix prices of commodities while permitting the inflation of the currency to continue and encouraging it by legislation of this kind.

The Banking and Currency Committee should bring out a bill stabilizing the currency within a given limit, so that the American people would know what to depend on and how to adjust their affairs to it. They should fix a maximum beyond which the currency could not be expanded by making it illegal to issue Federal Reserve notes, gold or silver certificates, United States notes, or any other kind of currency beyond that limit. Then a floor should be placed under it fixing the limit below which it would be impossible to deflate the currency. That could be done by providing in the law that if the currency were deflated below a given figure by the retirement of Federal Reserve notes, then the Government could issue United States notes with a gold reserve by them to make up the difference.

In that way you can stabilize the currency within a given limit, restore the confidence of the American people, and enable them to adjust their affairs in such a way as to avoid the feelings of uncertainty which they are now experiencing, or the panic into which they are likely to be thrown unless these safeguards are adopted.

This is the most serious problem of its kind with which our people have ever been confronted; and it is the duty of Congress to take the steps necessary to prevent the disasters of further wild inflation, or the perhaps greater disasters of a precipitate deflation, without protecting them from such catastrophes in the manner that I have indicated.

It is the only possible way to avoid the disasters of wild inflation and at the same time prevent the horrible catastrophes of a disastrous deflation, and enable our people to move forward with confidence in the security of our financial structure.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, there are quite a number of Members of this House who have been here longer than I, but on the 3d day of next January, at 12 o'clock meridian, God willing, I shall have served in this body 13 years. During that period it has been my privilege to serve on several committees and missions engaged in the work of this House. One of them was the Air Accident Investigating Committee many years ago, and after the war was over I was one of the first Members appointed to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Subsequently, it was by honor to be vice chairman of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board and chairman of its Subcommittee on Combat Aviation. During that period of time, and since, it has been my privilege to sit with the best informed men in the Military Establishment and many civilians who know something about this business.

Just the other day—day before yesterday, I believe it was—the President made an announcement that a second atomic explosion had occurred in the Soviet Republics. That is something that should give pause to every Member in this body. There were many who thought that the first explosion might have been an accident, but I do not think that you can trust the second one to be any accident.

Many of us will remember the events that preceded World War II, and how so many Members of this House hated to see that happen, but in expressing their distaste for that war, however you might want to look at it for yourself, they may have thereby jeopardized the effort that our country was attempting to make. Let us not do that now because these are times equally full of dynamite as the days before World War II.

It is my hope that by doing everything that we may reasonably be able to do—and, I say to the gentleman from Mississippi, without bankrupting ourselves—that we may ward off world war III. One of the biggest reasons why World War II happened was because the United States crawled into its shell and said that we did not want to have anything to do with anything that went on abroad; "a plague on all of your houses"; and by so doing we upset the balance of power in the world and thereby encouraged the strong nation—the aggressor nation—to attack the weak.

Let us not do that this time. We are the only nation fit and able to defend freedom today. We need badly to have other nations fit, able, and willing to defend their own freedom and hence the principle of freedom. ECA has done great things in spite of its many defects, but it will expire next June 30. This bill is designed to help those other nations to the point where they may defend themselves and join us in defense of freedom. I shall support the conference report.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the conference agreement on the mutual security bill. This measure has already been fully debated by both Houses. The separate versions that resulted were sent to conference and the House now has an opportunity to compare the text agreed upon by both Houses through their conferees with the text of the bill as it passed this House last August. Members of this body may indulge in a large measure of satisfaction that the bill presently before the House contains so much of the original House thinking on this subject.

Before I touch on some of the details of the conference agreement, I want to pay my respects to my fellow conferees in both Houses. There were fundamental disagreements in the two versions of the bill. But no bitterness or pettiness showed itself in the search for agreement. Members of both Houses and of both parties displayed a high degree of statesmanship. The genial chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee has expressed his appreciation for the support that we in this body gave him during the conference. May I state for the record, however, that the gentleman from South Carolina showed himself a first-rate tactician and diplomat in advancing the views of this body. The other House conferees were equally diligent in championing the House views and gave unstinted support to the chairman.

The chairman has already explained the two major agreements on amounts and organization. I would like to explain some of the agreements reached on other points.

In the House bill the point 4 program was put under the jurisdiction of the Mutual Security Administrator. The Senate did not share this view. The conferees discussed at length the administration of this program It was recognized that the point 4 program is unique in several ways. It is a long-time venture; it operates with modest means; its emphasis is on the improvement of grassroots areas rather than on purely military factors.

I must say that during the hearings on this bill I was tremendously impressed, as were many of my colleagues, by the character of the Director of the point 4 program, Dr. Henry G. Bennett. His presentation of evidence was marked by a refreshing simplicity. He had no visions of bureaucratic "empire building." He recognized that the current world situation called for two programs—the emergency big-grant program geared to the military needs and the long-range program with its emphasis on the rural approach. It was his convincing analysis of the program that led me, and I am sure many others, to the conclusion that the present administrative features of the program should not be disturbed. The success of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs in carrying out a similar program only strengthened my findings. Under these circumstances it was deemed desirable to insert section 508. Yet we were aware that, if unified direction of our foreign assistance program is to be achieved, both of these programs must be coordinated with the larger elements of that program. This coordination will be achieved through the Secretary of State to whom the President has delegated the administration of the point 4 program.

Technical development programs operated by ECA in southeast Asia will be under the Director. After June 1952 he assumes primary responsibility for the development and administration of programs of assistance designed to sustain and increase military effort, including production, construction, equipment and materials in each country or in groups of countries which received United States military assistance. The key word in this directive is "effort." The inclusion of this word will permit continued operation of STEM missions in the Philippines, Thailand, Formosa, and Indochina. Assistance to other nations will be carefully screened to determine whether they contribute to increased military effort. Further aid to them will depend, in a large measure, on their foreign policy.

In discussing appropriations that are authorized under this bill the chairman noted that up to $55,000,000 for strategic material development may be taken from title I. No one will dispute the importance of embarking on such a program. The ECA Administrator already has power to procure these materials and stimulate their production abroad. Under this bill the Director for Mutual Security will assume these powers.

The Defense Production Act empowers the President to make purchases of and commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials for Government use or resale and to encourage exploration, development, and mining of strategic and critical materials both in the United States and in foreign countries. By Executive order the President has delegated these functions to the Administrator of the recently created Defense Materials Procurement Agency.

It would appear that in participating countries under the Economic Cooperation Act there may be some overlapping in the responsibilities of the Director for Mutual Security and the Defense Materials Procurement Administrator. The conferees considered a proposal to transfer to the President the functions relating to the foreign procurement and development of so-called deficient materials in order that he might delegate this ECA authority to the Defense Materials Procurement Administrator. But they decided that these functions should be vested along with the other ECA functions in the Director for Mutual Security.

While the language of section 514 of this bill is silent on the relationship between the Director for Mutual Security and the Defense Materials Procurement Administrator, the conferees envisioned the utmost cooperation and assistance between them to achieve a common objective. As I study the history of this problem and the language and the intent of this section, I expect that the Director will find it appropriate to delegate to the Defense Materials Procurement Administrator, at least to some extent, the performance of these functions in participating countries. This is in line with the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] earlier today. Certainly that would be the orderly, efficient, and least costly way of carrying out this section.

One section of this bill deserves more attention than it has received. I refer to section 528 (b). This encourages countries receiving technical assistance to establish fair labor standards of wages and working conditions and management-labor relations. The significance of this language is twofold. The application of this philosophy will assure an improved and more stable economic base in those countries and thereby contribute to their political stability. The American worker will not be victimized by competition with cheap foreign labor. It was not possible to draft more precise or binding language. But it is the confident expectation of the conferees that the administrator of the point 4 program will lose no opportunity to carry out the intention of this section.

Closely connected with these provisions are those of section 516. The conferees drew upon ideas presented in the House and Senate versions. Briefly, this section calls for the administration of the mutual-security program so as to encourage free private enterprise, discourage cartels and monopolies, and encourage the free-labor movement. These, of course, are not new principles for the Congress. It has endorsed similar principles on many occasions. This seemed an appropriate time to urge upon our friends abroad that they move toward these objectives at the same time that they strengthen themselves against external threats. The acceptance of these principles, I believe, will add to their strength at home.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most carefully drawn bills to be presented to the Congress in recent years. No one can accuse its supporters of indifference to the American taxpayers. Each authorization was carefully examined and, where the judgment of the members determined it was possible, was pruned. We have written into this bill administrative machinery that focuses responsibility through centralization. We have responded to the conditions of the time by putting the bulk of our aid on the military side. The future measure of our economic assistance abroad—except for a few hardship cases—will be the degree to which that assistance will further the military effort. We have determined upon a target date for the termination of

our assistance, thereby assuring our people that we are not committed to aid in perpetuity.

I am immensely proud that this body has assumed the initiative in shaping this measure. The impress of the House is upon every section. I believe it is a good bill—sound in its principles and prudent in its provisions. I urge its passage.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 235, nays 98, not voting 95, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

YEAS—235

Abbitt	Doyle	Jones, Mo.
Addonizio	Eaton	Jones,
Albert	Eberharter	Hamilton C.
Allen, Calif.	Elliott	Jones,
Angell	Ellsworth	Woodrow W.
Armstrong	Engle	Judd
Aspinall	Evins	Karsten, Mo.
Ayres	Fallon	Kean
Bailey	Feighan	Keating
Bakewell	Fenton	Kee
Baring	Fernandez	Kelley, Pa.
Barrett	Fine	Kelly, N. Y.
Bates, Mass.	Forand	Kerr
Battle	Ford	Kersten, Wis
Beckworth	Forrester	Kilday
Bender	Frazier	King
Bennett, Fla.	Fugate	Kirwan
Blatnik	Fulton	Klein
Bolling	Furcolo	Kluczynski
Bolton	Garmatz	Lane
Bonner	Gary	Lanham
Bosone	Gavin	Lantaff
Boykin	Golden	LeCompte
Brown, Ga.	Goodwin	Lesinski
Brownson	Gordon	Lind
Bryson	Gore	Lyle
Buchanan	Graham	McCarthy
Burleson	Granahan	McConnell
Burnside	Granger	McCormack
Burton	Grant	McGuire
Bush	Green	McKinnon
Byrnes, Wis.	Greenwood	Machrowicz
Camp	Hale	Mack, Wash
Canfield	Hall,	Madden
Cannon	Edwin Arthur	Magee
Carlyle	Hall,	Mahon
Carnahan	Leonard W.	Mansfield
Case	Halleck	Marshall
Chatham	Hardy	Martin, Mass.
Chiperfield	Harris	Meader
Chudoff	Harrison, Va.	Merrow
Colmer	Hart	Miller, N. Y.
Combs	Havenner	Mills
Cooley	Hays, Ark.	Mitchell
Cooper	Hays, Ohio	Morgan
Corbett	Hedrick	Morton
Cotton	Heller	Moulder
Coudert	Herlong	Multer
Cox	Herter	Mumma
Crosser	Heselton	Murdock
Crumpacker	Hill	Murray, Tenn.
Cunningham	Hillings	Norblad
Curtis, Mo.	Hinshaw	O'Brien, Ill.
Dague	Holmes	O'Brien, Mich.
Davis, Ga.	Hope	O'Neill
Davis, Tenn.	Hunter	Ostertag
Dawson	Ikard	O'Toole
DeGraffenried	Irving	Patman
Denny	Jackson, Wash.	Patten
Devereux	Jarman	Patterson
Dingell	Javits	Perkins
Donohue	Johnson	Pickett
Doughton	Jones, Ala	Poage
Polk	Saylor	Teague
Price	Scott, Hardie	Thomas
Priest	Scott,	Thornberry
Rains	Hugh D., Jr.	Tollefson
Reams	Seely-Brown	Trimble
Rhodes	Shelley	Van Zandt
Ribicoff	Sheppard	Vorys
Richards	Sikes	Walter
Riehlman	Smith, Miss.	Watts
Riley	Spence	Welch
Roberts	Springer	Whitaker
Robeson	Steed	Wickersham
Rodino	Stigler	Wier
Rogers, Colo.	Sutton	Wigglesworth
Rogers, Fla.	Tackett	Wolverton
Rogers, Mass.	Talle	Yorty
Sasscer	Taylor	Zablocki

NAYS—98

Aandahl	Elston	Rankin
Abernethy	Fisher	Reece, Tenn.
Adair	George	Reed, Ill.
Allen, Ill.	Gross	Reed, N. Y.
Andersen,	Gwinn	Rees, Kans.
H. Carl	Hagen	Regan
Anderson, Calif.	Hand	Rogers, Tex.
Andresen,	Harden	St George
August H.	Harrison, Wyo.	Schwabe
Andrews	Harvey	Secrest
Arends	Hoeven	Shafer
Barden	Hoffman, Ill.	Simpson, Ill
Beamer	Hoffman, Mich.	Simpson, Pa.
Belcher	Horan	Smith, Kans.
Bennett, Mich	Hull	Smith, Wis.
Bentsen	Jenison	Stockman
Berry	Jenkins	Taber
Betts	Jonas	Thompson,
Bishop	Kearns	Mich.
Blackney	Larcade	Vail
Bow	Lovre	Van Pelt
Bray	McDonough	Vursell
Brehm	McGregor	Weichel
Budge	McVey	Wheeler
Burdick	Martin, Iowa	Whitten
Butler	Mason	Williams, Miss.
Chenoweth	Morris	Williams, N. Y.
Church	Nelson	Wilson, Tex.
Cole, Kans.	Nicholson	Winstead
Davis, Wis.	Norrell	Withrow
D'Ewart	O'Hara	Wolcott
Dolliver	Passman	Wood, Ga
Dondero	Potter	Wood, Idaho
Dorn	Poulson	

NOT VOTING—95

Allen, La.	Gathings	Preston
Anfuso	Gregory	Prouty
Auchincloss	Hébert	Quinn
Baker	Heffernan	Rabaut
Bates, Ky.	Hess	Radwan
Beall	Holifield	Ramsay
Boggs, Del.	Howell	Redden
Boggs, La.	Jackson, Calif.	Rivers
Bramblett	James	Rooney
Brooks	Jensen	Roosevelt
Brown, Ohio	Kearney	Sabath
Buckley	Kennedy	Sadlak
Buffett	Keogh	Scrivner
Busbey	Kilburn	Scudder
Byrne, N. Y.	Latham	Sheehan
Celler	Lucas	Short
Chelf	McCulloch	Sieminski
Clemente	McGrath	Sittler
Clevenger	McMillan	Smith, Va.
Cole, N. Y.	McMullen	Staggers
Crawford	Mack, Ill.	Stanley
Curtis, Nebr.	Miller, Calif.	Thompson, Tex
Deane	Miller, Md.	Velde
Delaney	Miller, Nebr.	Vinson
Dempsey	Morano	Werdel
Denton	Morrison	Wharton
Dollinger	Murphy	Widnall
Donovan	Murray, Wis.	Willis
Durham	O'Konski	Wilson, Ind
Flood	Philbin	Woodruff
Fogarty	Phillips	Yates
Gamble	Powell	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Werdel against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Velde against.

Mr. Denton for, with Mr. Busbey against.

Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Sheehan against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Jensen against.

Mr. Flood for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Mack of Illinois for, with Mr. Woodruff against.

Mr. Smith of Virginia for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Quinn with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Clemente with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Donovan with Mr. Sittler.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Scudder.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Radwan.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Beall.

Mr. Preston with Mr. Jackson of California.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. James.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Curtis of Nebraska.

Mr. Howell with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. McGrath with Mr. Buffett.

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Bramblett.

Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Murphy with Mr. Sadlak.

Mr. Gathings with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Wharton.

Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Prouty.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.

Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Morano.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Scrivner.

Mr. Rooney with Mr. Phillips.

Mr Staggers with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. O'Konski.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTOMOBILES FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1864) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans who served during World War II, and persons who served in the military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT NO. 1098)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1864), to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans who served during World War II, and persons who served in the military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That, subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, to provide or assist in providing an auto-

mobile or other conveyance by paying not to exceed $1,600 on the purchase price, including equipment with such special attachments and devices as the Administrator may deem necessary, for each veteran of World War II or of service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, who is entitled to compensation under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for any of the following due to disability incurred in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service of the United States during either of such periods.

"(a) Loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet;

"(b) Loss or permanent loss of use of one or both hands;

"(c) Permanent impairment of vision of both eyes of the following status: Central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye, with corrective glasses, or central visual acuity of more than 20/200 if there is a field defect in which the peripheral field has contracted to such an extent that the widest diameter of visual field subtends an angular distance no greater than twenty degrees in the better eye

"SEC 2 No payment shall be made under this Act for the repair, maintenance, or replacement of any such automobile or other conveyance and no veteran shall be given an automobile or other conveyance until it is established to the satisfaction of the Administrator that such veteran will be able to operate such automobile or other conveyance in a manner consistent with his own safety and the safety of others and will be licensed to operate such automobile or other conveyance by the State of his residence or other proper licensing authority: *Provided*, That a veteran who cannot qualify to operate a vehicle shall nevertheless be entitled to the payment of not to exceed $1,600 on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance, as provided in Section 1 of this Act, to be operated for him by another person, provided such veteran meets the other eligibility requirements set forth in this Act.

"SEC 3 The furnishing of such automobile or other conveyance, or the assisting therein, shall be accomplished by the Administrator paying the total purchase price, if not in excess of $1,600, or the amount of $1,600, if the total purchase price is in excess of $1,600, to the seller from whom the veteran is purchasing under sales agreement between the seller and the veteran.

"SEC 4. No veteran shall be entitled to receive more than one automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this act and no veteran who has received or who hereafter receives an automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of the paragraph under the heading 'Veterans' Administration' in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947, as extended, or the act of September 21, 1950 (Public Law 798, Eighty-first Congress), shall be entitled o receive an automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this act.

SEC 5 The benefits provided in this act shall not be available to any veteran who has not made application for such benefits to the Administrator within 3 years after the effective date of this act, or within 3 years after the date of the veteran's discharge or release from active service if the veteran is not discharged or released until on or after said effective date.

"SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Veterans' Administration, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry into effect the provisions of this act."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes."

And the House agree to the same.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
CARL ELLIOTT,
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1864) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans who served during World War II, and persons who served in the military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendments, namely:

On June 13, 1951, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported H R. 4233, which provided authorization for the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make a payment not to exceed $1,600 towards the purchase of an automobile or other conveyance for certain disabled veterans The eligible veterans, under the terms of this bill, were limited to those who had lost or lost the use of one or both hands or feet or who were blind, as defined, and who had served in World War I, II, or after June 27, 1950 In addition, provision was made that the veteran, if he desired, might elect to receive $1,600 in cash in lieu of the payment toward the purchase price of the automobile This bill passed the House on a call of the Calendar Wednesday, on June 20, 1951.

It was referred to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. That committee disregarded the House-approved measure, H R 4233, and on July 25, 1951, reported S 1864, which authorized automobiles for World War II veterans and those who served on or after June 27, 1950, who are entitled to compensation for the loss or loss of the use of one or both legs at or above the ankle. On August 9, 1951, the Senate passed this measure, and when it was referred to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the committee voted to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H R 4233 as passed by the House on June 20, 1951.

The bill agreed upon by the conferees closely follows the House bill as originally passed on June 20 and S. 1864, as passed by the House As agreed upon, the bill is limited to World War II veterans and those who served on or after June 27, 1950, who are entitled to service-connected compensation for the loss or loss of the use of one or both feet or one or both hands, or who are blind, as defined. In cases where the veteran is unable to operate the car, the payment shall be made nevertheless in those cases where the veteran can have the car operated by another person in his behalf. The provision for a cash payment in lieu of a payment towards the purchase of an automobile was deleted by the conferees.

Through August 31, 1951, the following vehicles have been paid for by the Veterans' Administration to eligible World War II veterans under existing authority:

Automobiles	25,699
Jeeps	61
Station wagons	26
Tractors	100
Trucks	175
Total	26,061

The Veterans' Administration is unable to give any estimate, obviously, of the number of veterans who will be eligible for the benefits of this act based on service on or after June 27, 1950. It is estimated, however, by this agency, that of World War II veterans, some 380 veterans will be eligible due to the loss or loss of the use of one or both feet, approximately 9,480 eligible due to the loss or loss of the use of one or both hands, and approximately 1,840 due to blindness.

The text of the laws which have been enacted on the subject is included below.

[Excerpts from public laws which authorize the furnishing of cars for amputees]

PUBLIC LAW 663, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS; VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

"Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: To enable the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide an automobile or other conveyance, at a cost per vehicle or conveyance of not to exceed $1,600, including equipment with such special attachments and devices as the Administrator may deem necessary, for each veteran of World War II who is entitled to compensation for the loss, or loss of use of one or both legs at or above the ankle under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, $30,000,000 *Provided*, That no part of the money appropriated by this paragraph shall be used for the repair, maintenance, or replacement of any such automobile or other conveyance and no veteran shall be given an automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this paragraph until it is established to the satisfaction of the Administrator that such veteran will be able to operate such automobile or other conveyance in a manner consistent with his own safety and the safety of others and will be licensed to operate such automobile or other conveyance by the State of his residence or other proper licensing authority: *Provided further*, That under such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe the furnishing of such automobile or other conveyance shall be accomplished by the Administrator paying the total purchase price to the seller from whom the veteran is purchasing under sales agreement between the seller and the veteran.

"SEC. 303. This Act may be cited as the "First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947"

"Approved August 8, 1946"

EMERGENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1948; PUBLIC LAW 161, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS; CHAPTER 206, FIRST SESSION

"The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized to disburse, during the month of July 1947, one-twelfth of the amount provided in each appropriation for the Veterans' Administration included in H. R. 3839 as passed by the House of Representatives and there are hereby appropriated such amounts as may be necessary for such disbursements: *Provided*, That amounts expended hereunder shall be deducted from such appropriation for 1948 when H. R. 3839 is enacted into law.

"Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: The authority and funds provided under this heading in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947 (Public Law 663, 79th Cong.), are hereby continued available until June 30, 1948"

THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1948; PUBLIC LAW 271, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

"Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: For an additional amount for 'Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans,' $5,000,000 to be available for the purposes specified under this head in the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 663)—$5,000,000."

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1948; PUBLIC LAW 785, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

"Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: For an additional amount for 'Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans,' $1,500,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services,' and to be available until June 30, 1949, for the purposes specified under this head in the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 663), as extended by the Emergency Appropriation Act, 1948."

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1949; PUBLIC LAW 904, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—AUTOMOBILES FOR DISABLED VETERANS

"For an additional amount for 'Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans,' $5,000,000."

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1949; PUBLIC LAW 343, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

"Funds heretofore appropriated for 'Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans' are hereby continued available until June 30, 1950."

PURCHASE OF AUTOMOBILES OR OTHER CONVEYANCES FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS, PUBLIC LAW 798, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

"That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Veterans' Administration the sum of $800,000 to remain available until June 30, 1951, to enable the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide or assist in providing an automobile or other conveyance by paying not to exceed $1,600, on the purchase price, including equipment with such special attachments and devices as the Administrator may deem necessary, for each veteran of World War II who is entitled to compensation for the loss, or loss of use, of one or both legs at or above the ankle under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That no part of such appropriation shall be used for the repair, maintenance, or replacement of any such automobile or other conveyance and no veteran shall be given an automobile or other conveyance until it is established to the satisfaction of the Administrator that such veteran will be able to operate such automobile or other conveyance in a manner consistent with his own safety and the safety of others and will be licensed to operate such automobile or other conveyance by the State of his residence or other proper licensing authority: *Provided further*, That under such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe the furnishing of such automobile or other conveyance, or the assisting therein, shall be accomplished by the Administrator paying the total purchase price, if not in excess of $1,600, or the amount of $1,600, if the total purchase price is in excess of $1,600, to the seller from whom the veteran is purchasing under sales agreement between the seller and the veteran: *And provided further*, That no veteran shall be entitled to receive more than one automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this Act and no veteran who has received or may receive an automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of the paragraph under the heading 'Veterans' Administration' in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947, as extended, shall be entitled to receive an automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this Act."

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1950, PUBLIC LAW 843, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

"Veterans' Administration: For an additional amount for 'Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans', $375,000."

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1951, PUBLIC LAW 45, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—AUTOMOBILES AND OTHER CONVEYANCES FOR DISABLED VETERANS

"To enable the Administrator to provide, or assist in providing, automobiles or other conveyances for disabled veterans as authorized by the Act of September 21, 1950 (Public Law 798), $800,000."

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
CARL ELLIOTT,
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks on the conference report S. 1864.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SABINE LAKE BRIDGE AND CAUSEWAY AUTHORITY

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5593) authorizing the Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority, hereby created, and its successors, to construct, maintain, and operate bridges over Sabine Lake, at or near Port Arthur, Tex.; to construct, maintain, and operate all causeways, approaches, and appurtenances pertaining thereto; and to finance said objects by the issuance of bonds secured by the said properties and income and revenues; and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is a private bill that does not call for any public expenditure of money, and it has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. COMBS. Yes. I will say to the distinguished minority leader that this authority is delegated certain public officials of the States of Louisiana and Texas and specifically provides that no obligation can be fixed against the States or the National Government. It is to be financed purely by tolls, and then the causeway is to become a freeway.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the postal service, promote national defense, and provide for military and other purposes, the Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority, hereby created, and its successors be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate bridges, causeways, approaches, and appurtenances pertaining thereto at a point suitable to the interests of navigation between a point at or near Port Arthur, Tex., and a point opposite in Cameron Parish, La., in accordance with the provisions of the General Bridge Act of 1946, as amended, qualified only by the authority, conditions, and limitations contained in this act

SEC. 2. There is hereby created a body corporate and politic to be known as Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority which shall have and possess all powers necessary, convenient, or proper for carrying into effect the objects stated in this act

SEC 3. The Authority shall consist of seven members, to wit: (a) The county judge of the county of Jefferson, State of Texas, (b) commissioner of precinct No. 2, county of Jefferson, State of Texas; (c) commissioner of precinct No. 3, county of Jefferson, State of Texas, (d) county clerk of Jefferson County, State of Texas; (e) president of the Police Jury of Cameron Parish, State of Louisiana; (f) secretary of the Police Jury of Cameron Parish, State of Louisiana, (g) ward No. 5 member of the Police Jury of Cameron Parish, State of Louisiana The persons holding the offices and positions above designated at the time of approval of this act, and their successors, shall be and become ex officio members of the Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority hereby created and shall continue as members of the said Authority so long as they shall hold the offices above stipulated. Four members of the Authority shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. The Authority shall choose its own Chairman and Vice Chairman. The Authority shall formulate and adopt its own rules for regulating the time and place of its regular meetings, and may hold special meetings upon call of the Chairman or in his absence, upon call of the Vice Chairman and one other member. The Secretary of the Authority shall keep and preserve complete records of all proceedings and acts of the Authority No member shall receive a salary for his services as member, but shall be paid his actual expenses not exceeding $25 per day for each day actually devoted to the performance of his duties hereunder. The Authority may employ a secretary, treasurer, engineers, attorneys, financial advisers, and such other experts, assistants, and employees as it may deem necessary, who shall be entitled to receive such compensation as the Authority may determine All salaries and expenses shall be paid solely from the funds provided under the authority of this act

SEC 4 There is hereby conferred upon the Authority hereby created, and its successors, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, maintenance, and operation of such bridges, causeways, and approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC 5 The Authority hereby created and its successors is hereby authorized to levy, fix, and charge tolls, fees, or other considerations for the movement of persons and property over its bridges, causeways, and approaches, and in fixing the tolls and rates to be charged for the use of such bridges, causeways, and approaches, and the appurtenances thereof, the Authority shall so de-

termine upon and adjust same as to provide funds sufficient for the following purposes:

(a) Creation of necessary interest and sinking funds to pay principal and interest on any bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness issued by the Authority pursuant to the provisions hereof, and to create such reserves for such bonds as may be provided by the Authority under the terms of the mortgages, deeds of trust, indentures, or other agreements pertaining to the authorization and issuance of such bonds;

(b) Provide for the reasonable cost of properly maintaining, repairing, insuring, and operating such bridges, causeways, and approaches;

(c) Provide for such depreciation, depletion, obsolescence, replacements, betterments, and improvements as in the judgment of the Authority may appear feasible and proper.

SEC 6. The Authority hereby created shall have all the powers, rights, privileges, and authority necessary or convenient for carrying out the purposes of this act, including, but without limitation, the following rights, powers, and authority: (a) To have perpetual succession as a corporation, (b) to sue and be sued, implead and be impleaded, complain and defend in all courts of law and equity, (c) to adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal; (d) to acquire, purchase, hold, lease, mortgage, sell, transfer, and dispose of all property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, or any interest therein acquired by the Authority, and to operate any of such properties for any lawful purpose; (e) to make bylaws for the management and regulation of its affairs, (f) to appoint officers, agents, employees, and servants, to prescribe their duties, and to fix their compensation; (g) to fix, levy, alter, charge, and collect tolls, charges, fees, or other considerations for the movement of persons and property over such bridges, causeways, and approaches; (h) to borrow money, make and issue negotiable notes, bonds, and other evidence of indebtedness of the Authority, and to secure the payment of such obligations or any thereof by mortgage, lien, pledge, or deed of trust, upon all or any of the property of the Authority, including the income and revenues thereof, and to make agreements with the purchasers or holders of such obligations or with others in connection with any such obligations, issued or to be issued, as the Authority shall deem advisable, and in general to provide for the security of said obligations and the rights of the holders thereof; (i) to make contracts of every kind and nature and to execute all instruments necessary or convenient for the carrying on of its affairs, and (j) without limitation of the foregoing, to borrow money from the United States Government or any corporation or agency created, designated, or established by the United States and to enter into contracts with the United States or such corporation or agency, or any other person, firm, or corporate entity.

SEC 7. Without limiting any powers anywhere in this act granted to the Authority, such Authority is hereby authorized to provide for the payment of the cost of the bridges, causeways, and approaches and the necessary lands, easements, and appurtenances thereto by an issue or issues of negotiable bonds of the Authority and to secure the payment of all or any of such bonds by mortgage, lien, pledge, deed of trust, or indenture upon all or any of its property or properties. Said bonds shall be authorized by resolution of the Authority, shall bear such date or dates, such interest rate or rates, be in such forms, and contain such provisions as the Authority may determine and which shall be provided in such resolution or in the mortgage, deed of trust, indenture, or other instrument securing said bonds, and shall be made to mature serially or otherwise over a period of not to exceed 30 years from the date of completion of the bridges, causeways, and approaches for the construction of which such bonds were issued. Any resolution or resolutions authorizing such bonds may contain provisions which shall be a part of the contract with the holders of such bonds with respect to: (a) The rates of tolls and other charges to be charged by the Authority for the movement of persons and property over such bridges, causeways, and approaches; (b) the registration of the bonds as to principal only or as to principal and interest and the interchangeability and exchangeability of such bonds, (c) the issuance of temporary bonds or interim receipts; (d) the redemption of the bonds and the price or prices at which they shall be redeemable, (e) the setting aside of interest and sinking funds for the payment of the interest on such bonds and the amortization of the principal thereof and of reserves for the protection of such bonds and the regulation and disposition thereof; (f) limitations upon the issuance of additional bonds; (g) the terms and provisions of any mortgage, deed of trust, indenture, or other instrument under which the bonds may be issued or by which they may be secured, and (h) any other or additional agreements which the Authority may arrive at with the prospective purchasers or holders of such bonds. The bonds shall be issued in the name of the Authority, signed by its Chairman, attested by its Secretary, and shall be registered by the duly constituted treasurer of the Authority, and coupon bonds shall have attached thereto interest coupons bearing the facsimile signatures of said Chairman and Secretary. Any such bonds may be issued and delivered notwithstanding the fact that one or more of the officers signing such bonds or whose facsimile signatures may be upon the coupons or any thereof, shall have ceased to be such officer or officers at the time when such bonds shall actually be delivered

The Authority may enter into any mortgages, deeds of trust, indentures, or other agreements with any bank or trust company or other person or persons in the United States having power to enter into the same, including the United States Government, or any corporation or agency designated or created by it, as security for the bonds, and may transfer, convey, mortgage, or pledge any or all of the property or properties of the Authority thereunder, including the income and revenues to be derived therefrom. Such mortgage, deed of trust, indenture, or other agreement may contain such provisions as may be customary in such instruments, or as the Authority may authorize, including, but without limitation, provisions as to: (a) The terms and provisions of the bonds or the resolution providing for the issuance of same; (b) the construction, operation, maintenance, repair, and insurance of the properties of the Authority and its duties with reference thereto; (c) the application of funds and the safeguarding of funds on hand and on deposit, (d) rights and remedies of such trustee and the holders of the bonds; and (e) possession of the properties covered by such mortgage, deed of trust, indenture, or other agreement All bonds issued pursuant to the provisions hereof which shall be secured by a mortgage, deed of trust, indenture, or other agreement, wherein a trustee is nominated, shall, before issuance, be duly authenticated by such trustee, and when any such bonds are duly authorized, issued, and delivered to any purchaser or purchasers, after having been duly authenticated by the said trustee, they shall thereupon become and be incontestable.

The bonds of the Authority may be sold in such manner, at such time or times, and at such price or prices as it may determine. The cost of the bridges, causeways, and approaches shall be deemed to include interest during construction and for not exceeding 12 months thereafter, and all engineering, legal, architectural, traffic-surveying, and other expenses incident to the construction of such bridges, causeways, and approaches, and the acquisition of the necessary property and appurtenances therefor, and incidental to the financing thereof, including the cost of acquiring existing franchises, rights, plans, and works of and relating to such bridges, causeways, and approaches now owned by any person, firm, or corporation and the cost of purchasing all or any part of the shares of stock of any such corporation, only if, in the judgment of the Authority, such purchases shall be found expedient If the proceeds of the bonds issued shall exceed the cost as finally determined, the excess shall be placed in the bond sinking funds herein provided for.

SEC 8 After payment of the bonds and interest thereon and discharge of any and all other obligations of the Authority, or after a sinking fund fully sufficient for such payment and its discharge shall have been provided and shall be held for that purpose the Authority shall be authorized to deliver deeds or other suitable instruments of conveyance of the interest of the Authority in and to its bridges, causeways, and approaches, that part within the State of Texas, to the State of Texas, the county of Jefferson, State of Texas, or any other agency of the State of Texas authorized to accept the same (hereinafter referred to as the Texas interest), and that part within the State of Louisiana, to the State of Louisiana, Cameron Parish, State of Louisiana, or any agency of the State of Louisiana authorized to accept the same (hereinafter referred to as the Louisiana interest), under the condition that such bridges, causeways, and approaches shall thereafter be free of tolls and shall be properly maintained and operated by the Texas interest and the Louisiana interest, as may be agreed upon; but if either the Texas interest or the Louisiana interest shall not accept the same, such bridges, causeways, and approaches shall continue to be owned, maintained, repaired, operated, and insured by the Authority and the Authority may continue to collect tolls at rates so adjusted as to provide a fund not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, insurance, and operation of the said bridges, causeways, and approaches under economical management, including reasonable reserves for depreciation, depletion, obsolescence, replacements, and betterments, until such time as the Texas interest or the Louisiana interest, or both, shall accept such conveyance under the aforesaid conditions. Upon the acceptance of such conveyance by the Texas interest or the Louisiana interest, or both, the Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority created by this act shall terminate and cease to exist.

SEC 9. In addition to all other rights, powers, and privileges herein conferred upon Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority, it shall have and possess all rights, powers, and privileges to acquire by purchase, lease, or otherwise, and to operate, such facilities as the Authority may deem necessary and proper to establish ferry services across Sabine Lake. The powers conferred by this section may be exercised in like manner as those herein elsewhere conferred with regard to the construction, maintenance, and operation of bridges, causeways, and approaches.

SEC. 10. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to authorize or permit the Authority, or any member thereof, to create any obligation or to incur any liability other than such obligations and liabilities as are dischargeable solely from the funds provided by this act. No obligation created or liability incurred pursuant to this act shall be an obligation or liability of any member or members of the Authority, but shall be chargeable solely to the funds herein provided, nor shall any indebtedness, liability,

or obligation created pursuant to this act be an indebtedness, liability, or obligation of the United States.

SEC. 11. All provisions of this act may be enforced or the violation thereof prevented by mandamus, injunction, or other appropriate remedy in any court having competent jurisdiction of the subject matter or of the parties.

SEC 12. The act of Congress approved June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 1008), and heretofore amended and extended by acts of Congress approved April 10, 1936, August 12, 1937, June 14, 1938, and July 26, 1939, are hereby repealed.

SEC 13. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a companion bill similar to the bill H. R. 5593, under consideration, since I represent the district concerned on the Louisiana side of the Sabine Lake and River which this bill authorizes the two States, Texas and Louisiana, to form an authority to build a causeway and bridge over portions of this joint undertaking between the said States.

I have yielded to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS] since the principal portion of the causeway and bridge is in his district; however, of course, I am in full accord with the objectives sought to be accomplished in this joint undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, Cameron Parish, La., is one of the most important sections of my district, and the completion of the project contemplated under the bill under consideration will, not only be beneficial to the traveling public generally, but will open up access to Cameron, the county seat of Cameron Parish, and one of the richest areas in Louisiana, which has heretofore been inaccessible due to road facilities and connections with main highways. The completion of this causeway linking the only uncompleted link of this important highway will tend to develop my Parish of Cameron and southwest Louisiana, and will make accessible one of the richest sections of Louisiana which has unlimited natural resources, as well as the finest duck hunting grounds in the United States. Of course, Mr. Speaker, we are not asking to complete this chain in this important intrastate highway for the benefit of duck hunters, but because it will provide egress and ingress to one of the greatest potential industrial sections of the United States. The completion of this causeway will not only make it possible to develop these resources, to say nothing of the right of citizens, to have all-weather roads for the benefit of the people who wish to travel to this Utopia, but also will provide means of transportation for business and industrial development of a long-neglected part of our State and Nation. I will briefly give you an historical view of this enterprise:

HISTORY OF THE COASTAL HIGHWAY

The coastal highway, as referred to in this bill is to be laid only along the southwest Louisiana coast. However, a section of the entire highway is already completed, running from Brownsville, Tex., to Port Arthur, Tex., and traverses some 450 miles. This development in Texas has been in operation some years and the growth of communities, summer homes, and commercial and tourist establishments has been nothing short of phenomenal.

About 20 years ago, the Congress passed an act establishing the Port Arthur Bridge Commission as an agency to deal with the construction of an interstate causeway between Texas and Louisiana. The proposed highway was to be constructed across the lower end of Sabine Lake and to connect the end of a highway south out of Port Arthur with the western terminus of the proposed Louisiana Coastal Highway.

According to Joseph W. Doxey, chairman, Cameron Parish Planning Board, the Port Arthur Bridge project dates back to about the year 1927, when a franchise was granted to H. L. McKee by the State of Texas and the Parish of Cameron, La., to operate a toll bridge across the lower Sabine. The time for beginning the work and completing it has been extended from time to time, the latest extension being by the Congress and signed by President Roosevelt on July 26, 1939. The Public Works Administration approved an outright grant amounting to $355,454 in 1938. When work on the project was ready to begin, a certain land owner enjoined the Port Arthur Bridge Commission from crossing his land, thus delaying the project once more. Then with the outbreak of World War II, nothing could be done. The present movement marks the first work on the project since before the war.

In 1926, the Louisiana Legislature, in Act 330, designated State Highway No. 292 and described it as follows:

> Connecting the southern termini of State Highway Routes Nos. 26 and 42 at or near the Intracoastal Canal and from the joint terminus, extending the highway southward to the Gulf of Mexico, and from that point westward through Pecan Island, Grand Chenierc, and Leesburg (Cameron), thence in a westerly direction through Johnson Bayou settlement to the Texas line at a point on Sabine Lake to intersect the proposed causeway from Port Arthur, Tex., over said Sabine Lake.

Aside from a portion in Cameron Parish which has been improved, and a section along Pecan Island which the inhabitants constructed, no work has been done on the remainder of the proposed and designated route.

In 1929 the Louisiana Highway Commission assigned project No. 694 to a survey from Intracoastal City via Chenier Au Tigre to Pecan Island, a distance of 25 miles. This survey is recorded in highway department records in field books Nos. 4640 and 4694.

Some 15 years ago, the Louisiana Coastal Highway Association was formed for the express purpose of spurring the construction of Louisiana State Highway No. 292. Their efforts were fruitless.

HISTORY OF HIGHWAY DEVELOPMENT ALONG THE CAMERON COAST

The first serious effort to build highways began in 1919 in Cameron Parish when bonds were voted to construct highways throughout the parish. A roadbed running from the eastern end of Grand Chenier to Cameron was built, but funds to hard surface it were not available. From time to time other roadbeds were built, but little surfacing was done until the State highway department took over practically all existing roads of any importance. In 1938, a second highway, running from Creole to Sweet Lake, was opened. All State roads in the parish are surfaced with clam and oyster shell, but the surfacing has worn thin in spots and is altogether absent in others.

Thus the roads are likely to become slippery and boggy in the winter rains, and during dry seasons are prone to develop into corduroy. The State owns and operates 157.7 miles of shelled roads, together with four ferries—Ship Channel Ferry at Cameron, ferry No. 2; Calcasieu River Ferry at Cameron, ferry No. 1; Grand Lake Ferry on the Intracoastal Canal on route 931; and Gibbstown Ferry at Intracoastal Canal, route 42. Considering the increase of traffic in general and in view of the high proportion of heavy truck traffic, the present State road system is far from being adequate. Trucks carrying equipment urgently needed for drilling operations, trucks loaded with quick-spoiling sea foods, and even United States mail trucks are often delayed by impassible roads. The ferries are obsolete, unsafe, and inadequate. Long and annoying delays are frequent, worn-out machinery, breaks down, and under normal traffic conditions, the small barges now in use are hopelessly inadequate.

The parish maintains 73 miles of dirt roads and 80 miles of shelled roads. For administrative purposes the parish is divided into six wards, each of which owns and operates its own road maintenance equipment.

There are no paved roads in Cameron with the exception of a one-half mile paved street in the village of Cameron, which was constructed from a special severance tax fund allocated to oil-producing parishes.

Most of the roads of the parish are constructed on a 100-foot right-of-way which allows ample room for future expansion.

The Cameron Parish Police Jury created early in January 1948, a road district comprising all of wards 1, 2, 3, and 5, which make up the entire coast line of the parish. The police jury has obtained permission from the State bond and tax board to vote and issue bonds for the project, estimated to cost the parish a total of $37[illegible]500. This sum will be divided thus: $137,550 for construction on the west end of the coast line to join the Port Arthur project, and $256,950 for the east end construction, ending at the Vermilion line. This cost covers engineering, embankments, culverts, clam shelling, and all other work that must be done before surfacing. The Cameron bond election is to be called some time between

the latter part of May and the first week in July, this year.

NATURAL BEAUTY OF THE COASTAL SECTION

Those who have traveled the often muddy and always rough roads by automobile and the narrow channels and bayous by boat to reach the coastal regions of Cameron and Vermilion Parishes come away praising the beauty of the Gulf-washed sands, the majestic oaks of the cheniers, and the abundance of flowers, fish, and wild birds.

The major part of the shore line is a low-lying marsh upon which the waves have cast sea shells and sand, forming beaches of varying height and width.

Blending with the endless roar of the surf, the call of the tern, sea gull, and other shore birds can always be heard. Wooded stretches are dense with growth of oak, pecan, cypress, prickly ash, locust, persimmon, haw, mangrove, hackberry, and red-berried firethorn. Growing in the towering trees are graceful vines: the trumpet, smilax, and wild mustang grape. Palmettos grow in thick profusion. And in the mild climate wild flowers thrive, for example, the water hyacinth, buttercup, iris, swamp lily, evening primrose, oleander, Indian fire, wild onion, cardinal flower, moss rose, mullein thistles, native lotus, wild pepper, and Indian turnip.

Fish—red fish, speckled trout, black fish, croakers, flounders, clams, oysters, shrimp, and crabs—are found in the Gulf waters. The marshes abound with all types of wild life such as deer, rabbit, muskrat, nutria, mink, opossum, and occasional squirrel, otter, and armadillo. The numerous lakes and ponds afford a refuge for geese and wild ducks, as well as the resident wild fowl. The varied types of grasses furnish a high-grade food for many animals.

Each season of the year clothes the cheniers in new colors. The favorite of many residents is spring, when the yellow of the cactus, the white of the yucca—Spanish dagger—pink of the peach blossoms, and the small delicate blooms of the mesquite give the land a dainty pastel dress. Complementing the colors are the fragrance of the orange blossom, the white blooms of pear and plum groves, and the songs of the migratory birds on their yearly visit.

Among the best-known settlements on the southwest Louisiana coast are Pecan Island, Mulberry Ridge, and Chenier Au Tigre in Vermilion Parish, and Grand Chenier, Holly Beach, Little Chenier, Dufond, Chenier Perdu, Creole, Cameron, and Johnson's Bayou in Cameron Parish.

Pecan Island is a chenier, approximately 18 miles long, rising a few feet above sea level. According to the records of the Smithsonian Institution, there are 24 Indian mounds on this chenier, some of which set 4 to 20 feet above the surrounding terrain. Some 400 persons reside on Pecan Island, making their living chiefly in farming, trapping, and fishing. Cotton, truck crops, oranges, sugar cane, sorghum, pears, figs, peaches, pecans, and a type of banana are crops especially well suited for this location. In recent years, modern machinery has been introduced, and reclaiming projects have proved that additional land may be developed.

Chenier Au Tigre is a series of beaches running approximately east and west, bisected by eight or ten ridges which are formed primarily by oyster reefs. The high land is approximately 4 miles long and varies from a quarter to three-quarters of a mile in width. The marshes between the ridges are overgrown by beautiful green grass, reminding the visitor of a great rice field in July. Though one of the smaller cheniers it is one of the most beautiful. Chenier Au Tigre was once inhabited by some 200 persons, but the gradual absorption of the land by large land companies forced migration, until only eight families remain.

The chief crops grown on the chenier are cotton, cantaloups, watermelon, oranges, grapefruit, pears, black walnuts, pecans, persimmons, plums, figs, bananas, and truck crops. The fruits grown here ripen about the same time as those in the Rio Grande Valley. A means of rapid transportation would enable the development of a commercial fruit industry. Chenier Au Tigre was a summer health resort for many years, and the effects of the minerals in the Gulf waters are said to be extremely beneficial.

In Cameron Parish, one of the smallest and loveliest of the cheniers is Chenier Dufond, at the southeastern corner of Grand Lake. Approached from the west, it rises, apparently floating above the blue waters of the lake, with its venerable live oaks standing above a white shell beach. Little Pecan chenier, with its Indian mounds, cypress swamp, and oak-fringed lake; Money Island, uninhabited, but famed in legend about the Lafittes, buried treasure, and captive Spanish princes; Chenier Perdu, neat, ordered, possessing probably the largest and most magnificent live oaks of all; Little Chenier, its white-beached coupes cool under the shadows of towering trees, its Indian mounds and charming lake lying against a sheer bluff of pure white shell, all these elicit admiration and praise.

But the largest of the Cameron cheniers and the one with the greatest attractions is Grand Chenier. For 25 miles the ridge rises above the surrounding marsh. A narrow belt of unbroken woods fringes the northern slope of the island. The clear, slow-moving Mermentau River touches at several points. And the purple-blooming water hyacinth lines the highways for miles, a ribbon of brilliant color. The wild iris grows in abundance and splendor. Marsh and woodland abound with wild flowers and flowering shrubs. Particularly lovely are the swamp lily and the pond lily.

The abundant palmetto produces numerous small white flowers arranged on a long central spike. More striking are the impenetrable clumps of Cherokee roses, hedging the highway for miles in some sections, particularly the Front Ridge between Cameron and Grand Chenier. Just west of Holly Beach, said to be one of the best in the State, and near the Gulf is found another interesting blossom: the blanket flower, a small, reddish-brown bloom, which grows in extreme profusion, carpeting the ground for acres.

Standing above high-water mark, long rows of salt cedars parallel the greater length of the Cameron beaches, their dark-green foliage contrasting strongly with the gleaming sand and white foam of the rolling breakers.

This strange and lovely coastal section of the State is little known. If its natural beauties and its opportunities for sport and recreation were developed and publicized, it would become a mecca for sportsmen and tourists.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) asked and was given permission to address the House on Tuesday next for 60 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, due to the arrival of a new boarder, a baby boy, I was unable to be present in the House on yesterday. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 5118) providing for unemployment compensation for Federal employees.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BILL

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my keen disappointment in the fact that by agreement the leadership of the House has put off the vote on the railroad retirement bill until October 16. I think we should have continued with the consideration of this legislation. We could have completed it this week or by the close of Monday next, and would have hastened the relief to many men and women who would benefit by our action in increasing railroad retirement payments. I think it is most unfortunate

that we have not passed the bill before now.

Mr. Speaker, I declare I cannot understand this action. I feel sure that at the close of the debate on the bill yesterday a majority of the Members were ready to vote on the measure. Certainly with 3 hours further debate which could have been had Saturday or Monday next, we could and should have approved the bill and sent it to the Senate.

I repeat what I said on the floor over a week ago, if this legislation is to be continually delayed, no legislation will be passed before the Congress adjourns. Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to let this happen. The railway employees must have an increase in their retirement benefits to help meet the increased cost of living.

ROBERT A. LOVETT, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I place the need for confidence in leadership among the high-priority spiritual needs of the American people today.

It is with this thought reverently and deeply in mind that I rise to speak of our Secretary of Defense, Robert A. Lovett.

All too often it is the custom for Members of Congress to give unstinting praise to newly appointed Cabinet officers. In this practice we sometimes set traps for ourselves. Our early judgment is not borne out. We are caught in the net of our own words. We find ourselves in opposition to the man whom we have lauded to the skies.

Nevertheless, in the face of experience, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I place my trust in the current Secretary of Defense.

Secretary Lovett is a civilian. It is the sense of the Congress and the people of the United States that, ordinarily, unless a rare arrangement of circumstances should occur, the head of our Defense Department should, and by right ought to be, a civilian.

Secretary Lovett is a banker in private life. His new task calls for just such a practical background.

Secretary Lovett has intimate knowledge of the international situation. He formerly served as Undersecretary of State.

Secretary Lovett knows his own job well. He was Assistant Secretary of War for Air under President Roosevelt. He was second in command to former Secretary of Defense Marshall.

Robert Lovett is a man who is amply qualified by character, ability, and experience for the responsibilities of his high office.

His selection for his vital post is certain to have a positive reaction among the American people in the restoration of the type of efficient, Christian leadership which may best guide them through this, their hour of sorrow and tribulation.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG] is recognized for 15 minutes.

JAPANESE PEACE CONFERENCE

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, the recent Japanese peace conference at San Francisco gave vivid proof that if the governments and peoples of the free world take the initiative in crusading for truth and freedom, they can win over the vicious, false propaganda of the agents of the Soviet Union

Mr. Andrei Gromyko, chief Soviet delegate, and his associates from Moscow, along with agents of the two satellite countries, Czechoslovakia and Poland, came to the conference determined to do what the spokesmen for communism have done whenever and wherever they have had the opportunity since 1945—to disrupt the conference, to delay its proceedings, to divide its delegates into warring factions if possible. They sought to block any effective action by peace-loving peoples to create a just and lasting peace with Japan.

Sometime before the conference, the man most responsible for the wording of the treaty and its acceptance by our allies, Mr. John Foster Dulles, proposed a plan to draft a set of rules for orderly procedure that would prevent the Communist agents from wrecking the conference. Fortunately, he was able to gain acceptance of such a plan by officials of the State Department, who heretofore have been extremely reluctant to stand up to the Soviet delegates in this struggle known as the cold war. The rules as adopted put a clamp on Gromyko's plan to talk the conference to death. He and his two stooge delegations were completely whipped. They had to sit there and hear the representatives of free peoples denounce them and all their works for their lack of cooperation in ending conflict in this war-weary world and building peace.

When this member presented a map of Russia to Gromyko, showing the slave-labor camps of the Soviet Union, Gromyko had "no comment" What comment could he have had? He had been hit by the strongest weapon in the hands of free peoples—the truth. Confronted firmly and relentlessly with the truth, the lying propaganda of communism falls flat on its face.

The time has now come to press our advantage. The time has come to tell the whole world, including the peoples behind the iron curtain, of our desire for peace, and how we hope to attain it. The time has come for us to challenge, openly and before all mankind, the false claim of the Kremlin despots, that they alone desire peace and that we of the democracies are the warmongers and imperialist aggressors.

At San Francisco, Gromyko and company tried to put over their usual scare. They tried to frighten and bulldoze the free peoples of the world into bowing down and doing their bidding. They were bluffing. We called their bluff, and their false front collapsed like a punctured balloon.

I agree with the words of Mr. John Cowles, newspaper and magazine publisher, who after a trip to many parts of the world and a close study of areas threatened by Communist aggression, recently declared:

> Even though we continue arming just as rapidly as we possibly can, we ought to place much more emphasis, I believe, on the kind of a peaceful world that we envisage, the kind of a world that will be possible only if Russian aggression is not permitted to plunge the world into an atomic holocaust.
>
> Through our default we have let the Russians monopolize the subject of peace, and embrace peace for propaganda purposes as if it were their exclusive property.
>
> The failure of the United States to make effective propaganda use of its deep desire for peace has resulted in much of the world suspecting that America has deserted her traditional role as a nonaggressive, peace-loving Nation.
>
> If America would only seize the initiative from Russia and conduct an American "peace offensive," we would rob the Russians of their single most powerful propaganda weapon. The whole free world, including America wants peace Let us say so, louder and longer than the Kremlin.

Now, if we are going to speak for peace, we must make it definite and positive. It is idle to talk of peace on earth and ignore the fact that this country is engaged in a war in Korea, a war that already has cost us 14,280 dead and 60,400 wounded as of October 1, 1951. It is senseless to plan for peace unless we are prepared, morally and physically, to meet the evil forces of aggression whereever they rear their ugly heads.

Let us now say to the whole world, "The Soviet Union says it is for peace. It berates the free governments and peoples as warmakers. All right. The Communist leaders will have to prove they are for peace. We are calling their hands. We are giving them a chance to clear the world of the tensions which their own aggressions and threats of aggression have created." If they accept, there will be set in motion the forces of a lasting peace. If they refuse, then let them be branded for what their own actions would prove them to be—false prophets, wolves in sheep's clothing, men with mailed fists wearing the white gloves of deception.

Mr Speaker, there are three ways by which the Soviet Union can prove the sincerity of its pleas. They are:

First. If the Soviet leaders desire peace, they can end the Korean war immediately.

Let this be the first test of their sincerity. Their stooges, the Red Chinese and Korean leaders, have been carrying on a series of fake and false cease-fire talks for weeks. If they mean business and desire the war to end, let us learn it now. If not, then let them brand themselves as liars, with the blood of all those who have died and are yet to die in that war on their hands.

Every intelligent and informed person living on the globe today knows that the aggression of the North Koreans against their brethren of the all but defenseless South Korea was the result of Soviet planning and directing. It is now apparent that the colossal bungling of our leaders in foreign affairs, resulting

in the loss of China to communism, fitted perfectly the design of the Kremlin masters. Their only surprise was the ease which we fell into their trap. With China in their bag, they began their next move in the game of domination in the Far East—infiltration into and political pressure upon South Korea. When these cold-war methods failed, the Red despots resorted, as they will in any area of the world unless they are stopped, to military action.

When the Red Chinese came into the war, it was the same story. Dictator Stalin and his politburo called the tune. They selected the very day for the first Chinese troops to enter. They have directed this war against the free peoples of the United Nations ever since. Every issue of every newspaper in every community of this land, every broadcast during the day or night, tell us of "Russian made" fighter jet planes, the famous MIG's, engaging our jet flyers in battle, or of Soviet-made tanks, artillery, and all other implements of war, taking a ghastly toll of lives of those who would defend the right of men to their freedom.

What do we of the democracies mean, permitting this to go on unchallenged? We took official action in this House and in this Congress, calling upon the United Nations to declare the Communist regimes of North Korea and of China as aggressors. The United Nations, sensing that the patience of the American people was wearing thin, dutifully made the declaration. So the Red Chinese and Red Koreans are officially aggressors. What then, I ask of you my colleagues, does that make the Red Russians? If the puppets are aggressors, what are the principals in this game of murder, pillage, and rapine in Korea? If Communist General Mao is an aggressor, what is Generalissimo Stalin, who gives General Mao his orders?

We know that Red officers give orders to their troops, but Soviet commissars give orders to those officers. Korean and Chinese troops, the cannon fodder on the mountains of fire and in the vallays of death, do the fighting, but Moscow maps the battle plans. Red soldiers pull the triggers, with guns made in Soviet Russia.

Shame upon our leaders that they do not face up to realities in this situation. It is time to say to the Soviet rulers, "We give you this chance to prove you want peace on earth by calling off the war you have planned and are now conducting. We know that the Koreans and Chinese would not fight for another day if the Kremlin bade them to stop. You can show your desire for peace by permitting the cease-fire talks to go forward in an entirely neutral place, with prompt decision for an end of the fighting. You can recall the foreign troops we know you have brought in from Eastern Europe to Manchuria and North Korea. You can stop furnishing the guns and planes and ammunition to kill the representatives of the United Nations you profess to serve. Do this, or be branded as the arch aggressor of all time and suffer the consequences of an outraged humanity, determined to protect its liberties before they are blotted out by tyranny."

What would Soviet Russia do if we said that? I do not know for sure, but I believe with all my heart that they would stop, look, and listen. And of one thing there can be no doubt: The peoples of the world, including those in slavery behind the iron curtain, would take heart and say, "At last those who profess their love for freedom, justice, and peace are talking the only language the Kremlin understands."

If the Communist rulers did not heed, then they should be met with our full political and military might. On the political field they should be branded by the United Nations as aggressors, shut out from further participation in the organization dedicated to peace and security, and cut off from both trade and diplomatic relations with ourselves and our true allies.

Second. If the Soviet leaders desire peace, let them end their program of aggression and threats of aggression all over the world.

The Korean war is just one segment of a world-wide pattern of aggression. Into every peaceful area the agents of the Soviet have moved, to stir up class hatred and internal conflict. Into every troubled area they have moved to increase that trouble. Their regime thrives on trouble and strife. Their infiltration is constant and relentless, and when it has produced a foothold in any government, there liberty dies and tyranny takes over. And when tyranny has entrenched itself, then aggression against a neighbor starts, and that aggression leads to war unless it gains its ends by threats and displays of force.

That was the pattern by which the little nations of Eastern Europe were taken over. That was the pattern by which China was conquered. That was the pattern that forced the isolated Tibetan rulers recently to bow completely to the yoke of Soviet control. That is the pattern of action now being applied to Indochina, with Burma to follow. Then, inevitably, the teeming millions of India and Pakistan will be marked for subjugation. By that time, Japan, prize area of the Far East in Soviet eyes, would be under terrific pressure from without and perhaps in the throes of internal revolution, and if Japan should be lost, the entire Pacific area would be lost for freedom and peace. While in Europe, the pattern emerges equally clear with the relentless liquidation of all democratic institutions and freedoms in the satellite countries, and the progressive sovietizing of Eastern Germany in preparation for the complete control of this industrial region in the heart of Europe.

It is time to say to the Soviet leaders that humanity will have no more of it. If the Soviet Union desires peace, then it should and must give up its aggressive designs on its neighbors everywhere. Specifically, it must call off the threats of its satellites against Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey. It must join in unification of Germany as an independent nation, freed from domination of any foreign power.

Such is the least the Soviet Union, with its black record of tyranny and aggression since 1945, can do to recover any shred of respect among freedom-loving peoples. We should give its leaders, here and now, the chance to choose whether they desire to cooperate with the peacemakers or expose themselves in the future as international criminals.

Third. If the Soviet leaders desire peace, let them join other nations in a system of collective security, with disarmament the goal.

Here we of the democracies have not made our case clear to the peoples of the world. Our protestations for peace have been silenced in the clatter of rearmament, which we consider necessary in order to protect the free world against continued Communist aggression. Although some rearmament is necessary, that does not excuse our failure to remind our neighbors, at every opportunity, at every rising of the sun, at every pronouncement from the Soviet propaganda machine, that only the threat of aggressive communism stands in the way of peace through justice and collective security.

It was the fond hope of the common man in every realm on earth, at the close of World War II, that the crushing burden of wars and preparations for more wars could be lifted forevermore. Had it not been for our short-sighted policies of appeasement and expediency, that hope could have been realized. But still the ideal lives. And still it can be realized, if we take firm and positive action now.

Let us offer to the leaders of the Soviet Government, openly and with the light of full publicity beating down upon the conference tables, the chance to say whether they desire to fulfill the declarations of the United Nations Charter with respect to collective security. The way is open. The representatives of free peoples have pointed that way time and again. We offered control of atomic weapons; our offer was spurned by the Soviet delegates. We offered to create a collective security, pledged to defend the weak whenever aggression might threaten; the Soviet delegates would have none of it.

Let us give them one more chance. Let the whole world know they are on trial in the showdown as to who wants collective security, and who refuses every offer looking to containing aggression before it breaks into armed conflict. If the Soviet rulers accept, then, with the ending of fighting in Korea and the ending of threats of aggression in other areas of the world, there can be hope for lasting peace through international cooperation and security. If they do not accept, or if, as is their custom, they stall and stall, dispute and disrupt, delay and deceive, then they will be classifying themselves in the thinking of peoples everywhere. They will be building their own prison of ostracism from peaceful society. The whole world will know, and understand—just as the whole world saw in San Francisco the true purpose of the Soviet delegates—and with righteous wrath, beat down their vicious propaganda with the sword of truth.

This show-down can be brought about promptly, by action first on the part of our own Government. Announcement

should be made that the Soviet Union will be given this choice of the way to peace, and that a conference to that end will be held. Our allies should be assisted in formulating cooperative action for similar conferences between their governments and that of the Soviet Union. At the same time, the United Nations should lay before the Kremlin representatives the same choice, with the alternative of being branded an aggressor against the United Nations. A time limit should be set for final decision.

The saddest spectacle of modern history is that of free peoples, possessing the great bulk of material wealth, skills, leadership in business and labor, production, and moral power, standing hesitant and impotent before the threat of a regime that recognizes neither God nor any rights that God has given man, His highest creation. We hold in our hands a weapon more powerful than the atomic bomb—the truth. This show-down with the leaders of the world-wide Communist conspiracy will give men of courage a chance to use it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MADDEN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Russians have given us a second and most timely warning by the second explosion of an atom bomb.

I think it appropriate as we give final approval to the military appropriation for 1952, that we give immediate and serious consideration to the grave problem of a balanced program for the common defense of our country against atomic attack.

The Members here today are wisely convinced that the military budget is a sound one and is definitely needed for the military experts of the common defense of the home front.

But I must warn that unless our national civil defense program receives our immediate attention, we are going to have a defense system which is entirely out of balance.

Perhaps the best way I can explain it is in terms of a football team. We are investing our money now, primarily, in the forward line of our defense—the military services. They take the first brunt of the attack on the defensive. On the offensive it is the military's job to crowd through the enemy's front line and carry the attack through.

By this same parallel today we are voting a tremendous amount of money for the forward wall and nothing for our backup or defensive operations.

The military has warned us over and over again that 7 out of 10 enemy atomic bombers will get through our defenses, no matter how much money this Congress votes for military defense.

I must ask you again what preparation is this Congress making through the civil-defense program to take the brunt of the attack—those 7 out of 10 bombers that will get through.

The finest military forces in the world could not operate long if the enemy smashed its home base behind it. It is the people and production of this country that make our most feared weapons. But it will be the people and production that are wide open to death and disaster on a staggering scale—if we do not have a civil-defense program ready when that attack comes.

The top military experts of our country, who have convinced this House that the expenditures in this budget are absolutely essential for our survival, are equally insistent that the military must have a civil-defense program in being to back it up in case of war. Our military leaders have insisted that the civil-defense program is a vital, urgent, coequal partner with the military in the common defense of our country.

General Marshall told a Senate committee just a month ago that civil defense was an urgent military necessity.

To emphasize this point, I should like to read what the able Secretary of Defense, Mr. Robert Lovett, had to say to the Senate Committee on Armed Services on September 5, 1951, about the urgency and need for civil defense for the protection of our cities and people:

> We continue to feel civil defense is a necessary and a vital part of national defense. The military services, I think, are perhaps more aware of the necessity for civil defense than almost anyone because their continuity of operation depends upon the functioning of our economy as a whole. I am not able to assign a reason for the apathy which Governor Caldwell (Director of Civilian Defense) properly identifies.

And testifying about the same time, General Bradley had this to say:

> While the Joint Chiefs of Staff feel that civil defense itself is not a military but rather a civil responsibility, the Armed Forces have in the past supported, and will continue to support, the very important mission of civil defense If war should come, the entire military effort will be concentrated upon the primary mission of defeating the hostile armed forces. In the event of an attack upon the United States by enemy aircraft, our military forces will do everything in their power to shoot down enemy planes. However, it is the opinion of the Air Force that should such an attack come, a large percentage of enemy aircraft would probably be able to penetrate our defenses In that event a competent Federal Civil Defense Agency must be prepared to function in order to return our workers and our factories to maximum production and restore communications in the shortest possible time. The military will be unable, in such a contingency, to direct this effort.
>
> There exists then a requirement for an organization, planned and staffed beforehand, to take over in the event of an emergency of this nature. We understand that the Federal Civil Defense Agency is preparing the plans, setting up the organization, and acquiring the necessary resources to do this essential job. If civil defense does not function effectively, our defense efforts will be very adversely affected.

I am certain that for the cost of one or two military air wings—which this Congress has voted funds—we could provide this country with an adequate national civil-defense program which our military leaders have insisted is so badly needed.

I would hate to think that the fifty-odd billions that we are voting here today for our military defense, might be completely wasted for lack of a civil-defense program to protect our production and our people and keep the military forces supplied and in action.

It will be several years before much of the money we are voting here today for fighters and bombers can actually mean planes in the air. In the meantime, for the cost of that air wing or two, we could have in being in a matter of 18 months or 2 years a tough, sound, civil-defense program.

Our military experts recognize that civil-defense forces must be trained and in being when the attack comes. You cannot train them after the bombs have fallen.

Russia has given us our second atomic warning. They may not wait for a third.

AUTOMOBILES FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the House agreed today to the conference report on the so-called amputee car bill. When this finally becomes law I know the many amputees and paraplegics will be happy, as I will be, too, when they will have a chance to engage again in gainful occupation. They will then have the courage and the will to go to work and they will be able to do this when the automobiles are provided. The conferees of the House did the best they could. I know we all regret that World War I veterans were eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I include the conference report and statement of the managers on the part of the House as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT NO. 1098)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1864), to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans who served during World War II, and persons who served in the military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That, subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, to provide or assist in providing an automobile or other conveyance by paying not to exceed $1,600 on the purchase price, including equipment with such special attachments and devices as the Administrator may deem necessary, for each veteran of World War II or of service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, who is entitled to compensation under the laws administered by the

Veterans' Administration for any of the following due to disability incurred in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service of the United States during either of such periods:

"(a) Loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet;

"(b) Loss or permanent loss of use of one or both hands;

"(c) Permanent impairment of vision of both eyes of the following status: Central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye, with corrective glasses, or central visual acuity of more than 20/200 if there is a field defect in which the peripheral field has contracted to such an extent that the widest diameter of visual field subtends an angular distance no greater than twenty degrees in the better eye.

"SEC. 2. No payment shall be made under this Act for the repair, maintenance, or replacement of any such automobile or other conveyance and no veteran shall be given an automobile or other conveyance until it is established to the satisfaction of the Administrator that such veteran will be able to operate such automobile or other conveyance in a manner consistent with his own safety and the safety of others and will be licensed to operate such automobile or other conveyance by the State of his residence or other proper licensing authority: *Provided*, That a veteran who cannot qualify to operate a vehicle shall nevertheless be entitled to the payment of not to exceed $1,600 on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance, as provided in Section 1 of this Act, to be operated for him by another person, provided such veteran meets the other eligibility requirements set forth in this Act.

"SEC. 3. The furnishing of such automobile or other conveyance, or the assisting therein, shall be accomplished by the Administrator paying the total purchase price, if not in excess of $1,600, or the amount of $1,600, if the total purchase price is in excess of $1,600, to the seller from whom the veteran is purchasing under sales agreement between the seller and the veteran.

"SEC. 4. No veteran shall be entitled to receive more than one automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this act and no veteran who has received or who hereafter receives an automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of the paragraph under the heading 'Veterans' Administration' in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947, as extended, or the act of September 21, 1950 (Public Law 798, Eighty-first Congress), shall be entitled to receive an automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 5. The benefits provided in this act shall not be available to any veteran who has not made application for such benefits to the Administrator within 3 years after the effective date of this act, or within 3 years after the date of the veteran's discharge or release from active service if the veteran is not discharged or released until on or after said effective date.

"SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Veterans' Administration, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry into effect the provisions of this act."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes."

And the House agree to the same.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
CARL ELLIOTT,
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Managers on the Part of the House.
HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1864) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans who served during World War II, and persons who served in the military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendments, namely:

On June 13, 1951, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported H. R. 4233, which provided authorization for the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make a payment not to exceed $1,600 towards the purchase of an automobile or other conveyance for certain disabled veterans The eligible veterans, under the terms of this bill, were limited to those who had lost or lost the use of one or both hands or feet or who were blind, as defined, and who had served in World War I, II, or after June 27, 1950. In addition, provision was made that the veteran, if he desired, might elect to receive $1,600 in cash in lieu of the payment toward the purchase price of the automobile This bill passed the House on a call of the Calendar Wednesday, on June 20, 1951.

It was referred to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. That committee disregarded the House-approved measure, H. R. 4233, and on July 25, 1951, reported S 1864, which authorized automobiles for World War II veterans and those who served on or after June 27, 1950, who are entitled to compensation for the loss or loss of the use of one or both legs at or above the ankle. On August 9, 1951, the Senate passed this measure, and when it was referred to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the committee voted to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H R 4233 as passed by the House on June 20, 1951.

The bill agreed upon by the conferees closely follows the House bill as originally passed on June 20 and S. 1864, as passed by the House. As agreed upon, the bill is limited to World War II veterans and those who served on or after June 27, 1950, who are entitled to service-connected compensation for the loss or loss of the use of one or both feet or one or both hands, or who are blind, as defined. In cases where the veteran is unable to operate the car, the payment shall be made nevertheless in those cases where the veteran can have the car operated by another person in his behalf. The provision for a cash payment in lieu of a payment towards the purchase of an automobile was deleted by the conferees

Through August 31, 1951, the following vehicles have been paid for by the Veterans' Administration to eligible World War II veterans under existing authority:

Automobiles	25,699
Jeeps	61
Station wagons	26
Tractors	100
Trucks	175
Total	26,061

The Veterans' Administration is unable to give any estimate, obviously, of the number of veterans who will be eligible for the benefits of this act based on service on or after June 27, 1950. It is estimated, however, by this agency, that of World War II veterans, some 380 veterans will be eligible due to the loss or loss of the use of one or both feet, approximately 9,480 eligible due to the loss or loss of the use of one or both hands, and approximately 1,840 due to blindness.

The text of the laws which have been enacted on the subject is included below:

[Excerpts from public laws which authorize the furnishing of cars for amputees]

PUBLIC LAW 663, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS; VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

"Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: To enable the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide an automobile or other conveyance, at a cost per vehicle or conveyance of not to exceed $1,600, including equipment with such special attachments and devices as the Administrator may deem necessary, for each veteran of World War II who is entitled to compensation for the loss, or loss of use of one or both legs at or above the ankle under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, $30,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of the money appropriated by this paragraph shall be used for the repair, maintenance, or replacement of any such automobile or other conveyance and no veteran shall be given an automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this paragraph until it is established to the satisfaction of the Administrator that such veteran will be able to operate such automobile or other conveyance in a manner consistent with his own safety and the safety of others and will be licensed to operate such automobile or other conveyance by the State of his residence or other proper licensing authority: *Provided further*, That under such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe the furnishing of such automobile or other conveyance shall be accomplished by the Administrator paying the total purchase price to the seller from whom the veteran is purchasing under sales agreement between the seller and the veteran.

"SEC. 303. This Act may be cited as the 'First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947.'

"Approved August 8, 1946"

EMERGENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1948; PUBLIC LAW 161, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, CHAPTER 206, FIRST SESSION

"The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized to disburse, during the month of July 1947, one-twelfth of the amount provided in each appropriation for the Veterans' Administration included in H. R. 3839 as passed by the House of Representatives and there are hereby appropriated such amounts as may be necessary for such disbursements: *Provided*, That amounts expended hereunder shall be deducted from such appropriation for 1948 when H. R. 3839 is enacted into law.

"Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans The authority and funds provided under this heading in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947 (Public Law 663, 79th Cong.), are hereby continued available until June 30, 1948"

THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1948; PUBLIC LAW 271, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

"Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: For an additional amount for 'Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans,' $5,000,000 to be available for the purposes specified under this head in the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 663)—$5,000,000"

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1948; PUBLIC LAW 785, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

"Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: For an additional amount for 'Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans,' $1,500,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services,' and to be available until June 30, 1949, for the purposes specified under this head in the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 663), as extended by the Emergency Appropriation Act, 1948."

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1949; PUBLIC LAW 904, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS; VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—AUTOMOBILES FOR DISABLED VETERANS

"For an additional amount for 'Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans,' $5,000,000 "

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1949; PUBLIC LAW 343, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

"Funds heretofore appropriated for 'automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans' are hereby continued available until June 30, 1950 "

PURCHASE OF AUTOMOBILES OR OTHER CONVEYANCES FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS, PUBLIC LAW 798, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

"That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Veterans' Administration the sum of $800,000 to remain available until June 30, 1951, to enable the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide or assist in providing an automobile or other conveyance by paying not to exceed $1,600, on the purchase price, including equipment with such special attachments and devices as the Administrator may deem necessary, for each veteran of World War II who is entitled to compensation for the loss, or loss of use, of one or both legs at or above the ankle under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That no part of such appropriation shall be used for the repair, maintenance, or replacement of any such automobile or other conveyance and no veteran shall be given an automobile or other conveyance until it is established to the satisfaction of the Administrator that such veteran will be able to operate such automobile or other conveyance in a manner consistent with his own safety and the safety of others and will be licensed to operate such automobile or other conveyance by the State of his residence or other proper licensing authority. *Provided further*, That under such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe the furnishing of such automobile or other conveyance, or the assisting therein, shall be accomplished by the Administrator paying the total purchase price, if not in excess of $1,600, or the amount of $1,600, if the total purchase price is in excess of $1,600, to the seller from whom the veteran is purchasing under sales agreement between the seller and the veteran: *And provided further*, That no veteran shall be entitled to receive more than one automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this Act and no veteran who has received or may receive an automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of the paragraph under the heading 'Veterans' Administration' in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947, as extended, shall be entitled to receive an automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this Act "

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1950, PUBLIC LAW 843, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

"Veterans' Administration: For an additional amount for 'Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans', $375,000."

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1951, PUBLIC LAW 45, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—AUTOMOBILES AND OTHER CONVEYANCES FOR DISABLED VETERANS

"To enable the Administrator to provide, or assist in providing, automobiles or other conveyances for disabled veterans as authorized by the Act of September 21, 1950 (Public Law 798), $800,000."

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
CARL ELLIOTT,
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

REMOVAL OF CROSSES IN CEMETERY (HONOLULU)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have been flooded with telegrams and letters regarding the removal of the crosses in the military cemetery in Honolulu. The bill which I have introduced, and I hope others have introduced similar bills, to replace these crosses, I hope will soon become law.

I should like to remind the Members, particularly those who were here when the now Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] was a Member of this body, that he was responsible for having the cemetery in Honolulu made a shrine for these soldiers who gave their lives for us. I know he is very much interested, and I think he has introduced a bill in the Senate for the purpose of replacing the crosses. They are symbolic of Christianity, of suffering, of sacrifice, as well as crucifixion. These honored dead are entitled to it, this recognition, and their families want it.

Mr. CANFIELD Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I received in the morning's mail a very touching editorial from a Hawaiian paper on that very subject I shall certainly be glad to support the gentlewoman's proposal.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts I hope the gentleman will insert the editorial in the RECORD. The following are some of the letters and editorials I have received:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
JONES-HUGHES CHAPTER, No 26,
Durant, Okla , September 29, 1951

MRS EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D C

DEAR MRS ROGERS: I have written you several letters in regards to automobiles for certain disabled veterans And I want to thank you for the way that you have worked on legislation to get automobiles for World War I, World War II, and the Korean war veterans In fact, we appreciate your telegram that you sent to the Disabled American Veterans National Convention, at Milwaukee, in August, and we also appreciate you, because you have always stood for legislation for World War I, World War II, and now the Korean veterans, all alike In other words, when you vote for legislation, you try to see that it includes veterans of all three wars above mentioned that have same disabilities And this is right. There is no discrimination then, and as you are on the conferees committee with Members of the House and Senate, to try to work out legislation that will give automobiles to certain disabled veterans, I hope you can see your way clear to support House bill 4233 and Senate 1864, which I think are just alike I think they are just bills, because first, I believe, the veterans that are covered in these bills are entitled to a car, and then it does include veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war that have the same disability.

I am enclosing copy of letter I have just written Congressman OLIN TEAGUE; this copy is self-explanatory. And I hope that the conferees committee of the House and Senate will be able to work out legislation that will give an automobile to World War I and World War II and the Korean veterans alike. I don't think any bill could be better than H. R. 4233 or S 1864. And I thank you for the blind veterans of Oklahoma and the United States for the things that you and other Members of Congress have done for us.

Yours truly,
W. S. "SONNY" RODGERS,
Service Officer.

SEPTEMBER 29, 1951.

Hon. OLIN TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE. As you have met me personally and know the work I am trying to do for the disabled veteran, there should be no use in me trying to tell you why I am writing you this letter.

I notice you have been selected on the House conferees committee, to get together with members of the conferees committee of the United States Senate, to try to work out and agree on a bill that will give automobiles to certain disabled veterans

I am writing you in regards to blind veterans I think Senate bill 1864 and H R 4233 both are good bills and just legislation

I hope that the Members of the House and Senate both always see fit, first to vote for just legislation, and then, second, to see that to eliminate legislation is not discrimination against any veteran In other words, if a man that lost his leg in World War II gets a car, why shouldn't a man in World War I that lost his leg get a car, too? All veterans of World War II, that have lost a leg or use of a leg have already received a car, therefore, they won't have to be counted The men that lost an arm in World War II, under S 1864 and H R 4233, would come in, also all veterans that have lost a leg, hand, or are blind in the Korean war would have to come in, and men that have lost a leg, hand, or are blind in World War I would be included under either of these bills But notice the ones in World War I that are included in either one of these bills, most of them are already at the graveyard So you can see the cost wouldn't be too much. And I believe it is just legislation

Will you please see that legislation is passed that will help the blind veterans of World War I as same as later wars, in regards to receiving a car? And if they prefer the $1,600 in cash all right, but lots of these boys can't buy a car, therefore they have to sit at home day and night because their neighbor doesn't want to be bothered with a man that is blind and taking him to town and then back home, ever since World War I But if this blind veteran had a car, his wife or some member of the family could run him to town and let him stay a while. I know how much this means and how much it would help this blind veteran Therefore I am writing you this letter, asking you to help these cases if possible And whatever legislation is passed, please see that it includes World War I veterans, World War II veterans and the veterans of the Korea war that has the same disabilities

There is no question that but what a man is blind, if his family owned a car they could take him down town and later come after him and this would help that blind veteran pass the time a lot I am speaking because I know what a car means to a blind man and lots of veterans in World War I that is blind has never owned a car because they weren't able.

I thank Congress for what they have done for the blind. But I don't think it is asking too much, to see that a car is made possible to be given to the blind veterans of World War I, World War II and the Korea war. And if they can't drive them themselves, make it possible, that the veteran if he wants the car, to get it, and let some member of his family, wife, brother, or sister drive for him. This will help that blind

veteran more than anything. Thanking you for any help or assistance that you can give the blind veterans of World War I, World War II, and Korean war, and yours truly.

Yours truly,

W. S. "SONNY" RODGERS,
Service Officer.

[Press release of Catholic War Veterans, Washington, D. C., September 29, 1951]

"WE WILL CARE FOR GRAVE MARKERS"—CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS

The Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America today wired President Truman to give to that organization the maintenance of grave markers, recently ordered removed by the Defense Department economy move. The Catholic Veterans leadership group meeting in Washington, D. C., passed a resolution and are geared for action to carry out the request for the honor and privilege of maintaining the religious symbols over the graves of the honored war dead

The text of the telegram follows:

"The Catholic War Veterans of the United States along with millions of other loyal citizens are shocked at the news of the removal of the white crosses from the graves of our honored heroes dead in military cemeteries. At a meeting of Catholic War Veteran leaders held in Washington, D. C , September 29, 1951, the following resolution was adopted and forwarded to you for your considered thought—executive order and we trust favorable acquiesence.

"'*Resolved*, That the leadership program representatives of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America assembled in Washington, D C., September 29, 1951, realizing our Government in its international relations has constantly ignored the existence of God and has constantly yielded to the sentiments of proponents of anti-religious actions and because now it seems to be projecting into our national program a similar disregard for God and the sacred symbols of religion in the action of our Department of Defense in its plans for removing from the graves of our honored dead, the symbol of religious identification, this action being promoted in the guise of economy. We are shocked and detest such thinking and action: Therefore be it

"'*Resolved*, That the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America call upon the President of the United States to relieve the Department of Defense of the expense of maintaining the symbols of religion now marking graves of our heroic dead and extend to the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America the honor and privilege of continuing to maintain over the graves of these honored dead the crosses and religious symbols which are in the hearts of the loved ones they left behind in making the supreme sacrifice for our country.'

"Respectfully,

"DONALD J. MCQUADE,
"National Commander."

HONOLULU STAR-BULLETIN,
Honolulu, Hawaii, October 3, 1951.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress from Massachusetts, Care of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I enclose clipping of a news story which appeared in the Star-Bulletin today and also reprint of an editorial which the Star-Bulletin carried last week.

The sudden removal of the crosses from the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific has raised a great deal of comment here. Most of it is in protest against the removal of the crosses. These protests come to us from widely diversified elements of our population.

Much comment has been occasioned here by the speeches you have made on the floor of the House concerning this episode.

Cordially yours,

RILEY H. ALLEN,
Editor.

[From the Honolulu (T. H.) Star-Bulletin of October 2, 1951]

ROGERS BILL WOULD RESTORE WHITE CROSSES

WASHINGTON, October 2.—Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS (Republican, Massachusetts) today introduced a bill to force the Army to restore white crosses on the graves of 13,000 American war dead in Hawaii's Hill of Sacrifice National Memorial Cemetery.

The Army removed the crosses last week and replaced them with flat headstones. Its action kicked off a storm of protests.

Meanwhile, Representative OVERTON BROOKS (Democrat, Louisiana) said that present law authorizes erect headstones but not flat place stones in national cemeteries.

Representative BROOKS is acting chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. He said he understood that the flat place stones are authorized to be furnished by the Government only for war dead who are buried in private cemeteries.

NO REPORT YET

Representative BROOKS said the Defense Department has not yet given him a report he requested on the removal of wooden crosses from the graves in the National Memorial Cemetery in Punchbowl Crater overlooking Honolulu They were replaced by flat stone markers.

The Army's action stirred up protests in the islands which were echoed in Congress and throughout the mainland.

Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS (Republican, Massachusetts) told the House yesterday she was preparing a bill to force the Army to restore the crosses.

[From the Honolulu, T H. Star-Bulletin of September 29, 1951]

THEY AWAIT THE VERDICT

The mute white crosses have been taken from the graves of the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific—but protests may restore them.

It took only 2 hours for the energetic task force of the Army to remove from Punchbowl more than 13,000 little wooden crosses. It will require more time to restore them—if they are to be restored.

But there is time for this task of restoration—those who sleep beneath the green turf in the ancient crater have no need for haste. They will wait, in patience, for the verdict.

All the hurry, all the ordered speed and discipline of their training, all the furious urgency of their attacks on the battlelines, all the sudden anguish of their mortal wounds before they fell, are of the past.

For them the suns will rise and will set over that dedicated Hill of Sacrifice in long, unhurried procession. The gentle winds and the stars will keep them company, even if in a burst of organized effort as well-timed and precise as the burst from a machinegun, the 13,000 white crosses came down in one unexpected afternoon.

In Washington, D. C., Delegate FARRINGTON has appropriately said that the wishes of the families of the men who lie in the Punchbowl graves should be consulted.

That can be done, and should be done. It should have been done, and thoroughly, sympathetically, before the order was given that tore the crosses from the ground.

To do it rightly, the families should have a clear picture of the alternatives—the graves with crosses and also with the flat stone marker, or the graves with only that flat, inconspicuous and unimpressive headstone.

And the families should know—many of them know already—that in our military cemeteries abroad, the white crosses still stand

And these next of kin should feel that it is not a question of economy—our doing fitting honor to those who are buried in Punchbowl

It is a question of giving to these heroes of our country the greatest possible evidence of respect and devotion we can give them

It is a question also of developing this national memorial cemetery as one of our Nation's most impressive, most distinctive burial places

It is a question of maintaining the physical facilities so that each Memorial Day the people of Hawaii can pay their distinctive tribute of leis and garlands, appropriately wreathed above the graves.

Yes; those who lie asleep in Punchbowl can await the verdict.

For them, all mortal haste is ended They lie quietly in the ultimate discipline of death, relying upon a grateful country to do them justice.

GLENWOOD SPRINGS, COLO.,
September 29, 1951.

HON EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
United States House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D C.

DEAR MRS ROGERS: We are very grateful to you for your H. R 5413 which cuts right through the hypocrisy of appeasement to the heart of the matter of calling a war a war.

John's mother and I have felt that if the policy of appeasement is extended to such a thing as reaching into a national cemetery we would not be satisfied to leave him in Arlington. We know that John, could he have foreseen the lengths to which appeasement has gone, would prefer to be placed in a cemetery where the hand of appeasement could not reach him.

We note that "Korea" will be permitted now, but that was authorized for the first time I protested with the difference that now it is to be Government paid and can be a part of the inscription instead of being relegated to the back or bottom of the stone. It is geographic, not historic and is still an evasion of the right of veterans of all wars to have the war in which they died on their stones.

We also note a weaseling bill, H. R. 5384 introduced by Mr. LANE which would permit "Korean conflict." This is doubly distasteful to parents and widows because it is such a patent attempt to evade the issue. Its defects are two very serious ones.

1. It is lexicologically incorrect and vague. A conflict is any dispute even between two men on the debating platform or in a prize ring. It is a general term; it may or may not mean a war. To really mean anything it has to be qualified; it must be used like this, "An armed conflict between nations." And when you have said that you have defined war; so why not use the word "war" in the first place. An armed conflict between nations exists whether or not a president, a congress, or a parliament has so labeled it.

2. It is a clumsy attempt to evade telling the truth. Better no inscription or just "Korea" which is a lesser evasion. It is not the inscription but the motive behind it that is so objectionable to relatives. Many are convinced that appeasement killed their kin,

and they do not want it to follow their dead to the cemetery.

If you will give me the names of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs I will get in touch with each member. If you will also advise me sufficiently ahead of time I will write each Member of the House just before the bill comes up for consideration of the floor—both bills, yours and Mr. LANE'S.

I enclose a mimeographed copy of my letter to the President written before I received notice of either bill, and a sheet containing the chronology of the affair. I have been sending them out to some 200 newspapers—not because I want publicity for myself or my son, but because I want the people to know what goes on in our leadership in Washington.

The organization whose letterhead I use has one objective: to protect the fighting man by fighting the appeasement which is so unnecessarily sacrificing his life. We have devoted all of John's death benefits to this crusade, and will continue to put all we can into the work. John and his family have put $1,600 into it in the last 8 months. I enclose a card. We have sent out 10,000 like it

This organization of relatives and friends of fighting men throughout the country can be counted on for continued resistance to appeasement. It is the hard core of resistance. Other people get mad and get over it; we stay mad.

I hope you will push this bill relentlessly. An inscription is a small thing, but it is the appeasement behind it that is the real issue.

Thanking you again, and with best wishes,

Yours very sincerely,

EUGENE R. GUILD,
Captain, United States Army, Retired, General Chairman.

P S—Please use in any way you see fit. John and I were born in Massachusetts—he at Winthrop, and I at North Scituate.

ROARING FORK RANCH,
GLENWOOD SPRINGS, COLO.,
September 20, 1951.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your reversal today of your previous ruling, forbidding even the word "Korea" on Arlington gravestones, still deprives my son and all Korean dead of the right, held by the dead of other wars, to have the war in which they died recorded on their graves.

The authorized single word, "Korea",[1] is still an evasion, a weasel word which dodges the issue and attempts to preserve the original deceit that the Korean war is not a war. It is still like your ruling appeasing the Reds on the Arlington gravestones of our five fliers shot down over Yugoslavia.

A soldier's grave has, until your stewardship, been the one inviolable page of history from which later generations could read the truth. Who tampers with it destroys its integrity. My son was killed by battlefield appeasement; must I now take him from Arlington's once hallowed ground because, lest the Reds be offended, it is to be again fouled by graveyard appeasement?

Your purpose in battlefield and graveyard appeasement is, no doubt, peace. And so was Chamberlain's. But his failure proves that peace cannot be had by kneeling to dictators. My son and the other 20,000 who have died in the name of peace in Korea were not on their knees to the Reds. Will you get up off your knees, Mr. President?

EUGENE R. GUILD,
Captain, United States Army, Retired

[1] Merely geographic; not historic.

BACKGROUND AND CHRONOLOGY

On September 21, 1950, Second Lt. John N. Guild, USMC, was killed in action in the now well-known assault on Hill 85 by Charley Company of the First Marines.

On May 10, 1951, he was buried in Arlington National Cemetery. On May 26, 1951, in ceremonies at Quantico, Va., he was posthumously awarded the Navy Cross for extraordinary heroism. Simultaneously a bitter letter by his father, Captain Guild, was read in the MacArthur committee hearings to General Collins on the witness stand. It blamed the son's death on appeasement and charged the administration with paying blackmail in American lives to the Reds.

On July 16, in response to a request from the Quartermaster General of the Army for inscription details on their son's headstone, Captain and Mrs. Guild requested that World War II, which the Quartermaster General stated was to be inscribed on the headstone, be omitted because their son had been a student at the Annapolis Naval Academy during that war, and had neither fought nor died in it. They requested that since Lieutenant Guild had fought and died in the Korean war, "Korean War" be substituted.

In reply on July 30, "Korean War" was forbidden, but it was stated that the single word "Korea" would be allowed at private expense on the back or bottom of the stone.

On August 3 the parents protested that this deprived all Korean dead of the right—accorded to the dead of other wars—of having the war in which they died for their country recorded on their gravestones, and that this was appeasement of the Reds by maintaining the fiction that we were not in a war, a fiction which carried appeasement even to the graves of the heroic dead They asked the Senators from Colorado to sponsor legislation giving the Korean dead the rights of which they were being deprived

On September 6, presumably as a result of the parents' continued protest, the President reversed himself and withdrew permission for use of the word "Korea" Despite the objection of the parents to "World War II," they were informed that "World War II" would be inscribed on their son's grave.

By September 20 public opinion became aroused Senator KNOWLAND, of California, and Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, said they would support corrective legislation in the Senate; and in the House Chairman VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee, declared he would sponsor a bill on the subject if necessary.

Then the President reacted. Through release No 1257-51, September 20, 1951, of the Defense Department, he again reversed himself and again permitted the word "Korea" to be used, although he continued to stubbornly refuse to name the war in Korea a war.

In the accompanying letter Captain Guild has replied that this still constitutes appeasement under which he cannot allow his son to remain in Arlington Cemetery, and urges the President to get up off his knees and abandon all appeasement of the Reds, including battlefield and graveyard appeasement.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *October 4, 1951.*

Representative EDITH N. ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: As the mother of an only son who is buried on Hawaii's Sacrifice Hill, may I thank you for your splendid action in having these crosses and stars of David restored to the graves of those who were not economywise in giving up their lives in defense of their country. Cannot these be replaced with material that will withstand the elements of the climate in Hawaii?

This action, if allowed to be consummated, will show an alarming situation. In deference to the godless countries no prayer of peace was said at the time of the opening of the United Nations sessions, nor at the signing of the Japanese peace treaty in California. How these countries must be gloating that now we are removing the very symbol of Christianity.

Again my sincere gratitude for speaking for the Gold Star Mothers, who do not have any lobbyists to plead their causes.

Gratefully,

AGNES G. MCGOVERN
(Mrs. Peter J. McGovern).

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with the remarks I made on the floor today I be permitted to insert after my remarks a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense and from Secretary Lovett with regard to the problems of releasing the reservists. The Department of Defense is today announcing a more expeditious program for the release of reservists, and I think this letter should be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include an editorial.

Mr. ANGELL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include an editorial.

Mr. WICKERSHAM in six instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr MANSFIELD and to include extraneous matter

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mr. AYERS and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. ABERNETHY and to include a resolution.

Mr. MACHROWICZ.

Mr. BAILEY.

Mr. POLK in two instances and to include resolutions.

Mr. BLATNIK in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include excerpts.

Mr. O'NEILL (at the request of Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania) and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. ENGLE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BAKEWELL and to include an article.

Mr. JENKINS and to include an address entitled "We Jump Into the Fire" notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $205.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, in four instances, and to include in one a radio speech made by him.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa and to include an editorial.

Mr. Bow and to include an editorial.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming, in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLSWORTH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAND.

Mr. REED of New York, in three instances, and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. BENDER, in four instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include an editorial.

Mr BEALL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include an editorial.

Mr. WERDEL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include an article notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $369.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRANT.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, in two instances, and to include certain letters.

Mr. GWINN and to include a newspaper clipping.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. GATHINGS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include an editorial.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2170. An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H R. 4496. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1952.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 990. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of Preston L Watson, as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased;

H. R. 3205. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10-percent or more degree of disability within 2 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service-connected;

H R 3504 An act for the relief of Nison Miller; and

H R. 5102. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval installations and defense production plants in such area.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DOLLINGER (at the the request of Mr. MULTER) for Friday, October 5, on account of illness.

Mr. BRAMBLETT (at the request of Mr. ALLEN of California), indefinite, on account of official business.

Mr. PRESTON, for Friday, October 5, on account of official business.

Mr. DEMPSEY (at the request of Mr. KLEIN), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for today, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, October 8, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

851 A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the semiannual report of the Federal National Mortgage Association for the 6 months ended June 30, 1951, pursuant to section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended, and section 2 (6) of Reorganization Plan No. 22 of 1950, to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

852 A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for an increase in the pay and certain allowances of members of the uniformed services"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

853. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 9, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on, and a preliminary examination and survey of the Illinois and Mississippi Canal, Ill., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on September 21, 1943, and authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945, to the Committee on Public Works.

854 A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report listing projects for the establishment or development of military, naval, or Air Force installations and facilities by the construction, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works which have been authorized by the Congress subsequent to the beginning of the Eightieth Congress and for which adequate funds for their completion had not been appropriated at the close of the Eighty-first Congress, pursuant to section 408 (b) of Public Law 564, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

855. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend sections 203 and 403 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, so as to authorize certain Government officers to assist in carrying out mutual civil defense aid between the United States and neighboring countries; to modify the loyalty oath so as to allow nationals of neighboring countries or of countries that are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty to participate in State civil defense programs without impairing their citizenship; and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

856 A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1952, in the amount of $7,527,527,790, to carry out the purposes of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 (Public Law 249, 82d Cong. (H. Doc No. 250)); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S 466. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Army certain property in St Louis, Mo; without amendment (Rept. No 1101) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr BOYKIN. Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries S 467 An act to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota, without amendment (Rept No 1099) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union

Mr. BOYKIN: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries S. 509. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U S. C. 718d), as amended, without amendment (Rept. No. 1100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments S. 1967. An act to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes, without amendment (Rept No 1102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON. Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 5230. A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of North Carolina of the Currituck Beach Lighthouse Reservation, Corolla, N. C; with amendment (Rept. No. 1103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr CELLER:

H. R. 5627. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Education to promote the public presentation of drama and music productions by State and land-grant and other accredited nonprofit colleges and universities, utilizing for such purpose auditoriums of the Federal Government and of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTER:

H R 5628. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, authorizing the Delaware River Joint Commission to construct, finance, operate, maintain and

own a vehicular tunnel or tunnels under, or an additional bridge across, the Delaware River and defining certain functions, powers, and duties of said commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H R 5629. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Public Works

By Mr MANSFIELD:

H R 5630. A bill to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Frenchtown irrigation district, Mont., to authorize its execution, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H R 5631 A bill to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Frenchtown irrigation district, the Malta irrigation district, the Glasgow irrigation district, and the irrigation districts comprising the Owyhee Federal reclamation project, to authorize their execution by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H R 5632 A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to require certificates of public convenience and necessity for the construction of pipelines, and additions to and extensions of pipelines, to be used for transportation subject to part I of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

By Mr. BUDGE

H R 5633 A bill to approve a contract negotiated with the irrigation districts on the Owyhee Federal project, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H R 5634 A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on certain claims of individual Navajo Indians against the United States, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

By Mr. STIGLER:

H R 5635. A bill for the relief of the State of Oklahoma, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr RANKIN:

H J Res 343. Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of the Army to replace the crosses and other religious symbols which formerly marked the graves at the National Memorial Cemetery in Hawaii, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL.

H Res 452 Resolution to provide for the payment of certain death and burial benefits to Thomas Logan; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mrs ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to pass legislation providing for a shipbuilding program, to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H R 5636 A bill for the relief of Ernest Ludwig Bamford and Mrs Nadine Bamford, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr HART:

H R 5637 A bill for the relief of Sergio Sciangalepore, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H R 5638 A bill for the relief of Giacomo Allegretta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H R 5639. A bill for the relief of Mrs India Taylor Palmi Stevenson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr MACHROWICZ:

H R 5640 A bill for the relief of Stanley DiLabbio, to the Committee on the Judiciary

H R 5641 A bill for the relief of Nicholas De Lorence-Pigulewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr MADDEN:

H R 5642 A bill for the relief of Angeliki Harilaos Scoupakos, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr MANSFIELD

H R 5643 A bill for the relief of Lauren F Teutsch, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr POULSON:

H R 5644 A bill for the relief of Basil Jamil Haib, to the Committee on the Judiciary

H R 5645 A bill for the relief of Jacques Poletti, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

449 By the SPEAKER Petition of Miami Townsend Club No 1, Miami, Fla., vigorously protesting the proposed opening of the welfare rolls to public exposure, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

450 Also, petition of Miami Townsend Club No 22, Miami, Fla., vigorously protesting the proposed opening of the welfare rolls to public exposure, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, October 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D, offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, whose spirit searcheth all things and whose love beareth all things, for this hallowed moment, turning from our divisive loyalties and our party cries we would bow humbly in a unity of spirit with a vivid realization of our oneness in Thee Forgive us for praying that Thy kingdom might come and then, by our own selfish stubbornness, barring the way when it has sought to come through us.

Grant us a fundamental fealty to the common good, expressing itself in divergent attitudes and convictions, which are the glory of our national heritage, yet putting above all partisan advantage the weal and welfare of the commonwealth to which we solemnly pledge our allegiance. With the wrecks of nations which have broken Thy law of love still smoking in ruins before our eyes, let the purifying stream of Thy mercy cleanse our national life lest our destruction be determined and we, too, go the way of the nations that have forgotten God. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 5, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S 537) to further amend the Communications Act of 1934, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1864) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans who served during World War II, and persons who served in the military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had rejected the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5113) to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H R 1227 An act to amend further the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and

for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947, as amended; and

H. R. 4475. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 404. An act to amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 625. An act for the relief of Col. Harry F Cunningham;

H. R. 654. An act for the relief of Ivo Cerne;

H. R. 773. An act for the relief of Mering Bichara;

H. R. 814. An act for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein;

H R. 850. An act for the relief of Mary Isumi;

H R. 948. An act to provide for terms of court to be held at West Palm Beach, and at Fort Myers, in the southern district of Florida,

H. R. 980. An act for the relief of Kikue Uchida;

H. R. 1131. An act for the relief of Edward C. Brunett;

H R. 1638. An act to facilitate the management of the national park system and miscellaneous areas administered in connection with that system, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1851. An act for the relief of Ark Ping Jee Nong (Ngon);

H R 1962. An act for the relief of Wanda R. Barnett;

H. R. 1964. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Central Division of the Southern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Bernard R. Novak;

H. R. 2072. An act for the relief of Jeremiah Coleman;

H R. 2169. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Homer G. Hamilton;

H. R. 2322 An act to authorize the improvement of East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla;

H. R 2398. An act to amend Public Law 848, Eighty-first Congress, second session;

H. R. 2506. An act for the relief of Masunari Saito and Isao Saito;

H R. 2547. An act for the relief of Yoshiko Ito;

H. R. 2589. An act for the relief of Sor Matilde Sotelo Fernandez, Sor Virtudes Garcia Garcia, and Sor Amalia Gonzalez Gonzalez;

H. R. 2590. An act for the relief of José M. Thomasa-Sanchez, his wife Adela Durán Cuevas de Thomasa, and his child, José María Thomasa Duran;

H R 2604 An act to authorize the appointment of Sidney F. Mashbir, colonel, Army of the United States, to the permanent grade of colonel in the Regular Army;

H. R. 3006. An act for the relief of the Antonio Corrao Corp.;

H. R. 3060. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Commerce Trust Co.;

H. R. 3137. An act for the relief of O. L. Osteen;

H. R. 3153. An act for the relief of Signa Angela Maino Cristallo;

H. R. 3368. An act providing for the conveyance of the Bear Lake Fish Cultural Station to the Fish and Game Commission of the State of Utah;

H. R. 3428. An act for the relief of Mitsuo Arita;

H. R. 3548. An act to provide that payments to States and Territories for care given to certain disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States shall be effective from the date such care commenced;

H. R. 3666. An act for the relief of Dorothy Kilmer Nickerson;

H. R. 3946. An act for the relief of Master Sgt. Orval Bennett;

H. R. 3981. An act to amend the act of July 8, 1943 (57 Stat. 388), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control";

H R. 4049 An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts certain lands and improvements comprising the Castle Island Terminal Facility at South Boston in exchange for certain other lands;

H. R. 4197. An act to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian homelands required for the use of the Board of Water Supply of the City and County of Honolulu for the location of a water shaft, pump station, and tunnel, and to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, so as to confer upon certain lands of Auwaiolimu, Kewalo-Uka, and Kalawahine, on the island of Oahu, T. H, the status of Hawaiian homelands;

H R 4318 An act for the relief of Allen W. Spangler;

H R. 4409. An act to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for public or private lands;

H. R 4567 An act for the relief of Roy Sakai;

H R. 4583 An act for the relief of Inooka Kazumi,

H R 4645 An act for the relief of Mrs. Marguerite A Brumell;

H R 4671. An act for the relief of Mark Paul Crowley;

H R 4687. An act to provide for the withholding of certain patents that might be detrimental to the national security, and for other purposes;

H R 4808. An act to provide for the granting of an easement for a public road through the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge in Dare County, N C.,

H R 4922. An act for the relief of Patricia Ann Eddings;

H R 4929 An act for the relief of Michael Bernard (Cervera);

H R 4930. An act for the relief of Charles H Craft;

H. R 4940. An act for the relief of Suzie Ballard;

H. R 4969. An act for the relief of Susa Yukiko Thomason;

H R. 5062 An act to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status,

H. R. 5104. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inge L. Curtis;

H. R. 5131. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike System and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5257. An act to amend section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), to increase the amount available as an emergency relief fund for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges damaged by floods or other catastrophes;

H R 5267. An act for the relief of Gertrude O. Yerxa, Mrs. G. Olive Yerxa, and Dr. Charles W. Yerxa;

H R 5317. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the George H. Whike Construction Co., of Canton, Ohio;

H. R. 5405. An act to amend section 207 (a) of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress;

H R. 5504. An act to amend section 12 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1950 to increase the amount available for the construction of access roads certified as essential to the national defense;

H R 5593. An act authorizing the Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority, hereby created, and its successors, to construct maintain, and operate bridges over Sab Lake, at or near Port Arthur, Tex.; to construct, maintain, and operate all causeways, approaches, and appurtenances pertaining thereto; and to finance said objects by the issuance of bonds secured by the said properties and income and revenues, and for other purposes; and

H J. Res 326. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to certain attorneys employed by the House Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 283. An act for the relief of Akiko Mitsuhata;

S 617 An act for the relief of Pascal Nemoto Yutaka;

S 1013 An act for the relief of Sister Monica Grant;

S 1277 An act for the relief of John R. Willoughby,

S 1437 An act for the relief of Maiku Suzuki,

S. 1464. An act for the relief of Peter Therkelsen Kirwan and Ernest O'Gorman Kirwan;

S 1499 An act for the relief of Georgette Sato,

S. 1713. An act for the relief of Charles Cooper,

S 1718. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Bozsik;

S. 1775. An act for the relief of Heinz Harald Patterson;

S. 1994. An act to authorize the use of the incompleted submarine *Ulua* as a target for explosive tests, and for other purposes,

H R 1227 An act to amend further the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947, as amended;

H. R. 4475. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. R. 5102. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval installations and defense production plants in such area.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. HENDRICKSON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARTHY was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today, tomorrow, and Wednesday of this week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MUNDT was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for 10 days, beginning on October 11.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of the 4th instant, the Vice

President, on October 5, 1951, signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 990. An act to confer jurisdiction of the Court of Claims to hear, determine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased;

H R 3205. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 2 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service-connected, and

H. R. 3504. An act for the relief of Nison Miller.

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 4th instant, the President pro tempore signed on October 5, 1951, the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 4496. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1952.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business, without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S DOC NO. 75)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of $2,000,000, for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN AUTHORIZATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend certain authorizations for construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CLARIFICATION OF BUDGET PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO VETERANS' CANTEEN SERVICE

A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify the budget program requirements relating to the Veterans' Canteen Service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Federal National Mortgage Association, for the 6 months ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILATION SERVICE

A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third annual report of the Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report), to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 203 and 403 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, so as to authorize certain Government officers to assist in carrying out mutual civil defense aid between the United States and neighboring countries, to modify the loyalty oath so as to allow nationals of neighboring countries or of countries that are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty to participate in State civil defense programs without impairing their citizenship; and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CIVIL DEFENSE INTERSTATE COMPACT BETWEEN STATES OF NEW YORK AND CONNECTICUT

A letter from the director, New York State Civil Defense Commission, New York, N. Y., acknowledging the existence between the States of New York and Connecticut of a civil defense interstate compact, which had been ratified by the legislatures of both States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO PASS LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR A SHIPBUILDING PROGRAM

Whereas there is pending before the Congress of the United States a bill, S. 241, known as the long-range shipbuilding bill; and

Whereas the purpose of said bill is to provide for a long-range shipbuilding program; and

Whereas shipbuilding is a vital industry and of importance to this Commonwealth: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the house of representatives respectfully urges the Congress to enact, and the President of the United States to sign, as soon as possible, the bill hereinabove mentioned; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

House of representatives, September 27, 1951, adopted.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

A true copy.

Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

PENALTIES FOR SELLING NARCOTICS TO MINORS—RESOLUTION OF CALVERT COUNTY (MD.) WOMEN'S DEMOCRATIC CLUB

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, disclosures by the Senate Crime Committee of the increase in addiction to narcotic drugs among the children of the Nation have aroused our people in all sections to the necessity of positive action to correct this alarming situation.

The Calvert County (Md.) Women's Democratic Club at its meeting on September 26, 1951, have gone on record as favoring increased penalties, including life imprisonment or capital punishment for second offenders in the selling of dope to minors.

I present the resolution for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CALVERT COUNTY, MD, WOMEN'S DEMOCRATIC CLUB

At a regular meeting of the Calvert County Women's Democratic Club, held on Wednesday, September 26, 1951, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas a lot of publicity has been given the question of selling dope and narcotics to minors and the safety and health of our children are at stake, and

"Whereas it is the belief of the members of this club that stiffer laws should be enacted in order to more properly take care of the situation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Calvert County Women's Democratic Club go on record as urging the passage of laws or the amending of existing laws which would triple the punishment for the first conviction of peddling dope to minors and would give life imprisonment or capital punishment as punishment for the second conviction; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution by sent to Senator HERBERT R O'CONOR, the United States Senator from Maryland investigating crime on a national level, and to Senator Omar R Crothers, Jr., the chairman of the legislative council committee investigating crime in Maryland"

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. J Res. 289. Joint resolution to terminate the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany; with an amendment (Rept. No. 892).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 1622. A bill to amend section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946; without amendment (Rept. No. 893).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 366. A bill for the relief of Stanislas d'Erceville (Rept. No. 895);

S. 440. A bill for the relief of Evangelos and Michael Dumas (Rept. No 896);

S. 471. A bill for the relief of Ai Mei Yu and Ai Mei Chen (Rept. No. 897);

S. 1212. A bill to amend section 2113 of title 18 of the United States Code (Rept. No. 898);

S. 1339. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chai Chang Choi (Rept. No. 899);

S. 1401 A bill for the relief of Lore A. M. Hennessey (Rept. No. 800);

S. 1462. A bill for the relief of Joseph Boris Tchertkoff (Rept. No. 901);

S 1819. A bill for the relief of Wolfgang Vogel (Rept No. 902);

S. 1949. A bill for the relief of Hattie Truax Graham, formerly Hattie Truax (Rept. No. 903);

H. R. 732. A bill for the relief of Konstontios N. Bellos (Rept. No. 904);

H. R 782. A bill conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Siegfried Oberdorfer (Rept. No. 905);

H. R. 824. A bill for the relief of Luisa Monti (Rept. No. 906);

H. R. 1100. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Bellini (Rept. No. 907),

H. R. 1119. A bill for the relief of Mario DiFilippo (Rept. No. 908);

H R. 1696. A bill for the relief of Jack Warner and family (Rept. No. 909);

H. R. 1908. A bill for the relief of Helena Jange Chinn (Rept. No. 910);

H. R. 2210. A bill for the relief of Hye Pah Kung (Rept. No. 911);

H R. 3221. A bill for the relief of Joji Ikeda, a minor (Rept No. 912);

H. R 3424 A bill for the relief of Yumi Horiuchi (Rept. No. 913);

H. R. 4270. A bill for the relief of the estate of Jennie Gayle, deceased (Rept. No. 914); and

H. R 4271. A bill for the relief of Mr and Mrs Richard G. Adams and legal guardian of Dorothy Margaret Adams (Rept. No. 915).

By Mr McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S 640. A bill for the relief of Isamu Furuta (Rept. No. 916);

S. 821. A bill for the relief of Wong Woo, also known as William Curtis (Rept. No. 917);

S 914 A bill for the relief of Masako Miyazaki (Rept. No. 918);

S. 1448. A bill for the relief of Robert William Larber (Rept. No. 919);

S. 1911. A bill for the relief of Michael David Liu, a minor (Rept. No. 920), and

H. R. 3376. A bill for the relief of Margaret K N. Miller (Rept. No. 921).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S 183. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Erhardt Otto (Rept. No. 922); and

H R 1181. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records (Rept No 923).

By Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R 1215. A bill to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 924).

By Mr JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2116. A bill to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate commerce by communications facilities, with amendments (Rept. No. 925).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 1563 A bill to provide for the licensing of certain persons engaged in the dissemination of information concerning horse- or dog-racing events and betting information concerning other sporting events by means of interstate and foreign communications by wire or radio, and for other purposes, with amendments (Rept. No. 926);

S. 1564. A bill to make unlawful the transmission in interstate commerce of gambling information concerning a sporting event which is obtained without consent of the person conducting such sporting event; without amendment (Rept. No. 927); and

S. 1624. A bill to prohibit the importing, transporting, and mailing of gambling materials; to prohibit the broadcasting of gambling information; to prohibit the transmission of bets or wagers by means of interstate communications; and to prohibit further the transportation of gambling devices in interstate commerce; with amendments (Rept. No 928).

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr McMAHON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I report favorably from that committee an original bill to amend the law which controls atomic energy within the United States, and I submit a report (No. 894) thereon.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has considered both the bill and the report in many meetings. Our study of the basic problems involved goes back 5 years; indeed it goes back in part to the original Senate Special Committee on Atomic Energy. We have given the bill and its accompanying report our exhaustive attention.

The Joint Committee is unanimous in its support of the bill. I believe that the best interests of the United States require that this bill be enacted into law before the Congress goes home.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 2233) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, reported by Mr. McMAHON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

IMPROVEMENT OF EAST PASS CHANNEL FROM GULF OF MEXICO INTO CHOCTAWATCHEE BAY, FLA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1080) to authorize the improvement of East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla., and I submit a report (No. 929) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask unanimous consent that a similar bill (H. R. 2322), which came to the Senate in a message from the House of Representatives today, be placed on the calendar.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2322) to authorize the improvement of East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla., was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

COMPACT BETWEEN COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AND STATE OF NEW JERSEY, CONCERNING A BRIDGE ACROSS THE DELAWARE RIVER—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1968) granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike system and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 930) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask unanimous consent that a similar bill (H. R. 5131), which came to the Senate in a message from the House of Repreesntatives today, be placed on the calendar.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5131) granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike system and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT RELATING TO LEGISLATIVE BUDGET—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, in the absence of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], I report favorably, without amendment, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5) to amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, relating to the legislative budget, and I submit a report (No. 931) thereon. This is the majority report. It is my understanding that the chairman of that committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] will submit his individual views on Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 at a later date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr CASE (for himself, Mr ANDERSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr SMATHERS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ECTON, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 2225 A bill to create a committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLEMENTS.

S 2226. A bill to authorize the construction of certain public works for navigation and flood control on the Big Sandy River and the Tug and Levisa Forks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2227. A bill to approve a contract negotiated with the irrigation districts on the Owyhee Federal project, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2228. A bill for the relief of William Elden Joslin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 2229 A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire, construct, operate, and maintain public airports in certain areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S 2230. A bill to amend section 1 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S 2231. A bill to effect entry of a minor child adopted or to be adopted by a United States citizen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 2232. A bill for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr McMAHON:

S 2233. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended; ordered to be placed on the calendar

(See the remarks of Mr. McMAHON when he reported the above bill, which appear under a separate heading)

By Mr McCARRAN:

S. 2234 A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal subdivision b of section 64, subdivision h of section 70, and sections 118, 354, and 643 thereof and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr NIXON:

S 2235 A bill making it a Federal offense for an officer or employee of the United States to accept any compensation or gratuity from any officer or member of a national committee of a political party, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr ECTON:

S 2236. A bill to extend certain 10-year oil and gas leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

By Mr. LANGER:

S 2237 A bill for the relief of Henricus F. J. Sleddens, his wife, Elizabeth, and his daughter, Sylvester, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2238 A bill to give proper recognition to the distinguished service of Col. J. Claude Kimbrough; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S 2239. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for payment under the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System of child's insurance benefits to children who have attained the age of 18 but are incapable of self-support because of physical or mental disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S 2240. A bill to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase and fix the salary of full-time referees and to authorize increased salaries for part-time referees, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S 2241. A bill to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Defense Materials Procurement Agency of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading)

COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND EVALUATE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE EXPERIMENTS IN WEATHER MODIFICATION

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to create a committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak 5 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

The bill (S 2225) to create a Committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification, introduced by Mr. CASE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ECTON, and Mr. YOUNG), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the bill just introduced is for the purpose of creating an Advisory Committee on Weather Control. I may say that the bill deals with the subject known as rain making.

I am joined in the bill by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], as cosponsors.

The Senator from New Mexico has been absent from the Senate under doctor's orders, but we have been in communication with him and with his telegraphic approval introduce the bill today in order that it may be considered by the Congress early in the next session.

It might be interesting for this body to note that the distinguished Senators cosponsoring the bill represent people living on the east coast, the west coast, the southern coast, and the northern boundary of the United States, as well as the central areas of the Southwest and the Great Plains. This seems to point up the fact that activities designed to modify weather directly concern, and may affect, all parts and corners of the Nation.

The bill is the outgrowth of hearings conducted March 14, 15, 16, and 19 and April 5, 1951, by subcommittees of the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Agriculture and Forestry, on S. 5 introduced by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], S. 222 by the junior Senator from New Mexico, and S. 798 by myself.

Testimony by the Nation's top scientists and others at these hearings demonstrated that attempts at weather modification had already proceeded far beyond what was generally known. And, while there is a need for controlled experiments and research in rain making, and the testimony showed this, the testimony and subsequent events revealed also an immediate need for correlating, evaluating, and giving direction to experiments already being conducted by private concerns and financed by farmers, ranchers, and other water users.

Incidentally, the most recent illustration of that was the fact that Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Searles, approved a contract for the Bonneville Power Administration to spend some $59,000 for rain-making work in the Northwest to replenish the reservoirs there in order that power might be generated for the production of aluminum.

In 1950 rain-making activities were limited and scattered, and were more scientific than commercial. But in this year, 1951, large areas of 17 States were included in the target areas of commercial rain-making experiments.

In 1951 one rain-making organization alone had under contract over 300,000,000 acres, or about 12 times as many acres as those under irrigation in the United States Farmers spent millions of dollars for the services of this organization, which now contemplates extending its activities to Central America, South America, South Africa, and soon to Europe.

The results reported from these uncoordinated experiments in 1951 have been confusing. Heavy rains have fallen in some regions, droughts have followed in others, and apparently no clear pattern can be discerned. Private rain-making concerns have prepared reports for their customers, but these have sometimes been challenged and have not always been made available to the public, which of course has a legitimate concern in its weather.

In some cases people have credited the rain-makers with beneficial rainfall. In other cases they have blamed them for excessive moisture, or have denied that any results at all have ensued as a consequence of their activities.

All of this has pointed to the need for knowing who is doing what We must find out what is going on, and then we may be able with some accuracy to determine what the results have been.

This bill seeks to provide the means for finding out what is going on. If enacted it would not prevent people from carrying on weather experiments but would require them to report what they are doing. It would create an independent and impartial committee to evaluate these weather modifying activities, so that thereby scientific and practical knowledge can be advanced and so that citizens can be protected from exploitation and from harmful and unwanted effects.

Mr. President, long ago Mark Twain said that everybody talked about the weather but no one ever did anything about it. People are now trying to do something about it, and it is the purpose of the bill that we find out what people are trying to do and what is taking place.

The bill directs the committee to recommend to the Congress more perma-

nent legislation, if this seems necessary or desirable. It also authorizes research and experimentation in weather control by existing Government agencies. In most sections of the country everything is dependent upon the weather. Even yesterday many people could not see or listen to a ball game because of the adverse weather. So the weather is something which directly concerns everyone. The proposed legislation has immense significance for the national defense. I earnestly hope that Members of the Senate will call for copies of the bill and copies of the hearings which were had earlier in the year, and to be prepared when the committee can get a place for the bill on the calendar, because the committee has indicated it will report a bill of this character favorably.

DOMESTIC MINERALS ACT OF 1951

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to be known as the Domestic Minerals Act of 1951, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2241) to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Defense Materials Procurement Agency of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Murray, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Domestic Minerals Act of 1951.

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC 2 (a) It is the policy of the Congress that every effort be made to stimulate the exploration, development, mining, and maximum production of strategic and critical metals and minerals by private enterprise to supply the industrial, military, and naval needs of the United States by providing for the conservation and development of these materials in order to decrease and prevent, wherever possible, a dangerous and costly dependence of the United States upon foreign nations for supplies of such materials. To this end it is the further policy of the Congress that every effort be made to stimulate, stabilize, and maintain a sound and active mining industry within the United States, to coordinate the programs now provided or to be provided by law for making scientific, technologic, and economic investigations concerning the extent and mode of occurrence and the development, mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of marginal ores and other mineral substances found in the United States or its Territories or insular possessions which are essential to the common defense or the industrial needs of the United States, and to stimulate the commercial extraction and production of the same.

(b) It is the policy of the Congress that small and/or marginal mining enterprises in the United States or its Territories or insular possessions be encouraged to make the greatest possible contribution toward achieving the objective of this act.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created within the Defense Materials Procurement Agency a Mine Incentive Payments Division, hereinafter called the "Division."

(b) The administrative officers of the Division shall be the Director, suitably qualified in actual administrative and mining experience, and the Assistant Director. The salary of the Director shall be $15,000 per annum. In the absence of the Director his duties shall be performed by the Assistant Director.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Director, and he is hereby authorized and directed, subject to the approval of the Administrator of the Defense Materials Procurement Agency, (1) to perform the functions hereinafter specifically authorized, and (2) to prescribe rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act in the simplest manner.

(d) The Director may select, employ, and fix the compensation of such engineers and other experts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and shall employ such other staff as he may deem necessary.

(e) All records of the Premium Price Plan for Copper, Lead, and Zinc shall be available to the Director and such records as the Director may request shall be transferred and delivered to the Division

SEC. 4. (a) To carry out the purposes of this act, production payments as prescribed by the Director shall be made to those producers whose operations require such payments on all ores, metals, and minerals determined to be strategic or critical, pursuant to section 2 (a), Public Law 520 (79th Cong., ch. 590, 2d sess.), and included in group I of the Munitions Board current list of strategic and critical materials, together with any minerals or metals that subsequently may be added thereto, and produced from ores, dumps, tailings, slag piles, or residues (excluding scrap materials), except that in the event that the Munitions Board shall find that further purchases of particular ores, metals, or minerals for national security stockpile purposes are no longer necessary or will within 1 year of the date of finding cease to be necessary, then (1) if such finding is made within 30 days after the effective date of this act, no payments shall be made under the authority of this act with respect to such ores, metals, or minerals, and (2) if such finding is made more than 30 days after the effective date of this act, no payments under the authority of this act shall be made with respect to such ores, metals, or minerals, produced after 1 year from the date of such finding: *Provided*, That in the event any such findings are amended by the Munitions Board to the effect that purchases of such ores, metals, or minerals have again become necessary for national security stockpile purposes the payment provisions of this act shall again become applicable subject to the limitations of this paragraph. All ores, concentrates, metals, and minerals on which payments are made shall meet minimum specifications determined by the Munitions Board for the national security stockpile.

(b) Production payments for any particular metals or minerals shall be in addition to the amount received per unit from other sources by the producer of the metal or mineral. Such payments shall not exceed the difference between the current market or ceiling price and (1) in the case of those metals that were produced under the Premium Price plan, an amount equal to the highest market price plus the highest production premiums received by any domestic producer during the calendar years 1942 to 1946, inclusive, and (2) in the case of other ores, metals, and minerals an amount equal to the highest amount paid any domestic producer for such ores, metals, and minerals during the calendar years 1942 to 1946, inclusive, by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or its subsidiaries or by other Government departments or agencies, such amounts specified in clauses (1) and (2) hereof to be adjusted by the Director in proportion to the changes in the Bureau of Labor Statistics wholesale price index of all commodities (1926 equals 100) since such highest sums or amounts were first offered or paid. Hereafter all maximum production payment limitations provided in this section shall be adjusted by the Director in proportion to each five-point change in the Bureau of Labor Statistics wholesale commodity price index of all commodities (1926 equals 100). These maximum limitations shall apply unless in the opinion of the Director with the approval of the Munitions Board, special additional consideration is necessary for the exploration or production of a particular metal or mineral, and in such case they may be exceeded.

(b) Production payments shall be made within the limitations defined in this act so as to encourage development, production, and conservation and provide adequate allowances for depreciation, amortization, and depletion and shall include a reasonable profit to the producer based upon efficiency and upon the values of all recoverable metals and minerals contained in the ores, excluding values of crushed rock or waste materials.

(c) At the discretion of the Director production payments payable on the production of any mine may be withheld during such times as the Director may find any of the following conditions to exist: (1) The producer is utilizing his labor force in mining lower grade ores than is normal for the particular mine being worked, (2) the producer is attracting labor to his mine by paying wage scales or contract rates in excess of those normal in mining operations to his district, and (3) there has been no decrease in grade of ore and production payments have not resulted in an increase in the output of strategic and critical ores, metals, or minerals in the local district.

(d) In computing the amounts of production payments no allowance shall be made for royalties in excess of 10 percent of the market price. It shall be a condition of the making of all production and exploration payments that the recipients thereof shall pay no royalties on exploration payments whatsoever, and shall pay no royalties on production payments except with the approval of the Director and where the landowner shares in the expense of transportation, milling, and smelting of ores sufficiently to justify computation of royalty on total receipts of the producer

SEC 5. (a) Exploration payments should be made to potential producers or producers of those ores, metals, or minerals on which production payments are payable on the following bases:

(1) Upon application to the Division by any bona fide operator in an amount not to exceed $1,500 per month for each mine or prospect.

(2) Upon application to the Division for particular projects in amounts to be approved by the Director

(b) Exploration payments received shall not be commingled with other funds and shall be subject to postaudit.

(c) Exploration payments shall be expended only in search for new ore deposits or for extension of known ore deposits

SEC 6 (a) In addition to the other powers and duties created by this act, the General Services Administration, Emergency Procurement Services, with the approval of Director may enter into such contracts including the establishment of revolving funds as would aid in effectuating the policies of this act

(b) All additional ores, metals, and minerals the production of which is wholly dependent upon production payments as provided herein shall be purchased at the market or ceiling price by the General Services

Administration, Emergency Procurement Services. The General Services Administration, Emergency Procurement Services, shall transfer such ores, metals, and minerals to the national security stockpile established pursuant to Public Law 520 (79th Cong., ch. 590, 2d sess.); *Provided*, That any producer may deliver an equivalent quantity of recoverable metal in form and grade satisfactory to the General Services Administration, Emergency Procurement Services, in lieu of the particular metal or mineral resulting from payments hereunder; *Provided also*, That the Administrator of the Defense Material Procurement Agency may, when in his opinion a critical industrial shortage of such ores, metals, and minerals exists, order all or any part of such additional production sold on the open market instead of transferring it to the national security stockpile.

(c) The General Services Administration shall be reimbursed out of stockpile funds appropriated under Public Law 520 (79th Cong., ch. 590, 2d sess.), to the extent of the current market price for all ores, metals, and minerals placed in the national security stockpile under this section.

(d) Each producer shall at all times have access to a complete file on all copies of all calculations and analyses and all other information or determinations used as a basis for his individual assignment, revision, or denial of production payments and exploration payments.

(e) Copies of all rules, regulations, and policies and changes therein shall be furnished to each producer registered with the division and shall be published in the Federal Register.

SEC. 7. (a) All disbursements for exploration and production payments as authorized by this act shall be made by the General Services Administration, Emergency Procurement Services, and shall not exceed $100,000,000 in any one year.

(b) The provisions of paragraph (a) of this section shall expire June 30, 1956

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated sums sufficient to carry out the provisions of this act.

The statement presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

There is widespread dissatisfaction the way our Government programs for the production of domestic minerals and metals are progressing. Outside of the granting of certificates of rapid amortization, which does not help most of the small and marginal miners, the exploration program is the only one which has shown any tangible results worth speaking of.

The manganese purchase depots are not functioning, the chrome depot at Grants Pass has purchased less than 2,000 tons. The manganese purchase depot for black manganese located at Deming, N. Mex., is only now being organized and it is too far away from other manganese-producing centers to do any good. The purchase depots for pink manganese at Philipsburg and Butte, in Montana, have been under negotiation for nearly a year and are not yet ready to operate.

The tungsten program is priced so that it does not return an operating profit to the domestic small or marginal mine with the usual grade of ore commonly found in domestic deposits and consequently the results are negligible.

Copper, lead, and zinc, and other metal and mineral prices are rising step by step and contributing to the general inflation without appreciably increasing either imports or domestic production. I have protested to the Office of Price Stabilization without avail.

This afternoon, I have introduced a new version of my mine incentive payment bill, placing the operation within the jurisdiction of my friend Jess Larson, Administrator of the new Defense Materials Procurement Agency. I feel strongly that, in spite of various announcements that all responsibility for the various mineral programs is now centered in Mr. Larson, he actually does not have the necessary authority for final and independent action and I have so informed President Truman. My new bill, I am sure, will immediately stimulate domestic mining to the point of maximum production, bringing into operation hundreds of mines producing a long list of strategic and critical minerals.

It would liberalize the present exploration program, which has many fatal deficiencies which have resulted in granting less than 200 projects in nearly a year and a half out of more than a thousand applications. There would be many more applications were more miners able to qualify, as they can under my bill, and the projects would be infinitely easier to get under way.

Under this new bill the stabilization price lines could be held, the mine operators will get adequate returns for their capital outlays and efforts, and there is a proviso which will put more metals into industry

Actually, the context of this bill could be written into an Executive order, as the Defense Production Act gives the Government ample authority to do so, could the agencies get together on a sensible program. I have asked numerous times that this be done, without getting results.

Therefore, I have introduced the plan, which was well-tested during the last war, as a separate bill and I trust the Congress and American industry will get solidly behind it so that our resources can be fully utilized.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R 404 An act to amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R 625 An act for the relief of Col. Harry F Cunningham;

H. R 654. An act for the relief of Ivo Cerne;

H. R. 773. An act for the relief of Mering Bichara;

H R 814 An act for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein;

H R 850. An act for the relief of Mary Isumi;

H R. 948 An act to provide for terms of court to be held at West Palm Beach, and at Fort Myers, in the southern district of Florida;

H R 980 An act for the relief of Kikue Uchida;

H. R. 1131. An act for the relief of Edward C. Brunett;

H. R. 1851. An act for the relief of Ark Ping Jee Nong (Ngon);

H. R. 1962. An act for the relief of Wanda R. Barnett;

H. R. 1964. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Central Division of the Southern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Bernard R. Novak,

H. R. 2072. An act for the relief of Jeremiah Coleman;

H. R. 2169. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Homer G. Hamilton;

H. R. 2506. An act for the relief of Masunari Saito and Isao Saito;

H. R. 2547. An act for the relief of Yoshiko Ito;

H. R. 2589. An act for the relief of Sor Matilde Sotelo Fernandez, Sor Virtudes Garcia Garcia, and Sor Amalia Gonzales Gonzales;

H. R. 2590. An act for the relief of José M. Thomasa-Sanchez, his wife, Adela Durán Cuevas de Thomasa, and his child, José María Thomasa Duran;

H. R. 3006. An act for the relief of the Antonio Corrao Corp.;

H. R. 3060. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Commerce Trust Co.;

H. R. 3137. An act for the relief of O. L. Osteen;

H. R. 3153. An act for the relief of Signa Angela Maino Cristallo;

H. R. 3428. An act for the relief of Mitsuo Arita;

H. R. 3666. An act for the relief of Dorothy Kilmer Nickerson;

H. R. 3946. An act for the relief of Master Sgt. Orval Bennett;

H. R. 4318. An act for the relief of Allen W. Spangler;

H R. 4567. An act for the relief of Roy Sakai;

H. R. 4645. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marguerite A. Brumell;

H R 4671 An act for the relief of Mark Paul Crowley;

H R. 4687. An act to provide for the withholding of certain patents that might be detrimental to the national security, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4922. An act for the relief of Patricia Ann Eddings;

H R. 4929. An act for the relief of Michael Bernard (Cervera);

H R. 4930. An act for the relief of Charles H. Craft;

H. R 4940 An act for the relief of Suzie Ballard,

H. R. 4969. An act for the relief of Susa Yukiko Thomason;

H. R. 5104. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inge L. Curtis;

H. R. 5267. An act for the relief of Gertrude O. Yerxa, Mrs. G. Olive Yerxa, and Dr. Charles W Yerxa;

H. R. 5317. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the George H. Whike Construction Co., of Canton, Ohio; and

H. J. Res. 326. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to certain attorneys employed by the House Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1638. An act to facilitate the management of the National Park System and miscellaneous areas administered in connection with that system, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2398. An act to amend Public Law 848, Eighty-first Congress, second session;

H. R. 4197. An act to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian home lands required for the use of the Board of Water Supply of the city and county of Honolulu for the location of a water shaft, pump station, and tunnel, and to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, so as to confer upon certain lands of Auwaiolimu, Kewalo-Uka, and Kalawahine, on the Island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, the status of Hawaiian home lands; and

H. R. 4409. An act to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for public or private lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2604. An act to authorize the appointment of Sidney F. Mashbir, colonel, Army of the United States, to the permanent grade of colonel in the Regular Army;

H R. 3548. An act to provide that payments to States and Territories for care given to certain disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States shall be effective from the date such care commenced;

H. R. 4049. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts certain lands and improvements comprising the Castle

Island Terminal Facility at South Boston in exchange for certain other lands;

H. R. 5062. An act to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status; and

H. R 5405. An act to amend section 207 (a) of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H R 3368. An act providing for the conveyance of the Bear Lake Fish Cultural Station to the Fish and Game Commission of the State of Utah; and

H R 4808 An act to provide for the granting of an easement for a public road through the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge in Dare County, N C.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H R 3981. An act to amend the act of July 8, 1943 (57 Stat. 388), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

H R 5593 An act authorizing the Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority, hereby created, and its successors, to construct, maintain, and operate bridges over Sabine Lake, at or near Port Arthur, Tex., to construct, maintain, and operate all causeways, approaches, and appurtenances pertaining thereto, and to finance said objects by the issuance of bonds secured by the said properties and income and revenues; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. FERGUSON:

Statement made by the President at a press conference regarding the Executive order to govern the handling of information, and the discussion at the conference.

By Mr. NIXON

Statement prepared by him concerning the investigation by the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments into the activities of William M Boyle, Jr., and Guy Gabrielson.

An American Creed, prepared by a group of Sierra Madre, Calif., business and professional men.

Statement by Col. S. H Bingham, chairman of the Board of Transportation of the City of New York, regarding the solution of transit problems.

Article entitled "The Strange Story of the Hollywood Ten," written by Victor Lasky.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Statement by himself before a conference of southern Democrat and northern Republican leaders regarding realinement of political parties.

Religious liberty report of the Illinois State Council, Knights of Columbus.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Address delivered by Paul A. Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, at their kick-off luncheon in the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., on Monday, October 8, 1951.

By Mr. JENNER:

Article entitled "Obit for a Congressman," published in Human Events for October 3, 1951, discussing the death of the late Representative Karl Stefan.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Article entitled "Not by a Dam Site," written by Alfred M. Green, and published in the October 1951 issue of the Machinists' Monthly Journal.

Article entitled "California's Dewey Anderson," written by Benton J. Stong, and published in the September 1951 issue of Frontier magazine

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Article entitled "Capitol Stuff," written by John O'Donnell and published in the New York News of October 5, 1951.

By Mr. LANGER:

Editorial entitled "The Russians Don't Like Being Encircled, Either," published in the Hartford Courant of February 19, 1951.

By Mr THYE:

Statement on United States policy in Asia, made on October 8, 1951, by Harold E Stassen before the Sparkman subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Editorial entitled "Stassen on Asia," published in the St Paul Dispatch of October 2, 1951.

By Mr. WILEY:

Transcript of interviews with young people in the program American Youth Forum, discussing problems of youth, broadcast from the Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D C., October 6, 1951.

By Mr McMAHON:

Article by John D Hickerson presenting the affirmative in a debate on the question "Should the U. S A. ratify the Genocide Treaty?"

By Mr. O'CONOR:

Article published in the Baltimore Sun of October 5, 1951, paying tribute to Dr E Paul Knotts as Maryland's family doctor for 1951.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH—CORRECTION

Mr BRIDGES. Mr. President, I recently inserted in the RECORD a statement signed by 25 Senators relating to attempts to suppress freedom of speech. My good friend the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] had signed the statement along with the original 25 Senators. Inadvertently, through a mechanical error, his name was omitted from the original statement. In order to do justice to the distinguished Senator I want to make this correction. Tomorrow or at a subsequent date when the matter is reintroduced with all the additional names affixed, the correction will appear; but, in the meantime, I wanted to apologize for the original error and make this correction

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON I thank the Senator from New Hampshire

JOSEPH ROSIER, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, West Virginia and the Nation have been saddened by the news of the death on Sunday, at the age of 81, of Dr. Joseph Rosier, a distinguished Member of the United States Senate from West Virginia a decade ago and an educator of national and international reputation.

Dr. Rosier was born in Harrison County, W. Va., at the town of Wilsonburg, on January 24, 1870. He attended the West Virginia public schools and in 1895 was graduated from Salem, W. Va., College. He had already begun his service as a teacher, first in the village school at Bristol, W. Va., in 1890, when he was only 20, then as principal of the public schools of Salem in 1891 and 1892, and superintendent of the schools of Harrison County in 1893 and 1894. He was a member of the faculty of Salem College in 1894–96.

Dr. Rosier gave long and devoted service to the cause of education in West Virginia. He was a teacher in the State normal school at Glenville in 1896 and 1897, and a member of the faculty of the State Teachers College at Fairmont in 1897–1900.

For the first 15 years of the present century—the decade and a half from 1900 to 1915—he served as superintendent of schools of Fairmont, W. Va.

In 1915, Dr. Rosier became president of the Fairmont State College and served for 30 years, until 1945, when he became president emeritus. During the First World War he served as county food administrator, in 1917 and 1918. In the years 1933–37 he gave of his ability as consultant on education for the Works Progress Administration.

Dr. Rosier, who was appointed to the United States Senate by my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], who was then Governor of West Virginia, served from January 1941 to November 1942, and later served in the West Virginia House of Delegates.

His was a long and distinguished and honored career, and his country and his State are the poorer for his passing.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

Mr. McKELLAR Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5215, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, with the understanding that as soon as consideration of the appropriation bill is completed, the Senate will resume consideration of Senate bill 1203, providing for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the distinguished Senator will yield for a quorum call.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, indeed. The Senator has a right to suggest the absence of a quorum at any time.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would the Senator rather have the quorum call before taking up the appropriation bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should prefer to have it before.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	Kerr
Bennett	George	Kilgore
Benton	Gillette	Knowland
Brewster	Green	Langer
Bridges	Hayden	Lehman
Butler, Md.	Hendrickson	Magnuson
Cain	Hennings	Malone
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Case	Hill	McCarran
Chavez	Hoey	McClellan
Clements	Holland	McFarland
Connally	Humphrey	McKellar
Cordon	Hunt	McMahon
Dirksen	Ives	Millikin
Dworshak	Jenner	Monroney
Ecton	Johnson, Colo.	Moody
Ellender	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Frear	Kefauver	Murray

Neely	Smathers	Underwood
Nixon	Smith, Maine	Watkins
O'Conor	Smith, N. J.	Welker
Robertson	Smith, N. C.	Wiley
Russell	Sparkman	Williams
Saltonstall	Stennis	Young
Schoeppel	Thye	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I renew my unanimous-consent request that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5215, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Chapter I—District of Columbia—Office of Civil Defense—Salaries and expenses," on page 2, line 15, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "234,000" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter III—Legislative branch," on page 3, after line 2, to insert:

SENATE

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Office of the Secretary: For an additional amount (effective on the first day of the first month following enactment of this act) to increase the basic salary of parliamentarian from $8,000 to $12,500 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; and for the basic salary of assistant parliamentarian to be selected by the parliamentarian, $5,940; $7,120, and the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1952 hereby is amended accordingly.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "House of Representatives," on page 3, after line 14, to insert:

For payment to Eleanor M. Fellows, widow of Frank Fellows, late a Representative from the State of Maine, $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 17, to insert:

For payment to Winifred Gillette, widow of Wilson D. Gillette, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 20, to insert:

For payment to Ruth M. Vaughn, widow of Albert C. Vaughn, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 4, to insert:

For payment to Ida Stefan, widow of Karl Stefan, late a Representative from the State of Nebraska, $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses of the House," on page 4, after line 11, to insert:

For payment to James C. Davis, contestee, for expenses incurred in the contested election case of Lowe versus Davis, as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $1,275.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 15, to insert:

For payment to Thomas B. Curtis, contestee, for expenses incurred in the contested election case of Karst versus Curtis, as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $1,460.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 19, to insert:

For payment to Raymond W. Karst, contestant, for expenses incurred in the contested election case of Karst versus Curtis, as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $1,889.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter III—Department of Justice," on page 6, after line 2, to insert:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $3,000,000; and appropriations granted under this head shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 50 additional passenger motor vehicles.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal prison system," on page 6, after line 8, to insert:

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Buildings and facilities," $400,000, for construction of a complete Federal jail at Anchorage, Alaska, on a site to be selected by the Attorney General.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 18, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Claims, Federal Airport Act

For an additional amount for "Claims, Federal Airport Act," $944,605, to remain available until June 30, 1953, as follows: Municipal Airport, Santa Fe., N. Mex., $71,444; Malcolm-McKinnon Airport, Glynn County, Ga., $36,340; Municipal Airport, Lakeview, Oreg., $16,627; Manteo Airport, Dare County, N C., $29,458; Municipal Airport, Shreveport, La., $238,281; Hyannis Municipal Airport, Barnstable, Mass., $45,136; Snohomish County Airport, Snohomish County, Wash., $38,886; New Castle County Airport, New Castle County, Del., $27,060; Municipal Airport, Watertown, S Dak., $66,747; Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Oreg., $4,017; Cut Bank Municipal Airport, Cut Bank and Glacier County, Mont., $32,836; Municipal Airport, Long Beach, Calif., $200,679; Municipal Airport, Lewiston and Fergus County, Mont., $58,558; Simmons-Nott Airport, Newbern, N. C., $78,536.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 16, to insert:

THE JUDICIARY

OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

Fees of commissioners

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1951, for "Fees of commissioners," $70,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter IV, title I, Treasury Department," on page 8, after line 7, to insert:

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For an additional amount for "Administering the public debt, $1,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation shall be used for advertising the savings-bond program by press, radio, or television.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the amendment, proposed by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, includes the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of this or any other appropriation shall be used for advertising the savings-bond program by press, radio, or television.

I believe that proviso is rather important. It seems to me that at the present time it is most necessary that we shall be able to have the bond sales conducted effectively. In that connection, I believe that freedom of action in bringing the bond-selling program to the prospective buying public is really

more important than the exact amount of the appropriation made available for that purpose.

For that reason, I move to eliminate the proviso included in the amendment, namely:

Provided, That no part of this or any other appropriation shall be used for advertising the savings-bond program by press, radio, or television.

I also move, in line 11, to reduce the figure "$1,000,000" to "$500,000." The Treasury Department already has been provided with more than $5,000,000 in the regular bill, and I think half a million dollars extra at this time would be sufficient.

As I have said, I believe it to be advisable to eliminate the proviso now included in the committee amendment, so that the Department may proceed within reasonable limitations to put across the savings bond program in any way it can.

Mr McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to make a suggestion to the Senator from New Hampshire. How would it do to reduce the amount by $500,000, but leave the proviso in the amendment, so that the conferees could work out the matter? I think there is reason in what the Senator has said.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator from Tennessee repeat that suggestion, please?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly. The Senator from New Hampshire has offered an amendment to the committee amendment. His amendment to the committee amendment is virtually in two parts. The first part is to strike out "$1,000,000" in line 11, and insert in lieu thereof "$500,000"; and the second part of his amendment to the committee amendment is to eliminate the proviso beginning in line 11.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire that, inasmuch as the committee has directed that the proviso be inserted, it would be best to retain the proviso and take that part of the committee amendment to conference; but I am perfectly willing to have the "$1,000,000" in line 11 reduced to "$500,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. I would be perfectly willing to have that amendment taken to conference. However, does the Senator from Tennessee have in mind that at the conference there will be discussed the policy in connection with the sales of savings bonds?

Mr McKELLAR. That question certainly will be discussed.

Mr. BRIDGES. So far as I am concerned, I would be willing to withdraw the part of my amendment calling for the elimination of the proviso contained in the committee amendment, but I still would reduce the figure "$1,000,000" in line 11 of the committee amendment to "$500,000", and take the committee amendment as thus amended to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire to the committee amendment on page 8, after line 7.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let me inquire why the Senator from New Hampshire wishes to reduce the amount by half.

Mr. BRIDGES. Because the Treasury Department has already received appropriations of more than $5,000,000 in the regular appropriation bill. I think that the important question is not the exact amount of money that is used for this purpose, but whether the money is used effectively. In other words, some persons in the Department have called my attention to ways in which substantial sums of money could be saved in connection with this program, which includes invitations to certain persons in various parts of the country to come to Washington.

If $500,000 is actually needed for this purpose at this time, I would not oppose appropriating it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I may say that both Senators will be on the conference committee, and I am sure the conference committee will consider the item carefully.

Mr. BRIDGES. The House committee cut it out entirely.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am trying to arrive at a reasonable figure.

Mr. HAYDEN In view of the attitude of the House, I think the proposed $500,000 reduction probably would be adjusted on the showing the Senator has in mind.

This much I do know—and I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire will agree with me—that a great many bonds will have to be sold.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. That is why I wish to eliminate the proviso in regard to the method of promoting sales through advertising. I think the Department should have considerable leeway in that respect.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. No doubt the Senator is aware that various advertisers give free time, free space, and so forth, if the mats and some script are prepared. For that reason, I take the same position that the Senator from New Hampshire does, namely, that it is best to eliminate the proviso now included in the committee amendment. We have already cut the budget estimate from $2,000,000 to $1,000,000, and I would be inclined to go along with that, too. However, by the proposed curtailment, we might be killing the goose that lays the golden egg of advertising.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am afraid that the proviso now contained in the committee amendment would be interpreted as preventing the preparation of the mats for advertisements which are carried free of charge. The proviso might not be interpreted in that way, but there is a serious question of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the matter should go to conference, and I am in favor of having that done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire to the committee amendment on page 8, after line 7.

The amendment, as modified, to the amendment was agreed to

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1951

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to House bill 5113, which was read as follows.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U S ,
October 5, 1951.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H R 5113) entitled "An act to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security," and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. In lieu of the matter proposed in the Senate amendment insert the following:

"*Resolved*, That this act may be cited as the 'Mutual Security Act of 1951'

"SEC. 2. The Congress declares it to be the purpose of this act to maintain the security and to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing military, economic, and technical assistance to friendly countries to strengthen the mutual security and individual and collective defenses of the free world, to develop their resources in the interest of their security and independence and the national interest of the United States and to facilitate the effective participation of those countries in the United Nations system for collective security. The purposes of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1571-1604), the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U S C. 1501-1522), and the Act for International Development (22 U S C. 1557) shall hereafter be deemed to include this purpose.

"TITLE I—EUROPE

"SEC 101. (a) In order to support the freedom of Europe through assistance which will further the carrying out of the plans for defense of the North Atlantic area, while at the same time maintaining the economic stability of the countries of the area so that they may meet their responsibilities for defense, and to further encourage the economic unification and the political federation of Europe, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1952 for carrying out the provisions and accomplishing the policies and purpose of this act—

"(1) not to exceed $5,028,000,000 for assistance pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U S. C. 1571-1604), for countries which are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and for any country of Europe (other

than a country covered by another title of this Act), which the President determines to be of direct importance to the defense of the North Atlantic area and whose increased ability to defend itself the President determines is important to the preservation of the peace and security of the North Atlantic area and to the security of the United States (any such determination to be reported forthwith to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives), and not to exceed $100,000,000 of such appropriation for any selected persons who are residing in or escapees from the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, or the Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied areas of Germany and Austria, and any other countries absorbed by the Soviet Union either to form such persons into elements of the military forces supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or for other purposes, when it is similarly determined by the President that such assistance will contribute to the defense of the North Atlantic area and to the security of the United States. In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the purposes of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, through assistance to any of the countries covered by this paragraph are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this paragraph. Section 408 (c) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1579), is hereby repealed

"(2) not to exceed $1,022,000,000 for assistance pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501-1522) (including assistance to further European military production), for any country of Europe covered by paragraph (1) of this subsection and for any other country covered by section 103 (a) of the said Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended. In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this paragraph: *Provided*, That not to exceed $10,000,000 of the funds made available pursuant to this paragraph may be utilized to effectuate the principles set forth in section 115 (e) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

"(b) Not to exceed 10 percent of the total of the appropriations granted pursuant to this section may be transferred, when determined by the President to be necessary for the purpose of this act, between appropriations granted pursuant to either paragraph of subsection (a): *Provided*, That the amount herein authorized to be transferred shall be determined without reference to any balances of prior appropriations continued available pursuant to this section: *Provided further*, That, whenever the President makes any such determination, he shall forthwith notify the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

"TITLE II—NEAR EAST AND AFRICA

"SEC. 201. In order to further the purpose of this act by continuing to provide military assistance to Greece, Turkey, and Iran, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $396,250,000 for furnishing assistance to Greece and Turkey pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 22, 1947, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1401-1410), and for furnishing assistance to Iran pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1571-1604). In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for assistance to Greece and Turkey, available for the fiscal year 1951, pursuant to the act of May 22, 1947, as amended, and for assistance to Iran pursuant to the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section.

"SEC. 202. Whenever the President determines that such action is essential for the purpose of this act, he may provide assistance, pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, to any country of the Near East area (other than those covered by section 201) and may utilize not to exceed 10 percent of the amount made available (excluding balances of prior appropriations continued available) pursuant to section 201 of this act: *Provided*, That any such assistance may be furnished only upon determination by the President that (1) the strategic location of the recipient country makes it of direct importance to the defense of the Near East area, (2) such assistanc is of critical importance to the defense of the free nations, and (3) the immediately increased ability of the recipient country to defend itself is important to the preservation of the peace and security of the area and to the security of the United Staets

"SEC. 203. In order to further the purpose of this act in Africa and the Near East, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $160,000,000 for economic and technical assistance in Africa and the Near East in areas other than those covered by section 103 (a) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U S C. 1501-1522), and of the Act for International Development (22 U S C. 1557).

"SEC. 204. Not to exceed $50,000,000 of the funds authorized under section 203 hereof may be contributed to the United Nations during the fiscal year 1952, for the purposes, and under the provisions, of the United Nations Palestine Refugee Aid Act of 1950 (22 U. S. C. 1556): *Provided*, That, whenever the President shall determine that it would more effectively contribute to the purposes of the said United Nations Palestine Refugee Aid Act of 1950, he may allocate any part of such funds to any agency of the United States Government to be utilized in furtherance of the purposes of said act and any amount so allocated shall be a part of the United States contribution to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and shall be so credited by said Agency.

"SEC. 205. In order to assist in the relief of refugees coming into Israel, not to exceed $50,000,000 of the funds authorized under section 203 hereof may be utilized during the fiscal year 1952, under such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe, for specific refugee relief and resettlement projects in Israel.

"TITLE III—ASIA AND PACIFIC

"SEC. 301. In order to carry out in the general area of China (including the Republic of the Philippines and the Republic of Korea) the provisions of subsection (a) of section 303 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1604 (a)), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $535,250,000. In addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the provisions of title III of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1602-1604), are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section. Not to exceed $50,000,000 of funds appropriated pursuant to this section (excluding balances of appropriations continued available) may be accounted for as provided in subsection (a) of said section 303.

"SEC. 302. (a) In order to further the purpose of this act through the strengthening of the area covered in section 301 of this act (but not including the Republic of Korea), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $237,500,000 for economic and technical assistance in those portions of such area which the President deems to be not under Communist control. Funds appropriated pursuant to authority of this section shall be available under the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501-1522), and of the Act for International Development (22 U. S. C. 1557). In addition, unexpended balances of funds heretofore made available for carrying out the purposes of the China Area Aid Act of 1950 (22 U S. C. 1547), are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section.

"(b) The third proviso of section 202 of the China Area Aid Act of 1950 is amended by inserting 'and of Korea' after 'selected citizens of China' the first time it appears therein.

"SEC. 303. (a) In order to provide for a United States contribution to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, established by the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations of December 1, 1950, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed $45,000,000. In addition, unobligated balances of the appropriations heretofore made, and available during the fiscal year 1951, for assistance to Korea under authority of the Far Eastern Economic Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1543, 1551, 1552), are hereby authorized to be continued available through June 30, 1952, and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by this section. Not to exceed 50 percent of the total of the appropriations authorized by this section may, when determined by the President to be necessary for the purpose of this act, be transferred to and consolidated with the appropriation authorized by paragraph 302 (a).

"(b) The sums made available pursuant to subsection (a) may be contributed from time to time on behalf of the United States in such amounts as the President determines to be appropriate to support those functions of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency which the military situation in Korea permits the agency to undertake pursuant to arrangements between the agency and the United Nations Unified Command. The aggregate amount which may be contributed on behalf of the United States pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be reduced by the value of goods and services made available to Korea by any department or agency of the United States for relief and economic assistance after the assumption of responsibility for relief and rehabilitation operations in Korea by the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency.

"(c) The provisions of subsections 304 (a) and (b) of the United Nations Palestine Refugee Aid Act of 1950 (22 U. S. C. 1556 (b)) are hereby made applicable with respect to Korean assistance furnished under this section.

"(d) Unencumbered balances of sums heretofore or hereafter deposited in the spe-

cial account established pursuant to paragraph (2) of article V of the agreement of December 10, 1948, between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea (62 Stat., pt. 3, 3788) shall be used in Korea for such purposes as the President determines to be consistent with United Nations programs for assistance to Korea and as may be agreed to between the Government of the United States and the Republic of Korea.

"(e) The function of the Administrator for Economic Cooperation under the provisions of section 3 of the Far Eastern Economic Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (22 U S C 1551), shall hereafter be performed by such departments or agencies of the Government as the President shall direct.

"TITLE IV—AMERICAN REPUBLICS

"SEC. 401 In order to further the purpose of this act through the furnishing of military assistance to the other American Republics, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $38,150,000 for carrying out the purpose of this section under the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended *Provided*, That such assistance may be furnished only in accordance with defense plans which are found by the President to require the recipient country to participate in missions important to the defense of the Western Hemisphere. Any such assistance shall be subject to agreements, as provided herein and as required by section 402 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1940, as amended (22 U S C. 1673), designed to assure that the assistance will be used to promote the defense of the Western Hemisphere; and after agreement by the Government of the United States and the country concerned with respect to such missions, military assistance hereunder shall be furnished only in accordance with such agreement.

"SEC 402. In order to further the purpose of this act among the peoples of the American Republics through the furnishing of technical assistance, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1952, not to exceed $21,250,000 for assistance under the provisions of the Act for International Development (22 U S C 1557) and of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act, as amended (22 U. S C. 281).

"TITLE V—ORGANIZATION AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

"UNIFIED DIRECTION OF PROGRAM

"SEC 501 (a) In order that the programs of military, economic, and technical assistance authorized by this act may be administered as parts of a unified program in accordance with the intent of Congress and to fix responsibility for the coordination and supervision of these programs in a single person, the President is authorized to appoint in the Executive Office of the President a Director for Mutual Security The Director, on behalf of the President and subject to his direction, shall have primary responsibility for—

"(1) continuous supervision and general direction of the assistance programs under this act to the end that such programs shall be (A) effectively integrated both at home and abroad, and (B) administered so as to assure that the defensive strength of the free nations of the world shall be built as quickly as possible on the basis of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid;

"(2) preparation and presentation to the Congress of such programs of foreign military, economic, and technical assistance as may be required in the interest of the security of the United States;

"(3) preparation for the President of the report to the Congress required by section 518 of this act.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided by this act, the Director shall not hold any other office or employment under the United States and shall not have any other responsibilities except those directly related to the coordination, supervision, and direction of the programs covered by this act or otherwise conferred upon him by law.

"(c) The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum.

"(d) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, the President is authorized to utilize the positions created in subsection 406 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended No person may serve in any such position under this subsection while at the same time he is an officer or employee of any other department or agency of the Government.

"(e) (1) The fourth paragraph of section 101 (a) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (50 U S. C 402 (a)), is amended by inserting after clause (4) the following:

" (5) the Director for Mutual Security,' and by renumbering clauses (5) and (6) thereof as clauses (6) and (7), respectively.

"(2) Section 4 (a) of Public Law 171, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended (59 Stat. 512), is amended by striking out 'Economic Cooperation Administration' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Mutual Security Agency' and by striking out 'Administrator for Economic Cooperation' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Director for Mutual Security '

"MUTUAL SECURITY AGENCY

"SEC 502 (a) The Economic Cooperation Administration and the offices of Administrator for Economic Cooperation, Deputy Administrator, United States special representative in Europe, and deputy special representative are hereby abolished.

"(b) To assist in carrying out the purpose of this act—

"(1) there is hereby established, with its principal office at the seat of the Government, a Mutual Security Agency, hereinafter referred to as the Agency, which shall be headed by the Director for Mutual Security, and

"(2) there shall be transferred to the Director the powers, functions, and responsibilities conferred upon the Administrator for Economic Cooperation by the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and by any other law, but no such powers, functions, and responsibilities shall be exercised after June 30, 1952, except as provided in subsection (c) of this section.

"(c) Not later than April 1, 1952, the President shall inform the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives which of the powers, functions, and responsibilities transferred to the Director by subsection (b) (2) are found by the President to be necessary to enable the Director after June 30, 1952, to carry out the duties conferred upon him by section 503 The termination provision of section 122 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, shall come into effect on June 30, 1952, and none of the powers, functions, and responsibilities conferred by that act shall be exercised after that date, except those powers, functions, and responsibilities found necessary to enable the Director to carry out the duties conferred on him by section 503 of this act, which powers, functions, and responsibilities unless otherwise provided by law shall continue in effect until June 30, 1954.

"ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF DIRECTOR FOR MUTUAL SECURITY

"SEC. 503. After June 30, 1952, the Director, on behalf of the President and subject to his direction, shall, in consultation with the Secretaries of State and Defense, continue to have primary responsibility for—

"(a) the development and administration of programs of assistance designed to sustain and increase military effort, including production, construction, equipment and matériel in each country or in groups of countries which receive United States military assistance;

"(b) the provision of such equipment, materials, commodities, services, financial, or other assistance as he finds to be necessary for carrying out mutual defense programs; and

"(c) the provision of limited economic assistance to foreign nations for which the United States has responsibility as a result of participation in joint control arrangements when the President finds that the provision of such economic assistance is in the interest of the security of the United States.

"APPOINTMENT AND TRANSFER OF PERSONNEL

"SEC. 504. (a) To carry out the functions conferred by sections 502 and 503 of this act, there shall be in the Agency a Deputy Director, a special representative in Europe, and a deputy special representative in Europe, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall have status and receive compensation comparable to the equivalent positions under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

"(b) Any personnel of the Economic Cooperation Administration, upon the certification of the Director for Mutual Security and with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that such personnel are necessary to carry out the functions of the Director for Mutual Security, and all records and property of such administration which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines are used primarily in the administration of the powers and functions transferred to the Director for Mutual Security by this act, shall be transferred to the Mutual Security Agency.

"(c) Of the personnel transferred to or employed by the Mutual Security Agency, not to exceed 50 may be compensated at rates higher than those provided for grade 15 of the general schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and of these, not to exceed 15 may be compensated at a rate in excess of the highest rate provided for grades of such general schedule but not in excess of $15,000 per annum. Such positions shall be in addition to the number authorized by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(d) On and after January 1, 1952, the number of United States citizens employed by the Mutual Security Agency shall be at least 10 percent less than the number employed by the Economic Cooperation Administration on August 31, 1951: *Provided*, That the Director for Mutual Security shall cause studies to be made from time to time for the purpose of determining whether further reductions in personnel are feasible and consistent with the accomplishment of the purposes of this act.

"THE SECRETARY OF STATE

"SEC. 505. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to infringe upon the powers or functions of the Secretary of State.

"THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

"SEC 506. (a) In the case of aid under this act for military end items and related technical assistance and advice, the Secretary of Defense shall have primary responsibility and authority for—

"(1) the determination of military end-item requirements;

"(2) the procurement of military equipment in a manner which permits its integration with service programs;

"(3) the supervision of end-item use by the recipient countries;

"(4) the supervision of the training of foreign military personnel; and

"(5) the movement and delivery of military end items.

"(b) The establishment of priorities in the procurement, delivery, and allocation of military equipment shall be determined by the Secretary of Defense. The apportionment of funds between countries shall be determined by the President.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the fiscal year 1952 the Secretary of Defense may furnish (subject to reimbursement from funds appropriated pursuant to this act) military assistance out of the materials of war whose production in the United States shall have been authorized for, and appropriated to, the Department of Defense: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this act shall authorize the furnishing of military items under this subsection in excess of $1,000,000,000 in value. For the purposes of this subsection (1) 'value' shall be determined in accordance with section 403 (c) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, and (2) the term 'materials of war' means those goods, commonly known as military items, which are required for the performance of their missions by armed forces of a nation, including weapons, military vehicles, ships of war under 1,500 tons, aircraft, military communications equipment, ammunition, maintenance parts and spares, and military hardware.

"OVERSEAS COORDINATION

"SEC 507. The President shall prescribe appropriate procedures to assure coordination among representatives of the United States Government in each country, under the leadership of the Chief of the United States Diplomatic Mission.

"RELATIONSHIP TO TECHNICAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION AND INSTITUTE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

"SEC 503 Nothing in this act shall be construed to modify the provisions of section 412 of the act for international development or the provisions of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act.

"DETAILS OF PERSONNEL TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 509. Whenever the President determines it to be consistent with and in furtherance of the purpose of this act, the head of any Government agency is authorized to—

"(a) detail or assign any officer or employee of his agency to any office or position to which no compensation is attached with any foreign government or foreign government agency: *Provided*, That such acceptance of office shall in no case involve the taking of an oath of allegiance to another government; and

"(b) detail, assign, or otherwise make available to any international organization in which the United States participates, any officer or employee of his agency to serve with or as a member of the international staff of such organizations.

Any such officer or employee, while so assigned or detailed, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his privileges, rights, seniority, or other benefits as such, an officer or employee of the Government of the United States and of the Government agency from which assigned or detailed, and he shall continue to receive compensation, allowances, and benefits from funds made available to that agency out of funds authorized under this act.

"SECURITY CLEARANCE

"SEC. 510. No citizen or resident of the United States may be employed, or if already employed, may be assigned to duties by the Director or the Secretary of State under this act or the act for international development for a period to exceed 3 months unless (a) such individual has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report thereon has been made to the Director or the Secretary of State, as the case may be, and until the Director or the Secretary of State has certified in writing (and filed copies thereof with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs) that, after full consideration of such report, he believes such individual is loyal to the United States, its Constitution, and form of government, and is not now and has never been a member of any organization advocating contrary views; or (b) such individual has been investigated by a military intelligence agency and the Secretary of Defense has certified in writing that he believes such individual is loyal to the United States and filed copies thereof with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. This section shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, nor shall it apply in the case of any person already employed under programs covered by this act who has been previously investigated in connection with such employment.

"ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 511. (a) No military, economic, or technical assistance authorized pursuant to this act (other than assistance provided under section 408 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended) shall be supplied to any nation in order to further military effort unless the President finds that the supplying of such assistance will strengthen the security of the United States and unless the recipient country has agreed to—

"(1) join in promoting international understanding and good will, and maintaining world peace,

"(2) take such action as may be mutually agreed upon to eliminate causes of international tension;

"(3) fulfill the military obligations which it has assumed under multilateral or bilateral agreements or treaties to which the United States is a party;

"(4) make, consistent with its political and economic stability, the full contribution permitted by its manpower, resources, facilities, and general economic condition to the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world:

"(5) take all reasonable measures which may be needed to develop its defense capacities; and

"(6) take appropriate steps to insure the effective utilization of the economic and military assistance provided by the United States

"(b) No economic or technical assistance shall be supplied to any other nation unless the President finds that the supplying of such assistance will strengthen the security of the United States and promote world peace, and unless the recipient country has agreed to join in promoting international understanding and good will, and in maintaining world peace, and to take such action as may be mutually agreed upon to eliminate causes of international tension.

"FUTURE AUTHORIZATIONS

"SEC. 512. In order to carry out the purpose of this act, with respect to those countries eligible to receive assistance as provided herein, funds shall be available as authorized and appropriated to the President each fiscal year.

"TRANSPORTATION BETWEEN TITLES

"SEC. 513. Whenever the President determines it to be necessary for the purpose of this act, not to exceed 10 percent of the funds made available under any title of this act may be transferred to and consolidated with funds made available under any other title of this act in order to furnish, to a different area, assistance of the kind for which such funds were available before transfer. Whenever the President makes any such determination, he shall forthwith notify the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. In the case of the transfer of funds available for military purposes, he shall also forthwith notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

"STRATEGIC MATERIALS

"SEC. 514. In order to promote the increased production, in areas covered by this act, of materials in which the United States is deficient, not to exceed $55,000,000 of the funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to section 101 (a) (2) of this act may be used pursuant to the authority contained in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501-1522).

"PROTECTION AGAINST ATTACHMENT

"SEC 515. All countries participating in any United States aid program or in any international organization receiving United States aid shall be required to so deposit, segregate, or assure title to all funds allocated to or derived from any program so that the same shall not be subject to garnishment, attachment, seizure, or other legal process by any person, firm, agency, corporation, organization, or government when in the opinion of the Director any such action would interfere with the attainment of the objectives of this act.

"ENCOURAGEMENT OF FREE ENTERPRISE

"SEC 516 It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that this act shall be administered in such a way as (1) to eliminate the barriers to, and provide the incentives for, a steadily increased participation of free private enterprise in developing the resources of foreign countries consistent with the policies of this act, (2) to the extent that it is feasible and does not interfere with the achievement of the purposes set forth in this act, to discourage the cartel and monopolistic business practices prevailing in certain countries receiving aid under this act which result in restricting production and increasing prices, and to encourage where suitable competition and productivity, and (3) to encourage where suitable the development and strengthening of the free labor union movements as the collective bargaining agencies of labor within such countries.

"PATENTS AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION

"SEC. 517 (a) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'invention' means an invention or discovery covered by a patent issued by the United States, and

"(2) the term 'information' means information originated by or peculiarly within the knowledge of the owner thereof and those in privity with him, which is not available to the public and is subject to protection as property under recognized legal principles.

"(b) Whenever, in connection with the furnishing of any assistance in furtherance of the purpose of this act—

"(1) use within the United States, without authorization by the owner, shall be made of an invention, or

"(2) damage to the owner shall result from the disclosure of information by reason of acts of the United States or its officers or employees,

the exclusive remedy of the owner of such invention or information shall be by suit against the United States in the Court of Claims or in the district court of the United States for the district in which such owner is a resident for reasonable and entire compensation for unauthorized use or disclosure. In any such suit the United States may avail itself of any and all defenses, general or special, that might be pleaded by any defendant in a like action.

"(c) Before such suit against the United States has been instituted, the head of the appropriate department or agency of the

Government, which has furnished any assistance in furtherance of the purpose of this act, is authorized and empowered to enter into an agreement with the claimant, in full settlement and compromise of any claim against the United States hereunder.

"(d) The provisions of the last sentence of section 1498 of title 28 of the United States Code shall apply to inventions and information covered by this section.

"(e) Except as otherwise provided by law, no recovery shall be had for any infringement of a patent committed more than 6 years prior to the filing of the complaint or counterclaim for infringement in the action, except that the period between the date of receipt by the Government of a written claim under subsection (c) above for compensation for infringement of a patent and the date of mailing by the Government of a notice to the claimant that his claim has been denied shall not be counted as part of the 6 years, unless suit is brought before the last-mentioned date.

"REPORTS

"SEC 518 The President, from time to time while funds appropriated for the purpose of this act continue to be available for obligation, shall transmit to the Congress, in lieu of any reports otherwise required by laws continued in effect by this act, reports covering each 6 months of operations in furtherance of the purpose of this act, except information the disclosure of which he deems incompatible with the security of the United States. The first such report shall cover the 6-month period commencing on the date this act becomes effective Reports provided for under this section shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, if the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, is not in session.

"LOCAL CURRENCY

"SEC 519 (a) Upon a determination by the Director that it will further the purpose of this act, not to exceed $10,000,000 of the funds made available pursuant to section 203 of this act and not to exceed $25,000,000 of funds made available pursuant to section 302 of this act may be advanced to countries covered by said sections in return for equivalent amounts of the currency of such countries being made available to meet local currency needs of the aid programs in such countries pursuant to agreements made in advance with the United States: *Provided*, That except when otherwise prescribed by the Director as necessary to the effective accomplishment of the aid programs in such countries, all funds so advanced shall be held under procedures set out in such agreements until used to pay for goods and services approved by the United States or until repaid to the United States for reimbursement to the appropriation from which drawn.

"(b) In order to assist in carrying out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, not to exceed $50,000,000 of funds made available under the authority of this act for assistance pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U S C 1501-1522), may be used to acquire local currency for the purpose of increasing the production of materials in which the United States is deficient.

"GUARANTIES

"SEC. 520. Funds realized from the sales of notes pursuant to section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, shall be available for making guaranties of investments in accordance with the applicable provisions of sections 111 (b) (3) and 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act, as amended, in any area in which assistance is authorized by this act.

"ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

"SEC. 521. Funds made available for carrying out the provisions of title I of this act shall be available for United States participation in the acquisition or construction of facilities in foreign countries for collective defense: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be expended for rental or purchase of land or for payment of taxes. Such funds shall also be available for the administrative expenses of carrying out the purposes of all of the titles of this act, including expenses incident to United States participation in international security organizations and expenses in the United States in connection with programs authorized under the Act for International Development Any currency of any nation received by the United States for its own use in connection with assistance furnished by the United States may be used by any agency of the Government without reimbursement from any appropriation for the administrative and operating expenses of carrying out the purpose of this act Funds made available for carrying out the purpose of this act in the Federal Republic of Germany may, as authorized in subsection 114 (h) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U S C. 1512 (h)), be transferred by the President to any department or agency for the expenses necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in the Federal Republic of Germany.

"LOANS

"SEC 522. Section 111 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S C 1501-1522), is hereby amended by adding a new paragraph as follows

"'(3) Of the assistance provided under the applicable provisions of this act with funds made available under the authority of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as great an amount (in no event less than 10 percent) as possible shall be provided on credit terms.'

"USE OF COUNTERPART

"SEC 523 Section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U S C. 1513 (b) (6)), is hereby amended by—

"(a) inserting in the second proviso thereof after 'wealth' the following: 'for the encouragement of emigration pursuant to subsection (e) of this section';

"(b) adding in the last clause of the second proviso 'and operating' after 'administrative',

"(c) striking from the last clause of the second proviso 'within such country';

"(d) substituting in the fourth proviso the words 'upon termination of assistance to such country under this act' in place of the words 'on June 30, 1952', and

"(e) adding at the end thereof the following new sentences. 'The Administrator shall exercise the power granted to him by this paragraph to make agreements with respect to the use of the funds deposited in the special accounts of "participating countries" (as defined in sec. 103 (a) hereof) and any other countries receiving assistance under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, in such a manner that the equivalent of not less than $500,000,000 of such funds shall be used exclusively for military production, construction, equipment, and matériel in such countries The amount to be devoted from each such special account for such use shall be agreed upon by the Administrator and the country or countries concerned'.

"RETURN OF EQUIPMENT

"SEC. 524. The President shall make appropriate arrangements with each nation receiving equipment or material under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (other than equipment or material furnished under terms requiring the nation to reimburse the United States in full therefor), for the return to the United States (1) for salvage or scrap, or (2) for such other disposition as the President shall deem to be in the interest of mutual security, of any such equipment or material as is no longer required for the purposes for which originally made available

"REIMBURSABLE AID

"SEC. 525. Section 408 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1580), is hereby amended by adding in the first proviso thereof, after the words 'of which it is a part', the words 'or in United Nations collective security arrangements and measures', and by changing the figure at the end of such section 408 (e) to '$500,000,000.'

"EXCESS EQUIPMENT

"SEC 526 The proviso in the first sentence of section 403 (d) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1574 (d)), is hereby amended to read as follows: '*Provided*, That after June 30, 1950, such limitation shall be increased by $250,000,000 and after June 30, 1951, by an additional $300,000,000'

"CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE EXPENSES

"SEC 527. Section 115 (h) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1513 (h)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'including local currency requirements of appropriate committees of the Congress engaged in carrying out their duties under section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946'

"UNITED NATIONS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC 528. The Act for International Development is amended—

"(a) by adding before the period at the end of section 404 (b) the following: ': *Provided*, That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, such contributions from funds made available under authority of sections 101 (a) (2), 203, 302, and 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 shall not exceed in the aggregate $13,000,000, and the use of such contributions shall not be limited to the area covered by the section of the act from which the funds are drawn'

"(b) by adding at the end of section 407 a new paragraph:

"'(d) Participating countries shall be encouraged to establish fair labor standards of wages and working conditions and management-labor relations.'

"(c) by repealing section 414.

"TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE BY PRESIDENT

"SEC 529 If the President determines that the furnishing of assistance to any nation —

"(a) is no longer consistent with the national interest or security of the United States or the policies and purpose of this act, or

"(b) would contravene a decision of the Security Council of the United Nations; or

"(c) would be inconsistent with the principle that members of the United Nations should refrain from giving assistance to any nation against which the Security Council or the General Assembly has recommended measures in case of a threat, to, or breach of, the peace, or act of aggression,

he shall terminate all or part of any assistance furnished pursuant to this act. The function conferred herein shall be in addition to all other functions heretofore conferred with respect to the termination of military, economic, or technical assistance.

"EXPIRATION OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 530. (a) After June 30, 1954, or after the date of the passage of a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of Congress before such date, none of the authority conferred by

this act or by the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1571-1604) may be exercised; except that during the 12 months following such date equipment, materials, commodities, and services with respect to which procurement for, shipment to, or delivery in a recipient country had been authorized prior to such date, may be transferred to such country, and funds appropriated under authority of this act may be obligated during such 12-month period for the necessary expenses of procurement, shipment, delivery, and other activities essential to such transfer and shall remain available during such period for the necessary expenses of liquidating operations under this act.

"(b) At such time as the President shall find appropriate after such date, and prior to the expiration of the 12 months following such date, the powers, duties, and authority conferred by this act and by the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, may be transferred for the purpose of liquidation to such other departments, agencies, or establishments of the Government as the President shall specify, and the relevant funds, records, property, and personnel may be transferred to the departments, agencies, or establishments to which the related functions are transferred.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 531. Sections 502 (a), (b) (2), and section 504 (b) of this act shall take effect on such date or dates as the President shall specify, but in no event later than 60 days after the date the Director first appointed takes office. Section 511 shall take effect 90 days after enactment of this act. All other provisions of this act shall take effect upon the date of its enactment."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the House rejected the conference report on a point of order with regard to only one item. The House thereupon adopted an amendment to the Senate amendment without that item, and it is now before the Senate.

I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat his motion, please? I could not quite hear it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have said that the conference report on the mutual security bill went back to the House of Representatives.

Mr. CASE. I understand that, but I did not understand the Senator's motion.

Mr. CONNALLY. I moved that the Senate agree to what the House has done, so as to end the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1950 TO INCREASE AMOUNT AVAILABLE AS EMERGENCY RELIEF FUND

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message from the House transmitting to the Senate House bill 5257, which has been passed by the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 5257) to amend section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), to increase the amount available as an emergency relief fund for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges damaged by floods, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, some days ago, the Senate passed a companion measure, which is identical with House bill 5257, but through mistake the House, instead of passing the Senate bill, passed its own bill.

The two bills are, as I have stated, identical. They increase from $5,000,000 to $15,000,000 the amount of contract authorizations which are available for the repair of primary-aid and secondary-aid roads damaged by floods. Of course the sums mentioned would cover the Federal Government's part, which is 50 percent in such cases.

The report of the Senate Committee on Public Works on the Senate bill was unanimous. The Senate has already passed its bill, and I ask, therefore, that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside in order that House bill 5257 may be promptly approved. It has to do with repairing the flood-damaged roads and highways, in Kansas and Missouri in particular.

Mr. CASE. Reserving the right to object, I may ask the distinguished Senator whether this is the matter which was presented to us and argued so ably by the Senators from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL and Mr. CARLSON]?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. Those Senators and their State have the most immediate and pressing interest in this fund, and I am sure that they and all other Senators would want these funds made immediately available, because the flood-damage work is now being held up until this bill can be enacted.

Mr. CASE. Is the increase provided in the amount the same for which they argued when they were speaking before the committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. Of course, the two distinguished Senators from Kansas would have liked to go further than this, as the Senator will recall, but the committee, after discussion, felt unanimously that the matter had better be kept on the traditional basis, so that the funds can be used only to pay the Federal Government's part in the repair of the damaged Federal-aid system roads, of either the primary or secondary system.

Mr. CASE. As I recall, the Senator is correct. The Senators from Kansas would have liked to go further. They regarded the situation as urgent, and since this could be done now without objection, they were in favor of doing this much, and then seeing what might be done in other ways later.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the request of the Senator from Florida that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5257) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 10, to insert:

TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the postal revenues)

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for "General administration, $1,315,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Postal operations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 16, to insert:

CLERKS, FIRST- AND SECOND-CLASS POST OFFICES

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Clerks, first- and second-class post offices, $600,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Clerks, third-class post offices, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the heading on page 9, line 22, after the word "Title", to strike out "II" and insert "III."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Reconstruction Finance Corporation," on page 10, line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$16,500,000" and insert "$17,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter V—Department of Labor—Bureau of Employment Security," on page 11, line 13, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$1,075,000" and insert "$1,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 25, after "(Public Law 78)", to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Security Agency—Office of Education—Payments to school districts," on page 12, line 12, after the word "districts", to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$5,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter VI—Department of the Interior—Bureau of Land Management," on page 12, line 18, after the figures "$2,000,000", to insert "and the limitation under this heading in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1952, on the amount available for personal services is increased by $650,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Indian Affairs," on page 12, line 2[illegible], after the figures "$300,000", to insert "and the limitation under this head in the Interior Department Appriation Act, 1952, on the amount available for personal services is increased by $56,980."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 2, to insert:

Construction: For an additional amount for "Construction," $575,000, to remain

available until expended; and the limitation under this head in the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act, 1952, on the amount available for personal services is increased by "$142,950": *Provided*, That no obligation shall be incurred under appropriations granted under this head for construction of school facilities at Ponemah, Minn., until school district number 45 of the State of Minnesota shall have deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation an amount equal to the proceeds of the insurance collected on the destroyed Ponemah school plant: *Provided further*, That balances in prior year appropriations under this head for acquisition of land may be used for purchase in the name of the United States in trust 20 acres of land in Placer County, Calif., for the use of the Indians of Auburn Rancheria.

The amendment was agreed to

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 18, to insert:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Construction and rehabilitation: For an additional amount for "Construction and rehabilitation," $2,285,000, to remain available until expended, of which $285,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund, and the limitation under this head in the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act, 1952, on the amount available for personal services is increased by $81,500.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, at the time the limitation in this item was adopted, which appears on page 14, line 2, of $81,500, no money had been included in this bill for the construction of the Palisades project in Idaho. Since $2,000,000 has been allowed for the construction of that project, the limitation on page 14, line 2, should be increased. I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. The Appropriations Committee has recommended that $2,000,000 be included in this bill for the Palisades project. On page 14, line 2, the limitation for personal services in the regular Interior Department appropriation bill is increased by $81,500 with respect to other construction projects in this bill, but in order to take care of the situation on the Palisades project, so that the construction may proceed, an increase should be made in the sum available for administrative personnel.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. HAYDEN. The information I have received from the Bureau of Reclamation was that the amount of $81,500 should be increased to $465,000. Is that agreeable to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. DWORSHAK. If the Senator will yield, it is my understanding that a certain amount of that is required for personal services. I think the committee, after having considered that proposal, is qualified to determine how much should be allocated for that purpose.

Mr. HAYDEN. In order to take the matter to conference, so that there may be no question about the limitation on administrative personnel, I move to strike out "$81,500" and insert "$465,500."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 2, to insert:

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Surveys, investigations, and research: For an additional amount for "Surveys, investigations, and research," $150,000, and the limitation under this head in the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act, 1952, on the amount available for personal services is increased by "$108,930."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 8, to insert:

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Investigation of resources: For an additional amount for "Investigations of Resources, $150,000, and the limitation under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1952, on the amount available for personal services is increased by "$22,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 14, to insert:

Construction: For an additional amount for "Construction," $530,000, to remain available until expended; and the limitation under this head in the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act, 1952, on the amount available for personal services is increased by "$67,425."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter VII—Independent Offices," on page 15, after line 2, to insert:

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

The funds provided in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, shall be available to the Commission for the employment of personnel in foreign countries without regard to the limitations on the amounts available for personal services contained therein and without regard to the provisions of section 605 thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Atomic Energy Commission," on page 15, line 12, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$260,000,000" and insert "$271,928,655"; and in line 12, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following provisos: "*Provided*, That the limitation contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act 1952, on the amount available to the Commission for personal services is hereby amended to read, 'of which not to exceed $9,642,111 shall be available for personal services for that activity designated "administrative services"': *Provided further*, That section 605 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, shall not be applicable to the Commission."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this amendment relates to the Atomic Energy Commission, which most people do not like to question, because of the fact that it is responsible for very vital work. However, I do not believe there are any "sacred cows" in the instrumentalities for which Congress appropriates funds. I realize that anyone who proposes a reduction in the AEC funds immediately creates the impression that he may be attempting to cut back the manufacture of atomic weapons; but, so far as I am concerned, that is not the case. It is not the funds for the production of atomic weapons that I would shave.

The Senate committee provided a reduction of 10 percent in personal services for administration, and allowed the full budget estimate for all the rest of the Commission's activities, but the House indicated a desire that the Commission simplify its program and practice some of the austerity which Congress has commended to various other agencies.

I feel the Senate should concur in general with the position of the House. I have been looking at the justifications submitted in connection with the supplemental request. On page 82, for example, I find a request for over $46,000 for information services. In view of President Truman's recent censorship decree, I feel sure that the agency will be unable usefully to employ 12 persons as information specialists.

On page 114 of the justification another item appears, a soft spot in my judgment. It is for a small bus terminal, to cost approximately $30,000.

On page 119 there is a request for $4,500,000, with which to build 300 dwelling units. According to my arithmetic, this amounts to $15,000 per family unit. It appears that less expensive dwellings could well be built during this period of national crisis.

On pages 120 and 121 I find a request for $3,105,000, to provide for an extension of the civil defense program, to build atomic shelters, and to finance a so-called shelter program. I may point out that both the House and Senate have seen fit to eliminate the shelter program from civilian defense. There is some question as to whether this agency should be treated differently from the way in which the civilian defense agency is treated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say that, both as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I would hope that the Senator would not press his amendment with respect to the shelter phase of this program, because it seems to me that there are special circumstances involved. Certainly the atomic energy plants of the Nation would be a primary target in the event of aggression from overseas, and certainly the development of our atomic energy program depends to no small extent upon the people in those plants. I would not feel that it would be wise or desirable to eliminate the shelter program so far as atomic energy activities are concerned.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. THYE. As a member of the Appropriations Committee which gave consideration to this specific item, I would say that I fully concur in the expressions just made by the senior Senator from California. I believe it would be a very serious mistake to strike this item from the bill by the amendment which has been proposed by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. So I would

say that I wish the Senator from New Hampshire would withdraw his amendment as to this particular item.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and the distinguished Senator from California that I have no desire to run counter to the wishes of the Senate. I merely point out the fact that the House and the Senate have eliminated shelters from the general civil defense program. I raised the question and was going to propose that all agencies be treated alike.

Mr. THYE. I fully realized, as did all the members of the committee, the importance of civilian shelters across the Nation, and that it could involve us in the expenditure of billions and billions of dollars, but I also recognize that there is a need to examine and study the question most thoroughly. We must have defense; we must have security for the executives in offices as well as for the other persons involved within important cities where the great industrial heart of America is located.

The office of the Civilian Defense Administrator when they reported to us did not give us as good a record as we would desire. I, personally, was disappointed, and felt the Appropriations Committee made a mistake when it did not make an appropriation for a specific study, because I think we have much to learn and we need to proceed along scientific lines, inasmuch as the cities and the States of the Union generally are proceeding in their endeavors to develop some type of safety for their people. If we on the national level do nothing, what is going to be the effect on the governors, the executives of the States, and the legislatures of the States so far as this problem is concerned?

I am personally disappointed that we have not appropriated sufficient funds to make a scientific study of the subject.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Minnesota is quite correct in the objective which he seeks. The Senate Appropriations Committee, in my opinion, did a wise thing when it allowed a definite sum not for building shelters, but for engineering surveys all over the country. We are taking a step forward in that direction. We allowed $6,500,000 for engineering surveys, and for looking over the shelter program. I agree with the Senator that that was a wise step. I think it is wise to do that before we start spending money for the actual construction of shelters.

Mr. THYE. I certainly agree with the Senator from New Hampshire on that point, but there are some cities which have taken definite steps. There are important cities where there are certain strategic plants or operations which it would be natural for an enemy to undertake to knock out.

I would feel that there would be some justification if Congress had made available funds which could have been used in matching already appropriated State funds, so that an effort could be made to afford protection to the technicians and research specialists engaged in the atomic-energy field. If we lose that type of personnel, that type of experts, we cannot replace them within several years.

I personally felt that we made a mistake in not providing a limited sum for matching, so that protection could be afforded the personnel in plants engaged in research and in work that must be carried on. If we lose such personnel, it will be a loss to the Nation that cannot be replaced for a long period of time.

That is my only reason for stating that we should not curtail this fund any more than it has already been curtailed.

Mr. BRIDGES. I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. I am glad to see that the committee has increased in several items the amount of money allowed for civilian defense. I am very doubtful whether the increases will be adequate, in view of the fact that a few days ago the second evidence of an atomic explosion in Russia has been given. It is quite clear that the Russians have the atomic bomb. It is equally clear that they have a substantial air fleet which would be adequate to carry atomic bombs from their air fields along the Bering Straits to any part of America except, perhaps, the southern tip of Florida.

It seems to me that failure to provide adequate civilian defense, or even a minimum amount of medical supplies to save lives in case of attack, is nothing less than a rash act. While we hope and pray that there will never be an atomic attack on America, the best way to invite such an attack is not to make sufficient preparation to combat it.

Late in August, just after the House had acted on this matter, I received a letter from the Monroe County office of civil defense in the State of Michigan. The Senator from New Hampshire may be familiar with the fact that Governor Williams, of Michigan, has taken a vigorous lead, insofar as he could do so, in building up the civilian defense organization in that State. The action which was taken by the House in not providing for an engineering survey of buildings which would be safe during an attack, and in reducing the item for medical supplies and equipment would leave us in a terrible situation if there were a raid.

I should like to show the effect this action has had on the Governor's efforts to build a civilian defense organization in the State of Michigan. I have a letter from Mr. James L. Robinson, the Monroe County director of civilian defense. He asks three questions. His first question is, Why did the House of Representatives cut the appropriation for civilian defense to 14 percent of the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget? Second, Did this action suggest that civilian defense is unnecessary? Third, Will local civil-defense organizations continue to function?

I am sure it can be seen that the effect of the action of the House was not only to reduce the Federal contribution to a point below where it should be but to discourage, and perhaps even to paralyze, the efforts made on the local level. The people back home want to run their own show; they want to organize it and manage it themselves. I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire would agree with that. He may agree also that if the people back home are given the idea that we do not think civil defense is a very important thing, that there is not very much danger involved, and if we do not give them adequate leadership and adequate appropriations, we may regret the results.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand the Senator was discussing the subject of atomic energy.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am. I was going to point out to the Senator from Michigan that we were on the subject of the atomic energy amendment, before he got into a discussion of civil defense.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was attracted to the wise remarks made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire favors the increase allowed by the committee for the Civil Defense Administration, and he intends to offer no amendment to cut the amount. Therefore, the Senator from New Hampshire will be on the side of the Senator from Michigan as far as this particular matter is concerned, if the Senator does not propose to increase the amount further.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not know what the Senator from New Hampshire intends to do, but I hope he will not propose a reduction in the atomic energy appropriation, for the reason that in committee we approved a cut of 10 percent on the administrative service, but we did not approve cuts in the engineering and other activities of the Atomic Energy Commission, because the program is being greatly extended. I hope the Senator will not make such a proposal.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from New Hampshire will recall we had quite an argument in the committee on the subject, that every phase of the matter was gone over, and the conclusion we finally reached has been presented to the Senate in the pending bill. I believe it was satisfactory to the Senator from New Hampshire at the time, and I hope it will remain satisfactory to him.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offered the amendment relating to the Atomic Energy Commission. It proposes, relatively, a very small reduction of funds. I cited a few ways in which I thought a reduction could be made to take care of some of the soft spots. I still think such reduction can be made. But in light of the viewpoint on the subject of shelters expressed by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE],

having to do with the necessity of shelters in connection with the atomic energy program, regardless of how the civilian shelters are treated throughout the country, and in deference to them, I will not argue that the shelter program should be curtailed.

Mr THYE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that his effort to economize is most laudable, but I cannot agree with him as to this particular item. I have had a very keen conviction that we have not done as much as we should have done so far as civilian defense is concerned. Because of the fact that atomic energy activity is the very heart of our national defense as of today, we should be most careful not to lose any of the specialists and craftsmen engaged in the work of atomic development, for then we would lose, so to speak, the very heartbeat of our national defense activities. Therefore, we should provide whatever is needed for the development of that activity

Mr. BRIDGES. In deference to the Senator I have withdrawn my argument so that is not included.

Mr THYE I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr BRIDGES. As I pointed out, there are several soft spots in the appropriation. For instance, the request for additional persons in connection with information service. In the light of the President's secrecy order I do not know whether the Atomic Energy Commission should have any more high priced specialists to issue news bulletins. There are a few instances where we can reasonably expect economy without interfering with the atomic energy program.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. At this time I do not feel qualified to resist, and I think as a matter of fact the Senator's proposal may have considerable merit, so far as it relates to information specialists. But how much is involved in that one item?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is a relatively small item It is approximately $46,000. It is proposed to employ 12 information specialists.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I certainly would not resist the Senator's amendment in that regard. I do, however, question his proposal as I understood it, to eliminate, in addition to the shelter program, the amount for housing. I should like the Senator to amplify that situation a little more before something is done which perhaps the Senate should not do with the information now at hand.

Mr. BRIDGES. There is an item in the bill for shelters amounting to $3,105,000, which I had included in my original list of items which might be cut or eliminated. But, in deference to the Senator from California and the Senator from Minnesota, I withdrew the argument.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understood the Senator specifically to mention something about cutting out housing.

Mr. BRIDGES. I was using shelter housing facilities as an example. The figure which I mentioned covers that item, and I eliminated it from my amendment. I think the debate which has taken place will clearly indicate, if the amendment should be adopted, what is intended. I also indicated I thought housing at the rate of $15,000 per unit was rather too expensive.

Mr DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. To me the astounding thing about the supplemental bill is that it is for the fiscal year 1952. Is that correct?

Mr BRIDGES. That is right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And the fiscal year is about 3½ months gone. In other words, we have a long way to go before we reach June 30, 1952, to complete the fiscal year. Now, here we are confronted with a supplemental bill for $1,751,000,000 to round out the year, when the agencies which are provided for by the bill have only started on the appropriations Congress made available for fiscal 1952.

The amounts carried in the supplemental bills are as large as the total cost of Government used to be 20 years ago. I understand that another deficiency or supplemental bill is in the making. That is certainly an amazing testimony to the capacity of the bureaus of the Government to estimate for their needs for a fiscal year. I would say that it seems that the power to appropriate and the authority to appropriate have passed out of the legislative branch. Such power is under the other branch of Government today.

Mr BRIDGES. The Senator from Illinois, of course, is right in the statement which he has just made. What I am afraid of is that if Congress does not end this session pretty soon we will be confronted with another supplemental bill. We have before us a major supplemental appropriation bill, and another one is on the way, and we may be confronted with even another if we do not close the session pretty quickly.

Mr DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it not true that the next supplemental bill will probably be taken up the coming Friday in the House, and that it is almost certain there will be another supplemental bill after that? It used to be that we called them deficiency bills. Now we call them supplemental bills. One of the reasons assigned for these bills is always that there is an emergency, and the emergency creates the need for new laws and new laws must be implemented, and so forth, without any idea as to what the cost of the law will be when it is put on the statute books.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. If things run true to form, after the 1st of January, probably one of the first things to come before the Congress will be another deficiency bill

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then as the end of the fiscal year approaches there will be an urgent deficiency bill. Then there will be a superurgent deficiency bill, and finally a superduper urgent deficiency bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. They are all superduper in size.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How in the world the estimates for the fiscal year are made is more than I can understand. It is a fair assumption now that the $71,600,000,000 scheduled for expenditure in the fiscal year 1952 is not going to begin to cover the estimates which will be coming forth, on the basis of what is before us at the present time.

Mr. FERGUSON. There will probably be deficiency bills totaling $10,000,000,000 between now and June 30 of next year if things continue as they are running now. This does not include any deficiency because of the fighting in Korea. That subject has been taken out of all the regular appropriation bills, so that there is no mention of any money for the Korean fighting. That will come in a supplemental bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield further so that I may ask the Senator from Michigan a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can understand the needs of certain critical emergency agencies. However, we notice as we go through the bill that there are appropriations for all the independent offices, for the Department of Commerce, for the Department of State, for the emergency agencies, for the Department of Justice, and for almost every other agency. Many of the functions for which appropriations are carried in this bill are nothing more than old-line functions.

When the estimates were made at the beginning of the fiscal year the various agencies had a pretty fair idea of what the workload was going to be. I can understand the intervention of certain conditions, such as atomic energy, with respect to which additional funds are necessary. But there are many items in this bill which persuade the junior Senator from Illinois that someone is taking a ride on the defense emergency, at the expense of the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what we find. Because of the emergency, each agency is attempting to pyramid on top of its regular and ordinary work, the so-called work which it is claimed has been brought about by virtue of the emergency, by virtue of price control, by virtue of controls of matériel, and other circumstances. Each agency claims that it has certain work which it must do, over and above its normal work But nowhere do we find a reduction in the normal workload because of the emergency.

Mr DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire further yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me add further that after a while, when the emergency has abated somewhat, I think we shall find, on the basis of past experience, that the defense levels for the estimates of

the bureaus and divisions in the Government will become the base for the new estimates, even though the emergency may have been considerably ameliorated.

Mr. FERGUSON. The distinguished Senator from Illinois has been a member of the Appropriations Committee in the House He is familiar with the facts. He knows that once we permit an agency to pyramid, it is very difficult to take any of the top of the pyramid off.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. While we are still on the item for the Atomic Energy Commission, let me say that I certainly would not disagree with the Senator from Illinois, who, as has been pointed out, has served on the Appropriations Committee of the House, that any number of agencies have undoubtedly used the defense emergency for the purpose of building up their estimates and getting what they could not get in the regular appropriation bills. I feel that the Appropriations Committees of both the Senate and the House must be constantly alert to that type of situation.

However, I submit—and this is the reason I am resisting the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]—that in the atomic-energy field we have a very special case. We know that since September 1949 the Soviet Union has had the atomic weapon. We know that within the past few weeks the Soviet Union has exploded another atomic bomb, and that it is moving ahead with its stockpiling and development in that field. It seems to me that for the security of this Nation—and, indeed, the security of the entire free world—we should be fully alert to the situation.

I am inclined to agree with Mr. Churchill, that if it had not been for the American superiority in atomic weapons the Soviet Union might have long since moved in Europe, where it has superiority with land armies and perhaps even in the field of air power. In the field of atomic development, it is essential that the United States maintain a preeminent position. For that reason I shall resist the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire to the committee amendment. I hope that it may be voted down. However, I may very well be prepared to support him in other amendments which he may offer.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. McMAHON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I happen to be a cosponsor of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire. Atomic energy is one subject which it is very difficult to discuss upon the floor of the Senate. I hope the chairman of the committe will take this entire subject into consideration if the pending amendment to the committee amendment is withdrawn by the Senator from New Hampshire, and that in the conference committee these various items may be given attention, to see what can be done in the way of possible reductions.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should certainly have no objection to the conferees going into this subject very thoroughly. However, the Senator is fully alive to the situation, as I am, that in dealing with this subject we are not in a position to discuss freely and fully some of the aspects of the atomic-energy program. For that reason I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will withdraw his amendment, and then let the justifications be made before the conference committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. That was the reason the Senator from Michigan did not discuss the subject of shelters. There are certain aspects which he does not wish to discuss upon the floor of the Senate. I am sure that statement is also true of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill, which I submit on behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] and myself, and I ask that the amendment lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall call the amendment up later, in the course of the debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to respond to my friend from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] by pointing out a few things. For example, there is an item in the bill of $5,100,000 for the Department of Agriculture, Office of the Secretary, for salaries and expenses. The committee cut it down, but that was the estimate of the Department. The Department pats the farmers of America on the back by telling them what a great productive effort they have made. They have piled up a mountain of stuff, to the point where the Commodity Credit Corporation is offering now, goodness knows how much surplus linseed oil, butter, cheese, and many other things. Then we come to an estimate of $5,100,000 for salaries and expenses.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me continue for a moment.

There is an item of $3,575,000 under the heading "Secretary of Labor." The committee cut it by about $1,000,000. The Labor Standards Act has been bottomed up pretty well. The National Labor Relations Board has been functioning for a long time. Wage stabilization controversies come before a different agency. I cannot for the life of me understand why so much extra personnel is needed.

There is an estimate for the Department of Commerce of $50,000,000, which was cut down by the committee to $39,000,000. Regular agencies are building up their workload. When they get through, their personnel levels are going to be higher than they have ever been in the history of the Government. Probably in technical peacetime those levels will be just as high as they have been in wartime. It seems to me that we are reaching the point where we can boast about it if we can operate the Government as cheaply in peacetime as we do during wartime. This is the evidence of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] to vouch for what I say. The Appropriations Committee is not playing favorites at all. We have tried as hard as anybody in the world ever tried to do the right and proper thing. Every Senator, Republican and Democrat, who served on that committee has tried his very best to report a proper bill. Senators should remember that this is a definciency bill. The committee may have made mistakes, but, taken as a whole, I think the Senator from New Hampshire will agree—I know the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] will agree, and I think the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] will agree—that we have done our best to prepare a bill which will meet the needs. If there is anything wrong about it, it can be corrected. We always correct the mistakes we make. I hope the Senate will allow this item to go to conference.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from New Hampshire is one of the conferees. He always has been one of the conferees. He is familiar with the work of the Atomic Energy Commission, and performs excellent service in connection with items concerning that Commission. He is one of the finest gentlemen I have ever known in my life, and one of the ablest men on the committee. He gets along with his fellow Senators very well.

The House had allowed only $260,000,000, and the Senate added $11,000,000. The Bureau of the Budget allowed only $200,000,000. When I say "only," I do not use that word in the sense in which it is ordinarily employed, because when we are spending such tremendous sums of money, we ought not to speak of them in that way. All the money appropriated is important, and may be more so in the future. I am very hopeful that after all the work that has been done on this bill by the committee, we may get ahead with it and pass it, and work out the differences in conference.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in the light of this discussion, and because I know atomic energy is a very delicate subject, since it was my privilege to be one of four United States Senators to be consulted in connection with appropriations from 1942 before the bomb

was exploded—we kept our secret well. I know the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy does an excellent job, perhaps we can adjust that matter in conference, I withdraw the amendment, and I ask that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for withdrawing his amendment. I hope that in conference the Senate's position will be sustained. The committee's findings were arrived at after a very thorough consideration of the necessities confronting the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Connecticut is absolutely correct in that statement. One of the hottest fights we ever had in committee was over this very item.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from New Hampshire know that the Atomic Energy Commission is now engaged in a very large expansion. The effort to apply the so-called Jensen-Ferguson amendment to the Commission has resulted, in the opinion of the joint committee, in the creation of a very serious situation in the affairs of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Connecticut knows that we have alleviated that situation.

Mr. McMAHON. I am talking about what was done in the main appropriation bill. I believe the limitation is kept on the administrative expenses. Let us see whether the Commission can live with a 10-percent limitation going into effect. I believe it will be very difficult, in the light of the present plans for expansion. Does the limitation on administrative officers include information officers?

Mr. FERGUSON. They would be included, yes.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from New Hampshire has referred to the President's order, and draws the conclusion—which I believe is unjustified—that information officers are not needed in the Atomic Energy Commission. One of the difficulties experienced by the Commission has been in getting to the people of the United States the proper information they should have. Information is given out reluctantly. I do not blame the Commission, because it is not pleasant for them to do it. I call attention to the Weapons Effects Handbook, which was issued by the Commission. It is an excellent work. It is certainly a very profitable book to people all over the Nation who are interested in civil defense.

Let us consider the Eniwetok experiments. The results of those experiments are being codified, and the information is being written up for dissemination to the public. It is valuable information. I wish it had been collated and published before, particularly the information with regard to the effect of atomic explosions on structures, as shown by the effect on the structures which were tested at Eniwetok. Such publications do not just happen. They must be worked over and must be properly prepared.

I do not intend to labor the subject. I again congratulate the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for having withdrawn the amendment. I believe it is in the best interest of the security of the United States. I am not alone in Congress in feeling that we should now engage in a very great expansion in our total capability in the field of atomic energy production.

I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire that if we in Congress find it possible before we adjourn to put ourselves on record as being in favor of such expansion, the entire personnel of the Commission will become very busy making plans and specifications before Congress reassembles in January to implement it by further appropriations, and that they will have plenty of work to do for all the employees they can possibly get. I believe they should do it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Connecticut will agree, however, that the Appropriations Committee and Congress have been very liberal in granting almost always the full amount requested by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. McMAHON. I believe that by and large that is true. It is fortunate that that has been so. With the exception of the restriction, which I believe the committee has now withdrawn, on the whole the Appropriations Committees of Congress have granted the appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission which have come from the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. FERGUSON. A great burden is placed on the Appropriations Committee, particularly in view of the secrecy involved, to determine the requirements of the Commission in the same light that it determines the requirements of other agencies of the Government.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Michigan merely raises one of the problems which the new force of atomic energy has brought to bear upon our national life. We are operating what is undoubtedly the largest manufacturing establishment in the whole world, and it is being operated behind the walls of secrecy. Our Government is operating that manufacturing plant. As the Senator from Michigan knows, approximately 100,000 people are engaged in production, expansion, and scientific investigation in connection with the work of the Atomic Energy Commission. I would say to the Senator from Michigan that this whole project in one sense is antidemocratic. It is a hard thing to operate in a democratic system, for reasons with which the Senator from Michigan is familiar.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the courage which the Senator from New Hampshire shows in venturing to question an appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission should not go unnoticed. The Atomic Energy Commission has been the "ice cream" agency of our Government so far as getting money has been concerned from the very outset of its creation.

It is very difficult, in dealing with estimates which the Atomic Energy Commission submits, to apply the same standards of checking that can be applied to the requests submitted by any other agency of Government. I am not opposed in any way to atomic energy development, but I do believe that the Appropriations Committee has a very difficult job to perform when it attempts to deal with estimates for the Atomic Energy Commission.

When the Senator from New Hampshire, or any other Senator, comes forth with a concrete proposal to try to make the Atomic Energy Commission spend its dollars as carefully as we attempt to have other agencies of the Government spend theirs, he should be commended for his effort.

I remember when the Atomic Energy Commission did not even have a responsible finance office. Yet they were asking for a billion dollars in appropriations. They did finally create and set up an agency which reviewed the estimates. In other words, they would come to Congress with a request for something that had a fancy name, and it would be very difficult for the average layman to know what it meant. No one could tell what it would cost. The representatives of the Commission would say, "We have never built anything like this before. No one has ever built anything like this before. We cannot give you a firm figure."

Therefore the Appropriations Committees of Congress have been laboring under that handicap, and they have had to agree: "That is probably true; you do not have any standards to go by."

However, a comparison of the appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission with the appropriations for activities which Members of Congress can understand, will show that the Atomic Energy Commission has received more funds for operating its cities and more funds for its educational facilities than have the defense agencies.

When we were dealing with the bills for Federal aid to communities which received an impact from defense activities, there was presented the problem of reconciling the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission received more funds for its schools and teachers and facilities of that sort than the defense agencies received in connection with the military installations. In that connection, the answer which would be given to the committee was, "These people are scientists, and their children deserve a better education than do the children in the school districts immediately adjoining military installations." So the Atomic Energy Commission requested more money.

A survey showed that the funds provided by the Federal Government for schools on the atomic energy reservations amounted to more per capita than the funds paid for students in the counties adjoining. That was true both at Los Alamos and at Oak Ridge.

Furthermore, I recall that the State sales tax which was collected in New Mexico was apportioned back, but was not credited to the schools provided by the Government on the reservation.

So when the Appropriations Committee deals with the Atomic Energy Commission, the Committee encounters difficulty, because so little of the Commission's work relates to normal activities and normal expenditures, and thus it is practically impossible to find something to use as a standard or a yardstick. However, in dealing with the schools and the management of the cities, the Appropriations Committee has been able to find ways in which to suggest that the Atomic Energy Commission might be more careful in its expenditures.

On the other hand, when we enter the field of new research developments, it is very difficult to find a way in which to inculcate into the minds of the managers of the Atomic Energy Commission the idea that they should be as careful in their spending as we ask other agencies to be.

I make these remarks even though if I were in the position of the Senator from New Hampshire, at this point I probably would agree to the suggestion that the amendment to the committee amendment be withdrawn or withheld.

However, I believe that the Atomic Energy Commission should be more careful in its expenditures, and should mix with its consideration of its scientists a little business judgment in connection with its expenditures.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief comment in answer to the Senator from South Dakota, or perhaps not in answer to him, because in some respects I would agree with him, namely, that in this field there are no precedents.

I remember an installation which the Commission began to build at Hanford. The preliminary estimate showed that the cost would be $6,000,000; but when that installation was completed, the cost was $29,000,000. The difference between the estimate and the final cost figure was not anyone's fault, but occurred because new engineering problems or new scientific problems were encountered almost every day, and the job from an engineering and scientific standpoint was tremendously difficult.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has a very peculiar relationship, as the Senator knows, to this agency. Unlike the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is not charged with the duty of being fully and currently informed as to the activities of the Commission. The relationship of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to the Atomic Energy Commission is quite different from the relationship of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Federal Communications Commission or the Interstate Commerce Commission or the various other executive agencies which come within the purview of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In a sense, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is an operating committee. We try to take care of our business and we try to hold the Commission to a very high standard.

As I said when the original debate was had upon the advisability of applying the Jensen-Ferguson rider to the Atomic Energy Commission in my opinion, the Commission is doing very well. It is vital and alive, and is not afraid to take chances. The results which were reported to the joint committee have been, I think, very satisfactory to the members.

I know that the Appropriations Committee has heard much of this information, but certainly not in the detail that we on the joint committee have heard it, because the Appropriations Committee simply cannot take the time to do so.

I feel that on the whole the Atomic Energy Commission is doing fairly well. At this point I wish to make that statement, because it seems to me that, day after day, all that many persons in the executive agencies receive from Congress is a swift kick in the jeans, regardless of whether they do a good job. So I think it is a good idea for a Senator to testify, if he believes it to be so, as I do, that the Atomic Energy Commission is doing all right.

I think we can do better. I think we must do better. I think we must do more. I believe that the event about which the Senator from California spoke, namely, the explosion of a second atomic weapon in Russia, should not go unnoticed by the Congress. Certainly it should not go unnoticed by the executive branch of the Government In my opinion, we must proceed with our expansion of this activity, because dollar for dollar we can get more for the security of the United States, in my opinion, from this activity than we can from any other measure or step which we might take for the security of our country. Time will not wait.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Nothing which I said should indicate any disagreement with the statement the Senator from Connecticut has just made. I personally believe that dollar for dollar we can get more in the way of national security from the atomic-energy program than we can in any other way, and I think the record over a period of years will show that the junior Senator from South Dakota has been sympathetic with that program—in fact, from the inception of the Manhattan District project, when we appropriated for it, and when I had some responsibilities in the days when it was a very highly classified matter.

Mr. McMAHON. I know that.

Mr. CASE. Both at that time and after the Atomic Energy Commission became an independent agency, I have had the definite feeling that the atomic-energy program offered more, dollar for dollar.

However, because that agency deals with a strange thing, something which is almost mystical, it is difficult to apply ordinary appropriations standards to it Furthermore, in that connection we are dealing largely with persons whose experience and background are in the field of science, rather than in the field of business management or construction.

So I feel that the Joint Committee and the Appropriations Committee have the responsibility of doing what they can to inculcate into the minds of the personnel of the Atomic Energy Commission a desire to save a dollar here or a dollar there, just as we expect the other agencies to save as much as they can. I believe that those two committees also have the responsibility of doing what they can to see that the Commission has personnel who will bring to it the business experience and the construction experience which the scientists themselves do not contribute.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course, Mr. President, as the Senator from South Dakota knows, the Atomic Energy Commission has made great efforts to bring into the project the best brains of management and the greatest competency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 15, in line 12.

The amendment was agreed to

The PRESIDING OFFICER The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 20, to insert:

DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

The limitation fixed in Public Law 137 granting $1,100,000 to the Displaced Persons Commission for loans pursuant to section 14 of the act, is hereby decreased to $500,000, and the limitation fixed in Public Law 137 granting $4,375,000 to the Displaced Persons Commission for the expenses of transporting to the United States displaced persons of German ethnic origin, is hereby decreased to $3,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 17, to insert:

RENOVATION AND MODERNIZATION, EXECUTIVE MANSION

For an additional amount for "Renovation and modernization, Executive Mansion," $261,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 4, to insert:

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses, General Services Administration," $3,080,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 7, to insert:

EMERGENCY OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary emergency expenses of the General Services Administration not otherwise provided for, for operation, maintenance, protection, repair, alterations, and improvements of public buildings and grounds to the extent that such buildings and grounds are under the control of the General Services Administration for such purposes as are provided for in Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, as amended; rental of buildings or parts thereof in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including repairs, alterations, and improvements necessary for proper use by the Government without regard to section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U S. C 278a); restoration of leased premises, moving Government agencies in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; furnishings and equipment; protection of vital records; and payment of per diem employees employeed in connection with any of the foregoing functions at rates approved by the Administrator of General Services or his designee, not exceeding current rates for similar services in places where such services are employed, $35,692,350: *Pro-*

vided, That of this amount, such sums as may be determined by the General Services Administrator to be necessary may be paid into other appropriations of the General Services Administration only for purposes of accounting: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available to effect the moving of Government agencies from the District of Columbia to accomplish the dispersal of departmental functions.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 15, to insert:

GENERAL SUPPLY FUND

For an additional amount for the "General supply fund," established by section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U. S. C. 219), for replacement of losses of inventory and equipment resulting from flood damage to the Federal Supply Center, Kansas City, Kans., $1,430,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 22, to insert:

EXPENSES, GENERAL SUPPLY FUND

For an additional amount for "Expenses, general supply fund," $256,000; and the limitation under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1952, on the amount available for personal services, is increased from "$8,201,000" to "$8,409,500."

The amendment was agreed to

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Housing and Home Finance Agency—Office of the Administrator—Alaska housing," on page 19, line 7, after the word "housing", to strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], I offer and send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 19, in line 8, it is proposed to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,000,000."

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF SENATE RULE IN REGARD TO REPORTS OF CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. At this time I should like to speak on another matter.

Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a proposed amendment to rule XXVII of the Senate, concerning reports of conference committees.

The amendment I am proposing intends to close the loophole through which conferees sometimes march to thwart the previously declared intention of both Houses of Congress, and to write an entirely new legislative provision.

The issue of the authority of conference committees was raised in the Senate last week in connection with the Mutual Security Act.

At that time the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] raised a point of order that section 101 (b) of the Senate version of the bill, which really was an entirely new bill, was identical with a provision contained in the bill as passed by the House of Representatives, and therefore, that it should not have been changed by the conferees.

The point of order was overruled by the Chair, and the Senator from Michigan appealed from the decision of the Chair. The vote was 41 to 36 sustaining the Chair.

The Senator from Michigan did not raise a further point of order, because he felt that the Chair had already ruled upon a similar point. It was stated in the debate by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] that the conferees had inserted in the conference report, and therefore into the measure itself, entirely new matter in relation to the Export-Import Bank. A point of order was made on the floor of the House against that provision, and the Senator from Michigan is advised that the point of order was sustained in the House, and as I understand, the bill was sent back to the conferees.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to inquire whether the bill was sent back to the conference committee on that point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that in the House a point of order was made against the conference report on the ground that the conferees had exceeded their authority with respect to the matter dealing with the Export-Import Bank, which was sustained by the Speaker. The House, instead of sending the bill back to conference, then adopted a substitute for the Senate amendment, identical with the language contained in the conference report with the exception of the provision against which the point of order was made. The Senate today agreed to the House amendment to the Senate amendment, which completed legislative action on the bill, and it now goes to the President for his approval.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; but the Speaker of the House sustained the point of order, did he not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The conference report was rejected on that ground.

Mr. FERGUSON. The House rejected it on that ground, did it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. So we find that the Senate acted on one point of order, which was overruled, and the House acted on another point of order, which was sustained. But the Senator from Michigan is now interested in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate in order that the Senate rules may be changed so that we may not again be confronted by a similar situation, involving a provision which would be subject to a point of order.

To review the situation, it will be recalled that the House and Senate had adopted identical provisions under title I of the bill, to the effect that 5 percent of the authorized military or economic aid appropriation might be transferred to the opposite aid fund. In conference the 5 percent was changed to 10 percent.

I am sure that until last week most members of the Senate must have felt such a thing was impossible. The common understanding is that conferees may consider only that which is in disagreement between the two Houses. Particularly was that true after the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. It is in fact the rule. Conferees are limited to the consideration of matters which are in disagreement. But years ago there developed a legislative practice whereby one House, after the other had passed a bill, would strike out all after the enacting clause and act upon an amendment in the nature of a substitute. Some or even most of the texts of the two bills could be identical. But technically—and here is the important part—the fact that one bill was a substitute for the other placed everything in it in disagreement.

It was as a resul of this technical or parliamentary disagreement that conferees were able to say that everything in the two bills, notwithstanding the identity of certain provisions in them, was in conference. From that point the conferees could proceed to write their own bill.

As a consequence of this procedure students of government have raised their voices in protest time and again. I believe it was the late President Woodrow Wilson who observed that as a result of this situation we really had three branches of Congress—the Senate, the House, and the conference committee.

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress—the La Follette-Monroney committee—sought to correct that situation in 1946 as indicated last week by what the Senator from Michigan said, which appears in the RECORD; and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], also indicated it was his understanding that a change had been made by the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress drafted a revision of the rules which would put into effect its recommendation that "Conferees of the two Houses be limited to adjustment only of actual differences between the two Houses and that matters on which both Houses are in agreement be not subject to change in conference."

The committee's recommendation was adopted, at least in part, and is printed in the Senate manual as paragraph 3 of rule 27. Until last week it was presumed that this provision had plugged the loophole which gave conferees such great latitude, even to the point of upsetting that which had in fact been agreed upon by both Houses.

A ruling of the chair, supported by a recorded vote of the Senate, now indicates that so far as the Senate was concerned, the loophole was not plugged. Students of government, members of the La Follette-Monroney committee and the supporters of its great work, and all of us who believe that the loophole as it seems to exist is a very dangerous and

undersirable feature of the legislative process, will now suport the amendment to the rule which I propose.

Now let us look at the loophole in its technical or parliamentary aspects.

Apparently the reason the La Follette-Monroney committee's recommendation failed to achieve its intended result was the omission of a single clause from the rule as it was finally adopted. The clause was passed by the Senate, but was stricken on the Speaker's table before it reached the floor of the House.

The clause, which appeared at the end of the first sentence of that which is printed in the manual as paragraph 3 of rule 27, read: "nor strike out anything agreed to and passed by both Houses."

What that clause intended was that if the House said military and economic-aid funds could be interchanged by 5 percent, and if the Senate bill said the same thing, the conferees could not drop that provision, nor could they change it.

As a matter of fact, I am not absolutely certain that intention would have held up. I have pointed out that technically speaking there is no agreement between the two Houses, despite the identity of provisions adopted by each, if one bill represents an amendment in the nature of a substitute. In that case everything is in conference; everything is in parliamentary disagreement; and the conferees by the second sentence of the rule may make "germane modifications of subjects in disagreement."

Let us see now how the conferees take advantage of the omission of that clause. Assume the House and Senate have passed identical provisions but one is a substitute, so technically they are in disagreement. In the absence of this clause the conferees resort to the fiction of striking out that which was in disagreement—the two identical provisions—and reinserting a new provision which is a germane modification. In the case of the mutal-aid bill they struck out section 101 (b), at least theoretically, and then reinserted it with the percentage changed from 5 to 10.

That change met the test of a germane modification of matter in disagreement. It was contended that the modification was germane to the dollar figures in the bill. I cannot agree to that, but under the rule it is not necessary to employ that argument. The modification was germane to the two identical sections which were in technical disagreement, and, according to the prevailing interpretation of the rule, that is all that was necessary.

The rule which I am proposing is a refinement of the clause advanced by the La Follette-Monroney committee, passed by the Senate but stricken in the House. It would be inserted at the end of the first sentence of paragraph 3 under rule 27 and would read as follows: "nor may they strike out matter passed in identical form by both Houses, nor modify any such matter."

This proposal closes airtight the loophole which we once thought had been plugged. It will be noted that there is no reference to "agreement" since that is susceptible of different interpretations and in its parliamentary sense is governed by the technicalities of an amendment in the nature of a substitute. We say "matter passed in identical form by both Houses," regardless of whether it was passed in one House as a substitute.

Any matter passed in identical form by both Houses would not be in conference, which is just what most of us had supposed the rule of conference to be after the passage of section 135 of the 1946 Reorganization Act. Any such matter may not be stricken out, nor may it be modified

I desire to comment briefly on the form which the present proposal takes. It is, first, a simple Senate resolution, proposing to change the Senate rules. It is not necessary to change the House rules at all because automatically a conference is limited by the rules of either House and the restrictions they place upon the respective conferees.

Second. This is in effect the addition of a new paragraph 3 to rule 27. As rule 27 appears in the Senate Manual, paragraph 3 is incorporated only for editorial purposes. Although binding, since it is a part of the Legislative Reorganization Act, paragraph 3 is not, strictly speaking, a part of rule 27 This resolution would formally incorporate paragraph 3 as a part of rule 27, with the furtner addition of the clause I have previously discussed

Mr President, I hope that this resolution and the change in the rule will be speedily adopted by the Senate It is precisely what the La Follette-Monroney committee thought was being accomplished by the Legislative Reorganization Act in 1947. Thirty-six Senators, by their vote on the appeal from the ruling of the chair this week, actually thought it had been accomplished. Other Senators, who did not agree with the flaw in the rule but who nevertheless saw one and were bound in their vote by that interpretation, will want this change made.

I dare say that every student of the legislative process who has recognized the evils of unlimited authority for conference committees will actively support this proposal. its need has been discussed frequently and at great length. Even in last week's debate on the ruling of the chair and even in the chair's ruling there was no disposition whatsoever to contend that conferees should have such wide powers.

This is a much-needed and worthwhile reform, in accordance with the first mandate of the Constitution which is to assure representative government.

I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution to amend paragraph 3 of rule 27 of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 221) was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph 3 of rule XXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate as shown on page 42 of the 1951 edition of the Senate Manual be and is hereby amended to read as follows:

"3 (a) In any case in which a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been referred to conferees, it shall be in order for the conferees to report a substitute on the same subject matter; but they may not include in the report matter not committed to them by either House; nor may they strike out matter passed in identical form by both Houses, nor modify any such matter. They may, however, include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement.

"(b) In any case in which the conferees violate subparagraph (a), the conference report shall be subject to a point of order."

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now before the Senate is the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to the committee amendment.

Mr LEHMAN Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr LEHMAN. I should like to be informed as to the exact committee amendment now pending

The PRESIDING OFFICER The committee amendment on page 19, line 27, is under consideration. The amendment proposes an increase in amount from $3,500,000 to $5,000,000. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] offered an amendment to make the amount $4,000,000 That is the question which is now pending.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr President, I should like to offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 20, line 2, when we reach that point

Mr. McCARRAN I understand there is pending an amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of that amendment, and I wish to discuss it at this time.

The amendment provides a saving of $1,000,000. It proposes to appropriate $1,000,000 less than the amount reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee, but it provides for a half million dollars more than the amount approved by the House. That is very significant, because the amendment would then place the matter in conference.

The item involved is a revolving fund to provide loans on new housing in Alaska There had been previously appropriated the sum of $10,000,000, of which approximately $6,100,000 has been used on loans already approved for 726 dwelling units. There are 749 dwelling units for which loan applications have been made or which are anticipated. Frankly, it appears that the amount of new money needed in this fund is at best a guess. We have studied the justification, and I believe my guess is perfectly reasonable as to the amount. The reason why I say it is a guess is because it is based on an assumption that all pending loan applications will be approved so that construction can begin during the current year.

Mr. President, we realize that in Alaska, in the winter months, it is very difficult to carry on building operations, and

therefore it is difficult to say just how much can be done in the time that remains this year.

It is interesting to note that construction costs in Alaska must be rising at a terrific rate. As I have stated, loans for 726 units have been approved. The total loans on 726 units are said to be $6,100,000. On 749 units, which is just 23 units more, applications for which are pending or expected to be pending, the total loans are estimated at $10,200,000. In other words, the first 726 units cost $6,100,000, but the figures as contained in the bill show that the cost for only 23 more units would be $4,100,000 It seems that the amount it will cost to put up the additional units has been greatly exaggerated.

It is entirely possible that Congress will be asked to furnish additional capital for the loan fund during the next fiscal year.

Mr. President, it appears that if the cost of 726 units was $6,100,000, it would not be necessary to spend $10,200,000 for 749 units, which would mean $4,100,000 for 23 units only. I know the Senator from New Hampshire will want to say something on this item.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Do I understand that this is for civilian housing and not military housing?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr BRIDGES. The record shows that there has already been approved for Alaskan housing $6,100,000 in loans. The loan requests, with preliminary approval by the Alaskan Housing Authority, under HHFA, are $4,500,000. In other words, there are $4,500,000 more under review. There are applications made and pending of $5,700,000. The total is $16,300,000. There has been previously appropriated for the revolving fund $10,000,000.

The House recommended $3,500,000. The Senate committee has increased that to $5,000,000. Its action is based on the assumption that nearly every loan, not only under review but for which application is pending, is to be granted. Certainly they must be more selective in the approval of loans than that they grant every application. Certainly we cannot encourage any housing agency in Alaska or anywhere else if such figures are going to be submitted. We can do away with such agencies if such figures are to be presented.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Did the Senator give the amount recommended by the House as only $3,000,000? I understood that was the figure given by the Senator from New Hampshire as well as the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; it was $3,500,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. If I used the figure $3,000,000, I should like to correct my statement and say $3,500,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if I were in charge of the bill, I would accept the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is present. I wonder if he will not accept the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator state what the amendment is?

Mr. BRIDGES. The amendment deals with Alaska housing. The Senator from Tennessee will find it on page 19. The situation is, as the Senator will note, that the House allowed $3,500,000 for this item, which would make available for Alaska housing $13,500,000. The Senate Appropriations Committee added $1,500,000, which would make $15,000,000 available.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am always willing to go halfway. So if the Senator will change his amendment and make it $3,750,000 I will be willing to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire proposed to strike the figure "$5,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$4,000,000."

Mr McKELLAR. Yes. I am asking the Senator from New Hampshire to cut his amount by $250,000 If the Senator from New Hampshire is willing to do so I shall accept that amount.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Senator from Tennessee offers to accept the figure "$4,250,000"——

Mr. McKELLAR. No, $3,750,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the Senator from Tennessee willing to reduce the figure to that amount?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then I accept. I modify my amendment accordingly.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan will also accept that figure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Both Senators accept the amount of $3,750,000. I agree to that figure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from New Hampshire on page 19, line 8, to the committee amendment, to strike the figure "$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$3,750,000."

The amendment, as modified, to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Motor Carrier Claims Commission—Salaries and expenses," on page 19, line 12, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$124,000", and in line 13, after the word "than", to strike out "$66,500" and insert "$82,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Science Foundation—Salaries and expenses," on page 19, line 19, after the word "including", to insert "award of graduate fellowships."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator from New Jersey would like to ask unanimous consent that all amendments relating to the National Science Foundation be passed over until the subsequent amendments have been fully considered. I make the request on behalf of my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. He is very much interested in the amendments relating to the National Science Foundation. My colleague wishes to be heard on the subject He is presently engaged in an important hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McKELLAR Let the amendments go over until the other amendments have been acted upon.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is my request.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I am very happy indeed to associate myself with the senior Senator from New Jersey in submitting an amendment. As a matter of fact, I had an amendment prepared which was identical with the one of the Senator from New Jersey. It is my understanding that the National Science Foundation item will lie over until all other committee amendments have been adopted.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is the request of the junior Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that course will be pursued.

Mr. HENDRICKSON I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Selective Service System—Salaries and expenses," on page 20, line 12, after the word "only", to strike out "$30,154,000" and insert "$31,800,000"; in the same line, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$1,856,000" and insert "$2,184,000"; in line 15, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$6,454,000" and insert "$7,598,000", and in line 17, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$429,000 "

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Veterans' Administration," at the top of page 22, to strike out:

SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITIES

For payment of liabilities under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, $5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce—Maritime activities," on page 22, after line 18, to insert:

OPERATING-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDIES

The third proviso of Public Law 137, Eighty-second Congress, under the head "Maritime activities, operating differential subsidies", is hereby amended by striking out "fifteen hundred and twenty-two" and inserting in lieu thereof "seventeen hundred and twenty-four "

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware asks for an explanation of the committee amendment on line 19, page 22.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask that it go over until the other amendments have been considered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Wait a minute. I will explain the amendment to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator from Tennessee like to have it go over until the last?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; until after the amendment in which the senior Senator from New Jersey is interested has been acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that course will be pursued.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 2, to insert:

STATE MARINE SCHOOLS

For an additional amount for "State marine schools", $409,050: *Provided*, That the provision under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, which reads "and $340,000 for uniforms, textbooks, and subsistence of cadets on an average yearly cost of not to exceed $475 per cadet" is amended to read "and $749,050 for the pay of 710 cadet midshipmen at $65 per month and $275 per annum for the subsistence of each cadet midshipman."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 12, to insert:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. Section 404 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952 (Public Law 137, August 31, 1951), is hereby amended by inserting the words "principal or primary" between the word "whose" and the word "duties" in the first sentence thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 18, to insert:

SEC. 702. Section 605 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952 (Public Law 137, August 31, 1951), is hereby amended by striking out the second proviso thereof and inserting in lieu of said proviso the following: ". *Provided further*, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 percent of the total provided for in the budget estimates for 1952, this section shall cease to apply."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 2, to insert:

SEC 703 The provisions of section 1414 of this act and the provisions of section 604 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, shall not apply to persons employed by the General Services Administration in the performance of functions or related assisting or supporting functions in connection with the publication of the Federal Register.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 4, to insert:

CHAPTER IX

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS
CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works

For an additional amount for "Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works," $168,000, to remain available until expended.

FLOOD CONTROL, GENERAL

For an additional amount for "Flood control, general," $1,750,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. BRIDGES. Just a minute, Mr. President. On page 26, line 14, the amendments were stated as one amendment. I thought there were two amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, after line 4, it is proposed to insert:

CHAPTER IX

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS
CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works

For an additional amount for "Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works," $168,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, after line 13, it is proposed to insert:

FLOOD CONTROL, GENERAL

For an additional amount for "Flood control, general," $1,750,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wonder if some question has been raised about that amendment The fact is that no budget estimate has been made for it. Perhaps the distinguished chairman of the committee will give us some explanation of it. I take it it has to do with the Texas project.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no budget estimate for the item. However, the Texas Senators submitted that amendment because of the recent floods in their State. They said that relief was needed. We have afforded relief to other localities similarly situated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, does this item represent the same project which the Senate defeated in an amendment to the main appropriation bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; the Senator does not have it exactly right. The item was in the main bill, and it was decided to take it up in the supplemental bill. We are only carrying out the wishes of the Senate. That is the only difference. I hope the Senator will not oppose the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand, an amendment to the same effect was offered on the floor at the time the main appropriation bill was pending.

Mr. McKELLAR. The item is divided into two parts. I believe that the $750,000 is for Tucson, Ariz., where the situation is very bad. The remainder is for Dallas, Tex., which is in an even worse situation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the distinguished Senator from Delaware will recall that at the time the regular bill was under consideration there was proposed an amendment appropriating $1,000,000 for work on the Buffalo Bayou flood-control project in Houston, which was withdrawn. It was offered to this bill, but the committee did not approve it. So as I understand, the only two items covered are the Tucson diversion channel, and the project for Dallas, Tex., which was included in an amendment offered by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. McKELLAR. His colleague agreed with him. The Senator from New Hampshire is correct. Some of the money was for Dallas, Tex., and the remainder was for Tucson, Ariz. There was a still larger sum for Houston, Tex., but the committee did not agree to it. That item, representing $1,000,000, was not placed in the bill. The appropriation was cut down to the amount now in the bill, which includes both items, that for Tucson, Ariz., and that for Dallas, Tex.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. In the case of Dallas, Tex., the city had expended $25,000,000 on a flood-control channel. If the storm had come a few miles closer to the city, it would have caused damage almost equal to the damage in the Kansas City disaster. So the committee felt that the project ought to be undertaken, in view of the very serious menace involved.

With respect to Tucson, recurring floods come down and fill the flood-control basins. Altogether approximately six lives have been lost in such floods.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 26, beginning in line 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the heading on page 26, line 17, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "IX" and insert "X."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of the Army—Civil functions—Government and relief in occupied areas," on page 27, line 25, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$21,800,000" and insert "$24,500,000", and on page 28, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$6,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of State—Government in occupied areas," on page 32, line 22, after "(22 U. S. C. 1131)", to strike out "$25,750,000" and insert "$26,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the heading, on page 35, line 5, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "X" and insert "XI."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Emergency agencies—Executive Office of the President—Office of Defense Mobilization—Salaries and expenses," on page 35, line 21, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$1,850,000" and insert "$1,711,250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 3, to insert:

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES

For expense necessary to enable the Council of Economic Advisers to carry out its

functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, $24,975.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and myself, I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 36, after line 3, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out lines 4 through 9, inclusive.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this particular amendment would save only $24,975, but even that is money. The amendment would strike out an item in that amount for the use of the Council of Economic Advisers. It seems to me that we have plenty of economic advisers. Most of their advice has not been too consistently right. They have been adequately provided for in the regular appropriation bills. Although this particular item is small, I do not believe that it was justified by the presentation, and I do not believe that the Senate would be justified in approving the item.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe the Senator from New Hampshire will change his mind if he will recall—as I am sure he will—just what happened. At first this item was in the amount of $75,000. It was sent back to Mr. Charles Wilson, who is the head of the agency, to determine the smallest amount with which the work could be carried on. The Senator will recall that. The amount of the item was reduced by the committee in accordance with that information.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not think the Senator is correct. I do not believe the item had to do with Mr. Wilson. It had to do with Mr. Keyserling. I think the Senator is referring to another item.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thought it referred to Mr. Wilson. I may be in error. However, I am told that it had to do with Mr. Wilson. I am not sure. The item is small, being only about $24,000. Of course, that amount ought to be saved whenever it is possible. We ought to save $24,000, or even $4. But it seems to me that in connection with a matter of this kind, when we send the item back to the Department with a request that it determine the smallest amount with which the work can be carried on, and the amount is reduced from $75,000 to $24,500, that ought to make a pretty good impression. It made a good impression on me, and I think it made a good impression on the committee. That is why the item was reported in the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. It seems that when we create new work in Government, all the agencies want an increase in their appropriations. This is one of the cases in that classification. The Council of Economic Advisers, headed by Mr. Keyserling, has specific work to be done. We gave them $300,000 for their regular work. Now they come with a request for $75,000 because of defense emergency work. Let me read from the side slip:

If it were possible to draw a sharp line of distinction between the Council's regular work and its defense emergency work, it would be easy to isolate the additional expenditures required by the defense mobilization program. But, as indicated above, it is impossible to draw any clear line between the mobilization activities of the Council and the Council's other functions. The work the Council performs for the President and for key emergency officials on mobilization problems necessarily involves everyone in the organization.

Mr. President, that does not mean that it is necessary to add a large staff of personnel. Naturally the most important work should be done first. As everyone knows, in the case of an organization as large as this one, which uses $300,000 a year, it is able to differentiate between the various kinds of work it does. It is able to do first that which is of vital interest, and to pass over that which is only of trivial interest to the United States.

Therefore, the Senator from Michigan feels that this agency can well do without the $24,975 in addition to the $300,000.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the Senator's position to be that when additional burdens result from the defense effort, all the agencies should set up a priority system?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The functions which are nonessential and which could be delayed or postponed should be delayed or postponed, and priority should be given to those functions which are essential to the present emergency condition.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. However, none of the agencies wants to drop any of the functions it performed under normal conditions. As soon as an emergency arises it wants extra money for its emergency functions, without dropping what the Senator from Michigan would term a more or less trivial function in its regular routine work. The agencies should sort out the work and do the important work first.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is precisely what was done in this case. We sent the item back to the Department with instructions——

Mr. FERGUSON. I have no complaint to make about the work of the committee. The committee was doing the best it could do.

Mr. McKELLAR. We did exactly what the Senator from California says ought to have been done. We sent the matter estimate to the Department and told them that wherever they could cut they must cut. They cut the item by more than two-thirds. It seems to me that they ought to have the amount which the committee has recommended. It is not an important matter, so far as I am concerned. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will withdraw his amendment, because I always have such high respect for his judgment. He is one of the strongest men on our committee. He is one of the finest men we have. I hope we can get along with the bill without much further trouble. I hope we will get through with it at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this item is not a large one, but I believe that the regular appropriation of $300,000 should be sufficient to take care of the requirements. So far as I am concerned I am becoming sick of various Government agencies attempting to ride on defense. They get their regular appropriations, and then they come to Congress for additional appropriations. Each seems to feel that it is much more vital to the Government than any other agency so far as defense is concerned. It is a small item, but I believe it could be eliminated without any great loss to anyone.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say that I am in entire accord with the Senator from New Hampshire. As the Senator knows, I believe we are spending too much money. I have done everything in the world I could do to get the agencies to spend less money. The Senator from New Hampshire will remember—and I say it with some pride—that on every appropriation bill this year I have either reserved the right or asked unanimous consent in the committee to vote against large appropriations. I believe we ought to do all we can to cut down the amount of money. I believe the Senator from New Hampshire is right. I am not going to make any great fuss about it any more.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to confirm what the Senator from Tennessee has stated, that the matter was referred to Mr. Wilson, and that Mr. Wilson came back with a recommendation in which he cut the amount from $75,000 to the sum which appears in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. $24,500.

Mr. HAYDEN. The following is shown in the letter addressed to the clerk of the committee:

With respect to Senator McKELLAR's request to submit to the committee the minimum money requirements of the various agencies engaged in defense mobilization for fiscal 1952, there is attached a table setting forth those minimum requirements.

Therefore, Mr. Wilson has O. K.'d this reduction.

I cannot agree with the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Michigan when they assume, because an agency was engaged in certain work in times when there was no emergency in existence, that automatically the work ceases to be of any importance when an emergency arises. I cannot follow that line of reasoning. If that is the case, perhaps the money should not have been appropriated in the first place. I cannot follow the line of reasoning that because we are in a period of emergency the work which the agency was doing in normal times is worthless.

Mr. BRIDGES. No. We say the agency should adopt a system of priority and give preference to its priority work, if it is performing important work. I have not seen anything come out of this agency which is particularly illuminating. I assume they can get by with

$300,000. It is a small amount we are now dealing with; but we must start to save even small amounts.

This is one item which I believe is a soft spot in the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire is to strike out the section on page 36, beginning at line 4. I raise the parliamentary inquiry whether that could not be accomplished best by voting "No" on the committee amendment, since the language is not in the bill but is being offered as a committee amendment, instead of moving to strike out the language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is correct The controlling parliamentary procedure is to put the question on the committee amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and myself, I withdraw the amendment and we shall vote on the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 36, lines 4 to 9. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask for a division.

On a division, the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Defense Production Administration—Salaries and expenses," on page 36, line 15, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$2,800,000" and insert "$3,330,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert the following proviso: *"Provided,* That transfers (not to exceed 10 percent) between the appropriations 'Salaries and expenses, Defense Production Administration' and 'Salaries and expenses, Defense Production Activities, Department of Commerce' may be made by agreement between the Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator of the Defense Production Administration with approval of the Bureau of the Budget."

LEASE OF GOVERNMENT FACILITIES AT CAMP CROWDER TO MID-WEST STORAGE & REALTY CO.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on September 13, 1951, I made a statement, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 11254 and 11255, in reference to the questionable manner in which the Government facilities at Camp Crowder, Mo., were leased in 1949 to the Mid-West Storage & Realty Co.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a brief summary of the pertinent facts in that statement.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

September 12, 1949: The Mid-West Storage & Realty Co., of Kansas City, Mo., was chartered with authorized capital stock of $50,000, of which $25,000 was paid in on October 18, 1949.

September 15, 1949: Three days later the above company leased from the War Assets Administration (Lease No. RP-24-1349) 113 buildings at Camp Crowder (later increased to 153) at an annual rental of $11,270.

September 19, 1949: The Mid-West Storage & Realty Co. leased this same property to the Commodity Credit Corporation (Lease No. T44-2-CCC-399) for the storage of grain. Mr W B. Walton, Director of CCC, signed this lease on behalf of CCC

The lease carried a notation that the CCC was obligated to store a minimum of 2,000,000 bushels of grain at these facilities, thus guaranteeing certain income to the lessors, which was most unusual for this type of grain storage agreement It is noteworthy that while it was customary for CCC to require a financial statement showing the responsibility of parties concerned, in this instance no such statement appears in the records

For the 20-month period ending May 18, 1951, during the time the CCC utilized these facilities, they paid the Mid-West Storage & Realty Co. $282,201 11

October 18, 1949: One month after the company was incorporated and leases had been signed with both War Assets and the CCC, the five stockholders of the Mid-West Storage & Realty Co issued checks to the company for $5,000 each, representing the $25,000 paid-in capital stock This means that at the time the leases were signed with the two Government agencies the net worth of the company was exactly zero.

What makes this contract more intriguing is the background of the personnel of the company who negotiated this extraordinary lucrative deal The five officers and principal stockholders of the company, each of whom paid in $5,000, were:

(1) A H Myers, Kansas City, Mo., president, listed as investment broker, member Kansas City and Chicago Boards of Trade, director and principal stockholder in several companies, including three companies operating and distributing coin machines

(2) Harry Easley, Webb City, Mo., vice president, listed as president and principal stockholder of the Home Loan & Land Co., Webb City, Mo. Former State director of WPA in Missouri No previous experience in grain storage prior to 1949.

(3) John Stark, treasurer, in grain brokerage and storage business for over 30 years; apparently the only one who had any previous experience in grain storage.

(4) Paul B Edwards, Joplin, Mo., stockholder, between January 1, 1949, and March 31, 1949, had a contract with War Assets Administration as maintenance-caretaker for Camp Crowder, under which contract he was paid $6,231 77 per month On April 1, 1949, effective the same day, he was awarded a new lump-sum maintenance and care contract (No. WS-8-P-302), under which he was paid $5,500 per month. Thus we find that War Assets was paying Mr. Edwards $5,500 per month as maintenance-caretaker for the same property which the Mid-West Storage & Realty Co. of which he was a stockholder was leasing from War Assets for less than $1,000 per month. He continued to collect these payments for several months after his company negotiated its lease.

(5) Dan M. Nee, Kansas City, Mo., secretary, from 1933 to 1948, was collector of internal revenue for the western district of Missouri, Kansas City, Mo He resigned in 1948 to run for governor. He was defeated. Partner in Bernard Motors, Inc., a Ford dealership in Lexington, Mo. Bernard Motors, Inc., was incorporated April 14, 1949, with Mr. Nee and Mr. Quirk J. Bernard, of Kansas City, Mo., and their wives, as sole owners.

Quirk J. Bernard, Kansas City, Mo., partner with Mr. Nee in this Ford agency was regional director, Kansas City, Mo., for the Liquidator of War Assets from 1948 through October 1, 1950, and in such capacity was the official who signed the favorable contract with his partner's grain company. During World War II, Mr. Bernard was associated with the Idle Tire Storage Co appraising and storing tires through Government contracts with the RFC and from August 1943 to February 1945 was a tire-rationing officer for the OPA.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, since that time I have been furnished with this additional information which I consider rather significant:

Mr Ardeis H Myers, of Kansas City, Mo., one of the partners in this unusually successful venture, has outstanding a proposed income tax assessment, including penalties, amounting to $675,344.16, representing deficiencies in the years 1942 to 1946, inclusive.

A breakdown of these assessments is as follows:

1942	$18,669 66
1943	103,210 65
1944	49,846 19
1945	307,085 37
1946	196,522 29
Total	675,334 16

This $675,000 outstanding tax account has been allowed to gather dust first in the Kansas City collector's office under Dan M Nee and now on the shelf here in Washington.

Failure to refer this claim to the Department of Justice for prosecution or collection has resulted in 3 years of the 5 years involved becoming noncollectible since the statute of limitations has expired.

Unless some action is taken prior to March 15, 1952, the assessment for 1945 will be cleared in the same manner.

I am not attempting to pass upon the merits or demerits of the proposed assessment of these taxes, but I point out that if the assessments were made and no action was taken because the Government did not believe they had a bona fide claim, they should have washed the slate on those years' assessments.

On the other hand, in view of the fact that there is nothing in the records which indicates that the Government has changed its mind as to the validity of these assessments, some explanation should be forthcoming as to why they were allowed to elapse without any effort being made to collect.

I make this statement particularly in view of the fact that the record shows that this entire assessment of $675,000 is still outstanding against Mr. Myers. What is more intriguing is the fact that the Treasury Department's records show that this same Dan M. Nee, who was collector of internal revenue in Kansas City, during the years involved—1942–46 inclusive—is now listed as the attorney representing Mr. Myers in his case against the Federal Government.

I felt that these facts were more than a mere coincidence in view of the fact that Mr. Myers and Mr. Nee are also partners in the Mid-West Storage & Realty Co., this partnership having been formed within a few months after Mr. Nee left the Government service.

The business activities of Mr. A. H. Myers, against whom this $675,000 tax

assessment is pending and one of the partners with Dan M. Nee, former collector, in the Mid-West Storage & Realty Co., are listed as follows:

A. H. Myers, about 50 years old and a native of Chillicothe, Mo., now lives in Kansas City and conducts various business enterprises, principally in Kansas City. For many years prior to 1942, he had various business interests at Chillicothe, among which were the Chillicothe Furniture Co. and the Consolidated Amusement Service Co. which distributed coin-operated amusement devices. During World War II he acquired an interest in, or owned, the Consolidated Amusement Service Co. at Waynesville, Mo., which also distributed coin-operated amusement machines. Waynesville is the town nearest to Fort Leonard Wood, Mo. The Consolidated Amusement Service Co. of Waynesville may be doing business as a subsidiary of the Consolidated Amusement Co. or Consolidated Distributing Co., both of which have main offices at 1906–1910 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo. Mr. Myers presently has financial interests in the following companies:

Mid-West Storage & Realty Co., Inc., Kansas City, Mo., president.

Consolidated Distributing Co., 1906–1910 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo., treasurer. Mrs. A. H. Myers is vice president of this company, and Mr. and Mrs. Myers are the principal stockholders. Mr. and Mrs. Irving W. Weiler are president and secretary of the company, respectively, and own the balance of the stock. The company wholesales coin-operated amusement devices in the Greater Kansas City area. Sales approximate $300,000 a year; surplus is about $75,000 on a capital stock investment of $40,000; and the company reportedly has always made substantial profits.

Consolidated Amusement Service Co., Chillicothe, Mo. Mr. and Mrs. A. H. Myers are partners. The company owns about 600 coin-operated music and pinball machines; monthly sales approximate $5,000; and operations appear to have been profitable. Consolidated Amusement Co., 1906–1910 Grand Ave., Kansas City, Mo. This company started in 1937 as an operating company for the distribution of coin machines but now reportedly serves as a holding company for various Myers and Weiler enterprises. It buys and sells securities and makes investments. Estimated sales for 1949 were $1,000,000.

A. H. Myers & Co., Waldheim Building, Kansas City. This company was formed in 1937, is not incorporated, and does a general brokerage and investment business. Mr. C. G. Choquette is in some way associated in the business.

Myers Grain Co., Inc., Board of Trade Building, Kansas City. Fifty thousand dollars capital stock. Mr. Myers is a member of the Kansas City and Chicago Boards of Trade.

Clinton Automatic Music Co., Clinton, Mo.; Myers' interest not known.

Creeton Music Co., Kirksville, Mo.; Myers' interest not known.

No financial statements covering all of Mr. Myers' business activities were available. However, bank balances for the various businesses were reportedly adequate, loans were few, the businesses were considered profitable, some very profitable, and he has the reputation of being a person of very substantial means.

Mr. Myers had not been connected with any business which operated grain storage elevators prior to 1949.

Mr. President, I may say that this record of Mr. Myers' activities was taken from a report of the General Accounting Office as prepared by their auditors.

Following my previous remarks, the officials of that company claimed that the $382,201.11 represented as the gross payments for the first 20 months was misleading, in that they claimed only a small percentage was net profit.

In answer to that erroneous claim, I have quoted further from the records of the General Accounting Office, whose auditors have checked the books of the Mid-West Storage & Realty Co.

Their report shows that at the end of August 1950, 11 months after its forming, the company had realized a profit, after all expenses, of $94,226.55. This is represented by $57,350.57 being carried as surplus, and $36,875.98 being paid to officers and stockholders.

The General Accounting Office further pointed out that the profit in subsequent months would be at a substantially higher percentage basis, due to the fact that in the first few months all expenses of getting the property ready were charged off as current expenses.

While the net figures for the remaining 9 months are not available, this preliminary report clearly indicates that the venture was an unusually profitable one for a group which at the time of the leasing of the Government property never had a single dime of their own money invested.

We should remember that this property was leased by these gentlemen from the War Assets Administration, which agency was represented by Mr. Quirk J. Bernard, another business associate of Mr. Dan M. Nee, collector of internal revenue

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. NIXON. Does the Senator from Delaware recall the date when he first made charges on the floor of the Senate in regard to the collector of internal revenue at St. Louis, Mr. Finnegan?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it was on May 7, 1951.

Mr. NIXON. The purpose of this question is to bring before the Senate the fact that the Senator from Delaware has indicated on several occasions in the past that when he speaks on matters of this sort, he speaks with authority, because today we read in the headlines about the very things the Senator from Delaware brought out on the floor of the Senate in the spring of this year.

I think the Senator from Delaware is to be congratulated again for digging up the facts, regardless of whom the facts may hurt, regardless of whether the person involved is in one political party or in the other, and in presenting them to the Senate today.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from California for his remarks.

I think it is fair to say that the one reason why the statement made on the floor of the Senate on May 7, 1951, was not contradicted and one reason why it has been supported is that at that time I was quoting from files which had been gathering dust in the Treasury Department. All the information which I called to the attention of the Senate on May 7, 1951, regarding Mr. Finnegan was in the files of the Treasury Department at that time and was there at the time when the grand jury first met in St. Louis in March 1951. However, the information was not presented to the second grand jury until I presented it here on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. NIXON. That is the point, namely, that files which are gathering dust in a Government agency are not serving the purpose they should serve, namely, exposing corruption where it exists, so that action can be taken to counteract it.

I think the action of the Senator from Delaware in bringing the matter to the attention of the Senate, so that action eventually was taken regarding it, is the way for us to proceed at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Unfortunately that is true. Apparently the only way for us to bring such matters to the attention of the public generally, and also to the attention of the Senate is to present them here on the floor. For some reason we find considerable reluctance on the part of the administrative agencies downtown to expose graft or corruption when it is found to exist in their departments.

That is the great charge against the present administration, namely, a refusal to let the facts be known. Any attempt to cover up corruption in any administration only makes the cases more suspicious. The people have a right to know what is going on.

Mr. NIXON. Ordinarily when matters of this type are brought to the attention of any administration, a basic decision must be made, namely, whether to handle the matter quietly and to allow the official involved to resign without any fanfare or publicity, and thereby hide the facts which were the cause of his separation from the Federal service, or to expose the matter in such a way that the public will get the facts, and so that at least we can make sure that such activities will not be countenanced in the future.

It seems to me that too often in the past the current administration officials—with some exceptions, let me say—have followed the procedure of allowing the person concerned to resign, and, in fact, sometimes complimenting him, without allowing the real facts causing his resignation to be known.

In this instance, when the man resigning has had the charges made and proved against him, it seems to me that the public is entitled to know what the facts are, because only in that way shall we prevent a repetition of such things in the future. Will the Senator from Delaware agree as to that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I agree. In connection with the statement I have just made, I point out again that I am not attempting to pass on the merits or

the demerits of the particular tax assessments. That is not my responsibility. The point is that these assessments were recommended by the Government examiners. If, after reviewing the assessments, it was found that the assessments were wrong, the Treasury Department owed the individual concerned the duty of acknowledging that the assessments were wrong, and should then have canceled them. However, so far as we know, that has not been done, and now when we find the same collector, under whom the assessments were proposed, now registered as the counsel for this taxpayer—naturally it looks questionable. What made this case even more suspicious was the fact that a few months after the collector of internal revenue resigned we find him not only engaged in business with but actually registered with the Treasury Department as counsel for the same taxpayer in his case against the Government. This cannot help but raise the question in our minds as to when Mr. Nee began representing this client. How close were their relations before Mr. Nee left the service and did this taxpayer get the same treatment other taxpayers received?

The Treasury Department has a responsibility to the American people to investigate, and to tell us exactly what happened and what they are going to do about it.

The questionable activities of just a few men are bringing discredit upon this whole revenue department and, in fairness not only to the American people but also to the thousands of honest employees in the service, the situation must be exposed and corrected

We must restore the confidence of the American people in their Government and that cannot be done by covering up the corruption.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the distinguished Senator from Delaware. Judging from his speech and from the various things we read in the newspapers, one would get the impression that Government officials are all a bunch of crooks and grafters. I wish to say that, in my opinion, Federal officials today are just as honest as were the Federal officials in 1926, 1927, 1928, 1929, 1930, 1931, and 1932. It was only a very short time ago that, under a Republican administration, a member of the Cabinet was sent to the penitentiary.

I am a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which for 2 years I had the honor to be chairman. When one reads, once in a while, about a mink coat, and such incidents are advertised morning, noon, and night, one is apt to draw an unwarranted conclusion regarding all Government officials.

Mr. President, it is my belief that some of the people who are committing crimes charged to persons connected with the Government, are not public officials. I recently picked up a newspaper from which I shall read briefly in order to show how very insignificant, comparatively speaking, is the number of public officials who are involved in wrongdoing. They represent about one one-hundredth of 1 percent of a total of about 2,500,000 Government employees. Those we read about in screaming headlines in the newspapers represent about that percentage of the total number of Federal employees.

The article to which I have referred is not one which I read in great headlines, though, in my opinion, it is a thousand times worse than some of the cases involving Government employees.

The article reads:

SEVENTH PITTSBURGH AREA BANKER IS SEIZED AS THIEF

PITTSBURGH, September 29.—The Pittsburgh office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation today announced that a new arrest has brought the number of bank embezzlement cases in this area in the last year to seven with total alleged thefts of more than $3,000,000.

The new arrest was that of Samuel Paul Lewis, 62, assistant cashier of the First National Bank, Indiana, Pa., who was arraigned here today before United States Commissioner Edward Snodgrass on a charge of violating the Federal Reserve Act.

Lewis, married and father of two adult children, was committed to the Allegheny County jail when he was unable to provide $15,000 bond. He had been employed by the bank for 40 years. Indiana is 45 miles east of here and is the county seat of Indiana County.

Fred Hallford, agent in charge of the Pittsburgh FBI office, said Lewis signed a statement admitting that since October 1947, he had taken $48,479 39 in bank funds by withdrawing various sums from the accounts of numerous civic organizations for which he served as treasurer

Hallford said Lewis insisted he returned all of the money

FORTY THOUSAND DOLLARS FROM RESERVE MISSING

Lewis' accounts were put under FBI examination last week when Federal bank examiners reported disappearance of $40,000 from the bank's cash reserve, Hallford said This money still is missing Hallford declined to say whether there is a connection between the $40,000 shortage and the admitted account juggling

Earlier this week, the FBI arrested Dennis Layfield, 44, a teller in the Wood County Bank of Parkersburg, W. Va., in connection with an embezzlement of $364,000

Other embezzlements in the area in the last year include the First National Bank, Cecil, Pa., $1,400,000, Parnassus National Bank, New Kensington, Pa., $600,000; First National Bank, also of New Kensington, $550,000, McKeesport, Pa., $50,000, and New Alexandria, Pa., $23,000.

Mr. President, I have another article before me, telling about an embezzlement at New Kensington, Pa., in the sum of $16,000. I also have an article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of October 3, which says:

RACKETEERS ARE TARGETS IN TAX COLLECTION DRIVE

Special antiracket squads have recommended that the Government collect $13,531,033 in back taxes and penalties from racketeers and gamblers.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question

Mr. LANGER. I should like to finish reading this article.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Will the Senator give the dates of those articles?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. The first article is dated September 29,

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. What year?

Mr. LANGER. This year. The date of the second article to which I referred was October 3, and the article which I am now reading into the RECORD is likewise dated October 3. I continue:

Announcing this yesterday, Internal Revenue Commissioner John B. Dunlap said 2,003 officers have been assigned to special squads established last April to check on the income tax returns of known or suspected criminals.

Naming no names, Mr. Dunlap said returns of 29,211 such persons are being checked.

Mr. President, I submit that, in simple fairness to Federal employees, it should be stated that many of them have proved their loyalty by working overtime, hours and hours and hours, and working Saturday afternoons without extra compensation. Yet every time a Federal employee is accused of stealing a small amount of money, we find the newspapers playing it up in big type clear across page 1.

I want the people of the country to know that the senior Senator from North Dakota believes that those who are today holding Federal positions are as honest, in proportion to the number employed, as they have ever been at any time in the history of the United States of America. I do not have to go back to the time of General Grant, under whose administration, as everyone knows, graft was rampant, when Indian trading posts were sold in much the same way that one would sell a horse or a hog When we consider that there are 2,500,000 Government employees, it is natural to expect that there will be some delinquents. Even Christ had his Judas. The result of these publications in the press is that today little children in school believe the charges of corruption which repeatedly come to their attention. These charges of corruption are doing more harm than good

I might add that it is very significant that in this morning's Washington Times-Herald—and I say to my Republican colleagues that certainly the Washington Times-Herald cannot be charged with being friendly to the administration—there is a statement to the effect that if the Republicans are going to rely in the next election upon charges of corruption, they will not get very far, and if they want a real issue they should look to the expenditure of money for foreign nations.

I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota how many persons are working as employees of the United States Government.

Mr. LANGER. In the neighborhood of 2,500,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. What is the population of the State of North Dakota?

Mr. LANGER. The population is 621,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The population of South Carolina is 2,000,000. I imagine that now and then a few thieves are found in the State of North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. We occasionally find a man who will sell a mortgaged horse,

or who will slaughter a young calf. Once in a great while we might find a man who holds public office and has stolen some money, but in the past 35 years no one has been arrested or convicted of stealing any money while holding a public trust. The Senator from South Carolina is chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and he is in charge, to a large extent, of 2,500,000 Government employees. I am sure he will agree that the reputation for honesty on the part of these 2,500,000 employees compares very favorably with that of a like number of employees in any other line of endeavor.

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think the Senator is correct. The Post Office Department spends approximately $2,250,000,000 a year. Does the Senator recall what bondsmen pay to the Post Office Department each year?

Mr LANGER. I do not.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not on an average of $78,000 a year?

Mr. LANGER. I do not have the figures in mind at this time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That amount of money is paid out each year in connection with persons who have mishandled money in some way. There are more than 600,000 postal employees who pay premiums to bonding companies amounting to $1,311,500 yearly. The bonding companies have had to make good an average of $78,000 yearly.

Mr. LANGER. We do not condone the taking of a single penny on the part of any public official.

I admire the way in which the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has fearlessly picked out a man who has been found to be corrupt. I do not want the people of the United States to get the idea that the public servants of the United States Government at this time are in any respect worse than others.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 36, beginning in line 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce—Office of the Secretary—Salaries and expenses, defense production activities," on page 37, line 11, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$39,450,000" and insert "$40,557,175."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on behalf of myself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the amendment of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 37, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "$40,557,175" and insert in lieu thereof "$40,025,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this amendment has to do with another relatively small cut in terms of what in normal times we would think of as a large Federal appropriation. In the light of this bill perhaps it is relatively small. It would result however, in a saving of more than half a million dollars, which is not to be sneezed at.

The amendment would accept the House version, so far as the Office of Technical Service, the Office of Transportation, and the Office of International Trade in the Department of Commerce are concerned. In addition, the Senate would concur in the House action in refusing the request of the Industrial Evaluation Board.

These agencies, in my opinion, are excellent examples of agencies which are riding on the coattails of defense. Each of these offices claims it has additional burdens as a result of the defense effort. As an example of their claims I should like to quote a statement of the Industrial Evaluation Board:

> There is no program more important to the defense of this country than the interdepartmental industrial security program.

Of course, by a peculiar coincidence, the Industrial Evaluation Board turns out to be the keystone of this program.

This statement appears rather surprising, in view of the Army, Navy, Air Force, FBI, CIA, and the Atomic Energy Commission. It develops that the program is only 7 months old. Its purpose is to decide which plants are most vital and which agencies should furnish special security guidance and direction.

These are typical examples of why it is costing so much to fight the war.

Most of these items have been dealt with adequately. A little further in the bill, under the Defense Transportation Administration, the committee has recommended $2,543,750. Of course, we must provide for defense transportation at this critical time, but why should the Department of Commerce want now, for the Office of Defense Transportation, $75,000 more?

As the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has indicated, these are supplemental appropriations. The regular appropriations, in most instances, have been made in regular appropriation bills. Under the guise of aiding the defense effort these various agencies are asking additional appropriations. This is, as I said, a small cut, but I believe we can save that amount of money by accepting the House appropriation on this particular item, which certainly is sufficient to cover the basic work with which they are entrusted.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, one of the very interesting things in this particular appropriation bill is the International Trade Office, which is asking for $225,000. The Export Control Department of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce has a regular appropriation of $5,388,000, and the same department has $3,000,000 for salaries and expenses. But this particular agency, the International Trade Agency, wants $225,000 in this bill. Let me read from the side slip to show what functions this agency performs:

> The Office of International Trade is assigned responsibility by the DPA for representing 65 foreign countries and areas by the National Production Authority and the Defense Production Administration allocating committees.

In other words, when a school board requests an allocation for material to build a school in the United States and wants an allotment of so much steel, immediately someone in the agency will say, "I am an American citizen; I work for the United States Government, but I want to put in an allotment for steel for Egypt." In other words, Mr. President, the foreign countries are going to have a representative in our Government watching out for their interests, when our own States and our own municipalities are asking for an allotment of a certain amount of material. I do not understand why we should be doing that kind of thing, appropriating $225,000 for looking after the interests of all the world when we are naturally supposed to look first after the interests of the American people. If the other countries need material, certainly they will have representatives, through their foreign offices, through their Embassies in this country, who can say, "We need and would like so much steel."

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Michigan is correct. I think we should stop and think of the fact that in the last decade we in the United States have poured out to the peoples of other nations almost $100,000,000,000. We certainly ought not to go to the expense of setting up within our own Government a division which will represent foreign governments, when they are contesting with vital projects in our own country, such as school districts or defense plants or something of that kind. The point of the Senator from Michigan is well taken.

Mr. FERGUSON. Could we not do without that item of $225,000?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I should like to say a word about it before we do without it or with it.

Mr. FERGUSON. The item is on page 171 of the slip sheets.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I see it. Yes, it is on page 171. The funds requested were $275,000. The amount granted was $225,000. My good friend the Senator from New Hampshire, talks about the way foreign people are getting our money. I wish he had voted with me on that subject. I voted to cut down allotments or gifts or whatever they may be called to foreign governments. As I recall, and if I am mistaken, I hope the Senator will correct me, the Senator from New Hampshire voted for very large appropriations—appropriations 100 times as large as this one. The last one I believe was $7,500,000,000. We are pouring out great sums of money to foreign countries. I believe in building up our own country. I have always taken that position. The Senator from New Hampshire knows I have taken it in the committee. I have taken it on the floor of the Senate. I have voted for every proposal to cut the amounts.

I voted for the proposal to cut the amount in question from $275,000 to $225,000. I think that is the proper amount. We cannot do ourselves any good by destroying the industries of our

own country while building up the industries of other countries. It is impossible for us to do ourselves any good by so doing. It ought not to be done. I am opposed to it. At the same time I think we should give other countries what it is right to give them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from Tennessee feel that a foreign nation should have in a Federal department a representative who is employed by the United States Government and is paid by the United States Government but who represents the foreign nation?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, sir. I not only do not believe in that——

Mr. FERGUSON. Well, that is what this proposal would do.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not believe in representatives of foreign nations being paid by our country, and I do not believe in American representatives being paid for lobbying in our own country. I do not believe in lobbying That ought to be done away with. When a lobbying bill was before the Senate I voted against lobbying. I do not recall how other Senators voted. I am against lobbying in America I am against lobbying in every other nation in the world. This item is not one for lobbying. This is included:

For expenses, except as hereinafter provided for, necessary to enable the Department of Commerce—

Not foreign countries—

to carry out its functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, including purchase (not to exceed one) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, employment of aliens, and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation,

One of the objectives is to prevent the entrance of foreigners who land on the Mexican side of the line. They are called wetbacks. They get into our country by means of use of fictitious names and by false statements, falsehoods told directly to our agents They ought not to do that I am opposed to it.

Mr FERGUSON. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that that particular item is covered in the appropriations for the Immigration Service and the Department of Justice rather than in this particular item?

Mr. McKELLAR That may be true, yes. But this is true about this item: It has already been cut down 10 percent by an amendment of the Senator himself.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator did a good job with that amendment, and I take my hat off to him for the good work he did. But that does not mean that we should not appropriate the necessary funds for running our own Government. It is easy enough to vote for the appropriation of billions of dollars—not millions of dollars, but billions of dollars, in one case $7,500,000,000—to other countries. But when we talk about $24,000—was that the amount referred to a while ago?

Mr. FERGUSON. It was $27,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Twenty-seven thousand dollars—my good friend from New Hampshire thought we ought to save that, beyond all question.

It is easy enough to vote for $7,500,000,000 We voted that sum of money to go to 54 nations of the world. But when it comes to America, which happens to be our home, and which I hope we will not do anything to hurt, it is proposed to refuse to give money which is needed.

Mr FERGUSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will decide——

Mr McKELLAR. I hope the Senate will adopt the committee amendment. It ought to adopt the amendment.

Mr HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr FERGUSON Yes.

Mr HAYDEN I cannot quite follow the Senator's argument that there is anything wrong——

Mr FERGUSON. I do not say it is wrong. I say it is unnecessary.

Mr. HAYDEN. Well, unnecessary. Put it that way then.

Mr FERGUSON. Not illegal.

Mr HAYDEN. If certain foreign governments need, for example, steel produced in the United States, or any other like commodity, is it not better to have the Department of Commerce, which is engaged in the supervision and encouragement of trade between nations, to check the requests, put them together, and take them to the Defense Production Administration rather than to have each individual foreign country make its own application without any checking on the part of the Department of Commerce? How does the Senator think we could obtain the most efficient distribution of materials?

Mr. FERGUSON I think a foreign government should go to the Department in the regular manner and present its claims for allocation, just as in the case of American citizens

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what is done.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire implies that the foreign government should bypass our Department of Commerce, and make its requests directly to the Defense Production Authority. I so understood the Senator

Mr. FERGUSON. An appropriation of $225,000 is asked for three-quarters of a year to provide representatives for 65 foreign governments. That is what the appropriation is for.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand; but how do they proceed, if the Department of Commerce is not allowed to represent them? If the Senator had his way, the 65 foreign governments would each be presenting their claims.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the way it should be.

Mr. HAYDEN. The claims should be screened and worked over by the Department of Commerce, and should receive the approval of the Department before being submitted to the Defense Production Authority.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan feels that we should not set aside $225,000 for the purpose of employing representatives of foreign governments. They ought to come here in the regular way, and our Department ought to handle each one of the claims. There should be no special representation.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is nothing in the record to show that the entire sum of money is to be spent for that purpose. That is only one function.

Mr McKELLAR. There are 54 countries using our money and doing the spending. I do not know how much they give us back, but I take it there is not very much that we get back.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, am I correct in understanding that this item is for export-licensing control?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. CASE. Is it for examination of requests by foreign countries?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; and for the representation of such requests before the Defense agency. We provide representatives for the foreign nations.

Mr CASE. Are we afraid that they will not ask for enough?

Mr FERGUSON Let me describe the situation which I found to exist in Korea I inquired in Korea how we decided to spend our ECA aid money I was told that it was rather difficult at times to find projects The man with whom I was discussing the question gave me an example of how he found a project. This was before the Korean war. He said, "I stood on the street one night and I saw that the people were lined up waiting for busses and streetcars. I came to the conclusion that they needed more and better transportation in Seoul, Korea, and I put that in as a project"

I told him that if he were to come to the city of Detroit or to other cities in Michigan and stand on the street during the rush hours in the evening, he would have to come to the conclusion that we needed more transportation Practically every city in the United States needs more transportation I do not understand why we are paying men to go into other countries to try to find projects. That is what this appropriation amounts to.

Mr. CASE. That suggests something to me, if the Senator will permit. I notice a series of increases to various departments, and the provision made for some departments which were not carried in the House bill. There is the Department of the Interior, the Federal Security Agency, and the Department of Agriculture. The language in all these cases seems to be the same. Is the Senator suggesting that that is the reason for the various proposals?

Mr FERGUSON. No The reason varies. I could not say that the various items follow a pattern. However, after this bill was passed by the House, or after it was taken up in the House, the departments thought of other items, and naturally they came to the Senate and asked that such items be included.

Mr. CASE. The reason for my asking the question is that a few years ago, when we were in about the first or second year of the Marshall plan, the Depart-

ment of Agriculture provided a man, and the Department of State took him and another man and created a special mission which it sent to England, to persuade the British to increase their requests for tobacco. We spent a great deal of money trying to persuade the British to increase their requests for tobacco, presumably so that the British, in the first place, might get more tobacco taxes, and in order that they might obtain more dollars. If the defense production activity of the Department of Commerce is for the purpose of persuading other countries to increase their requests, it represents a striking parallel to the situation which I have described.

Mr. FERGUSON. The purpose of the appropriation is to provide representatives for the foreign countries. I assume that at times they might try to persuade the foreign countries to increase their requests, as was done in the case of the ECA.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire will be agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of Senators to the hearings. I read from page 846 of the hearings:

Chairman McKELLAR. The next item in this part of the appropriation bill is the Office of International Trade. How does that come in there? It was approved by the budget for $275,000, but the House committee and the House struck it out. What about that?

Secretary SAWYER That is an item which involves the job given to the OIT, the Office of International Trade, in connection with mobilization They have been assigned the task of representing these various claimant countries as they call them in connection with the allocation of critical materials.

I digress long enough to say that the critical materials referred to include tin, aluminum, copper, and other materials which are necessary to carry on war.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to yield to my friend in just a moment. Continuing the reading from the hearings:

They have been assigned the task of representing these various claimant countries as they call them in connection with the allocation of critical materials. They represent 65 countries or something like that, who are after some of the materials that we produce here. The decision as to how much they get or whether they get any, and when they get it, depends on the investigations and recommendations that are made by this group. They are not the only ones, of course, who make recommendations, but the primary responsibility falls on them. That is a very important job at this time.

Chairman McKELLAR. Now, let me ask you: Have our defense forces the same particular business?

Secretary SAWYER. No.

Chairman McKELLAR Does the Department of State?

Secretary SAWYER. No.

That is the testimony. We reported this bill on the basis of the testimony which was given before the committee. We did not dispose of it on the basis of our own views, but on the basis of testimony. I think we have reported a proper bill. I am very sorry that my two good friends and other Senators who have interrupted, and whom I esteem and love very much, object to this item. I had hoped that they would not object. I wish to do them the courtesy of saying that they stated at the time the bill was reported that they were going to object. They stated that they objected to certain items, but I did not know that these were the items about which they were talking. However, they have the right to object.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Am I correct in understanding that, with respect to all these items, they are not items for procurement of defense materials, but are for the employment of people?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no

Mr. BRIDGES. They are for the employment of people or for personal services in presenting the claims of foreign countries for critical materials which we have, as against our own domestic allocations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Secretary Sawyer, who is a very fine man, testifies exactly to the contrary. He testifies that the purpose of the appropriation is the procurement of materials.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I do not like to differ with my distinguished friend from Tennessee, but I should like to read from the testimony of Secretary Sawyer:

That is an item which involves the job given to the OIT, the Office of International Trade, in connection with mobilization. They have been assigned the task of representing these various claimant countries as they call them in connection with the allocation of critical materials.

Not the critical materials which we are buying from them, but our own critical materials.

They represent 65 countries or something like that, who are after some of the materials that we produce here.

Mr President, we have poured out several hundred billion dollars in the last decade. Now we have reached the point where the United States Government is being called on to put on the payroll, for the taxpayers to pay, individuals whose business it is to represent foreign countries engaged in obtaining critical materials which we produce here. We have never done anything like this before.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES Yes.

Mr. CASE. These people go from department to department to get permits, or whatever is necessary, to obtain such critical materials for the foreign governments they represent, in competition with our domestic requirements, and our small-business men, who do not have any procurers on the payroll of the Government.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. The testimony appears at page 46 of the hearings on the supplemental appropriations bill. That is exactly what they are doing.

Mr. CASE. Is it not true that in the Department of Commerce, as well as in other agencies of the Government, some of the personnel is being laid off under the application of the 90 percent amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. CASE. In order to save the jobs of some people we are asked to provide money to put them back on the payroll in the guise of expediting the defense activities?

Mr. BRIDGES. It might be so.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, it might be. Anything might be. I should like to read from the testimony.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. We all agree that Mr. Sawyer is a man of truth and courage Mr. Sawyer testified:

The question is, How do we get the information, and who represents these various other nations in the committee, that is, the requirements committee in DPA that makes these decisions? This appropriation is requested because of the additional work that is entailed in that claimant-agency function performed by OIT That is then a very brief statement There are others here who can give it to you in detail if you desire.

He goes on to say further:

My comment, of course, is that I think the committee misunderstood, because I think they are essential, and I think they are very closely connected with the defense effort.

He goes on to say that he has gotten more tin, more aluminum, more copper, and more of the other scarce materials it is necessary we have at this time. The foreign countries use these men, it is true; but the persons we are discussing are men who are striving to build up materials for our defense effort.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to say, with respect to these claimants upon our domestic supply of essential materials, that it may be appropriate to note that recently the superintendent of schools in California came to see me in Washington because of the desperate situation with which the people of California are confronted in getting a limited amount of steel for school construction. In a great many areas in my State, which has had the largest population growth of any State in the Union, there are schools which are operating on a basis of two and sometimes three shifts a day in order to try to meet the educational requirements of the children within the areas. School districts have voted bonds, they have the money, but they cannot get the necessary steel and other materials with which to construct the school buildings.

As a matter of fact, in some areas where defense plants are erected—and I mention this fact because it ties in definitely with the defense program—employees are needed to run such plants. The employees who come to operate the plants have children. They

flood into such areas. The school districts want to get the materials necessary to enable them to construct schools, and they find it impossible to get the necessary supplies and materials. There are school children today in many areas in California who are meeting in living rooms in private homes, in lodge halls, and in civic halls, as well as part time in schoolrooms, while other children use the same schoolrooms at other times.

Certainly I believe the demands made upon us by other countries should be very carefully screened, and their demands should go through the same process that our people must go through, instead of having special people employed to plead their case.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from California. He has pointed out a very great weakness. In the State of New Hampshire, in the State of California, and in many other States of the Union, there are small school districts which take care of American boys and American girls who are deserving of education. Perhaps a school in one of these districts has burned down, and the school district cannot get the structural steel which is necessary to rebuild the school. Does the United States of America provide personnel to represent that school district to present its case for critical material? No. In the pending bill we are providing for individuals to represent 65 foreign countries, to present, as against the little school districts in New Hampshire, Illinois, Kansas, and every other State, their demands for critical material. It is an unheard-of step, and it is a step which I do not like to see taken.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I note in the testimony that Mr. Sawyer says that the appropriation is for representation on the part of those "who are after some of the materials."

It seems to me that the people of other countries are forever after things in this country, and that they are getting preferential treatment over Americans. Any Senator can testify from his own experience how many people come to see him every week, like suppliants with hats in hand, for a little extra copper, cobalt, steel, iron, and other critical materials which are indispensable to their business. We know from the operation of the controlled materials plan the great weight that is falling on business today.

It seems a little strange to appropriate money from the people's Treasury to pay representatives from abroad who come over "after some of the materials." Surely out of the compassion of our souls we ought to have something left over for our own people.

Mr. BRIDGES. I point out that the Department of Education undoubtedly consolidates the figures which are coming in from the school districts. However, that is wholly different from presenting claims, as is proposed here, for 65 foreign countries, in opposition to claims of our own individual citizens, for portions of the very scarce critical materials we have in this country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Earlier in the afternoon, when the Senator from New Hampshire was occupying the floor, I confessed a little frustration over the size of the amounts with which we deal here, for the figures in the appropriation bills which come before us simply baffle description.

I just came from the House side, and I hope it is no transgression of the rules for me to observe that in the House a second supplemental appropriation bill was just reported, and another one is still in the making.

The supplemental appropriation bill to which I refer carries $4,400,000,000, which is about $700,000,000 below the Bureau of the Budget estimates. Here is a sample, then, it seems to me, of the looseness with which we are spending money today. The blame must necessarily be on the estimate maker and at the other end of the avenue, because the appropriations have become so astronomical that I think Congress does not have the capacity to deal with them, unless, as I pointed out in connection with the Defense Establishment appropriation bill, we have a very large staff which virtually will live in the Bureau of the Budget and in the divisions of the executive branch, to find out what is going on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire to the committee amendment on page 37, in line 11.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on that question, I ask for the yeas and nays, for this issue is a vital one.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hennings	Millikin
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Benton	Hill	Moody
Brewster	Hoey	Mundt
Bridges	Holland	Murray
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Neely
Cain	Hunt	Nixon
Carlson	Ives	O'Conor
Case	Jenner	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kefauver	Smathers
Dirksen	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Knowland	Smith, N J
Ecton	Langer	Smith, N C.
Ellender	Lehman	Sparkman
Ferguson	Magnuson	Stennis
Frear	Malone	Thye
George	Maybank	Underwood
Gillette	McCarran	Watkins
Green	McFarland	Wiley
Hayden	McKellar	Williams
Hendrickson	McMahon	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the committee amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may we have the amendment read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 37, line 11, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "$40,557,175" and insert "$40,025,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I merely desire to say that this amendment would cut out items which the House committee rejected.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, since I have just entered the Chamber, may I ask the Senator from Michigan what the items are?

Mr. FERGUSON. The four items are, first, Industrial Evaluation Board, $196,100; second, Office of Technical Services, $36,075; third, Office of Transportation, $75,000; and fourth, Office of International Trade, $225,000.

Mr. AIKEN. Do these items represent work which cannot be performed in any other way?

Mr. FERGUSON. Three of them have regular appropriations. The item covering the Industrial Evaluation Board, $196,100, is one which has no appropriation at the present time.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the purpose of having an Industrial Evaluation Board?

Mr. McKELLAR. The purpose of it is simply that we may have our own agents giving attention to the stockpiling of certain scarce materials, such as copper and steel.

Mr FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan feels that it is for the purpose of evaluating a plant from the viewpoint of security. Every industrial plant of which the Senator from Michigan has knowledge is security-minded in its own right, and if not, the various military services which let contracts to the plant would certainly indicate whether there ought to be plant protection.

Mr. AIKEN. Did the Senator say that it was not considered by the House?

Mr. FERGUSON. The House considered it, but turned it down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. McCARRAN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to know if this amendment covers all the four items, Industrial Evaluation Board, Office of Technical Services, Office of Transportation, and Office of International Trade, or does it cover only one items.

Mr. FERGUSON. It covers all four items.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

The Senators from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. MCCLELLAN] are unavoidably detained on official business at one of the Government departments.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio ([Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—40

Aiken	George	Mundt
Bennett	Gillette	Nixon
Brewster	Hendrickson	O'Conor
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Schoeppel
Cain	Holland	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Hunt	Smith, N J
Case	Ives	Smith, N C.
Connally	Jenner	Thye
Dirksen	Johnson, Colo.	Watkins
Dworshak	Knowland	Wiley
Ecton	Langer	Williams
Ferguson	Malone	
Frear	Millikin	

NAYS—32

Benton	Johnston S. C.	Moody
Chavez	Kefauver	Murray
Clements	Kerr	Neely
Cordon	Lehman	Robertson
Ellender	Magnuson	Russell
Green	Maybank	Smathers
Hayden	McCarran	Sparkman
Hennings	McFarland	Stennis
Hill	McKellar	Underwood
Humphrey	McMahon	Young
Johnson, Tex.	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—24

Anderson	Flanders	McClellan
Bricker	Fulbright	Morse
Butler, Nebr.	Kem	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Kilgore	Pastore
Capehart	Lodge	Taft
Douglas	Long	Tobey
Duff	Martin	Welker
Eastland	McCarthy	Wherry

So the amendment offered by Mr. BRIDGES for himself and Mr. FERGUSON was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Defense Transport Administration—Salaries and expenses," on page 37, line 17, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$2,750,000" and insert "$2,543,750."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 17, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses, defense production activities

For expenses necessary to enable the Department of the Interior to carry out its functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, including purchase (not to exceed four) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; employment of aliens; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; $6,701,625.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and myself, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 38, line 4, it is proposed to strike out the figure "$6,701,625" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,250,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the amendment provides a saving of $1,451,625. It would represent Senate approval of the action of the House committee. A careful study of the House committee's report on these figures is most persuasive. The House committee report notes, for example, that the committee is not impressed with the need for 54 new positions to coordinate, at the Secretary's level, the defense activities of the Department of the Interior. Neither am I impressed. I agree with the House committee. After the House floor action, which denied all funds for the Interior Department, the Department officials did not trim by one cent their budget request before the Senate committee. They asked full restoration of the budget estimate.

Bear in mind that the Department of the Interior have had their entire appropriation in the regular appropriation bill. This is a supplemental appropriation bill of the same year for which we have already appropriated money.

Their presentation was filled with generalities about their responsibilities under the Defense Production Act. It is the same argument as that put forth by every department coming before Congress. Every one of them received their regular appropriation. Every one of them asks for additional hand-outs because of some special work they are supposed to do in connection with the defense effort. It is another example of a regular agency of the Government which is called on to do special work in an emergency. Instead of everyone pitching in to work a little harder or to spend a little volunteer overtime on the job, the departments take the easy way out. They ask Congress to give them additional funds so they can hire additional persons to do additional work, probably putting them on the permanent pay roll of the Government.

This department is no different from many of the others. The pattern is the same that will be found all the way through the Government.

The amendment would eliminate $1,451,625. It can be argued that the Department should have this money. Most departments and agencies can find a way to spend money. But it does not make sense to me that every department of the Government should have this sudden call to aid in the defense effort. They all claim to be a little different from anyone else, a little more important, and particularly when it comes to the desire to hire additional personnel.

Mr. MALONE. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Is it not a fact that a good many of the departments rate their heads by the number of employees that they are able to muster? In other words, when an office with two stenographers or five stenographers or employees of some other designation adds to the number beyond a certain point, the head of the office gets a raise in his own rating?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. One of the factors in determining promotional ratings in the Federal Government is too often the number of employees which a supervisor or a department or division head has under him.

Mr. MALONE. Is there anything in the evidence before the committee, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, to indicate that any of the additional work assigned to the Department would be slighted in the least if the Department did not receive the appropriation at this time?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. I do not think there is anything to indicate that it would be slighted. The testimony is filled with generalities. I think with the tremendous sums they have in the regular appropriation they would be able to absorb some of this new work without detriment to the routine work they are supposed to do.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. What did the Department of the Interior claim this money was needed for—for what specific purpose?

Mr. BRIDGES. It covers a wide area of activities. But it is primarily for coordination and administrative purposes. For instance, in the office of the Secretary, it is indicated that the budget estimate contemplates reviews of the determinations of bureaus to a far greater extent than is necessary for the making of policy and for adherence to established policy. For instance, it affects various divisions of the Department of the Interior, such as the Defense Electric Power Administration, the Defense Solid Fuels Administration, the Defense Minerals Administration, the Defense Fisheries Administration, the Petroleum Administration for Defense, and it adds a little to their regular appropriations,

They are claiming that additional burdens have been placed on them as a result of the defense effort.

Mr. WATKINS. The item has no relation to any one specific job, except as the Senator has indicated, has it?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. Take the item of the Defense Fisheries Administration. I read from the House committee report:

> The amount of $100,000, a reduction of $150,000 in the budget estimates is recommended. The committee is apprehensive in approving even this amount and will in the future expect a better justification for this program being placed in the defense category.

That is the way the House committee handled the matter. It allowed something, but even so, the committee stated it did not think the amount allowed was properly justified.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. As I understand, the principal justification for this additional money is that it is needed by reason of the burdens imposed upon the Department because of defense activities.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. Senators must bear in mind that, as the Senator from Utah well knows, we have given the Department of the Interior its regular appropriations covering all the various divisions, and their regular activities. This is a supplemental appropriation, on top of the requirements which were presented in the regular way.

Mr. WATKINS. It has nothing to do with any new reclamation projects, new buildings, or new activities with respect to wildlife, or anything of that sort?

Mr. BRIDGES. Not in a direct way. It has more to do with the divisions to which I have referred.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Do I correctly understand that the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire contemplates appropriating the amount allowed by the House committee?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. The House gave nothing for these items. The House rejected them.

Mr. BRIDGES. The House did not allow anything, but the House committee did. We are urging the House committee figures.

Mr. McCARRAN. So I understand.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think it should be made very clear that what the amendment would do would be to allow the figure approved by the House committee. As shown on page 4 of the Senate committee report, beginning with "Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary, Defense Production Activities," the House committee allowed $5,250,000. The Senate committee voted to allow $6,701,225. So the amendment would allow exactly what the House committee thought the Department was entitled to. Of course, the House allowed nothing, but we are not asking the Senate to do what the House did. We are asking the Senate to do what the House committee would have done. The House committee would have allowed $5,250,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would the Senator from New Hampshire be willing to modify his amendment by making the item for the Defense Minerals Administration $1,655,750 instead of the House figure?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. This is a new agency. Let me read what the House committee said about it:

> The responsibilities of this administration under the defense-production program are both varied and important, principally because of the fact that it deals with scarce and critical metals and minerals, the prime responsibility being to increase the production of these items It was testified that expansion in the mineral industries has exceeded $1,000,000,000 as a result of encouragement or actual assistance.
>
> Since the estimates for this activity were formulated and presented to the Congress it has been decided to transfer to the National Production Authority certain functions budgeted for this activity. While the extent of reduced requirements has not been finally determined, indications are that they will be substantial A further reduction can be achieved by lesser transfers to the Geological Survey and reduced administrative personnel. In the light of these considerations, the amount of $1,300,000 contained in the bill should prove adequate.

That is the amount which this amendment would give to the new agency for the next 9 months. It would be allowed $1,300,000. That certainly should enable the agency to get started and do a good job.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not so critical of what the Senator says, but I am thinking about the testimony before the Senate committee of Mr. Jess Larson, who will have charge of this function. It seemed to me in the committee, and it seems to me now, that the amount allowed by the House should be increased. The Senator will remember that in the committee we allowed $1,655,750. I am particularly interested in that one item. With respect to the other items, I think the department could get along very well, but I should like to see that particular item increased to what the Senate committee allowed.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the fact that the Senator is talking about a very important item. Minerals are of great value and importance to our defense. However, the Senator from Michigan feels—and I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire is of the same opinion—that while we recognize the importance of the item, this is a new agency, and that if it had $1,300,000, it could get along.

There are some other items of great significance. To illustrate how these various agencies are pyramiding, the amount recommended by the Senate in the regular appropriation for the Department of Commerce was $40,557,175. It now asks for $500,000. The regular appropriations for the Interior Department are about $60,000,000. It now asks for $5,000,000 in this particular bill.

With respect to the Office of the Secretary, I find this language in the report of the House committee:

> The committee is not impressed with the need in this office for 54 positions to coordinate at the Secretary's level the defense production activities of the Department. It would seem that the Budget estimate contemplates reviews of Bureau determinations to a far greater extent than is necessary for the making of policy and for adherence to established policy. The amount of $250,000, a reduction of $120,000 in the estimates, is approved.

In other words, the House committee felt that 54 additional positions were too many, and that the number should be reduced.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr AIKEN. I notice that the Senator from Michigan lays a great deal of stress on the development of mineral production in the United States. Does not the Senator from Michigan feel that mineral production would be considerably encouraged if American producers were permitted to charge the same prices for their output as foreign producers are permitted to charge?

Mr. FERGUSON. There can be no doubt about that.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Michigan knows that foreign copper is permitted to be sold for four or five cents a pound more than domestic copper. A similar situation prevails with respect to foreign lead and zinc. Foreign minerals are sold at higher prices than domestic minerals. I, for one, have never been able to understand why our domestic producers have been held down on the price of minerals, while the American people who own mines in other countries have been able to charge four or five cents a pound more. I believe the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] pointed out that at one time foreign zinc and lead were permitted to be sold at 10 cents a pound higher than the same metals produced in the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. No one can understand the logic of that situation. The Senator from Vermont is exercising his logic; therefore he cannot understand it.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Michigan know how much of this appropriation is intended to encourage the development of mineral production in the United States?

Mr. FERGUSON. One million three hundred thousand dollars. That is what the House committee allowed, and that is what would be allowed by this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Still, even that appropriation cannot be effective so long as the prices of American minerals are so far below the prices which we set on foreign production.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct. It is very difficult to tell the American producer, "Go out and find this material. We urge you to find it.

That is what this $1,300,000 is for. When you do find it we will pay the foreign producer more than we pay you." I am not surprised that American explorers for such materials do not try to go to foreign lands to produce the material, rather than here, because they would get much higher prices.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Michigan may recall that the Senator from New Mexico pointed out that at one time the person in one of the temporary agencies of our Government who was fixing the price of foreign minerals was financially interested in foreign production.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to explain to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that there is apparent confusion as to why that should be. It would not exist under a Republican administration, but under a Democratic administration the foreign producers get a preference of all the way from 1 to 10 cents a pound, depending on the material, and it is charged to the good-neighbor policy, just as gold mines remained open in other countries during the war, while our mines were closed and labor was put out of work.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who are very much interested in mineral production, whether if our amendment were amended so that instead of appropriating $1,300,000, the amount were changed to $1,500,000, it would be satisfactory to them?

Mr. WATKINS. I would suggest that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire ask the question of the senior Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BRIDGES. Because of the interest of the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Utah in this matter, and since the Senator from Nevada has suggested the restoration of $375,000, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Nevada, whether if our amendment were to appropriate $1,500,000 for the Minerals Division, instead of $1,300,000, the amendment would be satisfactory to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. MCCARRAN. It would be satisfactory to me.

Mr. WATKINS. It would be satisfactory to my State. We want it understood that we are vitally interested in what the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has said about prices for metals. One reason the metals are not being produced in this country is that the situation a few years ago was such that many of our mines closed down and exploration and development practically ceased. The operators could not get sufficiently high prices to take care of the costs involved. The mines consequently were forced to close.

As I understand, the spread in prices between imported and domestic minerals is such that it does not encourage our domestic producers. They resent it very much. They cannot take a gamble, which must be taken, on the present prices.

Furthermore, recently the labor unions have been insisting upon a higher wage scale, and the copper producers in my State in part granted their demands. It has increased the costs to an all-time high. I am not arguing that the workers were not entitled to more pay. I do not know anything about the merits of the question. However, the situation has conspired to slow down domestic production, domestic development, and domestic research with reference to the minerals needed in our defense effort.

As I understand, the amount of money proposed would take care of the administrative features largely, and it would have nothing to do with the money being paid to the metal producer.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. The Department can set up an agency which will do a good job if it gets busy.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. The whole thing adds up to this: While we are appropriating money for the Department of the Interior to encourage the development of mineral production in the United States, the controls agencies of the Government actually are putting penalties in the form of reduced prices, on the production of domestic minerals. It does not add up. It does not make sense. It ought to be corrected. It is terribly wrong. As the Senator from New Mexico told us 2 or 3 months ago, at least one of the key men in the control agency that was responsible was interested in the development of foreign mines. Whether there are any more of that stripe in the Government, I do not know. It does not make sense.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apropos of what the Senator from North Dakota, the Senator from Vermont, and the Senator from New Hampshire have been discussing, while it does not tie in directly with the amendment, I wish to point out that same policies of this administration have practically destroyed the gold-mining industry in the State of California. Historically California has been one of the great gold-mining States. The gold-mining industry and the workers in the gold-mining industry found that they were squeezed between two forces. On the one hand there was the fixed price of gold at $35 an ounce. On the other hand the policy of the administration had caused the costs of commodities and wages to go up. The price of gold was not allowed to go up. In foreign countries, however, producers were not faced with that problem. Their mines were allowed to take advantage of the world market. While it may be that some argument could be made to the effect that because of monetary policies it would not be wise to permit two different prices for gold to exist, I can never see the logic of not permitting the American mining industry to take advantage of the world gold price, which would have furnished employment to miners in California and in other gold-producing States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also true that we have been financing the deficits in other countries through the manipulation of gold prices—$35 an ounce in this country and as high as from $70 to $77 in other countries?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I believe that is correct. I will say also that I noted the other day that the Federal officials had uncovered some kind of ring which had been buying gold in this country at $35 an ounce and selling it abroad at a much higher figure. I believe in due time the proper committees of the Senate ought to very carefully investigate the gold transactions between the Treasury of the United States and foreign countries, by which we have permitted gold to go out of our Treasury into foreign countries. It should be determined whether those governments as governments have sold gold on the market at prices higher than the price permitted by the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree that such an investigation should be made.

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask the Senator from North Dakota whether the proposed modification of the amendment would be satisfactory to him.

Mr. LANGER. It would be satisfactory. I thank the Senator, and I wish to call his attention to a provision that the head of the strategic minerals production program is to develop new sources of materials. In North Dakota and in South Dakota there are large deposits of manganese. It has been questioned whether it would pay to develop those deposits in very large quantities. We believe it would pay to do so, instead of importing manganese from Russia. The amendment in its present shape is very satisfactory to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to quote further from Mr. Chapman's testimony:

Chairman MCKELLAR The House struck out from lines 10 to 14 on page 27 of the bill which would have appropriated $5,250,000 for this purpose.

Secretary CHAPMAN. That is right.

Chairman MCKELLAR. And you want it restored?

Secretary CHAPMAN. That is right, Senator. The problem is this: The House naturally expects, and they want to save money. I appreciate that. I am not averse to it.

Chairman MCKELLAR. You ought to be careful.

Secretary CHAPMAN. We have to be careful. Here is the problem we are faced with. The Congress felt that we could absorb this out of our regular appropriation. My regular appropriation was cut from the requested amount very considerably. It was about $53,000,000. With that amount of a cut, Senator, from my regular budget, I can only say this to you: Sure, if I should have to absorb, I would, but here is what would happen. It would end in inefficiency in my office, and it would cost the Government and the taxpayers much more than the amount of the money requested for our defense activities, because of the bungling inefficiency that would result from the reductions in staff and functions if we lose this money.

If I am forced to do it, of course I will do it, but I want you to know what the consequences of paying for defense activities out of our regular appropriations are going to be.

So the question is whether we are to accept or reject the testimony of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the money the Government spent a year or 2 years or 3 years ago resulted in the development of large mines which pay income taxes amounting to much more than the appropriation?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course.

Mr. LANGER. As I recall, 6 or 7 years ago in the State of Idaho alone by means of the expenditure of approximately $150,000, important tungsten mines were discovered.

Mr. McKELLAR. And they have been invaluable.

Mr. LANGER. Yes; they have been invaluable during the war, and they have brought to the Government millions and millions of dollars in income taxes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and they are also invaluable in times of peace.

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. In this case some Senators urge that we disregard the expert testimony. Of course, the majority of the Senate can do as they please. However, I say that the amendment now proposed to the committee amendment should be rejected in common honesty and common justice. I leave the matter to the Senate, Mr. President.

Mr. FERGUSON Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota raises a question about minerals and mines. Upon the suggestion of the Senator from North Dakota, the Senator from Nevada, and the Senator from Utah, we are giving increased appropriations to the new agency, the Defense Minerals Administration. The House voted for that agency $1,300,000, but we would add $200,000 to that amount, and would give the Defense Minerals Administration for the next 9 months $1,500,000.

Mr. LANGER. How much are we cutting the appropriation?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, we are not cutting it. Quite to the contrary, we are increasing it all along the line. There seems to be a combination of a certain number of Democratic Senators and a certain number of Republican Senators, and they are destroying the cuts which the committee has voted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the budget estimate was $1,790,000. We are recommending that the agency have $1,500,000, which is $290,000 below the budget estimate.

Mr. LANGER. We are cutting the appropriation $290,000; is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; but the agency has only 9 months in which to spend the appropriation, and the agency is really just beginning.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to point out a fundamental fact which apparently is overlooked, namely, that during the war there was created an independent agency with respect to defense production; and at the beginning of the present conflict in Korea, when it became evident that there must be some regulation and some aid to industry in order to promote the war effort, it was decided that instead of setting up an independent agency, the various regular departments of the Government would be delegated certain powers with respect to the matters over which they normally have jurisdiction in time of peace. For that reason, the Department of the Interior was given the function, which now goes under the name of the Defense Solid Fuels Administration. It relates to coal throughout the United States. It has authority to allocate coal cars and to allocate materials to aid in coal mining, instead of having an independent agency do that.

There is, likewise, the Defense Electric Power Administration, which is engaged in allocating materials to promote the production of electric power and to allocate the power itself.

Then there is the Defense Minerals Administration, about which we have talked, and in which those of us who live in the West are particularly interested.

Then there is the Defense Fuels Administration, which has to do with gas and oil.

Because the Department of the Interior in normal times knows about those subjects and because there are in the Department men who are qualified to pass upon them, it is proper that those functions should be assigned to that Department. As a result, the job is being done for about one-third of what it cost to do it during the war, and the work is done better, because there is no conflict between a standing Department and an independent agency.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr LANGER. In the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Arizona, would the reduction of this amount by $290,000 hurt the Government?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think there would be difficulty in the West if the amount requested were not allowed, insofar as the Defense Minerals' Administration was concerned, because the amount requested was a reasonable sum in the first place.

If Senators think the agency can get along satisfactorily with a smaller appropriation, and if Senators think the agency can process as promptly, with a reduced number of employees in Washington, the applications of Senators' constituents for materials with which to carry on mining, Senators can vote to reduce the appropriation. However, I think they will make a mistake if they do so.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. In the past, has not the difficulty frequently been in getting the top men to make the decisions, rather than in not having a sufficient number of employees?

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand that point. However, the pending motion is to reduce the number of top men who can make the decisions.

Mr. WATKINS. It seems to me that the point is that only the top men can make the decisions; in fact, frequently the Secretary of the Interior himself is the only one who can make the decisions. Under such circumstances, if the agency is given an additional $10,000,000, the decisions will not be made any more promptly.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this appropriation is for the agency which makes the decisions. If we reduce the funds available to that agency, there will be a lag in the making of the decisions. That is my opinion.

Mr WATKINS. I point out that there has been a lag in connection with such matters, sometimes to the extent of a year or more, not by reason of a lack of help, but because the Secretary cannot make up his mind

Mr. HAYDEN. That may be However, the Senator from Utah should remember that the pending proposal is to reduce the budget estimate. I think we should accept the budget figure. In the conference we can adjust these matters. However, if the Senator from Utah thinks we can now properly arrive at a smaller amount, I wish to assure the Senator that the amount of the appropriation will be smaller when the bill comes from the conference; the Senator from Utah can be sure of that.

Mr WATKINS I want to see the West properly taken care of so far as our critical-minerals defense program is concerned, but I have a strong feeling that if those in the administration who are interested have a desire to correct some of the deficiencies, they can do it. They can get by on the amount of money now proposed.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator bases his statement on a strong feeling. I am basing what I say on testimony taken before the committee, which showed that the kind of organization provided for is essential in order to carry on the necessary functions with respect to solid fuels, with respect to oil and gas, and with respect to metals and minerals. This organization should be maintained, and they ought to have a chance to do the work which is assigned to them.

Mr LANGER. Mr President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Did not the testimony given before the committee include not only that of Mr. Chapman, but the testimony of some of the outstanding mining men of the United States?

Mr. HAYDEN. It did; but, if the Senator will read their testimony, he will find that the men who came before the committee, the men in charge of the solid-fuel mining, knew how that business was handled. They came from the industry. There were men who appeared before our committee who were in charge of oil and gas, and who knew about that business. They came from the industry. They were not departmental stooges who happened to be around at the time. The Department brought in some of the men from each of the industries. It is now proposed that the number be cut down. That would result in the Department not

having adequate assistance. I think it would be a mistake.

Mr. LANGER. The testimony of these men resulted in the committee's arriving at the number 54, did it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire modify his amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. I modify the amendment to read "$5,450,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment as modified

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. As modified, on page 38, line 4, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike "$6,701,625" and insert "$5,450,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask for the yeas and nays

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr GILLETTE], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr GREEN and Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT and Mr O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr KERR], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr LONG], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr MAYBANK], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business

The Senators from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Ohio [Mr BRICKER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr MARTIN], are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr CAPEHART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] who is detained on official committee business is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea" and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—42

Bennett	Hendrickson	Mundt
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson
Butler, Md	Holland	Saltonstall
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Schoeppel
Cain	Jenner	Smathers
Carlson	Johnson, Colo	Smith, Maine
Case	Johnston, S C.	Smith, N C.
Cordon	Knowland	Stennis
Dirksen	Magnuson	Thye
Dworshak	Malone	Watkins
Ferguson	McCarran	Wiley
Frear	Millikin	Williams
George	Moody	Young

NAYS—20

Chavez	Hill	McMahon
Clements	Johnson, Tex	Monroney
Connally	Kefauver	Murray
Ecton	Langer	Neely
Ellender	Lehman	Russell
Hayden	McFarland	Underwood
Hennings	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—34

Aiken	Green	Morse
Anderson	Humphrey	Nixon
Benton	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Kem	Pastore
Byrd	Kerr	Smith, N J
Capehart	Kilgore	Sparkman
Douglas	Lodge	Taft
Duff	Long	Tobey
Eastland	Martin	Welker
Flanders	Maybank	Wherry
Fulbright	McCarthy	
Gillette	McClellan	

So the modified amendment offered by Mr BRIDGES for himself and Mr. FERGUSON to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1950

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate House bill 5504, to amend section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 to increase the amount available for the construction of access roads certified as essential to the national defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 5504) to amend section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 to increase the amount available for the construction of access roads certified as essential to the national defense, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is a privileged matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a similar Senate bill has already been unanimously reported and unanimously passed the Senate. The House bill is different in very small particulars. The Public Works Committee has been polled today and has unanimously approved the consideration and passage of the House bill. It has to do with access roads to defense installations, and it should be enacted at once. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL Is the Senator asking unanimous consent to consider the bill up at this time?

Mr HOLLAND. The Senate has already passed its bill, and this is a similar bill which has come from the House. It is a companion measure, changed in a small degree. The committee has seen the changes and has accepted them because the access roads are very urgently needed. Yes, the request is for immediate consideration of the House bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senate has already passed its bill, and the Senate committee has accepted the amendments of the House Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct

Mr CASE Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr HOLLAND I yield

Mr CASE Is it not correct that the House version is a little more modest than is the Senate version?

Mr. HOLLAND That is correct. The Senate committee would have preferred its own bill The House bill is more modest in the amount authorized.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H R 5504) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 4, to insert:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries and expenses, defense production activities

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to enable the Federal Security Agency to carry out its functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, $400,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 13, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses, defense production activities

For expenses necessary to enable the Department of Agriculture to carry out its functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, $4,174,414, to be derived from funds appropriated for the current fiscal year by section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)).

MR. BRIDGES. Mr. President, under the heading of the Department of Agriculture, there is a question raised among Members of the Senate as to why the Committee on Appropriations did not make a deeper cut. I realize that the amount provided is "to be derived from funds appropriated for the current fiscal year by section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended." In other words, it is a little different from some of the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, but among the requests made is one, for instance, by the Office of Information, for $110,000 more. The President has issued his secrecy order, and governmental agencies are limited as to the information their can give out. Why are departments asking for more personnel to put out more information when the President of the United States clamps down on the giving out of information, under the guise of secrecy, and stops the flow of information? That just does not make sense. So far as I am concerned, I shall offer an amendment to eliminate the additional funds requested for the Office of Information.

Then we come down to the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. I do not know why $150,000 more is needed for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

Then we have the Office of the Solicitor. Very adequate funds were provided in the regular appropriation bill for plenty of attorneys in the Solicitor's office, and I do not think $80,000 more is needed for that office.

The Secretary of Agriculture is very well equipped with assistants, and he has a very excellent establishment, and I do not think, because he has certain duties aimed in the direction of the defense effort, he should ask for $60,000 more.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and myself, I move to reduce the item on line 20, page 38, from $4,174,414 to $3,500,000, which is a cut of $674,414.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], offers an amendment which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 38, in line 20, it is proposed to strike out "$4,174,414" and to insert "$3,500,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. I may point out that in the committee the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] asked a question of Mr. Webster as to why the Department needed more help and more money for information purposes. Mr. Webster answered as follows:

Mr. WEBSTER. I probably made the point on the bulletins, but here is one that has not been revised since 1936, and it is one in very great demand, and when you look through it you find pictures of horse-drawn machinery and things like that.

It is just too bad if a bulletin like that has not been revised since 1933. Sometimes a bulletin of the nature referred to is useful. I do not think we need to scrap all the bulletins of that character, and limit bulletins to tractors and other machinery. I was brought up on a farm and lived for a long time on a farm and have no objection to pictures of horses being around. Perhaps the Department of Agriculture is getting too modern so they object to pictures of wagons and other machinery drawn by horses. There are many other things along that line to which I could call the Senate's attention. I have talked to some Senators who are very much interested in agriculture, who serve on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, and they agree with me that at least in some of these items we can well make a cut.

I do not think there is any need of going into the matter further. In my opinion this is the same pattern followed by so many of the departments which secure their regular appropriations and then come to Congress, using the excuse of the defense effort to secure additional appropriations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say that I believe the Senator from New Hampshire is correct in some of his statements, especially when he says that some agencies use a supplemental bill to make up for what they failed to obtain in the regular appropriation bill. But let us be fair. Is is not true that the Department of Agriculture is the one department that is receiving less money than heretofore, so far as appropriations are concerned?

Mr. BRIDGES. No, I would not say that. I am sorry I do not have the figures at hand. I think the Department of Agriculture has had its appropriation reduced this year. I would not say that it is the only department by a long shot.

Mr CHAVEZ. But is it not a fact that the Department of Agriculture of its own volition in making application for budget approval of money for the Department is the Department that did some cutting?

Mr. BRIDGES. I would not say it was the Department that made some cutting. It made some cutting, but I would not say the Department of Agriculture was the only one that made some cuts.

I will ask the Senator from Tennessee if he will accept the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, I will not accept it. The Senator will recall that practically every member of the committee voted for the committee amendment as it appears in the bill. I was one of the few—I believe I was at times the only member of the committee who voted for a lesser amount. But when we get to the floor of the Senate we find a very different situation. The Senator from New Hampshire seems to have more Democratic votes than I have with me. So I will just take what comes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] on page 38, line 20.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 39, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses, defense production activities

For expenses necessary to enable the Department of Labor to carry out its functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, $2,451,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 9, to insert:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries and expenses, defense production activities

For expenses necessary to enable the Housing and Home Finance Agency to carry out its functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, $774,225.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 18, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses, defense production activities

For expenses necessary to enable the Department of Justice to carry out its functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, $226,625.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Economic Stabilization Agency—Salaries and expenses," on page 40, line 12, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$123,940,750."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 40, line 12, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "$123,940,750", and insert in lieu thereof "$121,106,750."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the amendment would permit a saving of $2,834,000. It would reduce the funds provided to the Wage Stabilization Board and the Salary Stabilization Board of the Economic Stabilization Agency to the

amount approved by the House committee. The Wage Board would get $14,000,000 and the Salary Board would get $1,000,000.

Both these agencies are relatively new. They began to function within the last 6 months. I believe it is obvious that they would be flooded with requests for action during the first months of their existence. However, I do not believe an estimate for a long fiscal period of 9 or 10 months should be based on the early experience.

It should be noted that both Boards are recruiting personnel The reductions I propose would not result in anyone being discharged or laid off. There would be no reduction in force.

All the amendment would do would be to place a checkrein on the too rapid expansion of the Wage Board and the Salary Board.

At the time testimony was received the Wage Board had 940 employees and was shooting for an employment of 2,170. The Salary Board had 94 employees and they were asking for 523.

Both of these boards are the type of new Government activity which mushroom overnight. I believe it is easier to thwart the too rapid growth of such agencies rather than to try to cut them down after they have grown too large

Neither of the cuts proposed are very drastic. I believe they are fair and reasonable. They would be in consonance with the recommendations of the House committee

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr FERGUSON. What the amendment proposes is to go back to what the House committee recommended for these two agencies We are using the House committee figures, are we not?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], to the committee amendment on page 40, line 12

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Does the Senator from New Hampshire have any up-to-date data on the condition of the docket of these agencies?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not have any data. I had something at the time of the hearings. I assume these agencies had an accumulation at the start, but one could not project the same number over the period of a fiscal year that they had when they first came into operation or existence.

Mr. FERGUSON. The amendment would give the Wage Board $14,000,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. MOODY. Does the Senator feel he can give the Senate assurance that there would not be a pile-up of cases that would handicap defense production?

Mr. BRIDGES. No, I would not do that, because no one can give assurance, as the Senator well knows, as to what someone else will do. I would let the agencies have essentially what they asked for. It would be an economic trimming, but not basically disturbing the work. I think they could do the work efficiently and well with what the amendment proposes to give them. I hope so, but I could not give the Senator a guarantee, as he would not be able to give me one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the committee amendment on page 40, line 12.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I give notice that I shall move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the committee amendment on page 38, line 4, was agreed to, whereby the figure "$6,701,625" was changed to "$5,450,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. Is that a committee amendment?

Mr KILGORE. No, it is not.

Mr. McKELLAR Mr. President, can we not finish with the committee amendments? We had unanimous consent earlier today to finish the committee amendments first.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that the bells in my office failed to ring when a vote was taken on that amendment. The Senate has been voting on various amendments, and I was not present because the bells did not ring in my office.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The Senator can enter his motion to reconsider. It will come up later.

Mr KILGORE Very well.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Services Administration—Emergency operating expenses," on page 40, line 16, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$9,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 20, to insert:

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for organizing, and developing the program of, the Small Defense Plants Administration, established by section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation and purchase (not to exceed two) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $462,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Civil Defense Administration—Operations," on page 41, line 23, after the word "conclusive", to strike out "$10,755,000" and insert "$11,635,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal contributions," on page 42, line 4, after the numerals "1950", to strike out "$4,500,000" and insert "$14,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 5, to insert:

CIVIL DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FUND

For additional working capital for the "Civil Defense Procurement Fund", $5,000,000, and said fund shall be available without fiscal year limitation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Emergency supplies and equipment," on page 42, line 13, after the numerals "1950", to strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$60,500,000 "

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 17, to insert.

PROTECTIVE FACILITIES

For financial contributions to the States pursuant to subsection (1) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 for engineering surveys to establish availability of shelters in existing structures in critical target areas, $6,500,000, to remain available until expended

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 43, to insert:

EMERGENCY AGENCIES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 1101. The appropriations and authority provided in chapter XI of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, approved June 2, 1951, under the heading "Expenses of defense production" and "Federal Civil Defense Administration", shall be available from and including April 1, 1951, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period April 1 to June 1, 1951, inclusive, in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the heading, on page 43, line 12, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "XI" and insert "XII."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments," on page 43, line 20, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 63 and", and in line 22, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$13,791,464" and insert "$13,860,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 13, to change the section number from "1102" to "1202."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the heading, on page 45, line 7, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "XII" and insert "XIII."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Reductions in appropriations, contract authorizations, and authorizations to borrow from the Treasury," on page 45, line 15, after the word "Congress", to insert "except that the rescission proposed for the Bureau of Indian Affairs under 'Construction' shall be $4,240,000 instead of $4,340,000 as set forth in said document "

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the heading, on page 45, line 19, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "XIII" and insert "XIV."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions—Departments, agencies, and corporations," on page 45, line 22, to change the section number from "1301" to "1401."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 5, to change the section number from "1302" to "1402."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 9, to change the section number from "1303" to "1403."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 23, to change the section number from "1304" to "1404."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 4, to change the section number from "1305" to "1405. '

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 13, to change the section number from "1306" to "1406", and on page 49, line 43, after the word "reduced", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That section 409 of the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1952, shall not apply to the administrative expense limitations fixed by the act for Federal intermediate credit banks and for production credit corporations, or to the appropriation for the Farm Credit Administration except the portion thereof provided by direct appropriation from the General Fund of the Treasury."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 11, to change the section number from "1307" to "1407."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 18, to change the section number from "1308" to "1408 "

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 1, to change the section number from "1309" to "1409."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, after line 10, to strike out:

SEC. 1310. Immediately upon the enactment of this act and until termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950:

(a) The Civil Service Commission and the heads of the executive departments, agencies, and corporations shall make full use of their authority to require that initial appointments to positions in and outside the competitive civil service shall be made on a temporary or indefinite basis in order to prevent increases in the number of permanent personnel of the Federal Government above the total number of permanent employees existing on September 1, 1950. *Provided,* That any position made vacant by call to military service or by transfer to a national defense agency shall not be filled except on a temporary basis. All transfers (except at the same or lower grade and salary), reinstatements, or promotions to positions in the Federal Civil Service shall be made on a temporary or indefinite basis. All appointments, reinstatements, transfers, and promotions to positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949 shall be made with the condition and notice to each individual appointed, reinstated, transferred, or promoted that the classification grade of the position is subject to post-audit and correction by the appropriate departmental or agency personnel office or the Civil Service Commission. All transfers of permanent employees at the same grade and salary made on a temporary basis since September 1, 1950, shall be changed to a permanent basis as of the effective date of this act. Nothing in this paragraph shall operate to impair the permanent status of employees who are changed to a temporary or indefinite basis or to alter their retention status under reduction-in-force procedures from that in existence prior to September 1, 1950.

(b) The Civil Service Commission shall facilitate the transfer of Federal employees from nondefense to defense activities and encourage the retention of employees in defense activities, and shall provide for reemployment rights in the activities from which such employees are transferred.

(c) The Civil Service Commission shall make full use of its authority to prevent excessively rapid promotions in and outside the competitive civil service and to require correction of improper allocations to higher grades of positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. No person in any executie department or agency whose position is subject to the Classification Act of 1940, as amended, shall be promoted or transferred to a higher grade subject to such act without having served at least 1 year in the next lower grade

(d) From time to time, but at least annually, each executive department and agency shall (1) review all positions which since September 1, 1950, have been created or placed in a higher grade or level of difficulty and responsibility of work or in a higher basic pay level, (2) abolish all such positions which are found to be unnecessary, (3) with respect to such positions which are found to be necessary, make such adjustments as may be appropriate in the classification grades of those positions which are subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or in the basic pay levels of those positions which are subject to other pay-fixing authority. Not later than January 1 of each year each department and agency shall submit a report to the Post Office and Civil Service Committees and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives concerning the action taken under this paragraph, together with information comparing the total number of employees on the payroll on December 1 and their average grade and salary with similar information for the previous December 1.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC 1410 Immediately upon the enactment of this act and until termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950:

(a) The Civil Service Commission and the heads of the executive departments, agencies, and corporations shall make full use of their authority to require that initial appointments to positions in and outside the competitive civil service shall be made on a temporary or indefinite basis in order to prevent increases in the number of permanent personnel of the Federal Government above the total number of permanent employees existing on September 1, 1950: *Provided,* That any position vacated by a permanent employee called to military service or transferred to a national defense agency shall not be filled except on a temporary or indefinite basis. All reinstatements and promotions in the Federal civil service shall be made on a temporary or indefinite basis, and all permanent employees who are transferred from one agency to another shall retain their status as permanent employees in the agency to which transferred at the grade or basic pay level of their permanent positions in the agency from which transferred. All appointments, reinstatements, transfers, and promotions to positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949 shall be made with the condition and notice to each individual appointed, reinstated, transferred, or promoted that the classification grade of the positions is subject to post-audit and correction by the appropriate departmental or agency personnel office or the Civil Service Commission. All transfers of permanent employees made on a temporary or indefinite basis since September 1, 1950, shall be changed to a permanent basis as of the effective date of this act: *Provided,* That such employees shall retain their status as permanent employees in the agency to which transferred at the grade or basic pay level of their permanent positions in the agency from which transferred.

(b) The Civil Service Commission shall facilitate the transfer of Federal employees from nondefense to defense activities and encourage the retention of employees in defense activities, and shall provide reemployment rights for permanent employees in the activities from which such employees are transferred.

(c) The Civil Service Commission shall make full use of its authority to prevent excessively rapid promotions in the competitive civil service and to require correction of improper allocations to higher grades of positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended No person in any executive department or agency whose position is subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be promoted or transferred to a higher grade subject to such act without having served at least 1 year in the next lower grade: *Provided,* That the Civil Service Commission for positions in the competitive service and the head of the employing agency for positions outside the competitive service may by regulation provide for promotions of two grades in 1 year (1) to positions not higher than GS–5; (2) to positions not higher than GS–11 which are in a line of work properly classified under the Classification Act of 1949 at two-grade intervals, (3) to positions in the same line of work when the employee has completed a training period under a training program approved by the Civil Service Commission for positions in the competitive service, or approved by the head of the employing agency for positions outside the competitive service, and (4) of an employee of the agency concerned when there is no position in the normal line of promotion in the grade immediately below that of the position to be filled: *Provided further,* That this subsection shall not apply to any case involving an employee who is within reach for appointment to a higher grade position on a competitive civil service register, or being advanced up to a grade level from which he had been demoted or separated because of reduction in force.

(d) From time to time, but at least annually, each executive department and agency shall (1) review all positions which since September 1, 1950, have been created or placed in a higher grade or level of difficulty and responsibility of work or in a higher basic pay level, (2) abolish all such positions which are found to be unnecessary, (3) with respect to such positions which are found to be necessary, make such adjustments as may be appropriate in the classification grades of those positions which are subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or in the basic pay levels of those positions which are subject to other pay-fixing authority. Not later than July 31 of each year each department and agency shall submit a report to the Post Office and Civil Service Committees and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives

concerning the action taken under this paragraph, together with information comparing the total number of employees on the payroll on June 30 and their average grade and salary with similar information for the previous June 30.

(e) The provisions of this section, other than the proviso to the first sentence of subsection (a) and other than the last sentence of subsection (a), shall not be applicable to positions in the field service of the Post Office Department.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will some Senator explain the lengthy change relating to the Civil Service regulations?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the language which appeared in the House bill is known as the Whitten amendment. Representative WHITTEN, who was responsible for it, is entirely agreeable that this arrangement be made so that we can take the matter to conference. It is a legislative provision on an appropriation bill. So our committee asked the Committee on Civil Service of the Senate to go into the matter, and the language presented here was offered to us by the chairman of that committee, after consulting with other members of the committee. We are taking the subject to conference with the House, and I am sure that out of the conference will come a satisfactory piece of legislation.

Mr. CASE. As I understand, the language is intended to work out the problems which have arise in connection with the Whitten amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. It is a modification of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 51, after line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 18, to change the section number from "1311" to "1411."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 57, line 25, to change the section number from "1312" to "1412."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 8, to change the section number from "1313" to 1413."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement in connection with the change in the section number from 1313 to 1413, on page 58, line 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is only to change the section number.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct I wish to speak at this time in connection with the change in the section number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall be very brief. I wish to refer to the hearings before the Appropriations Committee. I refer to the testimony of Mr. Fleischmann and Mr. Wilson. I shall not go into all the details, but I read from page 242 of the side slips. This is from the statement by Mr. Fleischmann:

> The Defense Production Administration is primarily a high-level policy agency, as distinguished from a typical or routinized operations agency, and the loss of such extensive knowledge and reliable judgment would be an irreparable loss to the defense production program. The degree to which the Defense Production Administration controls the American industrial economy, incident to the military preparedness program, of necessity requires the services of industrial specialists and executives who are thoroughly familiar with the vast complexities of industry and the latest technological developments. This type of personnel can not be obtained unless higher than average Government salaries are paid.

I may say that I talked with Mr. Fleischmann today. He states that the vast majority of these employees are new people who are coming to Washington to try to help in the defense effort.

Mr. Wilson appeared before the committee. The hearings are quite extensive. I shall not bother Senators with the details, but on page 746 Mr. Wilson said:

> In my opinion, section 1313 of H R 5215 would also impede the progress of the mobilization effort Although the section does not apply to new agencies created under the Defense Production Act, it would limit the payment of salaries by mobilization agencies created within old-line departments to the average rate provided in the appropriations of the Department.

I am told that the majority of the new positions have been filled by newcomers, and not by transfers, although there have been some transfers.

> Under this section the National Production Authority would be required to maintain the average salary rate of the Department of Commerce, that is, $4,391, whereas the average rate in the National Production Authority is now $4,914.

What he will have to do is to release the high-priced employees who come to Washington, and the war-mobilization plan will be injured.

After talking with Mr. Wilson twice today, and with Mr. Fleischmann, I called this subject to the attention of Senators. I am not one of those who believe that Government agencies should transfer people at higher salaries, with the new employees coming to Washington. According to Mr. Fleischmann's testimony, and according to the testimony of Mr. Wilson before the committee, they both say that this section, applied to the National Production Authority, would hurt the defense effort. The higher-paid employees would have to be released to bring the average pay down.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr FERGUSON. I appreciate what the Senator is discussing, and I know how Mr. Wilson feels But would it not be possible to adjust the matter in conference?

Mr. MAYBANK. It cannot be in conference unless some language is changed.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am sure that the difficulty could be adjusted in conference.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not wish to differ with the Senator from Michigan. However, if we adopt the House language and there is no conference, we shall lose many of the better employees in the National Production Authority. Mr. Wilson would have to let some of the higher paid employees go in order to bring the average wage down. That is what was stated before the committee. I do not believe the Senator from Michigan was present in the hearings. The hearings cover many pages. In the side slips, the only reference to the subject is in the last paragraph of the statement by Mr. Fleischmann.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator realizes that there have been transfers.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from South Carolina does not approve of those transfers, as the Senator from Michigan knows. I do not believe we should have to release the better qualified employees who are brought here at higher salaries. I do not believe that the agency should be forced to take in clerks merely to bring the average down. The result would be that we would lose the best men. Among those who would suffer would be Senators, if a rule or regulation were adopted which would prevent capable business people from being employed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The senior Senator from South Carolina has said what will happen if we do not do something to give the conferees the right to compromise. So I have prepared an amendment which would put the subject in conference. I ask the chairman of the committee, after he has had an opportunity to examine the amendment, if he will take the amendment to conference. I think it will offer a basis for compromise in the free conference. I believe that the amendment would take care of the situation to which the senior Senator from South Carolina has just referred.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have worked hard on this program. I have been in constant touch with Mr. Wilson, Mr. Johnston, and Mr. Fleischmann. They tell me that if the Defense Production Administration is denied the opportunity to employ the proper type of people, the war program will suffer. The efficiency of the organization will be impaired. In the end, it would do injury to all of us. I know that the Senator from Michigan does not intend any such result.

I do not ask for any relaxation of the rule with reference to transfers from one Government department to another, at higher salaries. That is wrong. I believe the level may have to be raised even a little higher.

I have discussed the matter with various Senators I discussed it with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and other members of the Appropriations Committee. I did not have a chance to discuss it with the distinguished chairman of the committee. The chairman of the committee and I were present at the hearing. I do not know who else was there. However, Mr. Wilson has talked with me twice about the subject since then. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the chairman of the committee were present at the hearing. I have stated what will happen, Mr. President.

I have not seen the amendment which my distinguished colleague, the junior

Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] intends to offer, but I do know what the effect will be from the testimony before the Appropriations Committee. I believe I know what the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from New Hampshire have in mind. I know they do not intend to hurt the top people, because it will be necessary to exempt certain professional groups.

Mr. FERGUSON. There may be some positions that would have to be adjusted.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct. I want to see that done.

Mr. FERGUSON. But the mass transferring from one agency to another and the paying of higher salaries is not proper.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Michigan knows that I opposed such a proposal in the independent offices bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate it.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is essential that something be allowed to go to conference so that the chairman of the committee may be able to work with the National Production Authority and Mr. Wilson, so that some capable people can be brought in. I do not mean that the regular agencies are not capable of doing a good job.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Once in a while I become annoyed with the idea about capable people being brought in and how we may lose them. Mr. President, once they get into Government they never quit. They may fade away once in a while, like some soldiers, but they never quit. I have tried to do a little adjusting in committee, as the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] know, with reference to people who actually work for the Federal Government. No adjustments were made. I do not believe the Government will suffer one bit if we do not pay any particular attention to the so-called indispensable people either in NPA or any other agency.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor. I yielded for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator. How is Uncle Sam going to lose anything? Is the Government to quit functioning if the amendment of the Senator from Michigan prevails?

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to say to my distinguished friend from New Mexico that I am here to tell him exactly what Mr. Wilson and Mr. Fleischmann have stated and what the testimony was before the committee. I do not know what kind of people they are trying to get. They are not going to bring them in from the State of North Dakota, New Mexico, or South Carolina—I see my good friend the senior Senator from North Dakota—but at least we will have to raise the level if they are to function efficiently. That is all I have to say. So far as I am concerned, I have done my duty.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That being the case, inasmuch as we are investigating the adjustment and raising of salaries of people who actually work for the Federal Government, does not the Senator from South Carolina feel that we should wait until the survey has been made before we consider the indispensability of the people whom he has in mind?

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me answer the Senator from New Mexico in this way: There is no examination or investigation being made of those people, except perhaps by the Civil Service Committee, and I understand that the junior Senator from South Carolina has an amendment which I shall be pleased to hear and read in a moment. However, I wanted the Senator from New Mexico to know that what I have stated is what Mr. Wilson and Mr. Fleischmann have stated to me. After all, we have entrusted them with the war program. I might point out to the Senator, for example, what might happen if this amendment is not changed. Mr. DiSalle who heads the OPS would not be affected and so he could hire the top people away from Mr. Wilson and Mr. Fleischmann. I am sure that is not the intention of any Senator.

I believe the Senator from Michigan is correct when he says that there should not be any general raise. All I want is some change in the language so that the members of the conference committee can work out a proper amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Supposing we provide that there shall be a variation of 5 percent in the employees. Would that be satisfactory?

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not know what the effect would be.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to answer the Senator from Michigan first. As a matter of fact, I do not know. I believe there should be some language in the bill on the basis of which the conferees could work out a satisfactory provision. I have nothing further to say.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the language were changed so as to provide for 5 percent——

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not know whether that would be satisfactory to Mr. Wilson.

Mr. FERGUSON. The subject would be in conference.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Fleischmann do not want to have anything done which would hurt the war effort. Certainly they are not political appointees. Both of them have phoned me twice since the hearing. I listened to their testimony. I did not hear all the testimony, but I was at the hearing when Mr. Fleischmann testified. When we came to this point late at night I told the members of the committee that I would bring it up on the floor of the Senate. I do not know whether 5 percent is the answer. I hope language will be put into the bill which will leave the conferees free to act in a way that will not hurt the war effort.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Why does the Senator from South Carolina believe that only Mr. Wilson and Mr. Fleischmann are interested in the war effort? What about the rest of us?

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that I know every Government agency is interested. A short time ago I voted for the appropriations for the Department of Commerce, as did the Senator from New Mexico. The Senator from New Mexico is aware of the fact that I voted for the Department of Labor-FSA appropriations. Mr. Wilson made the statement to me because his nomination was acted on by my committee. The watch-dog committee of the Banking and Currency Committee has been trying to keep up as best it could. Perhaps we have not done as good a job as many Senators believe we should have done. I am not bragging about anything we have done. I merely wished to call the attention of the Senate to the situation in which I find myself.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. With the further indulgence of the good Senator from South Carolina, if the only two people who are interested in the war effort——

Mr. MAYBANK. I never said such a thing.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the only two people are Mr. Wilson and Mr. Fleischmann, we are in a terrible fix.

Mr. MAYBANK. I never said that. The Senator from New Mexico should not say I said it. A short time ago I voted for appropriations for Mr. Sawyer's department.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But the Senator from South Carolina has been talking about how much it will hurt the war effort.

Mr. MAYBANK. Because the agencies referred to must bring in new employees. The old-line agencies already have their people. I am aware of what the distinguished Senator has in mind. All agencies are working for the war effort. Let us take the Department of Agriculture, for example. No one is doing more than Secretary Brannan. I voted for the appropriation for the Department of Commerce only a few moments ago.

Mr. Fleischmann and Mr. Wilson must bring new people into the Government. I hope they will bring in the best people available.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I believe that what we want to do is to treat all agencies alike, whether they are a department or an independent agency. If we pass the bill in its present form we will find that a department would be cut down, but that an independent agency, like OPS, would keep its salaries up. OPS could go to the National Production Authority and get all of its best employees, which I think is wrong. For that reason I have an amendment which I believe will clarify the situation. It can be taken to conference and worked out in conference as the conferees see fit to do. All I am asking is that we provide something which can be worked on in the conference.

Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state that the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina is not now in order. At this time the Senate is considering committee amendments and amendments submitted to them.

Of course, the Senator's amendment will be in order later on.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I understand, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 13, to change the section number from "1314" to "1414."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 17, to insert:

SEC. 1415. (a) No part of the money appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, by this or any other act to the Department of Labor or the Federal Security Agency which is in excess of 75 percent of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the aggregate budget estimates for personal services submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by such Department or such agency, respectively, during such fiscal year in the performance of—

(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by a similar title, or

(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio, or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar materials,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2).

(b) No provision in any act appropriating funds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, shall be deemed to limit the amount of any appropriation made to any Department, agency, or corporation which may be used to compensate persons engaged in the performance of functions described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) of this section, if the aggregate number of persons employed during such fiscal year by such Department, agency, or corporation in the performance of such functions does not exceed four at any time.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 3, to change the section number from "1315" to "1416."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will now proceed to state the committee amendments which previously have been passed over.

The first committee amendment previously passed over was, under the heading "National Science Foundation, salaries and expenses," on page 20, in line 1, to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$6,300,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, to this committee amendment, I call up the amendment which I have had the honor of submitting in collaboration with some of my colleagues.

I wish to say a few words on this subject. I apologize for being late in reaching the Chamber, but I have been in committee meeting all day.

The effect of the amendment which I have offered, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], to the committee amendment, is to increase the over-all appropriation for the National Science Foundation from $6,300,000, as recommended by the committee, to $10,000,000. This is $2,600,000 less than the amount requested by Dr. Conant and Dr. Waterman, who, as all of us know, had charge of this matter for the Foundation.

As one of the original sponsors of the bill establishing the National Science Foundation, I have watched its early organization and development with more than an ordinary amount of interest and care. I am proud of the Foundation, and I am confident that it is destined to play a highly significant and fundamental role in the strengthening of the national security and welfare of the United States.

Mr. President, the idea of the National Science Foundation arose from a report made by Dr. Vannevar Bush, whom all of us know, and who was largely responsible for our program and scientific experimentation during World War II. It was under him and his colleagues that the atomic bomb was developed. So no one can fail to be impressed by the significance of his work and the experience behind his recommendations. When he turned over his work at the end of the war, he recommended that something of this sort be set up, and after some years of study, the bill was finally passed creating the National Science Foundation.

There is no necessity for me to dwell at length on the functions of the National Science Foundation, because we have reviewed its functions before in some detail. Let me now quote briefly from the testimony of two of America's most distinguished and capable scientists, who appeared before the Appropriations Committee several weeks ago. I had the privilege of being there with them. A number of other able men were there, but I shall quote brief excerpts from the testimony of Dr. Conant, of Harvard, and Dr. Oppenheimer, director of the Institute of Advanced Study, at Princeton. Dr. Oppenheimer, as all of us know, played a major role in the development of the atomic bomb. At this time I shall present only part of their statements, so as not to delay my colleagues.

The excerpt from Dr. Conant's testimony is as follows:

I am James B. Conant, president of Harvard University. I reside in Cambridge, Mass., and I am appearing before you this afternoon in my capacity as Chairman of the National Science Board of the National Science Foundation. I speak for the entire Board when I urge upon you gentlemen the necessity for a congressional appropriation of $12,600,000 for the fiscal year 1952.

Mr. President, I call my colleagues' attention to the fact that my amendment to the committee amendment proposes that $10,000,000 be appropriated for this purpose, or $2,600,000 less than the amount Dr. Conant requested.

I read further from Dr. Conant's testimony before the committee:

This is the amount of money required to be available during the coming 9 months for the National Science Foundation to get under way, and we, the members of the Board of the Science Foundation, together with scientists all over the United States, feel it is of the utmost importance for the National Science Foundation to get going at once.

REASON FOR FOUNDATION

Why do we think so? Because Congress having created, we believe very wisely, this new agency, must provide it with the necessary funds to operate or it will be equivalent to a signal to scientists all over the United States that Congress is not interested in scientific activities—

In what we might call between the war periods

I read further from Dr. Conant's testimony:

This might be called the psychological aspect of the situation or the morale aspect. Important as this is, it is, of course, secondary as compared with the necessity of getting the National Science Foundation started in order to contribute by this mechanism to the national defense. I use the words "national defense" advisedly, and in so doing assume that we are in for a long-drawn-out struggle, without breaking out into a global war, and, nevertheless, which will require partial mobilization and armament for years to come. In this process of arming the free world, science and technology play an enormous role. This requires no emphasis. You gentlemen, I am sure, are quite as well aware of it as I am. The point I should like to emphasize is that the development of new weapons and new industries to produce new weapons depends on (a) having a supply of well-trained scientists and engineers, and (b) having new scientific discoveries.

I may say in passing, having been connected with Princeton University for many years, where a great deal of technical research is being carried on, and where much of it was carried on during the late war, that my colleagues there are greatly concerned about the failure to develop new scientists to take the places of those who have retired or concluded their careers.

Mr. President I also have before me a brief excerpt from the statement by Dr. Oppenheimer, whom I mentioned a few minutes ago. He is director of the Institute of Advanced Study, and represented the National Academy of Sciences before the committee. Dr. Oppenheimer, who during the war was the great atomic scientist, made the following statement as part of his testimony before the committee:

The only argument that has been alleged against this appropriation that I know about is that the work of the Foundation in the near future will not contribute in a substantial way to defense.

RESULTS OF PROGRAM AFTER TRAINING COMPLETED

On this I regard myself as something of an expert.

It will not contribute in the next 6 months or a year; in fact, it will not have occurred, but it will not be very long. The fellowship program will start to pay off as soon as the men have their training.

Again I emphasize that this program provides both for basic scientific research and also for the development of trained

scientists to carry on the scientific research.

Dr. Oppenheimer further said:

The name attached to one of the vital components of the first atomic bomb was the name of a young man who took his degree with me at the time of Pearl Harbor. That kind of thing will happen over and over again.

The fellowship program is to increase the number; above all, to increase the quality of the work that is being done and, believe me, the quality needs increasing, and we cannot spend the money we are spending wisely without inventiveness, without the kind of hard thinking that only the training that you get in deep and troublesome problems will provide.

The other side is that research grants that the Foundation makes may never have anything to do with defense. That is really an attempt to hit the jackpot, but if they do, what they are likely to produce is out of all proportion to the money that is spent. The atomic bomb is an example of that. So is penicillin, so are innumerable things which I know.

That was a part of the statement made by Dr. Oppenheimer before the committee.

Mr. President, I commend the wisdom of my distinguished colleagues on the appropriations committee for restoring at least $6,000,000 of the $13,700,000 cut made by the House in the 1952 budget figure for the National Science Foundation. I am convinced that the House committee did not have the proper testimony presented to it or did not understand what was involved when it appropriated only $300,000 for the National Science Foundation for this year.

This recognition by the Senate committee of the vital importance to our national security of a strong program of research in basic science and a substantial addition to our pool of scientific manpower is judicious and timely. My only concern is that the restoration recommended by the committee does not go far enough.

With the $6,300,000 recommended, the National Science Foundation will be able to initiate the two important programs for basic research and training of scientific manpower which have been planned and are ready to go. This much is good. My proposal, to appropriate $10,000,000, rather $6,300,000, is better. It is better because it will provide for additional basic research in the sciences, for which plans have been carefully drawn, and which is critically needed to keep our Nation in the van in competition with our enemies. It is better because it will provide additional trained scientific workers for the laboratories and industries upon which our security depends, and which are now facing a shortage of workers unparallelled in our Nation's history.

I wish to emphasize that point. We hear from all sources that we are lacking in trained, scientific workers.

Specifically my amendment to the committee amendment would provide $2,000,000 more for basic research in such crucial fields as that of solar energy, genetics, radiation chemistry, metallurgy, meteorology, and many other fields basic to our defense, our health, and our prosperity. It would also provide $1,700,000 which would finance 750 additional fellowships in the sciences.

The record clearly shows the Nation's need for many times the amount of basic research and many times the number of trained scientific workers provided for in the Science Foundation program.

The $14,000,000 program requested by the President was itself a modest one, falling far short of the actual need, but designed to be within the capabilities of a new organization in its first full year of operation. Firm plans have now been made for carrying out a program of this scope. The only real reason that has been advanced for reducing the program to less than half is, of course, our economy program, with which I am in deep sympathy. But I think we must be very careful not to permit ourselves to be carried away and to provide inadequately for activities which are so vital, and which may well save us billions of dollars and millions of lives.

Every additional dollar appropriated for the Science Foundation program represents an additional blue chip in the deadly game we are playing for supremacy in the scientific and technical struggle in which we are now engaged. The stakes are high. We dare not underplay our hand.

I may say when I first discussed this matter with Dr. Bush years ago I asked him what it would take to carry on the work. He said, "Ultimately the cost might get very high up into the millions." He said he thought we would need in the beginning $25,000,000 in order properly to organize this work, so we would be doing an effective job in the basic sciences. I then took it up with some of the manufacturers of the country who have scientific research laboratories, and their scientific men said, "We will take care of applied science, but we must get your help to work in the area of basic science."

So, Mr. President, I submit this amendment and urge that it be adopted. In connection with it, I offer as exhibits, and ask unanimous consent that there be attached at the end of my statement, a memorandum prepared for me at my request by Dr. Waterman, who is the Director of the National Science Foundation; an editorial from the New York Times of September 24, 1951, on this subject; and, at the request of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], an address which he would have made had he been on the Senate floor today, and which I also ask to have incorporated in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION APPROPRIATION—EFFECT OF ACTION BY SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Effect of Senate committee action is to reduce the major program on support of basic research by 60 percent of the amount requested in the National Science Foundation appeal to the Senate. This reduces correspondingly the effort on the part of the Federal Government in providing for essential basic research to maintain maximum progress on the scientific front in the present emergency.

The effect on the major program for the training of scientific personnel—graduate fellowship program—is to reduce it by 46 percent, from 2,040 to 1,150 fellows. A smaller reduction in this program would be made than in the case of support of basic research since steps to increase the output of highly trained manpower are urgently needed, as stressed by the Director of Defense Mobilization (see accompanying statement by Mr. Wilson). In the face of increasing demand for scientific personnel, the output of engineers is expected to drop by 1954 to one-third of the 1950 output, while that for physical scientists will drop to 38 percent.

Support of research policy development and services will be reduced by only about 5 percent since this must be a continuing activity of the Foundation in which it may develop national science policy and support such essential services as interchange and dissemination of scientific information, support of the National Scientific Register, and support of the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific Research and Development.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT INCREASING APPROPRIATION FROM $6,300,000 TO $10,000,000

Increase of appropriation from $6,300,000 to $10,000,000 will enable the Foundation to increase support of basic research to 57 percent of the estimate originally submitted to the Congress. This would be an increase of 70 percent over that provided in an appropriation of $6,300,000. In view of the pressing needs for basic research both in following highly significant leads in science and in solving bottlenecks in defense research, this additional support is especially needed. Typical planned projects of this important nature now awaiting activation are briefly outlined in the accompanying paper, research programs of great promise and urgency in the national interest.

By this increase the foundation will be able to augment its fellowship program by the addition of 750 fellowships (from 1,150 to 1,900) and thus make further, much-needed contribution to the output of trained scientists beginning with the fiscal year 1954. It should be understood that the fellowship program in this appropriation would go into effect in the academic year 1952–53, beginning next September. The appropriation is required now in order to initiate the notices of the program, the receipt of applications, their analysis and final selection during the current fiscal year. On this schedule it is clear that there is ample time to carry through the selection process and the awarding of fellowships during the current fiscal year.

RESEARCH PROGRAMS OF GREAT PROMISE AND URGENCY IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST

In fulfilling its aims of providing support for basic research in the sciences, the foundation has planned definite programs in the fields of the mathematical, physical, engineering, biological, and medical sciences. These programs list specific objectives to be achieved within each of these scientific areas.

The general fields of interest to the National Science Foundation in its research program correspond to the universal needs of mankind for food, shelter, health, fuel, power, travel, communications, and defense. Research which can contribute to these major problems is in the national interest and should receive special attention. Fundamental research in the major areas of science inevitably has a most important bearing on one or more of these problems. Furthermore, basic research alone promises the spectacular advances which have occurred in the past. Several examples are given below to illustrate the manner in which studies of most promise in the above respects have been identified.

Basic research for defense

In the field of the physical sciences, basic research offers the only means of completely successful achievement in the following problems. The perfection of a fully effective guided missile, the design and performance of planes and missiles in supersonic flight and at very high altitudes, the development of substitutes for critical materials such as wool, electric insulating materials, quartz and such metals as cobalt, nickel, manganese, and tungsten. Especially needed are substitutes for critical materials to stand up under the high-temperature performance of jet engines Basic research in modern physics and metallurgy will furnish the leadership which development must have in this area. One of the most important developments now under way has resulted from the study of the properties of the metal titanium. This metal compares favorably with steel in strength. It can withstand high temperatures and also successfully resist corrosion. In order to capitalize upon its development, basic research is the present bottleneck, since feasible and economical quantity production of the metal depends upon fundamental studies of the chemistry of the metal.

Solar energy

One of the most important objectives of a modern nation is the availability of power. The world sources of power are chiefly three: Fuel, water, and recently, atomic or nuclear. With the exception of water power, these supplies were formed and stored up in the far distant past The location of fuel, whether coal, oil, or uranium is restricted geographically and limited in amount One of the major problems of science has always been research into means for storing solar energy Very significant and impressive advances have been made in recent years in understanding the steps of this process in living plants Still more recent researches have shown that solar energy may be trapped in the test tube by means of know chemical and enzyme systems, although still in the presence of living cell particles The means by which these green particles absorb the energy to activate the rest of the system is still the most important and mysterious part of the process Research on this will be strongly supported and encouraged by the Foundation for an understanding of its action holds major promise in the eventual exploitation of solar energy Success in this undertaking would ultimately mean that mankind wil be able by the use of synthetic materials to store energy and power from the sun. This offers the possibility that in time the human race may, if it wishes, become independent of the bygone stores of fuel. The magnitude of this accomplishment may be realized from the fact that, when the sun is overhead, each square mile of the earth's surface receives about 4,500,000 horsepower.

New sources of food

A similar case may be made with regard to new sources of food. The present food of mankind is derived from plants and animals, the latter depending in turn ultimately on plants. Much of the life in the oceans feed upon the omnipresent algae which grow in water under the influence of the sun. Under controlled conditions in the laboratory, progress in research on the growth of algae in water has already produced nutritious crop yields several times those of the best farm crops. This is now an experimentally demonstrated fact and it remains for the National Science Foundation to lend its full support to research aimed at bringing these results of basic research to the point where they can be used to increase our food supply.

Protein synthesis

Again, research in protein synthesis has reached a state where the leading investigators agree that a determined, cooperative attack may be successful. Protein is the universal substance in living creatures which enables them to utilize the energy which they receive in the form of nourishment. Protein is the common source of serums for combating disease. At present these serums are generally taken from animals inoculated with the disease. Unfortunately, protein obtained in this way includes components, of the nature of impurities, which may produce dangerous secondary reactions in human patients. If artificially produced proteins can be made in the laboratory, they may be made pure and free from these undesirable toxic effects. Not only that, but the synthetic production of protein would immediately open a vast field closely related and necessary to the field of development or artificial foods and fuels.

While the above constitute a few of the most important areas in which basic research can play an outstanding role, it should be stressed that these present potentialities are the outcome of years of fundamental research on the part of scientists and research men generally. Thus, fundamental studies in all the sciences continually build a potential for successful application. The outstanding discoveries which have come about in this way are the means by which man has brought about a fuller life and increasing power over his environment.

Both in the support of progress on this all-important scientific frontier and in the prompt capitalization on the findings of research, as a Federal agency the National Science Foundation is in position to take the lead in insuring a vigorous national effort in research and prompt, efficient cooperation and emphasis on the part of the country's leading scientists and their institutions.

SHORTAGE OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL PERSONNEL

(Statement by Charles E Wilson, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization)

This Nation is confronted with a serious shortage of scientifically and technically trained personnel.

The supply of scientific and engineering graduates in 1951 is less than half of that needed to fully man our economic and defense programs. Present indications are that the number of scientifically trained graduates will steadily decrease at least until 1954 while the demands of essential civilian and defense program, in the same period, will continue to increase.

We can and we must do something about this shortage

First, Government, industry, and educational institutions must make the most effective possible utilization of those persons who have received scientific and technical training.

Any failure to utilize such personnel in the most effective possible manner plays into the hands of those who want to see our defense mobilization program fail. All departments and agencies of the Federal Government must set the example in this respect.

Second, our educational institutions can develop counseling program which will result in a larger number of men and women being trained in these fields.

Students with aptitudes for such training can and should be shown that by obtaining scientific and technical training they can prepare themselves for satisfying employment and, at the same time, make a major contribution to the preservation of our way of life. If this demonstration is made, they will respond. More women, for example, should be enrolled in scientific courses and in engineering schools than is the case today. Their services are needed and will be utilized.

Third, industry and government should develop both on-the-job training programs and cooperative training programs with institutions of higher learning and other educational institutions which will result in employed persons receiving scientific and technical training.

Where persons now employed possess the aptitude for such training methods must be developed which will result in utilizing what will otherwise remain a hidden source of potential scientific and technical manpower.

I appeal to our educational institutions and to administrators in Government and industry to take every available measure to help alleviate the shortage of scientific and technical personnel. This must be done if our defense program is to succeed.

[From the New York Times of September 24, 1951]

THE SCIENCE FOUNDATION

"An example of a wide misunderstanding of advances in pure science" is the way in which James B Connant of Harvard characterizes the action of the House of Representatives in pruning to $300,000 the request for $14,000,000 which was made by Dr. Alan T. Waterman and which was designed to enable the National Science Foundation, of which he is the director, to begin work. Apparently the reams of testimony printed in the report of congressional committees that have questioned scorce of scientists on the part that scientific research can play in war and peace did not sink in If Congress needed any evidence to convince it of the importance of fundamental research it had only to reconsider the history of the atomic bomb, of radar, of the proximity fuse, of supersonic flight, of rockets, of penicillin, and other antibiotics and of the basis already laid for bacterial warfare. Most of the astounding technologic advance made in the last generation must be credited to men who had no other thought than that of adding to the sum total of human knowledge

The foundation's officers are in part responsible for this failure of Congress to appropriate the little money requested. They have been inactive. They have done little more than restate the principles set forth in the act that created the foundation. Their inertia is excusable because they wanted to feel their way and to let policies evolve with experience Yet we badly need an agency that will formulate a scientific policy for the Nation. We need, too, a thorough examination of American science to discover how a national science foundation can fill gaps in our theoretical knowledge and so aid the physical sciences, biology, medicine, and education We need finally, a fostering of education to overcome a critical shortage of men and women trained in science, engineering, and medicine.

The sum of $300,000 appropriated by the House is so pathetically inadequate that the foundation can do nothing but mark time for another year unless the Senate heeds the protests and admonitions of scientific bodies. Meanwhile these same bodies could do much to overcome both congressional and public apathy by vigorously explaining how dependent we are on theoretical scientists for new knowledge.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS IN SUPPORT OF EFFORT TO INCREASE FUNDS FOR NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FROM $6,300,000 TO $10,000,000

I am joining the effort of Senators SMITH of New Jersey, SMITH of Maine, IVES, LEHMAN, and MCMAHON to increase the funds for the National Science Foundation from $6,300,000, as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee in the supplemental appropriation bill, 1952, to $10,000,000. I support this move for the same basic reasons that I am continuing to support a bill to provide Federal aid to medical schools; namely, in order to avoid a ruinous deficit in future years of trained scientific manpower and of basic scientific knowledge.

When the Department of Defense appropriations bill was under consideration by the Senate, I proposed a reduction of $70,000,000 in the funds provided for research and development, a reduction amounting to roughly 5 percent of the $1,472,000,000 provided in that bill for research and development purposes. At that time, I noted the action of the House in reducing the funds for the National Science Foundation from a budget request of $14,000,000 to a token amount of $300,000, and stated my belief that our efforts were getting badly out of balance if we were unwilling to invest $14,000,000 for the training of scientific personnel and the development of basic scientific information, while at the same time we were unquestioningly devoting 100 times that amount for the development of more effective instruments of destruction. Although the $70,000,000 reduction was included in the Senate version of the defense appropriations bill, the conferees rejected the reduction in toto, and restored the full amount of nearly $1,500,000,000 for research and development. I regret that the conferees did not see fit to arrive at a compromise, effecting at least a 1-percent reduction in the total amount which would have left the research funds for defense 99 percent intact, and would have enabled us to transfer one one-hundredth of these funds to the National Science Foundation.

Despite the action of the conferees, I persist in my belief that our research efforts will be badly out of balance if we fail to provide at least the $10,000,000 called for in the Smith amendment, which in itself is $2,600,000 less than the revised budget request for the National Science Foundation.

I have done everything I could to reduce the amount of our spending, and to increase the revenues to be brought in by the current tax bill in order to reduce the pending deficit. I realize full well that the increase of $3,500,000 which is proposed by the Smith amendment will add, although infinitesimally, to the budget deficit in prospect for the current fiscal year.

But, in this respect, I am concerned with a deficit which could be just as serious, and just as difficult to correct as the budget deficit. I am referring to the prospective deficit of trained scientific personnel and of basic scientific knowledge which Congress has sought to avail by the creation of the National Science Foundation, to administer scholarship and fellowship aid to help in the training of future scientists; and financial help for basic scientific research.

It is true that the scholarship and fellowship program will not provide us with large numbers of fully trained scientists next month, or even next year. No one can predict when the program of basic research will bear fruit, or in what forms. By its very nature the specific aims of basic research are not definable. But in using these facts to show that the National Science Foundation has little relation to the security of this country, the House Appropriations Committee has, I believe, indulged in the same fallacy entertained by some who are opposed to the bill for aid to medical schools because they say it will bring no immediate, tangible results.

That fallacy, in my opinion, rests on the assumption that the emergency for this country is a matter of limited duration—of, say, 1, 2, or 3 years—and that anything which does not produce tangible results immediately cannot properly be associated with the emergency. If one carries that argument to an extreme, one might say that there is no use in contracting for large planes or aircraft carriers which will not be delivered for 2 years; or that there is no use doing research on atom-power airplanes since they will not be available for combat for, say, 10 years, and the emergency may be over before they can be brought into use. We do not say that, because we know that our failure now to plan for the future, by placing contracts or conducting research, will result in a deficiency in future months.

Exactly the same reasoning applies to the groundwork proposed in the program of the National Science Foundation toward the future provision of scientific personnel and information. While the deficits may not make themselves immediately apparent, they will do so at some future time, when it will be too late to make up for the deficiencies. One of the most serious mistakes we can make would be to let Russia get ahead of us in basic scientific discoveries.

The announcement of a second atomic explosion in Soviet Russia, definitely identified for the first time as the explosion of an actual atomic bomb, gives us the disquieting warning that our superiority in the field of atomic knowledge is growing narrower with each month. To me this indicates the urgent need of intensifying our explorations in other fields, in the hope that as our margin of superiority in one field lessens, that margin may grow in other fields.

What is being asked by the amendment offered by Senator SMITH is an increase of about $4,000,000—one-third of 1 percent of the total budget for research for the military departments which we appropriated almost without question. To deny this small increase for the National Science Foundation seems to fall into the category of "wasteful economy." I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Will the Senator from New Jersey send his amendment to the desk?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The amendment lies on the table.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, first I wish to say that I am thoroughly familiar with the arguments made by the able Senator from New Jersey, who had such a large part in what I feel was very sound and constructive legislation in establishing the National Science Foundation. I speak as one who supported that legislation, which was sponsored by the Senator from New Jersey, among other Senators. I also speak as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and as one who urged that the amount allowed by the House of Representatives of $300,000 be increased to $6,300,000. But, Mr. President, I must resist the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey and other Senators to increase that sum to $10,000,000.

I hardly need remind the Senate that we are living on borrowed money at the present time. The President has presented a budget to the Nation of approximately $71,000,000,000. The total tax intake into the Federal Treasury for the fiscal year ending June 30 last was $50,300,000,000. That was the highest take in the entire history of our country, and exceeded by $4,500,000,000 the high-water mark in tax receipts during World War II, which was for the fiscal year 1945.

Moreover, we have just passed a tax bill in the Senate calling for approximately $6,000,000,000 in new taxes. The House bill provided for about $7,000,000,000, and the bill is now in conference. The President, it will be recalled, requested about $10,000,000,000 in new taxes.

It seems to me, Mr. President, in the light of the fact that the House of Representatives allowed only $300,000, and the fact that the Senate Appropriations Committee increased the amount to $6,300,000, an increase of $6,000,000 over the House figure, those who have favored this legislation—and I was one of them—should be willing to accept this figure. For us at this time to support increasing the figure allowed by the Senate Appropriations Committee would, as I point out, merely add to the borrowings which the Federal Government will have to make.

I hardly need remind the Senate that the country is going to have to do some substantial refinancing this very year. for the past 9 months the redemption of Federal bonds has been higher than the sale of Federal bonds, and I do not believe that under the circumstances we have any right to borrow money to increase this appropriation of $6,300,000 to $10,000,000. I think the amount allowed is very liberal, under the circumstances.

For these reasons, even though I sympathize with the point of view of the Senator from New Jersey, and while I supported the legislation which he sponsored and which was passed by the Senate a year or so ago, and also supported the $6,300,000 figure in the Senate Appropriations Committee, I would not feel justified, under the circumstances, in increasing it another $4,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I desire first to express my deep appreciation of what the Senate Appropriations Committee did. The only point I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues is that it seems to me we have not provided adequately for the scope of this operation. We must get enough of the right kind of scientific research carried on—the kind of research we finally carried on during the latter years of World War II. We all know the enormous amount that had to be appropriated when the emergency came, in order to make the basic discoveries to make the atomic bomb possible. It seems to me that now is the time for us to encourage scientific work, to make further discoveries, and to work along the lines which these eminent scientists recommend. We are fortunate that many of those who helped in that vital period, such as Oppenheimer, Compton and Conant are still with us and are still pressing for adequate research.

It seems to me we should take on such an investment. We are only asking for $3,700,000 more than the Senate committee reported, as compared to the billions of dollars we have been compelled to vote for recently. Of course, I realize that since $300,000 was appropriated by the House there is danger that there may be a cut in the figure I propose anyway when it gets to conference. I am alarmed that if we are not careful we will not have enough of an enterprise going so that really constructive work can be done this year. But I do not want the committee for one minute to fail to understand my deep appreciation

for the attention they gave and the help they have given in the appropriation they have suggested.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think the entire committee is mindful of the importance of scientific research. A great deal of it is being done, and has been done by our great colleges and universities, and by many private firms in their laboratories; and certainly we want to encourage the younger men coming into the scientific field. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I think that I am alive to the importance of this field, but I feel that under all the circumstances the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee in increasing the House amount from $300,000 to $6,300,000 for the purpose of getting this program started was a fair and equitable allocation of funds. As soon as the condition of the Federal Treasury will warrant, I shall be prepared to support an expanded program; but I do not feel justified, in view of the fact that we are living on borrowed money, in increasing the appropriation by another $3,700,000.

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the Senator from California has the floor. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair) The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the only comment I desired to make on this subject was that the Senate Appropriations Committee did a very fair job Let me say to the Senator from New Jersey that the committee expressed very deep sympathy with the objective he seeks. They gave fair consideration when they raised the figure from $300,000, which the House allowed, to $6,300,000. They were very generous, they were very fair. They showed their entire sympathy for the objective he seeks, and I hope that he will be content to rest on that figure rather than at this time ask for a larger amount, because I do not know of a single item that received more generous treatment from the Appropriations Committee than did the appropriation for the National Science Foundation.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. THYE Mr. President, I was a member of the subcommittee and was present at most of the hearings in connection with the development of this particular item in the appropriation bill. I received communications from President J. L. Morrill, of the University of Minnesota; Dr. Lloyd H. Reyerson, of the University of Minnesota; and Dr. C. H. Bailey, of the Agricultural College of the University of Minnesota. I have received other communications, such as one which I have received from Dr. E. W. Davis, of the University of Minnesota.

Mr. President, this is October, and Congress will reconvene immediately after the first of next year. I feel that the committee definitely recognized the need and made a very substantial increase in raising the fund from $300,000, which the House had allowed, to $6,300,000, as provided in the Senate committee bill. If Senators will go through the record which was made in the subcommittee they will find that I said at the time of the hearings that I thought it necessary to appropriate a larger sum than that which had been appropriated by the House. I thought it was highly desirable, if necessary, to reduce the military appropriation in order to make possible an appropriation for basic research and scientific study in order that we might train youth to be qualified to do the scientific research necessary to supplement and aid the Armed Forces in their development.

The reason why I speak on the question at this time, Mr. President, is that I believe that the Appropriations Committee recognized the urgency and the need for a larger amount than had been allowed, and increased the House figure from $300,000 to $6 300,000 If that is insufficient, we can reexamine the question in framing our appropriation bill in 1952. The $6,300,000 will permit a beginning, so that the universities and colleges can proceed to develop their programs, and we can have an explanation of what they have developed when Congress reconvenes in 1952.

So, Mr President, even though I have a great admiration for the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and a great deal of confidence in his judgment and recommendations on this question, because he himself is an educator, as well as an able legislator, I regret that I cannot accept his proposal at this time. I believe that if we reexamine the question in 1952, when we have a new appropriation bill before us, we can immediately act and make available funds which will carry the program forward in an adequate manner.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am fully convinced of the importance of the work of the National Science Foundation. I was one of the original cosponsors, and was one of the Members of the conference committee which ironed out the differences between the House and the Senate. I think the passage of the National Science Foundation bill was one of the very constructive things in which I have taken part since I came to the Senate.

The bill provided for the creation of a board for scientific research, study, and education which has never been equaled in this country. We established last year a board of 24 of the leading scientists of the United States, persons chosen because of their competence, because of their expert knowledge, their experience, and their scientific know-how, to conduct the work of this institution. They were drawn from all over the country, from many different fields of scientific study.

The purposes of the National Science Foundation are briefly stated as follows:

> To develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences.

I do not think anyone could possibly question the value of scientific research. Some of the great advances which have been made in this country and in other countries have come into being exclusively because of research work and the advancement of scientific knowledge through expert channels.

The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] have referred to the fact that the appropriation carried in the Senate bill increases the House appropriation by $6,000,000. I realize that is a great sum. Those who talk about an increase in the appropriation by $6,000,000 remain very silent as to the fact that $6,300,000, while a large sum, is $7,700,000 less than the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, and is $8,700,000 less than the amount asked for by the great board of scientists who compose the National Science Foundation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Why should the Budget Bureau have any more information as to the needs for 2 months' work by this particular agency than has the committee which listened to the testimony?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am not able to answer that question.

Mr CHAVEZ. What is there about the Budget Bureau that makes it so infallible in its judgment as to how much money is needed?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am not going to get into an argument with the Senator.

Mr CHAVEZ. It is not an argument; it is a question which I am asking the Senator.

Mr LEHMAN. While I certainly do not claim that the Budget Bureau is infallible—we have found very frequently that it is not infallible—I do think that the staff for educational work is taken into account by the Appropriations Committee and by every other committee of the House and Senate, and certainly it is at least a reasonabe guidepost as to the amount of money which is needed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The House acted to the extent of $300,000.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is all they appropriated. I do not know their reasoning, of course.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Witnesses appeared before the House Committee on Appropriations, and the impression made on the House by the Budget Bureau was that $300,000 was sufficient. The Foundation did better in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Mr. LEHMAN. I realize that, but the amount is still $8,700,000 less than the amount asked for by the distinguished board of 24 of our leading scientists.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I happen to know some of them. I happen to know a most charming scientist from my State who is a member of the board. So the Senator is not telling me anything about how charming they are and how fine they are. I believe in Dr. Conant, and I believe in the program. But I think if they cannot get along with $360,000 from the middle of October to the 1st of January, they will need to be investigated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should say in answer to the Senator from New Mexico, as one who is interested in this proposition, that when the Bureau of the Budget submitted their figures to the House, with the support of the National Science Foundation, there was very little evidence presented to the House because the Board had been appointed just a very little while before by the President. The President delayed appointing the Board. So the Board did not have any detailed plans. They fixed an amount but they did not have any particularly good justification for it. When they came before the Senate committee, they had had more time to operate, and the director and the executive committee had done more work and they gave a more recent statement of their figures.

The Senator from New Mexico was present, as I was, at the committee hearing. I personally had hoped that this amount would be increased more than the committee increased it. In fact, I presented an amendment to make the figure $8,000,000. Finally, by way of compromise, the amount was fixed at $6,300,000. As I said, the Senate committee did have a better justification than the House. I hope the conference committee will sustain the action of the Senate committee, and I hope that, perhaps, in a subsequent supplemental appropriation bill, more funds will be provided for this institution, because I believe, as does the Senator from New York, that it is a very fine and necessary agency of Government.

Mr. LEHMAN Mr. President, the Senator from New York is not so well qualified as is the Senator from New Mexico to pass on the charm of the members of the Board, but he is well qualified to pass on their competence. The Board is composed of many of the leading scientists of the country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly there cannot be the slightest question in regard to the importance of research work at any time. Beyond that, I say that there never has been a time when that need is so absolutely overwhelming as it is at this particular time. I think the Members of the Senate overlook the fact that every great advance we have made in medical science, in physics, in chemistry, yes, in defense, has been due to research work, carried on by competent, expert men and women in the United States and in other parts of the world.

The Senator from California, for whom I have very great respect, mentioned the fiscal situation of the Government, and I agree with him very definitely that we have great problems to face, including, unfortunately, that of engaging in deficit financing, largely because things have happened with which the Senator from California and my other colleagues on the floor well know I have not been in sympathy. We have appropriated within the last 2 or 3 weeks $60,000,000,000 for defense, yet the Senate is unwilling to increase this appropriation by $3,500,000, although the appropriation may lead to developments in the scientific field which will be of outstanding importance, not only in our fight against disease, but also in our efforts to strengthen our defenses. Certainly many of the weapons which have been used for our defense have been developed through scientific research.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say that whatever our individual opinion may be, the only way in the world that this matter can be settled is by vote of the Senate. Senators are ready to vote. Why can we not vote? Senators may vote in any manner they wish, of course. We can vote by a standing vote; we can vote by taking the ayes and noes, or we can vote by the yeas and nays. Let us vote on the question and get through with it. I appeal to the Senator to let us vote on it, and vote now.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that I am not going to detain the Senate, and I take this opportunity of congratulating him on having done a magnificent job. I certainly would have felt derelict in my duty as a Senator of the United States had I not, on the floor of the Senate, expressed myself as to the importance of the undertaking we are considering.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure of that. I am not criticizing the Senator for doing so.

Mr. LEHMAN. I also have made it clear that I hoped that at this time the Senate would increase the appropriation to $10,000,000, and in the coming years increase it to the limit allowed by the act, $15,000,000.

I shall not detain the Senate longer. I think my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I have expressed ourselves as forcefully as we can, and as clearly as we can. Of course, as always, we must willingly and gracefully accept the judgment of the Senate on this matter until we can bring it up again, which we may be able to do on another occasion.

I simply wish to read one sentence from a letter which I have received from Mr. Charles Dollard, president of the Carnegie Corp. of New York. I may say that this is only one of many scores of letters I have received on the same subject. He says:

> Every study which has been made since the war, beginning with Vannevar Bush's report to the President in the summer of 1946, has stressed the need for more scientists and has pointed out that the necessary increase in the flow of trained talent cannot be achieved without some Federal subsidy.

In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter which I wrote to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], under date of August 25. In this letter I pointed out the need for a large appropriation, and made a plea for an appropriation in the full amount requested by the Director of the Foundation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 25, 1951.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: I have been quite concerned over the action by the House on the 1952 budget request for the National Science Foundation, in H. R. 5215. As approved by the House, the Budget request was reduced from $14,000,000 to $300,000, a reduction of 98 percent.

For many years, as governor and Senator, I have been deeply interested in scientific research. New York State, like Tennessee, contains many of the Nation's finest laboratories—government, academic, and industrial. I followed closely and supported the National Science Foundation legislation during its long consideration by the Congress up to its final approval in May 1950 In the face of the great need for more basic scientific knowledge there is no question in my mind that the modest sum of money requested for the Foundation can be wisely spent.

The House action on this appropriation reflects, I believe, the deep concern of its Members over the enormous cost of Government during the present emergency and a determination to reduce this cost on all activities that are not essential in this crisis. This is a concern that we all share. But in this age of technological warfare, basic research and science are critical resources, as vital to our national security as weapons and airpower. Indeed, new and more effective weapons depend upon the fresh ideas which come primarily from research laboratories.

Moreover, I am convinced that basic research saves money. A research project costing $50,000 can frequently save $5,000,000 in fruitless and aimless attempts to find solutions to technical or scientific problems on a trial-and-error basis.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, I am further interested in the activities of the Science Foundation in their relation to scientific advances which promote and safeguard the health of this Nation. The Science Foundation plays an important role in the entire structure of national health and medical research. I strongly urge you and the members of your committee to review the action taken by the House and to restore all the funds necessary for the National Science Foundation to carry on its vital functions.

To cut these funds for the support of scientific research and for the training of young scientists—the major functions of the foundation—is to strike a crippling blow at the base of the structure of national technological progress.

Very sincerely yours,

———,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Health.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments under the heading "National Science Foundation" previously passed over.

The first amendment passed over was on page 19, line 19, after the word "including" to insert "award of graduate fellowships."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on the same page, line 23, after the word "vehicles", to insert "expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 20, line 1, to strike out "$300,000" and insert

"$6,300,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I understood we were debating my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New Jersey is now in order. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. IVES, and Mr. DOUGLAS) offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 20, line 2, to strike out "$6,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for himself, and other Senators to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the committee amendment is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The next amendment passed over was on page 22, after line 18, to insert:

OPERATING-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDIES

The third proviso of Public Law 137, Eighty-second Congress, under the head "Maritime activities, operating-differential subsidies", is hereby amended by striking out "fifteen hundred and twenty-two" and inserting in lieu thereof "seventeen hundred and twenty-four."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This amendment was previously passed over on request of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I make the point of order that this amendment is out of order, in that it constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this is an amendment which was inserted in the original independent offices appropriation bill. The original appropriation bills covers 1,522 contracts which could be subsidized. This amendment would increase the number by 200. I respectfully submit that it seems at least open to consideration that a portion of the original appropriation bill could be amended by a supplementary appropriation bill which in substance increases the number of contracts, or brings under the law an additional number of the same type of contracts as are covered in the original appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in question appears to be legislation on an appropriation bill, and therefore the point of order is sustained.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I did not make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] made the point of order.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to speak just a moment on the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall not take long. I have no disagreement with the ruling of the Chair. I merely wish to point out to the Senate that this is another vote to shrink the American merchant marine, at a time of stress, at a time when we need every ship and every bottom we have.

The purpose of the amendment is to correct a situation which occurred in connection with the original appropriation bill. The House of Representatives—in particular, one Member of the House—insisted that there be some new voyages. The Maritime Board has already arranged for 1,522 contracts. Those are legal contracts, covering a period of years, in which the maritime operators can sue the Government.

The original bill provided that there should be some new voyages, to which no one has made objection. That would provide for new operators who wanted to enter a particular world trade route. This amendment would correct that situation and add 200 voyages, to take care of independent operators who wish to make application. If we cut the number down to 1,522, as the Senator from Delaware apparently wishes to do, we further shrink the American merchant marine.

This subject was discussed previously, and the Senate voted down the proposal. The action of the Senate is to shrink the American merchant marine. It does not accomplish anything. It merely makes more of a monopoly of the subsidized lines. It does not allow any new independent operators to make application.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In all probability the present law will not allow the Government to live up to its existing contracts in the next fiscal year.

Mr MAGNUSON. Admiral Cochrane testified time and time again before the Appropriations Committee as to what the situation would be. The 1,522 voyages do not even cover the contracts which are now in existence, under which the Government is legally obligated.

Again I say, if Senators do not want a merchant marine, let them say so, but why should we always stab it in the back with such tactics as this?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I always enjoy hearing the Senator from Washington. However, I wish he would turn the record over I have been in the Senate for 5 years, and I have heard the same record over and over again.

There is a duly constituted committee before which this proposal can be placed. All the Senator from Washington has to do is to introduce his proposal as a bill, and if it has any merit it can be reported from the committee. If it cannot be reported favorably from the committee, and cannot stand on its own merits, it has no place in an appropriation bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, that is not correct. The legislation is in existence providing for this activity. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 provides that the Government shall make contracts on application for subsidies over certain trade routes, subject to certain regulations. That provision is now in the law. We do not limit the number of voyages by law. We merely say that the Maritime Administration can go ahead and make contracts. The appropriation limits them because of the amount of money available. This subject does not come before our committee. It is not a matter of legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I point out once again that the Presiding Officer has ruled that this amendment constitutes legislation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think there is no question about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in connection with the committee amendment on page 19, line 8, a mistake was made in the figures earlier in the day. It was all my fault. It was not the fault of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], or the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. However, a mistake was made, and I ask unanimous consent, first, for the reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment as amended on page 19, beginning in line 7, was agreed to. If the committee amendment as amended is reconsidered, I shall ask unanimous consent to strike out the figures "$3,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,250,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think I understand what the Senator from Tennessee is attempting to do. I assume that that was what he meant to do at the time.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was what I meant to do at the time, but I became confused. I wish to correct the figure.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have no objection to the RECORD being corrected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have no objection, because I feel that that is what the Senator intended in the first instance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment as amended on page 19, beginning in line 7, was agreed to, is reconsidered; and, without objection, the figure "$3,750,000" will be stricken out, and the figure "$4,250,000" inserted in lieu thereof.

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to; and, without objection, the committee amendment as amended is agreed to.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 42, beginning in line 13, was agreed to, in order that I may offer an amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I told the Senator from Michigan that I would not object to the amendment, but would take it to conference, without obligation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr BRIDGES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is an item having to do with medical supplies. The committee went over the item very carefully. There is included in the bill a figure of $60,500,000 for medical supplies. If we provide a greater figure than that, we shall be competing with medical supplies for private individuals, and we shall force prices up. I do not believe that the program can consume or utilize effectively, at reasonable prices, more than a $50,500,000 item for medical supplies.

Therefore I will have to object to the unanimous consent request. The committee has raised the item above the House figures. It gave very careful consideration to all the items. We provided a start in all directions. It should be encouraging to the Civil Defense Administration—much more so than the House action. Much as I dislike to raise objection to the request of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], I must object, because I believe we have considered the subject very carefully.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] has the floor.

Mr. MOODY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question. As the Senator from New Hampshire has pointed out, this subject was very carefully considered by the committee. The committee has raised the amount by some $32,000,000. While the Senator from California would personally have preferred to see some other increases made in certain sections of the civil defense program, I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire that the facts presented by the civil defense officials were not sufficient to justify the appropriation of additional amounts at this time.

I should think that the better procedure, inasmuch as there is still to be reported another supplemental bill, would be for the Civil Defense Administration to prepare its facts very carefully, take the Senate bill as it is now about to pass the Senate, with the $32,000,000 in increases which we have provided, examine its program, and come with all the basic facts to both the House and the Senate committees. It may be that at that time they can justify certain additional increases in this category; and I am inclined to believe that they probably will be able to do so. They may feel that there are other elements which are more important for the general civil-defense program.

I certainly desire to do everything possible to encourage the States and cities which have carried on this program, and not make them feel that the Federal Government is not alive to the problem of civil defense.

I believe, however, that in justice to the over-all program, the Civil Defense Agency would be better advised to make a new presentation on the next supplemental bill.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, it may well be that the Civil Defense Agency should make another presentation. I am convinced that they should do so. However, I submit that there are certain basic facts in the situation which are perfectly clear whether they submit any further information or do not.

One of the facts is that Congress has appropriated nearly $60,000,000,000 for military equipment, and is about to appropriate $60,000,000 for the stockpiling of basic medicines which would be vitally needed in taking care of the American people in the event of an atomic bomb raid.

A single raid with 50 atomic bombs on American cities, which I am informed is within the present capability of Red Russia to carry out, would produce casualties of 3,000,000 dead, according to official estimates, and 3,000,000 injured. I am informed officially today that there is not in existence in the United States a sufficient amount of the type of medical supplies necessary to take care of casualties which would be produced by even a 2-bomb atomic raid.

If the Senator from New Hampshire wishes to object, that is his prerogative. But there are 54 target areas in America which have been selected by our experts on this subject as areas that should be particularly protected. The amount of $60,000,000 will not begin to provide for their protection.

Like every other Senator on the floor, I pray that America will never be subjected to an atomic bomb raid. However, the best invitation for an atomic raid on our cities is not to be prepared for it. At a time when we can and should appropriate $60,000,000,000 for military equipment, we ought at least to have a minimum amount of medical supplies available to take care of the casualties which would be inflicted in such an attack.

The degree and scope of the casualties which would be inflicted in a single atomic raid on American cities is not remotely comparable with the casualties which we suffered at any time during any war. There has been a strange complacency on this subject in places where there should not be such complacency. I believe the Senate should act, and not keep postponing action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Floor amendments are now in order, are they not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, between lines 21 and 22, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph as follows:

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SERVICES

For an additional amount to be used for continuing public assistance to Indians in New Mexico as set forth in the Santa Fe agreement, $79,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am submitting the amendment on behalf of the New Mexico Department of Public Welfare.

There are approximately 40,000 to 45,000 Indians in New Mexico. The Department estimates that there are 28,000 Navajos and 15,000 Pueblo and Apache Indians. Under the Navajo-Hopi bill which was sponsored by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and enacted several years ago, the welfare needs of the Navajo group are met without any undue hardship on the Department of Public Welfare. For non-Navajo Indians, the Santa Fe agreement has been in effect since 1949. Under this agreement the United Pueblo Indian Agency which supervises the affairs of the 19 Pueblos in the State and that of the Mescalero and Jicarilla Apache reservations, paid one-third of the budgeted assistance needs of the non-Navajo Indian.

For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1951 the Office of Indian Affairs failed to provide funds for relief needs of the Pueblo and Apache Indians. This throws the entire responsibility upon the New Mexico Department of Public Welfare which is operating under a more restrictive budget this biennium than previously, since the Department's State appropriation was cut by $371,000. The loss of this amount of State money represents a loss of between $600,000 and $700,000 "matching" Federal funds.

While the amount which will be required to take care of non-Navajo Indians is a relatively small item in our budget, being less than 3 percent of the total assistance fund budget, it is recognized that every additional expenditure which the Department has to assume makes it necessary to spread the amount of funds available extremely thin.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951, 566 cases including 946 non-Navajo Indians received public assistance in New Mexico totaling $152,631. The Indian Service provided one-third of this amount or $51,484, and the Department of Public Welfare paid $101,147.

In addition to meeting full public assistance needs for a growing caseload of non-Navajo Indians the Department is raising standards for all Indians since under previous policies we have found some discriminatory practices which we consider it advisable to discontinue. This will increase grants for Indians by approximately one-fourth. Under these circumstances the Department estimates that expenditures for

non-Navajo Indians during the fiscal year 1951-52 will be approximately $290,000, of which amount $102,000 will be required from State tax resources and $188,000 will be paid from Federal funds, as shown in the table which I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

New Mexico Department of Public Welfare—comparison of public assistance expenditures for non-Navajo Indians in New Mexico in year 1950–51 with estimated expenditures for year 1951–52

Category and year	Expenditures		
	Total	Federal	State
All categories, 1950–51	$101,146 50	$78,361 15	$22,785 35
Percent	100.0	77.5	22 5
Estimated all categories 1951–52	$290,000 00	$188,000 00	$102,000 00
Percent	100 0	64 8	35.2
Increase	$188,853 50	$109,638 85	$79,214 65
Old-age assistance, 1950-51	66,426 00	50,103 00	16,323 00
Estimated, 1951–52	164,000 00	101,800 00	62,200 00
Aid to dependent children, 1950–51	28,653 00	23,679.65	4,973.35
Estimated, 1951–52	98,000 00	68,600 00	29,400 00
Aid to needy blind, 1950-51	5,376 00	4,042 75	1,333 25
Estimated, 1951–52	15,000 00	9,500 00	5,500 00
Aid to the disabled, 1950–51	1 691 50	535 75	155.75
Estimated, 1951–52	13,000 00	8,200.00	4,900 00

[1] First payments to Indians under new program for aid to the permanently and totally disabled in January 1951.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, instead of asking for the $102,000, they have estimated that the $79,000 is needed in order to have the Federal Government do its share under the agreement it made with the State of New Mexico to take care of the Indians. All of them are being taken care of now, just as anyone else is; but there is an agreement by which the Federal Government will pay a certain amount to the State of New Mexico. The $79,000 is needed in taking care of 15,000 Indians throughout the State.

I hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment and at least will take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 58 it is proposed to strike out lines 8 to 12, inclusive.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, following this amendment I have an amendment relating to the Civil Service Commission, where there are about 14 employees who would be affected, in connection with the Civil Defense activities.

I should like to ask that the amendment be taken to conference and be considered there.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the amendment is submitted only for the purpose of having the matter taken to conference, I shall have no objection. However, I have strong objections to making such a change to any great extent, so that raids can be made on various other departments. I object to making it possible for such raids on other departments to be made.

When the bill reaches the conference, I hope something can be worked out.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think the Senator refers to the wrong amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina will suspend for a moment; evidently there is confusion as between the two amendments. Perhaps the clerk read the wrong amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, at this time I ask that the amendments which has been stated, namely, to strike out lines 8 to 12, inclusive, on page 58, be acted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina on page 58, in lines 8 to 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, now I ask that my other amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER Does the Senator from South Carolina propose another amendment at this time?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; I have another amendment, Mr. President. I offer it, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 25, after line 8, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC 704. The provisions of section 604 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1952 shall not apply to those persons engaged in functions of the Civil Service Commission related to (1) the preparation and issuance of material relating to the recruitment of personnel for the Federal service, and (2) the compilation of the Official Register of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this is the amendment about which I talked with the chairman of the committee. The amendment affects only 14 persons in the Civil Service Commission. Theoretically it would be possible to reduce that number somewhat, but we must have those employees in order to make up the Official Register and also to classify the employees in connection with the defense activities.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator's colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is the chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, whether this amendment was considered in the committee, and whether it is the one in which there were three provisions, the first of which was accepted, and the second of which applied to the Official Register alone.

Mr. MAYBANK. This is a different amendment, and applies only to the Official Register.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is this amendment satisfactory to the distinguished Senator?

Mr. MAYBANK. I should not say that it is satisfactory to me; the Senator should address his question to the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say that I am willing to take the amendment to conference for further consideration.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I feel that this matter should be studied. I am not familiar with the effect of the amendment on the other agencies. That is the trouble; when we vary in the case of one agency, the result can be to make complications in the case of the other appropriation bills

However, if the chairman of the committee indicates that he will take the amendment to conference, I suppose it can be worked out there.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, this division of the Civil Service Commission employs only 14 persons to do this work. Their work is required, first, in connection with recruitment today largely for defense activities; and, second, in connection with the compilation of the Official Register of the United States, in accordance with the law passed by Congress. That work must be done, and that is what the amendment is to care for.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I merely wish to make clear that I agree with my colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina. In the Appropriations Committee what we did was to make an exemption in the case of the Official Register.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] on page 25, after line 8.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in connection with the

amendment just agreed to, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement which I now send to the desk.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

I would like to say a few words regarding the provision in this bill and a similar provision in the independent offices appropriation bill, section 604, in the availability of funds for publicity and public relations work. This section was introduced by Senator BYRD and is familiar to all of us. The section lists many positions by title and also covers those same functions performed under any other job title. I am heartily in favor of the objectives of this section of the bill. However, I am concerned over the fact that because of its very specific language it could be construed in such a manner that it will injuriously affect one agency of Government in performing duties imposed upon it by law, and in carrying out other activities which have a direct bearing on national defense work. I refer to the Civil Service Commission.

As chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service, I am familiar with the duties performed by the Commission's Information Division. The Division has a total of 14 employees engaged in information work, including one stenographer and one messenger. A large part of the work performed by the Division deals with two activities: (1) Recruiting, which today is largely for defense positions, and (2) compiling the Official Register of the United States.

Most of the work of this Division is directly related to the preparation of informational material regarding personnel needs of the Federal Government in shortage categories. It also prepares material on the employment of the physically handicapped and the employment of veterans

I have received word from most of the leading veterans' organizations whose members have been greatly benefited by the work of this division, relating to opportunities affecting veterans, expressing concern over the situation created by this particular provision.

Press releases issued by the Commission deal largely with critical needs for particular kinds of employees and not with matters of propaganda or what is ordinarily referred to as publicity.

The compilation of the Official Register is not an activity created by the Civil Service Commission. It is imposed on the Commission by Congress. Congress has directed what the contents and size of the volume shall be. Only recently, Congress completed action on new legislation requiring that it be published not later than December 31 of each year. Obviously, the preparation of this volume has nothing to do with what we ordinarily have in mind by public relations work. I do not believe that Congress had this project in mind when it passed the recent legislation, yet it will be affected by this provision of the bill.

I do not believe that the Congress intended that the Commission should be handicapped in the issuance of its recruiting information, or in the preparation of the Official Register of the United States.

I therefore wish to introduce an amendment to the bill providing that the provisions of section 604 should not apply to the Civil Service Commission with respect to two activities: (1) the preparation and issuance of material relating to the recruiting of personnel for Federal service, and (2) the compilation of the Official Register of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I realize that earlier today the Senator from New Hampshire objected to a request for unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 41, in lines 23 and 24, relating to the Federal Civil Defense Administration, was agreed to.

I wish to ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which that amendment was adopted, in order to be able to offer an amendment to increase by $1,500,000 the amount of the appropriation for the executive direction of the Civil Defense Administration.

As the Senator from New Hampshire knows, in the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee our task has been to keep in touch with the Civil Defense program. The immediate urgency in connection with that program, so we have been advised, is for that agency to have in the national organization sufficient personnel to be able to carry out the program of cooperation and contact with the States and the local communities.

This item was reduced from $7,121,000 to $3,600,000 by the House of Representatives, and no additional amount was allowed by the Senate committee.

Of course, it is true that another presentation of this matter could be made in connection with another supplemental appropriation bill. However, in order to carry out the program at this time, the agency needs very badly to have personnel with which to cooperate with the States.

This item also includes the cost of their publications and their information service. With the additional amount, they can carry on their program; and they can wait until a later date to request funds for medical supplies and other things which will be necessary.

So, Mr. President, in order to be able to offer this amendment, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 41, in lines 23 and 24, was agreed to, be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 41, in lines 23 and 24, was agreed to?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, first let me say that, as the Senator from Tennessee well knows, I believe in civil defense, and I was one of those who in the committee proposed the readjustment of the House figure. We went over the matter very carefully; and I think we made the proper provisions in the proper places, and I consider the amounts to be fair.

I do not believe there is any reason at this time or that there is any evidence before us which would warrant our reopening this matter.

Therefore, at this time I am reserving the right to object. If other Senators wish to speak on this matter, I shall be glad to have us hear from them before I insist upon my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I feel that I shall have to object. This matter was gone over as carefully as was any other provision of the bill.

So far as I know, this is the first time I have seen the amendment now proposed to the committee amendment.

Has the Senator from New Hampshire seen the amendment to the committee amendment before? I have never seen it. It has never been presented to me in any way.

Under the circumstances, Mr. President, I feel that I have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to say to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] that the Senate will later have under consideration another appropriation bill which will be before the committee within a short time and if the Senator wishes to be heard, we shall be glad to hear him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understood that earlier in the day the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] gave notice that he would move to have an amendment reconsidered. I now ask whether a motion to lay that motion on the table will be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the motion will not be in order until the matter is brought up.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has not been brought up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been brought up. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill, H. R. 5215, was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. CORDON conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that had there been a record vote, I would have opposed and voted against the supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to call the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee to the

fact that the entire matter of providing for civilian defense in my judgment has been too slow and has not been adequate. I selected one item from the bill this afternoon, because I thought that was the one most acutely in need of action, namely, the shortage of medical supplies, the shortage of blood plasma, which would cause a very real and very terrible crisis in the cities of America if, unfortunately, a raid should occur.

I am sure that, among his many duties, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has some time in which he may go into this matter. I should like to urge him, in the additional bill which is to be brought up, to consider the broad program of civilian defense and to consider it in its entirety, because in my judgment the consideration has been inadequate thus far. I made some study of the program abroad, particularly as to what is being done in England, to prepare for such an eventuality. I feel that the situation deserves the attention of the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be most happy to give it my very best attention.

TINA BENTSEN

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably without amendment the bill (S. 2231) to effect entry of a minor child adopted or to be adopted by a United States citizen, and I submit a report (No. 932) thereon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the bill which the Senator from Texas desires to bring up is one which he discussed with me, as acting minority leader. As I understand, it involves the question of the adoption of a two weeks' old baby by a Representative and his wife, and it is desired to get the baby to this country. A nurse is available at the present time for the purpose. For that reason, and under the extraordinary circumstances, I said that so far as I was concerned, as acting minority leader, I would not object.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will not object to bringing a baby into the country, of course. But I simply do not want the unfinished business displaced. Let us have that well understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2231) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Tina Bentsen, shall be held and considered to be the natural born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd M. Bentsen, Jr., citizens of the United States.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr McCARRAN from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William Amory Underhill, of Florida, to be an Assistant Attorney General to fill an existing vacancy; favorably;

Cornelius J. Harrington, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois to fill a new position; adversely (Ex. Rept. No 3); and

Joseph Jerome Drucker, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois to fill a new position; adversely (Ex. Rept. No. 4).

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

REGULAR AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Reginald Carl Harmon for appointment in the permanent grade of major general in the Regular Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the United States Air Force are confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Murrey L. Royer to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATION OF CHESTER BOWLES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the majority leader inform the Senate when he plans to bring up the nomination of Mr. Chester Bowles to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plentipotentiary to India?

Mr. McFARLAND. It is our hope that we may bring it up immediately following the disposition of the bill to provide additional judges, which I hope will not take very long. I know that both Senators from Tennessee are anxious to have that bill disposed of, and as soon as we can do so, we will bring up the nomination of Mr. Bowles.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So it is the plan of the majority leader to proceed on the bill to provide additional judges, and, immediately following the disposition of that bill, to go into executive session for whatever debate there may be and for action on the nomination of Mr. Bowles.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will that be tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. I hope it will be tomorrow. I cannot guarantee anything.

Mr. McKELLAR. We cannot take up the nomination of Mr. Bowles tomorrow, unless we finish with the bill to provide additional judges; but I hope we may finish that tomorrow.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as I have previously indicated, the Armed Services Committee is scrutinizing military nominations, particularly those of general and flag rank. I shall therefore make some brief remarks concerning the pending military nominations, which include 89 of general or flag officer rank. This does not mean 89 new generals or admirals, nor does it mean there are that many promotions within the general or flag officer grade. Actually, if these pending nominations are confirmed, then 19 colonels of the Air Force, 12 colonels in the Army and 1 colonel in the Marine Corps will be promoted to brigadier generals, and 1 brigadier general in the Army will become a major general, 1 rear admiral in the Navy will become a vice admiral, and 9 brigadier generals in the Air Force will become major generals. The remaining nominations deal with permanent promotions, rank after retirement and specific assignments, all of which require Senate confirmation.

Sometime ago, the Armed Services Committee in considering the requirements for senior officers by the military services temporarily limited the numbers of generals and admirals of the military forces pending further study by the Department of Defense and the Committee. These nominations come within the limits set by the committee. When confirmed the Army will have a total of 493 generals on duty. The committee has set a maximum limit of 496. The 493 on duty is 6 more than have been on duty in recent months.

The Navy has a total of 266 admirals on duty, and this number will not be changed by the pending nominations. The committee has set a maximum limit of 280 admirals for the Navy. That simply means that there are as many going out of service in this group as there are coming in.

The Marine Corps has a total of 52 generals on duty, which number will not be changed by the pending nominations.

The committee has fixed the maximum limit for the Marine Corps at 60.

The Air Force will have a total of 316 generals on duty if the pending nominations are approved. This is 4 less than were on duty 1 month ago. The committee has set the limit for the Air Force at 333.

There are two additional phases of the military personnel policies which the committee is probing. The first is a study of promotions given to Reserve officers on active duty as compared to the promotion of Regular officers. There are indications that Regulars may be receiving preference over Reserve officers in many instances, and the committee will make a thorough study of this subject.

The second study, and one which has been of great concern to members of the committee, is into the voluntary retirement of senior officers prior to reaching the statutory age. At the conclusion of World War II the Congress was extremely generous and provided for the retirement of officers in the highest grade in which they served satisfactorily. Many senior officers took advantage of this authorization and retired prior to reaching the statutory age. Under present world conditions, with many being called involuntarily into service, it is not entirely consistent to allow some of our senior officers in high position to retire for personal reasons. The committee is carefully reviewing this matter with a view to correcting this situation.

Mr. President, these remarks do not pertain to any particular individual, but when a man, through force of effort and ability, we will say in his 40's, has attained a high rank in our military services, when he is in the prime of life, I personally do not think he should voluntarily retire merely for the purpose of making money; and this view is shared by a considerable number of the members of the Armed Services Committee We have evidence that that is what some of them are doing, that they are going into the field of commerce and industry and selling for a higher salary the reputation they have already acquired in the military service.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I desire to compliment the Senator from Mississippi on his speech. I indeed agree with what he has said. The officers in the services whom the Senator has been discussing should not retire and be given the benefits of a high retirement pay, and then go into positions where they make three or four times their retired pay, when the people are burdened with taxes. They should be patriotic enough to serve their country during this emergency.

Mr. STENNIS. I very much appreciate the fine remarks of the majority leader. Someone said to me recently, "The Government cannot compete with private industry and get the services of these men." My answer was that the Government is not supposed to have to compete with men who are already honor bound to serve in the profession in which they are trained, particularly at this time. We would have to take men from the Inactive Reserve and bring them into the service.

Mr. McFARLAND. We can cut off their retirement pay when they are making a large amount of money outside the service.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. I think we shall have to have legislation on the subject in order to remedy the situation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr SALTONSTALL. I wish to say, in furtherance of what the Senator from Arizona has said, that the Senator from Mississippi knows that the Defense Appropriation Conference Committee did adopt some of the House language on the subject. It changed it somewhat, but it did make it more difficult for officers to retire.

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to have that contribution from the Senator. He is a member of the Armed Services Committee, and he knows the custom to which I have adverted has developed, and we in the Senate have been party to it, indirectly. When an officer is ready to retire, he is stepped up from a lower grade and retired. It does not actually cost more money when an officer is retired as a lieutenant general than if he is retired as a major general, but we are throwing these titles around recklessly right and left and are cheapening the rank of the higher officers. We are cheapening it for admirals and generals, even colonels. I think it is a high attainment for one to reach such a rank.

Mr. McFARLAND. "Colonel" used to be a big title

Mr. STENNIS. A man told me recently that he had been in the service for 10 years and the highest officer he ever saw for most of that 10 years' time was a lieutenant colonel, who was commander of a military post

The committee is carefully reviewing the matter with a view to correcting the situation. The committee unanimously reported the military nominations on the Senate calendar, and recommends confirmation by the Senate.

Mr. President, I have not been trying to cast any reflection on the name of anyone who happens to be in the list My remarks are in connection with the general situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are no further nominations on the Executive Calendar. Without objection, the President will be notified of all confirmations of today.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. I move, as in legislative session, that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 9, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 8 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Edmund Port, of New York, to be United States attorney for the northern district of New York, vice Irving J. Higbee, resigned.

Myles J Lane, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York, vice Irving H. Saypol, resigned.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be generals

Lt Gen. John Kenneth Cannon, 3A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commanding general, Tactical Air Command, with rank of general with date of rank from date of appointment.

Lt Gen. Curtis Emerson LeMay, 26A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commanding general, Strategic Air Command, with rank of general with date of rank from date of appointment.

Lt. Gen. Benjamin Wiley Chidlaw, 23A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commanding general, Air Defense Command, with rank of general with date of rank from date of appointment.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general.

James H Strother
George F Good, Jr.
Merrill B Twining

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Raymond A. Anderson
Robert E Hogaboom
Joseph C. Burger

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters.

ALABAMA

James R. Levy, Ozark, Ala., in place of G. W. Carroll, resigned.

ALASKA

Doris V Richard, Annette, Alaska, in place of D. A. Wirsching, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Gurley C. Pitts, Altus, Ark., in place of B P. Davis, transferred.

Joe G. Hornberger, Manila, Ark., in place of E. C Fradenburg, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Geraldine J. Joiner, Adin, Calif., in place of F M Harvey, resigned.

Martha E DeVilbiss, Big Bear City, Calif., in place of S E Pearson, resigned.

Wyvonne E Ingram, Brisbane, Calif., in place of M. E. Tann, resigned.

Richard E. Beechly, Lamont, Calif. Office established September 16, 1947.

George M. Gallagher, Point Reyes Station, Calif., in place of M. A. Roels, retired.

COLORADO

Ellen L. Colclazier, Loretto, Colo., in place of Magdalene Skees, retired.

CONNECTICUT

William J. Phelan, Waterbury, Conn., in place of C. A. Babin, retired.

Lucy N. Leonard, Watertown, Conn., in place of D. G. Sullivan, retired.

FLORIDA

John M. Ayers, Altha, Fla., in place of A. L. Hansford, retired.

Norman F. Easton, Gibsonston, Fla., in place of M. R. Buzbee, resigned.

GEORGIA

Hillyer C. King, Athens, Ga., in place of J. R. Myers, retired.

John Preston Whigham, Eastman, Ga., in place of C. L. Persons, retired.

Edwin Parker Dodge, Nahunta, Ga., in place of S. K. Allen, transferred.

Elizabeth M. Gray, Poulan, Ga., in place of R. L. Sumner, resigned.

Hugh D. Crook, Senoia, Ga., in place of E. S. Arnall, retired.

HAWAII

Teruhisa Nishiyama, Haleiwa, T. H. Office established December 1, 1949.

Katsue I. Nishiyama, Kunia, T. H., in place of Toshihiro Nakagawa, resigned.

IDAHO

James F. Hughes, Boise, Idaho, in place of H. L. Yost, retired.

ILLINOIS

John P. Kvidera, Cary, Ill., in place of J. I. Kvidera, retired.

Russell W. Jones, Casey, Ill., in place of R. R. Barkley, transferred.

Gladys E. Marshall, Chestnut, Ill., in place of A. J. Buehler, transferred.

Gladys L. White, Valier, Ill., in place of C. E. Veach, retired.

INDIANA

Wilson Flack, Vernon, Ind., in place of A. J Trapp, resigned.

IOWA

Arnold A Benda, Brooklyn, Iowa, in place of Estelle Coon, retired.

Lois Kathryn Allison, Carnarvon, Iowa, in place of A. E. Mason, retired.

Robert J. Cavanagh, Delmar, Iowa, in place of M A. Waters, retired.

Eugene R. Wilbur, Randalia, Iowa, in place of E H Beman, retired.

KANSAS

William J Nelson, Natoma, Kans., in place of C. A. Bodmer, transferred.

LOUISIANA

Helen H Selle, Meraux, La., in place of C. A Meraux, retired.

MARYLAND

Woodrow B Lippy, Manchester, Md., in place of J R L. Wink, retired.

Charles W Jones, Millington, Md., in place of Leonard Wilson, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Manuel R Tavares, East Falmouth, Mass., in place of F. B. Curtis, retired

Donald P Greeley, Hamilton, Mass., in place of W L Foster, removed.

MICHIGAN

William J. McGill, Davison, Mich., in place of J W Harlan, retired

Kenneth R. Ruthig, Minden City, Mich., in place of A. C. Kulish, retired.

Harold F. Clark, Morenci, Mich., in place of Martha Swaney, resigned.

Leland S. Jennings, Saginaw, Mich., in place of J. D Mershon, retired.

Evelyn M. Evans, St. Joseph, Mich., in place of W. F. Murphy, retired.

MINNESOTA

Paul A. Stevenson, Motley, Minn., in place of J. B. Reynolds, retired.

Louis Rodal, Nielsville, Minn., in place of E. M. Paulson, deceased.

MISSISSIPPI

John C Graves, Jr., Roxie, Miss., in place of M. G. Flowers, retired.

NEBRASKA

Donald E. Hickman, Bushnell, Nebr., in place of J. L. Delong, retired.

Howard F. Nutting, Ericson, Nebr., in place of E D. Booth, transferred

Allen O. Wasenius, Oxford, Nebr., in place of J. T. Haffey, transferred.

Milton H. Maurer, York, Nebr., in place of P. A. Meehan, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Clarence W Colbeth, North Hampton, N. H., in place of M. E. Kierstead, declined.

NEW JERSEY

Ettore T Minervino, Denville, N J., in place of S. V. Dickerson, deceased.

Edith M. Jackson, Princeton Junction, N. J., in place of A. C. Fulton, resigned.

NEW YORK

Louis C. Nielsen, Amagansett, N. Y., in place of B. C. Hadel, retired.

Carl N. Cooper, Greenport, N. Y., in place of G A Rackett, deceased.

Charles F. Fitzgerald, Hague, N. Y., in place of S. B. Keenan, retired.

Paul A Lane, Larchmont, N. Y., in place of F. L Egger, retired.

John H. Chase, Milford, N. Y., in place of W. C. McRorie, retired.

Frank J. Daly, Norwich, N. Y., in place of H M. Bulger, deceased.

Mary B Bunnell, Scio, N. Y, in place of B. F Palmer, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Richard D. Dixon, Edenton, N. C., in place of C. E. Kramer, deceased

Edward L. Best, Louisburg, N. C., in place of T M. Harris, resigned.

Rupert R Rawls, Oak City, N. C., in place of J. A Rawls, deceased.

Robert L Harrison, Spencer, N. C., in place of W. H. Shannon, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Oscar G Tang, Cooperstown, N. Dak., in place of T A Marquardt, retired.

Frederick G Knauss, Hannaford, N. Dak, in place of George Knauss, retired.

James O Solberg, Lakota, N. Dak, in place of H J Simon, retired.

OHIO

Richard D Walter, Archbold, Ohio, in place of H. J. Walter, retired

Victor L. Will, Canal Winchester, Ohio, in place of P C Miller, transferred.

Waldon E. Reed, Galena, Ohio, in place of R E. Fissel, retired

Cora A. Williams, Green Camp, Ohio, in place of J J Williams, resigned

Robert S Prater, Kenton, Ohio, in place of C. S Prater, retired.

Garnett G. Schlechty, London, Ohio, in place of F. E Noland, retired.

Louis L Chevraux, Louisville, Ohio, in place of Henry Beuchat, transferred

Richard J Kelch, Versailles, Ohio, in place of J. H. Petitjean, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Robert L. Cummings, Kinta, Okla., in place of W P. Perrymore, transferred.

Lucille L. McAllister, Luther, Okla., in place of Belle Huntington, retired.

OREGON

Clarence E. Thomas, Deer Island, Oreg., in place of E. W Fowler, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

John Albert Vail, Chester Springs, Pa., in place of K. H. Vail, deceased.

Andrew W. Kovach, Grindstone, Pa., in place of W. E. Schell, retired.

Charles F. Gregory, Lake Winola, Pa., in place of Anna Cardiello, resigned.

Thomas J. Cavanaugh, Nanty Glo, Pa, in place of M A. Mash, retired.

Marie G. Hastings, Penndel, Pa., in place of C S. Doyle, retired.

Frederick G. McGee, Roslyn, Pa., in place of J. A. Kelly, removed.

Brace S Knabenshue, Warren, Pa, in place of J K Bell, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Joseph J. Ropp, Manning, S C., in place of N C. Wells, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Walter V. Wiedenman, Madison, S. Dak., in place of J. H. Ryan, resigned.

Bernard A O'Reilly, Stephan, S. Dak., in place of K H. Holtzman, declined.

TEXAS

E B Lee, Bessmay, Tex., in place of M C. Strother, deceased.

William F Schwenke, Coupland, Tex, in place of O P. Spiegelhauer, retired.

Daniel R. Walsworth, O'Brien, Tex, in place of C. M. Walsworth, retired.

Elfray L Orts, Paige, Tex., in place of H. J. Kuhn, transferred

Elmo M. Vickers, Pleasanton, Tex, in place of Zella Cook, retired.

UTAH

Clifford H. Sondrup, Ephraim, Utah, in place of J. L Willardsen, retired

David R Trevithick, Salt Lake City, Utah, in place of I. A. Smoot, retired.

VERMONT

George F. Lawrence, Jr, Manchester, Vt, in place of M. E. Malone, retired.

VIRGINIA

Herbert S Hulvey, Fort Defiance, Va., in place of J. F. Walker, retired.

WASHINGTON

Troy T Dean, Otis Orchards, Wash, in place of John Dean, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Nathan W Meadows, Rhodell, W Va., in place of Daisy Barker, deceased.

WISCONSIN

Donald E. Chape, Bayfield, Wis., in place of Marie Freeman, retired.

Erwin J. Hendrikse, Oostburg, Wis., in place of Willard Dirkse, resigned.

Herbert W. Johnson, Port Wing, Wis, in place of J. T. Helsing, retired

---

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 8 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm Murrey L. Royar, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY

Maj Gen. George Anthony Horkan, O7201, to be The Quartermaster General

Lt Gen. Stephen J Chamberlin, O3397, commanding general, Fifth Army (major general, U S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. James George Christiansen, O12075.

Maj. Gen. Paul Wilkins Kendall, O12199.

Maj Gen Willard Gordon Wyman, O12356.

Maj. Gen. William Benjamin Kean, O12470.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major general

Brig. Gen. George Hamden Olmsted, O199581.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Robert Whiting Daniels, O4648.
Col. James Robinson Pierce, O14979.
Col. Harry McKenzie Roper, O15176.
Col. Francis Townsend Dodd, O15306.
Col. Richard Warburton Stephens, O15569.
Col. Branner Pace Purdue, O16149.
Col. Thomas John Hall Trapnell, O16782.
Col. Verdi Beethoven Barnes, O17198.
Col. Thomas Lilley Sherburne, Jr., O17293.
Col. Paul DeWitt Adams, O17306.
Col. Paul Wyatt Caraway, O17659.
Col. Lynn Harold Tingay, O5970.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be majors

Alfred O Heldobler, MC, O419472.
Ted Johnson, MC, O309651.
Hyman Turner, MC, O336682.

To be captains

James A Austin, MC, O976256
William J Brensinger, MC, O1726954
Philip C. Canney, MC, O991174.
William A. Meriwether, MC
Daniel Stowens, MC, O478511.

To be first lieutenants

Kenneth W. Beesting, JAGC, O2018277
William H. Bigelow, DC, O1921547.
Richard R. Cahnovsky, DC, O975819.
Charles C Eaves, MC, O2207487.
Murray E. Finn, MC, O2209659.
Willard G. Fischer, DC, O980949
Morris Goldschlager, JAGC, O460165.
Stanley C Kolodny, DC, O1919648.
John M McGuire, MC, O976689
Donald A Norris, Jr , DC, O966541.
Bernard A. Ramundo, JAGC, O557455.
Veryl D Schwartz, MC, O1921418.
Howard A Shane, DC, O761475
Norman R Stoddard, DC, O980586.
Joseph P. Summa, DC, O1705968.
Charles C. Trommer, DC, O573610.
Charles W Vandas, DC, O992400
Robert D. Youmans, DC, O2063745.

To be second lieutenants

Nancy A Johnson, WAC, L1020590.
Alfred D Kneessy, MSC, O1873170
Patricia J. McQuaide, ANC, N770169.
Alice E. Sasse, ANC, N804380.

To be first lieutenants

Neal J Ahern, O1318004
George E Armstrong, O1290526
Ernest W Ellis, Jr , O1167825.
Gilbert J Grout, O1032588
Clifford D. Rhodes, O501414
William E Weber, O1330993
Oliver I. West, O1011395
Harold W Wymer, O1317721.

To be second lieutenants

Floyd H Abrams, Jr., O2003492.
Homer Ambrose, Jr., O1873145.
John F Arnaud, Jr , O1914625.
Harry P. Aubright III, O2211690.
Garratt A. Austin, O2003037.
Frank S. Badger.
William E. Baum, O1914583.
William A Beyer, O1340976.
James O. Burri, O2021467.
Leon J. Calhoun, O957817.
Archie E. Carpenter, O2211252.
Robert L. Carstens, O532751.
Rudolph D. Cassens, O2103792.
Walter B. Clark, Jr.
Charles E. Conner, Jr., O2002968.
Ollie D. Conner, Jr., O2204170.
Edwin K. Crowley, Jr., O961201.
Edmund R. Danzig.
Jay A. Davidson, O1861908.
Bernard H. Des Roches
Charles C. Early, O2208513.
Walter W. Fade, O1013295.
John A. Farnsworth, O1304884.
James B. Forster, O2211364.
Jack N. Foshee, O2204027.
Louis C. Fry, O2206205.
Robert P. Gary, O1874221.
Dorsey B. Greene, Jr., O2003538.
Lindsey W. Hale, O2204099.
James N. Hanson, O1325003.
William B Harvey, Jr.
Clyde T. Hathaway, O1049504.
Worten M. Hathaway.
George W. Hayden, O2201751.
Ward M. Haynes, O2102253.
Jamie R Hendrix, O2003544.
Gustav Heningburg, O1202846.
Robert A Hyerle, O2211358.
Leonard B Jankowski, O2004260.
Pendleton A Jordan III, O1873364.
Donald P. Kelly, Jr., O2104060.
George W. Keyes, O554077.
Bohuslav Z Kostka, O1339883.
Gaylord A. Lansrud, O956594.
Robert B. Mercer.
Langdon L Morton, Jr., O958405.
Fain M. Rankin, Jr., D1915366.
Richard N Raunswinder, O1872620.
John R. Rhodes, Jr , O2003001.
Paul R Ross, Jr , O2103937.
Dan E Schilling, O1915374.
John M. Shea, O2201824
Paul J. Slight, O2103877.
Franklin E Staples, O560366
William H. Talbot, Jr., O2206723.
Joseph W Tatasciore, O960256.
Robert W Thams, O1338877.
Paul A Thompson, O2208540.
Rolf W. Utegaard, O1862077.
Bruce E Wallace, O947977.
Andreul J Wetherington, O2004026
Thomas B Wynegar, O2003735.
Walter J. Zarnowski, O2203022.
Kenneth G Cassels, O2003050.
William H Dinkins.
John L Evans
Myron R Feldman, O1862119
Jack R. Fleming, O1872737.
Joseph B J Holden.
Everett E Hooper
Haldor T. Jonsson, Jr.
Frank M Simpson, Jr.
Alex Stewart, Jr , O2003904

REGULAR AIR FORCE

Maj Gen Reginald Carl Harmon, 721A, for appointment in the permanent grade of major general in the Regular Air Force, under the provisions of section 310, Air Force Organization Act of 1951, with date of rank to be established under the provisions of section 503 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADES INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE V OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE ESTABLISHED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE AFORE-MENTIONED TITLE

To be major generals

Maj Gen Bryant LeMaire Boatner, 362A.
Maj. Gen. Robert Wilkins Douglas, Jr., 46A.
Maj. Gen James Somers Stowell, 72A.
Maj. Gen. Glenn Oscar Barcus, 87A.
Lt Gen. Elwood Richard Quesada, 50A.
Maj. Gen James Wrathall Spry, 82A.
Maj. Gen. Patrick Weston Timberlake, 83A.
Maj. Gen. Joseph Smith, 84A.
Maj. Gen. Francis LeRoy Ankenbrandt, 267A.
Maj. Gen. Morris Robert Nelson, 277A.
Maj. Gen. Kenneth Perry McNaughton, 278A.
Maj. Gen. Clarence Shortridge Irvine, 296A.
Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, Jr., 387A.
Maj. Gen. Thomas Sarsfield Power, 481A.

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. Harry George Armstrong, 209A.
Brig. Gen. John Ferral McBlain, 203A.
Brig Gen. James Elbert Briggs, 356A.
Brig. Gen. Norris Brown Harbold, 369A
Brig. Gen. Albert Boyd, 424A.
Maj. Gen. Julius Kahn Lacey, 538A.
Maj. Gen. Carl Amandus Brandt, 563A.
Brig. Gen. Kenneth Eugene Webber, 117A.
Maj Gen. John Halliday McCormick, 253A.
Brig. Gen. Manuel Jose Asensio, 324A.
Brig. Gen. Alfred Rockwood Maxwell, 359A.
Brig. Gen. Robert Frederick Tate, 363A.
Maj Gen. John Alexander Samford, 377A.
Brig. Gen. George Ferrow Smith, 380A.
Brig. Gen. Delmar Taft Spivey, 385A.
Maj. Gen. Robert Kinder Taylor, 390A.
Brig Gen. Kingston Eric Tibbetts, 436A.
Maj Gen Frederick Rodgers Dent, Jr , 444A.
Brig. Gen. Reuben Columbus Hood, Jr , 498A
Brig Gen. John Kenton Gerhart, 525A.
Brig. Gen. Ralph Powell Swofford, Jr., 547A
Maj. Gen. Robert Merrill Lee, 590A.
Maj. Gen. Dean Coldwell Strother, 591A.

To be lieutenant general on the retired list

Lt Gen Richard Emmel Nugent, 57A, Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, United States Air Force (major general, U S. Air Force).

To be colonel

Bernt Balchen, AO426630.

To be captains (medical)

John H. George, AO463125
Dalton L Kinsella, Jr., AO2213534.
Gordon Saver, AO2212251
Robert E Shirley, AO1906683.

To be first lieutenants (medical)

William G Sanford, AO1907138
Harwood N Sturtevant, AO972875.
Arthur J. Thiele, Jr., AO972601.

To be second lieutenants

James L. Anderson.
Eugene Bartolich.
Irving L Burrows, Jr.
Glenn B. Shaffer.
Gordon S. Walls
Charles F Watson, Jr
Alwyn C Buckland, AO2216185.
William E. Buffington.
Stephen G Dardaganian, AO2230644.
Luis A. Davila Aponte.
Ralph L Kitchens.
Gene W. LaFitte.
William S. Paul
Billy J. Welch, AO1856225.

AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

To be major generals

Brig Gen. Alfred August Kessler, Jr., 216A.
Brig. Gen. Manuel Jose Asensio, 324A.
Brig Gen James Elbert Briggs, 356A
Brig. Gen. Robert Frederick Tate, 363A.
Brig. Gen. Norris Brown Harbold, 369A.
Brig Gen. Mark Edward Bradley, Jr., 552A.
Brig. Gen. Walter Campbell Sweeney, Jr., 555A
Brig Gen Herbert Bishop Thatcher, 634A.
Brig Gen John Beverly Montgomery, 1528A.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Joseph Theodore Morris, 175A.
Col. Omar Osmer Niergarth, 132A.
Col. Manning Eugene Tillery, 293A.
Col. Frank Hamlet Robinson, 336A.
Col. Wentworth Goss, 349A.
Col. James Wayne McCauley, 425A.
Col. Harold Webb Bowman, 486A.
Col. Merrill Davis Burnside, 495A.
Col. Hugh Arthur Parker, 505A.
Col. Jesse Auton, 518A.
Col. Troup Miller, Jr., 559A.
Col. William Madison Garland, 638A.
Col. Harold Roth Maddux, 650A.
Col. Olin Foster McInay, 19029A.
Col. Kenneth Paul Bergquist, 1117A.
Col. Aaron Warner Tyer, 1123A.
Col. Turner Clifton Rogers, 1232A.
Col. Brooke Empie Allen, 1287A.
Col. William Parker Fisher, 1294A.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 502 AND 509 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

(Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law.)

To be lieutenant colonels, medical

×Robinson, Robert Walker, 19134A.
×Knauf, George Milton, 19135A.
Booth, John Austin, 19139A.
×Lackay, R. Howard, 19636A.
×Bennett, Bruce Hardy, 19198A.
Downey, Vincent Michael, 19199A.
×Talbott, Charles Hudson, 19200A.
Arnoldi, Louis Bernhard, 19201A.
Humphreys, James William, Jr., 19928A.
Ficicchy, John, Jr., 19202A.
×Berry, Carl Ziegler, 19555A.
Henry, Joseph Raymond, 19203A.

To be lieutenant colonels, dental

×Eye, Kenneth David, 18882A.
×Messner, Jack Menefee, 18883A.
Oakley, Hal David, Jr., 18884A.
×Franklin, William Waldron, 18885A.

To be lieutenant colonel, veterinary

×Gale, John, 18982A.

To be lieutenant colonels, medical service

Martin, Jacob Bruce, 19392A.
×Belcher, Tolbert Henry, 19400A.
Parrish, Henry Nelson, 19404A
×Phelps, Allen Wray, 19412A.
×Larnce, Paul Cable, 19413A.
Rigsby, Elliott Powell, 19414A.
×Rogowski, Edward Casimir, 19416A.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Charles W. Fox, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving under a Presidential designation as Chief of Naval Material.

To be ensigns in the line of the Navy

Eugene H. Pillsbury
Spencer A Barrow

To be ensigns, Civil Engineer Corps

Gordon A Anderson
John F. Dobson
Charles M. Howe
Robert H Nelson
Calvin C. Norman
Claude E. Swecker, Jr.

To be lieutenant (junior grade), in the Civil Engineer Corps, in lieu of the line as previously nominated and confirmed

Gordon A. Anderson

IN THE MARINE CORPS

James A Stuart, to permanent appointment as brigadier general.

Homer L. Litzenberg, Jr., temporary appointment as brigadier general.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Philip O'Connor, C. C., of County Tyrone, Ireland, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, look down with favor on the Representatives of this great country gathered here today. Give to them counsel, wisdom, understanding that they may through Thee, O God of might, wisdom, and justice, judge wisely of the great events with which they have to deal. Give them power to realize the importance and responsibilities of these United States as supporter of the moral right in all parts of the universe.

Grant that the influence of this great country may always be on the side of wisdom, peace, and freedom as it is today. Grant also that the laws enacted here may be for justice and mercy.

Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct the deliberations of this House and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for the rule and government of this country so that they may tend to the preservation of peace and the promotion of natural happiness and may perpetuate for its citizens the blessings of equal liberty which are still unrealized in many other countries today.

Grant also to all the citizens of the United States that they may be blessed in the knowledge and sanctified in the observance of Thy most holy laws, that they may be preserved in union and in that peace which the world cannot give. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 5, 1951, was read and approved.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H R. 4386) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1952

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill will not be brought up under the program until when?

Mr McCORMACK. Wednesday

Mr. TABER. So that it will be available to the Members all day tomorrow, anyway?

Mr. McCORMACK Exactly.

Mr HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do I understand it is expected to come up on Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Wednesday, but if there is a roll call, the roll call will go over until the next day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk, and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREE ON STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] be substituted as a conferee on the State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary appropriation bill in place of our late colleague, Mr. Stefan. Mr. Speaker, I have notified the chairman of the committee that I was going to make this request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AN INVALUABLE MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I propose to do the unusual today; I propose to eulogize the gentleman from Michigan [Mr HOFFMAN]. I know it is unusual to eulogize a Member while he is still with us. My excuse for doing so—if I need any excuse—is that CLARE HOFFMAN is an unusual man, and I believe in "flowers for the living rather than flowers for the dead."

Mr. Speaker, after 15 years of observation and careful consideration, I have come to the conclusion that CLARE HOFFMAN is one of the most valuable Members of the House of Representatives. His keen sense of humor, his analytical mind, his nonpartisan, independent, impersonal attitude toward all legislative problems qualify him to an unusual degree for service in this body.

CLARE HOFFMAN is everlastingly on the job. He has few equals in this House in his ability to go to the heart of things. His analytical mind easily cuts through the fancy wrappings and the sugar coatings that is to be found covering most of the legislation that comes before us for consideration. Thus he uncovers the real heart or kernel that is on the inside of the fancy wrappings.

Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Michigan was born, the mold and ingredients used to shape his character and personality were either lost or destroyed—there are no more like him. Sham, hypocrisy, indirection, and inconsistency are absolutely lacking in Clare's make-up. That is what makes him both unusual and invaluable as a Member of this House. Clare is honest, forthright, and fearless—qualities very much needed in public life today. I have said many times on the floor of this

House and on public platforms, "The scarcest thing in Washington today is courage, backbone, intestinal fortitude." CLARE HOFFMAN has more than his share of these very desirable qualities. We need more men like HOFFMAN in Congress.

THE PLIGHT OF INDUSTRY

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] relative to the plight of the woolen mills in Massachusetts. I wonder whether the gentleman has ever heard about reciprocal trade agreements. Does the gentleman remember that? Through the ECA and other plans this administration has caused a complete breakdown in some industries. The special consideration given to foreign trade permits cheap goods to flood this country. Labor had better wake up, as well as the industrial sections of this county, if they want to keep their labor employed and some of their mills active, because under the present program they are going to export this labor and bring in these cheap goods and cheap labor to flood the country of the United States with that type of materials.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to remind the gentleman that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] voted for the escape clause in the recent legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And I think he voted for ECA also, and all the other plans to export American money and assist foreign countries to compete with industry in the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Wednesday next, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore granted.

UNITED STATES POLICY IN IRAN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. If there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the arrival of Premier Mossadegh focuses attention upon the grave problems in the strategic Near East. American policy in this area is more vital even than British policy and must be independent and not tied to British policy. Iran is dangerously weakened by the loss of oil revenue and the free world suffers from the loss of the oil. Yet, the Iranian people's renascent nationalism and desire for higher standards of living deserves our sympathy even though the way they seek to advance them may be misguided. Angry words or sanctions will not produce a solution. Friendship and help will. The United States economic help to Iran has been meager amounting primarily to a $25,000,000 Export-Import Bank loan not yet fully implemented plus point 4 aid of $1,500,000. Iran receives more generous consideration in the new mutual security bill, congressional action on which is just being completed. I urge that the United States offer an advance for the direct benefit of the Iranian people on this economic aid right now. This can be done without compromising the adversary positions on Iranian oil now before the United Nations Security Council. In the present situation such a gesture of friendship will do more to facilitate a settlement of mutual respect about the oil than recrimination and angry words. Iran must be kept among the free peoples and her people should not be goaded into becoming a soft touch for the Communists. The well-being of Iran's people comes first

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 192]

Allen, La.	Denny	Keogh
Anfuso	Denton	Kilburn
Armstrong	Dingell	Kluczynski
Ayres	Dollinger	Larcade
Baker	Donovan	Latham
Bates, Ky	Eberharter	Lind
Beall	Elston	Lucas
Belcher	Fenton	McCulloch
Bender	Fine	McGrath
Boggs, Del.	Fogarty	McMillan
Boggs, La.	Furcolo	Magee
Bow	Gamble	Martin, Mass.
Bramblett	Gathings	Miller, Calif.
Brown, Ohio	Gregory	Morano
Buffett	Hall,	Morgan
Burdick	Leonard W.	Morrison
Busbey	Hand	Morton
Byrne, N. Y.	Hébert	Murphy
Byrnes, Wis.	Hedrick	Murray, Wis.
Celler	Heffernan	Nelson
Chelf	Heller	O'Konski
Chudoff	Herter	O'Neill
Clemente	Hess	Phillips
Cole, N. Y.	Holifield	Poage
Cooley	Howell	Powell
Corbett	James	Price
Crawford	Jarman	Prouty
Dague	Jonas	Quinn
Dawson	Judd	Redden
Deane	Kearney	Regan
Delaney	Kelley, N. Y.	Ribicoff
Dempsey	Kennedy	Rivers
Rogers, Mass.	Sikes	Thompson,
Rogers, Tex.	Sittler	Tex.
Roosevelt	Smith, Va.	Vinson
Scudder	Staggers	Werdel
Sheehan	Stanley	Willis
Shelley	Stockman	Wilson, Ind.
Sieminski	Taylor	Yates

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and thirteen Members are present, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

STUDIES BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 436 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct through studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (d) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, after the comma, insert the following: "including, but not limited to, the insuring and guaranteeing of loans for private housing by any department or agency of the United States in order to determine to what extent the insurance or guaranty of such loans has been granted in the case of housing which is defective with respect to construction, drainage, sanitary conditions, and other features, and to what extent the practices and procedures followed by any such agency or department, and any acts of omission or commission of officers and employees thereof, have facilitated or made possible the insuring or guaranteeing of loans for defective housing"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

This resolution was reported by the Rules Committee on request of the Committee on Banking and Currency. It grants investigation and subpena powers to the Banking and Currency Committee which have already been granted to many other standing committees of the House.

When the committee considered the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], the committee also had before it a resolution introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] calling for an investigation of jerry-built housing guaranteed under the housing pro-

gram of the Federal Government. The committee thereupon included that amendment in the Spence resolution. The amendment requires the committee to go into the many problems which have been brought to the attention of the Congress by individuals living in houses which they have said are defective. Certainly the Congress should have full information as to any inspection failure which has allowed mortgage guarantee of defective building by any contractor.

The Rules Committee in considering this resolution went over the work of the Committee on Banking and Currency and considered the fact that it had a very wide and a very important jurisdiction. The Committee on Rules feels that the studies and investigations requested by this resolution are in the interest of the Congress and the interest of the Nation. It therefore recommends the adoption of the resolution as amended. Having served under Chairman SPENCE on the Banking and Currency Committee, I can attest both as to the importance of the work to be done and as to the efficiency of that work under the direction of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules at the beginning of the session took the position that it would go slow in granting rules on resolutions of the character of the one now before the House, where the resolution provided for foreign travel. Such resolutions as carried that provision were for some time held up but eventually the committee, because the case presented was strong, broke down and reported it. Following that, in every instance where a standing committee came with a resolution like this asking for a rule they granted it.

The resolution now before the House authorizes, as has been stated by the gentleman from Washington, the Committee on Banking and Currency to do foreign travel. Very frankly, I think in some instances that right has possibly been abused; but, after all, we have to rely upon the chairmen of these committees to exercise discretion and care in setting up these committees to visit foreign countries. In the instant case we would have to depend upon the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] who himself has never been on one of these visits and who, we are confident, will exercise extreme care and extreme caution in authorizing representatives of his committee to make these visits; in other words, what is here proposed is to do for the Committee on Banking and Currency what the House has consistently done for all the other great committees of the House. The Committee on Banking and Currency was late in coming in with its resolution.

Very frankly, I can see nothing for the House to do but to accept the resolution; and I can see no good reason why any prolonged discussion should be had.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that the Committee on Rules in the beginning of the session agreed that there would not be any more of these junkets, especially all over the world; and I am sorry that my good and able friend from Georgia now has felt inclined to rise on this floor and say that that principle has to be abrogated simply because, as I heard him make his statement, the able chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency had never been on a world trip. I believe that is the only reason that my good friend from Georgia [Mr. COX] mentioned.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman misinterpreted my remarks. I simply referred to the fact that the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and, so far as I know, any member of his committee, had not taken any of these trips abroad. I was doing that by way of applauding the gentleman and his committee for having shown reluctance in coming in and asking for this power. My position simply is that we are not now abrogating the rule. It has already been abrogated. My position is that since we have done this for all of these other committees we cannot, in my judgment, justify denying this same treatment to the Banking and Currency Committee. That is my position.

I agree with the gentleman that it possibly would have been better if the Rules Committee had stood firm in its refusal to take favorable action on these resolutions where they did carry this power to engage in foreign travel; but the committee abandoned that position and has consistently abandoned it in every instance where committees have come in with these resolutions. Many have come in, probably all of the great standing committees, with the exception of the Banking and Currency Committee. Since the resolution is here how can we quite justify not giving that committee the same treatment we have given the other committees? Yet at the same time, if the gentleman will permit, I want to congratulate him or applaud him for his earnestness in standing by the first position that the Rules Committee took. However, I cannot see how the House can reasonably afford to do otherwise than act favorably on the pending resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am sorry that I misinterpreted the gentleman's remarks. After all, his remarks speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution authorizes and directs a thorough study and investigation by the Banking and Currency Committee in respect to construction, drainage, sanitary conditions, and so forth. I have no objection to that investigation here in the United States, but I yield now to any member of the Banking and Currency Committee, to the chairman particularly if he is here, to tell me what is expected to be accomplished if he is given the power of this resolution. I yield to the chairman of the committee to tell me what he expects to accomplish in the way of investigation of sanitation, construction, and drainage in many foreign countries.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I introduced this resolution as chairman of the committee at the request of members of the committee. It was reported out of that committee without a dissenting vote. I do not think there is any purpose to go around the world and investigate housing and drainage conditions. This provision, with reference to investigating housing, was contained in a resolution introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] and was incorporated in the pending resolution by the Rules Committee. Of course, it only refers to investigating housing in the United States.

The jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency is very broad. The Defense Production Act is under its jurisdiction. The production of strategic and critical materials is also under its jurisdiction, and these are produced in many areas of the world.

The resolution authorizes the committee to investigate the investments of the Export-Import Bank wherever they may be. The Export-Import Bank is under the jurisdiction of this committee. This bank has investments in a large part of the world.

I am not going to make any argument as to why the committee should have this power. You have given it to other committees. It was not my original idea, but the committee, after consideration, thought they ought to have it and I, as chairman, introduced the bill to give them this power. This power of investigation and issuing of subpenas has been given to many other committees, and they have it now, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and certainly the Committee on Banking and Currency has as many important questions to solve and to consider within its jurisdiction as these other committees. The finances of the United States are in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency largely. Loans are under its jurisdiction, wherever those may be, as well as investments, wherever they may be, and for that reason, and acting on the unanimous request of the members of my committee I introduced the resolution. It makes very little difference to me whether you pass it or not. I do not know whether I will go abroad or not; I have not made up my mind. I never have been; I never have taken such a trip.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. If the chairman of the committee does not think it is important to go abroad there is not much use to go abroad, is there?

Mr. SPENCE. I have not made up my mind as yet whether I will go, but that is beside the question. The question is whether the committee can obtain information which will be useful to them as legislators and to their Government. I do not think there should be any discrimination as between committees. It seems to me that the Committee on Banking and Currency is as much entitled to this privilege and has as many important questions to solve and to investigate as the other committees that

have had that privilege. It would be discrimination to give it to other committees and not give that same power to the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters within their jurisdiction.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that I have been in Congress now for 10 terms. I have never gone on one of these junkets, and I will say to the American people that there have been times in this House when we had a difficult time in getting a quorum because of the junkets running to Europe and Asia. I think the people are justified in getting sick and tired of a great majority of Members of Congress going on junkets when sometimes, I repeat, it is hard to get a quorum.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am wondering if there is in contemplation an overseas housing project. Can the gentleman tell us?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. A housing project where?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Overseas.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio to answer about these housing projects in India or Pakistan or Iran or some place else.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I would like to say to the gentleman that this particular paragraph about housing, as I understand, was incorporated in the resolution by the Committee on Rules at the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL]. I stand to be corrected if I am wrong, but I believe the gentleman had in mind when he asked that that be incorporated, that they investigate some of the housing that has already been built or proposed to be built here in the United States which has been guaranteed in one form or another by some agency of the Government and as to whether or not it was built with proper sanitary conditions, whether or not there were sewage-disposal plants available, and so on, and I think he is sincere and I think he is right. But you are confusing the thing when you get the housing projects which are sponsored mixed up, for instance, with the Export-Import Bank or something else which has nothing whatever to do with housing either here or abroad.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Does the gentleman mean you can learn more about the Export-Import Bank in different countries throughout the world than you can by bringing in the officials and inquiring of them?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I will say to the gentleman that the loans are made in different places around the world and I do not think it would be amiss for the committee to look into what is being accomplished, and I think the best way to do that is to go to the spot and look at them.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman does not, then, I take it, have utter confidence in the ones who are running the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I do not think that shows a lack of confidence. I am sure the gentleman himself at times has wanted to look at projects that he has voted for right here in this country. I am of the school of thought that believes that you can find out more on the ground sometimes than you can by talking to people. After all, I might divert a little bit and say that if we had looked a little bit more closely on the spot at some of the money that is being spent by the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force we might not have to come in here with a tax bill, and we might be able to make them save enough money to avoid such a thing.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. In conclusion, may I say that I hope the Committee on Banking and Currency will offer an amendment to confine it strictly to the United States. Take the junket part out of it. I hope they do that. I just want to ask the Members in all sincerity whether so far anybody has made a case for the going around the world of 15 or 20 Members of the Congress with their staffs. I leave it in your hands whether they have made a case for it and whether they are justified and entitled to take the taxpayers' money now for some pleasure jaunt throughout the world.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the gentleman will yield, I might suggest to him that if he will yield me 10 minutes I will do the best I can to justify it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am very enthusiastic about this resolution, and I think the Committee on Banking and Currency should be allowed to make the investigations in both the fields of housing and especially in the field of loans by the Export-Import Bank. The Export-Import Bank has become an agency of the Government which deals with more capital and more lending authority than any other agency of the Government. At one time the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had an authorization of something like $18,000,000,000. In the Eightieth Congress we cut that down to $2,000,000,000 and provided that they should liquidate themselves.

In the field of foreign loans the Export-Import Bank has made over $3,000,000,000 of loans. Many of these loans are tied in with the defense effort for the development of the areas in foreign countries for the production of strategic and critical materials, including tungsten, uranium, manganese, sulfur, zinc, and so forth.

The question was asked recently of the committee: Is it expected that funds of the Export-Import Bank are going to be used to restore the Colosseum in Rome?" If course, the question was asked facetiously. But, to bring out a point, I think it is the duty of the Committee on Banking and Currency, under rule II of the Legislative Reorganization Act to follow through to determine whether there are loans being made, either here or abroad, which would compare with a loan which might be made to restore the Coliseum in Rome. I am very enthusiastic about this trip. I do not like to have it called a junket. It is an investigation, which should have been made years ago.

So far as the expense is concerned, let me call your attention to the fact that on the only one of these trips that I have ever been on, back in 1945 as a member of the so-called Colmer committee, we visited in Russia, in Moscow with Generalissimo Stalin. On that trip, and had it not been for that trip, and that visit which we had with Generalissimo Stalin, we would not have known that an application had been made by the Russian Government to the Treasury of the United States for a loan of $6,000,000,000. We did know the request had been made for a loan from the Export-Import Bank of $1,000,000,000, but Mr. Stalin informed us of the negotiations which had been going on in respect to a request for a Treasury loan of $6,000,000,000, and told us the details of the negotiations. You can imagine my surprise 60 days afterward to have the fact denied on an executive level here in Washington that there had ever been any negotiations with the Russian Government, on any request by the Russian Government for a Treasury loan of $6,000,000,000, when from the lips of Joe Stalin himself we had heard all the details of the negotiations. I think it is well that we investigate some of these cases. As a result of that investigation, which we made at that time, and I think the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] will bear out the fact, that as a result of the knowledge gained at that time with respect to the world economic situation in the field in which the Export-Import Bank functions, we saved the taxpayers of the United States billions of dollars.

With respect to the investigation of the housing situation, the investigation will be made undoubtedly by those of us who cannot for various reasons be absent from the United States, as much as I believe we would all like to go to South America or the Mideast to study the conditions in respect to strategic and critical materials and the available supply of them to the United States, and whether or not the moneys are being loaned by the Export-Import Bank are being loaned judiciously, and whether or not we are getting 100 cents back for every dollar.

The investigation in respect to Federal Housing Administration loans, mentioned in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, of course, will be confined to the United States. It is my purpose, if I do not go on this trip to ask that I be put on this committee to investigate that subject. That would necessitate some travel. I would prefer to travel to the north shore of Georgian Bay, and study the deplorable conditions with respect to fishing shacks up there, but I am afraid this resolution will not allow me to do that. So, I am going to make the sacrifice and try to find out something about this housing situation in the United States. We should start right here at Alexandria, and find out why the Federal Housing Administration is approving loans for large apartment houses alongside creeks which carry open sewage into the Po-

tomac River. That is something that must be investigated, and something that this Congress has to take cognizance of very shortly or else we might have one of the worst epidemics in this locality that you have ever seen in your life. Go down there and take a look at them as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], and I did a few weeks ago. Go down there and look at it and you will be absolutely ashamed that that stench prevails here at the Capital of the United States; raw sewage running down into the Potomac, right by those palatial residences which the Federal Housing Administration has approved. Of course, they should not have approved those projects until the Federal Government or some agency of the State of Virginia, acting separately or together, had cleaned up that terrible mess.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I think the unfortunate thing about the statement which the gentleman from Michigan is now making is that he is not going to go to Europe or to South America to investigate these loans, and especially with the recognized ability that he has shown in this House time after time on international financial arrangements. If he did go, the House would be better informed when the committee returns. I am glad to know, however, that he is going to look into this question of housing in the United States, but the House certainly will regret the fact that the gentleman could not go to Europe or South America.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the gentleman for his remarks. I wish I could go, because I do think this is an investigation which should be made.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope the gentleman, in connection with the FHA investigation, will try to find out whether there is any FHA policy with respect to segregation in housing.

I understand that is quite an issue that should be resolved.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I thank the gentleman.

Now I want to say one word in respect to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The Committee on Banking and Currency has never subdivided itself. The Committee on Banking and Currency has functioned, ever since it was set up in the Eightieth Congress under the Reorganization Act of 1946, with a smaller staff and with less expense than any other committee in this Congress. Do you know what makes up the staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency, a committee which handles as much if not more controversial legislation than any other committee in this House? For about 2 years they had a clerk, a deputy clerk, one staff member, and one stenographer. When the Eighty-first Congress replaced me as chairman of the committee, I suggested to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] that if I were to continue as chairman of the committee I would ask permission to add to the staff and add to the clerical force. So we added to the clerical force. We added one stenographer Since that stenographer was added the other stenographer has resigned; so we have now a clerical staff of a clerk, a deputy clerk, and one stenographer. On the professional staff we have two. Therefore, the entire staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency is made up of a clerk, a deputy clerk, a stenographer, and two members of the professional staff—five altogether. Where is there any other committee of this Congress which has functioned with so small a staff as efficiently and with as little expense as the Banking and Currency Committee has functioned? We are quite proud of it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. It occurs to me that protection of the country against abuse of this power to foreign travel must be found in the committee's sense of propriety. I have confidence to believe that the power would not be abused by the great Committee on Banking and Currency of this House. Therefore, I feel compelled to go along with this resolution.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I can assure the gentleman that the history and record of this committee is such that no more money is going to be spent than is absolutely necessary to find out everything that should be found out about these matters. The last thing similar to this was 3 years ago when a joint committee conducted an investigation and were allowed $25,000 and after completing the investigation we returned $12,500.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I would like to compliment the gentleman on his sane and sensible position, which he usually takes, in his talk this morning. The jurisdiction of the foreign affairs of this country may rest originally in the Foreign Affairs Committee, but I wish to say to the House that the members of the Banking and Currency Committee vote on the same resolutions that are brought before the House as do the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I am sure that the Committee on Banking and Currency can well expend this time. I, too, am tired of hearing these things called junkets when many of us go and spend money out of our own pockets to do it in order to understand and interpret these questions that we feel are necessary for the defense of our country. Some districts may be sleeper districts, and if Members are here from sleeper districts and are not interested then possibly we should have a resolution to abolish foreign affairs, abolish Russia, and then there would be nothing to it.

But in conclusion, in all seriousness I think the studies envisaged by this resolution will prove to be of great value to the Congress and the country.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Although I cannot guarantee it of course, it is my judgment that if this resolution is adopted and these studies made which, as I say, should have been made a good many years ago, it will prove to be one of the best investments the taxpayers of this country have ever made.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, this resolution will make possible a study that is long overdue. We have needed very badly to go into the mortgage-loan policies of the FHA and the VA throughout the United States. In my own district this year the American Legion in Hackensack passed a resolution calling upon the authorities to investigate their mortgage-loan procedures, because too often they found that improperly constructed homes had been built for sale to veterans under Government loan guaranties. Congress made it possible for the veterans to purchase the homes on easy payment terms. These homes had been approved and loans guaranteed on sites that had very bad health conditions, where proper drainage could not be established, where septic tanks overflowed, where sewage backed up, and where drainage in the cellars could not be obtained except by the constant use of sump pumps. Many other Members of Congress have stated to me that similar conditions meriting attention exist in their districts.

Following that resolution the Bergen Evening Record, a daily newspaper in my district, conducted an investigation of its own. They found some glaring instances where homes had been sold to veterans and to other people in the low-income group that just became a constant source of headache to the purchaser. I with to direct the attention of the House to this fact: We have said many times in passing legislation that we wanted to do everything we could to help the veteran. We have not helped the young veteran who has never purchased a home before if when he buys a house with absolutely no experience in house purchasing, all he obtains is a constant headache and a source of monetary difficulties for the rest of his life.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I want to commend the gentleman for introducing this resolution. I have received letters of a similar nature to those received by the gentleman. It seems to me that the gentleman from New Jersey has performed a very constructive service in bringing this matter to the attention of the House and to assure that the investigation is made.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I wish to call to the attention of the membership the fine cooperation the gentleman from New Jersey gave in the formulation of the resolution that is now before the House. The gentleman from New Jersey came to the Rules Committee with a resolution providing for the setting up of a special committee to make this investigation in which he is so greatly interested. The suggestion was made that possibly it is something that should be put in the hands of the Banking and Currency Committee. The gentleman accepted that suggestion.

Because of the fine impression that the gentleman made upon the Rules Committee in presenting his case, the Rules Committee, with his cooperation and his support, wrote his resolution into the one that you now have before you. So far as I am concerned, he is entitled to entire credit for the question now before the House. I want to compliment the gentleman, and I think he is well due that statement.

Mr. WIDNALL. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his very kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, this will not be a witchhunting expedition at all. It will be an attempt to fix responsibility where that responsibility is due for mortgage-loan guaranties only being applied where good housing is constructed. Something has happened with respect to the inspection policies of both the FHA and the VA in permitting final loan payments to be made on housing that has been improperly constructed.

In reference to the general resolution, may I compliment the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] for saying certain things that definitely should be said about other activities of the Banking and Currency Committee. I do not know of any other way that the Congress of the United States can become better informed and fully understand the problems that confront it in its daily deliberations than at first-hand to see the actual problem as it arises. Given the power to do this investigation work, which has been granted other committees of the House, I am sure the Congress and the people of the United States will benefit to a very great extent.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I would not have asked for this time if the pending resolution had not been characterized by the gentleman from Illinois as producing a junket. I am sure I would not have introduced the resolution if I had thought there had been no useful purpose in it, and I assure you also that the character of the members of the Banking and Currency Committee is such that the members of that committee would not have unanimously asked that it be introduced and unanimously passed if they had thought it was only a junket.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has made a very clear and convincing statement in regard to this matter. We hear every day denunciations of representatives of Government agencies who appear before our committees because it is alleged they have made misstatements or drawn conclusions unwarranted by the facts. I believe that if the committees of the House could get first-hand information on these subjects it would be very desirable, information that would be competent evidence in a court of justice. That is what this resolution provides, that we shall go and investigate the great investments that are made in behalf of the American people over the world, see how they are operating, what they are producing, and whether or not they are justified. We might also find other opportunities for investment that will produce critical or strategic materials so essential to our national defense at this time. The Export-Import Bank has a lending capacity of $4,500,000,000. It has loaned money throughout the world. It has loaned it where it will develop and produce prosperity in the underdeveloped countries, where it can bring peace and happiness to mankind. I think it is very essential that these things should be investigated.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If this money that has been loaned is bringing prosperity and good times all over the world, why investigate?

Mr. SPENCE. That is a specious question. Why investigate? Because we want to know the facts. The Committee on Banking and Currency at one time did have an investigating committee, but it turned back about half of the money that was appropriated for that purpose into the Treasury of the United States. I am sure that all the money that is not absolutely essential for this investigation will be turned back into the Treasury of the United States. You say "Why investigate an agency because it is doing well?" Probably one of the best reasons to investigate it is because you want it to continue to do well. When a bank looks like it is solvent, when it is doing a good business, is it not examined? Of course, all of them are examined and with this great financial institution that handles billions of dollars of the American people's money we should not only know where they are investing their money, but what is being accomplished by those investments, what is their probable future, and what are the opportunities for future investments that may produce those materials essential for our national defense. The only way you can do it is to make a personal investigation in the field.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should not inject myself into this discussion here today, but I am one of the Congressmen who believes that travel broadens a Congressman. I have been in every part of the world by virtue of the fact that we have troops in various parts of the world, and they present problems, with which the committee of which I am a member is concerned.

I know more about the Korean problem, I know more about the Chinese problem, I know more about the displaced persons problem, I know more about the cemetery problem and all those things in various parts of the world because I have gone there with Armed Services Committees to study these problems. Those trips are no junkets, by any stretch of the imagination. They widen a Congressman's knowledge. We are deciding questions here every week, almost, where important considerations are involved, and the broader the outlook of the Congressman has gained by virtue of his contact with various areas of the world, the better judgment he will have in voting and helping to get these measures passed, or to prevent some of them from being passed, which will help or hinder the security and prosperity of the country.

We have the same problem—and this is a sort of a selfish attitude in California. The Members of the Congress, by and large, do not understand the problems of California. We have a different kind of agriculture; we have a different kind of economy than any other State. We have an influx of thousands of people each month—four and one-half million in the last 10 years. I wish that every Member of Congress, especially the Committee on Agriculture, could come to California and thus learn to better understand our problems which we present to you here every year: Our agricultural problem, our water problem, tidelands problem and many others peculiar to our State.

Whether you want to believe it or not, America is the crux of the future of the world, and those who have gone around to the various parts of the world, who become better informed on those problems by personal contact, I think, are in a better position to make good decisions as to what the United States should do for the safety of the world and especially for our own safety.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the passage of this resolution. I think you can rely on the good judgment of the Banking and Currency Committee that no money wil be wasted, and no junkets will be made. I certainly deny that any trip I have made was a junket. My trips have taught me a lot that I could have learned in no other way.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, this is a ray of hope and light to me, to be able to follow the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], because the problem he presents is a problem I too have had for about 4 months with the Veterans' Administration, who have let contracts for new homes for veterans. I have two of

these home-construction projects in my district, and I have found that on one of these veterans' projects, involving about 15 young veterans who invested everything they had in their homes, that when a heavy rain comes they have to have a rowboat to get down and around in the basement. The result of the dampness in these basements is that none of the doors or windows in the homes will work.

The only recourse I have is to appeal to the Veterans' Administration on the complaint of these veterans that they have been swindled. Those of you who have appealed to the Veterans' Administration for redress know that in most cases you get a negative position—the position that there is nothing they can do about the matter. I would be very happy to give the gentleman from New Jersey the details about the projects to which I have referred, and I hope that somebody besides the Veterans' Administration will have an answer to all of these contracts that have been let with no responsibility attached so that the poor veterans have been swindled. Who will pay for it?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to offer an amendment striking out the words "or outside" so that the committee may not hold hearings outside the continental United States, but I understand that in order to do so the previous question must be voted down. Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Unless the gentleman from Washington yields for that purpose.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. May I inquire of the gentleman from Washington if he would yield to me for the purpose of offering that amendment?

Mr. MITCHELL. No; I would not.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding what my good friends have stated here today, I still think that this is going to be a junket. As far as what the gentleman from California mentions about an understanding of world problems, I believe it is probably far more important for the Members to go back to their districts instead of running around the world. If they would do that, they probably would have a better understanding of what the people back home feel about these matters and, after all, that is the important thing.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the quotation marks in line 6 on page 1 and in line 4 on page 2 will be stricken.

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the statement of my colleague from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. I do not think he would make the assertion he did if he were better informed as to the pending resolution and as to the conditions in the world.

Personally, I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything as to its meaning and effect. I know it will be adopted because it deserves unanimous approval.

As to the investigation of housing, when the Committee on Banking and Currency urged favorable consideration of its resolution there was also pending before the Committee on Rules a resolution introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL]. The Rules Committee was impressed that he had made a splendid case in support of his resolution and that the situation with regard to the construction of defective homes deserved to be investigated. However, we also knew that the Committee on Banking and Currency had original jurisdiction to investigate, so we suggested that his resolution be embodied in the general investigative resolution that was introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], in order to avoid having a separate, select committee making this investigation.

I fully appreciate that perhaps my colleague does not want an investigation of the defective housing that was built for ex-servicemen because he and others insisted continuously that servicemen's housing should be built by private industry, and that the Government should keep its hands off. Congress did leave it to private industry to build these homes for war veterans. I regret the information that came to me from the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] and other Members, that many of these homes were so cheaply and defectively thrown together without the slightest thought of giving value to the ex-servicemen for the large sums of money which were extracted from them under these contracts by private industry. In view that these facts perhaps might not have penetrated the mind of the gentleman from Illinois may account for his reason in criticizing the resolution. However, the majority of the membership of the Committee on Rules and myself came to the conclusion that we owed it to the veterans that we have a thorough investigation of the unfair advantages taken by the contractors, which represent private industry, in furnishing defective housing under GI loans and insurance. But, I think this investigation is very timely, it should be done. It is in the interest of the veterans.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] states he has been here for 20 years, and has never made a foreign House committee investigation trip. Well, I have been here twice as long and more, and I have never been on one of these investigation trips. Unfortunately, the Eightieth Congress started out with a large number of investigations and select committees. What was the result? They found that conditions under a Democratic administration were safe and sane, and there was nothing wrong anywhere. But, unfortunately, as our responsibilities grew all over the world, many of the Members, just as my colleague who does not seem to go out of his district, and yet knows all about what is going on all over the world, felt that before they would be obliged to vote, they should have some information on which to base their vote. I am of the opinion that it does not hurt any Member to obtain information that may help him to vote correctly in the interest of the country, and even in the interest of his congressional district.

As I stated earlier, you heard the remarks of the chairman of the committee. You heard the able gentleman, the minority leader of that committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], who very seldom approves unless he is absolutely satisfied that the legislation is in the right direction. He approves of, and recommends this resolution, and surely you are not going to say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] that he was wrong when he appealed to the Committee on Rules for favorable action on his proposal. He comes from your side. The Committee on Rules has acted fairly in the interest of the people, and in the interest of the Government. I think this resolution should be adopted. I think the Committee on Banking and Currency on investigation will be able to obtain more strategic materials at a lower cost, and from sources not controlled by combines and trusts, and thereby save the Government tremendous sums of money At the same time, the Committee on Banking and Currency will investigate the outrageous frauds committed by private enterprise in building these defective and poorly constructed homes for our deserving war veterans.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ALLEN of Illinois), there were—ayes 105, noes 8.

Mr ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 284, nays 15, not voting 129, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

YEAS—284

Aandahl	Baring	Brehm
Abbitt	Barrett	Brooks
Abernethy	Bates, Mass.	Brown, Ga.
Adair	Battle	Brownson
Addonizio	Beamer	Bryson
Albert	Beckworth	Buchanan
Allen, Calif.	Bennett, Fla.	Buckley
Andersen, H Carl	Bennett, Mich.	Burdick
	Bentsen	Burleson
Anderson, Calif.	Berry	Burnside
Andresen, August H.	Betts	Burton
	Bishop	Bush
Andrews	Blackney	Butler
Angell	Blatnik	Camp
Arends	Boggs, Del.	Canfield
Aspinall	Bolling	Cannon
Auchincloss	Bolton	Carlyle
Bailey	Bonner	Carnahan
Bakewell	Bosone	Case
Barden	Bray	Chatham

Chenoweth	Holmes	Potter
Chiperfield	Hope	Poulson
Chudoff	Horan	Preston
Church	Hunter	Priest
Cole, Kans.	Ikard	Rabaut
Colmer	Jackson, Wash.	Radwan
Cooper	James	Rains
Cotton	Jarman	Rankin
Coudert	Javits	Reams
Cox	Jenison	Reece, Tenn.
Crosser	Jenkins	Reed, Ill
Crumpacker	Jensen	Reed, N. Y.
Cunningham	Johnson	Rees, Kans.
Curtis, Mo.	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes
Davis, Ga	Jones, Mo.	Riley
Davis, Tenn.	Jones,	Roberts
Davis Wis.	Hamilton C.	Robeson
DeGraffenried	Jones,	Rodino
Devereux	Woodrow W.	Rogers, Colo.
D'Ewart	Karsten, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Dolliver	Kearns	Sabath
Dondero	Keating	Sadlak
Donohue	Kee	Sasscer
Dorn	Kelley, Pa.	Saylor
Doyle	Kerr	Schwabe
Durham	Kilday	Scott, Hardie
Eaton	King	Scott,
Elliott	Kirwan	Hugh D., Jr.
Ellsworth	Lane	Seeley-Brown
Engle	Lanham	Shafer
Evins	Lantaff	Shelley
Fallon	Lesinski	Sheppard
Feighan	Lovre	Short
Fernandez	Lyle	Simpson, Ill.
Fisher	McCarthy	Simpson, Pa.
Flood	McConnell	Smith, Kans.
Forand	McDonough	Spence
Ford	McGregor	Springer
Forrester	McKinnon	Staggers
Frazier	McMullen	Steed
Fugate	McVey	Stigler
Fulton	Machrowicz	Sutton
Garmatz	Mack, Wash.	Taber
Gary	Madden	Tackett
Gavin	Mahon	Talle
George	Mansfield	Teague
Golden	Marshall	Thomas
Goodwin	Martin, Iowa	Thompson,
Gordon	Mason	Mich
Gore	Merrow	Thornberry
Graham	Miller, Md.	Tollefson
Granahan	Miller, Nebr.	Trimble
Grant	Miller, N. Y.	Vail
Green	Mills	Van Pelt
Greenwood	Mitchell	Van Zandt
Hagen	Morano	Velde
Hale	Morris	Vorys
Hall,	Moulder	Walter
Edwin Arthur	Multer	Watts
Hall,	Mumma	Weichel
Leonard W.	Murdock	Welch
Halleck	Murray, Tenn.	Whitaker
Harden	Nicholson	Whitten
Hardy	Norblad	Wickersham
Harris	Norrell	Widnall
Harrison, Va.	O'Brien, Ill.	Wier
Hart	O'Brien, Mich.	Wigglesworth
Harvey	O'Hara	Williams, Miss
Havenner	Ostertag	Williams, N. Y.
Hays, Ark	O'Toole	Wilson, Tex.
Hays, Ohio	Passman	Withrow
Hedrick	Patman	Wolcott
Herlong	Patten	Wolverton
Heselton	Patterson	Woodruff
Hillings	Perkins	Yorty
Hinshaw	Philbin	Zablocki
Hoeven	Pickett	
Hoffman, Ill.	Polk	

NAYS—15

Allen, Ill.	Hoffman, Mich.	Smith, Wis.
Budge	Hull	Vursell
Clevenger	LeCompte	Wharton
Gross	St. George	Wheeler
Harrison, Wyo.	Smith, Miss.	Winstead

NOT VOTING—129

Allen, La.	Celler	Donovan
Anfuso	Chelf	Doughton
Armstrong	Clemente	Eberharter
Ayres	Cole, N. Y.	Elston
Baker	Combs	Fenton
Bates, Ky.	Cooley	Fine
Beall	Corbett	Fogarty
Belcher	Crawford	Furcolo
Bender	Curtis, Nebr.	Gamble
Boggs, La.	Dague	Gathings
Bow	Dawson	Granger
Boykin	Deane	Gregory
Bramblett	Delaney	Gwinn
Brown, Ohio	Dempsey	Hand
Buffett	Denny	Hébert
Busbey	Denton	Heffernan
Byrne, N. Y.	Dingell	Heller
Byrnes, Wis.	Dollinger	Herter
Hess	McMillan	Riehlman
Hill	Mack, Ill.	Rivers
Holifield	Magee	Rogers, Mass.
Howell	Martin, Mass.	Rogers, Tex.
Irving	Meader	Rooney
Jackson, Calif.	Miller, Calif.	Roosevelt
Jonas	Morgan	Scrivner
Judd	Morrison	Scudder
Kean	Morton	Secrest
Kearney	Murphy	Sheehan
Kelly, N. Y.	Murray, Wis.	Sieminski
Kennedy	Nelson	Sikes
Keogh	O'Konski	Sittler
Kersten, Wis.	O'Neill	Smith, Va.
Kilburn	Phillips	Stanley
Klein	Poage	Stockman
Kluczynski	Powell	Taylor
Larcade	Price	Thompson, Tex.
Latham	Prouty	Vinson
Lind	Quinn	Werdel
Lucas	Ramsay	Willis
McCormack	Redden	Wilson, Ind.
McCulloch	Regan	Wood, Ga.
McGrath	Ribicoff	Wood, Idaho
McGuire	Richards	Yates

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Wood of Idaho.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Armstrong.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Price with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Denny.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Fine with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Sittler.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Hand.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Scudder.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Heller with Mr Beall.
Mr. Ribicoff with Mr. Hill.
Mr. Lind with Mr. Jonas
Mr. Clemente with Mr Kearney
Mr. Quinn with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr Stockman.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Magee with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Buffett.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Corbett
Mr Byrne of New York with Mr. Morton.
Mr Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Scrivner.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Deane with Mr Latham.
Mr. McGuire with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mr Morgan with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Bramblett.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Willis with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Curtis of Nebraska.
Mr. Howell with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOURTH-CLASS MAIL

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 439 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1335) to readjust size and weight limitation on fourth-class (parcel-post) mail. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the bill, S. 1335, which this resolution will make in order, was unanimously reported by the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service. That committee came to the Committee on Rules, and asked for an open rule providing for 1 hour of debate. The bill limits the size of parcel-post packages, and readjusts the size and weight. It limits the girth and length combined to 72 inches, and provides that packages shall not exceed 40 pounds in the first and second zones, or 20 pounds in the third to eighth zones. The purpose of the bill is to divert heavy and oversized pieces of mail from parcel post to other means of transportation. Post Office and Civil Service Committee members, in appearing before the Committee on Rules, said that the limitation proposed would help eliminate the deficit due to the handling of fourth-class mail. It was pointed out that in the last 21 years, the accumulated deficit from handling fourth-class mail is in excess of $649,000,000. During the last 5 years, the deficit has been in excess of $350,000,000, more than half of the total. Under the bill, the farmers, the patrons of small post offices, and those living on rural or star routes, are exempted from the changes in weight and size of parcels.

Mr. Speaker, the parcel-post system was established by act of Congress on April 12, 1912. That system has been in operation since that time. Originally, the weight limitation was 11 pounds, and the size of the package was limited to 72 inches. Gradually this weight and dimension has been increased through Executive order of the Post Office Department until today the combined girth and length measurement permissible is 100 inches, and the weight 70 pounds. The committee report points out that as the size and weight of parcel-post packages increased the parcel business of the Railway Express Co. decreased. The report adds that the total Railway Express employment dropped from 81,000 in 1946 to 48,000 in 1950.

There are a number of postal patrons who are excepted from limitations proposed by the measure. It provides that parcels mailed at any post office or any rural route or star route for delivery at second-, third-, and fourth-class post offices, or for delivery by rural or star-route carriers, are exempt. Certain agricultural commodities, such as baby fowl, live plants, trees, and shrubs are exempt, under the bill.

Another exemption is for books and reading matter containing no advertising. In this case, the packages are limited to 100 inches in girth and length combined, with a limit of 70 pounds.

The open rule, of course, provides full debate of all provisions and any amendment desired by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the able gentleman from Washington has explained the rule, and also the main provisions of the bill. Although it is my understanding that some on this side are opposed to the bill, as now written, there is no objection to the rule, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1335) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1335 with Mr. ROGERS of Colorado in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is the purpose of this legislation to reduce the size and weight limits of parcel post which may be mailed between patrons within the city-delivery limits of first-class post offices, from the present size of 100 inches in length and girth combined, and 70 pounds in weight, to a size and weight limitation of 72 inches in length and girth combined, and 40 pounds in the first and second zones and 20 pounds in the third to eighth zones.

This bill, as amended, was reported out unanimously by your Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, after extensive hearings.

Parcel post was first established by act of Congress August 24, 1912, effective January 1, 1913. That legislation provided that the length and width of the packages should not exceed 72 inches and that the weight should not exceed 11 pounds. Since that time the Postmaster General, with the concurrence of the Interstate Commerce Commission, has increased both the size of these packages and also the weight. I might say that under the act establishing parcel post there is provision that parcel-post rates could be increased and the size of the packages and the weight of the packages could also be increased by the Postmaster General filing a petition with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and if the Interstate Commerce Commission approved the petition of the Postmaster General, then he could change the weight or size or rates of the parcel-post packages.

Congress has never passed any legislation, except the act of 1912, limiting the size or weight of these packages. Congress itself has never authorized the sending of any parcel above 11 pounds anywhere, under the parcel post system; but on August 5, 1913, the Postmaster General, with the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission, increased the weight to 20 pounds for zones 1 and 2, and 11 pounds in zones 3 to 8. On January 1, 1914, the Postmaster General and the Interstate Commerce Commission again increased the weight to 50 pounds to zones 1 and 2, and 20 pounds to zones 3 to 8. Then on July 19, 1915, the Postmaster General and the Interstate Commerce Commission increased the size again to 70 pounds to zones 1 to 3, and 50 pounds to zones 3 to 8, and increased the size to 84 inches.

Then on August 1, 1931, the Postmaster General, with the acquiescence of the Interstate Commerce Commission, made the weight for all zones 70 pounds, and the size 100 inches. So the weight, 70 pounds maximum, and 100 inches in size, have been in effect since August 1, 1931, a period of over 20 years. What has happened during that period of 20 years since we have had the 70-pound weight limit and the hundred inch size limit? It has put the Post Office in the express and freight business and it was never the intention of Congress to put the Post Office Department into the freight and express business.

The Postmaster General said before our committee on March 7, 1949:

> Because of greatly increased rates on express shipments, a large volume of parcels formerly handled by express have been channeled to parcel post. This has really put the Post Office Department in the freight business.

Listen to what the Postmaster General said further:

> We have insufficient distributing space, platform space, terminal facilities, trucks and suitable railway cars to cope with the situation, and all this makes our operations more expensive. Actually the postal service is being taxed as never before in its long history.

On March 7, 1951, the Postmaster General before our committee said:

> My guess, Mr. Congressman, is that it would be almost prohibitive to provide the money to handle freight. It ought to be channeled back to the express.

Then on March 1, 1950, the Postmaster General before the Senate Appropriations Committee, made this statement:

> The cost of providing facilities for the freight business that we are in would be almost prohibitive. Senator, I would like to give back the freight to the express company.

In appearing before our committee on April 4, 1949, the Postmaster General stated:

> Personally, I would like to see a reduction in the size and weight. The increase in the total number of parcels handled by parcel post in 1949 as compared with 1947 was 12 percent but was 70 percent for the parcels exceeding 40 pounds in zones 1 and 2, and 20 pounds in zones 3 to 8, inclusive. The burden to the Post Office Department has been increased by these larger and heavier parcels of strictly commercial traffic.

As a result of the Post Office Department taking over to a great extent these shipments of merchandise and the carriage of these tremendous packages there has been a very depressing effect on the business of the Railway Express Agency and on the motor carriers. Also, from 1949 to 1950, the less-than-carload railway express shipments were reduced from 220,000,000 in round numbers to 97,000,000—over one-third of the business lost.

The number of employees in the railway express agency in 1949 was 80,945; in 1951 the number of employees—that is today—is 41,709; so the express company as a result of the channeling of this freight and merchandise business into the parcel-post system of our Government has lost much of its business.

Ninety-three percent of all parcels are sent from first-class post offices. There are approximately 2,500 first-class post offices. All second-, third-, and fourth-class post offices under this bill will not be affected by this legislation, nor will there be any rural route out of any post office, whether first, second, third, or fourth class, affected by this bill. Practically every city which has a first-class post office has Railway Express service, and those few that do not have railway express service have truck or motor service. The express company has over 16,000 offices.

Mr. Chairman, our country was founded, built, and developed by the free enterprise system. Only by encouraging and fostering and maintaining our private enterprise system can we continue as a strong, prosperous, and powerful Nation. We must maintain a strong private express service; if we do not, there will be a nationalization of this service and this may eventually lead to the nationalization of other private businesses and services. The enactment of this legislation will result in a savings to the Post Office Department as there will be a reduction in facilities required for handling and transporting parcel-post packages.

I want to impress upon the committee that this legislation does not affect the present parcel-post system as it pertains to weight or size for any patron of any second-, third-, or fourth-class post office. It does not affect the present parcel

post service being received by the patron of any rural route anywhere in the United States, whether from first-, second-, third-, or fourth-class post office.

This legislation will have the effect of curtailing the size of a shipment sent from one first-class office to another first-class office for delivery within the city limits of that office.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this legislation will receive the approval of the committee and of the House today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this legislation, as has been explained by Hon. TOM MURRAY, chairman of our committee, is to readjust the size and weight limitations on parcels which may be sent through the mails under fourth-class mailing privileges. The legislation reduces present size and weight limitations to 72 inches over-all and 40 pounds in the first and second zones and 20 pounds in the third to eighth zones. At present, in all zones, the limitation is 100 inches in length and girth combined, and 70 pounds in weight.

Extensive hearings were conducted by our committee at which time representatives of the large users of fourth-class mail testified, as well as the Post Office Department and Railway Express Agency.

The legislation is supported by the Railway Express Agency, the Association of American Railroads, the International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers and Helpers, the International Association of Machinists, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, and the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks.

After careful consideration, the committee believed it advisable to make certain exceptions in connection with parcel post size and weight limitations. Parcels mailed from or addressed for delivery to patrons at second-, third-, and fourth-class post offices, parcels sent to or from rural or star routes, and parcels containing baby fowl, live plants, trees, shrubs, agricultural commodities, or books are exempt from the size and weight limitations provided for in the legislation. In other words, the legislation applies primarily to parcels moving to and from patrons of first-class post offices except rural and star routes thereof.

There are approximately 2,500 first-class post offices. It was pointed out that, without exception, these post offices have railway express or motor carrier facilities available for the delivery of heavy parcels whose size and weight are in excess of the limitations provided for in the bill.

The committee adopted the policy of eliminating the Post Office Department from competition with private enterprise in connection with the shipment of heavy parcels to and from patrons of first-class post offices. It is estimated that 51,000,000 parcels will be diverted from the mails by reason of the enactment of this legislation.

Although the Post Office Department expressed opposition to the legislation on the ground it was discriminatory, it is believed that the enactment of the bill will be advantageous to the Post Office Department because there will be a savings through the elimination of the handling of heavy and bulky parcels. Large packages which are mailed under fourth-class mailing privileges must be handled outside of the mail sacks, and these packages occupy a large portion of the space in many post offices. This space is required for the processing of first-class mail.

Large parcels also require special handling since they are not adaptable to the parcel-post slides and other mechanical devices in the post offices which are used in the handling of such fourth-class mail. Also, the heavier parcels crush the smaller parcel-post packages which causes excessive and unnecessary cost in rewrapping and damage.

Representatives of the Railway Express Agency who appeared before our committee pointed out that the Post Office Department, in effect, is competing with the Railway Express Agency. The agency is faced with a very critical loss of revenue by reason of the diversion during recent years of large numbers of parcels to fourth-class mail. The Railway Express Agency has experienced financial loss and, since 1946, 40,000 Railway Express employees have lost their jobs.

In my judgment, the exceptions which have been provided in the legislation to take care of patrons of rural and star routes and mailers of baby chicks, plants, shrubs, and agricultural commodities eliminate objections which might be raised to the enactment of this legislation.

I trust the Members will support this bill.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, a distinguished member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. GOLDEN. Is it not true also that this bill has nothing at all to do with the rate charged on parcel post packages, that it only governs the size and weight and has nothing to do with the cost at all?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It relates only to size and weight, not with respect to the amount charged.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I have tried to follow the gentleman closely because I represent an urban area, which has first class, and rural areas. I think the largest city in my district is Minneapolis.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. WIER. We have a number of rural routes out of the first-class post office in Minneapolis serving the abutting areas. Let us presume that a package is picked up on the rural route served by the Minneapolis post office and is destined to another first-class post office like St. Paul, we will say, would that be banned?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would say that this bill does not change the present law with respect to that situation.

Mr. WIER. I have no quarrel with the legislation insofar as it affects cities of the first class where the American Railway Express renders service, but I am concerned if it is going to affect any of my little communities of three, four, five and six hundred in any way.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The communities that the gentleman has described would not be affected by this legislation.

Mr. WIER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I stated a while ago this legislation is supported by the Railway Express Agency, the Association of American Railroads, the International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers and Helpers, the International Association of Machinists, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, so the committee, after careful consideration, believed it advisable to make certain exceptions in connection with parecel post size and weight limitations.

Mr. WIER. The Chairman of the Committee, the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Murray, made some statement about the position of the Post Office itself, the central office. By this bill what is the estimated savings over a period of a year to the Post Office Department?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That question is rather difficult to answer, but I will put it this way, that approximately a billion pieces of parcel post mail are handled. This will divert approximately 50,000,000 pieces of mail. It is difficult to estimate the savings. The amount by which the number of packages is reduced, of course, will be a saving. Not only that, but the larger the package the more difficult it is to handle, which naturally increases the cost. I think the gentleman is familiar with the problem of the storage and the space required to handle the packages, especially these larger packages.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. It costs 13 cents now for each one of these packages in the way of a subsidy, and we have that much less to pay on that subsidy. At the same time, as my good friend, the gentleman from Kansas, knows very well, since he served so many years on the committee, the Railway Express Co. is losing about $110,000,000 a year, and if this loss continues I am afraid we are going to have the Railway Express business to take care of and add that much more to our problem. We have at this time 74 percent of all the space taken up with packages in the Post Office Department.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I know that the gentleman wants to be fair and I should like

to ask him whether or not I am correct in my analysis of the hearings before his committee. The testimony before the committee, as I recall, was to the effect that the American Railway Express Agency estimated that the parcel-post deficit was about $173,000,000 whereas testimony by officials of the Post Office Department was to the effect that, based upon their studies it was only, I think, $77,000,000 plus and that by the recent increased rate structure which goes into effect October 1, that this deficit in the parcel-post division will more than be taken care of, and the department will not be operating at a loss at this time.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is my understanding that the increase in revenue provided by order of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will be approximately a million dollars. I am informed that increase will not quite, but almost, take care of the parcel-post share of the deficit. But in view of the action of the House with respect to increasing salaries of postal employees, there will be immediately a further deficit again in parcel post as the situation stands at the present time.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, as the gentleman recognizes, we have not figured in retirement, we have not figured in the cost of any of these Federal buildings that we have to make appropriations for, and we never figure rent. Also, the General Services Administration is handling some of the housekeeping functions, and that is free of charge. These costs could run up to a considerable sum, much larger than we have listed.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is eminently correct in his statement.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. If through the exceptions a large number of the larger packages must still be serviced by the Post Office, can the gentleman tell us whether the Post Office will make substantial savings by the adoption of this bill? The gentleman from West Virginia has said that it costs 13 cents a package as a subsidy. Would it be safe to say that the saving would amount to 13 cents times 50,000,000 pieces?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would not want to hazard a statement of that kind, but I would say there would be a considerable amount of saving from at least two standpoints. One is because the larger package does require more energy in its handling than the smaller package. The other is that you might get some of these larger packages out of the mail, and then you would have more room in the post office buildings.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. In addition, I think it would be helpful to point out that 93 percent of all parcel post moves between first-class post offices, from one first-class post office to another first-class post office. If we regulate that traffic here, then the savings will be on 93 percent as against 7 percent covered in the small post office.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The observation of the gentleman is correct. I believe our chairman made a similar statement.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey who has given this subject matter a great deal of thought and consideration.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I realize that the committee has made a very careful study of this matter. I am also aware of the very great personal interest my colleague from Kansas has had in this matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr WOLVERTON. Is the gentleman able to inform me, and I assume he can, which was the attitude of the committee with respect to this bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. This bill has the unanimous approval of the members of our committee.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, a member of our committee.

Mr. HAGEN. The gentleman is quite well versed on this subject, so I know he can answer some of the inquiries I have received.

Is it not a fact that the greater saving will be made in the fact that the Post Office, if this bill becomes law, will not have to build so many more additional warehouses, post office annexes, and so forth, facilities for taking care of this tremendous amount of parcel post?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is correct in his statement.

Mr. HAGEN. Further, is it not true that the losses on bad, damaged, and lost parcels will be much less because of the fact we are going to eliminate the heavy parcels weighing 70 pounds or thereabouts?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. The gentleman will recall that we had a considerable amount of testimony on that subject. Those who testified told us that one of their difficult problems was in handling these larger packages that had in some way become broken or injured, so that they had to work them over and tie them up.

Mr. HAGEN. They are always on the outside of the bag because of their size and weight.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is right. Many of them cannot be put in bags. They are too large to go in regular mail bags.

Mr. HAGEN. Is it not also true there would be a saving on the administrative side because there would be fewer losses, damage, and claims?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right. I am glad the gentleman has called attention to that problem. It is an important one.

Mr. HAGEN. Is it not also true that as far as injuries to the employees of the Department are concerned, if fewer of these odd-sized, odd-shaped, and sometimes sharply pointed packages of the larger dimensions, also the heavier ones, were handled, there would be fewer perils and less injury to the employees themselves?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. The committee gave a considerable amount of consideration to the question of whether or not there ought to be additional charges because of the handling of these odd-shaped packages the gentleman mentions.

Mr. HAGEN. It has been mentioned that there might be some discrimination against the people who are outside the first-class office areas, but is it not a fact that they now have facilities available such as trucking companies, dray line companies, door-to-door delivery companies, bus companies, express offices and agencies and all that sort of service, so they are getting more service, under any circumstances, than the people in the smaller towns?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman's statement is correct and well-explained.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Can the gentleman advise the House whether or not this legislation carries out any of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission with regard to the reorganization of the Post Office Department?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Perhaps only directly, in an attempt to reduce the cost and cut down the amount that we have to charge the Government to carry on the postal service. I would say indirectly, but not directly.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. How does the gentleman, and the members of the committee, reconcile the discrimination between the shipment of parcels at the different post offices? Suppose a patron comes in with two packages, both weighing 70 pounds, one of them may be acceptable at one post office, and the other package not mailable because addressed for delivery at another class post office.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has raised a question there in that there should be no difference, but we go on the theory that the packages sent through first-class post offices and delivered to first-class post offices are going through offices which have the facilities to handle the mail through the express, and you might not have that facility in a third-class post office and a fourth-class post office.

Mr. EVINS. What does the gentleman's committee propose to do for the small town that happened to have first-class post offices, but do not have any railway express service? The issue here

is not public-against-private enterprise. It goes much deeper than that. The parcel-post division was established as a service institution. Since its beginning it has built up an efficient system. American business and the consumer especially in many small towns have learned to depend upon the parcel post for service.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the parcel is mailed at a first-class post office and is delivered to a first-class post office, we are informed that you will find hardly any such place in the country that would not have railway facilities.

Mr. EVINS. My information is that there are some 74,000 parcel post delivery agencies in the country at the present time and that there are 23,000 Railway Express delivery services. How are the people residing in the 51,000 other points presently served by parcel post and where a Railway Express Agency is not available to be provided with service?

There is no other alternative but for packages to be broken down to reach the people through these 51,000 other outlets. This means that the Post Office Department will carry the tonnage, the only difference being that the Department will handle two to three times as many smaller packages.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not want to disagree too much, but I am going to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia who is quite familiar with that problem because he has given it much study. I will let the gentleman from West Virginia answer.

Mr. EVINS. I am reading the testimony given at the hearings before the gentleman's committee.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am inclined to believe the gentleman misunderstands the testimony.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I am afraid the gentleman is confusing the issue with third- and fourth-class post offices and rural post offices. We only have 2,500 first-class post offices in America.

Mr. EVINS. Will the gentleman answer the question I proposed earlier. What does the committee propose to do with these small town first-class post offices that do not have Railway Express service.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think the gentleman from Tennessee will find that there are no first-class post offices that send their mail through first-class post offices that cannot handle the packages through Railway Express. I do not know of any such post offices.

Mr. EVINS. I am quite sure that there are a number of first-class offices in small towns in my district that do not have adequate, if any, Railway Express service. I certainly think situations like this should be taken care of. Service to people in these areas should be provided.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not first-class offices, sir.

Mr. EVINS. I repeat that I cannot agree with the gentleman in this particular.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Has the committee analyzed what effect this would have on the consumer, both the recipients and the shippers of packages? Would it cost more money to ship by Railway Express, and if so, is that justified?

Mr. REES of Kansas. We think it is justified.

Mr. JAVITS. On what ground—would it cost less?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Because, rather than have the Government in the express business, would it not be better to let private industry handle that where it can do so.

Mr. JAVITS. Right now is the Government paying the difference between the actual cost and the railway cost?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It has been; yes.

I want to make this observation—there is an additional cost which may be called a hidden cost, requires larger facilities for handling these big packages. You cannot put them in the mail bags. Many have to be handled separately. So, if you add that cost, it means a great deal more. It is difficult to estimate the amount but it is considerable.

Mr. JAVITS. So, considering the whole thing together, it is the committee's opinion that the consumers will not be damaged in the sense that they will not have to pay any more than the aggregate cost now including the hidden costs?

Mr. REES of Kansas. We think we are fair with the consumers as well as with those who handle the mail.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from California who has indicated deep concern for the reason he represents a large metropolitan area. I can well understand his particular interest in this bill.

Mr. POULSON. I was going to follow up along that same line, and I was going to point out that in Los Angeles, for example, a great many consumers receive their packages that way Have you made an analysis to find out whether there was a loss? They have a great block of business, which is handled within the city.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I hope the gentleman was present as I pointed out a few minutes ago a city having first-class post offices such as the city of Los Angeles, where the packages are handled through the Los Angeles Post Office and delivered in a first-class city, and not on a rural route, then, of course, this legislation applies because in all those places you have the Railway Express, and other facilities for handling these packages.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. SIEMINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am, of course, for the passage of the proposed legislation relating to the readjustment of the size and weight limitations on fourth-class parcel-post mail. I have written over 300 letters, mailed last Friday night, to my constituents assuring them of my desire to be of service in this matter.

Interested parties visited me in my district office in Bayonne, N. J., several weeks ago, and oriented me on the facts behind this legislation. I appreciated their fairness in the problem. Letters from home stated reasons, 1, 2, 3, 4, as to why this measure must be passed. There was no demand to vote this way, or that way; merely kind requests to understand the hardships that would evolve on some should the bill be defeated,

In deference to opinions received, I should like to list some expressed as to why the bill should pass:

This business of subsidizing the parcel post is not only causing me extra taxes, but is resulting in a loss of business to Railway Express Agency, from which I earn my livelihood

Please do what you can to remedy this injustice.

Although the parcel post was originally intended to be self-sufficient it is depending more and more upon subsidizing for its existence

I am sure you will agree, that I as a taxpayer should not bear the brunt paying a governmental agency to, in the final analysis, put me out of work.

The parcel post was not originated to be abused to the point where it would enter into competition with the freight forwarding companies as it is today.

It will also mean the elimination of a subsidy to parcel post which in the last 5 years amounted to over one-third of a billion dollars This money could be better used in the defense program

---

Records which I have reviewed in connection with this matter show while the number of parcel post pieces handled between 1946 and 1950 increased 23 percent, the deficit with respect to the cost of handling parcel-post matter went up 145 percent. House bill 3465 would have a tendency to reduce this deficit from parcel-post operations.

May I solicit your support for the speedy passage of this bill which will reduce the burden on the taxpayer. Surely you must agree that the deficit incurred by the present parcel-post system is a needless waste of public funds

For many years we have watched our Government make progressive inroads into the transportation field, until today it seriously threatens the existence of the express company with which I am employed.

Since my return from the service I have had my fellow employees furloughed due to parcel post offering competitive services against Railway Express Agency, locally and Nation-wide.

We would respectfully request that you use your good offices to have bill identified as H. R 3465 placed high on the House calendar, and to support the bill when it comes to the floor for action in view of the gross inequity of the railroad continuing to subsidize the Post Office Department by handling parcel post at very much less than cost. This in turn permits the Post Office to perpetuate rates and limitations on parcel post which diverts legitimate railroad traffic from us in increasing volume. This pro-

posed bill is a small step in the direction of curtailing the Post Office in their increasing expansion into the less-carload merchandise and express traffic fields.

It will be noted during the period 1946 to 1950, while the volume of parcel post has increased 23 percent, the deficit has increased 145 percent

It will also be noted that the important parcel post service to or from the farmer or on rural routes will not be affected by this bill.

Our employees have a great stake in this bill because since 1946 about 40,000 of their coworkers have been laid off Our industry has borne the brunt of Government encroachment in the field of transportation and unless and until the size and weight of parcel post shipments are reasonably limited these men and women will live in fear of a similar fate

This fear is well-founded because 75 percent of the shipments we are still handling weigh 70 pounds or less (the present parcel post maximum weight limit) and are therefore subject to diversion to parcel post service

Only prompt action will reduce the postal deficit, help take the Post Office Department out of the freight business as Postmaster General Donaldson desires, and preserve free enterprise in express transportation.

Thousands upon thousands of your constituents—our drivers, messengers, express handlers, clerks, stenographers, etc—are looking to you to improve their uncertain future.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE]

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, the committee in the other body unanimously agreed to the bill. The House committee unanimously passed the bill, and the Senate by a voice vote passed the bill, and the House passed the bill last year. This is an effort to preserve private enterprise. The Railway Express Agency last year lost $110,000,000, which the railroads had to make up in the way of a subsidy. That will not continue very long before we may lose this type of service.

There are other types of service. We are not arguing the Railway Express Agency case alone. There are freight forwarders giving service that are being severely punished by the previous action of the Post Office Department in increasing the sizes of these parcels. There are other trucking companies that have handled some of the business.

This bill was amended until we have eliminated about all the objections. There are not many objections left even by the stretch of your imagination. This is a wholehearted effort on the part of our committee to cut down on debts in the Post Office Department. We are also worried about the serious possibility, because our committees have passed, and both Houses have passed, a pay bill, and there is another $250,000,000 to add to the former deficit of $500,000,000. So it makes a total of $750,000,000. With a subsidy of about 13 cents a package, we should help in cutting down on that deficit.

Previous costs have not included separation pay, rent on buildings, or interest on investment; cleaning by the GSA of some of the post offices, where the GSA is operating some of the services for the Post Office Department. Investments on trucks, permanent investments on lands; it does not figure any interest on all that money.

Here is another question that has not been mentioned. The railway freight and freight forwarders and truckers have been charged a tax of 3 percent. The only ones affected really by this bill are largely the mail-order houses. They are benefited considerably by this. For instance, take Sears, Roebuck & Co. I have nothing against them. As a matter of fact, I have bought things from them, and they are doing a good service. But they have a very heavy impact on our small businesses back home. Sears handles fast-moving items within the stores they have erected in many of the towns all over this country. Items that move most slowly are taken care of by a mail-order catalog. You can order an item through a mail-order catalog in the store. They will make the order in the store to Sears, and Sears in turn will send it to the factory, and they will send that item direct. Now that is a service in the rural areas. There is no doubt about that. We are not interfering with the service in the rural areas. We are not interfering with the service in the second-, third-, and fourth-class zones. But that is having quite an effect on the local stores in these first-class cities, because those stores in the first-class cities have to store the slow-moving items, and it costs them a great deal of money for that space.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I appreciate with what length and patience and work the committee has labored to bring forth this bill. I am inclined to think it may be the least objectionable bill to right this situation. However, I am inclined to remind the gentleman from West Virginia, when he speaks of the mail-order houses, particularly of Sears, Roebuck, that not only does the mail-order house benefit from the present provisions but all consumers, particularly the consumers of low income in the cities. The thing that worries me about this bill is that there seems to be a discriminatory provision against the person of small means, who has in recent years come to depend largely on the decreased cost of some of the items.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I will be glad to yield to the gentlewoman if she has a question, but I do not have time to yield for her to make a speech.

Mrs. CHURCH. What is the solution for that problem?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I might answer in this way: this is a subsidy, and we have to think about Uncle Sam's pocketbook. We are trying to meet the $750,000,000 deficit and at the same time preserve private transportation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman account to us on this point? As I understand, the person who receives a package if it is shipped by express will pay very much more even than if he paid the full amount it cost the post office to handle it; so there is no loss. Will the gentleman give us the justice, therefore, for our passing this bill under those circumstances?

Mr. BURNSIDE. We are just running a private concern out of business, and we soon will have another expansion in the Post Office Department of a billion or two billions to handle this parcel-post business.

Mr. JAVITS. Will not the facilities be needed for the third- and fourth-class post offices that you are going to service?

Mr. BURNSIDE. No; it will not; we are merely cutting down part of our problem.

Mr ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Within the weight limits authorized under the bill there is no change as to the first-class post offices; is that right?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Between first-class offices?

Mr ALBERT. Not in the minimum-weight limits between patrons of first-class offices; they will have the same right to send their parcel post they now have.

Mr. BURNSIDE. It is only a change between sending first class to first class; but there is no change between rural routes, second-, third-, and fourth-class offices.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for bringing up this legislation. I have heard enough of this debate to see that it is really needed, and I join with the gentleman in supporting it.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. In order that others may be informed, will the chairman of the subcommittee admit that the Postmaster General has opposed the enactment of this legislation? The Postmaster General is opposed to it.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I read from a statement by the Postmaster General:

Because of greatly increased rates on express shipments, a large volume of parcels formerly handled by express have been channeled to parcel post. This has really put the Post Office Department in the freight business.

The space question has become a terrific problem and the impact on the Post Office Department is leading to a situation just like that shown in these pictures where the parcel-post packages have to be piled up on the sidewalks and outdoors. I have pictures from many post offices all over the country showing where parcels are cluttering up street space.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I know that the gentleman is reading from some statement of

the Postmaster General, but I am reading from the committee report itself in which the statement is made:

In view of the foregoing the Department does not favor the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. BURNSIDE. At the same time the Postmaster General has given us no other solution. We asked him why; he said: "Pressures, pressures, pressures."

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. In a talk with Deputy Postmaster General Burke this morning he stated that they should not change the size and weight limitations but should increase the rates.

Mr. BURNSIDE. If you increased the rates you would have to charge the same the railway express charges and you would be putting the railway express company out of business. If the gentleman wishes to do away with private enterprise and establish in this country a socialized rail system that is another question.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr BURNSIDE. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I am not trying to advocate that. The gentleman stated that there had been no solution proposed; I gave him one.

Mr. BURNSIDE. The Postmaster General has had authority back as far as 1912 reenacted on four other occasions under which he can ask for a solution. He finally asked for a partial solution and he got a partial solution from the I. C. C. just recently which helped meet a part of this deficit to the extent of $106,000,000; but the deficit was running considerably more than that.

The Postmaster General with the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commerce proposes to increase parcel post rates effective October 1 but those increases will be insufficient to meet the cost of the service. The Postmaster General has testified recently that while they expected the increases to be adequate when they were proposed, increased wages and railway mail payments have altered the situation and he does not now think they will be compensatory; furthermore, the Interstate Commerce Commission presently is considering an application for increase in railway mail payments, and, as you all know, further wage increases for postal employees are on the way. The indications are that the deficits from parcel-post operations will be greater in the future than they have been in the past due to the additional expenses authorized or under consideration.

The growing deficit in parcel post operations is a matter of very serious concern to us all. The passage of this bill to reduce the weight and size limitations of parcel post shipments moving between the larger centers will do much to reduce the deficit from the parcel post operations.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wanted to inquire about the exceptions which appear on page 2: Baby fowl, live plants, trees, shrubs, or agricultural commodities. I assume that under agricultural commodities is intended to be included seeds for planting purposes.

Mr. BURNSIDE. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. So they would be exempt.

Mr. BURNSIDE. That is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Do I understand that seeds for planting purposes, including corn, vegetables, flowers, winter cover crops, hay, pasture, range and long grass, are excluded?

Mr. BURNSIDE. This would not increase the limitations you have now beyond the present setup or present weight. We are not eliminating the previous weights that have been agreed to by the agricultural areas. It does not interfere with those at all.

Mr. JENSEN. All agricultural products are exempt from the provisions of this act covering the weight and girth?

Mr. BURNSIDE. That is not affected. You are not sending many of those things between first-class post offices.

Mr. JENSEN. But they are exempt?

Mr. BURNSIDE That is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] understand that all of the items which I have just named are exempt from the provisions of this act?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct, when sold by the farmer or producer. It would not apply to processed goods. It would not apply to oranges being sent to a processing plant and then orange juice sent out therefrom. It would apply to products directly from the farmer.

Mr. JENSEN. Will it apply to a seed and nursery company that purchases seeds, seed corn, vegetable and flower seeds?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. Also cover crops, hay, and pasture seeds which they package and sell to people throughout the country?

Mr. BURNSIDE. This only applies between first-class post offices in the United States. It does not apply to second, third, fourth and rural areas. It does not change the weight or length in second-, third-, or fourth-class areas.

Mr. KEATING. The seeds are exempt under agricultural commodities?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. Practically all of these seeds come from the farmer and are to be sold back to a farmer for use. Would they be exempt?

Mr. BURNSIDE. It does not apply to them.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the chairman of the committee agree with that? This is serious business, you know, with many people I represent, and I want to know.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Unquestionably this will cover seeds. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. JENSEN. It will?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. There is no question about that. Furthermore, may I say to the gentleman from Iowa, these exemptions only apply to recipients who are patrons within the city delivery limits of the first-class post offices. Anything up to 70 pounds can be sent or received by anyone in a second-, third-, or fourth-class post office or anywhere on a rural route.

Mr. KEATING. Would the chairman specifically direct himself to this question. I am sure he has answered it already. This exemption under the paragraph referred to would be broad enough to cover this language: Seeds for planting purposes, including corn and vegetables, flowers, winter cover crops, hay and pasture, lawn and range grass seeds? They are all covered under the exemption "agricultural commodities"?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNSIDE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. HAGEN. Of the millions of parcels mailed in 1950 less than 2 percent weighed over 40 pounds. Is it not a fact that a great proportion of that 2 percent went into the rural areas, which are not affected by this bill?

Mr. BURNSIDE. That is correct.

Mr. HAGEN. So there should not be much concern in the mind of anyone here for the consumers in the cities as far as this bill is concerned, because less than 2 percent of the parcels that are mailed throughout the year weigh more than 40 pounds, and of that 2 percent a great portion goes into the rural areas which are not affected by the bill at all.

Mr. BURNSIDE. That is correct.

Now, a number of people have said that if the Post Office Department did more business that they would make more money. Well, here is a case of the more business you do, the more you lose. Here you see the figures. These are the exact figures taken from the records.

The number of pieces of parcel post in the fiscal year 1950 was 23 percent greater than in the fiscal year 1946; whereas the reported deficit increased 145 percent, and it was during this period that the greatest increase occurred in the volume of heavy and bulky shipments. The reduction in the weight and size limits provided by this bill will be a step in the direction of reducing the deficit, of taking the parcel post out of the freight business and of restoring that business to private enterprise. The increases in deficit are attributable in large part to a greater volume of heavy and bulky shipments which have been diverted from private transportation companies and which are more expensive to handle. The Postmaster General has said, "This has really put the Post Office Department in the freight business."

This bill proposes to remove some of this freight business from parcel post service and will be helpful not only in reducing the deficit but also in enabling

the Post Office Department to give a better all-around mail service.

The only objectors to this bill are those who are now benefiting through securing the transportation of their packages for less than the actual cost of furnishing the service. The users of the service pay only 74 percent of the parcel post transportation costs.

Parcel post service was established by Public Law 336, approved August 24, 1912, to provide a transportation service for small parcels, extending beyond that provided by the express companies, to give the farmer an opportunity to sell his products directly to consumers and to enable citizens of rural districts and small communities to receive merchandise by mail direct from merchants in large cities. While Congress believed a parcel post service was needed, it had no intention of making it a subsidized service. The committee chairman stated that it was the desire of the committee and of himself to establish a system that they were satisfied would be self-supporting. Public Law 336 included a requirement that the revenue produced be adequate to pay the cost of the service.

Parcel post was limited by the Sixty-second Congress to parcels not exceeding 11 pounds in weight and 72 inches in length and girth combined. These weight and size limits never have been changed by Congress but have been increased from time to time by administrative action, the last change becoming effective August 1, 1931, raising the weight limit to 70 pounds in all zones and the dimension limits to 100 inches. Thus, a service originally intended by the Congress to provide the farmers and residents of small communities with a transportation service at not less than actual cost has become the unfair competitor of express and other common carriers providing transportation for commercial shippers largely at the expense of the taxpayer. The Government has gone into the freight business and is conducting that business more and more for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many. What was intended as a proper exercise of a function of the Government to serve its citizens has become Government competition with free enterprise.

Private transportation agencies have had to increase their charges to meet increased cost of operation due largely to increasing wage and material costs. The Post Office Department has experienced similar increases but has not increased its rates except to a slight extent; consequently the burden of the higher cost of operation has been passed on to the taxpayer, the deficit ever larger—admittedly over $350,000,000 for the past 5 years—1946 to 1950. The taxpayers and not the commercial users of the service paid this deficit.

The Post Office Department does not have the facilities to take care of the heavier and bulkier packages now moving in increasing volume in parcel post and adding greatly to the operating deficits. The Postmaster General has testified that it is more expensive to handle those larger packages and that he wants to get out of the freight business. I favor its immediate passage for that reason and also because of my concern for the express employees, many thousands of whom have lost their jobs and now must seek other employment.

They have my sympathy—40,000 of them have been laid off since 1946; they have deluged us with their appeals to have us pass legislation to take the Government out of the freight business, reduce the deficit of the Post Office Department, and restore some, if not all, of those men to the jobs they wish and which they ought to have because they expected to make the transportation business their life work. Those men and the labor organizations representing them, the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees; the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America; the International Association of Machinists; and the International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers, and Helpers are urging us to stop the unfair competition of the Government by limiting parcel post to the purpose for which it was intended and to permit the express companies and other private transportation companies to handle the transportation business for which they were organized.

The purpose of this legislation is salutary. It will continue to afford to farmers and residents of small communities the service which the Congress intended they should have, but the limitations in weight and size will go far toward taking the Government out of the freight business and protect the principles of free enterprise, restore jobs to express workers, and reduce the post office deficit.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GOLDEN].

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think I can be of some assistance to the gentleman from Tennessee who was concerned about the small towns and the small communities. The bill as passed by the Senate did not except second-class post offices. We went into that in great detail and we found that there were a large number of second-class post offices throughout the United States in small towns that would be adversely affected if the second-class post offices were not excepted from the operation of the bill, because some of those small communities did not have facilities of the Railway Express and truck lines that would carry this kind of traffic. Therefore this committee, after thorough investigation, decided that they include in the exceptions the second-class post offices that are rather numerous throughout the country.

Now I want to address the members of the committee upon the idea that this is a turning point in support of private industry. Throughout my brief career here in Congress I have seen decided trends toward putting the Federal Government in one business after another until we have expanded the central Government to such an extent that we have in excess of 1,800 different commissions and bureaus of the executive department. As the result of the tremendous growth in the handling of fourth-class mail, commonly called parcel post, the Government of the United States has furnished destructive competition to legitimate private business. There are supporters on both sides of the aisle of this House that know that the continuation of private enterprise in America is essential to the continual freedom of our people and the prosperity of this Nation.

Let me point out some of the things that have grown up in the past few years. The volume of parcel post has grown phenomenally until, as the Postmaster General said, the Government is now in the freight business. What are the results of that? We have two great private enterprises that are essential to the welfare of this country, the railroads and the Railway Express Agency. This country cannot exist unless we have railroads to move shipments of freight among our citizens, and the prosperity of a Nation is measured by the railroads. What has happened? Since the Government has gone into competition with the railroad companies and the express company they have had a tremendous loss. Last year $135,000,000 was lost by the railroad companies because of the reduction in the carrying of parcel-post packages by the Railway Express. They have been hauling over this country railway express cars a quarter full, or a half full, and that loss of $135,000,000 was charged to Uncle Sam against the profits that those railroad companies made. On the other hand, the Railway Express lost tremendous sums, and that was charged against their profits, and there is a tremendous loss involved here besides crowding out independent, free enterprise.

Another chain reaction that comes about when the Federal Government undertakes to inject itself into some private field or private enterprise is the fact that 40,000 American men working for the Railway Express company have lost their jobs, because the Government has crowded them out of business. There are thousands of employees of the Railway Express out looking for jobs, their company paying them unemployment compensation. During the time they worked they paid their withholding taxes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to commend my colleague from Kentucky for his able statement and state that I am in accord with his views. I intend to vote for this bill. This legislation will be beneficial to the Railway Express Service and their employees in this country, and at the same time will not inconvenience the general public. It does not in anywise affect second-, third-, and fourth-class post offices.

Referring to the question the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] was concerned about a few minutes ago, I would like to ask my colleague from Kentucky if there was any evidence before the committee to the effect that first-class offices in the United States did not have proper railway and express service available.

Mr. GOLDEN. We did not have a single witness that I recall who said there was any community that had a first-class post office that did not have facilities of railway, express, and truck lines that did this business.

I am not speaking now from a party standpoint, for I know there are strong advocates of free enterprise on both sides of the aisle, but the best thing we could do would be to take this bill and make it a vehicle to start in the right direction to support private enterprise. You have a fine opportunity to do so here.

As I started to say, you lose the withholding tax that goes into the Treasury of the United States from these 40,000 express men that are walking the streets looking for jobs. The evidence before our committee shows that they paid more than $1,000,000 a month into the Federal Treasury when they were employed. It amounted to a loss of more than $14,000,000 a year because Uncle Sam had gone into some business and put some private person out of a job.

In addition, we have the 3-percent transportation tax. When a free-enterprise truck company carries packages it pays 3-percent transportation tax. The express company pays 3-percent transportation tax. The railroad companies pay the same. There is a loss of several millions in tax money if we take this business away from legitimate free enterprise.

There is another extremely important reason why this bill should be passed. We have not had a post-office building program in the United States since 1938. The last new post offices were constructed in 1941. The facilities we now have are overtaxed. If we do not divert this heavy traffic of parcel post back to private enterprise, we are going to have to spend hundreds of millions of dollars for new and enlarged post offices and for larger trucks to carry these packages.

I urge everybody to vote for this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration has nothing to do with the cost of mailing parcel-post packages. It is limited to provisions regulating the size and weight of parcel-post packages under certain exceptions set forth in the bill.

In recent years, the increase in parcel post handled through the Post Office Department has been phenomenal. In fact, parcel-post mail has grown so much in volume, in size, and in weight over the past several years that the Post Office Department is, under the present law, required to handle what could be justly called freight and as there has been no appropriations for the building of larger and more post offices in the United States since 1938 and the last post offices were completed in 1941, the post offices find themselves crowded for space and not properly equipped to handle this additional large volume of heavy parcel post. Furthermore, the trucks and vehicles used in the transportation of mails are no longer sufficient to carry such a great volume of heavy parcel post.

If it were to be determined that the Post Office Department would continue in the handling of heavy parcel post without limitations, it would soon be necessary to lay out large sums of money to build larger post offices and further large sums of money to buy heavier trucks and more of them to deliver these parcel-post articles.

The evidence before our committee where we made a careful study of this situation shows that the Post Office Department is losing in excess of $64,000,000 per year on handling parcel post. This item is one of the large items that contributes substantially to the annual deficit of the Post Office Department which has already passed $500,000,000 deficit each year.

We learned from the evidence introduced before our committee that 93 percent of parcel post of all sizes and weights was shipped from first-class post offices and received at first-class post offices. That left only 7 percent of the parcel post handled in the United States that was shipped from and received by second-, third-, and fourth-class post offices and on star and rural routes. The committee, I think, thoroughly recognized the good service to the people of America that parcel post renders. At the same time, it was made plain to our committee that in the larger cities that have first-class post offices, there were railway-express service and private enterprise, truck lines, that could and do handle the transportation of many articles that could be classed and shipped as parcel post.

While on the other hand we learned that out in the country and in many small villages and towns where there are post offices of the second, third, and fourth classes, and on star and rural routes, there were, in many instances, no adequate facilities furnished either by an express agency or private truck lines to carry parcels that could be mailed as parcel post.

While it is true that only 7 percent of all the parcel post of all weights and sizes traveled between post offices of the second, third, and fourth classes and from and to star and rural routes, yet that small percent was very vital to many millions of people that would not have any adequate service if we were to enact a law that would cut out or curtail the service they are now receiving from the Post Office Department by carrying parcel-post mail.

We discovered through a very careful study of this situation that the bill when it first came to our committee excepted from the operation of this bill only star and rural routes, and post offices of the fourth and third classes. It left in the bill first- and second-class post offices.

Our study of this situation revealed the fact that there were a very large number of second-class post offices in small towns of from 1,000 to 5,000 in population that would be absolutely cut off from the good service that they now receive from the Post Office Department in carrying parcel post if we were not to, in this bill, except from the operation of the bill second-class post offices.

There are many towns and villages in this country that have second-class post offices that have no railroad service at all and, therefore, no railway express service. There is a surprisingly large number of them, and I believe that a vast majority of the Members of Congress, if they will get the Post Office Guide and look up the size and classification of the post offices in their district, will find that each of them have quite a number of second-class post offices in their district unless they represent some of the large cities.

It would be devastating if we were not to exempt second-class post offices, because if we had not amended the bill in this particular, we would have in substance cut off these second-class post offices and their patrons from having any adequate service to carry parcels of any considerable weight. This would do more harm than good, and our committee saw fit to amend the original bill and to exempt from the operation of the bill, not only fourth- and third-class post offices, rural and star routes, but also to exempt second-class post offices.

Now, in view of the fact that 93 percent of all parcel post traveled between first-class post offices, it is not going to materially hurt the beneficial effects of this bill by exempting second-class post offices.

If and when this legislation is passed and there is a conference between the House and Senate, I do most sincerely hope that our conferees representing the lower House of Congress insists that second-class post offices be exempted from the operation of the bill.

Now I wish to return to the great savings that can be accomplished by this pending bill, as amended by our committee. To begin with, we can save for the taxpayers a large part of the $64,000,000 a year that is lost on parcel post. Furthermore, it was made plain before our committee that when the Post Office Department began to carry these large and heavy parcels, that they began to compete with private industry. Private industry, as we all know, has made this country great, and it must be protected. The independent truck lines owned and operated by independent American citizens, and the Railway Express Agency that is engaged in carrying express parcels and the railroads themselves are all private industry.

These private truck lines, railroads, and the express company are equipped to handle and transport heavy parcels and better equipped than the Post Office Department. When our Government, through the Post Office Department, began to handle large articles of parcel post mainly traveling between first-class cities, they began to compete with all of these private industries. There were some very bad results as a consequence of this. First among these, besides the loss of $64,000,000 per year, is the fact that out of the approximately 80,000 men who worked in the express business, about half that number, or 40,000, were frozen out of their jobs and lost their way of making a living.

When the express companies and the railroad companies began to lose this business that they formerly handled when the Post Office Department largely took over the handling of heavy parcel

post, the railroad companies began to lose revenue on account thereof. By carrying express cars which were already furnished by the express companies and railroad companies with only a half or quarter of a load of express, last year there was a loss to these private enterprises of more than $135,000,000. There has followed a chain reaction of losses as a result of the Government encroaching on private industries in this particular.

The 40,000 men who lost their jobs lost monthly wages in excess of $12,000,000. This Government lost in withholding taxes that would have been paid into the Treasury of the United States more than a million dollars a year. When these heavy parcels are transported by private truck lines, by freight, or by express this Government exacts a 3-percent transportation tax.

When this volume of parcel post is taken over by the Government, there is another tax loss to our Government when we lose this 3-percent transportation tax and the record in our hearings show that we lose in excess of $15,000,000 a year in transportation tax when the Post Office Department carries so much of this heavy parcel post.

So, in addition to the heavy losses on parcel post of approximately $64,000,000, we have all of these tax losses and injury to private industries and we have approximately 40,000 men thrown out of their jobs.

This committee tried honestly to solve these difficult problems. They tried to save the service for all patrons of star and rural routes, second-, third-, and fourth-class post offices, many of whom had no equivalent service.

The bill, as amended and reported by our committee, does not disturb in the least the parcel-post regulations insofar as weight and size are concerned for any of the above-mentioned users of the mails. It was shown in the hearings that parcels weighing more than 50 pounds up to the 70 pounds now permitted to go as parcel post amounted in the aggregate to 300,000,000 pounds for the year 1950.

Each year the volume of heavy parcel post seems to be increasing between first class cities in this country, and as we handle this parcel post at a heavy loss we can expect the deficit to our Government to grow more each year unless something is done about it.

It is the belief of our committee that the present bill being considered, as amended, will protect those people who do not have adequate similar service, will permit them to use parcel post under the present weight and size limits as they do now. On the other hand, in cutting down the weight and size of parcel post that is handled in such huge volumes between cities of first class, we can save the taxpayers of this country many millions of dollars that are now charged to the Post Office Department as a loss and a deficit; we can enable many individuals to be reemployed in private industry; we can collect a large sum from the 3 percent transportation tax; we can collect income tax from private truck lines, railroads, and railway express agencies, all of which would be a good thing to do.

As stated above, this bill does not increase the cost of mailing any parcels by parcel post. The Postmaster General has the authority under the law to go before the Interstate Commerce Commission and request increases in the cost charged for transporting through the mails parcel post.

This committee did not have before it any bill providing for any increase in the cost of handling parcel post and, as stated above, the present bill only deals with the size and weight limitations of parcel post moving between cities of the first class. It does not hamper or hurt patrons of the second, third, or fourth class post offices, or people living out on star or rural routes who have no other adequate service, and if our conferees will insist on protecting all of these patrons, we can enact this bill, saving a great deal of money, relieve the overburdened Post Office Department from handling so much of this heavy parcel post between first class cities, and to a large degree take the Federal Government out of competition with private industry.

One of the alarming things that confront the people of America is the constant growth and expansion of the Federal Government. It is my understanding that we now have something over 1,800 different departments, bureaus, and commissions in the executive branch of the Government. These various departments, in many instances, encroach upon private business and private enterprise; the rights, liberties, and jurisdiction of State governments and local governments have, in many instances, been invaded by this large growth and expansion of the central Government.

For the past several years the trend of the administrations has been toward creating new bureaus and new commissions to lead the Federal Government into new fields. As this has been done, more and more liberties of the people have been surrendered to the central Government. It has caused a tremendous additional expense and burden on the taxpayers. The custom has arisen and we Members of Congress witness it frequently here on the floor of the House when something probably needs to be done, some group runs to the Federal Government to do it, some bill is introduced and, although some of us resist it, the trend is still stronger toward allowing the Federal Government to assume more and more power to create larger and more Federal commissions and to add more expenses and more Federal employees on the backs of the American taxpayers and at the same time violate the underlying principles of a free people and take from them more and more of their liberties.

This trend should immediately be stopped. It should be reversed. The size of the Federal Government should be reduced. The objectives of the Hoover Commission reports should be adopted. We should have less Federal control of American industries and less competition with American free enterprise. The number of Federal employees, where it can be properly done, should be cut down and further and further consolidation of Federal bureaus and commissions should be made so as to save money, contribute to the efficiency of the executive branch of government, and reduce expense and waste in government.

This committee, the House Civil Service and Post Office Committee, in my opinion, is vitally interested in this subject. I think that many of these questions come directly under the jurisdiction of this committee and that we can render a valuable service to the people of America by reducing the size of the Federal Government and restoring the powers and liberties to the people.

It is further my opinion that without regard to politics, the Members of this Committee think that this should be done. The present bill, limiting the size and weight of parcel post traveling between post offices of the first class, if adopted, will be a vehicle to accomplish some of these purposes.

This bill, when adopted, will curtail and cut down Government competition with private enterprise. It will definitely save the taxpayers of America several million dollars each year. It will not disturb or injure those people that live on farms and out in the country and in small communities that have to depend upon parcel post and that have no adequate or similar service provided by private enterprise. We can reach approximately 93 percent of this Government interference and competition with private enterprise by passing this bill and we can, by the adoption of this legislation, make a beginning on taking big Government out of business, reduce the size of big Government, encourage private enterprise, stop waste and loss of useless expense to the taxpayers of America, and I urge that the bill be adopted.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am in full accord with the intent of this bill, which attempts to take away from the Government business that rightfully belongs to private enterprise.

This does not discriminate against local business. It will be helpful to local business because practically all items received through the mails can be purchased locally.

The bill will not affect the purchasers, for though there may be some savings in some items through buying from the mail-order catalogs, actually the people are paying the difference through taxes.

This bill affects only the first-class post offices, where approximately 90 percent of the parcel-post business is transacted. There will be no effect on second-, third-, and fourth-class offices. They will remain as Congress originally intended them to be, serving rural communities.

The Post Office Department lost $341,561,000 in the fiscal years 1946 to 1950, inclusive, handling fourth-class mail. This does not include the other expenses

of parcel post, as private shipping industry would have rental, benefits paid to employees, and the other expenses the Post Office Department is not paying. The express company has had to lay off 40,000 employees since 1945 due to competition with our own Government. On the passage or rejection of this bill will depend whether the Congress will have to appropriate approximately $2,000,000,000 for new facilities, buildings, and so forth, and plunge the Post Office Department into an ever-increasing deficit.

In regard to the question brought up on the floor about first-class post offices, which might not have railway facilities, I have one in my district. I have checked on it. The parcel-post people have established an office there this month.

Mr. BURNSIDE. The gentleman means the Railway Express?

Mr. LESINSKI. The Railway Express Agency did establish an office in that community. That occurs very rarely. Most first-class post offices are on a rail siding, or on the main line. This only occurs around a big city, or it might be about 20 miles out of town or 15—I would not even try to give you the approximate mileage where there are no rail facilities. In Detroit, in one community, as I said before, they had no rail facilities, and the express company did establish an office there in that community.

Mr REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Public Works and Buildings Committee, I would like to suggest to you Members of Congress that if you want to get any new post offices in your district, which in many instances are badly needed you had better be for this legislation, because otherwise we will have to use the material and money to build great warehouses to handle parcel post in the big cities of the Nation. I am for this legislation. I think it is a step in the right direction.

It was never intended we should put the Post Office Department into the express and freight business, and by so doing drive the express companies out of business, by subsidizing those who ship by parcel post at the expense of all the taxpayers.

If you believe in maintaining free enterprise, vote for this legislation. If you believe in socialization and nationalization of business, vote against it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], may I say that this legislation does not affect seeds for planting purposes including corn, vegetables, flowers, winter cover crops, hay, pasture, range, and lawn grass.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, when this parcel post was inaugurated, the statement in the law provided that it should be self-sustaining. It was not like ordinary mail where people assumed it would be a service by the Government, but this was something new tacked onto the post office, and it was supposed to be a plan where you would pay as you go.

Last year the parcel post in this country lost $77,000,000. The express companies lost $135,000,000. While they were losing, we lost at the same time, because we put out rates with which they could not compete.

Now, I can pay taxes as well as the rest of you. If you want to keep on giving subsidies to mail-order houses, just go ahead. That is the question before you now.

I was surprised to hear the gentleman from Tennessee say the Postmaster General was against this legislation. He may be against this particular bill, but he is the one who started the whole business. He came before the committee and said that every first-class post office in America was nothing but a freight depot and that we could not get any business through it because there was so much freight to handle.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. There is no testimony in the hearings this year by Postmaster General Donaldson. There is a statement by Deputy Postmaster General, Mr. Burke. He has indicated that the Post Office Department is in favor of the passage of this legislation.

Mr. BURDICK. Under the law, the Postmaster General has the privilege of going to the Interstate Commerce Commission and increasing the rates on parcel post. He did that. He went before the Commission and they raised the rates. You understand that Congress and our committee has nothing to do with rates at all. The only thing we can do is to fix the size of the packages and the weight. They are fixed so that it would not injure anybody except probably a few mail-order houses. I do not see how it is going to injure them either. If they cannot mail a 70-pound package, there is nothing in this law to prevent their sending two packages of less weight. It only affects first-class post offices. Suppose I wanted to ship something into the fifth zone, I could not ship it from here, under that regulation of size and weight, but I can go out here in the country 6 miles and send it through another post office and do the same thing. When we must have trucks to go to these first-class post offices, it is not much of a hardship to go to the other one too.

Now, I received a letter from North Dakota this morning. I do not often receive favorable ones, but this is good. They said I was the most diabolical Representative they ever had. I never denied that so very much, but they said the reason for it was that I was fighting the Postmaster General.

If he is not for this bill, what does he want to come before the committee for and say, "We cannot run a freight business any more"? Why did he propose something if this does not suit him? It is all in his hands. Our committee would listen to him.

Here is where the Postmaster General differs with this bill. He thinks we are not going far enough. He does not want to exempt any post office, whether first, second, third, and fourth class, and I anticipate an amendment will be offered when we start to read the bill to provide what the Postmaster General wants. That is going too far because there are thousands of post offices in the United States that have no express service, no truck service or any other licensed means of transportation. We cannot deny a service to the millions of rural people. We have gone as far as the committee thought it prudent to go and it will take much of the freight business out of first-class post offices where the congestion is as bad as the Postmaster General says it is.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BURDICK. I mentioned the gentleman's name, so I suppose I must yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That on fourth-class matter the limit of size shall be 72 inches in girth and length combined and the limit of weight shall be over 8 ounces and not exceeding 40 pounds in the first and second zones and 30 pounds in the third and eighth zones; except that in the case of parcels (1) mailed at any post office or on any rural or star route for delivery at any third- or fourth-class post office or for delivery by any rural or star route carrier, or (2) mailed at any third- or fourth-class post office or on any rural or star route, or (3) containing baby fowl, live plants, trees, shrubs, or agricultural commodities (not including manufactured products thereof), or (4) of books, permanently bound for preservation, consisting wholly of reading matter or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for students' notations and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books, the limit of size shall be 100 inches in girth and length combined and the limit in weight shall be over 8 ounces and not exceeding 70 pounds.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "third or fourth class" and insert "second-, third-, or fourth-class."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "third or fourth class" and insert "second-, third-, or fourth-class."

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. LANTAFF: Page 1, line 8, beginning with the word "mailed" strike out everything down to and including the first comma on page 2, line 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "mailed on any rural or star route, or (2) mailed for delivery by any rural or star route carrier."

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, the bill which we have before us proposes to readjust the size and weight limitations only insofar as first-class post offices are concerned.

The purpose of my amendment is to readjust downward the size and weight

limitations at all classes of post offices, thus removing from the bill a discriminatory feature insofar as first-class post offices are concerned. The amendment preserves the exceptions as to agricultural commodities. It also preserves the exceptions with reference to mailing to or from rural free delivery routes or star routes.

On July 13 when the Postmaster General submitted his views to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee with respect to this legislation he pointed out the difficulties in administering this particular law because of these exceptions with reference to classes of post offices. While I am supporting the committee bill that we have before us, I feel it does not go far enough. I believe just as much in the preservation of free enterprise as anyone who has preceded me here today, but we have not gone far enough to protect and preserve that free enterprise. If the post office is in direct competition with the railway express company in first-class post-office areas, then it is in business against private enterprise and the railway express company in the second-, third-, and fourth-class offices as well.

The Postmaster General told us of the difficulty of administering this law with these exceptions: When you go to a post office the parcel clerk will first have to determine whether it is going to a first-class post office, or to a second-, third-, or fourth-class post office. Then he will have to know the income of that particular post office for the last month to see if it is still a first-class office or whether it has changed its classification; so you can imagine the administrative difficulty under the bill as it is now written providing exceptions insofar as different post offices are concerned.

I believe certainly that because the Government is in competition with the railway-express agency this bill should be passed, and I believe also that we should go further and say that we are not only going to withdraw the Government from competition with the railway-express company in the first-class cities but that we are going to take the Government out of competition with them in other areas as well.

The bill in its present form would, of course, encourage the patron of a first-class office to go down the street, or around the corner, or down the road a mile or two to a second-class post office to make his mailing; in other words, if I have a 70-pound package to mail, instead of going to the post office in Miami to mail it I can, under this bill, go down the road a mile or two where there is a second-class post office and mail the same package to the same addressee. So I believe that not only should we adopt this bill to take the Government out of competition with the railway-express agency but that we should go further and remove the competition in all classes of post offices, thereby encouraging private enterprise to provide freight transportation in cities which have second-, third-, and fourth-class post offices.

There is one other point to be considered and that is that when Congress first passed this legislation it was made to apply to first-, second-, third-, and fourth-class offices without discrimination between them. Whenever there has been a change in the weight or size limitations, it has been uniform insofar as the change applied to all post offices.

So I respectfully submit that this legislation as reported by the committee is good; it is sound; it should be adopted, but I believe that we should go further and take the Government out of competition with the railway-express company and other transportation agencies not only in first-class but in second-, third-, and fourth-class post offices also.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the membership to turn down this amendment because it goes entirely too far. Our purpose in restricting this legislation to first-class offices was because of the fact that virtually every first-class post office in the United States has express or motor service. There are only about 2,500 first-class post offices in the United States.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF] would restrict weight and size to all post offices—first, second, third, and fourth class. There are nearly 40,000 second-, third-, and fourth-class offices compared to about 2,500 first-class offices. There are many, many of these smaller post offices, especially of the third and fourth classes, that do not have any kind of express or motor service. I have in my district second-class offices that do not have express service. I do not believe many of the third- or fourth-class offices in my district have any kind of express or motor service, and I refer particularly to regular certificated motor or truck service. I know other Members have a similar situation.

You would work a hardship upon the patrons in these small towns with second-, third-, and fourth-class offices if you applied this limitation of weight and size of packages to them. We are protecting the second-, third-, and fourth-class offices because they do not have adequate facilities to serve them from express or motor services. The first-class offices do. This would certainly be a hardship and would work great damage on the people residing in the small towns in the second-, third-, and fourth-class areas.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, our committee went thoroughly into this situation. In Kentucky we have 1,700 fourth-class post offices and I do not think over a dozen of those post offices have any Railway Express service at all. There are several hundred second- and third-class post offices in that State that have no service at all by any express company. Many of them have no truck service. That situation prevails throughout the United States.

If the amendment offered by our colleague from Florida were adopted, many millions of people would not have express service and they would not have parcel-post service. It would be a tremendous hardship on these people that have to depend upon the parcel post and have no other facilities.

With reference to the administrative difficulty, may I say that I do not think this presents any obstacle at all. There is a Postal Guide in every post office in America and you can turn in 2 minutes' time and find any post office that a package is being mailed to and opposite that you will see whether it is first, second, third, or fourth class. You will be able to know immediately whether or not this bill applies to them.

We had an example of that while we were considering this bill in committee. We wanted to find out whether or not there were a large number of second-class post offices in America serving small towns that had no railway service. We could find in a minute's time what class any post office was. It presents practically no difficulty from an administrative standpoint, and if you pass the amendment you better kill the bill because it will hurt more people than it will help. These small post offices and the people that send parcel post are not competing with anybody, because they have no Railway Express there now.

Mr HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the theory of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF] seems to be all right, but I gather from the opposition to it that it just would not work out well.

It calls to mind some of the protests I have been getting lately from women who insist that I support the constitutional amendment offered by our colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], which is designed to guarantee equal rights to women. These women from the Fourth District of Michigan complain that they are not treated fairly, that they have been and are being discriminated against. I wrote back to some of them and I said, "Well now, if you will give me a list of some of those things which indicate you are deprived of privileges that men enjoy, I will think about supporting the amendment" I always thought that women came first, just a little above poor men, when it came to exercising privileges or rights.

Now I learned this morning from some of our colleagues that there has long been discrimination against the women of the House. I learned that committees going on junkets, working committees going abroad and those traveling here at home, were averse—that is, the male Members of the committee were averse—to taking the women along.

I did not think so much about that until a subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, contemplated and began to discuss a trip abroad to learn what has been the practice with reference to the accumulation and disposition of war surplus property. We have on our committee some of the most intelligent and hardworking Members of the House—two women [Mrs. CHURCH and Mrs.

HARDEN]—and it was suggested that perhaps they go along with another woman from another committee to see and report what was going on.

Women are careful, conscientious, and thrifty—not easily fooled. On a committee such as this they would be a wonderful help—would return with a worth-while report.

Of course, openly the men on the committee have not objected, but in some roundabout way it came out that heretofore the men have not appreciated the presence of women and it was hinted by some who were not going that, if the ladies were going on this arduous investigation, perhaps none better go; just call the whole job off.

Now, with 10 of the hardest working, intelligent Members of the House—women doing at least their share of the work of the Congress—it just is not fair to even hint that they cannot or will not aid in an investigation of this nature. I cannot—I will not—be a party to that kind of procedure, because, for one reason, having been married for some 52 years, it is not advisable, I will say to my colleagues, to take that attitude. It will react to your disadvantage some time. Moreover, your report will not be as complete or helpful as it would be if they went with you.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am glad to see that the gentleman has seen the light and will support the amendment, and I think he is justified in everything that he said. I can readily understand why, perhaps, some of these committees do not want to take ladies along.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why is that? Will the gentlewoman go into detail?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Well, I could go into detail if my friend would permit me.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It will be a pleasure and also profitable to my colleagues.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I understand that some of these women are very hard-working women and they are inclined to keep the other members of the committee to the grindstone, and I can see for that reason they are not desired on these trips. They may spoil some of the more pleasurable moments, some of the recreation. These women do not ask for any special privileges; in fact, I am told that they take most of the rough as well as the smooth.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They wear slacks?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. They do, indeed. When necessary they wear slacks, and I am told they even go up rope ladders. So, I do not know any reason why these women should be discriminated against. And now I will say to my very distinguished colleague, as I said before, that I would like the male Members of the House to remember that the female of the species is more deadly than the male, and if they will look at their insurance tables they will also find that they boast of a longer life, very substantially.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What you have said is true and had we listened more often to what you have advised the Nation would not now be in so precarious a position. I wonder if my colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] has any explanation as to why we in the House have discriminated so often and so successfully against the women.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am very happy to yield. When our colleague from Illinois speaks we listen and profit from her wisdom. I hope the brethren will listen.

Mrs. CHURCH. I am not so sure that great attention is necessary. I hate to take any of the strength out of the gentleman's very gracious statement, but unfortunately it was totally unknown to me that I was not welcome on the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, I heard nothing of that kind—I do not think there was anything personal about it; just women generally. Some benighted individual who perhaps had forgotten his mother and his wife just opened his mouth and talked.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to say to the gentleman who did urge me to go along that I certainly never hesitate to give them the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There was nothing personal in the matter at all—it was just an old established custom dating back to the days when the women did the work while the braves went hunting and to war. There is one thing about those trips, though I have never been on one—it seems that the Members have been doing something that they do not want the women to learn about.

My own thought is that the Congress makes too many investigations that do not give results, but certainly if investigations are to be made there is no reason to bar the women Members of the House.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman starts his remarks, will he yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. In the gentleman's discussion I wish he would outline to me, for it is now dim, what the argument just concluded on the floor has to do with the size and dimensions of packages.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I cannot answer the gentleman's question, but it may be that some other problem has been solved that is worth while.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to appear in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida. May I say first that the gentleman from Florida is one of the outstanding, hard-working members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The problem of administering this amendment would be somewhat difficult. Many of the communities having second, third, or fourth-class post offices do not have the facilities for transportation that they would like to have. Express companies and other transportation facilities are not available. If it could be worked out that we could say that where express service is not available we would use present size and weight limitations—well and good—but of course you cannot work that out in legislation for the reason I have just suggested. We might be unable to distribute these packages under present conditions in many of these post offices. I believe we had better defer consideration of this amendment until a later time, even as laudable as the proposition is as submitted.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I want to confess my ignorance on the subject, on which the gentleman is an expert.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. About what would be the population the gentleman would expect where there is a second-class post office? I realize it depends on the volume of mail, but about what size town would it be?

Mr REES of Kansas. Approximately 15,000, I would say, as an estimate, but it would depend on the gross receipts of the post office and not the population.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. I looked that up, and there are a number of second-class post offices in towns from 1,500 to 2,500, in many towns that have no railroads at all.

Mr. VORYS. Anyway, it is as many as 15,000. I had thought that a second-class post office was in a town of about 2,500 or 3,000 people, where it might be possible that the other facilities were not available.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have four cities in my district that have second-class post offices that have a population of 10,000.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Of course, as the gentleman well knows, in the fourth-class post office there is no competition.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is true with reference to fourth-class offices. Of course, and there is no competition, or not very much, in the third-class offices. There is quite a considerable amount in second-class offices. But, I just suggest that because of the fact that we do not have other transportation facilities in these smaller places, it might be better not to accept the amendment at the present time. The committee ought to give consideration to the proposal as the gentleman has suggested, and I think they will do that when they take this matter up again for further discussion.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman realizes too that the Railway Express facilities are growing less day after day due to the proneness of the public-service commissions in several States to allow them to discontinue train service.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That has a good deal to do with it, that is true.

Mr. BAILEY. Therefore, if this proposal is adopted, the situation would become worse.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. If it were adopted, the situation would get worse.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. How much of the post-office deficit is chargeable to parcel post?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The parcel post had an estimated deficit of $100,000,000, or something over $100,000,000. Under the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, they have taken care of approximately $100,000,000. However, you cannot compute all of the deficit for the reason that these large parcels use so much space in post-office buildings. It is impossible to estimate how much that is costing the Government, and you cannot estimate how much it costs the Government to handle these large packages as compared with smaller packages.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. The other question I have in mind is, How much of that deficit would the committee bill save, or by what amount would it reduce that deficit in the Post Office Department, if the bill is passed as recommended by the committee?

Mr. REES of Kansas. This legislation has to do only with the size and weight of packages, so we are unable to estimate that.

Mr. DONDERO. I understand that, but a statement was made before the Committee on Public Works, by the National Building Commissioner, to the effect that if it were not for the parcel post, the present physical structures of the Post Office Department throughout the country would be adequate to handle the mail service.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have heard that, too.

Mr. DONDERO. We have a list in our committee of over 4,000 towns where they need new post offices, where they would not need them if it were not for the parcel post. What I am trying to get at is, How much of that burden will be relieved by the committee bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. We cannot estimate what it will be. I think the gentleman's observation is one that is well worth considering, and should be considered by our committee, when we give further consideration to the proposal.

Mr. DONDERO. I hope it can be done.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. The Postmaster General in his letter to the chairman of the committee talks about experience gained many years ago in the parcel-post set-up, and it struck me, after reading that letter, that Mr. Donaldson would favor the approach as proposed in the Lantaff amendment.

Do you not agree?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think he would. There is a great deal to be said for it. But, I am just observing that it might not work out under present conditions, that is all. It is commendable except that it might not work out as we hope it would.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr MURRAY of Tennessee: Page 2, line 8, after the comma, insert the following. "or (5) mailed in the United States, including the District of Columbia, for delivery by any Army or Fleet Post Office or in any Territory or possession of the United States, including the Canal Zone and Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, or mailed at any Army or Fleet Post office or in any Territory or possession of the United States, including the Canal Zone and Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, for delivery in the United States, including the District of Columbia, or any Army or Fleet post office or any Territory or possession thereof, including the Canal Zone and Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands"

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any controversy over this amendment. This merely exempts the territorial possessions from the provisions of this bill. It also exempts our Army and fleet post offices overseas.

I have a letter from the Secretary of the Interior saying that these possessions should be exempted from the bill because there is very poor transportation facilities in the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and American Samoa.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the amendment under consideration is one which was originally proposed to the committee by Hon. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Delegate from Hawaii. In its consideration of this matter, the committee inadvertently overlooked Delegate FARRINGTON'S proposal, but I am certain that had it been considered it would have been adopted unanimously.

As the Members know, Mr. FARRINGTON is in the hospital and unable to be present today to offer the amendment himself.

The purpose of the amendment is clear. It would permit the present size and weight of parcel post packages to be retained when they are sent to and from the Territories and possessions of the United States, including Army and fleet post offices.

The Territories and possessions of the United States are in zone 8 and it is clear that the importance of shipments through the mail to the Territories and possessions cannot be overemphasized. In my judgment, the exemption of these far-flung possesisons and Territories from the size and weight limitation provided for in the bill is as meritorious as the other exemptions which have been included.

I include a statement made by Delegate FARRINGTON before our committee, as well as a report from the Secretary of the Interior to the chairman of the committee endorsing the amendment:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH R FARRINGTON, DELEGATE TO CONGRESS FROM THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII, AT HEARINGS BEFORE THE HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, WITH RESPECT TO S. 1335, A BILL TO READJUST SIZE AND WEIGHT LIMITATIONS ON FOURTH-CLASS PARCEL POST, SEPTEMBER 18, 1951

Mr FARRINGTON Mr. Chairman, I am JOSEPH R FARRINGTON, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

I have requested this hearing in order to present Hawaii's point of view on this legislation. Because of our unique geographical position we have an unusual interest in it.

We of Hawaii import about two-thirds of the food we consume We import, in addition, most of the supplies, clothing, and the like, that are necessary in everyday life. Hawaii is an agricultural country. Our islands are without any mineral resources or natural power Manufacturing in Hawaii is, therefore, extremely limited and probably always will be.

We have only two means of transportation The first and most important of these is provided by oceangoing ships; the second by airplanes Naturally most of our supplies come by ship.

But interruptions in this service have been so serious in recent years that we have come to depend more and more on aviation for the transportation of essential supplies. This service is all that kept many businesses alive during 1949 when Hawaii was isolated for a period of 6 months by a strike of longshoremen.

Most of these supplies originate in the Middle West and the East. The rates under which these supplies can be shipped by parcel post are low enough to make it feasible to meet this cost during the period of an emergency, at least. On the other hand, the cost of handling these supplies by railway express and railway air express from the central and eastern parts of the country is regarded by merchants as prohibitive.

Parcel-post shipments to Hawaii all fall within the eighth zone. This means that the restrictions proposed in H. R. 3465 fall with unusual weight on Hawaii. The enactment of the bill in its present form would impose a real hardship on Hawaii It would be one that is extremely serious, almost critical, during a stoppage of shipping, as it would, for practical purposes, close the only feasible means remaining to obtain supplies.

A tabulation prepared by the postmaster of Honolulu shows that from April 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951, a period of 15 months, the total of sacks of parcels and prints received in Honolulu by surface mail was 434,191, the total of outside parcels received by surface mail 335,376, and the total in weight 26,398,-003 pounds.

In the event of a stoppage in shipping such as occurred in 1949, most of this would be

transferred to air parcel post. The merchants of Honolulu, as represented by the Retail Board of Trade of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, feel strongly that the present parcel-post service is necessary to maintain this life line in anticipation of emergencies which experience shows come all too often.

So far as I am able to ascertain, this point of view is shared generally, with the exception of the representatives of the Railway Express Agency.

I have letters to show that the proposed reductions in the size and weight of packages would prove a serious hardship. This is particularly true of companies dealing in machinery and equipment.

I would like to read at this point, Mr. Chairman, a radiogram which I have just received from the Retail Board of the Chamber of Commerce, which outlines this situation very briefly, and, I think, convincingly.

It reads as follows:

"Honolulu businessmen greatly concerned over proposed parcel-post weight and size reductions. Reductions considered too drastic. Considerable Hawaii business is dependent upon parcel-post shipments largely due to geographic location. Reductions would work hardships on Hawaii's people and economy. During times of maritime strikes parcel post is vital life line to Hawaii. Use of air express and air freight for supplies during strikes prohibitive. Air-express charges on 50-pound package, $50.90 San Francisco, $70.10 Chicago, $79 70 New York. Air-freight charges, $35.50 San Francisco, $44 Chicago, $47 New York. Same package parcel post $5.72 to door entire mainland. Post-office figures show 1,117,734 pounds to mainland January through June 1951, 10,417,447 pounds incoming same period. Usually last 6 months of year much greater. These figures jump tremendously during strikes. Businessmen here urge you ask consideration for Hawaii because of dependency upon Government shipping during emergency situations. We feel confident when facts are known and hardships understood consideration will be granted Hawaii."

I would like to propose, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that this bill be amended in a form which has been drafted by the legislative drafting service, to exempt the Territories and possessions from the provisions of this bill.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR MURRAY: Your committee has recently reported on S. 1335, a bill to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail. The purpose of this bill is to reduce the size and weight limits of parcels which may be sent through the mail. Among other things, it reduces the weight of such mail in the third to eighth zones from 70 pounds to 20 pounds.

The concern of the Department of the Interior with this measure lies in the fact that the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and American Samoa, as well as the Trust Territory of the United States, are all included within the seventh or eighth postal zones, and would therefore be affected by the weight reduction.

The weight reduction on parcel-post mail will work severe hardships on these areas. First, every one of the Territories suffers from inadeqaute surface transportation facilities from and to the mainland. Substantial portions of our territorial populations are completely dependent on parcel post for the delivery of goods. Secondly, freight rates on shipments to the Territories are extremely high. The effect of these two conditions has been, generally speaking, that only limited quantities of consumer goods are available in retail establishments in the Territories and must be supplemented by individual family orders from stores on the mainland. The third point which should be noted is that air parcel post and air freight rates, as compared with surface parcel post rates, are prohibitively high for most purposes. As a consequence of these several conditions, an extensive mail-order business is carried on between the mainland and all of the United States Territories and the Trust Territory. This business relies on surface parcel post mail. Reduction of the allowable weight of parcel-post purchases to 20 pounds would make it virtually impossible for people in various parts of the Territories under United States jurisdiction to obtain many necessities of living.

The situation is comparable to that obtaining in the rural areas of the continental United States where parcel post is depended on as the primary means of obtaining delivery of consumer goods. S. 1335 exempts from the weight and size limitations parcels mailed at any post offices or on any rural or star route for delivery at second-, third-, or fourth-class post offices or for delivery by rural or star route carriers on parcels mailed at any second-, third-, or fourth-class post offices or on any rural or star route The basic reason for this exclusion is to be found in the dependence of continental rural areas on parcel-post service. Amendments made by your committee to the bill as passed by the Senate were designed to "assure that needed postal service will not be denied to any segment of our economy or any geographical areas which do not have adequate alternate transportation service." To provide such assurance to persons in our territories and in the trust territory it is necessary that parcels coming from or destined for those areas be exempted from the new limitation.

We have received strong protests from the Territories with respect to their inclusion within the provisions of the act. Governor Morris de Castro, of the Virgin Islands, pointed out in a radiogram. "With inadequate surface transportation and high freight rates this provision of bill would greatly restrict purchases of essential items for parcel-post shipments to islands causing severe hardships and increasing cost of living in the Virgin Islands. For same reason that rural delivery in continental United States is being exempted from this provision, these islands should likewise be excluded"

It is my understanding that Delegate Farrington of Hawaii, has prepared an amendment to S. 1335 in the following language:

"On page 2, line 8, after the comma, insert the following: 'or (5) mailed in the United States, including the District of Columbia, for delivery in any territory or possession of the United States, including the Canal Zone or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands or mailed in any Territory or possession of the United States, including the Canal Zone or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for delivery in the United States including the District of Columbia or any Territory thereof, including the Canal Zone or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands'."

This department strongly urges adoption of this amendment, for the reasons indicated above.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

Secretary of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. All existing laws or portions thereof, inconsistent or in conflict with this act, are hereby amended or repealed.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the first day of the third calendar month following the calendar month in which it is enacted.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1335) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail, pursuant to House Resolution 439, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5257. An act to amend section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), to increase the amount available as an emergency relief fund for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges damaged by floods or other catastrophes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to a bill of the following title:

H R. 5113. An act to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security.

PROGRAM FOR OCTOBER 9, 1951

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the majority leader be so kind as to tell us the program for tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow the Customs Simplification Act of 1951 was to be considered. However, certain conferees are in constant session and because of interference with an important tax bill the Customs Simplification Act will not be considered.

I had also put down for consideration the Armed Services Reserve Act of 1951 dependent upon a rule being reported. No rule has been reported.

So the business in order for tomorrow will be, first, the civil functions conference report, if reported, which is expected. In any event there is a rule out on S. 1951, amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand it, that is being brought up under a closed rule?

Mr. McCORMACK. My understanding is that a closed rule will be reported.

Mr. SABBATH. The Rules Committee has agreed to a closed rule.

LAWRENCE, MASS., HAS PLANTS AND MANPOWER—LET US USE THEM

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the United States Government is the biggest buyer in the world.

The city of Lawrence, Mass., is the largest woolen-worsted manufacturing center in the world

The Nation is booming, the Government is calling for more and more production, but the machines and manpower of Lawrence are idling.

Why?

I intend to ask for a congressional investigation of this dangerous situation; one that will take place immediately and out in the open, let the chips fall where they may.

But first we must have orders for goods that will put people back to work. The Government must be prodded so that it will extricate itself from red tape and give the green light to local mills for the production of uniform cloth and other textile products that are needed in the national defense program.

I cannot for the life of me understand why the Government is giving favored tax treatment to encourage the construction of textile facilities elsewhere while the great plant capacity of Lawrence, backed by the know-how of management and the skill of laborers, is ready and anxious to swing into full production without delay.

I recall the conference held in July 1950 between Stuart Symington, Chairman of the National Resources Board, and representatives of other distressed areas, with a view to putting war industries in those communities, rather than in prosperous areas.

We already have the mills and machinery and skilled manpower in Lawrence to make the volume of cloth needed by the Armed Forces, but it is not being used.

Why? Why? is the persistent question which the Government by some strange perversity avoids answering.

We need orders, just as a hungry man needs food. Although an investigation into the reasons why he is hungry, so that steps may be taken to avoid a recurrence of that want in the future, is advisable, the first imperative is to provide him with sustenance.

Talk will not nourish him.

The opportunity to work and produce and earn life-giving income cannot be postponed.

Due to market conditions, some time may pass before orders for the production of civilian goods put him to work again.

In the meantime, the Government can take up the slack by having its textile requirements taken care of now. By so doing, it will not have to compete with civilian demands later on, which would be a happy blend of good business and social responsibility.

The Federal Government can do this if it is capable of understanding the situation.

I do not enjoy dwelling upon the depressing aspects of the crisis in textiles, but apparently this is the only way to shake the Government out of its lethargy and make it administer the blood plasma of production contracts to the anemic mills of Lawrence that are on the verge of paralysis.

During the last week of May 1949, 22,000 claims for unemployment benefits were filed in the greater Lawrence area.

During most of April and May 1950, the volume ranged from 9,600 to 10,000 per week.

In the last week of September 1951, the number of those drawing unemployment compensation checks had increased to 11,600.

These figures do not include those who are unemployed but who are not covered by such benefits. The estimate for these is 5,000.

For the past 3 years we have had a varying fever of unemployment.

At present, 25 percent of the labor force here is out of work.

This is the same critical percentage that was reached, Nation-wide, during the depression crisis of 1933.

After all, even unemployment compensation checks run out.

And they were never meant to be a substitute for the higher income earned by the productive work that men and women want.

We are already more than 3 months into the new fiscal year but the Quartermaster Department has been slow in making purchases. Perhaps the difficulties being experienced by the conferees in reaching an agreement between the House and Senate versions of legislation concerning defense appropriations for the fiscal year 1952 are a contributory factor.

The whole textile industry, and particularly its base at Lawrence, Mass., depends on the award of Government orders to carry it over this desperate period of inactivity.

The roots of the industry's trouble reach deep and in many directions. They will have to be uncovered by a Congressional investigation, and steps taken to cure the sickness before it becomes chronic, if not fatal.

Immediate emergency treatment, by the transfusion of Government orders that will restore circulation to the slack textile mills, is a must.

I ask the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense to take notice of the serious unemployment in textiles, and to take Executive action that will expedite the flow of Government contracts to distressed areas.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

ADMINISTRATION FAILS TO KEEP COMMUNISTS OUT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, on December 23, 1950, a man named Roman Kutylowski landed at Idlewild Airport in New York and was promptly taken into custody by agents of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service.

There was good reason to bar this man from the country. He is president of the Gdynia-American Lines, which are owned by the Polish Communist Government and which operate the ship *Batory*. The *Batory* is the ship on which Gerhart Eisler, the notorious Communist, escaped from the United States.

On his previous trips to the United States, Kutylowski had been an active propaganda agent for the Polish Reds. With large sums of money received from the Polish embassy he conducted radio programs and subsidized a Communist newspaper.

Under the terms of the McCarran Internal Security Act, Kutylowski was not admissible to the United States because of his subversive record. But less than 2 months later, he was released from Ellis Island—free to resume his Communist propaganda against the United States.

How did Kutylowski obtain his freedom? Simply by a letter from Secretary of State Dean Acheson to the Justice Department stating that Kutylowski's admission to the United States was highly desirable. He was promptly admitted

This summer a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee investigated this incredible case and concluded beyond doubt that Kutylowski's presence in the United States is detrimental to the security of this Nation.

It is bad enough that even one such case could take place, but an immigration inspector testified before the subcommittee that those things are happening all the time. In other words, there are innumerable Communist agents from foreign countries prowling around the United States because some of the top officials in the Truman administration will not lift a finger to stop them.

Most of the foreign spies work out of embassies, consulates, and other sanctuaries. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has told a Senate committee:

> Experience has revealed that foreign espionage agents seek the protection of a legal cover. By that I mean they seek admittance into the United States on diplomatic passports. They seek assignments to some official foreign agency and thus conceal themselves under the diplomatic cloak of immunity. To further avert suspicion, a high-ranking espionage agent may very well be employed as a clerk or in some minor capacity in a foreign establishment. However, when he

speaks, those with high-sounding titles follow his orders without question. Foreign espionage services maintain strict supervision over their activities in this country.

Before passage of the McCarran Act last year little could be done to keep out any alien who presented a diplomatic passport. The Visa Division of the State Department tried to exclude some Red spies with diplomatic status, but in every case the action was overruled by higher-ups in the Department.

A key purpose of the McCarran Act was to provide an iron-clad legal basis for closing that loophole. It gave the Government power to exclude from the United States all aliens, regardless of their status, who were coming to this country for sabotage, espionage, propaganda, or any other purpose that would endanger the public safety, and to deport from the United States any alien who slipped through the border and then engaged in these anti-American activities.

But the recent report of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee makes clear that these provisions are being virtually ignored. From July 1947 to March 1951, a total of 3,616 visas were issued to diplomats from Russia and other iron-curtain countries. Not a single visa application for an alien diplomat has been formally refused since passage of the McCarran Act, although in two or three cases visas were not issued.

Further, Walter W. Wiggins, investigation chief of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, admitted that not a single Red diplomat, out of the many thousands in this country, has been kicked out since the enactment of the McCarran Act. During the Senate investigation, Wiggins was asked what his department was doing to find out whether any diplomats could be deported for subversive activities. His reply.

We are making no particular effort to investigate those

Yet even Wiggins admitted what almost everyone knows to be true "that the control and direction of the Communist apparatus in the United States is centered in aliens in the consulates, embassies, and international organizations."

For example, the Communist spy ring that stole many Canadian atom bomb secrets worked through the Russian Embassy in Washington.

I do not mean to criticize unfairly the loyal, hard-working rank-and-file employees of the Federal law enforcement agencies. They are bound by the policies of their superiors. Wiggins disclosed, for example, that before investigating a foreign diplomat for suspected Communist activity, he would have to get clearance from the State Department, although the new law says that State Department approval is not necessary. He also said that if Attorney General J. Howard McGrath ordered an investigation of Red spies masquerading as diplomats, his agents would comply immediately. No such order has been forthcoming.

President Truman vetoed the McCarran anti-Communist bill last year upon the advice of Secretary of State Acheson and Attorney General McGrath, among others. Fortunately for the future of America, Congress passed the bill over Mr. Truman's veto. But if the Truman administration continues to ignore some of the most important provisions in the act, it will be accomplishing by indirection what it failed to accomplish directly.

After completing its investigation, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee urged that the State and Justice Departments forthwith inaugurate a vigorous program of enforcement of the provisions designed to exclude from our midst the countless diplomats who are actively promoting the cause of Red Russia. I join in demanding that this be done.

The hour is too late for the American people to stand for more appeasing and coddling of Communists. We are fighting a war in Korea in the hope of checking communism in that part of the world. The least we can do at home is to make sure that Communists do not take over our own part of the world.

FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H: Res. 454, Rept. No. 1108), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H R 2574) to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE USE OF CHEMICALS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 447, Rept. No. 1109), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That House Resolution 74, Eighty-second Congress, is amended by adding, after the words "H. Res. 323," in the fourth line, a comma and the following language: "and an investigation and study of the nature, extent, and effect of the use of chemicals, compounds, and synthetics in the production, processing, preparation, and packaging of cosmetics to determine the effect of the use of such chemicals, compounds, and synthetics upon the health and welfare of the Nation."

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 453, Rept. No. 1107), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1959) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by the direction of the Committee on Education and Labor, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Education and Labor may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include a letter and a newspaper article.)

THOSE IN RESPONSIBLE POSITIONS MUST PROVIDE MORAL THINKING

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS Mr. Speaker, when the violation of the honor code at West Point was revealed to the world in the early part of August everyone was stunned. People could not grasp or realize what had happened. The integrity and honor of the young men being educated and trained as leaders of our drafted Army of civilians had never been questioned, their characters were taken for granted. It is universally recognized that the West Point graduate endures a rigorous and exacting training, and the country approves of it and is proud of the results. Every confidence is placed in the character and physical fitness of these young graduates, and they have proved themselves completely worthy of that confidence by their ability and display of leadership in their chosen profession. Americans everywhere are justly proud of the graduates of West Point and Annapolis.

When this sad and really frightful news finally penetrated into the minds of men, and the implications involving the very honor of these national colleges were realized, people reacted in various ways and in different degrees. There were some who thought that the seriousness of the affair was overemphasized and felt that the guilty ones should be given another chance; others advocated dismissal from the Academy without the denial of future service for the coun-

try; while still others felt that the culprits should be cast into outer darkness without a chance for redemption. As a result of some correspondence and a pretty fair knowledge of the traditions of West Point, I can state without fear of contradiction that the guiltless undergraduates were glad to see the guilty ones go and would have resented their reinstatement in no uncertain way. As one of these young men wrote me there is no shade of gray between right and wrong. Without a doubt, he spoke the spirit of the institution.

The matter has now been dealt with by the authorities, and I am satisfied that they handled it with calm judgment and great moral courage. It must have been a most difficult problem and a tremendous tax on the emotions as well as the judgment of the loyal and honest men who had to face the responsibility of settling it. By their example they have raised on high once again the banner of truth and honesty that was being dragged in the mud.

Lessons must be learned from experience, and it is fair to ask what lessons have been learned from this distressing occurrence. Americans are wondering what is being done to prevent similar episodes in the future because they are not content to let the matter rest with the discharge of the guilty cadets. Americans do not demand any change that will weaken the honor code, but they do want to eliminate any system or policy which may be unwholesome or create false values.

Proselyting for good football players and the overemphasis of this sport has been blamed universally as the seat of the trouble. This activity and attitude is common among many of our institutions of higher learning and has caused more than one scandal. Highly paid and resourceful men are secured by institutions as coaches for football teams who surround themselves with a staff of specialized individuals and a corps of trainers, and as a result the young athlete is flattered and aggrandized beyond his endurance. He feels he is the indispensable man not only for the team but also for the real success and honor of his alma mater. This system headed by the coach, generally backed by a group of graduates, is the real culprit and the players are the victims who bear the blame. But who gets all the honor and glory for a winning team? The coach. We read in the news reports that his team wins the victory; his system is the best; his boys are well coached by him; and based on the success or failure of the season, he is given a new and better contract. There is money in it for him. It is the coach's business, but it is also his responsibility, and if scandal rears its ugly head in his domain, he should take the blame.

The present head football coach and athletic director at West Point, built up such a system in order to win games and to enjoy an unbeatable reputation. If that kind of leadership in athletics is retained there, scandal will again appear and those responsible for his retention will alone be to blame. There should be a thorough overhauling of this system, and not by those responsible for it but by those who have a real sincere affection for the Academy, and who glory in its fair name. Let the graduates of West Point come forward and assert themselves and propose changes to protect not only the Academy itself, but also the boys, many of them their own sons, who will go there in the days to come.

The president of the class of 1909, Gen. G. L. Van Deusen, retired, and a good friend of mine, recently wrote a letter to his classmates about this situation and I wish to read it to you. It contains thoughtful and constructive suggestions.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1951.

To: The class of 1909, USMA.

Subject: Honor code violations at West Point.

The Association of Graduates has recently published a letter on this subject from the Superintendent. Questions have arisen in the minds of many graduates on various phases of this subject and some of these questions may not have been fully answered by the Superintendent's letter. I have received several letters from other graduates registering surprise and chagrin over the situation I have communicated with one member of the review board, with certain members of the academic board, and with several cadets. However, the views and recommendations expressed below are my own and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of any other persons.

The Superintendent's letter covers the principal facts relative to the actual operation of the "organized cheating ring." The decision to separate the guilty cadets from the Academy was a proper one, justified by the circumstances and requiring real moral courage on the part of the Superintendent and his advisers. It is apparently concurred in by the overwhelming majority of the present members of the corps.

There are, however, other aspects of the situation calling for careful consideration. The following questions suggest themselves:

1. How did it happen that a small group of cadets became so detached from the spirit of the corps that they could justify such unethical practices to themselves?

There is no doubt that the varsity football squad had come to regard itself as a rather distinct unit within the corps. Some of the players had been recruited by high-pressure methods, had been materially assisted by Army personnel to obtain appointments and had probably entered the Academy under the belief that they would receive special consideration as long as they played good football. In some cases they were naturally poor students who would have found it difficult to make passing grades even without the additional burden of football training. All possible legitimate aid was extended to help these players maintain academic proficiency. But when such aid proved inadequate and their academic standing became precarious or entailed more mental effort than they were willing to make, some of them—a very few at first—succumbed to the temptation to use improper information about the questions used in the "writs." They realized that their action would not be condoned by the authorities or by the cadet honor committee but apparently justified it to themselves on the ground that they were putting out more than the average cadet for the reputation of the Academy—"reputation" being synonymous in their minds with a winning football team. In other words, West Point owed them a career or at least a diploma. According to press reports, loyalty to implicated classmates was openly placed above loyalty to corps honor in some instances. Certain players refused or failed to testify fully and frankly before an investigating board until they had discussed the matter with the director of athletics (who is also the head football coach). There is evidence of a highly ingrown state of mind among these men which caused an inversion of the relative values ingrained in the normal cadet. The varsity football squad had become welded into a compact group with its own special problems, interests, and loyalties. As a result, many of its members gradually adopted or tolerated a standard of honor incompatible with the ideals and traditions of the corps.

2. Did the procedure in connection with the holding of "writs" present an unjustified degree of temptation to the cadets?

Giving the same set of questions to different sections of the same class on successive days undoubtedly made it relatively easy to cheat. Col. Charles P. Echols (Pechols to you), one of the ablest and wisest West Point professors of our time, used to maintain that it was not proper to put too great a strain on the honor code. He therefore insisted that writs and exams be prepared and conducted in all details so as to offer the least temptation to cadets to violate the code. Colonel Echols was not motivated by any distrust of the average cadet, but by the feeling that it is wrong to make it easy for him to cheat, when perhaps his future may depend on the grade obtained that day.

It is contended by some that it would not be fair to offer two sets of questions on the same subject matter to sections attending at different times, on account of the impracticability of correlating the grades equitably. However, modern educational testing techniques make it possible to compare grades under such conditions with a high degree of accuracy, especially when the two groups are relatively large (as with recent West Point classes) and are paired off on the basis of previous academic performance (sections 1A and 1B, 2A and 2B, etc.).

3 Is the general educational system at West Point responsible for the tendency to cheat in order to obtain passing grades?

The critics of regimented education have of course seen in this affair a substantiation of their views that the comparatively rigid West Point system is fundamentally wrong. Some educators have expressed the opinion that the iron-bound curriculum, the strict daily grading and the absence of a cordial personal relationship between instructors and students are factors contributing to the delinquency of the erring cadets. Very few of those who have lived under West Point discipline and its honor code will share this opinion. It is hard to envisage a regime substantially different from the present time-tested one which would fulfill the proper objectives of West Point. One may readily admit that there is a definite place in the American educational system for the more "liberal" type of college without concluding that the educational processes of the Military Academy should be materially changed.

4 Following the disciplinary action taken in the case of the guilty cadets, what further corrective action, if any, is called for?

Neither the West Point authorities nor the alumni can escape a large measure of responsibility for permitting the conditions which helped to endanger such an unhealthy state of mind within the football squad. We should all accept a due share of blame, those who actively supported the organized recruiting of football material, those who realized that football was being overemphasized but failed to do anything about it; those who were too indifferent to know or care what was going on. Some 80 or 90 cadets have left the Academy under a cloud and the Nation is deprived of their services as future

leaders of our Armed Forces. Surely this is a costly sacrifice on the alter of the bitch goddess Success. The situation demands serious soul searching and drastic action to prevent a recurrence.

I propose that joint steps be taken at West Point and Annapolis to restore intercollegiate football at the two major service academies to its proper place. An athletic code should be adopted which will proscribe the recruiting or proselyting of athletic material; will require lighter playing schedules and training programs, and by scheduling all games on a home field will do away largely with the commercial aspects of the sport. We should no longer seek a national top ranking for our teams but instead should strive to regain the general admiration, liking, and respect which we enjoyed in the days of Cope Philoon's and contemporary elevens but which we have since lost in large measure.

The director of athletics has exercised too much influence on important matters of policy and procedure. It was a mistake to appoint the head coach of football, regardless of his other qualifications, to the director's job. This position should be filled by a broadminded man, experienced in the administration of college athletics, with no career interest in our success in any particular sport.

The increased size of the corps of cadets, necessitating its organization into regiments and greater separation in barracks, its dispersion during the summer training period, and the variety of collateral interests now available to the average cadet, all have contributed to a decrease in the extreme homogeneity—call it provincialism if you wish—which characterized the corps of our day. Every possible measure should therefore be taken to preserve and encourage the unity of the corps in its attitude toward fundamental principles.

The academic board is the natural body to coordinate the major elements of cadet training so that a proper balance will be maintained and long-range objectives kept in mind. The average tour of a Superintendent during the past half century has been slightly over 3 years. It is obvious that the Superintendent should rely strongly on the cumulative wisdom and experience of the academic board in charting the course of the Academy. Under the general guidance of this board intercollegiate athletics should be thoroughly integrated into the general program.

Finally, as graduates we tend to become too complacent and disinclined to a critical analysis of practices and conditions at the Military Academy. Granted that most of the changes in curriculum and administration in recent years have been beneficial, it does not follow that mistakes have not been made. Eternal vigilance is the price of maintaining ancient virtues. It is proper that the Association of Graduates and the several alumni societies should seek to enlighten the public on the splendid accomplishments of West Point. But hand in hand with our loyalty to our alma mater should go an active interest in its policies and trends. Nor should we hesitate to express our views, as groups or individuals, whenever we feel that these policies and trends are not calculated to promote worthy objectives.

GEORGE L. VAN DEUSEN.

There are penetrating questions asked in this letter and I find that the answers are sound and sensible. Furthermore, they are workable and should be given serious consideration by the authorities; but I claim you cannot cure the disease without first removing the focal point of infection, and in this instance it is the coach and the system he is responsible for. If every institution would face this situation squarely and honestly, these men who are athletic coaches would see the light and would once again become the useful character builders they were in bygone days. Whether the teams they coached won or lost, they were always known as men who stood for good sportsmanship and taught the youth of America to win if possible, but if they lost, to be good losers. They had the code of honor of Booth Tarkington's character, Monsieur Beaucaire, which he expounded to a cheater at cards when he said, "With the cards, with the dice, with the smallsword, but always fair, monsieur, always fair."

Cheating and immorality lead to ultimate destruction whether found in an individual or a nation, and the apparent decadence of our national morality may well give us cause for alarm. Unless the people of this country take a firm and definite stand against the acquiescence of our national leaders in attempts to justify loose moral standards, our country's supremacy will go the way of Rome and Greece to its destruction. This is not a partisan problem; it is a national problem, and our trend downward to decadence must be stopped now if we are to survive. Our memory is too short and in the fast-moving events of our time we forget what has happened to the standards of government laid down by the founders of our Republic. Someone has said that "We are in the hands of invisible government" and this may well be so. When one considers the revelations of the various investigating committees of Congress, and the actual complacency with which they are received by those in the very highest positions in our Government, we are stunned and dumfounded. Deep freezers, mink coats, loan favors, and jobs, all as gifts extended for favors or courtesies rendered, are nothing but bribes and are absolutely repugnant to any right-minded man. Americans never thought they would see the day when the authority and power of high office entrusted to elected officials would be prostituted in the mire of cheap if not nefarious politics as has been exposed recently. Political leaders, no matter what party they belong to, should be above reproach and do nothing or have any connection whatever with anything that may be misunderstood or is not in the interest of the common weal. Unless our country's leadership in government and politics is honest and aboveboard in thought, word, and deed, we will soon shrivel up and hasten to our destruction. Public officials, false to their trust, are enemies of the Republic, and such betrayals should be recognized as treason. This is well expressed in an editorial appearing in the New York Times on September 30 from which I quote briefly as follows:

There is more than one kind of treason. The kind we find in the statute books consists in giving aid and comfort to the enemy. But the betrayal of a nation's ideals is also treason. Political corruption is treason, and those who tolerate it or make little of it, even though they derive not 1 cent of profit from it, bear a heavy burden of guilt.

Perhaps, because of this general moral degeneration of our Government leaders, we should not be too critical of such lapses of the honor code as were revealed at West Point, but I say that unless we correct our ways and cease our hypocritical attitude we are lost.

I have confidence in the high standards of our citizens and believe that they will in their own time correct the moral laxity that is prevalent in high places today and save our United States from decay and oblivion. We are a long-suffering people, generous and forgiving, but we are against corruption and evil thinking and immorality. As long as we have a free press and freedom of religion, our people will, by the exercise of their free suffrage, keep America safe and strong. It is only thus, by the action of a liberty-loving people, that we can purify the thinking and actions of those who, perhaps unthinkingly, would betray us. Let us make alive our motto, "In God we trust," by asking the searching question of ourselves, Can God trust us?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BROOKS to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a very able address by the Assistant Secretary of Air, Mr. Eugene M. Zuckert, despite the fact that it exceeds the limit set by the Joint Committee on Printing and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $266.50.

Mr. LANE in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. FLOOD in three instances.

Mr. REAMS and to include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. HORAN and to include an editorial and an article.

Mr. LOVRE.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter; in one instance to include an article by Admiral Ben Moreell entitled "Let's Make the Draft Make Sense," notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit set by the Joint Committee on Printing and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $246.

Mr. LECOMPTE and to include an editorial.

Mr. JENISON in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILL and to include an article entitled "Beef Price Controls a Colossal Hoax."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin in two instances, in each to include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WICKERSHAM in five instances, to include speeches on soil conservation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) and include certain excerpts.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include certain excerpts.

Mr. JUDD in two instances, and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mr. BARING.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include a copy of a resolution.

Mr. REES of Kansas to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include a letter from the Secretary of the Interior to the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include a recent editorial from the Clinton Daily Item.

Mr. SABATH and to include an article appearing in Look magazine, August issue.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) and to include an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WERDEL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely on account of illness in family.

Mr. DOLLINGER (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD), for Monday, October 8, 1951, on account of illness.

Mr. FENTON (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM) for 1 week, on account of the death of a relative and serious illness in the immediate family.

Mr. GATHINGS (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD), for 10 days, on account of official business.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for 1 day, on account of official business.

Mr. RIBICOFF, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

Mr. MAGEE, for the week of October 8, 1951, on account of official business.

Mr. REGAN, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

Mr. YATES, for the week of October 8, 1951, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1227. An act to amend further the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947, as amended; and

H R. 4475 An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 283. An act for the relief of Akiko Mitsuhata;

S. 617. An act for the relief of Pascal Nemoto Yutaka;

S. 1013. An act for the relief of Sister Monica Grant;

S 1277. An act for the relief of John R. Willoughby;

S. 1437. An act for the relief of Maiku Suzuki;

S. 1464. An act for the relief of Peter Therkelsen Kirwan and Ernest O'Gorman Kirwan,

S. 1499. An act for the relief of Georgette Sato;

S. 1713. An act for the relief of Charles Cooper;

S. 1718. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Bozski;

S. 1775 An act for the relief of Heinz Harald Patterson; and

S. 1994. An act to authorize the use of the incompleted submarine *Ulua* as a target for explosive tests, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 9, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

857 A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of the tort claims paid by this administration during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951, pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, title IV, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress (28 U. S C., 2673), to the Committee on the Judiciary.

858 A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army dated July 12, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on the Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., with a view to ascertaining as near as can be estimated the exact damages resulting at or near Louisiana, Mo , by the creation of pool No 24 (Clarksville Dam) on the Mississippi River. This investigation was requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on April 13, 1948 (H. Doc No. 251); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

859 A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to clarify the budget program requirements relating to the Veterans' Canteen Service"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs

860. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 30, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Hackensack River, N. J , authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved on March 2, 1945 (H Doc. No. 252); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with four illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DURHAM: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H. R. 5646. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended; without amendment (Rept No. 1104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S. 1952. An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Tenth intermediate report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Report of the Subcommittee on Inter-Governmental Relations Concerning Bunker Hill School of Aeronautics, Inc. (Rept. No. 1106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 453. Resolution for consideration of S. 1959, an act to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1107). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 454 Resolution for consideration of H. R 2574, a bill to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, without amendment (Rept No. 1108). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 447. Resolution to extend the authority of the Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Food Products into the field of cosmetics; without amendment (Rept. No. 1109). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CANNON Committee on Appropriations. H R 5650. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept No 1110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DURHAM:

H R 5646. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R 5647. A bill to clarify the budget program requirements relating to the Veterans' Canteen Service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr CELLER:

H R. 5648 A bill to admit 50,000 immigrants, natives and citizens of Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr ELLIOTT:

H R 5649 A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (1) to provide that certain chronic and tropical diseases becoming manifest within 2 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service-connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr CANNON:

H. R 5650. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARING.

H. R 5651. A bill to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Defense Materials Procurement Agency of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R 5652. A bill authorizing the Oregon State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a dam and dike to prevent the flow of tidal waters into North slough, Coos County, Oreg ; to the Committee on Public Works

By Mr. GREEN:

H R. 5653. A bill to amend certain excess-profits-tax provisions in order to encourage the development and marketing of new and improved dentistry products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H R. 5654. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING

H R 5655 A bill to amend the Social Security Act, so as to reduce the amount of the deductions which may be made on account of outside income from the benefits payable to certain individuals thereunder, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr ALLEN of California (by request):

H R 5656 A bill for the relief of Sam Rosenblat, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr HELLER:

H R 5657 A bill for the relief of Bernard Gross, to the Committee on the Judiciary

H R 5658 A bill for he relief of William W Kleinman, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr RADWAN:

H R 5659 A bill for the relief of Mrs Hermine Lamb, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr WALTER:

H R 5660 A bill to effect entry of a minor child adopted or to be adopted by United States citizens, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr WIER:

H R 5661 A bill for the relief of Ayako Waki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

451. By Mr CANFIELD Resolution unanimously passed on October 5, 1951, by the New Jersey Press Association at its Thirtieth Annual Press Institute at Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J., to use every appropriate method to demand that President Truman modify his Executive order so that the public may have news and information which is its right under the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

452 Also, resolution unanimously adopted by the editorial committee of the New Jersey Press Association urging that the United States Government break off diplomatic and trade relations with Czechoslovakia, to cancel visas issued to Czechoslovak citizens, and to freeze the assets of Czechoslovakia in this country until such time as William N Oatis is freed, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

453 By the SPEAKER. Petition of West Palm Beach Townsend Club, No. 1, of West Palm Beach, Fla., vigorously protesting the proposed opening of the welfare rolls to public exposure, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, October 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Robert W. Olewiler, minister, Grace Reformed Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, once again we raise our voice in gratitude for all the manifestations of Thy purpose and power and for Thy never-changing faithfulness throughout all generations. We rejoice, that in the midst of these critical times when our troubles multiply, Thy word, O God, stands sure.

Be pleased now to lend a merciful ear to our supplications, especially as we pray for these Thy servants, who have authority and power over their fellow men Grant that they may not use it for selfish advantage, but be guided to do justice and to love mercy. Guard the dignity of this august body by tempering the all too rash and hasty judgments hurled upon it, and by increasing the courage, industry, honesty, and integrity of its Members. Defend them from evil, enrich them with all needed good, and direct and prosper their consultations, to the end that the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy people may everywhere be preserved and Thy glory everywhere advanced.

We beseech Thee to take away our feebleness toward the things of the spirit, keeping us mindful of our sins; not that we might be ashamed to lift up our eyes to new horizons of godly service and sacrifice, not that we might fear to press forward in new adventures of faith, but that we might in true humility beg Thy forgiveness and firmly resolve to do better. Speed the day when peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us for all generations. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 8, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1335) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 5113 An act to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security;

H. R. 5257. An act to amend section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785) to increase the amount available as an emergency relief fund for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges damaged by floods or other catastrophes; and

H. R. 5504. An act to amend section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 to increase the amount available for the construction of access roads certified as essential to the national defense.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED BY PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, October 9, 1951, he signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S 283. An act for the relief of Akiko Mitsuhata,

S 617. An act for the relief of Pascal Nemoto Yutaka;

S 1013 An act for the relief of Sister Monica Grant;

S. 1277. An act for the relief of John R. Willoughby,

S. 1437. An act for the relief of Maiku Suzuki,

S 1464 An act for the relief of Peter Therkelsen Kirwan and Ernest O'Gorman Kirwan,

S 1499. An act for the relief of Georgette Sato,

S 1713. An act for the relief of Charles Cooper,

S. 1718. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Bozsik,

S 1775 An act for the relief of Heinz Herald Patterson;

S 1994. An act to authorize the use of the incompleted submarine *Ulua* as a target for explosive tests, and for other purposes,

H. R 1227 An act to amend further the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947, as amended;

H R 4475 An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and

H R 5102 An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval installations and defense production plants in such area

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr LEHMAN Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow in observance of one of the most solemn holy days of my faith.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business, without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SNAKE RIVER RECLAMATION PROJECT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the initial phase of the Snake River reclamation project by the Secretary of the Interior, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions adopted by the Miami Townsend Club, No 22, the Boynton Beach Townsend Club, No 1; the Townsend Club, No 1,

of Miami, and the West Palm Beach Townsend Club, No. 1; all in the State of Florida, protesting against the opening of the welfare rolls to public exposure; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for a shipbuilding program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on October 8, 1951, p. 12736, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD)

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL SHRINE—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the City Council of Philadelphia on October 4.

The resolution calls attention to the neglect of the site in Philadelphia where the Declaration of Independence was written. It urges that the site be acquired by the United States Government, that it be designated as a historic shrine and maintained as a place of patriotic inspiration for all the people of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO ACQUIRE AND MAINTAIN AS A NATIONAL SHRINE THE LOCATION OF THE DRAFT AND PREPARATION OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Whereas the year 1951 marks the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing and adoption of the Declaration of Independence and the statement of the principles upon which this Nation was established; and

Whereas the Declaration of Independence was written and prepared in a building located at the southwest corner of Seventh and Market Streets, in the city of Philadelphia; and

Whereas the site of the said building is now in private ownership and used for commercial purposes without even a marker to designate the great historic event that took place at that location; and

Whereas the site should be in the ownership of the Government of the United States to be maintained as a shrine for all of the people of the United States and as an inspiration to their citizenship and patriotism: Therefore

Resolved by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That the Government of the United States is hereby requested to acquire and to maintain as a patriotic shrine the land at the southwest corner of Seventh and Market Streets in the city of Philadelphia where the Declaration of Independence was drafted and prepared.

Resolved, That the clerk of city council send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States and to the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT—PETITION

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a petition signed by Estelle M. Johnston, Helen M. Armstrong, and Lulu L. Thomson, and sundry other citizens of Portales, N. Mex., praying for the enactment of legislation providing equal rights.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTALES, N MEX., *September 27, 1951.*

To the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United State Senator for New Mexico.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ. We, the Portales Business and Professional Women's Club, petition you, and through you, the United States Congress, to pass the equal rights amendment during this session of Congress.

We are supporting the equal rights amendment in its original form, and disapprove any riders, amendments, or changes in wording, which would have the effect of continuing the inequalities which we seek to eliminate

The text of the equal rights amendment is "that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex

"Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"This amendment shall take effect 1 year after the date of ratification"

ADMINISTRATION BY GOVERNOR PHELPS OF AMERICAN SAMOA—RESOLUTIONS OF LEGISLATURE OF AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, four resolutions of the Territorial Legislature of American Samoa, the Fono, together with a copy of an official resolution directed to the Governor by the Fono. The resolutions concern the administration of the island's first civilian governor, Hon. Phelps Phelps. They are in answer to and in rebuttal of serious criticism against Governor Phelps by a group of Samoans whose statement was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, beginning on page A4816 of the Appendix.

I have no personal knowledge whatever of the present political situation in American Samoa, and do not in any way wish to be taking one side or another in any differences of opinion between the Governor and any group of Samoans. However, I do feel that in the interests of justice and truth, both sides should receive equal opportunity for presentation of their views, and hence I am happy to accede to the Interior Department's request.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution I

Whereas in the investigation undertaken by the Committee on Rules and House Administration it was shown in the testimony of several witnesses examined with reference to the petition of May 2, 1951, that the signatures of said witnesses had been affixed to blank paper which circumstance implied that they knew nothing of or about said petition, and yet these "blank papers" have come to jeopardize the good administration of Gov. Phelps Phelps; and

Whereas some of the chiefs among the signatories have affirmed their satisfaction with the administration of Gov. Phelps Phelps and experienced very great surprise therefore upon seeing a facsimile of the aforesaid petition from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with its allegations about Gov. Phelps Phelps which was not what had been represented to them as being the contents and substance of the said petition at the time their signatures were subscribed; and

Whereas all the allegations in the petition about and attacking Gov Phelps Phelps can never or ever will alter the belief of the Fono of American Samoa, leaders, and representatives of families, churches and groups in the hereinbefore-mentioned Gov. Phelps Phelps, who has ever shown and displayed those qualities of goodness, love, and justice in his administration and as proven by his acts before the public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Washington be advised of the falsity and groundlessness of such allegations as directed at Gov Phelps Phelps and contained in said petition of May 2, 1951, from one-half of 1 percent of the population of American Samoa, and be it furthe

Resolved, That the press be authorized to print and publish the facts in this hoax played on Washington by this petition of May 2, 1951, for the information of the public and especially those interested in the affairs of the government of American Samoa, and be it finally

Resolved, That a letter of commendation for Gov Phelps Phelps be drafted and delivered and copies thereof be forwarded to Washington and the Chief Executive and the legislature of Gov. Phelps Phelps' home State (New York)

Resolution II

Whereas the Committee on Rules and House Administration is in possession of the truth from its investigation and examination of the signers of the petition of May 2, 1951, addressed to the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the Secretaries of the Interior and Navy, commending one Fred I Simon; and

Whereas the aforementioned petition contained allegations galore which are injurious and derogatory to the efficient operation of the government of American Samoa, the Fono, Tutuila and Manu'a, and especially of the commendable and just administration of Gov Phelps Phelps, and

Whereas the aforesaid committee is aware and cognizant that the number of witnesses disclaiming all knowledge of said petition and had declared their signatures under such circumstances as rank forgeries, together with the infant signatories, is sufficient; and

Whereas decision in the matter was deferred until consideration thereof by the Fono in its special session of August 22, 1951, and the Fono having so proceeded: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That wherever obvious and/or evident violators of and offenses against the laws of American Samoa as found in the said investigation shall be communicated to the Attorney General of American Samoa for prosecution according to law.

Resolution III

Whereas the Committee on Rules and House Administration has conclusive proof and the facts obtained from its investigation and examination of witnesses called before it with regard to the petition dated May 2, 1951, by persons from Alataua County and Faumuina of Sa'ole County addressed to the President and the Congress of the United States and the Secretaries of the Navy and Interior, which petition has affected the operation of the Government of American Samoa under the administration of Gov. Phelps Phelps, the Fono, the Department of the Navy, and the Government of American Samoa; and

Whereas the said investigation has revealed not only from the testimony but also by direct examination the fact of the

participation of several Members of either House of the Fono in the proceedings under question; and

Whereas the foregoing committee is convinced of the impropriety and folly for a member of the legislature to be concerned in actions misleading and detrimental to the peace and happiness of the Fono and the people and Government of American Samoa; and

Whereas it is clear from section 86 of the code that either House of the Fono shall be the sole tribunal with respect to its members: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That each house of the Fono undertake an investigation of those members known and proven to have been concerned in said petition of May 2, 1951, and to render its decision in the next session of the Fono or the earliest available opportunity.

Resolution IV

Whereas exhaustive investigation has revealed and proven to the Committee on Rules and House Administration the monstrously outrageous and villainous practices followed in the formulations of the petition of May 2, 1951, and especially in the trickery played upon honest but credulous persons in obtaining their signatures without either their consent or knowledge and without treading the correct paths of human conduct, all contrary to law and much more so in the sight of God; and

Whereas said petition under investigation and to the knowledge of the said committee operated to misinform and mislead the President and the Congress of the United States and also the Secretaries of the Interior and Navy Departments of that Government and therefore injurious, derogatory, and disparaging to their prestige and fair fame, by the very nature and character of the contents of aforesaid petition which are absolutely false, deceiving and ill-advised; and

Whereas these practices permitted the cruel, uncharitable and unauthorized signing of the names of babes and infants of some 8 months, girls, boys, women and men who possess not the least bit of an idea as to this dark proceeding; and

Whereas said petition also outraged Samoan convention and protocol by its indiscretions and imputations on native dignities, honors and rights which have been the cause for innumerable dire occurrences in Samoa in the past, through its ill-use of and attribution of falsehood to persons of rank and consideration; and

Whereas the hereinabove-mentioned committee has heard the protest of several witnesses in the investigation and their declaration of disavowal of and dissent from said petition now that they do know they had been tricked; and

Whereas it has been incorrectly and falsely represented to Washington that the document was from "highest ranking chiefs, orators, and duly representatives of American Samoa," when the investigating committee knows that they are not as represented. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Washington be advised to ignore altogether said petition of May 2, 1951.

THE GOVERNMENT OF AMERICAN SAMOA,
THE LEGISLATURE, OFFICE OF THE FONO,
Tutuila, American Samoa, August 22, 1951.
Hon. PHELPS PHELPS,
Governor of American Samoa:

Whereas the special session of the Fono of American Samoa held on Wednesday, August 22, 1951, resolved the congratulations and a commendation should be extended to His Excellency Gov. Phelps Phelps who is the first civilian Governor of American Samoa, for excellent, satisfactory, and faithful services rendered to the Government of American Samoa, and these self-same services have been evidenced and proven; and

Whereas these commendable services by His Excellency Gov. Phelps Phelps, for the progressive and prosperous welfare of the people of American Samoa are well functioned for the cause of self-improvement in all activities concerned under his governorship; control, and serving for the prosperity and well-being of the people of American Samoa through earnestness, benevolence, patience, and faithfulness; and

Whereas such meritorious action must never go unnoticed by the people of American Samoa: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the hereinabove-mentioned Gov. Phelps Phelps, by these presents be commended and congratulated for such fine work; and be it further

Resolved, That such commendation be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the United States Government, and, that such commendation be published in the local monthly paper O Le Featonu for the information of the public; and be it finally

Resolved, That a copy of said commendation be forwarded to the Governor of New York State for the information of the legislature and people of the same State of Gov. Phelps Phelps

Soifua.

S. F. SATELE,
Chairman of the House of Alii.
M. T TUIASOSOPO,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S 2212 A bill to provide a program of cooperation between the Weather Bureau and consulting meteorologists; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr CHAVEZ:

S 2243. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims for property damage arising as a result of the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 2244. A bill to amend certain housing legislation to grant preferences to veterans of the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Banking and Currency

(See the remarks of Mr MAYBANK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading)

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 2245 A bill to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Frenchtown irrigation district, the Malta irrigation district, and the Glasgow irrigation district, to authorize their execution by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. AIKEN, Mr MORSE, and Mr. IVES):

S J Res. 107. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Ethics in Government; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN HOUSING LEGISLATION TO GRANT PREFERENCES TO VETERANS OF KOREAN CONFLICT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the veterans of the Korean war are not, under existing legislation, given preference in the purchase and occupancy of publicly owned war and low-rent housing, and of FHA-aided cooperative housing.

In order to accord the veteran of the Korean war the same treatment as other veterans, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to place veterans of the Korean war—persons who served in the Armed Forces at any time on or after June 27, 1950, and before a date to be determined by the President—on the same footing as veterans of World War II with respect to the renting or purchase of houses under programs administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The bill would not, however, give veterans of the Korean war benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, inasmuch as legislation for that purpose is now pending before other committees.

The bill would not result in any increased costs to the Government except for very minor additional administrative costs.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the provisions of the bill be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2244) to amend certain housing legislation to grant preferences to veterans of the Korean conflict, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The summary is as follows:

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR HOUSING PREFERENCES TO KOREAN VETERANS

LOW-RENT HOUSING

Section 1 would amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, to include as veterans to whom preferences are given in rental of public low-rent housing aided under that act persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and before a date to be determined by the President.

WORLD WAR II WAR AND VETERANS' HOUSING

Section 2 would give to persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and before a date to be determined by the President the same preferences in the rental of war and veterans' housing and the purchase of war housing under the Lanham Act as are afforded to veterans of World War II.

GREENTOWN PROJECTS

Section 3 would amend Public Law 65, Eighty-first Congress, which provided for sale of the three so-called Greentown projects with preference to groups of veterans, so as to include in the term "veterans" those who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and before a date to be determined by the President. At the present time, there remain under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Agency (administered by the Public Housing Administration) two of these projects located at Milwaukee, Wis., and Greenbelt, Md.

FHA-AIDED COOPERATIVE HOUSING

Section 4 would extend to those who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and before a date to be determined by the President the special FHA mortgage insurance advantages to veterans afforded by section 213 of the National Housing Act. Under this section cooperatives are given special mortgage insurance benefits proportionate to the percentage of members who are veterans.

COMMISSION ON ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGLAS, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 107) to establish a Commission on Ethics in Government, reported it favorably, without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 933) thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 9, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States, the following enrolled bills:

S. 283. An act for the relief of Akiko Mitsuhata;

S. 617. An act for the relief of Pascal Nemoto Yutaka;

S. 1013. An act for the relief of Sister Monica Grant;

S. 1277. An act for the relief of John R. Willoughby;

S 1437. An act for the relief of Maiku Suzuki;

S 1464 An act for the relief of Peter Therkelsen Kirwan and Ernest O'Gorman Kirwan;

S. 1499. An act for the relief of Georgette Sato,

S 1713. An act for the relief of Charles Cooper;

S. 1718. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Bozsik;

S. 1775. An act for the relief of Heinz Harald Patterson; and

S. 1994. An act to authorize the use of the incompleted submarine *Ulua* as a target for explosive tests, and for other purposes.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr LEHMAN:

Statement prepared by him paying tribute to Gen. Casimir Pulaski, and commenting on the designation of October 11 as Pulaski Memorial Day.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him and letter addressed by him to Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina relating to turning over loyalty investigations from the FBI to the Civil Service Commission.

By Mr MARTIN:

Broadcast by him to the people of Pennsylvania on October 8, 1951, being program No. 51 in series entitled "Happenings in Washington."

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address on inflation delivered by Walter P. Casey, before the Brawley (Calif.) Kiwanis Club.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for Mr. BYRD):

Editorial entitled "Jim Farley's Visit," published in the Syracuse Herald-Journal of September 8, 1951, dealing with the adoption of Hon. James A. Farley into the Iroquois Nation.

Statement entitled "Wake Up, America," by Fred Brenckman, relating to the recent decision of the California Appellate Court declaring the Charter of the United Nations has become the supreme law of the land.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Editorial entitled "Korean Goal Still Undefined Despite Bitter Cost," published in the Chicago Daily News of October 6, 1951.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Article by Fulton Lewis, Jr., in the column entitled "Washington Report," discussing the proposal to establish a new political party in the United States.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Resolutions adopted by Kansas League of Municipalities, at Topeka, Kans., on September 17–19, 1951, requesting the enactment by Congress of flood-relief legislation.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McMahon
Bennett	Hayden	Millikin
Benton	Hendrickson	Monroney
Brewster	Hennings	Moody
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bridges	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Neely
Cain	Hunt	Pastore
Carlson	Ives	Robertson
Case	Jenner	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N J.
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Langer	Sparkman
Dworshak	Lehman	Stennis
Eastland	Lodge	Taft
Ecton	Magnuson	Thye
Ellender	Malone	Underwood
Ferguson	Martin	Watkins
Flanders	Maybank	Welker
Frear	McCarran	Wiley
Fulbright	McClellan	Williams
George	McFarland	Young
Gillette	McKellar	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1203) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this proposed legislation, which was reported favorably from the Committee on the Judiciary by unanimous vote, is designed, and is primarily intended, to help relieve the congestion of cases in the Federal courts. There are, however, additional provisions of the bill intended to take care of other situations regarding the Federal judiciary.

I consider—and I think the Senate will agree with me—that this legislation falls into the "must" category because it necessarily affects the liberty and property of our citizens. Nothing should be given greater attention or more prompt consideration than a matter of this kind, which is so fundamental and so close to each individual in this great country.

Simply speaking, this bill will add to the Federal judiciary 18 new district judges and 1 circuit judge. It also provides for the holding of court in additional places, and makes certain technical changes in the law applicable to the Federal judiciary, where it has appeared justified.

The Senate will remember that by Public Law 205 of the Eighty-first Congress additional circuit and district judges were provided for the Federal judicial system in an effort to enable the judiciary to cope with the tremendous backlog of cases, and increased filings of new cases, in districts and circuits where the need was most apparent. As stated in the report on that legislation, it was only intended to take care of the very minimum needs of the Federal judiciary. A further study of the situation, as time has progressed, has shown the need for this additional legislation, in order to hold the ground gained, and to take care of certain situations which are becoming acute, and which were not specifically or adequately dealt with in previous legislation.

The Senate will, I know, keep in mind that this bill deals with one of the three major branches of the Government of the United States. It is incumbent upon the Senate and the Congress of the United States to see that that major branch of the Government is allowed to work effectively for the good of the people. We must not let the judiciary become bogged down by reason of a shortage of Federal judges. It has always been my firm conviction that the Federal judiciary, being so close to the people all over our country, carries the burden of making our democracy work, and that it is therefore essential that the Federal judiciary must give the public adequate and efficient service at all times.

Nothing that I can think of creates more confidence in the people, as regards their Government, than the knowledge that they may appeal to the courts and receive fair, honest, prompt, and efficient treatment of their grievances. At the same time, I know of nothing that can create more discontent than to have action on these grievances delayed for too long, or too superficially dealt with. With adequate judge-power, we get justice not too long delayed nor too hastily administered.

Backlogs and congestions are not conducive to a happy state of affairs; and where these situations exist, they must be taken care of.

Extensive hearings were held on the provisions of this legislation on April 17 and 19, May 1 and 7, and June 15 and 26, in an attempt to bring before the committee, as far as it was possible, the conditions that needed to be remedied in our Federal judiciary. The result of those hearings, as well as the additional data that came to the files of the committee,

are reflected in S. 1203, the bill now before us.

As an indication of what has happened to the judiciary in the past 10 years, let me point out that since 1941 the increase in private civil cases has been over 47 percent; and for all civil cases the increase has been over 42 percent; while during the same period the number of district judges authorized has risen only 12 percent.

The Committee on the Judiciary is convinced that the only possible solution to the problem is to furnish the Federal judiciary with sufficient manpower to staff the courts reasonably and adequately. In the past, all manner of makeshift plans for solution of this problem have been tried; but all have met the insurmountable obstacle of an inadequate number of judges. We are trying now to remove that obstacle. Once the courts are adequately staffed with judges, the backlog of cases can and will be disposed of, and the courts can then remain current in their work.

Mr. President, of course, this program will cost money; and it may be thought by some that in the interest of economy a new circuit judgeship and 18 new district judgeships should not be created. However, let us examine the record. As my colleagues well know, and as I have indicated before, we are dealing here with one of the three major branches of the Government. The national budget for the entire Federal Government for the fiscal year of 1951 is over $75,000,000,000. The portion of this budget which is appropriated for the judges of the Federal judiciary is only $25,304,665. This means that out of the total budget, the judiciary appropriations total about one-thirtieth of 1 percent. It seems to me that for the tremendously important functions of this major and coordinate branch of the Government, such a percentage is very small indeed. In other words, the administration of justice comes pretty cheap, as things go. If, in the interest of economy, we were to abolish all our Federal judges, from the Supreme Court on down, the total savings would be one-thirtieth of 1 percent of our national budget. On this basis, I cannot see where the question of economy should be deemed of any relative importance in dealing with a matter of such grave and major consequence with relation to the fundamental rights of the people.

Most of the provisions of the bill have been recommended by the Judicial Conference of the United States, and the balance are the recommendations of the committee after a careful study of the hearings and the data which came to the committee files.

Let me say a word right here about the Judicial Conference.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Has the Judiciary Committee given consideration to changing the jurisdictional limit in the Federal courts, as has been recommended by at least some of the judges in cases of diverse citizenship?

Mr. McCARRAN. That has been before the committee in times past. Recently the committee has not considered the matter.

Mr. McFARLAND. I take it, then, that the committee did not deem it wise to make such a recommendation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Not in connection with this bill. That is a matter which has been studied in the past, and in all probability will come up in a bill by itself.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have another question, if I may interrupt at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. McFARLAND. There is one problem that worries many of us, and that is that the two distinguished Tennessee Senators have contrary views regarding the Tennessee judgeship. I think everyone would like to accommodate both of them. What was the recommendation, if any, of the Judicial Conference in regard to those judgeships?

Mr. McCARRAN. I intended to make that known when we reached it, but the Senator's question now brings it squarely up.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask the question because the Senator said the bill conforms in most instances with the recommendations of the Judicial Conference. Will the Senator from Nevada point out the various instances? Does the bill provide for the creation of more judgeships than were recommended by the Judicial Conference, or what is the difference between the provisions of the bill and the recommendations of the Judicial Conference? If that point is covered in the Senator's prepared remarks, I shall not insist on the question at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. No, it is not.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Nevada will do so at this time, because the matter is of importance, and I think we should know.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say that the Judicial Conference in dealing with the conditions in Tennessee—and I now hold in my hand the recommendations of the Conference this year—confirmed their recommendation of last year, which I also hold in my hand, as follows:

> Middle district of Tennessee: The creation of one additional district judgeship, with the proviso that the first vacancy occurring in this district shall not be filled.

I shall read that again; this is the recommendation of the Judicial Conference:

> The creation of one additional district judgeship, with the proviso that the first vacancy occurring in this district shall not be filled.

In that instance, the Judicial Conference is dealing with the middle district of Tennessee.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator go one step further, and say whether the amendment I have proposed to the bill follows the recommendation of the Judicial Conference?

Mr. McCARRAN. It does.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nevada a further question? I notice that an amendment is pending to increase the number of judges in the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth and Ninth Circuits. Did the committee give consideration to increasing the judgeships in those districts?

Mr. McCARRAN. We did vote to increase by one the circuit judgeships in the fifth circuit. The committee considered creating two additional judgeships in the ninth circuit, but the matter seemed to the committee one which should receive further study. If the amendment calling for the creation of two additional judgeships for the ninth circuit is offered, I shall express myself when I have to cross that bridge.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I shall await his views with interest.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The distinguished chairman of the committee has referred to the Judicial Conference. Does the Senator have readily at hand a statement of the action the Judicial Conference has taken with reference to the other provisions for judgeships in the bill? My understanding is that the bill provides for the creation of some additional judgeships which were not recommended by the Judicial Conference—for instance, one in Florida.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Judicial Conference recommended the creation of two additional circuit judgeships for the ninth circuit, and I think we largely followed the recommendations of the Judicial Conference.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Are not several additional judgeships provided for in the bill. I think the committee acted wisely in reviewing the statistics and in listening to the testimony of Senators. Does not the bill provide for the creation of several additional judgeships which were not recommended by the Judicial Conference?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; there are some which the record warranted, we believe; and we provided for their creation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to ask a further question of the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As I understand, the Judicial Conference did not consider the question of a roving judge for middle Tennessee and west Tennessee.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall be unable to answer the Senator's question with any degree of authority because I did not have the privilege of attending the Judicial Conference. I was invited to attend the Judicial Conference, as the chairmen of the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate are invited, but I did not have an opportunity to attend the conference either this year or the year before.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. In answer to the Senator's questions, I read from Mr. Chandler's communication, Mr. Chandler being the secretary of the Judicial Conference:

The pending bill provides for the creation of all the judgeships included in previous recommendations of the Judicial Conference which were renewed at the recent annual meeting except two circuit judgeships for the ninth circuit and three permanent district judgeships for the Southern District of New York. The pending bill provides for one permanent additional district judgeship for the Middle and Western Districts of Tennessee, whereas the conference heretofore recommended an additional district judgeship on a temporary basis for the Middle District of Tennessee, and at the recent meeting renewed that recommendation. The pending bill provides for one additional district judgeship for the Southern District of Florida and the Judicial Conference at its recent meeting this week recommended this provision. The pending bill also provides for making permanent the existing temporary judgeship for the Southern District of Texas. The additional district judgeship for the Eastern District of Wisconsin which is now recommended by the Judicial Conference has not heretofore been requested and is not provided for in the pending bill.

That is a communication of date September 28, 1951, addressed to myself.

Mr. President, if I may continue now, I shall conclude my explanation of the bill very shortly. The Judicial Conference of the United States is composed of the senior Federal circuit judges of all the circuits. The conference has a regular meeting once a year, and makes an annual report, including recommendations in the whole field of legislation affecting the Federal judicial system. The provisions of this bill which represent legislative implementation of recommendations by the Judicial Conference constitute by far the major portion of the bill, as I have pointed out; and, in fact, the Judicial Conference has this year reaffirmed its 1950 recommendations, so that it may be said that the Judicial Conference has twice recommended substantially what this bill provides.

Of course, this bill is not intended to be a cure-all for every condition that may need attention; but enactment of this proposed legislation will help to get our judicial system on a firm and healthy footing and keep it there.

As I have stated before, the bill as reported by the committee provides for 1 additional circuit judge and 18 district judges. All of these provisions are dealt with in detail in the committee report.

The committee has carefully gone into each and every one of the provisions of the bill, and has recommended that it be considered favorably. I trust that my colleagues will look with favor upon this proposed legislation, and I herewith recommend the bill to the Senate with the hope that it may be passed speedily.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, in the pending bill there is a committee amendment authorizing a roving judge for North Carolina, for the eastern, middle, and western districts of the State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the desire of the Senator that this amendment be taken up at this time?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I was going to ask that it be disagreed to. There will be no opposition to it, and we could get it out of the way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair may say that the committee amendments are customarily taken up in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I was going to ask unanimous consent that the bill might be read for the committee amendments.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Very well.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask that the bill be read for committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the regular order. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 4, after the comma, to strike out to and through line 3, on page 2, and insert:

One additional circuit judge for the fifth circuit. In order that the table contained in section 44 (a) of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this section in the number of circuit judges for the fifth circuit, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to said circuit:

Circuits	*Number of judges*
* * * * *	
Fifth	7
* * * * *	

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I desire to call up for consideration the amendment which I have on the desk. It is an amendment to the committee amendment, and is offered on behalf of the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. CAIN] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, it is proposed to strike out lines 4 to 11, inclusive, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

One additional circuit judge for the fifth circuit and two additional circuit judges for the ninth circuit. In order that the table contained in section 44 (a) of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the changes made by this section in the number of circuit judges for said circuits, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to said circuits:

Circuits:	*Number of judges*
* * * * *	
Fifth	7
* * * * *	
Ninth	9
* * * * *	

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, this amendment provides two additional circuit judges for the ninth circuit. It is necessary because of the great influx of population into that area. Six million people have moved into the area since 1940, and as a result of that huge increase in population and the legislation which is being enacted in the various States comprising the ninth circuit, the volume of business has grown tremendously. It has always been, of course, a very busy circuit court, because the area comprises seven Western States, all of which are mineral-producing States. They provide a huge amount of litigation connected with the mining industry. Furthermore, there is much litigation in connection with the vast development that is going on in those Western States. It seems to me that no one could object to this proposal, because it is recommended by the Judicial Conference and by the bar association of California and the bar associations of the various States comprising the ninth circuit.

I have a letter from the Chief Judge of the Circuit Court, Mr. William Denman, in which he points out the facts to which I have referred. He says:

This area presents the greatest diversity of litigation of any of the circuits, arising from the diversity of its peoples' cultures, occupations, manufactures, agricultures, fishing, and air, sea, and land transportation—all reflected in new laws from 10 highly productive legislatures.

He further says:

The average for the other circuit judges of the United States is but 45 docketings, that is, each ninth circuit judge has 54 percent more than this average. The history of the productive power of the present 7 judges in this greatest diversity of legal problems shows they are unable to take care of more than the average of docketings for each circuit judge.

The arrearages of the circuit's litigants are the greatest in the history of the court and are increasing daily. The details of the above appear in the accompanying statement.

I ask that the letter and the accompanying statement be printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS,
NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT,
San Francisco, Calif., September 12, 1951.

Re amending Senate bill 1203. The litigants' need for two additional circuit judgeships for the ninth circuit.

Hon. JAMES E MURRAY,
United States Senate, Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR: Since 1940 6,000,000 people have moved into the ninth judicial circuit, consisting of the 7 Western States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the Pacific Islands.

This area presents the greatest diversity of litigation of any of the circuits, arising from the diversity of its peoples' cultures, occupations, manufactures, agricultures, fishing, and air, sea, and land transportation—all reflected in new laws from 10 highly productive legislatures.

The new litigation created by this 6,000,000 added population had its appeals begin to reach our court shortly before July 1, 1950. In the succeeding fiscal year they mounted to 409 and in the last 4 months are coming in at the rate of 489 per annum, that is 69.9 docketings apiece for each of the present 7 judges.

The average for the other circuit judges of the United States is but 45 docketings, that is, each ninth circuit judge has 54 percent more than this average. The history of the productive power of the present seven judges in this greatest diversity of legal problems shows they are unable to take care of more than the average of docketings for each circuit judge.

The arrearages of the circuit's litigants are the greatest in the history of the court and are increasing daily. The details of the above appear in the accompanying statement.

We urge you to aid these litigants and our court by voting to restore to the Senate omnibus judges bill No. 1203, the provision for the two additional judgeships for this ninth circuit as recommended by the Judicial Conference of the United States and by the California State Bar Association.

Very faithfully yours,

WILLIAM DENMAN,
Chief Judge.

THE LITIGANTS' NEED FOR ADDITIONAL JUDGESHIPS FOR THE NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT—STATEMENT ON THEIR BEHALF AND THAT OF NINTH CIRCUIT CONFERENCE BY CHIEF JUDGE WILLIAM DENMAN

The ninth judicial circuit, with the greatest diversification of Federal litigation of all the circuits, which has received the largest 10-year increase in population in the recent history, requires two more judges on its court of appeals.

A. THE STATISTICS OF THE GENERAL INCREASE IN THE NINTH CIRCUIT'S LITIGATION

Your ninth circuit has had the most extraordinary population increase and voluntary population movement in the recent history of the world, and I am saying "in the world" with intent Nothing equals it in volume except the involuntary Russian deportation of the Kulaks from their farms into prison labor in Siberia

Five million two hundred and eighty-one thousand people have come by migration or birth into the ninth circuit in the last 10 years, increasing the population from 11,922,953 in 1940 to 17,204,295 in 1950. This is against a population increase for the remainder of the country of 14,667,573. Excluding the ninth circuit, the decade's increase for the country is 10.9 percent. For the ninth circuit it is 44 3 percent.

Incidentally this mere decade's increase exceeds by 1,350,000 people the total population for the United States when Washington became President. The mere increase is 2⅓ times the total of the people in the ninth circuit in 1891 when its court of appeals was created

The rate is 528,000 a year and it is safe to say that by the time the bill here considered is disposed of by the Congress, the ninth circuit will have had added to it 6,000,000 people since 1941.

It is true that in certain areas of the United States their population produces less litigation and in others more litigation than the average of the whole country. Hence comparison of mere population increase to litigation must be used with caution. However, the ninth circuit increase comes from every walk of life and every income bracket and from every State in the Union. It was reasonable to expect that soon after settlement they would produce something corresponding in an increase in litigation.

On this basis of comparison, the figures given by the statistical section of the Administrative Office show the following: The 5,282,000 increase would produce annually in the trial courts 1,857 civil cases and 1,237 criminal cases, requiring on the average of all the other districts and circuits, 7 5 additional district judges and 2 2 additional circuit judges.

The fact is that the ninth circuit's docketings have had a vastly greater decade's increase than that shown by this anticipatory calculation. This is due in part to the decade's great increase in Federal legislation of a regimentary character. The rest is largely due to outpouring of similar legislation from ten legislatures, seven of the States of Washington, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Nevada, Arizona, and California, two of the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and one of our possessions, Guam.

From all these causes the actual civil docketing in the circuit's trial courts rose gradually in the decade from 3,541 in 1941 to 7,018 in 1950. The decade's increase is 98 percent while that of the remainder of the Nation, excluding the ninth circuit and the District of Columbia, is 39 1 percent. That is to say the ninth circuit rate of increase in civil cases is two and one-half times that of the comparable other nine circuits.

Of far greater importance in determining the burden of appellate courts is the number of cases actually reaching trial in the lower courts, from which appeals arise. In the ninth circuit the number is markedly in excess of the average of the rest of the country. In 1950 the total of civil cases reaching trial in the United States, excluding the ninth circuit, was 5,317. That is 531-plus each for the average of the 10 other circuits The ninth circuit lower courts had 1,222 such trials; that is over 100 percent more than the average of the other circuits. On the same comparison the criminal docketing reaching trial in the ninth circuit's lower courts is greater than the average of the rest of the country by 46 7 percent.

There is a wide divergence of view as to the wisdom of the extent of the Nation's and the States' and Territories' regimentation of the lives of their citizens But so far as concerns the circuit's litigants, they, in the language of Grover Cleveland, are confronted by "a condition and not a theory"

B. NEW JUDGESHIPS RECENTLY CREATED CAUSE INCREASE IN APPEALS

So far as concerns the district courts in the ninth circuit's States and Territories, Congress has responded fully to our need, save in the third division of Alaska and in Arizona. In the 3 years preceding the last decade, it gave the circuit two new judgeships, in the last decade seven more, and in this year another one for Guam However, five of these judgeships were created in August 1949, and one in 1950, and none of the positions filled until 1950 and 1951, hence the impact of the appeals from their decisions is not reaching us until the 1951 fiscal year

C. THE NEED OF THE LITIGANTS OF THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT FOR TWO MORE CIRCUIT JUDGES, BECAUSE OF THE BURDEN OF ITS GREATEST VARIETY OF CASES AND ITS INCREASED AND CERTAINLY INCREASING CASE LOAD

The Judicial Conference of the United States and the California State Bar Association have recommended to Congress the creation of these two circuit judgeships. The decade's increase of 44 percent of its population and 98 percent in docketings in the lower courts, such docketing producing 100 percent more trials than the country's average, has been described above It is from this source that the court of appeals receives the burden.

When we consider the number of circuit judges to all the trial judges, including those of the Territories and dependencies, producing the litigation from which appeals arise, the comparison of the ninth circuit to the rest of the country is more striking Omitting the ninth circuit, as of 1950 the rest of the country had 58 circuit judges taking appeals from 187 trial judges; that is 1 circuit judge for 3 22 trial judges For the ninth circuit the 7 judges take appeals from 37 trial judges or 1 appellate judge for 5.28 trial judges. That is to say, the ninth circuit's circuit judges take appeals from over 60 percent more trial judges than the rest of the country.

We have had seven circuit judges since June 1937. Since that time the number of district judges of the 9 States and Territories has risen from 27 to 37, an increase of 37 percent. As seen, six of these were not appointed until the fiscal year 1950 and the impact of the appeals from their decisions is just beginning to reach us.

Our docketing in the fiscal year 1951 was 409. In the last 4 months it has risen to the rate of 489 per annum or a case load of 69 9 per judge, against an average in 1951 of all the circuit judges of the country of but 45. For each ninth circuit judge, this is 54 percent more than the country's average. On these figures the ninth circuit should have at least the two judges recommended by the conference

As of today, the ninth circuit's appellant litigants are suffering under the greatest arrearages of cases at issue and to be tried, and cases submitted and not decided, since we have had seven judges. Our court has the longest period of pendency of litigation of any of the nine other comparable circuits.

D. THE GREATEST DIVERSITY OF LEGAL PROBLEMS IN THE NINTH CIRCUIT

Apart from the burden shown by the statistics is a more cogent reason why the circuit's litigants should have these added circuit judges. The ninth circuit judges have greatest diversity of character of legal questions Ten of the Nation's most vigorous State and Territorial legislatures are pouring out their reforming and regimentary laws with which its circuit judges are confronted, while the average for the remaining nine comparable circuits is but four and one-half legislatures. In this respect the ninth circuit has double the load to carry

When the character of the legislation is examined, its burden is much greater These laws flow from the people in Alaska, in the frigid zone, down the Pacific coast and Mountain States from Canada to Mexico and out to Hawaii and to Guam, both in the Tropics with an infusion of Asiatic and South Pacific people The difference in climate, terrain, and races creates the greatest diversity of political and social relationships Its vast and varied areas from its mineralized and forested mountains through its rich valleys to the Pacific and out in its islands have their equally varied agriculture, including pineapple and sugarcane, citrus and deciduous fruit orchards, cattle raising, lumber mills, mines and oil fields, irrigation under the inherited Spanish law, water-power plants supplying all kinds of manufacturing enterprises, land transportation and world maritime commerce, each producing its kind of litigation

While all the above may sound like the literary outpourings of a chamber of commerce secretary, for the ninth circuit litigants and its courts it is the exact truth Its burden in variety of law and volume of cases is more than the litigants' present circuit judges are able to master and the recommendations of the Judicial Conference and the California State Bar Association for two additional judges are amply warranted

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, with reference to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana, I may say the State of Montana is embraced in the ninth circuit. There is no question that there has been a terrific influx of population into the Pacific Coast States. There is no question that the workload in the ninth circuit is exceedingly heavy.

Of the seven judges now on the bench in the ninth circuit, four are from one State, three of them from other States. The States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Arizona, and Nevada, together with the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, are comprised in the ninth circuit.

Speaking for myself only in this matter, the reason the chairman did not favor two additional judges for the ninth circuit was that he could not secure any understanding at all that the other

States of the ninth circuit would be recognized for membership on that bench.

I have nothing whatever against the State of California. I am very happy to be in a neighboring State of the great State of California. I admire the bench and bar of California, which are among the best in the Nation. But I think the other States which comprise that great region should be represented by membership on the Ninth Circuit Court. For that reason, I thought it best that we bring up the matter by a bill separate unto itself.

I shall not oppose the amendment. I hope that the spirit in which the amendment may be adopted, if it be adopted, will be recognized by the appointive power, those who select judges for the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I agree with the views of the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill. I think it is recognized by everyone that the Western States are constantly increasing in population. My own State of Montana during the past 2 years has increased in population as the result of the industrial development occurring there, including the development of public power and various industries that are being established there. The same is true of the other States and Territories that are included in that area. It seems to me that the States other than California which are not represented in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals should have some consideration in connection with the filling of these judicial positions.

Montana has always been a great mining State. A tremendous volume of very important mining litigation has arisen in the State, some of which has gone to the Supreme Court, and resulted in leading cases in mining law. The same is true of other Western States with regard to reclamation and industrial problems of various kinds. So it seems to me that there should be on the bench men coming from some of the other States in that district who are versed in mining law, in reclamation law, resources development, and in other subjects which are of great importance to western growth and development.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to say in further connection with the amendment that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee is not interested from the standpoint of his own personal interest, because the State of Nevada, which I represent, has a judge on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. But the other States, the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and Arizona, and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, should certainly be recognized by the appointment of a judge on that bench.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana is recommended by the Judicial Conference. It was not put into the bill by the committee for the reasons which I have stated. I hope the spirit in which it may be now inserted in the bill on the floor of the Senate will be recognized, and will be considered by the appointive power when it comes to considering appointments to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to say that my junior colleague from California and myself are supporting the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana because we believe that the tremendous growth which has taken place in the ninth circuit justifies additional judges in that circuit, and I hope the amendment will be accepted by the able chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am entirely content, so far as I have the authority to do so, to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. As one of the cosponsors of the amendment, I believe the case in support of adding two judges to the ninth circuit is clear and positive. I wish, however, to be strongly associated with the observations just made by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

It appears to be the case that a majority of the ninth circuit judges have been appointed from one State, and that nearly all of the present judges come from one political party. It is bad for the health of the judiciary and for justice when any circuit becomes lopsided as to geography and politics. These considerations should be before the President when he appoints the two new judges to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is also associated with the other Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] in proposing the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana for himself and other Senators to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning in line 15, on page 2 it is proposed to strike out "one additional district judge for the District of Connecticut."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 17, to strike out "two" and insert "one."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on line 18, page 2, to strike out "judges" and insert "judge."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 22, page 2, to strike out "three additional district judges for the southern district of New York."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 2, line 23, to insert "one district judge for the eastern, middle, and western districts of North Carolina."

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, at the time the committee placed that amendment in the bill, the senior Senator from North Carolina and I thought it was probably the proper way to take care of the situation in North Carolina. There are three district judges in our State. The committee amendment provides for a roving judge for the three districts.

Upon further reflection and after making some further studies, although such studies are not complete, we have found that since 1940 the number of pending civil cases in the eastern district has risen from 119 to 267, or more than 100 percent.

In the middle district for the same period the figure has risen from 65 to 101, or more than 50 percent. In addition, there has been no progress in reducing the backlog of cases in any district, and in the eastern and middle districts there has been a considerable increase in the backlog of cases pending, to the extent of approximately 100 percent since 1940.

On the criminal side, the cases per judge for the eastern district amount to 730 as against the national average of 169 in 1950. For the same year the criminal cases per judge in the middle district were 454 as against the national average of 169, and in the western district for the same year the figure is 392 as against 169 for the national average.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is apparent that an additional judge is needed in North Carolina; but on further reflection we have reached the conclusion, that is to say, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] and I, that this is not the proper way to accomplish the objective, and, therefore, we feel that it would be better to delete the amendment from the pending bill in order that we may have an opportunity to make a further investigation and study to the end that we may recommend the passage of a bill which will more nearly fill the needs of our State. That means that we shall have to canvass and study the various counties in the various districts, since a tremendous increase in business of more than 100 percent has occurred in one district and more than 50 percent in another.

Therefore, Mr. President, I request that the committee amendment be disagreed to, the effect of which will be to eliminate North Carolina for the present with respect to an additional judge.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, so far as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee has authority to do so, I accept the suggestion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 23, inserting the words "one district judge for the

eastern, middle, and western districts of North Carolina," and to strike out lines 13 to 15, on page 5, of the bill.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I also ask that the committee amendment on page 5, lines 13 to 15, be disagreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment referred to by the Senator from North Carolina is rejected.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to line 19 on page 2 of the bill. The reason for that is that I am advised by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that he desires the deletion on lines 19 and 20 of the words "one additional district judge for the northern district of Georgia" That being true, I would move to delete that language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada moves to delete language on lines 19 and 20 of page 2 of the bill

Mr. McCARRAN. It would also mean the deletion of the language in lines 19 and 20 on page 4

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That language in the table would be deleted if the Senator's motion is agreed to.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to delete certain language in lines 19 and 20 on page 2

The motion was agreed to

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the corresponding change will be made in the table on page 4, that is the language in lines 19 and 20 on page 4 in the table will be deleted.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 1, after "Ohio", it is proposed to insert the words "one additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was, on page 3, line 3, to strike out the words "one additional district judge for the middle district of" and insert the words "one district judge for the middle and western districts of."

The PRESIDING OFFICER Without objection——

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

Mr. McCARRAN. This is Tennessee now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Tennessee is ready to vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this is a rather remarkable case in many of its aspects. Three years ago our district judge at Nashville was stricken with heart trouble and was sick for some time, and fell behind with his work, only because of his illness. He was a splendid judge. He is a splendid man. Therefore it was found necessary to introduce a bill. Both Senators from Tennessee introduced bills to create an additional judgeship for Tennessee. Not a word was said about west Tennessee in either bill. If I remember correctly, the bills were substantially the same. A very large amount of evidence was taken on those bills. The lawyers of middle Tennessee are overwhelmingly for the bills as introduced by both Senators. Both Senators were present when the hearings were had. There was not then raised any question of the kind which has since been raised.

As is usual in such cases the suggestion regarding this additional judgeship was first presented to what is called the Judicial Conference of the United States, and after a full and careful examination, the Judicial Conference recommended that an additional judgeship in Middle Tennessee should be provided for. Neither bill was passed at that time.

The next year the senior Senator from Tennessee introduced a bill, and the junior Senator from Tennessee announced that he thought he would introduce a bill for the same purpose again, but upon examination it was found that he had not introduced such a bill. He testified in the case. He said it made little difference with him whether there was a roving judge for west Tennessee or whether, if any one of the three judges got behind with his work, a judge would be assigned to the district where he was needed, as had been done before, as all of us who are lawyers, know

Up to that time, Mr. President, the record shows that not a single solitary word of any kind had been spoken or mentioned about a roving judge I do not remember the exact dates, but probably a year or 2 years had elapsed before anything was said about a roving judge. I believe it was mentioned at the last hearing. Remember, all the lawyers from middle Tennessee had been present at the hearings. The subject had gotten the greatest notoriety, but nothing was said about a roving judge until, I believe it was, the last hearing, or the last hearing but one, when my colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee stated that he wanted a roving judge for west Tennessee. He was asked his reason, and his reply was that west Tennessee had increased in population. That is true. Tennessee had not gained a new Representative in Congress, I am sorry to say, but its population had increased.

Now mind you, Mr. President, not a single word had been said about a roving judge up to that time. The junior Senator from Tennessee testified he thought it would be perhaps a little better to have a roving judge, though he did not think it would make much difference. That is his testimony. I wanted to know why a roving judge was wanted. A roving judge can be appointed from any part of the State or any part of the district in which judgeships are created. But a roving judge cannot be appointed for west Tennessee from middle Tennessee, unless the words "roving judge" are used, or words to that effect.

I asked the junior Senator from Tennessee if he had heard from anyone in west Tennessee asking that a roving judge be appointed. The record is open to anyone. It was rather a roving answer. Indeed, I thought the answer was very roving. He said that in his opinion a roving judge should be created because of the increase in population. I do not recall that theory ever having been advanced before. As I told him at the time, it seemed to me like a case of politics. Someone wanted a judge appointed from west Tennessee, but a judge could not be appointed from west Tennessee unless he were a roving judge.

This is the testimony on one side—the testimony of one single witness. It is true that since the last hearing the junior Senator from Tennessee has been quite active in obtaining views from certain lawyers in west Tennessee. They were asked if they did not want a roving judge. Indeed, things became so active that while the Memphis Bar Association had well nigh unanimously expressed its opinion in favor of a judgeship for middle Tennessee, making the statement that a judge for west Tennessee was not necessary or desirable at that time because the judge was up with his docket and no cases were behind, that evidence did not seem to weigh with the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee who is the junior Senator from our State.

Let me explain what I mean by "middle Tennessee," "west Tennessee," and "east Tennessee" I am using those terms as though Senators knew how our State is divided. There is a sort of natural subdivision of the State. That part of the State east of the Great Smoky Mountains, which are a part of the Alleghenies, is called east Tennessee. Between the mountains on the east and the Tennessee River on the west is the area called middle Tennessee. By the way, contrary to what one might expect, that river flows north through Tennessee. It dips down into Alabama and Mississippi, and then comes back and forms the boundary line between west Tennessee and middle Tennessee. That part of our State between the mountains and the Tennessee River is called middle Tennessee. That part of the State between the Tennessee River and the Mississippi River, which flows in nearly exactly the opposite direction, forms west Tennessee. Those distinctions have been observed from the beginning of our Tennessee history.

Let us see for a moment about west Tennessee. I told the junior Senator from Tennessee, when he first brought the matter up, that I had never heard of a single solitary person in west Tennessee who wanted an additional judge. If there were a chance to get another judge there, the people in that district might be expected to want one. But not a single soul had ever written me on the subject. I challenged the junior Senator from Tennessee to say whether he had ever received a single request from west Tennessee for the appointment of a roving judge. I would not say that he beat around the bush.

The record is there. It speaks for itself. However, he answered with considerable hesitation. He stated that he had received a letter, or letters, which he could read into the record. I said, "Read them into the record." I am a great believer in reading things into the record. I asked that the letter or letters be read into the record, and at my request the junior Senator from Tennessee very kindly read a letter.

What, Mr. President, do you suppose that letter was about? It was not about a roving judge at all. The letter was a petition. While it was in the form of a letter it was really a petition from a very excellent young lawyer—I am not sure that he is a young lawyer, because time passes so rapidly as we become older; but he is a lawyer at Dyersburg, Tenn., which is in the western part of the State. The letter was not in the form of a request for a roving judge at all. It asked the junior Senator from Tennessee to use his mighty influence to have a judicial district created in west Tennessee, like the one we have at Jackson. That was the subject of the letter. There was not a word in it about a roving judge. This lawyer merely wanted a judgeship. The letter mentioned the judge whom the writer wanted to hold court. It was Judge Boyd, a distinguished and able judge in west Tennessee. There was not one word about a roving judge.

Since that time I understand that the junior Senator has received two or three other letters—perhaps half a dozen. I have not counted them, but there are not many. The other day he stated that he had not applied to anyone for letters of that kind. It developed that not only had the Bar Association at Memphis, Tenn., been applied to, but that after it had expressed itself against a roving judge, it again considered the question at the request of the junior Senator from Tennessee. The second time it turned down the application.

Let us see what the proof is on the other side. The Judicial Conference, whose duty it is to pass upon just such a matter, came to the conclusion that a temporary judge was needed.

Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered reads: "One additional district judge (the first vacancy in which office shall not be filled) for the middle district of" Tennessee. It is a very simple amendment. It is what the people of middle Tennessee want and what the judicial conference wants.

There are three Federal judges, one for each district in Tennessee, and two circuit judges, Judge Hicks and Judge Martin.

Inasmuch as Judge Martin was appointed district judge and held that office for some years before he was appointed circuit judge, I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate to read just what the situation is in Tennessee. The letter is addressed to me. I inquired of him. I was not ashamed to ask about the district judgeship situation when it came up in my State. Of course, I asked about it. Judge Martin writes:

In reply to your inquiry as to whether in my opinion there is necessity for a roving judgeship to include the western district of Tennessee, I desire to express the emphatic opinion that there is not.

With your strong endorsement—

Of course, he is wrong about that, because my endorsement is not strong—

I had the honor to be appointed and to serve as United States district judge for west Tennessee from May 8, 1935, to September 16, 1940.

This is a man who is not judging things by population. This man was born and reared there. I remember when John D. Martin was not as tall as some of the fine-looking page boys I see before me.

I repeat a little from the letter:

I had the honor to be appointed and to serve as United States district judge for west Tennessee from May 8, 1935, to September 16, 1940, when, again with your endorsement, I was appointed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, on which court I have continuously served to this date.

Someone may say—and I am sure my friend the junior Senator from Tennessee, will say—that politics is involved; that I appointed this man. Well, I had recommended Judge Boyd, too. Of course I recommended Judge Martin. But the law gave me that right, and I am not ashamed of recommending him. I exercised my right.

The letter continues:

When I went on the district bench in 1935 I found a heavily congested docket, including more than 400 war risk insurance cases. By holding daily sessions, including Saturdays, and 70 night sessions, I was able to bring this calendar to currency within 14 months, during which time I had also served by designation for 3 weeks at Louisville, Ky. I was able to keep the docket current during the full period of my incumbency and to serve additionally for several months in other districts, including 9 weeks on the TVA trial at Chattanooga; several sessions with Judges Gore and Taylor on land condemnation at Knoxville, another period at Louisville; several weeks at Columbus, Ohio; and a month or so in the southern district of Mississippi. When I went off the district bench there was no more current district in the 84 districts of the United States. We were trying cases in all departments of our jurisdiction within 30 to 90 days of the filing of the action or the indictment.

My successor—

Here comes the real meat of this case—

My successor, Judge Marion F. Boyd, by zealous, diligent and continuous service, has kept the docket in a completely current condition, as the official statistics of the administrative office will show.

I stop in the reading long enough to say that not only does Judge Martin make that statement, but Judge Hicks makes the same statement. Incidentally, I am sometimes charged with being a partisan. I am a Democrat, and I am proud of it. However, I recommended Judge Xen Hicks, who is a good Republican, for the office he holds, and he has made an excellent judge. If there was any politics about that appointment, I never knew it. There may be politics as the junior Senator from Tennessee views it; he may find politics in it; but he cannot find half as much politics in that as I find in his desire to take in west Tennessee under the peculiar circumstances of this case. The only way it can be explained, Mr. President, is that someone in west Tennessee wants the judgeship and the junior Senator from Tennessee wants to indorse him for it.

It is true he said he did not expect to have a person he recommended appointed. He may have gone further than that; he may have said that he would not expect to have a person he recommended appointed if I would make an agreement about it However, I do not make agreements about such things. I think the suggestion should be turned down.

I continue to read from Judge Martin's letter:

Because of the long continued illness of Judge Davies, a situation developed in middle Tennessee which required attention, as the cases were piling up. Dale Hollow and Center Hill projects near Cookeville brought many land condemnation suits which the Government and the landowners were unable to settle.

By the way, Mr. President, both those places are in middle Tennessee.

I read further from Judge Martin's letter:

So, by designation of Judge Hicks, last summer I went to Cookeville and held six extended daily sessions each week for 5 weeks and tried 57 condemnation cases to juries and one case in which the jury was waived

I am reading from the letter of Judge Martin, Mr. President. He is a circuit judge for the Sixth Circuit. However, the fact that he is a circuit judge does not mean that he is above trying law suits. He does try law suits. The junior Senator from Tennessee talked a great deal during the recent fracas in Tennessee, as well as in other parts of the United States, in regard to crime. If he had brought any of his law suits before Judge Martin or any of these other judges, the suits would have been tried long before this. As a matter of fact, I do not know whether they have been tried by now. I have not seen any word in the newspapers to the effect that they have been tried, although I hope they have been, for any man who violates a law should be tried.

Judge Martin in his letter states that he tried 57 condemnation cases. We lawyers know what that means. That is not child's play; it is work. All lawyers know that. That is a place for work and for a working lawyer.

Judge Martin goes on to say in his letter:

Judge Chandler of Oklahoma gave about a month's time at Nashville and cleaned up the criminal calendar in the summer of 1950.

He did that because of the trouble with the docket in middle Tennessee. However, there is not a word about west Tennessee. Why? Because west Tennessee was not behind a single case, but was up with the docket. I happen to remember something about the matter, not only from personal presence, but also because one of the first cases I ever tried

in the circuit court of appeals was before Circuit Judge William Howard Taft, at Memphis, when he came there to clear up the docket at Memphis.

By the way, Mr. President, if the Senate will pardon me for a minute, let me say that I thought Judge Taft was a fine judge, too. He decided that case in my favor. Indeed, he had two cases, and he decided both of them in my favor. I conceded beyond question that he was a most able judge. He was also one of the most delightful characters God ever made.

I read further from Judge Martin's letter.

Subsequently, the Judicial Council of the United States, composed of the chief justice and the chief judges of all the circuits, made the recommendation to Congress of an additional judge for middle Tennessee to be included in the so-called judicial omnibus bill—

Which is the bill that is before us now—

now pending in the Senate. The inclusion of the western district of Tennessee was not recommended

Mr. President, it has never been recommended officially by any human soul, except one, and that is the junior Senator from Tennessee. Incidentally, the proof in that connection is not in the record. Since the record was closed, that proof has been taken in an effort to bolster up this peculiar kind of transaction. Surely, Mr. President, we have not come to the time when judges are selected in such a way.

Here and now I want to call on my colleague to withdraw his objection to this amendment. He is the only person in Tennessee who favors the particular form of the bill that he recommends, unless he has induced someone else to endorse it. The judges do not want it. The bar associations do not want it, although I believe the junior Senator from Tennessee did get the bar association in Haywood County or some other county to endorse his proposal. I know all the counties of Tennessee by name; I learned them from beginning to end 35 years ago, and I can repeat them to this day. I think it was the bar association in Haywood County that endorsed the proposal of the junior Senator from Tennessee. If he has the endorsement of some other bar association, he probably has gotten it since that time. I think the Bar Association of Haywood County wants a roving judge appointed, so they said.

I read further from Judge Martin's letter:

As a former judge of the western district of Tennessee and now as a member of the Sixth Circuit Judicial Council and, as such, a supervisor of the work of the district courts, I can unhesitatingly state that there is no need for an additional district judge for this district.

Mr. President, Judge Hicks, who belongs to a different party, has in the record a letter or a telegram, I believe—I wish to be accurate—in which he says there is no necessity for an additional district judge for that district.

The bar of Memphis officially have said there is no need for it.

My heavens, Mr. President! If there were a chance for an appointment of this sort to go to one of the many fine lawyers in Memphis—and some of the best lawyers in the world live there; I know, because I have had experience with them; I have fought with them, and I know what kind of men they are—one of them would be delighted to wind up his career by being appointed to a judgeship of this sort.

Mr. President, I have only a little more to say about this matter.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter from Judge Martin, to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS,
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT,
MICHIGAN-OHIO-KENTUCKY-TENNESSEE,
August 22, 1951

Hon KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senator,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR. In reply to your inquiry as to whether in my opinion there is necessity for a roving judgeship to include the western district of Tennessee, I desire to express the emphatic opinon that there is not

With your strong endorsement, I had the honor to be appointed and to serve as United States District Judge for West Tennessee from May 8, 1935 to September 16, 1940, when again with your endorsement I was appointed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, on which court I have continuously served to this date

When I went on the district bench in 1935, I found a heavily congested docket, including more than 400 war-risk insurance cases. By holding daily sessions, including Saturdays, and 70 night sessions, I was able to bring this calendar to currency within 14 months, during which time I had also served by designation for 3 weeks at Louisville, Ky. I was able to keep the docket current during the full period of my incumbency and to serve additionally for several months in other district, including 9 weeks on the TVA trial at Chattanooga; several sessions with Judges Gore and Taylor on land condemnations at Knoxville; another period at Louisville; several weeks at Columbus, Ohio; and a month in the southern district of Mississippi. When I vacated the district bench, there was no more current district in the 84th district of the United States. We were trying cases in all departments of our jurisdiction within 30 to 90 days of the filing of the action or the indictment.

My successor, Judge Marion S. Boyd, by zealous, diligent, and continuous service, has kept the docket in a completely current condition, as the official statistics of the administrative office will show.

Because of the long continued illness of Judge Davies, a situation developed in middle Tennessee which required attention, as the cases were piling up. Dale Hollow and Center Hill projects near Cookeville brought many land condemnation suits which the Government and the land owners were unable to settle. So, by designation of Chief Judge Hicks, last summer I went to Cookeville and held six extended daily sessions each week for 5 weeks and tried 57 condemnation cases to juries and one case in which the jury was waived. Judge Chandler of Oklahoma gave about a month's time at Nashville and cleaned up the criminal calendar in the summer of 1950, and Judge Leslie Darr of the eastern district of Tennessee also, from time to time, gave additional aid to the middle district. But, inasmuch as Judge Davies continued to be partially disabled and could not hold long session hours, the Judicial Council for the Sixth Circuit recommended the creation of an additional judgeship for the middle district of Tennessee. Subsequently, the Judicial Council of the United States, composed of the Chief Justice and the Chief Judges of all the circuits, made the recommendation to Congress of an additional judge for middle Tennessee to be included in the so-called judicial omnibus bill now pending in the Senate. The inclusion of the western district of Tennessee was not recommended.

As a former judge of the western district of Tennessee and now as a member of the Sixth Circuit Judicial Council and, as such, a supervisor of the work of the district courts, I can unhesitatingly state that there is no need for an additional district judge for this district. The incumbent, Hon. Marion S Boyd, has asked for no help except in a case now and then in which he disqualified himself for good reason. Moreover, he has served in other districts most graciously when designated to do so by the Chief Judge of the circuit.

In my humble judgment, the creation of district judgeships with overlapping jurisdiction is not wise public policy, except when both districts served are in real need of a regular extra judge, which is not the case in the western district of Tennessee. In a single-judge district, the established policy of the judge with respect to extent of punishment of the guilty and the exercise of probation in the broad judicial discretion vested in the judge produces a uniformity which does not exist where another judge has like jurisdiction in the district. Of course, in the large cities, of necessity there is plurality of district judges and, in consequence, a lack of uniformity in the imposition of criminal punishment This is unfortunate, but unavoidable in big cities under the present system of jurisdiction; but there is no necessity to bring about a lack of uniformity where an additional district judge is not needed

Furthermore, the matter of allowance of fees in bankruptcy and receiverships has brought disparity among individual judges; and, as a practical matter in the administration of justice, the creation of a roving judgeship where not needed would tend to lead to clashes between the two judges as to which will try certain types of cases, applications for injunctions would be presented to the particular judge whom the applicant's attorney chooses to select; and unpleasantness may come about in the appointment of court officials

None of the ideas expressed herein is theoretical; all are based on practical observation I should not have felt free to volunteer my personal views, but am responding freely and frankly to your request.

With warmest personal regards, as always,
Sincerely your friend,
JOHN D. MARTIN.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Judge Martin unhesitatingly is opposed to a roving judgeship. The two other judges in Tennessee—one a district judge, and one a circuit judge—have also written to me saying unhesitatingly that they are against it. The only person who is really and truly in favor of it is Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

Mr. President, I wish to put another telegram into the RECORD. It is from Judge Marion Boyd. No better man than Judge Boyd has ever been made The junior Senator from Tennessee admit-

ted that he even went to school with Judge Marion Boyd, and admitted that Judge Boyd is a man of fine character and a man who will tell the truth. Judge Boyd said they do not need an additional judge; he said there is no necessity for an additional judge; he said that the docket was not a case behind.

Mr. President, do you know what was done? Someone—I do not know who it was; I do not know whether it was the FBI; I have not looked into the matter yet, but I will do so—now has charged, without having a shred of evidence or truth to go on, that the trouble is that Judge Boyd sometime in the future may need an assistant. Are we going to appoint judges for such a reason as that? There may come a time when each of these judges might encounter a little difficulty in connection with some case, and might need assistance; but is that the way we are to make provision for judgeships? I do not believe it. I simply do not believe it. Mr. President, think of it. The evidence given by lawyers in Nashville and in middle Tennessee is all on the other side. If there is a lawyer who has taken a contrary view, I have never seen his testimony. If there is such evidence, it has been carefully concealed, and I have not seen it. The judicial conference is unanimously opposed to a roving judgeship. The people of west Tennessee are opposed to it. What is the reason for urging it? I have been in the Senate a long time, and this question has intrigued me somewhat. I wonder what in the name of heaven has caused my distinguished colleague to want a roving judge for west Tennessee, when the people of west Tennessee themselves do not want a roving judge.

Mr. President, I have stated the facts. I have taken longer than I had intended; I am sorry. I had thought of comparing the proposal with our throwing money away on other things, but I shall not do that. We throw money away on many projects, but we have not thrown any away on roving judges, and I hope that we may never throw our money away for the purpose of having stand-by judges who may be necessary once a year or once every 10 years. I do not know what such a judge would do. Take a man like myself: I am a workingman. I do not know what I would do if I had nothing to do except to try a case when Judge Boyd was absent from his court in west Tennessee.

Mr. President, officially and personally, I ask Senators to vote in favor of this amendment, which would mean that we would have no roving judge in Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Butler, Nebr.	Cordon
Bennett	Cain	Dirksen
Benton	Carlson	Douglas
Brewster	Case	Duff
Bricker	Chavez	Dworshak
Bridges	Clements	Eastland
Butler, Md.	Connally	Ecton
Ellender	Kefauver	Neely
Ferguson	Kilgore	Pastore
Flanders	Knowland	Robertson
Frear	Langer	Russell
Fulbright	Lehman	Saltonstall
George	Lodge	Schoeppel
Gillette	Magnuson	Smathers
Green	Malone	Smith, Maine
Hayden	Martin	Smith, N. J.
Hendrickson	Maybank	Smith, N. C.
Hennings	McCarran	Sparkman
Hickenlooper	McClellan	Stennis
Hill	McFarland	Taft
Hoey	McKellar	Thye
Holland	McMahon	Underwood
Hunt	Millikin	Watkins
Ives	Monroney	Welker
Jenner	Moody	Wiley
Johnson, Colo.	Morse	Williams
Johnson, Tex.	Mundt	Young
Johnston, S. C.	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. KEFAUVER obtained the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the senior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Judicial Conference recommended that an additional judge be appointed for the eastern district of Wisconsin, which has probably the heaviest load in the United States. I have talked to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and members of the committee and they are willing that the bill be amended accordingly. I realize that it is a little bit unusual, but I now ask unanimous consent that my amendment be considered at this time without consuming additional time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I beg the Senator's pardon and I beg the pardon of the Senate. My attention was diverted to another matter for the moment. Will the Senator kindly restate his request?

Mr. WILEY. My unanimous-consent request deals with the appointment of an additional judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin. My amendment would amend the original bill, in accordance with the recommendation of the Judicial Conference and in accordance with the facts and the equities of the case, as the chairman of the committee knows.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say, Mr. President, that the Judicial Conference, at its 1951 meeting, just about 10 days ago, recommended what the Senator from Wisconsin is offering in his amendment. The only question I have in mind now is that we are on the committee amendments. I take it the Senator wants to bring up his amendment out of order.

Mr. WILEY. Yes. I ask unanimous consent to bring it up out of order.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none. The amendment presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, it is proposed to strike out the word "and" in line 7, and before the period in line 8 to insert a comma and the following: "and one additional district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin."

On page 6, it is proposed to strike out line 21 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Wisconsin:
Eastern 2

* * * * * *

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement showing the facts in connection with the amendment may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WILEY REGARDING AMENDMENT PROVIDING FOR APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

The purpose of this amendment is to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

The origin of this amendment is as follows: Between September 24 and September 26 the Judicial Conference of the United States met and came to certain conclusions with regard to the need for various additional judges in various districts of the United States. Certain of these conclusions merely reaffirmed previous Conference decisions which had already been conveyed to the Senate and House Judiciary Committees. On the other hand, one of the new conclusions arrived at by the Judicial Conference was that the heavy workload in the eastern district of Wisconsin necessitated the appointment of an additional Federal district judge there.

Going back a step further, the creation of the judgeship had been recommended previously by the circuit council for the seventh circuit. This council consists of the court of appeals for that circuit, Chief Judge J. Earl Major, of Springfield, Ill.; Judge Otto Kerner, of Chicago, Ill.; Judge F. Ryan Duffy, of Milwaukee, Wis.; Judge Philip J. Finnegan, of Chicago, Ill.; Judge Walter C. Lindley, of Danville, Ill; and Judge H. Nathan Swaim, of Indianapolis, Ind.

The action of the circuit council had been presented to the Conference by Judge Major and favorable action was taken on the basis of that recommendation.

Immediately on learning of this recommendation last week, I contacted the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in the Supreme Court Building, and in particular the Chief of the Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics, Mr. Will Shafroth, for additional information to confirm or deny the recommendation. Mr. Shafroth sent to me a complete statistical statement proving the serious and unavoidable congestion of civil cases in the eastern district of Wisconsin—whose work is now handled by only one judge, the Honorable Robert E. Tehan. Indeed there is such a tremendous civil case load there that there was very considerable excess of cases filed in 1950 and 1951 over the cases terminated in those years. The civil case load per judge in that district is much higher than the case load per judge on the national average for all the districts of the United States. The clerk of district recorded that as of June 30, 1951, there were 126 civil cases then pending which had been at issue for more than 6 months. Forty-two of these cases were reported as having been ready for trial for at

least 6 months but had not been reached because the court was not able to hear them.

I will not at this time attempt to take the time of the Senate to present the entire statistical statement. Suffice it to say that in my judgment the statistics amply prove the necessity for the additional judgeship. Before making this recommendation I had contacted legal authorities in the State of Wisconsin who, I believe, are best familiar with this situation, and they confirmed the recommendations of the Judicial Conference.

This amendment which I am offering at this time is, I understand, acceptable to my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee. I should therefore like to call it up for action at this point.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words with respect to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Several days ago, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I received a letter from the Administrative Office of the United States Courts dated September 28, 1951, in which, as has been stated by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Judicial Conference of the United States at its meeting held on September 24, 25, and 26 recommended that there be created an additional district judgeship for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

Pursuant to that communication I was furnished by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts the statistical tables relating to the business of that district, and, as has been stated by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, the statistics indicate the need for this additional judgeship. As an example, an examination of the statistics shows that in the eastern district of Wisconsin in the year 1948 there were commenced 148 civil cases, and by 1951 that figure had risen to 259. In 1948 there were pending 129 civil cases, and in 1951 that figure had risen to 278. The statistics show, for example, that where there is a national average of cases commenced per judge of 204, in the eastern district of Wisconsin this figure is 259 per judge.

I offer these figures in addition to those submitted by the senior Senator from Wisconsin to bear out his recommendation, and on the basis of my understanding relating to the situation in this district I am glad to join in the request that the amendment submitted by the senior Senator from Wisconsin be considered favorably.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Nevada, chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the pending question, which is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to the committee amendment on page 3, line 4.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment on page 3, line 4, it is proposed to insert: "One additional district judge (the first vacancy in which office shall not be filled) for the middle district of."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the original bill provided for a permanent district judge for the middle district of Tennessee. The bill as amended and reported by the Judiciary Committee provides for a roving judge to sit in middle Tennessee and west Tennessee. The amendment offered by the senior Senator from Tennessee provides for a judge for middle Tennessee, with the proviso that the first vacancy shall not be filled.

Mr. President, I am here to defend, support, and speak in behalf of the position of the Committee on the Judiciary, which position was taken not only once, but twice. So far as I know, there was no dissenting vote in the Judiciary Committee on either of those two occasions, with respect to the position which I am presenting, which is the position of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The subject was first considered during this session of Congress at a committee hearing on May 17. Thereafter, on July 30, the committee unanimously agreed to my amendment for a roving judge between the two districts, middle Tennessee and west Tennessee. The reporting of the bill was held up while the chairman of the committee was making a laudable effort to adjust the differences with respect to the Tennessee judgeships. On August 17 another hearing was held, at which time the pros and cons were gone into. On August 20 the question was again submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary, which at that time reaffirmed its former position, which is the position I am now defending.

Throughout all these proceedings I have tried not to engage in personalities, but only to consider the question on the merits of the issue. That is all I ask here today. This is not a political question so far as I am concerned. The merits of the situation in the two districts amply justify the position which has been taken by the Committee on the Judiciary on two occasions.

This matter is important to the lawyers of middle Tennessee and west Tennessee, to the judiciary generally, and to litigants. However, it is not a question which should be occupying a great deal of the time of the Senate, particularly at this late hour. These questions, in my opinion—and I think most Members of the Senate will agree—are questions which should be settled by the Committee on the Judiciary, because they involve statistics; they involve case loads, they involve the amount of work, and the condition of the docket—questions which cannot be gone into in detail on the floor of the Senate. If the Committee on the Judiciary, after considering the facts, as they have been considered, had decided the issue in favor of the position taken by the senior Senator from Tennessee, I certainly would not be here on the floor of the Senate trying to upset the position of the Committee on the Judiciary, which has peculiar knowledge of this subject.

Mr. President, no one regrets more than I do that this subject must be discussed, that we did not reach an agreement, and that the committee's position could not be accepted on the floor of the Senate. There is nothing I can do about it; but, feeling in good conscience that the committee is correct, I see nothing to do except to present the facts, which plainly uphold the position of the committee, as I see it.

It was stated by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Tennessee that apparently I was the only one who had recommended this position. As a matter of fact, it has been recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary. In order to expedite consideration of the entire problem, in last Thursday's RECORD, beginning at page 12599 I inserted a number of recommendations by bar associations, as well as editorials from leading newspapers, which show, it seems to me, that both in middle Tennessee and west Tennessee this solution is satisfactory.

Later I shall refer to some of these recommendations. They include recommendations from a number of bar associations—not from Haywood County, but from Lake County, Dyer County, and Weakley County. More recently the bar association of Henry County submitted a recommendation. Many of the leading lawyers in west Tennessee have also submitted their views.

It will be seen also that the great daily newspapers of this section, including the Commercial Appeal in west Tennessee, the Memphis Press-Scimitar, of west Tennessee, as well as certain newspapers in middle Tennessee, including the Nashville Tennessean, which has a very wide circulation in that area, approve the recommendation of the committee, and feel that this is the best way to solve the problem.

To get at the issue, I think it would be best to review very briefly the history of how this controversy came about and to state briefly something about the facts in the case.

In March, 1949, the judge in the middle district of Tennessee suffered a heart attack. During the remainder of the year he was unable to try any cases. In January of 1950, at the suggestion of several members of the middle Tennessee bar, I introduced a bill providing for an additional judge in middle Tennessee, on a permanent basis. The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] also introduced a bill in April or a little later. As he has stated, I believe the bills were identical.

I immediately set about to determine the case load of the work which was done in middle Tennessee, preparatory to presenting the request for an additional judge in middle Tennessee. I found that the case load in middle Tennessee simply does not justify two judges operating exclusively in that district. I shall go into the statistics a little later. However, over a 10-year period the case load in middle Tennessee was just about the average case load for the Nation. It was a little more, but there was not a great deal of difference.

It is true that there are some new defense plants in that area, which involve condemnation cases in middle Tennes-

see. So there is some additional work, above what one judge should be required to do on a permanent basis. However, on the basis of two judges for middle Tennessee on a long-time basis there would not be enough work for them to do, when the case load of middle Tennessee is compared with the average case load for the rest of the Nation.

The first hearing which was held on this subject was on August 22, 1950. It has been referred to by the senior Senator from Tennessee. At that time a number of lawyers from middle Tennessee came to Washington to testify in behalf of the bill. The main thing they were asking for was some kind of relief to enable the court to catch up with the heavy docket in middle Tennessee at that time. District Judge Davies testified that he had worked so hard that he had suffered a heart attack, and had not been able to try any cases. He stated that, looking at the situation from a permanent viewpoint, or over a long period of time, he, or whoever the judge might be, would need some assistance, even if he were an able judge.

The matter of a roving judgeship was first mentioned in the hearing on August 22, 1950. The situation was very well summed up at that time by one of the leading members of the bar of Nashville, Mr. Cecil Sims. I do not know whether he was an officer of a bar association. However, we all recognize him as being a leading lawyer who is familiar with the conditions. At page 175 of the hearings Mr. Sims states:

> What we need is about a judge and a half. As a matter of fact, we have a man who is doing a one-and-one-half-man job in middle Tennessee. And I think you will find that they need some help over in east Tennessee over in Knoxville.

Mr. Albert Williams, who I believe is president or an officer of a bar association, stated at page 177 of the hearings, in colloquy with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]:

> Senator WILEY. Is it your judgment that the appropriate means of solving this problem would be to have a roving judge for the middle and western districts?
>
> Mr. WILLIAMS. My preference would be for the judge for the middle district; but, of course, a roving judge for the middle and western districts would be a great help over what we have now. Anything is better than nothing, and that would be an advantage to us over the present situation.

The truth of the matter is that Judge Davies himself said that there was some merit to a roving judge. His testimony is to be found at page 176 of the hearings conducted in August 1950. This is what Judge Davies said. The chairman, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] was presiding. I was present most of the time. I quote from the testimony:

> The CHAIRMAN. What would you think if Congress should look with favor on a roving judge to serve in all of the districts of Tennessee?
>
> Judge DAVIES. I would look with favor on anything that Congress would decide to do about it.
>
> I would only point this out to the committee; and that is that there are now two judges in the eastern district of Tennessee, and the other two judges are in the middle and western districts. There is only one in each district.

Judge Davies further said:

> It might be that if there were to be a roving judge it might be better to have him from the middle and western districts, because they already have two in the eastern district.

So the testimony went on. Judge Davies, lawyers from Nashville, and also Representative GORE, from middle Tennessee, who testified, looked with the same degree of favor on the idea of a roving judge between the two districts.

No action was taken in the Eighty-first Congress. Early in the Eighty-second Congress the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, wrote a letter to the members of the committee, stating that he planned to have an omnibus bill take care of all the judicial districts, and asked the opinion of the members of the committee. I replied to the Senator from Nevada by letter dated February 15, in which I said:

> The principle recommendation I have to make with regard to our three Tennessee districts is the creation of an additional judgeship to assist in both the middle and western districts.

I went on to say that the record showed that west Tennessee had a little more than the national average case load, and that the appointment of an additional judge would solve our problem.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> UNITED STATES SENATE,
> COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
> *February 15, 1951.*
>
> The Honorable PAT MCCARRAN,
> *United States Senator.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter of January 17 with reference to the bill the Judiciary Committee is drafting, under your direction, dealing with the creation of additional Federal judgeships and needed changes in judicial districts.
>
> I think your judgment in including all these provisions in a single bill is very good. In that manner, we may consider the effect upon our Federal judiciary as an entity.
>
> The principal recommendation I have to make with regard to our three Tennessee districts is the creation of an additional judgeship to assist in both the middle and western districts. The eastern district of Tennessee has two judgeships, but there is only one each in the middle and western districts. In 1950, the western district of Tennessee had a little over the national average of civil cases per judge, and the middle district considerably under. The number of criminal cases commenced per judge in the western and middle districts was very much larger than the national average. The western district disposes of its cases much more rapidly than in the other two Tennessee districts.
>
> The judge of the middle district was ill and unable to try any cases from September 1949 to October 1950, resulting in a docket congestion which still exists to some degree. His efforts have been supplemented by those of visiting judges. For this reason, and for the further reason it is considered that the middle district judge is unlikely to recover completely in the foreseeable future, my colleague introduced S. 3467 after I introduced S. 279 in the Eighty-first Congress seeking an additional judgeship for the middle district. The judicial conference approved a provision for a second judgeship on a temporary basis in September 1950.
>
> However, after reviewing the hearings on S. 3467 and the procedural statistical computations of the administrative office of the United States courts, I am firmly of the opinion that any additional United States judgeship in Tennessee should consist of a roving judgeship for both the middle and western districts of Tennessee.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> ESTES KEFAUVER.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a hearing was held on May 7, 1951, at which Judge Davies appeared. He stated that his health was somewhat better and that he had gone back to work and was able to carry a part of the load. His statement will be found at page 191 of the hearings. At this hearing I reviewed the amount of work in the middle district and also the western district, and showed that the western district had a heavier case load and that it needed help over a long period of time more than did the middle district. I further stated that in order to give the judge a full amount of work to do and to be of benefit to lawyers and litigants and citizens in both districts the judge should be a roving judge.

The matter was brought up, as I have stated, in committee, and on August 30, in consideration of the case load and the statistics, the committee agreed with my proposal.

Thereafter there was one other brief hearing, at which time the question was again gone into, and the committee again sustained its position.

The situation is that west Tennessee has a population of 984,720, as compared with middle Tennessee's population of 896,173, which means that there are more than 88,000 more people in west Tennessee than there are in middle Tennessee. It will also be seen by the chart that west Tennessee is advancing more rapidly in population than middle Tennessee.

As a matter of fact, Memphis, as we all know, has become one of the chief centers of trade and commerce, and a distribution center, with many great national companies having their southern or southeastern offices there. The ourt at Memphis has a great many admiralty cases to try. Memphis is growing more rapidly than any other Tennessee city. Therefore, judged by population growth during the past 10 years, there is every reason to believe, as shown by records, that west Tennessee is growing more rapidly in population. Of course, that means more litigation and more need for courts.

There are defense establishments both in west and middle Tennessee. As a matter of fact, in Memphis, according to the latest Martindale, there are 661 lawyers, whereas in Nashville there are 525 lawyers, which means that there are about 140 more lawyers in Memphis than there are in Nashville. Of course, where the lawyers are, that is naturally where the litigation is; otherwise, the lawyers would not be there.

Mr. President, the records kept by the administrative office of the United States Courts—and they are digested on the chart before us—show that in west Tennessee in an 11-year period the total number of cases commenced is 5,015. In middle Tennessee over the same period the total is 4,467, or about 550 more cases in that period in west Tennessee than in middle Tennessee. The cases are both civil and criminal cases.

The national average is 4,401. Therefore, west Tennessee is far above—a substantial percentage above—the national average. Middle Tennessee is just about at the national average. I believe in fairness it should be stated, however, that the judge in middle Tennessee has had some cases of a class, such as condemnation cases, in which several cases are covered by one case. I believe he said that in one of those instances one case covered in excess of 100 trials. Unquestionably, the number of defense establishments and the growth of middle Tennessee will keep it substantially above the national average, although not nearly so much above as is the case in west Tennessee.

The average number of cases commenced per annum in middle Tennessee is 406; in west Tennessee, it is 456. The national average is 400.

It will be seen that over a 10-year period the number of cases terminated in west Tennessee is 4,782; over the same 10-year period it is 4,103 in middle Tennessee.

It is true that the Judicial Conference recommends that because of the illness of Judge Davies a temporary judge be assigned there, or that a temporary judgeship be created there for the purpose of helping Judge Davies catch up with his docket, and that the first vacancy there be not filled.

The showing is and the undisputed facts are that there is some additional amount of work over the national average in middle Tennessee, and that there is a great deal of additional work over the national average in west Tennessee. Looking to the facts and stating the matter on a permanent basis, the creation of a roving judgeship would fill the needs of these two districts for many years to come.

As a matter of fact, several recommendations for the creation of additional judgeships have been made by the chairman of the committee which were not recommended by the Judicial Conference. Of course, the opinion of the Judicial Conference is good evidence, but it is not by any means controlling on the committee. In the bill provision is made for the creation of five or six additional judgeships which were not recommended by the Judicial Conference.

Furthermore, if the facts showing the increasing case load in west Tennessee, and showing that the lawyers in northwest Tennessee want to have a term of court held there, had been presented to the Judicial Conference, I have no doubt that its action also would have been different.

Mr. President, we know that already these districts are above the national average in terms of the amount of work they have, and we know that their work is growing rapidly, particularly in the case of west Tennessee. Furthermore, we know that every session of Congress results in placing an additional workload upon the district judges, particularly as a result of the enactment of the law creating the Office of Price Stabilization and the laws relating to the Defense Establishment and the various control establishments, all of which cause a considerable amount of additional work to be placed upon the judges.

Mr. President, in Tennessee the eastern district has two judges. The middle district now has one judge, and the western district has one judge. The lawyers and the litigants in northwest Tennessee have earnestly petitioned to have a term of court held there, and they are anxious to have that done. In northwest Tennessee there are some very populous counties—Obion, Lake, Dyer, Weakley, Gibson, and other counties, which are probably more than 100 miles from Memphis, where court is held, and they are a substantial distance from Jackson, Tenn.

The record here will show that the bar associations of practically all the west Tennessee counties are anxious to have terms of court held there.

Mr McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Will the Senator name the counties?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to have the Senator name them.

Mr KEFAUVER. Yes, I will name them, I may say to the Senator.

First let me say, before I name these counties, that the distinguished Senator has inferred that I have written a number of letters by means of which I have tried to stir up backing for this proposal. I would like to state emphatically that I have not. I wish to say that I think I have written only one letter, which was an explanation sent to a friend, Lucius Burch, about what the problem is. It is true that after the directors, as distinguished from the members, of the Memphis Bar Association or the Shelby Bar Association acted on the matter, I did write them a letter in which I pointed out the facts which I did not think they had considered.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will also admit, will he not, that they turned down, for a second time, his proposal?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. President, I think I may cover some of those matters——

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator need not cover them unless he wants to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the Senator will permit me to finish my remarks, I shall be happy to discuss, then, any of those matters, if he wishes me to do so. I think that will be better than to have a running colloquy.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator need not answer unless he wishes to do so.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the air may be somewhat charged. If I can finish my statement, I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Senate will find beginning at page 12599 the names of the bar associations and others who have endorsed the proposal for the creation of a roving judgeship.

Mr. McKELLAR. Page 12599 of what?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of October 4.

Mr. McKELLAR. However, we closed this case several weeks ago, and the committee acted upon it. The testimony to which the Senator refers was not before the committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I do not yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator should make an accurate statement of facts, if he is not going to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I refuse to yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Tennessee declines to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a few days before that time, the senior Senator from Tennessee had certain communications placed in the RECORD. I felt that in order to provide for the expenditious consideration of the proposal which now is before us, and in order not to take up unduly the time of the Senate, it would be helpful if I were to place in the RECORD the resolutions and editorials, and then I could simply refer to them without having to read them.

Certain resolutions will be found on page 12599 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and on the following pages. That is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of October 4.

The first resolution is by the Dyer County Bar Association. Dyersburg is the county seat. The bar association says that a special meeting was called, not merely a meeting of the directors of the association, as was done in Memphis and in Jackson, but a special meeting of all the lawyers of the Dyer County Bar Association. The resolve is, in part, that—

Whereas the Dyer County Bar Association recognizes the necessity of an additional Federal judgeship for the State of Tennessee to relieve the congested dockets of the various courts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Dyer County Bar Association, met in a special called meeting on this the 24th day of August 1951, That said bar association extends its thanks to the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER and commends his actions in this matter, be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Dyer County Bar Association be instructed to forward this resolution to the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER.

Adopted: GEORGE W. PIGUE,
President.
GRANGER LATTA,
Secretary.

The Lake County Bar Association adopted a resolution not only asking that a roving judgeship be created, but also setting forth the necessity for the appointment of an additional judge in that section. The resolution reads in part as follows:

Whereas the United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee now convenes in Memphis and Jackson; and

Whereas the distance from these two cities to points in those counties situated in the northwestern section of Tennessee including the counties of Dyer, Lake, Obion,

Weakley, Lauderdale, and others, results in great, and at times, prohibitive expense and inconvenience to litigants, witnesses, and jurors alike attending this court; and

Whereas the city of Dyersburg in Dyer County, Tenn., is centrally located in said northwestern section of the State and is conveniently accessible to all points in said session—

And they proceed to ask that another term of court be held at Dyersburg.

The next resolution asking for the creation of a roving judgeship will be found on page 12599 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Let me say that at this time I have before me the originals of the resolutions.

This resolution is from the Weakley County Bar Association. Dresden, Tenn., is the county seat. That bar association also called a special meeting of the bar. Here is the letter, signed by the persons designated to write it. The letter reads, in part, as follows:

WEAKLEY COUNTY,
Dresden, Tenn., August 27, 1951.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR: At a recent meeting of the Weakley County Bar Association held in Dresden, Tenn., a resolution was unanimously passed appointing the undersigned as a committee to communicate with you and memorialize you to support the bill to create a roving Federal judgeship as reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee for middle and west Tennessee.

They go on to point out the fact that Weakley County is a long distance from Memphis and Jackson, and that it would be of great convenience to the lawyers and litigants and jurors if a term of court were held in Weakley County, particularly at Dresden.

Then, Mr. President, it will be seen that the Lake County Bar Association also had a special meeting, and asked that this action be taken.

Then, Mr. President, I have a telegram from Paris, Tenn. That is in Henry County, also in west Tennessee. I read:

This association endorses the concurrency of jurisdiction in the middle and western districts if an additional United States district judge is authorized for Tennessee. We also urge an additional division in the western district to sit at Dresden.

PARIS BAR ASSOCIATION,
By R. L. DUNLAP, Jr.,
President.

Mr. President, also in the RECORD on the pages to which I have referred will be found the names of a large number of lawyers, and I have their letters and telegrams here. It would seem that practically all the lawyers from Union City, in Obion County, which is the northernmost county in the State of Tennessee, were included: Paul G. Hudgins, Tom Elam, Robert Fry, Sam C. Nailling, E. H. (Tito) Lannon, David G. Caldwell, Hardy M. Gramham, Charles B. Fields, W. E. Hudgins, W. M. Miles, C. W. Miles 3d, George Cloys, Fenner Heathcock.

Next is a petition or a telegram from the lawyers of the Gibson County Bar Association, which I believe is geographically the largest county in the State, containing five or six small cities, in which a large number of lawyers ask that there be a roving judgeship, and also that court be held in that section.

A number of letters are in the RECORD, and I have other letters here, some of which I have been asked to treat as personal, and others, which I could put into the RECORD, from lawyers throughout west Tennessee, but quite a number from lawyers in Memphis, complaining of the fact that no meeting of the bar association there was called, and that they did not have an opportunity to vote; that the matter was simply decided by the directors. But the seven or eight other counties have called meetings of their bar associations, and they speak for the lawyers. It is not easy for the lawyers, particularly in places like Memphis or Jackson, where court is already being held, to take a position which is opposed to that of the sitting judge. Lawyers hesitate to do that. But one lawyer, Mr. R. Garland Draper, says he thinks 90 percent of the lawyers of west Tennessee are in favor of this proposal.

We all know what the creation of another term of court in northwest Tennessee would mean, and it is my intention, because I think the people of the vicinity are entitled to it, if this matter is settled so that there will be a roving judge who can give some of his attention to west Tennessee, to introduce a bill, and to ask the Judiciary Committee to approve the establishment of a term of court there, because there are several large-sized cities—that area is growing—and it is unfair and inconvenient for litigants to have to go many miles, to Memphis or to Jackson, in order to have their cases determined.

Mr. President, I have always felt that the two great newspapers of west Tennessee had very good judgment about things that were in the best interests of the people of that section. First is the Memphis Press-Scimitar, which gave consideration to the problem, and which in a very strong editorial, dated September 6, 1951, pointed out that in view of the rapid growth of west Tennessee, the roving judge proposed would be able to help out in west Tennessee in handling the increased number of cases, which is above the national average, and which, of course, will continue to increase. The Press-Scimitar points out that while Judge Boyd, for whom I have very high respect, by very hard work has been able to keep up with his docket, the same thing might happen to him that happened to Judge Davies: he might become ill, and in that event there would be no one to look after the docket.

Furthermore, Mr. President, a newspaper which is very highly regarded and which stands for the welfare of the community and for a fair position is the Memphis Commercial Appeal, which has a long and distinguished history and which I believe has the largest circulation in that part of the South. The Memphis Commercial Appeal, in an editorial entitled "A Roving Judge, If Any," comes out very strongly for this position. Among other things, it says:

It seems to us that Judge Boyd has done and is doing a good job, but that very fact dictates against overtaxing him and his court. Memphis is growing more rapidly than any other section of Tennessee. The greater the population the greater the load for the Federal court. Another highly pertinent item is that Memphis' growth involves constant additions to the sizable and substantial commercial and industrial facilities of the city and section.

It then says further:

If there were a roving Federal judge available for middle and west Tennessee, Federal court could be held at locations other than Memphis and Jackson and this would mean a material convenience for lawyers, jurors, witnesses, and persons concerned in legal actions. Presumably the people in a number of middle Tennessee communities would be similarly favored by a judge with what we believe the lawyers call concurrent jurisdiction.

All the circumstances seem to put logic on the side of creating a roving judgeship if there is to be any new one at all.

Mr. President, the Nashville Tennessean, of which of course is in middle Tennessee, which has the largest circulation of any newspaper in that area, and which is a great newspaper with a fine record, a newspaper which certainly would defend the position of middle Tennessee in any controversy of this sort, published an editorial, which is in the RECORD, in which it says:

The important questions are whether there would be sufficient business for two full-time Federal judges in the middle district, and whether the new judge could not better serve by helping to care for the case load in two districts. Senator KEFAUVER insists that two judges would be superfluous in the middle district, but that a roving judge for the middle and west districts would serve an imporant purpose.

It then goes on to say that—

In the light of facts, the institution of a roving judge for service in two districts is both practical and advisable. The layman has been impressed by Senator KEFAUVER'S declaration that he would be entirely willing for a middle Tennessean to be appointed to the post, in agreement with his protesting colleague.

So, Mr. President, looking at this proposition over a long period, the appointment of a temporary judge with the first vacancy not to be filled, does not solve anything.

In the first place, life being as uncertain as it is, if a temporary judge, with the first vacancy not to be filled, was appointed, then, possible next week, or within 2 weeks or a year, or at some time in the near future, we would have with us again the problem as to what should be done about the increasing case load in Tennessee. If that situation should not arise for 12 or 15 years, before the first vacancy, the two judges, working together, would be able to catch up with their dockets in middle Tennessee within 1 or 2 years, and after that there would be work enough for only about one and one half or one and a third judges, and they would not be earning their money. There would not be a full day's work for two judges after they got their docket caught up, and in the meantime, during all of this time, the lawyers and litigants in west Tennessee who have a case load greatly above the national average, and who are asking for a term of court in another section of the district, which would further increase

the case load, would be without the services of this roving judge, to which they would be entitled.

The plan presented in the bill, in the opinion of the bar associations and the leading newspapers of the State—I do not know of any daily newspaper which has taken a contrary position or has proposed a judge for only middle Tennessee—would solve the problem for the foreseeable future, and possibly for generations, because the situation is that there is more work in middle Tennessee than one judge can do, and there is considerably more than one judge ought to do in west Tennessee, particularly if he holds another term of court in northwest Tennessee. So it would be ideal to have a judge to help out in both districts and keep the dockets current.

It should be pointed out, Mr. President, that in these days, when antitrust cases and other technical cases are being tried, at times a judge becomes involved in a case the trial of which lasts for 3 or 4 months. Such a case is at this time in progress at Vicksburg, Miss., where a number of Memphis lawyers are engaged in a trial taking several months. If that should happen in western Tennessee, or if any judge, because of overwork, should not be able to carry on as vigorously as he has been doing, here would be the same situation in west Tennessee which now prevails in the middle district.

The validity and the worth of roving judges are well recognized by the judiciary and by the Congress. In the very bill now before the Senate there is provision for a roving judge in eastern and western Missouri. There was a provision for one in North Carolina, but that has been eliminated from the bill for further investigation. There is one for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia.

Mr. President, it costs approximately $40,000 a year, I believe, to pay the salary of a new Federal judge and to provide the necessary stenographic assistance, the bailiff, and the library expenses. It may cost a little more than that. So that there is some economy in what is now proposed. If there are two judges for middle Tennessee, there is going to be a continuing and insistent demand, as there is now, for relief in west Tennessee, because if middle Tennessee is entitled to an additional judge, west Tennessee is more than entitled to one, because the case load there is heavier. So the first thing we know, we will have to have another judge in west Tennessee. The matter does not involve a great deal of money, and the economical course would be to have one judge to take up the excess work and serve in both districts.

Mr. President, I have taken the position I occupy because I think it is right. We all know, and there can be no question about it, that the judge in middle Tennessee, the lawyers, and the litigants, are entitled to some relief. Many defendants have been in jail for a long time awaiting trial. The court business is increasing. I believe my position to be sound. The recommendations which have come here have not come through my solicitation. I have asked one lawyer in Memphis, whom I consider to be very outstanding, and who is a good friend of mine, for his ideas about the question, and to see what other members of the bar with whom he was associated thought about it. Naturally, in conversations with lawyers from west Tennessee I have asked how they felt about it. I am convinced that lawyers in the northwestern part of the State, almost to a man, as shown by the resolutions of their bar association, feel that there should be a roving judge, and that he should hold a term of court in northwestern Tennessee.

Mr. President, something has been said here and there about politics. Politics has no place in the judiciary or in the determination of a question like that now before the Senate. It certainly had no influence in my deciding what I thought should be done in this case. Whatever my recommendation may be worth, I have not committed myself to anyone; and when, at the last hearing, on August 17, it was insinuated that the junior Senator from Tennessee might have been actuated by some political motive and that he might have someone in west Tennessee whom he desired to recommend for a judgeship, I agreed with the chairman of the committee—and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] was there——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not yield at this point, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEELY in the chair). The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. At page 18 of the record the senior Senator from Tennessee said:

> Is there someone you want to appoint or recommend for appointment in west Tennessee? Is that your idea?

I replied:

> Senator McKELLAR, I know you have said that There is nobody that I have committed myself to recommend. If you feel that is the matter, I will agree here and now, if that will solve the problem, that anybody I recommend will be from middle Tennessee, if that is what you feel is bothering me.

That is from the record. There are just as good lawyers in middle Tennessee as there are in west Tennessee. There should be no difficulty in finding an able judge from either section. So I have made that offer. There it is, in the record.

Mr. President, I have heard the plea many times that committees should be sustained on the floor. The senior Senator from Tennessee asked yesterday that the Appropriations Committee be upheld in some of its positions, and I think that on practically every proposition the Appropriations Committee was upheld. But particularly, Mr. President, in matters affecting the judiciary, where there is a question of figures and case load, and the members of the committee keep in touch with the problems in the various districts, many detailed figures and calculations have to be considered which can be gone into only in committee.

Mr. President, this matter has been submitted to the Judiciary Committee on two occasions. What is proposed is what the people want, what the lawyers of both districts would be satisfied with. Even Judge Davies, in the middle district, would be satisfied with this arrangement. It is what the lawyers and litigants in northwest Tennessee are asking for. It is the consensus of the leading representatives of the press who reflect the public opinion of that section. So I hope, Mr. President, that the position of the committee will be sustained.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Did the State bar association take any action on this question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The State bar association has not taken any action.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sorry that I could not be present during all the discussion, but I am interested in the question which was just propounded by the Senator from New Jersey. Do I correctly understand that the Judicial Conference made any recommendation, or does it make recommendations in such cases?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; the Judicial Conference does make recommendations. The Judicial Conference made a recommendation that there be two judges for middle Tennessee, the first vacancy not to be filled. It pointed out that they have been concerned with the judge in the middle district being sick, and the increase in the case load. The proposition of the heavier case load for west Tennessee, and also the fact that in northwest Tennessee the lawyers want to have a term of court there, which would further increase the heavier case load for west Tennessee, so far as I know was not presented to the Judicial Conference, and I do not know what action they would have taken if it had been.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I just have a word or two to say in reply. It does not seem to me that it is really necessary, but I have one or two things I wish to say. The junior Senator from Tennessee said that Judge Davies and Judge Boyd approved the idea of a roving judge. I read a telegram from Judge Boyd:

> Answering your inquiry during 11 years I have presided over district court for western Tennessee every case has been handled promptly. Will Shafroth's—

He is secretary of the Judicial Conference—

> Will Shafroth's records at administrative office will show this. Our calendar is absolutely current at this time. No one to my knowledge has suggested the need of additional judges for this district.

Now that ought to be sufficient proof. I will say, for whatever value it has, that the junior Senator from Tennessee was asked at the hearings if he knew Judge Boyd. He said he did. When asked if he was a truthful man he said he was. As I say, I do not know the value of that, but that was the evidence.

The truth is that the only possible semblance of any suggestion of a case the junior Senator from Tennessee has is that grows out of the fact that, since this matter came up and he found himself without a leg to stand on, he has been hunting all over the State for testimony, and he has gotten two or three letters—maybe three or four. I had a great deal of difficulty in getting him to put the letters in the record The only letter he put in the record, as I recall—and the record is here and speaks for itself—the only letter he put in the record was about an entirely different thing, and did not apply to the roving judge at all. It was about establishing a judgeship for west Tennessee and a term of court in the northwestern part of the State. That is an entirely different matter. And in that very letter the writer spoke of Judge Boyd holding the court there. He never spoke of a roving judge. He never had a word to say about a roving judge. The Senator did not deal directly with the other letters he spoke of. He said there was something private in them so he could not put them in But whatever the reason, he has not put them in. They are not in the record. The only one that I know has the statement in it that Judge Boyd was a nice man.

Judge Boyd sent me the telegram I have read. I want to read it again. It will take but a moment. It is just two or three lines.

Answering your inquiry—

I made the inquiry and found what shape this was taking; that it was taking a political shape, absolutely political. The Senator said he made an offer to trade with me. No; I did not trade with him about this judgeship. I did not trade with him because I did not believe that he would carry out the trade if it was made. That is the reason why I did not do it

I continue with Judge Boyd's telegram:

Answering your inquiry, during 11 years I have presided over district court for western Tennessee every case has has been handled promptly. Will Shafroth's records at administrative office will show this. Our calendar is absolutely current at this time. No one—

No one. I am not guessing when I make a statement—

No one, to my knowledge, has suggested the need of an additional judge for this district.

How could anything be stronger than that? The judges are against the position of the junior Senator from Tennessee. The lawyers are against his position. Since the matter came up and he found himself in the predicament he was in he has been very diligent in trying to get people to write him letters saying that a roving judge is necessary, but he does not publish the letters. If Senators vote for his proposal on the ground that he has letters, let them remember they are not in the record. If they had been put in the record, all right. I asked him a little while ago to put them in the record. He would not do it. Indeed, he refused to yield when I pressed him about the letters.

Now, Mr. President, as I say, this is not the way to appoint judges. Judges ought to be appointed in a proper way. I think the junior Senator from Tennessee makes a great mistake in undertaking, after the evidence is all in and he knows it, to gather as much as he can from Tom, Dick, and Harry.

He mentioned the names of two or three lawyers in west Tennessee. I do not happen to know them. Unfortunately for me I do not know them. I have no doubt they are all right in every way, but I just do not know them.

As I said in the very beginning, and as I told the Senator in the Senate committee, no one has asked me about a roving judge for west Tennessee except the junior Senator from Tennessee. He is the only advocate for a roving judge, except those he has since drummed up, perhaps a half a dozen. They are the only ones who are in favor of roving judges. When a man has political friends in a State, Senators can understand why he would write to them to support his position. I believe the junior Senator was nominated by a minority vote, but he has somebody for him in western Tennessee The result is that he has written letters, and, notwithstanding his denials, he has used every effort to get letters to bolster up his position. He has taken a wrong position. He ought never to have taken that position. No Senator, no real Senator, ought to do it He made a great mistake in doing it I hope the Senate will not sustain that method of appointing judges.

If there is one thing I am proud of, it is our judicial system. I saw a jury not long ago that was going to try a Communist in the State of New York. When I looked at the list my heart sank. I did not know whether it would be possible for justice to be done by such a jury Yet that jury in the State of New York—in the city of New York, if you please—after deliberation came in with an honest, upright verdict. I am proud of it I am proud of a State which has citizens of that kind. I think we ought to have in our country a judicial system which is second to none. We must have that kind of a system.

The question might be asked of me, "Why are you interested in this question?" I am interested in it just as I am interested in anything which affects my State. I simply want to do the right thing. The other day I wrote to the President, after he had withdrawn a nomination, that I had no one to suggest in place of the original nominee. Why? Because I think the President did a brave and proper thing, and I wanted to uphold him when he did a brave and proper thing.

Mr. President, the record about which the junior Senator from Tennessee has talked for half or three-quarters of an hour is based entirely upon statements which have been made since the case was heard before the Committee on the Judiciary. None of the letters referred to was before the Judiciary Committee. The record which has been made was made upon a case which has been made up by friends of the junior Senator from Tennessee. I am sorry that he has done it. I urged him not to do it, but he has seen fit to do it.

Mr. President, I ask that the Senate agree to the pending amendment to the committee amendment. That is all I have to say. I leave the question to the judgment of the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEELY in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bennett	Hennings	Monroney
Benton	Hickenlooper	Moody
Brewster	Hill	Morse
Bricker	Hoey	Mundt
Bridges	Holland	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Pastore
Cain	Jenner	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Case	Johnson, Tex	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnston, S C.	Schoeppel
Clements	Kefauver	Smathers
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N J
Douglas	Langer	Smith, N C.
Duff	Lehman	Sparkman
Dworshak	Lodge	Stennis
Eastland	Magnuson	Taft
Ecton	Malone	Thye
Ferguson	Martin	Underwood
Frear	Maybank	Watkins
Fulbright	McCarran	Welker
George	McClellan	Williams
Gillette	McFarland	Young
Green	McKellar	
Hayden	McMahon	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, in my term of office in the Senate, nothing has been more unhappy to me than the position I have had to occupy with reference to this question. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I attempted as best I could to reconcile the differences between the two Tennessee Senators. I had certain views on the matter which I tried to express to them.

Mr. President, I held up the bill, without reporting it to the Senate, for a considerable time, in hope that we might accomplish a result which would avoid the controversy which has developed on the floor of the Senate.

So far as I am concerned, the entire matter now turns—and the recommendation to which I now refer is the only one on the basis of which I can cast my vote—on the direction and recommendation of the Judicial Conference. Of course that is not satisfactory to some; but on two different occasions—in 1950, and again in 1951—the Judicial Conference recommended a temporary judge for the middle district of Tennessee. They made no recommendation—not even in the present year, 1951, after the bill was pending on the Senate Calendar—for the western district of Tennessee.

I shall cast my vote in keeping with the recommendation of the Judicial Conference, much as I dislike to cast a vote either one way or the other in this controversial matter.

I think the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has some merit to his argument. I think the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has some merit to his argument. The balance which turns the scale, so far as my conclusion is concerned, is the fact that the Judicial Conference—after the bill had been reported by the Senate committee and was on the calendar—within the last 2 weeks reaffirmed their stand for a temporary judge for the middle district of Tennessee.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it is not discreet, sir, nor is it pleasant to participate in a troublesome matter which is chiefly of concern to two friends, who are Members of the Senate, in which they represent the same State. However, having been born a Tennessean, I wish to say a brief word in support of my intention to vote for the amendment which has been offered by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

Mr. President, it so happens that a member of my own family, whom I have not seen for many, many years, lives in Jackson, Tenn. Until I received from her a letter, under date of September 25, I did not know of the existence of such a person. If I have been correctly informed, she is presently the chief clerk of the United States District Court of the Western District of Tennessee, about which many things have been said this afternoon. I am constrained to believe, Mr. President, that her views on the pending question ought to be considered, and certainly they have been appealing to me.

I shall read only a portion of her very welcome letter, because the other references in it are completely personal in character.

This lady writes to me, in part:

I have been in this office for over 20 years, and in charge of it for more than 15 years, having worked under three judges, one Republican and two Democrats, and I feel that I have a pretty good idea of the needs of this western district of Tennessee We do not need a roving judge in this district, as you can see from the latest report of the Judicial Conference of the United States that this district is as current with its docket as is any in the country. * * * There are 16 counties in the Jackson Division, and I believe I am in a position to know. When this bill is brought up before the Senate, you do not know how much I would appreciate it if you will oppose the passing of it.

Your family and mine have been too closely connected by blood and association for me to hesitate to ask this of you.

Mr. President, I hope to have a chance to meet this lady some day. It would be good to know her as a friend and relative, and to express my admiration for her willingness to speak her piece on the pending question over her signature.

She concludes her letter as follows:

Assuring you of my appreciation, and I am sure the taxpayers would join me in it if they just knew about it, I am,

Sincerely,

BESSIE JONES TRICE.

Mr. President, when I add the substance of this letter to the logical case the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has presented this afternoon, and join the remarks made earlier in the day by the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], in years gone by a president of the American Bar Association, who expressed his own and the official disapproval of roving judges in general, I think there is reasonable doubt at this time to assume a necessity for appointing a roving judge for Tennessee; and I shall oppose such intended action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to the committee amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—60

Aiken	Green	McFarland
Bennett	Hayden	McKellar
Brewster	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Md.	Holland	Robertson
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Russell
Cain	Jenner	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Case	Johnson, Tex	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Connally	Knowland	Stennis
Cordon	Langer	Taft
Dworshak	Lodge	Thye
Eastland	Malone	Underwood
Ecton	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Welker
Frear	McCarran	Williams
George	McClellan	Young

NAYS—19

Benton	Hunt	Morse
Douglas	Kefauver	Murray
Duff	Lehman	Pastore
Fulbright	Magnuson	Smathers
Gillette	McMahon	Sparkman
Hennings	Monroney	
Hickenlooper	Moody	

NOT VOTING—17

Anderson	Humphrey	O'Conor
Byrd	Kem	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Kerr	Tobey
Dirksen	Long	Wherry
Ellender	McCarthy	Wiley
Flanders	Nixon	

So Mr. MCKELLAR's amendment to the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the adoption of the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I have no objection.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was on page 3, in line 7, after the word "and", to strike out "two" and insert "one."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same line, after the word "district", where it occurs the second time, to strike out "judges" and insert "judge."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 13, after "(56 Stat. 1083)", to insert "the existing judgeship for the southern district of Texas created by section 2 (d) of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges and for other purposes,' approved August 3, 1949 (63 Stat. 495)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 4, after line 10, to strike out:

Connecticut ---------- 3

* * * * *

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 17, after the word "Southern", to strike out "5" and insert "4."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 5, after line 8, to strike out:

New York:

* * * * *

Southern ---------- 19

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after line 19, to insert:

Pennsylvania:

Eastern ---------- 8

* * * * *

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 6, after line 2, to strike out:

Middle ---------- 2

* * * * *

And after line 4 to insert:

Middle and western ---------- 1

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, that amendment should be corrected in ac-

cordance with the amendments previously adopted. I ask that it be so corrected.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not understand.

Mr. McCARRAN. It should be changed in accordance with the amendment adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be changed to correspond with the previous action of the Senate, and in order to harmonize this language with what has already been done, this amendment should be rejected. Is that satisfactory to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 8, to insert:

Southern---------- 4

* * * * *

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 16, after "Western", to strike out "4" and insert "3."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after line 21, to insert:

(b) (1) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the district of Arizona. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 3, to renumber the subsection from "(b) (1)" to "(2)"; in line 8, to change the subsection number from "(2)" to "(3)"; after line 13, to insert:

(4) Subsection (c) (6) of section 90 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the word "Washington", so that the subsection will read as follows:

"(6) The Swainsboro Division comprises the counties of Bullock, Candler, Emanuel, Jefferson, Jenkins, and Toombs

"Court for the Swainsboro Division shall be held at Swainsboro."

The amendment was agreed to

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 22, to change the subsection number from "(3)" to "(5)"; on page 8, line 3, to change the subsection number from "(4)" to "(6)"; in line 8, to change the subsection number from "(5)" to "(7)"; after line 14, to insert:

(8) The present incumbent of the judgeship for the southern district of Texas created by section 2 (d) of the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes," approved August 3, 1949 (63 Stat 495), shall henceforth hold such office under section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 22, to change the subsection number from "(6)" to "(9)".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 3, after the word "while", to strike out "such" and insert "the present."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 7, to strike out:

(7) The existing judgeship for the eastern and western districts of Washington is abolished. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this paragraph, the portion thereof relating to Washington is amended by striking out "Eastern and western ---------- 1."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 16, to strike out:

SEC. 5. The first sentence of the fourth paragraph of section 371 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "Whenever any circuit or district judge eligible to resign under this section or to retire under this section or section 372 does neither, and the President finds that such judge is unable to discharge efficiently all the duties of his office by reason of permanent mental or physical disability and that the appointment of an additional judge is necessary for the efficient dispatch of business, the President may make such appointment by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC 5 Section 371 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 371. Resignation or retirement for age; substitute judge on failure to retire.

"(a) Any justice or judge of the United States appointed to hold office during good behavior who resigns after attaining the age of 70 years and after serving at least 10 years continuously or otherwise shall, during the remainder of his lifetime, continue to receive the salary which he was receiving when he resigned

"(b) Any justice or judge of the United States appointed to hold office during good behavior may retain his office but retire from regular active service after attaining the age of 70 years and after serving at least 10 years, continuously or otherwise. He shall, during the remainder of his lifetime, continue to receive the salary of the office.

"The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a successor to a justice or judge who retires.

"(c) Whenever any circuit or district judge eligible to resign under this section or to retire under this section or section 372 does neither, and the President finds that such judge is unable to discharge efficiently all the duties of his office by reason of permanent mental or physical disability and the appointment of an additional judge is necessary for the efficient dispatch of business, the President may make such appointment by and with the advice and consent of the Senate If such additional judge is appointed, the vacancy subsequently caused by the death, resignation, or retirement of the disabled judge shall not be filled

"Any circuit or district judge whose disability causes the appointment of an additional judge, shall, for purposes of precedence, service as chief judge, or temporary performance of the duties of that office, be treated as junior in commission to the other judges of the circuit or district."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 14, to insert:

SEC. 6. (a) The first sentence of section 26 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, as amended (48 U. S. C 1405y), is amended to read as follows:

"The President shall, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint a judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands who shall hold office for the term of 8 years and until his successor is chosen and qualified unless sooner removed by the President for cause, and a district attorney who shall hold office for the term of 4 years and until his successor is chosen and qualified unless sooner removed by the President for cause."

(b) This section shall take effect upon its approval but shall not affect the term of any incumbent whose term has not yet expired.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment. If there are no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S 1959. An act to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 2231 An act to effect entry of a minor child adopted or to be adopted by a United States citizen.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, would the majority leader permit me to ask unanimous consent to take up a bill which is on the calendar, which is directly related to the bill we have just passed, providing for the widows of judges? If we create judges, we should certainly so provide that their dependents are taken care of.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have given notice of the consideration of other matters. I know there is some objection to that bill, and I would not want to take it up at this time until notice is given.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, these bills are related. The bill to which I refer is to take care of the widows of judges. Certainly that has to do with the functioning of the judiciary.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have not given notice of that bill. I know there is objection to it.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is bound to be objection to any bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. There are other matters which we want to dispose of this afternoon.

Mr. McCARRAN. If we can get through with it within an hour——

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there are Senators interested in other matters and I have made commitments and feel that we should go ahead with the order on which we are proceeding.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am just pleading with the Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Senator from Nevada will talk to me later, we shall see what we can work out, but I do not want to take up his bill this afternoon.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEELY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Department of the Air Force, vice John A. McCone, resigned, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Maple T. Harl, of Colorado, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; and

Henry Earl Cook, of Ohio, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Telford Taylor, of New York, to be Administrator, Small Defense Plants Administration.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the majority leader. Is it his intention, in proceeding to executive business, to take up the nomination of Chester Bowles?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; but the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] will be absent some time this week and he stated that he would use only a few minutes to dispose of the nominations of two judges from Illinois. I told him that if it would not take more than a few minutes, I did not think there would be any objection. He thought the nominations could be disposed of in approximately 10 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand there is to be no opposition from the Senator's side of the aisle to the report of the committee?

Mr. McFARLAND. I cannot say that. I would not want to say in advance, but I think the nominations can be disposed of in approximately 10 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If they are not concluded by quarter past four, will the Senator drop them in favor of the other nominations? I ask that question because there are Members on this side of the aisle who have remained because they understand other nominations were going to come up.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think we can work that out if it should take any undue amount of time.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have already asked to be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow, and it will not be possible for me to be present. I still want the opportunity of voting on the nomination of Chester Bowles. I think it is fair to ask that the debate, if there be any debate, on the report, be limited to 15 minutes.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. McFARLAND. I think perhaps the judgeship nominations could have been disposed of while we have been talking about them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the nominations of Joseph Jerome Drucker and Cornelius J. Harrington, to be United States district judges for the northern district of Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nominations of Joseph Jerome Drucker and Cornelius J. Harrington to be United States district judges for the northern district of Illinois, which had been reported adversely by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Joseph Jerome Drucker and Cornelius J. Harrington to be United States district judges for the northern district of Illinois?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise reluctantly to oppose the nominations of Joseph Jerome Drucker and Cornelius J. Harrington who have been nominated to fill the two new positions on the Federal bench in the Northern District of Illinois.

I wish to present only a brief statement, file the remainder of my remarks for the RECORD, and merely comment upon the general situation.

Mr. President, as is well known, the Constitution provides that the President shall "nominate and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate appoint" Supreme Court judges and Federal judges in lower jurisdictions. The phrase "with the advice and consent of the Senate" was not intended to be lightly construed. I have gone into the constitutional history of the Convention of 1787, which shows that it was originally the tentative position of the Constitutional Convention that the Federal judiciary should be appointed, first, by the Congress, and then, in a later decision, by the Senate.

It was not until relatively late in the convention that the compromise was finally worked out that the President should nominate, but that the advice and consent of the Senate were required for final appointment. In other words, the Senate was expected to play an active part in selecting Federal judges.

There was a very good reason for this decision of the Constitutional Convention. There were really two reasons for it. In the first place, the judiciary is, in a sense, the arbiter of grave and basic disputes between the executive and legislative branches over their respective powers. It is, therefore, in the interest of sound government that the judiciary should not be beholden to only one of the two branches, but that there should be joint consent of the two branches required for the selection of judges.

The second reason was that great as the knowledge of a President may be, he cannot, in the nature of things, in the vast majority of instances, know the qualifications of the lawyers and local judges within a given State as well as do the Senators from that State. However excellent his general knowledge, the President does not have the detailed knowledge of the qualifications, background, and record of judges in a particular State. So, therefore, the position of the Constitutional Convention in requiring the advice and consent of the Senate was not lightly taken. It was intended to make the Senate a coordinate branch in the selection of these high officers.

I mention that because there is sometimes a tendency to forget the constitutional history and sound sense behind the provision and for some persons lightly to conclude that the appointment of persons to such offices should be the exclusive prerogative of the President. I shall file for the RECORD a somewhat fuller summary of this constitutional history, with a citation of some of the many precedents in Senate action on nominations made under circumstances like those in the present cases.

The facts in this case are very well known. Late in January I submitted two recommendations for appointment to the two vacancies. I had considered the matter for over 6 months and had taken careful counsel with leading members of the bar and leading citizens of Chicago. In my judgment these men whom I recommended were extremely well qualified. It is my understanding that they were investigated by the Attorney General's office and found worthy, and that the recommendations were forwarded to the President.

The President took no action upon these recommendations, and he did not act during the spring and early summer. I was not consulted by him or by any of his representatives at any time about the matter.

Then on the 13th of July, without any prior consultation with me, the President sent down to the Senate the names of Joseph J. Drucker and Cornelius J. Harrington. My first disposition was to make an immediate protest, but I considered the matter further and thought it was possible that the President and his advisers had facts which they had not revealed to me. I, therefore, asked the Chicago Bar Association to conduct an advisory poll of its members upon the matter. The Illinois Bar Association also took a poll, and one of the local newspapers, the Chicago Sun-Times, took a poll of all the lawyers, whether members of the bar or not, in Cook County.

I ask unanimous consent to file at the end of my remarks the record of these polls together with the summary of the constitutional history which I have previously mentioned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A, and exhibit B.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I can say that the polls showed an impressive and indeed an overwhelming decision by the lawyers and qualified attorneys of the region as to the superiority of the men whom I suggested as compared with the President's appointees.

I want to make it clear that, like the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in similar cases last year, I do not want to label the nominees themselves as being personally obnoxious to me. I regard them as estimable men and fine citizens. But I should like to point out that they were nominated without consultation

with me, without any indicaion of the reasons for their selection, and contrary to the recommendations of the much more highly qualified men whose names I had forwarded and who were supported by the heavy preponderance of informed opinion in Illinois.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I noted the Senator's reasons for opposing the nominations of the two gentlemen, on the basis that the Senator from Illinois was not consulted regarding their appointment. May I ask the Senator if he deems that sufficient reason for opposing confirmation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would say that before I would continue to interpose that objection, I would want to make certain in my own mind that my choices were superior.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Based on the assumption that the Senator has choices that are superior, and would recommend them if given opportunity to do so, or has recommended them, as the case may be, and then the Senator not being consulted regarding whom the President nominated, would the Senator judge that to be a sufficient reason for the Senate not to confirm?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have no power of decision as to what other Senators should do.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am asking the Senator for his expression of opinion about it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator means what I would do in similar cases?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In case some other Senator were not consulted?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would say that would be very persuasive—

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think we are actually adopting a precedent when we take a position on the matter, and I wanted to make that clear

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should say it would be a very persuasive factor in my mind. I do not mean that every appointment should be farmed out to a Senator, but that it would be a persuasive factor—not necessarily controlling—in my own decision.

I did not in this case wish finally to interpose my own opinion until I had taken a referendum of the bar. We had three referenda, and each one of them confirmed my opinion, and made me believe that my opinion was not captious and that my judgment was correct as to the relative qualifications of the various candidates.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to thank the Senator from Illinois. Representing his people, he faced a problem which may confront other Senators from time to time.

Mr DOUGLAS. That is true.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I simply feel that in this instance we are going to establish a precedent.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President—

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wanted the Senator's view that the situation does justify the Senate in refusing to confirm if other candidates are available or better qualified.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or if there are other candidates, previously recommended by the Senator whom the President does not consult, who are better qualified.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may propound a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the Senator from Arkansas will recognize the fact that the Senate has on three distinct occasions established this precedent in the past.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was under the impression that at the last session of Congress three judges were not confirmed by the Senate in one day, as I recall, because the Senators in whose States the appointments were made had not been consulted about the matter. That is my recollection.

Mr McCARRAN. Let me say that in the Virginia case, in regard to which both Senators from Virginia appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary and objected on the very ground now being used by the Senator from Illinois, the case was brought to the floor of the Senate and the position of the Senators from Virginia was sustained.

Again in the case of Georgia where almost identical grounds were used before the Committee on the Judiciary as those used by the Senator from Illinois, the matter was brought to the floor of the Senate and again the Senate sustained the Senators from Georgia.

The same was true in the Iowa case. So the precedent has already been established.

Mr McCLELLAN. As I recall, we voted on all three cases the same day.

Mr McCARRAN No. The Virginia case came up many years ago; at least 10 years ago

Mr. McCLELLAN. We voted on two cases the same day.

Mr McCARRAN. We voted on two cases the same day. We voted on the Iowa case and the Georgia case on the same day

Mr. McCLELLAN. That was at the last session of Congress.

Mr McCARRAN. Yes, that is my recollection.

Mr McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the only thing I wanted to point up is that this may not be the last time the Senate will be confronted with the same situation Yet heretofore generally it has been expected that a Senator who opposed a nomination should say that the nominee was personally obnoxious to him and therefore, of course, the Senate generally respected that attitude on the part of their colleague.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that in this instance I am following in the illustrious footsteps of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] who did not say that the candidates were personally obnoxious, but that the manner and method of their selection made them obnoxious. I am taking my ground on precisely the same point.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator. I wanted to understand it, and I wanted to make the record clear that if we take that action again we are, I may say, confirming the position we have taken in the past, and it is becoming a fixed, definite precedent in the United States Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I always like those lines of Tennyson:

> Where freedom slowly broadens down
> From precedent to precedent.

In this case I think that is very appropriate.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We are under some obligation to the Senator from Massachusetts not to run beyond 4:15.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is it not true that the Senator is following a constitutional course in this instance in demanding that the President recognize the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from New Jersey has stated bluntly what I have been attempting to convey politely by way of circumlocution.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think I can conclude this by saying I regret the incident very much. It was not of my making. In a sense, it has been forced upon me. But I must reluctantly raise my objection to the appointment of these candidates because of the manner and method of their selection, and because the result would, in my judgment, be antagonistic to the cause of good government and the maintenance of a strong, independent judiciary.

EXHIBIT A

SUMMARY OF CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF ADVICE AND CONSENT CLAUSE AND CITATION OF LEADING SENATE PRECEDENTS

My study of the appropriate records indicates that the following is the constitutional theory upon which "the advice and consent of the Senate" is required by article II, section 2 for judicial appointments. As is well known, the "Virginia plan," drafted largely by James Madison and George Mason and presented to the Constitutional Convention of 1787 by Edmond Randolph, was the nucleus from which the Constitution was developed and furnished the basis for the discussions within the convention. It is less well known that clause 9 of this plan provided that the national judges should be chosen by the legislative and not by the executive branch. (See Hunt, Madison's Notes of the Constitutional Convention, vol III of the Writings of James Madison, pp. 19-20: "A national judiciary be established to consist of one or more supreme tribunals and of inferior tribunals to be chosen by the National Legislature")

There was a rather full discussion of this proposal on June 5 of 1787. Messrs. Rutledge and Pinckney favored appointment by the legislature, while James Wilson opposed it. Madison favored selection by the Senate but asked that the matter go over over for later consideration (Hunt, op. cit., pp. 90-92). The issue was again discussed on July 18. Luther Martin, Roger Sherman, George Mason, Edmond Randolph, and Gunning Bedford spoke in favor of the Senate making the appointments and a motion to vest

the appointing power in the Executive was defeated by a vote of six States to two (Hunt, op. cit., vol. III, pp. 461–464). The issue was again debated on July 21, and a modified proposal, that the Executive should make the nominations for the Federal judiciary and that these should become appointments unless disagreed to by the Senate, was again defeated by a vote of six States to three. Instead, by a vote of six to three, the convention resolved that the judges were to be appointed by the Senate (Hunt, op cit., vol IV, pp. 35–36). This provision was retained in the draft presented by the Committee on Detail on August 6 (Hunt, vol. IV, op cit, p. 101). It was discussed on August 23 (Hunt, vol. IV, op. cit., p. 285), but final approval was postponed. It was not until the Committee on Unfinished Parts reported on September 4 that the final compromise was worked out (see Farrand's Records of the Federal Convention, vol. II, p. 495), which was finally embodied in article II, section 2; namely, that the President should "nominate and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate appoint ambassadors * * * judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States" (Hunt, op. cit., p. 432).

This review proves, I believe, that the advice and consent of the Senate required by the Constitution for such appointments was intended to be real and not nomial A large proportion of the members of the convention were fearful that if the judges owed their appointments solely to the President, the judiciary, even with life tenure, would then become dependent upon the executive, and the powers of the latter would become overweening. By requiring joint action of the legislature and the executive, it was believed that the judiciary would be made more independent.

There was a second advantage which became more and more important as circuit and district courts were added to the Federal judiciary. This was that a Senator from a given State would normally know the ability, capacities, and integrity of the lawyers and judges within that State better than could a President who, however excellent, had of necessity to deal with the country as a whole. Assuming that a Senator was not markedly inferior to the President in devotion to public duty, this would justify his having a voice in the selections.

The requirement for senatorial advice and consent is, therefore, soundly based upon both the Constitution and common sense. It has been upheld in innumerable instances. Beginning with the refusal of the Senate in August 1789 to confirm the nomination by President Washington of Benjamin Fishbourn as naval officer of the Port of Savannah, there has been an almost unbroken chain of precedents on this point. John Adams stated that this was the practice in his time (John Adams, Works, vol. IX, pp. 301–302). In Cleveland's time it was applied to the Supreme Court of the United States and not merely to circuit and district judges. I could cite numerous other cases in the last 30 years, such as the Naut case in Ohio in 1921, the Moore case in 1933, the Boyle case of 1938, the Roberts case in Virginia in 1938, and the Switzer and Andrews cases in 1950.

Only last year, in the Iowa and Georgia cases, the Senate upheld the principle that the objection of a Senator in order to be valid need not be directed against the person appointed by the President, but that it might also properly be focused upon the method and manner by which the appointment was made. I am standing upon similar grounds in the nominations now before us and in addition I am objecting to the probable effects upon the judiciary if such an appointment were to be confirmed.

EXHIBIT B

REPORT OF CANVASSING COMMITTEE OF CHICAGO BAR ASSOCIATION ON MEMBERSHIP POLL ON FEDERAL DISTRICT JUDGESHIPS

The final result of a secret poll of the members of the Chicago Bar Association with respect to Joseph J. Drucker and Cornelius J. Harrington, nominated by President Truman, and Benjamin P. Epstein and William H King, Jr., recommended to the President by Senator DOUGLAS to fill the two newly created additional Federal district judgeships is as follows:

For the first additional judgeship:

Joseph J. Drucker	553
Benjamin P. Epstein	3,656

For the second additional judgeship:

Cornelius J. Harrington	1,310
William H. King, Jr.	3,003

The association has therefore expressed its preference for Benjamin P. Epstein and William H. King, Jr.

The Chicago Bar Association previously by its board of managers had found all four of the above persons to be qualified to fill such vacancies. This poll of the members was requested by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, the senior Senator from Illinois.

The details of the balloting are as follows:

Counted	4,358
No signature slip	72
Spoiled ballot	70
Ballot but not voting	20
Total ballots sent in	4,520

This is the largest vote with respect to judicial office in the association's history.

CHARLES A. BANE,
Chairman, Canvassing Committee.

JULY 26, 1951.

Poll of members of the Illinois State Bar Association residing in the northern district of Illinois re candidates for United States district judge

	Do you deem him qualified for office of United States district judge?		Vote for not more than 3
	Yes	No	
Joseph Jerome Drucker	594	1,948	426
Benjamin P. Epstein	2,415	354	2,237
Cornelius J Harrington	2,085	561	1,463
William H. King, Jr	2,562	159	2,318
Joseph Samuel Perry	2,106	334	1,968

The undersigned hereby certify that the above is a true tabulation of the votes cast in the poll above described.

AMOS M. PINKERTON.
D A. WATSON.
DEIRD JACKER.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., *July 24, 1951.*—Total ballots mailed, 4,915; total ballots re eived, 3,168 (64.25 percent).

Results of Chicago Sun-Times poll of Cook County lawyers on Federal court judgeships

Judge Benjamin P. Epstein	5,823
Judge Joseph J. Drucker	1,189
* * *	
William H. King, Jr.	4,520
Judge Cornelius J. Harrington	2,610
* * *	
Total ballots returned	7,625
* * *	
Spoiled or blank ballots	495

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous consent heretofore granted, the Senate will proceed to vote upon the nomination of Joseph Jerome Drucker, to be a United States district judge for the Northern District of Illinois, and Cornelius J. Harrington, to be a United States district judge for the same district in one vote.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to these nominations? Senators who wish to approve the nominations will vote "aye." Those opposed will vote "no."

Mr. MCCLELLAN and Mr. WELKER asked for a division.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does an "aye" vote mean a vote for confirmation and a "no" vote a vote for rejection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A vote "aye" is a vote to confirm the nominees; a vote "no" is a vote to reject the nominees. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it. The "noes" have it, and the nominations are rejected.

The clerk will state the next nomination on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William Amory Underhill to be an Assistant Attorney General, in the Department of Justice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am happy to comment briefly upon the confirmation by the Senate of the nomination of an able young citizen of Florida, Mr. William Amory Underhill, who has been named by the President to serve as an Assistant Attorney General of the United States. Mr Underhill, now just 41 years of age, has been appointed to this responsible post in our Government a little more than 5 years after the time he entered the Department of Justice, in 1946, following honorable service during World War II as an officer in the Navy.

Mr. President, I have known of this young man and have known his people throughout his lifetime—his people before the time of his birth. They are long-time, highly respected residents of a county in Florida adjoining the county of my birth and my present place of residence.

I believe that this young man, who by character, ability, and hard work has come up to this position of high responsibility at such an early age, and from a modest but truly American background, is entitled to the praise, congratulations, and encomiums of the citizens of our State; and I voice the pride and satisfaction of the people of our State in the merited recognition which has come to this deserving citizen of Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like very much to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida about William A. Underhill. I, too, have known this young man for quite a long while and have taken pride in his steady

and deserved advancements in the Department of Justice. He is a young man whose ability, integrity, and fairness entitle him to the honor and responsibility which has now come to him, and I am sure that he will meet the demands of this new job with his customary efficiency. I am sure his friends are very proud, as are all the citizens of Florida, in this nomination by the President of the United States, and the unanimous confirmation of his nomination by the United States Senate.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE—NOMINATION OF CHESTER BOWLES TO BE AMBASSADOR TO INDIA AND NEPAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India, and so serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal, which nomination had previously been passed over

The PRESIDING OFFICER The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr SALTONSTALL. Mr President, I suggest the absence of a quorum

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll

Mr SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered

Mr SPARKMAN. Mr President, representing the Committee on Foreign Relations I wish to make a very brief statement on the nomination of Mr. Chester Bowles to represent the Government of the United States in India and in Nepal, the position in Nepal being without additional compensation

The Committee on Foreign Relations, upon Mr Bowles' name being presented to it, passed over action on the nomination, because of the request of a member of the committee The Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations appointed a subcommittee, consisting of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Maine [Mr BREWSTER], with the junior Senator from Alabama as chairman of the subcommittee

The subcommittee held hearings. No one appeared before the subcommittee in opposition to Mr. Bowles No one, so far as I know, made any request to be allowed to testify in opposition to Mr. Bowles' nomination. The only witnesses heard were Mr. Bowles himself and Mr. George C. McGhee, Assistant Secretary of State for the Middle East and Southeast Asia, which area includes India.

Following the testimony of these witnesses the subcommittee voted 3 to 2 to recommend to the full committee that Mr. Bowles' nomination be reported favorably to the Senate.

The matter was presented at a meeting of the full committee, and the full committee by a voice vote voted to report the nomination to the Senate with the recommendation that it be confirmed

I believe I am correct in saying that when the vote was taken in the full committee there were only two Senators of the Republican minority present, and they were the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] had been present during the course of the meeting, but as I recall he was called out of the room to the telephone, and the vote was taken during the time he was absent.

There were only those two members of the minority present when the vote was taken Both the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr SMITH] had interposed objections to the confirmation, and I assume that they will take advantage of the opportunity in the course of the debate to state their reasons for opposing Mr. Bowles' nomination

The Senator from New Jersey stated his position very frankly to the subcommittee I shall not to try to paraphrase his entire statement, because I am certain he will make his thoughts known to the Senate in the course of the discussion He stated very frankly that the principal reason for his opposing the confirmation of Mr Bowles' nomination was that the matter of consultation, a matter in which, I will say in all frankness and fairness, the Senator from New Jersey has been particularly interested, was not followed in making the selection of Mr Bowles.

The Senator from New Jersey issued a press release, a copy of which he sent to every Member of the Senate, in which he made a very fair and frank statement of his position

As I say, the subcommittee recommended to the full committee a favorable report In doing so the subcommittee gave a rather sketchy outline of what had taken place in the subcommittee, and it is very largely the substance of the report which has been filed with the Senate I hope every Member of the Senate will read the report. It is very short At least I hope that they will listen to my reading the pertinent portions of it.

First is Mr Bowles' background.

He was born in Springfield, Mass., on April 5, 1901. He graduated from Yale in 1924. He was married and has three children. He was employed by the Springfield Republican from 1924 to 1925. He established Benton & Bowles, Inc., an advertising firm, in 1929, and was later chairman of the board He was an elector for Franklin D. Roosevelt in November 1940

It may be interesting to know that he was reared as a Republican, and I believe the testimony before us shows that he did not change his registration as a Republican until 1932. He stated that he believed, looking back upon events, that his change from the Republican Party to the Democratic Party was brought about by his strong convictions in behalf of the League of Nations back in the days of Woodrow Wilson. At any rate, he changed his party affiliation in 1932, and in 1940 he was an elector in the election of President Roosevelt.

Mr BREWSTER. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr BREWSTER It would appear, would it not, that his change of front was rather long delayed, since the League of Nations had been a rather dead issue for some 10 years at the time, and the result of this change did not apparently bear fruit, because while the administration which he favored was elected in 1932 it made no move to redeem what he apparently expected from his advocacy of our entry into the League of Nations He did not point out the incongruity, but it seems to me that it does reveal a little illogic.

Mr. SPARKMAN If the Senator from Maine wishes to relish that thought, of course it is his right to do so. I did not say that that was the first time Mr Bowles had voted the Democratic ticket As a matter of fact, I am of the opinion that he supported Al Smith in 1928, but I do not recall that he said so. I merely mentioned the point as a part of his background, not that it has of itself any bearing upon his competence to hold the position to which he has been nominated. It is part of his background, and it was so related to the subcommittee

In 1942 he was State rationing administrator for Connecticut. Later he became general manager of the Office of Price Administrator in Washington, and in 1943 he was appointed Price Administrator by President Roosevelt In 1946 he was appointed Director of Economic Stabilization by President Truman

He was an American delegate to the United Nations Educational and Scientific Organization Conference in 1946 and 1947.

He was Governor of Connecticut during 1949 and 1950, during which time, so I have heard it frequently said, he was one of only a very few governors in the United States who balanced the budget of his State.

He is the author of a book, Tomorrow Without Fear, published in 1946.

Mr President, today there was placed in my hand a telegram signed by George D Stoddard, president of the University of Illinois, and chairman of the United States National Commission for UNESCO. In connection with the item relating to Mr. Bowles' work with UNESCO, I think it is fitting that I read the telegram at this time.

CHAMPAIGN, ILL., *October 8, 1951.*

Sent day letter CONNALLY

"In Paris in 1946 Mr. Chester Bowles and I were among the members of the United States delegation to the first UNESCO conference. I was most favorably impressed, as was the whole delegation, by Bowles' fine intellectual grasp of international issues, by his unfailing courtesy and patience, and by his remarkable ability to work with others.

I regard Bowles as an outstanding public worker, gifted, devoted, and deeply aware of the responsibilities of the United States in the world of today. As Ambassador to India, his broad experience in business and public administration, supported by solid traits of character, would place him in the highest tradition of American foreign affairs. We need more men like him."

Best wishes.

GEORGE D STODDARD.

Mr BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BENTON. Does the Senator from Alabama know that in addition to having balanced the budget of the State of Connecticut during his 2-year term of office as Governor, Governor Bowles was one of only three Governors in the United States who achieved that distinction without raising taxes? I make that comment simply to add to the reference the Senator from Alabama made a moment ago.

Mr THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask the Senator from Minnesota to wait a minute, please.

Let me say that I am glad the Senator from Connecticut has added the phrase "without increasing taxes," which I had inadvertently omitted. I am delighted to have him make that addition, because it is very important, particularly in these times.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut what States were the ones whose governors were able to balance the State budget without increasing taxes. The Senator has mentioned three.

Mr. BENTON. I wish I could name the other two. I am much better acquainted with the record of the State of Connecticut than I am with the records of the other States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. To judge from the question, I would guess that Minnesota may have been one of the other two.

Mr. THYE. Inasmuch as the Senator from Connecticut specifically stated that Mr. Bowles was one of the three governors, my curiosity was aroused, and I wished to know who the other governors were.

Mr. BENTON. I shall make that statement for the RECORD when I obtain the information.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama permit a further question?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has the floor. Does he yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that I have frequently heard the statement to which he has referred, namely, that in only three States were the budgets balanced that year, without increasing taxes.

Mr. THYE. What year was that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Nineteen hundred and forty-nine to nineteen hundred and fifty. Frankly, I do not know whether the statement is a correct one and I do not know what the States were. So far as I am concerned, the information is hearsay, and I recognize it as such.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am advised that the State of New Jersey, under Governor Driscoll, had the same experience.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am delighted to know that New Jersey is the second.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Iowa, and I assume that now we shall hear that Iowa is the third State in that group.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Iowa was the other State in that category, and let me say that not only did my own State accomplish that, but it also substantially increased its surplus and paid most of its soldiers' bonuses out of that surplus during that period of time. I do not know whether other States are included in that category, but those are three.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am delighted to have those three stated.

Mr. President, I see the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] rising. I must tell him that now Maine cannot qualify. [Laughter.]

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I was going to inquire of the Senator from Alabama whether it would not be much better to put Mr. Bowles to work in this country, as Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in Washington, rather than to send him abroad. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am quite sure that if the Senator from Maine will get behind such a move, it may be capable of accomplishment.

Mr. President, in further reference to Mr. Bowles, let me say that on graduation from college, he was considered for appointment to China in the Foreign Service, but was unable to leave the United States because of the illness of his father.

In 1945, Secretary of State Byrnes invited Mr. Bowles to become an Assistant Secretary of State, but he did not accept because he considered it to be his duty to remain as Price Administrator.

In 1946 he was an American delegate to the UNESCO Conference.

Mr. Trygve Lie approached him about the possibility of his accepting a post with the United Nations as an Assistant Secretary. In 1947–48 he headed the U. N. appeal for children and traveled extensively in Europe on behalf of the fund. He has studied widely and has written articles on foreign relations.

Now we come to the main points covered in the hearings.

Two main points were raised in the subcommittee questioning of Mr. Bowles. One pertained to his knowledge, background, and experience in diplomatic affairs, especially with regard to the Far and Middle East; the other pertained to his familiarity with and knowledge of India and the Far East.

The subcommittee questioned Mr. Bowles as to his views about Mr. Nehru, about technical assistance and a point 4 program for India, the Indian situation in general, and what Mr. Bowles conceived his mission to be if he were appointed.

Mr. Bowles' answers, especially as they pertained to technical assistance, raised concern in the minds of some of the members relative to his concept of his mission. Therefore Assistant Secretary of State George McGhee was invited to consult with the subcommittee concerning the instructions under which Mr. Bowles would operate.

Mr. McGhee stated that while it was desirable that anyone going to India should have previous experience with India, "it is highly unlikely that you would find such a man, even if you sought a man in the career service."

The Department of State, in finding a successor to Loy Henderson in India, considered a noncareer man who would approach the Indian problem with an open mind. Of course, Mr. Henderson has, as we know, just been transferred to Iran.

Mr. Bowles, as is customary in the case of ambassadors, will be charged with the execution of policies, not with their formulation.

ECA or its successor will administer aid for India, and that administration will not be the primary responsibility of Mr Bowles.

Some question has been raised as to whether, in view of the importance of India in world affairs, the President should have consulted with Senate leaders prior to the nomination of Mr. Bowles. While the committee agrees that prior consultation with respect to appointments is desirable in certain cases, there is clearly no constitutional obligation on the part of the President to do so.

Now we come to the committee's conclusions:

In considering its recommendation, the committee is primarily concerned with the vital importance of the Indian post. Realizing the growing threat of communism in all Asia, the committee is anxious to ascertain that a thoroughly capable man is assigned the post.

Mr. Bowles made an excellent impression on the subcommittee. He is able, personable, and persuasive. He should be able to fill the Indian post with credit and distinction.

The committee recognizes that he has had little formal training in diplomacy; but this will undoubtedly be offset by his native ability, enthusiasm, and personal qualities.

The committee frankly acknowledges that Mr. Bowles has not visited India, but that is not unprecedented. Distinctly in his favor is the fact that press reaction in India to Mr. Bowles' appointment has been generally favorable.

The committee is also mindful of the fact that it is customary for the Executive to make appointments to important diplomatic posts drawing people from all walks of life. There are many important business and pro-

fessional men who have been appointed as ambassadors without any previous diplomatic experience. In such instances it has been the practice of the Senate to confirm the appointments unless it finds moral turpitude or gross incompetence in the man whom the President wishes to appoint.

Given the present unsettled conditions in the world, the committee considers it important that Mr. Bowles be sent to his post at the earliest possible time. It is hoped, therefore, that the Senate will confirm his appointment without delay.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President——

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thought the Senator from Alabama had concluded his remarks.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall conclude with a further brief statement, Mr. President.

As stated in the report, following Mr. Bowles' testimony, there was some question in the mind of one or more members of the subcommittee with reference to Mr. Bowles' conception of what his job in India would be, if his nomination was confirmed. I may say that question was raised by the fact that India is such an enormous country. For instance, there are 500,000 villages in India. There are more villages in India than there are radio sets in India, if I recall the figures correctly. My recollection is that there are 350,000 radio sets in India. It is a problem to get around over India, to cover the entire area, and even to get news around over India, and to its more or less little independencies, which are almost isolated from other areas of India.

Mr. Bowles, in discussing what he thought ought to be done in India, made it very clear that he believed that whatever was done ought to be at the village level. When the question was raised about the fact that there were 500,000 villages in India, Mr. Bowles made a statement to the effect, that when the funds under the Foreign Aid Act were decided upon, when the amount was known and the question of allocation arose, he naturally was hopeful that India might receive as large an allocation as possible, considering the business of the country, the complexity of its problems, and the importance of India in the world's history.

Mr. President, I merely wish to say, in connection with that matter, that if there was anything at all in all the hearings about which any question was raised, it was regarding Mr. Bowles' attitude with reference to the economic-aid program, the technical-assistance program. But I recall to the minds of Senators the fact that what Mr. Bowles recommended was exactly what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] argued for in our hearings on the foreign-aid bill, exactly the program which the Senate committee adopted, and exactly what was finally adopted in the program as a whole, whereby we retained point 4 exactly as it is now, headed by Dr. Bennett, who made a very fine impression upon our committee, with Mr. Holmes, the point 4 program man representing us in India, who, I believe, made a better impression on the committee than any other person who testified on the foreign aid bill. Mr. Bowles endorsed exactly the program which Mr. Holmes had laid before the committee.

There is one other point, Mr. President, to which I wish to call attention, with reference to Mr. Bowles' idea of what ought to be done in Asia, and in that general area of the world. I read to him two paragraphs from a speech which was made to a joint session of the Congress in the early part of this year by Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I have frequently quoted that portion of General MacArthur's speech, because I regard it as perhaps the best part of what he said in recognition of what the real problem in Asia is today. I asked Mr. Bowles to comment on that. His answer was, "I subscribe to it wholeheartedly."

Mr. President, I do not care to take more time in discussing this nomination. I think I have stated, briefly, I know, but I hope rather adequately, what the impressions were which certainly came to me as an individual member of the subcommittee, and which apparently came to the subcommittee as a whole, with reference to the fitness of Mr. Chester Bowles to represent this Government as Ambassador to India. I simply remind the Senate once more that not one single person appeared who testified against him, and not one single person, certainly so far as I know, asked to be allowed to appear for the purpose of testifying against him.

Mr HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is my understanding correct, however, that the Senator from Alabama received a substantial number of letters of protest against the appointment of Mr Bowles?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Iowa anticipated the very next thing I was going to say. At the time we started hearings on Mr. Chester Bowles' nomination, there were eight letters in the committee files commenting on the nomination. Most of them were very brief letters. I read them to the subcommittee at our first meeting, and as I recall, every one of them was very general in nature I am not certain how many additional letters came, but I now exhibit to Senators the entire file. Knowing, Mr. President, how vocal people are when they actually feel that something is being done which ought not to be done, I submit that this is a remarkable demonstration in the case of Mr. Chester Bowles. The file which I hold in my hand is the entire committee file.

Mr. President, in all fairness, I desire to say that I have received some letters, many of which will duplicate the letters which came to the committee, though some of them are not duplicates.

Mr. President, I am also pleased to exhibit to Senators my file, consisting of letters both of disapproval and of approval. I dare say that half of them are for approval, and of the other half I dare say three-fourths of them are duplicates of what are in the committee file.

I believe it is important for us to remember the absolute lack of opposition, so far as testimony before the committee is concerned, the absolute lack, apparently, of desire to testify before the committee, and apparently, certainly so far as our mail is concerned, the lack of any great concern on the part of the people of the country.

I believe, Mr. President, that under all the circumstances the subcommittee which was appointed was as objective as any subcommittee could be. I have known Mr. Bowles ever since he was Price Administrator in Washington. I was serving in the House at the time. I had just as many conflicts with him as various other Members of the Senate had. I do not think he ever yielded to me on a single point, and I have heard others say the same thing. But that has nothing to do with my decision. I went into the subcommittee with a completely open mind, and I think every other member of the subcommittee did. We tried to listen to the testimony honestly and to arrive at a conclusion. I know that in making up my mind I took the evidence which was reported to the committee. That is all, as I see it, that we have to stand on.

I submit, Mr. President, that the subcommittee was right in recommending to the full committee favorable action on the nomination of Mr. Bowles, and that the full committee, when it considered the nomination, was right in recommending to the Senate that Mr. Bowles' nomination be confirmed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President I regret very much that I cannot vote to confirm the nomination of Mr. Bowles to be Ambassador to India, and I desire to make a few remarks in explanation of my position because normally I would follow the line of reasoning which the distinguished Senator from Alabama has just enunciated in regard to a nomination of this kind.

Let me say, in the first place, that I have had very happy personal relations with Mr. Bowles, and certainly if his nomination is confirmed I shall do everything in my power to assist him in the discharge of the responsibilities he may have to assume. But in order to make my position clear, Mr. President, I must go back a little bit to a time before this nomination came to the Senate. As my colleagues know, I have been very much concerned for a period of 2 years over the situation in the world, especially the situation in the Far East and in the Middle East. I refer especially to China and to India. I feel, as I am sure some of my colleagues also feel, that we would have avoided a good many pitfalls in China in the development of policies, especially since the close of the war in that area, had there been wholehearted cooperation between both sides of the aisle, and full cooperation with the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate.

The late Senator Vandenberg, who was a tower of strength in the development of our policies in Western Europe under the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, and so forth, constantly felt that we were at fault in neglecting to apply

to other areas of the world the programs we adopted for Western Europe, even though the issues in other areas were critical and we were not asked for our advice.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If the Senator will wait a minute, I prefer to finish my statement before yielding.

I desire to point out to the Senate, if I may, that about a year ago, when the question of a Japanese peace treaty arose, it concerned all of us, especially the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and the President of the United States, in my opinion, very wisely appointed a Republican to conduct the negotiations in order to bring into the situation not only a bipartisan approach, but an all-American approach, and to prevent politics entering into the question.

Mr. Dulles immediately conferred with the Foreign Relations Committee. He leaned over backward to confer with his former colleagues on this side of the aisle. We in the Foreign Relations Committee, on our part, realizing that certain problems would arise, constantly tried to be prepared to deal with them as they affected various areas of the world with some intelligence. We organized subcommittees to cover different areas. I happen to be a member of the subcommittee on the Far East. My colleague, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is familiar with what confronted us. We had been very greatly disturbed about eastern relations. The Indian and Chinese picture required intensive thought and study, and, in my case, a trip in order to enable me to study what was being done. It is a subject which, in these critical times, should be approached only by those who know something about the conditions.

My colleagues will bear me out in the statement that in the case of the Japanese peace treaty Mr. Dulles met constantly with the Far Eastern Subcommittee, and discussed the issues before us in regard to the peace treaty step by step. We participated in the plans and the contacts with other countries. We discussed the subject back and forth, and when the time came for the peace treaty to be sent to other nations for approval, before we went to San Francisco, we had the feeling that in Washington we had stood together and could support it. When the delegates went to San Francisco there never was a better demonstration of an all-American bipartisan approach, without any suggestion of politics.

We had an excellent subcommittee, and the whole committee was prepared to work, and yet the whole committee was ignored in regard to the choice of an Ambassador to India, and we were simply sent the name of someone to be the Ambassador, without our having been consulted in any way with regard to the issue, and as to who might be the most effective person to place in the position.

So, Mr. President, my first point in this connection is that I object to the nomination of Chester Bowles because of the way in which it was made. I think my colleagues will agree that the President would have been very wise to take the Foreign Relations Committee into his confidence, along with the Secretary of State, and especially for him to have taken into his confidence the subcommittee which was working constantly on the issues involved.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I prefer to finish my statement, if I may, before yielding.

It seems to me this is an outstanding instance of how a bipartisan foreign policy could be applied. I know that many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle do not believe there is any such principle, but I have been trying to defend that principle since the late Senator Vandenberg worked so hard for it, and I admired so much his approach to it. We should take the same approach, no doubt, and say, "Let us stand together and let us see who is the best man for this position." Instead of that, we have had suggested to us the name of a man whom we all like, a man who has been successful in his business, which is that of advertising. But there is a question whether an advertising expert is the best man for the position of Ambassador to India.

Mr. Bowles had a hard time when he was head of the OPA. He did have experience as Governor of the State of Connecticut, though there were differences of opinion there with regard to his qualities. But he has had no experience whatever in foreign affairs. He has had no contact whatever with the Middle East. He admitted that he had never been to the Far East. Neither one of those areas has ever been visited by Mr. Bowles.

There is a difference of opinion about his philosophy. I am not in accord with his social and political philosophies, and I feel that he would not represent the America in which I believe. That is what an Ambassador has to do.

I submit, Mr. President, there should be someone going to India as our Ambassador who has been there before, who has studied conditions there, who knows the oriental mind, who has a knowledge from first-hand observation and not from merely reading books. Without any reflection at all on Mr. Bowles, whose character is of the best, he has not been appointed in the way in which he should have been appointed if we hope to make a success in this particular situation.

It has been stated that the newspapers in India have been favorable to Mr. Bowles. Why should he not receive some favorable clippings? It seems inconceivable that they would attack him before his nomination has been confirmed.

But I am not discussing that point, Mr. President. The only point I am making is that the Senate must make up its mind whether it feels (a) that the nomination was made in the manner in which it should have been, and (b) whether under the circumstances the man is qualified to take the post when we have so little knowledge of his ability.

The President can send his appointments to the Senate any time he may wish. If a western European country were involved, if he had nominated Mr. Bowles, for instance, to a post in Belgium, which understands our civilization as we understand hers, I do not think we would have raised any objection; but to send him to India, which is one of the danger spots of the world, it seems to me is something which we Senators should explore and see if we cannot take a stand with reference to doing things in the proper way when critical subjects have to be considered.

As I have said, today Asia is one of the danger spots of the world. I submit that the matter has not been handled in a way to do justice to the Senate of the United States or to the administration in getting the best possible representative of the United States in India.

I do not wish to labor the point further. I merely express my own conviction why it is necessary, greatly to my regret, for me to oppose the nomination of Chester Bowles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Ambassador to India?

Several Senators asked for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, it is with no expectation that I shall change the minds of Senators that I now rise to say a few words to the Senate and to give testimony to the worth of a man who has demonstrated by his public service, by his life and character, by his integrity, and his devotion to duty, that he is of such stature and ability as to bring satisfaction to the minds and hearts of those who have tried to judge him and his work.

Chester Bowles has been a success in the business world. He was a success as Administrator of the OPA. He made a great many enemies. He was engaged in the kind of work that makes enemies. But the fact remains that the line was pretty well held. In the greatest conflict in history we succeeded in banking the fires of inflation, and it was not until after the close of the conflict that, in the opinion of some of us, the drafts were opened up and the fires of inflation were fed, with the results that we now know.

After that he became Governor of my beloved State. He was elected in a hard campaign in 1948, rather unexpectedly elected, by a small plurality. I believe that history will demonstrate that he was a great Governor. He was on the job continuously. He had a bright and live and wide-awake administration. No scandal touched the administration of the States' affairs. Many programs of public improvement were brought into being, notably a great housing program. As has already been mentioned, the State's budget was balanced and there was no increase in taxes. Thereby hangs a little tale that perhaps it would be well for me to tell.

In the campaign of 1950, in which I had the honor to run on the same ticket with ex-Governor Bowles, a vigorous campaign was made on the ground that we had run into the red about $7,000,000,

as I recollect, and this fact was attested to by the Treasurer of the State, who, I hardly need add, was not running on the same ticket as the governor or myself.

The truth or falsity of that assertion—and Governor Bowles kept protesting that it was not so—could not be definitely ascertained until after his term of office expired, namely, on July 1. Although I have not personally seen the figures, I am told that they showed a nice balance. But that undoubtedly did have an effect in the campaign.

There is one thing I do not want to do, and that is try that 1950 campaign over again, although I have been asked by some of my colleagues, "How was it that the Democratic governor was defeated and the two Democratic Senators were elected?" The Governor fought a hard campaign, and he fought it well. And shall I say that the kind of campaign that was waged against him in the State of Connecticut is one that I do not think either I or the people of the State now want to hold an inquest on. There is no use in raking up the kind of campaign that was made against him, but in some respects it was a shameful one.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wonder if my colleague from Connecticut will yield to me briefly?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, the State of Connecticut had the right to make its own decision as to whom to elect to the Senate and whom to elect as Governor. I do not believe, however, it is quite fair to think that Mr. Bowles should be punished because he lost. If we are to be consistent, we should be trying to use American personnel in order to carry on our philosophy. If I recollect correctly, the people of New York turned down Mr. Dulles exactly as the people of Connecticut turned down Mr. Bowles. The good Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] in an American political battle conducted according to the rules of the game, as we understand it, defeated Mr. Dulles. Nevertheless, we are all proud of the fact that this country can use a defeated candidate's talents in order to advance American institutions; and that is exactly how I feel about Mr. Bowles.

Mr. McMAHON I thank the Senator from New Mexico very much. I think he makes the point very well. I have the highest regard for Mr. Dulles' achievement. I was glad to hear the Senator from New Jersey pay testimony to the Japanese peace treaty, and undoubtedly he had in mind the great part the defeated candidate for the Senate in New York played in bringing about that treaty. I do not doubt that there have been Senators who have been defeated for reelection and then given diplomatic posts with reference to whom there was no suggestion made that because of their defeat they were unworthy of executive appointment.

I have in mind, for instance, Senator Sackett, of Kentucky, who was named by Mr. Hoover—possibly Mr. Coolidge—as our Ambassador to Germany. He served with honor and distinction.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In order to make the statement definite, I wish to say that Hon. Frederic M. Sackett, of Kentucky, was named by President Hoover to be Ambassador to Germany on January 9, 1930.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Of course, it is a very strange doctine indeed that the Senator from New Jersey wishes to invoke that the Foreign Relations Committee, yes even a portion of the Foreign Relations Committee, should be called in by the President of the United States to advise with him about whom he should nominate as ambassadors abroad. Frankly that is a new doctrine to me. I knew that it was customary, and indeed invariably the case, for a President of the United States to consult with the Senators from the State from which a man is nominated. If he does not do so, if he chooses to ignore that time-honored custom of this honored body, then things happen, such as happened here earlier today in the case of the two judges from Illinois whose nominations were rejected by the Senate.

No; I do not think that is a custom, tradition, or a philosophy that Senators on the other side of the aisle wish to nurture and bring into full fruition, as they look with great hopes to taking over the executive department, hopes which I dare say will be frustrated by the people of the United States, for I think it might be found embarrassing in some far distant day were they now to try to fasten it onto the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. In a moment. I know of no consultation that took place with the members of the Foreign Relations Committee in regard to Mr. Gifford when he was appointed Ambassador to Great Britain.

There is just one other thing to which I desire to refer; and I wish that I did not have to refer to it in this debate, because I wish neither to prolong the debate nor to drag in extraneous issues.

Again we have had on the floor of the Senate a claim that the foreign policy of the United States, so far as the Middle East and Far East are concerned, was conceived in silence, perpetuated in party caucus, and kept secret from the minority party, and particularly the minority Members of the Senate. I say that there is no more demonstrable error in the history of our times than that. During the 2 years from 1947 to 1949, under the chairmanship of the late great Arthur Vandenberg—and he was my friend—and under the domination of the Republican majority in the Senate, the China policy was written on the floor of the Senate, so far as the legislature was concerned. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee I can testify that from 1947 to this very good date there has not been any step taken in the foreign policy of the United States with regard to the Far East, or with regard to anything which could be regarded as approaching major proportions, that has not been placed before the Foreign Relations Committee. If that fact needs to be demonstrated, I invite any Senator to look at the executive hearings before our committee.

I do not know what we could have done about China. I do not know what we could have done to have changed the situation, other than a full-scale participation in the civil war which went on there. Perhaps we should have done it. I heard no cries raised in this body for expeditions into the interior of China.

Mr. President, if I were to digress on this subject I should be talking for a very long time indeed. Perhaps we had better save this question for a full-scale debate some day in this body, until we try out, as best we can on a suitable issue, the question of where the body is buried, so far as our far eastern policy is concerned.

I do not believe that Mr. Bowles has very much to do with that question. He was not in the State Department at the time He was not a Member of the Senate during the Eightieth or Eighty-first Congress, which had the responsibility so far as the legislature is concerned, for what happened in China. The responsibility cannot be very well laid at his door. We had our defeats, from which certain people would like to divorce themselves and remain married only to the victories. No; Mr. Bowles was at that time the OPA Administrator or Governor of the State of Connecticut.

Mr. President, I close by referring very briefly to what the principal Republican newspapers of my State have said about this nomination. They fought Mr Bowle's intensely and vigorously in the campaign of 1950. But, as is customary when campaigns are finished and men take a cooler and more dispassionate view of personalities and issues, when their judgments are not colored with competition and rivalry for the possession of office, we are more likely to get balanced judgments and opinions on the worth of policies and public men.

The Senator from Alabama has called my attention to the fact that on pages 26, 27, and 28 of the hearings are printed editorials from the Hartford Courant, from the Hartford Times, which is not a Republican newspaper, but an independent newspaper with Democratic leanings, and two editorials from the Bridgeport Post, which is a Republican newspaper. I quote from the editorial from the Courant, the oldest newspaper of daily publication in the United States, as Senators know. I have disagreed at times with its editorial page, but so far as I am concerned it is a newspaper which is published and edited by gentlemen. I would to God that we had all over the United States the same high standards of newspaper ethics as are exemplified by the Hartford Courant and the Bridgeport Post, both of which occasionally give me a spanking.

What does the Courant say?—

Mr. Bowles is a highly intelligent man, with imagination, psychological insight and an acute sense of social responsibility. In India he will see a country that is badly off,

not only because it is poor but also because it is shackled by customs and superstitions that continually accentuate that poverty. The soil of the country, for instance, grows worse each year because much of the natural fertilizer is burned for fuel. Though on the verge of starvation, the people do not slaughter cattle for food These are some of many customs that run counter to what the occidental considers good sense.

There will be a great deal in India to draw on the humane instincts of both the Ambassador and Mrs. Bowles. Both are in a position to help the distressed masses there, and doubtless both are aware of the challenge implicit in this appointment. They will bring support to Prime Minister Nehru in his work of uplift and reform, opposed by the social reactionaries of that fabulous land.

Incidentally, let me say a word about the wife of the Ambassador. Popularly known in our State as Steb Bowles, she is a gracious lady, a fine mother, and one of the most charming persons it has been my pleasure to meet. She will be of very great help to the Ambassador in the task which he is about to undertake.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I noticed that the Senator referred to the Bridgeport Post as being a Republican newspaper. How long has that situation prevailed?

Mr. McMAHON. Too long, O Lord, too long.

Mr. AIKEN. As I recall, a very fine, lovable, white-haired old gentleman named McGovern used to operate that newspaper. I always regarded him as quite an ardent member of the anti-Republican Party of Connecticut. I was wondering when the change took place.

Mr. McMAHON Jim McGovern is one of the grand old men of our State.

Mr. AIKEN. He was a good friend of mine, and I thought a great deal of him, but I wondered if he had turned Republican.

Mr. McMAHON. No. Jim McGovern, the grand old man of our State, and president of the Associated Press in the State for many years, is still alive. He is getting well along in years. He was the editor and publisher of the Bridgeport Star, which was taken over by the Bridgeport Post and the Bridgeport Telegram, which are owned and published by Republicans. Mr. McGovern is still with the paper in a less active capacity than formerly. He acts in somewhat of an advisory capacity. I think it will delight my friend and the Senator's friend to know that he has had this tribute paid to him by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I certainly had a very high regard for Mr. McGovern, and I am glad to have the explanation as to how the Bridgeport Post came to be Republican.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut if it would not be an oversimplification if the United States Senate were to insist on the appointment to the so-called tough diplomatic spots or other tough spots in handling our foreign affairs, only of men who have been raised in the career diplomatic service? I think recent events, such as the selection of men like Paul Hoffman, a great member of the Republican Party, have demonstrated that from among our businessmen we can select men who have broad knowledge, and who, given an assigned task, handle it with great distinction. In view of Mr. Bowles' experience, first in business and later as Administrator of the toughest problem ever handed a Federal administrator, that of the OPA in World War II, and in view of his service as Governor of the great State of Connecticut, I believe there has been ample demonstration that he has had adequate experience to enable him to succeed in the tough assignment of being Ambassador to India.

Mr. McMAHON. I certainly think that the answer to the question and the suggestion of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] must be in the affirmative. I do not believe we wish to promote the idea that only in the professional Foreign Service are to be found candidates for future ambassadorial posts. Frankly, Mr. President, if I were to try to imagine a man who was better suited to occupy the post of Ambassador to India it would be hard for me to think of a better candidate than Mr. Chester Bowles. I mean that from the bottom of my heart. Some Senators may be right in their contrary views, or perhaps they may be wrong. However, in the great poverty stricken country of India, a land which is intensely nationalistic and in which new and serious problems are arising, problems which we wish to try to help them solve, it seems to me that we want a man who has a capacity for a fresh approach, who has warm human instinct, who is intelligent, and who has demonstrated his capacity for hard work. It would seem to me that on all grounds and specifications Mr. Chester Bowles fits the picture better than anyone else in public life.

I hope the Senate will confirm the nomination of Mr. Bowles by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I referred to Hon. Paul Hoffman, and the outstanding job he has done. I am informed that he is enthusiastically in favor of the selection of Mr. Bowles as Ambassador to India. I believe the judgment of Mr. Hoffman is reliable because of the outstanding corps of men he has caused to be associated with him in the organization of ECA and their accomplishments. I feel that the Senate would be making a grave mistake in failing to take advantage of the opportunity to confirm the nomination of Mr. Bowles.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I cannot think of anyone who is less qualified to be Ambassador to India than Chester Bowles. I know him well. I have some respect for his ability in some lines. I first met him when he came before the Committee on Banking and Currency with respect to the OPA. I was very favorably impressed with him, and he started off very well, but before he was through he had antagonized practically every member of the committee. He adopted the theory of a controlled and planned economy. By the time he got through his administration of OPA was practically universally despised by the people of the country.

So far as his experience in business is concerned, he was an advertising man, and I do not think that gives him any qualification whatever to be Ambassador to India, which today is one of the most crucial spots in the entire world.

In the second place, it is stated that he is a man of experience because he was Governor of Connecticut. The people of Connecticut did not think he made a very good Governor, because they refused to continue him as Governor. That is not experience upon which to base a man's qualification for Ambassador to India. He was defeated in Connecticut when our distinguished colleagues, both of them Democratic Senators, were elected, at the same time that the people of Connecticut rejected Mr. Bowles as Governor because of his theories of government, which were contrary to what the people of Connecticut believed in.

Mr. McMAHON and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut. I believe he was on his feet first.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course, I know that the Senator from Ohio has an intimate knowledge of what goes on politically in every State in the Union. He keeps up with what goes on in the country on a day-to-day basis. I honor him for his assiduous devotion to his duty.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator from Connecticut for a question, not for praise. I thought he came to bury Caesar, not to praise him.

Mr. McMAHON. That was my answer to the Senator from Ohio, because the Senator from Ohio implied a compliment to the Senators from Connecticut—and I will take a bow for my colleague—by pointing out that we had won in the election. I am sure it was no reflection on the great Senator from Ohio that, while in the last election he carried the State of Ohio by an overwhelming vote, in 1944 he came within 3,000 votes of being defeated.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to ask a fair question, because I disagree with the Senator's statement that the fact that Mr. Bowles was defeated for the governorship of Connecticut automatically disqualifies him as Ambassador to India.

Mr. TAFT. I said that the fact that he had been Governor of Connecticut had been urged as a reason why he was qualified to be Ambassador to India. I said it was no justification for such a qualification.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No.

Mr. TAFT. I do not say that fact alone disqualifies him.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; it was just an indication. Is there as much justification

for sending Mr. Bowles to India as our Ambassador as there was for sending Mr. Dulles to negotiate with Japan a treaty of peace, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Dulles also was defeated by the people of his State?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Dulles has had long diplomatic experience. He has had experience in the diplomatic field ever since his early youth. I believe his grandfather was Secretary of State in the Cleveland Cabinet. He has studied the whole question of our foreign policy. I do not believe the two are in any way comparable.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me see if I can find one that may be comparable.

Mr. TAFT. I have no doubt that the Senator from New Mexico can find an equally unqualified ambassador in this administration.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The people of Kentucky, rightly or wrongly, defeated former Senator John Sherman Cooper as Senator from Kentucky. I do not believe the fact that the people of Kentucky decided in a political campaign not to return Mr. Cooper as a Senator disqualified him from being a servant of the United States in international affairs. He had not had any experience, either.

Mr. TAFT. Former Senator Cooper served on various boards and commissions. He was not appointed out of a clear sky, before he had had any diplomatic experience, as Ambassador to the most important post probably in the entire world. In any event, I am not claiming that the mere fact that Mr. Bowles was defeated in Connecticut disqualifies him to be Ambassador to India. What I said was that it was no argument in his favor. The fact that he was governor of Connecticut does not indicate that he is qualified to be Ambassador to India. That was the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], as I understand.

Of course, Mr. Bowles has had no experience as a diplomat with a big "D." He has never had anything to do with our foreign policy. In the second place, he is not a diplomatic man. I have had a great deal of experience with him in that respect. There is no reason to think that he would act diplomatically in the sense in which we try to maintain our relations with a foreign country. In short, as I have stated, he has adopted the almost complete collectivist policy. He is in favor of spending money. I believe that one of the most dangerous places to send a man who is in favor of passing out money is India, because their whole view is that we should give them the world. That is Mr. Bowles' philosophy. Before the committee he stated.

> I hope that the committees will do everything they can do in allocating the money, to see that we get as much as we can out there. That is the thing that you are working on now. It is a big country, and whatever we have won't be enough. It never is, of course.

In other words, a part of his general philosophy is passing out American money, not only in India, but throughout the entire world. No other promise can be so dangerous, and any such leaning on Mr. Nehru can be very dangerous, because when the policy is finally rejected by Congress or cut down it will only antagonize the Government of India and delude them into believing that in some way we are prejudiced against them because we do not give them as much money as they want.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am sure that if the Senator from Ohio would read the first sentence he would see that Mr. Bowles was talking about money which Congress was in the process of authorizing. However, I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio whether he is aware of the fact that only yesterday the administration was severely taken to task because of its miserly conduct toward India by a very distinguished gentleman in the Republican Party, Mr. Harold Stassen.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. May I ask the Senator from Alabama what Mr. Stassen criticized? Will the Senator state the specific thing Mr. Stassen criticized?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; he said this country had been miserly—I am not sure he used that exact word—in the amount of money it had provided for India and for Asia; and, as a matter of fact, he said we had been derelict because we had not set up a Marshall plan for that area.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield further to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask whether the statement to which the Senator from Alabama refers was given by Mr. Stassen in reply to questions which the Senator from Alabama asked of Mr. Stassen.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, it was given in his direct statement; and then the members of the subcommittee queried Mr. Stassen in regard to what he meant.

Mr. THYE. Was that statement made in the afternoon, after 3:30 p. m?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know at what time the statement was made. I was there from 10 a. m. until 7:30 last night, with Mr Stassen. I could not tell the Senator the particular minute when Mr. Stassen made any particular statement. However, he devoted a great part of his prepared statement to India and to an attack on the administration for its miserly conduct toward India.

In response to questions, he specifically pointed out that we had provided a Marshall plan for Europe, and he felt that we were derelict in our duty in not providing a Marshall plan for India.

Mr. THYE. I would suggest that the Senator from Alabama read the testimony, because it is obvious to me that his mind has played tricks on him, relative to the testimony given yesterday, because I was at the committee hearing until 3:30 p. m. yesterday, and that is why I asked the Senator from Alabama at what time Mr. Stassen made the statement to which the Senator from Alabama has referred.

I will state to the Senator from Alabama what Mr. Stassen said.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have sent for an official transcript of the testimony, and I shall be pleased to rest on it

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. I yield further to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I will state to the Senator from Alabama what Mr. Stassen said. Mr. Stassen said that the administration had been slow in making available wheat to India; he said that the administration had dragged its feet for about 15 months when there was dire need for the wheat because there was starvation in India. That was the testimony given by Mr. Stassen.

He may have told the Senator from Alabama something about the Marshall plan, after 3:30 in the afternoon; but prior to 3:30 in the afternoon, Mr. Stassen was only speaking about the fact that this administration had dragged its feet in regard to the wheat loan.

Mr. Stassen did say that there was need for technical aid to India because India has a vast amount of land which can be well irrigated because there are ample water resources there; but Mr. Stassen was not critical of the administration because it had not put forth a Marshall plan for India.

I hope the Senator from Alabama will read the record of the testimony, in order that he may be positive in what he says on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield once more; but I should like to conclude my statement, and then the Senators can have their own debate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder whether I may reply to the last statement made by the Senator from Minnesota, and then I shall not ask the Senator from Ohio to yield further.

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My very good friend, the Senator from Minnesota—and he is my good friend, and I admire him greatly—admits he left the hearing at 3:30 in the afternoon. I think it was at 7:30 yesterday evening when I left there; at least, it was well along in the day.

I am perfectly willing to stand on the official transcript.

I know Mr. Stassen said what I have stated he said.

Furthermore, with reference to the sending of grain to India, and speaking of one's mind playing tricks, either his memory played him a trick or else he simply did not come out with the facts, if they were in his possession. I challenged him on his statement at the time; and he told me, as I recall, that it was not until December 1950 or January 1951 that Madam Pandit first made the official request for grain for India. I find that it was in December 1950; and instead of 15 months elapsing, the President, in a special message to Congress on February 2, 1951, urgently asked that Congress give early approval to the request of India for grain.

Mr. President, that is the record, and I submit it to any fair-minded person.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, my impression is that Mr. Nehru asked for the wheat when he was in the United States,

which was nearly a year before 1950. However, I do not purport to know the details of that subject.

I merely wish to conclude what I have to say regarding this nomination.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Ohio will yield again to me, long enough to permit me to answer on the last point.

Mr. TAFT. Yes, I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In October 1949 Mr. Nehru was in the United States. He had conversations with our proper officials, including the President, with reference to certain trade agreements, including the purchasing of grain, not for the purpose of relieving famine, but to build up a stockpile, the only difference being that he wanted the grain at a price less than the prevailing market price; in other words, he wanted it on a subsidized basis, but we told him that we could not furnish it to him on that basis.

However, no request was made for grain to relieve famine, until Madam Pandit made an official request in December 1950.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, to summarize, I only wish to say that we have the responsibility of determining whether a man is qualified for the position to which he may be nominated.

I see no qualifications on the part of Mr. Bowles. I see nothing in his business experience to show such qualifications; I see nothing in his experience as Governor of Connecticut to show such qualifications. Certainly I see no diplomatic experience on this part; certainly I see nothing in his character, so far as I can tell, which can be pointed to as proof that he possibly would be a good diplomat in one of the key positions of the world.

Finally, Mr. President, it seems to me that Mr. Bowles' general philosophy is that of a man whom we should not send to India at this time—a man who has his general philosophy of spending and of a general, planned economy. I do not think such a man will be the proper one to combat the possible spread of communism in India. I do not think he is a man who will really picture to Mr. Nehru the true attitude of the American people.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that we have the responsibility of rejecting the nomination of a man who is brought into this situation without any qualifications, and is nominated to hold one of the key positions in the world today.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am one of those who have opposed, and who now oppose, giving the consent of the Senate to the appointment of Mr. Bowles as Ambassador to India.

In the first place, I wish to clear away any question about moral turpitude or personal gross incompetence. Those two things are completely out of the picture, so far as I am concerned. Not only do I not know of any moral turpitude on the part of Mr. Bowles, but I believe him to be, within the limitations of his particular economic and social philosophies, a completely moral man in keeping with his belief. I raise no point about that; I believe Mr. Bowles to be, within the length and breadth of his particular philosophy, a completely honest man.

Mr. Bowles has considerable competence in the advertising field, and he has considerable competence in the bureaucratic field in government, in that he has been able to secure, after making a substantial amount of money in private life, various appointments in the nature of preferential positions in the bureaucracy which has been built up. So he has a certain competence which is not to be denied, and for which I credit him.

By the same token, the fact that I think Mr. Bowles believes in government management philosophies, as against what I believe to be the genuine, proper theory of government, namely, the self-responsibility theory and the individual responsibility theory, and not the fact that Mr. Bowles happens to belong to a political party which is different from the one to which I belong, could constitute a reason why I would oppose confirmation of his nomination to be a diplomatic official in some sections of the world.

Mr. President, we have all sat here during our terms in the Senate and voted to confirm nominees or raised no objection to men appointed by the President of the United States to high office, in spite of the fact that, in most instances, had some of us had the power to appoint or the power to designate, we would never have designated them to the positions for which they were chosen. If disagreement in politics were the sole and only reason for opposing a Presidential appointment, of course, practically no appointees of a partisan President would ever be voted for by the opposite party. That is not the case, Mr. President. I have voted for and approved the nominations of countless individuals who do not belong to my political party, on the theory that I had no specific reasons for opposing them for the particular positions for which they were selected, and I felt that I should go along with them. As a Member of the Senate I feel that I should oppose a nominee only when I believe the best interests of the country will be served if his nomination is not confirmed.

We are all familiar with the argument that the President has the power to appoint and that he has a constitutional responsibility in a constitutional field. Of course he has the constitutional responsibility first to nominate—not to appoint, but to nominate. Then, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, he may thereafter appoint; and that places the Senate in a position of at least equal responsibility in passing upon or approving nominations of citizens for high offices.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] a moment ago said he might well approve, as far as his responsibility was concerned, the appointment of Mr. Bowles to some other position in the world where conditions were different and where the sensitivity of the situation was not so acute. I might find myself in a position of that kind, so far as Mr. Bowles is concerned, in regard to other spots. But, Mr. President, every Senator who has spoken this afternoon, either for or against Mr. Bowles, has admitted that at this time southeast Asia is a very sensitive and a very difficult area. Some have even added the statement, which may be very appropriate, that it is a sick area of the world today; and very sick indeed in some sections.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that if one has a very sick child or a very sick relative, he sends for a trained, experienced physician to treat the sick child or relative; he does not send for the Fuller-brush man.

I believe India is one of the most sensitive spots in the world so far as the balance of political governments in the next few years is concerned. I believe India is indeed an acutely sensitive spot. I think we had better send a trained physician there to represent our school of therapeutics, if you please, Mr. President, rather than the Fuller-brush man to sell them gadgets; and by selling gadgets I mean, selling a bill of goods based upon increasing American bounty and dollar diplomacy rather than selling ideas and affording guidance along the way of enterprise and self-responsibility among the people of India, which I think is the only formula by which we can help people to lift themselves from either degradation or poverty up to responsibility.

The Senator from Ohio quoted from the record of the subcommittee, and I call attention to some very significant language in the testimony. The subcommittee was courteous to me in inviting me to attend the hearings, and I appreciate it. I attended for a limited time when Mr. Bowles was testifying. During that time he used the following language in connection with his idea of how we should undertake in the 500,000 villages and among the 375,000,000 people of India to lift them up. Among other things, he said:

> I hope that the committees will do everything they can do in allocating the money, to see that we get as much as we can out there. That is the thing that you are working on now.

That statement, together with some of his other statements, all taken together, led me to a definite impression about his attitude. So, after that, when the chairman asked me whether I had any comments or any questions to raise, I said this to Mr. Bowles, among other things:

> Frankly, I have been disturbed over the period of the past several years with the avidity with which this country is pouring out our money in other countries in an attempt to have them spring full-blown into economic self-sufficiency overnight, when they have gone for thousands of years with an organized society and haven't made progress under their own power.

In interpreting what I believed to be his position, I further said to Mr. Bowles:

> Now, frankly, I disagree with your philosophy of our American Ambassador going out to India with the idea of getting as much American money as we can to spend around over India on point 4, simply because they

have 350,000,000 people there, in 500,000 villages.

In that statement, Mr. President, I was trying to interpret to Mr. Bowles and make perfectly clear in the hearings that I thought he was going forth to India on a money-spending expedition. Mr. Bowles had to catch a train that afternoon. There were several pages of discussion after that, but Mr. Bowles at no time contradicted the interpretation I stated to him of his attitude as to what he should do as American Ambassador to India.

I feel that India is an important part of the world, indeed a vital part of the world. There are a number of countries in Southeast Asia which do not always see eye-to-eye with what we call the West. I have the feeling that many of those countries are still very much disturbed by the imperialistic or colonial policies which have been in force there for a long time, that their attitude is one of question and wonder, that they do not understand exactly what the American system is, and that, if we are to get along with them and if our relations are to become increasingly better, we must have there in important positions representatives who fully understand at least what are some of our concepts of the American system, which is a system of self-help, of hard work by the individual, of self-responsibility, and of free individual enterprise. I feel that people who have been preaching up and down the land, not only in the United States over the past 15 or 20 years, but who also as our official representatives have been preaching to other nations of the world the idea that we are gradually collectivizing our business, our opportunities, and our whole enterprise system, which has made this country strong, are ambassadors of disservice to our country and to the freedom-loving nations of the world.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator whether he understood as I did the remarks of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], which rather shocked me, in a way, because, unless I have misinterpreted what he said, the Senator stated that one of the reasons for the selection of Mr. Bowles was that apparently we had no career diplomats who could take the post. If that be so, then certainly our diplomatic policy has been in a bankrupt state, if, with all our diplomats abroad who have had service, there could not have been selected a man who had had some diplomatic experience in the area of India. I personally do not believe we are in any such bankrupt position.

In dealing with the critical situation in Asia, one name occurs to me as that of a man who might have been an ideal choice for the post in India, and I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa if he does not think that this man at least represents a type which has had diplomatic experience and might have filled the bill. I refer to Dr. Ralph Bunche, who has given devoted service to this country in connection with the United Nations and elsewhere, and who might have been able to furnish an excellent representation to India and to help interpret this country to India and India to this country.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Dr. Ralph Bunche is a great and eminent American of great ability. He undoubtedly has great capacity to discharge the duties of any office which he undertakes. I hope the Senator from California will pardon me if I say I would rather not refer to any particular individual as the one who could best fill the position of Ambassador to India, because there are a number of men who could well look after the interests of the United States in selling American principles in the Orient. I would prefer not to pinpoint any individual at the moment. It happens to be the responsibility of the President to nominate individuals, and it is the responsibility of the Senate to pass upon their qualifications.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the difficulty in getting the right man for the right position lie largely in the fact that such positions go to those who have made very liberal campaign contributions to the party chest, that the career diplomats do not make enough money to make such contributions, and, therefore, do not receive any important ambassadorial posts? Is not that fact responsible for some of the troubles in which we find ourselves? I am standing up for the career diplomats. I do not see how they can get money enough to secure appointments to any of these positions.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say to the Senator that I think there are any number of diplomats in our career diplomatic service who could do an admirable job of representing American ideals and basic principles to the Indian people. As to some of the more important posts, it no doubt takes more money out of the pocket of the Ambassador to operate the Embassy post than career diplomats, in many cases, can afford, unless they inherited money or married rich wives. As a consequence, too often in the past persons have been appointed to diplomatic posts based upon their financial situation rather than upon their diplomatic experience

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is entirely correct I am not casting any aspersions on any of the Ambassadors to the more important posts, and I am not casting any aspersions on Mr. Bowles. I am simply pointing out that there has been an unfortunate practice of giving the more important posts to the more liberal campaign contributors, and we ought to get off that basis one of these days.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think that practice has been indulged in too often in the past. I do not know how much Mr. Bowles contributed to the national, State, and local Democratic campaign funds, but I assume, although I do not criticize him for it, that he contributed the full legal limit all the way down the line, because I understand he is a wealthy man.

I will say to the Senator from Vermont, since he has raised the question of political appointees, that I am thoroughly convinced that the appointment of Mr. Bowles had politics at its base. It was a political reward to a supporter of the administration, and it was not made because of any diplomatic ability which he possesses.

Mr. AIKEN. I was just wondering about that. The statement was that he was appointed for political purposes. I was wondering whether it was to promote political purposes, or whether he was to have a selling job.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It was a political reward for political support of the present administration.

Mr. AIKEN. That practice has been indulged in for a long time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct. I have no doubt it has been indulged in by both parties in the history of the country. But that does not make it right.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I hope the Senator from California will listen to this statement. He purported to quote me a few minutes ago as saying that we had a dearth of material from which to fill these diplomatic posts.

First of all, I should like to invite his attention to the fact that India has been an independent nation only since 1947, and there have been very few persons of the rank of Ambassador who have served in India.

I think the Senator from Iowa has answered the question adequately with respect to an individual. It is our responsibility to approve or disapprove an individual whose nomination the President sends to us. I believe it is fair to keep that in mind.

If the Senator from Iowa will permit, I should like to call attention to the fact that there is today a higher percentage of career officers in diplomatic posts than there ever has been before in the history of this Nation. As of February 8, 1951, there were 66 posts, chiefs of missions. Forty-four were filled by career officers, or 67 percent; noncareer officers, 22, or 33 percent.

With reference to the appointments made by President Truman during the time he has been in office, there were the following noncareer officers, according to the list which has been furnished me:

Prentice Cooper of Tennessee, who was appointed to Peru in 1946. Mr. Cooper had been Democratic Governor of Tennessee.

Myron M. Cowan, of New York, to Australia, July 1, 1948. I think he is recognized as one of our best diplomatic officers. He is now in the Philippines. I do not know what his background is as to office holding or his political alinement.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. He comes from Iowa; he must be a pretty good man.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know whether he is a Democrat or a Republican.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not, either.

Mr. SPARKMAN. He must be somewhere close to the middle of the road.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say that the high degree of intelligence and ability with which he performs his duties makes me think he is a Republican.

Mr SPARKMAN. The next is Dwight P Griswold, of Nebraska. He was a Republican Governor of Nebraska.

The next is Walter S. Gifford, of New York, who is a well-known Republican.

The next is Ellsworth Bunker, of New York, who was sent to Argentina this year He is a prominent business executive and bank director I do not know what his political affiliation is. I dare say the Democratic Party received very few contributions from that list of noncareer appointments which were made during the time President Truman has been in office.

Mr AIKEN. Mr President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator refers to Mr. Ellsworth Bunker, who is one of my good neighbors, who has a farm about 2 miles from where I live in Vermont. I would not ask for a better neighbor. He has been in the sugar business and has been very successful at it. So far as I know, he has not had diplomatic experience He has been a liberal contributor to the Democratic Party, however. I have not heard that he is not making a good Ambassador in Buenos Aires. I am confident he would try very hard to fill, with credit, any position which he held

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator from Alabama that I think he has added materially to the strength of the argument I have been making, when he now points with pride to the fact that the administration has actually been promoting more trained career diplomats in the Diplomatic Service. Then I ask him: Why in one of the most sensitive diplomatic jobs in the world today, so far as the American Government is concerned, does it not continue the policy toward which he so proudly points, and appoint a trained, experienced diplomat to take care of the interest of the United Sttates in that sensitive and, as some say, sick area of the world?

Mr. President, I am going to conclude what I have to say. I feel as do some other Senators about the effect of speeches on votes. The Senator from Connecticut said he did not think he would change any Senator's mind. I do not think I will change any Senator's mind by what I am saying. But I do want to register my protest chiefly because, as I said a moment ago, if there is a sick part of the world, or a part of the world whose recovery, so far as concerns association with the West, is in the balance, then to that sick part of the world we should send a physician, and not a Fuller-brush man.

My desire is to see men appointed to diplomatic and other positions who are qualified and experienced in representing and maintaining the basic ideals of the American system of government as I understand them, and as I hope we all understand them.

I have no objection whatever so far as Chester Bowles' personal character is concerned, so far as his moral character is concerned. I believe him to be a moral man. I believe him to be an honest man. I believe him to be a truthful man. But I believe him to be an inexperienced man appointed to a position where we need the best qualified man available. I have supported persons named to various ambassadorial positions whom I did not think were necessarily the best qualified, but I did not think the American prestige and the American philosophy of government would suffer greatly as the result of their appointment. In this instance, when there is to be dealt with an extremely sensitive situation, indeed, a dangerous situation, because, as the Middle East goes, so may the entire Orient go eventually, I feel that it will take handling of the most delicate sort, of the most experienced sort, and in the last analysis of the most American sort by a person who in all respects is qualified to undertake the task. Therefore, for the reasons I have stated, I shall vote against Mr Bowles' appointment

Mr. BREWSTER Mr. President, I was a member of the subcommittee dealing with this matter. I shall not review the comments which have been made by other Members on this side of the aisle, with which I heartily concur, but I do want to complete the record so far as the pending nomination is concerned.

In the first place, Mr. Bowles' career has been referred to. I desire to call attention to certain details which were not quite adequately covered. I quote Mr. Bowles' own statement regarding how he first got into public life. He says on page 2 of his evidence:

I then stumbled by accident into the Office of Price Administration—

I hope he will not sometime say he stumbled by accident into the position of Ambassador to India—

first as rationing administrator in a very small area, then as State director, finally as Administrator, and finally as Director of the Economic Stabilization Office, at which time I gave some of you gentlemen in Congress difficulties, but I had my own difficulties too, if you remember.

We are all familiar with that administration, which the President himself was finally obliged to terminate and repudiate.

Then he was offered the position of Assistant Secretary of State, which he refused for reasons which he considered sufficient.

He then went as delegate to the UNESCO Conference where he spent some 3 weeks, and from that he became head of the Children's Fund which, in his own words "was a colossal failure." I do not attribute responsibility to him, but he himself tells how they started out with some very large ideas to raise $200,000,000. They finally raised $20,000,000, and then the whole proposition collapsed.

At the request of Life magazine, he wrote an article, which they refused to print, I do not know what it contained.

He was then offered a position by Trygve Lie in the United Nations as assistant secretary, which he declined.

He accepted a position as consultant to the Children's Fund.

He then wrote a book on economics, which is now in use as a textbook by freshman classes in our colleges. I do not think that qualifies him for the very intricate economic problems we are going to face.

Now coming down to his appointment, there are recurring and apparently well-founded rumors that this selection was not primarily that of the State Department, but of the President for reasons which the Senator from Iowa has mentioned, that it was primarily a political rather than a diplomatic selection. Naturally, that is a matter which the State Department will not discuss, but there are well-founded rumors that they viewed with a somewhat hesitant eye the selection of a person without diplomatic experience, who had never been in the Orient, for a position which is probably the most critical our country has to fill at the present time.

There are one or two other interesting items in his testimony which I am sure will have a rather curious reaction in the post to which he is going. We asked him before the committee what he conceived to be his function, what he should do. The Senator from Ohio has already referred to his attitude toward very greatly increasing the aid which we should extend. But one of the other items which he thought was of importance was the desire to improve the system of government in the country to which he goes—a very interesting conception of an ambassadorial function. As I recall, it was a diplomat from England who once undertook to contribute something to the improvement of our own Government by a suggestion as to the policies we should pursue, and he was given his papers of exit by a great Democratic President, Mr. Cleveland. But Mr. Bowles is going to improve things over in India. This is what he is going to do:

I think, for instance—

He said—

to say it is none of our business if Italy or France or some other country collects their taxes, it is no business of ours whether they have a sensible tax system or whether there is good administration, and that it is only up to us as a friendly nation to help them is ridiculous.

In other words, we should really show these countries how to conduct their governments.

I think we have an obligation to see that they do a good job of administration, that they do an honest job, that their taxes are collected—

Please page the Internal Revenue Bureau of the present Democratic administration and see whether we are the ones to go over to India and tell them how to administer honestly their system of tax collections, when half of our internal-revenue collectors have already resigned under fire and several of them are under indictment and on the way to jail. I think our friends in India will probably have a sufficient sense of humor to appreciate the idea of Mr. Bowles

leaving behind him the wreck of this administration, in this country, in the Internal Revenue Bureau, so far as taxes are concerned, and going to India to tell the people there how to do an honest job in collecting taxes. Mr. Finnegan would be a better man, I think, to send to India to do that job if that is what is supposed to be done.

There was one other aspect of this matter concerning which, I think unintentionally, Mr. Bowles perhaps told a great truth. He was asked about the concept of how their economy could develop. He told the story of the Indian Socialist who came to this country and surveyed our system, and after he had looked it over for a while and had talked with a good many people, said, "I am confused." That was certainly a well-warranted conclusion as he looked at what was going on in this country. What does Mr. Bowles say:

> I think it would be part of my job to perhaps carry that confusion a little further and demonstrate we have something here that is dynamic.

I am afraid that that will be the result of Mr. Bowles' participation in the administration of the affairs of the office of Ambassador.

Somewhat more seriously, Mr. Bowles said that he thought he was in a position to explain our system. Whether or not he is a good man to expound our system is, I think, certainly a matter of some question. I cannot believe that anyone here will seriously contend that the economic ideology and theories with which Mr. Bowles has been identified are characteristic of the majority of the Members on either side of this aisle, or of the great people of this country, in either political party. When we send a man with what he conceives to be his missionary function to reform and reconstruct a great nation such as India, which for thousands of years has been living under conditions certainly of great difficulty, with the idea that by either the contribution of our money or the influencing of their internal governmental policies, he can reconstruct the situation, such action seems to me more nicely calculated to bring about the misunderstandings which have so tragically occurred in Europe.

Many of us on both sides of the aisle were present at the Interparliamentary Union meeting in Dublin a year ago, when we heard the representatives of India and other countries denounce us for the policies we were pursuing, which were called economic imperialism, in spite of the fact that all we have been doing since the war has been to give away billions of dollars of our money to try to help unfortunate people around the world. In the concept of those representatives of the Government of India we were simply economic imperialists, trying to impose some kind of system on them. Whether it be Mr. Bowles in the guise of instructor in economics, telling them how to govern their country, or whether to be Mr. Bowles in the guise of Santa Claus, giving them hundreds of millions of dollars—the figure he mentioned was $250,000,000 a year as a starter, which we should give them—in whichever function he appears, I greatly fear that the results will be most unfortunate in our relations with India and our influence in India, as well as in connection with the impressions which India forms with respect to us in America.

I do not stress the matter of consultation, although I think the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was entirely justified in urging a different attitude by the administration in the approach to the so-called consultative committees which have been created by the Committee on Foreign Relations to deal with the four areas into which the world has been divided. I believe that would be a far better way in which to achieve the coordination of approach in foreign policy which is absolutely vital if we are to carry on.

We had the word of the late Senator Vandenberg that he had never been consulted, except in one instance, so far as our Asiatic policy was concerned. That has been largely true with respect to all that has occurred since, in spite of the readiness of Senators on both sides of the aisle—and this is equally as true of the Democratic side of the aisle as it is of this side—to participate in such consultations with responsible authorities in the executive department. I believe that the only way in which coordination of approach can be achieved is through the competent committees of the Congress. Such coordination is absolutely vital if America is to pursue a continuity of policy which will command the respect of all the world.

The pending nomination is a glaring instance of what I have in mind, not because we were not consulted, but because the man who has been nominated has neither the diplomatic experience nor the knowledge of the Orient which would qualify him for one of the most delicate and difficult diplomatic posts to be found in the whole wide world today.

So I hope that Senators on both sides of the aisle will vote with an eye to what they conceive to be the best interests of the country, for whose welfare we are now so responsible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, before voting on this nomination I should like to ask two or three questions.

First, was any charge made in the committee against Mr. Bowles' character?

Mr. BREWSTER. No.

Mr. AIKEN. Was there any charge against his loyalty or general level of intelligence?

Mr. BREWSTER. That question was not raised.

Mr. AIKEN. The question was not raised, as I understand.

To what extent will Mr. Bowles, if his nomination is confirmed as Ambassador to India, determine the policy of this country toward India and toward Asia in general?

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the answer to that question is that India, because of its remoteness and because of the peculiarly involved character of its problems, is probably more sensitive on that score than any other spot in the world. We shall be peculiarly dependent not only upon the information, but the advice of our representative at that post. We had previously sent there our most experienced diplomat, a man with 30 years' service, Mr. Loy Henderson. It was a matter of considerable concern that a man with such vast experience, who had been before the consultative committee only 2 months ago, was sent to a less important post.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know why Mr. Henderson was transferred? What reason was given for that?

Mr. BREWSTER. No reason was given except that he was sent to Iran, which, of course, is a very critical point now. But why he was selected for such a transfer I do not know. I indicated that this was understood to be a political appointment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask one or two further questions.

Did Mr. Bowles express any opinion on Asiatic policy, and particularly Indian policy, which might, perhaps, make trouble for the United States in the future?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is what I referred to in my statement. His concept of the duty of an Ambassador was to reform the tax system and assume responsibility for the administration of the economy, which was not calculated to be helpful.

Mr. AIKEN. Did he make the statement that the tax system of India ought to be reformed? So far as that goes, I understand that the tax systems of Italy, France, and several other countries could stand a little reforming. Possibly that is true of the tax system of the United States.

Mr. BREWSTER. He indicated that India certainly was in very sad need of reconstruction of its economic and political life, and that he hoped to contribute to that end. That, I think, is a most disturbing aspect.

Mr. AIKEN. And that led some members of the committee, did it not, to fear that Mr. Bowles might undertake to make over the internal affairs of India when he got there?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. One further question. We assume that whoever is named Ambassador to India will be a Democrat and a contributor to the Democratic campaign fund. In all probability he will be a Truman Democrat. Is there any assurance that if Mr. Bowles' nomination is not confirmed, someone not meeting those qualifications will be named to the post?

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not think we could get any assurance of that character. We can only pray. I do not think it is a very good argument for confirming the nomination of an unqualified man to say that we may get another unqualified man. I do not believe that we could have one considered who could be much less qualified on this particular angle than Mr. Bowles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India?

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON]. If present and voting the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are detained on official business

On this vote the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—43

Aiken	Holland	Moody
Benton	Hunt	Morse
Chavez	Johnson, Colo	Murray
Clements	Johnson, Tex	Neely
Connally	Johnston, S C	Pastore
Douglas	Kefauver	Robertson
Eastland	Kilgore	Russell
Fulbright	Langer	Smathers
George	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Gillette	Lodge	Smith, N C.
Green	Magnuson	Sparkman
Hayden	Maybank	Stennis
Hennings	McFarland	Underwood
Hill	McMahon	
Hoey	Monroney	

NAYS—33

Bennett	Ecton	Mundt
Brewster	Ferguson	Saltonstall
Bricker	Hendrickson	Schoeppel
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. J.
Butler, Md.	Ives	Taft
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Thye
Cain	Knowland	Watkins
Carlson	Malone	Welker
Case	Martin	Wiley
Cordon	McCarran	Williams
Dworshak	Millikin	Young

NOT VOTING—20

Anderson	Frear	McKellar
Byrd	Humphrey	Nixon
Capehart	Kem	O'Conor
Dirksen	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Duff	Long	Tobey
Ellender	McCarthy	Wherry
Flanders	McClellan	

So the nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCFARLAND. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

VISIT TO THIS COUNTRY OF MOHAMMED MOSSADEGH, PREMIER OF IRAN

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, of late much has been said about bettering the lot of so-called backward people. In the first place, if there are backward people in the world and the reasons for that status are investigated, it is generally found that they have been oppressed by colonialism and by so-called better-informed people taking advantage of them in the exploitation of their natural resources.

There is no reason whatsoever, under the proper form of government and with the proper development of her natural resources, why the people of Iran should not make headway in bettering their condition. It appears to me there is no reason, irrespective of the stern necessities of the past, why the colonialism of the English or what is left of the British Empire should continue to keep the people of Iran in a backward state.

Yesterday there arrived in this country of opportunity the Premier of Iran, Hon. Mohammed Mossadegh, who is to appear before the United Nations in an effort to protect the dignity of the Government of Iran and of the humanity that exists in Iran. It seems to me that all of us who believe in the philosophy of the Government of the United States of America should be happy about his visit. He probably stands in the same position Benjamin Franklin occupied at the time when he was in Europe fighting for the rights of the American Colonies.

Many a foreign visitor has been met with honors and with a word of welcome at the various airports and seaports of our country. I, for one, welcome Mohammed Mossadegh to this country in the hope and the confidence that right will prevail and that something will be done about helping the backward people of Iran.

ARMED SERVICES RECRUITMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, some 10 days ago when the appropriation bill for the armed services was before the Senate, I pointed out what I considered to be a very unnecessary expenditure on the part of the armed services, in putting on radio and television shows as a

part of recruitment programs. I made particular reference to the program The Shadow, which was put on by the armed services at considerable expense to the Government. I also referred to the sponsoring by the Treasury Department of Sammy Kaye's orchestra, which probably cost more than The Shadow was costing the armed services.

I am happy to report that now I have been informed that The Shadow has gone back into private industry, and may be heard regularly every week, selling some kind of hair tonic, although I do not know what particular variety.

I am also informed that at that time Sammy Kaye was contributing his services to the Treasury Department. He also has now secured a private contract, and started the new programs on October 7, I understand. However, I wish to give him credit for contributing his services during the time when he was not under private contract.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to announce that on account of there being so many conference committees working and so many subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee working, the Senate will recess from today until Thursday.

On Thursday we shall take up Senate bill 2233, Calendar 845, a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

After that bill we hope to call the calendar of unobjected-to bills from the beginning, insofar as the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are then prepared in connection with the calendar.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Eighty-four bills have been placed on the calendar during the past week. The Senator from Kansas and the Senator from New Jersey inform me that they will be ready to have the calendar called from the beginning, if it is clearly understood by the majority leader that the bills which they have not had time to investigate will simply go over, regardless of their merit, and so forth.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I agree to that.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, does that mean the entire 84?

Mr. McFARLAND. No.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No, it does not. I would say to the Senator from Nevada that we hope to be ready in the case of a great number of those bills. However, time is short, and the Senator from Nevada knows that 84 bills have been placed on the calendar since October 1.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there is on the calendar another bill which, if objected to, I told the distinguished Senator from Nevada we would take up following the call of the calendar. It is House bill 4693, Calendar No. 727, amending the Bankruptcy Act.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not see the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] on the floor at this time. However, I understood that the majority leader was going to try to bring up before the recess or adjournment the home rule bill for the District of Columbia. Since no particular business is planned for tomorrow, I wonder whether it will be possible for that bill to be worked in tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. We gave consideration to the home rule bill. We may be able to bring it up. However, it will take several days of debate. We are very anxious to dispose of the appropriation bills and the conference reports. Some of the bills on the agenda will have to go over, but I am still hopeful that the particular bill to which the Senator has referred will be one which will not have to go over. We may be able to take it up next week.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is very much interested in the bill, and he tells me that he will be engaged in conferences on the pay bill all day tomorrow and will not be able to attend a session in the Senate Chamber at that time.

That is why we are planning to take a recess until Thursday in order to give the committees an opportunity to prepare and submit conference reports.

I should like to point out that at best there will be only 2 months between the end of this session and the beginning of the next one. In view of that fact not very much will be gained by considering a bill before January.

The House is making every possible effort, I am informed by the Speaker, to get all the appropriation bills through the House by the end of the week. If we make the same effort, on this side of the Capitol, it will not be many days until we can adjourn. However, we simply cannot keep on taking up bills and working on the floor without giving the conference committees an opportunity to work on the conference reports, and still expect to conclude the session.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Arizona still is of the opinion, is he, that there is an opportunity to conclude the session before October ends?

Mr. McFARLAND. Well, Mr. President——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is he hopeful?

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not wish my friend to make me feel bad this evening in regard to when we are going to end the session. We are going to end it as soon as we can. I am going to work as hard as I can toward that objective; and I know that my good friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, will do the same. I hope we shall be able to adjourn quite a bit before November 1. Certainly we will adjourn as soon as we can. However, this evening I am not going to set any dates.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Arizona has made a clear statement regarding the schedule for Wednesday and Thursday. In order that Senators may make some plans, if possible, for the week end, can the Senator from Arizona give us any idea of what may be done following Thursday?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am hopeful that on Friday there will be a number of conference reports which will be ready for consideration. If not, I shall make an announcement, possibly on Thursday.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in order to have the bill pending, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2233, Calendar No. 845, a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2233) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

THE PRESIDENT'S ORDER RESTRICTING OFFICIAL INFORMATION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on September 24, 1951, a Presidential Executive order was issued "establishing minimum standards for the classification, transmission, and handling by departments and agencies of the executive branch, of official information which requires safeguarding in the interests of the United States." This executive order extends military security regulations to all civilian agencies, and establishes machinery for the censorship and control of the American television, radio, periodicals, and press. It is a new and dangerous departure in American history. Accordingly, the following Republican Members of the United States Senate declare:

MANIFESTO

The American heritage of freedom is a product of vigorous, uncontrolled public discussion. Within the framework of laws which safeguard the rights of individuals, it has been the historic privilege and the sacred duty of Americans to criticize our Government. This power, in the hands of a free people, has prevented the accumulation of evil in government. The open forum of public debate has been, and will ever be, the greatest enemy of tyranny.

We are in the midst of a war. The emotional tensions caused by this conflict tend to restrain people from making objective criticisms of their Government.

Partisan politicians tend to attribute all fault-finding to depravity or disloyalty.

Freedom of speech means freedom of speech for all. It means freedom of speech for those who agree with the party in power. It means freedom of speech for people who disagree with those who hold the reins of government. The defects in government

are usually exposed by those who are critical. No single group of Americans has a monopoly on ideas or patriotism.

Any attempt to restrain the inherent right of an American to criticize his Government must be resisted by all freedom-loving persons.

There is evidence that some persons and groups in authority in our Government are unable to tolerate criticism. This is manifested by the smear tactics and propaganda techniques now being used to silence any opposition.

There is evidence that no man can criticize our Government today and escape intemperate reprisals.

This is an alarming situation. It cannot be ignored

We, therefore, the undersigned, Members of the United States Senate, pledge to the American people that we shall fight to guarantee that, in the difficult days ahead, no man's voice will be silenced.

We shall vigorously resist any attempt to conceal facts from the American people.

We shall defend, to the utmost, the fundamental right of free, unlimited discussion of controversial questions of government.

We shall rally to the defense of any person against whom reprisals are directed as a result of the exercise of his constitutional right of freedom of speech.

The issue involved is paramount. The voice of the people must be heard.

(Signed)

George D Aiken	James P. Kem
Wallace F. Bennett	William F. Knowland
Owen Brewster	William Langer
John W Bricker	Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.
Styles Bridges	Joseph R McCarthy
Hugh Butler	George W. Malone
John M Butler	Edward Martin
Harry P Cain	Wayne Morse
Homer E Capehart	Karl E. Mundt
Frank Carlson	Richard M. Nixon
Francis Case	Leverett Saltonstall
Guy Cordon	Andrew F. Schoeppel
Everett M Dirksen	H. Alexander Smith
James H Duff	Margaret Chase Smith
Henry C. Dworshak	Robert A. Taft
Zales N Ecton	Edward J. Thye
Homer Ferguson	Arthur V. Watkins
Ralph E Flanders	Herman Welker
Robert C Hendrickson	Kenneth S. Wherry
Bourke B. Hickenlooper	Alexander Wiley
Irving M. Ives	John J. Williams
William E Jenner	Milton R. Young

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, October 11, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate October 9 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

UNDER SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Department of the Air Force, vice John A. McCone, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 9 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

William Amory Underhill, of Florida, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

REJECTIONS

Executive nominations rejected by the Senate October 9 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Joseph Jerome Drucker, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois. (New position.)

Cornelius J. Harrington, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois. (New position.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Charles F. Phillips, Francis Asbury Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer.

O Thou Eternal Spirit, as a fitting prelude to the day, we pause to listen to the still small voice, remembering that it was said of old, "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength."

Hear our prayer for a troubled world. Dispel the clouds of gloom that plague the hearts of men. Bring to naught all vicious schemes to thwart the ends of peace. Bless all sincere efforts in its behalf. Deliver us from fears, strengthen us with undiscourageable good will, and prompt to deeds of friendliness that changes foes to friends.

Hear the prayer of the world for security, a security that is real. Help us to see that ultimate security is found in righteousness and justice and brotherhood. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord."

Remember these good and able men who guide the destiny of the Nation. Give to them wisdom from on high, insight into the issues of these days, and the guidance that always comes to those who walk with God. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5504. An act to amend section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 to increase the amount available for the construction of access roads certified as essential to the national defense.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2231. An act to effect entry of a minor child adopted or to be adopted by a United States citizen.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5215. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. CORDON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONFERENCE REPORTS OF CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL (H R. 4386) AND APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY (H. R. 4740)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file conference reports on the bills (H. R. 4386) making appropriations for civil functions, and (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2231) to effect entry of a minor child adopted or to be adopted by a United States citizen.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Tina Bentsen, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd M. Bentsen, Jr., citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL COLSON

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last evening I attended a banquet given in honor of General and Mrs. Charles F. Colson, who has been the commanding officer at Fort Devens for several years, by the townspeople and others of the surrounding neighborhood. He and Mrs. Colson are immensely popular and have done many, many kindnesses for the service men and women, and for the State. General Colson has had $16,000,000 a year to expend

at Fort Devens in connection with that very large post, the reception center through which 100,000 men have passed, and out of that number only two went a. w. o. l., and those two were ill. That is a remarkable record. I think we do not express enough appreciation of our Army and our service officers. General Colson has supervision over a very wide area, in fact, he is manager of it with absolute authority. Today it is tremendously important to have men of fine character to hold their officers in line. It is said there are no poor privates if there are good officers. It is of such importance to have the soldiers well trained and well equipped for their own protection and for the protection of the United States.

General Colson has had a long and distinguished service in the Army. He is a great general and a great Christian.

Following is the program of the testimonial dinner:

AYER CIVIC DINNER—TESTIMONIAL TO BRIG. GEN. CHARLES F. COLSON, COMMANDANT, FORT DEVENS, TOWN HALL, AYER, MASS., OCOTOBER 8, 1951, 7 P. M.

PROGRAM

Invocation—Rev. Father William J. McCarthy, St. Mary's, Ayer

Honorable Joseph M. Markham, chairman, board of selectmen

Colonel Edward B. McCarthy, assistant commandant, Fort Devens

Honorable Lyman K. Clark, judge, first district court

John J. Long., Jr., chairman, Army area advisory commission

Honorable Edith Nourse Rogers, Congresswoman, Sixth District

Brigadier General Charles F. Colson, commandant, Fort Devens

Benediction.....Rev. Hugh Penny
Federated Church, Ayer

Toastmaster.....Richard J. O'Toole
Chairman of committee

"Life is to be fortified by many friendships. To love and be loved is the greatest happiness of existence." (Sydney Smith.)

"Welcome ever smiles, and farewell goes out sighing." (Shakespeare.)

MENU

Fruit cocktail, hot roast young turkey, sage dressing, brown gravy, cream mashed potato, green peas, cranberry sauce, sweet mixed pickles, assorted rolls, creamery butter, salad, banana fritters, cherry fruit sauce, cakes, assorted ices, coffee.

LET CANADA GO AHEAD AND BUILD THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the old chestnut—the St. Lawrence seaway—is back with us again. Just like the proverbial cat—it has nine lives.

Let me read to you what the Chester, (Pa.) Times said editorially on October 3, 1951, concerning Canada's threat to build the St. Lawrence seaway:

LET CANADA GO AHEAD AND BUILD THE SEAWAY

Canada has offered to build the St. Lawrence seaway on its own, if the United States won't participate in the multi-billion-dollar project that would be closed to shipping at least 5 months of the year.

The House Public Works Committee shelved the St. Lawrence seaway proposal on July 26, but the President, bent on finding ways to spend more tax moneys, has been trying to force it through, on the excuse that it is needed for national defense. That's usually been a sure way to wangle an appropriation out of Congress.

If Canada is so anxious to have the seaway, we say let 'er build it. We're busy bolstering the economy of Canada's "Mother Country," Great Britain. Construction of the seaway by Canada could be a nice gesture in return.

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 453 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1959) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by the direction of the Committee on Education and Labor, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Education and Labor may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the bill S. 1959. The purpose of the bill is to resolve problems arising from the recent Supreme Court decision regarding representation certificates. It dispenses with the requirement of existing law that an election must be held before a labor organization and an employer may enter into a union-shop agreement. I am pleased to say the great committee of the House, the Committee on Education and Labor, after careful consideration has approved the Senate bill as it passed the other body unanimously. There is general demand for this legislation, and I may say it is something unusual. This is one bill that will not cost the Government anything; in fact, it will very likely save the Government $1,000,000 a year or more by elimination of the unnecessary elections provided for in present law that have failed to aid the cause of labor and industry.

In view of the fact that the Committee on Education and Labor reported this bill almost unanimously, and the Committee on Rules acted without a dissenting voice in granting the rule, I shall not take up any more time. I see the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor is here. May I say that it is indeed gratifying that that committee for once has brought in a bill by an almost unanimous vote. In view of that, we must concede that it is legislation in the right direction and will aid the administration; it will permit industry to work in harmony with labor, eliminating to a great extent, strikes and discord in these trying times.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I addressed to Mr. DiSalle, together with his answer thereto, be included in my remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time on the resolution, to which there cannot be any objection. Nevertheless, I shall yield 30 minutes to my colleague and fellow member on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1951, I introduced H. R. 1870 to protect the bald eagle in the Territory of Alaska. I have urged the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to which the bill was referred to report the bill out so that it might be enacted into law without delay but the committee has failed to take action. I have appeared before the committee having jurisdiction over this legislation a number of times since a similar bill was first introduced by me in a previous Congress. In fact, my bill, H. R. 5507, passed the House in the Eighty-first Congress but for some unknown reason it was pigeon-holed in the Senate.

The bald eagle has been the symbol of America's greatness and ideals of freedom down through the years and is protected under Public Law 567, Seventy-sixth Congress, throughout all our land with the exception of the Territory of Alaska, where it is hunted down and killed and there is a bounty on its head. During the 5-year period from 1917 to 1921, 12,368 pairs of bald-eagle feet were delivered to the officials of Alaska for the 50-cent bounty. In 1923 the bounty was raised to a dollar, and in 1949,

though opposed by Governor Gruening, it was raised to $2. During the 18 years from 1923 to 1940 bounties were paid on 91,091 birds. The Territory of Alaska has paid a total of nearly $100,000 for the destruction of 103,459 eagles. This information was given in a report to the Fish and Wildlife service in 1941 and the slaughter of the bald eagle in Alaska still continues while the committees sleep and permit this legislation for the protection of this national symbol to be pigeon-holed. Where does the opposition to this worthy legislation come from? You may draw your own conclusions.

I include in this connection an interesting article entitled "The Bald Eagle With a Price on Its Head," by Irston R. Barnes which appeared in the Atlantic Naturalist, volume 7, No. 1, September-October 1951 issue:

THE BALD EAGLE WITH A PRICE ON ITS HEAD

(By Irston R. Barnes)

The bald eagle, since the Nation's beginnings, has been the symbol of our aspirations, of greatness promised and of greatness fulfilled. It was a fitting symbol of a vast and bounteous land, of majestic mountains and of limitless horizons of plains and encircling oceans.

The living symbol should have been honored, preserved, and protected. Yet the eagle has been hunted and persecuted, so that few adults and fewer children have thrilled to its soaring flight. In Alaska, it has been subjected to the final indignity of being stigmatized an outlaw with a bounty on its claws. If it disappears as a living species, the bald eagle will become for all times a symbol of our incapacity to safeguard our resources, of the failure of twentieth century America to preserve for succeeding generations the good earth and its creatures.

When our country was first settled, the bald eagle lived in virtually every State. Today a few scattered populations survive. In the States, the eagle is now represented by significant populations only in Florida and in the Chesapeake Bay region. In Florida the bird has been protected and encouraged, but its population is still shrinking as encroaching community growth eliminates nesting sites. It has been estimated that there are 350 pairs nesting in Florida, perhaps 150 pairs in Virginia, Maryland and Delaware. Scattered pairs are known in other States probably not over 8 or 10 in Georgia and the Carolinas, 8 in New Jersey, a few in the Lake States, 3 in Pennsylvania, perhaps 20 pairs in Maine, and a small group on the Santa Barbara Islands off the coast of California Over much of its former range the eagle has been extirpated.

The northern race of the bald eagle, slightly larger than the members of the southern race with which we are familiar, has two population centers—one in the maritime provinces of Canada, the other in Alaska and British Columbia. Only in Alaska has the the eagle survived in significantly large numbers.

The disappearance of the eagle over much of its former range emphasizes the fact that there are danger points beyond which a population may not be reduced if the species is to survive. Many factors combined to reduce the eagle population in the United States—the spread of urban populations with consequent destruction of nesting sites, industrialization and pollution of rivers, lumbering which has both destroyed nest sites and altered the flow of rivers, and, of course, the stupid persecution which the ignorant have directed against all predators.

The precarious position of our national symbol was recognized by the Congress in 1940 when Federal protection was extended to the eagle. However, to avoid delay in the enactment of that statute, arising from protests coming from Alaska and without any finding that the protection of the eagle in Alaska was not necessary and appropriate, the 1940 bill was amended to exempt Alaska. The introduction in the Eighty-first Congress of bills to amend the 1940 act extending protection to the eagle in Alaska was thus a matter of unfinished business. The original exemption seemed to carry no serious threat to the eagle in Alaska, but the reenactment of a bounty law in 1949 added an economic motive to the predatory propensities of those who shoot the bird and made Federal protection essential.

The history of the bounty in Alaska is significant, both in illustrating the unsound economics of bounties and in documenting the record of the destruction of the eagle in Alaska. From 1917 to 1940 Alaska offered a bounty on eagles at 50 cents a bird from 1917 to 1923 and at $1 after 1923. In 1941 the appropriation for the bounty was eliminated; none was provided in 1943; and in 1945 the law providing for a bounty on the eagle was rescinded. In 1949 the Alaska Legislature reenacted the bounty (the vote being 23 to 1 in the Alaska House and 12 to 3 in the Senate); Governor Gruening, although opposing the bounty, allowed the measure to become law without his signature. The bounty was fixed at $2.

The slaughter of the eagles under the stimulus of the bounty has been appalling. Ralph H. Imler's unpublished report to the Fish and Wildlife Service, Alaska Bald Eagle Studies, 1941, placed the destruction at 103,459 eagles from 1917 to 1940.

"The Territory of Alaska first paid bounty on bald eagles in 1917. During the 5 years, 1917–21, 12,368 pairs of feet were presented for the 50-cent fee. In 1923 the bounty was raised to $1 and more hunters became interested in killing eagles. During the 18 years from 1923 to 1940 bounties were paid on 91,091 birds. Thus the Territory has paid a total of nearly $100,000 for the destruction of 103,459 eagles" Statistics obtained on an annual basis from the Territory's treasurer's office are not wholly comparable, showing higher totals for the earlier years and having no figures for 2 years, 1933 and 1935.

Year	Disbursements	Bounty	Number of eagles
1917	$1,048 50	$0. 50	2,097
1918	1,500 50	.50	3,181
1919	1,320 50	.50	2,641
1920	1,188 50	.50	2,377
1921	1,065 50	.50	2,131
1922	1,659 00	.50	3,318
Total	7,872 50		15,745
1923–24	2,498 00	1.00	2,498
1925–26	6,695.40	1.00	6,695
1927–28	1,630 00	1.00	1,630
1929	2,082 00	1 00	2,082
1930	8,196.00	1 00	8,196
1931	1,804 00	1.00	1,804
1932	4,999 25	1 00	4,999
1934	7,490 00	1.00	7,490
1936	13,009 25	1.00	13,009
1937–38	12,793 00	1 00	12,793
1939–40	2,500.00	1.00	2,500
Total	63,696 90		63,696
1949 to Feb. 15, 1950	14,910 00	2.00	7,455
Total	86,479.40		86,896

On the basis of the combined figures, the total kill appears to have been 114,291.

The eagle population cannot long survive such intensive persecution. The 50-cent bounty produced an average slaughter of 2,624 birds a year. A year (1949 to February 16, 1950) of the $2 bounty pushed the slaughter to 7,455.

For 4 months, May to August, in 1941, Mr. Imler traveled 4,880 miles along the waterways of southern Alaska. He made a census along 837 miles of shore line, counting 677 bald eagles, and average of 0.81 eagle per mile; a large census mileage on Admiralty Island yielded a figure of 0.89 eagle per mile. Perhaps a more accurate measure of ability to withstand persecution is the number of active nests; along much of the shore line about one to three occupied nests were found in an average 15-mile section.

Eagles are especially vulnerable to persecution. The reports of concentrations—12 in 180 yards on Admiralty Island, 32 in Keku Strait, thirty-plus at Anan Creek on July 11 (with a report of 100 seen the week before), 45 at Rodman Bay and Creek, Baranof Island—are indexes of vulnerability, not of abundance. Such concentrations, along shores accessible to gunners, of birds normally dispersed over wide areas, expose the eagle to devastating slaughter. Moreover, the eagle is a large bird; perching conspicuously on the tops of the Sitka spruces and other tall trees on the coast, they make striking pictures and easy targets. Their large nests are easily spotted, and birds on or near the nests are ready victims.

No conclusions as to the total Alaska eagle population can be drawn from the available figures The concentration figures give a wholly false impression of abundance. Likewise, 0 81 times the shore line would be an unreliable figure; the northern coasts do not support as large a population as the southern coast where the study was made. Certainly it may not be assumed that there is a vast breeding population in the interior that can balance bounty persecution along the coasts. Eagles tend to be concentrated along the waterways; they are not spread over the whole interior. The counts were made when the birds were concentrated along the coast following the spawning runs of salmon. If for argument it be assumed that there are three nests, or six breeding birds, for every 15 miles of Alaska's 34,000 miles of shore line, the breeding population would be about 14,000 birds, if each pair succeeds in raising two young, an unwarrantedly high assumption, the coastal population would be 28,000 adults and young, and the annual kill based on the 1949–50 figures, becomes 25 percent.

How can the Territory of Alaska justify itself not only in opposing protection for the eagle but in branding it an outlaw with a bounty for its destruction? It is said that the eagle is a menace to the game and fish of Alaska which, if not kept in check, will seriously deplete the wildlife resources of the Territory. More specifically, it is asserted that as a predator the eagle lives on grouse, salmon, ptarmigan, rabbits, housecats, and fauns.

As a general answer, it should be understood that all studies of predation have established that under normal conditions no predator destroys, or even seriously depletes, the prey population on which it lives. The predator lives on whatever prey is most abundant and most easily captured; it harvests the surplus population Predation is most severe when a multiplying prey species overcrowds its environment. The effects of predation on a prey population cannot be estimated by counting the kill of predators; if the surplus were not taken by the predator, the prey population would presumably be subject to even greater reduction in numbers through internecine fighting, disease, and starvation The Malthusian law operates inexorably among wildlife populations.

A general answer is not enough in the case of the bald eagle. An examination of the specific counts in the indictment against the eagle is possible. In 1941, the Fish and Wildlife Service made a study of the economic relations of the bald eagle in Alaska, analyzing the stomachs of 304 birds. This is the only study on the basis of which the eagle's diet may be judged.

The eagle feeds largely on fish; 79 percent of its food was fish. Salmon constituted 23.8 percent, herring 3.5 percent, and 51.7 percent was fish of no economic significance. Unlike the osprey, which it enjoys hijacking, the bald eagle is more of a scavenger than a predator, and this is particularly true of its consumption of fish. Dr. Clarence Cottam, Assistant Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, has stated that the great preponderance of salmon taken is carrion, for after spawning the adult salmon die and are cast upon the stream banks. In his considered opinion, only occasionally is a live salmon taken. However, salmon is of great economic importance to Alaska, and it is particularly noticeable that when the salmon enter the shallow waters of the streams to spawn they are vulnerable to predation by eagles, bears, and Indians as well as by white fishermen. However, in the course of his 1941 field investigation, Mr. Imler encountered only one instance in which an eagle may have been carrying a salmon that was not carrion. Eagles do take live fish; many sculpins, flounders, and gadids are taken alive by Alaskan eagles, but these are not commercially important fish.

The occasional live salmon that the eagle takes cannot possibly affect the salmon fisheries. Indeed, studies on the Alaskan rivers have revealed that large spawning runs do not necessarily result in large production of young and large returns several years later; on the contrary, large broods with good survival rates sometimes are produced by relatively small runs. Any actual or supposed reduction of the number of spawners by predation, therefore, has little, if any, effect on the salmon populations, compared with the effect of conditions that determine the survival of eggs and young. The rate of survival is often astonishingly low. On the Karluk River, the average number of young red salmon returning to the sea is less than 1 percent of the eggs laid, and 79 percent of this 1 percent is lost during their ocean existence. The average red salmon lays 3,700 eggs; perhaps 37 young fish reach the ocean; only 8 return to spawn. At Little Port Walter, the percentage of survival of young to eggs from 1941 to 1950 ranged from 0.2 to 6.4 percent, averaging 2 1 percent. The modern trend in fishery biology is to regard the number of spawning fish, above the required minimum, as less important than the conditions that the hatching eggs and small fry have to surmount before they return to the ocean.

Waterfowl constituted 15 5 percent of the food of the 304 eagles, with ducks amounting to 9.3 percent. The ducks were principally scoters taken along the coast, a duck so little prized by hunters that they are seldom picked up when shot. Ducks are important in the eagles' diet principally in the winter months.

Mammals were only 2.9 percent of the food of the eagles analyzed. Deer remains amounted to 1.1 percent of the stomach contents. But this consisted of carrion, not deer killed by the birds. No fox remains were found in the 304 eagle stomachs examined and no first-hand evidence of preying on foxes were encountered. Nevertheless, the fox farmers interviewed were unanimous in accusing eagles of preying on their stock. A letter to the House subcommittee from I. E. Williams of Juneau supplies one explanation of the allegation of eagle predatism on foxes. On the coastal island fox farms, multiplication and crowding lead to the outbreak of disease; the dead foxes scattered about the island attract eagles; each eagle shot by the farmer allows him to salvage a $2 bounty for his dead fox.

The fox farmers have adequate means for safeguarding their animals without shooting eagles. Some measure of protection could be had by cutting down the large nest trees on the islands where foxes are kept, thereby forcing the eagles to nest elsewhere. Even occasional depredations on foxes could be prevented by penning the fox pups. Penning would have important advantages for the fox farmer: it would cut the losses due to parasitic diseases, which often break out among crowded fox populations; and furs from penned foxes bring appreciably higher prices than furs from foxes which have been running free on the islands. In appraising the testimony of fox farmers against the eagle, it is well to remember that in Florida where the eagle is protected and encouraged, there are instances of eagles nesting in chickenyards with no records of their taking the chickens under their nests.

Exaggerated notions are still current regarding the size prey that an eagle can take. Tales of eagles carrying off babies are now universally recognized as pure fantasy. Equally fanciful are stories of eagles attacking sizable dogs, sheep, goats, and deer. An eagle will not attack anything it cannot carry off, and an eagle, weighing only 8 to 14 pounds, cannot lift more than its own weight.

The bounty can lead to the virtual extermination of the eagle along the Alaska coast The reports of 50 to 100 eagles over the spawning grounds of salmon, of 45 birds in 6 miles in Prince William Sound, or of 12 birds in 180 yards underscore its vulnerability. The eagles concentrated by the abundance of carrion represent the population of vast areas. The slaughter along the coasts and streams can not only eliminate the resident population, which might otherwise be a real tourist attraction, but can also seriously deplete the interior population

The economics of the bounty system explains the special interest nature of the law. Inasmuch as the eagle is not a harmful predator, the payment of "nearly a hundred thousand dollars for the destruction of 103,459 eagles" is actually a raid on the Territorial treasury. This point was made by Mr. Albert Day, director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, in a telegram quoted by Governor Gruening in a letter of March 21, 1949, to the speaker of the Alaska house: "Eagles in Alaska feed chiefly on carrion and predatism on game animals and fish limited Bounty on eagles as provided Territorial house bill 77 not justified under present conditions. Such legislation if enacted will result in needless destruction of eagles and wasteful expenditure of Territorial funds It should not be permitted to pass."

The bounty benefits a special segment of the population: The fox farmers, who bait eagles in with disease-killed fox carcasses; the fishermen, whose high-powered rifles shoot eagles out of the spruces around their anchorages; the trappers, who throw out skinned carcasses of trapped animals to lure the eagles down; the bounty hunters, who find easy pickings among the eagles that crowd in to feed on the salmon that die after spawning. The bounty is paid by the taxpayers who contribute to Alaskan revenues, and indirectly and more largely by all those who might have benefited commercially if more Alaskan wildlife survived to attract more tourist interest.

An analysis of why the legislation to protect the eagle in Alaska failed is revealing. The Grant-Angell bills (H R. 5507 and H. R. 5629, 81st Cong) were strongly endorsed by spokesmen for the leading wildlife and conservation organizations: American Museum of Natural History, National Audubon Society, Wildlife Management Institute, the Emergency Conservation Committee, National Forest Association, and the Wilderness Society. Some 30 letters supporting the legislation were received by the subcommittee from individuals and organizations, including the Isaac Walton League of America and various State and local Audubon societies.

Delegate BARTLETT, of Alaska, appeared in opposition to the bills, questioned witnesses, and introduced four letters opposing protection for the eagle. All revealed biological illiteracy and self-interest. Otis H. Speer, who obviously confused the bald eagle with the golden eagle, asserted in a letter to the Ketchikan Daily News that the bald eagle of Alaska is a "distinctive kind and different breed" from the national emblem. Emery F. Tobin identified himself as editor of the Alaska Sportsman. But the pooh-bah in the opposition was Harry T. Cowan, owner of Cowan's Sports and Clothing Center, president of Alaska Sports and Wildlife Club, and secretary-treasurer of the trappers unit. The final opponent identified was C. R. Snow, of Ketchikan. Obviously, these opinions and judgments are entitled to little weight It would be clearly unfair to the majority of Alaskans to judge them in terms of their self-appointed wildlife experts.

The support for the bill marshaled eminent biological and conservation authorities. It was conclusively demonstrated that the bald eagle does no damage to salmon or to the fox-farming industries, that it is not significant in limiting game populations, that bounties accelerate the destruction of the Alaskan eagles, and that the eagle should be protected both as a symbol of independence and freedom, as a tourist attraction, and as a legitimate part of the Alaska fauna How then did the legislation, having passed in the House of Representatives, fail to be reported out of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

The answer seems to lie in the inconsistent and disturbing position taken officially by the Department of the Interior in a letter of March 29, 1950, to the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. William E. Warne, Acting Secretary, stated that the proposed legislation was unnecessary as the Department had authority under the Alaska Game Law of July 1, 1945, to adopt protection whenever it is determined that the bald eagle or any other species of wildlife needs the protection afforded by that law. And there is nothing of record to support his conclusion that although various bounty laws relating to the taking of bald eagles have been in effect in the Territory for many years, the effect of these laws on the population of the bird appears to have been largely negligible * * * Thus, although this Department is opposed to any bounty law as such, it does not appear that there is any necessity at the present time to attempt to override by Federal regulations the Territorial legislature.

On June 8, 1951, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries held hearings in executive session on H. R. 1870, a bill to extend protection to the bald eagle in Alaska. Only two witnesses were present—Dr. Clarence Cottam and Donald J Chaney of the Fish and Wildlife Service—in addition to Delegate BARTLETT On this occasion, the Fish and Wildlife Service took a strong position in opposition to the bounty, but it did not advocate absolute protection for the eagle in Alaska, and it neither opposed nor supported the pending bill. The chairman of the subcommittee reported hundreds of letters in support of the legislation and one was read into the record in opposition.

At the hearing the subcommittee seemed reluctant to impose protection against the opposition of the people of Alaska, perhaps because the Federal Alaska game law could be invoked to protect the eagle if the Department of the Interior were convinced that such a step was essential. There seemed a disposition to compromise with nothing more than a warning to the Alaska Legislature that a failure to remove the bounty might lead to favorable action on the bill. But as the Alaska Legislature does not meet

until 1953, the eagle would be exposed to at least two more years of intense persecution.

All interested in the protection of endangered species are concerned to understand the position of the Department of the Interior. It is apparently compounded of diverse elements. The bounty is opposed; it is without justification. The eagle is considered to be fairly common in Alaska; it is not in immediate danger of being wiped out. Public opinion in Alaska is reported to be strongly adverse to granting protection to the eagle; enforcement would present serious difficulties for the available staff.

While respecting the good will and competence of the Department and its Fish and Wildlife Service, many conservationists and most Audubon members are compelled to question both the facts and the conclusions cited as reasons for not supporting protection for the Alaskan eagle. The considerations in support of protection warrant immediate enactment of a Federal protective statute.

1. There is virtually universal agreement that the bounty is unjustified. The Department is opposed to any bounty law as such. Mr. Day, Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, has stated to Governor Gruening that the bounty would result in needless destruction of eagles and wasteful expenditure of Territorial funds. Dr. Clarence Cottam's testimony on the food habits of the eagle demonstrated that there is no economic basis for the persecution of the eagle. Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, the respected former Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service and president of the Wildlife Management Institute, gave unqualified support to Federal legislation protecting the eagle, and cited the bounty—which gives bounty hunters an excuse to be in the field at all times of the year with a gun, thus increasing the illegal kill of other game species and leading to violations of other conservation regulations—as an added reason for mandatory protection. The enactment of the Federal law would not effect a repeal of the Alaska bounty law, but collection of a bounty would be evidence of having killed an eagle. A few convictions with $500 fines would soon make the $2 bounty seem poor business.

2. There was no competent evidence presented at the hearings that the eagle could survive in the coastal area under the accelerated bounty slaughter of recent years. All the competent authority that spoke to the issue took the position that Federal regulation is needed No comparative studies have been presented to justify the statement by Mr Warne, Acting Secretary of the Interior, that "the effect * * * on the population of the bird appears to have been largely negligible" A contrary conclusion finds more support

3 Alaskan opposition to protection for the eagle has been exaggerated and accorded far too much weight. At the time of the June 8 hearing, only one Alaskan had written in opposition to the present bill; only four wrote in opposition to the earlier bill. Surely there is no justification for shaping public policy to the selfish interests of those who sell guns and ammunition or of the bounty hunters. Equally there is no warrant for deferring to those who erroneously think that the eagle is a menace to fox farming, salmon fisheries, and wildlife generally; deference to their mistaken beliefs only confirms them in their errors. Indeed, enactment of the bill could be the beginning of a more adequate public understanding of the rightful place of the eagle among Alaskan wildlife. It need not be feared that with "absolute protection" the eagle would multiply to the point of becoming a menace to fisheries and wildlife.

4. The "State's right" argument against the protection of wildlife is out of step with the times, as well as being misplaced in its application to a Territory operating under a federally enacted game law. Wildlife, especially birds, are the exclusive property of no one region. The Migratory Bird Treaties have aligned sovereign nations in conventions to protect migrating birds. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act extends Federal protection in this country regardless of what action the States may take Similarly, there was no question of separate State's rights when the 1940 Bald Eagle Act was passed. It was difficult to understand the logic of the Alaskan exemption in 1940; it is more difficult to understand it since the restoration of the bounty on eagles in 1949

Charles L. Broley, who is as intimately acquainted with bald eagles as anyone who has studied them, has suggested that the eagle should be brought under the protection of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. As a retired Canadian banker wintering in Florida, he has during the past 12 years climbed to nests more than 800 times and banded some 1,200 birds Recoveries of his banded birds have shown that Florida eagles after nesting early disperse to the north during the summer, even reaching into Canada. He is convinced that the eagles along the Alaska coast move south along the British Columbia coast during the winter and he asserts that Canada has a legitimate interest in the eagles being shot in Alaska

The present Congress should consider and enact a law amending the Act for the Protection of the Bald Eagle of June 8, 1940, extending mandatory protection to Alaska. The measure should not be tabled with a warning to the Alaska legislature that the bounty should be repealed. The act should be passed even if the bounty law is rescinded. Public hearings on the measure should be held And all conservation and wildlife organizations should assume responsibility for securing a full record with a proper interpretation and evaluation of the technical evidence. The protection of the bald eagle in Alaska is long overdue.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the statements made by the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] concerning the pending rule. The rule makes in order consideration of the bill, which I believe has had nearly the unanimous approval of the Committee on Education and Labor. The purposes of the bill are two. First, to resolve certain problems arising from Supreme Court decisions, and, second, to dispense with the requirement in the existing law that an election be held before a labor organization or an employer can make a union-shop agreement. I am informed there is virtually no objection on the part of either labor or management to the bill. There certainly should be no objection to the rule, which makes in order the consideration of the bill which has already been passed by the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on my side, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. There is no reason why any legislation of this type should be brought on this floor under a closed rule. We are coming in here with an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act, S. 1959, introduced by Senator TAFT in the other body, and requesting the House to go along with the closed rule. It has been stated here today that S. 1959 passed unanimously in committee. When this bill was reported out of committee it was reported out without hearings with a bare majority present—13 members.

I would like to have the opportunity to offer a substitute to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, and other Members of this body, I am sure, would like to have the opportunity to offer amendments to this particular bill.

By adopting a rule of this kind we are setting up a procedure where it will be more difficult to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. There are vicious provisions in that law, numerous provisions that are very oppressive to labor. In fact, the law in its present form is unworkable and the Members of this body should not be denied the opportunity of offering amendments and making corrections they think proper. The way we are proceeding here today, if this rule is adopted, in my opinion, will severely cripple our chances of repealing the Taft-Hartley law in the future.

I realize I am speaking out here today as a lonely voice in the wilderness I know that the machinery is well greased and that the rule will be adopted, but here is what we are doing: We are getting ourselves in a position where we are going to a gentleman in the other body, the author of the Taft-Hartley law, and to his friends, calling upon them for relief, when we find situations that are oppressive in this act, and there are 50 or more oppressive and unworkable sections in the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. Speaker, I am against this procedure. I feel that legislation of this type should not come to the floor of the House under a closed rule.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1959) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1959, with Mr. EVINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to correct the RECORD to some extent. The gentleman from Kentucky just remarked about the committee meetings. I want to assure the House that every Member of the committee knew exactly what was coming up, and every member of the committee had ample time to discuss the bill. When the committee assembled it was not a unanimous vote, as the gentleman from Illinois indicated

awhile ago. I did not make the statement; he did. There were two votes of "present," one of which since has changed to a vote of "aye" and there were two votes recorded against it.

I only make this statement, Mr. Chairman, to assure the House that we are not having any squabbles or fights in the committee, and there is no question about getting 13 members there to do a particular job. I never ask why a person is absent from the committee, but the committee functions and every member of the committee, including the gentleman from Kentucky, does a good job. We work together.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Senate bill 1959. As amended and passed by the other body, the bill is a simple one. It validates certain labor contracts signed between employers and the A. F. of L. and CIO unions during the period after the passage of the Taft-Hartley law, when there was so much controversy about the signing of the non-Communist affidavits by the top officers of those two major organizations, and the date when they actually complied with the requirement. As you will recall, there was a time following the passage of the Taft-Hartley law when the NLRB held the opinon that only local unions involved in contracts with employers would have to sign the non-Communist affidavit, and they so held. Later, to be exact, in May of 1951, this year, the Supreme Court held in the Highland Park Manufacturing Co. case that the top officers of the national and international unions, the A. F. of L. and the CIO would also have to be in compliance with the Taft-Hartley law by signing the non-Communist affidavit in order that contracts be valid when the facilities of the NLRB were used. That decision cast a grave doubt over the validity of representation certificates and union-shop authorization certificates issued by the Board prior to the date when the CIO and AFL officers complied with provisions of 9 (f) (g) and (h) of the Taft-Hartley law.

The dissenting opinion in a recent decision of the NLRB on July 11, 1951, stated that the remedy lies with Congress, and not with the Board. He expressed the opinion that only by action of Congress could the contracting parties rely upon union-security agreements after the May 1951 Supreme Court decision. I am in accord with that viewpoint and it is for that reason that I support the pending bill.

Not only does this bill validate certain contracts involving union-shop elections but it also does what many of us tried to do under the Wood bill, that is, do away with the requirement or necessity of a union-shop election prior to the time when the labor representatives and employers could sign union-shop agreements. As you probably realize those union-shop elections have been won overwhelmingly by the unions and the general reaction or feeling is, why put the Government and the various boards to the administrative trouble and expense of holding the elections when they are usually one-sided anyhow? For that reason I am quite in accord with the provision eliminating the necessity for a union-shop election prior to the negotiation of a union-shop contract.

In substance this covers what the bill does. I know that there is some opposition to it by certain groups and I imagine they will speak for themselves or those in Congress who represent their viewpoint will probably disclose that fact to you later. But it seems to me that an argument to the effect that unless we repeal the entire Taft-Hartley Act no changes should be made, even when in line with what labor organizations wish, is somewhat fallacious. We heard that same argument when we brought forth the Wood bill. At that time we agreed to 20 changes in the Taft-Hartley law, all in line with the wishes of the various leaders of labor organizations in this country. This is one of the amendments we agreed to at that time, namely, doing away with the union-shop-election requirement. It is quite aside from the point and not a sound argument, in my opinion, to say that because we are not repealing the Taft-Hartley Act we should vote for no changes, even though they might be in line with what labor organizations wish.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VELDE. At the time this came before the committee the gentleman will notice that I voted present because I was not quite familiar with the contents of the bill and how it would affect enforcement of the Taft-Hartley Act. I was afraid at that time this bill would be a means of getting around the requirement that union officials file non-Communist affidavits. However, I now concur in the statements made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and those made by the ranking minority member of that committee regarding this bill and I shall support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. McCONNELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Illinois. I want to report that our committee is getting along fine. I have never seen a group of men cooperate any more nicely, or work together any better. So far, I think only about one bill has come out with a split vote. I hope the dove of peace continues to hover over our committee.

Mr. Chairman, this bill (S. 1959) came to us from the Senate. It passed the Senate by unanimous consent. The Committee on Education and Labor, after considerable study by the members, including the chairman, approved the bill and reported it to the House.

There are only two things covered by this bill. Both of them are time saving and money saving. Neither of them is opposed on the ground that it is not wise. There is some opposition to any amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act, as some of you are aware, but these happen to be two amendments that have not stirred up any opposition as to their merits.

One relates to the closed shop. The experience of the Labor Relations Board and labor organizations and management is that under the present arrangement the compulsory election for closed shop was not workable and did not prove to be of any benefit to either side, but, as a matter of fact, was more or less of a nuisance. They are safeguarded in that when 30 percent of them want an election they can call it; but at the present time it is compulsory to hold the election.

The other item was by far the most important and certainly a rather expensive proposition. A considerable period of time elapsed between the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act and the time when the two major labor organizations, the A. F. of L. and the CIO, signed the non-Communist affidavits. Many contracts were made by these organizations with management. The contracts were and are agreeable. The work is going on. There is no question of trouble about the contracts. Then, the Highland Park Co. case went to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court decided that any of those contracts signed prior to the signing of the non-Communist affidavit, as required in the Taft-Hartley Act, were not good, and it would be necessary to hold other elections. According to the report from the National Labor Relations Board, that would cause some 4,700 elections to be held unless this corrective legislation is passed. About 4,700 on that particular proposition. It is estimated that the actual bedrock cost of holding these elections would be somewhere close to a million dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

In addition to that cost there would be necessary legal expenses, and so forth, to the extent that they can see an expense of probably in excess of a million dollars in holding elections that the unions can see no need to hold, and management can see no need to hold, and no good to come from them. On the other hand, it very likely would encourage one union through its enthusiasm probably to invade another, and the other doing likewise with them, with the employer caught in between the two rocks, certainly that would not be very good for either party or the public. So this piece of legislation comes to you with a justification from both sides; and, so far as I have been able to learn, it comes without any question as to its merit or as to the necessity and wisdom of passing it.

I hope the House will adopt the bill. I do not believe there will be any lengthy debate, but if there are any questions concerning the legislation I am sure either the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] or myself will attempt to answer.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. I have had some correspondence with regard to another bill, S. 1973. Can the gentleman tell me what that bill provides and if it is going to be reported by your committee?

Mr. BARDEN. I am not familiar with the bill by number. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] knows about it I would be pleased to have him answer.

Mr. McCONNELL. That bill is still over in the Senate committee; it has not been reported out of the Senate committee yet. No companion bill has been introduced in the House. That changes the 30-day requirement for joining a union under the union shop and also does away with the union-security-election requirement.

Mr. MORANO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, in spite of some of the statements that have been made here this morning, particularly the statement of the chairman of the Commitee on Rules who presented the resolution for the Rules Commitee, that all of labor was supporting and behind this bill, I say to you that that is not true. I for one as a member of the American Federation of Labor over a long period of time am taking the floor now to oppose this amendment to the National Labor Relations Act.

The way in which this legislation is before us today is unusual. It is here because of many, many mistakes and errors that were made in the original passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. We are here today considering two amendments to that infamous piece of legislation.

In the closing days of the Eighty-first Congress one of the authors of this piece of legislation by admission and by introduction of amendments in the other body found that there was necessity for about 30 changes in the language and in the various sections of the Taft-Hartley Act. That bill came to the House committee too late to be processed. As has been said here today, a majority in the House in the closing days of the Eighty-first Congress also agreed that in the experience that had been had under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in the short period of less than a year they had found grounds, need, and necessity for at least supporting and endorsing 22 changes here on the House floor in this piece of legislation.

This bill comes here today in a very unusual proceeding. It so happens, as has been said by the committee minority and majority leaders, that as the result of confusion in the original passage of the law there was a feeling predominant around the country, subscribed to by some of the officers of the National Labor Relations Board, that the language of the Taft-Hartley Act insofar as it applied to the officials of labor unions having to take the oath of anticommunism was limited or confined in general to the officers of the local union involved in the particular controversy or the particular contract. That was later cleared up by a decision of the National Labor Relations Board that spread it to the next echelon of labor. Later they then interpreted the law to mean that all of the international representatives of that local union likewise had to subscribe to that oath.

Again later the question arose, because of the position of John L. Lewis, as to whether the top echelon with which a labor organization might be affiliated also had to subscribe to the anti-Communist affidavit. Again a decision was made later that that was a necessity; that any affiliation up and down the line of an official of that affiliated local union was also a party to this anti-Communist affidavit. That brought on this lawsuit. I think most of you are aware of the fact that John L. Lewis has not signed that oath to this day. It is also true that Mr. Murray, the president of the CIO, was reluctant and hesitant about signing it because of his dislike for it, and he withheld his signature for some time. It is also true that in the American Federation of Labor there were some international unions that did feel they were bound by this particular oath, and they also withheld subscribing to this particular oath. That meant when this Court decision was made with that interpretation a number of international unions, having local unions as well as their own international, found themselves with a very perplexing problem on the basis of that Supreme Court decision. Where they had not signed the Communist affidavits in accordance with the law, all contracts under that international union and its affiliates became null and void. The result of that was the bringing into being this piece of legislation. It so happens that a few of these international representatives and some few members of affiliated locals, finding themselves perhaps up against a raiding fight, where the contract became void, both unions could start a campaign to win the representation in that plant. So they appealed to a Member of the other body, who was joined by another Member of that body, in the introduction of this legislation to overcome this difficulty.

There were no hearings held, I might say, in the other body, either. No hearings were held in either body on this legislation. So we do not get a test of the proponents and the opponents here. This bill passed under the most extraordinary and most unusual circumstances in the other body, primarily perhaps because of the two authors. It passed by unanimous consent. There were no hearings on this legislation. I am sure as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House that there have been no hearings on this. We are just following the same policy. It is true, as the chairman of the committee says, that a meeting was called. I was notified; however, I had some important business to try to get some money for my dear, beloved State of Minnesota out of this $80,000,000,000 that the Government is spending. So I was at the Pentagon, which was known to the chairman. No hearings have been held in either body as to whether this is a unanimous decision of labor or whether there is opposition to it. I want to say to you that, speaking at the Minnesota State Federation of Labor convention in Duluth last Monday, I found in my remarks that the great majority of the delegation at that convention are opposed to this action. I have no quarrel, and I am not going to quarrel, with these unions who find themselves in trouble at this time. I sympathize with those unions that find themselves in this predicament, but again I say that is all the result of mistakes and errors of judgment, and the haste with which the Taft-Hartley Act was originally passed.

I have the bill here which was passed by the other body. One of the authors of this bill in the other body has readily agreed to and subscribes to amendments to the number of 32, which he is willing to support. So, I will accept that as the number of grave errors that he confesses to in the Taft-Hartely Act. Some of you can say "Well, listen WEIR, what is wrong with the Taft-Hartley Act?" I have been listening to that for 2 years. What is wrong with it? I will tell you what is wrong with it. It is another piece of legislation which was passed in a state of hysteria by the Congress because at that time I am fully cognizant of the fact that we had some rather disturbing labor disputes. It was concocted by the opposition of labor, the national manufacturers and the open shop proponents in this Nation, who brought it in. That was testified to, and subscribed to, by some of the lobbyists that we had before the Committee on Education and Labor of the House. We know who the authors of the bill are. We know who got paid to draw it and prepare it and present it.

Now, when you ask me what is wrong with this bill, it just so happens that perhaps the argument of today will not fit the argument tomorrow if the Taft-Hartley Act is to remain on the statute books. It so happens that I am a member of the labor committee that visited south of the Mason and Dixon's line. One of our jobs was a number of labor disputes down South. We had extensive hearings

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEIR] has again expired.

Mr. WEIR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, the chairman does not intend to use much time, but there are others who would like some time. I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. WIER. I will close by saying this: that I stand here today, as I will stand here from now on, opposing this kind of legislation.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. The gentleman will recall that a joint nonpartisan committee of the House and Senate Labor Com-

mittees was appointed to study and observe the workings of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. WIER. Yes.

Mr. BREHM. And then they were to come back with recommendations as to changes which were anticipated would improve the act. Does the gentleman know if this present proposed legislation is one of those changes recommended by that joint committee?

Mr. WIER. No. I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. BREHM. Well the gentleman will recall that such a committee was appointed?

Mr. WIER. I must disagree with you. There has been no such committee appointed from the Labor and Education Committee of the House.

Mr. BREHM. I beg your pardon You must have misunderstood me. There was a joint committee of 14 members, seven each from both the Senate and House Labor Committees who were to make recommendations. This committee was set up in accordance with section 401 of Public Law 101—Eightieth Congress—and they recommended some 20 or more changes designed to improve the act. Their report is No. 986, second session of the Eightieth Congress. My question was whether or not this bill is in keeping with one of their recommendations. I rather think it is.

Mr. WIER. I hope the House will defeat this bill. I intend to vote against it, and I am going to ask for a roll call.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this three minutes for the purpose of telling some gentlemen on the Committee on Education and Labor what I think of the high-handed tactics back of this legislation. This is legislative process at the worst.

First of all, there was no occasion for the request for a closed rule on this legislation. Whenever you have a closed rule there is always some objective back of it. That is, of course, to deprive Members of the House of an opportunity to offer amendments to improve the legislation or to consider other amendments. I do not like the collusion between the membership of our committee which resulted in reporting out this resolution. There has been some talk by different members of the committee about what happened in the committee. There were just 13 of the 25 members of the committee present. The chairman claimed that two of them voted present and two of them voted "No." That means that this legislation was reported out by nine members of the Committee on Education and Labor, if the gentleman's statement is correct, and I have no doubt but that it is correct.

The objective of this legislation is to defeat the labor movement. Anybody who gets up here, like the chairman of the Rules Committee, who forgot that he promised me some time to speak against the rule, and makes the statement that all groups of labor are in favor of this legislation, is not stating the fact. That is a misstatement of facts, and it is not true. I represent a district that has various kinds of labor groups in it. The major labor groups in my district are the United Mine Workers, and they are opposed to the bill. To say that the American Federation of Labor is for this legislation, only 2 weeks ago in their San Francisco convention, they went on record demanding outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The gentleman knows that the CIO favors repeal of the Taft-Hartley law; only some groups within the two organizations are back of this legislation.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Is that the only reason they object to this legislation? Because they do not want to improve the act but want to repeal it?

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman wants my answer, I am opposed to putting a new patch on a garment that was made out of rotten cloth in the first place; that is my answer.

Mr. LANHAM. I voted against the Taft-Hartley Act myself because I thought it was too oppressive and too strong at the time; but it seems to me that if we can improve it we ought to do so. I think there is very little chance of ever repealing it—as a matter of fact I do not favor its repeal but its perfection and interested to know if that is the only objection the labor unions have to this legislation. I cannot agree with the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia that it—the Taft-Hartley law—is made out of rotten cloth. It is not a perfect labor relations act, neither is it the slave labor law it has been called. By amendments like this it can be made a good law.

Mr. BAILEY. May I say to the committee that at this time what we need most in America is unity, and that means unity among labor as well as other segments of our society. This legislation approaches the same situation that you had when you considered the original Taft-Hartley law. The objective of the legislation is to destroy the labor movement by creating dissension among the various labor groups of the country. I am opposed to it and I would oppose the rule had I been on the floor. I am sure the chairman of my committee knows that no later than this morning at the time our own committee met I asked him for time to speak against the rule. I thought I had made arrangements with the chairman of the committee, but apparently I had not.

I shall offer a motion to recommit this legislation at the proper time.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure my friend from West Virginia realizes that I have no control over the chairman of the Committee on Rules who handled the rule, and I, of course, could not yield him any time that belonged to someone else.

As to the action of the committee, we had 3 proxies, which made 16; otherwise the gentleman's statement is correct; but I am sure he will strike out those words indicating some connivance when he corrects his remarks because every member of the committee was well informed.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to place myself on record in opposition to the closed rule. I do not believe this is the type of legislation that lends itself to fair consideration under that kind of rule. The Congress should not adopt the principle of closed rules for labor-management legislation. Where human rights are involved, we in Congress should be careful to debate the questions fully and without arbitrary procedures in order to legislate wisely and justly.

I do not believe this legislation goes far enough, but as the few steps in this bill are steps, even though short, toward more fair labor-management legislation, I will support the bill and vote for it. I urge the Education and Labor Committee to give prior consideration to relieving the inequities in the present Taft-Hartley law. Labor and management are doing a fine job in cooperating for the national defense, and we in Congress should see that this voluntary cooperation is encouraged.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, having the utmost confidence in the members of the committee which reported the bill, this is a rather embarrassing situation for me. I just do not understand what section 18 means, that is as to whether this amendment goes far enough to permit collective bargaining if the union's officers still refuse to sign the anti-Communist affidavit required by the Taft-Hartley Act as a condition to collective bargaining. May I ask whether that is still necessary, or does the amendment just wipe out the old requirement?

Mr. McCONNELL. This validates certain contracts signed by the CIO and the A. F. of L. after the signing of the Taft-Hartley bill and before the top officers signed the non-Communist affidavit they were required to sign. They are now in compliance with the act and any contract made now would be valid.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They will be required to sign the affidavit in the future before new contracts are made?

Mr. McCONNELL. They will be required to sign the non-Communist affidavit; that is true.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then as I understand the other section of the bill it is that union officials may without an election, without the approval of the union members go ahead and agree upon what you call a union shop—which in fact is a closed shop contract—with a 30-day withdrawal clause.

Mr. McCONNELL. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, that again is a closed shop, with the exception of the 30-day probation period. This amendment will save a considerable amount of money in that it will do away with elections, and I suppose the argument is, is it not, that the elections have always resulted in favor of the position taken by the union officials?

Mr. McCONNELL. Overwhelmingly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But there is also a question of principle involved. Is the Congress now saying to all the workers of America, to all those who must get their livelihood through their daily toil—I notice the clerical workers in the union are on strike now, according to the papers—or to everyone who wants to work, that in addition to paying taxes to the Federal, State and local governments, he must also before he can go to work pay an initiation fee and then such additional dues and special assessments as may be levied by the union officials or by the executive officers of the national union with which his local union is affiliated. You are short-cutting the procedure and as may sometimes happen, it may be not very often though, if you get a crooked employer and a crooked union official, the two of them acting together just can sell the poor worker right down the river, and if they wish—out of his job. I do not see how or why the House or the Congress should declare that in order that a man may work he must join a designated organization and pay whatever fee or fees may be levied by either the local, the international or the officers of either. I am a Lutheran. Maybe if I followed through the theory back of this legislation I might make all workers join the Lutheran Church, become a member of our church, pay an initiation fee and pay so much every Sunday. I do not think that is right.

Ever since the Lord drove Adam and Eve out of the garden the average woman and man had to work, at least a little if he would eat. This administration has made it difficult to meet the taxes imposed by existing tax agencies and to now add to those existing and exacting agencies another which can impose a tax, compel its payment, before a man is permitted to work on even a defense job while his son is drafted to fight abroad is unjust. Much as I would like to curry favor with the labor bosses I cannot take this one. I might add that Republican politicians, if any there be, who seek that vote will not get it, Truman and his slick advisers have whatever of it that can be delivered, already "in the bag."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, S. 1959, an act to amend the National Labor Relations Act which was passed in the other body on October 1, 1951, should receive the approval of this body. Here is an instance where an amendment to the act is constructively in the interests of the public, labor, and the Federal Government.

This amendment has my support for these reasons:

First. In May of this year the Supreme Court held that the CIO and the A. F. of L. are national or international labor organizations within the meaning of—subsection H—section 9 of the NLRA. The enactment of S. 1959 will achieve certain economies of more than a million dollars. It has been estimated that to repeat the elections necessary under the decision of the Supreme Court would involve polling 2,000,000 union people at a cost of $850,000. Investigation and litigation would cost an additional $200,000.

Second. These elections have placed a heavy burden on the National Labor Relations Board and have almost always resulted in a situation favoring the union shop. If we can eliminate these elections the Board will be able to devote its time to the handling of representation and unfair labor practice cases.

Third. This bill will validate those elections already taken by the Board which have been affected by the Supreme Court decision. In other words, it would mean merely repeating the same procedure that has been taken in a previous election.

Let me say, however, that enactment of this amendment will in no way excuse disobedience to court judgments and court decrees which have already become final. Nor will this amendment reinstate any unfair labor practice procedures which have already been dismissed by the Board.

The bill continues to safeguard employees against subjection to union shop agreements which a majority disapproved. The Board will still conduct elections on the petition of 30 percent or more of the employees in a bargaining unit. Both the National Labor Relations Board and the general counsel for the Board have expressed themselves in favor of this legislation. This appears to me to be only a common sense way of meeting a difficult situation which was never anticipated prior to the Supreme Court decision of this year. The elections thus far held before that decision have already been admittedly honest and conducted in accordance with the rules of the Board. For these reasons I believe this amendment is not only sound but makes good sense and is in accordance with the best interests of labor, the public, and the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, this bill corrects only one of the many evils in the oppressive Taft-Hartley Act It is like throwing out crumbs to pacify the victims of a grave injustice. There are many things wrong with this act which one of its authors admitted when he proposed some 30 different changes in the law.

The fact this bill comes to the floor under a closed rule and forbids debate and amendments to correct other features in this discriminatory law is in itself evidence of the injustice of this legislation.

The real impact of this punitive legislation is felt by working men and women in Southern States, where wages are the lowest and working conditions are the poorest. It becomes difficult and almost impossible for factory and mill workers to organize a union without fear of economic reprisal to themselves and members of their families.

In many progressive States where working people have enjoyed strong labor organizations the act has not been as harmful as in backward States. But even in these States it has retarded organization because of fear of discrimination, and it remains as a threat which would become more real if the Nation should slip into another "Old Deal" depression, that some seek to lead us into.

I will support this bill, but I want to point out that it is still only a drop in the bucket, so far as improvement to this unjust Taft-Hartley Act is concerned.

I want to read to you an editorial from the Machinist, weekly publication of the International Association of Machinists, A. F. of L., which was published only a few days ago and which gives us a little background information about this bill and the law it seeks to amend:

THE ALL-UNION SHOP IS HERE TO STAY

You won't read much about it in the newspaper headlines, but up in Congress they are getting all ready to wrap up a gift for us poor, faceless characters who do the work.

Somewhere, in the back rooms where the decisions are made, they have agreed to concede on the fight against the union shop.

From here on we can have the union shop—if we can negotiate it—without even being required to line up and vote for it.

The bill already has been approved by the Senate. The House Labor Committee has also recommended approval by that body.

Back 4 years ago when the Taft-Hartley bill was being debated, a lot of supposedly intelligent and well-informed Senators and Congressmen were convinced that we really did not care much for our unions Convinced by the lobbyists for the National Association of Manufacturers that given a secret ballot, we would vote against the all-union shop.

ALMOST UNANIMOUS

So they put it in the Taft-Hartley Act along with a lot of other mistaken ideas. They made it illegal for any employer to grant a union shop unless and until the employees voted for it.

They were cute about it, too. Every other election requires a majority of those voting to carry the question. For the union shop they made the requirement a majority of all those eligible to vote That meant that a man who was sick and could not vote on election day was automatically counted as voting "No."

When they started holding these elections, the politicians discovered that men and women who work for a living know that they get a better break in an all-union shop. The elections were almost unanimous.

Not only did the elections fail to weaken unions, actually they turned out to be a bargaining tool to help convince the company that its employees really preferred an all-union shop with everyone in the union

Over the 4 years since Taft-Hartley was passed, 5,336,971 Americans went to the polls in Government-supervised union-shop elections. Here are the election results:

For the union shop	4,886,141
Against the union shop	450,830

These votes were cast in 44,587 different plants and shops in every State and in every county in the United States, and in almost every industry. Ninety-seven percent of these elections went overwhelmingly in favor of the union shop.

THREE MILLION DOLLAR MISTAKE

Now the antilabor forces in Congress are willing to concede. They are going to amend the Taft-Hartley Act to withdraw

the requirement that elections must be held before an employer can grant the union shop. A few months ago Congress also amended the Railway Labor Act to permit unions to negotiate union-shop agreements.

We can say now without fear of contradiction that the all-union shop is an American institution, established by 5,000,000 votes as a permanent rule of collective bargaining in the United States.

The 5,000,000 Americans who voted in these Taft-Hartley elections not only showed that the all-union shop is a popular and necessary part of labor relations, they also proved how far wrong Taft and company were when they voted in the Taft-Hartley Act.

The union-shop election was only one of the minor mistakes in the act. Yet this mistake alone has cost Uncle Sam almost $3,000,000, spent to conduct these elections, to prove that any union member knew all along, that it's always better to work in a union shop.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I am going to oppose the motion to recommit. On August 23, I introduced in the House H. R. 5291, the provisions of which are identical to those of S. 1959, the measure now before us. In addition to rectifying a condition which has grown out of conflicting Supreme Court and National Labor Relations Board decisions, a step which has the endorsement of labor and management alike, the bill also amends the Taft-Hartley Act with respect to one of the provisions which have proved unwise ever since that legislation was put on the statute books.

The first of these provisions of S. 1959 will be very helpful in preserving the stability of labor-management relationships which is so important to the smooth progress of the defense effort. The second will prevent a needless drain on the resources of the NLRB by eliminating the requirement that the NLRB hold elections to authorize the making of union security contracts.

The net effect of the bill is to let unions and employers know where they stand with respect to activities undertaken in relation to them by the National Labor Relations Board and to prevent a needless expenditure of money.

Mr. Chairman, the motion to recommit should be defeated and the bill should receive the support of every Member of this House.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, there are no committee amendments to be offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EVINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1959) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 453, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am, Mr. Speaker.

Mr BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, do I not have the privilege of recognition?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. May I inquire if it is not the practice and the rules of the House of Representatives that the right to offer a motion to recommit goes first to someone on the minority side?

The SPEAKER. In response to the gentleman from Indiana, that is correct, if he is a member of the committee, reporting the bill. The Chair quotes from page 301 of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives as follows:

A member of the committee reporting the measure and opposed to it is entitled to recognition to move to recommit over one not a member of the committee.

If anyone who is a member of the committee on the minority side desires to claim the right to offer a motion to recommit the Chair will recognize him; otherwise he will recognize the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hold that the gentleman is not too late in offering the motion. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BREHM I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion, and that motion must be in writing.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON. I understood that the Speaker had already recognized the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The SPEAKER. The motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia had not been reported. This is comity that has always existed in the House of Representatives between the majority and the minority.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BREHM moves to recommit the bill S. 1959 to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 22, nays 306, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

YEAS—22

Bailey	Hull	Staggers
Bishop	Kee	Tackett
Brehm	Kelley, Pa.	Trimble
Flood	O'Neill	Walter
Gordon	Perkins	Wier
Hays, Ohio	Ramsay	Wilson, Tex.
Hedrick	Robeson	
Hoffman, Mich	Sittler	

NAYS—306

Aandahl	Curtis, Nebr.	Jenkins
Abbitt	Davis, Ga.	Jensen
Abernethy	Davis, Tenn.	Johnson
Adair	Davis, Wis.	Jones, Ala.
Addonizio	DeGraffenried	Jones, Mo.
Albert	Denny	Jones, Hamilton C.
Allen, Calif.	Devereux	
Allen, Ill.	D'Ewart	Jones, Woodrow W.
Andersen, H Carl	Dingell	
	Dolliver	Judd
Anderson, Calif	Dondero	Karsten, Mo.
Andresen, August H.	Donohue	Kean
	Donovan	Kearns
Andrews	Doughton	Keating
Angell	Doyle	Kerr
Arends	Durham	Kersten, Wis.
Aspinall	Eaton	Kilday
Auchincloss	Eberharter	King
Ayres	Elliott	Kirwan
Bakewell	Ellsworth	Lane
Barden	Engle	Lanham
Baring	Evins	Lantaff
Barrett	Fallon	LeCompte
Bates, Mass.	Feighan	Lesinski
Battle	Fernandez	Lind
Beall	Fischer	Lovre
Beamer	Forand	Lyle
Beckworth	Ford	McCarthy
Bender	Forrester	McConnell
Bennett, Fla.	Fugate	McCormack
Bennett, Mich	Fulton	McDonough
Bentsen	Garmatz	McGregor
Betts	Gary	McGuire
Blatnik	George	McMillan
Boggs, Del	Goodwin	McMullen
Bolling	Gordon	McVey
Bolton	Graham	Machrowicz
Bonner	Granahan	Mack, Ill.
Bosone	Granger	Mack, Wash
Bow	Grant	Madden
Boykin	Green	Mahon
Bray	Greenwood	Mansfield
Brooks	Gross	Marshall
Brown, Ga.	Gwinn	Martin, Iowa
Brownson	Hagen	Martin, Mass
Bryson	Hale	Mason
Buchanan	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Merrow
Buckley		Miller, Md.
Budge	Halleck	Miller, Nebr.
Burdick	Harden	Miller, N. Y.
Burleson	Hardy	Mills
Burnside	Harris	Mitchell
Burton	Harrison, Va.	Morano
Bush	Harrison, Wyo.	Morris
Butler	Hart	Moulder
Camp	Harvey	Multer
Canfield	Havenner	Mumma
Cannon	Hays, Ark	Murdock
Carlyle	Herlong	Murray, Tenn.
Carnahan	Herter	Nelson
Chatham	Heselton	Nicholson
Chenoweth	Hill	Norblad
Chiperfield	Hillings	Norrell
Chudoff	Hinshaw	O'Brien, Ill
Church	Hoeven	O'Brien, Mich.
Clemente	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Hara
Clevenger	Holmes	Ostertag
Cole, Kans.	Hope	O'Toole
Colmer	Horan	Passman
Cooley	Hunter	Patman
Cooper	Irving	Patten
Cotton	Jackson, Calif.	Patterson
Cox	Jackson, Wash.	Philbin
Crosser	James	Pickett
Crumpacker	Jarman	Polk
Cunningham	Javits	Potter
Curtis, Mo.	Jenison	Poulson

Preston	Schwabe	Vail
Price	Scott,	Van Pelt
Priest	Hugh, D., Jr.	Van Zandt
Rabaut	Scrivner	Velde
Radwan	Scudder	Vorys
Rains	Secrest	Vursell
Rankin	Seely-Brown	Watts
Reams	Shafer	Welchel
Reece, Tenn.	Sheppard	Welch
Reed, Ill.	Short	Wharton
Reed, N. Y.	Sieminski	Wheeler
Rees, Kans.	Simpson, Ill.	Whitten
Rhodes	Simpson, Pa.	Wickersham
Richards	Smith, Kans.	Widnall
Riehlman	Smith, Miss.	Williams, Miss
Riley	Smith, Va.	Williams, N Y.
Roberts	Smith Wis	Wilson, Ind.
Rodino	Spence	Winstead
Rogers, Colo.	Springer	Withrow
Rogers, Fla.	Stigler	Wolcott
Rogers, Mass	Stockman	Wolverton
Rogers, Tex.	Sutton	Wood, Ga.
Rooney	Talle	Wood, Idaho
Sabath	Teague	Woodruff
Sadlak	Thomas	Yorty
St. George	Thompson,	Zablocki
Sasscer	Mich	
Saylor	Tollefson	

NOT VOTING—100

Allen, La.	Fogarty	Miller, Calif
Anfuso	Frazier	Morgan
Armstrong	Furcolo	Morrison
Baker	Gamble	Morton
Bates, Ky.	Gathings	Murphy
Belcher	Gavin	Murray, Wis.
Berry	Gore	O'Konski
Blackney	Gregory	Phillips
Boggs, La	Hall,	Poage
Bramblett	Leonard W.	Powell
Brown, Ohio	Hand	Prouty
Buffett	Hebert	Quinn
Busbey	Heffernan	Redden
Byrne, N Y	Heller	Regan
Byrnes, Wis.	Hess	Ribicoff
Case	Holifield	Rivers
Celler	Howell	Roosevelt
Chelf	Ikard	Scott, Hardie
Cole, N Y.	Jonas	Sheehan
Combs	Kearney	Shelley
Corbett	Kelly, N Y.	Sikes
Coudert	Kennedy	Stanley
Crawford	Keogh	Steed
Dague	Kilburn	Taber
Dawson	Klein	Taylor
Deane	Kluczynski	Thompson, Tex
Delaney	Larcade	Thornberry
Dempsey	Latham	Vinson
Denton	Lucas	Werdel
Dollinger	McCulloch	Whitaker
Dorn	McGrath	Wigglesworth
Elston	McKinnon	Willis
Fenton	Magee	Yates
Fine	Meader	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Hand.
Mr. Quinn with Mr Leonard W. Hall.
Mr Morrison with Mr. Cole of New York
Mr Hébert with Mr Corbett.
Mr Keogh with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Elston.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Vinson with Mr Prouty.
Mr. Fine with Mr Crawford
Mr. Shelley with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Howell with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Armstrong.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Deane with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Case.
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Buffett.
Mr. Magee with Mr. Bramblett.
Mr. McKinnon with Mr. Busbey.
Mr. Ribicoff with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Yates with Mr Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Belcher.
Mr Regan with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. O'Konski.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 307, nays 18, not voting 103, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

YEAS—307

Aandahl	Cooper	Hoeven
Abbitt	Cotton	Hoffman, Ill.
Abernethy	Cox	Holmes
Adair	Crosser	Hope
Addonizio	Crumpacker	Horan
Albert	Cunningham	Hunter
Allen, Calif.	Curtis, Mo.	Ikard
Allen, Ill.	Curtis, Nebr.	Irving
Andersen,	Davis, Ga	Jackson, Calif.
H Carl	Davis, Tenn	Jackson, Wash
Anderson, Calif.	Davis, Wis	James
Andresen,	DeGraffenried	Jarman
August H	Denny	Javits
Andrews	Devereux	Jenison
Angell	D'Ewart	Jenkins
Arends	Dingell	Jensen
Aspinall	Dolliver	Johnson
Auchincloss	Dondero	Jones, Ala.
Ayres	Donohue	Jones, Mo.
Bakewell	Donovan	Jones,
Barden	Doughton	Hamilton C
Baring	Doyle	Jones,
Barrett	Durham	Woodrow W
Bates, Mass	Eaton	Judd
Battle	Eberharter	Karsten, Mo.
Beall	Elliott	Kean
Beamer	Ellsworth	Kearns
Beckworth	Engle	Keating
Bender	Evins	Kersten, Wis
Bennett, Fla	Fallon	Kilday
Bennett, Mich	Feighan	King
Bentsen	Fernandez	Kirwan
Betts	Forand	Lane
Blatnik	Ford	Lanham
Boggs, Del.	Forrester	Lantaff
Bolling	Fugate	LeCompte
Bolton	Fulton	Lesinski
Bonner	Garmatz	Lind
Bosone	Gary	Lovre
Bow	George	Lyle
Boykin	Goodwin	McConnell
Bray	Gordon	McCormack
Brehm	Graham	McDonough
Brooks	Granahan	McGregor
Brown, Ga.	Grant	McGuire
Brownson	Green	McMillan
Bryson	Greenwood	McMullen
Buchanan	Gross	McVey
Buckley	Gwinn	Machrowicz
Budge	Hagen	Mack, Ill.
Buffett	Hale	Mack, Wash.
Burdick	Hall,	Madden
Burleson	Edwin Arthur	Mahon
Burnside	Hall,	Mansfield
Burton	Leonard W.	Marshall
Bush	Halleck	Martin, Iowa
Butler	Harden	Martin, Mass.
Camp	Hardy	Mason
Canfield	Harris	Merrow
Cannon	Harrison, Va.	Miller, Md.
Carlyle	Harrison, Wyo.	Miller, Nebr.
Carnahan	Hart	Miller, N. Y.
Chatham	Harvey	Mills
Chenoweth	Havenner	Mitchell
Chiperfield	Hays, Ark.	Morano
Chudoff	Hays, Ohio	Morris
Church	Herlong	Moulder
Clemente	Herter	Multer
Clevenger	Heselton	Mumma
Cole, Kans.	Hill	Murdock
Colmer	Hillings	Murray, Tenn.
Cooley	Hinshaw	Nelson
Nicholson	Roberts	Talle
Norblad	Rodino	Teague
Norrell	Rogers, Colo.	Thomas
O'Brien, Ill.	Rogers, Fla	Thompson,
O'Brien, Mich.	Rogers, Mass.	Mich.
O'Hara	Rogers, Tex.	Tollefson
Ostertag	Rooney	Vail
O'Toole	Sadlak	Van Pelt
Passman	St George	Van Zandt
Patman	Sasscer	Velde
Patten	Saylor	Vorys
Patterson	Schwabe	Vursell
Philbin	Scott, Hardie	Walter
Pickett	Scott,	Watts
Polk	Hugh D., Jr.	Welchel
Potter	Scudder	Welch
Poulson	Secrest	Wharton
Preston	Seely-Brown	Wheeler
Price	Shafer	Whitten
Priest	Sheppard	Wickersham
Rabaut	Short	Widnall
Radwan	Sieminski	Williams, Miss.
Rains	Simpson, Ill.	Williams, N Y.
Rankin	Simpson, Pa.	Wilson, Ind.
Reams	Smith, Kans.	Winstead
Reece, Tenn.	Smith, Miss.	Withrow
Reed, Ill.	Smith, Va.	Wolcott
Reed, N Y.	Smith, Wis.	Wolverton
Rees, Kans	Spence	Wood, Ga
Rhodes	Springer	Wood, Idaho
Richards	Stigler	Woodruff
Riehlman	Stockman	Yorty
Riley	Sutton	Zablocki

NAYS—18

Bailey	Hull	Robeson
Bishop	Kee	Sittler
Fisher	Kelley, Pa.	Staggers
Flood	O'Neill	Tackett
Golden	Perkins	Wier
Hoffman, Mich	Ramsay	Wilson, Tex

NOT VOTING—103

Allen, La	Furcolo	Morrison
Anfuso	Gamble	Morton
Armstrong	Gathings	Murphy
Baker	Gavin	Murray, Wis.
Bates, Ky	Gore	O'Konski
Belcher	Granger	Phillips
Berry	Gregory	Poage
Blackney	Hand	Powell
Boggs, La.	Hébert	Prouty
Bramblett	Hedrick	Quinn
Brown, Ohio	Heffernan	Redden
Busbey	Heller	Regan
Byrne, N Y	Hess	Ribicoff
Byrnes, Wis	Holifield	Rivers
Case	Howell	Roosevelt
Celler	Jonas	Sabath
Chelf	Kearney	Scrivner
Cole, N. Y	Kelly, N Y.	Sheehan
Combs	Kennedy	Shelley
Corbett	Keogh	Sikes
Coudert	Kerr	Stanley
Crawford	Kilburn	Steed
Dague	Klein	Taber
Dawson	Kluczynski	Taylor
Deane	Larcade	Thompson, Tex
Delaney	Latham	Thornberry
Dempsey	Lucas	Trimble
Denton	McCarthy	Vinson
Dollinger	McCulloch	Werdel
Dorn	McGrath	Whitaker
Elston	McKinnon	Wigglesworth
Fenton	Magee	Willis
Fine	Meader	Yates
Fogarty	Miller, Calif.	
Frazier	Morgan	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Hand.
Mr Quinn with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr Coudert.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Case.
Mr. Klein with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Magee with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Deane with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Fine with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Ribicoff with Mr. Fenton.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Celler with Mr Crawford.
Mr Redden with Mr Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Scrivner.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Armstrong.
Mr Byrne of New York with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Gamble.
Mr Denton with Mr Elston
Mr Holifield with Mr Phillips.
Mr. Howell with Mr. Bramblett.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Busbey.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Hess.
Mr Shelley with Mr Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr Yates with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. SITTLER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BAILEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SUTTON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks on the bill just passed at a point in the RECORD preceding the roll-call vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

BROADER PARTICIPATION

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, real cooperation between the English-speaking peoples is always of great importance, but it would be a great mistake to try to base our efforts for preserving world peace and rehabilitating economically distressed nations on a union dominated by the Anglo-Saxon peoples and their satellites alone. Such a policy would bring deep resentment from other great nations as was shown by the disastrous failures of Hitler. To weld a truly effective organization for world peace, it is absolutely necessary to secure the wholehearted participation of the great Latin races, the Slavic and Celtic peoples, the Semitic groups, and peoples of many other diverse blood strains identified with the Near East and East. In such a union the free democratic world could present a truly united front before the Soviets.

Translated into practical terms, that would mean the acceptance of the Spanish and, of course, of the Italian peoples. It would mean the enlistment of the Irish people with their ago-old fervor and militancy in the cause of liberty. It would mean cooperation with the new State of Israel and our Jewish brethren throughout the world. It would mean our acceptance of the great Polish people, historically devoted to freedom, and the liberation of that people together with our loyal friends of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, who are all looking to us for succor and relief from tyranny. It would mean that we should seek to embrace within the orbit of our free world organization the many peoples of Africa and the Orient already sorely beset by the cruel pressure of Soviet conspiracy, of infiltration, and aggression.

The great practical obstacles that stand in the way of such cooperation are by no means insurmountable, if an honest, just and fair-minded approach is made. This Nation can mount a program to bring all these peoples to the side of the free world by immediately coming into closer relations and cooperative action with Spain, Ireland, Italy and the free Polish Government. If we were able to marshal, not only the resources of wealth and manpower, but the dynamic enthusiasm, the spiritual strength and political militancy of these nations, we should have made notable progress toward the goal of throwing up truly effective road blocks in Europe and Asia against the powerful march of Soviet military and ideological pressure.

I speak particularly today in behalf of the enlistment of the Irish, the Italians, the Spanish, and the Polish in our cause. Let us no longer be blinded by unreasoning prejudice and illogical hostility to the immeasurable value of having these noble peoples on the democratic side in fact as well as in theory.

Nor should we overlook the fact that the people of Western Germany are of the greatest importance to the defense of Western Europe. We should foster every possible cooperative measure to rehabilitate and strengthen these people and bring them into our efforts to sustain western civilization against Communist zealots.

There should be no further delay regarding the revision of the Italian Treaty. Highest official of this Government, as well as the American people, are agreed upon the importance of a rejuvenated and free Italy. We must move speedily to extend our helping hand and generous assistance to this noble people, which has manifested such admirable determination to ward off the ravages of communism in their fair land. The Italian nation should be welcomed into the free world and assisted in setting up appropriate armed force to help meet every challenge of communism.

I have never been able to understand, and I have frequently deplored, our attitude toward Poland. I think there has never been a greater crime committed against any free nation in history than the one which so cruelly consigned the noble Polish people to the merciless domination of communism. That agreement was never ratified by the United States Senate and it is disapproved and renounced by an overwhelming number of loyal Americans. We should move with all possible haste to make this renunciation official by taking measures to liberate Poland from the bestial serfdom and subjugation she now suffers.

Forthright action to consolidate all these great peoples would unquestionably inspire all the small struggling nations of the earth to reawakened zeal for our cause, and our Nation would soon enjoy restored prestige and confidence in many quarters of the globe where these important elements of good will are presently at a low ebb. Such measures would be of inestimable benefit to our struggle against communism.

It is dangerous to underestimate an adversary, but it is even more dangerous, in my opinion, for the greatest nation on earth to cringe and cower before his blandishments. If we would have other nations respect us, we must vigorously assert our own self-respect, our faith in ourselves and our democratic way of life, our courage and determination to face up to any threat to our security, our invincible will to protect the United States and its free institutions, come what may. Let us have more talk about our strength and less talk about our own weakness in our willingness to appease where we should fearlessly face the true issues of survival which confront us Let us have less talk about the atomic bombs of Russia and more talk about the far more numerous and more devastating atomic bombs of the United States and our ability to deliver them promptly, should we be required to do so. I pray that moment may never come.

And let us have more talk about peace, about the prospects for universal disarmament and atomic control designed to check future war.

I have felt that our efforts along these lines have not been as vigorous and sustained as I would like to see them. It is true that we cannot force our views upon an unwilling nation. But we can at least present before the world council and before world opinion the blueprint for a peaceful world. We can urge a conference for atomic control and disarmament and let the peoples of the world know that we are not imperialist warmongers, as so often charged by Soviet propaganda, but we are, on the other hand, true lovers of liberty, true seekers of peace, true and vigorous apostles of a free, peaceful world in which fear of atomic bombs or other terrible weapons of human destruction shall not have a place.

PEACE COMES NOT ONLY FROM THE GOVERNMENT; IT COMES FROM THE PEOPLE

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this week I shall leave Washington on a solo flight of 33,000 miles, touching in 30 countries and seeing at first hand

conditions in many areas of the world. This flight is made with only one purpose in mind and I am sure it is the dominating purpose in the hearts and minds of all Americans.

The overpowering hope of us all, regardless of political party, regardless of economic background, regardless of race or creed, regardless of any petty differences among us—our common hope is that the world may be at peace, not merely for our own times but for generations yet to come. We hope that such a peace may produce a world in which wars and rumors of wars will not be an ever-present accompaniment of our daily life.

Yet this is not a "peace at any price" for which we hope. We want no peace which will cause us to give up our own cherished institutions. We want no peace which will be without the freedoms which we hold dear and which are too much a part of our hallowed American heritage to surrender. We want peace, but we want a peace which will recognize our right to live as men.

And these rights and privileges we desire for ourselves, we wish for all the peoples of the world. We in the United States have no desire to manage the affairs of the entire family of nations. We do not wish to decide all of the details of politics and economy for other peoples. We wish rather a world in which each people and each nation can order its own affairs in a peaceful, free manner, without interference and pressure from other powers.

We, in America, have no quarrel with our neighbors in Europe or Asia or any land. We wish no war, cold or otherwise. We wish only to live in peace and for all nations to live in harmony and understanding with one another.

It is to extend this sentiment that my trip is being taken. I am not going as an official ambassador of the United States Government. I am going alone, in a private, civilian airplane. I will carry with me only one article for each city in which I stop. That article is a scroll conveying the greetings and the hopes for peace from my home area of central Illinois to the people of these foreign towns.

It is fitting that this expression should come from central Illinois for it is an area dominated in its traditions and its thinking by one of the greatest of all Americans—Abraham Lincoln. No President has ever been taken to the heart of the American people so warmly as has the martyred Civil War President. The reason for this is, I believe, simple. Lincoln was one of the people. Only from Abe Lincoln could have come the statement that the Lord must have loved the common people because he made so many of them.

It is from the descendants of these common people of the Abraham Lincoln district that I bear greetings to the people of the world.

It is further fitting that these sentiments of peace on earth to all men of good will should come from the Lincoln country. Perhaps no man ever so well expressed the idea of the brotherhood of man as did Lincoln. In his second inaugural address, his impassioned plea that old hatreds and recent bitterness must be forgotten so that the Nation could bind up the wounds of war stands unsurpassed as a landmark of Christian charity. These words are just as applicable to the present situation. This world now needs a return to the doctrine of forgiveness and of Christian brotherhood as much as it ever did in 1865.

However, these expressions of a desire for peace and of brotherhood are not restricted to the Lincoln district. I am sure that they are echoed in the hearts of every American and I feel that I am only expressing their sentiments for them in a way which will serve as a symbol of what is in the American mind today.

However, the peace we want will not come to us without effort on our part. Nothing worth securing can be obtained without sacrifice, work, and thought.

Sacrifice and work we all know from our experiences of the last 10 years.

Often, however, the third necessity—that of thought—is forgotten. Work and sacrifice are essentials, but equally so is a thoughtful attitude on the part of our leaders and our citizens. Every proposal for a better United States deserves the thought and the study of every American.

The past years have seen too much of the attitude of praising or condemning a person or a proposal merely because of sponsorship by a particular economic or political group. This attitude has been labeled "partisan politics."

No political party has a monopoly on capable men; no political party has a monopoly on scoundrels. No political party has a monopoly on desirable legislation; no political party has a monopoly on undesirable legislation.

Every person holding a political office has at least one duty and unless he performs that duty he is unworthy to hold political office. He must conscientiously study every piece of legislation which appears before him; he must carefully familiarize himself with every proposal which affects his constituents. And this study must not be based merely on noting which party is proposing this policy; it must be a searching examination of just how this proposal will react on his constituents and on the whole country. His vote must then reflect the result of this examination and not merely party loyalty or loyalty to one group within his district.

But not all the responsibility for thinking rests on the officeholder. The average citizen has an equally serious obligation. Almost every year the citizens go to the polling place to indicate their choices for political office. All too often, little thought is given in advance of the day of election as to how he will mark his ballot. This is just as wrong as the officeholder giving no thought to his votes or policies. The citizen has the duty of studying the candidates and examining their records carefully. Then, and only then, is he truly a citizen expressing himself intelligently and well.

This is not unrelated to the original idea of peace. I believe it is directly related to peace. Only by having an intelligent, thoughtful group of voters, equally ready to think as to sacrifice and work, can we hope to formulate national policies which will produce peace.

Peace comes not only from the Government; it comes from the people, but furthermore, peace does not come only by wishing—it comes only with the assistance of every American.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday the President announced that Russia has exploded another atomic bomb; last Friday came Stalin's belated confirmation of what we already knew. The news has now had a chance to sink in; it is time we ask ourselves what it means for the defense of our country and our freedom.

One thing should now be clear to all of us—the Kremlin is moving heaven and earth to develop more powerful and more destructive nuclear weapons. Atomic tests are intended to determine progress in developing better weapons; this test means that the Russians are moving forward. Stalin means business.

I fear that some Americans still doubt this. Six years ago, after Hiroshima and Nagasaki, many of our countrymen confidently predicted that the Kremlin would need at least 20 or 30 years to master the secret of atomic energy—there were even those who made bold to suggest that the Russians would never achieve an atomic bomb And 2 years ago, even after the President revealed that the Russians had in fact exploded an atomic bomb, some Pollyannas still looked the other way and pretended that this epochal event had never occurred. Some said that the Soviet explosion was accidental rather than planned; others knowingly declared that the test was a fluke, a lucky experiment that could never have been repeated; still others asserted that the Russians could never stockpile these atomic weapons in large quantities.

Those of us who sat on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy could not take refuge in such comforting notions. We realized that the general scientific laws underlying atomic weapons were known to all qualified nuclear physicists. We knew also that Russia did not lack for topflight scientists. We studied top secret intelligence reports which indicated that the Soviets were trying their mightiest to overtake and surpass us in the atomic armaments race.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, it has been my duty and privilege to devote many hours each week to a study of atomic problems. I have repeatedly tried to warn the American people and my colleagues in this House of the dire necessity of bolstering our atomic defenses. When I returned from the Eniwetok atomic tests last spring, I went on record as urging an immediate doubling of the scale and scope of our atomic effort. And just 6 weeks ago, I stood on this very spot and

warned with all the solemnity at my command that "it is just plain indisputable that the Soviets are in the atomic-weapons business on a big scale, and with every day and week that passes, they are adding to their stockpile these destroyers."

None of us can any longer ignore the obvious. The obvious facts are these: The Russians have already exploded atomic bombs. They will explode more weapons in the future. They are stockpiling weapons at an increasing rate. Right now they can launch an atomic attack at 20 or 30 American cities.

What are we going to do about it? There is no cause for unreasoning panic. Our Atomic Energy Commission has not been resting on its oars. We have in being a formidable—and rapidly growing—stockpile of atomic weapons. Until now, our atomic superiority has held the Kremlin in check. The ground troops of Stalin vastly outnumber those of the free world. The Red air force is far larger than the combined air fleets of the free peoples. In only one field of military endeavor—the field of atomic weapons—have we maintained a commanding lead over the Soviets. Yet this trump card alone—the fearful retribution that would be visited upon the men of the Politburo if the dictators struck—has served to keep Stalin from beginning the third world war.

Falling behind in the atomic armaments competition will mean national suicide. The latest Russian explosion means that Stalin has gone all out in atomic energy. It is high time that we now go all out.

Few people realize that since VJ-day only 3 cents out of every defense dollar has been devoted to the output of atomic bombs. In other words, less than one-thirtieth of our total military spending has gone to produce the one weapon in which we are preeminent. In the last fiscal year, typically enough, we spent about four-fifths of a billion on atomic weapons and in the meanwhile we paid out five times this sum—or more than four billions—for small arms, bullets, hand grenades and the like.

In the past—in the past, I say—there were reasons for this seemingly upside-down allocation of our defense funds. At the outset of our program there were shortages in raw materials and bottlenecks in technical equipment—limiting factors on the supply of atomic weapons.

But now these obstacles to all-out atomic production are being surmounted. The time will come when we can make these weapons in dozens of varieties and in thousands and tens of thousands. The hour is drawing close when atomic weapons tailored to all types of combat situations can be made available—when they can be produced in qualities and types sufficient to serve as the paramount instrument of deterrence either against all-out war or against future Koreas.

I believe that we must immediately and dramatically expand the scale and scope of our atomic effort. In place of the approximately $1,000,000,000 we are spending on atomic weapons this year, I propose that we now undertake to spend between six and ten billions annually on this supreme deterrent against Kremlin aggression.

I put it to the Members of this House as a fact that there is virtually no limit on the number of atomic weapons we can produce, if only we now boldly increase the moneys and resources presently devoted to our atomic program. Too many Americans have wrongly imagined that there are fixed and immutable limits, on the number of weapons we can make. In part because atomic energy is so novel, in part because large areas of our program are necessarily shrouded in secrecy, a great many people without access to the true facts have mistakenly assumed that the manufacture of atomic weapons is exempt from the economic laws which govern the production of other commodities. This is not so. For all its exquisite gadgetry, an atomic bomb—from the production standpoint—can be likened to a tank. Now nobody would ever imagine that the quantity of tanks we can produce is a constant—that we can turn them out only in X or Y number. If we want more tanks, we simply spend more money and exploit additional resources. Perhaps we need more steel for armor plate, so we increase our exploration program; we develop low-grade deposits. And then we build more factories, more assembly lines, more machine tools. So it is with atomic energy. The size of the end product is proportional to our effort

The Atomic Energy Commission has officially informed the joint committee that, given more money and more resources, it can now multiply the scale of our atomic effort.

We can no longer give heed to the philosophers of scarcity in our thinking about atomic materials. The potential supply of nuclear weapons is almost without limit.

Another thing is also without forseeable limit—the military's need for atomic energy. I have personally always deeply regretted that from Hiroshima onward many military thinkers regarded the atomic bomb as primarily a strategic weapon, to be used against industrial targets. Given this assumption, it was easy to go a step further and wrongly imagine that the atomic bomb could be used only against cities and civilians. Those holding this view proceeded to argue that—since the number of cities in the enemy country is limited—the supply of atomic weapons we can profitably use is correspondingly limited. Advocates of this doctrine accordingly questioned the necessity of producing atomic weapons in truly massive quantities.

Regarded only as a strategic weapon, the atomic bomb did not tell us how we could halt an enemy's troop in the field while we were destroying his munitions factories; it did not tell us how we could spare our allies the agonies of occupation while we were knocking out an aggressor's war potential. It did not tell us how we could launch counter-strikes against an enemy's strategic airfields and thereby prevent him from hitting against our own cities. Nor—when viewed purely as a strategic weapon for use against targets deep in the fastness of the Soviet Union—did the atom directly answer the problem of dealing with a future Greece or Korea or Malaya.

Moreover, Stalin has been quick to exploit, and turn to his own propaganda advantage, the mistaken but widely held belief that the atomic bomb could be directed only against cities and factories. Stalin has sought to convince the world that his best weapon, the Red army, is moral whereas our best weapon, the atomic bomb, is immoral. Actually, of course, our military men have always regarded atomic weapons as precision instruments to be used only against specific targets vital to an aggressor's war machine. Yet—however wrongly—the idea has gained currency that our defense plans are based upon killing non-combatants, that atomic weapons must inevitably destroy the guilty and the innocent alike.

But 1951 finds us in the middle of a revolution in military thinking. Strategists now recognize that atomic weapons can be used with extraordinary effectiveness in all phases of warfare—if we now act to produce atomic weapons in huge quantities and great varieties—as we can if only we are willing to spend between $6,000,000,000 and $10,000,000,000 a year on our program.

Atomic energy will be used against enemy troops on the ground. Atomic artillery in various forms will eventually substitute for divisions of ordinary foot soldiers. Short-range guided missiles with atomic warheads will replace conventional howitzers.

The atom will be used on the sea. Nuclear-powered submarines will revolutionize the range and effectiveness of underwater craft. We can develop nuclear-powered aircraft carriers capable of launching planes and carrying atomic bombs.

And the atom will be used in the air. It will be directed not only against an enemy's industrial might but also against the air bases from which he would strike against our cities. Even more, light planes carrying atomic weapons will be used to knock out an enemy's attacking troops and advance supply dumps.

In other words, we can look forward to tactical atomic weapons being used against soldiers in uniform and against troops in the field. We can outflank Stalin's mass armies with our atomic weapons. Our Western European friends have long feared that they would be overrun by the Red army while our Air Force was destroying Russia's military vitals. But now our allies may look forward to halting the Red army in its tracks with the help of the tactical atom.

Consider how this will increase Western Europe's will to resist. Put yourself in the position of Stalin and ask yourself this question: If you were planning to send the Red army crashing across Western Europe, which would you most fear—an ordinary artillery piece or one that fired an atomic warhead? If you were in the Kremlin, you would most fear atomic firepower—real firepower.

Consider also how the prospect of tactical atomic weapons bears upon the problem of halting little wars as well as big wars. If you were a Communist puppet planning some military adventure along the borders of the slave world, would you dare attack if you knew the United States possessed tactical A-bombs in great numbers and many varieties?

Consider, finally, how tactical atomic bombs will answer Stalin's propaganda to the effect that our weapons are immoral.

The hard fact, in addition, is that atomic firepower—measured purely in terms of sheer military effectiveness—is vastly more efficient than the conventional firepower of the Second World War. Atomic explosives can outperform ordinary TNT on land, sea, and in the air.

Even further, atomic firepower, dollar for dollar, is actually hundreds of times cheaper than the cost of conventional high explosives. For less than a hundred dollars, an atomic weapon can generate the same destructive force which costs many thousands of dollars when produced by ordinary means.

Indeed, if we now get about the task of orienting our entire Military Establishment around the power of the split atom, I foresee the day when major reductions in our defense budgets will become possible, when we will be able to purchase greater security for the American people at less cost to the taxpayer.

Do not mistake my meaning. An army cannot fight on expectations—no matter how great. No sensible man, for instance, would suggest that, within a matter of months, we can assign most of our conventional weapons to our military museums and replace them with atomic armaments. As a matter of fact, we can never dispense with ordinary armaments. We will still need troops in the field to exploit breakthroughs achieved with tactical atomic weapons. We will still need bombers to deliver these weapons to their targets.

Also, in urging all-out atomic production, I want specifically to disassociate myself from the proponents of push-button warfare. The day is not in sight, and never will be, when we can win wars without the loss of American lives. Infantry will not become outmoded; we will still need machine guns; destroyers will still roam the seas. I agree with that tireless worker for atomic preparedness, Chairman BRIEN MCMAHON, of the Atomic Energy Committee, that you cannot fight a war from the back seat of a Cadillac.

Let me also put to rest any thought that I regard the atom as a miracle weapon, which need not conform to the classical principles of grand strategy. I maintain precisely the exact opposite. For all its immense power, the atomic bomb is a finite weapon. The real peddlers of military nostrums are those who imagine that the atom can be decisive in warfare without producing it by the thousands and tens of thousands.

Tactical uses of atomic energy alone will profitably absorb all the atomic weapons it is within our power to turn out.

Mr. Speaker, it is just ordinary common sense to give supreme priority to our atomic program. It is simple logic to stress the one field in which we can remain ahead of the Soviets. Unless we make ourselves into a garrison state, it is truly difficult to imagine matching the Red armies division for division. In raw quantitative power—power measured by the yardstick of foot soldiers and ordinary weapons—the Soviets have an actual and potential advantage. But in qualitative military power—in the power of laboratories, scientific skills, and specialized brains—the advantage is overwhelmingly on our side.

I confess to being struck by the irony of having to advance complicated and detailed arguments in support of an all-out atomic program. This is the best weapon we have—it is our one real hope of deterring Stalin. It is the natural weapon of a country weak in brute manpower but superlatively strong in science and technology. How can we afford not to go all out? How can we conceivably not want to make every possible atomic weapon we can?

I believe that reasonable men can differ only on the degree of expansion that is now physically possible. In my own mind I am positive that we can immediately undertake to quintuple our expenditures on the atom—to spend six billions annually. But it may well turn out that we should now increase our spending to 10 billions a year.

I cannot, however, imagine any Member of this House going before his constituents and saying that he is not in favor of making every single atomic weapon it is within our power to produce.

The goal of the American people is now, and ever has been, a just and lasting peace. We wish to live in friendship and brotherhood with the everyday peoples of all the world, including the millions of ordinary Russians now enslaved by Stalin. To keep the peace, we need strength—not only military strength, but economic and moral strength as well. I have spoken today only of enlarging our military defenses. But let no man think that more atomic weapons, standing by themselves, provide a complete answer to Red aggression. Hungry men are easy victims for the false doctrines of Stalinism. So we must help the economically impoverished to help themselves. And beyond all else, we must appear before the court of world opinion with a cause that is noble and just. No matter how efficient its weapons or how strong its economy, a nation must stand on the side of decency if it is to prevail in the competition for the minds of men.

We must tell the world that we now stand ready—as we have stood ready in the past—to put our atomic armaments and all other weapons under effective United Nations control whenever Stalin agrees to a plan that will do the job. We must assure all men of good will that we manufacture atomic weapons only because the Kremlin forces us to, and that we would far prefer to devote our moneys and resources to a war against human wretchedness.

But so long as the Politburo compels us to live in a world of uncontrolled weapons, we have no alternative but to maintain and increase our atomic lead.

If some day we win through to real peace, there will be no need to sell our atomic materials as war surplus; in time of real peace, the stuff in our atomic stockpile will be more valuable than all the gold stored at Fort Knox. It is not generally realized that the very same material used in atomic bombs can be used to fuel peacetime industrial reactors. The identical material which propels an atomic submarine can someday power peaceful ships of commerce. Plutonium and uranium-235 will last thousands of years without deteriorating. If the day comes when men make war no more, the money spent today on our atomic defenses will not be wasted—the fissionable materials which can keep us ahead in the atomic armaments competition will immeasurably enrich our lives in time of peace. Every last ounce of our atomic stockpile is as valuable in peace as it is in war. Today, the atom, in the form of weapons, is the shield of our liberties and the bulwark of our freedoms. Tomorrow, in the form of peacetime power, the atom can remake this world closer to the heart's desire.

I say that therefore we must now—not next year, not next month, but now—get about the job of going all-out in atomic energy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to compliment the gentleman from Washington for once again, in a statesmanlike manner, giving to this House the benefit of his wide knowledge of this particular program. I think the Congress and the people are indebted to the gentleman from Washington for the fine contribution which he has just made, and should take his considerations and recommendations extremely seriously.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I thank the gentleman from Montana. May I say that all of the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Republicans and Democrats alike, are interested in seeing that we stay on top in this atomic struggle.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I also want to congratulate the gentleman from Washington. The gentleman is in a position, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to obtain information vital to the interests of our country and to the kind of a future world in which the people of all lands in this generation and generations to come would desire to live. I know that in making the speech he did today, he did so after profound consideration and probably collaboration with others.

Am I correct in my last statement?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The speech of the gentleman today represents a major con-

tribution, not only to the membership of the House but to the people of the country, and to the people of other free countries. It is also a message to Stalin and his group, and in a language that they thoroughly understand and appreciate—the language of power.

I hope the press of the country will give the gentleman's speech as wide publicity as possible. We hear a great deal about the freedom of the press, and that a free press is a fair press. The gentleman's speech is one that should be carried to the people as widely as possible.

I would like to ask the gentleman a question; and, if he tells me that he prefers not to answer it, I will understand the reason why. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the production of atomic weapons for tactical purposes is in such shape that the experimental stage is over, and that they can be produced in large numbers?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Gordon Dean, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in a speech in California last week, I believe, stated that we were producing tactical weapons. We now have in our possession tactical weapons that we can use in the field in direct support of our ground troops, much in the same manner that we utilize heavy barrages to pave the way for the advance by infantry.

Mr. McCORMACK. So it is the gentleman's opinion, based upon his knowledge and information, that mass production of atomic weapons for tactical purposes can now be carried out?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Yes; I would like to emphasize strongly to the Members of the House my very firm belief that one of the worst things that has happened to the United States and the free world is that the atomic bomb has been held up to the free world as a weapon that could be used only against women and children; that it is a weapon that is limited to strategic purposes. The truth is that there are but a limited number of strategic targets in the world; the truth is that the atomic bomb in America's possession has its greatest strength and can be utilized most effectively in tactical use. There is no limit to the number of tactical weapons that we would need to support our ground troops. The military experts who have come before our committee are agreed that we will be able to hold Western Europe if we can outflank the numerical superiority of the Russians by atomic power. That is the one way to outflank Russian superiority in manpower.

Mr. McCORMACK. I take it the gentleman's speech is a recognition that all of our services are essential, I mean the Navy, the Air Force, the Infantry; that the gentleman is not emphasizing atomic weapons for the purpose of disparaging any other branch of the service. The gentleman feels that the maximum emphasis in conjunction with other branches of our armed services that could be made in the field of atomic weapons should be utilized as a powerful coordinating factor with all our armed services; is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I suppose, looking ahead, that the largest part of the stockpile will be made available to the Army in direct support of our ground troops, because as I indicated earlier, what the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission has said, we are now in the business of producing tactical weapons that will be used to support our ground troops. Unfortunately the Russians have implanted in the minds of millions of people all over the world the idea that the atomic bomb's only use was in the killing of women and children. The result is that for the time being it has sterilized our atomic stockpile, if I may use that expression.

Mr. McCORMACK. The purpose of my last question was to have the RECORD show that if the gentleman's mind was as I have interpreted it, that he was not advocating that from the angle of defense we put "all of our eggs in one basket," to wit the basket that might be labeled "atomic weapons," but that he was urging——

Mr. JACKSON of Washington I was urging that all three services should make use of the weapon in the event of an all-out war.

Mr. McCORMACK. But he was urging the recognition of the importance of the power of atomic weapons in connection with the other services of our Armed Forces.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is right. The atomic bomb in proper situations can be effectively used in the event of an all-out war by aircraft carriers.

The nuclear-powered submarine, from information that has come to our committee, will make it possible to do almost unbelievable things in submarine warfare. We are all familiar, of course, with the mission of the Air Force insofar as the atomic bomb is concerned. But I would like to make it clear that what we are doing if we produce this fissionable material, atomic material, on a mass scale, is that we are producing nothing more nor less than cheap TNT. The bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima, as was made public some time ago, contained an equivalent of 20 kilotons, or 20,000 tons of TNT. What I am trying to say to the House again is that this is the cheapest TNT that we can make.

The only answer that we have to Stalin and Soviet imperialism is superior American firepower. We will never be able to match them soldier for soldier. We can only outmatch them with superior firepower. How do you get superior firepower? Through the utilization of the resources that are available to us to expand our atomic energy program.

Mr. McCORMACK. So that mass production in the field of atomic weapons has now arrived? It is no longer a theory or an experiment. Of course, there are further experiments that will go on all the time by our scientists.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman is essentially correct. Without being repetitious, I would like to just add one other note to what the gentleman has so effectively asked.

If we avoid world war III, and that is our primary objective, that is the objective of our foreign policy and our military effort, America will have in its possession a stockpile of energy never known to man heretofore. So that we can overnight convert to use, if I may use a Biblical expression, swords as they are today in the form of atom bombs, we can convert these swords into plowshares for the betterment of mankind. Every bit of this material that is not exploded can be refabricated for peaceful industrial purposes. The same material that you use to explode an atom bomb is the identical material that you will use to generate electricity to power ships of commerce, to run airplanes, trains and a multitude of those things that require energy here on earth.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I know how serious, how sincere, and how concerned the gentleman is in his presentation today. I know, too, something about his unique background of study and experience qualifying him to make the remarks he has just made. He does well to emphasize that we are now living in a world of uncontrolled weapons. This being so, does the gentleman think that we are being very realistic in the development of a sound and timely program of civilian defense of American cities and towns against a possible atomic attack by an aggressor nation?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. First of all, I would like, if I may at this point, to pay my tribute to him for his farsighted determination to see a proper buildup of our civil-defense program.

In my remarks 6 weeks ago on the floor of this House, and the gentleman from New Jersey participated in that discussion, I called the attention of the House at that time to the fact that the Russians were in the atomic business on a grand scale. I hope that when the bill comes back from the Senate the House will exercise a little more wisdom in the light of recent events and will increase the budget for civil defense. As a minimum the Russians are capable of destroying 20 to 30 American cities tonight.

Now I do not say for one moment that civil defense provides a complete answer to atomic attack or that there is any final answer to civilian defense. But when one bears in mind the terrible destruction that can come in the event of such attack, it behooves all of us to see to it that we have made every proper effort to safeguard against such a catastrophe.

I want to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey for his sustained and continued interest in this effort. I may say, if my recollection serves me right, that he was one of the first, if not the first, Member of the House to rise in the well and ask that we make a real effort in our civilian defense program.

Mr. CANFIELD. I appreciate what the gentleman has just said, and I am

glad that our military leadership is beginning to bear emphatic testimony on the need of a civilian defense program now. I think the testimony given to the Senate Subcommittee on Armed Services, hearing the presentation for civilian defense on September 5 last, by Mr. Lovett, was most timely, and I hope that the Members of the House will bear that testimony in mind when we act further on these civilian defense requests. Mr. Lovett said he could not understand the apathy of this hour, and most certainly we are making it very difficult for former Governor Caldwell and his group in charge of civilian defense administration. We are being naive.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Along the same line of inquiry by the gentleman from New Jersey, while we do not have too much information regarding Russia's development of atomic energy, is it not true that we can reasonably suppose that their first use of the atomic energy they have developed may be along strategic lines, which would endanger our cities and our civilian population?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I feel a little embarrassed here because I am not a specialist in military strategy. But I would like to say to the Members of the House that the members of the joint committee on both sides are at this business every day of the week, and we have a responsibility, you know, under the law, of trying to keep currently informed on every phase of atomic development. In that connection we obviously go into highly classified top-secret matters. I think it is quite clear that the primary objective of the Russian military force in the event of another war would be to destroy the source of America's strength. The source of America's strength is America's industrial might. The Russians well realize that in two great wars we entered the conflict without an adequate military force in being. They realize that in order to win another war they must destroy America's capacity to carry on and sustain a conflict over a period of time. So, I think, without any question, that at least for some time they will concentrate their effort on the strategic use of the atomic bomb in the event of another war.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That was my own impression. I do not believe we are revealing any classified information in reaching that conclusion at all. They not only have the strategic development, logically, first, ahead of the tactical development, but they also have the anticipation of destroying our industrial potential. They do not have quite the need for the tactical use of it, because they have the larger manpower for tactical operations.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. My point has been to make it clear that in the strategic use of the atomic bomb, it is only a matter of time when they can match our ability to use the bomb strategically. You do not have to be a military expert to figure that out. But in the tactical use of the bomb, owing to America's superior technology and industrial capacity, we can outflank the Russian Army with its superior numerical force. In that area there is no limit to the number of atomic bombs that you can use in support of your Ground Forces. But in the strategic use there are a limited number of targets, and in the war operations on the battlefield you need an unlimited amount of firepower. So it is in the area of tactical uses, as I view it, that America should concentrate its strength. In that area there is no limit to the amount of fissionable or bomb material that we will need come another conflict. It is in that field in particular where we should constantly associate our atomic efforts. It is because of the fact that the atomic bomb has been used strategically, has killed women and children, that in the minds of millions of people today the atom bomb has only one use, that is, to kill more millions of people in the event of another war. That is not the source of America's strength in the event of another conflict. The greatest source of America's military strength in the event of another conflict is in the tactical use of the atomic bomb.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That has been one of our principal problems all the way from the very inauguration of the atomic weapon. My questions, during the years that the matter of atomic energy came up first in the military committee some 6 or 7 years ago while I was on that committee, all bore on the potential development of it as a tactical weapon. From our own point of view that is highly important. My questions were with reference to the matter of whether you could transport the atomic energy warheads secretly, store it indefinitely, and set it off by remote control. Those were my questions in the military committee bearing upon possible tactical use of it. That is our own problem and of course we are facing it. From the point of view of defense against strategic attack, I think the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey are very timely, that the potential enemy's first strike toward us would be to destroy our industrial potential, and that would be probably within their first availability, anyway, namely, the strategic use of the atomic weapon.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I would think that in stockpiling their atomic weapons they are being stockpiled for strategic use to destroy the heart of America militarily speaking, that is, our industrial potential.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks today. I think he has made a real contribution to our discussion in this rather vital field of national defense.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I thank the gentleman for his fine contribution.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, the vice chairman of our committee. I may say incidentally that he has been a real force on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and an effective force.

Mr. DURHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I add, a real force anywhere.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. We all concur heartily in that.

Mr. DURHAM. I want to thank the gentleman for the discussion here today. Probably this is one subject we have not discussed as fully on the floor of the House as we should because of certain events and, of course, the secrecy under which it was first built, and under which, of course, at the present time in certain fields we have to continue to operate. But the gentleman has, as I have said, made a real contribution.

This job of the committee has not been easy at all. It has been a tough one. We have had problems and are still having them, and we will continue to have them. But its one push and drive has been to produce more efficient material so that we would have more weapons. We find ourselves today in just exactly what the gentleman has advocated since becoming a member of the committee, I believe in 1949, with demands coming from all three of the military services, which of course in 1946 many people were not thinking so much about.

Now we are faced with a tremendous expansion program if we are to produce and provide what the military is going to require in the event that war should come. It is going to take a great deal more of production of fissionable materials for tactical weapons, which the gentleman has discussed here today. It is going to have to be done through certain groups of people—this House, the Senate, the Commission, and those who are charged with the responsibility of directing our military services in pushing this program from every angle. The contribution, which the gentleman has made here today, in my opinion, marks another milestone in the question of our national defense, because he has brought into the discussion today a new field, and that is the field of tactical weapons. We must tackle that problem, and we are going to have to solve it. In my opinion, as the majority leader has said, they are going to be produced on a mass scale in a very short period of time. Again, I want to thank the gentleman for taking the time to explain to the House some of the details, and some of the problems that face us as a committee. The gentleman certainly has contributed to the national defense effort as well as to our effort in the committee as wholeheartedly as any member that I have ever worked with.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. For the benefit of the Members of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina is chairman of the subcommittee dealing with reactors. A reactor is an atomic furnace. It is the industrial machine that produces one of the materials needed for atomic bombs. It is the leadership that the gentleman from North Carolina has provided as vice chairman

of our committee that, in my opinion, is going to pave the way for the expansion which we have discussed here today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like the RECORD to show that about 18 months before the first bomb was dropped on Japan, certain Members of the House of Representatives, and Members of the other body, were acquainted with the experiment which was going on. I know nothing of the contents of that bomb. I do not want to know anything about it. I did not know then, and, as a matter of fact, I have to guess now where the plant is located. At least 18 months, or thereabouts, before the first bomb was dropped in Japan, there was a conference between the Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and myself. We were told about this race for time in the experiment—the race between the United States and Germany. We were told we had to get about $1,600,000,000 or $1,800,000,000 in the following two fiscal years to carry out the experiment, which President Roosevelt had begun with blanket funds appropriated to him, which experiment had then become too large to carry on under the blanket appropriation to the late President. Some members of the Committee on Appropriations then had to be made familiar with the situation and taken into confidence, and I think it is to the everlasting pride of the House of Representatives, and the other body as well, that there never was a leak on that subject during the entire 18 months.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman has made a very able presentation here. It has been very informative. So far as I personally am concerned, I have been interested in this question, and was interested in it immediately following World War II. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has any knowledge, and whether he would be willing to make a statement at this time, or make a denial as to whether atomic bombs or atomic energy have been used thus far in the Korean war?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I have no knowledge of the use of any atomic weapon in Korea or elsewhere, since Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman has made no inquiry along those lines with reference to the Armed Forces?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I would rather not discuss that at this time, as to whether we have or have not had a discussion.

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask the gentleman for two reasons, because I think it is very pertinent. I think the gentleman probably is getting correspondence, just as I am, and as I think most of the Members of the House are, about the coming winter in Korea. All of us knew what those boys went through last year. People stood it last year and perhaps they will have to do it again this year. They will be patriotic. I am sure the fathers and mothers who have sons over there will be patriotic about it, but I think this has reached the stage now where we are interested in either negotiating or winding this thing up in Korea in the fastest possible time. If it is necessary to use these weapons in order to bring that conflict to an end, I think the people of this country are interested in doing that. I do not believe I misrepresent public opinion, but I will leave it to the gentleman and other Members of this House who are getting correspondence from their homes about it. I believe it is time for us to come to a conclusion as to what we are going to do in Korea. In other words, that we are going to set some reasonable deadline upon these negotiations which have been going on now I believe in excess of 2 or 3 months. It should be certainly long enough to negotiate the kind of peace that you have there, or cease fire to continue other negotiations to bring about the rest of it.

The second thing that has occurred to me, and this might be carried out under civilian defense, but I do think in the light of the gentleman's remarks it is important to be said: As I understand atomic energy and the manufacture of weapons, it is possible for a person to carry an atomic bomb about with them in a suitcase and to enter any plant in this country for the purpose of destroying the plant or our industrial capacity I think most people have the idea, through information which has been given out through the press, that the only way that would be possible would be for someone to drop a bomb from an airplane on a city It seems to me the security of this country with reference to the prevention of sabotage is just as important as it would be to defend this country by a 150-group air plan.

Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. We have a real problem of sabotage. To say that the atomic bomb can be carried around in a suitcase, of course, is not correct.

Mr SPRINGER. I am glad to hear that from the gentleman.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I can state for the gentleman's information that such statements that are bandied about render a disservice. I am not critical of the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. I understand, of course.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. But the statement has been made, time and time again, and I believe the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] will confirm me in what I am saying—let me say to the gentleman that in my opinion, in the event of another war, there is a clear and present danger to the coast lines of America, by carrying the atom bomb in submarines, in merchant ships, and by other means, other than by airplanes. But to say that it can be carried around in suitcases and planted in cities is carrying it a bit too far. However, I do not believe that in the event of another war the Russians will make their entire effort in delivering the bomb through the use of airplanes. America is vulnerable along its shore line. I am not giving out any information when I say that. It has been discussed time and time again. There is a real danger that Russia in the event of an all-out war would attempt to deliver the bomb by both air and sea.

Mr. SPRINGER. One more question and I think I am through. The gentleman has been very kind to go thus far. Is there any knowledge which the gentleman has that the use of the atomic bomb or atomic energy in other forms is now contemplated in the Korean war?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Owing to the fact that I am on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and that anything I might say in that regard might have some repercussions, I would rather not at this moment discuss the question that the gentleman has put to me with reference to Korea.

I have indicated in my remarks today that we now have in our possession tactical weapons that can be used in the field in direct support of our group troops. I do not, for obvious reasons, feel that I should at this time comment beyond that. I hope the gentleman understands.

Mr. SPRINGER. I understand perfectly Just one further question: Is it contemplated that there will be any public release as to whether or not atomic energy or atomic bombs will be used in Korea? Has there been discussion as to whether or not that is to be given out to the press or newspapers?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I would rather not comment any more on that particular point.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I wish personally to thank the gentleman and compliment him for the intelligent and informative statement he has brought to the membership of the House. He certainly has made a contribution in a field which is important not only to the defense of our own country but also to the defense of the free world. I would like to ask the gentleman if he cares to express an opinion on the following: Is it possible that we are correctly evaluating the potential offensive strength of the U. S. S. R.? Or are we underrating that strength or perhaps having a tendency to overrate it?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I can answer the gentleman this way: Our committee receives intelligence reports from time to time available of course only to members of the joint committee, reports on the Russian position in this field. Each successive intelligence report we receive paints a little darker, a little grimmer picture of what they are doing.

I think we will not be making a mistake in overestimating their capabilities. Everything that has come out so far has been unfortunately a tendency to underestimate their capabilities. A little over a year ago, shortly after the first explosion, a noted American citizen came out and said "Russia does not have the atomic bomb." I can say to the Members of the House that we have ways

of knowing scientifically that they do have the bomb. Somebody said that it was just a reactor blowing up or a pilot plant blowing up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the extreme importance of this particular matter I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed for fifteen additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. We must realize that the Russians have some very noted scientists, topmen who are capable of doing the job. We must realize that if the Russians make an all-out effort in this field they can do a real job. I for one firmly believe that because of our unique industrial capabilities we can keep so far ahead of them that they will not attempt to undertake a third world war.

The one deterrent we have is to remain on top of the stockpile. If we do not, then we are indeed in trouble.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. DOYLE. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Washington very earnestly for his very splendid contribution to the total record of matter on the atomic bomb. I think every Member of this House is well aware of his interest and integrity in going to the bottom of all such questions. I think the gentleman from Washington knows that as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, as I am, I recently traveled to the far north, Alaska, and while in one of those cities I heard a Russian broadcast describing the United States of America as warmongers. It made me realize, I may say to the gentleman, that perhaps the world conflagration in the form of another hellish war is closer than we think; but, nevertheless, I wish to say to the gentleman it made me feel also I would always continue at every opportunity to emphasize that my Nation is not interested in being a warmonger. We are interested primarily, objectively and paramountly in being a Nation which is determined to be strong enough to compel world peace.

While I know the gentleman emphasized that point of view to a certain extent in his remarks, may I ask the gentleman in that connection to take a few seconds at least to emphasize in his remarkable speech before it is printed the fact that the billions of dollars in money which we are spending are not being spent to be strong enough to wage war nor for anything more or less than to protect the freedoms of the freedom-loving people of the world against communistic aggression. Will the gentleman take a minute to emphasize that of his own personal knowledge as a member of this important committee that is the objective, if I am right, in the spending of billions and billions of dollars for atomic energy to be used in tactical weapons. Am I in error?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentlemen is not in error. Our objective is peace. Our entire atomic energy effort and our military effort are geared to that one objective of peace. Our record is clear, our conscience should be clear. At the end of the war we agreed to a program of atomic disarmament. We offered our atomic stockpile to an international organization under the United Nations. We said that we would agree to an international control of atomic energy under a rascal-proof system. We said we would favor that without any hesitancy at all. That program we agreed to was drawn up, not by politicians but by scientists and experts, by men who were familiar with the necessary requirements about a rascal-proof system of international control of atomic energy. That program and that proposal was agreed to by the entire free world excepting, of course, Russia and its satellite nations. All nations agreed to it except Russia and the satellite areas. We have made that proposal time and time again. But we must not agree to just international control of atomic weapons. We must agree to international control of all weapons, atomic and conventional as well. To do otherwise would be for the free world to walk into a ghastly bear trap, because it would leave Russia and its satellites, if we agreed to international control of atomic energy and did nothing about conventional weapons, in possession of a large mass of conventional arms and men that would make it possible for her and her satellites to overrun the free world.

If we are to have international disarmament—and we are for it; we have laid our cards on the table; the proposal is there for acceptance—we must remember that we must have control of all weapons.

Mr. DOYLE. I understand that this proposal is still open. The gentleman did not emphasize that control, although he realizes it, means international inspection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is why, of course, the Kremlin has not agreed. The iron curtain cannot exist under a system of international inspections. It goes to the very heart of the difficulty with the Soviet Union. But you cannot have international control of atomic energy unless you have international inspection of the materials used in setting off an atomic bomb.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask one further question? Am I in error then when I conclude and have concluded for some time, when we are asked to vote these billions of dollars for our national defense, including this atomic energy development, the alternative is either to pay taxes or to pay tribute. Am I in error in that conclusion?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Let me answer it in this way. It is a small price to pay for the other alternative cost, namely, world war III, with trillions—I do not say billions—trillions of dollars in property damage and millions of Americans dead overnight.

Mr. DOYLE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think that is the only alternative. I honestly and firmly believe that if we make the supreme effort in this field we have a real opportunity of achieving our objectives wherever possible and avoiding world war III.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Something has been said here this afternoon about civilian defense or alleged lack of civilian defense in this country. Can the gentleman tell us what the Russians are doing to prepare their civilian population for defense against atomic warfare?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I would like to confine my remarks, for obvious reasons, again. I can say this much, that today the Russians have about 20,000,000 of their people engaged in civil defense in the Soviet Union. They are making an all-out effort in this particular field. I believe that statement is borne out, at least, by the information that we have received.

Mr. GROSS. Twenty million people working in civilian defense in Russia?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Twenty million people engaged in this effort, is our latest estimate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted that the gentleman from Washington has seen fit to bring to the attention of the House today the importance of atomic weapons and also the weakness of this country insofar as 20 to 30 of our most important industrial cities are concerned. I am wondering if sometimes we do not in this country overestimate the importance of the atomic bomb and atomic weapons and at the same time underestimate the importance of atomic developments in Russia?

I was pleased to note the emphasis which the gentleman placed upon the possibility of using the ingredients to make an atomic bomb or weapon for industrial purposes in peacetime. I know that if he had time he could go on and also cite how some of these atomic ingredients could be used in bettering the health of our people.

I would like to bring to the attention of the gentleman, though, the importance of the duality, so to speak, of his remarks, covering atomic developments and the industrial potential of this country, because when a group of us visited Europe 3 or 4 months ago and had a number of conferences with Eisenhower, he told us at that time that in his opinion the atomic bomb was not the most important factor in keeping the Russians from carrying on a conquest by aggression, but that the real important factor was the industrial potential of America and the industrial know-how of our people here. I think there is a great deal in what General Eisenhower had to say,

and I am delighted to mention it at this time because it fits in so perfectly with the remarks made by the gentleman concerning the development of atomic energy for various purposes and also brings in the importance of the American industrial potential and the need for a first-rate civil-defense program in this country, because the remarks which the gentleman has made certainly indicates where we should place emphasis from now on.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman has made a very fine contribution. I certainly would not want to convey the impression that we can defend Western Europe with the atomic bomb alone What has happened is that the firepower of our American division has increased tremendously overnight with the announcement by the chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission that we are now producing tactical weapons.

Mr. GROSS Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS The gentleman says he does not care to comment on the development of tactical weapons for ground troops.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I did not say that. I did not want to say anything on the floor with reference to this situation in Korea at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but I want to say something, if the gentleman will permit me, that if we now have developed tactical weapons and they are not in use in Korea, someone is seriously to blame for not putting them to use. This business of fighting a war over there with bayonets, as we are doing today, and with machine guns and the other weapons of World War II and World War I, does not make sense.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I have learned since I have been on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that one has to consider a lot of factors, a lot of situations, before one can make a proper decision. I do not believe I would be serving the cause of peace today if I got into a discussion on the floor of the House on the point the gentleman has raised. I am not saying that it might not be used or it will not be used. I do not believe that I myself, and I speak only for myself, would be helping our over-all objective, which is peace, to bring that terrible conflict to an early conclusion, if I should make a direct answer to the gentleman's question. I hope the gentleman will understand.

Mr. GROSS. Are you not just as dead if you are killed by an atomic warhead as if you were killed by a 3-inch shell or the fragments of one?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman is opening up a vhole new subject of discussion. I for one want to measure my remarks when I get into the subject the gentleman now proposes to open. I think there are people who should speak out on that in connection with the matter at the proper time. I do not feel in a position at this moment to speak. We make tactical weapons for the defense of America and the free world. We do not know what may happen tomorrow in the whole world picture. Those weapons are precious weapons. I suppose the fundamental objective of our immediate effort is to conserve our resources and vital materials to face our primary antagonist, which is Russia. We must be careful in determining objectives of over-all military strategy, about the possible dissipation of those resources against secondary antagonists.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I think the gentleman from Washington has been as explicit as he can be. However, I feel we who have heard him today have the right to draw this conclusion, namely, that the mothers and fathers of our dear ones, our boys in Korea, have a right to derive encouragement from what he has said.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think certainly the announcement by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission that we are now producing tactical weapons may be some reason why there is a new announcement about truce discussions. I think that Mr. Dean's statement may be well understood in certain quarters of the world today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr McCORMACK. Again, I congratulate the gentleman on his powerful contribution to the House of Representatives and to the people of America, a contribution which is based, if I may read the gentleman's mind, on confidence and optimism, trying to give the American people as complete information as he can on the subject he has discussed, consistent of course with the national interest of our country. If I were to give a title, or were to characterize the gentleman's constructive effort today, my title or characterization of this discussion would be "Peace Through Strength."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I thank the gentleman. I would quite agree with such a title or characterization because it is through this type of strength that we have the best chance of avoiding world war III.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McGUIRE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

MOVE FOR PEACE NOW

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was truly gratified to learn that the State Department, after such a great lapse of time, had changed its attitude toward Spain. The recent negotiations with that nation conducted under the leadership of our late lamented and very great naval hero, Admiral Forrest Sherman, whose tragic and untimely demise we all so deeply mourn, mark a most welcome step in our diplomatic relations with that nation and in our efforts to consolidate and unify the strength and potentials of the free world.

The Nation is most grateful to Admiral Sherman, a noble son of Massachusetts, for his many effective contributions to the national welfare during a most illustrious naval career. But few of his many splendid achievements will be viewed with greater appreciation than his successful interim negotiations with the Spanish Government.

There are many reasons why our own great Nation should have renewed friendly cooperative relations with Spain long ago—some strategic and military, some economic, some political, and some which relate to the historical American ideals and traditions.

Lest anyone should misunderstand my viewpoint in this vital matter, let me state emphatically that I am fundamentally just as much opposed in theory and practice to fascism as I am to communism. Both systems are totalitarian. Both are antagonistic to democracy. Both are predicated upon the dominance of the State over the rights of the individual.

But I would point out that historically it has not been at all unusual in the past for this Nation to extend diplomatic recognition and engage in commercial intercourse and friendly relations with other nations whose philosophy, political institutions and way of life were at variance with our own. It is a well-established historical fact that, in keeping with this policy in the past, we have recognized monarchies and oligarchies and dictatorships of varying types as well as several socialistic governments, and preeminently the Soviet Union.

It must now be obvious to thinking citizens that there were no tenable logical grounds for refusing to recognize Spain, and for refusing to avail ourselves of her expressed willingness to cooperate materially and effectively with our program for building up the strength of the free world against possible totalitarian aggression.

I am not a believer in the suppression of the rights of minorities. I am unalterably opposed to those individuals and governments who preach and practice intolerance in any form. I deplore and detest principles and practices of government which are designed to curb the liberties and rights of the individual citizen.

But it strikes me as being absolutely irrefutable that any nation, such as our own, that can recognize and continue diplomatic relations with the Soviet could claim no sound reason for refusing to recognize a government like Spain.

The Soviet is engaged in persecuting not only minorities, but majorities, of its own people and the peoples of other formerly free nations. One dictatorship is not necessarily benign while another is malignant.

So far as idealistic Americanism is concerned, any form of dictatorship must be looked upon with disapproval. But I would reiterate that mere disapproval

of a form of government is not necessarily grounds for nonrecognition and noncooperation in the sphere of world polity, and particularly with regard to our program for protecting the freedoms of democracy-minded peoples against those who are conspiring to superimpose the super-state of Godless, atheistic, Marxist communism upon the entire world. Such a policy is unrealistic and contrary to American interests.

I am not prepared to inveigh against the present Spanish government; neither do I advocate or sponsor the principles upon which it is based. Whatever the limitations of the Spanish Government as measured by American ideals, whatever undemocratic character attaches to the present Spanish regime, it must be acknowledged and admitted that that nation has not carried on ruthless aggression against its neighbors.

It has not closed down an iron curtain against its borders and the borders of other free nations which, by diplomatic concessions, by aggression, or by infiltration, it has managed to dominate.

It has not set up Trojan horses of infiltration, conspiracy and subversion in other Democratic nations.

It has not unloosed a flood of propaganda, espionage and sedition in other nations and in the United States.

It has not perverted sworn officials of our own Government to the shameful betrayal of solemn public trust.

It has not plotted and promoted perfidy and treason among our workers, among our citizens, and among our Government officials.

It has not conspired for the destruction of our free institutions.

It has not spread Marxist or Fascist doctrines throughout the world and in our own Nation.

It has not stagnated and ridiculed the efforts of the United States to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace in the world.

It has not reduced millions of helpless, defenseless democratic-minded peoples to serfdom more cruel than that of Hitler.

It has not moved to enslave the peoples of the Orient, China and Indochina, the Malayan Peninsula, and India and Africa.

It has not engaged and assisted other nations to wage ruthless willful war against their neighbors.

It has not been a party thereby to the maiming and killing of more than 85,000 American boys.

It has not done any of the outrageous things which violate and challenge free institutions, threaten the security of our Nation, and which have made it necessary for us to wage a limited war 8,000 miles from our own shores and to maintain the largest peacetime armed forces in history at overburdening expense to the American people.

To the contrary, dictatorship or no dictatorship, the Spanish Government has stood for moral and religious principles, for cooperation with other nations in defending the free world and in promoting peace and friendly relations.

Moreover, that government has exhibited a most warm-hearted good will and friendship toward our own Nation, and has proffered the hand of friendship toward America, even in misrepresentation and vilification by organized groups.

I have not the slightest doubt that most Americans will approve the belated action of our Nation in moving toward the expansion and consolidation of our diplomatic relations and security cooperation with Spain. If current reactions to these measures can be counted and evaluated, it would appear that large numbers of American people will reserve opinion as to the motives which prompted the softening of our attitude toward Spain at this particular time.

Why have we waited so long to recognize Spain? Why have we waited so long to take measures looking toward the utilization of her territory and resources, material and human, in the protection of western civilization? These are questions that will be asked by many Americans.

I recognize the argument that will be made by some from now on, that our Nation should follow the British Socialist lead and join in the recognition of Red China. But I wonder whether we propose to countercheck the surge of Marxist expansion, infiltration, imperialism, and aggression. I wonder how far this Nation can afford to permit Marxism, by aggression or subversion, to spread its slimy tentacles across the face of the earth? When do we propose to lay down a firm, declarative policy to the Soviets and their puppets worthy of our great Democracy, worthy of our war aims, worthy of the ideals and sacrifices of our people? We did not do it at Berlin. We did not do it at Yalta, Tehran or Potsdam. We did not do it in Poland and Lithuania or in Czechoslovakia, and we have not done it in China or Formosa. How much longer can we afford to wait before calling a halt to the movement of encirclement which is rapidly outflanking this Nation militarily and economically, both from the east and the west?

Are we so weak and spineless that we will stand by while our citizens like newspaperman Oatis and others are rotting in foreign Marxist jails without making a real determined effort to free them?

Are we so indifferent to the plight of those professing honest and sincere religious beliefs that we remain silent and inactive while more than 65,000,000 Christians are shut in behind the iron curtain, shamefully persecuted, jailed, pilloried, humiliated and beaten, their leaders stripped of their sacred robes, lashed and drugged? Shall we make no real determined effort to help these suffering people? Shall we refuse to lift a finger to relieve them from bondage and persecution? The American people want to know.

Thinking Americans, must be greatly disturbed and greatly concerned about the press of Marxist influence into all parts of the civilized Christian world. Is this what we fought for? Is this what our boys bled and died for, to insure world conquest and domination by communism over democratic government and democratic principles, and the complete destruction of our cherished ideals of democracy and freedom?

I would be the last one to admit that there is serious risk involved in any diplomatic policy respecting Marxism. There are risks of diplomatic breaks which in my opinion should have been assumed long ago. There is the risk of the repetition of blockades. There is the risk of extending the iron curtain to other areas of the world. There is the risk of war. But there is also another risk which should cause Americans and all lovers of freedom to shudder, namely, world domination by communism and the ultimate destruction of this Nation from without, if not from within.

In my opinion, if this Nation delays too long in formulating and executing an unyielding and uncompromising policy toward Marxism, we will be inviting disaster. The disaster may not come in a year or in 5 years, but it will come ultimately just as the sun will rise tomorrow, and it will come at a time when our potential enemies have organized and consolidated their ill-gotten gains and are strong and powerful, when perhaps we have dissipated our resources and are not as able to cope with them as we are today. No one can predict how much longer our economic system can stand the strains and burdens of limited war.

We should wake up and put these great national and world questions on a firm, consolidated basis of militant defense of America, Americanism, and democracy. Let there be no flinching or compromising, or further appeasement. If a truce comes in Korea, it should be predicated on sound principles of upholding the dignity and interests of our own Nation. If the Soviets are sincere in their peace offensive, if they really mean to have peace, let our country joyfully embrace the opportunity to establish a just and lasting peace. But we seek definite proof of sincerity of motives and honesty of purpose from those who have operated up to this time by strategy based upon deceit, lying, propaganda, intimidation, and violence.

If the Russians really mean business regarding their professions for peace, let them indicate their willingness to sit around the peace table and in an honest spirit discuss principles and definite measures by which peace can be achieved. The first of these measures must be disarmament and the control of atomic and hydrogen energy and other terrible modes of destruction. Let us not permit the belated negotiations with Spain to be used in any propaganda sense as a bait for appeasement of Red China and her admission into the United Nations.

I am somewhat out of patience hearing high policy officials of this Government making speeches up and down the Nation telling the American people how powerful our enemies are, how destructive their weapons are, how very much in danger of atomic attack our Nation is, how certainly it can be bombed and smashed by foreign planes. The American people well know the dangers in the present international situation, as well as the potential strength of the Soviet, and they cannot be scared or frightened

into yielding to appeasement and craven cowardice by high-powered, blood-curdling speeches calculated to build fear and war hysteria in the Nation.

In fact, the American people would be interested in hearing some speeches about the strength of our own arms, the power of our own productive machines, the vitality and greatness of our own Nation, our potential to wage war against possible enemies, our ability and firm intention to defend the United States, and our great striking power through the air and on the sea against any nation that dares attack us.

These are some of the things the American people would like to hear from our leadership in these troubled days instead of whining fear and useless speculation about the dangers we face Let us be prepared and fear neither friend nor foe. Let us deal justly and honorably with all nations and place our faith in the Lord.

These great issues will have to be met and faced some time. As I have advocated for a long time, in my judgment they should be met, courageously, bravely, and militantly, but with a clearly expressed desire for world peace, rather than later when the tides of international military and economic strength may have turned preponderantly against us. I hope that the Government may be prompted to consider and act upon these proposals now. The American people are indignant that any part of our world policy should have been shaped by men who do not believe in democracy, and they earnestly seek repudiation of the principles and shameful commitments such men were able to write into American foreign policy. With faith in the Almighty, let us act, and act before it is too late.

SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a statement by President Truman on October 4, 1951.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Following is the text of a statement by President Truman today defending his recent order tightening control over Government information:

"There has been considerable misrepresentation and misunderstanding of the Executive order issued on September 24, 1951, relating to the handling of information which has been classified in order to protect the national security This Executive order represented an honest effort to find the best approach to a problem that is important to the survival of the United States. I issued this order with great reluctance, and only when I was convinced after lengthy consideration that it was necessary to protect the United States against its potential enemies. I think my record in defending civil liberties in this country demonstrates that I have no desires to suppress freedom of speech or freedom of the press.

"I would like for the public to understand what this order undertakes to do and why it was necessary to issue it.

"In its simplest terms, the problem is what we should do to keep military and related secrets from falling into the hands of enemies of the United States. I do not believe that any one could seriously contend that military secrets should be published in the newspapers or that anyone has a right or duty to see that military secrets are made public. I believe that everyone, including Members of Congress and newspaper editors, should think twice before advocating a theory that would lead to that result. Whether it be treason or not, it does the United States just as much harm for military secrets to be made known to potential enemies through open publication, as it does for military secrets to be given an enemy through the clandestine operations of spies "

OBJECTIVES EASILY AGREED ON

"On the other hand, I do not believe that protection of military secrets should be made a cloak or cover for withholding from the people information about their Government which should be made known to them I believe that everyone, including Government officials, should try to prevent this from happening.

"It is easy to agree on these two objectives, but it was difficult to establish the means for accomplishing both of them.

"In those agencies of the Government priminarily concerned with national security matters, such as the Department of State and the Department of Defense, we have had for a number of years a system of classifying information to prevent its disclosure to unauthorized persons when it would be dangerous to the national security This system has worked reasonably well, although it has not in all instances prevented the publication of information which aided our enemies against the United States and in other cases it has been used to classify information which actually had no particular relationship to national security."

AGENCIES BORROW SECRETS

"In the present defense mobilization period, it has become necessary in an increasing number of cases to make military secrets available to executive agencies other than the military departments in order that these other agencies might effectively perform their functions that are necessary in supporting the defense effort. It is also necessary for some of the civilian agencies such as the Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for example, to originate and protect some information vital to our defense It should be readily apparent that military secrets in the hands of these other agencies should be protected just as much as when they are in the hands of the military departments It would also seem to be sensible to provide that different agencies take the same kind of precautions to protect this information It would not make any sense to have a paper containing military secrets carefully locked up in a safe in the Pentagon, with a copy of the same paper left lying around on the desk of a lawyer in the Justice Department.

"Now the purpose of this Executive order is to provide a common-sense answer to these problems. It is to provide that information affecting the national security shall continue to be protected when it gets out of the hands of the military departments and into the hands of other agencies. The purpose is to provide that these other agencies shall provide the same kind of protection that is provided in the military departments."

CORRECTION OF ABUSES

"Another purpose of the order—and it is a most important purpose—is to provide that information shall not be classified and withheld from the public on the ground that it affects the national security unless it is in fact actually necessary to protect such information in the interests of national security.

"In other words, one of the purposes of this Executive order is to correct abuses which may have grown up by use of overclassification of information in the name of national security.

"I think this Executive order represents a reasonable approach to a very difficult problem. I think it will work in the public interest, and I expect to watch it closely to see that it is not used as an excuse for withholding information to which the public is legitimately entitled.

"It may well be that experience under the order will indicate that it should be changed. In that case I will be glad to change it, and I will be glad to give consideration to reasonable suggestions for changes that are advanced in good faith.

"I would like to suggest to those who are seriously and honestly concerned about this matter that they consider it objectively and with the interest of the United States uppermost in their minds. I would like to suggest that they consider how we can best accomplish objectives which all of us should be able to agree upon. I do not believe that the best solution can be reached by adopting an approach based on the theory that everyone has a right to know our military secrets and related information affecting the national security."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr WICKERSHAM in six instances and to include addresses by Dr. Bennett.

Mr. LANE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK in four instances and in two to include quotations.

Mr. HINSHAW and to include an article entitled "What Price Air Power?" notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $246.

Mr. VAN PELT and to include an editorial.

Mr. STEED.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include a letter.

Mr. RABAUT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include a letter.

Mr. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Iowa) and to include a quotation.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa and to include a speech.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASPINALL in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CARNAHAN and to include extraneous material.

Mr. SPRINGER and to include an editorial from the Peoria Journal of September 25, 1951, together with his comments thereon.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5113. An act to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations

in the interest of international peace and security;

H. R. 5257. An act to amend section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), to increase the amount available as an emergency relief fund for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges damaged by floods or other catastrophes; and

H. R. 5504. An act to amend section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 to increase the amount available for the construction of access roads certified as essential to the national defense.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 990. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased;

H. R. 1227. An act to amend further the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes";

H R. 3205. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 2 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service-connected;

H R. 3504. For the relief of Nison Miller;

H R. 4475 An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R 5113. An act to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security;

H. R 5257 An act to amend section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), to increase the amount available as an emergency relief fund for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges damaged by floods or other catastrophes; and

H. R. 5504. An act to amend section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, to increase the amount available for the construction of access roads certified as essential to national defense.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BELCHER (at the request of Mr. SCHWABE), on account of the death of his father.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (3 o'clock and 18 minutes, p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 10, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

861. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting the Thirtieth Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, pursuant to section 16 of the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

862. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the initial phase of the Snake River reclamation project by the Secretary of the Interior"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

863. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a resolution adopted by the Judicial Conference of the United States at its sessions held in Washington September 24–26, 1951, in reference to S. 1958, an act to provide for jury trials in condemnation proceedings in the United States district courts, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

864. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HART: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. Report on the handling of explosives under the supervision of the Coast Guard in the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 1113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works. H. R 4963. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of certain fuel-fired electric-generating plants in order to make it possible for the Department of the Interior to meet certain defense-power requirements in the Pacific Northwest, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 331. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Chicago International Trade Fair, to be held in Chicago, Ill., March 22 to April 6, 1952; without amendment (Rept. No. 1115). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3219. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Robert E. Vigus; with amendment (Rept. No. 1111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H R. 2962. A bill for the relief of the widow of Frank Winfield Burman, lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve; with amendment (Rept. No. 1112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DURHAM:

H R 5662. A bill to amend the laws of the District of Columbia to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons and for other purposes, as enacted by Congress, May 7, 1906, and as amended February 27, 1907, and as amended March 4, 1927 (D. C. Code of 1929 title 20, sec. 2–601 et seq.); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 5663. A bill to provide for the control, inspection, and equipment of pharmacies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 5664. A bill to provide for an increase in the pay and certain allowances of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 5665. A bill to provide that postmasters and rural carriers in the postal service shall be appointed solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the position; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 5666. A bill to authorize the Maritime Administration to assist in the conversion of certain vessels into ore carriers for use in the foreign trade of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 5667. A bill to make clear that fishermen's organizations, regardless of their technical legal status, have a voice in the exvessel sale of fish or other aquatic products on which the livelihood of their members depends; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 5668. A bill making it a Federal offense for an officer or employee of the United States to accept any compensation or gratuity from any officer or member of a national committee of a political party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H R. 5669. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred twenty-fifth anniversary of the granting of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad charter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 5677. A bill to amend certain housing legislation to grant preferences to veterans of the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5678. A bill to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. Res. 455. Resolution to print the prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, D. D., at the opening sessions of the House of Representatives of the United States, Eighty-second Congress, from January 3, to October 8, 1951, inclusive; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 5670. A bill for the relief of John H. Vogel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 5671. A bill for the relief of Humberto Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5672. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Dominguez and Barbara Dominguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 5673. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shizu Ikezaki Horita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5674. A bill for the relief of Mark O'Toole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 5675. A bill for the relief of Henry Rang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (by request):

H. R. 5676. A bill for the relief of Max Hermann Keilbar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

454. The SPEAKER presented a petition of International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, Washington, D. C., relative to immediately making available the necessary funds for civilian defense, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast made Thyself known as a prayer-hearing and prayer-answering God, help us to believe that more things are wrought by prayer than we have ever dreamed of.

Give us the glad assurance that through communion with Thee our confused and intractable spirits can be lifted out of restlessness into peace, out of weakness into strength, out of sorrow into joy, and out of defeat into victory.

Grant that we may always have such a clear vision of Thy will that none shall ever lose his way. Inspire us with wisdom to understand and interpret rightly the meaning of life's varied experiences.

May we keep our minds and hearts sensitive and responsive to the promptings and leading of Thy divine spirit as we seek to discharge faithfully every imperative duty.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1203. An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

EXPLANATION OF VOTE

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on roll calls 194 and 195 I was unavoidably absent. If present I would have voted "nay" on the motion to recommit and I would have voted "yea" on the passage of the bill.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BAKEWELL asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to address the House today for 1 hour, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

RESERVE POLICY LEGISLATION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to announce that I asked for 1 hour today to address the House because some of the members of the Armed Services Committee desire to discuss the Reserve policy bill which will come up for consideration next week. We wanted to invite the Members of the House to participate in the discussion and give them notice that that will be brought up after the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk today.

INOOKA KAZUMI

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of S. 2080, for the relief of Inooka Kazumi, which is at the Speaker's desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what the nature of the bill is.

Mr. WALTER. This is a bill to authorize an American army officer and his wife to bring a child into this country which they legally adopted. The officer has orders to sail on Saturday of this week. The Senate passed the bill last week.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It sounds like a good bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions of law excluding persons of races ineligible to citizenship from admission to the United States, the minor child, Inooka Kazumi, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Frazer Harris, Jr., citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 196]

Abbitt	Fulton	Morrison
Allen, La.	Furcolo	Morton
Anderson, Calif.	Gamble	Moulder
Andresen, August H.	Gary	Multer
Anfuso	Gathings	Mumma
Bailey	Gavin	Murphy
Baker	Golden	Murray, Wis.
Barrett	Goodwin	Norblad
Bates, Ky.	Gore	O'Konski
Battle	Granahan	Patterson
Belcher	Green	Perkins
Berry	Gregory	Phillips
Blackney	Hall, Leonard W.	Poage
Boggs, La.	Hand	Powell
Bramblett	Harvey	Preston
Brown, Ohio	Hebert	Priest
Burdick	Hedrick	Prouty
Burleson	Heffernan	Quinn
Burton	Heller	Redden
Busbey	Herlong	Regan
Byrne, N. Y.	Herter	Rhodes
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman, Ill.	Ribicoff
Case	Holifield	Rogers, Mass.
Celler	Howell	Roosevelt
Chiperfield	Jackson, Calif.	Sabath
Chudoff	James	Scott, Hardie
Clevenger	Jarman	Shafer
Cole, N. Y.	Javits	Sheehan
Combs	Jensen	Shelley
Crawford	Kearney	Short
Dague	Kelly, N. Y.	Simpson, Ill.
Dawson	Kennedy	Stanley
Deane	Keogh	Stigler
Delaney	Kilburn	Stockman
Dempsey	Kirwan	Taylor
Denton	Klein	Teague
Dingell	Larcade	Thompson, Tex.
Dollinger	Latham	Thornberry
Dorn	Lesinski	Vinson
Eberharter	Lucas	Vorys
Elston	McConnell	Werdel
Fallon	McCulloch	Whitaker
Fenton	McGrath	Willis
Fine	Mack, Ill.	Wilson, Ind.
Flood	Magee	Wolverton
Fogarty	Marshall	Wood, Idaho
Ford	Miller, Calif.	Yates
Frazier	Miller, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 285 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Pending that motion, I would like to agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] as to time for general debate.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have several requests for time. I think we ought to have an hour and a half on a side.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman does not think we can get along with 1 hour on a side?

Mr. TABER. I would think not, although I would like to. I will not use any more time than I am compelled to. I think that would be a fair figure, however.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time be limited to not to exceed 3 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New

York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the agreement reached, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] for 1½ hours.

The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we submit the last supplemental bill of the session. As is customary, we include in this bill all appropriations required during the interim between the first and second sessions of this Congress.

The estimates submitted to us totaled $5,126,495,570. Of that amount the committee reports to the House, with favorable recommendations, $4,420,559,420, a reduction of $705,936,150.

The bill is arranged by chapters, each chapter under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee reporting it. I will now recognize for general debate the chairmen of the several subcommittees.

I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to conserve the time of the House and therefore will not speak very long, but let me suggest to the membership that they turn to the committee report on page 17. There they will find some seven or eight items under the jurisdiction of the Independent Offices Subcommittee. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], and myself are here; and we will attempt to answer any questions that may be propounded to us.

Looking at the report you may come to the conclusion that some of these cuts are rather severe; but, Mr. Chairman, we had only one point in mind in making the cuts, and that was ar effort to save a little money. Some of the programs involved here in several branches of housing are not complete and will not be for several months. We allowed enough money to meet any emergency or contingency that may come up, and in January we shall have ample time to review it again.

The Atomic Energy Commission sought some $484,000,000; we allowed $200,000,000 on the testimony of the Atomic Energy Commission itself that of the $695,000,000 heretofore appropriated for the Savannah River project those funds will not be committed in their entirety until about April of next year. We allowed $200,000,000 with the idea of taking a look-see again in January and certainly not with any idea of delaying or hurting the program in the slightest.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I understand in the item on page 2, under the heading "Federal Security Agency" you have reduced the amount from $25,000,000 to $1,000,000 for defense community facilities and services. In the Atomic Energy plant area on the Savannah River they will not be able to build their homes. No money can be borrowed through the FHA for such facilities and services. The loans guaranteed by the FHA are for houses and do not include facilities and services. The amount provided in the bill includes nothing for hospitals, police or fire protection, or libraries. The amount provided will not even permit construction of water purification and sewage treatment plants.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say to the gentleman that there is much in what he says, but that particular item comes under the group headed by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and I am sure he will be glad to explain it. I may say to the gentleman that there is no disposition to slow down the program. It is my understanding that no plans are ready. Before the water plants and so forth can be built there must be some housing and so forth and so on. In attempting to speak for another subcommittee, which I am none too well prepared to do, I can assure the gentleman that the community there will not be hurt.

Mr. H CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In answer to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], I may say that I am one of the Members detailed to sit on this subcommittee. Our subcommittee decided that we could not make allowances, for example, for such things as hospital construction. We did not want to go into that at this time. We felt that such could wait until January or February and be considered in the regular bill. We did, however, make an allowance for two things which seemed to be urgent. These had to do with water purification and disposal of sewage. Those, I understand, are the only critical items which face us as far as this particular recommendation is concerned. So we did put that money in the bill, knowing full well we were in complete agreement in the subcommittee that the other matters requested of us could wait until January or February for detailed planning to come to us. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] will bear me out when I say there were no plans or no details given to our subcommittee to back up these requests for $25,000,000. They were just pulled out of the air, so to speak. These people admitted that themselves. So we gave them absolutely what is urgent and we have a full, open mind for the future and will do what is right when it comes before us next year.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. My understanding is that most of this housing is outside the corporate limits; therefore they cannot get money through the FHA for facilities and services but only to build homes. This will certainly prevent going ahead with these needed homes in that vicinity.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say to the gentleman from Georgia that I concur in what our distinguished friend from Minnesota has said. There is no intention here to hurt any of these communities as far as housing is concerned and there is plenty of money to take care of emergency housing until January. There are about $25,000,000 in here for that purpose.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. I am interested in those communities where the houses are already built, where reactivation of plants has taken place, such as the Lockheed plant in Cobb County, Ga., where the houses are built but where there are not sufficient community facilities to take care of the houses that must be built in the future to accommodate the great number of people that are having to be brought into that community. If we do not plan now for those things then when the houses are built we will not have facilities to serve them. It is a critical situation and it should not be put off until January.

Mr. THOMAS. We understand that the communities facilities organization is visible at work and that they are going to have specific plans ready in the near future, but until they come up with that program we have given them $7,500,000; so if there is anything really urgent in the meantime there is money to take care of it. I assure the gentleman there is no disposition to slow it down or to hurt it because the gentleman does live in a very critical area and we are going to see that his section is taken care of because it is a great national defense area.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I sat in on the last hearings that were held in regard to this matter and I was there long enough to determine for myself at least that there was no great urgent need for these facilities which have been requested in this bill, especially in most of the towns where these projects are to be built. Of course, the whole thing is a subterfuge in the respect that we passed an authorization bill of $60,000,000 to take care of these towns. You will find that the Administrator made a conservative estimate that there were around 200 towns which would come within the category of getting this kind of help. Certainly $5,000,000 does not go very far in building all of these kind of facilities that are required under this bill. Five million times 200 makes exactly $1,000,000,000. So this is just a drop in the bucket and to start in on a program of this nature that is going to cost billions before we get through with it without sufficient

plans and without knowing what we are going to do simply is not good legislation. For that reason I uphold the committee in allowing the amount it did allow.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McKINNON. I realize that the chairman has done a very fine job, but I want to make clear that this money is being allocated to the Housing Administrator for the construction of defense housing. I also realize that a lot of work has to go in before we start any program coming out. The funds we are appropriating for are not intended for any 6-month period or 12-month period, but are appropriated to be used to put on as large a staff as necessary to put this program under way, is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. McKINNON. I notice that they made a cut of about 25 percent in the program for Fannie May. Fannie May is a very useful instrument at this time, because it is a program that is to fill the need for housing in these critical defense areas. Fannie May should be allowed to take up these mortgages so that private institutions can do the job and get into this picture. But the bottleneck right now is on mortgages and on Fannie May, and if we limit that by 25 percent we are going to cut down the private builders by 25 percent, and we cannot afford to do that now.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, the gentleman realizes that we have to have houses. Let us get the houses, and then we will take care of Fannie May, because we agreed with you that Fannie May is a very, very intricate part of this program.

Mr. McKINNON. You do not have the houses and then you let Fannie May go out of existence before we even get the houses started.

Mr. THOMAS. Fannie May is very much in existence. It has only 676 employees. We gave her another 119. They have 676 employees on the payroll now. We are not going to hurt her. If she needs more than that, we will give it to her, because we realize that she is playing a very valuable part in this program.

Mr. McKINNON. What I cannot quite reconcile, may I say to the gentleman, is the fact that you say you will give her all the money she needs, but you cut her 25 percent.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. McKINNON. Yet she requested 25 percent more.

Mr. THOMAS. She has no mortgages to sell under this new housing program, may I explain to my distinguished friend from California, and when she gets these new mortgages, and if these 119 employees plus the 676 she now has are not sufficient, we will be here, you know, not a minute later than January, and by January there will not be a single one of these houses built. I am afraid that is the answer. We will not hurt her in the slightest, and in the meantime they can take these 676 employees plus these 119, and certainly in my humble judgment they will not need the 119 for another 90 days. But, rather than take any chance of slowing the program down, that was our recommendation.

Mr. McKINNON. The gentleman realizes that Fannie May has about $350,000,000 plus another $200,000,000 for houses allocated for the acceleration of the Fannie May program to get defense houses built by private builders so as to avoid government housing.

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. McKINNON. Yet you make a 25-percent cut.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right. Of course, the housing program is not yet started, they have not been built, they have no definite place to put them, and when it starts rolling we will take care of it. The gentleman comes from a great area out there, and I think he is just a bit overanxious. They will build a lot of houses down in that section of California. You take that area out there, a good many times the Army is in there and the Navy is in there and the Marine Corps is in there, and we just passed a bill here the other day permitting the Navy to go in there and rehabilitate some of the water plants and some other projects, and we will not do it piecemeal. We will carry it on just as quickly as it should be done. I will give the gentleman the good word on the matter that we will take care of this and take care of it just as it ought to be done.

Mr. McKINNON. I understand from what the gentleman has just said that if we come back to this committee with a showing that we have insufficient funds in these various housing agencies to do the job that is necessary for the defense effort, the gentleman will really make an effort to get it corrected.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RILEY. With further reference to the appropriation for community facilities—purification of water, and installation of sewage disposal plants, there are some seven or eight towns on the perimeter of the Savannah area alone which the $1,000,000 appropriated for purification of water, installation of sewage plants, and so forth, will be insufficient. These people cannot go ahead and make plans because they have no guaranty that they will get any money for this purpose unless the committee will give them some guaranty that the money will be available when they are ready to use it. You cannot get engineers to make plans unless they know that the money is going to be forthcoming to build these facilities. You cannot order the material. It takes a long time to get some of the materials for these facilities. Then FHA comes along, and they cannot approve loans on the houses unless these sewage facilities are available, because they cannot sell the mortgages insured on homes unless those homes have modern conveniences. So we have to have a starting point somewhere. It seems to me that the critical thing at the present time is to have sufficient appropriations to start these community facilities where they are not available and where the little towns are already bonded to the constitutional limit and cannot sell their bonds or borrow money to do it on their own accord.

Mr. THOMAS. I may say to the gentleman from South Carolina that he is just about 99.9 percent correct, as he always is. He and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] have certainly carried a tremendous load in their section. I commend them for the fine job they have done for their area. Let me point out, however, that in this total bill here for community facilities there is appropriated $8,500,000. That $8,500,000 is under the jurisdiction of two separate and distinct agencies. I think that is an error from an administrative point of view; still, that is no fault of the Committee on Appropriations and I doubt if it is the fault of anyone, because it is the result of compromise between the House and the other body. But between the two organizations having $8,500,000, that is going to be ample to take care of the gentleman's area and the area in California represented by my friend [Mr. McKINNON] and the areas in which other Members are interested, and there will be some left over. When this program gets rolling in January we will be back here. I assure the gentleman the Committee on Appropriations is going to do everything humanly possible to take care of this just as the gentleman wants it done.

Mr. RILEY. Will the gentleman offer another supplemental bill if the need is shown for it?

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentleman stays on the committee, as he has in the last 6 months, we will certainly do just exactly as he wants us to do, because we know he is very cognizant of the problem.

Mr. RILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the only requests for time that I have are on the provisions relating to military construction, coming under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee upon which I work. Those items appear on page 8 to 12, inclusive of the bill. There we have provided for $1,159,326,198 for the Army. That includes barracks, purchase of lands for various purposes, the building of mess halls, and other facilities in connection with the training and quartering of troops. The troops are in the groups that will have to be sent overseas to Korea, and to the east of Europe. The number of troops involved probably will run better than 1,500,000 in the Army before we get through.

For the Navy, there is $909,000,000 for barracks, quarters, dry docks, and warehouses. There is also an item for the building of a dam in connection with the San Diego water supply, which is necessary to take care of the increases that are carried in connection with the fleet base. That, I understand, however, is largely reimbursable.

For the Air Force we have the largest item. There we have a figure of $2,112,000,000 for barracks, quarters, flying fields, and so on. There are also flying fields for the Navy. It is necessary to lengthen many of the fields because of the jet fighters, which require a take-off field with a runway of at least 7,500 feet—and they do better with 8,500 feet.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I notice there is an appropriation of some two or three million dollars for the construction of an air base at what is called the Grandview air terminal at Kansas City. I notice inserted in this bill this language on page 10. No other air base is covered so far as I can discover by similar language, although perhaps there may be. The language is as follows:

Provided, That no part of these funds shall be expended for actual construction of facilities or structures at Grandview air terminal, Missouri, until the city of Kansas City, Mo., has conveyed to the United States Government the fee simple title to all lands required for the base or has given the United States Government at least a 25-year lease to such land on a nominal rental basis.

Can the gentleman explain why that provision is inserted in the bill?

Mr. TABER. That was inserted in the bill because there was very serious question in the minds of a great many, including myself, as to whether or not this was going to be an air base which would be at all useful or satisfactory.

I think I might yield at this point to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] who is personally familiar with all the details and all the situation that is covered by this Grandview proposition. I think he can make a clearer and more complete answer to it than I would be able to do, because of his personal knowledge of the local situation.

Mr. SCRIVNER. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], if you will look on pages 420, 421, and 422 of the hearings, you will find that sometime prior to August 6, 1951, the city of Kansas City, Mo., had agreed with the Air Force that Kansas City would procure and convey such land as was necessary for this air base, but pointing out in this agreement that that might require a charter amendment which would take some time, and might even require legislative authority from the Missouri Legislature before they could donate it. They suggested that in the interim, between the time the conveyance was made and the present occupancy, there would be a long-term lease on a nominal basis, and they suggested 25 years. Since the city of Kansas City, Mo., had made that offer, and apparently the Air Force had accepted it and had started moving the Central Air Defense Command into Kansas City and will bring in another air command which is now based on Long Island, that language was put in there to insure that the city of Kansas City would procure, as promised, this land when they could, and in the meantime would rent it on a nominal basis.

Mr. GROSS. Then they will have the right to convey fee simple title to this land or give a 25-year lease?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Apparently the gentleman was not listening to my explanation. That long-term lease is necessary for the interim period between the present time and the time it is possible to get authority, either through legislation or a change in the city charter, for the city of Kansas City, Mo., to convey the land.

Mr. GROSS. But you definitely set up two propositions, elective with the city.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. In these leases executed by the Air Force, what clause of cancellation is contained therein?

Mr. SCRIVNER. This is not a lease. This is merely a preliminary agreement. As a matter of fact, the city authorities of Kansas City today are in Washington, at the Pentagon, trying to work out this problem. Of course, the lease is not here, but you will find, if you will read the hearings, that I insisted that there be an ironclad lease, with fixed terminology, so that nobody could misunderstand it, because we have seen in times past these leases between the military and communities on the use of an airport have brought nothing but headaches to both the military and the communities themselves.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not a fact that most of these leases are on a 30-day basis, as far as the Air Force is concerned, and may be canceled on the part of the Air Force in 30 days?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I imagine they will have a pretty easy escape clause.

Mr. GROSS. So you can build an airport at Grandview and the Air Force can turn it back to the city within a period of 30 days, if they elect to do so?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I suppose that might be possible, if Congress says so. As I say, the lease has not been drawn, so that the terms cannot now be stated, but the Air Force cannot negotiate with the city of Kansas City, or any other municipality, until the money is appropriated and the funds made available for them to go to work.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I find in the committee print the Federal Security Agency listed here. Is it not true that this Donald W. Smith, who I understand was relieved of his post, has been taken over by Oscar Ewing's Federal Security Agency? And what is his work if that be true?

Mr. TABER. As I understand, Donald W. Smith was released from RFC when Mr. Symington went in after Mr. Smith's connections with very questionable performances had been exposed by a committee representing the other body. Mr. Oscar Ewing apparently figures that the release under those circumstances qualified Smith to be taken in at $42.50 a day as a consultant for 60 days in the Federal Security Agency. That is all I know about it, but those seem to be the facts. I cannot give you the exact date that he was taken in but it was some day in September.

Frankly, I am not going into the details of a lot of these items. Some people will raise questions about the Camp Pendleton appropriation in California. That is a Marine base. I am not going into a lot of details in connection with it but will leave that to others who have had an opportunity to study the matter.

There is a question as to an Army base at Bethany in Delaware on the coast, where there is an empty aircraft battery and where there is a Delaware National Guard barracks for about 450 men. Frankly, the Air Force seems to want this and the State of Delaware seems not to be ready to let them have it. What the right thing to do is I would not say until I have had a little more opportunity to go into the picture, but I understand other Members will raise these questions. Frankly, all of these items have been covered in a very short time; we have not had the kind of opportunity for hearings we would have in peacetime; you never can do that. There are a good many classified projects; there are a lot of projects we would not think of embarking upon if we did not have a war condition confronting us. But I believe we have done a fair job in approaching the amounts they would like. For instance, the Navy took a base of July 1, 1950, as to prices. I may get this a little wrong, but not much. Then they added about 10 percent to that base. The engineers who do the Army and the Air Force construction work added 20 percent to that base. Ten percent is as far as the cost of construction has generally increased. We felt that there could be a settling down of the prices that the Air Force and the Army were to pay to somewhere near the level of the Navy, and that results in a considerable amount of cuts.

Now, there is another situation involved in that there were some bases that we took out which the Air Force told us we could take out that were not in shape at this time for construction. We have the situation which is described at page 19 of the report. We reduced the estimate of $1,159,000,000 to $927,000,000. We raised the Navy figure from $915,000,000 to $927,000,000 because we had no budget estimate for the $18,000,000 which was required for a dam at San Diego, Calif, which we felt obliged to put in. There was a reduction of $77,000,000 in the Army estimates and a total of $291,000,000 in the Air Force. They abandoned a program for using a base at Baltimore moving their set-up into Camp McGuire, N. J., which resulted in a considerable saving. There were several other items that were left out. Those all appear in the report for the Air Force.

The Air Force items begin on page 208 and run to the end of the report. The Raleigh-Durham air base was left out because there were other territories that had not been explored. The Olmsted air base was left out. Some items for laundries and dry cleaning were left out which the committee felt they could get along without.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I believe the bill is larger than it ought to be, but I do not know how we can do anything better under the time that we had to work in and with the situation as it is. Where it is planned to have permanent barracks the bases are set up on a 25-year life and will largely be of concrete or brick construction. Where they are set up as a temporary proposition to take care of the present emergency and what we expect in the next 10 years, they are built of a lighter construction. I do not think we will run into any of the tar-paper construction that was prevalent in the last war and which worked out so poorly.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is all I care to say at this particular moment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the agricultural request was for approximately $1,500,000 which was to be used by the flood-control section of the Soil Conservation Service on 15 watersheds in the general area of the recent floods in the Missouri Valley. The committee went into the matter fully, and, of course, we are familiar with the problem that has arisen out there and the urgent need to do something to remedy the situation. But this type of work is of a long-range nature. The flood-control operations of the Department of Agriculture are planting trees and small retarding basins and grasses and other types of work which, over a period of years, will help a lot to slow down sediment and run-off. In regard to these 15 watersheds surveys had been made on only 3 of them. On the others they had not even completed the survey, and, as you know under the law, the way these operations are handled, first the Congress provides for a survey to be made, then it is sent to the appropriate legislative committee—the Committee on Public Works—and they, in turn, approve it, and then it must pass the Congress. Now none of those things have been done in connection with the 15 watersheds. If the committee had provided funds for those 15, they would have been providing funds before the Department knew what the plan was to be, before they knew whether it would be feasible, and thus would initiate something that could not bring about any real relief for a period of quite some time. So the committee has done all that we have authority to do and all I think that they can do at this time.

We have increased the surveying and planning money to the Soil Conservation Service by approximately $186,000. That is to let the Soil Conservation Service speed up this study and these survey reports so that the Congress can act properly. That also will enable them in this period, when the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior and others are trying to evolve some plan, to prevent a reoccurrence of this situation and to permit them to carry on this part of the planning and keep up to date with the rest of it.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and I notice what is contained in the printed report on page 9, the essence of which is the same as the gentleman has stated here, that you did not make available $1,475,000 because the authorization bill had not yet passed.

Now this question: Does the gentleman happen to know whether or not there is already appropriated and on hand in this particular section of the Department of Agriculture unused and unallocated construction money?

Mr. WHITTEN. No. I presume that there probably is some. The only money that has been appropriated to the flood-control phase of soil conservation is some planning and survey money that can be used in the areas that qualify. The construction money is limited to the watersheds where the surveys have been completed and the Congress has approved the survey reports. Now that is the only thing we can do, because there are literally hundreds of these, and unless the Congress takes them in an orderly fashion there just is no way for us to handle them.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska I was thinking of the situation where one of these agricultural flood-control projects might be authorized and the action completed at a time when it would, you might say, just miss the next annual appropriation for construction work. Does the gentleman know whether or not in such a case the Department would be permitted to spend money already appropriated?

Mr. WHITTEN. There have been times when that has happened, and there has been some transfer, I think, maybe, in some cases, insofar as the law is concerned, of moneys appropriated for approved watersheds. Insofar as the tiedown is concerned, what they do is they come before us and they justify the appropriations for particular watersheds. Congress then acts on that. There is an understanding from the justifications and in the money appropriated that it will be used for the purposes for which it has been requested. Insofar as the law is concerned, it might not be tied that closely, in the event some other watershed is approved, but usually they will find some means and clear it with the appropriate committees of Congress to initiate such work as may be needed.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I know the gentleman has been very fair and very thorough in his work on this matter. If I may suggest, the next time money is appropriated for construction of this type of project the committee might give thought to the fact of making it available for projects already authorized or hereafter authorized, in order that we might speed the program as rapidly as Congress does provide the money.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will recall, I have had a little different idea on this type of work than lots of others. It is one of the places where you have a real problem. In the area with which I am familiar, in my own section of the country, the War Department came in and constructed four big dams. Part of those projects calling for those dams are to do this soil work on the headwaters. That is what the Congress considered. But it has been the awfulest job to try to get the Congress to recognize its responsibility, having created the situation which exists there, that this is a part of that and should be provided for.

If the gentleman will remember further, the only place we took a licking, when the agricultural appropriation bill was before the Congress, was in that what we did provide for this work was reduced. I am in thorough accord with the gentleman, but I have not always had my way on this matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska Was there any discussion with the gentlemen from the Department of Agriculture who were before you in reference to spending small amounts of money for some experimental and demonstrational projects in flood control under the Soil Conservation Service?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not know that we went into that, because if justification had been sent up for 15 watersheds, as I say, that had not been approved by the Congress. Under the law we had no authority to appropriate the money for that. The survey reports had been had on only about three, and they had not been approved, and the others had not even been completed. When we found that out, knowing this was something that could not bring relief short of many years and perhaps it might take 25 years, we thought it was something the proper legislative committee should go into. For that reason we did not pursue it.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Is the money in this bill limited to surveys in the Missouri and upper Mississippi region, or can it be used wherever the Department would make the survey?

Mr. WHITTEN. The money is added to the money they already have We provide funds for this type of work for the country. This situation has pointed up so clearly the urgent need out there, and particularly must they expedite it so as to bring this phase of it along as rapidly as other phases are brought along in trying to effect some cure. So this money is appropriated to the general fund which can be used over the whole United States in its entirety. But when it is appropriated, in view of that situation, they are bound to take it that it is primarily to speed up work in that area.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CARNAHAN. The 15 critical watersheds are in the Kansas-Missouri area?

Mr. WHITTEN. The 15 that were included. Personally, I will have to say

this: As far as this type of work is concerned, I did raise the question whether you can primarily do this kind of work down where the floods are or whether this type of work should be further back, in the watersheds where the water gets started. There is the further question, whether the Department of Agriculture would not bring you folks in the central area more relief by being further up the creek than down through the central part. Again, that is for the engineers and those others who are familiar with this kind of thing to determine. The 15 watersheds that were sent up to us were primarily down in the central part where the floods actually hit. They were close in, as against being further up toward the crest of the area drained by these streams

Mr. CARNAHAN. The appropriations carried in this bill are for preliminary studies of those watersheds?

Mr. WHITTEN. Those watersheds are now and have been under study by the Department. Three of the reports have virtually been completed. Twelve have not been. The money is appropriated to expedite the completion of the surveys in these areas so that they can go before the Committee on Public Works and carry forward this phase of the planning in connection with other projects that certainly should be studied in the area to prevent this thing happening again.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, if members of the committee will turn to the report, they will see that most of the report on this supplemental appropriation refers to the military construction budget of over $4,000,000,000. May I say frankly at the outset, if you will look over the list of installations for which we provide for construction at this time, you will find somewhere between 300 and 400 different places where we had to consider requests for money for the type of construction they were going to do. In the time we have had to consider this item, of course, we could not make a personal inspection. We could not make a personal inspection to learn whether or not all these things were needed, merited, and warranted at these particular places. So far as I am concerned, the conclusion is more or less inescapable that in many of these places the military was asking for something that they had always wanted but have never been able to get, and that they were using this emergency to obtain.

They talked about an austere program all the way through. But, going back in my own personal experience, and thinking of the type of training and facilities and quarters that took care of me, all of this is pretty flossy stuff. That goes for the Army as well as it does for the Air Force and for the Navy.

We were surprised somewhat at the difference in the cost of these various projects as presented by the Army and the Air Force. Both of those services, of course, use the services of the Army engineers. The cost of construction as presented by the Navy shows that there is somewhere in the neighborhood of almost 10 percent difference in their proposed costs of comparable items. We concluded that if the Navy could construct the various items and buildings for 10 percent less, certainly with all the years of experience that the United States engineers have had, and their much vaunted skill and efficiency, they, too, could very well look their cost figures over. So we gave them a little help to get them down to the Navy figures, and trimmed their estimates in the neighborhood of $200,000,000 in construction funds.

We did find there was reluctance on the part of the engineers to let out bids, which would make it possible for contractors throughout the country to use new and modern methods of construction. I think, after the session was over, they came to the conclusion that the advisable thing to do was to revamp their bids so that any new, modern, and less expensive methods of construction could be used, and should be used.

You will see in this report that there is required a huge amount—millions of square feet of warehouse space. That is necessary because in our regular 1952 appropriation, and supplemental appropriation bills that preceded it, we provided for the procurement of all sorts of supplies, weapons, munitions, vehicles and machines for the present build-up of the Armed Forces, and for some future build-up. It does no good to obtain all of these things spending billions of dollars, and then let them set out in the open field to deteriorate. When you have your supplies they must be warehoused or those supplies are lost. So, when you are buying more supplies, you have to have more shelter for them.

With the expansion of the Air Force up to 95 groups, they had to go out and reopen and expand airfields. There is no airfield today, under the new equipment coming out, the heavier bombers or heavier fighters or the faster jet fighters, requiring a longer take-off and heavier bases for parking, and all of that, that will not have to be expanded, and the cost of construction for the expansion of those airfields is tremendous.

You will recall that during World War II the Air Force was a part of the Army. After the war was over the Air Force was set off as a separate entity. The only installations that they have are those installations which the Army set off to them. As we look over the list, they had a lot of airfields, so-called, that are not the type that we need and can use now. I feel that the Air Force has got pretty well down to the bottom of the list of the good bases that can be used without tremendous expenditure. I am just leaving this thought with you. Soon you will be asked to provide for a greatly expanded Air Force, over and beyond 95 groups. That means that for each group you are going to have at least one of three possible airfields where you can split them up to have squadrons. You might just as well mark it down now that every new airfield you open from now on is going to cost you close to $50,000,000. So that mere figures, 120, 130, 140 groups in the Air Force, is swell, if your country can afford it. Not only will you have to have a greater number of men in the force, a greater number of maintenance men, more buildings, and all that, in addition to all of your new planes. You had better sit down with a sharp pencil and see what situation the country's Treasury is in before you go off on the deep end of making any promises of expanding. National defense is costly.

One of the reasons why the amount given to the Navy for construction was the smallest is, as you understand, the Navy has been in existence as long as the Nation. They have had a long period of development of permanent bases of various kinds. They have very well established shore bases. Much of the construction here is overseas, because with some of the obligations we are now taking on it is going to cost us. We have been in Japan before; we were getting some of the benefit of the Japanese occupation. The Japanese were paying as a part of occupation costs, a part of the cost of maintaining, constructing, and operating these installations. But now that we have entered into a peace treaty with Japan, which has not yet been ratified, instead of taking the cost out of the Japanese economy, it is all coming out of American economy. We now must spend the taxpayer's hard-earned dollar for the construction and improvement of bases which we will be granted the right to use in Japan.

Of course, as you go overseas, whether Hawaii, Guam, Wake, Okinawa, wherever it may be, the cost of construction is at least one and three-fourths times the cost of construction here in the United States. So that what we spend a dollar to get in the United States, we spend $1 75 to get someplace else. The cost overseas goes up tremendously, but many of these stations are such that we must do some building now if we are going to keep military men in those places.

Okinawa itself is just a little spot of an island, an atoll out in the middle of the Pacific, 7 feet above sea level. You can imagine what happens every time a little wave ripples over that island. You have great deterioration of property. Of course, it take a particular type of construction that will withstand the salt water and the sea water and the sea spray. Going into all that costs quite a few dollars. But if you are going to have it, if you are going to have a bigger Army, if you are going to have a bigger Navy and a bigger Air Force, you have got to spend money for the construction that is necessary to put them in these various new installations. You can not have these things without paying for them. You cannot do it merely for the asking; you as Members of Congress must impose upon the American taxpayer a tremendous burden. I might say incidentally that unless there is a pay-as-you-go program, unless our income tax revenue comes in to pay for this as we go, if you must sell bonds to pay for this construction it is going to cost you 25 percent more, because when you read the Treasury bond ads you see they say "Invest $3 with Uncle Sam today, and 10 years from now take back $4." That is a 25 percent increase in 10 years. If

you are going to do it on a borrowed money basis it will cost 25 percent more if the bill is finally paid in 10 years, and if it takes a longer time it will cost proportionately more.

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I did not make some of the features I referred to in regard to Grandview Airport perfectly clear to the Members. I suggested to the gentleman from Iowa that if he would look at the hearings, pages 420, 421, and 422, he will find a rather complete discussion of it. You will find on page 420 where General Myers said that Kansas City intended to acquire the land for Grandview Airport and donate it—donate it—that means given free, no strings, to the Government. As a matter of fact the city manager of Kansas City, Mo., signed an agreement so to do, together with the acting mayor, the city clerk, and the deputy clerk. The agreement was rather loosely drawn, I may say, on August 5, 1951, relative to Grandview.

Knowing that the Air Force does not care to spend great sums of money on leased property that has a rather tenuous tenancy, they set out:

The city manager is hereby authorized to enter into negotiations with the Air Force to lease to the United States the Grandview Airport and such additions thereto as may be hereafter acquired by the city—

For how long are they going to lease it?—

until such time within the authority of the city council as the city may lawfully convey such property.

In other words, their agreement was possibly an inducement for the Air Force to bring this installation to Kansas City, because it is a worth-while one; eventually there will be $35,000,000 or possibly $50,000,000 spent there; it will bring in an additional payroll into Kansas City, Mo., of some 35,000 or 40,000 people. A lot of cities are looking for things like that. So apparently somehow, somewhere, somebody told the Air Force that if they would bring the Central Air Defense Command to Kansas City, Mo., the city would get the land for the airport, temporarily lease it, and then would give it to them. It is going to take some little time, going to require a change in the charter; a lot of red tape has got to be cut. When people speak of a nominal sum it is generally considered to mean $1, $5 per year, or something like that. As I pointed out, this agreement is rather loosely drawn. It did not say how much land they were going to get. It would have been very poor business upon our part, at least as I view it, if we were to authorize the Air Force to go into a program that is going to cost between $35,000,000 and $50,000,000 and not know any more about this agreement with the city. We felt, therefore, that as a safeguard and protection for the United States of America and its taxpayers we should write into this bill that none of the money for Grandview is to be spent until and unless the city of Kansas City Mo., keeps its promise. In my book a promise made is a promise to be kept. If the city did not intend to keep that promise to donate the land they should not have made it. Now that they have made it they should be required to hold to it. So the committee said that none of the money earmarked for Grandview is to be spent until, first, the city of Kansas City, Mo., acquires the land, and then leases it to the Air Force for a nominal sum for a long term, 25 years, not any $25,000, $35,000, or $50,000 a year; second, when they can get authority from the State or an amendment of their city charter to transfer that property in fee simple as a gift or a donation to the United States Government, that should be done. That is all this language means, that is all it does, and that is all it is intended to do.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Let us go back to the lease proposition again. You can execute a lease for 25 years, and the Army can cancel it in 30, 60, or 90 days by the provision they put into that lease; is that right?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. And turn the airport back to Kansas City.

Mr. SCRIVNER. If that is put in the lease, they could cut it off on a 30-day notice. I am talking about the Air Force, not the city. This would be a prerogative of the Air Force we are talking about now.

What will happen to the property that is on there? I do not know. But that is one of the reasons that we insist on having some iron-clad provision upon which we could base our conduct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, as far as disposal of the structures that will be erected there are concerned, nothing could be done without an act of Congress. They could not be disposed of by the Air Force merely by stating they will turn it back to the city of Kansas City, Mo. The Air Force has not the authority to do that. Only Congress can provide for the disposal.

Mr. GROSS. It could turn the runways back, it could turn the field back, a vastly expanded field.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes; I agree on that. Once the runways are built they are there to stay. That was done after World War II. I can show the gentleman airport after airport after airport throughout the country where the Air Force had leases with municipalities where runways and structures were built. Then when the war was over they turned the airport back to that municipality with a recapture clause. All of them are having headaches—the Air Force and the cities—because in some of the airports the city was getting a revenue. Now the Air Force says: We want it back as of the first of this month. The revenue is gone, the city is faced with litigation possibly, or at least a lot of hard, bitter feelings from the people using the structures, who have been occupying it and paying rental.

As I pointed out, when these things are done there better be a hard, fast, iron-clad agreement drawn up so that not only the Air Force but the Federal Government will know what is going on and the cities also will know what to look forward to.

Mr. GROSS. What justification was there for the building of an air base at Grandview, Mo., in view of the fact that at St. Joseph, Mo., about 40 or 50 air miles from Grandview, Mo., there is a deactivated light bomber base constructed in World War II that by the admission of the Air Force is falling to pieces today, which should be reactivated if it is to be saved?

Mr. SCRIVNER. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa that, as far as I can recall, and I have a pretty good memory, the St. Joseph air base was not mentioned at all. What kind of an air base it is I cannot tell the gentleman. I have flown over it, but I have no knowledge of it personally.

They went into great detail as to why Kansas City, Mo., is a strategic and desirable place to put the Central Air Defense Command. It is located centrally in the Midwest, it is accessible to at least nine transcontinental railroads, it is accessible to innumerable transcontinental highways. If you will pardon the reference, since it is close to my home, it has a very fine climate for that part of the country.

Mr. GROSS. For that part of the country?

Mr. SCRIVNER. It is the heart of America. In my book it is the best part of America. Other people do not agree with that statement, but that is my feeling. It is the hub of highways, railroad, telephonic, and radio communication. You can find all that information in the hearings upon which the Air Force choice was based.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, there is only one item in the bill for the Department of the Interior and that is for the benefit of the Choctaw Indians in Oklahoma, which will be carried out by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which, as you know, is part of the Department of the Interior.

Right after the turn of the eighteenth century when the Indians were entering into treaties with the United States Government, several treaties were entered into in Oklahoma with the Choctaw Indians. The total amount has aggregated about ten-thousand-and-some-odd dollars each year. We have made these annual appropriations for 100 years, I assume. Last year the Congress enacted legislation to, I would say, liquidate these treaties by making full and final settlement with these Indians. We enacted a law, Public Law 747, which provided that they should be paid a lump sum settlement in case they approved the settlement by vote, and they have approved it by vote. We authorized them to receive $385,000, $5,000 of which was to be used as expenses. The Committee on Appropriations has presented the bill as provided by law, except in one respect. It is estimated that the expenses for the enforcement of this law making this final settlement cannot be done on $5,000. It is going to take more than

that, and we included the additional sum needed in this appropriation, and that only is not authorized by law. It is estimated that there will be about 56,000 separate families to deal with and 8,000 are living and the others are dead, leaving heirs, and each deceased person has on an average of about four survivors, and each of these heirs will get from $2 to $17. It is a big job, and I do not believe it can be done with $5,000. The committee is recommending $385,000, of which amount not to exceed $34,333 may be used for expenses.

That is all I desire to say, if there are no questions.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. In regard to the item the gentleman has just mentioned, and I appreciate his explanation, I was wondering if he could tell the committee how that money is to be spent. Who is to get that extra money? Specifically I am wondering why our well-staffed Indian Bureau, with its many employees, could not handle this comparatively small item

Mr. NORRELL. If and when this money is expended we want the Government to be sure that they are paying the proper heirs—and all of them, take their receipts therefor, and secure full and final releases, so the Government will not be responsible for any further sums I will be glad to yield at this time to the chairman of the legislative committee to answer the question, if he desires to do so.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would be very glad if someone could answer that, as to whether it means additional employees in the bureau.

Mr. NORRELL. I will yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] to explain the item.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, if permissible, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], whose district is particularly affected by the legislation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, this item for the distribution of these funds simply carries over an organization that has been in effect for about 3 years, the purpose of which has been to pay out these various per capita payments. My understanding is that it will require the employment of only five additional temporary employees.

When the coal and asphalt lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians were sold, a temporary per capita section was set up. This section was set up to do the job of making per capita payments. It was necessary because there is nobody else in the Indian Office at Muskogee that would be able to carry on this particular function and do his regular job as well. Making these payments is quite a job because in some cases complicated heirships must be determined. It takes clerks and lawyers to do that job.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The gentleman means there will be extra employees hired by the Bureau to do this job?

Mr. ALBERT. I do not think it will be necessary to hire many extra employees because they already have this section set up. It will simply mean carrying on their per capita section until the whole job is finished. I believe this appropriation contemplates the employment of only five more employees.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Understand, I am very much in favor of the commutation of these treaties and all other treaties with the Indian tribes. It ought to have been done a half century ago. But why cannot the present employees of the Indian Bureau carry this on in the normal process of their work, without the necessity of having additional funds?

Mr. ALBERT. They cannot carry on this job and do their other jobs, which have no relation to this whatsoever, without additional money for something else.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NORRELL. May I say to the gentleman there are only five new jobs here, and they are strictly temporary.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The reason they cannot do it with the present number of employees is because the present number of employees has been cut to the bone by reason of the appropriation bill. This is extra work, not regular work; therefore, they cannot do it with the regular employees.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STIGLER. May I say further that due to the decrease in the appropriation for the Indian Service the Muskogee office was cut some twenty-odd employees. They have been given their separation notices. It is absolutely necessary to have these additional employees, which this money will provide, in order to do the work of making these payments.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman, but I was under the impression that the Indian Bureau had not been cut, since the reports I have received every year for the last 20 years show, particularly the last compilation I got, the steadily increasing appropriations of the Indian Bureau.

Mr. STIGLER. May I add that in my investigation of the cut made in the Indian Service, when I received notice of the cut made in Oklahoma I thought Oklahoma was being discriminated against, but when I contacted the Commissioner I was advised that the cut is Nation-wide. The percentage is just about the same in Oklahoma as it is throughout the United States. Also, the central office here took a cut.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman.

Does not the gentleman think it would be a good idea now to proceed as rapidly as possible with the computation of all of the treaties applying to the Indian tribes?

Mr. NORRELL. Wherever it can be done, I certainly do.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. There was no cut in the House, but the cut occurred in the other body. The administrative cut was something over $300,000, as I recall the figures off-hand.

Mr ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I can take no great pride in being a party to bringing that portion of the bill which applies to the Department of Defense here to the floor for discussion today. Certainly, I cannot be happy about bringing it here with as little real information available to the membership generally, and more specifically, with as little real information as has been made available to the members of the subcommittee that has been called upon to pass upon the request for over $4,000,000,000 in funds.

I cannot refer to my temporary service on this subcommittee as being enjoyable, and I say that in spite of the very congenial and competent membership of that subcommittee, and the great courtesy and helpfulness and tolerance which was shown to me as a new and temporary member by the chairman of that subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and in fact by all of the regular members of that subcommittee.

I cannot refer to that experience as enjoyable because it increased the personal feeling of futility and frustration in the effort to keep expenditures of the Federal Government within reasonable limits. The Armed Services Subcommittee on Appropriations is compelled to deal in billions of dollars on about the same basis, and often with less real information, than is true of the other subcommittees dealing in millions. And always hovering over their heads is the spectre of inadequate physical defense for our country in an hour of peril.

Some of you are familiar with the efforts made in our subcommittee on civil functions to deeply cut expenditures wherever we saw an opportunity in this day of drastic Federal fiscal situation. Some of you did not agree with that effort. Some of you have given me and my Civil Functions Subcommittee colleagues a very miserable few months while we awaited a final decision on that bill, a decision which as of today seems to have been indefinitely postponed.

In that case at least, there were some tangible facts to act upon, and we were able to judge much more accurately the consequences of our decisions. The

Armed Services Subcommittee must deal with a great many intangibles. Much of the testimony must be off the record, which increases the responsibility of the members of the subcommittee and increases the reliance which the rest of us must place upon them. I think the part of this bill for the Department of Defense reflects that situation. Except for a readjustment of funds on the basis of our best estimate of construction costs, and except for a few specific deletions which are explained in the committee report, the Armed Services got just about what they asked for in the hearings before the subcommittee.

I want to say in that connection that as a new member, and a temporary member, I got the very distinct impression that the Navy provided us with justifications which were much easier to follow and were more carefully prepared, and more comprehensive, than was true of the justifications which were presented by the other branches of the Armed Services.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. For about 10 years, I have been sitting at the other end of this performance which is going on here today, and passing on bills authorizing the building of these vast installations. We had one a while ago, which no one so far as I know in our committee, was in any position to make any reasonable cross examination of witnesses in justification of these installations. The cost of these installations is up in the millions of dollars, and even in the billions of dollars, as the gentleman knows. I wish the gentleman would, if he has thought about it, outline what he thinks would be some method whereby our committee, and the appropriation subcommittee which handles these problems, could find a way to make the military really justify the authorizations as well as the appropriation. I would just like to express one thought that I have with reference to that, and I would like to see what the gentleman has to say about it. I think we ought to have a bigger staff of experts on our committee.

It has been mentioned that we must find someone who can screen these various demands and try to find some reasonable evidence on which we can base our decision to authorize these projects.

What would be the gentleman's comment on that, or could he give us some of his ideas as to how either his committee or our committee can find a way to actually test the need for these tremendous expenditures?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am afraid the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], formerly from Wisconsin, has given me an order much too big for me, a new, temporary member of that subcommittee, to attempt to fulfill. I do know that it is something that men who have served on that subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] have all given a great deal of thought to. I think they have some good ideas, but the circumstances in connection with this bill were such that there just was not an opportunity to put those ideas into effect.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I might make a suggestion that might have some value, as to whether these things are justified—and I do not believe they are justified. I think this is as full of pork as anything that has been before the Congress. That is, if these committees, both legislative and appropriation committees, would call on their colleagues in the districts in which these things are located, they would get a lot of information that they are not getting today.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to say that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has made a very astute observation, because it has come to the attention of the House Committee on Insular and Interior Affairs that in this bill is a sum in excess of $11,000,000 for the construction of a dam at Camp Pendleton, in California, and before our committee on Monday of this week General Hill testified that in the first place he did not know whether there was water in the river sufficient to fill that dam if it were built; and, second, that if the water were there, the Navy would own the water when it came down, but they wanted to go ahead and ask this committee to authorize $22,000,000 for the construction of that dam.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I was interested in what the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] had to say, but here is the situation that confronts me: In this bill is an installation called Travis Air Base, $32,981,000. In my congressional district are 10 Army, Navy, and Air Force installations. The amount of money that is given to that district is probably $500,000,000. It is utterly impossible for a local Congressman in that kind of a district to go around and try to find out whether the requests that they make are justified. Furthermore, the requests are not made until after the Congress is in session, and those of us from the far reaches of the country do not have time to go home and do that. We must have some hired help, in my opinion, to go out there at the grass roots and screen the demands of these various agencies. I believe we could save—and I mean this advisedly—millions and perhaps billions of dollars.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has made a significant contribution, but I want to say in connection with the statement just made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] whom I respect most highly, and who does a great work here for economy; I point out that the subcommittee welcomed every Member to appear and the committee would hear any Member interested in any of these bases. Every Member who indicated a desire to discuss an item was given an opportunity to do so before the subcommittee.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In line with what the gentleman from Virginia said, I suspect that every Member feels that there is just too much money in this bill, and I dare say that every member of the subcommittee shared with me the impression that there is a lack of real austerity in the program presented by the Defense Department in spite of the fact that the requests that came in were screened and cut by the Pentagon and the same process went on in the Bureau of the Budget before the program was presented to Congress.

No one can seriously doubt but that Defense officials have included in this request some old chestnuts which have been held in abeyance until the proper psychological moment in the Congress and throughout the country. I think one witness came awfully close, in fact, to admitting that in his testimony. The fault for this cannot be placed entirely upon the Defense Department. As a Nation we have been more emotional than practical in providing for the Military Establishment; certainly, no long-term planning by Defense Department officials has been possible in a Nation which has underbuilt and overdestroyed in times of peace and which has reversed itself and overbuilt in time of national emergency. I believe that this bill is an example of the latter.

This measure contains very little, if any, of the sinews and the muscles of defense; it is almost entirely a housekeeping bill; there is much more in it for the protection of the men and the supplies of the armed services than there is for the protection of the United States. For instance, there is troop housing for 409,000 men at a cost of $836,000,000; bachelor officers' quarters for 21,000 men at a cost of $123,000,000; 536,000 acres of land at a cost of $48,000,000; 48,000 square feet of warehousing at a cost of $394,000,000. Probably those bare figures are not very impressive, but to give you an illustration of what they mean let me say that the land involved in this particular bill is more than three-quarters of the actual land area of the State of Rhode Island.

This measure has been handled on an urgent basis; the subcommittee drove itself, and it drove its executive clerk, Bob Lambert, and assistant executive clerk, Lawrence Miller, drove them hard in order to bring this portion of the bill to the floor.

With those reductions which have been made I am in thorough agreement. I had hoped there would be more reductions, but the fact is that time either in the preparation of justifications by the requesting officials or in the subcommittee consideration did not permit the kind of detailed investigation required for intelligent appraisal and intelligent reduction. We were in truth thrown on the mercy of the Defense Department, and I doubt whether its past record for economical use of allotted funds is such that we can be happy in that position. I cannot help thinking, Mr. Chairman, and I certainly do not want this to be interpreted as indicating anything but the greatest admiration and respect for the subcommittee members with whom I had the privilege of serving temporarily, that we cannot take a great deal of pride in supporting this measure. On the other hand, however, there is great need for some of the construction involved, and I doubt whether any Member can accept the awful responsibility of opposing this bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], chairman of the Subcommittee on the Armed Services.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 50 minutes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I should like to make one statement before I yield because I have no intention whatever of taking the 50 minutes. I will take only a few minutes.

I will undertake to use only about 10 or 15 minutes and let the rest of the time be allotted to others.

Mr. Chairman, 94 percent of the funds provided in this bill are for the military public-works program. The House, on August 14, by a vote of 352 to 5 approved an authorization for military public works in the sum of about $5,600,000,000. The House evidently was convinced at the time there was great necessity for a tremendous increase in our military construction program.

Of the funds requested about one billion three hundred million would be spent on overseas projects and the remainder in the bill would be spent on projects in this country

It was pointed out at the time we had the authorization before us a short time ago that there was great need for additional barracks and facilities. While the country generally is enjoying unprecedented prosperity, it would certainly be intolerable if the Congress were not willing to provide minimum facilities for the men who leave their homes and serve in the Armed Forces and hazard their lives for their country.

Some may wonder why we need additional public works when we had a much larger force during World War II. They may properly ask why we do not use those facilities.

The Air Force during World War II had 1,900 installations. With this bill they will have a total of 309 installations in active service. The Army had about 603 installations in World War II. Under this bill they will have 170 installations. Most of them are now in operation. The Navy during World War II had about 385 shore bases. Under this bill they will have about 240. So it is necessary, since we have declared surplus and disposed of so many of our bases, the great majority of them, that we build up our base structure and provide housing for our people who serve in the Armed Forces, including barracks and quarters. There is very little family housing provided except in a few isolated areas.

The situation requires, as every thinking person will quickly realize, some additional bases. In World War II we were not confronted with the probability that we would use continental United States for take-offs for long-range intercontinental bombing of a potential enemy; but if world war III comes that will be the order of the day. Of course, we have to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on our strategic bombing bases and on our strategic bombing program.

There was no serious danger during World War II that this country would be bombed from abroad, and so we did not have to have interceptor fighter bases for the defense of continental United States we are now confronted with a different situation. We have gone to great expense to build a radar chain, a radar fence, an aircraft warning system, across this country. Through that network we propose to undertake to discover the approach of enemy aircraft, and we must have fighter bases, and they are provided for in this bill—bases, where interceptor squadrons will be located. So a lot of additional money is required there.

During World War II when we produced the planes, ammunition, tanks, and so forth, these items went into the stream of transportation and they went to the scene of combat, generally speaking. There was no comparable problem of storing large quantities of war matériel, but now we are not engaged in an all-out war. Yet we are in a war, in the truest sense of the word, of course—there is no glossing over that fact—in Korea. But by and large the matériel which is coming off the lines now is that which will be used in the event of a much larger war than the one we are presently in. We had a carry-over on June 30, 1951, of about $37,000,000,000 which we previously provided, most of it to procure things such as tanks, guided missiles, ammunition, aircraft, and so forth. We have in the bill which was recently approved by the Congress, the regular annual military appropriation bill of about $56,000,000,000, approximately $30,000,000,000 for procurement. Would it not be a very sad commentary if we failed to provide warehousing for all this highly expensive equipment? To do otherwise would be an indefensible act on the part of the Congress.

I am thoroughly sold on the necessity for this bill, and I do not doubt but that we will have to go further. Of course, I regret the fact that in the spending of so great a sum of money there will be instances of abuses and waste. Moreover it is disturbing that we are having to spend vast sums of money for military purposes.

I have mentioned the necessity for a big warehousing program and for bases for interceptor aircraft. There is, of course, great necessity for additional barracks for men to live in at the camps. Aircraft runways have to be extended to accommodate the fast jet planes. Air bases have to have additional storage capacity for gasoline. Many bases require storage for both the high octane gas and the type fuel which is used for jet aircraft.

In this bill I think we can take pride in the fact that we are not providing a lot of substandard construction. On the other hand, we are providing fairly decent construction which will last, in many cases, almost indefinitely. Barracks will be constructed out of some kind of cement block, pumice stone or some sort of masonry in many cases, and the warehousing will be of the better type of construction, and it is not very much more expensive than the nonpermanent type of construction. Of course, if we go into an all-out war in the near future, we would have to throw this program into the discard and go into a tar paper shack construction program in many localities. We are seeking to build here on a solid base. If this national emergency lasts for 2 years or 10 years or 50 years this money, generally speaking, will be well spent. In my opinion, it is a wise thing for the Congress to provide this better type construction program. So all in all, it seems to me we do not have to apologize for the thing we are doing today. Certainly our objectives are good.

Unfortunately in the administration of the program by the Department of Defense there will be some waste of money. I do not know of any businessman who can run even a small business without wasting some money and making some mistakes. He can always look back at the end of the year and say "I wish I had done differently with respect to such a problem." Some of this money is going to be wasted, but we must seek the best possible program. We have men representing the Appropriations Committee who are studying this program and seeking to detect waste and bad management. Members of the committee are working for more economy and efficiency. The military forces have certain regulations and requirements with respect to the program. Yet, some of this money is going to be wasted, despite the worthy objective which we all seek.

Would it not be a sad thing if world war III should break tomorrow and the American people should point to the Congress and say, "Gentlemen, in war we have to have bases from which to strike the enemy. What has Congress done to provide bases from which we can strike the enemy and win the war with a lesser loss of human life?" We could say, "We provide in this bill over a billion dollars in base structures to make victory less costly in the event of world war III."

Not for aggressive purposes, but for purposes of our own defense, we are providing bases and installations which will serve us well indeed in the event world

war III should come. It is the only sensible thing to do. We hope that we never will use them. Certainly we would not use them in an aggressive war.

Let me say this, that it is not possible to go into a community and take some of the land, take some man's farm, his home, without inconveniencing somebody. Projects are usually wanted by the chamber of commerce and private businessmen who have something to sell, but often the land which is taken is the precious homestead of some good American. So those factors are involved here.

We have urged that every precaution be taken to create the least maladjustment in the community. It is certainly the intent of the committee that despite the funds provided here, the Army and Navy and Air Force should go into no area whatever if they cannot go in there on a satisfactory basis. The Congress does not expect, let me say for the record, that funds will be expended for "X" installation if it develops that it is not possible to make a satisfactory agreement with the local community and the State and the county that may be involved.

Something has been said about staff. When we confront the difficult problems of life we always look for an escape. Men who are bewildered and confused look for some relief, some escape through some source. Congress, with this huge and almost intolerable burden, would like to have an honorable escape, would like to find an easy way. Would it not be wonderful if we had a staff, somebody to do our own thinking, to do our own planning, to do our own work, to make our decisions, and relieve us of all our worries? It would certainly be wonderful if we had some sort of procedure like that. There is not any easy way to dodge responsibility. The Departments have a system of bureaus. The head of the bureau often knows very little about what is going on. The program is too big. He cannot keep abreast of it. He delegates to the staff this and that responsibility and he loses touch with the situation. But, the head of the bureau, who is supposed to have the best brains in the organization, is often ignorant of what is going on. The problem of what to do is most difficult.

We could have legislation by bureaucracy if we wanted to have staffs to do all our thinking and do all our work for us. But there is no way to do that. We have had from 8 to 35 people working for the Committee on Appropriations on military matters this year. We do not have a perfect set-up. We need a much better one and I have consistently urged a better set-up. But, of course, we cannot do our work by proxy. I am not saying we do not need all the help we can get from inside the Congress and from outside the Congress, but I think it is easy to sit back and think, "Oh, if we just had somebody to do our work and do our thinking and do our planning and make our decisions, wouldn't it be lovely." Do not be deluded and misled by such lack of clear thinking. There is not any way for us to escape our responsibilities. So far as I know, the public works program which is now being proposed is a fairly decent program. None of us can fully know all the facts and all the ramifications but, in a general way, it seems that we are making a sensible approach to our military construction requirements. The point is, I think we must take this business of staff and investigations with a grain of salt. Yet, of course, we must recognize there is some basis for a more adequate research and study program. Unfortunately, we are in session so much there is not adequate opportunity for us to see as much of the actual field operations as we need to see. Let me say clearly and unequivocably that we seek to get maximum efficiency and that we do not and will not condone or defend waste and extravagance.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I was interested in what the gentleman said about the Congress dodging its responsibility. In my opinion, the armed services across the river are dodging a chance to get some housing, which the Government will own. As you know, we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars on Wherry housing. I have been thinking about this problem for a long time. The armed services have built the houses, and it has gone out to the world that they have been built without appropriations. The armed services furnish the tenants. Everyone of these people on the military payroll who lives in those houses, gets rent money. The money for quarters for military personnel last year amounted to about $500,000,000. We have not acquired one single dollar of equity for that $500,000,000. I spent a number of months with a man designated by Defense Secretary Johnson studying this problem. We wrote a bill under which we can use the rent money to build houses. The rent money that is allowed in the pay bill would enable us to own every one of those houses in 12 to 16 years. Under the present plan, we are not getting one single dollar of equity for all the rent money that we put out. The landlords will be on those military installations under the law, that they work under, the Wherry law, for 33 years drawing rents. I have tried in vain to get a report on my bill, but all I get is a cold shoulder.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman, as a member of the committee on the Armed Forces, could well explore that situation. There is merit to what he says. This Wherry housing is not the perfect answer to the housing problem.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. On page 9 of the bill there appears an item on line 13 of $909,024,460 for the Navy. I understand included in that item is a sum slightly in excess of $11,000,000 for the construction of a dam on the Santa Margarita River, near Camp Pendleton. Is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. SAYLOR. The gentleman is familiar with the testimony of General Hill before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on Monday of this week.

Mr. MAHON. That is right. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman and I have discussed this matter previously.

Mr. SAYLOR. At that time General Hill admitted that he did not know whether the water was physically available in the river, if the dam were built; and, secondly, if the water really were available, whether the Navy owned it. Is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. I have not carefully read his testimony, but serious doubt has been raised with respect to the project. The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] will offer, on behalf of the committee, an amendment which will strike this proposed dam out of the bill. It will be stricken from the bill, if the House approves, and the Armed Forces will be forbidden, by this act of the Congress, from proceeding with this proposed dam. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. There can be no mistaking the fact that if the Congress approves the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], these funds will be stricken from the bill and the committee will follow through in seeing that congressional action is given full force and effect.

Mr. SAYLOR. I have that amendment prepared, but if a member of the committee will offer it, I will be glad to have him do so.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. The gentleman realizes that out at Camp Pendleton we have an investment of something like $75,000,000. To replace that investment today would cost around $200,000,000. If we do not get water from that installation out there, the possibility presents itself that we will have to lose that entire investment. The gentleman also realizes that when that land was originally acquired there was an agreement in the purchase of the property that two-thirds of the water available in that area would be allocated to Camp Pendleton. Since that time opposition has developed through the expansion of Fall Brook, and surrounding facilities, that perhaps requires more water. But still we, as Members of Congress, should look into this thing very thoroughly and take steps to protect our investment, and not be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman makes a very good point. The fact that this money is stricken out at this time does not mean that probably further investigation will reveal that the dam may have to be constructed in any event, but it will not be constructed unless there is further action by the Congress. The gentleman is right, that we will have to take necessary steps to provide water facilities for this very expensive and important installation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I think the RECORD should show that the committee has been in session since the first of the year,

but actually you do not have any investigators to check these justifications when they come before you, and this bill is built up practically altogether on what the Defense Department has said.

Mr. MAHON. We have had investigators working for several months investigating the construction program.

Mr. WHITTEN. How many have you had?

Mr. MAHON. We have presently eight. They are under the supervision of the chairman [Mr. CANNON]. I fully agree that we should have a more adequate set-up for investigative work, and I have sought a more adequate arrangement.

Mr. WHITTEN. Did you have the benefit of their report before this action?

Mr. MAHON. We had the benefit of preliminary reports on construction, but we have not had the full report. We did have quite an extensive report on the main bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman knows my feelings about it. I do not know of any subcommittee that could have worked any harder; I do not know of any more able men in the Congress than the members of this committee; but this problem is beyond that The experience we have had in the past leads us to know that these things will bear a great deal of checking. The request usually originates in the field and it works its way up to the top. They say they have reduced it. The man at the bottom knew that it would be reduced. The point I am making is that something should be done to check these matters, because, as has been pointed out the Congress can say "well we gave them the money." Our responsibility goes further than that. We should see that the money is spent properly for needed purposes. We cannot cut national defense without proving our case. You cannot prove it without somebody to get the evidence. We have been prone to give them a billion dollars without a proper check to see that it was needed and properly spent. I still want to know if the gentleman does not agree that we ought to have some investigation of these matters, so that he and the subcommittee members could have more information on which to act on and not have to accept the presentation of the department to the extent we all have to do.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] desires any information about any subject whatever, all that is necessary is to ask for it. No man on the committee has ever asked for any information which could be secured that we have not had available. The most carefully trained and experienced investigators that are available anywhere in the world are at our command. If the gentleman has had no information it is because he has not asked for the information.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I have promised to yield back much of the time that was given to me and I shall not be able to yield back much if I cannot proceed. I hope the Members will let me proceed. I much regret the situation.

I would say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I fully agree that we need a more perfect staff for investigative work but there is no perfect answer to our difficult problem.

As members of the subcommittee we give 12 months a year to a study of the problems of national defense appropriations. There are not any more months in the year, and that is all that we can personally do. Insofar as our studies are concerned, we bring in here voluminous reports. Here is a report on every project in the bill that is not secret or classified, giving some basic information for the members to read.

Mr. WHITTEN. Will the gentleman listen to me? Will the gentleman permit me to make a statement?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. WHITTEN. This report and hearings consisting of hundreds of pages came to me first yesterday and I find conflicts in the report and hearings I may say the hearings consist practically altogether of the presentation of the Defense Department. That is what I would check

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will read the entire report I think he will be reasonably satisfied with the report. Every Member of Congress has the responsibility to take the floor and offer amendments to help us eliminate waste of public money. I think we all have the same desire to reduce waste to the minimum. We all realize in the big military program there is, and there will be, waste.

Mr WHITTEN. Will the gentleman give me a little time to do that? I have been seeking time to show changes that can be made in the committee procedure.

Mr. MAHON. To offer amendments?

Mr WHITTEN. To have some time to explain this. The gentleman has 50 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. I am trying to conclude so that other members may have a chance to be heard. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 28 minutes

Mr. MAHON. I will take two additional minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Very briefly.

Mr. BROOKS. I would like to say on behalf of the gentleman and his subcommittee that we had occasion to check with him and with his subcommittee often, and we find they are doing a magnificent job. I do not hesitate at all to take the floor and say that I think the gentleman's committee is doing a competent job in handling these finances.

May I say also, in addition, that a great many of the items to which the gentleman refers in this bill have also recently been checked by the Armed Services Committee. This makes a double check on some of these items. If we had to cull out of the departments all the information the gentleman and his committee have provided the Congress it would take us months and months to get it.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, we are confronted with a very difficult situation; there is no way to escape this responsibility. We have just got to do the best we know how.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understood the gentleman to say a short time ago that the Department had no intention of taking a man's farm if he did not want to part with it.

Mr. MAHON. I had no intention of saying that. No man wants to give up his farm. The problem is national defense. There are local and individual problems, but the overriding and controlling motive is the security of the United States. We must secure that, but we also seek to reduce to a minimum the hardship upon individuals. I think the gentleman will agree with me on that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not understand it that way.

Mr. BONNER Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I do not intend to get into any argument.

Mr MAHON. The gentleman under the 5-minute rule can get time.

Mr. BONNER. There are some questions I would like to ask

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will make then brief I yield.

Mr. BONNER. I cannot make them brief unless the gentleman gives me time to state the question. I happen to be on a committee that has been looking into some of the expenditures of the armed services, certainly with no criticism but with an interest in the civilian economy of this country as well as national defense. Now, there is no doubt about it from field studies that there has been tremendous waste and duplication of services in the armed services.

Mr. MAHON. I know of this gentleman's interest. How long has the gentleman been working on that?

Mr. BONNER. For a year.

Mr. MAHON. I commend him for the good work he is doing.

Mr. BONNER It is difficult for the average Member to come here and vote against this bill because you have held hearings and you have made studies. I pointed that out in the beginning.

Mr. MAHON We all want to make reductions where reductions can safely be made. Eternal vigilance is not only the price of liberty, it is the price of economy and I applaud the gentleman. Where does he think reductions could safely be made in the bill?

Mr. BONNER. We issued a report in which we pointed out certain things that I am going to ask the gentleman. Will the gentleman tell the House the number of new bases that are being built by the Air Force? The number, that is all.

Mr. MAHON. I believe there are six.

Mr. BONNER. Now, will the gentleman answer this question: Are you providing in here money to create a new supply system? We have three supply systems now. Then we go into the Air Force. Is the Air Force getting money here to create a new warehouse supply system? We are trying to unify the armed services under an act of Congress, under directives. We are trying to bring about economy in management,

and so forth. Is there any provision in here for new warehouses for the Air Force?

Mr. MAHON. The Air Force and the Navy Air Force are getting something like $24,000,000,000 worth of airplanes and related equipment. They have to have warehousing. There is $400,000,000 in this bill for warehousing. I do not know of anything we can do about that.

Mr. BONNER. Is it warehousing for the Air Force?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; in part.

Mr. BONNER. In their air operations or for their supply bases? The system heretofore has been supplying any common items for the air service.

Mr. MAHON. That is true.

Mr. BONNER. We have been told in repeated places, for instance, at Atlanta, that the Atlanta general depot can supply the common-use items to the Air Force. Now, does the Air Force propose under the money you are setting up here building up its own supply system? I ask the gentleman that question.

Mr. MAHON. They are not building up a supply system except to a limited degree. They are relying upon the Quartermaster of the Army for general items. It is not proper that I take any more time. Other Members have a right to be heard.

Mr. BONNER. Will the gentleman answer the question then that the Air Force does not propose to set up separate depots?

Mr. MAHON. They have depots here and there.

Mr. BONNER. Depots for a general supply system of their own.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman answers that question "No," there is no money in here for that purpose?

Mr. MAHON. The answer is "No."

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman called attention to a typographical error on page 42 of the report, involving the base at Camp Robinson, Ark.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Will the gentleman give the correct figure?

Mr. MAHON. The figure given in the report, which is not repeated in the bill itself, is $4,321,300, whereas the figure should be $3,521,300.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has just stated that he would like to save some money in the bill if a place can be found to save it, and I am sure he is sincere about that. There is one item in the bill for a camp in my district where the Government proposes to take large acreages of land from farmers, for whom the gentleman has just expressed his sympathy. I would like to point out to the gentleman that the Government now owns within 1 mile, just 1 mile of where they intend to construct this railhead facility, approximately 100,000 acres of land. Now I have asked the War Department to use its own land. I asked the Committee on Armed Services to have the War Department look into using its own land, land that the Government owns. It would be highly appreciated if the gentleman would have the War Department look into that and we could at least save that amount of land.

Mr. MAHON. I will be glad to look into the matter. I will confer personally with the Department of the Army. The gentleman is referring to railhead facilities, I take it?

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is right.

Mr. MAHON. I will look into that.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, all of this discussion this afternoon, I think, will be worth eventually a good many hundreds of millions of dollars in savings to the people of America. At the first meeting of the full Committee on Appropriations following the outbreak of war in Korea I urged that then was the time to appoint a "watchdog committee" within the confines of our full appropriations committee, properly staffed, so that we could check on the expenditure of the billions of dollars which we knew then, a year ago this last summer, would have to be appropriated for our national defense. It was my hope at that time that such a "watchdog committee" would be set up, but the majority in control gave this suggestion no consideration.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, one of the members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANFIELD. I remember the statement made by the gentleman from Minnesota very well, and I subscribe to his statement here this afternoon. His warnings will be borne out in the days to come.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If I recall rightly, the gentleman from New Jersey subscribed to it at that particular time. I repeat, no consideration was given to our urging that everything possible be done toward eliminating as much waste as possible in the war effort through the establishment of such a committee.

Mr. CANFIELD. All our military history establishes this fact, that our military leaders are not careful, not prudent spenders, and by engaging in these watchdog operations we can save perhaps billions of dollars and avoid scandals which are being perpetrated this very day.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. Mr. Chairman, I was hopeful when the Committee on Armed Services came on this floor months ago and asked for an enlarged staff, saying at that time it was their purpose to check carefully into these enormous expenditures, that that job of checking would be done, but personally I have no evidence to show that that great Committee on Armed Services has done the sort of a job that we must have done. It is high time that we get down to business and watch as to just how these tens of billions of dollars are utilized for national defense. There is no one of us here but who wants to give for our national defense every dollar that is needed, but at the same time, Mr. Chairman, we do not want to spend any but what is absolutely essential.

A "watchdog committee," properly staffed, as I proposed 15 months ago, could have had gathered for our consideration here today a far more illuminating picture as to the needs of the armed services than we have had presented to us by the hard-working subcommittee which reported this bill. The staff members could look into at once rumors of wasteful spending, and our committee could then close the gate on that particular wastage. But to date, even in the face of this great need for such a watchdog committee, the majority in control refuse to create that needed check upon wasteful expenditure by the military. I think that it is high time to create that "watchdog committee" and screen as far as possible these enormous appropriations. It is our duty to follow through and see that scandals do not emanate in the expenditure of these huge amounts. I do not intend, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, to in any way evade my responsibility to look carefully into the expenditures of money which we make available in the line of appropriations. I am not reflecting in the least on the members of this great subcommittee. It has done the best job that it has been able to do, after many months of hard work, but those gentlemen are unable, physically, to do the job that they have to do. There simply are not enough hours in a day for them personally to try to follow through the use of these thousands of millions of dollars we have made available for our national defense.

You will all recall that we had quite a fight here on this floor last spring because of the lack of an adequate staff for each subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. That lack of staff shows up even more strongly than ever in this very important bill we are discussing this afternoon. We are legislating in the dark; we are appropriating in the dark. Unless we use some common sense and put on the necessary qualified men to search out the facts, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has so well stated, and give to the Congress the information it must have, then we are not doing our duty to the people of the United States to the best of our ability. A saving of several billions of dollars, which I firmly believe could be effected with no harm whatsoever to our war effort, would go a long way toward making unnecessary the tax bill now in conference. I sincerely trust that those in control will see fit to establish the safeguards against waste which many of us have urged should be done.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, before addressing myself to the question I had intended to speak on, in the debate a few minutes ago the gentleman from Florida suggested that all Members had had an opportunity to appear in connection with

matters affecting their districts. The first I knew that any matter within my district was being considered was when I had a call from my district yesterday asking me what they were going to do with the Canton-Akron Airport. There is no way I could have known that matter was coming up. I suggest that the Members do not have the opportunity to appear on matters affecting their districts because they do not know about them.

When I called the Department of Defense yesterday, after having been advised from my district that they were coming in to spend $1,558,000, the only information I could get from them was that they were considering putting a base somewhere near Cleveland, Ohio, and that the Canton-Akron base was under consideration. After more prodding and plugging at the question, I finally got the fact that they had determined to go into the Canton-Akron airport. As Representative of the people of that district, I was not given the opportunity by anyone to know that they were going in there.

When I made inquiries of the Defense Department as to whether or not they were considering some installations there, I was told they were considering the area, and later was advised after digging and going into the matter considerably, that they were not only considering the area, but were considering the Canton-Akron Airport, and had a complete installation set out, and not even the county commissioners, who own the airport—the county commissioners of the two counties, Summit County represented by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] and I, representing Stark County—the county commissioners who own the airport knew nothing about it. The managers of the airport knew nothing about it. The people who have charge, the trustees, had no idea that any consideration was being given to the use of the Canton-Akron Airport. The first I knew about it, as a Representative in Congress of these people, was when the people of the district called back to ask about it, it having been found in the report on the bill when it came out. Mr. Chairman, that shows that we as Members of the Congress have not had an opportunity to appear to discuss this matter as has been suggested.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct myself to another matter while we are considering the appropriation of more millions of dollars or billions of dollars for these agencies to carry on. I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the agencies and departments of Government continue to flout the will and desires of the Congress and the laws which we enact. I think we should consider, when we are debating these appropriation bills, that it is about time we cut off the appropriation for those agencies that refuse to accept the will and the laws enacted of the Congress. I have particularly in mind a recent regulation issued by the Petroleum Administration for Defense in the Department of the Interior, which has to do with the distribution of petroleum and natural gas. I am sure that the Members of the House and of the committee will remember when we considered the Defense Production Act, an amendment was adopted which was commonly referred to as the Bow amendment. The Bow amendment to that act provided, in substance, and simply, that where the States have regulatory bodies exercising the function and control and distribution of natural gas, that those States could certify to the President that they were controlling and regulating it, and that the PAD would have no authority or control over them. In other words, it was an amendment for States' rights to permit the States to continue the proper functions of the States, which at that time was threatened to be taken from them by the PAD. The Secretary of the Interior acting as the Petroleum Administration for Defense on the first day of October issued an order. Let me read to you who are interested in the States and in the question of States' rights, and the preservation of our form of Government, what this directive says and what the Secretary of the Interior says he has a right to do. He says:

> Where a directive, or an amendment or supplement thereto, is issued, it shall take precedence over the provisions of any general order, regulation, direction, or other action of the Petroleum Administration for Defense, over the provisions of any contract to which any person, to whom the directive, amendment, or supplement is issued, may be a part.

He further says that he may issue a directive which will take precedence over the provisions of any rate schedule, tariff, regulation or order of any regulatory body, including the regulatory bodies of the several States and Territories.

I have written, several days ago, to the Secretary for an explanation as to why he feels he has a right to issue directives taking over the functions of the regulatory bodies and utility commissions of the States As of this time I have had no reply from the Secretary of the Interior. He does not set out his jurisdiction in these matters, which he feels he may have, but there is this veiled threat in this regulation in which he says that any person who willfully violates any provision of any of the directives, amendments, or supplements issued pursuant to this regulation, may be prohibited from delivering or receiving any material under priority controls or other administrative action.

I say to the committee that here again is an agency, which we are supporting with our appropriations, usurping the functions of the States, and saying to the States that he may issue a directive overruling any regulation they may make on tariff rates or distribution.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think I joined with the gentleman at the time his amendment was offered, and I made a speech which followed his in the RECORD, if I recall correctly.

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. I understand you to say that he has now issued a directive which, in substance, overrules the Defense Production Act?

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Did I understand that correctly?

Mr. BOW. Yes. This regulation, and which the Secretary of the Interior, acting as PAD Administrator, says that he may issue directives. He says that his directives shall take precedence over the provisions of any rate schedule, tariff, regulation, or order of any regulatory body, including the regulatory bodies of the several States and Territories. In other words, he has said in this regulation that he can issue a directive which will take precedence over any State order, which would include distribution, not only of natural gas but of petroleum; and, under the NPA Act, as I interpret it, he has simply authority to intervene before regulatory bodies and present the position of the NPA; not to issue regulations or directives which would overrule any rate or tariff which they might make.

Mr. SPRINGER. I believe your amendment left it to the States which had regulatory bodies regulating these things, to regulate them entirely. Is that not contained within the Defense Production Act?

Mr. BOW. That is right. The so-called Bow amendment provided that where States had regulatory bodies exercising jurisdiction, they would so certify, and that no order of the PAD, or any other body, would take precedence over the State, and the State would retain its rights. What this does is again show an executive department attempting to usurp the functions of the States.

Mr. SPRINGER. I understand the gentleman has written the PAD Director. Is that correct?

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. And has had no answer?

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. I trust the gentleman will further pursue this and bring it to the attention of the House at the earliest moment. I think there are Members in this body who will seek to support him in that, to find out what the PAD Director is attempting to do and how he is attempting to usurp the powers which were taken away from him under the Defense Production Act, and returned to the regulatory body of the various States.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate on the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, be extended 1 hour, half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, does that include sufficient time for others of us who are interested in this over-all proposition to be recognized for some time? I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. The final 50 minutes on this side was yielded to our good friend, and some of us have been foreclosed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I will take care of the gentleman for 10 minutes out of that time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit while the House is engaged in general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

MUTUAL ASSISTANCE BILL REPORT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the mutual assistance bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5650, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable discussion pertaining to the presentation presently before the House. I am addressing myself to the part under consideration, which has to do with military appropriations. I want to say to the gentlemen who have interested themselves in the bill that has to do with appropriations for the dam at the Marine base on the Santa Margarita River in California that when the proper place in the bill is reached, when it is read for amendment, I intend to comply with my commitment to the committee and offer the amendment to give you a chance of removing it from the bill insofar as the dollar value pertains.

Now I should like to address myself to criticism that has developed on two different occasions in which this subcommittee has been unfortunate enough to be called upon in the passage of legislation to appear before the membership of this House and try to give to them the results of the hearings which we have been privileged to conduct. I do not know how the other members of this subcommittee feel, but I am going to say to the membership of this House that I as an individual having 14 years of experience on this Hill refuse to be used as a whipping post for somebody's political idiosyncrasies. I want you to understand that, before I go any further. Furthermore, this committee has spent 10 months, day after day and hour after hour, in conducting hearings in order that they might come to the floor of the House and make a proper presentation insofar as their ability permitted them to scrutinize the presentations of the Defense Department.

I would further like to call to the attention of the membership of this Congress who apparently at this time seem to think that this particular committee is one upon which they can vent their individual displeasure that they might well go back and look over the record of Congress and check their own votes and see who contributed to the need for these appropriations. You, by your legislative activities, established the office of the Secretary of Defense; that bill was presented to the membership of this Congress upon the premise that it would coordinate all military activities and that it would save a tremendous amount of money. This has not happened to date.

There have been 10 or more screenings of every presentation that has been made to our committee, if we can take the word of the individuals who appeared before the committee. I am going to say to the assembled Members of this House and to the people in these galleries and the Nation that the time has not arrived insofar as I individually am concerned when I think I have any justification to consider that every man who appeared before our committee in uniform is a liar. I think they have as much integrity as any man or men who are presently serving in this Congress on both sides of this Capitol, and I hold no reservations for any individual.

I further feel that Members of the House of Representatives, individually and collectively, before we start being too critical of the members of the Appropriations Committee, start your criticism back when the original authorization laws were presented by the legislative committees. Go back and check the facts, go back and see where the authority was granted; how did you vote then? Now you come along and ask us to make appropriations for them because of that authority that you have vested in the respective departments, yet you criticize us for following out the mandate of the Congress itself. I think it is a stupid operation. Those who contributed to that philosophy I personally and individually respect, but do not agree with them. You talk about the need for certain items in this bill, I would like to ask you this. If you put 50 new men on the business of investigating and screening requests or to go through the screening process that has been gone through as far as this bill is concerned, which cover at least 500 men, or if you put 500 more men on the screening of these bills who is going to delegate to themselves the authority to scrutinize the activities of the investigators and screen their reports? Every committee on both sides of this Capitol can be depended upon to do its best, yet we have investigators who sometimes make mistakes.

As far as I am concerned, I have reached the stage in these functions where I want to see what is going on individually, and I am willing to depend upon my experience and observations. As far as the appropriations are concerned and the subcommittee that is presently functioning in that capacity, I would like to call attention, if I may, to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. We are just as much prepared, Mr. WHITTEN, to get the facts as they apply to this bill as your splendid Committee on Agriculture. We have the same limitations.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to say to the gentleman that I have the highest regard for himself and every member of his subcommittee. If I did not, I think I would be wasting my time to get an investigation made and reported from that committee. It is the regard I have for the gentleman that leads me to believe he would make full use of information which could be ascertained, and, certainly, with all deference to the gentleman, any time they ask the gentleman and the members of his committee to sit here for 10 months, I believe you could and would use all of the help you can get in trying to bring these facts before you. If they are before you I know what your

committee and what you would do. I have served with the gentleman for years and I do not know of anybody who is more courageous, honest, or able to meet their responsibility.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman. I would like to say again that perhaps the mechanisms or devices that are made available to our committee are not enlarged to the degree that some people would like to have them; but, nevertheless, we are making the best use of the tools we have, I can assure the gentleman of that.

There have been some members of the House who said that they have no knowledge of what is going on in their own congressional districts. I can tell you this much: I know what is going on in mine. If you want to know what is going on insofar as appropriations are concerned you can readily start your ability to evaluate the concept by paying attention to what is being authorized, because, arbitrarily, when you authorize a certain procedure, whether it be the Armed Forces or otherwise, then appropriations follow to a degree.

I can say further that I have never known any member of my committee, and certainly the gentleman from Texas, with whom I have the honor to serve under as chairman, to deny any request that has even been made to our committee for appearance by any Member of this House, and even outsiders, that we have not granted it. There is no man who serves in this House, who is worthy of the position he occupies, that should not know enough of the procedures of the House to go down to the committee that is handling anything in which he is interested and manifest his interest.

Perhaps I have expressed myself rather forcibly, but I mean exactly what I said. It is time to quit using this subappropriations committee to clean up your own dirty linen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the debate the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] called for a "watchdog committee."

We now have a "watchdog committee," but it is not doing very much watching. The "watchdog committee" was created back in 1932. It was a merger of some 15 or 20 committees of the House, empowered to make all the necessary checks and investigations desired. If there ever was a time when there was need for that "watchdog committee" to function, it is now.

We cannot criticize the Appropriations Committee. I think the Appropriations Committee is doing an admirable job. They have a staff of some 16 or 18 persons and with that limited number of employees they are asked to do a monumental job. Every member of that committee is doing a good job. However, the committee of which I happen to be a member is not functioning. It is not proceeding as is provided under the rules of the House.

I have never worked harder either in my own business or as a Member of Congress during my six terms here than I have during this past year. But I am not overworked on the committee or by the committee. As a matter of fact, the work we are called on to do as Members of this body results from the confusion in the various Government departments and the orders and countermanded orders, and the fact that the people in our own districts—are confused. One day they receive an order and the next day they get a countermand directive from either the same department or another department. But the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has had not over 12 meetings of the full committee since the first of the year. We have four or five subcommittees, and I know the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], is doing as fine a job as he can with the limited tools with which he has to work. You cannot function properly when you are not provided with the manpower or the appropriation to do the job of watching these expenditures. These expenditures should be checked when they are made; not after. We are always locking the door after the horse is stolen. That seems to be the general policy of our committee. We investigate after the damage is done. It seems to me that this Congress, the Speaker and all Members, should read again the functions of this committee, the rules under which we operate, and then act in accordance with what the Congress intended. This committee could perform a valuable function, could serve a valuable purpose, if it would investigate the expenditures as they are made.

Mr. H CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the gentleman is making a wonderful contribution to the subject we have under discussion. I think the gentleman also will agree with me that we have no intention today—at least I as a member of the Committee on Appropriations do not have such intention—of criticizing the Subcommittee on Appropriations. We are criticizing the fact that we do not have the machinery to properly get down into every nook and cranny and find out the facts before we operate upon such a bill as this.

Mr. BENDER. My friend, we do have that machinery, to parallel the work of the Appropriations Committee, if the Committee on Expenditures would function as was intended.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct, but in addition to that he must have a qualified staff of the best accountants to operate under the direction of such a legislative committee.

Mr. BENDER. It appears to me that the greatest business in the world, the United States Government, spending almost a hundred billion dollars a year for defense and nondefense purposes, could well afford to provide the necessary funds to have the equipment and personnel to do the job of checking that is so essential. Take all these committees of the House and Senate, principally in the other body now exposing wholesale corruption, downright stealing and fixing after the damage has been done. Would it not have been better if these transactions had been checked when they were made.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman is discussing an issue that is not going to die today or tomorrow. Someday this Congress is going to do this, when it may unfortunately be a little late.

Mr. BENDER. All these post-mortem investigations are tremendously expensive. If we would spend half the money to watch the expenditures as they are made that we spend afterwards in having a circus performing resulting from the exposures we read of every day, you would appreciate the value and importance of what I am trying to say.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr SIKES], a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the armed services.

Mr. SIKES. Mr Chairman, no one of us claims this is a perfect bill. We have been working on it a long time. We have had hearings for a long time. We have taken the best advice we could get We believe we have a better bill than the bill on which we began work.

I said a few moments ago that an opportunity had been presented for every Member to appear who wished to appear before our committee to discuss these bases, and that is exactly what I meant. The committee did not poll the individual Members to determine if they wanted to appear, and I know of no precedent for that kind of action, but every Member who indicated to the committee that he wished to appear was welcomed.

This is not a new matter that is before the House. Military construction has been discussed for several months. It has been a good many weeks since the authorization bill containing practically the same bases and the same provisions was approved by the House and later became law. We are carrying out a mandate of the Congress when we bring you this bill. Ample opportunity certainly has been provided for every Member to acquaint himself with the provisions of the construction program.

Let us talk for a little while about the bill and its provisions. We have in this measure for the Army $1,159,000,000, for the Navy $927,000,000, and for the Air Force $2,112,000,000, or a total of $4,198,000,000. With this money we are buying time. Buying time is an expensive process. We realize that. We would like to be able to say that we do not consider it necessary to request this appropriation, but in all sincerity we feel there is no choice. We feel this is the most economical way to buy time, if you can discuss economy in connection with a $4,000,000,000 bill. It is a gamble, yes. If we do not get into a big war we are not going to need some or perhaps most of the construction provided in this bill. But if we get into a big war we are going to need them badly and need them immediately. We will need them much

more quickly than we could provide them after war started. When the big war comes, we will be hit on all sides without warning. We cannot start from scratch after it comes and get ready to fight it in time to save ourselves. So we are buying time; gambling with tax money against the necessity for even costlier expenditures. However, I would like to point out that the committee made some substantial savings in the bill. I say substantial savings because $357,000,000,000 is a pretty substantial amount. It is something less than 10 percent, yes. But $357,000,000 is still a great deal of money to save. We dug it out by nickels and dimes, a few hundred or a few thousand dollars at a time, where we thought we could. The total $4,000,000,000 is about the amount that the committee was able to save from the Senate version of the big military appropriation bill, which we brought back to you last week. Had we brought back the Senate version of that bill, it would have cost $4,000,000,000 more than the $57,000,000,000 appropriated for military operations this year. We saved that $4,000,000,000, and it just about takes care of the cost of the construction which now appears to be essential.

Frankly, I personally thought that more use could be made of existing facilities than is provided in this bill. I argued that in the committee. I also thought there were many instances where we could rehabilitate or remodel existing facilities rather than accept the greater cost of new facilities. We have some good examples where that has been done with a very material saving. I thought we should have followed the pattern of rehabilitation and repair more closely and by doing so I am confident we could have saved at least a few more millions of dollars.

However, in the final analysis, weighing the needs of the services, the possible requirements of the future, and taking into consideration the savings we have made, we feel it represents the best bill that we could bring to you on this occasion for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to address a question or two to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Expenditures, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. I should like to ask, Can you possibly justify the construction of the Grandview Air Base at Grandview, Mo.? The question is just that simple.

Mr. MAHON. Generally speaking, there is some fear in this country that in the event of a big, all-out war, the Nation will be subject to bombing attack. If the country should be subject to bombing attack, we would need to have interceptor fighters stationed at strategic points, and have their work coordinated with the radar screen set-up in order that important centers, such as the rail centers at Kansas City and other vital points, at Pittsburgh, Detroit, New York, Washington, and places of that kind, could be to some extent defended. There had to be some place to put these bases, and Grandview was one of the places selected by the Air Force. It seemed to me to be a good selection, although, of course, I would not be the one to pass final judgment on that.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman understands that the farther south you go, the farther you are away from the radar screen; is that not true?

Mr. MAHON. It all depends. When you go south, the farther away you are from one part of the radar screen and the closer you are to other parts of the radar screen.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to know how you can overlook the air base that was constructed at St. Joseph, Mo., or the deactivated air base at Ottumwa, Iowa. Why not expand one of the bases present within 30, 40, 50, or 60 miles of Grandview, Mo.?

Mr. MAHON. Study after study was made with respect to this matter. I happen to know that the President, himself, requested a special study to be made after he learned that the Air Force had selected Grandview. He wanted to know if the Air Force could more appropriately select some other base. But, the military people clung tenaciously to the point that Grandview was the best place. At St. Joseph, Mo., I believe that is the place, it was found that the runways could not be extended, and that the glide would imperil the lives of the pilots, and imperil the safety of the planes. Insofar as I have been able to determine, and I have carefully studied the matter, the decision was a reasonably good one and was made by the Air Force and not by higher authority. You can go to any other place and say, "Why didn't you do this or why didn't you do that?" But the decisions were made by the Armed Forces and they were approved by the House of Representatives by a vote of 302 to 5. The site was authorized by law.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman in his remarks earlier today spoke of the permanent or semipermanent construction that is being initiated under this program in the establishment of air bases. The base at Ottumwa, Iowa, is of brick construction; is that not true?

Mr. MAHON. I have not been to the base. It is a Navy installation, which the Navy requires. It is not as suitable for the interceptor program as the base at Kansas City. It is true that at Sioux City, Iowa, the base will be reactivated under the auspices of the Strategic Air Command.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman says the Navy requires the Ottumwa base. The fact is that the base is deactivated. That is how much the Navy requires it. The gentleman very well knows or should know, despite the testimony given by Lieutenant Colonel Noonan, as set forth in the hearings, that the President ordered an investigation of the Ottumwa Air Base for an entirely different reason. That was for the purpose of contract training of Air Force pilots and not for the purpose of establishment of an air base.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman should realize all the way through that as we go into this military build-up, if conditions continue to worsen, the Department of Defense is going to reactivate scores of additional bases.

Mr. GROSS. But we are not in an all-out war, and you are here spending a tremendous amount of money.

Mr. MAHON. For the defense and security of the Nation.

Mr. GROSS. But why do you not activate those bases that are presently nonactive?

Mr. MAHON. There are not enough nonactive bases that could be used that are in very satisfactory condition. About all that is left of most of the air bases that have not been reactivated is the runways. But this Ottumwa, Iowa, base is not regarded as the best solution to the problem. I do not think there should be any politics resorted to in the selection of military installations.

Mr. GROSS. As far as I am concerned, there is no politics in this business, but I am not here for the purpose of lending my support to the building of an international airport at Kansas City, with the taxpayers in my district in the State of Iowa paying for it. If the taxpayers of Texas want to do so, that is all right with me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say first that I appreciate the courtesy of my friend from New York [Mr. TABER] in yielding me this time. When you want to raise questions, apparently it is difficult to get time. This is a serious question, I want to say to start with. I raised this question in the committee. This is about the fourth or fifth time that I have raised this question. It is not new.

There is not a subcommittee in the Congress in which I have greater trust. I know the members will do what they believe to be right at any and all times. They have brought you a bill that I cannot say is out of line. But as fine as this committee is it can do a better job with more information. Our problem is the system, and because I have asked some questions some of my good friends seem to think I am being critical of this committee. Far from it. Because they are members of the committee they should not feel they have to defend every thing in this bill as being absolutely sound and all right. A few days ago I pointed out some of the things that happened a few years ago when I was on one branch of this subcommittee. At that time I was told all of that has been corrected now. That kind of thing does not happen. Money was wasted then. It will be again. What we need do is try to prevent such waste as far as possible instead of finding out about it after the fact.

We have a subcommittee of another committee headed by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]. He and his committee have done and are doing a fine job—but they investigate expenditures—after the fact.

There is no abler man in the House nor a more honest one than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and the same goes for Messrs. SHEPPARD, SIKES,

RILEY, DAVIS, and SCRIVNER, but what I seek is a force for their use to check these matters presented them. This Congress will spend $60,000,000,000, which will go through this subcommittee and as able and fine as the members are, they could well use the services of 30 men to check the items submitted.

The military men are fine citizens; just like other citizens of our country. They are doing a fine job, but they have not made a reputation in the field of saving money. If you want to know what the general attitude of the public and their belief can be sustained by the facts, just talk to anybody who lives near a military installation, anybody.

You may ask what I claim to know about this. During the last war I served on the Appropriations Subcommittee of the Navy; I served under the distinguished gentleman from California, and there is no finer man in Congress than HARRY SHEPPARD. He was on the right side at all times.

During the latter part of the war the Navy asked for several hundred millions of dollars to construct new air fields and other facilities. I asked the Navy: "Why do you not use some of these bases that the Army has abandoned?" They replied: "The Army has not abandoned any bases." They went out during the noon hour and came back with the letter showing the Army had not abandoned any bases; and yet the Navy wanted $350,000,000 for air bases with other facilities with the approval of the very fine chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]. We brought the Army witnesses before us, I questioned them about whether they had vacated any facilities. The Army said that they had not abandoned any of them, that they had just vacated them; that they had caretakers there. As a result the Army surrendered any number of bases to the Navy and the money was saved to meet other needs.

I am talking about accepting what the military says about it. They do not mean to misrepresent, but it is too big. Before we got the facts, I asked if they did check with the other services before they asked for such appropriation. "Oh, yes, we checked them; for 3½ years we have had a committee on the interchange of facilities for just such purpose; we have checked this thing. The Army has not abandoned them." As I say the Army itself said the same day they had not abandoned any such facilities.

We investigated that and found that the committee on interchange of facilities for 3½ years of its existence had never had a meeting. Do not tell me that we are mistreating our friends on this committee to ask that some check be made. No; it is too big, and I think this is demonstrated by the fact that they have had to sit day after day for 10 months just to hear the presentation of the Defense Department.

My good friend from California said this is just like the Department of Agriculture. It is and should have close inspection. I may say that I have had an investigation of the Department of Agriculture every year that I have served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations and I know we have saved millions of dollars and have not hurt the Department; we have helped it, and the folks at the top want to have it.

Here is another experience I had when I was on the committee handling naval appropriations. There was a request of us for $2,000,000 to consummate a contract between the Navy Department and the Standard Oil Co. On inquiry I found the Navy had leased Elk Hills oil reserve in California. I do not have exact percentages, but they leased the Elk Hills Naval Reserve to Standard Oil with the exclusive right to take out the oil in perpetuity from now on. The Standard Oil had about 20 percent of the land but got about 35 percent of the oil under the contract, and they got all the oil for 5 years. They said: "Yes; but the Standard Oil has got to pay it back at the end of 5 years." But on investigation I found that the rate of repayment was at such a low rate that it amounted to less than the interest on what they would have already gotten, which meant actually no repayment.

Now the Navy came in and said, "This is all right"; the Secretary of the Navy said, "Why, you are all wrong; this is 100 percent O. K." And many of my friends on the legislative Committee on Naval Affairs said to me: "You are just as wet as you can be. That contract is all right."

I reported it to the Department of Justice and asked that they look into it. The Department of Justice did look into it and held it was illegal The Secretary of the Navy then said in the record: "I pulled a boner." And we recaptured the Elk Hills.

Now, those are the little incidents that you happen to run upon. They are matters of public record. There are many, many others. I can tell you of one instance in an area not in my district where a military housing installation was being built near the end of the war. The contractor with a contract to tear it down had to wait for the contractor who had the contract to build, to complete building the installation before he could proceed to tear them down. You do not believe in that, I know?

I have the highest regard for this subcommittee, but I say that the chairman of my committee, and I say it here and now, should use the instrumentality which he provides in the way of investigators to give to this committee full information so that as far as possible these kind of things can be prevented. It is not humanly possible to sit 10 months, day after day after day, asking the best questions you can, depending upon what they bring to you, without anyone to send to check. This does not mean that there is any necessity for wrongdoing on the part of anybody. It is just too big. There is something in the very system that is conducive to waste, in my opinion.

Do you know how most of these requests originate? They originate in the field. Take, for instance, installation X. The Department asks, "What do you need?" There is a man in charge of that installation. That is his empire. He puts everything in. Sure, it is reviewed, it is trimmed all the way up, but do you not know that the man down there knows that is going to happen? Do you not know that the folks down there and the local people want officers' quarters, houses, and so forth, and the Atomic Energy Commission wanted and got an eighty- or ninety-thousand-dollar dog and cat hospital? It works its way from the bottom to the top. I cannot change any system here. I could be wrong about my ideas of a system. But do you not think as badly as you need to use every dollar you can get your hands on, for the best use it can be put to, that it would be better for the top defense people to decide what they needed? I mean, what their plans were in size, and so forth, and from the top determine what is necessary, then match that with what they have, instead of, as this record shows, originating down below and being reviewed from there on up to the top.

But whether I be wrong on that or not, I know that every man who has a military installation in his own area, and there are plenty of them in this House, will agree that the fine gentleman from Texas and the other members of the committee, in whom I have the highest confidence, who have worked undoubtedly harder than most anybody in this Congress, can use all of the information we can give them? And that is not to accuse anybody of wrongdoing. I am not saying that you should cut the military just for the purpose of saving money out of what it needs at a time like this. I say you should cut out waste in the military so that you can use the money for the things they say in their own bill they were unable to provide funds for. I say, do what you can to direct our funds in the right way for they are rapidly running out through inflation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I want to back up the gentleman from Mississippi in his statement that his investigations and the investigations made at his request into the Department of Agriculture have saved the taxpayers of America millions of dollars.

Mr WHITTEN. I appreciate the gentleman's statement I appreciate his fine service in this House because his efforts have always been directed toward saving public money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. TABER Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes

Mr. CANFIELD Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey

Mr. CANFIELD. I think the gentleman will find that one Harry Truman said at one time that the military were rather imprudent spenders.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman. The President made his name known through uncovering waste in military spending, I think, we would do much better to prevent it. I have had the privilege and honor of serving as

the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. During the time I have occupied that position, I have never come to you and told you, it is this way. I have always tried to say, this is the way I see it, then I have tried to tell you why I saw it that way. I have welcomed any questions or any questioning and you cannot give me too many facts as long as I am chairman of that subcommittee. I have had investigations each year and expect to continue them. I know the gentleman from Texas would welcome any additional facts, too.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Cl airman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I think the RECORD ought to show also that it has been obvious where we have investigated the Department of Agriculture, the administration of the laws have improved, too, as well as the morale in the field.

Mr. WHITTEN. It was a service rather than a hindrance and that is the way it would be here.

A $60,000,000,000 military spending program is too big for the folks who are in the military. It is too big for any five or seven or eight men. Only by checking and double checking can we hope to make our dollars go to the best purposes. Many think the Treasury is more or less inexhaustible.

It is not. We can keep printing money but I was in China during the war when they quit printing $10 bills because it cost more to print them than they were worth. But I do not know how much you can cut down the money that is in this bill. I say we ought to have an adequate staff of investigators who could check these matters. It would help to eliminate waste and if we do not save a cent, we could use the money saved for other very essential purposes.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN. The gentleman from Mississippi did not make it clear how many of those air bases had been vacated or abandoned.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, the Navy, as I recall, used 69 the first year and they ended up the second year using one-hundred-and-twenty-odd facilities, a little different from bases, and the Secretary of the Navy, if I may say so, commended the action of our committee and said that they had saved $350,000,000, all because we happened to get on to an instance of a vacant air field. As big as this bill is, there will be plenty such instances if we can find them. This subcommittee will make good use of any information it has for I know the members are that kind of men.

Let us spend at this time our money in the best way possible, and the very best investment the chairman of my committee can make is to give an adequate staff to the gentleman from Texas, because if they do have a chance at the facts, I have the utmost confidence in this subcommittee using such facts to the very best interest of the Nation.

I might add further the right-thinking people in the military, and most are that kind, will welcome such checks.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it crystal clear that the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations is anxious for every Member to constitute himself a committee of one to investigate any abuses in defense spending and report those abuses which come to his attention to the committee, not only today, but at any time he has an opportunity. I think it is true, as I said earlier, that some of this money is going to be wasted, and we want to cut waste to the lowest possible minimum, and we have investigators working for the committee today and we have them working every day, and we are always calling for investigations.

I think we must recognize that eternal vigilance, and capable, full, and complete investigation is necessary in all branches of the Government in order that we may achieve the maximum of success in our effort toward good government. I commend the gentleman from Mississippi for his hard work and for his unfailing loyalty to the cause of good government and national defense.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman joins, then, with what I said in this instance.

Mr. MAHON. I believe in greater vigilance and greater effort and every possible investigation of all waste and the offering of amendments by Members when they know where savings can be made. If anybody knows how reductions can be made in bases in his own district, I think it is his duty to tell the committee about the situation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Of course, the whole tenor of what I had to say was that the committee itself, in spite of all its efforts, cannot know, and certainly if we would be right in that, the average Member could not. You cannot afford to cut national defense without proof; you cannot afford to. I cannot afford to. I say, let us get the truth and then we will know what to do.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman correctly states it. Let us get the truth; and I think that is all we are striving for.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY].

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I am going to call attention to a few brief facts that I think indicate that this committee is carrying out the wishes of the American public, the Congress, and the considered decisions of the General Staff and the Department of Defense.

I am sure there is not a person in this hall who is not in favor of keeping the defense forces of this country in good shape, and I am sure there is not a person here who does not subscribe to the fact that we must have a large and modern Air Force. That is what we are striving to do under this bill. More than one-half of all the money in this appropriation goes to the Air Force, and a part of the money which is appropriated for the Navy under this bill goes to the Navy Air Force, to provide for them necessary facilities for their expansion. We cannot have an Air Force unless we have facilities for the men and for the equipment.

Bear in mind that no matter how fantastic or how amazing or how wonderful the weapons and the machinery we have today, it still takes the trained human mind and the skilled human touch to make these machines and these weapons operate. Without trained men it is no more than a wasted effort to have equipment, ammunition, and these wonderful things that we have invented and produced.

More than one-fourth of all of this appropriation is for modest living quarters for the men we are taking into the service, not plush living quarters, as has been indicated in some instances here today. I do not believe there is a person who has served in the Armed Forces in any branch who would brag on the luxuriousness of the quarters which had been furnished him, but the quarters must be sanitary, fairly convenient, and conducive of good health.

I do not believe there is anyone in this hall who wants to take the youth of America and put them into a camp without at least average facilities conducive to good health and some small comfort. So the simplest of living conditions have been provided.

Just as business and farming—and Congress recently has put additional mechanical equipment into its offices—are being mechanized and industry has improved tools, so the Army, Navy, and Air Force, in order to carry out their mission, must have improved mechanical equipment.

For instance, in an infantry division alone, the motor equipment has been increased approximately 40 percent over the motor equipment used in World War II for the same number of men just 5 or 6 years ago. To the average infantry division has been added a tank battalion and an antiaircraft battalion, requiring more equipment.

No longer can a soldier reach up over the mantelpiece, take down his rifle, and walk out the front door prepared to go into battle. A man must be trained to use these new, complicated, and ingenious mechanisms. More training facilities, more runways, shops, hangars, repairs and inspection facilities, and things of that kind must be furnished. It takes months for the average football team or the average baseball team to coordinate its men and produce a team in which the alumni of the institution may be proud, but only men are involved in this operation. In the armed services, where intricate machines and men are both involved, and where machines and men have to be coordinated, it takes longer to train adequately. No one wants to send the young men of America into battle without proper training, proper instruction, and proper practice in using these machines.

The Air Force is comparatively new. The question has been asked here as to where are all the World War II bases. I am sure the Military Establishment

cannot be accused of destroying these bases of their own free will and accord. They gave them up reluctantly because the Congress and the public asked them to do so. These bases were built hurriedly in a time of emergency, and during the stress of war, when materials were inferior and the workmanship crude. They were extremely temporary. Today, if you go into these bases, you will find that the plumbing is gone, the wiring is gone, the transformers are gone, and the furnaces are gone—sold and carried away with practically nothing left but the field itself. In some instances the utilities have been taken out of the ground and sold to subdivisions elsewhere to carry out the great home-building program that came about after World War II. So there is not much left to some of these bases. We had in all 1,933 of them. They were reduced in June of 1950—and I want you to remember this—in June of 1950, just a little over a year ago to 210 bases. The airplane groups were reduced from 243 in time of war to 48. Now we have built that Air Force back up to 87 groups with an over-all objective at the present time of 95. If you go beyond the 95, it is going to take additional money. But we have most of the money which we need to provide the 95 groups. You cannot have an airplane without a base. You cannot operate that airplane without modern runways and modern facilities for their inspection and repair. You cannot have those planes operating without men who are trained and skilled and practiced. So this bill today provides part of the foundation for the Air Corps, and the Army, and the Navy. I hope the bill will be passed without further objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, just for the information for those Members who are on the floor so seriously considering this bill, word has just been brought in that the score now is: Yanks, 4; Giants, 1.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 19 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time simply for two purposes. One is to commend the Committee on Appropriations for certain action taken relative to an appropriation for a certain project located on the Savannah River, and in order to furnish evidence which will deny certain charges that have been made by Members of Congress and certain newspapermen who evidently are trying to whitewash a rather sorry situation. It so happens that I did find time—I know that very few of us do find as much time as we would like—but on the 28th of August, I went to this project which is identified as project No. 8980. I did not go there as Congressman WHEELER from the Eighth District of Georgia, I went there dressed as a common laborer with overalls, khaki shirt and brogans, and so on. I was not recognized in my official capacity until I had finished a day of investigation. I was not allowed to see certain of the areas, but I saw enough to make me sick at heart. If I had been allowed to see certain of the areas where technical work is being done, or is supposed to be done, since I am not an atomic technician, I could not testify as to whether they were doing the work properly and with a minimum of waste. I do maintain, however, that I can within certain creditable bounds, testify as to the reasonable number of men that it should take to dig a hole 3 feet wide by 6 feet long by 4 feet deep.

The criticisms made of my investigation by Mr. Shockley of the Augusta Chronicle may be well made in the light of his own experience but the fact of the matter is that your great Committee on Appropriations has been sufficiently convinced of the validity of my arguments as to withhold appropriation of $284,000,000 until such time as further investigation can be made and further justification can be furnished to the committee. They are to be highly commended for having taken this action. Further honest investigation will, I am sure, disclose ample justification reduction of appropriations in this field.

In my experience I found that which is somewhat on the wasteful side, especially so in some particular instances. I personally observed 14 men with 3 foremen and 2 traffic directors performing the simple task of digging a small hole in the ground. The two traffic directors were required simply because of the fact that so many people were engaged on this particular project that they were spilling over onto the pavement, requiring a traffic director on either side to keep the cars from running down these so-called laborers.

I sat there in my automobile with my secretary, John Ellis, and actually saw people with shovels move up to this small excavation measuring about 3 feet by 6 feet, get one shovelful of dirt, toss it aside, smoke a cigarette, and by the time they had smoked the cigarette it was time for them to go back and get another shovelful of dirt.

That was just one example of the gross waste that I saw there.

That did not concern me nearly as much as something else I saw there. When I presented myself for prospective employment on this tremendous defense project as a laborer, I asked for a job as a carpenter; and I am a fairly good jack-leg carpenter, to use a colloquialism. I was told peremptorily that I must hie myself back to the city of Augusta, Ga., 25 miles away, and pay tribute to certain labor union racketeers who were holding forth there. I say "pay tribute" for this simple reason: After spending a day there and talking with boys who went to school to me, fellows who would take their hair down and talk to Professor WHEELER instead of Congressman WHEELER, I learned that the common practice carried on by these labor goons—and incidentally they are doing more to hurt the cause of good organized labor in this country than all the Taft-Hartley laws you ever heard of—John Doe goes to the head of the union in August, after having been sent there. In other words, he goes to the hiring hall. That is what it amounts to. The union official tells Doe he cannot issue him a union card, but that he will issue him a worker's permit, which will entitle him to work on the project. If he happens to be a metal worker, he must pay $50 to this union official and agree to pay the difference between that and $108, at the rate of $2 a day for each day he works. That card has no legal significance with the union, or otherwise. No sooner is that initiation fee paid than that card is pulled and sold, like a sack of potatoes, to some other prospective worker, denying the first man the privilege of working on this defense project.

I was told that I must go back to Augusta, get into the good graces of the union leaders, and that when and if the business agent saw fit, he would put my name on the list to come back out there and work.

Those are two of the major charges that I have made, generally speaking. I saw instance after instance of featherbedding, loafing, union racketeering, and sheer waste of taxpayers' money. Certain newspaper people in that area say that I do not know what I am talking about. Well, maybe I am a little unversed in how many people it should take to dig a hole 3 feet wide by 6 feet long. Maybe it should take 14 men with 3 foremen and 2 traffic directors. If it does, however, then we can never win the atomic race on which we have embarked.

When I returned to Washington from the project I did just what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has just finished suggesting that we do: Instead of going to the news gallery or somewhere to catch some cheap publicity out of that which I saw, I went to the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. THOMAS of Texas] handling the funds for this particular project and I told him what I had seen and what he would see if he were to go there. I told certain other people, including the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], a hard-working and able member of the subcommittee. At my insistence the Comptroller General sent investigators down there, and I have in my hand their very cursory report. Mr. Warren admits in his cover letter that it is cursory, that they were pushed for time, that they wanted to get this back to the committee before the committee finished with the bill. I refer those people who say I do not know what I am talking about to this report. Time will not allow me to read this report in its entirety, but to properly identify this investigation let me read for you:

INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGATIONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE SAVANNAH RIVER PLANT, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, PROJECT NO. 8980

A limited investigation and field payroll check has been made at the Atomic Energy Commission development located in western South Carolina near Augusta, Ga., identified as project No. 8980 and "Savannah River Plant." The scope of the investigation was limited to certain allegations made by the Honorable WILLIAM MCDONALD WHEELER, Representative from the State of Georgia, who recently visited the project unofficially, and whose findings were widely reported by the press. The major allegations made by

Congressman WHEELER, as a result of his observations, are:

1. That more employees are assigned to a given task or job than required, resulting in excessive loafing and manpower waste.

2. Employees are permittted to work Saturdays and Sundays at overtime rates, when the present stage of construction apparently does not warrant it.

3. Hourly wage rates paid by the contractor, the Dupont Co., are higher than the authorized prevailing rates for similar crafts in the immediate area.

Without burdening your patience I want to pick out a few of the salient findings as reported by these official, unbiased investigators:

1. Five men changing spotlight on pick-up truck.

Contractor's reply: No explanation.

2 Twenty-three men working in an area approximately 10 by 10 yards in size, obviously too small a space for efficient operation.

Contractor's reply: No explanation.

3 Seven men handling the cutting of a 6- by 10-inch timber; only four men were actually engaged in the process.

Contractor's reply: Contractor's safety policy and union requirements

4. Water Department truck with two men in cab, four in back. The men in back were holding hammers and carpenter's tools

Contractor's reply: Crew of four men were engaged in repairing and installing drinking-water barrels in the area.

5. Groups of two to six workers sitting around tool and work shacks.

Contractor's reply: Waiting for tools or materials, and such condition is common to large construction projects.

6. Two men leaning on plumber's vise, not working.

Contractor's reply: No explanation.

8 Many persons standing around, apparently supervisors.

Contractor's reply: Such employees were foremen and supervisors. Union rules and company policy require one foreman to each 12 workers. A review of time cards indicated the average number of workers to each foreman was about 10.

The following is an excerpt from the report made by the Comptroller General which sheds considerable light on the situation I am attempting to describe to you. If you are sufficiently interested you can get the complete report from the committee. The particular excerpt is as follows:

AEC policy with reference to wage rates for manual construction employees is set out as follows:

"(b) Manual construction employees: Minimum rates to be paid laborers and mechanics are determined under the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act. Employment conditions and additions to or revisions of the manual schedule will be established in accordance with rates paid and conditions prevailing in the project area or region, and/or the company's established practices. Approval of this office may be requested in establishing such rates under the contract."

FINDINGS

Several contractors in the Augusta area having large construction jobs under way were interviewed concerning prevailing wage scales for manual construction employees and the impact on the available labor supply by the Savannah River plant.

Clausson & Webster, one of the contractors interviewed, is presently constructing a $2,000,000 housing development for the Augusta Housing Authority under a fixed-price contract. Mr. J. S. Tate, superintendent in charge, said that 50 to 60 laborers, representing about 50 percent of total common labor force, are lost weekly to the Savannah River project as a direct result of higher wages paid by the du Pont Co., and reported easier working conditions. Other crafts, including carpenters and cement finishers employed by Clausson & Webster, have also been attracted to the Savannah River project for similar seasons.

Under the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act and present wage controls, Clausson & Webster are authorized to pay only 75 cents per hour to unskilled common labor and $1.75 per hour for carpenters. The wage rates offered and paid by the du Pont Co. are $1 per hour for common labor and $2 per hour for carpenters. Similar wage differentials are in effect for other crafts. The construction superintendent further said the added daily 1 hour overtime offered by the du Pont Co. provides a stronger appeal to workers than Saturday or Sunday overtime. In order to make up construction time lost as a result of labor shortages, Mr. Tate said he had resorted to Saturday overtime with an added weekly payroll expense of $750 to $1,000

Several of the contractors interviewed said they were much disturbed over the fact that they had to abide by Government wage regulations, whereas another contractor having a Government contract is apparently authorized to pay higher wage scales.

The business agents and international representatives of the carpenters' union, laborers' union and other crafts were interviewed with reference to the effect on local wage scales and labor supply by the Savannah River plant Findings were as follows:

1 Common labor is being drawn from all over the Southeastern States Some workers drive 200 miles per day to and from work at the Savannah River project

2 Other principal construction crafts, including carpenters, electricians and metal workers have been able to fill the Du Pont Co's requests for workers without seriously affecting the available labor supply for other local construction.

3. Since the beginning of construction at the Savannah River project, wage rates higher than local prevailing scales have been paid by the Du Pont Co for most crafts

4 Display-type advertisements were carried in Augusta newspapers advertising for workers at higher rates than local contractors were authorized to pay under Government wage regulations.

GENERAL

Interview with newspaper reporter

Following release of Congressman WHEELER's observations and allegations to the press, the Augusta Chronicle, local morning newspaper, assigned a reporter to visit the project and write a series of four articles on his findings with respect to manpower waste and loafing at the Savannah River project. Copies of the articles were secured and are included with this report as exhibits B, C, D, and E.

Mr. Arthur Shockley, the reporter in question, advised a GAO representative that he visited all restricted and unrestricted areas of the project and although escorted by AEC and contractor representatives, was given a free hand in choosing the area to be visited and in observing and interviewing workers. As brought out in his articles, Mr. Shockley's findings were apparently in direct conflict with those of Congressman WHEELER.

Attention is invited to the statement by Mr. Shockley that Congressman WHEELER did not visit any of the restricted areas, where the majority of the workmen are employed, and therefore could not have observed loafing or manpower waste except in unrestricted areas.

Interviews with local citizens

Three local citizens who addressed letters to Congressman WHEELER in support of his findings and allegations were interviewed. Two of those interviewed had no definite information to offer, their source of information being friends whose names they did not care to divulge. They highly praised Congressman WHEELER for his initiative in causing an investigation to be made of this matter.

The third citizen interviewed was Mr. L. L. Johnson, 2015 Central Avenue, Augusta, Ga., who until recently was employed at the Savannah River project as carpenter. Mr. Johnson voluntarily furnished the following statement of charges:

"I worked at the Savannah River project as carpenter beginning February 1, 1951, for a period of approximately 6 months. I would like to verify Congressman WHEELER's statement as to the waste of manpower and other things. I have seen so many men on a job that they were in each other's way. I do not expect an outsider to believe my estimate, but I have seen 200 men on a job that I believe 30 men could have handled. You say the Government has to have them there when the work does open up, but I have seen them there for 6 months. I, myself, have hauled away approximately 100 kegs of open and mixed-up nails when a job was finished to be re-stored in the warehouse If these nails were ever used again, it would cost more manpower to unmix them than they were worth.

"I have seen work torn down and rebuilt apparently in order to keep men busy. I have seen a pair of steps built on each corner of a 20-foot square structure when it looked to me that one would have done since they were only temporary and were torn down the next day. I have seen men driving in nails and other men pulling them out just to look busy.

"I have seen the whole area making 10 hours a day when half the men could have done as much work in 7 hours. On September 12 I was sent with 30 men to an area. Five of us were assigned to a foreman named Powell The first thing he told us was that we hadn't much to do, but try to look busy. I was with him 8 days and he gave me only 2 jobs in that time One job lasted about 2½ hours, the other about 4 hours. All the rest of the time we were supposed to try to look busy."

Atomic Energy Commission headquarters explanation

The allegations made with respect to the Savannah River project (and similar references to a comparable project at Paducah, Ky.) were discussed with Mr. W J. Williams, the Deputy General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, who furnished the following background and information:

Allegation No. 1: More employees are assigned to a given task or job than required, resulting in idle time and manpower waste.

Mr Williams pointed out that the Savannah River project and the Paducah project were both started about January 1951, and in the last 4 months the employees at the Savannah project have been built up to about 15,000 in round figures, and the Paducah project to about 11,000, that at the Paducah project, due to heavy rains, they did not get into effective work until last May. At present the Paducah project is only about 5 percent completed and the Savannah project about 3 percent; that it is pretty generally conceded that a job has to be at least 15 percent completed before it is properly organized—especially jobs of the kind here involved. Mr. Williams grants that there is idle time on the projects, but that there is no more idle time than could reasonably be expected in view of the nature of the projects, and he maintains that such idle time is being cut down all the time. A close over-all supervision is being kept by the Atomic Energy Commission, both at the projects and by its engineers from Washington who periodically visit the projects and make progress reports of the work.

Due to the nature of the work and to the urgency for its completion at the earliest possible date, some employees whose full services are not immediately required have

to be on hand so that the work may properly progress at such time as their services are fully required. This is further true due to the security measures required. Security clearances of the various craftsmen employed are required. Some delay is, or has been, involved in clearing the personnel security questionnaires by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. From the time the employee executes the questionnaire, from 30 to 90 days elapse before it is cleared by the FBI. And in order to cut down idle time as much as possible, some of the employees are given an emergency clearance by the Atomic Energy Commission, after taking fingerprints and examining FBI files; an emergency clearance takes about 2 weeks usually.

Another factor involved is that the Atomic Energy Commission wants the Savannah River project completed by next October. So the Commission is "pushing" Du Pont, the contractor; and Du Pont, in turn, to play it safe is using every effort to get enough men on hand to do the job. Due to the technical nature of the job involved, Mr. Williams explained, it is not possible to do the job in an orderly manner; it is necessary that the project as a whole progress at the same time—all of the units must necessarily progress as a group because of their interrelation. As a result this necessarily tends to make it hard to plan so as to keep everybody busy all the time, maybe too many employees are on hand at times but it cannot be helped. Again, the employees must have orientation and training to do the job. A man cannot be fired unless it is absolutely necessary. After he has been cleared and trained his services must be utilized if at all possible.

Allegation No. 2: Employees are permitted to work Saturdays and Sundays at overtime rates, when the present stage of construction does not warrant it.

Mr. Williams said that the men at Paducah are now working 6 days a week, 8 hours a day. Maintenance force only is employed on Sundays. At Savannah the men work 9 hours a day for only 5 days a week. Saturday work is done only in special cases such as concrete pouring and the like.

While Mr. Williams admitted that steel workers and some of the other special crafts work 9 hours a day and that this fact is used as an inducement to recruit workers in these special crafts and as a means of keeping them on the job, he pointed out that this is just a part of the reason they work 9 hours a day. He made it clear that the principal reason for these crafts working 9 hours a day is to advance the work. He said that while the 9-hour day is an inducement to keep the craftsmen on the job that it should clearly be borne in mind that these men do work.

Allegation No. 3: Hourly wage rates paid by the contractor, Du Pont Co., are higher than the authorized prevailing rate for similar crafts in the immediate area.

Mr. Williams said that the prevailing rates both at Paducah and Savannah, at the beginning of the projects, were submitted to and approved by the Department of Labor, which Department made surveys and established the prevailing rates by agreement with all of the crafts involved; that barring minor adjustments made in certain crafts, these rates now prevail.

General remarks

Savannah Project

Mr. Williams explained that the Du Pont Co. is hired to engineer, design, develop, construct, and operate the Savannah project. So Dupont hires the subcontractors. Atomic Energy Commission has personnel at the project, that is, Atomic Energy Commission personnel, for security purposes, for handling clearances; it also had fiscal auditors there, as well as engineering and administrative personnel. Atomic Energy Commission also exercises an over-all supervision of the project relative to award of contracts, etc.

Paducah Project

This is a little different set-up. While at Savannah River Du Pont has the job as a whole package, so to speak, at Paducah Atomic Energy Commission has direct contracts with three or four contractors for designing, engineering, and constructing the job. The McGraw Construction Co. has the prime contract for construction; the Carbide and Chemical Division is the purchasing, designing, and operating contractor for Atomic Energy Commission; and Giffels & Vallet are the architects.

Wabash Project

This project is at Dana, Ind., about 20 miles out of Terre Haute. It is another job tied in with the Savannah project. About 5,000 men are employed there and the project is about 60 percent complete.

Strikes at Paducah

There is a strike at Paducah project by the metal workers, they want travel pay in addition to their regular pay. Mr. Williams said that they had a half dozen strikes at the beginning of the project. This was followed by about 2 months with no strikes. Then the present strike came on. He said there seems to be a pattern to these strikes. He explained that in connection with the Paducah project that the Tennessee Valley Authority is building a 600,000 kilowatt electric plant for Atomic Energy Commission at the Paducah project; that Electric Energy, Inc. (which is a corporation formed by Kentucky Utilities, Union Electric, Mill Sant Utilities, Southern Illinois Power, etc.) is building another 600,000 kilowatt electric plant for Atomic Energy Commission on a site about 7 miles from the Paducah project. Mr. Williams explained that there has been a series of strikes; the pattern is that there will be a strike at the Electric Energy, Inc., job, and when it is settled then it will be followed by a strike at the Tennessee Valley Authority job, then another at the Paducah project and so on.

Continuing with another part of the report:

No 9: Numerous trucks observed within restricted areas with two and three men in cab and occasionally two to four in the back.

Contractor's reply: This condition also noted by contractor's representative escorting GAO representative who said he could offer an explanation.

That was in the restricted area. He goes on to report on the unrestricted area. The first observation here is:

1. On two separate work days five to six men were observed standing under a tree near the entrance gate to the firing range pit talking and apparently loafing. No work of any type underway at this site.

Contractor's reply: Could not explain.

2. Gravel pit on highway near Ellenton, S. C, with ¾-yard power shovel and six idle workers Contact with the group disclosed the workers' classification to be—

One grade foreman; one shovel operator; one shovel oiler; three flagmen on highway at pit entrance.

I will not go into detail much further, but I do want to point out one or two more glaring ones here:

3. Two workmen observed sitting in warehouse doorway on cement bags and talking. The time was noted and on a revisit to the area 1 hour later, the same two men were still idle.

Contractor's reply: No explanation.

4. At a cross-road intersection, where a ditching operation was in progress, two men were observed leaning against a parked truck and six laborers working in nearby ditches.

Mr. Chairman, I will not have the time and you would not have the patience to listen to the full report on this one particular project. But here it is. It is available to you, having been sent to the committee.

In the beginning I said I wanted to commend the committee for its action. I was making reference to its action in reducing the appropriation for this particlar project from $484,240,000 down to $200,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, when I said I wanted to commend them for this action, I did not mean to imply that I do not want the Atomic Energy Commission to have all of the money, all of the materials, and all of the manpower that is required to do a decent job. I did mean that I thought their action was extremely wise in that perhaps it will cause some of these people to sit up and take notice, and begin to realize that this money comes from somewhere else than at the direction of some employee down at Treasury Department pushing another button and rolling off some more worthless paper money. I do not particularly care how much they pay a man to work so long as they do not disrupt the labor picture in that particular area and so long as he does work commensurate with the amount he is paid. I do object to a system where we are so scared and tend to pussyfooting side so much that we will allow a bunch of labor racketeers to hold American citizens up, as it were, just as surely as if they were sticking a gun in their back, making them pay tribute for the privilege of working on a defense project.

I do not object to legitimate union activities, but when you start to causing a man to pay tribute to the tune of $108 to do some metal work on an atomic energy plant in these crucial times, then we have reached the place where we kowtow too definitely and too completely to some so-called labor leaders who are nothing more or less than cheap, chiseling racketeers. Further investigation will disclose the fact that some of the cheapest and most unscrupulous labor racketeers to be found anywhere are in almost complete charge of the labor situation at the Savannah River project. They should be apprehended and punished as saboteurs, for that is exactly what they are.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman, who is certainly making a great contribution to this discussion, can tell us what kind of a contract this is. Is it one of those cost-plus things? Perhaps that might explain some of this.

Mr. WHEELER. It is a fee contract. The Du Pont Co. is to do this job for $1 plus the complete cost of operation of construction. Another contract will cover the actual operation of the plant when it is constructed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Can the gentleman tell us then how the profit comes

to the contractor? He turns in his bill for the whole thing, and then his profit is included, is it?

Mr. WHEELER. I have not learned as yet on what basis the subcontracts are let. I was speaking merely of the prime contract, the one which the Du Pont Co. has with the Atomic Energy Commission.

I want to make it as clear as possible that I do not want anything I say or anything I do to interfere in any degree with the building of the atomic-energy project on the Savannah River or at Paducah, Ky., or anywhere else, but I do feel that when we, without asking anyone's permission, authorize people to reach into the homes of this country and take men, send them to Korea or anywhere else on this earth, we should at least require a condition to exist back home where that boy's brother or father or friend, who does not maybe qualify for the military service, can go and make his contribution to the building of atomic bombs, hydrogen bombs, or any other mechanism of war that we require. I saw evidences of this same thing during World War II. If you go down to some projects in my section and start digging, I am sure you could dig up some rusty nails by the keg, where workers were ordered to bury them so as to not have to account for them, making time. How do you think those boys in Korea manage to make time? How many of those boys in Korea had to pay $108 for the privilege of going to that God-forsaken place to fight a bunch of heathens? Did we write into the Draft Act the requirement which said that those boys, in order to bear arms in the defense of their country, would be required to pay $108 or $50 or any other amount? One makes just as much sense to me as the other. It makes just as much sense to me, I emphasize, to charge a draftee $108 for the privilege of being drafted into the military service as it does to charge some carpenter or bricklayer or metal worker $108 for the privilege of making his contribution to an atomic-energy project. That is not the America I knew at one time and I am not nearly as old as I look. The mileage makes me look this way.

I want to commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] for the suggestions he made before I took the floor. We are all too prone to stand up and shell the woods with broadcasts in criticism of this department or another department or project. I wish more of you would go see for yourselves, and I do not mean to discredit these gentlemen of the Committee on Appropriations. They have an intolerable task. I am sure that if you would do that, and if you found the sort of thing I found, they would show the same spirit of cooperation with you that they did with me, that they would send some investigators and they would hold up some appropriations until a final investigation had been made.

I apologize for taking the time of the House this afternoon on this very important measure. I did think it would be worth while to call some of these things to your attention. I hope I have not created the impression that I am straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. I hope this particular project is the only place you will find this sort of thing going on, but I am convinced to the contrary. The very fine and distinguished members of Subcommittee on Independent Offices, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. GORE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. YATES, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. COUDERT, and Mr. COTTON, have all done an outstanding job in withholding from the Atomic Energy Commission $284,000,000 until such time as the waste I have cited can be fully investigated and eliminated.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in this discussion. I have been interested in it because the matter of wastefulness particularly in military expenditures has been of great concern to me. I was interested especially in the observations of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] a few moments ago concerning happenings at the Savannah River project.

I have had and still retain a deep conviction that we are making a lot of expenditures in the military that are unnecessary. I believe we can save millions of dollars if we can attack the problem intelligently and systematically. The question that is involved is where and how can we make these savings.

It seems to me that the matter under discussion is a double-barreled proposition. There is need for more careful study with respect to both authorizations and appropriations. Reference has been made today to the responsibility which each Member of the House who supported the authorization bill has for the appropriations bill now before us. Each such Member of the House does have a responsibility and the Appropriations Committee in the bill before us seeks to provide the funds to carry out the work which was previously authorized.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I feel deeply that there are many items in that authorization bill which could and should be eliminated. They were not eliminated by the committee because the committee simply did not have the time or the facilities to eliminate them or to study that bill as carefully as should have been done. I think the same thing applies to the Appropriations Committee. The manner in which the authorization legislation was presented to the Congress and the manner in which the appropriation legislation was presented to the Congress has had more to do with the condition of this legislation than any other one fact.

I think if we had organized the Congress in such a manner that the committee had had a more adequate staff we might have had some improvement, but even with the best organization possible, in the time we have had it would not have been possible to give the study and the thought and the careful analysis to either the authorization bill or the appropriation bill which they should have had.

We came in here at the beginning of this year with a critical situation, with an essential need to build up our military establishment, to build up our defenses. The need was and is urgent. We have had only a limited time in which to act on these measures. The Committee on Armed Services did the best it could with the authorization bill, realizing when it was brought out that it was not a perfect measure. I think the same thing applies to the Appropriations Subcommittee which handles the legislation now before us.

I want to make this observation. During the time this measure was under consideration by the Appropriations Committee its chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], called me on the phone and said, "I understand that your Subcommittee on Expenditures has been looking into certain military expenditures." He said, "I would like you to tell me a single instance where we can cut this bill." I had to tell him that I could not point to a single place where I could prove that he could cut the bill. I can see a lot of places where I think it can be cut, but unless we can demonstrate that the military are wrong in the presentation they have made, we cannot cut the bill. The risk is too great.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Operations of the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments, during this year we have had our staff working on certain aspects of military expenditures. We are at the moment pursuing a study which has been in progress over a considerable period of time in connection with the procurement of automotive parts. That involves the expenditure in excess of $1,000,000,000 a year. I believe by the time we conclude that activity, we will have demonstrated ways in which a substantial percentage of that billion dollars can be saved in the future. The Government Operations Subcommittee proposes to go into this matter of military public works for which this bill provides funds. This is the matter which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] spoke on a while ago. Our staff has been working on this matter preliminarily for some little while. I think the Congress realizes that the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments does not have jurisdiction until after an authorization has been passed, and after an appropriation has been passed. We do have jurisdiction with respect to the use of the funds by governmental agencies, after they have been appropriated. We have a responsibility with respect to the efficiency with which the funds are expended, and the economy of programs which are inaugurated. Our subcommittee, with a capable staff—perhaps not adequate—but with a capable staff intends to go thoroughly into this military public works program. In that connection, I do not believe we can be of maximum effectiveness, unless our work is coordinated and unless we are working with the complete cooperation of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations. I have discussed this matter both with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON],

chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I sincerely hope that we may have the full cooperation of both committees in our pursuit of this activity. I say we have a competent staff, and we expect to do a competent job.

There is one other thing I think I ought to mention, which was touched on by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]. It is a difficult problem even with an adequate staff for members of the committees, and particularly the committee chairmen to be certain that the results obtained by the staff people are what they ought to be because the investigators have to be screened, and their work has to be screened very carefully. I want to assure the House that the Subcommittee on Government Operations intends to do its best on its study of this military public works program. I sincerely hope we will have the cooperation of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services in our effort

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say with due deference to all Members of the House, patriotic, conscientious men who work hard in the interests of our country, that in my judgment they are better politicians generally than they are businessmen. That goes for those in the Government, those in the executive departments of Government especially, outside of the military. We have the biggest corporation on earth here to direct. We are talking about spending, and probably will spend from $60,000,000,000 to $100,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, as a businessman all my life, may I say, we need better business application in the procurement of all of these things that we need for the military.

That leads me to a point that has been on my mind for the last number of months, especially since the war in Korea. Here we are going to spend $60,000,000,000 for national defense. The thing that bothers me is that we could save, in my judgment, billions of dollars; we could prevent these expensive investigations that come up after the horse has been stolen out of the barn, if we spent only $1,000,000 alone out of the $60,000,000,000, in getting together a staff that would work the year around, that would make full investigations and that would give the committees the information we need before voting for appropriation bills like this. I think if we would apply better business policies; that is, to spend a million dollars for a hundred of the best men we could get, to staff the Appropriations Committee, the Armed Services Committee and other committees and stop this waste, and see that we got a thousand dollars worth when we spent a thousand dollars. We would save by such action billions of dollars.

But we have gone on from year to year since I came here and we have not done it. I think we are failing the people. When you read of the waste that has just been delineated to you by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] it brings to my mind this fact: Can we carry on this sort of waste and buy the things we have to buy in military procurement, and if we are forced into an all-out war, can we carry this waste and build the military machine that will protect this country and protect the freedom of the people? Can we do that without utter collapse financially and wreckage of this Nation? I have urged time and again that we provide for trained experts, and get all the information we need so we can intelligently vote on these appropriation bills.

The Congress throughout the years has failed to provide a staff of businessmen that is necessary to get to the bottom of the facts, so that we can legislate intelligently, and so that we can prevent the waste of billions of dollars of the peoples' money. How long will we grope in the dark and waste billions of dollars?

Mr H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman who has always fought for economy is making a very worth-while contribution to this discussion. I want to reiterate what he has just stated, that certainly no business corporation expending $60,000,000,000 would hesitate to provide $1,000,000, or one part in $60,000, to see to it that that money was properly expended.

Mr VURSELL. The gentleman is unquestionably right.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr VURSELL. Briefly.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Would not the existence of such a qualified investigative staff, working all the time wherever specified by the proper committee of the Congress, prove to be a very salutary influence as far as efficiency is concerned?

Mr. VURSELL. It would seem to me it would.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. Would it not be the part of wisdom to set businesmen in with those men in the military, who have not had much experience in business, to help buy the billions of dollars worth of things that we need, so that we would have lesser inflationary impact on the economy of the country? Could we not save a great deal of money in that way? Doubtless the waste which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] has talked about is being carried on all over the Nation. This could and would be stopped if we applied better business management and had a sufficient group of experts who would help stop this waste in their cooperation with the Congress.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee when it comes to building barracks what is the general average of cost per man per barrack in the military project here?

Mr. MAHON. There is a lot of information in the hearings on that. Twenty-four hundred dollars per man, I believe; but, of course, it all depends on how much space you give the man.

One fortunate thing about this whole construction program is that in continental United States contracts will be let on a competitive bid basis which will give us much greater assurance of economy and less chance of waste. There is going to be waste, but the chance of waste is not so great when you have competitive bidding. Furthermore, civilian construction is receding in many areas and contractors are hungry for contracts.

Mr. VURSELL. I have been told by the Quartermaster's department that in one important defense area they had to advertise several times for bids that the contractors wanted from $4,000 to $6,000 per man for building a barrack. They finally got them down to where they let some contracts. It would seem to me with the reference the gentleman made that we should not go into a community unless we receive the cooperation of the community, should require and investigation in the area to which I refer, and I will give the committee the information I have.

Mr. MAHON. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VURSELL. Something ought to be done. I am told that they are paying painters $30 a day and that they are taking the painters from all around the area; that there is exorbitant cost and waste and hoarding of manpower throughout this entire area, and that doubtless is going on all over the Nation. That is why I reiterate that we ought to adopt better business principles and hire the men necessary to give the Congress the information it needs. Such action followed through would save out taxpayers billions of dollars. It would increase the confidence of the people in their Congress. Let us not forget, our first line of defense is the financial solvency of our Nation. If that goes, all is lost, and we will have nothing to defend.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we have concluded debate on this side. I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Corps of Engineers

Military construction, Army: For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installation, and facilities for the Army, as authorized by the act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.), the act of January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, 81st Cong.), and the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, 82d Cong.), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed $10,000,000 for advance planning as authorized by section 504 of said act of September 28, 1951; to remain available until expended, $1,159,326,198.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOGGS of Delaware: On page 8, line 17, strike out "$1,159,326,198" and insert "$1,158,520,748."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Delaware has posed a very important question with respect to Bethany Beach, which has been discussed with members of the committee previously. I am authorized to say for the committee that it is willing to accept this amendment and give greater time for the local community and the State and other officials of his area to work out some arrangement which we hope will be satisfactory to all concerned. In view of the questions which have been raised, we think the amendment is well grounded and the committee is willing to accept it.

Mr BOGGS of Delaware. I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. This action, in my opinion, will be very wise.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply cuts out of this supplemental appropriation bill the sum of $805,450, which has been requested by the military for an installation and location project incident to an antiaircraft artillery firing range and training station in the vicinity of Bethany Beach, Del.

At the outset let me give complete assurances not only for myself but on behalf of the people of the State of Delaware of our sincere desire to cooperate in every way possible with our Nation's necessary defense efforts. About this I think there can be no doubt. However, we believe that cooperation and understanding work both ways and must necessarily work both ways to accomplish the best results

There is a long story behind the offering of this amendment. The story is too long for me to tell in detail, but briefly this fund is being requested by way of an appropriation before the Department of the Army has worked out an agreement with the appropriate officials of the State of Delaware and others to take over some 468 acres of land owned by the State of Delaware and private parties. The expenditure of this amount is dependent upon the working out of a satisfactory agreement. This appropriation is opposed at this time not only because an agreement has not been reached but because appropriating the sum now would work a sort of squeeze-play on the people and officials of the State of Delaware when negotiations for an agreement are undertaken. This action is resented and considered by many as unusual, high-handed tactics on the part of the Army, especially so since the Army not long ago started a condemnation proceeding which was resisted by the people of Delaware, the Governor and other officials of the State, including the congressional delegation. As a result, the Army withdrew the condemnation proceedings to take the lands in this area for the purpose of an antiaircraft artillery firing range.

Further negotiations are contemplated, and I am advised this morning that tentative appointments have been set up. However, this sum should not be appropriated in this bill at this time until agreeable arrangements have been worked out with the officials of the State of Delaware and a public hearing with the people in the area involved.

Insofar as time will permit, may I show you here on this map the some 22 miles of Atlantic Ocean coastline which we have in the State of Delaware. You can see on this narrow strip of land between Rehoboth Beach, Del., and Bethany Beach, Del., the general area the Army desires. You can see that along this narrow strip of land there is a main highway, which, if this land were taken over for antiaircraft firing purposes, would necessarily close at different times during the firing period the use of this highway to the public, which is a matter of important concern to the people of the area.

You can see that in this area is the Indian River Inlet leading into Indian River Bay and the Indian River. This area supports a large fishing party industry. This industry would be seriously jeopardized by too extensive artillery firing in the immediate area.

You can see further that at both ends of this narrow strip—Rehoboth and Dewey Beach at one end and Bethany Beach and Fenwick Island at the other—there are large year-round as well as summer residential areas, where normal trade and business activities of the community continue year-round. Taking this precious bit of area would add greatly to the congestion in an already busy area.

In addition, we have here at Lewes, Del., a great fish-oil manufacturing industry—two large establishments supported by many ships. These ships come up along the Delaware coast to get into the harbor at Lewes with their cargo. Extensive firing activities in the area will interfere with this industry. In addition to that, right off Lewes, Del., is the Delaware breakwater, where all the ships that go up through the Delaware Bay and River to Wilmington, Del., Chester, Philadelphia, Philadelphia Navy Yard, or through the Delaware and Chesapeake Canal to Baltimore, enter to take on their pilots, and many of these ships coming up from the ocean naturally come in rather close to this contemplated firing area. This probably could be worked out so that no damage could be done. However, you can see that it raises a serious consideration.

I mention the above just to give some idea of the problems involved here and why the people of Delaware and the officials of the State are concerned and careful in the consideration of whatever proposals the Department of the Army may desire to make. You can see why the people of Delaware are hesitant in giving up this precious bit of its small coast line. This is especially true in view of the fact that the Delaware people have studied the maps of our coast line and find large areas and many miles of coast line that apparently seem uncongested and which probably would make more appropriate and more desirable sites for such a proposed long-term establishment of this nature.

If it is possible to find an area which could be utilized without disrupting the economy of the local community, as would be the case in Delaware, and without taking practically all of what is left of Delaware's Atlantic seacoast, it would seem natural, proper, and reasonable for the Delaware people to insist upon the Department of the Army to make every effort to locate this proposed establishment in such an area. It seems to me that we are not unreasonable in insisting upon this position under the circumstances and when it is clearly evident that there are many other areas along the coast which could be utilized without interference with the life and economy of the areas involved.

May I point out that knocking this amount from the appropriation bill here in the House today will not interfere with negotiations between the Army and the officials of the State of Delaware, and if those negotiations result in agreement in the course of the next week or 10 days, this amount could be put in the bill when it reaches the other body; and if even later an agreement is reached, the supplemental appropriation bill which normally comes up in the early part of the session could include this amount and there would be no objection, I assure you. I cannot see where there would be any delay whatsoever in going forward with the defense program under these circumstances.

This is not an idle gesture on my part. This is a very important matter—a matter of deep concern to the people of the State of Delaware—and I hope my colleagues in the House will recognize the interests of the people of Delaware in voting to eliminate this item at this time until an understanding and agreement has been reached. I assure you that if anyone of you were to make the same plea on behalf of the people of your area, I certainly would respect it and cooperate with you to the fullest in your efforts to see that your people whom you represent are given the best and the most courteous of consideration and understanding by the authorities of our Federal Government. This is all I am asking in this case. Your support will be greatly appreciated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and that anyone desiring to offer amendments may be permitted to offer them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHEPPARD: On page 9, line 13, after the comma, strike out the figure "$909,024,460" and insert "$897,628,460."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, this has to do with the dam at Santa Margarita Marine Base in California, which we have discussed on the floor previously in general terms and is in accordance with our agreement with the gentlemen who are interested.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 10, line 13, strike out "$2,112,172,550" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,099,351,550"; and on page 10 strike out lines 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and line 20 to the colon and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That no part of the funds provided in this bill shall be expended at Grandview Air Terminal, Mo."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to accept the challenge of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] to offer an amendment to this bill. I was very much surprised that the Committee on Appropriations left in this bill an amount of almost $13,000,000 for the construction of an air base at Grandview, Mo. My amendment simply eliminates the nearly $13,000,000 that is proposed for the construction of an air base at Grandview by deducting that amount from the total appropriations contained in this section and it provides, of course, that no air base be constructed there.

The limitation placed in this bill to the effect that no part of these funds shall be expended for construction of facilities or structures at Grandview Air Terminal, Mo., until the city of Kansas City has conveyed to the Government the fee simple title to lands required for the base or has given the Government at least a 25-year lease to such land on a nominal rent basis is little more than window dressing.

Members of the House well know that I opposed this scheme of building a super-duper airport for the Kansas City area when the authorization bill was before the House several weeks ago.

Further investigation documents my contention that the proposed $13,000,000 hand-out to the Grandview, Mo., Airport, which I have opposed and will continue to oppose, is simply a scheme to turn an almost dead horse into a big money winner—a proposition under which the Truman family and insiders can scarcely help but benefit.

Since 1941, when the city of Kansas City bought the Grandview Airport for a million dollars, the return on the investment amounted to little more than a 1,300-bale hay crop in 1949. The place is about 16 miles south of Kansas City and therefore of little interest to commercial airlines, with no regularly scheduled flights in or out.

But now that the field is slated to become headquarters for the Central Air Force and the Continental Air Command, as disclosed on the floor of the House of Representatives by the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee who supported the deal, a gold rush is on, extending several miles north and as far as 30 miles south, down to and including a town by the name of Peculiar.

According to a nearby resident, owners of land near the airport are asking as much as $1,500 an acre.

There is every indication that those in the know have long been aware that a deal was cooking at Grandview, judging from the activities of Enos A. Axtell, who will be remembered as Truman's hand-picked candidate in 1946 to purge from Congress Roger Slaughter, a Democrat who refused to knuckle under the Truman machine lash. With Truman's backing, Axtell defeated Slaughter in the Democratic primary, which was notorious for the still unsolved vote stealing scandal. But Axtell lost in the general election to Albert Reeves, Jr., a Republican.

Since then, Axtell has been inactive on the political surface, but busy around Grandview buying up land. I am informed he now controls 440 strategically situated acres, including his home property and 120 acres, the latter purchased last May at an undisclosed price. In addition, he is said to have contracted to buy 80 acres at $500 an acre.

Axtell admits that he hopes to convert into profitable housing projects his home property, the 120-acre tract and the 80 acres under contract, and this is where the Truman family may come in. To carry out his housing plans, it is generally agreed that Axtell will need the cooperation of Vivian Truman, who is the President's brother as well as the head of the FHA in Kansas City. Vivian Truman is quoted as saying that the FHA is prepared to grant loans for housing projects at Grandview.

Real-estate men are of the opinion that the airport deal will at least triple the value of Axtell's home property, which he calls the Circle A Ranch but which reportedly is suitable for little more than pasture.

It should be pointed out that the boom around Grandview is not predicated solely upon the proposed initial handout of $13,000,000. With the project will go an annual payroll for some 6,000 personnel and totaling an estimated $13,000,000 a year. To the boomers, this of course means heavy sugar is to be made not only in land, but in businesses and housing.

What about the Truman family at Grandview? The President lived there when he was a young man. His brother, Vivian, and his sister, Mary Jane, still live there. The Truman property is well located for the boom, consisting of 394 acres not far from the airport, and 4 lots in town. The Truman land lies on both sides of Highway 71, adjoining Grandview, with another paved highway running through the property. Is there any doubt that these highway frontages are made to order for subdividing, and at an enormous profit?

The Truman family's 394 acres are all that are left of original family holdings of 2,000 acres, accumulated before the Civil War by Solomon Young, the President's maternal grandfather.

During the depression, the land which over the years had dwindled to 394 acres, was mortgaged to Jackson County to secure a $35,000 loan granted to the Trumans out of county school funds. The loan was foreclosed in 1940 when Truman was a Senator and when his fortunes were at a low ebb. I might add that the year before that the late Boss Tom Pendergast, was sent to prison for income-tax evasion.

From 1940 until 1945, the land was held by a Kansas City real-estate man who was friendly to Truman. In 1945, Truman, who was then Vice President, recovered the 394 acres. Exactly how this manipulation was brought about is not known. Suffice it to say that the Truman family now owns the 394 acres near where Truman administration forces are determined to spend initially $13,000,000 of the taxpayers' money on a hayfield airport despite the fact that the same authorization bill provided $22,462,000 for another airport at Knobnoster, Mo., 59 miles east of Grandview, and when an Air Force installation isn't being used at St. Joseph, Mo., some 50 miles north of Grandview, along with other comparatively nearby deactivated bases in Iowa and Kansas.

Meanwhile, returning to the boom fever, the town of Belton, population 1,200, 5 miles south of Grandview, is losing no time. About 2 months ago it voted to annex almost 2 square miles of territory. The city fathers of Belton believe their town is in better position to cash in than Grandview. They point out that Belton has a WPA sewer system, whereas Grandview is a town of several hundred septic tanks, with no city sewer system.

One resident sums it up as follows: "When the wind is right, Grandview really smells."

And with the airport deal in the wind, it is not just the septic tanks.

No, it is not just the septic tanks at Grandview, and it is not just the proposed airport extravaganza at Grandview that is in the wind.

Only this morning it was disclosed that Truman followers are conducting a direct-mail campaign for contributions to build a million dollar Harry S. Truman Memorial Library. Where do you suppose they intend to build this Truman library? At Grandview, Mo., of course.

The followers of this administration, which repeatedly claims to be the champion of the little people, have not been soliciting ordinary citizens of this country for funds for the library, but are soliciting rich individuals and big corporations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can agree on a limitation of time on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, unless the gentleman from Iowa is given a fair opportunity to be heard I would not be willing to close debate at this time. I think it should have a good hearing, if we are going to operate that way.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman expect me to withdraw the objection to listening to this tirade and political nonsense?

I withdraw my objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying before I was interrupted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], whose withdrawal of his objection proves he has nothing to contribute to this discussion, the followers of this administration, which repeatedly claims to be the champion of the little people, have not been soliciting ordinary citizens of this country for funds for the library, but are soliciting rich individuals and big corporations. The incentive to cough up funds for the library is that these moguls can deduct the contributions from their income taxes, and thus, in the long run, charge the proposition off to the taxpayers of the Nation.

Yes, there is plenty in the wind at Grandview, Mo., in Jackson County, home territory of the Truman family and the late boss Tom Pendergast, and, as usual, it is the taxpayers who will foot the bill.

I appeal to the Members of the House to adopt this amendment and stop at least one of the raids that is being made on the taxpayers of this country.

I warn you that that $13,000,000 it is proposed to spend on this scheme is simply a start.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] has already told you that it is expected forty to fifty million dollars will eventually be spent on this present hayfield airport at Grandview It will be a red-letter day for the boss-ridden municipal government of Kansas City if this bill is passed and the white elephant Grandview airport can be unloaded on the taxpayers of the entire country.

As long as there are already established but inactivated air bases within a comparatively few air miles of the Kansas City area there is absolutely no justification for this squandering of public money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must admonish the galleries that under the rules of the House they are not permitted to show their feelings one way or another on any question. The Chair trusts that the rules of the House will be respected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the people in the gallery be permitted to write us afterward about the matter?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can so inform them later on.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 10 minutes with the last 3 minutes to be allotted to the gentleman from Texas, now speaking.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] were cheered by the people in the gallery. They are typical of our people and they but expressed the sentiment of our people who are tired of the wasteful spending; much, or at least some, of it apparently being spent for no good reason, some to profit those who are in the know. Perhaps it is well that we have a rule in the House that no one in the gallery should express an opinion by applause or otherwise because some of us might be unduly influenced. We might be reminded of what our constituents want rather than what the administration wants. Of course, our deliberations should be entirely free from any outside influence. As if they ever were. As I understand the situation, the folks who applauded may write their own Congressman and Representative, or they can meet them out in the hall and express their opinions about what ought to be done. That is, until the President issues another order or directive.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa does not seem to be subject to the same objection confronting some of these projects because I take it from what he said the people in that vicinity are in favor of this matter, at least some of the larger land owners—am I right?

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I have a letter from a resident in Grandview, Mo., who asked that his name not be disclosed, who is wholeheartedly opposed to this proposition.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Can he not sell his land at a good price? I gather from your argument that the land owners down there—and you named some, I think you named some of Mr. Truman's associates—would be able to get a rather good price for their land if this went through. Some might otherwise profit

Mr. GROSS. I assume he could, but he did not think it in the public interest.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, an exceptional citizen maybe?

I was quite interested when the chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill made a certain statement here on the floor and I was glad to hear it I asked him about it afterward Evidently he did not understand me or I did not understand him, for he intimated I did not get him correctly. But here is what he actually said. I quote:

> It is certainly the intent of the committee despite the funds provided here that the Army and the Navy and the Air Force should go into no area whatever, if they cannot go in there on a satisfactory basis. The Congress does not expect, let me say for the RECORD, that funds will be expended for X-installation if it develops that it is not possible to make a satisfactory agreement with the local community and the State and the county that may be involved.

Now, that is a rather refreshing thing because it is my understanding that in many of these places the Government has gone in—that is, it did on other occasions—took land by condemnation and still holds it after the need no longer exists.

I have in mind an air base at Peru, Ind., known as Bunker Hill Base. A subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures went down there awhile ago trying to learn whether it had been improperly used as a base for the establishment of a school which acquired surplus war property. That base cost somewhere between $23,000,000 and $25,000,000. It covers 2,100$^{05}/_{100}$ acres of fertile, tillable land, and typical of the land that is the pride of Indiana. On that base there are several miles of runways and landing fields, but the base itself is now leased by the Navy—and has been for some years—to the city of Bunker Hill for $1 a year and with maintenance clauses in the lease. The city of Bunker Hill has sublet it to the Bunker Hill Corp., controlled by three or four men, really by two men—a man named Ladd and a man named Curran—who at the time of the making of the first lease was a commander or a lieutenant commander in the Navy and on active duty. They are operating that base, using the land that grows soybeans, or a part of it at least, some 900 acres of it, for profit; and, so far as the rest of it is concerned, they are renting the buildings and making a profit of more than $36,000 a year out of the use of the base—I mean they are drawing salaries and then making a small profit in addition to the salaries, which are substantial.

Now, just why we should appropriate $56,000,000,000 or more to provide other bases, some of them nearby, while that base which is usable remains idle, I do not understand. There is nothing wrong with that base. The buildings are in good repair. Do similar situations exist in other sections of the country? I can appreciate the difficulty that the committee which had this bill in charge labors under, because, as I gather from the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee—and he has done a remarkably fine job, perhaps as perfect a job as anyone could do—the basic difficulty grows out of the fact that apparently no one knows the extent of the program which we are asked to implement with dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been fixed.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute out of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. I will try to reciprocate by yielding back part of the time that I would have under the motion I just handed up and which I withdraw.

I gather from what the gentleman said—and I am not critical of anything that his committee has done—that it is extremely difficult to know just how much money the Armed Forces should have because you do not know what they want to do. It would be similar to the situation which would exist if I would say I was going downtown and I would say to my secretary, "I would like some money." She could not tell how much I actually needed unless I had some idea of what I was going to buy when I got downtown. If I did not know what I wanted how would she have any idea of how much money I should have. Until the State Department, or whoever formulates our policy, tells us how far we are going in this war in Korea, just how far we are going in Germany and what the objective is over there, the gentleman's committee does not know—it cannot know—what the armed services should have to do their job. I am asking today the same question that was asked by the Times-Herald and the Washington News earlier, and which I have asked several times before from the House well: "Will someone tell the people of this country who are footing the bill, who are furnishing the men who are being killed, will someone tell them what it is that our men who are fighting abroad must do, what objectives they must reach which, having reached, they can come home and say it is all over?" If you have the answer to that question and knew the job which the military and the State Department are attempting to do, we could get a little more information in considering a bill of this kind; we could act intelligently.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for his generous references to members of the committee.

I am one of those naive Americans who thinks that Members of Congress, generally speaking, are doing their best to do a good job for the United States of America. I think it is a pretty good country, the best one on earth, and I think it is worth defending.

The gentleman from Michigan poses a very difficult question: How far shall we go and what shall we do? We do not know what the next move may be of those who plot the destruction of democracy and the United States and the installation in every capital in the world of a totalitarian government, a government which would sweep away the liberties of the people. We do not know what is in the mind of the Kremlin. We cannot draw the curtain and peer into the future. We are trying to find the right road. We do not know when and if a general war will come. We are seeking to be reasonably well prepared to meet the demands of the future.

The pending amendment has to do with an airport at Grandview, Mo., near one of the greatest railroad centers and one of the vital spots in the United States, Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] sweeps across the border into Missouri and feels that he sees something radically wrong. Well, the Air Force selected Grandview as an interceptor base. It is coordinated with a radar fence in such a way that maximum defense could be given to the people and to our industrial and transportation system.

The newspapers have criticized this Congress because we have not provided what they say is enough civilian defense. One thing we are trying to do in this bill is to provide these interceptor bases which will give us some degree of civilian defense which is, of course, not all that we should have.

We treated the Grandview site a little differently than we did sites at other places. In other places we leaned over backward to take care of the people whose property had to be taken, but at Grandview the city had offered the land. The city said, "We will provide it to the Government on a lease basis or fee simple basis." So in order to be doubly sure that we were being fair to the taxpayer—it was not completely fair, I suppose, to the people of Grandview because we singled them out for more restrictive treatment—we provide in the bill that the Government cannot spend any money for the base unless the land is made available to the Government by the city.

This Missouri project was fought by the gentleman from Iowa in the authorization bill, but his fight was lost there although he pursued it with vigor, and the authorization bill passed by a vote of 302 to 5. It seems useless for me to talk about striking out the project because I do not believe the House would think of striking out one of the important links in the chain of national defense just to please the whim of the gentleman from Iowa. Let us not break one link in this radar chain of defense for the United States. I do not think you will.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Gladly.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has not yet justified the building of a brand-new air base at Kansas City when you have inactive, deactivated bases all around it, as close as 27 miles over in Kansas, as close as 50 miles in the State of Missouri. Now, justify spending $50,000,000 to build an air base at Kansas City, Mo., with these deactivated bases surrounding it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired; all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 36, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: On page 14, line 2, add a new section and insert the following:

"Any funds provided by this act shall not be available for the compensation of persons performing domestic information functions or related supported functions in excess of 50 percent of the amount provided herein."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to every appropriation bill that has been adopted in the House in this session, and except in one instance it has been approved by the committee. I offer it now in connection with this bill in the hope that we can limit every domestic information service to 50 percent of any amount that is provided in this bill. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas, who is handling the bill, how much we provide in this bill for information services?

Mr. MAHON. There is no money provided in the military public-works part of this bill, which is 94 percent of the money involved in the entire bill, for information purposes. Of course, money is provided here for the advertising of bids and things of that kind, which is perfectly proper and necessary, if we want this construction in the continental United States to be on a competitive basis so that we will get the best deal for our money; but for propaganda and for public information service in the sense generally accepted, there is not a dollar in this bill for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am sure the gentleman is cognizant of the fact that hardly a radio program goes on the air today that does not bring in something about our national defense and things of that kind. While I am not opposed to the advertising of bids and legitimate information, I believe you will find in this bill somewhere plenty of fat which can be cut.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for approval of my amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment myself though I have not had an opportunity to carefully read and study it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to your attention a report that the Expenditures Committee of the House has recently issued. This report is based on an active field study by the membership of this subcommittee going into the field visiting air bases, naval bases, and Army bases.

I was impressed with the statement made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], a member of the full committee, but who is chairman of a different subcommittee. He pointed out that the Expenditures Committee has no jurisdiction until after authorizations and appropriations have been made, then it can go in and see that the money is properly spent.

Mr. Chairman, in opening our field hearings I call the attention of the Members of the House to my statement, I being chairman of the subcommittee that conducted this investigation. This statement was made in Atlanta, Ga., before the commanding officer of the Atlanta, Ga., depot. I said:

With the tremendous budget we are presently considering in the Congress, we should all take the necessary steps to eliminate duplication practices, waste, and extravagance.

Mr. Chairman, in visiting and going through the depots and establishments, it is something to observe the waste, the extravagance, the overstaffing, and the duplication. Of course, there is nothing that an ordinary Member can do when these authorization bills come in from a responsible committee that has given the matter careful study but to go along with the committee. However, there are questions that arise in the minds of the Members of this House

When the appropriation bill came in, the questions I asked the chairman of the subcommittee were certainly pertinent, because, Mr. Chairman, today in considering this appropriation bill some concern should be given and registered to any possibility of a third and independent supply system which is coming into being and which will come into being unless this Congress takes some note of it.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I wish to commend the gentleman for his efforts in connection with these investigations. I think they are bearing some fruit and I believe the committee should continue its effort. I will be glad to cooperate with him in connection with the supply system, which is an important matter. I should like to say further that all Members, when Congress reassembles in January, should report to appropriate committees as to conditions which they observe in their own districts as to military waste and things of that kind.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, today in considering this appropriations bill some concern should be registered about any possibility of a third and independent supply system for common items by the Department of the Air Force. In 1947 we directed our goal at unification; today it appears we are veering more toward triplification.

Recently a subcommittee of the Expenditures Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, made a detailed study of military supply management, the very first venture of this kind since the National Security Act. Our analysis led to the finding that—

There is no merit in creating an additional supply system for the Air Force since it is receiving satisfactory supply support with respect to common-use items from the Department of the Army. The duplication of facilities and staff and the resulting lack of uniformity would place a needless burden on the budget of the United States.

Since achieving independent status in 1947, the Department of the Air Force has continued to receive these nontechnical items from the Army, while procuring technical items through its own facilities. Considerable indication was given to the subcommittee during its field conferences that an aggressive group in the Air Force was determined to set up its own complete supply system. This would introduce an element into the budget as needless as it would be expensive.

Shortly after the issuance of this subcommittee report Secretary Lovett testified on the views expressed in it and stated that any expansion of the existing supply systems for the procurement and distribution of classes of common items of supply, not already agreed upon, shall be made by a military department only if in consonance with a recent Department of Defense directive, and if approved by the Secretary of Defense. Searching and repeated inquiry of the Secretary could not ascertain what the extent of the phrase "not already agreed upon" included. Chairman Small of the Munitions Board indicated that under a general agreement known as the Eisenhower-Spaats agreement some 30 or more individual agreements had been made by the Army and the Air Force permitting the Air Force to take quartermaster and other common supply items from the Army depots to Air Force depots. Further field investigations by the subcommittee disclose that 560 carloads of these items in just one instance have been taken from the Army Quartermaster depots to the Air Force depots This action does not appear to harmonize with the view expressed by the Secretary in his July 17 directive indicating that priority study shall be given to the feasibility of assigning to a single military department the responsibility for procurement distribution, including storage and issue for classes of common-use items of supply and equipment and depot maintenance of such equipment. Should this movement, as typified by the transfers alluded to, continue, there will be very little area for action and too much area for study. The result will be a new competing supply system independently operated for all items by the Department of the Air Force.

Our duty here today is clear. We must be assured that by this appropriation under consideration we are not undoing the work of the National Security Act which directs the Secretary to take "appropriate steps to eliminate unnecessary duplication or overlapping in the field of procurement, supply, transportation, storage, health, and research." We are attempting to more closely integrate our fighting forces with the most effective means for supply. This Secretary of Defense directive of July 17, 1951 recognized:

Full agreement has not yet been reached among these agencies with respect to the specific intent and interpretation of previous action in the Department. Nor is there complete accord on the respective responsibility and authority of the Munitions Board, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the military departments.

This is of serious concern to all because of the 4-year lapse since the passage of the so-called Unification Act of 1947, as well as 13 months after the outbreak of the Korean war. This clarifying directive was intended to delineate more clearly the delegation of authority and responsibility among the Munitions Board, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the military departments.

The action of Secretary Lovett has been the most heartening note struck in this slow moving and expensive agency of our Government.

Today, military departments constitute 3 percent of our national population and enjoy six-sevenths of our budget. Every citizen has a very understandable right to satisfy himself that appropriations do not carry any items unnecessary, extravagant, or unwarranted.

Mr. Chairman, by the observations I have made and the statements contained in this report I do not desire to cast any reflection whatever on the personnel of the armed services, enlisted or commissioned, but I must tell you that they are the greatest spenders that have ever been located or found in America. They disregard altogether the value of a dollar. They care nothing about the cost of operation.

They are doing a magnificent job today in Korea. They have done a wonderful and magnificent job around the length and breadth of this world in defending democracy. But they need managers. This House should rise up and be the manager for the armed services of the Nation, of which we are so proud.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BONNER SUBCOMMITTEE

LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK FOR MILITARY SUPPLY MANAGEMENT

On the basis of field observations to date, and other data available, supply management in the Department of Defense and the component military departments lacks adequate centralized direction and coordination.

Recommendations

The role of the Munitions Board, as it pertains to supply management, should be strengthened. The Secretary of Defense should vigilantly exercise his authority to eliminate duplication in supply activities.

Clarification by the Congress of the basic statute, the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, is necessary to implement fully centralized supply direction and coordination and to avoid conflicting administrative interpretations.

PROGRAMING OF MILITARY PROCUREMENT

There is need for greatly improved programing of military procurement. The subcommittee noted in its field surveys that large quantities of coffee, black pepper, rope, wool, clothing, and other soft goods were being bought to fulfill stated military requirements without any serious regard for the impact of these tremendous purchases on the civilian economy. When military procurement officers in the field received orders to buy, they went out and bought—frequently during periods of unusual scarcity and unfavorable seasons, at greatly inflated prices, and in competition with other military and civilian agency buyers.

Recommendations

Large-scale activities in the field of military procurement should be improved through a realistic balanced program of schedules of purchase based on advance planning and prior determination of requirements. Purchases should be so distributed over fiscal periods and geographical areas as to afford phased production and adequate warehousing geared to seasonal industries wherever they are affected. When practicable, purchases should be made for direct delivery from supplier to point of use to avoid excessive cost of Government warehousing and transportation and to utilize to the fullest, existing commercial facilities.

Greater use should be made of single-purchase assignments wherein one service procures all items of a particular type or class for all departments. There should also be maximum effort in the form of joint and pooled operations with respect to all aspects of supply management.

A realistic program of priorities in purchasing should be established and made operative at the Department of Defense level so that procurement can be geared to allocating materials, facilities, and manpower in keeping with the relative importance of the various programs for the national defense.

Efforts to improve the supply accounting systems of the military departments should be speeded up in the interest of achieving efficient supply management.

MEDICAL SUPPLY MANAGEMENT

There are unnecessary duplications and costs, particularly in the distribution phase, of medical supply management. Furthermore, medical supply activities are being presently carried on to a large extent under the administrative direction of doctors commissioned as medical officers of the armed services. During a period when the armed services and civilian communities are greatly in need of the services of doctors, the continuance of such personnel in these duties to the detriment of their professional skills cannot be sanctioned.

Recommendations

Pending the development of a fully integrated medical supply system for the Department of Defense, in the Department of the Navy all medical supply functions should be transferred immediately to the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts; in the Department of the Army, to the Quartermaster Corps.

Medical supply missions in the fields of military procurement and distribution can be adequately administered by civilian personnel aided by a small medical advisory service group.

Medical requirements presently under consideration for civilian defense will place a heavy burden on the small group of manufacturers concentrating on this type of supply. On the basis of prior planning, total Government requirements, both military and civilian, should be scheduled in such a way as to permit orderly production.

A realistic plan of cross servicing of medical supply should be initiated at once as an additional step toward integration in this field.

SUPPLY RELATIONSHIPS WITH GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Notwithstanding the intent of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (81st Cong.), the Federal Supply Service of the General Services Administration is furnishing only a minimum of such common supply items as pencils, typewriter ribbons, carbon paper, etc., to the military services.

Recommendation

The General Services Administrator, after advising and consulting with affected agencies as provided in section 205 (h) of Public Law 152, should issue mandatory regulations for the procurement and distribution of common administrative supply items.

SUPPLY RELATIONSHIPS WITHIN AND AMONG THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

Army technical services

Progress in supply coordination is not satisfactory among the technical services of the Department of the Army. There is competition in buying, overstocking, excessive use of personnel, space, and facilities, inflated costs and unnecessary burdens on industry, and further disruption of the civilian economy.

Recommendations

The Quartermaster Corps should be made responsible for the procurement and distribution for the Department of the Army and Department of the Air Force of all common-use items not supplied by General Services Administration. These functions should be closely coordinated with those of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Department of the Navy, and the General Services Administration.

The Secretary of Defense should designate an appropriate office to determine additional items for inclusion under the category of "common use" within and among the military departments.

Air Force supply system

There is no merit in creating an additional supply system for the Air Force since it is receiving satisfactory supply support with respect to common-use items from the Department of the Army. The establishment of such a supply system would be a step toward triplication, and not toward the goals sought from unification. The duplication of facilities and staff and the resulting lack of uniformity would place a needless burden on the budget of the United States.

Recommendation

No third and independent supply system for common-use items can be justified. The introduction of a new competitive element is unwarranted and is contrary to the spirit of the National Security Act, as amended.

All expenditures of funds and employment of personnel directed toward planning, developing or implementing such an independent supply system for the Department of the Air Force should be terminated immediately and a report to that effect will be requested from the Secretary of Defense.

Cross servicing

There is an evident lack of realization of the benefits of cross servicing within and among the military departments. The Secretary of the Navy opposes this system even though the Secretary of Defense has endorsed it in principle.

Recommendation

Department of Defense policies on cross servicing should be fully implemented. The Munitions Board should work out a comprehensive program of cross servicing within and among the military departments and such program should be ordered into effect by the Secretary of Defense.

CATALOGING ACTIVITIES

Only with the successful development of a common language for all Federal supply activities can maximum economy and efficiency be brought to the property-management field.

Recommendation

Every effort should be taken to assure that the completion deadline set by the Munitions Board for the Federal cataloging program is met (June 30, 1952). As segments of the catalog are developed (medical, electronics, etc.) they should be put to the maximum use at all levels and in all phases of Federal supply management.

STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS

Our preliminary investigations show that the standards work of the Munitions Board has made slow progress. A vitalized program must be developed.

Recommendation

The Munitions Board Standards Agency should be given a strong charter adding the necessary powers of decision and clearly outlining its authority, duties, and responsibilities. The Agency should be more ably staffed in order that it may more rapidly produce standards and specifications for the great quantity of items procured by the military services. The number of variations and deviations in specifications should be reduced as much as possible in order to prevent duplication in purchasing, distribution, and utilization.

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

There is a definite need for an improved program of traffic management to eliminate needless duplication and to search out areas for realizing greater economies in the movement of Government goods and personnel.

Specific recommendations are not made at this time. The Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization of your Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has undertaken a detailed study in the field of traffic management and will give special emphasis to the military phases.

UTILIZATION OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

There is no justification for disposing of usable property at a fraction of its value when great quantities of the same or similar items are being purchased in other Government activities. The subcommittee has evidence of such practices in the case of military equipment transferred to the German Government which was later imported into the United States and resold to Government agencies.

Evidence of inadequate administration and abuse of the sale-exchange features of Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, have come to the attention of the subcommittee. There is reason to believe that valuable equipment is being exchanged and being held for exchange when it should be further utilized by the Federal Government. The sale-exchange features of the law merit closer scrutiny by the General Services Administration.

Recommendations

In the utilization of military property, improved standards for screening as to what constitutes salvage, as well as more exact standards for determining replacement of military equipment, should be instituted by the Department of Defense.

The Munitions Board should immediately examine the use that is being made of military warehouse and office space. There is no justification in utilizing valuable space for the storage of obsolete or inactive records, supplies, and equipment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG] be permitted to proceed for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the action of our distinguished chairman in this request. I am one Member of this House who will be voting for this bill with a very heavy heart. The anxiety that I feel and the anxiety I am sure others of my colleagues feel is due largely to the realization that perhaps we are putting too many of our defense eggs into the one basket of military strength.

I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from Texas or someone on the committee would answer a question in connection with the statement on page 14 of the report of the committee. The statement concerns the appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission to be expended on the project in the South. The wording to which I refer is as follows:

> The committee has the very definite impression that everything the Commission plans to build is with the idea that it will be in business at this location for the next 50 years.

I want to ask the gentleman from Texas if he can tell us the real meaning of that. Does it not indicate that this committee has in mind that this project for the creation of atomic or hydrogen weapons is going to be in existence for 50 years?

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that I wish I knew whether it would be in existence 1 year or 10 years. I certainly hope not 50 years. What the committee had in mind was, in our humble, and I might say simple, manner to attempt to urge the Commission to use great care in screening its projects and cutting out unnecessary details They are building some two-hundred-odd buildings there, and the committee is firmly of the opinion that if there were a careful screening and examining of these plants, they could cut out this unnecessary gadget and that corner here and so on, and thus save considerable money. We were surprised to learn that there were some 12 or 15 architect-engineers on that project, and we think that with that many, and with careful screening of those plans and specifications, we can save some money.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I greatly appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Texas. I am in thorough sympathy, as I am sure all my colleagues are, with careful screening to prevent waste and extravagance in this bill for huge military expenditures. Nevertheless, the statement I have read stands squarely in line with many other statements in regard to appropriations for our military defense. The distinguished Secretary of Defense, General Marshall, earlier in this session came before one of our committees and said that our country faces 10 years of tension in this cold war with Soviet Russia. He was followed soon after that by his assistant in the Defense Department, Mrs. Rosenberg, who on direct questioning with regard to the expenditures to meet the threat of communism said "We must gird ourselves for 25 years of tension with the Soviet Union."

Mr. Chairman, before the vote is taken on this bill, I think we ought to raise the question of whether or not we are placing too much dependence upon atomic and other weapons. Despite the necessity for meeting the threat of communism by the building of atomic bombs, if we rely upon force alone, if we have no other answer to this challenge than counterthreats of force, we are on the wrong track and we will lose this battle.

What has become of all those fine promises in regard to collective security? This bill contemplates that perhaps for 50 years time we shall still be faced with a threat of aggression somewhere. That means we have lost all faith in a system of collective security promised us when we set up the United Nations. It means we have no other answer to communism than 50 years of tension, 50 years of piling up of armaments. I say to my colleagues, this battle against communism is for the minds and hearts of the people of the world, and simply piling up weapons and doing nothing else will result only in warfare with those atomic and hydrogen weapons. I think we ought to win this battle in less than 50 years. I believe we can win this battle in 2 or 3 years, if we make a determined effort to win the minds and hearts of the people, and get them on our side. We cannot do that by threats or use of force alone.

Mr. Chairman, as we contemplate what this bill would spend, and what it means in terms of our dependence upon armed force, we must ask another question: What about the promised control of atomic weapons? If this sort of armament race is to go on for 50 years, then the implication is plain that we have abandoned all hope of international control of atomic energy and weapons. It means that the mad race for bigger and more deadly implements of war will go on and on—50 years, a hundred years, or forever.

I ask the further question: Will this sort of thing scare Stalin and his fellow conspirators in the Kremlin? The answer is an emphatic "No" They are not frightened by our armament strength. They may be deterred for a time by our superior military might, including our atomic bombs, but not for long. Already we know they are trying to match our strength. Already they have the atomic bomb. Just last week they announced the explosion of another such bomb of their own. That was clear notice to us, and to the fearful, wavering peoples of the world, people trying to decide which side to join in this struggle, that they, the Communist leaders, are making progress and will some day be able to match us in weapons of destruction.

Never in all history has an armament race brought peace, or secured any peace won, or furthered the interests of peace. Let us recognize the one indisputable fact, that weapons are made only for use in military action. Peace is established and secured by the building of conditions of justice, freedom, and opportunity.

To the extent that we rely solely upon armaments, as contemplated in this measure, we shall lose the battle against communism. To the extent that we supplement our military defense with positive action looking toward winning the minds of men to an appreciation of liberty, equality, and democracy, to that extent we shall be making progress toward peace.

I repeat—we do not need to go on blindly trying to spend ourselves into physical strength, when we have weapons more powerful than atomic bombs. Or even hydrogen bombs. We do not need to face the hopeless prospect of 50 years of atomic rivalry. With the right kind of leadership, with vision and courage to try our other weapons, the weapons of truth and justice, of brotherhood and opportunity, we might win this so-called "cold war" in our generation—even in the next few years.

While we give notice to the world that we are willing to devote such of our resources as are necessary to defend freedom throughout the world, let us not lose sight of our obligation also to prove to the world that we have a positive plan for the building of peace. That we propose to meet the aggression of communism with firm action, but that our bigger task is to make the conditions upon which communism thrives impossible in the future; that we propose to help the great underprivileged masses of the world to conditions of greater economic and social security; that we propose to work steadily toward the goal when the chains of Soviet tyranny shall be struck from the hands of mankind, because all men everywhere have found a better way

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. Does not the gentleman believe that as of today, the power we hold in atomic energy has deterred communism more than any other thing in the world?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It may have been a deterrent, but it will be only until they get atomic bombs to match ours. That is exactly what they seem to be doing. Then the Communist leaders will fear us no more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under considerat on the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill, and all amendments thereto, to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock a m.

Mr. TABER. I thought it was to be 11 o'clock.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, while they are deliberating, is there anything to this statement that the House will take a recess when the other body adjourns for 30 days?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no knowledge of anything about the other body. I have no knowledge as to anything the gentleman has inquired about.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, I understand the first thing on the program tomorrow will be continuation of the bill we have just been considering?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I am going to ask unanimous consent at the proper time that further consideration of this bill be postponed until tomorrow, so that any Member wishing to offer a motion to recommit will be protected.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. McCORMACK Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the bill H. R. 5650 be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MUTUAL ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that points of order may be considered as reserved on the Mutual Assistance Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I trust the request of the gentleman from New York will be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. There was no objection to the request.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the supplemental appropriation bill may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any other special orders heretofore entered.

CONTESTED ELECTION CASE—OSSER AGAINST HARDIE SCOTT (H. DOC. NO. 253)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed:

OCTOBER 9, 1951.

The Honorable the SPEAKER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to lay before the House of Representatives the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives from the Third Congressional District of the State of Pennsylvania, Maurice S. Osser against Hardie Scott, notice of which has been filed in the office of the Clerk of the House; and also transmit herewith original testimony, papers and documents relating thereto

In compliance with the act approved March 2, 1887, entitled "an act relating to contested-election cases," the Clerk has opened and printed the testimony in the above case, and such portions of the testimony as the parties in interest agreed upon or as seemed proper to the Clerk, after giving the requisite notices, have been printed and indexed together with notice of contest, and the answer thereto and original papers and exhibits have been sealed up and are ready to be laid before the Committee on House Administration.

Two copies of the printed testimony in the aforesaid case have been mailed to the contestant, and the same number to the contestee, which, together with the briefs of the parties, will be laid before the Committee on House Administration, to which the case shall be referred. This office has today been advised by the attorney for the contestant that no brief is being filed in reply to contestee's brief.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE TRUMAN MEMORIAL LIBRARY

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans were shocked to read in this morning's newspapers of a brazen scheme to finance a million-dollar Harry S. Truman Memorial Library by tapping large corporations for contributions which otherwise would be paid to the Federal Government in income tax.

Even before this Congress has agreed on the final form of the pending tax-increase bill, advice has been dispensed far and wide on how to evade that tax increase—and to do so in the name of the President of the United States. This is the same President who says that a seven-billion tax increase is not enough and that more money must be dragged out of the American people.

The author of the letter proposing this scheme wrote, "I know that the President would be happy to have George Allen, as treasurer, drop in at the White House and show him your contribution."

The letter making the appeal for funds for the Truman library contains statements that emphasize the fact that contributions made to such a project would be exempt from taxation under the new revenue act. Certainly, many people in the administration, in the Internal Revenue Department, and many of those doing business with the administration are tax conscious and concerned with tax loopholes. It is not, therefore, unusual that this appeal is bottomed on a promised tax exemption. Perhaps it is predicated on the Finnegan tax-exemption plan. In this morning's newspapers we have read how James P. Finnegan, the former collector of internal revenue in St. Louis, remained in that job on the personal insistence, expressed three times, of President Truman himself. Finnegan is the man who grew wealthy in the tax collector's job and at the same time failed for 3 years to pay his own taxes in full.

I suppose the Truman Memorial Library should be approached in a big manner just as things are done in the collector's office. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that there are certain priceless documents which undoubtedly would be housed in such a library. In future years these documents will be of such interest to the historians who are chronicling the history of our times that they will become priceless. Of course, it is impossible to know what the Truman Administration or its advisers intend to do with these papers. It may be that they will be utilized for the personal benefit of the Democratic National Committee or its chairman. It may be that they will be offered to the highest bidding with the intimation that money spent for acquiring them would thereafter be considered as tax-exempt. But this is mere speculation, Mr. Speaker.

It may be that the entire project will collapse if Truman should exercise his iron curtain Executive order and suppress all of his papers. But let us assume that these papers to which I refer will ultimately go to a Truman Memorial Library. Should not the letter of the President to the music critic of the Washington Post be adequately and handsomely housed? Is it not fitting that the President's apology to the Commandant of the Marine Corps occupy a prominent place where it can be seen by all? And think, Mr. Speaker, of the public interest in the letter of the President in which he said that John L. Lewis was not fit to be a dog catcher. The list grows long, but time grows short. And then too there are many other letters about which the public knows nothing. The addressees who receive these letters saw fit not to publicize them. But history has a way of bringing to light such documents, and so, Mr. Speaker, I say that certainly the collection which would be deposited in a Truman Memorial Library would be an interesting one.

The originator of the letter, in making this appeal for the Truman library, when asked about the letter said:

The point is—do something with their money for libraries, universities, and institutions rather than spend it on public rela-

tions and many other things that can be charged off as business expenses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many will agree that the Truman Memorial Library is a more worth-while project as recipient of donations than is the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, our great universities, our great health-research organizations, and our charitable trusts? By which will the public benefit more?

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I think that this is a matter in which the American public has a considerable interest. I think the public thinking and sentiment on this subject will crystallize rapidly. I think that there will be little doubt in the immediate future as to what the public thinks of a proposal of this nature and a suggestion regarding tax loopholes for friends of the administration. I think there will be little doubt in anybody's mind within the next few days as to what the public and the press think is the more worthy object for charitable contributions. It must be obvious that those in the Truman administration believe in one set of laws for the Truman-Pendergast crowd and another set for the rest of the American people. It is plain that this administration believes in and practices a double standard of morality.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WICKERSHAM). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

ORGANIZED RESERVES OF THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, at this late hour I shall not take 60 minutes. It was my purpose this morning in asking for this time to discuss the Reserve bill that has just recently been reported out of the Committee on Armed Services to the House of Representatives and which we hope to bring up next week. It is my purpose to cover it in a general way; then if anyone, when I finish, desires to pick up and carry on and make further comment, or if they desire to ask questions and discuss generally the bill, that will be highly satisfactory and I invite discussion.

The purpose of the legislation is to organize the Reserve components of the armed services—the Army, Navy, and Air Force, which would include the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard. The reason for this is that your Reserve organizations have grown up without any legislation at all. I think there are only two major pieces of legislation on record covering the Reserve organizations. One of these is Public Law 810, which is the retirement legislation that I worked upon for 8 years and another is the Reserve Inactive Duty Pay Act. There has been piecemeal legislation passed from time to time, but there is no Reserve organization in the Army as such, no organization covering the Reserve components as such, in our Defense Department at the present time.

We propose, therefore, by this bill to set up such an organization. We propose by this bill, for instance, to provide for an Assistant Secretary of Defense and Assistant Secretaries for all of the military departments to handle Reserve matters and we provide that these duties shall constitute their major duties in connection with their respective offices.

We propose by this measure to require each of the major services to designate an officer of general or flag rank to handle the responsibilities of the Reserves. We believe that only by this sort of recognition can we hope to get proper consideration for our Reserves not only in legislation before the Congress but also for consideration by the executive department.

Mr. Speaker, I know that what has happened in the last 12, 14, or 15 months regarding the Reserves has not been satisfactory to the Members of Congress or the country. I know that there have been a great many things done that are not satisfactory to us as Members. I know the great abuses that have grown up, especially in reference to the calling of Reserves to the Korean war. I know that there has been a great amount of unfairness perpetrated, many injustices perpetrated and many things that you and I would not tolerate, in connection with the recalling of Reserves to active duty, many of whom have gone to Korea. It is not the purpose of this bill to condone that action, it is not our purpose to set up a bill which we hope will unscramble the scrambled eggs, because you cannot do that. Things have happened that cannot be undone.

It is the purpose of this measure to get a good, workable Reserve organization together. In doing this in the past the departments have set up committees to work out a proper Reserve organization in the Defense Department. A good many committees have been set up in the past. The last one was called the Reserve Components Policy Committee. This Committee worked 2 years to frame a bill to submit to the Congress of the United States. They gave us a bill some time about March 15. Our Committee on Armed Services, through its Subcommittee on Reserve Components, has been working on this measure since it was handed to us by the executive department. We have not accepted the measure as it was given to us. We have provided 90 major amendments to the bill; in other words, we have rewritten the bill so as to give you here today a bill which bears the complete and unanimous endorsement and approval of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but in handling the bill the Members of the Reserve Subcommittee called before it representatives of all the major Reserve organizations in the country. We called before us representatives of the Reserve Officers Association, the Air Reserve, the National Guard; we asked the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Amvets, the DAV, all to participate in the discussion of this measure and to make suggestions. We asked them, Mr. Speaker, to sit in front of the subcommittee. We put them all together, and as we took up the bill, paragraph by paragraph, sentence by sentence, we asked them to give their suggestions and approve or disapprove the sentence or the paragraph and, finally, when the bill was written, the entire bill. We give you today a bill which bears the unanimous approval of those organizations, both Reserve and patriotic, who are specially interested in having a good, fair, workable, equitable Reserve system for the United States Defense Department.

Let me tell you briefly about the Reserve program. Our bill provides for three classes of Reserves. It provides for the Ready Reserve, it provides for the Standby Reserve, and it provides for the Retired Reserve.

Under the bill we provide that the Ready Reserve shall be in the future what might be termed the Minute Men. The Ready Reserve will be composed of the men who will be called in the event of an emergency. We provide that this emergency may be declared by the Chief Executive, the President, but that the number of Reserves called shall be designated by the Congress of the United States.

In the second category we provide for the Standby Reserve. The Standby Reserve shall be an organization in which those Reserves are placed that will be called only in the event of an all-out emergency so declared by Congress, such as war. So that the man in the Ready Reserve will know that for the period that he stays in the Ready Reserve he is subject to immediate call. When he is transferred to the Standby Reserve he will know, Mr. Speaker, that he is in a sheltered position, reasonably safe from call, in any event except in an all-out war.

You say, "How does that have reference to the present situation?" I will tell you. In calling our Reserves up in recent months, they have called many men who felt that they should not have been called because of their position in the Reserve components of our armed services. For instance, they called the inactive reservists. We had the Organized Reserves. That is a man who was in an organization; he was trained, he was paid for his inactive-duty training. He was told in the event of an emergency, he would be called upon. We had the inactive reservist who, on the other hand, was not given a uniform, was not paid. He was given the impression that he would not be called except after the organized reservist was called, yet in this emergency the inactice reservist has been called out and in many cases thousands and thousands of cases, he was called before the organized reservist, and therefore throughout the length and breadth of this country we have heard the criticism of unfairness, of inequities, or injustices in the Reserve system, and I think the charge is largely true. So our bill will set up new categories to remedy this defect. We will under the present bill say that there shall not be the division we have had before, but that a man who is placed in the Ready Reserve shall be subject to immediate call and the man who works his way into the

Standby Reserve shall not be called except when there is an all-out war or an all-out crisis. In that event, the entire manpower of the Nation will be subject to call.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman is making a very good statement and one that I am sure will be welcome all over the Nation because of the confusion that has existed particularly since the Korean war with respect to the Reserves and their status, their availability, whether they would be called and if so when and in what order. The result has been a tremendous amount of confusion, to which the gentleman has referred, because so many of those in the Reserves, either active or inactive, had no way of knowing when their time might come or whether it would come at all. That of course has resulted in business difficulties and difficulty in obtaining employment, many employers hesitating to hire a man who was in that state of uncertainty. So, as the gentleman has pointed out here, this measure will completely solve that problem. It sets out a program, a definite one whereby every man will know exactly where he stands and if and under what conditions he will be called in case of emergency.

I wonder if the gentleman would indicate for the RECORD what number of reservists it is anticipated will be called into the Ready Reserves annually after this program gets under way.

Mr. BROOKS. Those figures were given us as to the size of the Reserve, both Ready and Standby, but they were given us in executive session and we were told at that time that they were military secrets, and that they would rather we would not discuss them on the floor.

Mr. FISHER. Will the gentleman then indicate, for I am sure it is a matter of common knowledge, the total number of young men who would go into UMT each year, the approximate number that will be available?

Mr. BROOKS. There are 1,100,000 men arriving at the age of 18 each year. When you eliminate those that would physically not be found fit for military duty and those that for some reason might not qualify mentally or for other reasons might not be usable, I would estimate that there would be roughly around 700,000, maybe 750,000. I have heard a lower estimate, but I would judge it to be 750,000.

Mr. FISHER. Under the UMT program, as I understand it and as it will work in connection with this Reserve program, it is planned that those who take the UMT training will automatically go into the Ready Reserve for a certain period of time? Is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. May I say this to my distinguished friend from Texas: As I told the Rules Committee, this bill is set up so that if the Congress chooses in its wisdom to activate UMT, this program will be workable under the bill. If Congress, on the other hand, does not activate UMT, the bill is still a usable bill and will do substantial justice to the Reserves everywhere.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the distinguished majority leader of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], who is addressing the House, is, and I say this not in a flattering way but in a complimentary sense, which he deserves, one of the ablest and hardest working Members of the House. He has certainly devoted untiringly his efforts and his time to this bill and all bills that relate to the national defense of our country, not confining his efforts to that type, but specializing in that type of legislation because he is a member of the important Committee on Armed Services, and that type of legislation is of vital concern to the national interest of our country and to the kind of future world we are going to live in.

I want the RECORD to show that the gentleman has diligently labored in committee and out of committee on the drafting of this bill and on bringing it up for consideration in the House as early as possible. The bill was no sooner reported out of committee than the gentleman visited me as majority leader asking me to program the bill. He then had the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mrs. Rosenberg, telephone me to let me know how important they consider the bill as reported out of the committee to be and to say that while there may be a few provisions of the bill they would much rather have out of the bill, they are for this bill as reported out of committee. Then the gentleman appeared before the Committee on Rules a few days ago. The members of the Committee on Rules in their wisdom did not act upon the request for a rule at that time. They did not disapprove it, however. Then, the gentleman came back to the leadership, to the Speaker of the House and to me, urging and impressing upon us the importance of this legislation. As a result, the Speaker promised the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] and instructed me as majority leader to program the bill for next Monday to be taken up under suspension of the rules. I make this statement, being completely aware of all those facts, and I make the statement with pleasure not only as a compliment to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], which he richly deserves, but so that all interested in this bill might know of the untiring and steadfast and painstaking efforts the gentleman has put on this particular bill.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman very much. Mr. Speaker, I am humbled by the splendid compliments the majority leader has paid me. I want to say his statement as to the importance of this legislation is absolutely correct. I feel keenly about this situation because I believe that the future of the United States depends upon the proper handling of our Reserves. I am proud of the fact that after taking a bill, which is no doubt very controversial in itself, we have worked on it through the months, and have harmonized all the differences both in and out of committee—we harmonized the differences between all of the Reserve organizations, and all of the patriotic organizations into this one bill. We have been able after painstaking effort to bring you a bill, which is backed up by the unanimous support of all of the committee and all of these great organizations. I think, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion of my remarks that if we are going to have a defense system, which this country needs and needs badly at the present time, if we are going to safeguard the safety and integrity of the United States of America, we must develop our Reserve program. You cannot continue to carry the burden of financing huge military organizations that do not provide for an adequate Reserve program. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] in order that I may appear before the Committee on Rules, which is meeting at 5 o'clock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WICKERSHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me before I go to the Committee on Rules to attend the meeting also?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I was unavoidably delayed in getting here because of business in my office. I merely want to say I wholeheartedly and genuinely concur in the fine compliments and the well-deserved praise paid by our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], to the gentleman from Louisiana. All of us know the injustices and inequities in the present Reserve program, and we know how these injustices and inequities have affected the men who have been called into the services against their will. This legislation is really designed and written to correct many of these injustices and inequities. Mr. Speaker, this is a most difficult piece of legislation. For many years—not only in this Congress, I will say to our distinguished friend from Massachusetts—for many years the gentleman from Louisiana has labored patiently, diligently, and hard to bring this legislation about. I am glad it is now coming before us. I simply want to join the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] in expressing my deep and sincere appreciation not only to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] but to the members of his subcommittee who have worked so hard on this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I have worked with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] for 9 consecutive years on this and kindred problems. He and I are the ones who piloted Public Law 810 through the House of Representatives. I do not know of any man in the Congress who has worked harder and done more for the Reserves of the United States than the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]. I am heartily in accord with this bill.

It so happens that I have been delegated to go to California to study the

military housing problem, and I may not be here to vote on the bill, if I were here I would enthusiastically vote for it. The best parts of this bill were written by the committee. One provision provides that one of the Assistant Secretaries of the Department of the Army and of the other two Departments is to spend all of his time with the Reserve program. Everybody knows that the Reserves have been the stepchild of the armed services, and only incidental time was given to them by the regular establishments. A man with flag or general rank must be placed in charge of the Reserve program in each service.

The bill is so written that a man can now plan his program in a Reserve component. There will be nothing indefinite about it. He knows exactly what will happen over a span of 7 or 8 years. Practically all those things that are good in the bill were placed there by the committee. We took some of the power from the Department of Defense. We took some of the power from the President It is really a bill that was written by Members of the House of Representatives, as far as the good features of the bill are concerned, and I would like the RECORD to show that.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman has made a very correct statement and a very timely one. We all know that our distinguished colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is one of the well-informed men on military matters on the Armed Services Committee, and I know that his expression is indicative of the good work that has been done and the value of this bill as it has been finally drafted. As finally drafted, the bill has the approval of the Department of Defense, as well as the various Reserve and veterans' organizations over the country.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The gentleman from Texas has been allotted some time under a special order and ought to have the opportunity of expressing his views under the special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WICKERSHAM). The gentleman has been recognized for the balance of the time under a special order previously granted to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr FISHER. I do not yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts at this time. I have yielded to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. NICHOLSON. The point of order is that under a special order any gentleman who has the floor under that special order has to take his time and cannot delegate his time to somebody else. If he does, how much?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana received unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] might complete his time.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, for the third time, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I share the same complimentary attitude toward my Louisiana neighbor [Mr. BROOKS], for our districts do adjoin, as has been expressed by so many. I know that doubtless he has done a very worthwhile job, because I have had many letters from people in my own area who have been very hopeful that his bill would be brought to the floor readily and very soon. It so happens that at Kilgore, Tex., the very heart of the east Texas oil fields, we had what was known as the Seven Hundred Petroleum Co. All of a sudden a great mass of men were drafted from that particular area and brought back into service, with considerable disruption of many families and several oil companies, although there was no criticism from either standpoint. It is certainly felt by those people who have written me that this bill is a step in the right direction and a very definite improvement over the situation that has existed up to this time.

Mr. FISHER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr CUNNINGHAM. I want to say that I endorse everything that has been said by others in regard to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], chairman of the subcommittee. As the newest member on that subcommittee, I probably have a viewpoint not shared by any of the others. To me it was not only a pleasure but also an education to serve on the committee with the gentleman from Louisiana I learned more about the Reserve program problem than I ever knew before.

I want to pay this tribute to our distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]. The manner in which he conducted the hearings was exemplary. He allowed everyone who wanted to be heard about the Reserve program problem to testify; most of all, he waited until the representatives of all the Reserve organizations, including the National Guard Reserve organization, had an opportunity fully and completely to state their views; following that he permitted them to sit in the committee room along with the committee and to advise as we went through the bill paragraph by paragraph and line by line to see that it met with their approval. The final result of this wonderful work on the part of the chairman was that as we finally reported the bill it met with the unanimous approval of all the representatives of all the Reserve organizations who appeared before our subcommittee.

Also I think it will be a great relief and a great satisfaction to the reservists throughout the country once the bill is enacted.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman has made a very good and a very correct statement. I think the distinguished gentleman from Iowa who has devoted himself tirelessly to unraveling some problems of the Reserve program which we had before our committee, will agree with me that rarely will one ever see a major bill, one of this importance, that has been given such thorough attention during a hearing as was this Reserve bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I do heartily concur in that statement.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX I am sure we all recognize that this was much-needed legislation. The chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] was kind enough to ask me to attend the hearings. I sat with the committee on numerous days during that period although not a member of the Armed Services Committee. I was very much impressed by the way all segments of the Reserves and the Reserve Organizations were represented. This type of procedure is something that is much needed I think in some of the other committees of this House.

I may also add that I have tried to solicit suggestions from reservists of the various branches of the service, and those suggestions have been taken up. My feeling now is that this is a very excellent bill that has been reported out.

Mr. FISHER. I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr NICHOLSON. I just want to know if this bill is before the Congress, whether or not it is going to be acted on, whether we will take care of the reservists or not. As I understand, some of the Members feel that this Reserve program is good; but it does not appear so to me after getting letters from everybody throughout the district I represent.

If this bill is going to help the Reserve system I am for it, naturally, after hearing the gentleman who preceded me; but does it?

Mr. FISHER. I may say to the gentleman that that is the whole purpose of the bill. This legislation is to undertake to prevent a repetition of many of the rank injustices which have resulted from the operation of the Reserve program since the Korean war broke out. One of the objects is to prevent a repetition of the injustices and hardships that were referred to by many Members of the House here this afternoon. It probably is as near a complete answer to the various problems that may arise in the future as could be devised by our committee working for many weeks and hearing scores of witnesses, including spokesmen for all the Reserve organizations and all of the veterans' organizations.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for those remarks he has just made. I think it kind of makes the rest of us who have not gone into the matter so deeply feel that we can arrive at a pretty good conclusion on the whole matter. The gentleman is to be congratulated.

Mr. FISHER. I thank the gentleman. In conclusion, may I say as one of the members of the subcommittee that I join in the commendation so properly extended to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], chairman of the subcommittee handling this matter. He has done an excellent job. He has worked

long and hard and has been fair to the extreme in giving everyone an opportunity to present their viewpoints. Every viewpoint that has been presented was very carefully and very thoroughly considered. Many of them have been incorporated into this bill. Ideas were presented by various Members of the House and various organizations over the country that are interested in the future defense of this country as it may be affected by a Reserve program.

The idea of a Reserve program, of course, is to provide a reservoir of reservists in the future in order that we may hold down the cost of a preparedness program and always have available men who are ready and trained and who can be called on very short notice to meet any emergency that may arise. This is a security measure and it will add to the military strength of the Nation. It provides fair, efficient, and orderly procedures for the training and recall of our military personnel who are in Reserve units.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], is recognized for 10 minutes.

PEANUT FIGURES FOR VARIOUS PEANUT PRODUCING COUNTIES

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on July 10, 1951, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a detailed county-by-county study concerning cotton. The study disclosed, for example, that the average number of dollars per allotment in one county within a given State was $24,000, while in another county in the same State the average number of dollars per allotment was less than $100. This is quite a spread within a State for a crop that is strictly controlled in a given year.

The peanut picture is interesting, too. In one Alabama county—Limestone—the average value per allotment in dollars is $61, whereas in the same State the average value per allotment in another county—Henry—is $3,551.

In one Florida county—Dixie—the average value per allotment in dollars is $88, whereas in the same State the average value per allotment in another county—Putnam—is $1,799.

In one Georgia county—Gwinnett—the average value per allotment in dollars is $48, whereas in the same State the average value per allotment in another county—Terrell—is $4,075.

In one Louisiana parish—Bienville—the average value per allotment in dollars is $36, whereas in the same State the average value per allotment in another parish—Webster—is $2,105.

In one North Carolina county—Chatham—the average value per allotment in dollars is $94, whereas in the same State the average value per allotment in another county—Northampton—is $2,806.

In one Oklahoma county—Seminole—the average value per allotment is dollars is $83, whereas in the same State the average value per allotment in another county—Washita—is $1,116.

In one Texas county—Angelina—the average value per allotment in dollars is $79, whereas in the same State the average value per allotment in another county—Comanche—is $2,581.

In one Virginia county—Brunswick—the average value per allotment in dollars is $375, whereas in the same State the average value per allotment in another county—Isle of Wight—is $4,048.

It occurs to me the spread in counties within the various States is quite interesting.

In spite of what the Secretary of Agriculture says about these studies, I again request him to make studies of this kind in regard to all controlled or allotted crops or crops subject to control. I invite him to make studies with reference to wheat and tobacco immediately.

Please note the Secretary's letter to me written September 18, 1951:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, September 18, 1951.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We have your letter of September 14, 1951, with which you sent us a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 10, 1951, in which you had inserted voluminous statistics on cotton.

In answer to your request as to whether we would be willing to perform similar studies with regard to other crops, we call your attention to the fact that our budget for the current fiscal year has been severely reduced below the level of last year along with a sharp reduction in the number of personnel. This situation raises a question about preparing special surveys. We doubt that the expenditure of the time and money needed to accumulate such special statistics would be warranted by the results.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

I include certain letters in regard to the farm program:

THE CLARKSVILLE TIMES,
Clarksville, Tex., September 28, 1951.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR LINDLEY: Your efforts in behalf of our east Texas farmers deserve more praise than they are being accorded.

Much of the legislation and administrative authority it conferred during the last 18 years proved detrimental in one way or another to the east Texas farm program because of penalties and inequities suffered by small producers.

Thousands have found the going too tough and quit. Many of these have moved. My county's population is down one-third since 1930.

Thanks for your approval of my editorial on the subject of cotton-acreage allotments. I have commented on the price situation in another editorial in the Times of September 28, copy of which is enclosed.

I warmly commend you for what you are endeavoring to accomplish.

Sincerely,

JOE PINSON.

THE OKLAHOMA PUBLISHING CO.,
THE FARMER-STOCKMAN,
Dallas, Tex., September 7, 1951.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 10 and July 23 containing your remarks on the inequities of the cotton-allotment system.

You have made an excellent case repeatedly, but if you'll pardon my saying so, as long as there's any kind of enforced-allotment program such inequities are inescapable. In the first place, the historical-base principle is diametrically opposed to the American principle of free enterprise, and, in my opinion, is cut out of the same cloth as tariffs and labor laws giving such privileges to certain groups and individuals.

It seems to me, therefore, that the fight ought to be on the principle of the thing rather than its operation. Since the first triple A such inequities have been in evidence and have been perpetuated in spite of all the hearings and statistics and stage dressing that the bureaucrats in Washington set up in the form of State and county committees who are presumed to have sufficient freedom of action to avoid the worst of the inequities between man and man and county and county.

I congratulate you on the efforts you have made to get a fair deal for your section of the State but, if you will pardon my saying so, I doubt that you will be able to accomplish much as long as the present agricultural adjustment act and the regulations written thereunder are in force.

I haven't time to go into the matter more deeply at the present time, but would be glad to talk with you any time the opportunity occurs and assure you that both personally and editorially, we are in sympathy with your aims.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

T. C. RICHARDSON,
Texas Editor.

Note the Secretary is preparing recommendations for changes in allotments. This is mentioned in the last paragraph of his letter to me written October 1, 1951:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., October 1, 1951.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of September 18, stating that Mr. G. E. Hutcheson, of Anna, Tex., has written concerning inequities which he feels are present in wheat acreage allotments, and he thinks some changes should be made.

Your letter does not say what inequities Mr. Hutcheson thinks exist in the wheat allotment programs, or what changes he would suggest. We cannot tell if he objects to the allotments on the national, State, county, or farm level. We do not know if he refers to legislation pertaining to acreage allotments, or to the manner in which the programs have been administered.

An acreage allotment program was in effect for the 1950 crop of wheat, when the national allotment was 72,719,009 acres, and the allotment for Texas was 6,068,356 acres. In the summer of 1950 a wheat allotment program was announced for the 1951 crop, when the national allotment was set at 72,784,810 acres, and the allotment for Texas at 6,263,158 acres. However, the Korean war set in motion a chain of reactions which changed the supply-requirements situation radically. By the end of December 1950 it became apparent that the country would need increased production of wheat and other grains, and on January 5, 1951, the wheat allotment program was suspended.

By the time the wheat allotment program was terminated, producers in the winter wheat area, including Texas, had planted most of their 1951 wheat crops, and the majority were in compliance with their farm acreage allotments. The producers in the spring wheat area were not restricted at the time of planting. Perhaps it is this unfortunate but unavoidable circumstance which your correspondent has in mind.

The Department is preparing recommendations for changes in existing provisions of legislation pertaining to acreage allotments and marketing quotas, which will be presented to the Congress soon. We are not quite ready to discuss these recommendations at this time, but you will be hearing about them before long.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary.

I have tried to help our peanut farmers. Note on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 8, page 11423, my amendment to give a 2-acre minimum to every recognized peanut producer. Also I include certain other data in connection with peanut allotments:

Mr BECKWORTH. Mr Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr BECKWORTH: On page 19, after line 18, insert the following

"'4 Add at the end of section 359 of such act the following new subsection: "(j) the penalty provided for in this section shall not apply with respect to peanuts produced by any person who is recognized by the county committee as being a peanut farmer if his total acreage planted to peanuts during the year in which such peanuts were produced did not exceed 2 acres."'"

Mr COOLEY Mr Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes

The CHAIRMAN Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr BECKWORTH Mr Chairman, this is in line with the general principle I have advocated in regard to a minimum for cotton producers A strange thing has happened in some of our counties We find that a person who has been growing cotton cannot grow cotton, and in instances he has been growing peanuts, he cannot now grow any peanuts—certainly not enough to stay in the business

I have here some letters from folks—some, incidentally, not from my district. This one says:

"Number of producers who will cease to grow peanuts. 50"

That is from one Texas county.

"Number of producers receiving less than 2 acres who will cease growing peanuts 90 percent of those who receive less than 5 acres."

In another Texas county there are 53 old grower farms that receive less than 2 acres, and 69 new grower farms that receive less than 2 acres It is estimated that 80 percent of the farms will cease to grow peanuts and 50 percent will cease to farm

I submit to the Members of this House that by legislation, you are definitely putting people out of the business of growing a given crop which they have grown, and also putting them out of the farming business in some cases It is my opinion that an amendment like this would have a salutary effect to prevent that being done, putting people off the farms or out of the business of growing certain crops.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1950.

DEAR FRIENDS: County by county in your State I'd like the following information:

I would like to know the number of peanut producers in each county. Generally in thinking of your average farmer and producer, what is the least number of acres he can afford to grow or economically grow? How many producers in your State received allotments less than the number of acres you mentioned in answer to the immediate previous question? How many of your peanut producers receive allotments of less than 2 acres? Of the number of peanut farmers receiving allotments of less than 2 acres, how many will cease to grow peanuts? Approximately how many will cease to farm for themselves? How many new producers applied for peanut acreage in your State this year—1950? How many acres did you have to distribute to them? Approximately how much did each receive?

I repeat, I'd like to obtain this information county by county.

Regards,

LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., June 13, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of May 29 in which you requested certain information regarding peanut acreage allotments and the acreage of peanuts that should be grown on the farm to sustain the farm family

I am attaching a summary of the number of farms and total allotted peanut acreage for all Texas counties The summary is prepared to show data separately for "old" farms and "new" farms

We do not have information on the other questions raised in your letter and feel that we cannot afford to ask our county committees to make the statistical analyses and summaries required since each county has a very heavy work load for the next several months I trust that the attached summary will answer most of the questions on peanut allotments

Very truly yours,

B F VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee

1950 peanut allotments (original issue)

County	Old farms	Allotments	New farms	Allotments
Anderson	1,011	12,196 3	296	207 7
Angelina	78	125 9	14	2 8
Atascosa	968	26,638 7	74	314 2
Austin	174	2,379 6	6	24 1
Bailey	4	33 5	1	1 6
Bastrop	344	2,654 5	71	51 5
Baylor	3	43 3	1	0
Bee	96	1,096 7	34	33 1
Bexar	571	9,466 7	30	101 8
Blanco	1	10 5		
Bosque	86	1,949 2	15	26 2
Bowie	58	306 9	7	3 9
Brazos	34	127 0	5	2 8
Brooks	10	48 1		
Brown	526	9,242 8	3	12 3
Burleson	79	525 4	10	6 9
Burnet	22	341 7	2	4 7
Caldwell	89	717 0	19	9 4
Callahan	596	8,675 3	33	100 1
Camp	39	91 5	13	2 9
Cass	122	718 3	54	23 2
Castro			1	5 5
Cherokee	206	1,470 2	203	77 7
Clay	42	365 6	14	13 4
Coke	5	83 0	1	1 1
Coleman	12	98 2		
Collingsworth	89	1,443 9	20	27 3
Colorado	117	1,391 5	24	21 0
Comanche	1,924	56,071 4	20	180 8
Cooke	671	8,528 6	20	84 2
Coryell	31	271 6	3	8 8
Dallas	9	66 9	1	1 1
Denton	619	9,478 2	35	111 1
De Witt	462	3,700 0	27	41 7
Dickens	1	0	1	0
Dimmit	3	116 1	4	6 6
Duval	120	2,083 0	3	20 8
Eastland	1,575	37,612 4	17	112 5
Erath	1,286	22,733 8	28	163 3
Falls	25	90 1	5	1 2
Fannin	882	9,854 3	36	101 8
Fayette	268	2,507 2	12	29 3
Fisher	19	235 8	5	5 4
Fort Bend	5	175 6	1	4 2
Franklin	239	634 6	33	9 7

1950 peanut allotments (original issue)—Continued

County	Old farms	Allotments	New farms	Allotments
Freestone	228	1,080 0	37	20 6
Frio	421	18,919 9	28	192 9
Gaines	69	2,336 5	29	67 7
Garza	16	406 0	2	4 7
Gillespie	207	2,475 1	6	26 0
Goliad	31	165 1	7	4 5
Gonzales	351	4,227 2	55	65 7
Grayson	936	15,331 4	66	171 2
Gregg	10	19 6	2	2
Grimes	107	584 9	58	20 4
Guadalupe	403	5,272 8	30	61 4
Hall	16	217 2		
Hamilton	52	445 3	6	5 9
Harris	95	3,383 1	9	38 7
Harrison	8	20 6		
Henderson	310	1,880 0	227	86 9
Hidalgo			1	3 4
Hill	534	8,458 8	9	61 7
Hood	575	11,615 3	23	135 2
Hopkins	534	2,211 1	113	46 5
Houston	561	8,440 8	127	143 6
Jack	87	639 0	15	14 3
Jackson			1	7
Jim Hogg	47	1,358 1	6	17 1
Jim Wells	20	239 9	8	15 2
Johnson	502	5,557 6	5	15 1
Jones	165	2,757 9	7	30 1
Karnes	176	1,696 6	30	30 5
Kent	51	909 1		
Kimble	5	41 4	2	4 8
Kleberg			7	4 6
Lamar	570	5,041 7	24	33 9
Lamb	1	66 5		
Lampasas	22	418 6	1	4 3
La Salle	57	2,891 5	3	20 6
Lavaca	639	3,101 3	91	47 0
Lee	980	10,218 0	78	124 3
Leon	345	2,559 1	77	46 3
Liberty	14	55 0	10	1 9
Limestone	257	1,859 1	40	29 1
Live Oak	36	420 7	12	8 0
Llano	107	4,007 5	1	6 9
McCulloch	65	1,643 9	7	21 8
McLennan	99	1,111 1	17	18 6
McMullen	3	35 7		
Madison	101	729 1	39	20 7
Marion	31	168 8	2	3 3
Mason	204	8,271 3	13	36 9
Maverick	9	27 5	6	1 8
Medina	182	2,880 7	24	36 3
Menard	12	122 3	4	4 3
Milam	410	2,885 5	49	49 1
Mills	91	1,707 4	9	17 9
Montague	477	3,851 7	31	47 6
Montgomery	36	282 8	8	4 1
Morris	218	1,617 2	22	21 1
Motley	23	561 3	4	18 2
Nacogdoches	62	245 7	29	8 6
Navarro	4	10 6		
Nueces	1	11 8		
Palo Pinto	187	3,296 1	20	45 9
Panola	24	60 9	6	1 6
Parker	798	11,088 6	67	129 1
Parmer	1	8 0		
Polk	11	9 4	3	2
Rains	22	112 6	7	3 6
Red River	66	287 8	54	10 8
Robertson	204	1,450 2	31	21 0
Runnels	50	650 9	4	7 9
Rusk	209	488 7	48	11 5
Sabine	4	6 3		
San Jacinto	19	20 9		
San Patricio	4	37 3		
San Saba	372	8,736 1	30	96 5
Shelby	44	52 6	2	6
Smith	58	135 7	37	5 8
Somervell	151	3,624 1	5	31 0
Starr	3	52 6	16	10 7
Stephens	58	724 0	3	9 8
Stonewall	184	4,808 3	9	54 8
Tarrant	196	1,165 2	10	7 9
Taylor	9	68 2	3	2 3
Terry	22	582 9	6	10 1
Titus	566	2,207 5	156	44 1
Travis	9	177 2		
Trinity	36	248 5	27	5 4
Tyler	19	23 0		
Upshur	165	440 3	64	15 0
Van Zandt	187	638 4	95	25 3
Victoria	25	183 9	4	2 6
Walker	25	47 5		
Waller	273	7,070 3	47	103 6
Washington	19	76 9	12	4 6
Webb	3	56 0	4	1 7
Wheeler	35	372 1	3	5 4
Wichita	1	0		
Williamson	50	327 3	3	3 8
Wilson	1,157	22,660 1	107	272 7
Wise	912	11,765 3	33	130 1
Wood	477	1,284 4	56	21 6
Young	31	293 9	6	6 4
Zapata	14	297 1	14	3 5
Total	31,918	477,397 9	3,711	4,996 8

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Giddings, Tex., May 29, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to your letter of May 15 and we herewith enclose the following information:

1. Number of peanut farms in Lee County: 1,054.
2. The least number a farmer can afford to grow: 10.
3 Number of producers receiving allotments less than the above. 661.
4. Number of producers receiving allotments less than 2 acres: 174.
5 Number of producers who will cease to grow peanuts (approximate): 50
6 Number of producers who will cease to farm for themselves (approximate): 25
7. Number of producers who applied for new grower allotment, 1950. 72.
8 Number of acres to distribute to them: 109 7.
9 Approximate acreage for each new grower 1 5

Very truly yours,
WARREN D MOODY,
Secretary, Lee County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Montague, Tex., June 7, 1950.

Re peanut questionnaire.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your recent questionnaire, you will find listed below the information you requested concerning peanut growers in Montague County.

Number of peanut producers in county: 375

Smallest acreage producer could afford to plant: 5.

Number of producers receiving less than 5 acres: 207.

Number of producers receiving less than 2 acres: 71.

Number of producers receiving less than 2 acres who will cease to grow peanuts: 90 percent or approximately 64.

Number of producers receiving less than 2 acres who will cease to farm for themselves: 50 percent or approximately 35.

Number of applicants for new grower allotments: 34.

Number of acres for distribution to new growers: 73.2.

Acreage (approximate) each new grower received: 1 5 to 3.

Yours truly,
BUEL E. WRIGHT,
Secretary, Montague County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Bastrop, Tex., June 1, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This will reply to your letter dated May 15, 1950, regarding peanut farms in Bastrop County

Bastrop County has 346 old grower peanut farm allotments and 69 new grower peanut farm allotments. The committee believes that the average producer cannot afford to economically grow less than 3 acres of peanuts. In Bastrop County 96 old grower farms received an allotment of less than 3 acres, and 69 new grower farms received less than a 3-acre allotment.

There are 53 old grower farms that received less than 2 acres and 69 new grower farms that received less than 2 acres. It is estimated that 80 percent of the producers on the farms receiving less than 2 acres will cease to grow peanuts and 50 percent will cease to farm for themselves. There were 73 applications for new grower allotments and 69 received allotments. New grower farms received 51.5 acres from the State committee reserve. Allotments ranged from 0.1 to 1.5 acres.

Respectfully,
NORMAN U. NOVOSAD,
Administrative Officer, Bastrop County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Allendale, S. C., June 1, 1950.

Mr LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am listing below the information requested in your letter dated May 18, 1950:

1. What is the least number of acres an average farmer can afford to grow or economically grow: 5.
2. How many producers received allotments less than the number of acres shown in 1: 135.
3. How many peanut producers received allotments less than 2 acres: 76.
4. Of the number of peanut farmers receiving allotments of less than 2 acres, how many will cease to grow peanuts: 50 percent.
5. Approximately how many will cease to farm for themselves: None.
6. How many new producers applied for peanut acreage this year (1950): 9.
7. How many acres were distributed to them: 18.6.
8. Approximately how much did each receive. 2

Very truly yours,
HENRY B BARKER,
County Administrative Officer, PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Thomasville, Ga., June 30, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter dated May 17, 1950:

Peanut producers in Thomas County	983
Peanut producers who received less than 5 acres	567
Peanut producers who received less than 2 acres	164
Peanut producers who ceased to grow peanuts in 1949	28
New producers who applied for peanut acreage in 1950	74

Generally, in thinking of the average farmer, 5 acres of peanuts is the least number of acres he can afford to grow economically.

One hundred seventy-four and one-tenth acres were distributed to the 74 new producers. This averaged approximately 3.2 acres per producer.

We cannot yet determine the number of producers who will cease to grow peanuts in 1950.

Very truly yours,
EDWIN Z. STERLING,
County Administrative Officer, Thomas County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Crawfordville, Fla., May 29, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In compliance to your letter dated May 12, 1950, we are furnishing you with the following information:

Number of peanut producers in county	78
Least number of acres producers can economically grow	5
Number of producers that received allotments less than the number of acres given in immediate previous question	40
Number of producers that received allotments less than 2 acres	16
Of the number of producers receiving allotments of less than 2 acres, how many will cease to grow peanuts	8
Approximately how many will cease to farm for themselves	5
How many new producers applied for peanut acreage in your county this year—1950	15
How many acres did you have to distribute to them	31.3
Approximately how much did each receive	2.9

Yours very truly,
KENNETH A STRICKLAND,
Administrative Officer, Wakulla County, Fla.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Wellington, Tex., May 31, 1950.

Hon LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of May 16, 1950, with reference to the peanut-acreage allotment for our county:

1. We have 109 farms with peanut allotments.
2. Producers in general should have at least 15 acres per farm in order to grow them economically.
3. There are 78 farms in the county that have an allotment of less than 15 acres
4 We have 15 farms with less than 2-acre allotments.
5 All farms with less than 2-acre allotments will cease to grow peanuts.
6 Probably none of these producers will cease to farm for themselves, but will have to grow other crops for a livelihood.
7. We have 21 producers who applied for new-grower allotments.
8. A total of 27.3 acres were allotted to new growers of this county by the State committee.
9. On an average each new grower received 1.3 acres.

Trusting this supplies the information requested.

Yours truly,
MILLARD P. BROWN,
Secretary, Collingsworth County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Quincy, Fla., May 26, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of May 12, 1950, we have 175 peanut producers in Gadsden County The least number of acres a farmer can grow econom-

ically is usually 5 acres; 89 of these allotments are under 5 acres; 39 received less than 2 acres. Nearly all of these will quit growing peanuts for harvest. We have no way of knowing how many farmers will cease to farm for themselves on this account. It will cause some to do so. Seventeen new growers applied for peanut acreage this year—1950. We had 17.4 acres to distribute to them. These range from 0.5 to 1.7 acres.

Trusting this is the information you desired, I am,

Yours truly,

BERNARD H. CLARK,
Administrative Officer, Gadsden County FMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Inverness, Fla., May 22, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have one farmer producing peanuts in Citrus County, Fla., or allotment. In growing these peanuts to be dug it is not economically profitable to grow less than about 30 acres, since no other growers in the county are growing peanuts for digging, and it is not possible to rent a picker, etc. This one producer has an allotment less than he can produce economically. No producer received an allotment of less than 2 acres. None will cease to grow peanuts or to farm for themselves because of allotments of less than 2 acres. No new producers applied for allotments for 1950 because no allotment was available for distribution to new growers in this county.

Yours very truly,

E. A. ZELLNER,
Chairman, PMA County Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Arapaho, Okla., May 31, 1950.

Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of May 18 we wish to advise that we are a very small peanut-producing county. In fact we have only two allotments, both of which are about 20 acres. They are both group I or old grower allotments.

We received approximately 30 applications for 1950 new grower peanut allotments. We were unable to give any of these new grower allotments because the county reserve for new grower allotments was zero. This was due to the fact that our county allotment was approximately 40 acres and 1 percent of our county allotment would be less than one-half acre for new grower farms.

Hoping this information will be helpful to you, we remain,

Yours very truly,

RUSSELL E. DILL,
County Administrative Officer

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Greenville, S. C., June 2, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter dated May 17, 1950, we wish to advise that Greenville County is not a peanut county and has only five peanut-allotment farms with a total of 12.4 acres. The least number of acres the average farmer and producer can afford to grow is 10 acres. All allotments in the county are less than 10 acres, and three allotments are less than 2 acres, and none of these will cease to grow peanuts or farm for themselves. We did not have any applications for new-grower allotments.

We hope this information will be of help to you, and at any time we can furnish you any information we will be glad to do so.

Very truly yours,

T. LLOYD GARRETT,
County Administrative Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
Little Rock, Ark., June 1, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH. We have forwarded your letter of May 26 to the extension service for reply, as their farm management specialist says he has some information which may be useful to you. Several other persons were contacted, but did not know how large an acreage of peanuts is needed to support a family that depends on peanuts as their primary money crop.

Inasmuch as a question of this kind involves farm management and sociology, and also since I have not raised peanuts, it was believed best to refer the matter to the extension service.

Sincerely,

MILES MCPEEK,
Agricultural Statistician

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Quitman, Tex., May 29, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN. This is in reference to your letter, dated May 13, 1950, to the Wood County PMA Committee.

We have approximately 400 peanut producers in the county. The least number of acres each producer can afford to grow is 2 acres. We have about 150 producers who received allotments of less than 2 acres. Of those growers having allotments of less than 2 acres, there will be about 25 or 50 who will cease to grow peanuts. I do not believe there will be any cease to farm for themselves. The number of new producers were 35 and the number of acres distributed was 21.4 acres and the average to each was 0.6 of an acre.

The excess acreage (for oil) up to the 1947 picked and threshed will help at least 150 or 200 producers in Wood County.

Hoping the above is the desired information, I am

Yours very truly,

ROY E. BARNETT,
Secretary, Wood County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Quitman, Tex., April 10, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reference to your letter of April 5, 1950, to the county committee.

(1) The number of farmers receiving 5 acres of cotton or less was 1,248. (2) The number of new producers of that applied for allotments were 340. (3) The acreage that was available to distribute among the new producers was 300. (4) Each producer received from 1 to 1.1 acres. (5) The number of zero allotments were 10. (6) The percent of new producers regarded as genuine farmers was 88 percent (300) applications.

The number of applications left from item 2 less item 5, less item 6, consisted of 30 applications that did not meet the necessary eligibility requirements.

If you desire further information, please advise.

Yours very truly,

ROY E. BARNETT,
Secretary, Wood County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Stillwater, Okla., June 23, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Attached is a list, by counties, of the number of 1950 peanut acreage allotments in Oklahoma.

We do not know the exact number of peanut producers in each county; however, the attached list of allotments will represent approximately the number of producers in each county.

This information is being submitted in compliance with your communication of June 9, 1950.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES T. CAMERON,
Chairman, Oklahoma State PMA Committee.

Number of 1950 peanut allotments in Oklahoma

Atoka	1,073
Beckham	52
Bryan	2,095
Caddo	2,265
Canadian	96
Carter	444
Choctaw	1,015
Cleveland	76
Coal	488
Comanche	343
Cotton	23
Creek	909
Custer	2
Dewey	4
Garvin	461
Grady	618
Grant	2
Greer	22
Harmon	20
Haskell	288
Hughes	2,065
Jackson	94
Jefferson	138
Johnston	537
Kingfisher	2
Latimer	26
Le Flore	103
Lincoln	1,022
Logan	31
Love	627
McClain	278
McCurtain	378
McIntosh	425
Marshall	303
Murray	44
Muskogee	180
Okfuskee	1,197
Oklahoma	154
Okmulgee	827
Osage	13
Pawnee	29
Payne	151
Pittsburg	933
Pontotoc	694
Pottawatomie	993
Pushmataha	328
Seminole	1,483
Stephens	766
Tulsa	28
Wagoner	11
Washita	101
Total	24,237

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Richmond, a., June 12, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge receipt of the return of our letter of June 8 with attachment of summary of 1950 peanut acreage allotments for Virginia. We note that at the bottom of this letter you have requested that we give you county-by-county the number of producers in each county.

For your information, under the 1950 allotment regulations, all farms on which peanuts were produced in any year of the 3-year period 1947, 1948, and 1949 are eligible for allotments and should have been issued allotments. In addition, the instructions provided for issuing "new farm" allotments to certain farms on which peanuts will be produced in 1950 but on which peanuts were not produced in the past 3 years. Therefore allotments have been issued to all farms producing peanuts in each county and the number of producers should be identical with the number of allotments shown in our tabulation It is, of course, true that on many farms tenants are involved who might be considered peanut producers and the number of allotments as shown in our tabulation would include only one producer for each farm However, all our contacts are with the farm operators and we have no record of the number of tenants involved on various farms on which peanut allotments have been issued.

As requested, we are returning herewith your letter and the attached tabulation of 1950 peanut allotments.

Yours very truly,
R. B. BRIDGFORTH,
Chairman, Virginia PMA State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Richmond, Va., June 8, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge your letter of May 29, 1950, requesting certain information on peanuts produced in Virginia I regret the delay in replying to your letter, which was occasioned by my absence from the city.

For your information I am enclosing a tabulation showing by counties the number of peanut allotments established and the acreage allotted for 1950.

The remaining information requested by you would require a great amount of time and clerical help in making a compilation, and because of the pressure of other work in our office at this time I do not believe we will be in a position to furnish the other information until a later date.

As soon as our work will permit us to gather this information we will be glad to furnish it to you.

Very truly yours,
R. B. BRIDGFORTH,
Chairman, Virginia PMA State Committee.

Summary of 1950 peanut acreage allotments—Virginia

County	Number of allotments	Allotted acreage
Accomac	4	20 5
Brunswick	498	1,682 0
Charles City	1	7. 5
Chesterfield	46	172 5
Dinwiddie	646	5,575 7
Elizabeth City	1	3. 6
Greensville	1,110	13,327. 4
Gloucester	3	12. 3
Isle of Wight	1,267	21,224. 0
James City	13	182. 4
King and Queen	2	11 1
Lunenburg	3	15 3
Mecklenburg	76	262 2
Middlesex	2	15 3
Nansemond	1,446	20,086 5
New Kent	11	81. 5
Norfolk	35	349 7
Nottoway	1	5. 4
Prince George	520	5,413. 5
Princess Anne	5	15 1
Southampton	1,949	40,575. 4
Surry	749	11,216. 3
Sussex	1,159	20,045. 5
State totals	9,547	140,300. 7

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Stillwater, Okla., July 19, 1950

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Enclosed is a tabulation showing, by counties, the 1950 peanut acreage data which you have requested from each of the peanut counties in Oklahoma. This data is being submitted in compliance with your request in our recent telephone conversation.

The data in columns 2, 5, and 6 are necessarily based on estimates. Where dashes appear in these columns, we were unable to secure an estimate from the county committee.

We hope that the enclosed tabulation will serve your purpose and that you will call on us for any additional information which you think will be helpful.

Very truly yours,
CHARLES T CAMERON,
Chairman, Oklahoma State PMA Committee.

1950 peanut data—Oklahoma

District	County	Number of peanut producers (1)	Smallest acreage which can be grown economically (2)	Number of producers with allotment less than that in column 2 (3)	Number of producers with allotment under 2 acres (4)	Number of producers in column 4 who will cease to grow peanuts (5)	Number of producers who will cease to farm for themselves (6)	Number of producers who applied for 1950 "new grower" allotment (7)	"New grower" allotment (8)	Average of "new grower" allotment per producer (9)
2	Grant	2	20	2	1	1	0	2	0	0
	Total district	2		2	1	1	0	2	0	
3	Osage	13	3	3	1	1	0	0	0	0
	Pawnee	20	3	1	1	0	0	35	0	0
	Tulsa	21	2	0	0	0	0	7	0	0
	Wagoner	11	5	1	0			6	0	0
	Total district	74		5	2	1	0	48	0	
4	Beckham	44	5	3	0		0	9	4	4 0
	Custer	2	10	0	0		0	30	0	0
	Dewey	4	5	1	0	0	0	5	0	0
	Washita	101	5	46	30	30	0	6	10	1. 7
	Total district	151		50	30	30	0	50	14	
5	Canadian	73	3	13	8	6	2	43	5	50 0
	Cleveland	76	5	27	10	10	0	5	0	0
	Creek	909	3	371	214	128	20	120	45	2 8
	Grady	598	5	273	131	0	0	80	46	2 4
	Lincoln	987	5	721	141	90	0	51	39	1 0
	Logan	31	5	1	4	0	0	2	0	0
	McClain	275	4	155	142	0	0	38	13	0 5
	Okfuskee	1,250	5	712	278	139	25	122	65	5
	Oklahoma	148	4	87	17	5	1	20	8	3 0
	Payne	147	5	63	6	0	0	33	7	1 7
	Pottawatomie	925	3	103	47			92	63	3 0
	Seminole	1,479	3	389	190	125	19	133	75	2. 8
	Total district	6,898		2,923	1,188	503	67	739	366	

1950 peanut data—Oklahoma—Continued

District	County	Number of peanut producers (1)	Smallest acreage which can be grown economically (2)	Number of producers with allotment less than that in column 2 (3)	Number of producers with allotment under 2 acres (4)	Number of producers in column 4 who will cease to grow peanuts (5)	Number of producers who will cease to farm for themselves (6)	Number of producers who applied for 1950 "new grower" allotment (7)	"New grower" allotment (8)	Average of "new grower" allotment per producer (9)
6	Haskell	251	5	109	38	38	8	37	9	3.0
	Hughes	1,940	5	542	137	14	7	64	102	5.5
	McIntosh	425	3	181	99	5	0	62	19	1.3
	Muskogee	179	5	73	70	68	0	30	11	3.7
	Okmulgee	687	4	348	153	75	0	105	37	2.0
	Pittsburg	900	5	410	138	75	25	205	58	4.8
	Total district	4,382		1,663	635	275	40	503	326	
7	Caddo	2,260	6	729	223	190	100	275	292	1.6
	Comanche	301	6	150	44	44	0	19	17	1.5
	Cotton	23	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Greer	20	5	5	1	1	0	0	0	0
	Harmon	20	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Jackson	70	2	0	0	0	0	24	8	4.0
	Total district	2,694		891	268	235	100	318	317	
8	Atoka	965	5	292	106	79	39	108	67	2.8
	Bryan	2,020	5	463	186	96	12	207	281	5.0
	Carter	435	10	117	7	7	0	40	32	4.0
	Coal	481	5	262	72	43	0	51	22	3.0
	Garvin	442	8	156	11	11	0	19	26	5.5
	Jefferson	107	5	41	11	11	0	31	8	8.0
	Johnston	540	5	96	9	5	5	19	50	2.5
	Love	610	15	326	7	3	0	17	74	4.4
	Marshall	296			2			13	72	10.3
	Murray	37	5	13	4	4	0	5	0	0
	Pontotoc	688	5	439	228	110	20	40	30	7.0
	Stephens	752	7	206	21	10	0	54	49	4.9
	Total district	7,373		2,411	664	379	76	664	711	
9	Choctaw	1,045	4	240	33	20	10	150	42	3.0
	Latimer	26	5	6	0	0	0	3	0	0
	Le Flore	95	5	32	2	2		8	6	3.3
	McCurtain	294	5	232	122	56	10	88	9	3.0
	Pushmataha	323	5	122	38	22		34	20	4.0
	Total district	1,783		632	195	100	20	283	77	
	State	24,357		8,577	2,983	1,521	303	2,607	1,811	

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND
MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Nashville, Tenn., June 19, 1950.

Hon LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of May 29 requesting information in regard to peanut production in this State, we are enclosing a tabulation which will furnish you with most of the information you desire from the questions which you have asked in your letter.

In regard to your question as to what is the least number of acres a producer can afford to grow or economically grow, this is a question which is very difficult to answer in this State, for there are so many variable factors involved, such as the size of the farm, other crops and livestock on the farms, and since peanut production in this State is a minor crop. We do not have very many farmers that depend solely upon peanuts for a living for himself and family.

The number of peanut allotments of less than 2 acres established in this State is 277. The number that will cease to grow less than 2 acres is estimated at 50. The number that will cease to farm for themselves is estimated at none. We have in this State a number of farms which produce less than 1 acre of peanuts, and these farms do not have an allotment established for them, under the present regulations for peanuts.

Trusting this is the information you desire and assuring you that it has been a pleasure to have served you in this instance, I am,

Very truly yours,

CARL FEY,
Chairman, State PMA Committee.

1950 peanut allotments

County and code	Total number allotments	Number: Old farms	Number: New farms	Acreage allotted old farms	Acreage allotted new farms	Total acreage allotted
63-003 Benton	93	84	9	516.9	4.6	521.5
63-006 Bradley	8	7	1	18.2	.4	18.6
63-009 Carroll	6	5	1	33.0	6	33.6
63-016 Coffee	1	1	0	5.0	0	5
63-020 Decatur	87	79	8	436.5	6.8	443.3
63-022 Dickson	10	10	0	10.5	0	10.5
63-024 Fayette	2	2	0	16.5	0	16.5
63-033 Hamilton	5	3	2	3.2	.7	3.9
63-036 Hardin	7	7	0	34.1	0	34.1
63-041 Hickman	55	52	3	100.7	.9	101.6
63-043 Humphreys	367	332	35	1,602.7	20.3	1,623.0
63-050 Lawrence	22	18	4	29.3	2.8	32.1
63-051 Lewis	133	130	3	265.5	1.4	266.9
63-057 Madison	1	1	0	6.4	0	6.4
63-066 Perry	195	173	22	939.4	3.6	943.0
63-081 Stewart	2	2	0	2.3	0	2.3
63-091 Wayne	32	30	2	71.7	3.2	75.0
Giles	2	1	1	3.7	0	3.7
Hardeman	4	1	3	13.8	3.3	17.1
Total	1,029	938	91	4,104.9	48.6	4,153.5

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Paris, Tex., May 29, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In complying with your letter of May 16, 1950, please find below the information you were seeking.

Number of peanut producers in Lamar County: 393.

What is the least number of acres he can afford to grow or economically grow: 1 acre.

Number of producers in county that received less allotment than mentioned in above question: None.

How many peanut producers received allotments of less than two acres 80

Of the number of peanut farmers receiving allotments of less than two acres, how many will cease to grow peanuts: None.

Approximately how many will cease to farm for themselves: None.

How many new producers applied for peanut acreage in your county this year, 1950: 24.

How many acres did you have to distribute to them: 78 acres.

Approximately how much did each receive: 1.5 acres.

Very truly yours,

ROY P. MASON,
Secretary, Lamar County, PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Cross City, Fla., May 31, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congressman, Third Congressional
District of Texas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Reference is made to your letter of May 12 relative to peanut producers in Dixie County, Fla., Dixie County is primarily a livestock county and most of the farmers produce peanuts for hog feed. However, we do have some 20 farmers who grow peanuts for digging. Of these 18 have less than two acres allotment. It is the general thinking of the average farmer that they cannot economically dig and pick

less than 5 acres. Of the number of farmers having less than two acres allotments none will cease growing peanuts but about 75 peacent of them will not dig. We had no new producers applying for acreage this year but the reason for this was that when told the probable size of new grower allotments those that were interested decided that it would not be worth the trouble of filling out the forms

Trusting that this is the information that you desire, I am,

Very truly yours,

CLARENCE L. DICKINSON,
County Agent.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Fairfield, Tex., June 6, 1950.

Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Appreciate receiving your recent letter regarding peanut producers in our county, however, at the present time we are so busy with measuring peanut and cotton crops, that we do not have a clerk available to secure the necessary information you requested.

Yours very truly,

NORMAN H LAMBERT,
Secretary, Freestone County PMA.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
DEPARTMENT OF GAME AND FISH,
Santa Fe, N Mex., June 8, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to your letter of May 26 relative to the number of acres of peanuts required to support a family.

It is my opinion that in the section of eastern New Mexico where peanuts are raised successfully that from 5 to 7 acres of peanuts in good irrigated land is sufficient to support a family nicely

Yours very truly,

ELLIOTT S. BARKER,
State Game Warden.

NORTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Raleigh, June 7, 1950.

Hon LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of May 26, 1950, this is to inform you that the number of acres that a family of a man, wife, and three or four children need for a primary money crop is from 8 to 10 acres of Virginia-type peanuts. I mention the Virginia-type peanuts as this is the only variety grown on a commercial scale in this State The above estimate of acres is based on a yearly average of from 1,000 to 1, 00 pounds per acre, and also on the basis of the present support price.

Very truly yours,

L. Y. BALLENTINE, *Commissioner.*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
De Ridder, La., June 1, 1950.

DEAR SIR: Please find enclosure for your attention.

Yours very truly,

T. SHELBY OAKES,
Parish Administrative Officer,
County Committee of Beauregard County.

1. Cotton producers in Beauregard Parish 807
2. Farmers receiving 5 acres or less of cotton 272
3. New producers applied for acreage 150
4. Acreage to distribute among new producers 415
5 Acreage each received 2-3 4
6. Farmers receiving zero acreage 13
7 Percent of new producers regarded as genuine farmers 90
8. a Acreage the new cotton amendment helped new producers ..... None
   b Old ones ..... None
9 Number of producers receiving less than 5 acres that will probably grow no cotton 15
10 Number of farmers that will cease to farm for themselves ..... -----

---

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
De Ridder, La., May 22, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In reference to your letter of May 18, 1950, listed below is a tabulation to your questionnaire.

Thank you for your interest in peanut and cotton farmers

Very truly yours,

T. SHELBY OAKES,
Administrative Officer, Beauregard Parish Production and Marketing Administration.

Peanuts, 1950

Number of peanut producers 67
Number of peanut acres he can economically grow 5
Number of producers received allotment less than 5 acres 60
Number of producers received allotment less than 2 acres 47
Number of producers received less than 2 acres that will cease to grow peanuts 25
Number of producers that will cease to farm for themselves ..... ---
Number of new producers applied for allotment in 1950 3
How many acres did you have to distribute 5.9
Approximately how much did they receive (all 3) 5.9

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Troy, N C., May 26, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Questions requested in letter dated May 18, 1950:

1. Number of peanut producers: One.

2. Least number of acres he could economically grow: 16.

3 Producers that received allotments less than 16: None.

4 Producers that received allotments less than two: None.

5. Number of peanut farmers to receive allotments less than two: None.

6. How many will cease to grow peanuts: None

7. Approximately how many will cease to farm for themselves: None.

8. How many new producers applied for peanut acreage this year: None.

9. How many acres did you have to distribute to them: None.

10. How much did each receive: None.

Very truly yours,

DAVID MCALISTER,
Secretary, Montgomery County PMA

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Junction, Tex., May 24, 1950.

Hon LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HONORABLE BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of May 13, 1950, please find the following information:

1. Number of peanut producers in your county: 10.

2 Least number of acres of peanuts farmers and producers can afford to grow or grow economically: 15

3 Number of producers in your county receiving allotments less than the number of acres we mentioned in answer to the immediate previous question 1

4. How many of your peanut producers received allotments of less than 2 acres. 1.

5. Of the number of peanut farmers receiving allotments of less than 2 acres, how many will cease to grow peanuts. 1.

6. Approximately how many will cease to farm for themselves: 1

7. How many new producers applied for peanut acreage in your county this year, 1950 2.

8 How many acres did you have to distribute to them 4 8

9 Approximately how much did each receive 2 4

Yours very truly,

MILDRED M. SNEAD,
Secretary, Kimble County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Jackson, Tex., June 7, 1950.

Mr LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congressman, Third District, Texas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR BECKWORTH: In answer to your letter relative to peanut allotments in Jack County.

We believe the least acreage allotment to the farmer should be not less than 10 acres since special equipment is needed in harvesting the crop.

We have only six old growers who have an allotment of less than 2 acres which I believe was caused by not planting their allotment and maintaining their history.

Jack County had 15 applications for new-grower peanut allotments for 1950 I believe the law limits the State to 1 percent of the State allotment for new growers. Due to heavy work in the county this year the State office asked that we send the new-grower applications to them to figure. The 15 were allotted 14 3 acres but not many will plant their allotment of less than 1 acre.

We had so many in 1949 that didn't plant their allotment that we sent cards to all of our peanut growers asking that they return the card stating if they would or would not plant their 1950 peanut allotment. Then if they said they would not plant their allotment the county committee took all the allotment they were permitted to and distributed it to other growers.

We are more of a livestock county than farming but we do have 548 allotment farms: Wheat, cotton, and peanuts.

We do appreciate your interest in the small farmer who must be cared for in the marketing-quota program because there are children to be fed, clothed, and sent to school, besides some soil- and water-conservation work to do.

Everyone should feel their responsibility on soil and water conservation since it affects everyone.

Very respectfully,

WILLIAM E. YOWELL,
Administrative Officer, Jack County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Dade City, Fla., May 29, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Your letter of May 12, regarding peanut producers in this county, is hereby acknowledged.

Please be advised that we have only two peanut allotments in this county, with both receiving allotments in excess of 2 acres. These two allotments are 17.4 acres and 2.4 acres, respectively. They were not affected by the new regulations.

Very truly yours,

CARL P. DEAL,
Administrative Officer, Pasco County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Saluda, Va., June 1, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH. With reference to your inquiry of peanut producers in Middlesex County, we wish to advise that there are only two peanut growers in our county. One of these farmers maintains an allotment of approximately 10 acres, which is the least acres that the producer can afford to grow economically. The other producer now has an allotment of 2 7 acres, which we do not believe justifies him to grow peanuts

There were no producers applying for new peanut allotments this year.

These farmers farm for themselves and we believe they will continue to do so This we hope will give you the desired information, since we are not a peanut-producing county.

Yours very truly,

FLORENCE G. WILLAFORD,
Secretary, Middlesex PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Conway, S. C., May 29, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: With reference to your letter of May 17, 1950, the following information from Horry County, S. C., is supplied herewith:

1. The average farmer in this county feels that the least number of acres of peanuts that he can afford to economically grow would be 2.5 acres.

2. There are 339 peanut producers with allotments in Horry County. Of this number 287 have allotments less than 2.5 acres.

3. 279 farmers in this county have received allotments of less than 2 acres.

4. It is not believed that any producer who is interested in peanut production would cease to grow peanuts this year because his allotment is less than 2 acres.

5. Since this is primarily a flue-cured tobacco county, no farmer will cease to farm for himself because of his small acreage of peanuts.

6. There were not applicants for new grower peanut allotments in this county for this year, the reason being that there is hardly any probability of a person receiving over a 1-acre allotment.

Yours very truly,

BUCK N. KING,
County Administrative Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Henrietta, Tex., June 1, 1950.

LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR BECKWORTH: There are 42 peanut producers in Clay County. About 3 acres is the least number of acres a farmer can afford to grow There were 13 producers in this county that received allotments of less than the 3 acres mentioned above There were six producers that received allotments of less than 2 acres. Peanut farmers receiving allotments of less than 2 acres, will cease to grow peanuts commercially but will grow some for home use. None will cease to farm for themselves. There were 13 new producers that applied for peanut acreage in Clay County in 1950 New grower reserves were retained in the State office. All new growers received a total of 13 4 acres.

Yours truly,

ERMON D WILLIAMS,
Secretary, Clay County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Burgaw, N. C., May 26, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C

DEAR HONORABLE BECKWORTH This is in reply to your letter of May 18, 1950. The following is a list of the questions and answers requested in your letter:

1. The number of peanut producers in Pender County. 335.

2. Number of acres of peanuts a producer can grow economically: 5.

3 Number of allotments less than 5 acres in county 185.

4. Number of allotments in county less than 2 acres: 56.

5 Number of allotments in county less than 2 acres which will not be planted: None.

6. Approximately how many will cease to farm for themselves. None.

7 Number of producers who applied for new allotments in Pender County in 1950: 11.

8 How many acres did we have to distribute to them? We did not have any acreage to distribute to them as the distribution of acreage is done in Raleigh for new growers.

9. How many acres did the new growers receive in Pender County. 3.

Very truly yours,

T. W. GARRISS,
Secretary, Pender County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Lampasas, Tex., May 27, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In answer to your letter of May 13, 1950, we give the following information.

There are 24 peanut producers in Lampasas County, and 20 acres is the least number of acres that he can afford to grow or economically grow. Twelve producers in our county received allotments less than the number of acres mentioned above. There were no producers who received less than 2 acres. One new producer applied for peanut acreage in our county this year, 1950. We had 4 5 acres to distribute to them. Each one received 4 5 acres since there was only one new producer.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM W. WILSON,
Secretary, Lampasas County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Burnet, Tex, May 29, 1950.

To: Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH, House of Representatives, Washington, D C.

From. Raby A. Alford, secretary, Burnet County PMA.

Subject: Information requested in letter of May 13, 1950.

Information as requested is listed below:

What is the least number of acres average peanut producer can afford to grow: 5.

How many producers received allotments less than acreage mentioned above 7.

How many of your peanut farmers received allotments of less than 2 acres: 2.

How many of this number (receiving allotments of less than 2 acres) will cease to grow peanuts. 2.

How many will cease to farm for themselves. None.

How many new producers applied for peanut acreage in 1950. 2.

How many acres did you distribute to them. 4 7.

Approximately how much did each receive: 1.5 and 3 2.

I include the data I referred to at the first part of my statement:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., October 8, 1951.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your request for information concerning peanut acreage allotments by counties for 1950.

The attached table shows by State and county the number of eligible farms, the acreage allotted to old farms, the average acreage per eligible farm, estimated production per county, estimated value of peanut crop per county, estimated average production per eligible farm, and estimated average value of peanut crop per farm.

The table excludes reserves for new farms, small farms, and corrections. We estimated the production by applying the 1950 preliminary county yields to the individual counties.

In arriving at estimated values we used the following prices by areas: Virginia-Carolina, 12.7 cents, southeastern, 10.4 cents; and southwestern, 10.3 cents.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD K. HILL,
Deputy Administrator.

Peanut acreage allotments to old growers, by State and county, estimated production and value, crop year 1950

	Number of eligible farms (1)	Acreage allotted to old farms (2)	Average allotment per eligible farm (3)	1950 county yield per acre (4)	Indicated production from allotted acres (column 2× column 4) (5)	Indicated value of production from allotted acres (6)	Average production per farm (column 5÷ column 1) (7)	Average value per farm basis (column 7) (8)
ALABAMA								
District 1:		*Acres*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*		*Pounds*	
Franklin	40	51.5	1.3	645	33,218	$3,155	830	$86
Marion	81	94.6	1.2	657	62,152	6,404	767	80
District 2								
Lauderdale	2	13.4	6.7	710	9,514	909	4,757	495
Limestone	3	2.3	.8	760	1,748	182	583	61
Marshall	4	7.2	1.8	710	5,112	532	1,278	133
District 3A								
Bibb	4	12.0	3.0	635	7,620	792	1,905	198
Blount	238	395.2	1.7	626	247,395	25,729	1,039	108
Chilton	25	64.7	2.6	607	39,273	4,084	1,571	163
Winston	10	17.6	1.8	655	11,528	1,199	1,153	120
District 3								
Calhoun	14	24.0	1.7	710	17,040	1,772	1,217	127
Cherokee	2	5.0	2.5	710	3,550	369	1,775	185
De Kalb	2	3.8	1.9	757	2,877	299	1,438	150
Etowah	1	7.0	7.0	760	5,320	553	5,320	553
District 4								
Hale	17	68.8	4.0	503	34,606	3,599	2,036	212
Sumter	6	130.7	21.8	556	72,669	7,558	12,112	1,260
Tuscaloosa	13	85.5	6.6	637	54,464	5,664	4,190	436
District 5								
Autauga	251	1,027.1	4.1	606	622,544	64,745	2,480	258
Dallas	81	312.0	3.9	454	141,648	14,731	1,749	182
Elmore	39	142.6	3.7	605	86,273	8,972	2,212	230
Lowndes	21	151.4	7.2	505	76,457	7,952	3,641	379
Montgomery	244	1,837.4	7.5	707	1,299,042	135,100	5,324	554
Perry	112	519.8	4.6	556	289,009	30,057	2,580	268
Wilcox	27	211.0	7.8	658	138,838	14,439	5,142	534
District 6								
Clay	41	58.4	1.4	610	35,624	3,705	869	90
Lee	25	55.2	2.2	607	33,506	3,485	1,340	139
Macon	71	387.8	5.5	676	264,397	26,457	3,583	373
Russell	224	1,867.5	12.8	404	1,747,705	180,771	7,758	807
District 7								
Baldwin	5	11.0	2.2	760	8,360	869	1,672	174
Mobile	26	165.0	6.4	910	150,150	15,616	5,775	601
Washington	1	4.2	4.2	500	2,100	218	2,100	218
District 8								
Butler	1,002	5,610.4	5.6	848	4,757,619	494,792	4,748	491
Conecuh	940	4,726.0	5.0	884	4,177,784	434,490	4,444	462
Covington	2,340	16,530.7	7.1	1,111	18,375,607	1,911,063	7,853	817
Crenshaw	1,604	14,950.0	9.3	1,091	16,310,450	1,696,287	10,169	1,058
Escambia	270	1,665.5	6.2	949	1,580,560	164,378	5,853	609
Monroe	225	903.4	4.0	909	821,191	85,404	3,650	380
District 9								
Barbour	1,766	34,287.7	19.4	929	31,853,273	3,312,740	18,037	1,876
Bullock	682	5,876.1	8.6	626	3,678,439	382,558	5,394	561
Coffee	2,160	40,478.7	18.7	1,030	41,693,061	4,336,078	19,302	2,007
Dale	1,427	24,305.4	17.0	970	23,576,238	2,451,929	16,522	1,718
Geneva	2,008	24,607.0	12.3	980	24,114,860	2,507,945	12,009	1,249
Henry	1,328	46,752.5	35.2	970	45,349,925	4,716,392	34,149	3,551
Houston	2,660	43,987.8	16.5	1,040	45,747,312	4,757,720	17,198	1,789
Pike	1,643	38,194.5	23.2	1,081	41,288,255	4,293,979	25,130	2,614
Total	21,685	311,618.6	14.4	980	308,808,313	32,116,062	14,241	1,481
ARIZONA								
Pima	3	950.0	316.7	[1] 500	475,000	48,925	158,333	16,308
ARKANSAS								
District 2								
Gleburne	2	15.2	7.6	475	7,220	744	3,610	372
Van Buren	3	3.2	1.1	453	1,450	149	483	50
District 3								
Craighead	6	10.5	1.8	540	5,670	584	945	107
Lawrence	2	16.0	8.0	540	8,640	890	4,320	415
Randolph	1	2.4	2.4	500	1,200	124	1,200	124
District 4								
Crawford	19	67.5	3.6	500	33,750	3,476	1,776	183
Franklin	355	1,923.9	5.5	530	1,019,667	105,026	2,872	296
Johnson	17	55.4	3.3	440	24,376	2,511	1,434	148
Logan	2	12.0	6.0	428	5,136	529	2,568	265
Polk	8	8.6	1.1	440	3,784	390	473	49
Yell	86	226.2	2.7	450	101,790	10,484	1,198	123
District 5								
Conway	12	38.5	3.2	507	19,520	2,011	1,627	168
Faulkner	9	24.7	2.7	538	13,289	1,369	1,477	152
Grant	4	4.3	1.1	515	2,215	228	554	57
Hot Spring	12	19.7	1.6	496	9,771	1,006	814	84
Perry	1	2.4	2.4	535	1,284	132	1,284	132
Pulaski	12	15.1	1.3	486	7,339	756	612	63
Saline	12	14.3	1.2	537	7,679	791	640	66
District 7:								
Hempstead	21	77.2	3.2	457	35,280	3,634	1,470	151
Howard	9	11.1	1.2	427	4,740	488	527	54
Little River	19	153.7	8.1	497	76,389	7,868	4,020	414
Sevier	37	68.3	1.8	477	32,579	3,357	881	91
District 8:								
Calhoun	7	14.3	2.0	472	6,750	695	964	99
Clark	17	40.5	2.4	422	17,091	1,760	1,005	104
Cleveland	11	15.2	1.4	492	7,478	770	680	70
Dallas	17	28.3	1.7	432	12,226	1,259	719	74
Nevada	16	28.7	1.8	402	11,537	1,188	721	74
Union	28	40.8	1.5	402	16,402	1,689	586	60
Total	747	2,938.0	3.9	475	1,494,252	153,908	2,000	206

[1] Estimated.

Peanut acreage allotments to old growers, by State and county, estimated production and value, crop year 1950—Continued

	Number of eligible farms (1)	Acreage allotted to old farms (2)	Average allotment per eligible farm (3)	1950 county yield per acre (4)	Indicated production from allotted acres (column 2× column 4) (5)	Indicated value of production from allotted acres (6)	Average production per farm (column 5÷ column 1) (7)	Average value per farm basis (column 7) (8)
CALIFORNIA								
Number of farms and county allotments not available.								
FLORIDA								
District 1:		*Acres*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*		*Pounds*	
Bay	10	126.2	12.6	800	100,960	$10,500	10,096	$1,050
Calhoun	207	2,399.4	11.6	933	2,238,640	232,819	10,815	1,125
Escambia	12	56.6	4.7	1,071	60,788	6,322	5,066	527
Gadsden	158	1,277.7	8.1	671	857,337	89,163	5,426	564
Holmes	800	4,787.5	6.0	828	3,964,050	412,261	4,955	515
Jackson	2,715	36,029.4	13.3	822	29,616,167	3,080,081	10,908	1,134
Jefferson	139	1,601.4	11.5	712	1,140,197	118,580	8,203	853
Leon	108	747.3	6.9	580	433,434	45,077	4,013	417
Liberty	1	12.0	12.0	200	2,400	250	2,400	250
Okaloosa	197	1,104.5	5.6	1,083	1,196,174	124,402	6,072	631
Santa Rosa	629	7,277.4	11.6	1,171	8,543,668	888,541	13,583	1,413
Wakulla	68	751.2	11.0	667	501,050	52,109	7,368	766
Walton	380	1,736.9	4.6	254	441,173	45,882	1,161	121
Washington	312	1,490.2	4.8	957	1,426,121	148,317	4,571	475
District 3								
Columbia	194	1,210.3	6.2	406	491,382	51,104	2,533	263
Dixie	22	29.6	1.3	628	18,589	1,933	845	88
Hamilton	40	259.5	6.5	389	103,541	10,768	2,588	269
Lafayette	129	287.6	2.2	575	165,370	17,198	1,282	133
Madison	56	361.6	6.5	624	225,638	23,466	4,029	419
Suwannee	347	1,878.0	5.4	817	1,534,326	159,570	4,422	460
Taylor	2	7.4	3.7	390	2,886	300	1,443	150
District 5								
Alachua	192	2,284.8	11.9	494	1,128,691	117,384	5,879	611
Citrus	1	14.4	14.4	[2] 597	8,597	894	8,597	894
Gilchrist	130	315.7	2.4	644	203,311	21,144	1,564	163
Levy	204	2,628.0	12.9	691	1,823,832	189,679	8,940	930
Marion	347	3,054.6	8.8	608	1,832,760	190,607	5,282	549
Pasco	2	19.8	9.9	[2] 597	11,821	1,229	5,910	615
Putnam	3	107.9	36.0	481	51,500	5,398	17,300	1,799
Union	1	2.0	2.0	[2] 597	1,194	124	1,194	124
Total	7,406	71,858.9	9.7	820	58,125,997	6,045,102	7,848	816
GEORGIA								
District 1								
Bartow	1	47.8	47.8	375	17,925	1,864	17,925	1,864
Dade	1	3.2	3.2	[2] 375	1,200	125	1,200	125
District 2								
Gwinnett	6	6.9	1.2	400	2,760	287	460	48
Walton	1	1.6	1.6	[2] 400	640	66	640	67
District 4								
Chattahoochee	58	518.4	8.9	53	276,307	28,736	4,764	495
Coweta	8	10.8	1.4	[2] 764	8,251	858	1,031	107
Fayette	2	10.3	5.2	[2] 764	6,869	818	3,435	409
Harris	24	147.7	6.5	[2] 483	71,136	7,429	2,606	275
Henry	1	2.6	2.6	[2] 764	1,986	207	1,986	207
Macon	666	8,712.2	13.1	734	6,394,755	665,055	9,602	999
Marion	501	5,601.4	11.2	725	4,061,015	422,346	8,106	843
Meriwether	4	1.6	1.2	[2] 764	1,514	305	878	91
Muscogee	24	97.2	4.0	383	37,228	3,872	1,551	161
Schley	11	4,904.2	13.9	887	3,900,141	406,270	12,373	1,282
Talbot	119	619.6	5	570	353,172	36,740	2,968	309
Taylor	410	3,908.5	9.6	842	3,198,062	332,908	7,800	811
Upson	10	26.2	2.6	475	12,445	1,294	1,244	129
District 5								
Baldwin	36	139.6	3.9	460	64,216	6,679	1,784	186
Bibb	39	123.6	3.2	1.0	55,450	5,770	1,419	148
Bleckley	489	3,879.6	7.9	796	3,088,162	321,169	6,315	657
Butts	2	3.3	1.6	[2] 764	2,511	261	1,256	131
Crawford	136	637.2	4.7	450	286,740	29,821	2,108	219
Dodge	1,109	10,645.6	9.6	861	9,165,862	953,250	8,265	860
Hancock	57	132.5	2.3	311	41,208	4,286	723	75
Houston	543	9,589.7	17.7	755	7,240,221	752,983	13,334	1,387
Johnson	403	2,248.8	5.6	488	1,097,463	114,136	2,723	283
Jones	10	17.0	1.7	600	10,200	1,061	1,020	106
Laurens	1,560	13,077.3	8.4	770	10,117,985	1,052,390	6,486	677
Monroe	1	3.0	3.0	[2] 761	2,283	237	2,283	237
Montgomery	221	2,128.5	9.6	905	1,926,292	200,344	8,716	906
Newton	5	44.9	9.0	633	28,422	2,956	5,684	591
Peach	187	1,675.5	9.0	785	1,315,368	136,778	7,034	732
Pulaski	559	12,711.6	22.7	791	10,094,010	1,049,737	18,055	1,878
Treutlen	62	344.4	5.6	634	218,005	22,673	3,516	369
Twiggs	371	3,064.6	8.3	67	2,059,411	214,179	5,551	577
Washington	753	4,860.0	6.5	505	2,454,300	255,247	3,259	339
Wheeler	241	1,496.2	6.2	959	1,434,856	149,225	5,954	619
Wilkinson	243	1,690.9	7.0	658	1,112,612	115,712	4,579	476
District 6:								
Bulloch	1,539	15,953.0	10.4	1,023	16,319,919	1,697,272	10,601	1,103
Burke	1,015	12,985.4	12.8	614	7,973,036	829,196	7,855	817
Candler	269	2,002.5	7.4	979	1,960,448	203,887	7,288	758
Columbia	17	43.1	2.5	500	21,550	2,241	1,268	132
Effingham	121	860.8	7.1	660	568,128	59,085	4,695	488
Emanuel	684	5,023.7	7.3	675	3,390,998	352,664	4,958	516
Glascock	211	1,257.5	6.0	487	612,402	63,690	2,902	302
Jefferson	781	7,133.2	9.1	569	4,058,791	422,114	5,197	540
Jenkins	454	4,625.5	10.2	848	3,922,424	407,932	8,640	899
McDuffie	18	59.7	3.3	467	27,880	2,900	1,549	161
Richmond	176	1,376.6	8.1	484	666,274	69,292	3,786	394
Screven	775	7,694.4	9.9	761	5,855,438	608,966	7,555	786
Warren	82	175.4	6.3	529	92,787	9,650	1,131	345

[2] District average.

Peanut acreage allotments to old growers, by State and county, estimated production and value, crop year 1950—Continued

	Number of eligible farms (1)	Acreage allotted to old farms (2)	Average allotment per eligible farm (3)	1950 county yield per acre (4)	Indicated production from allotted acres (column 2× column 4) (5)	Indicated value of production from allotted acres (6)	Average production per farm (column 5÷ column 1) (7)	Average value per farm basis (column 7) (8)
GEORGIA—continued								
District 7:		*Acres*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*		*Pounds*	
Baker	390	18,340 3	47 0	957	17,551,607	$1,825,373	45,004	$4,680
Calhoun	396	20,748 6	52 4	871	18,072,031	1,879,491	45,636	4,746
Clay	362	14,728 5	40 7	876	12,902,166	1,341,825	35,641	3,707
Decatur	1,134	20,379 4	18 0	816	16,629,590	1,729,477	14,665	1,525
Dougherty	280	8,627 8	30 8	793	6,841,845	711,552	24,435	2,541
Early	1,208	40,990 9	33 9	991	40,621,982	4,224,686	33,627	3,497
Grady	1,220	10,874 6	8 9	952	10,352,619	1,076,672	8,486	883
Lee	415	19,744 5	47 6	896	17,691,072	1,839,871	42,629	4,433
Miller	760	24,345 4	32 0	975	23,736,765	2,468,624	31,233	3,248
Mitchell	1,145	26,126 6	22 8	1,016	26,544,626	2,760,641	23,183	2,411
Quitman	181	5,619 3	31 0	742	4,169,521	433,630	23,036	2,396
Randolph	766	27,793 3	36 3	880	24,458,104	2,543,643	31,930	3,321
Seminole	602	15,618 2	25 9	1,074	16,773,947	1,744,490	27,864	2,898
Stewart	491	11,491 9	23 4	776	8,917,714	927,442	18,162	1,889
Sumter	866	21,424 4	24 7	846	18,125,042	1,885,004	20,930	2,177
Terrell	659	28,592 6	43 4	903	25,819,118	2,685,188	39,179	4,075
Thomas	927	7,232 5	7 8	812	5,872,790	610,770	6,335	659
Webster	375	12,276 0	32 7	809	9,931,284	1,032,854	26,483	2,754
District 8								
Atkinson	59	267 6	4 5	1,096	293,290	30,502	4,971	517
Ben Hill	559	8,656 6	15 5	1,071	9,271,219	964,207	16,585	1,725
Berrien	358	2,566 7	7 2	1,214	3,115,974	324,061	8,704	905
Brooks	979	6,605 2	6 7	861	5,687,077	591,456	5,809	604
Coffee	616	4,501 2	7 3	1,020	4,591,224	477,487	7,453	775
Colquitt	1,307	11,969 8	9 2	1,096	13,118,901	1,364,366	10,037	1,044
Cook	331	1,944 2	5 9	1,387	2,696,605	280,447	8,147	847
Crisp	665	17,300 2	26 0	941	16,196,486	1,675,075	21,220	2,519
Dooly	1,092	23,835 8	21 8	703	16,756,567	1,742,683	15,345	1,596
Echols	5	10 5	2 1	1,055	11,078	1,152	2,216	230
Irwin	862	18,820 5	21 8	1,329	25,012,444	2,601,294	29,017	3,018
Jeff Davis	63	310 9	4 9	1,015	315,564	32,819	5,009	521
Lanier	6	15 6	2 6	800	12,480	1,298	2,080	216
Lowndes	255	1,288 9	5 1	789	1,016,942	105,762	3,988	415
Telfair	618	5,140 8	8 3	944	4,852,915	504,703	7,853	817
Tift	872	15,222 4	17 5	1,271	19,347,670	2,012,158	22,188	2,308
Turner	711	24,238 3	34 1	1,095	26,540,938	2,760,258	37,329	3,882
Wilcox	967	16,184 3	16 7	908	14,695,344	1,528,316	15,197	1,580
Worth	1,401	36,688 1	26 2	1,162	42,631,572	4,433,683	30,429	3,165
District 9								
Appling	179	933 2	5 2	793	740,028	76,963	4,134	430
Bacon	31	82 0	2 6	500	41,000	4,264	1,323	138
Bryan	81	432 5	5 3	766	331,295	34,455	4,090	425
Evans	145	943 8	6 5	1,008	951,350	98,940	6,561	682
Long	3	5 5	1 8	[1]939	5,164	537	1,721	179
Pierce	19	25 7	1 4	700	17,990	1,871	947	98
Tattnall	249	1,707 8	6 9	944	1,612,163	167,665	6,475	673
Toombs	426	3,218 0	7 6	976	3,140,768	326,640	7,373	767
Ware	6	8 5	1 4	[1]939	7,982	830	1,330	138
Wayne	17	32 3	1 9	600	19,380	2,016	1,140	119
Total	40,330	689,759 2	17 1	925	633,622,757	65,896,766	15,711	1,634
LOUISIANA								
District 1:								
Caddo	2	146 0	73 0	280	40,880	4,211	20,440	2,105
Webster	1	2 0	2 0	250	500	52	500	52
District 2								
Bienville	20	25 7	1 3	273	7,016	723	351	36
Claiborne	15	28 5	1 9	220	6,270	646	418	43
Lincoln	22	48 6	2 2	250	12,150	1,251	552	57
Union	38	326 9	8 6	425	138,932	14,310	3,656	377
District 4								
Natchitoches	5	12 8	2 6	350	4,480	461	896	92
Sabine	19	41 4	2 2	276	11,426	1,177	601	62
District 7 Beauregard	67	173 2	2 6	360	62,352	6,422	931	96
Total	189	805 1	4 3	340	284,006	29,253	1,503	155
MISSISSIPPI								
District 2								
De Soto	10	17 4	1 7	480	8,352	860	835	87
Lafayette	17	18 9	1 1	460	8,694	904	511	53
Panola	3	2 9	1 0	430	1,247	130	416	43
District 3								
Itawamba	371	220 7	.6	460	101,522	10,558	274	28
Pontotoc	39	38 9	1 0	430	16,727	1,740	429	45
District 4								
Leflore	45	73 0	1 6	520	37,960	3,948	844	88
Yazoo	51	63 6	1 2	510	32,436	3,373	636	66
District 5								
Attala	76	94 0	1 2	450	42,300	4,399	557	58
Holmes	44	45 2	1 0	450	20,340	2,115	462	48
Leake	60	64 2	1 1	410	26,322	2,737	439	46
Madison	176	295 5	1 7	420	124,110	12,907	705	73
Rankin	73	83 7	1 1	390	32,643	3,395	447	46
District 6								
Chickasaw	6	5 1	.9	440	2,244	233	374	39
Kemper	124	125 5	1 0	390	48,945	5,090	394	41
Lowndes	146	213 9	1 5	420	89,838	9,343	615	64
Monroe	37	56 3	1 5	430	24,209	2,518	654	68
Noxubee	165	354 7	2 1	410	145,427	15,124	881	92
District 7								
Copiah	3	16 8	5 6	360	6,048	629	2,016	210
Hinds	123	273 5	2 2	390	106,665	11,093	867	90
Lincoln	43	42 3	1 0	350	14,805	1,540	344	36
Warren	6	12 0	2 0	370	4,440	462	740	77

[1] District average.

Peanut acreage allotments to old growers, by State and county, estimated production and value, crop year 1950—Continued

	Number of eligible farms (1)	Acreage allotted to old farms (2)	Average allotment per eligible farm (3)	1950 county yield per acre (4)	Indicated production from allotted acres (column 2× column 4) (5)	Indicated value of production from allotted acres (6)	Average production per farm (column 5÷ column 1) (7)	Average value per farm basis (column 7) (8)
MISSISSIPPI—continued								
District 8:		*Acres*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*		*Pounds*	
Covington	47	106.8	2.3	390	41,652	$4,332	886	$92
Jefferson Davis	38	57.9	1.5	400	23,160	2,409	609	63
Lamar	4	9.2	2.3	410	3,772	392	943	98
Simpson	48	49.1	1.0	440	21,604	2,247	450	47
Smith	14	10.6	.8	410	4,346	452	310	32
District 9:								
Clarke	96	146.7	1.5	430	63,081	6,560	657	68
George	3	9.6	3.2	410	3,936	409	1,312	136
Greene	18	83.0	4.6	440	36,520	3,798	2,029	211
Jasper	119	110.0	.9	390	42,900	4,462	361	38
Jones	45	57.5	1.3	430	24,725	2,571	549	57
Lauderdale	91	99.1	1.1	410	40,631	4,226	446	46
Newton	72	42.6	.6	410	17,466	1,816	243	25
Stone	6	4.7	.8	410	1,927	200	321	33
Total	2,219	2,904.9	1.3	425	1,220,994	126,981	550	57
MISSOURI								
Scott	2	207.8	103.9	[1] 500	103,900	10,702	51,950	5,351
NEW MEXICO								
Lea	47	750.4	16.0	1,200	900,480	92,749	19,159	1,973
Quay	4	10.5	2.6	915	9,608	990	2,402	247
Roosevelt	423	5,899.5	13.9	915	5,398,042	555,998	12,761	1,314
Total	474	6,660.4	14.1	935	6,308,130	649,737	13,308	1,371
NORTH CAROLINA								
Mountain district 2:								
Granville	1	4.4	4.4	798	3,511	446	3,511	446
Warren	156	449.8	2.9	898	403,920	51,298	2,589	329
District 5, Chatham	2	2.3	1.2	646	1,486	189	743	94
District 8:								
Anson	3	8.0	2.7	751	6,008	763	2,003	254
Montgomery	1	14.8	14.8	950	14,060	1,786	14,060	1,786
Moore	8	72.4	9.1	760	55,024	6,988	6,878	874
Richmond	35	213.9	6.1	950	203,205	25,807	5,806	737
Coastal district 3:								
Bertie	2,208	29,621.7	13.4	941	27,874,020	3,540,001	12,624	1,603
Camden	27	75.2	2.8	855	64,296	8,166	2,381	302
Chowan	777	8,259.0	10.6	998	8,242,482	1,046,795	10,608	1,347
Currituck	70	265.2	5.2	1,112	294,902	37,453	4,213	535
Edgecombe	1,197	20,797.7	17.4	922	19,175,479	2,435,286	16,020	2,035
Gates	1,249	9,662.6	7.7	1,126	10,880,088	1,381,771	8,711	1,106
Halifax	2,855	35,698.5	12.5	1,116	39,839,526	5,059,620	13,954	1,772
Hertford	1,350	18,951.5	14.0	1,197	22,681,946	2,880,988	16,804	2,134
Martin	1,644	19,280.8	11.7	1,074	20,707,579	2,629,863	12,596	1,600
Nash	385	4,270.6	11.1	1,021	4,360,283	553,756	11,325	1,438
Northampton	2,158	37,453.9	17.4	1,273	47,678,815	6,055,210	22,091	2,806
Pasquotank	44	120.8	2.7	950	114,760	14,575	2,608	331
Perquimans	718	4,985.7	6.9	922	4,596,815	583,796	6,402	813
Tyrrell	134	368.5	2.8	1,026	378,081	48,016	2,822	358
Washington	618	4,680.8	7.6	803	3,758,082	477,353	6,082	772
District 6								
Beaufort	455	1,459.4	3.2	798	1,164,601	147,904	2,560	325
Craven	47	196.0	4.2	903	176,988	22,477	3,766	478
Greene	74	469.3	6.3	950	445,835	56,621	6,025	765
Johnston	56	175.4	3.1	855	149,967	19,046	2,678	340
Jones	10	95.1	9.5	855	81,310	10,326	8,130	1,033
Lenoir	25	178.8	7.2	760	135,888	17,258	5,436	690
Pamlico	1	13.5	13.5	855	11,542	1,466	11,542	1,466
Pitt	1,321	9,620.4	7.3	912	8,774,805	1,114,273	6,642	844
Wayne	72	201.7	2.8	810	163,377	20,749	2,269	288
Wilson	69	335.1	4.9	1,074	359,897	45,707	5,216	662
District 9:								
Bladen	1,933	6,696.6	3.5	983	6,582,758	836,010	3,405	432
Brunswick	114	274.4	2.4	912	250,253	31,782	2,195	279
Columbus	773	2,394.8	3.1	1,140	2,730,072	346,719	3,532	449
Cumberland	223	848.4	3.8	912	773,741	98,265	3,470	441
Duplin	16	55.8	3.5	998	55,688	7,072	3,480	442
Hoke	7	20.5	2.9	941	19,290	2,450	2,756	350
New Hanover	74	414.4	5.6	713	295,467	37,524	3,993	507
Onslow	51	264.0	7.1	836	220,704	28,029	4,328	550
Pender	328	2,160.2	6.6	736	1,589,907	201,918	4,847	616
Robeson	352	1,110.9	3.2	979	1,087,571	138,122	3,090	392
Sampson	231	934.3	4.0	980	915,614	116,283	3,964	503
Scotland	8	67.7	8.5	950	64,315	8,168	8,040	1,021
Total	21,880	223,444.8	10.2	1,062	237,386,558	30,148,095	10,849	1,378
OKLAHOMA								
District 2: Grant	2	10.0	5.0	500	5,000	515	2,500	258
District 3:								
Osage	13	100.0	7.7	750	75,000	7,725	5,769	594
Pawnee	29	101.7	3.5	990	100,683	10,370	3,472	358
Tulsa	21	107.7	5.1	700	75,390	7,765	3,590	370
Wagoner	11	39.0	3.5	840	32,760	3,374	2,978	307
District 4:								
Beckham	43	405.7	9.4	1,020	413,814	42,623	9,624	991
Custer	2	34.0	17.0	620	21,080	2,171	10,540	1,086
Dewey	4	23.0	5.8	500	11,500	1,185	2,875	296
Washita	95	980.2	10.3	1,050	1,029,210	106,009	10,834	1,116

[1] Estimated.

Peanut acreage allotments to old growers, by State and county, estimated production and value, crop year 1950—Continued

	Number of eligible farms (1)	Acreage allotted to old farms (2)	Average allotment per eligible farm (3)	1950 county yield per acre (4)	Indicated production from allotted acres (column 2× column 4) (5)	Indicated value of production from allotted acres (6)	Average production per farm (column 5÷ column 1) (7)	Average value per farm basis (column 7) (8)
OKLAHOMA—continued								
District 5		*Acres*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*		*Pounds*	
Canadian	73	465 0	6 4	550	255,750	$26,342	3,503	$361
Cleveland	76	180 6	2 4	500	90,300	9,301	1,188	122
Creek	893	4,406 0	5 0	575	2,567,950	264,499	2,876	296
Grady	508	4,591 1	7 7	550	2,525,105	260,086	4,223	435
Kingfisher	2	5 0	2 5	[1]517	2,735	282	1,368	141
Lincoln	987	3,955 3	4 0	550	2,175,415	224,068	2,204	227
Logan	31	125 8	4 1	450	56,610	5,831	1,826	188
McClain	276	1,294 8	4 7	670	867,516	89,354	3,143	324
McIntosh	1,172	6,534 5	5 6	520	3,397,940	349,988	2,899	299
Okfuskee	151	766 0	5 1	580	444,280	45,761	2,942	303
Oklahoma	147	734 0	5 0	680	499,120	51,409	3,395	350
Payne	905	6,317 3	7 0	600	3,790,380	390,409	4,188	431
Pottawatomie	1,448	2,492 9	1 7	470	1,171,663	120,681	809	83
District 6								
Haskell	251	836 8	3 3	500	418,400	43,095	1,667	172
Hughes	2,030	19,348 2	9 5	515	9,964,323	1,026,325	4,909	506
McIntosh	411	1,907 0	4 6	510	972,570	100,175	2,366	244
Muskogee	178	1,092 3	6 1	490	535,227	55,128	3,007	310
Okmulgee	721	3,695 3	5 1	502	1,921,556	197,920	2,665	274
Pittsburg	920	5,765 0	6 3	460	2,651,900	273,146	2,883	297
District 7								
Caddo	2,088	29,358 7	14 1	850	24,954,895	2,570,354	11,952	1,230
Comanche	326	2,484 9	7 6	740	1,838,826	189,399	5,641	581
Cotton	23	123 0	5 3	700	86,100	8,868	3,743	386
Greer	22	188 3	8 6	070	182,651	18,813	8,302	855
Harmon	20	104 0	5 2	620	64,480	6,641	3,224	332
Jackson	70	759 0	10 8	910	690,690	71,141	9,867	1,016
District 8								
Atoka	965	6,737 9	7 0	335	2,257,197	232,491	2,339	241
Bryan	2,039	28,314 1	13 9	500	14,157,050	1,458,176	6,943	715
Carter	435	3,095 0	7 1	500	1,547,500	159,393	3,557	366
Coal	481	2,176 0	4 5	370	805,120	82,927	1,674	172
Garvin	412	2,147 4	5 5	730	1,786,602	184,020	4,042	416
Jefferson	107	764 5	7 1	550	420,475	43,309	3,930	405
Johnston	518	4,945 0	9 5	470	2,324,150	239,387	4,487	462
Love	610	7,430 6	12 2	470	3,492,100	359,686	5,725	590
Marshall	206	3,641 5	12 3	460	1,675,090	172,534	5,659	583
Murray	44	235 0	5 3	600	141,000	14,523	3,205	330
Pontotoc	683	3,049 3	4 5	450	1,372,185	141,335	2,009	207
Stephens	756	4,880 0	6 5	650	3,172,000	326,716	4,196	432
District 9								
Choctaw	1,001	4,263 2	4 3	450	1,918,440	197,599	1,916	197
Latimer	26	79 1	3 0	440	34,804	3,585	1,339	138
LeFlore	95	644 0	6 8	565	363,860	37,478	3,830	394
McCurtain	290	919 7	3 2	450	413,865	42,628	1,427	147
Pushmataha	323	1,968 3	6 1	515	1,013,675	104,409	3,138	323
Total	23,150	174,982 1	7 6	580	100,785,932	10,380,949	4,354	448
SOUTH CAROLINA								
District 1								
Greenville	5	11 1	2 2	725	8,048	837	1,610	167
Laurens	3	2 6	.9	350	910	95	303	32
Spartanburg	1	1 8	1 8	425	765	80	765	80
Union	4	5 3	1 3	475	2,517	262	629	65
District 2								
Chester	2	1 1	.6	320	352	37	176	18
Fairfield	4	4 1	1 0	925	3,793	394	948	99
Kershaw	62	279 3	4.5	770	215,061	22,366	3,469	361
District 3								
Chesterfield	2	1 0	.5	950	950	99	475	49
Darlington	17	44 7	2.6	1,075	48,053	4,998	2,827	294
Dillon	35	140 9	4 0	1,050	147,945	15,386	4,227	440
Florence	382	1,279 3	3 3	1,060	1,356,058	141,030	3,550	369
Georgetown	2	5 2	2.6	600	3,120	325	1,560	162
Horry	337	470 8	1.4	860	404,888	42,108	1,201	125
Marion	4	14 4	3 6	850	12,240	1,273	3,060	318
Marlboro	10	68 3	6 8	1,075	73,423	7,636	7,342	764
Williamsburg	6	45 6	7 6	800	36,480	3,794	6,080	632
District 4								
Abbeville	4	2 1	.5	625	1,313	137	328	34
Aiken	407	3,964 0	8.5	563	2,231,732	232,100	4,779	497
Edgefield	4	5 1	1.3	400	2,040	212	510	53
Greenwood	2	1 2	.6	545	654	68	327	34
Newberry	8	6 7	.8	750	5,025	523	628	65
Saluda	3	5.1	1.7	940	4,794	499	1,598	166
District 5								
Calhoun	11	27.7	2.5	615	17,036	1,772	1,548	161
Clarendon	4	31.4	7.8	605	18,997	1,976	4,749	494
Lee	143	1,024 4	7.2	1,095	1,121,718	116,659	7,844	816
Lexington	99	130 0	1.3	780	101,400	10,546	1,024	106
Orangeburg	53	98 8	1.9	690	68,172	7,090	1,082	113
Richland	29	27 0	.9	735	19,845	2,064	684	71
Sumter	429	8,152 4	7.3	980	8,089,352	321,293	7,201	749
District 8								
Allendale	211	1,184.1	5.6	750	888,075	92,360	4,209	438
Bamberg	15	43 6	2 9	600	26,160	2,721	1,744	181
Barnwell	599	4,045.6	6 8	675	2,730,780	284,001	4,559	474
Beaufort	6	12.1	2.0	575	6,958	724	1,160	121
Berkeley	3	1.5	.5	575	863	90	288	30
Charleston	55	50 9	.9	800	40,720	4,235	740	77
Colleton	13	49.7	3.8	650	32,305	3,360	2,485	258
Hampton	240	1,447.7	6.0	840	1,216,068	126,471	5,067	527
Jasper	18	10.6	.6	540	5,724	595	318	33
Total	3,202	17,697 2	5 4	790	13,944,334	1,450,216	4,356	441

[1] District yield.

***Peanut acreage allotments to old growers, by State and county, estimated production and value, crop year 1950*—Continued**

	Number of eligible farms (1)	Acreage allotted to old farms (2)	Average allotment per eligible farm (3)	1950 county yield per acre (4)	Indicated production from allotted acres (column 2× column 4) (5)	Indicated value of production from allotted acres (6)	Average production per farm (column 5 ÷ column 1) (7)	Average value per farm basis (column 7) (8)
TENNESSEE								
District 2:		*Acres*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*		*Pounds*	
Carroll	5	33.0	6.6	700	23,100	$2,934	4,620	$587
Fayette	2	16.5	8.2	770	12,705	1,614	6,352	807
Hardeman	1	13.8	13.8	880	12,144	1,542	12,144	1,542
Madison	1	6.4	6.4	760	4,864	618	4,864	618
District 3								
Benton	84	516.9	6.2	870	449,703	57,112	5,354	680
Decatur	79	436.5	5.5	860	375,390	47,675	4,752	604
Dickson	10	10.5	1.0	600	6,300	800	630	80
Hardin	7	34.1	4.9	600	20,460	2,598	2,923	371
Hickman	52	100.7	1.9	740	74,518	9,464	1,433	182
Humphreys	332	1,602.7	4.8	795	1,274,147	161,817	3,838	487
Lawrence	18	29.3	1.6	700	20,510	2,605	1,139	145
Lewis	130	265.5	2.0	680	180,540	22,929	1,389	176
Perry	175	940.4	5.4	915	860,466	109,279	4,917	624
Stewart	2	2.3	1.2	500	1,150	146	575	73
Wayne	30	71.7	2.4	700	50,190	6,374	1,673	212
District 4: Giles	1	3.7	3.7	600	2,220	282	2,220	282
District 5: Coffee	1	.5	.5	[1]650	325	41	325	41
District 6								
Bradley	7	18.-	2.6	[1]700	12,740	1,618	1,820	231
Hamilton	3	3.2	1.1	[1]760	2,240	284	747	95
Total	940	4,105.9	4.4	860	3,533,712	120,732	3,000	457
TEXAS								
District 1								
Parmer	1	8.0	8.0	607	4,856	500	4,856	500
Bailey	4	33.5	8.4	1,000	33,500	3,450	8,375	863
Gaines	69	2,336.5	33.9	580	1,355,170	139,583	19,640	2,023
Lamb	3	66.5	22.2	650	43,225	4,452	14,408	1,484
Terry	22	582.9	26.5	650	378,885	39,025	17,222	1,774
District 2								
Baylor	3	43.3	14.4	653	28,275	2,912	9,425	971
Coleman	12	98.2	8.2	500	49,100	5,057	4,092	421
Collingsworth	80	1,443.9	16.2	650	938,535	96,669	10,545	1,086
Fisher	19	235.8	12.4	550	129,690	13,358	6,826	703
Garza	16	406.0	25.4	400	162,400	16,727	10,150	1,045
Hall	16	237.2	14.8	600	142,320	14,659	8,895	916
Jones	165	2,757.9	16.7	650	1,792,635	184,641	10,854	1,119
Kent	51	909.4	17.8	475	431,965	44,492	8,470	872
Motley	23	561.3	24.4	550	308,715	31,798	13,422	1,382
Runnels	50	650.9	13.0	500	325,450	33,521	6,509	670
Stonewall	184	4,808.3	26.1	680	3,269,644	336,773	17,770	1,830
Taylor	9	68.2	7.6	640	43,648	4,496	4,850	500
Wheeler	35	372.1	10.6	600	223,260	22,996	6,379	657
District 3								
Brown	526	9,242.8	17.6	520	4,806,256	495,144	9,137	941
Callahan	596	8,675.3	14.6	640	5,552,192	571,876	9,316	960
Clay	42	365.6	8.7	550	201,080	20,711	1,788	184
Comanche	1,924	56,071.4	29.1	860	48,221,404	4,966,805	25,063	2,581
Eastland	1,575	37,612.4	23.9	670	25,200,308	2,595,632	16,000	1,648
Erath	1,286	22,733.8	17.7	720	16,368,336	1,685,939	12,728	1,311
Hood	575	11,615.3	20.2	740	8,595,322	885,318	14,948	1,540
Jack	87	639.0	7.3	575	367,425	37,845	4,224	435
Mills	91	1,707.4	18.8	570	973,218	100,241	10,695	1,102
Montague	477	3,851.7	8.1	600	2,311,020	238,035	4,845	499
Palo Pinto	187	3,296.1	17.6	670	2,208,387	227,464	11,810	1,216
Parker	798	11,088.6	13.9	680	7,540,476	776,869	9,471	975
Somervell	151	3,624.1	24.0	750	2,718,075	279,962	18,000	1,854
Stephens	58	724.0	12.5	650	470,600	48,472	8,114	836
Wise	912	11,765.3	12.9	570	6,706,221	690,741	7,353	757
Young	31	293.9	9.5	550	161,645	16,649	5,214	537
District 4:								
Bosque	86	1,949.2	22.7	620	1,208,504	124,476	14,052	1,447
Cooke	674	8,528.6	12.4	460	3,831,156	394,609	5,684	585
Coryell	31	271.6	8.8	525	142,590	14,687	4,600	474
Dallas	9	66.9	7.4	600	40,140	4,134	4,460	459
Denton	619	9,478.2	15.3	670	6,350,394	654,091	10,259	1,057
Falls	25	90.1	3.6	700	63,070	6,496	2,523	260
Fannin	882	9,854.3	11.2	520	5,124,236	527,796	5,810	598
Grayson	936	15,331.4	16.4	645	9,888,753	1,018,542	10,565	1,088
Hamilton	52	145.3	8.6	525	233,782	24,080	1,496	963
Hill	534	8,358.8	15.7	750	6,269,100	645,717	11,740	1,209
Johnson	502	5,557.6	11.1	600	3,334,560	343,460	6,643	684
Lamar	370	3,041.7	8.2	500	1,520,850	156,648	4,110	423
Limestone	257	1,859.1	7.2	670	1,245,597	128,296	4,847	499
McLennan	99	1,111.1	11.2	750	833,325	85,832	8,417	867
Milam	440	2,885.5	6.6	710	2,048,705	211,017	4,656	480
Navarro	4	10.6	2.6	[1]611	6,477	667	1,619	167
Tarrant	196	1,165.2	5.9	550	640,860	66,009	3,270	337
Williamson	50	327.3	6.5	750	245,475	25,284	4,910	506
District 5								
Anderson	1,011	12,196.3	12.1	850	10,366,855	1,067,786	10,254	1,056
Anechna	78	125.9	1.6	475	59,802	6,159	767	79
Bowie	58	306.9	5.3	550	168,795	17,386	2,910	300
Brazos	34	127.0	3.7	550	69,850	7,195	2,054	212
Camp	39	91.5	2.3	650	59,475	6,126	1,525	157
Cass	122	718.3	5.9	650	466,895	48,090	3,827	394
Cherokee	205	1,470.2	7.2	850	1,249,670	128,716	6,096	628
Franklin	239	634.6	2.7	750	475,950	49,023	2,025	190
Freestone	228	1,080.0	4.7	580	626,400	64,519	2,747	283
Gregg	10	19.6	2.0	500	9,800	1,009	980	101
Grimes	107	584.9	5.5	525	307,072	31,628	2,870	296
Harrison	8	20.6	2.6	450	9,270	955	1,159	119
Henderson	310	1,880.0	6.1	850	1,598,000	164,594	5,155	531
Hopkins	534	2,241.1	4.2	900	2,016,990	207,750	3,777	389
Houston	561	8,440.8	5.0	850	7,174,680	738,992	12,789	1,317
Leon	345	2,559.1	7.4	670	1,714,597	176,603	4,970	512
Madison	101	729.1	7.2	575	419,232	43,181	4,151	428
Marion	31	168.8	5.4	540	91,152	9,389	2,940	303

[1] District yield.

Peanut acreage allotments to old growers, by State and county, estimated production and value, crop year 1950—Continued

	Number of eligible farms (1)	Acreage allotted to old farms (2)	Average allotment per eligible farm (3)	1950 county yield per acre (4)	Indicated production from allotted acres (column 2× column 4) (5)	Indicated value of production from allotted acres (6)	Average production per farm (column 5÷ column 1) (7)	Average value per farm basis (column 7) (8)
TEXAS—continued								
District 5—Continued		*Acres*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*		*Pounds*	
Montgomery	36	282.8	7.9	700	197,960	$20,390	5,499	566
Morris	248	1,617.2	6.5	750	1,212,900	124,929	4,891	504
Nacogdoches	62	245.7	4.0	725	178,132	18,348	2,873	296
Panola	24	60.9	2.5	600	36,540	3,764	1,522	157
Polk	11	9.4	.9	470	4,418	455	402	41
Rains	22	112.6	5.1	570	64,182	6,610	2,918	301
Red River	66	287.8	4.4	850	244,630	25,197	3,706	382
Robertson	294	1,450.2	4.9	580	841,116	86,635	2,861	295
Rusk	209	488.7	2.3	850	415,395	42,786	1,988	205
Sabine	4	6.3	1.6	500	3,150	324	788	81
San Jacinto	19	29.9	1.6	500	14,950	1,540	787	81
Shelby	44	52.6	1.2	550	28,930	2,980	658	68
Smith	58	135.7	2.3	750	101,775	10,483	1,755	181
Titus	566	2,297.5	4.1	850	1,952,875	201,146	3,450	355
Trinity	36	218.5	6.9	550	136,675	14,078	3,797	391
Tyler	19	23.0	1.2	450	10,350	1,066	545	56
Upshur	165	410.3	2.7	700	308,210	31,746	1,868	192
Van Zandt	187	638.4	3.4	775	491,760	50,960	2,646	273
Walker	25	47.5	1.9	575	27,312	2,813	1,092	112
Waller	273	7,070.3	25.9	760	5,373,428	553,903	19,683	2,207
Wood	477	1,284.4	2.7	790	1,014,676	104,512	2,127	219
District 7								
Blanco	1	10.5	10.5	500	5,250	541	5,250	541
Burnet	22	344.7	15.7	475	163,732	16,864	7,442	767
Coke	5	83.0	16.6	525	43,575	4,488	8,715	898
Gillespie	207	2,475.1	12.0	475	1,175,672	121,094	5,680	585
Kimble	5	41.4	8.3	500	20,700	2,132	4,140	426
Lampasas	22	418.6	19.0	570	238,602	24,576	10,846	1,117
Llano	167	4,907.5	24.0	525	2,103,938	216,706	12,599	1,298
McCulloch	65	1,644.9	25.3	580	954,042	98,266	14,678	1,512
Mason	293	8,271.3	28.2	600	4,962,780	511,166	16,938	1,745
Menard	12	122.3	10.2	390	47,697	4,913	3,975	409
San Saba	372	8,736.1	23.5	680	5,940,548	611,876	15,969	1,645
District 8								
Austin	174	2,379.6	13.7	850	2,022,660	208,334	11,625	1,197
Bastrop	344	2,654.5	7.7	600	1,592,700	164,048	4,630	477
Bee	96	1,096.7	11.4	450	493,515	50,832	5,141	530
Bexar	571	9,466.7	16.6	530	5,017,351	516,787	8,787	905
Burleson	79	525.4	6.6	550	288,970	29,764	3,658	377
Caldwell	89	717.0	8.1	580	415,860	42,834	4,673	481
Colorado	137	1,391.5	10.2	870	1,210,605	124,692	8,836	910
DeWitt	462	3,700.0	8.0	625	2,312,500	238,188	5,005	516
Fayette	208	2,507.2	9.4	540	1,353,888	139,450	6,052	520
Goliad	31	165.4	5.3	500	82,700	8,518	2,668	275
Gonzales	351	4,227.2	12.0	530	2,240,416	230,763	6,383	657
Guadalupe	403	5,272.8	13.1	430	2,267,304	233,532	5,626	579
Karnes	176	1,696.6	9.6	495	839,817	86,501	4,772	492
Lavaca	639	3,104.3	4.9	550	1,707,365	175,859	2,672	278
Lee	980	10,218.0	10.4	650	6,641,700	684,095	6,777	698
Medina	182	2,889.7	15.9	540	1,560,438	160,725	8,574	883
Nueces	1	11.8	11.8	[2] 580	6,844	705	6,844	705
San Patricio	4	37.3	9.3	580	21,634	2,228	5,409	557
Travis	9	177.2	19.7	600	106,320	10,951	11,813	1,217
Washington	19	76.9	4.0	700	53,830	5,544	2,833	292
Wilson	1,157	22,660.1	19.6	575	13,029,558	1,342,044	11,262	1,160
District 9								
Brazoria	34	127.0	3.7	[2] 768	97,536	10,046	2,869	296
Fort Bend	5	175.6	35.1	650	114,140	11,756	22,828	2,351
Harris	95	3,383.4	35.6	780	2,639,052	271,822	27,780	2,861
Liberty	14	55.0	3.9	450	24,750	2,549	1,768	182
Victoria	25	183.9	7.4	900	165,510	17,048	6,620	682
District 10								
Atascosa	968	26,638.7	27.5	470	12,520,189	1,289,579	12,934	1,332
Brooks	10	48.1	4.8	400	19,240	1,982	1,924	198
Dimmit	3	116.1	38.7	575	66,758	6,876	22,253	2,292
Duval	120	2,083.0	17.4	500	1,041,500	107,274	8,679	894
Frio	421	18,919.9	44.9	605	11,446,540	1,178,994	27,189	2,800
Jim Hogg	47	1,358.4	28.9	400	543,360	55,966	11,561	1,191
Jim Wells	20	239.9	12.0	450	107,955	11,119	5,398	556
La Salle	57	2,891.5	50.7	575	1,662,612	171,249	29,168	3,004
Live Oak	36	420.7	11.7	450	189,315	19,499	5,259	542
McMullen	3	35.7	11.9	500	17,850	1,839	5,950	613
Maverick	9	27.5	3.1	1,000	27,500	2,832	3,056	315
Starr	3	52.6	17.5	450	23,670	2,438	7,890	813
Webb	3	56.0	18.7	400	22,400	2,307	7,467	769
Zapata	14	297.1	21.2	450	133,695	13,771	9,550	984
Total	31,949	477,524.9	14.9	660	314,201,744	32,362,055	9,835	1,013
VIRGINIA								
District 5 Chesterfield	43	161.0	3.7	850	136,850	17,380	3,182	404
District 6								
Accomac	1	9.5	9.5	1,600	15,200	1,930	15,200	1,930
Gloucester	3	12.3	4.1	[2] 1,554	19,114	2,427	6,371	809
James City	10	161.8	16.2	1,600	258,880	32,878	25,888	3,288
King and Queen	1	3.6	3.6	[3] 1,534	5,594	710	5,594	710
Middlesex	2	15.3	7.6	[3] 1,551	23,776	3,020	11,888	1,510
New Kent	11	81.5	7.4	1,450	118,175	15,008	10,743	1,364
District 8								
Lunenburg	3	15.3	5.1	[4] 1,535	23,486	2,983	7,829	994
Nottoway	1	5.4	5.4	[4] 1,535	8,289	1,053	8,289	1,053
District 9								
Brunswick	435	1,520.7	3.5	844	1,283,471	163,001	2,951	375
Dinwiddie	622	5,491.0	8.8	1,100	6,040,100	767,093	9,711	1,233
Greensville	1,101	13,301.2	12.1	1,110	14,674,332	1,863,640	13,328	1,693

[2] District average
[4] State average—no district average.

Peanut acreage allotments to old growers, by State and county, estimated production and value, crop year 1950—Continued

	Number of eligible farms (1)	Acreage allotted to old farms (2)	Average allotment per eligible farm (3)	1950 county yield per acre (4)	Indicated production from allotted acres (column 2× column 4) (5)	Indicated value of production from allotted acres (6)	Average production per farm (column 5÷ column 1) (7)	Average value per farm basis (column 7) (8)
VIRGINIA—continued								
District 9—Continued		*Acres*	*Acres*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*		*Pounds*	
Isle of Wight	1,264	21,207.2	16.8	1,900	40,293,680	$5,117,297	31,878	$4,048
Mecklenburg	72	256.7	3.6	750	192,525	24,451	2,674	340
Nansemond	1,442	20,076.0	13.9	1,640	32,924,640	4,181,429	22,833	2,900
Norfolk	25	278.7	11.1	1,300	362,310	46,013	14,492	1,840
Prince George	500	5,290.6	10.6	1,240	6,560,344	833,164	13,121	1,666
Princess Anne	2	2.8	1.4	1,300	3,640	462	1,820	231
Southampton	1,946	40,542.3	20.8	1,550	62,840,565	7,980,752	32,292	4,101
Surry	744	11,192.4	15.0	1,895	21,209,598	2,693,619	28,507	3,620
Sussex	1,150	19,995.6	17.4	1,330	26,594,148	3,377,457	23,125	2,937
Total	9,378	139,620.9	14.9	1,535	213,588,717	27,125,767	22,776	2,893

NOTE.—Columns (1) and (2) taken from Forms MQ-26, county peanut acreage allotment summary sheet, column (3) is column (2) divided by column (1); column (4) is 1950 preliminary county yield per acre. Source Bureau of Agricultural Economics, USDA, column (5) is column (2) multiplied by column (4), column (6) is column (5) multiplied by regional price. Regional price, Virginia-Carolina, 12.7 cents, Southeastern, 10.4 cents, Southwestern, 10.3 cents; column (7) is column (5) divided by column (1), column (8) is column (7) multiplied by regional price.

(Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain data with reference to peanuts in the peanut-growing counties of the Nation.)

AMERICAN FIGHTING MEN IN KOREA

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I think the entire world should be interested in a great humanitarian project that is being conducted by American fighting men in Korea. I have just been informed of it by Corp. Lionel Barrow, of Springfield, Mass., who is a member of our Armed Forces fighting in Korea.

In a letter to me he tells me the story of a combat unit's drive to help 108 North Korean orphans through the winter. Let me emphasize that the orphans being aided are North Korean orphans.

The units involved are the Twenty-fifth Tropic Lightning Division's tankers—the Eighty-ninth Medium Tank Battalion—commanded by Lt. Col. William Hamilton—and its attached organizations, Company A, Seventy-ninth Medium Tank Battalion, and the Fourteenth Infantry Regiment Tank Company.

I am now going to quote from a letter written by Corporal Barrow:

To the Chinese Communists "Task Force Hamilton" means blazing 76's and certain death, but to 108 children between the ages of 2 and 15 in an orphanage in Seoul, it means candy and security against the hard winter which will soon be upon us.

It may seem incongruous to some people that a battalion of hard-hitting tankers who spend their days and nights killing and being killed should also be willing to prevent death by providing the money which will feed, clothe, and shelter 108 North Korean orphans they have never seen. But it doesn't seem so to us.

Within the week the Eighty-ninth Tank Battalion of the Twenty-fifth Division will have turned half of a needed $1,650 over to the U. N. Civil Assistance Command for the He-Myung Orphanage in Seoul.

The money will be used by the UNCAC's public welfare officer, Mr. P. G. Croes, to buy shoes, woolens, fuel, supplement their diet, put windows in the somewhat wrecked building.

As one constant visitor to the orphanage explained, those are the things they need, "not high-heeled shoes, silk panties, nylons, lipstick, semiformal party dresses. Necessities, not frivolities."

However, this is but one part of a two-fold plan. "There is a definite need for aid from organizations in the States," Mr Croes told me. "Units like yours [meaning the Twenty-fifth Division] can come to the rescue in an emergency such as exists today but it takes an outfit stably located like a church or a well-established social organization to provide the steady flow of goods and money that is needed."

Part 2 of the plan calls for getting a personal contact between the tankers and the kids, having the tankers write to their families, friends, etc., and interest them in sending the needed items overseas on a regular basis.

I think that this action by our fighting men in Korea is one of the most inspiring deeds that has ever come to my attention. It is an object lesson that should serve as an example in the world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted as follows, to:

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in five instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. ANGELL in two instances and to include in each an editorial.

Mr. WICKERSHAM and to include certain addresses by Dr. Bennett.

Mr. FEIGHAN and to include an article.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia and include an article by W. E. Taylor, research engineer, on the subject of coastal power.

Mr. HALLECK.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin in two instances and to include newspaper material.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida and to include an article.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SABATH and to include an article by Mr. Daniels in the magazine America.

Mr. CARNAHAN (at the request of Mr. BOLLING) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURDOCK in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY and to include an editorial or a newspaper article.

Mr. CLEMENTE.

Mr. GWINN and to include an article by Roswell McGill, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $184.50.

Mr. SPRINGER and to include an editorial from the Peoria Star and his comments thereon.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. VELDE (at the request of Mr. DEVEREUX) and to include extraneous material.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. THORNBERRY (at the request of Mr. LYLE), indefinitely, on account of illness in the family.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1203. An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1959. An act to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 2231. An act to effect entry of a minor child adopted or to be adopted by a United States citizen.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 9, 1951, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5102. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an

adequate water supply for naval installations and defense production plants in such area.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 11, 1951, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

865. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C 136), was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

866. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C 136), was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

867. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S C 136), was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

868 A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136), was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

869. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Francisco Gomez-Sandoval, file No A-7828132 CR 35734, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

870. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore-leave purposes only, of alien seamen found to be excludable as persons within one of the classes enumerated in section 1 (2) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

871. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the cases of Carlos Solis or Carlos Solis Avalos, file No. A-7178312 CR 31795 and Carlos Francisco Solis, file No. A-7178313 CR 31795, requesting that they be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

872. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization granting the application for permanent residence filed by the subjects of such orders, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

873 A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U S C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

874. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease under the terms of Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress for the month of August 1951; to the Committee on Agriculture

875 A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of Public Law 25 enacted by the First Guam Legislature, pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, Eighty-first Congress, the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

876 A letter from the Clerk, United States House of Representatives, transmitting a letter relative to the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives from the Third Congressional District of the State of Pennsylvania, Maurice S Osser versus Hardie Scott (H. Doc. No 253), to the Committee on House Administration, and ordered to be printed.

877. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize and validate payments of periodic pay increases for temporary indefinite employees of the Department of the Navy within the period of March 17, 1947 to July 1, 1948, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Public Works. S 1450. An act to provide for the exchange of certain lands owned by the United States of America for certain privately owned lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2131. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Hawaii; with amendment (Rept. No. 1117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3544. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Yellowstone River; with amendment (Rept. No. 1118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. BOSONE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3954. A bill to authorize the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, to grant and convey to Salt Lake City, Utah, a portion of the lands heretofore granted to such association by the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr BENTSEN Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R 4408. A bill to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act; with amendment (Rept No. 1120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union

Mr REDDEN Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs H R 4799. A bill to amend section 73 (i) of the Hawaiian Organic Act, without amendment (Rept No. 1121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr BENTSEN. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R 5369 A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands located within, and in the vicinity of, the Federal Communications Commission's primary monitoring station, Portland, Oreg ; without amendment (Rept. No. 1122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union

Mr. ROONEY Committee of conference. H R 4740. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1123). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARY. Committee on Appropriations. H. R 5684 A bill making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept No 1124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union

Mr SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 456. Resolution waiving of points of order on H. R. 5684, a bill making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept No. 1125). Referred to the House Calendar

Mr LYLE Committee on Rules. House Resolution 457. Resolution for consideration of H. R 5426, a bill relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, without amendment (Rept. No 1126) Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MITCHELL Committee on Rules House Resolution 451. Resolution to amend rule XI (2) (f) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No 1127). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H R 5679 A bill to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Defense Materials Procurement Agency of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H R. 5680 A bill to amend the act of October 5, 1949 (Public Law 322, 81st Cong.), as amended, so as to extend the time of permits covering lands located on the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 5681. A bill for the relief of flood sufferers in designated flood-disaster areas for losses of tangible personal property suffered in the July 1951 floods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 5682. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (U S C , title 12, sec. 264); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. IRVING:

H. R. 5683. A bill to amend Public Law No. 875 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to Federal contributions to States and to local governments in connection with disaster expenditures made before the President determines that a major disaster exists; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 5684. A bill making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. J Res. 344. Joint resolution providing for recognition and endorsement of the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H R 5685. A bill for the relief of Rumi Takemura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H R 5686 A bill for the relief of Alexander A. Senibaldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 5687. A bill for the relief of Peter Mihaly Berend, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R 5688. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James J. O'Rourke, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H R 5689. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emma de Sarmezey; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R 5690. A bill for the relief of the John D. McWilliams Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

455. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions adopted by the New Jersey State Federation of Labor at a mass meeting held in Newark, N. J., on September 29, 1951, calling for stricter price and rent controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

456. By Mr. HART: Petition of New Jersey State American Federation of Labor at a mass demonstration of trades-unionists from 10 counties, and others held in the city of Newark, September 29, 1951, appealing to Congress to alter the present law governing rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

457. Also, resolution of New Jersey State American Federation of Labor at a mass meeting of trades-unionists and other interested consumers from 10 counties of the State held under the auspices of the New Jersey State American Federation of Labor, demanding speedy and favorable congressional action looking toward the repeal of the vicious features of the price-control law; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

458. Also, petition of the New Jersey State American Federation of Labor at a mass demonstration of trades unionists from 10 counties of the State of New Jersey, seeking relief for GI families and recontrol of reactivated military and defense areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

459. Also, petition of New Jersey Press Association which unanimously adopted a resolution calling the attention of the United States to awaken the world to the tyranny of Soviet officials of Czechoslovakia and to take every action possible for the release of William N. Oatis, imprisoned representative of the Associated Press; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

460 By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Irwin Aerie No. 1671 of the Fraternal Order of Eagles urging the Federal Government to secure the freedom of William N. Oatis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

461. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Associated Townsend Clubs of Dade County, Bay Front Park, Miami, Fla., vigorously protesting the proposed opening of the welfare rolls to public exposure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

462. Also, petition of James J. Laughlin, attorney, Washington, D. C., relative to impeachment of William C. Coleman, judge, United States District Court for the District of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, October 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we beseech Thee that Thou wilt make this moment of devotion a pavilion of Thy peace, as, trusting only in Thy mercy, we bring our soiled lives to Thy cleansing grace. We come with burdens on our minds and hearts for our Nation and the world and with deep anxiety concerning the future our children will inherit from our hands; yet we live in the faith that Thy truth is marching on, even in the perplexities and dislocations of these terrific days.

We thank Thee for every word of truth which has been spoken the wide world through for all of right which the human conscience has perceived and woven into the social fabric, which all the wrath of misguided men cannot destroy. Make us the ministers of that understanding and love which will not halt its growing sway until it joins all nations and kindreds and tongues and peoples in one great fraternity. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 9, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On October 8, 1951:

S. 1349. An act to establish a Department of Food Services in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

On October 10, 1951:

S. 617. An act for the relief of Pascal Nemoto Yutaka;

S. 1183. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," as amended; and

S. 1437. An act for the relief of Maiku Suzuki.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2080) for the relief of Inooka Kazumi.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5215) making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. TABER, and Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S 1959 An act to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S 2231. An act to effect entry of a minor child adopted or to be adopted by a United States citizen.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GILLETTE was excused from attendance on sessions of the Senate to and including October 25, 1951.

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARTHY was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCLELLAN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from today until next Wednesday.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for a week.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVENTION CONCERNING FEE-CHARGING EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES ADOPTED BY INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 257)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of August 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

LAW ENACTED BY FIRST GUAM LEGISLATURE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a law to amend section 337 of the Penal Code of Guam relating to cockpits and cock fighting, which had been enacted by the First Guam Legislature (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers), to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIEN SEAMEN

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore leave purposes only, of certain alien seamen (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization granting the application for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Four letters from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Francisco Gomez-Sandoval from a report relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on September 4, 1951; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF BOARD OF ACTUARIES OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND (S. Doc. No. 76)

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF CONVENTION OF AMERICAN INSTRUCTORS OF THE DEAF

A letter from the president of the Thirty-fifth Convention of the American Instructors of the Deaf, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings and transactions of the thirty-fifth convention of that organization held June 18-22, 1951, at Fulton, Mo. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

CIRCULARS RELATING TO APPLICANTS FOR NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

A letter from the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, transmitting circulars relating to applicants for the Nobel Peace Prize (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the third annual convention of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers (CIO), at Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide adequate funds for civil defense; to the Committee on Armed Services

Resolutions adopted by Townsend Club, No. 1, of St. Cloud; Townsend Club, No 1, of St. Petersburg; Townsend Club, No. 13, of St. Petersburg; the Associated Townsend Clubs of Hillsborough, and the Associated Townsend Clubs of Dade County, all in the State of Florida, protesting against the opening of welfare rolls to public exposure; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the national convention of the American War Dads Auxiliary, at Topeka, Kans., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide adequate aid for the midwestern rehabilitation program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted at the national convention of the American War Dads Auxiliary, at Topeka, Kans., relating to the use of conscientious objectors in non-combative service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the national convention of the American War Dads Auxiliary, at Topeka, Kans , favoring the enactment of legislation to provide adequate housing facilities for families of service men who wish to live near training camps; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the national convention of the American War Dads Auxiliary, at Topeka, Kans , relating to the release of information pertaining to United States commitments and agreements with the Security Council of the United Nations regarding military assistance, and the method of selection and the name of the present chairman of the military staff committee of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the national convention of the American War Dads Auxiliary, at Topeka, Kans., favoring the establishment of a Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs in the Senate; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

WILLIAM N. OATIS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, with Associated Press Correspondent William N. Oatis still languishing in a Czechoslovak prison, it is heartening to note the many evidences that are continually being presented to indicate that the people of America are still deeply concerned and determined not to let the matter drop until his release is affected.

I have a copy of a recent report by the committee on international law of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York which has studied the various aspects of the case, diplomatic as well as those affecting the United Nations.

The committee concludes its report on the matter by presenting resolutions to the Association of the Bar of the City of New York which brand the treatment of Mr. Oatis as "a violation of the freedom of information" and urge that this Government continue not only to take appropriate action through the United Nations and other available channels but also initiate efforts to secure international acceptance of basic guaranties for the defense of any accused persons.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions of the committee be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Association of the Bar of the City of New York holds that the "trial," prosecution, and conviction of William N. Oatis by the Government of Czechoslovakia was a denial of legal process as that term is traditionally understood in civilized countries and constituted a travesty of justice; and further

Resolved, That the Association of the Bar of the City of New York holds that the application of the definition of espionage in Czechoslovak law to the case of William N. Oatis is a violation of the freedom of information, one of the fundamental freedoms which all members of the United Nations, including Czechoslovakia, are pledged to respect; and further

Resolved, That the Association of the Bar of the City of New York urges the United States Government to continue appropriate action through the United Nations and other available channels and by other available means to effectuate the release of William N. Oatis; and further

Resolved, That the Association of the Bar of the City of New York further urges the United States Government to take appropriate action to secure international acceptance of basic guaranties for the defense of accused persons.

Respectfully submitted.

Committee on International Law; Dana Converse Backus, Chairman; Joseph L. L Broderick; Clarence U Carruth, Jr.; William Tucker Dean, Jr; Thorold J. Deyrup; A. Michael Frothingham; William E. Jackson, Mary Gardiner Jones; Dorothy Kenyon; Parker McCollester; Paul V. McNutt; Edmund L. Palmieri; A. J. Gustin Priest, Seymour B. Quel; Gerard Swope, Jr.; Louis Waldman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Lexington (Ky.) Lodge, No. 89, of the BPOE, in regard to the arrest of William N. Oatis.

This resolution speaks for itself, but since I have been a member of this Lexington Lodge of the Elks for more than 30 years, I deem it a privilege to concur in this sentiment and to say to my colleagues in the Senate that it comes from as truly loyal and patriotic a group of American citizens as can be found anywhere in the United States.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the arrest, trial, and conviction of William N. Oatis, an American citizen, by the Communist dictators of Czechoslovakia was a travesty of justice by any civilized standards and an obvious propaganda effort designed to embarrass the United States of America; and

Whereas William N. Oatis became a victim of Communist oppression while performing his duties as the chief of the Associated Press Bureau in Prague, which duties were to obtain factual news and report it; and

Whereas William N. Oatis was arrested in secret, kept incommunicado, and denied opportunity to have counsel of his own choosing, and the representative of the United States has been refused permission to visit him since the date of his arrest: Now, therefore, the members of Lexington Lodge, No 89, of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America pledge to the President of the United States their full support of the strongest measures that may be necessary to obtain the release forthwith of William N. Oatis.

October 2, 1951.

WHEELER B BOONE,
Exalted Ruler.
C H. MALICK,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF PEACE TREATY WITH ITALY—RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I present for appropriate reference resolutions of the Massachusetts Legislature adopted October 4, 1951, memorializing the Congress of the United States to revise the treaty of peace with Italy. As I do so, let me restate once again my complete agreement with the purport of this resolution. On last February 19 I wrote to the Secretary of State asking that the Italian peace treaty be revised, pointing out that the limitations in the treaty were not only bad for Italy, but bad for the armed forces being set up under the North Atlantic Pact and adding that they imposed a moral stigma on Italy which was wholly undeserved. The text of this letter was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 22, and soon thereafter there appeared an editorial from the Boston Post which said: "It is well that Senator LODGE has taken the lead in urging the United States to act to scrap the Italian peace treaty." To this was added the statement in La Notizia, the Italian daily newspaper published in Boston, saying: "We have nothing but high praise" for my proposal.

On March 20, in conjunction with the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, Senator PASTORE, I introduced Senate Resolution 102, calling upon the President to take immediate steps to revise the Italian treaty. The resolution held it to be the view of the Senate that it disapproved those provisions which interfere with the inherent right of the Italian Government and people to defend themselves. Later, during the debate on the troops to Europe resolution, and working in conjunction with Senator PASTORE and Senator WATKINS, of Utah, I took part in amending the pending proposal to call for a revision of the existing treaty rather than for the negotiation of a new treaty. As thus modified, the amendment carried and stands before all the world as an official expression of the United States Senate condemning the present Italian treaty. The resolutions of the Massachusetts Legislature, therefore, are laid before a Senate which has already expressed itself in the same sense on this important matter. I am glad, therefore, to present them to the Senate.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO REVISE THE TREATY OF PEACE WITH ITALY

Whereas Italy has during these past several years reconstructed her politico-social structure on the basis of democratic principles, and has fully assumed her share of responsibility in the mutual defense of the peace-loving democratic nations; and

Whereas the punitive and vindictive character of the peace treaty with Italy stands forth in obvious contrast to the actual international position of Italy, and, in particular, to her present active participation in the Atlantic Pact; and

Whereas the military clauses of the treaty continue to impose burdensome limitations upon Italy, so as to make it almost impossible for her to provide adequately for her own defense and for that of the Atlantic Pact nations, and

Whereas with a complete disregard for the treaty, Italy, as a result of the repeated Soviet vetoes, has not been permitted to enter the family of the United Nations; and

Whereas other clauses of the treaty, among which are those dealing with the Free Territory of Trieste, have been defined as inexecutable by the three major Allied Powers (United States, England, and France) by virtue of the tripartite declaration of March 20, 1948; and

Whereas the state of minority in which Italy is kept exercises a negative influence upon Italian public opinion, weakens the authority and prestige of the democratic Government, and offers valid arguments to the Communist opposition; and

Whereas only recently the Allied Nations have stipulated, in spite of the Soviet veto, the treaty of peace with Japan on a justly comprehensive and conciliatory basis: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby requests the Congress of the United States to revise the treaty of peace with Italy so as to bring the international position of Italy into harmony with the present situation, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted, October 2, 1951.

LAWRENCE R GROVE, *Clerk.*

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, October 4, 1951.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

A true copy.
Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.)

CIVIL DEFENSE—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday, October 8, the Senate sustained the action of its Appropriations Committee in recommending the restoration of only $32,300,000 of a $407,000,000 House of Representative cut in civil defense funds which had originally been requested by the President. These funds are part of H. R. 5215, the first supplemental appropriations bill which has now gone to conference committee.

At this time I present a resolution forwarded to me by the intergovernmental liaison officer of the Milwaukee Civil Defense and Disaster Committee, Wayne F. Anderson, urging the appropriation of sufficient funds for civil defense and urging the empowering of the Civil Defense Administration to deal directly with those municipalities of the Nation which, like Milwaukee, are the potential chief target areas. At stake in this matter is not merely the question of the amount of funds, but rather the channels through which the funds shall be transmitted. I might mention at this point that in few cities of the Nation have there been more diligent strides made toward effective civil defense than in Wisconsin's largest city, Milwaukee.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, as transmitted to me by Mr. Anderson, and as certified by Stanley J. Witkowski, city clerk, be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD for consideration by my colleagues in the full Senate as this issue arises again in the future and for consideration by the Senate-House conferees.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the original Wadsworth civil defense plan called for the expenditure of $3,100,000,000 over a 3-year period for shelters, regional stockpiles of critically needed materials, communications, organizational equipment, and local personnel and administration; and

Whereas the Wadsworth plan recommended that the Federal Government finance 54 percent or $1,670,000,000 of the total $3,100,000,000 program; and

Whereas the United States Congress appropriated only $31,750,000 for civil defense purposes for fiscal 1951; and

Whereas the administration, upon the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, requested the Congress to appropriate $535,000,000 for civil defense for fiscal 1952, and

Whereas the House of Representatives' Appropriations Committee has recommended that only $65,255,000 be appropriated for civil defense purposes for fiscal 1952; and

Whereas the report of the House Appropriations Committee expressly and impliedly states that the States and municipalities should bear much larger portions of the responsibility for financing civil defense than was originally recommended in the Wadsworth plan; and

Whereas the American Municipal Association, many other organizations, and many municipal officials have expressed their opinion to the Congress on several occasions that our civil defense program will not be truly effective until the Federal Civil Defense Administration is empowered to deal directly with the municipalities that are the chief target areas; and

Whereas civil defense is widely recognized to be inextricably tied in with the military defense of our Nation; and

Whereas it is absolutely necessary that the Federal Government use its taxing and borrowing powers so as to raise funds with which to take the lead in financing civil defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is requested to appropriate realistic amounts of money for civil defense purposes for fiscal 1952 and succeeding years; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress be and hereby is requested to empower the Federal Civil Defense Administration to deal directly with the municipalities of the Nation that are the chief target areas in the organizing and equipping of civil defense organizations and in the construction and preparation of adequate defense facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That the intergovernmental liaison officer of the Milwaukee Civil Defense and Disaster Committee be and hereby is authorized and directed to forward a copy of this resolution to those Senators and Representatives who represent the city of Milwaukee, and to such other Senators and Representatives as may be on committees considering civil defense matters.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 5062. A bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status; without amendment (Rept. No. 934); and

H. R 5405. A bill to amend section 207 (a) of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 935).

By Mr STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R 1180. A bill to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No 936).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 206. Resolution extending the authority and increasing the limit of expenditures for the investigation of personnel needs and practices of governmental departments and agencies; with an amendment (Rept. No. 937).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H R. 4203. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 7 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945; without amendment (Rept No. 941).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S 2078. A bill to authorize the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices at military, naval, and Coast Guard camps, posts, or stations and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 943).

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT, RELATING TO DECENTRALIZATION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I report favorably an original bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the decentralization of certain Governmental personnel, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 939) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 2251) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the decentralization of certain Governmental personnel, and for other purposes, reported by Mr. McCLELLAN from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

CONVERSION OF NATIONAL BANKS INTO AND THEIR MERGER WITH STATE BANKS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably an original bill to clarify the act of August 17, 1950, providing for the conversion of national banks into and their merger and consolidation with State banks, and I submit a report (No. 940) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 2252) to clarify the act of August 17, 1950, providing for the conversion of national banks into and their merger and consolidation with State banks, reported by Mr. MAYBANK from the Committee on Banking and Currency, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

INCREASED LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 219, submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] on October 3, 1951. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I shall not object, let me inquire whether this is a resolution providing an additional $10,000 to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; it is for the purpose of paying the cost of stenographic help in connection with the hearings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. 219) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-second Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946, and Senate Resolution 171, agreed to August 6, 1951.

COMMITTEE TO PARTICIPATE IN DISCUSSION WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF CONSULTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF COUNCIL OF EUROPE—REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have two resolutions relating to the same subject matter, the first being a concurrent resolution.

From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without additional amendment, Senate Concurrent Resolution 36, reported by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] from the Committee on Foreign Relations on October 4, 1951, with an amendment, and I submit a report (No. 938) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona a question: Is this a consultative assembly organized with a definite objective?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes. The representatives of the group were here, and visited with the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and extended this invitation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

The amendment of the Committee on Foreign Relations was, on page 3, after line 8, to insert:

The expenses incurred by Members of the Senate, the House, and by staff members appointed for the purpose of carrying out this concurrent resolution shall not exceed $15,000 for each House, respectively, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members. Payment shall be made upon the submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the respective House or Senate delegation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That not to exceed 14 Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly with the representatives appointed by the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe for public discussion of problems of common interest, as envisioned by the resolution of the Consultative Assembly of May 12, 1951. Of the Members of the Congress to be appointed for the purposes of this resolution, half shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House from Members of the House, and half shall be appointed by the President of the Senate from Members of the Senate. Not more than four of the appointees from the respective Houses shall be of the same political party.

The expenses incurred by Members of the Senate, the House, and by staff members appointed for the purpose of carrying out this concurrent resolution shall not exceed $15,000 for each House, respectively, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members. Payment shall be made upon the submission of

vouchers approved by the chairman of the respective House or Senate delegation.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the House may not find time to act upon Senate Concurrent Resolution 36, which has just been agreed to by the Senate, and which provides for participation in the conference by seven Members of each body of the Congress, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 215 reported by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] on October 4, 1951, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment, and I submit a report (No. 938) thereon. This resolution would authorize 7 Senators to perform the same functions as Senate concurrent resolution 36. It is with the understanding that if the concurrent resolution becomes effective, there will be no expenditures under this Senate resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the word "Senate" to insert a comma and "not more than four of whom shall be of the same political party."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate is authorized to appoint not to exceed seven Members of the Senate, not more than four of whom shall be of the same political party, to meet jointly with the representatives appointed by the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe for discussion of problems of common interest, as envisioned by the resolution of the Consultative Assembly of May 12, 1951, and to designate the chairman of the delegation The expenses of the Members so appointed and of a staff appointed for the purpose of carrying out this resolution, which shall not exceed $15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the delegation.

The preamble was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 11, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S 1959 An act to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S 2231. An act to effect entry of a minor child adopted or to be adopted by a United States citizen.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2246. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize greater assistance to the States in extending and improving health services for the prevention and reduction of chronic diseases;

S 2247 A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to the States in extending and improving diagnostic outpatient health services; and

S 2248. A bill to authorize loans to assist in the establishment of clinics or medical groups designed to afford improved diagnostic service or improved diagnostic and curative service; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

(See the remarks of Mr LEHMAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading)

By Mr. DOUGLAS·

S 2249 A bill for the relief of Biancamaria Cori; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr KERR

S 2250 A bill for the relief of Giovannina Echelle, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr McCLELLAN·

S 2251 A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the decentralization of certain Government personnel, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar

(See the remarks of Mr McCLELLAN when he reported the above bill, which appear under a separate heading)

By Mr MAYBANK:

S 2252 A bill to clarify the act of August 17, 1950, providing for the conversion of national banks into and their merger and consolidation with State banks, ordered to be placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAYBANK when he reported the above bill, which appear under a separate heading)

By Mr MOODY·

S 2253 A bill for the relief of Lina Naim Karnasralla, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr HILL:

S 2254 A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans for the construction of newsprint plants, to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr JENNER

S 2255 A bill to provide that records made by public officers and employees shall be the property of the people and making unlawful failure or refusal to open such records to the public and the American press; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S 2256 A bill for the relief of certain persons who, while serving as members of the Army Nurse Corps, were commissioned as officers in the Army of the United States but were not paid the full amounts of pay and allowances payable to officers of their grade and length of service;

S 2257. A bill for the relief of Emma Pomeroy Von Lewinski;

S 2258. A bill for the relief of Camilla Marie Gutterres; and

S. 2259. A bill for the relief of Nariko Kato and her minor daughter, Mariko Kato; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. HENDRICKSON.

S 2260. A bill for the relief of Nick Martin Morin, and

S 2261. A bill for the relief of Samuel, Agnes, and Sonya Lieberman, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. McCARRAN):

S. 2262. A bill to validate certain payments for accrued leave made to members of the Armed Forces who accepted discharges for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for an indefinite period; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON (for Mr. DIRKSON):

S J. Res. 108. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference three bills dealing with matters relating to the improvement of the public health, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared explaining the bills be printed in the RECORD

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD

The bills introduced by Mr. LEHMAN were read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

S 2246 A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize greater assistance to the States in extending and improving health services for the prevention and reduction of chronic diseases;

S 2247 A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to the States in extending and improving diagnostic outpatient health services; and

S 2248 A bill to authorize loans to assist in the establishment of clinics or medical groups designed to afford improved diagnostic service or improved diagnostic and curative service

The statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

I regard these measures as being of great importance to the general welfare and as essential to our national security.

All three measures seek, in effect, to shorten the lag between medical science and medical care, to narrow the gap between what our medical scientists know about detection and treatment of illness and the degree to which the benefits of this knowledge are available to sick people

One of these bills would provide $10,000,000 a year to be used by the public health service for grants-in-aid to the States and localities for the prevention of chronic illness, and to minimize suffering by making available as promptly and as widely as possible the achievements of medical science

Another bill would authorize $25,000,000 in 1952, and $50,000,000 annually thereafter for grants for the purpose of maintaining more adequate out-patient clinics in hospitals and health centers, for the early detection of diseases, for referral of persons found to be suffering to appropriate medical personnel, hospitals, clinics, and agencies, and for more adequate treatment, home care services and community planning for the ambulatory sick.

The third bill is designed to encourage the development of medical practice of the highest quality on a group basis through the provision of loans for the acquisition and equipment of facilities and for the maintenance and operation of clinics and medical groups designed to afford improved diagnostic and curative services.

It has been said that 328,000 people die each year whose lives science knows how to save. These are deaths that could have been prevented if every person in the country were assured the health and medical services that he needs. Medical science has made great strides in the diagnosis, treatment, and control of illness. It is necessary to make sure that there is equal progress in making the benefits of medical science available to sick people.

Many factors limit the degree to which these benefits are available to the people who

need medical care. One is the ability of people to pay for medical care. Another is the shortage of medical personnel. Failure to achieve the fullest utilization of scarce personnel and facilities is another. We are handicapped, too, by a lack of operational experience with devices and arrangements for making medical care and medical facilities available to the people.

These three bills that I have introduced today would not solve the total problem of this Nation's health deficit. But they would make it possible for many sick people to see a doctor who might not otherwise do so. Diagnosis and treatment would become available to thousands of people who otherwise might not have them. The enactment of this legislation would increase our scientific knowledge, because the more people that we treat and cure and restore to social usefulness, the more we learn about cures and treatments and rehabilitation.

And our medical-care know-how and operational experience would be increased, so that we would have a surer and more reliable knowledge of what kinds of medical care arrangements and institutions can most economically and most efficiently carry out the purposes of conserving the Nation's health. As a result of this experience, each future dollar appropriated by this Congress to promote health and medical care would bring more efficient service to a larger number of people.

Chronic illness—cancer, diabetes, heart disease, rheumatism, arthritis, and other disabling conditions—is now the major health problem of the American people.

It has been estimated that the toll of chronic illness costs this Nation about $11,000,000,000 every year in lost production. This does not take into account the material and psychological cost to individuals and families or the increased load which is consequently placed upon public assistance and private charity.

The great success of medical science during the last half century has resulted in lengthening the average life span of the American people by many years. If present trends continue, about 40 percent of our people will be in the middle and old-age group within 30 years. As a consequence, there is every reason to believe that the magnitude of the chronic illness problem will become even greater in the next few decades.

Thus, in the interest of the well-being and happiness of the people and the economic vitality of the Nation, it is essential that we develop and mobilize the means and expedients for controlling chronic illness and for making the benefits of medical science available to those who are ill.

Moreover, in the long-range mobilization picture, it is important that adequate provision be made for preserving and improving the health of the people of the United States as a basic national resource, just as it is essential that we promote and develop to the maximum degree possible the productive facilities of our industry, agriculture, and commerce. Let me expand this just a bit. Our human resources are perhaps our most limited resources. We have 160,000,000 people as compared with China's 460,000,000, India's 350,000,000, and Russia's 300,000,000. Our productivity per man hour is the greatest in the world and we strive constantly to increase productivity per man-hour. We must also strive to conserve and increase the numbers of men and women who are in good health and available for production and for service.

When General Eisenhower returned from Europe at the end of World War II, he was deeply concerned about this problem of human resources. Because of this concern he brought together at Columbia University men of many backgrounds and talents to focus their thinking on this problem. The results of these Columbia studies and of other similar ones now being undertaken with the support of the Ford Foundation will be very useful to us in defining the details of this problem more clearly. They have already pointed up the underlying danger of a health deficit which it is our responsibility to anticipate and to prevent.

In the days ahead we will need to strive very hard to sustain this Nation's accustomed standard of living and at the same time to sustain the degree of preparedness necessary for security. We can do so only if we continue to improve and to conserve the muscles and the nerves that will be required for this effort.

The Nation's good health is not expendable at any time, least of all in a time of emergency. The things that I propose that we do now are not dramatic. They are in fact rather prosaic, but they are things that we can do immediately and at a price that, as good husbandmen, we should manage to pay out of the Nation's housekeeping money in order to insure that the members of America's families will have the good health to occupy their place at the machines and workbenches, to till the fields, to manage the households, and to guard the ramparts.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and twenty-one postmasters.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

Article entitled "The Nation Marches Forward," written by him and published in the October 1951 issue of the American Vocational Journal, official organ of the American Vocational Association, Inc., discussing the necessity to prepare for defense against attack by Russia from without and against inflation from within.

By Mr. LODGE:

Statement entitled "Casimir Pulaski, Soldier of Liberty," broadcast by him recently over the radio, regarding the celebration of Pulaski Day on October 11, 1951.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him opposing the President's Executive order for the censoring of news, together with a letter addressed to Senator WILEY by John A. Creviere, of De Pere, Wis., dated October 8, 1951, and an editorial from the Chicago Daily News, both on the same subject.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "The Missouri: We Need Unification," written by him and dealing with the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority.

Editorial entitled "Defeating Our Purpose," published in the New York Times of September 5, 1951, relating to racial segregation at the TVA during a visit of a group under the exchange-of-students program.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Address entitled "A Banker Looks at His Supervisor," delivered by C. Francis Cocke, vice president of the American Bankers Association, before the annual meeting of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, in St. Louis, Mo., September 27, 1951.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

Address delivered by Dr. William Jennings Price, of Danville, Ky., on the occasion of the presentation to Kentucky of the first post office at Danville, as published in the Danville Advocate, together with the introductory note by the editor.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Editorial entitled "Ulterior Motives," published in the Kansas Farm Bureau News of August 1951, regarding the proposed appropriation for the Tuttle Creek Dam in Kansas.

Article entitled "To Spend $75,000 Per Square Mile To Catch Small Part of Rainfall," published in the Eureka (Kans.) Herald of August 23, 1951, regarding the erection of a dam on the Verdigris River, Kans.

By Mr. HOEY:

Letter addressed to him by Mrs. Fay Mashburn, of Gneiss, N. C., regarding conditions in the United States.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Article entitled "Unregistered Bull in a Hotel Lobby," written by a contented cowman and published in the West Texas Livestock Weekly of September 27, 1951.

Article entitled "Defense of the Dollar," from the Topeka Daily Capital of September 16, 1951.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

Article entitled "Big Man Does Things in a Big Way," written by Francis P. Douglas and published in the Washington Star of October 4, 1951, a tribute to Jesse Larson, General Services Administrator.

By Mr. MALONE:

Editorial entitled "Our Emergency Economy," published in the Erie (Pa.) Times of August 27, 1951.

Editorial entitled "We Call Them Allies," from the Portland (Maine) Express of September 1, 1951.

By Mr. THYE:

Article entitled "Secrecy Order Is Threat to All Our Basic Rights" written by Carroll Binder, and published in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of October 7, 1951.

Editorial entitled "Beef Control," published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of October 8, 1951.

Article entitled "New Book Puts Stassen in Spotlight for 1952," by Charles Lucey, published in the Washington Daily News of October 11, 1951.

By Mr. MOODY:

Editorial entitled "Halting a Black Market," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of October 1, 1951, relating to the threat of a black market in meat.

Review by Avery Craven, published in the New York Herald Tribune, of the book entitled "Lewis Cass, the Last Jeffersonian," by Frank B. Woodford.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a statement for not to exceed a minute and one-half.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, today, October 11, 1951, marks the one hundred and seventy-second anniversary of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, one of history's great fighters for freedom. General Pulaski distinguished himself by his valor, his military genius, and his tireless zeal in the pursuit of liberty and of happiness for his people.

Unable to achieve these ends in his homeland, he crossed the seas and died in an effort to achieve them for America. For many decades General Pulaski's name has been held in the highest esteem because of his devotion to the cause of freedom in which we stand embattled today.

When I was Governor of Massachusetts, I remember the pleasant talk I had with three Polish pilots who were then fighting with the British. They had been prisoners first of the Russians and then of the Germans. They came from Lwów and had escaped by various means to England. As we talked one of these boys said to me, "Would you like to have your city of Boston presided over by a man who could not talk your language, who did not understand your customs or your history, and who had no feeling whatever for the aspirations of your people?" "Well," he continued, "that is exactly what has happened to me in my home city today." At that time I was not personally familiar with the conditions in his home city nor can I pretend to be today, but it is clear that the tyranny against which these young Poles were then fighting was very little different from that under which the freedom-loving people of Poland exist today. Their situation, their suffering and their aspirations should certainly make those of us outside the iron curtain think long and deeply.

We know well that today there are thousands upon thousands of Polish people within the boundaries of Poland who have known and who love freedom, who are hard-working, self-respecting citizens, and who although they are under the aggressor's yoke are yearning for an opportunity to work and fight for freedom as did General Pulaski so many years ago. These people deserve our help and if we are to help them with real effectiveness, it is essential that this Nation continue to build its strength to a degree that will deter any aggressor, and that will give hope—real hope—to those who for so many years now have been denied genuine freedom.

On this one hundred and seventy-second anniversary of the passing of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, we will do well to remind ourselves of the ideals for which he fought and died, this man to whom freedom was a lifetime objective, not for himself alone, but for others. I am proud and happy to join with the thousands of citizens of Massachusetts who are of Polish origin or descent in the observance of this anniversary of the death of one of freedom's greatest heroes.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, today, October 11, is a day of special significance to every patriotic American, and particularly to those among us who are of Polish birth or ancestry. It marks the one hundred and seventy-second anniversary of the death of Count Casimir Pulaski, a renowned soldier of the American Continental Army who left his native land and crossed the ocean to assist the infant Colonies in their struggle for freedom.

That by his valor and military qualifications he attained the rank of brigadier general in the Continental Army before making the supreme sacrifice of his life for our country has won for him an enduring place among the revered military heroes of our land.

To the thousands of patriotic Americans who were born in or whose parents or forebears came from Poland, he has always been a symbol of the love and devotion which all these splendid citizens of our land have for the United States.

In these troubled times, when Poland is suffering under the control of a Communist dictatorship, observance of General Pulaski Day is of special importance because it brings so thoroughly into focus the comparison between life and liberty in this land of freedom and the degradation and slavery to which Poland is now subjected by its ruthless communistic masters.

With the patriotic achievements of Count Pulaski fresh in all minds today therefore it is thoroughly appropriate that we extend to all our loyal fellow citizens of Polish birth or ancestry the thanks of a grateful Nation and the heartfelt wish that their own homeland may soon again be rescued from the blight of Communist oppression.

POWER DAM AT ROANOKE RAPIDS, N C.

Mr HOEY. Mr. President, I have had occasion frequently to refer to the action of Hon. Oscar Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, in hindering and delaying the construction of a power dam at Roanoke Rapids, N. C., by the Virginia Electric & Power Co. It is a matter of common knowledge that additional electric power is needed in eastern North Carolina, and Mr. Chapman has loudly proclaimed this need, but he has exerted all the influence and power of his position to try to keep the people of eastern North Carolina from obtaining this much-needed power because he wants the Government to build this power dam instead of a private company. He admits the need of the power and warns the country about power shortage, but he is unwilling to have that need met unless it can be provided by the Government and unless the taxpayers' money is used for that purpose.

The Federal Power Commission granted the application of the Virginia Electric & Power Co. to build this dam, and Secretary Chapman has fought the matter for nearly 2 years and continues to fight it both before the Federal Power Commission and in the courts.

The examiner of the Federal Power Commission decided against him. The Federal Power Commission unanimously decided against him. Now the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit has unanimously decided against him, but he is considering carrying it to the United States Supreme Court.

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals was delivered by Hon. John J. Parker, who is presiding circuit judge and who is a resident of North Carolina. This opinion was delivered on October 1, 1951.

The interests of the people of eastern North Carolina is so great in this matter that a delegation of more than 40 citizens—businessmen, farmers, merchants, doctors, and lawyers—paid their own way and made a trip to Washington and called upon Secretary Chapman to try to dissuade him from delaying this matter any longer, and urging that he abide by the decision of the court and let them have this dam built and obtain this power which they need. So far he has not made a definite announcement as to what he will do.

I am submitting herewith a part of the opinion rendered by Judge Parker for himself and the other circuit judges, which illustrates the utter lack of any legal basis for the action of Mr. Chapman, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

These are petitions by the Secretary of the Interior and a cooperative association engaged in supplying electricity to its members, asking that we review and set aside an order of the Federal Power Commission granting a license to the Virginia Electric & Power Co. to construct a dam at Roanoke Rapids, N. C., some distance down the Roanoke River from the Government project at Buggs Island. Petitioners contend that the Roanoke Rapids project was removed from the licensing power of the Commission by reason of the comprehensive plan for the development of the Roanoke River Basin approved by Congress in the adoption of the Flood Control Act of 1944; that the Commission is precluded from granting the license because of its approval of the comprehensive plan; and that, at all events, the Commission transcended its authority and abused its discretion in granting the license because the project as licensed was substantially different from the project as set forth in the plan approved by Congress, because it was not economically feasible and because it involved the surrender to a private corporation of valuable public power rights All of these contentions were rejected by the Commission, and in addition the right of petitioners to raise the contentions was questioned on the ground that neither petitioner is a party aggrieved within the meaning of the statute, providing for review of the Commission's order, 16 U. S. C. 825 L (b).

Four questions are presented for our consideration: (1) Is either of petitioners an aggrieved party within the meaning of the statute providing for review? (2) Has Congress withdrawn the proposed development at Roanoke Rapids from the licensing power of the Commission? (3) Is the Commission precluded from granting the license here questioned by reason of its approval of the comprehensive plan for the development of the Roanoke River Basin? And (4) has the Commission transcended its authority or abused its discretion in granting the license? We think that all of these questions must be answered in the negative.

1. STANDING OF PETITIONERS TO SUE

Review of the order of the Commission is asked under 16 U. S. C. 825 L (b), which allows review upon the petition of "any party * * * aggrieved by an order issued by the Commission." While petitioners were permitted by orders of the Commission to intervene in the proceedings before that body, this was upon condition that such permission not be construed as recognition that they might be aggrieved by any orders entered in the proceeding. The Solicitor General gave his permission that the Secretary of the Interior file a petition for review of the Commission's order; but it is clear that this could not confer any right to seek the review unless the Secretary is a party aggrieved within the meaning of the statute.

The inquiry then is whether either the Secretary or the cooperative association can be held to be aggrieved by the order granting the power company the license to construct the dam at Roanoke Rapids.

The only grievance which the Secretary puts forward is that, if the power dam were built by the Government, he would have the right to sell the electric power produced; and the only grievance asserted by the cooperative association is that, if the Secretary should sell the power, it would have a preference in the right to purchase same. The language of the statute relating to the matter is as follows (58 Stat. 890):

"SEC. 5. Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use threof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Rate schedules shall be drawn having regard to the recovery (upon the basis of the application of such rate schedules to the capacity of the electric facilities of the projects) of the cost of producing and transmitting such electric energy, including the amortization of the capital investment allocated to power over a reasonable period of years. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives."

It is perfectly clear that this statute confers no right or interest in any power project or its development, or any responsibility with regard thereto, upon the Secretary of the Interior, or upon the cooperatives mentioned; but merely provides how the surplus power developed at Government projects shall be disposed of. Whether a project shall be developed by the Government or under license by private enterprise is a matter which Congress has committed, not to the Secretary or to cooperatives who may desire to purchase power from him, but to the discretion of the Commission. Section 7 (b) of the Federal Power Act provides:

"(B) Whenever, in the judgment of the Commission, the development of any water resources for public purposes should be undertaken by the United States itself, the Commission shall not approve any application for any project affecting such development, but shall cause to be made such examinations, surveys, reports, plans, and estimates of the cost of the proposed development as it may find necessary, and shall submit its findings to Congress with such recommendations as it may find appropriate concerning such development."

That the United States, representing the people of the country, may have an interest in the construction of a power project does not confer upon the Secretary of the Interior any authority to go into court for its protection. The safeguarding of that interest has been confided to the Power Commission; and before a member of the Cabinet may attack the Commission's action before the courts he must be able to point to some special interest for which he is charged with responsibility that may be adversely affected by the action attacked. The only responsibility of the Secretary relates to the disposal of surplus power from Government projects; and no duty or responsibility with regard thereto can possibly arise until the Government has authorized the project and entered upon its construction.[1] Until then he has no more duty or responsibility in this connection than has the Postmaster General. A fortiori the cooperative association, whose only possible interest is to purchase power which the Secretary may sell, has no such right, duty or responsibility with respect to the construction of a power project as would give it standing in court to question an order of the Commission. No case has been cited which supports the right of either the Secretary or the association to ask review of the Commission's order, and we know of none. For cases holding generally that some right or interest of a complaining party must be invaded to justify him in asking relief in court, see *Alabama Power Co.* v. *Ickes* (302 U. S. 464); *Federal Communications Commission* v. *National Broadcasting Co.* (319 U. S. 239); *U. S. Cane Sugar Refiners* v. *McNutt* (2 Cir. 138 F. 2d 116).

There is nothing in *United States* v. *Interstate Commerce Commission* (337 U. S. 426), which supports the position of petitioners. That case holds merely that suit by the United States to protect its interests is not precluded merely because the suit must be brought against a governmental agency. Nothing is said to indicate that an officer of the Government may go into court against such agency to protect the public's interest with respect to a matter as to which he is charged with no duty or responsibility.

For the reasons stated, we are of opinion that petitioners are not parties aggrieved within the meaning of the statute and consequently have no standing in court to ask that the order of the Commission be reviewed or set aside. Assuming, however, that they have such standing, we do not think that they have made a case entitling them to relief, since we are of opinion, for reasons which we shall now examine, that the granting of the license here in question was within the Commission's power and that there is no basis for holding that the discretion vested in it by law was not properly exercised.

Mr. HOEY. Herewith follows a discussion of the power and authority vested in the Federal Power Commission to grant the license, followed by a very able and illuminating presentation of both the facts and the law covering the entire case. It is a most convincing opinion and is written in Judge Parker's best style.

After reviewing the facts and citing numerous authorities showing that the Congress did not intend to preempt the whole field on the Roanoke River for Government development and denying development by private companies, the court makes this final analysis of the situation which is both convincing and conclusive:

It is argued that the granting of the license to a private company involves the surrender of valuable power rights belonging to the public, because it is said that the Government could obtain the capital necessary for development at a low interest rate and could supply current at a low cost to the users of electricity. The question as to whether a power project should be licensed for construction by private enterprise or constructed by the Government itself is one which, as we have seen, Congress in section 7 (b) of the Federal Power Act has entrusted to the judgment of the Commission; and the Commission has given consideration to the question and has decided it adversely to the contention of the petitioners. Its findings with respect to the matter are as follows:

"(57) The record in this proceeding does not provide a proper or sufficient basis for judgment or a finding under section 7 (b) of the act that development of the water resources at Roanoke Rapids should be undertaken by the United States itself or for the submission of such findings and a recommendation to Congress to such effect, as provided in such section.

"(58) The evidence received does not show that the Roanoke Rapids site would be developed at any time by the Federal Government, should the pending application for license be denied Such denial would of course permit the water, which the applicant plans at once to utilize, to continue to be wasted to the sea."

The Chief Examiner of the Commission, in his report, which was approved by the Commission, said:

"All arguments for recommendation for Federal development would seem to be premised upon an assumption for which no basis can be found in the record—that the United States will in fact build Roanoke Rapids within some reasonable, foreseeable time, if no Federal license is issued to a private or non-Federal applicant. The contrary appears to be the fact. The probability is that so far as the United States is concerned, the water resources at Roanoke Rapids are destined to be undeveloped and unutilized for a long time to come. It is not believed that such wastage or nonutilization of water resources can be in the public interest, particularly when there is a need for the energy in the area and a private developer with private capital stands ready, willing, and able to utilize them, with the protection of the public interest furnished by the terms and conditions of a Federal license."

Little need be added to what was said by the Commission and the Chief Examiner. The fact that the cost to benefit ratio for Roanoke Rapids is higher than that of the other projects in the general plan does not mean that private enterprise is being allowed to profit at the expense of the public. Roanoke Rapids is a straight power project and its high ratio is based upon its estimated power production, increased as it will be, by the headwater benefits from Buggs Island. If Roanoke Rapids is licensed for private development, however, these headwater benefits will be taxed in favor of the Government as owner of Buggs Island and against the Roanoke Rapids project, so that the public will be compensated for any benefit that results to Roanoke Rapids from the Buggs Island construction. Surely it is in the public interest that this be done rather than that the potentialities of Roanoke Rapids remain undeveloped and the Government lose the compensation for the headwater benefits which would accrue from its development.

The proposed development will involve the investment of some $27,000,000 by the power company. It will have a total installed capacity of 91,000 kilowatts. The annual value of its capacity and energy will be around $400,000 over and above annual costs. All of this is being lost so long as the project is not constructed; and its construction, even though by a private enterprise, adds just that much to the wealth of the country and the available electrical energy, so greatly needed in this period of national emergency. To permit its construction as provided by the license, will surrender no public assets to anyone but will merely permit the power company to develop the property which it has already acquired for power purposes and thus utilize a source of power now being wasted. The property will be operated in the public interest and the charges for power will be fixed by the Commission, as provided in the power act. The United States will be paid for headwater benefits from Buggs Island around a quarter of a million dollars a year and will have the right to acquire the project at the end of the term of the license in accordance with the terms of that act. In this situation, it cannot reasonably be said that the Commission has abused its discretion and is surrendering valuable rights of the public because it does not refuse a license for construction by private enterprise of this proj-

[1] The Secretary of the Interior has, in fact, no responsibility whatever with respect to the disposal of power produced by any project until the Secretary of the Army has certified that in his opinion it is not needed in the operation of the project.

ect which Congress has shown no intention of constructing.

For the reasons stated, the petitions asking that the order of the Commission be set aside will be denied.

Mr. HOEY. I have omitted from the above much of the opinion, but all of it is to the same effect and represents the reasoned judgment and sound wisdom of a very fine circuit court. It is certainly to be hoped that the Secretary of the Interior will realize, as the court very clearly says, that he has nothing more to do with this matter than the Postmaster General would have or any other official of any branch of the Government. In view of this decision, it is hard to see how he would be justified in continuing to deny the people of North Carolina the power which he admits they so much need merely because he wants the taxpayers to furnish the money to build the dam instead of letting a private company build it, when the rates will be regulated and the public protected as fully and completely as if the Government were making the development. Actions of this kind on the part of Government officials is a clear explanation of why the public is not too favorable to public power and why they are opposed to having the Government enter any further into the field of private enterprise.

REMOVAL OF TEMPORARY MARKERS OVER GRAVES OF WORLD WAR II DEAD IN NATIONAL CEMETERY AT HONOLULU

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to place in the RECORD a short statement on behalf of the American Battle Monuments Commission, prepared by Col. C. B. Shaw, in charge of the Washington office. The substance of the statement is that it has no authority and has had nothing to do with what has happened in the National Cemetery in Honolulu regarding the removal of temporary markers. I am told by the American Battle Monuments Commission that it is purely a matter for the military authorities to consider. The Commission and others have received communications with reference to the subject.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I understand that Members of the Senate, and of the House also, are receiving many communications protesting the recent removal of the temporary markers over the graves of the World War II dead in the National Cemetery at Honolulu, and it will be helpful to them, perhaps, if I point out that this is an Army matter.

The American Battle Monuments Commission is responsible only for our military cemeteries in foreign countries and it is erecting over each of the graves in these cemeteries a permanent white marble Cross or Star of David Under the law, the Commission has no functions or responsibilities whatsoever in the national cemeteries in the United States and its Territories and possessions. These latter are under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army and I would suggest that Senators receiving protests regarding the action of the Army authorities in Hawaii and who desire further information on the subject address their inquiries to the office of the Quartermaster General.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which was, on page 3, after line 8, insert:

A-7130337, Bach, Nathan.
A-7130336, Bach, Lena nee Winerlok.
A-5950016, Diakatos, Androioannis.
A-7190920, Yatrakis, Thekia George nee Vardakas
A-7190919, Yatrakis, George Petros.
A-6474461, Zwick, Samuel or Wick
A-7184995, Iny, Frank Jacob.
A-7184996, Iny, Muzli Masri
A-6811549, Heidmeier, Elfriede.
A-6698695, Berlonghi, Ercole
A-6698706, Berlonghi, Anese nee Brambilla
A-7392825, Easterling, Ilda Marie Chislaine nee Finet.
A-3686108, Hu, Seng-Chiu.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is a concurrent resolution relating to the suspension of deportation of certain aliens pursuant to law. The law provides that the Attorney General may suspend the deportation of certain aliens but he must report his action to the Congress for affirmative approval.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 39, after it had passed the Senate, was amended in the House. The House added 13 cases to the concurrent resolution. We have checked these 13 cases and find them worthy of approval. Accordingly, I move that the Senate concur in the House Amendment to Senate Concurrent Resolution 39.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Nevada states that these 13 cases are just as worthy of consideration as the other cases which the Senate has already approved.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct, so far as we can determine.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada to agree to the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTOMOBILES FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1864) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans who served during World War II, and persons who served in the military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see House proceeding of October 5, 1951, p. 12720.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement prepared by me in regard to the conference report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

The House of Representatives approved the conference report on this bill on Friday of last week.

S. 1864, as it passed the Senate unanimously on August 9, provided for the extension for three more years of the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay for the purchase of automobiles for World War II veterans who have suffered the loss or the loss of use of a leg. This measure also extended the same benefits to veterans of service in the Armed Forces who have seen active duty on or after July 27, 1950.

The House of Representatives amended this bill by inserting the language of H. R. 4233, which it had passed on June 13. This House bill would have granted automobiles to veterans of World War I, World War II, and of the Korean conflict, who suffered either the loss or the loss of use of an arm or a leg, or who are blind S. 1864, as the House amended it, also permitted the payment of $1,600 cash in lieu of the automobile

The conference report has wider coverage than the original Senate bill, but is considerably less than the House-amended version. While the Senate conferees agreed to include under this legislation veterans who suffered the loss or loss of use of an arm or who are blind, the House conferees receded from their insistence on including World War I veterans, and also agreed to eliminate the cash payment provision. This action of the House conferees brings the legislation more in line with recognized concepts of veterans' rehabilitation.

This measure would permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to authorize payments on the purchase of automobiles for World War II veterans and veterans of the Korean conflict who have suffered the loss or loss of use of an arm or leg, or who are blind It also changes the provision which requires the veteran to be able to operate the vehicle, by permitting him, if he is physically unable to drive, to purchase one so that it may be operated for him by another person.

I believe this conference report represents a fair compromise of the differences between the House and Senate versions of this desirable legislation.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2233) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following members answered to their names:

Bennett	Chavez	Ecton
Brewster	Clements	Ferguson
Bridges	Connally	Flanders
Butler, Md.	Cordon	Frear
Butler, Nebr.	Dirksen	Fulbright
Cain	Douglas	George
Capehart	Duff	Green
Carlson	Dworshak	Hayden
Case	Eastland	Hendrickson

Hennings	Magnuson	Robertson
Hickenlooper	Malone	Russell
Hill	Maybank	Saltonstall
Hoey	McCarran	Schoeppel
Holland	McClellan	Smathers
Humphrey	McFarland	Smith, N. J.
Hunt	McKellar	Smith, N. C.
Ives	McMahon	Sparkman
Jenner	Millikin	Stennis
Johnson, Colo.	Monroney	Taft
Johnston, S. C.	Moody	Thye
Kefauver	Morse	Underwood
Kerr	Murray	Watkins
Knowland	Neely	Welker
Langer	O'Conor	Wiley
Lehman	O'Mahoney	Williams
Lodge	Pastore	Young

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent because of a death in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

SHIPMENT OF ARMS AND EQUIPMENT TO GENERAL EISENHOWER

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in the New York Times for yesterday, October 10, there appeared an editorial entitled "Sacrifice at Home," which refers to my statement last week that the shipment of arms and equipment to General Eisenhower's forces is seriously inadequate. The New York Times states, flatly, "It is time to make the investigation," which I suggested. I suggested last week that a subcommittee look into the matter of why shipments to General Eisenhower are so inadequate. Because of the vital importance of this matter, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD so that Senators will be reminded of the way in which the United States at present is failing to discharge its responsibilities.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SACRIFICE AT HOME

When so responsible a Senator as HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., of Massachusetts, states that the shipment of arms and equipment to General Eisenhower's forces from the United States is of "shocking inadequacy," it is time to make the investigation which he suggests. Although the figures on movement of arms are secret, Mr. LODGE says, "they are currently only about one-fifth as large as they should be." The Senator—one not given to wild statements—asserts that "apparently we cannot demand of ourselves enough production to support our own troops and preserve our own peace."

These are serious charges. They strike at a fundamental question: Is this country making as great a productive effort and as great a civilian sacrifice as the political and military conditions require? In his last quarterly report Mr. Wilson spoke of "slippage" in production; yet deliveries of military goods were expected to amount to more than $5 billions, one-third more than the preceding quarter and four times the rate of a year ago. But impressive as such figures are, doubt remains as to whether they are nearly as large as the national interest truly demands, and whether we are not still ambling along on a "guns and butter" economy. The figure of 1.1 million passenger cars for the current quarter represents a cut of one-third below the 1950 average, but it is still at a rate so high that it has been exceeded only in 3 years of our automobile history.

The very fact that "no shortages of consumer goods yet exist" is in itself an indication that we are not really making the all-out effort that the critical nature of the times demands. There seems to be a tendency among our political leaders to think we can fight a world-wide struggle against Communist imperialism with one hand while with the other we continue to play with the luxuries to which we have become accustomed It can't be done, and the sooner we realize it the better.

There is one thing of which we are confident. The American people, mindful of our soldiers in Korea, on the Elbe, and in many other troubled areas of the world, will not shrink from sacrifice once they are shown that it is necessary. We think that, as usual, the people are ahead of their leaders and will willingly make whatever effort is necessary to preserve their freedom for future generations.

STRATEGIC USE OF THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the development of atomic explosives in sizes small enough to be fired as an artillery shell or delivered by relatively small planes raises at once the question of using them to support our troops in Korea. I believe that if they can be used efficiently and profitably that they should be used, and herewith state my reasons.

First, we are hugely outnumbered by the Communists and their satellites in Korea and can, therefore, only hope to meet them on an equal footing by superiority in equipment.

Second, the use of atomic weapons for purely military purposes and solely against military personnel could not possibly justify any moral disapproval of us on the grounds that we are using the atom weapon against civilians.

As a matter of fact, a strong argument could actually be made for using the atomic bomb strategically so as to permit a defensive line of atomic craters to be made at some point across the Korean Peninsula. Such an operation should only be undertaken after all civilians have had ample time to evacuate. Under such circumstances, this might be an action against which no reasonable objection could be made. No possible objection, however, could be made to using the atomic weapon solely for tactical purposes.

In the third place, let us remember that we have already failed to keep faith with our troops in Korea by our failure to mobilize effectively enough to regain the diplomatic initiative and to put firm pressure on the Kremlin to call off the Korean aggression which I believe they could do if they wanted to do so. We must not fail them further. The use of the atomic weapon could result in the saving of many American lives. It could shorten the war, thereby saving not only American lives, but the lives of everyone concerned. It is, therefore, well worthy of favorable consideration and action if its military feasibility proves to be real.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2233) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, at no time in the history of this Nation's development of atomic energy has the use of overwhelming care and precision judgment in the control of restricted data been more essential to the common defense and security of the United States. Supremacy in atomic preparedness has become the critical bulwark in our survival as a free people. Information control is a factor basic to such supremacy.

It was with solemn attention to these principles that the law was first framed, and the joint committee, from its inception, has kept the identical principles at the forefront in scrutinizing the Nation's atomic endeavors. The same overriding concern for the common defense and security has dominated consideration of the bill which is now recommended to the Congress.

I wish to emphasize to the Senate that the judgment of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on this matter is unanimous; in other words, the nine Members of the House and the nine Members of the Senate constituting the joint committee were in complete and entire agreement as to the wisdom and desirability of proposing this amendment to the act.

In considering the activities of friendly nations that impact directly upon atomic endeavors within the United States, the committee has given intensive attention to an important and complex problem requiring the most responsible and informed appraisal. This problem in all its ramifications involves considerations of secrecy and cannot be detailed here. Without violating secrecy, however, it can be said that the problem includes these aspects: If, for example, certain carefully circumscribed information were made available to another nation, that nation could furnish as a direct result of the information tangible benefits to the United States which would substantially promote our own atomic preparedness. In this type of special situation, moreover, a failure to undertake an arrangement with another nation would mean that the United States will be less well equipped—in measurable

degree—to use atomic energy for defense purposes.

The joint committee has exhaustively explored and weighed the issues thus presented. It particularly took into account the unique benefits obtainable from a speedy determination of basic policy.

After conscientiously evaluating all factors from the perspective gained through half a decade of service within the classified atomic energy field, the members of the joint committee unanimously concluded that an arrangement with another country of the kind just outlined would substantially promote and would not endanger the common defense and security of the United States. They equally concluded that such an arrangement could only be acceptable subject to severe limitations and restrictive conditions.

It is the committee's thoroughly considered judgment that any determination must be confined to cases where the factors involved are plain and compelling and where, in effect, all reasonable and patriotic men with full knowledge of the facts can render a common verdict. The committee sees a clear need for acting to strengthen the atomic preparedness of the United States in the self-interest of the United States.

All concerned, the members of the joint committee, no less than the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, are agreed that the situation should be met by new legislation. The two amendments which the joint committee unanimously recommends are, first, a new subsection (3) to be added at the end of the present section 10 (a), which reads, of course, as it appears in the bill.

The second amendment, a companion, is listed as section 5 (a) (3), and it also appears in the bill, and, in addition, is set forth in the report.

The committee believes that the above amendments are the minimum to assure the attainment of enhanced atomic security and that they contain maximum security safeguards. Before the Atomic Energy Commission could enter into an arrangement involving restricted data with another country under the proposed legislation, certain conditions would have to be met; and then follow 20 conditions, to which I call attention. They appear on page 3 of the report, as follows:

1. The common defense and security must be promoted.
2. They must not merely be promoted but substantially promoted.
3 They must not be endangered.
4. The commission must decide that conditions (1), (2), and (3) have been fulfilled.
5. The commission must so decide unanimously.
6. Any arrangement must be specific.
7. No restricted data on design and fabrication of atomic weapons could be communicated.
8 The arrangement must be made with a country which does not threaten the security of the United States.
9. The restricted data to be communicated must be limited and circumscribed to the maximum degree consistent with the common defense and security objective in view.
10. The commission must adjudge that the security standards of the recipient nation, as applied to the data to be communicated, are adequate.
11. The National Security Council (of which the Secretary of Defense is a member) must make a recommendation in writing.
12. The President must determine in writing that the arrangement would substantially promote the common defense and security.
13. The President must determine in writing that the arrangement would not endanger the common defense and security.
14. The President must include in his written determination the recommendation of the National Security Council.
15. The President must give specific consideration to the security sensitivity of the restricted data involved.
16. The recipient nation must undertake to maintain security safeguards.
17 The President must give specific consideration to the adequacy and sufficiency of such security safeguards.
18. The joint committee must be fully informed for at least 30 days beforehand.
19. The Congress must be in session during these 30 days.
20. In computing the 30 days there must be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days.

An amendment to section 5 (a) (3) is recommended on parallel grounds, in that the present section imposes a limitation on persons. Section 18 (c), in turn, defines "person" in such a way as to exclude the Commission but to include, for example, a private American contracting firm which might be required to assist in implementing an arrangement as contemplated in the proposed amendment to section 10. Where restricted data are involved, all the conditions and safeguards just described would apply.

The committee of course intends that the section 10 amendment have no retroactive but only prospective application. The meaning of the remainder of section 10 would remain completely unchanged. In particular, the existing technical cooperation arrangement of the United States with Britain and Canada, which has its roots in the wartime partnership between the three countries, remains unaffected.

Just as the proposed legislation would not disturb the powers and the authorities of the Commission, so all other prohibitions, restrictions, and limitations of the act remain in effect. The proposal is directed at special circumstances and deals with these alone.

The joint committee's overriding concern has been and is the security and supremacy of the United States in the atomic energy field. The joint committee unanimously urges the Congress to enact the bill herein reported before adjourning.

Mr. President, I think that that pretty well describes what the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has recommended to the Senate be done. This bill proposing amendments to the act has received most careful consideration. We have consulted the executive departments. I know of no disagreement upon the part of anyone in the military, in the Atomic Energy Commission, or in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy as to the wisdom of adopting the amendments proposed by the bill. So, Mr. President, I hope that the bill will be passed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for some questions to develop certain phases of this matter?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to my friend the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say by way of preface that I support this amendment and am supporting it. I believe that it is a wise move. The point I am about to mention did not come up in committee, and I raise it today with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for the purpose of having the RECORD made clear.

I was informed yesterday in a round about way, not directly by either of the departments, that the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff had not been ascertained in connection with the feasibility, propriety, or national-security phases of these amendments, and that the opinion of the Military Liaison Committee had not been secured or ascertained.

Yesterday, upon hearing that, I wrote to General Bradley a letter making inquiry on that point. General Bradley is out of the country, but the letter was sent to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I have had no reply to that letter, except a telephone call saying that formal declaration had not been made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the matter; but I do have a letter which was delivered to me a moment ago from Mr. LeBaron, chairman of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission, saying the matter had not been formally considered by the Military Liaison Committee. I think undoubtedly the distinguished chairman has had some contact in one way or other with the military through its various branches, and I think it would be very helpful if he would state what the situation is, because I would not want to move further if I felt that this proposal met with opposition on the part of the military, for instance, or if they had some sound reasons for believing that the amendments proposed by the bill should not be adopted. I think it would be well to make clear what the situation is in that respect, and, no doubt, the Senator from Connecticut can do so.

Mr. McMAHON. I think it can be cleared up without any difficulty, and it should be made clear in the RECORD. General Bradley returned home from Tokyo last Thursday morning, and as the Senator knows, he left for Europe, I believe, on Sunday morning. He worked all day in the Pentagon, but he called me about 4:30 in the afternoon and asked me whether he could come to see me. He came about 6 o'clock, and we spent about an hour discusing this matter.

General Bradley is very vigorously in favor of the amendments proposed by the pending bill. In fact, the criticism, if any, which he voiced to me was that he thought perhaps we had not gone quite far enough. I did not ask the General about his specific ideas, nor as to just how far he wanted us to go, because I knew this bill represented certainly the widest kind of amendment that could be obtained at this session of the Congress. Personally I believe that under the bill

the Commission will be able to do everything I want to see them do at this time.

The Secretary of Defense in talking about the matter with the Chairman of the Commission on Atomic Energy has expressed himself as in favor of this bill. I think I can assure the Senator from Iowa that there is not only no opposition, but, on the contrary, the most vigorous and wholehearted approval of the efforts which will culminate in this legislation.

On Sunday, quite by accident, I met General Bradley again, and he mentioned the fact to me that he had talked personally with two Members of the Senate, urging them to get behind this bill and urge its passage. He particularly told me that he had talked with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and that he had expressed to him the hope that the Senator from Georgia would support the bill, in the event that there was any opposition.

So I think I can say to my good friend, the Senator from Iowa, that from topside to bottomside there has not been a single individual who has voiced any opposition.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then, Mr. President, if the Senator will yield again, merely to clarify the situation further, I may state my position. I know of no objection from the military department, either the military liaison committee or the National Defense Department or Joint Chiefs of Staff, to the passage of this bill. I make the statement that I know of none. Neither do I know of my own knowledge of any affirmative approval on their part. The Senator from Connecticut has been in close touch with this subject, and I wonder whether he can go further and state whether he knows of any objection to this bill on the part of the military liaison committee or the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. McMAHON. I know of absolutely none. I again say for the RECORD that I believe this proposal has the wholehearted approval of everyone connected with the atomic energy project, either on the civilian or military side.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think that is a reassurance in great measure for the RECORD, and for the Members of the Senate. I wanted to make that clear, because of certain remarks I want to make when the Senator has concluded.

Mr. McMAHON. I yield the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have supported this bill as it finally has come from the committee, for several reasons.

I believe I am aware of circumstances in which the advantage of the United States will be promoted by being able to exchange certain restricted information, in a limited degree, if I may use that term, in connection with our atomic program.

As I think almost every Senator knows, I have been very strongly opposed in the past, and shall continue to be in the future, to placing arbitrary authority in the discretion of any one or two men who, at their own convenience or because of curiosity, could begin to exchange with other nations information on this very vital subject. One of the reasons of my opposition is that the information is vital. The development of atomic energy may mean the survival of our Nation at some future time. I hope it will never come to that point, but it might very well be that important. Once information is given by us to someone else outside of our jurisdiction, it makes no difference whatsoever what the solemn agreements are in connection with giving the information, it can never be recalled, and it cannot, to all intents and purposes, be reliably controlled. I care not how friendly may be the nation with which we deal, I care not how altruistic their attitude may be, I care not how much they seem to be obligated to us, once we divest ourselves of such information and place it in the hands of another sovereign power, we can neither police it nor control it. Therefore, it is a most serious thing to give away vital atomic secrets, even of a lower scale or category than bomb fabrication, or weapon information.

I have been very careful about supporting any movement that would enlarge the right of our people to give away such information. On several occasions I have been quite active in preventing what I thought was an attempt on the part of some persons to give away information which I thought went far beyond the limitations of our law, and the release of which would be detrimental and prejudicial to our interests.

There have been occasions in the past when our convenience would have been served if we had been able to exchange information more freely, but, by the same token, in my judgment, the danger to our security would have been increased away out of proportion to any convenience we would have received by such an exchange. However, from time time certain instances may arise where, in my judgment, under carefully safeguarded restrictions, our people should be able to discuss and exchange certain information with others who may have acquired information through divergent processes and which would be very helpful to us.

So I think that under proper restrictions and safeguards we can authorize a slight enlargement of the Atomic Energy Act to permit the exchange of certain information. The act, I believe, is very well safeguarded along that line.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to propound a question to either the Senator from Iowa or the Senator from Connecticut. In the opinion of either Senator will this bill, if it is enacted, increase the security of the United States rather than diminish it? In other words, by passing this bill will we give ourselves greater opportunity for more security in connection with the use of atomic energy and for the advancement of the study of atomic energy than we would have if we did not pass the bill?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If I correctly understand the Senator's question, the answer is "yes." But the term "security" is a very loose term. The passage of this bill will put us into a position, under carefully safeguarded conditions, where we ought from time to time to be able substantially to benefit ourselves in the atomic energy field. By benefiting ourselves in that field, we shall eventually get to the point where one can say, "Yes, it will benefit our security," because the more we develop our ability and the more we gain superiority in our ability to control atomic energy, the greater our security. It is on that basis alone that I would support the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has answered my queston in the way in which I wanted it answered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the fact that this bill amending the act provides for some very careful and important safeguards. Since all governmental activities, whether they be scientific, political, or otherwise, are in the hands of human beings and must be administered by human beings, who rise or fall according to the way they exercise their judgment, we must put the discretion and the administration of the bill into the hands of human beings. We have a Chief Executive, a National Security Board, a Military Liaison Committee, Joint Chiefs of Staff—there are all kinds of officials and agencies who are supported to look after our security. Therefore, the administration of any provision of this kind essentially must be within the discretion, sound judgment, and the patriotic restraint of those who administer it.

So the committee attempted to safeguard it as much as was possible and still leave the way open for reasonable exchange of information. For instance, it is provided that no restricted data can be exchanged, even with the proposed amendment of the law. That is one safeguard.

Another one is very important; at least, it seems important to me. I may say our disagreements in the committee are usually friendly; we look at things a little differently, though we usually get down to a common ground; but there was some objection to one provision, and some of us thought it was very important. If it is wrong, I shall have to take the responsibility for insisting on it, but the bill provides that no exchange arrangement shall be proposed or entered into without the unanimous agreement of the five members of the Atomic Energy Commission. I fully realize that that leaves the decision up to one man. One can block action if he is foolhardy or goes off on a tangent. But, by the same token, it is up to the President to appoint persons who possess reasonable judgment and sound convictions and work in the best interests of the country, and it is up to the Senate to approve such appointments.

I believe that any agreement involving the exchange of vital information should be of such a level of benefit to this country that the five members of the Commission would be unanimous in deciding whether it would be advantageous. That is provided for in the bill. So that, first, there must be a unanimous decision of the five members of the Commission.

Among other provisions, there is the proposal that prior to the confirmation of any agreement with any other coun-

try or group, the matter must be submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy 30 days prior to the consummation of any such agreement. The joint committee does not have the power to stop any administrative decision of the Commission, but it has a great coercive effect on them. If the joint committee comes to the conclusion that what they propose to do, even though the Commission is unanimous, is not good for the security of the United States or in our own best interests, I feel quite certain that the Commission would not arbitrarily override the opinion of the joint committee. So that is another safeguard.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. If the restrictions or safeguards contained in the bill had been in the original act at the time so many scientists from foreign lands were coming here, would we have had the spectacle of some of them securing vital information and then going behind the iron curtain with it?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No. I may say that the act presently is more restrictive than the bill would make it. The bill does not tighten up the security. It opens the situation up just a little bit, so far as a limited exchange with foreign countries is concerned, when it would advantage us to make such exchange. I do not believe passage of the bill will affect that situation at all. I think a different element is involved. What the scientists in question did was traitorous to their own countries and to us and to everyone else It is impossible by legislation to keep traitors from being traitors They were working under cover and what they did clearly violated the law which was in effect at that time. So that they were and are law violators. To change the law one way or the other would not change their souls or their moral responsibility. They are scoundrels and they will always remain scoundrels. I think there is a limited situation involved.

Another provision is that any such agreement must be submitted to the President, who shall secure the written recommendation of the National Security Council on any proposed agreement. The National Security Council is composed of a distinguished group of highly able American citizens, whose duty it is to look after the basic security of the United States and to make recommendations in certain very important fields. The bill requires that the President shall secure the written recommendation of the National Security Council, and after incorporating in his written finding the recommendation of the National Security Council, the President must find "that the arrangement would substantially promote and would not endanger the common defense and security of the United States."

I feel that those are about as substantial and encompassing safeguards as we can put into the act. I think the bill takes the question of exchange of information regarding atomic weapons or materials or designs about as far away from the frailties of individual judgment or the judgment of a very few people, as it can be taken, and still leave an opportunity to accomplish what is desired.

As I said a moment ago, there are some who believe that this amendment to the law is too restrictive. They would like to have more latitude and more freedom. So far as I am concerned, there is plenty of freedom, if substantial national advantage is to be secured from an exchange of information. If the advantage and benefit accruing to our country are in such degree as to warrant the exchange, then the exchange should be approved by all five members of the Commission.

It should have the substantial, if not complete, moral approval at least of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the President's findings incorporating the recommendation of the National Security Council should set forth that fact. I believe our security is buttoned up by the safeguards provided just about as completely as can be done.

I would prefer an affirmative written record of the approval of this amendment by the Department of Defense and by the Military Liaison Committee. I would prefer that it be in the RECORD. However, the chairman made a statement as to his consultation with the Department of Defense. He states that there is no objection raised so far as he knows. I know of no objection to the bill by the Department of Defense. I feel that there is not sufficient ground at this time for any delay in the passage of the measure. I believe it will be helpful and that by its judicious use in the various opportunities which may arise, the proposed law will give us an opportunity to benefit ourselves and not result in harm. If the measure is administered in the spirit in which it is written, in the spirit in which the joint committee approached it, and with an understanding of national security and a zeal to protect it and the secrecy of our process—if it is administered in that spirit by the human beings who will have charge of it, then I feel our national security will not be impaired, and that we will stand a chance of substantial benefit.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (S. 2233) was passed.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that this is the first major amendment to the act which Congress passed in 1946 to operate the atomic energy project. I think that is a pretty good record. I believe that from time to time, as future developments occur, both in science and in world conditions, there may be reasons for adopting further amendments to the law. But I now wish to pay my tribute to the Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives who in 1946 were able to fashion a piece of legislation which had been designed to carry out behind high walls of secrecy the most momentous manufacturing project in the history of mankind, and so fashioned it in a totally unexplored field that now 5 years have gone by before the necessity for a major amendment has arisen.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. McFARLAND Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of unobjected-to bills on the calendar, from the beginning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McMAHON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first bill on the calendar.

SUBSISTENCE AND TRAVEL EXPENSES OF JUDGES—BILL PASSED TO FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 32) to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges traveling while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official stations and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at the rate of 7 cents per mile was announced as first in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I ask that the bill be passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arizona if he has talked with the Senator from Illinois within the past few days? My understanding is that he has no longer any objection.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will consult with him.

Mr. McCARRAN. May the bill go to the foot of the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be passed to the foot of the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 618) to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request, I ask that this bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

SUBSISTENCE AND TRAVEL EXPENSES OF JUDGES—BILL PASSED TO FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 36) to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges while attending court or transacting business at places other than their official station, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at a rate of not exceeding 7 cents per mile, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, this is the same as Senate bill 32, which was passed to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that this bill be passed to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be passed to the foot of the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2929) to authorize the Postmaster General to prohibit or regulate the use of Government property under his custody and control for the parking or storage of vehicles was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 35) to provide for the appointment of deputy United States marshals without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations was announced as next in order.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution wil be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1590) for the reimbursement of the S. A. Healy Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request, I ask that this bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2119) to amend sections 544 and 546 of title 28, United States Code, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have a request that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

TESTS FOR ALCOHOL IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN OFFENSES—BILL PASSED TO FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 951) to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in blood, urine, or breath of persons tried in the District of Columbia for certain offenses committed while operating vehicles, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have a request that the bill go over. I ask that it be passed to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be passed to the foot of the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1414) for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1376) providing for the dissolution of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the transfer of certain functions related to national defense heretofore vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 172) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if there is no objection to the bill, I ask for an explanation of it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have a request from the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will go over.

The bill (S. 1748) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended with reference to the designation of organizations as successors in interest to deceased persons, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. I have a request that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

The bill (S. 1770) to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, and eliminate certain exemptions therefrom, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. Previously I requested that the bill go over because of its length, but I am not going to object to its being passed today if the Senator from Nevada believes that it should be passed on the call of the calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN. I believe the bill should be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1770) to amend the Administrative Procedure Act and eliminate exemptions therefrom, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 9, after "Sec. 2.", to insert "(a)"; on page 2, after line 14, to insert:

(7) Section 16 of the Rubber Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 108).

In line 17, to change the subsection number from "(7)" to "(8)"; in line 19, to change the subsection number from "(8)" to "(9)"; in line 22, to change the subsection number from "(9)" to "(10)"; in line 24, after "Congress);", to insert "and"; after line 24, strike out:

(10) The paragraph headed "General provisions—Department of Justice" in chapter III of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 843, 81st Cong.); and."

On page 3, line 6, to reletter the subsection number from "(c)" to "(b)"; in line 12, after the word "proceedings", to insert "In the administration and interpretation of the Administrative Procedure Act, no implication shall be drawn by reason of the repeal by this act of any exemption from the provisions of such act heretofore granted with respect to any agency of the Government or to any functions exercised by any such agency"; and in line 19, to reletter the subsection from "(d)" to "(c)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That clause (4) of section 2 (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act is amended to read as follows:

"(4) the functions conferred by the following statutes: the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the Contract Settlement Act of 1944; and the Surplus Property Act of 1944."

SEC. 2. (a) All laws or parts of laws enacted prior to the date of approval of this act which grant exemption from the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act are repealed, and the following parts of laws are specifically repealed:

(1) Section 302 of the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 918);

(2) Section 601 of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1946 (60 Stat. 993);

(3) Section 6 (a) of the Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947 (61 Stat 37);

(4) Section 210 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 201);

(5) Section 301 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 99);

(6) Section 5 of the Second Decontrol Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 323);

(7) Section 16 of the Rubber Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 108);

(8) Section 7 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (Public Law 11, 81st Cong.);

(9) Section 3 (1) of the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 (Public Law 421, 81st Cong.);

(10) The first sentence of section 709 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (Public Law 774, 81st Cong.); and

(11) Section 305 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Cong.).

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to invalidate, or to require any change in, any proceedings conducted by or before any agency of the Government which were commenced prior to the effective date of this section, or to invalidate any action of any such agency taken prior to such date or any action taken after such date in connection with any such proceedings In the administration and interpretation of the Administrative Procedure Act, no implication shall be drawn by reason of the repeal by this act of any exemption from the provisions of such act heretofore granted with respect to any agency of the Government or to any functions exercised by any such agency.

(c) This section shall become effective on the thirtieth day following the date of its enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, would the Senator from Nevada mind stating the purpose of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, at the New York convention of the American Bar Association, the house of delegates of that organization on September 19 adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the Federal Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 was enacted largely through the efforts of the American Bar Association and this association has since (house of delegates, February 27, 1951, 37 ABA Journal 322) declared that all the reasonable safeguards provided by that act are required to protect the essential rights of the public to due process of law before Federal administrative agencies: Be it

Resolved, That the American Bar Association approves in principle the repeal of all Federal laws or parts of laws which grant exemptions to Federal administrative agencies from the provisions of Administrative Procedure Act and approves the provisions of S 1770, a bill introduced by Senator McCARRAN for that purpose: And be it further

Resolved, That the President is hereby authorized to appear, or to designate a member of the association to appear, before the appropriate committees of Congress to present the views of the association in support of this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 5, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "(12) Section 111 of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 (Public Law 9, 82d Cong.)."

Mr McCARRAN. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment which I now propose is to complete the listing in S. 1770 of all of the statutes containing provisions of exemption from application of the Administrative Procedure Act. The necessity for this amendment, recently discovered, perhaps points up the extent to which the Congress has permitted dissipation of the force and scope of the Administrative Procedure Act.

As the report on S. 1770 points out, when the Administrative Procedure Act was enacted in 1946 it was intended to apply to the functions of all Federal administrative agencies, with certain prescribed exceptions which were written into the act for good and substantial reasons determined upon careful deliberation. During the first 5 years of the existence of the Administrative Procedure Act the Congress displayed a growing tendency to delimit the application of its safeguards on agency action by exempting certain statutory functions from the purview of the act. I thereupon introduced S. 1770 to repeal those exempting provisions and thereby reinstate the original scope of the act.

Members of the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary collaborated with the legislative counsel's office in the attempt to make S. 1770 all-inclusive with respect to the exemptions previously granted. The long list of laws contained in section 2 (a) of S. 1770 resulted from painstaking research required by the lack of annotation and by the brevity of the exempting provision in those laws. Quite by happenstance we have now uncovered one more instance, in the Renegotiation Act of 1951, where an exemption from the Administrative Procedure Act was included in brief terms, and hence, I offer the proposed amendment to S. 1770 in a further effort to make that bill all-inclusive, in accordance with its purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1976) to provide for home rule in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. STENNIS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CREATION OF CORPORATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 664) to amend section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law, and for other purposes," was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have a request that the bill go over. I also have a request that the next two bills on the calendar, namely, Senate bill 1260 and House bill 1764 go over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Will the Senator from Arizona withhold his objection?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, of course. It it not my objection.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. May I ask whose objection it is?

Mr. McFARLAND. It is the objection of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The Senator from New Mexico has informed the junior Senator from New Jersey that he has withdrawn his objection to Senate bill 664.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know about that. I have been given a list of bills to which objection has been raised. I ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Which calendar number is the Senate considering at the moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar 595. Would the Senator from Arizona consent to having the bill go to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. McFARLAND. This is satisfactory.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Would the Senator from Arizona withhold his objection to Calendar 609, Senate bill 1260?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. First, let us dispose of Calendar 595, Senate bill 664. That bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. CHAVEZ subsequently said: Mr. President, when I was out in the reception room talking to some constituents, Senate bill 664, Calendar No. 595, was passed over at my suggestion upon the request of another Senator. Heretofore I have objected to the bill because I wanted to study it further. However, I have no objection to consideration of the bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey ask unanimous consent that the action of the Senate in passing over the bill be reconsidered?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I do, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 664) to amend section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "any", to strike out "company to use any of their funds in the purchase of any stock in any other corporation: *Provided, however*, That this provision shall not apply to charitable, educational, and religious corporations incorporated under the Code of the District of Columbia or under any act of Congress" and insert "corporation, except a charitable, educational, or religious corporation incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia or under any act of Congress, to use its funds to purchase stock in any other corporation", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation

of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law" (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 29-216), be amended to read as follows:

"It shall not be lawful for any corporation, except a charitable, educational, or religious corporation incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia or under any act of Congress, to use its funds to purchase stock in any other corporation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his study of the bill and for withdrawing his previous objection to it.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CIVIL DEFENSE TRAINING SCHOOL — BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1260) to authorize the acquisition of property for the establishment of a Federal civil defense technical training school, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wonder whether the majority leader would mind stating which Senator objected to the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has requested that the bill go over. I do not know what his objection is.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will withhold the objection, I should like to say that in my judgment it is exceedingly important that Calendar No. 609, S. 1260, be considered and passed before the Senate adjourns, because the establishment of a technical training school by the Federal Civil Defense Administration is an absolutely necessary step if we are to have a national civil defense program. I very strongly urge the majority leader to set a date for the consideration of the bill if it cannot be passed on the call of the calendar.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to join in what the Senator from Florida has stated. As Mr. Caldwell has said, the enactment of this bill is a very necessary step for our civil defense program. I understand that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] wanted to inspect the property before the bill was acted on. My information is that he has inspected the school which is intended to be purchased.

I wonder whether the majority leader would object to having the bill placed at the foot of the calendar, so that we may ascertain whether, following that visit, the objection might be withdrawn.

Mr McFARLAND. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Tennessee has sent word that he does not want the bill passed during the call of the calendar. I shall give consideration to the Senator's request in regard to taking up the bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Would the Senator object to having the bill go to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no objection, except that the senior Senator from Tennessee has just sent word about this bill. We have telephoned to him since the bill has been under discussion, and he does not want the bill passed during the call of the calendar. I will give consideration to having the bill called up at another time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

SETTLEMENT BY THE ARMED SERVICES OF PAY AND CERTAIN CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES

The bill (H. R. 1764) to authorize the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force to settle, pay, adjust, and compromise certain claims for damages and for salvage and towage and to execute releases, certifications, and reports with respect thereto, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill was before the Judiciary Committee and was studied extensively and was studied by the staff, and then was considered by the full Judiciary Committee, and was rejected; it was not reported favorably. However, now we find the bill coming up.

I am quite certain that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] did not know of the history of the bill, namely, that it had been submitted to the Judiciary Committee and was turned down by the committee, or the bill would by him have been referred again to the Judiciary Committee.

I do not know why or how the bill got to the Committee on Armed Services.

I respectfully suggest that the bill should be sent to the Judiciary Committee, and should not be passed during the call of the calendar, at this time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this is my first knowledge that the bill had been referred to the Judiciary Committee and had been turned down. I have some faint recollection that something was said about some bill which went to the Judiciary Committee, but I do not think it was this one, and there is nothing in our record to show it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me make it clear that we had a Senate bill which was identical with this House bill. This is a House bill which came from the House and evidently was referred to the Armed Services Committee. The Senate Judiciary Committee had the Senate bill before it.

Mr. STENNIS. I am advised by a member of the staff that he examined the record in regard to the bill, and there was nothing to indicate that the bill had been turned down by the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. There were no hearings, but the bill was considered by the staff, was studied by the staff, was referred to the full committee, and by the full committee was rejected.

Mr. STENNIS. I hold in my hand a document entitled "Stenographic transcript of hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, March 7, 1951, on Senate bill 313," which I am advised now by the staff is the same as House bill 1764, although I have no independent knowledge that the Judiciary Committee ever turned down the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is the record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada ask that the bill go over?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; I should like to have the bill go over until we can clear the record on it.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I should like to say that in the Armed Services Committee we had no knowledge that the bill or one similar to it had been rejected by the Judiciary Committee. We are very glad indeed to have the Judiciary Committee consider the matter again, as it may wish; but we think the bill is of some importance.

Based on the experience of the Navy, which is operating under the same system now proposed for the Army and the Air Force, the bill commends itself to us very highly. When all such claims have to be filed with the courts, if the claims involve more than $1,000 and relate to any kind of collision or damage of any sort by components of the Army or the Air Force the result is to throw a tremendous burden upon the courts and upon the Treasury.

Mr. McCARRAN. As I now recall, it was the idea of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee that the bill had merit, but I did not attempt to urge my ideas on the committee, and the committee turned down the bill. It might be that upon further consideration of the bill, the committee would look at it differently.

I suggest to the Senator from Mississippi that at some time before we conclude having the calendar called, perhaps it might be well to have the bill go back to the Judiciary Committee, and perhaps the committee will do something with the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's remarks. I hope the Judiciary Committee will give consideration to the bill. I believe it will be passed, once it is understood.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator from Mississippi consent to having the bill referred to the Judiciary Committee? If so, I will say to the Senator that I will bring the bill before the Judiciary Committee next Monday.

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be glad to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator make that request?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, Mr. President; I ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the Judiciary Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, some time ago, when it was before the Senate on the calendar, I raised a question with reference to House bill 1764. I was evidently in error in regard to its companion bill (S. 313). I find a statement by myself in the RECORD, made on a previous date, in which I stated:

Pursuant to the order of the Senate Judiciary Committee entered on June 25, 1951, I move that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 313 and that it be referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

Of course, that did happen, subsequent to the other event which I have recited today. It is a matter which had entirely slipped my mind. I apologize to the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that we revert to the consideration of Calendar No. 609, House bill 1764.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the question is with reference to returning to the consideration of Calendar No. 610, and withdrawing it from the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on the Judiciary is discharged from consideration of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I withdraw the objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nevada that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of H. R. 1764?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1764) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PHILIPPINE SCOUTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1216) to authorize the President to convey and assign all equipment contained in or appertaining to the United States Army Provisional Philippine Scout Hospital at Fort McKinley, Philippines, to the Republic of the Philippines and to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain Philippine Scouts hospitalized therein, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 2, line 6, after the numerals "381", to strike out "Seventy-sixth" and insert "Seventy-eighth"; and on page 3, line 11, after the word "conditions", to insert "and limitations."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 515) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 751) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims for basic and overtime compensation was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Upon objection, the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 1570) to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey requests that the bill be passed over, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 16) to provide for the payment of an annuity to widows of judges was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Upon objection, the bill goes over.

GRANTS FOR HOSPITAL FACILITIES TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2094) to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection, so that I may address myself to the majority leader?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I withhold the objection for that purpose, but thereafter I shall ask that the bill go over.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, it is my considered judgment that this bill is a very worth-while measure. The bill merely enables voluntary, private hospitals in the District of Columbia, which serve practically the entire metropolitan population of the District of Columbia, to avail themselves of certain Federal grants for the purpose of expanding their hospital facilities.

This bill came up before a subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee, and we had extensive hearings. The proof was quite abundant that these plans cannot be carried to fruition unless the aid provided by the bill is afforded. I realize that possibly such a measure cannot be passed on the Consent Calendar, but I hope that the majority leader will give serious consideration to the fact that possibly it could be brought up for debate and for consideration and acted on by the Senate before Congress finally adjourns.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McMAHON in the chair). The Chair would like to join in the request of the Senator from Rhode Island that consideration be given to the bill at this session.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I object to this bill, and shall continue to object to it, for I think it would set up a precedent in the United States which we do not want. It would say to every religious hospital in the United States, "Come in and we will let you have money with which to build a hospital." That is what is proposed, in effect, and for that reason I think it would result in a mixture of church and state. I shall continue to oppose it for that reason.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, it is regrettable that the Senator from South Carolina should make that statement. Certainly I am sorry to hear it, as every other Member of the Senate should be. These hospitals are rendering a great humanitarian service, regardless of religious affiliation. Because the Cross of Christ may be on the turret of some hospital is no reason why it does not render Christian service to the sick, the needy, and the afflicted, and certainly if there was ever a time in the history of this country when we should forget that there are differences in religious beliefs, and remember that we are a Christian Nation, and that Christianity comes out of institutions such as would be aided by this bill, it seems to me that time is now.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to join to the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Nevada, and to add that there appeared before the committee representatives of the trustees of practically every voluntary and private hospital in this community, and all of them agreed that what has been proposed would be good legislation, and there was not raised a single question of mixture of church and state.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Carolina, but in doing so suggests that there are but 2 minutes of time for debate on this bill remaining.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senate that I agree that the church hospitals are doing a wonderful work, but at the same time I call attention to the fact that we as a government cannot do what we should do to carry along hospitalization in the United States, even in State, county, and municipally owned hospitals.

Furthermore, so far as I am concerned, I try to do what I think it right with the taxpayers' money, and when we tax people in the United States, I do not believe we have a right to take the money collected and give it to hospitals. We have not done it in the past. A health center was established in the District, and it is possible to get the necessary hospital care through that health center, without coming directly to the Federal Government. Why is that not done? Instead of that, the proposal in the bill is to come directly to the Federal Government and to say, "Give us so much money." I think that is wrong. That is the question which I am raising at this time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KERR. As I understand, the Senator is entirely in favor of the program of the building of hospitals.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Absolutely.

Mr. KERR. But he is oposed to the method proposed in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Absolutely.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator realize that we are now giving Federal money for the expansion of private and voluntary hospitals in every State of the Union, under the Byrd-Hill Act?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. But we are not giving it to them directly.

Mr. PASTORE. To whom is it given?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The money is given through the State or through a health center. We set up a health center in 1946 for these hospitals, and they are now coming to us for money. There is $21,000,000 available. We are waiting for those interested to come and get it. But they will not come under the system provided heretofore. That is what I am complaining about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On request, the bill goes over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1475) to amend section 1 of the act to provide aviation education in the senior high schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved December 16, 1941, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVAL ATTACHÉS, OBSERVERS, AND OTHER OFFICERS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R 2737) to authorize the reimbursement of certain naval attachés, observers, and other officers for certain expenses incurred while on authorized missions in foreign countries was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

Notwithstanding the proviso in section 1 of the act of July 18, 1947, under the headings "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts" and "Pay and subsistence of naval personnel" (61 Stat. 386), Navy and Marine Corps personnel shall be entitled to reimbursement for amounts expended by them prior to March 2, 1948, for hiring and maintaining permanent household staffs or for hiring servants for specific occasions of official entertainment, while in the performance of their duties in foreign countries as attachés, observers, or on any other authorized missions in connection with Naval Intelligence: *Provided*, That such reimbursement shall be paid from the unexpended balance of the appropriation which would have been made but for the prohibition contained in said proviso *Provided further*, That any payments which have heretofore been made for such purposes are hereby expressly validated.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has returned to the floor. Let the Senator from Illinois be advised that the Senator from Mississippi has proposed an amendment to the pending bill. The Senator was out of the Chamber at the time. It is the amendment about which the Senator from Mississippi spoke to the Senator from Illinois several moments ago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if I may address an inquiry to the Senator from Mississippi, do I correctly understand that the Senator from Mississippi is proposing that reimbursement of the payment illegally made by the Navy shall be made out of past appropriation funds?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, an explanation of this bill was made at a prior call of the calendar, and the bill was carried over on objection by the Senator from Illinois. The Senator from Mississippi now offers an amendment providing that the funds must be paid out of the funds which remain with the Navy from the fiscal year 1948, there being some funds remaining for the fiscal year 1948 which are available for this purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think the action of the Navy in this respect was so illegal that they should be taught a lesson, and I hope the Senator from Mississippi will accept an amendment reading: "*Provided*, That the $42,000 spent by the officers in question in good faith shall be taken from the amount appropriated to the Department of the Navy for emergencies and extraordinary expenses for the year 1952," because we appropriated for the Navy, I believe, a total of almost $20,000,000,000.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have order? It is impossible for me to hear the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I believe we have appropriated for the Navy for the current year about $20,000,000,000, and we have made a very large appropriation for emergencies and extraordinary expenses as an item in the appropriation. The payment covered by the pending bill was an expenditure of $42,000 made by the officers in the field in good faith, but as a result of a ruling by the Navy Department which directly disobeyed an act of Congress.

First, I wish to congratulate the committee for cutting down the total amount of claims from $89,000 to $42,000. I agree that the officers in question who made the payments should not bear the burden of the expense, but the Navy Department deserves some discipline for its illegal act in gross violation of the intent and letter of the law. It would seem to me that if the payment were charged to emergencies and extraordinary expenses for this year, they could bear $42,000 out of a total appropriation running into the billions of dollars. I very much hope that the Senator from Mississippi will be willing to accept this change; otherwise, I shall be compelled, reluctantly, to object, and the officers will then receive nothing.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi is really more in line with the committee action on the bill than is the amendment suggested by the Senator from Illinois. But in view of the Senator's position, that he will object to the consideration of the bill unless his amendment is accepted, I agree, under those circumstances, to a substitution of the Douglas amendment for the amendment which I offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi withdraw his original amendment and offer the Douglas amendment as a substitute?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 6, it is proposed to insert after the period the following:

All payments made under the provisions of this act shall be made from, and all payments validated under such provisions shall be charged to, the amount appropriated by the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1952, to the Department of the Navy for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, as authorized by section 6 of the act of August 2, 1946.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have the greatest of faith in the integrity and good will of the Senator from Mississippi, but it appears to me that this bill would establish a precedent which might be detrimental in the future. I should like to know a little more about the provisions of the bill and should like to have more opportunity to study it. For that reason, I ask that it go over.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the Senator withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. An explanation of the bill was made when it was first called up, and my time is now exhausted and there is no time to explain the bill further. If the Senator will let it go to the foot of the calendar, so that it will be called again, I think I can satisfactorily explain it to the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am very sure the Senate will have another call of the calendar before Congress adjourns. I may be in favor of the bill, but I do not feel that it is wise to establish a precedent by paying amounts through legislation which might in the future lead to more claims of the same nature. So I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4692) to authorize the appointment of Joseph F. Carroll as a permanent colonel in the Regular Air Force was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

DETERMINATION OF WHEN PSYCHOSIS SHALL BE PRESUMED TO BE SERVICE-CONNECTED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 320) to amend veterans regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for psychoses developing to a compensable degree of disability within 3 years from the date of separation from active service, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an

amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, for the purpose of hospital and medical treatment, including out-patient treatment, authorized under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, a veteran of World War II (as defined in Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended) developing an active psychosis within 2 years from the date of separation from active service in such war shall be deemed to have incurred such disability in such active service.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may I inquire what the result of the amendment would be? I think we should have the information in the RECORD.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the bill as passed by the House created the presumption of service connection in the case of any person who served in the Armed Forces and who suffered a psychosis within 3 years from the date of separation from active service.

The Committee on Finance amended the title so as to read:

An act to assure hospitalization and outpatient treatment by the Veterans' Administration of World War II veterans who develop an active psychosis within 2 years from the date of separation from active service.

We changed the bill in two ways. First, we limited the time to 2 years, instead of 3, in which the presumption would exist Upon the development of a psychosis within the 2-year period the patient would have top priority for hospitalization and out-patient care.

It seems, Mr. President, that there are some 8,000 or 10,000 veterans who have such disability. They not only constitute a problem which is of grave concern to the Government, but it is also one in which the Government has a very sympathetic and very keen interest, and also a very direct responsibility. It was the belief of the committee, however, that the greatest service that could be rendered the veterans would be to give them top priority for hospitalization and out-patient care. Therefore the benefit of the presumption goes to affording them hospitalization and out-patient care, and it limits the presumption from 3 years to 2 years.

The Government has the facilities with which to give the veterans hospitalization and out-patient care.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is not the thought behind the bill the fact that it is completely impossible to tell with any degree of certainty exactly from what cause these psychoses have originated?

Mr. KERR. That was one of the considerations in connection with reporting the bill as amended.

Mr. HOLLAND. And the purpose of the bill is to give the veteran the benefit of the doubt if the psychosis develops within 2 years from his discharge from the service. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. And to find by presumption, as stated in the bill, that the psychosis is the result of his military service?

Mr. KERR. Yes; but in addition to that, he has priority for hospitalization and out-patient care.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to assure hospitalization and out-patient treatment by the Veterans' Administration of World War II veterans who develop an active psychosis within 2 years from the date of separation from active service"

Mr KERR subsequently said: Mr. President, with reference to calendar 707, House bill 320, which was passed a few minutes ago, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, ask for a conference with the House, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I was absent from the Chamber when this bill was considered and passed On the last previous call of the calendar I objected to it. Before it is finally approved, I should like to ask reconsideration of the vote by which the bill was passed, because I believe it establishes a very dangerous precedent

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr President, a parliamentary inquiry

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Chair please state the bill which is now before the Senate, about which the Senator from Oklahoma inquired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill being discussed is calendar 707, House bill 320, which was previously passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which that bill was passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider will be entered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is it appropriate to make a statement at this time?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, why can we not follow the regular order, and then argue these questions afterward?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That bill is not now before the Senate. It has been passed. A motion to reconsider has been entered, and the regular order is that the clerk report the next measure on the calendar.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. KERR. Is the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma, that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, out of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time was still ripe for a motion to reconsider; therefore the Senator from Illinois had the right at any time within that time to enter his motion. That has been done, and, it being a privileged motion, it takes precedence. The Chair may say that, of course, if any Senator wishes to comment on this particular bill, he may take advantage of the opportunity to do so when another bill is called, under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. CHAVEZ Mr President, is it in order to call for the regular order at this moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is that the clerk report the next measure on the calendar; which the clerk will do Following that, any Senator may obtain recognition.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 18) to authorize suits against the United States to adjudicate and administer water rights was announced as next in order.

Mr McFARLAND I object.

Mr. CHAVEZ Mr. President, I have no objection, but I should like to have the Senator from Nevada give us some information with reference to the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr President, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to permit the United States of America to be joined as a defendant in any suit for the adjudication of rights to the use of water from any water source, or for the administration of such rights, where it appears that the United States is the owner, or is in the process of acquiring ownership of rights by appropriation under State law, and where there is a showing that the United States is a necessary party to such adjudication. Section 2 of the bill provides for the development of a catalog of water rights owned by the United States to be kept by the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of reference thereto as the need may arise. The bill specifically excepts the joinder of the United States in any suit or controversy in the Supreme Court of the United States involving the right of States to the use of the water of any interstate stream.

In the Western States the doctrine of prior appropriation is the water law, controlling water rights in those States. It is based on the proposition that "first in time is first in right," and recognizes the right of a landowner on a given stream to continue the use of water which he has appropriated for a beneficial use. No person can appropriate more than is reasonably necessary for the benefit of his land, and must continue to use that appropriation in a beneficial manner. Due to the fact that water is so scarce in the Western States, all such water has for many years been appropriated and put to beneficial use.

The Government has long recognized and conceded, particularly in the Desert Land Act of 1877, the supremacy of State law in respect to the acquisition

of water. It has been under these State laws that the water rights of the owners on a given stream have been adjudicated. Under the laws of many States, in order that an adjudication of the water rights of a stream may be had, it is necessary to join all the parties owning or claiming to own any rights to the stream. If one or the other of the owners of the rights cannot be joined, the effect of the decree is obvious. Since the United States has not waived its immunity in cases of this nature, suits for the adjudication of water rights necessarily come to a standstill, and confusion results.

The necessity that all owners or claimants of water rights on a given stream be joined in a suit for the adjudication of water rights is conceded. For example, in the Santa Margarita case in which the Government is seeking to adjudicate all of its rights to the Santa Margarita River in California, the Government has joined or is seeking to join all the claimants on that stream, even though it would appear that about 90 percent of the water rights repose in 10 percent of the litigants. This abundantly appears from the transcript of the hearings held September 21, 1951, by the Committee on the Judiciary, in reference to the confirmation of the nomination of A. Devitt Vanech, to be deputy attorney general. I direct attention to this point to show that the Department of Justice admits that in order to get a proper and complete adjudication of the water rights of a given stream or water source, it is necessary to join all the parties having or claiming to have an interest in the waters of said stream.

Particularly in view of the fact that the United States has acquired its water rights from former owners who were subject to such suits, the committee is of the opinion that to allow the United States in its own right or as a trustee to have a better right than the former owner is not fair and just to the other water users on the stream.

Section 2 of the bill provides for a common repository for all the claimed water rights of the United States in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, so that at all times the public may know, upon request, just what the water rights claimed and held by the United States are It also establishes a place where the United States Government itself may go on short notice to determine any or all of its holdings.

The committee believes this bill to be meritorious, and I trust that the Senate may at some time take it up, if consideration of it is objected to today.

Let me say to the Senator from Arizona [Mr McFARLAND] that there is no State in the Union more interested in the bill than is the State of Arizona, because the State of Arizona recognizes the right of prior appropriation as against riparian doctrine. The State of New Mexico, the State of Nevada, the State of Idaho, the State of California—in fact, all the western arid and semiarid States—are interested in the bill, because the Government of the United States, during the past 15 or 18 years, has acquired on the various natural streams of the West holdings in real estate which was formerly taken up by private citizens and in connection with which they, as private citizens, diverted water from the natural streams and applied it to the land. Then the Government acquired the land and the water rights. If some water user on the stream seeks to establish what his water rights are, he must of necessity bring the Government in as a party defendant or a party litigant in the suit.

Mr. CHAVEZ Mr President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am happy the Senator from Nevada has made a statement explaining the purpose of the bill and the reasons for it. I have no objection to the bill I know what it means to my State. But I should like to ask a question. If the Interior Department is made the repository of water rights, be they in the United States Government or in individual citizens, does that mean that Indian rights will also be integrated?

Mr. McCARRAN No. All that the bill provides is that the Interior Department shall be a repository for the rights that have been acquired and are held by the United States, so that one seeking to determine water rights on a given stream may know what rights, if any, are claimed by the Government

Mr CHAVEZ Does the Government claim those rights as the Government, or could it act as trustee, let us say, for a tribe of Indians?

Mr. McCARRAN It could act as a trustee, I suppose. But, Mr President, there is a deeper and more far-reaching purpose If my time has not expired——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator be allotted further time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I appeal to the Senator from Arizona, because his State is as much interested in this matter as is my State, or as is the State of New Mexico, or as are any of the other arid or semiarid States Why the Senator from Arizona should object to the bill is more than I can understand.

Mr McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I concede that my State is interested, but it is interested that the bill not be passed. After I have an opportunity to study it, at some appropriate time we can take it up on the floor of the Senate and debate it, but I object to consideration of the bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Douglas in the chair). Objection is heard.

The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

FINANCING OF SAFETY EQUIPMENT OF RAILROADS

The bill (H. R. 4693) to amend section 77, subsection (c) (3), of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill seeks to amend subsection (c) (3) of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act for the purpose of clarifying the power of the bankruptcy court in railroad reorganization proceedings to permit a priority to certificates issued for the financing of safety equipment over existing obligations, receivership charges, and past or future State and local taxes. It is widely contended that the bankruptcy court has such power under the present provisions of subsection (c) (3), but this legislation would expressly clarify that power, and, incidentally, would expedite the financing of automatic safety equipment to be installed on the Long Island Railroad, where it is urgently needed.

It should be noted that this legislation does not disturb the discretion now vested in the bankruptcy court with respect to the granting of priority in obligations, but only clarifies the scope of the obligations to which the priority may apply in the discretion of the court.

The Interstate Commerce Commission recommends favorable consideration of the bill in its present form, and the Department of Justice makes no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H R 4693) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRAVEL AND SUBSISTENCE EXPENSES OF JUDGES—BILL PASSED OVER

Mr McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar No. 21, Senate bill 32, which has previously been passed over.

Mr McFARLAND. Mr President, I have no objection. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has informed me that he withdraws his objection. I objected to the bill only on his behalf.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar No 21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will revert to Calendar No. 21, Senate bill 32.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, Calendar No. 228, House bill 36, is a companion bill. I ask unanimous consent for the substitution of that bill and its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 36? The Senator from Illinois has objected in the past, but he withdraws his objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 36) to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their offi-

cial station, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at a rate of not exceeding 7 cents per mile, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "not exceeding."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, are we not setting a precedent in allowing judges $15 a day for expenses? That is more than is allowed other Government employees. Are we not opening the door for others to come in and ask for a like sum?

Mr. McCARRAN. This provides only for actual expenses up to $15. Judges have always been allowed more for expenses than have others.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. How much do they receive now?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the present allowance is $9.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is not that the same allowance as is made for other Federal Government employees while traveling?

Mr. McCARRAN. The allowance for judges was $9 when the allowance for everyone else was $6. Then we brought the allowance for others up to $9 It is the opinion of the committee that when judges travel they should live as judges ought to live. Judges must be detained for a long time, holding court at points remote from their regular place of holding court. The committee feels that under existing conditions, $15 a day is not too much, especially in these times, when a ham sandwich cost $2.50.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that the allowance for others ought to be increased as well?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is a matter which we shall have to deal with later.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I fear that if we pass this bill, it will be an opening wedge for others to demand the same allowance. I do not know that judges ought to receive more than anyone else when they travel.

Mr. McCARRAN. The judges are required to travel. They are ordered to travel.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I object to further consideration of the bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The Chair requests that the RECORD show that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has withdrawn his objection.

The bill will be passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Illinois.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1452) to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 106) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia" was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Over by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2137) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into lease-purchase agreements to provide for the lease to the United States of real property and structures for terms of more than 8 years but not in excess of 25 years and for acquisition of title to such properties and structures by the United States at or before the expiration of the lease terms, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, this bill was sponsored by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. He and I were discussing certain amendments. The Senator from Arkansas is out of the city at the moment. For that reason I ask that the bill go over

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR CHIEF OF DENTAL DIVISION OF BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

The bill (H. R. 4205) to provide retirement benefits for the Chief of the Dental Division of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2104) to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CHARLES W. VANDERHOOP—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R 2546) for the relief of Charles W. Vanderhoop was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON By request I ask that the bill be passed over.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am glad to do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know who objects to the bill. The bill involves a Massachusetts citizen who is an Indian. I believe that this is a meritorious case, and I hope that the Senator who objects can be asked to discuss this question before it comes up again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey withhold his objection so that I may make a brief explanation?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly withhold my objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill provides for payment of the sum of $639.39 to Charles W. Vanderhoop for adjustment of his retirement pay for the period January 1, 1933, to December 29, 1937, as a retired employee of the former Lighthouse Service of the Coast Guard, which amount has been barred by the 10-year statute of limitations.

The committee recommends this award, inasmuch as it is evident that the claimant had no knowledge of any rights accruing to him until the ruling of the Comptroller General of October 23, 1947, and upon receiving such knowledge claimant filed for the money properly due him. The justice of the claim is upheld by the fact that the Government has settled for all of that period which was not barred by the statute of limitations.

The committee is of the view that the statute of limitations should not apply in this instance for the reason that until the ruling was made by the Comptroller General on October 23, 1947, the claimant had no claim which he could have prosecuted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with what the Senator from Nevada has said. As I understand, this man is an Indian who was retired. He was a lighthouse keeper on Marthas Vineyard, and was retired in due course. He had no knowledge of his rights until this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am informed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who is not present, and who I think is the objector, that he believes that these cases should be covered by a general statute. There is a precedent for this case, because another Massachusetts case went through last year under similar circumstances.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL Does the Senator know of any pending bill providing for a general statute on this subject?

Mr. McCARRAN. There is none to my knowledge.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and the distinguished Senator from Nevada understand that the junior Senator from New Jersey has no objection. He is objecting on behalf of another Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the Gay Head Indian will have to wait some time for his reimbursement.

BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2180) to provide for slaughter quotas and allocations of livestock was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) providing for a consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 354) to amend Public Law 106, Seventy-ninth Congress, with regard to compensation for overtime and holiday employment was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that this bill go over, not because the junior Senator from New Jersey has

any personal objection, but I do not feel that this is legislation which should pass on the call of the calendar. I think it ought to be debated and carefully considered by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Does the Senator from South Carolina wish me to withhold my objection?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment, to permit me to make a brief statement?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am glad to do so.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think this bill should be considered, but not at this time on the call of the calendar. I hope we can take it up in the near future. The bill is not my idea. It is recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission. They have made a study of overtime. The bill was recommended to the committee, and the committee reported the bill favorably. For that reason I hope the Senate can consider it before we adjourn.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I share that hope.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 79, 103, 104½, and 107, to the bill, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HELEN DICK

The bill (S 64) for the relief of Helen Dick was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Helen Dick, of Long Beach, Calif., shall be deemed to have been born in England, which was the birthplace of her father, Robert McCulloch Dick

YOUICHI NOBORI

The bill (S. 527) for the relief of Youichi Nobori was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That, solely for the purposes of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Youichi Nobori, a minor Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Lieutenant Colonel and Mrs. Richard G. Winters, citizens of the United States.

CONSTANCE CHIN HUNG

The bill (S. 605) for the relief of Constance Chin Hung was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of section 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall be held to be applicable to the alien Constance Chin Hung, the minor, unmarried child of George Chin Hung, a citizen of the United States.

MOTOI KANO

The bill (S. 639) for the relief of Motoi Kano was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purposes of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Motoi Kano, a minor Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Dixon Y. Miyauchi, a citizen of the United States.

ALBERT WALTON

The bill (S. 740) for the relief of Albert Walton was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 331 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, and if otherwise eligible under all other provisions of the said act, Albert Walton may file the petition for naturalization prescribed by law.

MITSUKO SAKATA LORD

The bill (S. 811) for the relief of Mitsuko Sakata Lord was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, nothwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Mitsuko Sakata Lord, the wife of Peter J. Lord, a United States citizen, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

RALPH ALBRECHT HSIAO

The bill (S. 971) for the relief of Ralph Albrecht Hsiao was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall be held to be applicable to the alien Ralph Albrecht Hsiao, the minor unmarried child of Valley A Udick, a citizen of the United States.

AGNES ANDERSON

The bill (S. 985) for the relief of Agnes Anderson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Agnes Anderson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MISAO KONISHI

The bill (S. 1120) for the relief of Misao Konishi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Misao Konishi, a minor Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Sgt. and Mrs. Harvey L. Houser, citizens of the United States.

BARBARA ANN KOPPIUS

The bill (S. 1256) for the relief of Barbara Ann Koppius was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Barbara Ann Kopplus, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year such quota is available.

FRANCISCA QUINONES

The bill (S. 1323) for the relief of Francisca Quinones was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Francisca Quinones shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

THE TOWN OF MOUNT DESERT, MAINE

The bill (S. 1482) for the relief of the town of Mount Desert, Maine, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the town of Mount Desert, Maine, the sum of $26,986.60. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such town against the United States for reimbursement of expenditures made by such town in combating a forest fire in the Acadia National Park from October 24, to November 1, 1947: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this

act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

DANIEL J. CROWLEY

The bill (S. 1682) for the relief of Daniel J. Crowley was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Daniel J. Crowley, 225 Frye Avenue, Peoria, Ill., the sum of $4,439.10 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of medical, nursing, and hospital expenses suffered by him as the result of being hospitalized with poliomyelitis on April 1, 1946, while on authorized leave from his duties as a commissioned officer in the United States Naval Reserve: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ASCANIO COLLODEL

The bill (S. 1934) for the relief of Ascanio Collodel was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Ascanio Collodel shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JOSEPH FLURY PALUY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 43) for the relief of Joseph Flury Paluy, which has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 5, after the name "Joseph", to strike out "Fleury" and insert "Flury", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Joseph Flury Paluy, of Paris, France, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence provided he is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BERTA GOMES LEITE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 828) for the relief of Berta Gomes Leite, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "laws", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States, and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Berta Gomes Leite becoming a public charge", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of the ninth category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Berta Gomes Leite may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws: *Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Berta Gomes Leite becoming a public charge.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. YAU SHUN LEUNG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 895) for the relief of Dr Yau Shun Leung, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Yau Shun Leung shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control office to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROY Y. SHIOMI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 904) for the relief of Roy Y. Shiomi, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of secton 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from admission into the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, Roy Y. Shiomi, the spouse of an American citizen, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BERNARD KENJI TACHIBANA

The bill (S. 931) for the relief of Bernard Kenji Tachibana was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Bernard Kenji Tachibana, the minor child of Mrs. J. W. Carter, a United States citizen, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

KIM SONG NORE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1236) for the relief of Kim Song Nore, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of law relating to inadmissibility of aliens because of race, Kim Song Nore may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PENG-SIU MEI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1280) for the relief of the minor child, Peng-siu Mei, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the act of December 17, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 601, 60 Stat 975, 8 U S C 212 (a)), the minor child, Peng-siu Mei, may be admitted to the United States as a nonquota immigrant if such alien is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRUMAN W McCULLOUGH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1604) for the relief of Truman W. McCullough, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Truman W. McCullough, of Colorado Springs, Colo., the sum of $5,000 in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Truman W. McCullough against the United States for compensation for the death of his minor son, Harley Beryl McCullough, who died as a result of burns sustained while fighting a forest fire as a volunteer fire fighter, at Camp Carson, Colo., on January 17, 1950: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PANSY E. PENDERGRASS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1668) for the relief of Pansy E. Pendergrass, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$10,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Pansy E Pendergrass, of Columbia, S C., the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for injuries suffered by her in a fire which occurred in the hotel in which she was billeted in Kobe, Japan, on April 22, 1950: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY BONGART AND EVELYN BONGART

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1909) for the relief of Henry Bongart and Evelyn Bongart, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "state", to insert a colon and the following proviso. "*Provided*, That the said Henry Bongart and Evelyn Bongart return to the United States for permanent residence within a period of 1 year following the effective date of this act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc, That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Henry Bongart and Evelyn Bongart shall not be held to have lost United States citizenship under any of the provisions of the Nationality Act of 1940 providing for loss of citizenship through continuous residence in a foreign state. *Provided*, That the said Henry Bongart and Evelyn Bongart return to the United States for permanent residence within a period of 1 year following the effective date of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOE KOSAKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2095) for the relief of Joe Kosaka, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions of law excluding from admission into the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Joe Kosaka shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Herman W. Hearn and his wife, Marylyn Jeanne Hearn, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALICE IBRAHIM HANNAN IBRAHIM AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 839) for the relief of Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Yacoub Mayous Muhannad Elliyan, Afifeh Michail Jiries Issa Matar, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 4, after the name "Ibrahim", where it occurs the second time, to strike out "Yacoub Mayous Muhannad Elliyan, Afifeh Michail Kiries Issa Matar,", and on page 2, line 5, after the word "available", to insert "*Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut becoming public charges"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required number from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available: *Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, countries, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut becoming public charges.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut."

MARIA RHEE AND MRS. SEUNGHWA AHN, AND MOO HEI AHN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1052) for the relief of Maria Rhee, Mrs. Seunghwa Ahn, and Moo Hei Ahn, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Maria Rhee shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Maria Rhee."

EXTENSION OF YOUTH CORRECTION ACT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—BILL PASSED TO FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 1184) to extend the Youth Correction Act to the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is a general bill to amend the Federal Youth Corrections Act so as to extend its provisions to the District of Columbia. The provisions of the Federal Youth Corrections Act are not in dispute. The only question involved is whether this act should be applied to the District of Columbia.

Three problems which gave rise to objections and prevented the inclusion of the District of Columbia in the original act were: (1) That a serious budgetary problem might arise; (2) that the method of sentencing convicted persons in the District of Columbia is different from that used in other district courts; and (3) the District of Columbia has a separate parole board.

The problems which arose due to the method of sentencing in the District of Columbia and the separate parole board have been solved by the language of this bill. The separate parole board may still function, in its own sphere, as the applicability of the Youth Corrections Act is discretionary with the judge. Similarly the fact that the Youth Corrections Act is discretionary with the judge has bypassed the problem inherent in the method of sentencing persons convicted in the District of Columbia.

The budgetary problem does not present the difficulty that was originally anticipated. If the provisions of this act are employed in regard to 100 persons—approximate average number convicted in this age group—the cost will be slightly less than $20,000 a year. These figures were submitted by the special committee of the American Bar Association on improving the administration of justice in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the Judiciary Committee whether this bill bears at all upon the problem recently developed in the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia in respect to the giving out of certain information?

Mr. McCARRAN. It does not.

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator from Nevada know whether any members of the Judiciary Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia have gone into this bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; I do not know.

Mr. CASE. I have no objection to the bill personally, Mr. President.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] is on both committees; I believe he is on both the Judiciary Committee and the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CASE. He was last year.

Mr. McCARRAN. Perhaps he will know whether the matter is before the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I am no longer a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCARRAN. I apologize.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have no personal objection to the bill. However, in view of the fact that we have a Judiciary Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I should like to have an opportunity to confer with its members.

I wonder whether there would be any objection to having the bill go over at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator from South Dakota wish to have the bill go over to the next call of the calendar, or does he wish to have the bill placed at the foot of the calendar?

Mr. CASE. If I am able to see some of the members of that subcommittee this afternoon, I shall be glad to have the bill discussed later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

ARTHUR E. HACKETT

The bill (H. R. 794) for the relief of Arthur E. Hackett was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this bill waives the statute of limitations, as I understand.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this measure will allow the claimant, Arthur E. Hackett, to file his claim for employees compensation for injuries received in line of duty. The injuries occurred on September 30, 1931, and the evidence shows that a notice of injury was filed by Mr. Hackett with the Pine Ridge Agency of the United States Indian Service on December 19, 1933. While the law requires that a written notice of injury should be filed within 1 year of the date of injury, the claimant did not know the extent of his injury until after the 1-year period and there appeared evidence to the effect that his notice was never sent in to the Bureau of Employees Compensation until January 17, 1949. It would, therefore, appear that some negligence existed on the part of the Government in connection with the transmission of this claim.

The committee was of the opinion that in order that no injustice be done to this claimant, the claimant should at least have the right to have his claim considered. The committee therefore recommends favorable consideration of the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I take it that the distinguished Senator from Nevada feels that the waiver of the statute of limitations is justified in this instance.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, in this instance I do.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 794) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. MIROSLAV KUDRAT

The bill (H. R. 1252) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Miroslav Kudrat was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANZ GEYLING

The bill (H. R. 1413) for the relief of Franz Geyling was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

N. H. KELLEY AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1596) for the relief of N. H. Kelley, Bernice Kelley, Clyde D. Farquhar, and Gladys Farquhar, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think this is another instance in which the statute of limitations will be tolled. May we have an explanation as to the reason therefor?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is Calendar No. 830, House bill 1596. This bill would let four persons have a determination made of their individual liability for income taxes for the taxable year 1934.

These claimants were sole stockholders of the firm of Baker, Kelley, & MacLaughlin, Inc., which was liquidated pursuant to a plan of complete liquidation. Under section 112 (b) (7) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code, they were entitled to certain tax benefits, provided claim therefor was filed within 30 days of the adoption of the plan of liquidation.

These claimants gave instructions to their accounting firm to comply with the law in this respect. Through no fault of their own, but through the fault of their agents, the formal notice of election was not actually filed until approximately 8 days after the expiration of the 30-day period provided by law.

On the ground that the fault was not that of the claimants, this proposed legislation will allow the filing of the election to be treated as though within the proper time, in order that there may be a determination of the case on the merits.

The committee is of the opinion that to do otherwise would be to impose upon these claimants an injustice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1596) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF NORA B. KENNEDY, DECEASED, AND MRS ANN R. NORTON

The bill (H. R. 3430) for the relief of the estate of Nora B. Kennedy, deceased, and Mrs. Ann R. Norton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF JAKE JONES

The bill (H. R 4154) for the relief of the estate of Jake Jones, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEWYT CORP.

The bill (H. R. 4931) for the relief of the Lewyt Corp. was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Reserving the right to object, I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Nevada will inform the Senate whether any profits are reflected in the relief sought to be obtained in this instance.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the committe files show a definite statement that there is no element of profit in this amount. The claimant will still be out of pocket after this sum is paid. The sum was not computed on the basis of total loss, but was limited to the difference between this claimant's bid and the next lowest bid.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4931) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOUIS R. CHADBOURNE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 971) for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the name "Massachusetts", to strike out "the sum of $8,923.92. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Louis R. Chadbourne against the United States as retroactive retirement pay from March 1, 1949, to the date of his release from active duty September 19, 1945" and insert "a sum equal to the amount he would have received as retirement pay from the date of his release from active duty to March 1, 1949, had he been retired on the date of his release from active duty, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for such pay "

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

RHODA AKIKO NISHIYAMA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1236) for the relief of Rhoda Akiko Nishiyama, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line six, after the name "States", to strike out "shall be deemed to be nonquota immigrant if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws" and insert "may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS BARRON

The resolution (S. Res. 216) to refer to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 1051) for the relief of Thomas Barron was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S 1051) for the relief of Thomas Barron, now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

COMPACT BETWEEN MONTANA, NORTH DAKOTA, AND WYOMING RELATING TO YELLOWSTONE RIVER

The bill (S 1311) granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming, relating to the waters of the Yellowstone River, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill, please?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have just come to the floor. May I ask what the calendar number of the bill is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is Calendar No. 837

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, several years ago the Congress passed a bill authorizing the States of Montana and Wyoming to enter into an agreement with respect to the disposal and utilization of the waters of the Yellowstone River. Under the procedure prescribed by that measure, each of the States was required to appoint commissioners and a commissioner was named to represent the Government of the United States. They held their sessions and came to an agreement.

The compact was satisfactory to the two States involved, and it is now here for approval by the Congress.

That, in brief, is the purpose and effect of the bill.

The bill deals with the use of the water of this stream, which rises in Wyoming and flows into the State of Montana. The agreement, signed on behalf of both States and by the commissioner appointed in behalf of the United States, is set forth at length in the report.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1311) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of the Congress is hereby given to an interstate compact relating to the waters of the Yellowstone River which was signed (after negotiations in which a representative of the United States duly appointed by the President participated) by the Commissioners for the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming on December 8, 1950, at Billings, Mont., and which was thereafter ratified by the legislatures of each of the States aforesaid as provided by Public Law 83, Eighty-first Congress, approved June 2, 1949, which compact reads as follows.

"YELLOWSTONE RIVER COMPACT

"The State of Montana, the State of North Dakota, and the State of Wyoming, being moved by consideration of interstate comity, and desiring to remove all causes of present and future controversy between said States and between persons in one and persons in another with respect to the waters of the Yellowstone River and its tributaries, other than waters within or waters which contribute to the flow of streams within the Yellowstone National Park, and desiring to provide for an equitable division and apportionment of such waters, and to encourage the beneficial development and use thereof, acknowledging that in future projects of programs for the regulation, control, and use of water in the Yellowstone River Basin the great importance of water for irrigation in the signatory States shall be recognized, have resolved to conclude a compact as authorized under the act of Congress of the United States of America, approved June 2, 1949 (Public Law 83, 81st Cong., 1st sess.), for the attainment of these purposes, and to that end, through their respective governments, have named as their respective commissioners

"For the State of Montana: Fred E Buck, A W. Bradshaw, H W Bunston, John Hersog, John M. Jarussi, Ashton Jones, Chris Josephson, A. Wallace Kingsbury, P. F. Leonard, Walter M McLaughlin, Dave M. Manning, Joseph Muggli, Chester E. Onstad, Ed F. Parriott, R. R Renne, Keith W Trout;

"For the State of North Dakota: I. A. Acker, Einar H. Dahl, J. J. Walsh;

"For the State of Wyoming: L C Bishop, Earl T. Bower, J Harold Cash, Ben F Cochrane, Ernest J. Goppert, Richard L Greene, E C Gwillim, E. J. Johnson, Lee E. Keith, N. V. Kurtz, Harry L. Littlefield, R. E. McNally, Will G. Metz, Mark N. Partridge, Alonzo R Shreve, Charles M. Smith, Leonard F. Thornton, M. B. Walker;

who, after negotiations participated in by R. J. Newell, appointed as the representative of the United States of America, have agreed upon the following articles, to wit:

"'ARTICLE I

"'A. Where the name of a State is used in this compact, as a party thereto, it shall be construed to include the individuals, corporations, partnerships, associations, districts, administrative departments, bureaus, political subdivisions, agencies, persons, permittees, appropriators, and all others using, claiming, or in any manner asserting any right to the use of the waters of the Yellowstone River System under the authority of said State.

"'B. Any individual, corporation, partnership, association, district, administrative department, bureau, political subdivision, agency, person, permittee, or appropriator authorized by or under the laws of a signatory State, and all others using, claiming, or in any manner asserting any right to the use of the waters of the Yellowstone River system under the authority of said State, shall be subject to the terms of this compact. Where the singular is used in this article, it shall be construed to include the plural.

"'ARTICLE II

"'A. The State of Montana, the State of North Dakota, and the State of Wyoming are hereinafter designated as "Montana," "North Dakota," and "Wyoming," respectively.

"'B. The terms "commission" and "Yellowstone River Compact Commission" mean the agency created as provided herein for the administration of this compact.

"'C. The term "Yellowstone River Basin" means areas in Wyoming, Montana, and North Dakota drained by the Yellowstone River and its tributaries, and includes the area in Montana known as Lake Basin, but excludes those lands lying within Yellowstone National Park

"'D. The term "Yellowstone River system" means the Yellowstone River and all of its tributaries, including springs and swamps, from their sources to the mouth of the Yellowstone River near Buford, N. Dak., except those portions thereof which are within or contribute to the flow of streams within the Yellowstone National Park.

"'E The term "tributary" means any stream which in a natural state contributes to the flow of the Yellowstone River, including interstate tributaries and tributaries thereof, but excluding those which are within or contribute to the flow of streams within the Yellowstone National Park.

"'F. The term "interstate tributaries" means the Clarks Fork, Yellowstone River; the Bighorn River (except Little Bighorn River, the Tongue River, and the Powder River, whose confluences with the Yellowstone River are respectively at or near the city (or town) of Laurel, Big Horn, Miles City, and Terry, all in the State of Montana.

"'G. The terms "divert" and "division" mean the taking or removing of water from the Yellowstone River or any tributary thereof when the water so taken or removed is not returned directly into the channel of the Yellowstone River or of the tributary from which it is taken

"'H. The term "beneficial use" is herein defined to be that use by which the water supply of a drainage basin is depleted when usefully employed by the activities of man.

"'I. The term "domestic use" shall mean the use of water by an individual, or by a family unit or household for drinking, cooking, laundering, sanitation, and other personal comforts and necessities; and for the irrigation of a family garden or orchard not exceeding one-half acre in area.

"'J. The term "stock water use" shall mean the use of water for livestock and poultry.

"'ARTICLE III

"'A It is considered that no commission or administrative body is necessary to administer this compact or divide the waters of the Yellowstone River Basin as between the States of Montana and North Dakota. The provisions of this compact, as between the States of Wyoming and Montana, shall

be administered by a commission composed of one representative from the State of Wyoming and one representative from the State of Montana, to be selected by the Governors of said States as such States may choose, and one representative selected by the Director of the United States Geological Survey or whatever Federal agency may succeed to the functions and duties of that agency, to be appointed by him at the request of the States to sit with the commission and who shall, when present, act as chairman of the commission without vote, except as herein provided.

"'B The salaries and necessary expenses of each State representative shall be paid by the respective State; all other expenses incident to the administration of this compact not borne by the United States shall be allocated to and borne one-half by the State of Wyoming and one-half by the State of Montana.

"'C. In addition to other powers and duties herein conferred upon the commission and the members thereof, the jurisdiction of the commission shall include the collection, correlation, and presentation of factual data, the maintenance of records having a bearing upon the administration of this compact, and recommendations to such States upon matters connected with the administration of this compact, and the commission may employ such services and make such expenditures as reasonable and necessary within the limit of funds provided for that purpose by the respective States, and shall compile a report for each year ending September 30 and transmit it to the Governors of the signatory States on or before December 31 of each year.

"'D The Secretary of the Army; the Secretary of the Interior; the Secretary of Agriculture; the Chairman, Federal Power Commission; the Secretary of Commerce, or comparable officers of whatever Federal agencies may succeed to the functions and duties of these agencies, and such other Federal officers and officers of appropriate agencies of the signatory States having services or data useful or necessary to the compact commission, shall cooperate, ex officio, with the commission in the execution of its duty in the collection, correlation, and publication of records and data necessary for the proper administration of the compact; and these officers may perform such other services related to the compact as may be mutually agreed upon with the commission.

"'E. The Commission shall have power to formulate rules and regulations and to perform any act which they may find necessary to carry out the provisions of this compact, and to amend such rules and regulations. All such rules and regulations shall be filed in the office of the State engineer of each of the signatory States for public inspection.

"'F. In case of the failure of the representatives of Wyoming and Montana to unanimously agree on any matter necessary to the proper administration of this compact, then the member selected by the Director of the United States Geological Survey shall have the right to vote upon the matters in disagreement, and such points of disagreement shall then be decided by a majority vote of the representatives of the States of Wyoming and Montana and said member selected by the Director of the United States Geological Survey, each being entitled to one vote.

"'G. The Commission herein authorized shall have power to sue and be sued in its official capacity in any Federal court of the signatory States, and may adopt and use an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

"'ARTICLE IV

"The Commission shall itself, or in conjunction with other responsible agencies, cause to be established, maintained, and operated such suitable water gaging and evaporation stations as it finds necessary in connection with its duties.

"'ARTICLE V

"'A. Appropriative rights to the beneficial uses of the water of the Yellowstone River system existing in each signatory State as of January 1, 1950, shall continue to be enjoyed in accordance with the laws governing the acquisition and use of water under the doctrine of appropriation.

"'B. Of the unused and unappropriated waters of the interstate tributaries of the Yellowstone River as of January 1, 1950, there is allocated to each signatory State such quantity of that water as shall be necessary to provide supplemental water supplies for the rights described in paragraph A of this article V, such supplemental rights to be acquired and enjoyed in accordance with the laws governing the acquisition and use of water under the doctrine of appropriation, and the remainder of the unused and unappropriated water is allocated to each State for storage or direct diversions for beneficial use on new lands or for other purposes as follows:

"'1. Clarks Fork, Yellowstone River: (a) To Wyoming, 60 percent, to Montana, 40 percent. (b) The point of measurement shall be below the last diversion from Clarks Fork above Rock Creek.

"'2 Bighorn River (exclusive of Little Bighorn River): (a) To Wyoming, 80 percent; to Montana, 20 percent. (b) The point of measurement shall be below the last diversion from the Bighorn River above its junction with the Yellowstone River, and the inflow of the Little Bighorn River shall be excluded from the quantity of water subject to allocation

"'3. Tongue River: (a) To Wyoming, 40 percent; to Montana, 60 percent. (b) The point of measurement shall be below the last diversion from the Tongue River above its junction with the Yellowstone River

"'4. Powder River (including the Little Powder River): (a) To Wyoming, 42 percent; to Montana, 58 percent. (b) The point of measurement shall be below the last diversion from the Powder River above its junction with the Yellowstone River.

"'C. The quantity of water subject to the percentage allocations, in paragraph B 1, 2, 3, and 4 of this article V, shall be determined on an annual water year basis measured from October 1 of any year through September 30 of the succeeding year The quantity to which the percentage factors shall be applied through a given date in any water year shall be, in acre-feet, equal to the algebraic sum of:

"'1. The total diversions, in acre-feet, above the point of measurement, for irrigation, municipal, and industrial uses in Wyoming and Montana developed after January 1, 1950, during the period from October 1 to that given date;

"'2 The net change in storage, in acre-feet, in all reservoirs in Wyoming and Montana above the point of measurement completed subsequent to January 1, 1950, during the period from October 1 to that given date;

"'3. The net change in storage, in acre-feet, in existing reservoirs in Wyoming and Montana above the point of measurement, which is used for irrigation, municipal, and industrial purposes developed after January 1, 1950, during the period October 1 to that given date;

"'4. The quantity of water, in acre-feet, that passed the point of measurement in the stream during the period from October 1 to that given date.

"'D. All existing rights to the beneficial use of waters of the Yellowstone River in the States of Montana and North Dakota, below Intake, Mont., valid under the laws of these States as of January 1, 1950, are hereby recognized and shall be and remain unimpaired by this compact. During the period May 1 to September 30, inclusive, of each year, lands within Montana and North Dakota shall be entitled to the beneficial use of the flow of waters of the Yellowstone River below Intake, Mont., on a proportionate basis of acreage irrigated. Waters of tributary streams, having their origin in either Montana or North Dakota, situated entirely in said respective States and flowing into the Yellowstone River below Intake, Mont., are allotted to the respective States in which situated.

"'E. There are hereby excluded from the provisions of this compact:

"'1. Existing and future domestic and stock water uses of water: *Provided*, That the capacity of any reservoir for stock water so excluded shall not exceed 20 acre-feet;

"'2. Devices and facilities for the control and regulation of surface waters.

"'F. From time to time the Commission shall reexamine the allocations herein made and upon unanimous agreement may recommend modifications therein as are fair, just, and equitable, giving consideration among other factors to: Priorities of water rights; acreage irrigated; acreage irrigable under existing works; and potentially irrigable lands.

"'ARTICLE VI

"'Nothing contained in this compact shall be so construed or interpreted as to affect adversely any rights to the use of the waters of Yellowstone River and its tributaries owned by or for Indians, Indian tribes, and their reservations.

"'ARTICLE VII

"'A. A lower signatory State shall have the right, by compliance with the laws of an upper signatory State, except as to legislative consent, to file application for and receive permits to appropriate and use any waters in the Yellowstone River system not specifically apportioned to or appropriated by such upper State as provided in article V; and to construct or participate in the construction and use of any dam, storage reservoir, or diversion works in such upper State for the purpose of conserving and regulating water that may be apportioned to or appropriated by the lower State: *Provided*, That such right is subject to the rights of the upper State to control, regulate, and use the water apportioned to and appropriated by it: *And provided further*, That should an upper State elect, it may share in the use of any such facilities constructed by a lower State to the extent of its reasonable needs upon assuming or guaranteeing payment of its proportionate share of the cost of the construction, operation, and maintenance. This provision shall apply with equal force and effect to an upper State in the circumstance of the necessity of the acquisition of rights by an upper State in a lower State.

"'B. Each claim hereafter initiated for an appropriation of water in one signatory State for use in another signatory State shall be filed in the office of the State engineer of the signatory State in which the water is to be diverted, and a duplicate copy of the application or notice shall be filed in the office of the State engineer of the signatory State in which the water is to be used.

"'C. Appropriations may hereafter be adjudicated in the State in which the water is diverted, and where a portion or all of the lands irrigated are in another signatory State, such adjudications shall be confirmed in that State by the proper authority. Each adjudication is to conform with the laws of the State where the water is diverted and shall be recorded in the county and State where the water is used.

"'D. The use of water allocated under article V of this compact for projects constructed after the date of this compact by the United States of America or any of its agencies or instrumentalities, shall be charged as a use by the State in which the use is made: *Provided*, That such use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in another shall be charged to such latter State.

"'ARTICLE VIII

"'A lower signatory State shall have the right to acquire in an upper State by purchase, or through exercise of the power of eminent domain, such lands, easements, and rights-of-way for the construction, operation, and maintenance of pumping plants, storage reservoirs, canals, conduits, and appurtenant works as may be required for the enjoyment of the privileges granted herein to such lower State This provision shall apply with equal force and effect to an upper State in the circumstance of the necessity of the acquisition of rights by an upper State in a lower State

"'ARTICLE IX

"'Should any facilities be constructed by a lower signatory State in an upper signatory State under the provisions of article VII, the construction, operation, repairs, and replacements of such facilities shall be subject to the laws of the upper State This provision shall apply with equal force and effect to an upper State in the circumstance of the necessity of the acquisition of rights by an upper State in a lower State

"'ARTICLE X

"'No water shall be diverted from the Yellowstone River Basin without the unanimous consent of all the signatory States. In the event water from another river basin shall be imported into the Yellowstone River Basin or transferred from one tributary basin to another by the United States of America, Montana, North Dakota, or Wyoming, or any of them jointly, the State having the right to the use of such water shall be given proper credit therefor in determining its share of the water apportioned in accordance with article V herein

"'ARTICLE XI

"'The provisions of this compact shall remain in full force and effect until amended in the same manner as it is required to be ratified to become operative as provided in article XV.

"'ARTICLE XII

"'This compact may be terminated at any time by unanimous consent of the signatory States, and upon such termination all rights then established hereunder shall continue unimpaired.

"'ARTICLE XIII

"'Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or prevent any State from instituting or maintaining any action or proceeding, legal or equitable, in any Federal court or the United States Supreme Court, for the protection of any right under this compact or the enforcement of any of its provisions.

"'ARTICLE XIV

"'The physical and other conditions characteristic of the Yellowstone River and peculiar to the territory drained and served thereby and to the development thereof, have actuated the signatory States in the consummation of this compact, and none of them, nor the United States of America by its consent and approval, concedes thereby the establishment of any general principle or precedent with respect to other interstate streams.

"'ARTICLE XV

"'This compact shall become operative when approved by the legislature of each of the signatory States and consented to and approved by the Congress of the United States.

"'ARTICLE XVI

"'Nothing in this compact shall be deemed:

"'(a) To impair or affect the sovereignty or jurisdiction of the United States of America in or over the area of waters affected by such compact, any rights or powers of the United States of America, its agencies, or instrumentalities, in and to the use of the waters of the Yellowstone River Basin nor its capacity to acquire rights in and to the use of said waters,

"'(b) To subject any property of the United States of America, its agencies, or instrumentalities to taxation by any State or subdivision thereof, nor to create an obligation on the part of the United States of America, its agencies, or instrumentalities, by reason of the acquisition, construction, or operation of any property or works of whatsoever kind, to make any payments to any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, municipality, or entity whatsoever in reimbursement for the loss of taxes,

"'(c) To subject any property of the United States of America, its agencies, or instrumentalities, to the laws of any State to an extent other than the extent to which these laws would apply without regard to the compact.

"'ARTICLE XVII

"'Should a court of competent jurisdiction hold any part of this compact to be contrary to the constitution of any signatory State or of the United States of America, all other severable provisions of this compact shall continue in full force and effect

"'ARTICLE XVIII

"'No sentence, phrase, or clause in this compact or any any provisions thereof, shall be construed or interpreted to divest any signatory State or any of the agencies or officers of such States of the jurisdiction of the water of each State as apportioned in this compact'

"In witness whereof the Commissioners have signed this compact in quadruplicate original, one of which shall be filed in the archives of the Department of State of the United States of America and shall be deemed the authoritative original, and of which a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each signatory State.

"Done at the city of Billings in the State of Montana, this 8th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1950

"Commissioners for the State of Montana: Fred E Buck, A W Bradshaw, H W Bunston, John Herzog, John M Jarussi, Ashton Jones, Chris Josephson, A Wallace Kingsbury, P F Leonard, Walter M McLaughlin, Dave M Manning, Joseph Muggli, Chester E Onstad, Ed F. Parriott, R R. Renne, Keith W Trout.

"Commissioners for the State of North Dakota I A. Acker, Einar H. Dahl, J. J. Walsh.

"Commissioners for the State of Wyoming: L C Bishop, Earl T. Bower, J. Harold Cash, Ben F Cochrane, Ernest J. Goppert, Richard L. Greene, E C Gwillim, E J. Johnson, Lee E Keith, N V Kurtz, Harry L Littlefield, R. E McNally, Will G. Metz, Mark N. Partridge, Alonzo R Shreve, Charles M. Smith, Leonard F. Thornton, M. B. Walker.

"I have participated in the negotiation of this compact and intend to report favorably thereon to the Congress of the United States.

"R J NEWELL,
"Representative of the United States of America."

SEC 2 The right to alter, amend, or repeal section 1 of this act is expressly reserved. This reservation shall not be construed to prevent the vesting of rights to the use of water pursuant to applicable law and no alteration, amendment, or repeal of section 1 of this act shall be held to affect rights so vested.

REMISSION OR MITIGATION OF FORFEITURES UNDER THE INDIAN LIQUOR LAWS

The bill (H. R. 1087) to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," to empower the courts to remit or mitigate forfeitures under the Indian liquor laws was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OR OTHERWISE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN FLORIDA

The bill (H. R. 2684) to provide for the sale, transfer, or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr HENDRICKSON Mr President, may we have a brief explanation?

Mr HOLLAND. Mr. President, for my colleague and myself I wish to say that this bill has to do with a strip of land on the seacoast of west Florida, near the city of Panama City, containing but a few acres, or perhaps only a fraction of an acre; the record does not show how much But the strip lies between the old meander line of the survey and the actual water line of the Gulf. The area has been built up with summer cottages, and the question of the title to that strip is the thing which is in issue. This bill has the full approval of the Department of the Interior As a matter of fact, they helped in the drafting of the bill. The bill gives consent for a survey to determine whether this strip of land is unsurveyed public land or whether it is an accretion to the land as it existed at the time of the original survey, and the question is whether it is public land or not If it is public land, then it will be offered for sale to the adjoining property owners at the fair assessed value, and that value will be paid If it is not public land but an accretion to the private landowners' holdings, of course the bill gives authority for quitclaiming of the title to the private owner. Of the two methods, one or the other is available to completely perfect the title, and the survey must be had before it can be determined which method would be applicable.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. What is the acreage involved in this bill, with reference to the amount of land?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry that the report does not show, but it is so inconsequential that that was not the question at all. The question was whether the land on which these cottages are built actually extends to the water's edge. There is a slender strip of land between the meander line shown on the

survey and the actual present water line of the Gulf.

Mr. STENNIS. Would the Senator from Florida say it is less than an acre?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; the Senator from Florida is not able to say. He is able to say that it is an unsubstantial amount, not sufficient to have extended from one quarter section line to another. It is a very minor matter, regarding which there is full approval by the Department of the Interior, which cannot make this survey without passage of this bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, does it involve less than 5 acres?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator would be glad to give the exact acreage if he had it, but he is sorry that he does not. He does know that the amount is unsubstantial, so far as the acreage is concerned. The only substantial point in the question is whether the title to the lots on which these vacation cottages are situated extends to the salt water or is cut off by a narrow strip; and the only way to determine that fact is through the making of a survey.

Mr. STENNIS Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, the bill provides for a sale, does it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. The bill provides for a sale at the true value to be fixed by the Department of the Interior, in the event the lands are found to be unsurveyed public lands. But if the lands are found to be simply accretions to the privately owned lands along the Gulf, long ago conveyed by the Government, then the bill would permit of a quitclaiming of that to which the Government has no right or title.

The matter involves purely a technical correction of title, and I am sure that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs can give a complete clearance to this bill, because, as he and I know, it was held up because of the pendency of the tidelands question for a very close checking by the attorneys general who were interested in that question, and by the attorneys for the Government, who were equally interested in it, and it was found to be a purely technical, inconsequential question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say that the area was so insubstantial that the Department of the Interior never thought it worth while to survey the lands. The request for the bill proceeds from the owners of the contigous lands, and it is for the purpose of determining whether the United States has any unsurveyed lands there. So that the survey itself is a guaranty of the protection of the United States, but the fact that this is between the meander line and the shore line is one which must be determined in order that the titles may be cleared up.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a question, is the property substantial in value?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No.

Mr. STENNIS. A substantial value is not involved?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No substantial value is involved.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is no substantial value and there is no substantial acreage. The Department of the Interior was unwilling to finance a survey without passage of this bill, and the guaranty of the private property owners that they would put up the cost of the survey, which condition is provided by the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it ought to be added that the bill requires an appraisal of the lands, if they are found to be public lands.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest, Mr. President, that the full text of the report which was made by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs should be printed in the RECORD at this point, and I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

There being no objection, the report (No 886) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2684) to provide for the sale, transfer, or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make an investigation to determine whether certain lands on the shore of the Gulf of Mexico are unsurveyed public lands A companion bill was introduced in the Senate (S. 767) by Senator HOLLAND, of Florida.

The adjoining uplands which have been patented to private ownership are described as T. 6 S., R 12 W., Tallahassee meridian, Florida. If the Secretary finds that the shorelands are unsurveyed public lands, H R 2684 would require him to survey, appraise, and sell such lands to the persons who owned the adjoining uplands as of October 2, 1946. If the shorelands are not found to be unsurveyed public lands, the Secretary shall quitclaim the lands to the adjoining upland owner.

The bill also authorizes the Secretary to accept contributions to carry out the provisions of the act.

Only an investigation of these lands can disclose whether these shorelands are unsurveyed public lands. Ordinarily the water line itself constitutes the boundary of the land rather than the meander line. Failure of the survey to include within the meander line small, irregular areas of land does not invalidate title to the shorelands. The general rule that the water line constitutes the boundary of the land is subject to an exception. If there has been a showing of fraud or such gross error as amounts to fraud in the survey, the meander line will constitute the boundary. Title to accretions generally accrue to the upland owner. Where a substantial accretion has occurred after survey prior to entry, a patent thereafter issued to the entryman does not convey the accredited land.

If the shorelands are not unsurveyed public lands, there appears to be no objection to the quitclaim of all interest in the land by the Federal Government in order to help remove any cloud on title to the land. In the absence of any desire by the State of Florida or a political subdivision thereof to utilize these lands for any public purpose, and if the lands are unsurveyed public lands, it would appear that they could be best utilized by the upland owner. This committee has no information to indicate that the State of Florida or any of its subdivisions is interested in acquiring these lands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

USE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN CITY OF CANTON, S. DAK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 690) to permit certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of Canton, S. Dak., for park, recreation, airport, or other public purposes, to be leased by it so long as the income therefrom is used for such purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 1, after line 2, to strike out:

That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to transfer by quitclaim deed or other appropriate means to the city of Canton, S Dak , so much of the right, title, and interest remaining in the United States in and to the lands (including buildings and improvements) conveyed to the city of Canton pursuant to the act entitled "An act providing for the conveyance to the city of Canton, S Dak , of the Canton Insane Asylum, located in Lincoln County, S. Dak " (60 Stat. 998), as may be necessary to permit the city of Canton to lease such lands or any part thereof for private use.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

That the Administrator of General Services be authorized to amend the document of transfer dated October 17, 1946, which conveyed certain lands therein described (including buildings and improvements) to the city of Canton, S. Dak., pursuant to the act entitled "An act providing for the conveyance to the city of Canton, S Dak., of the Canton Insane Asylum, located in Lincoln County, S Dak." (60 Stat. 998), as may be necessary to permit the city of Canton to lease such lands or any part thereof for private use.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services be authorized to amend the document of transfer dated October 17, 1946, which conveyed certain lands therein described (including buildings and improvements) to the city of Canton, S Dak , pursuant to the act entitled "An act providing for the conveyance to the city of Canton, S. Dak., of the Canton Insane Asylum, located in Lincoln County, S Dak " (60 Stat. 998), as may be necessary to permit the city of Canton to lease such lands or any part thereof for private use

SEC. 2. Rentals derived by the city of Canton from the lands described in this act shall be used for park, recreation, airport, or other public purposes, and the transfer provided for by this act shall be expressly conditioned that if the grantee shall fail or cease to use such rentals for such purposes, title to the lands described in this act shall revert to the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PRIVILEGES TO REPRESENTATIVES OF MEMBER STATES ON COUNCIL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

The bill (S. 2042) to extend certain privileges to representatives of member states on the Council of the Organization of American States was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to remove a discrimination, or a difference which exists in the treatment of certain representatives of American states in Washington. Regular ambassadors and their staffs are given certain privileges and immunities When the Organization of American States was established, some nations had their regular ambassadors to represent them in the Organization of American States. Others sent additional ambassadors. The privileges and immunities which are extended to all other ambassadors and their staffs are not etxended to these extra ambassadors, so that in the Organization of American States there are approximately two-thirds who have the privileges and immunities and one-third who do not It is merely a slip or an oversight in establishing the Organization of American States. The purpose of the bill is to remove that defect.

Mr. CHAVEZ Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr CHAVEZ I believe the general purposes of the bill are sound. Can the Senator from Alabama tell us, however, whether the privileges and immunities of ambassadors of member states in the organization apply to other personnel they may bring here?

Mr SPARKMAN. They apply only to the staff. They become a part of the staff representing a certain country, and there may be within the group representing certain Latin American nations possibly two-thirds enjoying privileges and immunities and one-third not enjoying them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not mind their enjoying the privileges and immunities if they are appropriate, but I object to the abuse of privileges and immunities. Do the privileges and immunities which the Senator has in mind include parking around the Senate Office Building?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was looking at the report to see if those privileges and immunities are enumerated I have a letter here in which they are enumerated.

Mr. CHAVEZ. This morning I tried to get out of my parking place to go to the Pentagon Building. It took me 15 minutes to get a so-called diplomatic car out of the way, which was double-parked. I do not believe diplomats should have any more privileges or immunities with regard to violating traffic laws in the District of Columbia than has the Senator from Alabama or the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am certain that is not one of the privileges and immunities involved.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Some countries might send a large number of persons to Washington in connection with their staffs. Is it the intention that with reference to groups, each group will be limited, or could it be expanded so that we might get into some difficulty in extending the same rights and privileges in many other places?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not believe there is any danger of that I am sure the Senator realizes that if any particular country wants to expand its staff by additions it has to make application for those particular individuals. If there should be any unusual expansion or extension I am sure our country would take note of it. I do not believe we need be afraid of that.

Mr CASE. Mr President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. What credentials will these people carry?

Mr. SPARKMAN. They will have to be accredited to their respective organization in the United States, just as is the case with any ambassador or members of his staff.

Mr. CASE. What numbers of persons are involved?

Mr SPARKMAN. There are 53 non-American staff members now in the directory of the Organization of American States. Approximately 28 are accredited already to their respective embassies in Washington or to the United Nations, and already have diplomatic status. There are only 25 persons affected.

Mr CASE. The Senator is undoubtedly aware that there has been an occasional mention in the press of diplomatic immunity extended to staff members of representatives of the United Nations. Some think we have gone too far in opening the gate without having some control over the screening of persons who may come What assurance can the Senator give that this bill would not open up similar problems?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not believe it is likely to open up such a problem. I know the problem to which the Senator refers We must remember that the United Nations presents a different question. It is an organization over which the United States alone does not have control. It is true that it operates within our own country, but we had to enter into agreement that a certain status would be provided for the area around the United Nations, and that representatives from their respective countries would be allowed in that particular area. When it comes to the question of people coming to Washington, the Senator knows that the Government can say "Yes" or "No" to the admission of an individual person.

Mr. CASE. That suggests that there would be the usual visa requirements.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The same requirement is involved which now applies to embassies and embassy staffs. The individuals are already in this country. It is not a case of letting them in. Twenty-eight of them enjoy the privileges and immunities of all the staff representatives of their countries which have representation here, but there are 25 who are denied those privileges and immunities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Alabama has expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Reserving the right to object, and I would not ordinarily object, I think the Senate is pretty well satisfied that so far as friendship for Latin America is concerned, there is no better friend than is the Senator from New Mexico, but I do not believe that legislation of this type should be passed on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

I would like to look at it further. Therefore, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr President, before the bill goes over, may I ask the Senator from New Mexico if, instead of having the bill go over, he would consent to let it go to the foot of the calendar, until he shall have had an opportunity to read it?

Mr CHAVEZ No, I could not make up my mind in 3 hours; and I am a friend of Latin America.

Mr. SPARKMAN I know that, but what the Senator is doing——

Mr CHAVEZ But simply because I happen to be a friend of Latin America, I do not want anyone to come to this country and receive privileges which are not granted to American citizens, including immunity in cases of traffic violations, including double parking, including bumping into a man's home and ruining it and then being let off because of diplomatic immunity I care not whether they are Latin Americans or British, I am not in favor of such things.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield one more time?

Mr CHAVEZ I yield

Mr. SPARKMAN I simply want to say that if those privileges are extended to diplomatic representatives it is not because they are given by law. As a matter of fact, what the Senator is doing is to pick out 8 Latin-American countries and say to them, "We are going to treat you differently from the way we are treating the other 12." That is exactly what the Senator's position amounts to.

Mr CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am willing to assume that responsibility and to compare my friendship for the Latin-American countries with that of any other Member of this body.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The time is getting short during the present session of Congress. Furthermore the agreement with the American states is due to go into effect very shortly. The matter is set forth so clearly in a letter which I have that I should at least like the Senator from New Mexico to agree to read the letter before he asks that the bill go over until the next call of the calendar.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But, Mr. President, no one is going to be hurt if the bill goes

over at this call of the calendar. There is not a Member present who does not agree that we are going to have another call of the calendar before we adjourn. Hence I do not think it is going to hurt anything whatsoever to allow Senators to look into the matter as to whether they should object to the proposed legislation.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER subsequently said: Mr. President, a while ago Senate bill 2042, Calendar No. 841 to extend certain privileges to representatives of member states on the Council of the Organization of American States was being discussed. I see the Senator from New Mexico is now on the floor of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that we may return to consideration of that bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. What is the status of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has asked unanimous consent that the Senate return to Senate bill 2042, Calendar No. 841, and that the bill be immediately considered. The Senator from New Mexico objected at the time the bill was reached on the call of the calendar, but now says he has no objection.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Was it not agreed that the bill should go to the foot of the calendar? Are we to stop every few moments and consider bills which have gone to the foot of the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. At the time the bill was reached the Senator from New Mexico objected to its consideration. He now has withdrawn his objection.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2042) to extend certain privileges to representatives of member states on the Council of the Organization of American States, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, under such terms and conditions as he shall determine, the President is hereby authorized to extend, or to enter into an agreement extending, to the representatives of member states (other than the United States) on the Council of the Organization of American States, and to members of their staffs, the same privileges and immunities, subject to corresponding conditions and obligations, as are enjoyed by diplomatic envoys accredited to the United States.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1347) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not feel that this bill is calendar legislation. I think it is a measure that should be thoroughly debated and thoroughly considered by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER Does the Senator from New Jersey object?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr President, I wonder if the Senator from New Jersey will withhold his objection for a moment until I may explain the bill?

Mr HENDRICKSON. I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr DOUGLAS Mr. President, it is now the 11th of October. If this bill is not passed now it is very likely that at the present session of Congress we shall get no legislation at all for improving the Railroad Retirement Act.

Those who do not favor this particular bill, reported from the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, seem to favor the bill reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which is now before the House. The House bill will probably be voted upon next week.

In order to get this much-needed legislation through before the end of this session, I hope that Senators who favor the House bill rather than the Senate bill will allow Senate bill 1347 to pass and be willing to take their chances as to the details of the proposed legislation in the conference committee.

The bill reported by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee provides a simple 15 percent across-the-board increase for pensioners and annuitants, a 33⅓-percent increase for survivors, and a study of the railroad retirement system in its relationship to Social Security.

Senate bill 1347, as reported by the Senate Labor Committee, also provides for a 15 percent across-the-board increase, as does the House bill, a 33⅓-percent increase for survivors, as the House bill does, and also for a study of the railroad retirement system, as the House bill does. But it goes further. In order to make the benefits of the railroad retirement system comparable to those of the social-security system, whose participants, for instance, in social security, pay only one-fourth of the amounts of withholding taxes that are paid by the railroad employees, the committee included in its bill a provision for a wives' benefit precisely equal to that provided by the social-security system. There is not now a wives' or spouses' benefit under the railroad-retirement system, although the contributions under that system are four times as great as under the social-security system.

The committee bill also contains a provision that in no case will any railroad employee get benefits less than those he would have received had he been covered by social security.

In other words, it is the aim of the new bill to provide benefits which at a minimum will be equal to social security benefits and which in certain respects will be very much more.

In order to pay for these two provisions, and not to overstrain the fund, the committee felt that it was necessary to increase the revenue of the Railroad Retirement account The committee did this in two ways First, the committee provided for an increase in the tax base from the present level of $300 a month to $350 a month. This was a compromise with the $400 figure included in Senate bill 1347 as it was originally introduced. This increase in the tax base from $300 to $350, which will bring in approximately $50,000,000 a year in gross revenue, and which will probably produce a net addition in excess of benefits of approximately $20,000,000 a year, is probably the major point of difference between those who favor the House committee bill and those who favor the Senate committee bill.

The Senate committee bill also has a provision for paying those with less than 10 years of railroad service social security benefits, with the railway fund turning over to the social-security system the amounts which would have been paid in for these workers had they been under social security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask permission that I may speak for two more minutes.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois may continue for two more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New Jersey very much.

I will not deny that there are very real differences between the House bill and the Senate bill, but unless we pass this proposed legislation in the next few days, it will probably be impossible to get it enacted into law in the present session of Congress. Therefore, I hope the Senator from New Jersey will withdraw his objection, allow the bill to pass on the call of the calendar, and take his chances, along with the rest of us in the conference committee.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Does the bill represent substantial agreement between the groups affected?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, it does not. We have tried all summer long to secure agreements between the so-called nonoperating unions, the operating unions, and the railway trainmen. The bill reported by the committee made proposals about which we felt that an agreement was possible. The so-called nonoperating unions have agreed to accept the bill as a compromise, but it is not satisfactory to the so-called operating brotherhoods. There are also private organizations which I think are satisfied with the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Then, Mr. President, I suggest that this is not proposed legislation which should be considered on the mere call of the calendar. I think it should be thoroughly considered and thoroughly discussed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that the bill reported in the House is the bill favored by the so-called operating brotherhoods. This bill does not go as far as the bill advocated by the nonoperating unions. It "waters down" the nonoperating union bill. Why would it not be possible for the House, if it wishes, to pass whatever bill it desires—quite possibly the operating brotherhood's bill—and for the Senate to pass Senate bill 1347 as altered, and then to have the differences thrashed out in conference? Otherwise, in all probability we shall get no action whatsoever, and the present inadequate benefits for railroad workers will continue, which I think we should avoid.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional 2 minutes allowed the Senator from Illinois have expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be given three additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is recognized for three additional minutes

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it not true that the Senator's bill is a compromise between the positions which have been taken by the two groups of brotherhoods? As I understand, both groups of brotherhoods are very anxious that some legislation be passed at this session. Do they not feel that if this bill is passed at this time, with the bill passed by the House, the matter can be worked out in conference, so that the inequity can be adjusted at this session?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope very much that the differences can be worked out. We have been trying for most of the summer to do it. The nonoperating unions have accepted the compromise which we have proposed, but the operating unions have not done so as yet.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that in the bill reported by the Senator from Illinois the principal items of the operating brotherhoods' request, the basic factors which the operating brotherhoods want in a bill, are included?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What the Senator has done is to supplement that action by including some of the requests or suggestions made by the nonoperating unions. However, the bill does not go as far as the nonoperating brotherhoods wanted us to go.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On the benefit side we have added a wives' benefit of 50 percent of the retired employees' benefit, up to a maximum of $40. The maximum is the same as is provided for those covered by the Social Security Act. To provide funds for that purpose we have made an increase in the present maximum tax base from $300 a month to a new maximum of $350 a month. This preserves the historic difference between the tax base of the social-security system and the tax base of the railroad retirement system. We have also provided that employees with less than 10 years' service are to be paid benefits from the social security system, with the railroad retirement fund paying into the social-security system an amount equal to that which would have been paid under the system by such employees, and their employers, had they been covered by the Social Security Act. We have taken the operating brotherhoods' proposal and have added a wives' benefit. This does not seem satisfactory to the operating brotherhoods.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has carefully protected the solvency of the fund.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that the Senator has been checking into the actuarial soundness of the proposal before the Senate, and has carefully tried to weigh the requirements of benefits from the fund itself?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The actuaries of the Railway Retirement Board estimate that the long-time cost of the proposal now being advanced will be approximately 14 06 percent, whereas the maximum contributions will be 12½ percent. I think there is a very real question about the future financing of the fund, but we have a companion resolution calling for an investigation of both the financing of the fund and the relationship of the railway retirement system to social security. So we do not believe that the resources would be imperiled by the passage of this bill. I think the resources would be imperiled if we were to add a wives' benefit without increasing the tax base. I think it is necessary to increase the tax base and to provide for the transfer of certain funds between social security and railway retirement, in order to provide the wives' benefit.

I merely wish to bring out the fact that the actuarial soundness of the fund has been carefully considered. At the Senator's own suggestion—and I think this proposal was supported by the operating and nonoperating brotherhoods—it was urged that a further study be made so as to guarantee the long-range solvency of this important fund.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] has reserved the right to object. He is entitled to 5 minutes.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, from the colloquy which has ensued, I think it is quite obvious that this is not a bill which should be passed on the call of the calendar. It is clear to me from the discussion between Senators on the other side of the aisle that there are many controversial issues involved in the bill. The report contains 72 pages of fine print. The bill itself is 33 pages long. It has been on the calendar for just about a week. Although the junior Senator from New Jersey has no personal objection to the bill, he does not think that it is good policy to legislate on a controversial subject during the call of the calendar. I, therefore, object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

PROPOSED TERMINATION OF STATE OF WAR BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND GERMANY

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 289) to terminate the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany was announced as next in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Over.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized under his reservation of objection.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, if this joint resolution contained nothing but a statement terminating the state of war with Germany, I, of course, would strongly favor it. I would not only vote for it but strongly urge its immediate passage. The resolution as recommended by President Truman and approved by the House carries out the objective of terminating the state of war with Germany. But when the resolution came to the Senate committee it was drastically and unwisely amended.

In general the amendment which was added in committee reopens all the cases of suits by citizens for return of seized enemy property. These suits have been closed and settled for years, by agreement of the parties to the lawsuits. The amendment reopens all these cases solely to give relief to a few persons. I am against the amendment, without reservation.

Even aside from the fact that it serves special privilege, the amendment is bad, because it would harm the purpose of the joint resolution terminating the war. The resolution was sought to be enacted to improve our relations with the friendly Government of Western Germany. That is a government which we have sponsored and protected. It is a government with which we are cooperating in our world-wide effort to defend free nations from Soviet aggression. That government and its citizens—indeed all the Allied governments—will carefully read the resolution terminating the war. They will be puzzled by the amendment reopening alien property lawsuits. When they learn that it is intended to benefit one man or a few men, they will be doubly shocked.

I do not believe that this is a subject which can possibly be debated and considered in the very short time which is permitted under the unanimous-consent calendar. It is a matter which I think should be definitely and carefully considered with the intention of striking out this amendment and allowing the resolution, as recommended by the President and as passed by the House of

Representatives, to be passed in the Senate. To consider the joint resolution as it now stands, with this very unfortunate amendment, in the short time allotted to us, I think would be very dangerous and unfortunate. Therefore I object.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York withhold his objection?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do for the moment but my objection will stand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I would agree with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] that this is a matter which has too far-reaching implications to be disposed of on the Consent Calendar. At the same time I wish to go on record as saying that I believe there is nothing which the Senate or Congress could act on which would be more important than passing House Joint Resolution 289, and, so far as the Senate is concerned, to declare that there should be a treaty of peace negotiated with Germany. At the time the President sent his message to Congress and the joint resolution was referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I submitted an amendment which I intended to offer when the resolution came up for consideration. The amendment would add a section to the bill, reading as follows:

At the end of the joint resolution, it is proposed to insert the following:

"SEC. 2 In furtherance of the purposes of section 1 hereof, the President of the United States hereby is requested to proceed with the negotiation of a treaty of peace between the United States and the Government of Germany and to submit the same for the consideration of the Senate at the earliest practicable date; and the President is advised that it is the sense of the Congress that said treaty of peace should be negotiated jointly with the allies of the United States in the war against Germany except that if such joint negotiations prove impossible or impracticable, the treaty should be negotiated as was the treaty with Japan."

Mr. President, it is my conviction that nothing we could do today would contribute more to insuring the stability of the world than to conclude a treaty of peace with Western Germany, or with all of Germany, if that were possible, and thus stabilize conditions in Europe. The future of the world's peace hangs upon getting a stable situation in Western Europe.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe we could accomplish the objectives which the Senator from South Dakota has in mind by passing the resolution and, if necessary, acting on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota, provided, of course, that the amendment attached to the resolution, which has nothing to do with the ending of the war, be withdrawn.

Mr. CASE. That may be correct, but it seems to me that we need to have more than a unilateral declaration that the war is at an end. It should be a mutual agreement reached with the Germans, so that they can come into a federation of Western Europe, and thus provide stability to Western Europe and make available the resources which the German people can contribute.

The shooting war with Germany came to an end several months before the shooting ended in the war with Japan. Yet we have already signed a treaty of peace with Japan. From the standpoint of time alone, the treaty with Germany should have been negotiated prior to the treaty with Japan. We ought to proceed to declare the war at an end and to have a treaty of peace signed with Germany. It would win for the friends of General Eisenhower and all peace-loving people the contributions which Germany is able to make by reason of natural resources, manpower, and strategic position in Europe.

Mr. President, I hope that consideration of the resolution will not be too long delayed.

Mr. STENNIS and Mr. LEHMAN addressed the Chair.

Mr. LEHMAN. Do I still have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's reservation to object is still pending.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Objection was made by the Senator from New Mexico. With all due deference to the other Senators who are waiting to be heard on other bills, I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is called for.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether——

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I speak for 2 more minutes?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from New York has exhausted his time and more.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The joint resolution will be passed over.

STANISLAS D'ERCEVILLE

The bill (S. 366) for the relief of Stanislas d'Erceville was announced as next in order.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I may be heard for a minute or two, may I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PRIVILEGES TO REPRESENTATIVES OF MEMBER STATES ON COUNCIL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to join the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] the present occupant of the Chair, in urging eventual favorable consideration of the bill (S. 2042) Calendar 841, which was passed over a short time ago. The bill would provide certain privileges to be extended to the representatives of member states on the Council of the Organization of American States.

I came into the Chamber after a short absence while the Senate was giving its consideration to the bill and when objection was heard from the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

I am a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations which has to do with the subject involved. The matter has been under consideration for some little time, and I believe we were unanimous in feeling that it would be advantageous to us and courteous in our attention to our friends and neighbors of the American Republics if this privilege were granted to the few persons, who by force of certain circumstances, do not now have the courtesies extended to them.

I believe the overwhelming number of those who represent other conntries in the Council of American Republics do have such status and recognition. There are some 13 or 14 out of possibly 65 foreign representatives—I may be in a little error in that regard—who do not have those privileges extended to them.

I earnestly hope that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] will study the subject carefully, as I know he will, and I hope that he will be persuaded that it is a gesture of friendship and a gesture of courtesy, and a matter of propriety, that these privileges be extended to the very few remaining persons who do not enjoy them at the present time.

If it were a question of opening up diplomatic privileges to a new category of foreign representatives, or anything of that kind, I might take a different attitude. It is only a small group of persons—and they can be counted almost on the fingers of two hands—who do not now enjoy the privileges and courtesies which most of their fellow diplomats and associates enjoy. I wish to take the opportunity of associating myself with the remarks of the Senator from Alabama, who is the chairman of the subcommittee of which I am a member, to encourage the Senator from New Mexico to examine the subject carefully. I am sure that when he does so he will come to a complete agreement with us.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I may say to my good friend from Iowa that I am as good a friend of Latin Americans as anyone in the United States. I have tried to place them in the right light within the United States. I tried to have this body, Congress, and our representatives in the State Department do what can be legitimately done in order to bring about friendship between us. I am their friend. The only thing that I am trying to impress upon this body is that, whether they be Latin Americans or anything else, including subjects of His Britannic Majesty, they should not abuse the privileges that are given to them.

Only a few short days ago the newspapers of this city were filled with accounts of the driver of a diplomatic car who ran into the home or the business house of a local citizen. Because he had immunity our local citizen had to suffer the consequences.

It is that kind of abuse that I am against, whether it involves Latin Americans or any others.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Of course, I agree heartily with the Senator that there are cases where abuses of a diplomatic status are known to have occurred. Perhaps there have been a few occasions when Americans have abused their diplomatic status in foreign countries, too.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not like that, either.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. All of us regret that. However, I do not think that objection applies to this bill. This is a matter of principle.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have no objection at all to the bill, provided it is realized that this is a gesture of friendship. It is common decency, and the dignified thing to do, to allow them the privileges when they are sent here as the representatives of a foreign country; but they should realize that because we extend that privilege to them, we do not extend to them the right to violate any of our laws.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I could not agree more fully with the Senator from New Mexico; I think his position is utterly sound.

I merely wish to suggest—and I believe I am correct—that all the representatives who attend this conference be given the same diplomatic status as that of the representatives of the other American republics, because there are only a few of these persons—13 or perhaps 15, as I understand—whereas there are perhaps 50 or 75 others who enjoy diplomatic status.

I earnestly hope that the admonition the Senator from New Mexico has given—and in which I join him heartily—against violation of diplomatic privileges will receive earnest attention.

I hope the Senator will see fit to withdraw his objection to the bill before the present call of the calendar is over.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not want an American diplomat who enjoys the privileges of a foreign country to violate that country's laws, either.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I fully agree with the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Iowa. If they make a motion to reconsider, I shall agree to it; I shall not oppose it or object to it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Very well.

Mr. President, what is now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar 846, Senate bill 366, is the measure on the calendar which has been reached.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. When would it be in order for me to move to reconsider? Would such a motion be in order after Senate bill 366 has been disposed of? In other words, should I wait until Senate bill 366, Calendar 846, has been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair say to the Senator from Iowa that Senate bill 366, Calendar 846, has just been reached, and the Senator from Iowa has consumed his time on that bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I did not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that, but the Senator from Iowa made a speech which consumed the 5 minutes available to the Senator, under the rule, during the call of the calendar. If the Senator from Iowa will wait until the next measure on the calendar is called, he may speak again.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico still is entitled to the floor on this bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No, Mr. President; I wish to make the motion to reconsider, if necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New Mexico may yield to the Senator from Iowa for the purpose of making that motion.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am going to object at this time.

STANISLAS D'ERCEVILLE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 366, Calendar 846?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 366) for the relief of Stanislas d'Erceville was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Stanislas d'Erceville shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

EVANGELOS AND MICHAEL DUMAS

The bill (S. 440) for the relief of Evangelos and Michael Dumas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Evangelos and Michael Dumas, the adopted sons of Mr. and Mrs. E A. Dumas, citizens of the United States, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct appropriate numbers from the first available appropriate quota or quotas.

AI MEI YU AND AI MEI CHEN

The bill (S. 471) for the relief of Ai Mei Yu and Ai Mei Chen, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor children, Ai Mei Yu and Ai Mei Chen, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Adelia L. Eggestein, a citizen of the United States.

DEFINITION OF SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION

The bill (S. 1212) to amend section 2113 of title 18 of the United States Code was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation, please?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is Senate bill 1212, Calendar No. 849.

The Federal Bank Robbery Act protects banks and savings and loan associations whose accounts are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and which operate under State charters.

The change which would be accomplished by means of the enactment of Senate bill 1212 in amending subsection (g) of the Federal Bank Robbery Act would be a technical change to recognize that not all of the institutions whose accounts are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation are known by the name of savings and loan associations, but that some of such institutions are called building and loan associations or homestead associations or by other names. However, all are essentially the same basic type of institution and all are popularly referred to, as a class, as savings and loan associations.

The bill simply accords to State institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation the same protection accorded to State institutions whose accounts are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation by the Federal Bank Robbery Act.

The Department of Justice and the Housing and Home Finance Agency urge the enactment of Senate bill 1212. The committee, therefore, recommends enactment of the bill.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I have no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1212) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, That subsection (g) of section 2113 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"(g) As used in this section the term 'savings and loan association' means any Federal savings and loan association and any insured institution as defined in section 401 of the National Housing Act, as amended."

DR. CHAI CHANG CHOI

The bill (S. 1339) for the relief of Dr. Chai Chang Choi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Chai Chang Choi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this

act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

LORE A. M. HENNESSEY

The bill (S. 1401) for the relief of Lore A. M. Hennessey was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Lore A. M. Hennessey, the wife of Sergeant First Class Joseph J. Hennessey, an American citizen, may be admitted to the United States for permanent resident if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

JOSEPH BORIS TCHERTKOFF

The bill (S. 1462) for the relief of Joseph Boris Tchertkoff was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Joseph Boris Tchertkoff shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available *Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Joseph Boris Tchertkoff becoming a public charge.

WOLFGANG VOGEL

The bill (S. 1819) for the relief of Wolfgang Vogel was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Wolfgang Vogel, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr and Mrs Max Dubberke, citizens of the United States.

HATTIE TRUAX GRAHAM

The bill (S. 1949) for the relief of Hattie Truax Graham, formerly Hattie Truax, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hattie Truax Graham, formerly Hattie Truax, Cloverdale, Ind., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States of the said Hattie Truax Graham, formerly Hattie Truax, for the death of her former husband, Ola Truax, on January 21, 1944, who died as the result of burns sustained in a fire at the Evans Hall housing project, Evansville, Ind., which was under the supervision and management of the National Housing Agency, the United States Court of Claims (Congressional No. 17857, decided April 3, 1951, pursuant to S. Res. 268, 81st Cong.) having found that the United States was negligent in failing to enforce its safety regulations, and that such failure was the proximate cause of the death: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ISAMU FURUTA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 640) for the relief of Isamu Furuta, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 8, after the word "citizen", to strike out the comma and "and the said Isamu Furuta may be permitted to enter the United States as a nonquota immigrant for permanent residence", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (U. S C., title 8, sec. 213 (c)) which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Isamu Furuta, husband of an American citizen.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WONG WOO, ALSO KNOWN AS WILLIAM CURTIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 821) for the relief of Wong Woo, also known as William Curtis, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "Lieutenant" and insert "Captain", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, Wong Woo, also known as William Curtis, a Chinese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Captain and Mrs. Ralph Archer, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MASAKO MIYAZAKI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 914) for the relief of Masako Miyazaki, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race, shall not hereafter apply to Masako Miyazaki, the Japanese fiancée of Lester G. Barrett, Jr., a citizen of the United States, and that the said Masako Miyazaki may be eligible for a nonquota immigration visa if she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that marriage between the abovenamed parties occurred within 3 months immediately succeeding the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT WILLIAM LAUBER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1448) for the relief of Robert William Lauber, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of section 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of that act, the minor child, Robert William Lauber, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Sergeant and Mrs. William J. Lauber, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MICHAEL DAVID LIU, A MINOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1911) for the relief of Michael David Liu, a minor, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the act of December 17, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 601; 60 Stat. 975, 8 U. S. C. 212 (a)) Michael David Liu, alien minor unmarried son of Mrs. Gloria Yuer Liu, a United States citizen, may be admitted to the United States as a nonquota immigrant in accordance with sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, if such alien is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELFRIEDE ERHARDT OTTO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 183) for the relief of Elfriede Erhardt Otto, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), insofar as concerns any act or acts of Elfriede Ehrhardt Otto, of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has notice at the time of the enactment of this act, Elfriede Ehrhardt Otto may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is not otherwise inadmissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Elfriede Ehrhardt Otto."

KONSTONTIOS N. BELLOS

The bill (H. R. 732) for the relief of Konstontios N. Bellos was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONFERRING OF CITIZENSHIP POSTHUMOUSLY UPON SIEGFRIED OBERDORFER

The bill (H. R. 782) conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Siegfried Oberdorfer was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I will not object to the bill, but I should like to have an explanation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, House bill 782 confers United States citizenship posthumously upon a citizen of Germany who was admitted to the United States for permanent residence and was killed while serving with the United States Army on Guadalcanal in 1943. It does not appear that any person would benefit financially through enactment of the bill under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 782) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUISA MONTI

The bill (H. R. 824) for the relief of Luisa Monti was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EUGENIO BELLINI

The bill (H. R. 1100) for the relief of Eugenio Bellini was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIO DiFILIPPO

The bill (H. R. 1119) for the relief of Mario DiFilippo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACK WARNER AND FAMILY

The bill (H. R. 1696) for the relief of Jack Warner and family was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HELENA JANGE CHINN

The bill (H. R. 1908) for the relief of Helena Jange Chinn was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HYE PAH KUNG

The bill (H. R. 2210) for the relief of Hye Pah Kung was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if I correctly understand this measure, it is a bill which provides for a situation in which an alien entered the United States in 1946 as a student. He is now taking graduate work at San Francisco State College, and resides in San Francisco, allegedly with his foster parents. The question I would raise with the distinguished Senator from Nevada is this: Is it to be our practice, when exchange students come into this country, to permit a rather liberal situation to develop, whereby they then ask for citizenship, or for the relief that is sought in bills of this type, in view of the fact that the probable reason for their coming to this country on an exchange basis is that they may return to their native lands to fulfill some useful purpose in the countries from which they came? I am not making any serious objection, but I do think this question should be clarified for the record.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is the thought of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and that policy has been carried out by the committee. Cases of this kind have been scrutinized very carefully. It is not here proposed to establish a policy of admitting to citizenship by special private bills those who come in under the exchange-student program. We do not look upon it with favor. I would never favor it, and I do not think it is a proper policy to pursue, because it would defeat the very object of the exchange-student law. But there are exceptions, and exceptions are the things which emphasize the rule.

The bill covers what is, in the judgment of the committee, an exceptional case. A Representative in Congress is especially interested in this particular case. The bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 30-year-old subject of Great Britain of the Chinese race. He entered the United States as a student in August 1946 and is now taking graduate work at a college in California. He resides with his foster parents, who are citizens of the United States.

Everything surrounding this case removed it from the general idea that we have of denying citizenship to exchange students. I want to say to the Senator from Kansas that his expressions, as I understood them, are in keeping with my thought on the subject.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection to the bill. I thank the distinguished Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2210) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOJI IKEDA, A MINOR

The bill (H. R. 3221) for the relief of Joji Ikeda, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

YUMI HORIUCHI

The bill (H. R. 3424) for the relief of Yumi Horiuchi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF JENNIE GAYLE, DECEASED

The bill (H. R. 4270) for the relief of the estate of Jennie Gayle, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. RICHARD G. ADAMS AND LEGAL GUARDIAN OF DOROTHY MARGARET ADAMS

The bill (H. R. 4271) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Richard G. Adams and legal guardian of Dorothy Margaret Adams was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARGARET K. N. MILLER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3376) for the relief of Margaret K. N. Miller, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "$12,500" and insert "$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM CORRECTION OF MILITARY OR NAVAL RECORDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1181) to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will permit me, first I may say there is a typographical error in the calendar print of this bill which should be corrected by a technical amendment. The error is, in line 24, on page 5, where reference is made to "subsection (e)." The reference should be to "subsection (g)." I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be amended to correct this typographical error. To state the amendment properly, it is, on page 5, line 24, to strike out the small letter "e" in the parentheses and insert in lieu thereof the small letter "g"

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be amended to correct this typographical error.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, regarding the bill itself, which is calendar No. 874, House bill 1181, it was originally reported favorably to the Senate by the Armed Services Committee and thereafter by order of the Senate referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for further consideration.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the respective secretaries of the Armed Forces and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard to make certain payments which become due as a result of action taken by the respective boards for the correction of records authorized under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The Senate Judiciary Committee considers this to be a meritorious bill, which will relieve it of some of the burden of the consideration of private claims. It has added certain safeguards to the bill, which will prohibit any payment of a claim that has heretofore been compensated by a private bill; requires the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Treasury to file semiannual reports with Congress with respect to the nature

and type of claims paid; precludes payments of any sums which would ordinarily be handled by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; and finally expands the authority of the Navy Board alone so as to permit that board to consider the cases of some half dozen officers who, it is alleged, were unjustifiably passed over for promotion due to wartime conditions.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I do not intend to object to the passage of the bill. I do not intend to object to the amendments, but I do desire to explain the amendments, as I see them, and I hope we may possibly persuade the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to withdraw them.

This bill, H. R. 1181, as the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee has said, is designed primarily to correct certain errors in records. The Committee on Armed Services, after very lengthy hearings, reported favorably on the bill as it came to us from the House, without amendment.

Two of the amendments which have been recommended by the Senate Judiciary Committee—and I refer to subsection (g) and subsection (h) on pages 5 and 6 of the bill, as reported by the committee—are most objectionable to the Department of the Navy. Those subsections do not affect any other branch of the armed services; they affect only the Navy. The new subsections (g) and (h) would extend the jurisdiction of the Board for the correction of naval records to the review of cases of nonpromotion of any officer of the Navy or the Marine Corps which occurred between January 1, 1942, and August 7, 1947, and would provide for the advancement, retroactive with pay, of any officer whom the Board considered should have been promoted.

Mr. President, I think I can say primarily that these amendments are designed in behalf of an individual officer of the Navy. The Navy Department opposes these subsections for the following reasons: First, they would open up to review by an administrative board the Navy selection system for the promotion of officers The Navy selection system has its own review board, built in, so to speak. This review system has proved itself in the past in many cases. Officers who initially were passed over, after review have subsequently been promoted by a later board. All the officers affected by the proposed new subsections have already had the benefit of this review. In addition, the cases have had special review by a review board established in 1946, and by another one established in 1947.

I think the Senate is aware of the fact that when an officer of the Navy is passed over twice, he may voluntarily resign his commission. The reason for that is that in bringing along a young officer who has a great deal of capacity and ability it is necessary, if the Navy is to retain his services, that promotion be made possible for him.

The Board adjusted the precedence of many officers who had been passed over during wartime. Subsections (g) and (h) would afford an additional review for the benefit of those remaining officers who were not promoted as the result of reviews previously outlined.

The Navy Department considers any further review is unnecessary and unwarranted, and is in the nature of an attack on the Navy selection system, which has proved itself down through the years.

The Senate Judiciary Committee adopted the subsections without giving the Navy Department or the Department of Defense an opportunity to testify concerning them. The report of the Senate Judiciary Committee states that only five or six officers would fall within the category covered by the subsections. That is incorrect, since more than 10,000 Regular and Reserve officers would be eligible to apply for additional review if the subsections were enacted into law.

One of the original purposes of the bill was to perfect the review system and make it unnecessary to introduce private bills in behalf of some 900 members of the various services whose records have subsequently been corrected, but until the passage of this bill there will be no way in which the officers can be compensated when the corrections have been made. To act upon these 10,000 cases would be beyond the capacity of the Board for the Correction of Naval Records, and would result in a considerable administrative expense.

The Board for the Correction of Naval Records is a civilian board. It was not designed and does not have the necessary knowledge to pass on promotions of naval officers.

Finally, Mr. President, the enactment of these subsections into law would authorize the Board for the Correction of Naval Records to act as a review board, considering only one officer's record at a time. That is completely contrary to the principles of the selective system, wherein the selection board considers all officers, and recommends for promotion only the better qualified officers of the group. It is impossible for a board or an individual to determine whether or not an officer should be promoted in competition with others of the same group, by considering only a single record. In other words, if there are a thousand officers and there are vacancies for only 500, the Board must necessarily consider the records of all of them before they select those who can be promoted.

Mr. President, in view of these facts, the Department of the Navy requests that the Senate Armed Services Committee oppose subsections (g) and (h), appearing on pages 5 and 6 of the bill as reported by the Judiciary Committee, when the measure is considered on the floor. The Navy Department has been authorized to present its opposition to these subsections.

As I stated, Mr. President, I am not going to oppose the amendments, and I am not going to oppose the bill. I thought a record should be made of the fact that the Navy is opposed to the amendments, but they are still anxious that the bill be passed in order that the payments may be made in the 900 cases which have now been acted on, and they will accept the amendments so that the bill may pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in my judgment the Senator from Wyoming presents a valid objection to one phase of the amendments. I do not think it falls within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee.

I am looking for the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. The amendment was offered by him in the full committee when we were considering the subject. It was voted on by the full committee. It is probable that the full committee took the statements made by the Senator from Washington, which I shall not attempt to quote, because I would be quoting them from memory.

As to the other amendments, relating to subsections (e) and (f), I would not recede from them. If the Senator from Washington were on the floor and would consent to our receding from subsections (g) and (h) I would have no objection. But he is not on the floor at this time.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. May I ask the distinguished Senator if it would be agreeable to let the bill go over until the next calendar day? In the meantime, we can have further conferences with reference to the two objectional sections.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection.

As I recall, it was stated that the last amendment which was adopted by the committee on the motion of the Senator from Washington would affect only 5 or 6 individuals, but I do not want to bind the Senator from Washington by that statement. I have no objection to the bill going over. If I knew the Senator from Washington would come to the Senate floor, I would be willing to have it go to the foot of the calendar in the hope that he might consent to striking the last amendment, but as to the other two amendments, I would not feel like receding from them.

Mr. President, if we might have the amendments relating to subsection (e) and (f) adopted at this time, then I would ask unanimous consent that the bill go to the foot of the calendar in the hope that we might later deal with the amendment respecting subsection (g).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments of the committee except the amendments which the Senator from Nevada has suggested be passed over temporarily.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after line 20, it is proposed to insert:

"(1) This subsection shall not be deemed to authorize the payment of any claim heretofore compensated by Congress through enactment of a private law.

On page 4, line 21, after the word "other", to strike out "qualifications." ", and insert "qualifications.", and after line 21, to insert:

"(e) The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Treasury, for their respective Departments, shall make semiannual reports to the Congress of all claims paid under this subsection during the period covered

by each such report. Each such report shall include, with respect to each such claim, a statement of the amount paid, to whom, and a brief description of the claim.

"(f) Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the payment of any amount as compensation for any benefit to which the claimant might subsequently become entitled under the laws and regulations administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the amendment proposing the insertion of subsection (g) is an amendment which I personally think does not come within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, and I doubt very much that it should become law. I should like to have the bill go to the foot of the calendar. The Senator from Washington may come in and agree with our position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, further consideration of the bill will be postponed at this time, and the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that we may revert to Calendar No. 874, House bill 1181, as I desire to make a statement and confess that my memory was in error. The amendments to which I had reference were offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and not by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], in the Committee on the Judiciary. I am sorry that I made a mistake, and I desire to corect it at this time.

I now have the consent of the Senator from Indiana to recede from the amendments he offered in the committee, and I do recede from them on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary. The bill may be presented now to the Senate without the amendments incorporating subsections (g) and (h), if that is satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 1181, Calendar No. 874?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R 1181) to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the two amendments referred to by the Senator from Nevada will be rejected.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 1181) was read the third time and passed.

WHITE RIVER BACKWATER AREA—AMENDMENT OF FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1946

The bill (S. 1622) to amend section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? Does the Senator from Nevada object to the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes . I should like to have it explained. It seems, however, this is a bill which should not be passed on the call of the calendar.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the bill was introduced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], but having participated in the hearing on the measure, I shall be glad to explain it in so far as I can.

It appears from the report that the Flood Control Act of 1936 provided for the construction of a levee system in the lower White River known as the White River backwater area. Ten years later the 1946 Flood Control Act made the same provision with reference to the similar areas of the St. Francis River Basin and the Yazoo River Basin, the difference being that in the case of the St. Francis River and the Yazoo River Basins, those two areas were taken into the lower Mississippi Basin as an integral part thereof, and subject to all the laws and provisions affecting the Mississippi River Basin.

The purpose of the amendment to the law is to take the backwater of the White River, which is equally a part of the alluvial basin of the Mississippi River, out of the position in which it was placed in the 1936 act, and to give it equal standing not only with the St. Francis River Basin and the Yazoo River Basin, but with all other portions of the alluvial basin of the lower Mississippi River. The Public Works Committee unanimously approved the measure for passage.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First I wanted to explain that my colleague the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], was unexpectedly called away from the Senate by a death in his family, and had to go to Arkansas in a plane about an hour ago. That is the reason why he is not here to explain the bill.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is a member of the committee, and, of course, has explained the bill correctly. I only want to endorse what he has stated, and say that this is a matter that is very important to the continuation of the system of levees and the maintenance of them in accordance with the accepted policy with regard to the St. Francis and Yazoo River basins. There was no difference at all in the committee. The bill had the unanimous report of the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1622) to amend section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subparagraph (q) under the subtitle "Lower Mississippi River" in section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (Public Law 526, 79th Cong.), is hereby amended by inserting after the words "Saint Francis River Basin" a comma and the words "the White River Backwater Area."

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN LAND AND OTHER PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

The bill (H. R. 1215) to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

JAMES P. FINNEGAN, FORMER INTERNAL REVENUE COLLECTOR IN ST. LOUIS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a bulletin which just appeared over the Associated Press, dealing with the indictment of James P. Finnegan, former collector of internal revenue at St. Louis.

There being no objection, the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LOUIS —James P Finnegan, former internal-revenue collector here and a prominent figure in a congressional investigation into reported corruption in the Nation's tax-collection service, was indicted by a Federal grand jury today on charges of bribery.

Finnegan quit under fire last April soon after the grand jury began an investigation touched off by charges made against him on the Senate floor by Senator WILLIAMS.

Two of the five counts in the indictment accused Finnegan of accepting a $250 check from a firm involved in income-tax difficulties.

The others were under a Federal law prohibiting a Government employee from receiving compensation for services involving a controversy in which the Government is a party

Finnegan, a genial, loquacious friend of President Truman, has been the central figure in hearings before a House Ways and Means subcommittee in Washington, digging into widening reports of scandals in the Internal Revenue Bureau.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, immediately following that, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, October 10, 1951, written by Mr. Jack Steele, in which he pointed out that James P. Finnegan claimed that Mr. Truman had insisted he keep his position as collector in St. Louis.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINNEGAN SAYS TRUMAN ASKED HIM NOT TO QUIT

(By Jack Steele)

WASHINGTON, October 9 —James P Finnegan, former internal revenue collector in St. Louis whose "outside" activities while holding that post are now under fire, testified today that he tried to resign at least three times in 1949 and 1950 but was urged in each instance to remain by the President or the White House.

Mr. Finnegan told a House Ways and Means subcommittee that he discussed his intention of resigning on at least one occasion with "the President of the United States" and that Mr. Truman had "asked me to stay on."

While he did not firmly fix the date of this conversation with the President, it appeared from his testimony that it took place in October 1950—some months after the Internal Revenue Bureau had started the first investigation of com plaints about Mr. Finnegan's conduct of his office.

He also testified that on this or other occasions he was asked not to resign by Matthew J Connelly, secretary to Mr. Truman; George J. Schoeneman, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and "possibly" by John W Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury

Mr Finnegan finally resigned last April when a second grand jury was called in St. Louis to begin a probe of his affairs after Senator JOHN J WILLIAMS, Republican, Delaware, charged that the Internal Revenue Bureau had withheld vital evidence from a previous grand jury.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD excerpts from an article appearing in today's Washington Times-Herald, and also an excerpt from an article appearing in today's Washington Post, the first article having been written by Robert Young, and the second by George T Draper; in which they quote Mr Snyder to the effect that he had been trying to get Mr. Finnegan removed for 9 months prior to his resignation April 4, 1951

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times Herald of October 11, 1951]

H T KEPT FINNEGAN IN JOB, KNOWING CHARGES—SNYDER

(By Robert Young)

Treasury Secretary Snyder testified yesterday that although President Truman had full knowledge of serious charges involving the way James P Finnegan was conducting himself as Federal tax collector in St Louis and knew the Treasury Secretary wanted Finnegan to resign, the President took no suspension or removal action

Snyder told a House Ways and Means subcommittee investigating Internal Revenue Bureau scandals in a half-dozen major cities he recalled asking Finnegan to resign in August 1950, and at about the same time the matter was thoroughly discussed with the President

---

[From the Washington Post of October 11, 1951]

(By George T Draper)

When Representative KING informed the Secretary that Finnegan had said he had been advised to stay on the job by the President after trying to resign three times in 2 years, Snyder answered:

"I am only speaking for myself I did not advise him to stay on Through the Commissioner, I advised him a number of times to resign"

Finnegan finally resigned last April.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on March 15, 1951, I was discussing the conditions in the St. Louis office with Commissioner Schoeneman, and at that time I raised the question regarding Mr Finnegan's pending resignation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point my question to Mr. Schoeneman and his answer.

There being no objection, the question and answer were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator WILLIAMS. Is the collector under fire from the Department in any manner as to improper conduct? Is there any suspicion that there might be a reason for his resigning?

Mr SCHOENEMAN. No, sir, there isn't anything that we are looking into that would be a reason for his resigning because it is a matter that he has discussed several months ago I should say at least 4 months ago he expressed a desire to resign, and for some reason or other he has delayed that resignation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, not being satisfied with Mr. Schoeneman's answer, later, on April 11, I addressed a letter to Hon. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD my letter to Mr. Snyder and his reply to my letter. In this letter Mr. Snyder claims that Mr. Finnegan's resignation was purely voluntary and clearly indicates he has no suspicion in regard to Mr. Finnegan.

Needless to say, the information upon which I based my speech of May 7, 1951, and upon which evidence Mr. Finnegan now stands indicted, was in the Treasury Department's files at the time both Mr. Schoeneman and Mr. Snyder were questioned I call particular attention to those paragraphs of these letters dealing with Mr. Finnegan

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., April 11, 1951

Hon JOHN W SNYDER,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D C.

DEAR MR SECRETARY: On April 4, 1951, you relieved Mr James P Finnegan of his duties as Collector of Internal Revenue in the St. Louis, Mo., office While I congratulate you upon this belated action, I am concerned that you did not go further and publicly outline your reasons for this action, at the same time stating what further action you contemplate.

I also believe that you should announce what action you plan to take toward clearing up the deplorable conditions existing in the third district of New York On at least two occasions the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr George J Schoeneman, has called the deplorable conditions in that office to your attention, and while he presented no specific charges against Collector Johnson, he did urgently recommend his removal

Now that you are recommending that Congress place another $10,000,000,000 tax increase on the already overburdened taxpayer, it is imperative that we convince the American people that no favoritism nor any special protection for anyone will be condoned by your Department

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J WILLIAMS

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D C., April 21, 1951

Hon JOHN J WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D C

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS Thank you for your letter of April 11, 1951

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue and his staff have indicated to you in some detail the steps which have already been taken to correct lax administrative conditions in the third collection district of New York. While some of the supervisory personnel have been withdrawn, there are still five men from the Washington headquarters group remaining in that office The effectiveness of the steps taken by this group is reflected by the present much-improved conditions of that office.

A few months back Commissioner Schoeneman requested Collector Johnson's resignation. As you know, neither the Commissioner nor I have any power of removal over the collector. However, we have been trying for some time to find a strong person we could recommend to replace Collector Johnson—one who would be capable of holding and improving the gains we have made in the work of that office. In our efforts to obtain the proper kind of a replacement a number of persons have been considered. We have found that some did not possess the necessary qualifications, while others amply qualified have declined to accept the position I hope that our efforts will soon result in obtaining the right person Due to the presence of the headquarters group, however, the work of the office during this time has not suffered

The collector at St. Louis voluntarily resigned earlier this month. You may rest assured that in the event any irregularities are found in that office, appropriate steps will be taken to effect their correction I am determined that the revenue laws shall be administered without partiality or favor.

Your interest in the effective operation of the Bureau is heartening

Sincerely,

JOHN W. SNYDER.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN LAND AND OTHER PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, in reply to the request of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] for an explanation of H R. 1215, the bill last called on the calendar, I wish to say that the bill would give to the Navy certain rights with reference to acting on easements over rights-of-way for highways, for opening up streets, for installation of utilities, and things of that nature. It is authority that has already been granted to the other services, and now is requested by the Navy. The bill also sets forth the specific location and the specific type of easements requested. They are in no way at all of a substantial nature.

The committee did, however, delete from the bill certain items the transfer of which we felt were not proper to allow, primarily some city property which would have been taken off the tax rolls of the communities where the property is located. So the committee deleted that section from the bill. I should be glad to take up each of the various items in detail, but I will say to the Senator from New Jersey that they are not of a substantial nature

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I think that is not necessary at all. I thank my distinguished colleague from Wyoming for the explanation

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1215) to authorize certain land and other property transactions and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 2, after line 3, to strike out:

SEC 102 The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to convey to the Government of Puerto Rico, for highway purposes, under such terms and conditions as he may

deem appropriate, two strips of land containing eighty and twenty-four thousand one hundred and eighty-six one-hundred-thousandths square meters and one hundred and nine and six hundred and one one-thousands square meters, more or less, respectively, said strips being a part of approximately one hundred and eighty and fourteen one-hundreths acres of land located in the ward of Pueblo Viejo, municipality of Guaynabo, Puerto Rico, title to which was acquired by the United States by declaration of taking filed in condemnation proceedings in the District Court of the United States for the District of Puerto Rico, Numbered 2453 Civil, metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department.

In line 20, to change the section number from "103" to "102"; on page 3, line 14, to change the section number from "104" to "103"; on page 4, line 5, to change the section number from "105" to "104"; and on page 8, after line 12, to strike out title III, as follows:

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to transfer to the Department of the Air Force, without reimbursement, the following property, together with all improvements and appurtenant facilities, and the machinery, equipment, and other personal property accessory thereto:

Project No.—	Type of project	Location
Plancor 220	Industrial plant	Milwaukee, Wis.
Plancor 324	do	Adrian, Mich.
Plancor 821	do	Johnson City, N. Y.
CIN 1	Warehouse	Indianapolis, Ind.

SEC. 302. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized to transfer to the Department of the Air Force, without reimbursement, Plancor 2304, consisting of an industrial plant, at North Grafton, Mass., together with all improvements and appurtenant facilities, and the machinery, equipment, and other personal property accessory thereto: *Provided*, That such transfer shall not include inventories of raw materials and work in progress.

SEC. 303. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized to transfer to the Department of the Army without reimbursement, Plancor 166 M, consisting of an industrial plant, at Muskegon, Mich., together with all improvements and appurtenant facilities and the machinery, equipment, and other personal property accessory thereto: *Provided*, That such transfer shall not include inventories of raw material and work in progress.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

TRANSMISSION IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE OF CERTAIN GAMBLING INFORMATION—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1564) to make unlawful the transmission in interstate commerce of gambling information concerning a sporting event which is obtained without consent of the person conducting such sporting event was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall be required to object—this bill, together with House bill 1563, Calendar No. 878, Senate bill 1624, Calendar No. 879, and Senate bill 2116, Calendar No. 880, have been on the calendar for only a few days. As I understand, we do not have access to the printed hearings. I must announce an objection at this time.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection momentarily?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to withhold it.

Mr. O'CONOR. My only purpose is to express the hope to the leadership that these measures may be scheduled for consideration in the near future. The measures to which the Senator from Kansas refers are measures of the greatest importance. With respect to one of the bills, the Committee to Investigate Interstate Crime unanimously concluded that it represented the very keystone of the entire legislative program, which is aimed at circumventing the activities of interstate racketeers. The bills are interrelated, and have received considerable attention by the committee. Of course, they were reported favorably. I merely express the hope that it may be possible for the Senate to consider them in the near future.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the acting minority leader, I am sure that I speak the desires of every Senator on this side when I say that if these bills are going to help in the present situation they should be brought up for consideration by the majority leader at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. O'CONOR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think I express the feeling of the legislative committee on this side when I say that we have not had an opportunity to study them in the brief time they have been on the calendar.

Mr. O'CONOR. I did not mean to criticize at all in commenting upon the situation.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'CONOR. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I take it from the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Maryland that he thinks these bills are far too important to pass on the call of the calendar.

Mr. O'CONOR. I do. I will say to the Senator from New Jersey that I do not think they could be sufficiently explained, or that sufficient consideration could be given to them in the brief time allowed on a call of the calendar. There are a number of very important questions which deserve debate. My only reason for commenting is that I think it is timely to emphasize the need for prompt action. Otherwise, a great deal of the work heretofore done will go for naught, unless remedial and corrective action, such as is here proposed, can be taken promptly.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The junior Senator from New Jersey wishes to associate himself with the remarks of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that, along with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], I submitted a resolution, Senate Resolution 207, on September 12, which resolution was considered by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and voted down by a vote of 7 to 6. That resolution provided for the continuation of the crime investigating committee. Under the original resolution establishing the so-called crime committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was directed on September 1, when the committee's life expired, to take over the files and unexpended funds. I wish to serve notice that before the Congress adjourns I shall submit a resolution and ask for a vote by the Senate.

I had occasion a couple of nights ago to listen to one of our very able colleagues on television. He pointed out that great need for vigilance in respect to crime and emphasized the terrible situation which exists in America. I certainly associate myself with him in that respect. Therefore, I cannot understand why the United State Senate is now dropping this whole subject, just as though it were a hot potato.

We have spent many hundreds of thousands of dollars in investigations over a period of time. We obtained some very illuminating facts and information. We had three or four very fine television shows. One of our colleagues has written a book on the subject. At the present moment there is being presented a television show which is sponsored by one of our business organizations, which is taking advantage of what the United States Senate did in respect to crime investigations. I have no objection to it. However, as we follow the moderator, we find what a terrible situation exists in the United States. I agree that it is a deplorable situation. I say that organized crime does exist in the United States, and I cannot understand why the United States Senate now wants to drop the investigation and do nothing further about it.

I understand that the Committee on the District of Columbia intends to investigate crime in the District of Columbia. That committee and other standing committees have the right to subpena witnesses from outside the District of Columbia. But, for some unknown reason, suddenly we are to drop this subject. Why are we going to drop it? If the investigation was a good thing a year ago, it is a good thing today. I do not know what has happened. I shall submit the resolution to which I have referred before we adjourn, and ask that the Senate vote on it. What is the idea of spending so much time and money on the investigation and then dropping the whole subject?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am amazed to hear the Senator from Indiana say that we are going to drop this entire subject. I have seen no evidence anywhere that we propose to drop it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Evidently the able Senator is not familiar with the facts. The life of the so-called crime committee has expired. It has gone out of existence, and there is no committee at the moment, other than the Committee on the District of Columbia, which is looking after District affairs, that is investigating this subject. The District Committee are the councilmen of the city of Washington. They have a right to investigate crime in the city of Washington, just as the city council of any city in the United States has the right to investigate crime in the particular city.

I think the Senator is in error when he says that the subject has not been dropped. It has been dropped. Nothing is being done about it. The Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, by a vote of 7 to 6, decided to do nothing about it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The fact that these bills are pending on the calendar is proof positive of the fact that we have determined not to drop the matter.

Mr. CAPEHART. We have not yet passed the bills.

Mr HENDRICKSON. It is the hope of the junior Senator from New Jersey that they will be passed soon.

Mr CAPEHART. Certain proposed legislation has been introduced. I hope the able Senator from New Jersey is not associating himself with the view that the investigation by the committee should be dropped. I certainly did not intend to intimate that he was. I think the American people want to get more out of this investigation than they have had to date. I do not understand why we do not proceed with the investigation. So far as I know the committee did a good job.

Mr. O'CONOR Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

The committee exposed a great deal of corruption and crime throughout the Nation, including narcotics peddling. There ought to be a standing committee of the Senate to look into this subject, for many years to come. I shall try to obtain a vote on my resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. O'CONOR Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may ask the Senator from Indiana a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the time of the Senator from Indiana will be extended to allow the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] to ask a question.

Mr. O'CONOR. I merely wish to ask the Senator one question, which is not in any degree in criticism of or opposition to the sentiments which he expressed. However, I think we are talking about two different things. As the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] has correctly stated, not only are there on the calendar a series of bills, but altogether some 22 bills have been introduced which are designed to take corrective action to cure the very conditions which the 16 months' investigation revealed. Of course, we can do only one thing at a time. We believe that the present proposals would represent a very major step toward the successful completion of the work. The Senator from Indiana is talking about something else.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am talking about the continuation of the committee to investigate crime conditions in the United States. For some unknown reason the Senate—or at least the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which was authorized by the original resolution setting up the committee to take over the unfinished business, unexpended funds, and all the records, has voted to do nothing further. It was understood, at least by inference, that it was to continue the investigation. The committee, by a vote of 7 to 6 decided not to do it. I shall submit the resolution and ask the Senate to vote on it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I want the record clearly to show that it is the sincere hope of the junior Senator from New Jersey that the effort to rid the country of crime will not end at this point, but that from here on in we shall proceed with new vigor in the direction of crime elimination until there has been an end to crime in America.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I inquire what is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas (Mr. SCHOEPPEL) asks that the four bills, S 1564, S. 1563, S. 1624, and S. 2116, Calendar Nos. 877, 878, 879, and 880, respectively, go over.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished occupant of the Chair and to inquiring Senators that I, too, would like to have crystal clear what I have in mind. Objection has been lodged to the consideration of these four bills on the calendar. Frankly, I share the view that these bills, important as they are, should not be taken off the calendar. I hope they can be brought up for consideration and passed as quickly as possible. However, I am compelled to object to each of them at this time. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that they be not considered at this time, but that they be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be passed over.

IMPROVEMENT OF EAST PASS CHANNEL FROM THE GULF OF MEXICO INTO CHOCTAWHATCHEE BAY, FLA.

The bill (S. 1080) to authorize the improvement of East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that there is an identical House bill on the calendar. It is Calendar No. 882, House bill 2322. Without objection, the House bill will be considered. The clerk will state the House bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2322), to authorize the improvement of East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1080, Calendar 881, is indefinitely postponed.

COMPACT BETWEEN PENNSYLVANIA AND NEW JERSEY CONCERNING DELAWARE RIVER BRIDGE

The bill (S. 1968) granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike System and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this bill is designed to give the consent of Congress to a compact between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey. It was introduced by the four Senators from those two fine States.

The Committee on Public Works unanimously recommends the passage of the bill. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] if he cares to discuss the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I believe the distinguished Senator from Florida has explained the purpose of the bill. I merely wish to add that the project has great values from the standpoint of our national defense program. The new turnpike in New Jersey, when joined, by the bridge which is contemplated to be built, to the present turnpike in Pennsylvania, will add greatly to the facilities of transportation in this important but congested area, where the highways are already badly overburdened. I hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it was the unanimous feeling of the Committee on Public Works that the two States should be highly commended for the turnpike effort which is being put forth by both States, and for their desire to join their respective turnpikes by the crossing of the Delaware River which is provided by the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, there is a similar House bill on the calendar, Calendar No. 884, House bill 5131.

I ask that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill and be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the House bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5131) granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a

connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike System and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would call the attention of the junior Senator from New Jersey to the fact that the only difference between the House bill and the Senate bill is found on page 1, line 5, in both bills. The House bill uses the word "herein"; whereas the Senate bill uses the word "therein."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The amendment should be made in the House bill. I move that the House bill be amended accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey offers an amendment, on page 1, line 5, to strike out the word "herein" and insert in lieu thereof the word "therein." The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1968, calendar 883, is indefinitely postponed.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 5) to amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, relating to the legislative budget, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the concurrent resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has asked for an explanation of Senate Concurrent Resolution 5. Can a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration give an explanation of it?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that the concurrent resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be passed over.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT

The resolution (S. J. Res. 107) to establish a Commission on Ethics in Government was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask that the joint resolution go over.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is chairman of the subcommittee handling this matter, is not present on the floor of the Senate. I do not believe he expected, nor did I, that the concurrent resolution would be adopted on the call of the calendar, although I know of no objection to it.

I merely wish to call the attention of the Senate to the very excellent report.

For myself, I wish to say that I think the subcommittee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have done an excellent job in rephrasing and, in fact, improving in many ways the original joint resolution which I introduced some months ago.

EXTENSION OF YOUTH CORRECTION ACT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, when Senate bill 1184, Calendar No. 826, was reached during the call of the calendar, I asked that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair advise the Senator from South Dakota that there is one bill ahead of that bill; and those bills will be called.

ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN EXEMPTIONS FROM ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], if I may do so. With respect to the bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, and eliminate certain exemptions therefrom, which I think is Senate bill 1770, let me say that insofar as concerns emergency agencies of the Government which have been created or which may have to be created because of certain conditions arising out of the Korean situation or as a result of conditions which may develop in the future, if those agencies make a finding, they do not have to wait 30 days before issuing the orders, if it appears impractical, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest. In other words, if an emergency exists, they can so certify, and then can issue the orders forthwith.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, an agency having an emergency matter in hand need simply state in its order that because of the existing emergency, they will not come under the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Mr. MAYBANK. So, for instance, if it is necessary for Mr. Wilson or Mr. Johnston or Mr. Fleischmann or some of the emergency agencies which have been created to issue an order because of an existing emergency, they will not have to wait 30 days, if an emergency exists, but they can simply state their determination to that effect, and then can proceed to issue the order. That is what I understood the Senator to say would be the fact in a case in which the emergency agencies were concerned.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me read to the Senate from a memorandum printed in the report on Senate bill 1770:

> The Administrative Procedure Act was designed with cognizance of emergency situations and, therefore, provides various exceptions and exemptions from its specified procedures when a certain functional operation or exigency requires expeditious process. For instance, section 4 of this act, dealing with rule-making procedure (with which most of the agencies are primarily concerned in assuming, arguendo, enactment of S. 1770), provides at the outset that the procedural requirements shall not apply to those matters involving "any military, naval, or foreign affairs function of the United States." Further, subsection 4 (a), relating to notice of proposed rule making, provides that said subsection shall not apply "* * * in any situation in which the agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of the reasons therefor in the rules issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest."

The memorandum from which I have been reading, as it appears in the report, was carefully considered by the committee before it acted on this bill; and the views expressed in the memorandum accurately reflect the views of the committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator from Nevada. That was the understanding I had of the law, and that was what the distinguished Senator from Nevada told me.

Therefore, Mr. President, I do not think it necessary for the special agencies set up in connection with defense matters to wait 30 days to issue an order which might have to be issued within 24 hours or less because of an emergency.

DELAWARE RIVER JOINT TOLL BRIDGE COMMISSION—SUPPLEMENTAL COMPACT BETWEEN STATES OF PENNSYLVANIA AND NEW JERSEY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1938) granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 942) thereon. In a sense, this bill is kindred to a bill already passed by the Senate today.

I understand that the distinguished majority leader has given his consent to having the bill considered, and I understand that the distinguished minority leader has done the same. The four Senators affected would like very much to have the bill acted on today, and the subcommittee has joined in that request.

I hope this measure, Senate bill 1938, giving congressional approval of a supplemental compact between those two States, may be added to the calendar and may be disposed of before we terminate the call of the calendar. I wish to give notice of that before Senators leave the floor.

BILLS PASSED OVER

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, has the calendar been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two bills have gone to the foot of the calendar, and the first of them will be called at this time.

The bill (S. 951) to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in blood, urine, or breath of persons tried in the District of Columbia for certain offenses committed while operating vehicles was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think this bill should go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill is passed over.

The bill (S. 1184) to extend the Youth Correction Act to the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, at the time when the bill was reached during the call of the calendar, I asked that the bill go to the foot of the calendar, in order that I might consult with a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia who is on the judiciary subcommittee of that committee.

I have consulted with him. He has not had an opportunity to examine the bill. He feels and I feel that the bill should receive further study.

Therefore, Mr. President, I respectfully ask that the bill go over until the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill is passed over.

DELAWARE RIVER JOINT TOLL BRIDGE COMMISSION — SUPPLEMENTAL COMPACT BETWEEN STATES OF PENNSYLVANIA AND NEW JERSEY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Florida wishes to call up a bill to which he referred a few moments ago.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, unless there is objection, on behalf of the four Senators mentioned—the two Senators from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the two Senators from the State of New Jersey—and on behalf of the Committee on Public Works, and with the consent of the majority leader and the consent of the minority leader, I should like to ask that Senate bill 1938, granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the two States represented by the four Senators mentioned, be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as acting minority leader, I certainly do not object. I think it is a most proper thing to do, because two related bills have been passed by the Senate today, and therefore the compact would carry out the purpose of those bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1938) granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, by way of brief explanation, let me say that there are already two compacts in existence, one of which relates to the lower reaches of the Delaware River, the other one of which relates to the upper reaches of that river. There is involved in this bill a Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission. The supplemental compact simply extends jurisdiction of the Commission to include the belt which, up to now, has not been included in either the lower reaches or the upper reaches of the river.

I believe that is a correct statement of the gist of the supplemental compact now submitted to Congress for its consent and approval.

The Committee on Public Works is unanimous in its feeling that the efforts of the two States in this regard should be commended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the committee amendments.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "herein" and insert "therein."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 25, to strike out "considered" and insert "construed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The next amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, line 1, after "Delaware River," it is proposed to strike out "Notwithstanding any of the provisions of the General Bridge Act of 1946, as amended, or of any special act of the Congress authorizing or consenting to the construction of any bridge so acquired or heretofore or hereafter constructed by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission," and in the next word "said" to strike out "s" and insert "S"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 2, after the word "tolls", to strike out the comma and insert a period, and strike out "or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide funds not exceeding the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair and operation of such bridge or bridges under economical management"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 5, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 3 The right to alter, amend or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Florida has so ably explained the purposes of the bill that I shall not labor the Senate at all with any explanation of the bill or its merits. It has great merit. Here again we take a step forward with our defense program.

But, Mr. President, I do desire to take this opportunity to pay sincere tribute to the distinguished governors of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, whose leadership has so advanced these great projects, these great river crossings, and these developments in the Philadelphia Basin.

Governor DUFF, of Pennsylvania, now Senator DUFF, and Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey, labored long and hard to bring the projects into fruition. And now Governor Fine and Governor Driscoll are laboring together for a development in the Delaware River Basin, the like of which will probably be found nowhere else in the world.

I would not want this moment to pass without saying of those great and distinguished leaders and statesmen that they have done much to develop the areas over which they exercise authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1938) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the supplemental compact or agreement set forth below, and to each and every term and provision thereof: *Provided*, That nothing therein contained shall be construed to affect, impair, or diminish any right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States or of any court, department, board, bureau, officer, or official of the United States, over or in regard to any navigable waters, or any commerce between the States or with foreign countries, or any bridge, railroad, highway, pier, wharf, or other facility or improvement, or any other person, matter, or thing, forming the subject matter of the aforesaid compact or agreement or otherwise affected by the terms thereof:

"Supplemental agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey amending the agreement entitled 'Agreement Between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey Creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission as a Body Corporate and Politic and Defining Its Powers and Duties,' as heretofore amended, by extending the jurisdiction and powers of the commission.

"Whereas the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission (hereinafter referred to as the 'commission') was created by a compact or agreement entitled 'Agreement Between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey Creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission as a Body Corporate and Politic and Defining its Powers and Duties,' executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the 19th day of December 1934, pursuant to an act of its general assembly approved the 25th day of June 1931 (Pamphlet Laws 1352), as last amended by an act of said general assembly approved the 18th day of May 1933 (Pamphlet Laws 827), and executed on behalf of the State of New Jersey by its Governor on the 18th day of December 1934, pursuant to an act of its senate and general assembly approved June 11, 1934 (ch. 215, Laws of 1934; R S (1937) 32:8–1), to which compact or agreement the consent of the Congress of the United States was given by section 9 of an act of the Congress approved August 30, 1935 (Public, No 411, 74th Cong., 49 Stat. 1051, 1058); and

"Whereas said compact or agreement was amended by a supplemental agreement, executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the 8th day of July 1947, pursuant to an act of its general assembly approved June 13, 1947 (Pamphlet Laws 592), and executed on behalf of the State of New Jersey by its Governor on the 3d day of July 1947, pursuant to an act of its senate and general assembly approved June 13, 1947 (ch. 283, laws of 1947), to which supplemental agreement the consent of the Congress of the United States was given by an act of the Congress approved August 4, 1947 (Public, No. 355, 80th Cong., 61 Stat. 752); and

"Whereas it is necessary to protect the investment made by the commission in the bridge now under construction between the city of Trenton, N. J., and the borough of Morrisville, Pa., and the investments made by said Commonwealth and said State in the approach highways connected with said bridge, and in order to finance additional

bridges over the Delaware River and thereby facilitate the flow of traffic between said Commonwealth and said State: Now, therefore,

"The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey do hereby solemnly covenant and agree, each with the other, as follows:

"Paragraph (a) of article X of the agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its powers and duties, which was executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the 19th day of December 1934, and was executed on behalf of the State of New Jersey by its Governor on the 18th day of December 1934, as amended by the supplemental agreement which was executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the 8th day of July 1947, and was executed on behalf of the State of New Jersey by its Governor on the 3d day of July 1947, be and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The commission may acquire, construct, rehabilitate, improve, maintain, repair, and operate bridges for vehicular or pedestrian traffic across the Delaware River between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey at any location north of the boundary line between Bucks County and Philadelphia County in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as extended across the Delaware River to the New Jersey shore of said river. The commission may also, subject to the approval of the State Highway Department of the State of New Jersey and the Department of Highways of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, lease such bridges as lessor to, and contract for the operation of such bridges by, one or more public bodies, instrumentalities, commissions, or public agencies.

"'Whenever any bridge north of the boundary line described above in this paragraph (a), proposed to be acquired by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this agreement, has been constructed pursuant to consent or authorization granted by Federal law, the acquisition of such bridge by the commission shall be by purchase or by condemnation in accordance with the provisions of such Federal law, or the acquisition of such bridge by the commission shall be pursuant to and in accordance with the provisions of sections 48:5–22 and 48:5–23 of the Revised Statutes of New Jersey, and for all the purposes of said provisions and sections the commission is hereby appointed as the agency of the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania exercising the rights and powers granted or reserved by said Federal law or sections to the State of New Jersey and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania jointly or to the State of New Jersey acting in conjunction with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The commission shall have authority to so acquire such bridge whether the same be owned, held, operated, or maintained by any private person, firm, partnership, company, association, or corporation or by any instrumentality, public body, commission, public agency, or political subdivision (including any county or municipality) of, or created by or in, the State of New Jersey or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or by an instrumentality, public body, commission or public agency of, or created by or in, a political subdivision (including any county or municipality) of the State of New Jersey or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

"'In addition to other powers conferred upon it, and not in limitation thereof, the commission may acquire all right, title and interest in and to the Tacony-Palmyra Bridge, across the Delaware River at Palmyra, N. J., together with any approaches and interests in real property necessary thereto. The acquisition of such bridge, approaches and interests by the commission shall be by purchase or by condemnation in accordance with the provisions of the Federal law consenting to or authorizing the construction of such bridge and approaches, or the acquisition of such bridge, approaches or interests by the commission shall be pursuant to and in accordance with the provisions of sections 48:5–22 and 48:5–23 of the Revised Statutes of New Jersey, and for all the purposes of said provisions and sections the commission is hereby appointed as the agency of the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania exercising the rights and powers granted or reserved by said Federal law or sections to the State of New Jersey and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania jointly or to the State of New Jersey acting in conjunction with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The commission shall have authority to so acquire such bridge, approaches and interests, whether the same be owned, held, operated or maintained by any private person, firm, partnership, company, association or corporation or by any instrumentality, public body, commission, public agency or political subdivision (including any county or municipality) of, or created by or in, the State of New Jersey or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or by any instrumentality, public body, commission or public agency of, or created by or in, a political subdivision (including any county or municipality) of the State of New Jersey or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The power and authority herein granted to the commission to acquire said Tacony-Palmyra Bridge, approaches and interests shall not be exercised unless and until the Governor of the State of New Jersey and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania have filed with the commission their written consents to such acquisition.

"'The word "bridge" as used in this agreement shall include such approach highways and interests in real property necessary thereto in said Commonwealth or said State as may be determined by the commission to be necessary to facilitate the flow of traffic in the vicinity of any such bridge or to connect such bridge with the highway system or other traffic facilities in said Commonwealth or said State: *Provided, however,* that the power and authority herein granted to the commission in connection with the approach highways shall not be exercised unless and until the Department of Highways of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania shall have filed with the commission its written approval as to approach highways to be located in said Commonwealth and the State Highway Department of the State of New Jersey shall have filed with the commission its written approval as to approach highways to be located in said State.

"'Notwithstanding any other provision of this agreement or any provision of law, State or Federal, to the contrary, the commission may combine for financing purposes any bridge or bridges hereafter constructed or acquired by it with any or all of the bridges described or referred to in any trust indenture securing bridge revenue bonds of the commission at the time outstanding, subject to any limitations or restrictions contained in such trust indenture.

"'Notwithstanding any provision of this agreement, nothing herein contained shall be construed to limit or impair any right or power granted or to be granted to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission or the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, acting alone or in conjunction with each other, to provide for the financing, construction, operation, and maintenance of one bridge across the Delaware River south of the city of Trenton in the State of New Jersey: *Provided,* That such bridge shall not be constructed within a distance of 10 miles, measured along the boundary line between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, from the bridge being constructed across the Delaware River by the commission between the Borough of Morrisville in said Commonwealth and the city of Trenton in said State, so long as there are any outstanding bonds or obligations of the commission for which the tolls, rents, rates, or other revenues, or any part thereof, of said bridge now being constructed shall have been pledged; but such bridge may be constructed at any other location north of the boundary line described above in this paragraph (a). Nothing contained in this agreement shall be construed to authorize the commission to condemn any such bridge.'

"In witness whereof, this 12th day of July 1951, Alfred E. Driscoll has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the State of New Jersey and caused the great seal of the State to be attached thereto.

"ALFRED E DRISCOLL,
"Governor, State of New Jersey.

"Attest:

"LLOYD B. MARSH,
"Secretary of State.

"And, on this 17th day of July, 1951, John S. Fine has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and caused the great seal of the Commonwealth to be attached thereto.

"JOHN S. FINE,
"Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

"Attest:

"GENE D. SMITH,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

SEC. 2. Subject to the provisions of the compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, as amended, said commission is hereby authorized to acquire any bridge heretofore constructed under the authority or with the consent of the Congress across the Delaware River. Said commission is hereby authorized to combine for financing purposes any two or more bridges heretofore or hereafter constructed or acquired by the commission and to fix and charge tolls for the use of such bridges so combined and to pledge such tolls in accordance with the provisions of the said compact or agreement, as amended: *Provided,* That in fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of any bridge hereafter constructed or acquired by said commission or any bridges so combined, the same shall be so adjusted as to provide funds sufficient to pay the reasonable costs of maintaining, repairing, and operating such bridge or bridges and their approach facilities under economical management, and to provide funds sufficient to amortize the costs of such bridge or bridges and their approach facilities, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, and said commission may continue such tolls on all bridges heretofore or hereafter constructed or acquired by the commission until all such costs shall have been amortized; after funds sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge or bridges shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of toll.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as I understand—and if I am in error, I hope I may be corrected by the Chair—the call of the calendar has been concluded, and we are not now operating under the 5-minute rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is correct.

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR HENDRICKSON, SENATOR SCHOEPPEL, AND THEIR STAFF ON THE MINORITY CALENDAR COMMITTEE

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I rise at this time to say a word of commendation of two Senators on the other side of the aisle, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. I think it would be unfortunate for us to conclude the call of the calendar without noting with praise the excellent work done by our colleagues and the painstaking manner in which they have, not only today, but heretofore, devoted themselves to the study and consideration of the calendar bills. They, with their very able counsel, Mr. Kammerman, have done outstanding work; and, creditable as it is, I think it deserves the praise and thanks of the Senate.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and myself, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. I am sure both of us are deeply appreciative of his words of commendation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Maryland in the expression just made by him in reference to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. Their work in this body has been most commendable. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and in dealing with a great number of claims and immigration matters, I have found their criticism and their careful study of the bills most helpful. To pass these claim bills continuously is a task which requires careful scrutiny. I welcome and have welcomed and will continue to welcome the fine work of those two Senators and their able staff.

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE WORK AND WORKLOAD AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1951, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

Mr McCARRAN. Mr. President, if I may do so with propriety, I should like to dwell for a minute or so on the workload of the Senate Judiciary Committee during the Eighty-Second Congress. As of September 30, 1951, that workload consisted of 48 6 percent of all Senate bills and resolutions introduced; 60.4 percent of all House bills and resolutions presented in the Senate; 50.8 percent of all bills and resolutions irrespective of origin.

Not only has the Judiciary Committee received a far larger share of the Senate's total workload than any other standing committee of the Senate; it has also performed a larger share of all committee work than any other committee. Of 844 written reports submitted in the Senate by all committees, the Judiciary Committee has submitted 466, which represents 55.2 percent.

The total of reports made to the Senate does not give the whole picture of committee activity, because committee consideration of many bills resulted in adverse action and indefinite postponement. Furthermore, the committee has handled and disposed of more than 3,646 individual immigration cases involving suspension of deportation, and 1,190 cases involving adjustment of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended. Each case is equivalent to a bill.

Through September 30, 1951, during the Eighty-Second Congress, the Judiciary Committee has received 1,244 Senate bills and resolutions and 369 House bills and resolutions, making a total of 1,613 bills and resolutions.

As of September 30, 1951, the committee had disposed of 562 Senate bills and resolutions and 317 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 879 bills and resolutions.

Of the bills thus disposed of, 69 were general bills other than claims or immigration; 242 were private relief bills; 555 were private immigration bills; 6 were general claims bills; and 7 were general immigration bills

Committee approval was granted to 242 Senate bills and resolutions and 225 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 467 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

It should be noted that written reports were filed by the committee with respect to all but one of the 467 bills and resolutions approved.

Of the bills and resolutions acted upon favorably, 51 were general bills other than claims or immigration; 122 were private relief bills; 286 were private immigration bills; 3 were general claims bills; and 5 were general immigration bills.

Bills postponed indefinitely by the committee included 320 Senate bills and resolutions; 92 House bills and resolutions; or a total of 412 bills and resolutions of both houses.

Of the bills thus acted upon unfavorably, 18 were general bills other than claims or immigration; 120 were private relief bills; 269 were private immigration bills; 3 were general claims bills; and 2 were general immigration bills.

Measures pending before the committee as of September 30, 1951, included 682 Senate bills and resolutions and 52 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 734 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

Of these bills, 141 are general bills other than immigration and claims; 114 are private relief bills; 443 are private immigration bills; 18 are general claims bills; and 18 are general immigration bills.

Committee action, in most cases, must await reports from interested departments and agencies in the executive branch. As of September 30, 1951, the number of bills and resolutions pending before the committee with respect to which reports have been requested but not received was 417, of which 31 were general bills other than claims or immigration; 35 were private relief bills; 336 were private immigration bills; 8 were general claims bills; and 7 were general immigration bills.

Thus it will be seen that out of the 1613 bills and resolutions referred to the committee, the number of cases in which the committee has not acted but in which the committee either had received the reports or deemed reports unnecessary, totaled 317, of which 110 were general bills other than claims or immigration; 79 were private relief bills; 107 were private immigration bills; 10 were general claims bills; and 11 were general immigration bills.

It will be noted the committee has disposed of 317 House bills and resolutions out of 369 such measures referred to it, leaving only 52 House bills and resolutions pending as of September 30, 1951.

This means the committee took action on 85.9 percent of all House measures received.

In comparison, out of 1,244 Senate bills and resolutions referred to it, the committee acted upon 562, leaving 682 Senate bills and resolutions pending. This means that, although the committee had to start from scratch in all such cases, action was taken on 45.1 percent of all Senate measures received.

Suspensions of deportation by the Attorney General and adjustments of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, are, under authority delegated by the Congress, reported to the Congress in groups; but in the committee, each such individual case requires separate investigation, appraisal, and action. At the beginning of the Eighty-second Congress, there were pending in the committee 2,761 cases of suspension of deportation, to which were added 6,761 additional cases submitted since the beginning of the Congress, making a total of 9,522 cases, of which 3,646 were approved; 527 were held for further consideration; 27 were withdrawn by the Attorney General; leaving 5,322 cases in process as of September 30, 1951.

At the beginning of the Eighty-second Congress, there were pending 845 cases of adjustment of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, to which were added 1,511 additional cases submitted during this Congress, making a total of 2,356 cases, of which 1,190 were approved and 7 were withdrawn by the Attorney General, leaving 1,159 cases in process as of September 30, 1951

Through September 30, 1951, the committee received 83 Executive nominations, of which 22 were Federal judges, 29 were United States district attorneys, 21 were United States marshals, 1 was Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, 1 was Assistant Commissioner of Patents, 1 was Deputy Attorney General, 1 was an Assistant Attorney General, 2 were Examiner in Chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office, and 5 were members of the Subversive Activities Control Board As of September 30, 1951, nominations still pending totaled 11.

Mr. President, I have read this statement to the Senate in order that I might express my gratitude for and commendation of the fine attention and the fine

work which have been exhibited by the 12 members of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate. It speaks volumes for the fact that they have given their attention and their continuous thought to these perplexing questions running into thousands every month.

Mr SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say, from this side of the aisle, that so far as I know, the committee has given perfectly nonpartisan consideration to the questions referred to it, and so far as my personal office is concerned, it has given what I would call excellent service. As one Member of the Senate, I certainly appreciate it.

I would also say that I agree with the Senator from Nevada in his references to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. We on this side of the aisle get much comfort from their activities because we feel that the calendar cases are being well investigated, and that no bills are going to be passed which the Senate might later have cause to regret.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I also wish to add a word of commendation of the good work of the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Kansas, and to express my appreciation for the cooperation which they have given me as Majority Leader in handling these matters. I include also the work of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. He seems to have charge of approximately two-thirds of the bills on the calendar. So I feel he is to be commended for the good work he has done as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I retired, with great reluctance, from the Committee on the Judiciary as a result of the Reorganization Act, but since I have observed the tremendous burden of work that committee has to carry, and of which the Senator from Nevada, the distinguished chairman of the committee, has to take so much personal supervision, I feel that I escaped a great deal of very arduous labor. I join with the majority leader in expressing commendation of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for the administration talent which he necessarily possesses to discharge this great burden of work.

Mr. McFARLAND. I may say to my good friend from Wyoming that the distinguished and able chairman of the Judiciary Committee evidently is very fond of work, because he does a great deal of it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I would do more work if the majority leader would only permit me to get my bills up.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I would say that no Senator could get more bills on the calendar and get them up more quickly than does the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I feel very humble indeed in the face of all these compliments, and I am grateful, and I know the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is grateful, for the commendation we have received from distinguished Senators on both sides of the aisle.

I take advantage of this opportunity, while I am on my feet, to say that the splendid work of the Committee on the Judiciary would never have been fully realized if it had not been for the able and inspiring leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. It has been an inspiration to serve with him.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to join in the warm congratulations and strong commendations of the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Kansas and of the Senator from Nevada in the commendatory references to the members of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr MORSE Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes on an extraneous matter. First, however, let me say that I wish to join in the very deserving commendations given to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] for the splendid work they have performed, not only for this side of the aisle, but, I feel, for the entire Senate, as members of what we have come to call the Republican Calendar Committee I have never known them to fail to give very careful and studious consideration to the bills pending on the calendar. I am sure they would share my view when I say that the splendid work which they have done would not have been possible if it had not been for the very able assistance of Mr David Kammerman, who has aided them in the handling of calendar matters.

Some of us, as the Senate knows, have certain very strict policies in regard to calendar bills, such, for example, as my insistence that no Federal property shall be given away for nothing, either to private institutions or to public bodies, and that if the property is to be used for a public purpose by a public body they must be willing to pay at least 50 percent of the market value of the property.

Mr President, these members of the Republican Calendar Committee, along with the able assistant, Mr. Kammerman, so thoroughly understand the position of the junior Senator from Oregon in regard to the application of that principle that I never need to be on the floor if I am called off the floor for some official purpose when any bill is pending, because I know they will see to it that an objection is raised, and that the principle of the Senator from Oregon in regard to this type of proposed legislation will be protected during his absence from the floor. That is one specific example of the detail to which the two able Senators go in seeing to it that the interests and rights of Members of the Senate are always protected in regard to the calendar.

Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is in need of meeting a plane almost immediately, and I understand that a measure in which he is interested is about to be called up. I shall be very happy to yield to him at this time, and I shall later discuss another matter.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 537) to further amend the Communications Act of 1934, which were, on page 2, line 12, after "owners", insert "The authority granted to the President, under this subsection, to cause the closing of any station or device and the removal therefrom of its apparatus and equipment, or to authorize the use or control of any station or device and/or its apparatus and equipment, may be exercised in the Canal Zone", and on page 2, strike out all after line 14 over to and including line 4, on page 3, and insert:

(h) Any person who willfully does or causes or suffers to be done any act prohibited pursuant to the exercise of the President's authority under this section, or who willfully fails to do any act which he is required to do pursuant to the exercise of the President's authority under this section, or who willfully causes or suffers such failure, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished for such offense by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both, and, if a firm, partnership, association, or corporation, by fine of not more than $5,000, except that any person who commits such an offense with intent to injure the United States, or with intent to secure an advantage to any foreign nation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $20,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1864) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

ADDITIONAL ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 11, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S 1864) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AND THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I listened to the discussion by the dis-

tinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] on Senate bill 1347, the bill relating to amendment of the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act. I was convinced by that discussion that the proper way to settle the impasse was for the Senate to consider the bill now and then to work out the differences in conference. I had hoped that the railroad men, who are vitally interested, would be able to reach an agreement on this proposed legislation before it came before the Senate. Since that does not appear possible, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1347, Calendar No. 842.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1347) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act and for other purposes.

GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Mr BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to speak briefly. I am sorry to interrupt the course of events, but I rarely inflict my voice on the Senate. What I shall say is a little apart from the discussion which is proceeding, but it is, I think, a matter which it is well to have in the records of the Senate so that, while it is said there are none so blind as those who will not see, and none so deaf as those who will not hear, those on either side of the aisle who are giving consideration to the future political developments in this country may at least be advised that there are factors which perhaps have not been sufficiently considered.

I refer now to the current discussion, widely quoted in the press, regarding the future course of General Eisenhower, commanding our forces in Europe at the present time under the Atlantic Pact

Returning from Europe in the latter part of July, the Senator from Maine made the statement that General Eisenhower seemed to him to be the indispensable man in Europe. There was some cynical comment as to whether my opinion might be prejudiced by my own views as to who might wisely be nominated for President this coming year. I was gratified a little later, on August 3, 1951, when Mr. Bernard Baruch, who is certainly not susceptible of being charged with being overly friendly to the Republican Party, returned from Europe with precisely the same statement. I quote from the New York Times of Friday, August 3 The headline is as follows: "Eisenhower's job defined by Baruch—Military task of preserving world peace is put before a political role here."

Then follows the article:

General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower is "thoroughly imbued with the idea of preserving the peace of the world" and should be allowed to continue in his military post, Bernard M. Baruch asserted yesterday.

* * * * *

General Eisenhower's mission, he said, was "probably the most important task a single individual has had in our lifetime."

There was considerable comment on this matter at the time. The President of the United States referred to it briefly on the same day, as it appears in the New York Times, when he was quoted as follows:

One of the reporters at the news conference told the President that Bernard M. Baruch, returning from Europe and conferences with General Eisenhower, had stated that the general was doing the greatest job since Peter the Hermit, who preached the First Crusade, and that persons trying to get him away from his job and into politics were doing a disservice to the country

Mr Truman said he thought the general was doing a magnificent job and that he hoped and believed he would continue to do that job as long as necessary

The discussions continued, however, among the columnists and the commentators as to General Eisenhower's activity, and among the week-end visitors who flocked over to Europe to secure his autograph and to discuss with him issues he was willing to discuss.

We come down now to the present time, and the Senator from Maine was rather profoundly gratified to have his opinion of 2 months ago confirmed by so responsible an organ as the New York Times, which, in its issue of Tuesday, October 9, carried a special article from Bonn, Germany, by Drew Middleton, a special correspondent of the Times, one certainly not suspect as to his partisan affiliations I wish to read what he said; and it seems to me that in the current discussions in this country regarding our future foreign policies and the various men who may participate, it would be well to bear in mind an opinion such as is expressed in this article in yesterday's New York Times. I read:

The prospect that General of the Army Dwight D Eisenhower, Supreme Allied Commander, may return to the United States to run for the Presidency as the Republican candidate next year has set distress signals fluttering in defense ministries and army commands of Western Europe.

Reports that a "Draft Eisenhower" boom is developing produced a flood of anxious questions by general officers and defense officials, who have gathered in Germany for United States Army maneuvers

This apprehension is based on fears that withdrawal of General Eisenhower's confident dominant personality would seriously delay defense efforts in several European countries, that with a less forceful personality at the helm of the Supreme Command West Germany would achieve a position of predominance in the command, and an anxiety over the ability of any successor to handle the delicate and important political aspects of the Supreme Commander's job

The least publicized achievement of General Eisenhower in Europe has been his transfusion of confidence to the peoples of the Continent and the armies that represent them This is most evident in the French Army, but it is no less evident or important in the armies of Norway and Denmark or the Low Countries.

"I really do not think we would be here if Eisenhower had not convinced our people and our Government first that we had to arm, and second, that once armed, we had a good chance of averting a Soviet invasion," a Dutch officer said during the British maneuvers.

"What will happen in Holland if he goes I do not know."

What worries this officer and many others is that they expect General Eisenhower to leave his job at Supreme Headquarters, near Paris, next spring. This is the season that they regard as critical in 1952, the period in which they feel the Russians will decide whether to attack that year or wait

Since the rearmament of West Germany first was discussed openly in the autumn of 1949 at Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery's headquarters at Fontainebleau the overriding fear in west European commands and defense ministries has been that a rearmed Germany in time would seize military leadership of the Continent.

This especially was true of the French high command. Its generals envisaged a situation in which German rearmament to the extent of 12 divisions, the number favored by United States military authorities, would be followed by gradual withdrawal of United States troops from Europe.

I may say that General Eisenhower himself has envisioned such withdrawal as early as might prove practicable.

Under these conditions, they feared that Germany, anxious to regain her lost territories in the east, now under Polish administration, would try to lead the rest of Western Europe in a war of revenge against the Soviet Union

To the French, General Eisenhower brought hope and security. Not only did he trim the exaggerated plans of United States planners down to size but he brought about adoption of a plan under which German divisions of 13,000 men each were to be incorporated into a European army The French worry today is whether General Eisenhower's successor will have influence in Europe or with the United States Congress to keep German rearmament within the boundaries now set for it

French officers also noted that no other United States commander enjoyed the same confidence in Europe—

That is very natural, since General Eisenhower was the leader of the liberation of Europe, and it is only natural that he should enjoy their confidence to a preeminent degree.

Mr DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Maine for the high opinion in which he holds General Eisenhower—a high opinion in which the Senator from Illinois joins. I deeply appreciate it, and I am sure that there will be forthcoming in the future further evidences of the high opinion in which the Senator holds General Eisenhower.

Mr. BREWSTER I have never failed to express that opinion on repeated occasions In fact, the only criticism which I received when I returned from Europe was that I had extolled General Eisenhower too far. When Mr. Baruch said that the job which General Eisenhower was doing in Europe was more important than any other job in the world, I think he was well warranted. I hope the Senator from Illinois shares my opinion.

Continuing to read from the New York Times article:

French officers also noted that no other United States commander enjoyed the same confidence in Europe and that General Eisenhower's successor, no matter how competent, would be faced with an extremely

difficult task of achieving cooperation between the new German army and the forces of the Continent.

"Let us not think that we or the Dutch or the Norwegians like having the Germans with us," a distinguished French general said recently. "We know it is necessary, but it will take someone with General Eisenhower's tact, forcefulness, and experience to weld all these forces. Who else can do that?"

A strange aspect of conversation with these military leaders is that none has any doubts that the job that General Eisenhower is doing in Europe is more important than the Presidency.

I hope the Senator from Illinois will note this. This is the opinion of military leaders in Europe.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is there any office in the world more important than that of President of the United States?

Mr. BREWSTER. This is not my opinion. This is the opinion of the military leaders in Europe. Mr. Baruch apparently indicated somewhat of an inclination toward the same view.

Told that Americans thought differently, one Belgian general shrugged his shoulders and remarked that this would not be true if the Russians were sitting on the Mexican border and General Eisenhower was trying to unite 48 different States to resist them.

It can be seen how our European friends feel about the matter.

The French, who expect to provide a majority of the forces for a European army, although their apprehensions about German strength indicate that there is still a considerable gap between promise and fulfillment—

They were supposed to have 10 divisions by the first of December. We shall be fortunate if we have five French divisions.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Would not General Eisenhower, as President of the United States, have charge not only of Western Europe, but of all the world, so far as that is concerned, in speaking for the United States?

Mr. BREWSTER. I would not undertake to advise the Senator from South Carolina as to what his party might do. I was speaking simply from the standpoint of Republicans who are concerned with the safety and security of our country and the successful implementation of the North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Neither am I saying what the Senator from Maine might do if he were a candidate running on the Democratic ticket.

Mr. BREWSTER. I can well understand why the Senator from South Carolina might desire some other nomination than his party is likely to make.

Continuing with the article from the New York Times:

The French, who expect to provide a majority of the forces for a European army, although their apprehensions about German strength indicate that there is still a considerable gap between promise and fulfillment, would like General Eisenhower's successor to be a French general. The British would like to see the job go to a Briton, especially Field Marshal Viscount Alexander. But they know they have no chance of getting French acceptance, and thus would like another United States general.

One shift that has been much discussed would send Gen. J. Lawton Collins, United States Chief of Staff, to Supreme Headquarters in West Europe, with Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Supreme Commander in the Far East, returning to Washington as Chief of Staff. Another name mentioned in connection with General Eisenhower's job is that of Gen Mark W. Clark, Chief of United States Field Forces, who has had abundant experience in Europe, politically and militarily.

This is what interests the Senator from Maine, because it is the precise language which he used 2 months ago:

European military leaders, however, regard General Eisenhower as indispensable. Their distress at the possibility of his departure indicates that they are under no illusions that the danger of a Soviet attack has been averted by military accomplishments of the last 12 months.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will my good friend and former college mate yield for a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Maine has spoken of the distress which the European military leaders would feel if General Eisenhower were to depart from Europe, return to the United States, and become President. Would that distress of the European military leaders be equal to the distress which many politicians in both parties would feel if General Eisenhower were to leave Europe and become President of the United States?

Mr. BREWSTER. I have not heard any particular distress expressed in that regard, so far as concerns the politicians with whom I have discussed the matter. I believe that certainly General Eisenhower—and I hope the Senator from Illinois agrees with me—would be a very great improvement on some Presidents we have had. I note that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] indicates that he might possibly agree.

It is pointed out in this article—and again I am citing it as the opinion of an impartial and neutral observer in Europe—that next spring may be the crucial time. The picture of General Eisenhower turning tail and leaving Europe at that particular crisis, when the Russians may be ready to launch their attack, is not one which in my judgment reflects the approach General Eisenhower is likely to take. In other words, I have supreme confidence in the conception of General Eisenhower as to his job and his responsibilities. I am profoundly gratified that the Congress of the United States has gone as far as it has in upholding his hand, although thus far unsuccessfully, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] indicated earlier, when he pointed out that we were sending him only one-fifth of what we were supposed to send him. That is equally true of the difficulties which he is having in mobilizing and unifying the countries of Europe, both in their rearmament and in the development of their military potential. I believe that the people of the United States, irrespective of the politicians, may well consider the factors which are pointed out by so impartial a critic as Mr. Drew Middleton, of the New York Times.

EVALUATION OF FISCAL REQUIREMENTS OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES—AMENDMENT OF THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider the action of the Senate on the bill (S. 913) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States, made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], be agreed to, and that the bill be restored to the calendar. The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, after 2 years of study. It should be restored to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is very much interested in this question. Unfortunately, he is unable to be present on the floor of the Senate. However, the Committee on Rules and Administration has reported a similar bill, which he introduced. It deals with the same general subject. It is now on the calendar. Under the circumstances I certainly would have no objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan, so that in the discretion of the majority leader both bills may be considered at the same time.

Mr. MOODY. That is the purpose of my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. Senate bill 913 will be restored to the legislative calendar.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see pp. 12684–12686, House proceedings, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 5, 1951.)

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I merely wish to say that I have discussed the conference report with Senators on this side of the aisle, and I know of no objection. However, because of the size of the bill and its importance, if the request of the Senator from Wyoming is granted I shall

ask that we have a quorum call so that Senators may be notified.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Before proceeding with the conference report I wish to address a question to the Senator from Arizona. He made a motion that the railroad retirement bill be made the unfinished business of the Senate. I understood that there would be no debate with reference to taking up the bill. A moment ago, however, it was suggested that there might be some debate on it. Therefore, I feel it would be preferable to proceed with the conference report at this time.

Mr McFARLAND. I have no objection to the Senator from Wyoming proceeding with the conference report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall make a motion that the Senate agree to the conference report, either now or after a quorum call has been had.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will be very glad to have the Senator from Wyoming make his motion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr MORSE. Mr President, will the Senator from Massachusetts withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. MORSE I should like to make a brief statement. I see no reason for having a quorum call.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator from Oregon desire to discuss the conference report?

Mr. MORSE. Not the conference report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator from Oregon as to the length of his proposed remarks?

Mr MORSE I am unable to say.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The conference report is a privileged matter. It is now almost 5.30 o'clock. I do not believe that it would take a great deal of time to dispose of the report. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Oregon that he will have an opportunity, and just as an effective opportunity as he has now, to make his remarks after the quorum call and after the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to my good friend from Wyoming that I cannot stop a quorum call, but I intend to discuss what I wish to discuss before we adopt the conference report. I had hoped that we could dispose of the railroad retirement bill, and I was willing to accommodate the Senator from Illinois, thinking that that was the question to which we would devote our attention, but it did not work out that way. I do not intend to delay any further. As soon as I get the floor in my own right I intend to say what I have to say. However, I do not see any reason for a quorum call.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I withdraw my request for a quorum call.

GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have two or three subjects which I intend to discuss.

First, I wish to say that I can well understand why certain forces within my party would like to keep General Eisenhower in Europe. I do not share their point of view that he should stay in Europe, because I believe the overwhelming demand of the common men and women of America for a political leadership in the White House which will unify the country will be heard with such increasing vigor in the months ahead that it will be clear not only to General Eisenhower but to our friends throughout the world that the greatest service he could render, not only to his country but to free peoples everywhere, would be to run for the Presidency of the United States.

I can think of nothing that would cause greater disunity in our country and cause more uncertainty and disturbance within world public opinion as to America's future foreign policy than to have nominated at the Republican convention next summer a reactionary Republican. I believe it to be very important that my party nominate a man such as Dwight Eisenhower, who will instill confidence not only in the more than 150,000,000 American people, but also in the millions of men and women who are our friends among the other free peoples of the world.

Mr. President, I do not accept the premise that Eisenhower is indispensable either in his position in Europe or in any other position; but I do hold to the point of view that in this period of acute crisis Eisenhower ought to serve his country in the capacity in which he can render the greatest service for our generation and for history. I believe he can best do that as a candidate for the Presidency of the United States on the Republican ticket. I am satisfied that once it is made clear to the American people that Eisenhower is available for that high office all other candidates will pale into insignificance, because of the tremendous public reaction in favor of the great Eisenhower

I would say to my Republican brethren far and wide across the land, Mr. President, that I consider it to be so important to defeat the present Democratic administration that we should not miss the great opportunity to select a man who will unify the country and will leave no room for doubt as to the defeat both of the reactionary forces within my party and of the Democratic administration at one and the same time.

It can be expected that in the months ahead a strong plea will be made—and with some plausibility—for keeping Eisenhower in Europe, because that is where his political opponents really want to keep him. They must keep him there if they are to nominate a reactionary Republican. They know full well that if Eisenhower turns his task in Europe over to other able men who wear the American military uniform, the objectives of his program will proceed unimpeded and successfully. For the sake of national unity and international security he must be made available to perform the great service which I think history has destined him to perform for the American people as their President.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to discuss another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

THE IRANIAN OIL DISPUTE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to discuss at this point an article appearing in the newspapers today under the title "Our Oil." The article is printed under the byline of Peter Edson.

I read the first paragraph of the article:

> The way in which American oil production has been mobilized to bail the British out on their Iranian oil dilemma is a story little known outside the international petroleum industry. But it presents a number of United States oil policy problems.
>
> Should United States petroleum production be allowed to go into export in large quantities? Or should United States oil be kept for this country, exclusively? And how much foreign oil should be brought to America, to save United States reserves?

Mr President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the article may be printed at this point in the RECORD, without my reading it, as part of my remarks, so that I may make further comment upon it.

There being no objection, the remainder of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Both United States and foreign oil demands now stand double their prewar 1938 rate Forecasts indicate the foreign demand will probably increase more rapidly in the future Foreign demands were rising steadily when Iranian production was cut off by the strikes of last March and April.
>
> Iranian output had been running at about 610,000 barrels a day. Loss of 30,000,000 barrels in a few weeks upset all free-world markets. European countries dependent on Iranian oil tried to get oil from United States companies. Department of Justice gave its clearance on June 25 for 19 United States companies operating abroad to work together to relieve the world oil shortage. Stewart P. Sherman of New Jersey Standard was named chairman of the group.
>
> By early August a plan of action had been worked out to relieve world oil shortages. Tankers and storage tank capacity were pooled Crude oil and products were exchanged At first, 200,000 barrels of Middle East crude that had been coming to the United States daily were diverted to Europe This has now been cut down to 90,000 barrels a day, for the rest of the year. Other middle eastern and Venezuelan producers found they could step up their production by 270,000 barrels a day.
>
> European consuming countries were then put on an allocation basis, which cut daily demand by 75,000 barrels a day, for products Free-world refining capacity was inventoried. It was found Eastern Hemisphere refineries could produce an additional 195,000 barrels a day And from the United States 190,000 barrels a day of refined products will be supplied by December.

All these diversions from normal American supplies have been made possible by drawing on American reserves for the domestic market. When the Iranian crisis first developed, United States stockpiles were high. There was some fear in the industry that prices would have to be cut, to reduce stockpiles. The Iranian shortage was therefore a boon, in cutting down the surpluses.

The United States Government, with an eye to the defense situation, wants stockpiles kept high. Petroleum Administration therefore asked Louisiana Conservation Commission and Texas Railroad Commission to allow greater production, and so meet the world oil shortage. Both agreed.

The Texas Commission, however, has sent a letter to the United States State Department, asking why the United States should drain its resources to meet Anglo-Iranian shortages. Independent United States producers, on the other hand, are alarmed by increased competitive American production in the middle east and Venezuela. And United States consumers have a right to ask why they should have to pay higher prices, to meet Europe's shortage.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we should face the fact that the Iranian oil problem presents some very serious international questions for the United States. It is directly connected with United States foreign policy. In this country there are many persons, including myself, who are very much concerned as to just what is the policy of the United States State Department in regard to American-British oil tactics. For example, I should like to know to what extent and to what degree the policies advocated by Harriman in his recent negotiations between the Iranians and the British represent also the policy of the State Department of the United States. I am sure there are in this country many other persons who hold a point of view similar to mine and would like to know, as I would, to what extent the State Department proposes to underwrite the exploiting practices of the British in Iran. I happen to be one who holds to the point of view that we cannot justify underwriting and guaranteeing the British oil practices in Iran, because, for the most part, they have been characterized by exploitation. Today the British are reaping the negative results from the abuses they have perpetrated in Iran for many years in respect to oil.

Of course, there is serious international danger from the standpoint of the threat of Russia to Iran; and I yield to no one in my opposition to creeping communism in the Middle East or anywhere else in the world. Nevertheless, we should not play into Russia's hands by supporting a British oil policy which, in my opinion, on the basis of the facts and in accordance with the merits, cannot be justified. We should realize, Mr. President, that the nationalization of the oil industry of Iran is an accomplished fact, and that we are not going to turn back the hands of that economic clock.

Therefore, I believe that our Government should use its good offices in regard to the Iranian dispute only to the extent of doing what it can to see to it that the legitimate—and I stress the word "legitimate"—economic rights of the British in Iran and the legitimate domestic economic rights of the Iranians are protected. Here we have, once again, an international legal question involving the respective rights of two sovereigns, in a dispute which should be settled by the rules of reason, not by the jungle law either of economic force or of the rattling of the weapons of war.

Mr. President, if they once come to understand the economic facts and the facts concerning the British practices in Iran, I seriously question that the American people will react with very much enthusiasm to any policy on the part of their Government which would seem to back up the British in their demands to continue to take out of Iran more than a fair and just return on the investment which the British have in the oil properties in that nation. I am satisfied that any careful presentation of the evidence bearing upon the British practices in Iran will show that the British have been following in Iran a course of action similar to the one which both the British and the United States oil companies followed prior to the nationalization of the oil industry in Mexico some years ago. Our record in this field of international oil policy is not a flawless one. It is not a lily-white record. A great many eyes around the world are watching what steps we take in Iran, and are looking to see whether we truly have changed our course of action and are willing to practice some of our professings of recent years, namely, to stand for economic justice in the field of international oil policy. We must demonstrate before it is too late that we are not going to support a program of economic imperialism and exploitation, which too frequently has characterized the policies of Great Britain in the backward areas of the world, and which, unfortunately, according to the record, has to too great an extent characterized our own policy in certain instances in the field of international economics.

Mr. President, there is available a great tribunal for the trial of both the legal and the related economic questions in connection with the Iranian oil problem, and that is the World Court. In keeping with the ideal which our Government so constantly emphasizes in its Voice of America programs and in its pronouncements from the State Department and the White House, that we stand for a system of international justice through law, I feel that we ought to make clear both to Great Britain and to Iran that we believe both countries should bring this issue into the World Court for a determination of the legal questions and a decision upon the facts. According to my view, such a sound procedure and resort to international justice would in and of itself guarantee both to Great Britain and to Iran that their legitimate rights would be protected. It would give assurance that Iran would not be allowed, by way of issuing a legislative edict or an executive order by her Premier, to confiscate and steal property which does not belong to her, an act which she cannot justify as a kind of legal larceny. It would also make clear to Great Britain that she, on the other hand, must face the fact that Iran as a sovereign state has the right, as did Mexico some years ago, to nationalize her oil industry; but that at the same time Iran has a corollary duty and obligation, in keeping with the spirit of international law, to see to it that just compensation is paid for property which she takes over under the establishment of such a new national oil policy.

It would be well for all Americans, as we consider this Iranian oil crisis, to profit from some of the lessons which I hope we have learned from the expropriation policy of Mexico some years ago. I was then and still am a critic of the ways and the means that Mexico adopted to accomplish the nationalization of her oil industry. Yet that she had the right to nationalize her oil industry no one can justifiably question; and that she had good cause to nationalize her oil industry likewise I think no one can justifiably question. From Mexico's standpoint she was forced to nationalize her oil industry because what the great oil companies and oil promoters of Great Britain and the United States did in Mexico was a national shame. They went into Mexico and they wasted great quantities of oil. They wasted great quantities of natural gas necessary to preserve for maximum production the oil reserves of Mexico. They took out of Mexico the lion's share of that oil for the selfish profits of British and American oil companies, leaving very little for the benefit of the Mexican people, who, in the last analysis, Mr. President, were the true owners of that great oil heritage which nature gave to Mexico. As a result of the nationalization of the oil industry of Mexico, a running feud, in my opinion, has been carried on by certain forces within the State Department against the organization charged under Mexican law with the administration of the oil industry in Mexico known as Pemex. Little cooperation has come out of the State Department with Mexico in respect to its oil industry, and yet Mexican leaders sit by and see the State Department demonstrate the most friendly of attitudes toward the representatives of the oil industry in other Latin countries, in which countries the great oil companies of the world still are taking advantage of an opportunity to exploit the oil resources of those countries; Mexican leaders see certain people in the State Department demonstrate great interest and concern over American oil policies in the Middle East, and now at the present time great interest and concern over the policies of Great Britain in Iran. I think it is a very short-sighted policy on the part of our Government, too, because in this little country of Mexico to the south of us are some of the richest oil reserves remaining in this continent. I suggest that what the State Department should be doing is building up a bridge of good will between the United States and Pemex, encouraging and aiding Pemex in developing the oil resources of Mexico. Such would be in keeping with a good-faith point 4 economic program.

Yes, Mr. President, I think the United States State Department should recognize that the oil industry of Mexico has been nationalized, and unquestionably

it is going to remain nationalized. Any continuance of a negative, antagonistic attitude on the part of the United States State Department toward Pemex is not going to change the nationalization policy of Mexico in respect to her oil. But I think there are just grounds for complaint on the part of the State Department toward certain policies which have been practiced in the past by Mexico prior to and during the process of nationalization of the oil industry. I think that if the State Department would take the steps necessary to remove the causes of the antagonisms which have developed over Mexican oil policies some of those differences could be settled, either on a diplomatic basis, or if necessary, by reference to the World Court for determination, as I suggest the Iranian dispute should be referred to the World Court for determination.

We are missing a great opportunity in the little Republic to the south of us by what I consider to be an antagonistic attitude on the part of the State Department toward the nationalization of the oil industry in Mexico. The State Department is opening itself to the suspicion that instead of representing the diplomatic interests of the United States, it is influenced greatly by the economic interests of certain powerful oil companies with tremendous international holdings.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. Not at this point

Mr. President, I think we are missing a great opportunity in the little Republic to the south of us because, so far as I can find out, there is general agreement among the leaders of our country that the head of Pemex, Senator Antonio Bermudez, is not only one of the outstanding statesmen of Mexico, but he is recognized as one of the outstanding statesmen of the world against whom not a serious question as to his honesty, integrity, and sound character can be raised. That is the type of leadership in a foreign country that the United States should be encouraging and supporting, rather than placing obstacles and handicaps in his path He is a statesman who, during World War II, as a great Mexican leader, demonstrated clearly his friendship for the United States. In fact, Mr. President, he is an international figure who, perhaps, is the best-informed man in the world on the intricate problems that develop in connection with the nationalization of a country's oil industry. I would say, Mr. President, that I doubt if we could turn to any man in the world today who could give sounder counsel to the leaders of the United States in respect to the Iranian oil problem than can the head of Pemex, Senator Bermudez.

I think the leaders of the United Nations, Mr. President, would do well if in their consultations on the Iranian oil problem, they brought in Bermudez as an expert witness to testify in the hearings and to speak his mind on the problems that confront the country in the nationalization of its oil industry, because I think he is the world's outstanding authority on nationalization policy in respect to oil.

Let me make clear, Mr. President, that I hold no brief for the nationalization of the oil industry of Mexico. I think it was a mistake to nationalize it. Let me make crystal clear that I would oppose, with all the vigor at my command, any attempt to attempt to nationalize the oil industry of my own country or any other industry of my country. But we have got to face some international facts, Mr. President, and I think one great fact we have to face is that a new strategy is developing among the backward areas of the world on the part of the young nations—young from the standpoint of adopting democratic processes—and that tactic, Mr. President, is, I think, to nationalize more and more as a technique in order to drive out of their countries the exploiting imperialistic policy of some of the nations of western civilization which have exploited their natural resources for so long.

If we are going to stop this nationalization policy in many of these areas—I think it has many dangers connected with it, because I have a feeling that it is a step on the road to a form of totalitarianism—then the United States, Great Britain, France, Holland, and the other great countries of the world that have extensive holdings in many foreign lands are going to have to change suddenly their policy of draining out of these backward countries such a large share of the products that they are taking out of the natural resources of those countries.

Iran is a perfect example. I think that one of the best ways, Mr. President, for us to stop the kind of capitalizing upon the Iranian situation which Stalin and his Communist crowd employ—so we are informed by information that gets to us through the press and from reports from our own Government officials—is for the free countries of the world to make clear that we are going to practice these great principles of the United Nations charter which include principles that recognize the economic right and opportunity of the peoples of foreign lands to enjoy for their own benefit and for the purpose of raising their own standard of living, their own natural resources. These principles include international protection of the right of foreign investors that helped to develop the natural resources of another country a fair return on their investment, but no more. That is a policy that will make clear that we are willing to help our weaker friends around the world in this fight for economic and political freedom upon which the rights of individuals are so dependent. Also, at the same time, it will make clear that we intend to stop the practice of economic exploitation which has characterized so much of the economic foreign policy of Great Britain and, to too great a degree, the economic foreign policy of the United States as well.

Thus, Mr. President, on this subject I make these remarks because I think Peter Edson has written a column today which deserves the careful attention of the Members of the Congress. We better be on guard against what I think is the danger that an exploiting British oil policy may draw us into a war in the Middle East. As for me, Mr. President, I do not think we should sacrifice the lives of American boys in order to guarantee Great Britain that she should be allowed to keep the disproportionate profit that she has been taking out of Iran oil, instead of adopting a policy of a fair return on the investment that British capitalists have made in Iran.

I desire now, Mr. President, to turn my attention to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon may proceed.

INDEPENDENT AIR CARRIERS

Mr MORSE. Mr President, I have before me an article by Thomas L. Stokes entitled "Death for the 'Nonskeds'." In introducing the article I want to say that one of the most useful and constructive Senate committees has been the Senate Select Committee on Small Business. This committee, under the able chairmanship of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], has worked harmoniously and made a major contribution to the small business community in our economy, resulting in a contribution to the defense effort.

Recently that committee filed a unanimous report dealing with the small independent air carriers, the so-called nonskeds, and this report sets forth a program which could give this new and vital segment of our air transportation industry a definite place in civil aviation.

The battle of the independents versus the large subsidized airlines is a graphic example of the small enterprises fighting for existence against the entrenched protection-minded corporations, with the referee in this case the Civil Aeronautics Board, taking a position which is noticeably favorable to the already established carriers.

The present phase of this struggle has been ably set forth in an account by Thomas L. Stokes, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers. Since this struggle involves not only small business, but the future of our civil aviation, with very important military overtones, I should like to have unanimous consent to place this article, and the remarks I have just made in respect to it, in the body of the RECORD, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr MONRONEY in the chair) Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., of October 1, 1951]

DEATH FOR THE "NONSKEDS"—CAB IS STRANGLING SMALL AND INDEPENDENT AIRLINES WHICH SUPPLEMENT, NOT COMPETE WITH, MAJOR FIRMS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

There's lot of lip service to free enterprise and the protection and promotion of small, independent business, but some agencies with authority to do something about it are certainly amiss.

For example, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Government agency created to regulate and supervise our newest transportation industry It might be expected to have a broad and fresh outlook with aviation and its

development in its keeping. Yet it is embarked now on a policy of strangling the so-called nonscheduled airlines most of them started by World War II veterans. This new, small business enterprise is meeting a public need for cheap and safe travel and freight service, and operates without any Government subsidy such as is paid the regular, scheduled airlines. Nor is it a real competitor for the big lines, but supplementary, providing service for those who can't patronize the latter.

The monopolistic attitude of CAB, which recently was attributed by the Senate Small Business Committee to subservience to the major scheduled lines, now is dramatized by its action in stopping operation of Air Transport Associates, Inc., a nonsked line operating from Seattle to Anchorage and Fairbanks. This line has been of great service, along with other nonskeds, to the people and business of Alaska and in helping to develop that outpost now so important to our national security.

Air Transport Associates was doing its job too well. It was put out of business by the CAB on the technicality of flying too often and violating regulations which drastically limit the number of trips. That limitation has driven other nonskeds out of business.

These trip regulations which restrict nonsked operations to three trips between any major traffic points in the United States and eight trips between any other points in any 4-week period, are part of what Senator SPARKMAN (Democrat, Alabama), chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, called "a campaign to force all of the so-called nonscheduled coach airlines—the independent segment of the carrier industry—out of business."

His committee, after an investigation, asked the CAB to work out a program to protect the nonskeds and embrace them in our air-transportation system, specifically, among other things, to rescind a regulation requiring each nonsked company to apply individually for new authority to operate—previously provided by certificates of necessity. Senator SPARKMAN called this regulation a "death sentence" and said what would happen is that the nonskeds would be killed off, one by one, as they applied for new authority.

As if in proof, the first thing that happened thereafter was that the CAB refused further authority to Modern Air Transport, Inc., headed by a war veteran, which operated three large passenger planes that had flown 20,000,000 passenger-miles in 1949-50 for a gross revenue of $750,000

Now comes elimination of the Alaska line.

How important it was to Alaska was demonstrated in telegrams and letters that swamped the CAB from citizens and businesses there when the CAB threatened a few months ago to restrict its operations Now it's been eliminated entirely

How important to Alaska are all the nonskeds operating in that Territory was dramatically exhibited by facts and figures presented by Gov. Ernest Gruening when he appeared a few months ago before the Small Business Committee to complain bitterly about the way the "absentee bureaucracy" of CAB is hampering nonsked operations there. It had begun, he said, "to clamp down on this initiative and enterprise and has in consequence greatly retarded the normal development of Alaska." The legislature memorialized the CAB in vain. With scores of illustrations of human interest he showed how the nonskeds performed figuratively, almost literally, a store-to-door freight service from the United States to Alaska, carrying great quantities not only of necessities such as fresh fruits and milk which must be brought in, but innumerable other things needed in a still pioneer community, from household essentials to spare parts for farm implements and once, even, a new switchboard for the Fairbanks telephone office when it was destroyed by fire.

Incidentally, on the same day when Air Transport Associates was put out of business, the CAB reopened the previous suspension of Modern Air Transport, Inc., which provoked Senator SPARKMAN'S outburst, and included it with 46 other nonskeds in a new order consolidating all pending applications into a single proceeding to decide whether and to what extent the nonskeds ultimately can continue to operate

Keep talking, Senator SPARKMAN.

AMENDMENT OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AND THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, earlier today I entered a motion to take up Senate bill 1347, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], believing we would be able to conclude consideration of the bill tonight, remained and missed a plane he was planning to take. However, now the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] tells me that he has a substitute for the pending bill, which he will offer, that he wants to debate it, and that he believes it will take a full day to consider it.

A conference report has now been made the unfinished business. It will be followed by a privileged conference report on the State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary 1952 appropriation bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator hope to take that up tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. Both are going to be taken up tomorrow. Therefore, in view of the opposition that has developed to Senate bill 1347, the railroad retirement bill, which I did not know about at the time I made the motion, it will serve no useful purpose to go ahead with the railroad retirement bill today. Since we will have two conference reports tomorrow and there may be other conference reports to be taken up on Monday, I now withdraw the motion for the consideration of Senate bill 1347.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall not oppose the Senator's action. I simply wish to say that the opposition is not to a bill, but the opposition is to the form in which Senate bill 1347 is at the present moment.

Mr. McFARLAND. I stated that the Senator from Ohio said that he had a substitute which he would want to debate for a least a day. That alone would make it impossible to dispose of the bill quickly. Not knowing when the bill can be taken up, I think it best to withdraw my motion for consideration until I know more about the disposition of the various conference reports. Therefore I withdraw my motion for consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has withdrawn his motion.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess untill 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, October 12, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 11 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

DIRECTOR FOR MUTUAL SECURITY

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Director for Mutual Security.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Laurence Sherman Kuter, 89A (major general, Regular Air Force), to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general with date of rank from April 11, 1951, under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1951

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the source of every blessing, Thou hast endowed men and nations with glorious capacities and insights to discover the wonders and mysteries of the universe with their unlimited possibilities for good but we penitently confess that mankind frequently uses them for cruel and unworthy ends.

Grant that by Thy spirit of mercy and compassion the mind and heart of man may be emancipated from all attitudes of hatred and bitterness, rancor, and revenge, and be tempered with some finer essence of brotherly kindness and forbearance and forgiveness.

Help us to believe in a social order in which men everywhere join hands in a great cooperative effort to establish peace and righteousness upon the earth. May we so reorder our own personal lives that we shall bear witness to our loyalty to the moral and spiritual standards.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations has presented to the House as a major part of the second supplemental appropriation bill,

1952, a military construction request for approximately $4,500,000,000, the largest request ever made for the construction of military bases, warehousing, housing, runways, research and development facilities, logistic facilities, and the numerous items required to provide for the support of our highly mechanized military forces, their support, and comfort.

Some may recall that within the past year large sums have been appropriated for military construction to initiate a program that is now well underway, more than 75 percent of the funds heretofore provided being under contract and the work is going forward each day. The funds being considered in the present bill is to continue the program and increase the tempo of the program in order to provide a base to support the military forces now in being and to provide a base for mobilization should a quick mobilization become a quick necessity.

The present program has been under development and planning for the past several months during which time the question of size, form, and location of the various projects required to meet minimum needs have had to be assessed and evaluated in relative priority in relationship to other urgently needed projects. In the evaluation the assigned mission of the military forces was the central or driving force having in mind the scheduled unit activations, personnel build-up, technical-training programs, and deliveries of materials procured from prior appropriations and to be acquired from appropriations to be provided in the 1952 fiscal year appropriation acts. The military construction most certainly should be keyed to the orderly expansion of the military forces as the military programs cannot proceed without a construction program to support it.

The development of a program of the size here presented and under consideration appears to be almost impossible task but when it is understood that it has resulted from a statement of requirements from many field commanders who are familiar with their particular needs, and that those requirements have been evaluated by higher echelons who know the programs and strengths anticipated to support the programs, the pieces begin to fall into place, and taken piece by piece it is possible to understand the requirements.

It is a policy of our Nation that we give to our military forces the most effective support that it is possible to give. This not only includes the essential support when our forces are in front lines and in the thick of battle but includes support of the activities all the way along the line from the indoctrination center, the training camps, the transportation from place to place, the housing, that the individual requires and his comfort at all times. On the other hand the same thought must be given to the effectiveness of our military personnel through giving them the latest and most modern equipment whether it is an atomic weapon, radar communication, or a helicopter. These technical equipments are not effective unless properly stationed and supported with the many things provided with funds as contained in the present bill.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], chairman of the subcommittee that considered the request for these funds, has indicated the arduous task that the committee has had in considering the request for more than 440 projects and it is understandable for each of the projects is a complete entity in itself. The program is so arranged and so funded that each request represents a usable segment of over-all program and the committee is to be congratulated that it did not see fit to so cut funds that a complete and usable segment could not be constructed. In other words, the committee is not permitting partial construction of a base so that it may not be used until additional funds and construction to follow are required before the base or that part of the base can be used. In many instances the complete base or facility will not be complete but the items to be constructed with the funds provided will be usable parts of the base or facility and will fit into the program that has been adopted and is being augmented in many ways.

The funds provided in the bill are divided between the three military departments, the Army receiving $1,159,326,198; the Navy $927,024,460; and the Air Force $2,112,172,550, and are intended to provide only the most essential construction. In order to determine the most essential construction items certain assumptions were adopted by the services. These assumptions were:

First. That new construction would be limited, where possible, to operational items needed to permit approved forces to be maintained in an effective operational condition.

Second. That existing and available facilities would be utilized to the maximum extent possible, and that replacements should not be considered if the facility could be utilized one or more additional years; that no facilities in standby condition would be reactivated if it were more economical to utilize presently active defense installations.

Third. That expansion beyond the immediate requirements for ammunition, shipping facilities, staging areas, expansion of general storage facilities, and improvements of utilities would be deferred for consideration in future requests insofar as such a course could be safely followed.

Fourth. That with reference to housing, particularly within the continental United States, maximum utilization would be made of title VIII of the Federal Housing Act which permits construction by private capital of living quarters for Department of Defense personnel and their dependents.

Fifth. That maximum use would be made of existing medical facilities regardless of the service currently having jurisdiction over such facilities, and that new construction would be limited to additional requirements or replacement of medical facilities that are in such condition that they could not be used for at least one additional year.

Sixth. That recreational and welfare facilities should be limited to those which are necessary to supplement facilities available in nearby communities and demonstrably necessary for the proper care of the effective combatant forces.

Seventh. That public-works construction be time-phased with the expansion of the forces and the delivery and contemplated use of new equipment.

Eighth. That authority be provided for the early detailed planning of complete facilities, in order to prevent hasty and uneconomical construction practices of projects contemplated to be undertaken.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should have our qualified support.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves that the bill (H R 5650) be recommitted to the House Committee on Appropriations with instructions that funds for the construction of facilities at Grandview Air Terminal, Mo., be stricken out.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 25, noes 8.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 127, nays 183, answered "present" 2, not voting 116, as follows:

[Roll No. 197]

YEAS—127

Adair	Bush	Halleck
Allen, Ill	Case	Hand
Andersen, H Carl	Chenoweth	Harden
Angell	Chiperfield	Harrison, Wyo.
Arends	Church	Harvey
Armstrong	Clevenger	Herter
Auchincloss	Cole, Kans	Heselton
Bates, Mass.	Corbett	Hill
Beall	Coudert	Hillings
Beamer	Crumpacker	Hoeven
Bender	Cunningham	Hoffman, Mich.
Bennett, Mich.	Curtis, Mo	Holmes
Berry	Curtis, Nebr.	Horan
Betts	Denny	Hull
Bishop	Devereux	James
Boggs, Del.	Dolliver	Jenison
Bolton	Dondero	Jenkins
Bow	Ellsworth	Jensen
Bray	Fulton	Jonas
Brehm	Golden	Judd
Brownson	Graham	Kean
Budge	Gross	Kearns
Buffett	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Keating
		McCompte

Lovre	Radwan	Smith, Wis.
McConnell	Reece, Tenn.	Springer
McGregor	Reed, N. Y.	Taber
McVey	Rees, Kans.	Talle
Mack, Wash.	Riehlman	Thompson,
Martin, Iowa	Rogers, Mass.	Mich.
Martin, Mass.	Sadlak	Vail
Mason	St. George	Van Pelt
Meader	Saylor	Van Zandt
Miller, Md.	Schwabe	Vursell
Miller, Nebr.	Scott, Hardie	Weichel
Miller, N. Y.	Scott,	Wharton
Morano	Hugh D., Jr.	Widnall
Mumma	Scrivner	Wigglesworth
Nelson	Seely-Brown	Williams, N. Y.
Nicholson	Shafer	Wilson, Ind.
O'Hara	Simpson, Ill.	Withrow
Ostertag	Simpson, Pa.	Wolcott
Poulson	Sittler	Woodruff
Prouty	Smith, Kans.	

NAYS—183

Abbitt	Garmatz	Moulder
Abernethy	Gary	Murdock
Addonizio	George	Murray, Tenn.
Albert	Gordon	Norblad
Allen, Calif.	Granahan	Norrell
Anderson, Calif	Granger	O'Brien, Ill.
Andrews	Grant	O'Brien, Mich.
Aspinall	Green	O'Neill
Ayres	Greenwood	O'Toole
Bailey	Hagen	Passman
Barden	Hale	Patman
Barrett	Hardy	Patten
Battle	Harris	Philbin
Beckworth	Hart	Pickett
Bennett, Fla.	Havenner	Polk
Bentsen	Hays, Ark.	Preston
Bolling	Hays, Ohio	Price
Bonner	Hedrick	Priest
Bosone	Herlong	Rabaut
Boykin	Hope	Rains
Brown, Ga.	Hunter	Rankin
Bryson	Ikard	Reams
Buchanan	Irving	Rhodes
Buckley	Jackson, Wash.	Richards
Burdick	Jarman	Riley
Burnside	Javits	Rivers
Burton	Jones, Ala.	Robeson
Camp	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Colo.
Canfield	Jones,	Rogers, Fla.
Cannon	Hamilton C.	Rogers, Tex.
Carlyle	Jones,	Rooney
Carnahan	Woodrow W.	Sabath
Chatham	Karsten, Mo.	Sasscer
Chelf	Kee	Scudder
Chudoff	Kelley, Pa.	Secrest
Clemente	Kerr	Sieminski
Colmer	Kilday	Smith, Miss.
Cooley	King	Smith, Va.
Cooper	Kirwan	Spence
Cotton	Kluczynski	Stanley
Cox	Lane	Steed
Crosser	Lanham	Stigler
Davis, Ga	Lantaff	Sutton
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Tackett
Davis, Wis	Lind	Teague
DeGraffenried	Lyle	Thomas
Dollinger	McCarthy	Tollefson
Donohue	McCormack	Trimble
Doughton	McGuire	Walter
Doyle	McKinnon	Watts
Durham	McMillan	Welch
Engle	McMullen	Wheeler
Evins	Machrowicz	Whitaker
Fallon	Madden	Whitten
Feighan	Mahon	Williams, Miss.
Fernandez	Mansfield	Willis
Fisher	Marshall	Wilson, Tex
Flood	Merrow	Winstead
Forand	Mills	Wood, Ga.
Forrester	Mitchell	Yorty
Fugate	Morgan	Zablocki
Furcolo	Morris	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Bakewell Short

NOT VOTING—116

Aandahl	Burleson	D'Ewart
Allen, La.	Busbey	Dingell
Andresen,	Butler	Donovan
August H.	Byrne, N. Y.	Dorn
Anfuso	Byrnes, Wis.	Eaton
Baker	Celler	Eberharter
Baring	Cole, N. Y.	Elliott
Bates, Ky.	Combs	Elston
Belcher	Crawford	Fenton
Blackney	Dague	Fine
Blatnik	Dawson	Fogarty
Boggs, La.	Deane	Ford
Bramblett	Delaney	Frazier
Brooks	Dempsey	Gamble
Brown, Ohio	Denton	Gathings
Gavin	Larcade	Regan
Goodwin	Latham	Ribicoff
Gore	Lucas	Roberts
Gregory	McCulloch	Rodino
Gwinn	McDonough	Roosevelt
Hall,	McGrath	Sheehan
Leonard W.	Mack, Ill.	Shelley
Harrison, Va.	Magee	Sheppard
Hébert	Miller, Calif.	Sikes
Heffernan	Morrison	Staggers
Heller	Morton	Stockman
Hess	Multer	Taylor
Hinshaw	Murphy	Thompson, Tex.
Hoffman, Ill.	Murray, Wis.	Thornberry
Holifield	O'Konski	Velde
Howell	Patterson	Vinson
Jackson, Calif.	Perkins	Vorys
Johnson	Phillips	Werdel
Kearney	Poage	Wickersham
Kelly, N. Y.	Potter	Wier
Kennedy	Powell	Wolverton
Keogh	Quinn	Wood, Idaho
Kersten, Wis.	Ramsay	Yates
Kilburn	Redden	
Klein	Reed, Ill.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr Taylor for, with Mr. Quinn against.

Mr. Butler for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Sheehan for, with Mr Mack of Illinois against.

Mr. McCulloch for, with Mr. Dempsey against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Denton against.

Mr. Werdel for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr Reed of Illinois for, with Mr. Byrne of New York against.

Mr Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Roosevelt against

Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Bates of Kentucky against.

Mr. Busbey for, with Mr Regan against.

Mr Wood of Idaho for, with Mr. Perkins against

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Gregory against.

Mr Blackney for, with Mr. Cole of New York against.

Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Fenton for, with Mr. Rodino against.

Mr. Dague for, with Mr. Flood against.

Mr. Patterson for, with Mr Klein against.

Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Multer against.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Heller against.

Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mrs Kelly of New York against

Mr. Velde for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr Morton for, with Mr. Murphy against.

Mr. McDonough for, with Mr. Delaney against.

Mr. Phillips for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Anfuso against.

Mr. Goodwin for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Vorys for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Fine against.

Mr. Murray of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Brooks against.

Mr. Potter for, with Mr. Donovan against.

Mr. Baker for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Crawford for, with Mr. Yates against.

Mr. Belcher for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Deane against.

Mr. Bramblett for, with Mr. McGrath against.

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Howell with Mr. Elston.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Ribicoff with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

Mr. Redden with Mr. Aandahl.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Wolverton.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr O'Konski.

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Hess.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Ford.

Mr. Magee with Mr. D'Ewart.

Mr. BONNER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BAKEWELL changed his vote from "nay" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 301, nays 19, answered "present" 1, not voting 107, as follows:

[Roll No. 198]

YEAS—301

Abbitt	Cunningham	Jarman
Abernethy	Curtis, Nebr.	Javits
Adair	Davis, Tenn.	Jenkins
Addonizio	Davis, Wis.	Jones, Ala.
Albert	Dawson	Jones, Mo.
Allen, Calif.	DeGraffenried	Jones,
Allen, Ill	Denny	Hamilton C.
Andersen,	Devereux	Jones,
H Carl	Dingell	Woodrow W.
Anderson, Calif	Dollinger	Judd
Andrews	Dolliver	Karsten, Mo.
Angell	Dondero	Kean
Arends	Donohue	Kearns
Armstrong	Doughton	Keating
Aspinall	Doyle	Kee
Auchincloss	Durham	Kelley, Pa.
Ayres	Eaton	Kerr
Bailey	Elliott	Kersten, Wis.
Bakewell	Ellsworth	Kilday
Barden	Engle	King
Barrett	Evins	Kirwan
Bates, Mass.	Fallon	Kluczynski
Battle	Feighan	Lane
Beall	Fernandez	Lanham
Beamer	Fisher	Lantaff
Beckworth	Flood	LeCompte
Bender	Forand	Lesinski
Bennett, Fla.	Forrester	Lind
Bennett, Mich.	Fugate	Lovre
Bentsen	Fulton	Lyle
Berry	Furcolo	McCarthy
Betts	Garmatz	McConnell
Bishop	Gary	McCormack
Boggs, Del.	George	McGregor
Bolling	Golden	McGuire
Bolton	Gordon	McKinnon
Bonner	Graham	McMillan
Bosone	Granahan	McMullen
Bow	Granger	Machrowicz
Boykin	Grant	Mack, Wash.
Brehm	Green	Madden
Brown, Ga.	Greenwood	Mahon
Brownson	Hagen	Mansfield
Bryson	Hale	Marshall
Buchanan	Hall,	Martin, Iowa
Buckley	Edwin Arthur	Martin, Mass.
Budge	Halleck	Meader
Burdick	Hand	Merrow
Burnside	Harden	Miller, Md.
Burton	Hardy	Miller, Nebr.
Camp	Harris	Miller, N. Y.
Canfield	Harrison, Va.	Mills
Cannon	Harrison, Wyo.	Mitchell
Carlyle	Hart	Morano
Carnahan	Harvey	Morgan
Case	Havenner	Morris
Chatham	Hays, Ark.	Moulder
Chelf	Hays, Ohio	Murdock
Chenoweth	Hedrick	Murray, Tenn.
Chiperfield	Herlong	Nelson
Chudoff	Herter	Nicholson
Church	Heselton	Norblad
Clemente	Hill	Norrell
Clevenger	Hillings	O'Brien, Ill.
Cole, Kans.	Hinshaw	O'Brien, Mich.
Colmer	Hoeven	O'Hara
Cooley	Holmes	O'Neill
Cooper	Hope	Ostertag
Corbett	Horan	O'Toole
Cotton	Hunter	Passman
Coudert	Ikard	Patman
Cox	Irving	Patten
Crosser	Jackson, Wash.	Patterson
Crumpacker	James	Philbin

Pickett	Sasscer	Thompson,
Polk	Saylor	Mich.
Poulson	Scott, Hardie	Tollefson
Preston	Scott,	Trimble
Price	Hugh D., Jr.	Van Zandt
Priest	Scrivner	Vursell
Prouty	Scudder	Walter
Rabaut	Secrest	Watts
Radwan	Seely-Brown	Weichel
Rains	Shafer	Welch
Rankin	Sheppard	Wheeler
Reams	Short	Whitaker
Reece, Tenn.	Sieminski	Whitten
Rees, Kans.	Simpson, Ill.	Widnall
Rhodes	Simpson, Pa.	Wier
Richards	Sittler	Wigglesworth
Riehlman	Smith, Miss.	Williams, Miss.
Riley	Smith, Va.	Williams, N. Y.
Rivers	Spence	Willis
Roberts	Springer	Wilson, Tex.
Robeson	Stanley	Winstead
Rogers, Colo.	Steed	Withrow
Rogers, Fla.	Stigler	Wolcott
Rogers, Mass.	Sutton	Wood, Ga
Rogers, Tex.	Taber	Woodruff
Rooney	Tackett	Yorty
Sabath	Talle	Zablocki
Sadlak	Teague	
St. George	Thomas	

NAYS—19

Buffett	Jensen	Smith, Kans.
Bush	Jonas	Vail
Curtis, Mo.	McVey	Van Pelt
Gross	Mason	Wharton
Hoffman, Mich	Mumma	Wilson, Ind
Hull	Reed, N. Y.	
Jenison	Schwabe	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Smith, Wis.

NOT VOTING—107

Aandahl	Fine	Morrison
Allen, La.	Fogarty	Morton
Andresen,	Ford	Multer
August H.	Frazier	Murphy
Anfuso	Gamble	Murray, Wis
Baker	Gathings	O'Konski
Baring	Gavin	Perkins
Bates, Ky.	Goodwin	Phillips
Belcher	Gore	Poage
Blackney	Gregory	Potter
Blatnik	Gwinn	Powell
Boggs, La.	Hall,	Quinn
Bramblett	Leonard W.	Ramsay
Bray	Hébert	Redden
Brooks	Heffernan	Reed, Ill
Brown, Ohio	Heller	Regan
Burleson	Hess	Ribicoff
Busbey	Hoffman, Ill.	Rodino
Butler	Holifield	Roosevelt
Byrne, N. Y.	Howell	Sheehan
Byrnes, Wis.	Jackson, Calif.	Shelley
Celler	Johnson	Sikes
Cole, N. Y.	Kearney	Staggers
Combs	Kelly, N. Y.	Stockman
Crawford	Kennedy	Taylor
Dague	Keogh	Thompson, Tex.
Davis, Ga	Kilburn	Thornberry
Deane	Klein	Velde
Delaney	Larcade	Vinson
Dempsey	Latham	Vorys
Denton	Lucas	Werdel
D'Ewart	McCulloch	Wickersham
Donovan	McDonough	Wolverton
Dorn	McGrath	Wood, Idaho
Eberharter	Mack, Ill.	Yates
Elston	Magee	
Fenton	Miller, Calif	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Magee with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Deane with Mr Kilburn.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr Cole of New York.
Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Kearney
Mr Eberharter with Mr Latham.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Velde.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Wolverton.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Wood of Idaho.
Mr Sikes with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Fenton
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Phillips
Mr. Redden with Mr Crawford.
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Butler.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Busbey.
Mr. Ribicoff with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Elston.
Mr Howell with Mr Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Larcade with Mr Bramblett
Mr Denton with Mr August H Andresen.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. D'Ewart.

Mr. VURSELL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. BYRNES. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a special order was granted whereby the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] would be recognized for 1 hour today in connection with remarks relating to General Pulaski. The gentleman from Michigan is, of course, very busily engaged in the conference on the tax bill. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON] be substituted for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] in control of the time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, THOMAS, WHITTEN, TABER, and DAVIS of Wisconsin.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. ROONEY (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No 1123)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H R. 4740) "making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 3, 10, 12, 13, 19, 22, 23, 26, 30, 38, 50, 52, 64, 80, 90, 93, 98 and 106.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 67, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102 and 103, and agree to the same

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows. In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "not to exceed $200,000 for the settlement of claims as authorized by Public Law 455, approved March 10, 1950,", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$74,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$34,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$6,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,285,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,245,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$10,415,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$3,060,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$74,970,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$22,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "purchase (not to exceed one for replacement only) and"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 66 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,625,000", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 68 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$8,399,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$9,343,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$3,183,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$25,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows.

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 603 No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant after August 1, 1951, through the fiscal year 1952: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the department,

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate,

"(d) to the Department of Justice, except general administration personnel;

"(e) to the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

"(f) to the Judiciary Branch;

"(g) to the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

"(h) to the operational personnel of the Weather Bureau, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Bureau of Public Roads,

"(i) to the Patent Office;

"(j) to the Civil Aeronautics Board;

"(k) to employees under the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 as amended;

"(l) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2: *Provided further*, That when the total number of personnel in a department subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the budget estimates for 1952, this section may cease to apply."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC 605. Except for the automobiles officially assigned to the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, automobiles assigned for operation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and one-half of the chauffeur-driven automobiles in operation in the Departments on July 1, 1951, no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government in the District of Columbia whose primary duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 79, 103, 104½, and 107

JOHN J. ROONEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
PRINCE H. PRESTON,
FRED MARSHALL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CLIFF CLEVENGER (except 106),
JOHN TABER (except 106),
BEN F. JENSEN (except 106),
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ALLEN J ELLENDER,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
STYLES BRIDGES (I do not sign this conference report as to amendment No 106; reserving the right to move in Senate to have a new conference),
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL (I do not sign this conference report as to amendment No. 106; reserving the right to move in Senate to have a new conference),
HOMER FERGUSON (I do not sign this conference report as to amendment No. 106, reserving the right to move in Senate to have a new conference),
Managers on the Part of the Senate

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Amendment No 1—Salaries and expenses: Provides that funds for operation of the International Claims Commission shall be available from this appropriation as proposed by the Senate and places a limitation thereon of $200,000. The accounts of the Department are to be so kept as to specifically record the exact expenses of the International Claims Commission inasmuch as the total cost for the Commission is to be restricted to the overall 3% of claims adjusted.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3—Salaries and expenses: Strike out language proposed by the Senate authorizing not to exceed $200,000 for maintenance and operation of commissary and mess services.

Amendment No. 4—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $74,200,000, instead of $73,000,000 as proposed by the House and $74,487,777 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed $56,079,253 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not less than $7,500,000 of this appropriation shall be used to purchase for-

eign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the House. The amount of $7,500,000 is to apply to the last nine months of fiscal year 1952.

Amendment No. 7—Acquisition of buildings abroad: Appropriates $7,500,000, instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House and $7,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8—Acquisition of buildings abroad: Provides that not to exceed $94,500 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9—Contributions to international organizations: Appropriates $30,297,861 as proposed by the Senate instead of $27,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10—Contributions to international organizations: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate appropriating such additional sums due to increase in rates of exchange as the Secretary of State may determine to be necessary to pay, in foreign currencies, the quotas and contribution required by the several treaties, conventions, or laws established by the amount of the obligation.

Amendment No. 11—Missions to international organizations: Provides that not to exceed $1,179,540 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12—Missions to international organizations: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate providing that employment under this appropriation in connection with the Organization of American States may be without regard to the civil service laws.

Amendment No. 13—International contingencies: Strikes out the language proposed by the Senate providing medical and hospital expenses of members of United States delegations while in a travel status outside the United States.

Amendment No. 14—International contingencies: Appropriates $2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15—International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico: Provides for expenditures for the purposes set forth in sections 101 through 104 of Public Law 786, approved September 13, 1950, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16—International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed $737,550 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17—International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, construction: Appropriates $12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $14,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18—International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, construction: Provides that not to exceed $1,188,939 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19—American sections, international commissions: Appropriates $702,000 as proposed by the House instead of $687,200 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that not more than $60,000 of this amount shall be available for the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.

Amendment No. 20—American sections, international commissions: Provides that not to exceed $268,888 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21—International Claims Commission: Strikes out separate appropriation for this Commission, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22—International information and educational activities: Strikes out the language of the Senate authorizing the purchase of nine passenger motor vehicles.

Amendment No. 23—International information and educational activities: Strikes out the language proposed by the Senate providing for expenses of hospitalization and medical care of grantees who become incapacitated while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation.

Amendment No. 24—International information and educational activities: Provides that not to exceed $34,000,000 shall be available for personal services instead of $33,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25—International information and educational activities: Provides that $6,500,000 shall be available for exchange of persons instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26—International information and educational activities: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate providing that no part of this appropriation shall be expended for subscriptions to or distribution of any privately edited or published magazines, journals or newspapers unless copies thereof are regularly filed with the Secretary of the Senate and with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

It is the intention of the conferees that no part of the funds appropriated herein are to be used for the purchase of radio sets for free distribution.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration

Amendment No 27—Salaries and expenses, general administration: Appropriates $2,285,000, instead of $2,250,000 as proposed by the House and $2,320,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 28—Salaries and expenses, general administration: Provides that not to exceed $2,245,000 shall be available for personal services instead of $2,145,690 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29—Salaries and expenses, general legal activities: Provides that not to exceed $7,774,150 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30—Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division: Appropriates $3,200,000 as proposed by the House instead of $3,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 31—Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division: Provides that not to exceed $3,035,932 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32—Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals: Provides that not to exceed $10,415,000 shall be available for personal services instead of $10,316,390 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33—Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals: Provides that not to exceed $219,800 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Bureau of Investigation

Amendment No. 34—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed $78,473,211 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Amendment No. 35—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed $30,159,900 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Federal prison system

Amendment No. 36—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons: Provides that not to exceed $15,387,450 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37—Support of United States prisoners: Provides that not to exceed $217,200 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Alien Property

Amendment No. 38—Salaries and expenses: Makes available for general administrative expense $3,600,000 as proposed by the House instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed $3,060,000 shall be available for personal services instead of $2,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 40—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,484,530 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the House. Of the amount appropriated, not to exceed $120,000 shall be available for Under Secretary of Transportation and Office of Transportation.

Amendment No. 41—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed $1,363,230 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No. 42—Technical and scientific services: Provides that not to exceed $224,280 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of the Census

Amendment No. 43—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed $5,623,973 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44—Seventeenth decennial census: Provides that not to exceed $5,646,654 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No. 45—Censuses of business, transportation, manufactures, and mineral industries: Provides that not to exceed $147,812 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Civil Aeronautics Administration

Amendment No 46—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed $74,970,000 shall be available for personal services instead of $75,971,477 as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No. 47—Establishment of airnavigation facilities: Appropriates $22,500,000, instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the House and $25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No. 48—Establishment of airnavigation facilities: Provides that not to exceed $4,965,300 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 49—Technical development and evaluation: Provides that not to exceed $916,063 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50—Maintenance and operation, Washington National Airport: Appropriates $1,300,000 as proposed by the House instead of $1,257,984 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51—Maintenance and operation, Washington National Airport: Provides that not to exceed $875,000 shall be available for personal services instead of $828,145 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52—Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act. Makes funds available until 1954 as proposed by the House instead of 1958 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53—Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: Appropriates $28,700,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $35,840,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 54—Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: Provides that $15,000,000 shall be for projects in the States as proposed by the Senate instead of $17,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 55—Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: Provides that $10,000,000 shall be for liquidation of prior contract authority as proposed by the Senate

instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 56 and 57—Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: Provide that $2,700,000 shall be for necessary planning, research, and administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,840,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No 58—Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: Provides that $450,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries and Expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration" as proposed by the Senate instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House

Amendment No. 59—Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act. Provides that not to exceed $1,937,447 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No. 60—Maintenance and operation of public airports, Territory of Alaska: Appropriates $325,000, instead of $2.5,000 as proposed by the House and $350,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 61—Maintenance and operation of public airports, Territory of Alaska: Provides that not to exceed $315,753 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 62—Air navigation development. Appropriates $1,874,562 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,883,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No 63—Air navigation development: Provides that not to exceed $75,937 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 64—Transport aircraft development Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $597,500 for carrying out the provisions of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 867)

Civil Aeronautics Board

Amendment No. 65- Salaries and expenses: Authorizes the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle instead of four as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 66—Salaries and expenses Appropriates $3,625,000, instead of $3,550,000 as proposed by the House and $3,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 67—Salaries and expenses. Provides that not to exceed $3,354,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Coast and Geodetic Survey

Amendment No. 68—Salaries and expenses Appropriates $12,200,000, instead of $12,375,000 as proposed by the House and $11,877,688 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 69—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed $8,399,000 shall be available for personal services instead of $8,075,810 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce

Amendment No 70—Departmental salaries and expenses Provides that not to exceed $2,641,869 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 71—Field office service: Appropriates $1,953,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No 72—Field office service: Provides that not to exceed $1,593,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 73—Export control: Appropriates $5,388,180 as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 74—Export control: Provides that not to exceed $4,606,380 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 75—Fxport control: Provides that not to exceed $99,000 of the amount which may be transferred to "Salaries and Expenses" under the Office of the Secretary may be used for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Patent Office

Amendment No. 76—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed $8,834,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Public Roads

Amendment No 77—Federal-aid highways: Provides that not to exceed $9,343,500 shall be available for personal services instead of $8,563,500 as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No. 78—Forest highways: Provides that not to exceed $3,183,500 shall be available for personal services instead of $2,914,200 as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No 79—Public lands highways Reported in disagreement

Amendment No. 80—Tongass Forest highways, Alaska Appropriates $3,500,000 as proposed by the House instead of $3,480,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 81—Tongass Forest highways, Alaska. Provides that not to exceed $200,000 shall be available for personal services instead of $180,000 as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No 82—Inter-American highway Appropriates $3,000,000, instead of $4,000 000 as proposed by the House and $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No 83—Inter-American highway Provides that not to exceed $315,900 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No 84—Access roads (act of September 7, 1950). Appropriates $1,500,000, instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Bureau of Standards

Amendment No 85—Operation and administration Provides that not to exceed $490,203 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No 86—Research and testing: Appropriates $3,807,419 as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No 87—Research and testing: Provides that not to exceed $3,083,228 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 88—Radio propagation and standards Appropriates $2,735,220 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,800,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No 89—Radio propagation and standards: Provides that not to exceed $1,483,020 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No. 90—Working capital fund: Appropriates $2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Weather Bureau

Amendment No 91—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $25,500,000, instead of $26,000,000 as proposed by the House and $25,069,477 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 92—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed $19,500,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

General provisions—Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 93: Strike out the language proposed by the Senate making available not to exceed $5,000 for entertainment of prominent persons, representatives, and dignitaries of foreign governments.

THE JUDICIARY

Supreme Court of the United States

Amendment No. 94—Care of the building and grounds: Provides that not to exceed $147,500 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Court of Customs and Patent Appeals

Amendment No. 95—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed $176,715 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Customs Court

Amendment No. 96—Salaries and expenses Provides that not to exceed $401,165 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Court of Claims

Amendment No. 97—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed $495,580 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Other courts and services

Amendment No 98—Miscellaneous expenses: Appropriates $750,000 as proposed by the House instead of $768,750 as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No. 99—Administrative office of the United States courts. Provides that not to exceed $488,500 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 100—Expenses of referees. Provides that not to exceed $800,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate

Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated

Amendment No. 101: Provides that not to exceed $263,274 shall be available for personal services for administrative expenses, as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No. 102 Provides that not to exceed $344,796 shall be available for personal services for expenses of vocational training of prisoners, as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 103—Section 602: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No 104—Section 603. Restores the provision of the House, with certain amendments, limiting the filling of vacancies

Amendment No. 104½—Employees engaged in personnel work: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 105—Limitation on employment of chauffeurs: Inserts the language proposed by the Senate limiting the number of chauffeurs in the District of Columbia as amended to except one half of the number on the rolls as of July 1, 1951.

Amendment No. 106: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate relating to persons engaged in information activities.

Amendment No. 107—Section 606: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 108: Corrects section number.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
PRINCE H PRESTON,
FRED MARSHALL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CLIFF CLEVENGER (except 106),
JOHN TABER (except to amend 106),
BEN F. JENSEN (except to amend 106),
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the pending conference report——

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield me some time so that I may have an opportunity to discuss the conference report.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall gladly yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in this conference report, the House conferees have seen fit to fail to agree with the

Senate on the inclusion of an item of nearly $600,000 for the testing of jet-type aircraft. That item was deleted from the House bill by this subcommittee before the bill came to the House in the first instance. I think the subcommittee on further consideration will want to put this item in on a later date, if for no other reason than that it means another year's delay to our own industry in catching up with the British in the development of jet-type aircraft for transport purposes. The British are now so far ahead of us by virtue of the fact that no one seems to be able, or willing, to test these vehicles sufficiently far to obtain certification by the Civil Aeronautics Board so that none of them are being flown in the United States. In the meantime, the British are going ahead very rapidly to develop this type of aircraft, and capture the markets of the world from the manufacturers of the United States. I hope the gentleman will see fit through his subcommittee to agree to that expenditure in due course. It has been recommended by every agency of the Government, and practically all of the private agencies.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true a recently captured Russian aircraft was found to have better jet engines and better heat-resistant material in it than our engineers thus far have been able to develop?

Mr. HINSHAW. That may be, but that is really not a part of this business. It is a very important item, but nevertheless it does not come into this business I am discussing.

Mr. JUDD. Yes; but adequate testing woud help us to develop needed improvements.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman from New York will yield me a minute extra, if necessary, I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. ROONEY. How can I refuse my good friend? I shall gladly do so.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does not the gentleman from New York think it is important for American industry to at least maintain a parity with the British in the development of this type of aircraft?

Mr. ROONEY. I certainly do, and I would like to see the American aircraft industry and commercial airlines spend some money of their own in research development and testing. The proposition submitted to this committee with regard to turbo-jet testing was, in the opinion of this committee, and I believe I can speak the thoughts of all of us, both the minority and the majority, utterly ridiculous. The department proposed to use an Army jet bomber, a B–45, for the purpose of testing whether or not such jet aircraft would be suitable for private transport. We have been informed by people in the industry in whose judgment we have great confidence that such would be nothing more than a boondoggling job. Further, the military already have a fabulous sum for testing jets.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to say that jet type aircraft in transport service are not now acceptable for flying in patterns around civil airports because of the exceedingly high speed which it is necessary for them to maintain. They would constitute serious hazards to the slower types of transport now in use. It is necessary to develop new procedures in air traffic control to accommodate jets in traffic patterns around congested airports, such as LaGuardia in New York. It may be necessary to develop new aids to traffic controllers and perhaps new aids to navigation. The $600,000 requested is for conducting flights of jet aircraft in simulated transport service. For that purpose the Air Force will make available two B–47's. For that purpose B–47's are just as useful as the jet transport—of which we as yet have none. This testing is only indirectly, although importantly, related to the manufacture of jet transports and certainly no airline can afford to buy airplanes that may not be certificated for use within a short period of time. Testing of jets in simulated transport service is the first step to take, but this subcommittee fails to see the critical importance of this $600,000 item.

I think it is very important, and I want to appear before the gentleman's committee the next time they hold a hearing on this matter.

Mr. ROONEY. We shall be glad to hear the gentleman and shall highly respect his observations.

Mr. HINSHAW. The Civil Aeronautics Administration cannot certificate such a vehicle, be it a bomber or otherwise, until they find out what the characteristics of it are in flight in and about the major airports in the United States. Somebody will be killed if they do not find out in advance how these planes will act. No manufacturer can afford to put up the necessary $25,000,000 in order to develop such an aircraft until something is known about its flight characteristics in and about airports. I thank the gentleman for the privilege of attending his committee when it meets on this subject, and I hope he will give me a little advance notice so that I may be prepared.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. We have provided upward of $600,000,000 in the armed services bill for the testing of jet engines, including those that may be used in transport operations for the military. It seems to me that would cover the matter.

Mr. HINSHAW. In fact it does not, although I appreciate the gentleman's point of view in the matter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the next gentleman, may I say that insofar as this conference report is concerned the budget estimates for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and for the Federal Judiciary were in the amount of $1,258,296,141. When the bill passed the House the amount appropriated therein was $1,045,940,115. The bill as passed by the Senate contained appropriations in the amount of $1,045,452,863. We today bring you a conference report which provides appropriations which are about two and one-half million dollars less than either the House bill or the Senate bill, and which are $215,428,254 lower than the amount of the budget estimates for the three Departments and the Judiciary.

The following is a breakdown of the figures to which I have just referred:

Budget estimates	
State	$283,686,476
Justice	184,356,000
Commerce	763,763,925
Judiciary	26,489,740
Total	1,258,296,141
Passed House	
State	$226,357,000
Justice	181,567,000
Commerce	612,098,000
Judiciary	25,918,115
Total	1,045,940,115
Passed Senate	
State	$227,877,838
Justice	182,137,600
Commerce	609,500,560
Judiciary	25,936,865
Total	1,045,452,863
Conference	
State	$228,104,861
Justice	181,602,000
Commerce	607,242,911
Judiciary	25,918,115
Total	1,042,867,887

Mr. Speaker, I must call attention to a very important amendment referred to in the conference report as Senate amendment numbered 106. Inserted by the Senate, it would have provided for the reduction of the information activities of the Department of State to the extent of 25 percent. The majority of the House and Senate conferees voted that the Senate recede from its amendment which would also have affected the Departments of Justice and Commerce. The importance of the elimination of this Senate amendment is referred to in the following letter of the President of the United States dated September 24, 1951:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 24, 1951.

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROONEY: I am writing to you and Senator MCCARRAN to call your attention to a matter which, in my opinion, is of great importance in this time of national crisis.

I should like to urge strongly that the Senate amendment to the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriations bill (H. R. 4740), which would reduce the information activities of these three agencies by 25 percent, be eliminated or revised. The effect of this amendment would be particularly harmful in the case of the Department of State.

It would seriously cripple the activities of the Office of Public Affairs of that Department. It is the function of this office to supply the American people with factual information on the nature of the world situation and this Nation's part in it. The Office of Public Affairs is the main source of contact between nearly 500 national organizations and the Department of State. Scores

of requests from patriotic, military, religious, labor, and agricultural organizations are handled by this office every day. It answers thousands of letters a year from individual citizens who have written to their Government on vital issues of foreign policy. Many of these letters have been referred to the Department by Members of the Congress. The Office of Public Affairs prepares popular pamphlets, leaflets, and other publications for distribution to the public, to school and college students, and to Members of Congress who want to send current information on foreign policy to their constituents. Far from being a propaganda operation as some of its opponents have charged, the State Department's public liaison activities are a service operation set up to fill the legitimate requests of our people for information about foreign affairs

The Office of Public Affairs also helps to keep officials in the executive branch informed about public opinion on foreign policy issues. Mail from the public, editorials, magazine articles, and radio comments are analyzed and this information is relayed promptly to key officials throughout the Government. If our foreign policy is to be responsive to the will of the American people, and if our officials are to know what the people want, it is imperative that the Government maintain a channel such as the Office of Public Affairs for two-way communication with the public

I might note that the Hoover Commission commended this operation and recommended its expansion, rather than its contraction.

I understand that the House and Senate conferees are meeting today to discuss the different versions of this bill. I am of the opinion that these vital public information activities of the Department of State should be continued. It would be tragic if the day-to-day operations of our foreign policy were to be carried on in the dark, with our people poorly informed about matters of such vital importance to them.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

The recommendations of the so-called Hoover Commission referred to in the President's letter are contained in the Hoover Commission Task Force Report on Foreign Affairs—appendix II, pages 74, 80–81 January 1949—and read as follows:

Two additional major responsibilities have also been added to those of the prewar era. One is the responsibility for a large share of the integration and coordination of foreign policy formulation and execution through interdepartmental committees and other interdepartmental arrangements. The other is the responsibility for furnishing to the American public and peoples of foreign countries information as to the nature and purposes of the United States objectives and policies in the world of today. Providing information to the American public is a recognition that with our new position in the world the support of an informed public is essential, as was amply demonstrated in 1945 in the case of the United Nations charter and again in 1947–48 in that of the Marshall plan. Similarly, furnishing information to foreign peoples through radio (the Voice of America), publications and motion pictures may be an important ingredient of an effective foreign policy.

The broad democratic basis upon which the United States must conduct its foreign affairs today makes American public opinion a vital factor both in the determination of fundamental objectives and in the formulation and execution of policy. Whereas in Great Britain foreign affairs have long been of intimate concern to the British public, the State Department for a long period worked in a relatively quiet cove unaffected by public sentiment. Today it is forced not only to ascertain what American public opinion is but also to win its acceptance and support. Furthermore, it has found that the opinion of the peoples of foreign countries, as contrasted with their governments, also bears upon the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States. * * *

The public opinion problem is twofold in nature. First, it requires the State Department to ascertain the status of American and foreign public attitudes and to use public opinion data as one of the factors in policy determination. Second, it requires the State Department to make its own position known to the public so as to gain acceptance and support

In the former instance the Office of Public Affairs seeks to tap and evaluate American public opinion Summaries of public opinion developments drawn from press and radio sources are regularly prepared and circulated within the State Department and to the missions overseas. Data from public-opinion polls are utilized and on occasion special surveys are made of public opinion on particular subjects In general this machinery seems to be adequate for ascertaining American public attitudes. But while the top command is interested in the data produced, the present mechanism is not adequate to insure that such data will be regularly employed as one of the factors in top command policy machinery.

In the second respect, that of the State Department's making its position known to the public, liaison is maintained with many private organizations, speakers are sent out to private groups, letters and inquiries are handled, and a considerable body of material on foreign relations is made available through the State Department Bulletin and other publications. On the whole, however, it appears that this process has not been as fully developed as is desirable.

Finally, Mr Speaker, the committee feels that it has returned to the House with a fine conference report, one that should be speedily adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to bring to the attention of the committee officially a matter about which a constituent has written me.

It is the old story which we have heard before from other Government departments and agencies, but I feel it is of sufficient importance that it should engage our attention.

An estimable and reliable constituent has written me that she has heard from her daughter who is married to a Foreign Service officer in Soerabaja, Indonesia. The daughter writes her as follows:

Congress has cut down appropriations for the State Department. Do you know how this affects us? Our typhus and typhoid shots are several weeks overdue, because there are no appropriations yet to cover the money for doctor and nurse to come from Jakarta. We will have to start the whole series over again. I hope they don't have to pay hospital expenses instead.

Then my constituent very naturally adds:

Don't you think this is a pretty poor place to start economizing? I am bringing this to your attention in hopes there is something you can do to remedy this situation.

This reaction is not at all surprising. It represents the resentment understandably felt by a mother which would be thoroughly justified if it were a fact that a cut of a couple of million dollars in a seventy-five million appropriation were the cause of denying proper medical attention to her loved ones.

This is a repetition of the sort of situation we are constantly encountering. Of course, it is utterly ridiculous for the Foreign Service post in the field to lay at the door of Congress its failure to provide necessary inoculations for its personnel. But they must have some whipping boy to cover up their lack of planning. They must say something to their loyal people who are conscientiously serving in the jungles and remote areas of the world. So they pick on the Congress of the United States.

We, as Members, have experienced this same excuse so often that it is an old story. But it causes deep and natural concern among those unfamiliar with the trick. It is as old as bureaucracy itself. But I would feel remiss in my responsibilities were I not to bring this specific case forcibly and officially to the attention of the Appropriations Committee.

I have written the Secretary of State and received a reply that—

The Department of State is not aware of any curtailment of medical facilities or travel funds for the medical staff in Indonesia. However, we are requesting the embassy in Djakarta to make a thorough investigation of the conditions set forth in your letter and to inform the Department immediately of its findings.

Following the usual pattern, the Department will undoubtedly advise me in due course that it was all due to a "misunderstanding."

But we must try to devise better means of preventing such efforts on the part of Government agencies to bring improper pressure to bear upon the Members of Congress who are attempting to discharge their duty to protect the taxpayers against extravagances in spending.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, that is all nonsense. All they would have to do to economize would be, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has told us, to cut down on their liquor bill: they have plenty of money.

Mr. KEATING. That is certainly one place where it would be wiser to practice economy and there are many others. Certainly one place where the Congress definitely did not intend they should curtail their activities was in the field of protecting the health of those stationed in disease-infested areas.

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include a letter and other extraneous material.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the result of this conference with a figure below what either House had provided is generally satisfactory. There is, however, one amendment that the Senate put in, No. 106, that I and some others felt should be adopted because it would re-

duce the information personnel very substantially and effectively, and improve the tone of their service. I hope that maybe the next time something of that kind can happen.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 79: Page 45, line 6, insert:

"Public Lands Highways: For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the act of September 7, 1950, $2,500,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,125,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No 103 Page 63, line 18, strike out section 602 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 602. No representative of the United States Government in any international organization hereafter shall make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ percent of the budget of any international organization for which the appropriation for the United States contribution is contained in this act: *Provided*, That in exceptional circumstances necessitating a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ percent of the budget, a commitment requiring a United States appropriation of a larger proportion may be made after consultation by United States representatives in the organization or other appropriate officials of the Department of State with the Committees on Appropriation of the Senate and House of Representatives: Provided, however, That this section shall not apply to the United States representatives to the Inter-American organizations."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 602. No representative of the United States Government in any international organization hereafter shall make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ per centum of the budget of any international organization for which the appropriation for the United States contribution is contained in this act: *Provided*, That in exceptional circumstances necessitating a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ per centum of the budget, a commitment requiring a United States appropriation of a larger proportion may be made after consultation by United States representatives in the organization or other appropriate officials of the Department of State with the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives: *Provided, however*, That this section shall not apply to the United States representatives to the Inter-American organizations.

"No representative of the United States Government to any international organization of which the United States is not now a member shall, unless specifically authorized in an appropriation act or other law, make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ per centum of the budget of such international organization."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the language proposed by the conference committee is substitute language for that written into this bill by the House under an amendment which I offered, which reads as follows:

None of the funds appropriated in this act——

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. May I point out that the Senate wrote in all of the language except the second or last paragraph beginning "No representative of the United States Government," and so forth. This last paragraph was written into the bill by the conferees, and the entire language then adopted unanimously by the conferees on the part of both the House and Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I apologize to the gentleman for my oversight; however, it is substitute language, in effect, written in by the Senate for the language which the House put in the bill. I shall read the House language:

None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to pay an assessment to any international organization which exceeds one-third of the total annual cost thereof.

The language which was written in by the House on an amendment which I offered, and which carried on a teller vote 155 to 137, provided for a limitation on the funds appropriated in this specific act. The substitute language or the language of the Senate amendment as agreed to by the conferees provides for a limitation on funds that are hereafter appropriated, and, as far as I can tell from the language in the Senate amendment, it does not actually permit a cut in these funds, and it has no force or effect because it leaves wide open loopholes. It says:

Provided, That in exceptional circumstances necessitating a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ percent of the budget, a commitment requiring a United States appropriation of a larger proportion may be made after consultation by United States representatives in the organization or other appropriate officials of the Department of State with the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

In my opinion, what this language says is that we shall limit our contributions to these organizations hereafter—not applying to this particular bill, but to future appropriation bills; that the House shall give the Appropriations Committee, the Department of State, and our representatives in the United Nations Organization legislative authority to bind the United States Congress in the future.

I would have no objection to the amendment that has been placed there, I presume by the conference committee, wherein it states that "this section shall not apply to the United States representatives to the inter-American organizations."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would not in the least object to that and I do not think any Member of the House would under the circumstances; but, in my opinion, we should limit the funds appropriated in this bill under the amendment which was offered and accepted by the House.

Of the two, the House limitation is the only one that has any teeth in it.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say with regard to this item that the language which is now being considered by the House is the unanimous language of the conferees on the part of both the House and Senate.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. There are several inter-American agreements with reference to lighthouses and that sort of thing where we have to go 50 percent. We would expect to do that in the future. This was the best language that we could get out of the Senate, everything considered.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Spreaker, may I point out that the conference on this bill took five sessions and covered a period of 17 days. There was a great deal of thought given by the conferees to each of the items in disagreement, and the one now under consideration took quite a bit of the time of the conferees.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" had it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-six Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 200, nays 126, not voting 102, as follows:

[Roll No. 199]

YEAS—200

Abbitt	Fulton	Murdock
Addonizio	Garmatz	Norblad
Albert	Gary	Norrell
Allen, Calif.	Gordon	O'Brien, Ill.
Anderson, Calif	Granahan	O'Brien, Mich.
Andrews	Granger	O'Neill
Angell	Grant	O'Toole
Aspinall	Green	Passman
Bailey	Greenwood	Patman
Bakewell	Gwinn	Patten
Barden	Hale	Philbin
Barrett	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Polk
Bates, Mass.	Hardy	Preston
Battle	Harris	Price
Beckworth	Harrison, Va.	Priest
Bender	Hart	Prouty
Bennett, Fla.	Havenner	Rabaut
Bentsen	Hays, Ark.	Rains
Boggs, Del	Hedrick	Ramsay
Bolling	Herlong	Reams
Bolton	Herter	Rhodes
Bonner	Heselton	Richards
Bosone	Holmes	Riley
Boykin	Ikard	Rivers
Brown, Ga	Irving	Roberts
Bryson	Jackson, Wash.	Robeson
Buchanan	Jarman	Rodino
Buckley	Javits	Rogers, Colo.
Burnside	Jenkins	Rogers, Fla
Burton	Jones, Ala	Rogers, Tex
Camp	Jones, Mo.	Rooney
Canfield	Jones, Hamilton C.	Sabath
Cannon	Jones, Woodrow W.	Sadlak
Carlyle	Judd	Sasscer
Carnahan	Karsten, Mo.	Scott, Hardie
Case	Keating	Scott, Hugh D., Jr
Chatham	Kee	Scrivner
Chelf	Kelley, Pa.	Secrest
Chudoff	Kersten, Wis.	Seely-Brown
Clemente	Kilday	Sheppard
Clevenger	King	Sieminski
Cole, Kans	Kirwan	Smith, Miss
Cooley	Klein	Smith, Va.
Cooper	Kluczynski	Spence
Corbett	Lane	Staggers
Cotton	Lanham	Stanley
Coudert	Lantaff	Steed
Cox	Lesinski	Stigler
Crosser	Lind	Stockman
Davis, Tenn.	Lyle	Sutton
Dawson	McCarthy	Taber
DeGraffenried	McCormack	Teague
Dingell	McGuire	Thomas
Dollinger	McMillan	Tollefson
Donohue	McMullen	Trimble
Doughton	Mansfield	Walter
Dovle	Marshall	Watts
Durham	Merrow	Welch
Eaton	Mills	Whitaker
Elliott	Mitchell	Wickersham
Engle	Morano	Widnall
Evins	Morgan	Wier
Fallon	Morris	Wigglesworth
Feighan	Moulder	Willis
Fernandez	Multer	Wolcott
Fine	Murray, Tenn.	Yorty
Forand	Nelson	Zablocki
Fugate	Nicholson	

NAYS—126

Aandahl	Colmer	Hoeven
Abernethy	Crumpacker	Hoffman, Mich.
Adair	Cunningham	Horan
Allen, Ill	Curtis, Mo.	Hull
Andersen, H Carl	Curtis, Nebr.	Hunter
Arends	Davis, Ga	James
Armstrong	Davis, Wis.	Jenison
Auchincloss	Denny	Jensen
Ayres	Devereux	Jonas
Beall	Dolliver	Kean
Beamer	Ellsworth	Kearns
Bennett, Mich.	Fisher	LeCompte
Berry	Forrester	Lovre
Betts	George	McConnell
Bishop	Golden	McGregor
Bow	Graham	McVey
Bray	Gross	Mack, Wash.
Brehm	Hagen	Martin, Iowa
Brownson	Halleck	Martin, Mass.
Budge	Hand	Mason
Buffett	Harden	Meader
Burdick	Harrison, Wyo.	Miller, Md.
Bush	Harvey	Miller, Nebr.
Chenoweth	Hays, Ohio	Miller, N. Y.
Chiperfield	Hill	Mumma
Church	Hillings	Murray, Tenn.
	Hinshaw	Nelson
	Nicholson	Schwabe
	O'Hara	Scudder
	Ostertag	Shafer
	Patterson	Short
	Pickett	Simpson, Ill.
	Potter	Simpson, Pa.
	Poulson	Sittler
	Radwan	Smith, Kans.
	Rankin	Smith, Wis.
	Reece, Tenn.	Springer
	Reed, N. Y.	Tackett
	Rees, Kans.	Talle
	Riehlman	Thompson, Mich.
	Rogers, Mass.	Vail
	St. George	Van Pelt
	Saylor	Van Zandt
		Velde
		Vursell
		Weichel
		Wharton
		Wheeler
		Whitten
		Williams, Miss.
		Williams, N. Y.
		Wilson, Ind.
		Wilson, Tex.
		Winstead
		Withrow
		Wood, Ga.
		Woodruff

NOT VOTING—102

Allen, La.	Flood	McKinnon
Andresen, August H.	Fogarty	Machrowicz
Anfuso	Ford	Mack, Ill.
Baker	Frazier	Madden
Baring	Furcolo	Magee
Bates, Ky.	Gamble	Mahon
Belcher	Gathings	Miller, Calif.
Blackney	Gavin	Morrison
Blatnik	Goodwin	Morton
Boggs, La.	Gore	Murphy
Bramblett	Gregory	Murray, Wis.
Brooks	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Konski
Brown, Ohio	Hébert	Perkins
Burleson	Heffernan	Phillips
Busbey	Heller	Poage
Butler	Hess	Powell
Byrne, N Y	Hoffman, Ill.	Quinn
Byrnes, Wis	Holifield	Redden
Celler	Hope	Reed, Ill.
Cole, N. Y.	Howell	Regan
Combs	Jackson, Calif.	Ribicoff
Crawford	Johnson	Roosevelt
Dague	Kearney	Sheehan
Deane	Kelly, N. Y.	Shelley
Delaney	Kennedy	Sikes
Dempsey	Keogh	Taylor
Denton	Kerr	Thompson, Tex.
D'Ewart	Kilburn	Thornberry
Dondero	Larcade	Vinson
Donovan	Latham	Vorys
Dorn	Lucas	Werdel
Eberharter	McCulloch	Wolverton
Elston	McDonough	Wood, Idaho
Fenton	McGrath	Yates

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Butler against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Hess against.

Mrs Kelly of New York for, with Mr. Werdel against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky for, with Mr. Latham against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Sheehan against.

Mr. Gregory for, with Mr. Wolverton against.

Mr. McGrath for, with Mr Kilburn against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Gavin against.

Mr. Donovan for, with Mr. Dague against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin against

Mr. Mack of Illinois for, with Mr. McDonough against.

Mr. Yates for, with Mr. Phillips against.

Mr. Byrne of New York for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. Denton for, with Mr. Busbey against.

Mr. Magee for, with Mr. Cole of New York against.

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana for, with Mr. Morton against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Baker against.

Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Wood of Idaho against.

Mr. Quinn for, with Mr. August H. Andresen against.

Mr. Heller for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Goodwin against.

Mr. Murphy for, with Mr. Fenton against.

Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Gamble against.

Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Crawford against.

Mr. Howell for, with Mr. Hope against.

Mr. Ribicoff for, with Mr. Kearney against.

Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Machrowicz for, with Mr. Elston against.

Mr. Kerr for, with Mr. Dondero against.

Mr Baring for, with Mr. Belcher against.

Mr. Deane for, with Mr. D'Ewart against.

Mr. Dempsey for, with Mr. Bramblett against.

Mr. Eberharter for, with Mr. Regan against.

Mr. Flood for, with Mr. Johnson against.

Mr Fogarty for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Vorys.

Mr. McKinnon with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Ford.

Messrs. ALLEN of Illinois, CHENOWETH, and TACKETT changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. MERROW and DAWSON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 104½: Page 65, line 11, insert the following:

"SEC 603 No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of 1 such employee to 115, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to personnel work concerning employees of the Foreign Service of the United States"

Mr ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104½, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC 604 No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of 1 such employee to 115, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That excess factors arising from unusual requirements approved by the President may be used in applying a different ratio, but in no instance shall the number be in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to 85, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel

program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting: *Provided further,* That this section shall not apply to personnel work concerning employees of the Foreign Service of the United States."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the amendment just read by the Clerk represents the unanimous agreement of the managers both on the part of the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 107: Page 67, line 21, insert the following:

"SEC. 606. The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place two positions in grade GS–18, and seven positions in grade GS–17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, and such positions shall be in lieu of any positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation previously allocated under section 505. The compensation of the Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation hereafter shall be $17,500 per annum.

"The Secretary of State hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place one additional position in grade GS–17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949.

"The Secretary of Commerce hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place one additional position in grade GS–17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 606. The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place two positions in grade GS–18, and seven positions in grade GS–17, in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, and such positions shall be in lieu of any possessions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation previously allocated under section 505. The compensation of the Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation hereafter shall be $17,500 per annum.

"The Secretary of State hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place the position of Director, Office of Budget and Finance in grade GS–17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

"The Secretary of Commerce hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place the position of Director, Office of Budget and Management in grade GS–17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday next be dispensed with and that it may be in order for the Private Calendar to be called on Thursday next. There are only two bills on the Private Calendar at the present time and the Committee on the Judiciary is now reporting out some more private bills, so it would be better to call the Private Calendar on Thursday rather than on Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object, this probably will be the last call for the Private Calendar in this session?

Mr. McCORMACK. I sincerely hope so. I shall do everything I can to accomplish that much desired result.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I hope the gentleman's strength will be redoubled.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On October 3, 1951:

H R. 711. An act for the relief of George Lukes; and

H R. 4463. An act for the relief of Nadine Carol Heslip.

On October 9, 1951:

H. R. 662. An act for the relief of William O. Stevens;

H. R. 710. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suzanne Chow Hsia and her son, Sven Erik Hsia;

H R. 804. An act for the relief of Sisters Maria DeRubertis, Agnese Cerina, Marianna Bonifacio, Dina Bonini, and Edvige Gasparini;

H. R. 1128. An act for the relief of Harvey McFarland and Laurance Anthony Warnock;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of David Lee Harrigan;

H. R. 3818. An act for the relief of Yutaka Nakaeda;

H. R. 3965. An act for the relief of five sisters of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary; and

H. R. 4688. An act for the relief of Cecelia Wahls.

On October 10, 1951:

H. R. 579. An act for the relief of Hendryk Kempski;

H. R. 580. An act for the relief of Kwang Myeng Chu;

H. R. 901. An act to provide for the admission of Janet and Daisy Wong to the United States;

H R. 1102. An act for the relief of Emilio Torres;

H R. 1136. An act for the relief of Sister Natalie (Marie Palagyi) and Sister Alice (Elizabeth Slachta);

H R. 1420 An act for the relief of Dr. Eugen Jose Singer and Mrs. Frieda Singer;

H R. 1816 An act for the relief of Shoemon Takano;

H. R. 1818. An act for the relief of Hego Fuchino;

H. R. 2165. An act for the relief of Matthew Terry;

H. R. 2444. An act for the relief of James A. Vines;

H. R 2498. An act for the relief of Marianne and Michel Speelman;

H R 2621. An act for the relief of Mrs. Giulia Di Gaetano Coccia;

H. R. 2745. An act to amend section 2801 (c) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 2807. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Poborski;

H R 2916. An act for the relief of Shizu Torauchi Parks;

H R. 3436. An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport grain between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1951;

H R. 3585. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy certain property located at Decatur, Ill.;

H. R. 3895. An act for the relief of Ethel Cristeta Berner.

H. R. 5113. An act to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security; and

H J. Res. 290. Joint resolution providing for the recognition and endorsement of the World Metallurgical Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1864) entitled "An act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans who served during World War II, and persons who served in the military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and for other purposes."

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 456 and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5684) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill or any of the provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH]. May I

inquire of the gentleman from Oregon whether he expects to consume any time on that side?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. We have no requests for time on this side other than for extensions of remarks, although I expect to make a few remarks myself.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have no requests for time, although I want to speak on the resolution myself. I wonder if the gentleman would care to speak now, and then I will speak and move the previous question.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

SAVE AMERICA. PUT ONLY LOYAL AMERICANS ON GUARD—OUST THE REDS, SPENDTHRIFTS, AND GRAFTERS; RESTORE THRIFT, HONESTY, AND SANITY TO OUR GOVERNMENT

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor and privilege of serving in the House of Representatives for some 13 years, and during that time have seen all of my colleagues in the Oregon delegation when I was sworn in leave the House through death or retirement, leaving me as the dean of the Oregon delegation.

It has been my custom at the close of each session of the Congress to give a brief account of my stewardship during the session drawing to a close.

The longer I serve here the more I am convinced of the soundness of the observations of the late Speaker of the House, Champ Clark, when he said:

> A man has to learn to be a Representative just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor. It is an unwise performance for any district to change Representatives at short intervals. A new Congressman must begin at the foot of the class. No man should be elected to the House simply to gratify his ambition. All Members should be elected for the good of the country. The best rule is for a district to select a man who is industrious, honest, energetic, sober, and courageous and keep him there so long as he discharges his duties faithfully and well. Such a man will gradually rise to a high position and influence in the House. His wide acquaintaince with Members helps amazingly in doing things.

My long service, I find, helps me immeasurably to secure favorable committee and House action on Oregon projects.

In offering myself as a candidate for reelection in the November election of 1950 I said:

> The hour has struck; let's build to full strength forthwith our national defenses and thereby protect our soldiers overseas and stop the Red aggressors and win the war; let's crack down on price gougers, war profiteers and black markets; let's put only loyal Americans on guard, oust the Reds, subversives, bureaucratic blunderers, and spendthrifts from our own Government and restore honesty and sanity and save human liberties.

I have endeavored so far as lay within my power during the session now drawing to an end to keep that pledge made to the people of my district who saw fit to return me to this high office. Anyone familiar with the conduct of national affairs, both domestic and foreign, realizes that we have been in the midst of a spending regime which has surpassed all others throughout our entire history.

It has been my purpose, and I have endeavored so far as God gave me the strength and ability, to help plug the holes in the Treasury and to stop the orgy of wild and profligate spending and to restore sanity in Government, to balance our budget, and to live within our income. Unfortunately this administration, in control of both branches of the Congress, as well as the executive department, has continued this program of reckless spending until our Government is threatened with insolvency, if not utter destruction. If the Hoover report had been adopted and the Congress had followed efficient and economic procedure, billions of tax dollars could have been saved.

The Eighty-second Congress holds the record for inefficiency. The dilatory tactics of the Eighty-second Congress and its complete failure to perform a job worthy of the Congress is due entirely to the manipulations of the administration and its leadership's failure to adopt and carry out a program needed to solve the many serious problems which are facing us and the world. The Congress has been in session going on 10 months, and little has been accomplished, due to the dilatory and inefficient handling of the legislative program. Major legislation, including appropriation bills which should have been passed before July 1, have not reached the President.

In carrying out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for saving $5,400,000,000 a year, the Citizens Committee reports it has submitted 19 bills and 1 concurrent resolution. Of these 20 proposals, hearings have been held in both Houses on only 1 minor measure. No hearings have been held in the House on the other 19 measures and no hearings in the Senate on 15 measures. The executive branch has come out in opposition to 12 measures and has supported 2 measures in part. It has not taken a public position on the other 6 measures. Fifty-one new reorganization plans were suggested to President Truman in a letter from Dr. Robert L. Johnson, chairman of the Citizens Committee, on May 8, 1951. Up to now only the plan for the RFC has been forwarded to Congress, despite the fact that 24 of the plans were submitted in final form for the President's signature.

It is thus seen that the present administration is giving only lip service to the Hoover recommendations and has failed miserably to put into effect this program. This administration has control of both branches of the Congress and all of the committees and unless the party leadership gets behind the Hoover legislation it cannot be enacted.

The leadership in the House and the Senate has failed to take up the Hoover report legislation and as a result it is suffering from a stalemate. Personally I am doing everything that I can to free the log jam and get the measures enacted into law. The Hoover Commission was established by the Republican Eightieth Congress and it may be that the present administration for that reason is refusing to permit the recommendations to be enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against the tax bill recently which sought to raise $7,200,000,000. We had already passed in the last year two tax bills aggregating $10,000,000,000. As pointed out by the United States News and World Report in a recent issue, tax collectors, starting soon, are going to be taking $84,000,000,000 a year out of the pockets of people and the treasuries of corporations. They will take nearly $1 out of each $3 of the Nation's income. This is a record amount.

Next year, collectors of taxes will take $90,000,000,000, or even more. At the peak of World War II tax collectors reached into the pockets of the public for $48,000,000,000. That was a little more than $1 out of every $4 of income. Back in 1940, when taxes seemed so painful, the take was under $16,000,000,000, or less than $1 in every five of income. Those are total taxes, Federal, State and local. The trend in all of these taxes is sharply upward.

Just how far the trend has gone can best be shown by relating the tax take to national income. In 1929, for example, the total tax take in the United States amounted to less than 13 percent of national income. By 1940, taxes were taking 19 percent of the national income. This year, taxes are going to be taking more than 30 percent of the national income. The load, in other words, already is past the 25-percent level that has been set as the danger point. To put it still another way, the annual tax load grew from $151 for each adult in the United States in 1929 to $184 in 1940. Now that tax load on each adult is about to go to $860. The individual burden has grown nearly six times, with most of the growth in the last 11 years. The problem that is raised for Government is one of where to find safe sources of new revenue—if anywhere.

The boosts in taxes, living costs and social-security payments have wiped out wage gains, and higher wages put in force since Korea have resulted in less, not more, buying power for many workers. Real take-home pay, especially in buying power, has dropped. This is the result of the dilemma in which tax garners now find themselves in their inability to find new sources of tax revenue and being forced to increase drastically the tax on low-income groups. The reason is that taxes on higher incomes already have reached levels that leave upper-income families too few dollars for Government to tap in any sizable amounts. Among individual incomes above $100,000 a year, for example, Federal taxes already take all but about $2,000,000,000 of total income. Confiscation of all income over $100,000 would yield relatively little in the way of new revenue. Government, in fact, would reap less than $11,000,000,000 more if it expropriated all personal income over $25,000 as President Roosevelt once suggested. It is to levels below

$25,000 that tax planners are looking for any new revenues that are proposed after the 1951 increase. Individuals who earn $10,000 to $25,000 a year have a total of more than $16,000,000,000 left after Federal taxes. People with incomes of $5,000 to $10,000 have an aggregate of nearly $82,000,000,000 left. And individuals with incomes of less than $5,000 have a total of more than $90,000,000,000 left over. This question raises a further problem about Government spending. Even present taxes will not bring in all the money that the Government plans to spend. The problem posed is whether Government spending can go on at current levels without producing damaging inflation.

The power to tax is the power to destroy. As David Lawrence so well said:

Bankruptcy can come from a run on the dollar. When people some day discover that taxes have reached the saturation point, and that total revenues are declining as rates are raised, they will become apprehensive. It is but another way of saying that there are limits to the taxing power of government, and that when a nation is spending more than it is taking in, or can take in, from taxes each year, the end has been reached.

The administration wants to spend seventy-one billions in the coming fiscal year which is six times more than the late Franklin D. Roosevelt spent in any year prior to World War II and 12 times the annual cost of the Government in the highest year prior to the Roosevelt administration. In the 12 years of the Roosevelt administration the Government spent more than three times the amount expended in the 144 years from the time of George Washington to 1933. All indications now are that this administration will top the Roosevelt regime in spending. Following is the score sheet:

Period	Receipts	Expenditures	Debt
All Presidents to 1933	$91, 586, 076, 130	$112, 203, 367, 065	$22, 538, 072, 164
Roosevelt administration, fiscal 1934 to 1945	165, 760, 825, 357	372, 235, 200, 271	259, 115, 345, 802
Truman administration, fiscal 1946 to 1951	256, 626, 307, 445	266, 007, 122, 624	250, 000, 000, 000

In voting against this tax bill I called attention to the fact that this bill is inflationary rather than deflationary in view of the fact that it makes available for Government spending over seven billion additional dollars in the markets of our country and of the world for goods available for use either by private citizens or the Government. The Roosevelt-Truman administration, the greatest spendthrift administration in all history—has based its philosophy upon the principle of tax and tax and spend and spend. The President has said that it is impossible to reduce Government spending and lower the cost of government, and he challenged the Congress to do so. It is my judgment that, if we are to have a program of economy in the Federal Government and eliminate the flagrant waste that is now taking place and stamp out dishonesty and the grafting and needless spending of public money by dishonest bureaucrats and public officials, it is necessary to curtail the amount of tax dollars available to them to spend. In my judgment, there is no other way to compel this administration to bring the Government back to a sound fiscal policy, eliminate waste and graft and useless expenditures, and keep expenditures within our income.

Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly in accord with a pay-as-you-go program and, except in cases of extraordinary emergency, such as a world-wide war, I believe that each generation should collect the necessary Government revenues to meet Government expenses, and not carry its debts over for future generations to pay. However, in the guise of pay-as-you-go, I am not willing to tax the American people with unnecessary and stupendous taxes, as this bill does, merely to place in the hands of a spendthrift Government the power and opportunity to spend more tax dollars in foreign lands and on unessentials. I believe it is entirely possible for this administration, by eliminating waste and graft and unnecessary expenditures, not only in the domestic field but in foreign relief and aid and in military expenditures, to save the full amount sought to be raised by this tax bill. If such curtailments in Government expenditures and the reduction of the costs of government are made, this bill would be unnecessary. I have supported all appropriations needed for national defense during my entire 13 years in the Congress, and I will continue to do so. However, in the guise of national defense, I am not willing to squander the taxpayers' money and render our country insolvent by levying huge sums when the administration has not given the Congress proof that the expenditures are necessary.

I was especially opposed to the tax bill because it was brought up under a closed or so-called gag rule which did not permit the Members the right to offer any amendments to correct the many injustices in taxes imposed on certain individuals and groups, under the bill. It exacted from small-income taxpayers receiving from $1,000 to $1,500 a year from dividends a 20-percent withholding tax which in many cases would take food from the mouths of low-income groups. They will not be able to get refunds on these taxes unjustly withheld where no tax is payable until long after the withholdings have been made. A glaring example of the operation of this is shown by the following letter I received from an Oregon resident:

My wife and I are old. She is 75 and I am 81 years. We have worked hard and saved carefully all our lives that we might have enough to take care of us during our declining years. We have a total income from interest and dividends amounting to about $1,000 a year. From this you propose to withhold 20 percent. Unless this bill is defeated we will face stark despair. We ask you to vote against.

One of the glaring injustices of the bill was the levying of a 12½ percent additional tax on low-income workers which, together with the present high tax exacted of them would amount in many cases to confiscation and deprive these low-income taxpayers of the meager funds needed for the support of themselves and their families.

In our own domestic problems, I have been glad to have taken the lead in the House in the fight for old-age security. The elderly people of America are the forgotten ones. Many of them are in dire need and lack sufficient income to supply them with the minimum of food, clothing and shelter. In this period of inflation and high prices, with the purchasing power of the dollar shrunk to 50 cents, the meager incomes they are receiving are wholly inadequate to keep body and soul together in many instances. Our Government, which is sending billions upon billions of dollars overseas for help to foreign nations in distress, should certainly provide a minimum for the care and protection of our old folks here at home who are in need.

Reports coming to us here in the Congress from Government agencies and from our own Members who have had occasion to travel in foreign countries where American dollars are being lavishly spent, find that we are financing many public works such as flood control, river and harbor improvements, docks, railroads, highways, public buildings and other public projects. While we are doing this we have been stingy in providing the necessary funds for carrying out our own programs of public works here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I personally hold the belief that if our Nation is to continue strong and if it is to keep its finances healthy so that we may meet our commitments overseas, we should not overlook the full conservation, development, and utilization of our own great natural resources. We have failed to provide the money for flood control and river and hydroelectric power development and other public works so necessary to protect our own economy and industries at home. As a result we are meeting with difficulty in our rearmament program in finding the essential materials needed. Aluminum is one of the strategic materials which we produce in the Northwest and which is in short supply due to the lack of hydroelectric power. If the projects under construction or approved for construction in the Columbia River area had been speeded up we would not have had this dearth of hydroelectric power due solely to the short-sighted policy of the Government. Furthermore, if adequate funds had been made available we could have provided against the great loss we suffered in the recent floods in the Columbia River area and floods in the Missouri River Basin, aggregating millions of dollars besides great loss of life.

Foreign spending has reached to gigantic proportions and has added materially to the inflation which is robbing the low-income groups of America of the ability to buy even the necessities of life. President Truman has asked for an appropriation of $8,500,000,000 to be used for military and economic aid to foreign countries. He plans an over-all expenditure for the fiscal year of over

$71,000,000,000. If this appropriation is granted it would mean the total authorized gifts, loans, and credits in the last 10 years for foreign aid would aggregate $124,000,000,000. Between January of 1940 and January of 1951, Congress voted nearly one hundred and three billions for foreign aid, more than twelve billions in loans, and approximately one and a half billions in international credits. The total, exclusive of President Truman's latest request, is almost one hundred fifteen and a half billions, not all of which has been expended to date. It should be noted that the figures quoted do not include the billions now being spent by our country for the defense of other countries nor the multi-billion-dollar cost of winning World War II. This staggering sum represents about half of our national debt which now amounts to approximately two hundred fifty-six billions. Our 10-year outlay to foreign countries, if President Truman's request for eight and one-half additional billions is granted, will equal about one-fifth of the entire physical assets of the United States.

A freight and transportation expert has vividly illustrated the immensity of the President's latest foreign-aid program. Taking the $8,500,000,000 figure which President Truman proposes to spend abroad this year, he translated these figures into carloads of dollars as follows:

A silver dollar weighs 26½ grams, or approximately $17 to the avoirdupois pound. Forty thousand pounds is considered good average loading of a box car, and on this basis there would be $680,000 to a carload. Mr. Truman's give-away program this year, therefore, means that we are asked to load up 12,500 boxcars of dollars and ship them off to foreign lands, and during the past decade, 182,352 carloads of such dollars, or train 1,450 miles long.

I think it is clear to everyone that the most critical problem facing us except war is inflation. The purchasing power of the dollar has now shrunk to about half what it was in normal times which means that small-income groups, persons retired and living on pensions and persons living on fixed investments, have their purchasing power cut in two. It is conceded by all that inflation is the result of more money than there are goods to purchase. The Government is the worst offender in adding to this inflationary spiral by reason of the immense purchases it is making and the profligate spending of the people's money, which can only be obtained from borrowings and taxes. The orgy of spending of the people's funds is evidenced by the Army, which we, here in the Nation's Capital, are told bought 4,636,000 web belts, 11,753,000 pairs of combat boots in a rush order, 1,917,000 pounds of black pepper in 9 months; 6,000,000 cans of paint, in quarts and gallons, a full year's supply; 5,000,000 pounds of margarine at 25½ cents when the Department of Agriculture was selling 5,500,000 pounds of butter to Italy at 15 cents. The jump in price of the boots, for example, rose from $7.82 to $16 as a result of this rush buying.

Political morality in the United States is at a low ebb. In these days of grafting top Internal Revenue officials, deep freezes, mink coats, and influence peddlers corrupting the integrity of political life, it is heartening to note the philosophy of a former President of our Republic, the late Theodore Roosevelt. He held that—

The man who debauches our public life is a foe to our well-being as a Nation, and no government can ever be a permanent success if administered in accordance with base ideals. Honesty—

He said—

is not so much a credit as an absolute prerequisite to efficient service to the public. Honesty we must have; no brilliance, no smartness can take its place.

Elihu Root, himself a great American statesman, said of Theodore Roosevelt:

He did not originate new truths but he drove old fundamental truths into the hearts and minds of his people so that they stuck and dominated * * * always driving, driving home the deep fundamental truths of public life, of a great, self-governing democracy, the eternal truths upon which justice and liberty must depend among men * * * Review the rosters of the few great men of history and you will find Theodore Roosevelt was the greatest teacher of the essentials of popular self-government the world has ever known.

We here in the Nation's Capital are aroused and deeply grieved over the disclosures of our congressional committees and other Federal investigators showing the depth to which public officials have fallen in their lack of adherence to honesty and common decency in the conduct of the public duties entrusted to them. At no time in our history with which any of us here have had to do has there prevailed so much dishonesty, corruption, favoritism and raiding of the public treasury as that which exists today. The present administration seems not only unable to rid the administration of these grafters and influence peddlers but it seems unwilling to do so. It is not amiss to call attention to only a few of the many dishonest raids on the public treasury that have been brought to light in the last few months.

In connection with the current Senate investigation, RFC Administrator W. Stuart Symington announced that a fee of $18,000 had been paid by a St. Louis manufacturer to Joseph H. Rosenbaum, the Washington attorney who bought the $9,000 mink coat for Mrs. E. Merl Young, White House secretary. Mr. Symington halted further disbursements of an $188,750 RFC loan to the American Fixture & Manufacturing Co., of St. Louis, because of the concealed payment of $18,000 to Rosenbaum, previously identified as one of the top influence men.

The War Assets Administration leased Government buildings at Camp Crowder, Mo., to a Kansas City, Mo., firm for less than $12,000 a year. The Commodity Credit Corporation, needing this storage space, paid the Kansas City corporation $381,201 in 20 months for use of the Government-owned buildings. Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, said that the officers of the Kansas City firm included a former western Missouri internal-revenue collector and a former State WAP director.

Former Democrat Mayor Frank Hague, of Jersey City, said on September 12 that Abner (Longie) Zwillman, big-time gambler, "is the boss, the king—he is now the Democrat leader of New Jersey." Mr. Hague said that Zwillman, named in the Senate crime investigation hearings as a kingpin gambler, "has become the new leader of the Democrat Party there. Because of his financing of the party's campaign, his word is supreme in all matters of policy and patronage affecting the party."

Two members of the pro-Truman State Democrat Committee of Mississippi pleaded guilty on September 5 to selling Federal jobs and were sentenced to prison. The 10 other defendants, who include top leaders of the pro-Truman faction in the State, have not yet come to trial. A Senate investigating committee reported these self-confessed grafters received $2,500 from six persons. Witnesses told the committee they paid the money to get post-office jobs. Grand jury indictments followed.

On September 10 a tax official admitted receiving $5,909 from a printing company, presenting a startling picture of the operations of a top Internal Revenue Bureau official at hearings in New York before a House Ways and Means subcommittee. James B. E. Olson, former chief of the Federal alcohol tax unit in New York, admitted he had solicited business for a St. Louis printing company from two liquor concerns while he exercised complete authority over such companies. Mr. Olson received $5,909.81 as vice president of the American Lithofold Corp., of St. Louis, in 1949 and in 1950, but he said the only work he ever did for the money was to make two phone calls. The two phone calls were to the Jacob Ruppert Brewery and Austin Nichols & Co., Brooklyn wine and liquor dealers. Both of them subsequently ordered printing from the St. Louis company. American Lithofold is the same company that obtained a $565,000 loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in its fourth application after it had hired William M. Boyle, Jr., as its attorney. Mr. Boyle later became Democratic national chairman. Mr. Olson told the House subcommittee that he and Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., former collector of internal revenue, were brought into the American Lithofold Corp. as vice presidents at the invitation of James P. Finnegan, collector of internal revenue in St. Louis. Olson and Nunan were to receive salaries of $750 a month, but this was later changed to a commission of 10 percent on all business they developed.

These are only a few instances among many that have been brought to light since the Eighty-second Congress convened in January. If space permitted, I could detail dozens of similar cases of corruption and dishonesty in our Federal Government. Like termites these chiselers are boring from within threatening the very foundations of our governmental structure. As General Eisenhower said:

The problem in defense is how far you can go without destroying from within what you are trying to defend from without.

During all of my legislative career here in the Nation's Capitol, I have supported to the full the activities of the House Un-American Activities Committee and other Federal agencies in their work of exposing and bringing to justice Communists and Communist sympathizers within our own Government agencies in the Capital and elsewhere. As a result of this work many of the Alger Hiss and William Remington type who held high positions in the State Department have been not only weeded out, but many have been convicted and sent to jail. Unfortunately the administration has not even given lip service in the attempt of the Congress to weed out these Communist sympathizers from the Government, and in many cases such as the Alger Hiss case, success was achieved over the opposition of the administration. There is much work to be done still in this field in ridding the Government of these public servants who are peddling secret war information to our enemies.

Rome survived about a thousand years; the Greek civilization survived about 500 years; we are only 175 years old but unless there is a rebirth of political honesty and morality in public office our beloved Nation will follow the corrupt nations of the past which are now buried in the dust of the ages and in oblivion. Immorality and dishonesty in public life can lead only to destruction and downfall of our beloved Nation. There is only one way left to us to remedy this disgraceful mess and that is for the voters themselves to rise up in righteous wrath and out these corrupt politicians from public office and to bring the guilty to justice. This is not a partisan political question and all loyal citizens, regardless of the political party to which they belong, have this one most important duty to perform and that is to join together in stamping out corruption and dishonesty in government.

Time, which settles all things, will write the true history of this sordid period in our Nation's history when honesty and integrity have been giving way to crime, graft, and political favors. As Omar Khayyam, in his Rubaiyat said:

> The moving finger writes and, having writ, moves on. not all your piety nor wit shall lure it back to cancel half a line, nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

We are now engaged in a war of major proportions on the opposite side of the globe, known as the Korean war. The war was not declared by the Congress which alone has the power to declare war under the Constitution. President Truman sent our soldiers into this undeclared war and thereafter advised the Congress he had done so.

General MacArthur, the most outstanding military leader and statesman of our time, who did such a heroic job in bringing peace to Japan in the rehabilitation program for this war-torn country, described the Korean war as follows:

> I shrink with a horror that I cannot express in words, at this continuous slaughter of men in Korea. The battle casualties in Korea today probably have passed the million-man mark. Our own casualties, American casualties, have passed 65,000. The Koreans have lost about 140,000. Our losses, on our side, are a quarter of a million men. I am not talking of the civilian populations who must have lost many, many, many times that. The enemy probably has lost 750,000 casualties. There are 145,000 of them that are now in our prison bull pens, prisoners, so they might be excepted from that figure because they live; but a million men in less than 11 months of fighting, in less than 11 months of this conflict, have already gone, and it grows more savage every day I just cannot brush that off as a Korean skirmish. I believe that is something of such tremendous importance that it must be solved, and it cannot be solved by the nebulous process of saying "give us time, and we will be prepared, or we will be in better shape 2 years from now," which is argumentative I don't know whether we will or not; and neither do you, because you do not know, and none of us know the capacity of the enemy.
>
> He may build faster than we do, I couldn't tell you I don't know that, you are gambling on chances, but I say there is no chance in Korea, because it is a fact—you have lost a million men now. You will lose more than a million if you go on another year, if you go on until 1953, you will lose another million. What are you trying to protect? The war in Korea has already almost destroyed the nation of 20,000,000 people I have never seen such devastation I have seen, I guess, as much blood and disaster as any living man, and it just curdled my stomach, the last time I was there After I looked at that wreckage and those thousands of women and children and everything, I vomited. Now, are you going to let that go on, by any sophistry of reasoning or possibilities? They may be there, but this is a certainty What are you going to do? Once more, I repeat the question, what is the policy in Korea? If you go on indefinitely, you are perpetuating a slaughter such as I have never heard of in the history of mankind. Now, what I am trying to do is find some reasonable and honorable way to stop that slaughter. It is not to conquer this country, or China, or anything else. It is to bring this thing to an honorable end.

The first year of the Korean war cost the taxpayers of the United States $8,375,815,524 according to an official Treasury report based on expenditures up to the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1951. The Treasury statement said the cost of the strictly military program for the first year of the Korean fighting was $7,255,400,000. The report said that nonmilitary expenditures attributable to the Korean war totaled $1,120,415,524.

The people of the United States are entitled to know why it is those in control of our Government since 1933 have kept our country almost continuously in war and made it possible for the Communist Government of Russia to extend its domination from 170,000,000 people in 1945 to 800,000,000 today while the administration was spending more than all other administrations in our history combined. It is because we lack effective, forthright, farsighted leadership at home and abroad. Why is it that notwithstanding the billions appropriated for national defense, we found ourselves inadequately prepared to meet the Korean conflict? This lack of leadership and willingness to accept political expediency has left us confronted with exorbitant prices, mounting taxes, dwindling savings, and insolvency. We are attempting to substitute billions of dollars for effective and forthright leadership and to substitute bullets for statesmanship. No armed force can survive internal weakness, corrupt and vascillating leadership. In truth America's greatest need is honest and effective leadership on the national level, leadership that is courageous, far seeing, honest, and guided by high moral principles and spiritual values. These we do not possess today. It is time for all loyal Americans regardless of party affiliations to take up this fight to restore them and for the restoration of democratic processes here at home and the preservation of our American way of life and our capitalistic system of free enterprise which is being undermined by socialistic panaceas.

If our Nation is to maintain its solvency, the time has arrived to make a drastic cut in our foreign expenditures. The economy of our country will not continue to stand this excessive burden and the tax resources of the Nation have reached the saturation point where increased levies will bring in less tax dollars. By this program we have foisted upon the American people the burden of inflation and high prices which is preventing wage earners and those depending on fixed incomes from receiving a minimum of the necessities of life. The aged, with meager allowances from old-age assistance pension grants or fixed-dollar income, are faced with actual starvation in many cases. The time has arrived when we must give consideration to our own people here in the United States, reduce the tax burden, eliminate unnecessary gifts and loans to foreign countries, and insist that such countries take up the burden of their own defense and rehabilitation with a minimum of aid from the United States.

Mr. Speaker, has not the time arrived for us to take stock and determine whether or not, as a Nation, we are on the right road? We have gone down the war road now for over a generation, and as a result have bankrupted our Treasury and have filled the cemeteries around the world with our heroic war dead, and yet we are proceeding from one war to another without any hope of achieving world stability and bringing peace and good will among men.

In a speech at Philadelphia on June 20, Senator KEFAUVER, Democrat of Tennessee, is quoted in the press as saying:

> I say this as a Democrat, the present administration has given the public nothing to look forward to in foreign affairs for the next 30 years except war and paying for wars.

Max Lerner, the noted author, said that a warless world will have its beginnings in what each of us does in his own community. If humanity moves away from the corrupt and bestial, it will be by the reestablishment of the sense of society, the sense of what ties men to other men. This functioning sense of society at the level of daily living, is the course to which alone we can look.

The program for moral rearmament is taking hold of many leaders throughout the world. Moral rearmament has

been described as a "world force having as its principal objective adequate preparedness of free nations for the ideological conflicts in which the world is now engaged." That is an objective which challenges the interest and imagination of all of us who believe in the strength and guidance of God. We believe that material forces alone cannot assure permanent peace, security, and tranquility among nations and among people. We who believe in God see that our spiritual strength, as well as our material strength, must be mobilized to meet the universal threat of godless Communist materialism.

Greater cooperation between all nations of the earth in the solution of these common problems which make for security and well-being will hasten the day when all problems may be settled around the peace table rather than by guns and bombs. In my recent hurried trip around the globe, viewing the ravages of war and death and devastation on every hand, I was deeply impressed with the futility of attempting to solve by force of arms the grave international problems having to do with their political, economic, and social welfare now confronting the nations of the world.

We are experiencing in America today and throughout the world a spiritual famine. Our leaders have demonstrated that they are helpless to steer the Ship of State into peaceful waters and into a realm where spiritual values prevail rather than war and bloodshed. We have come to the stark realization that material forces alone cannot assure permanent peace, security, and tranquility among the nations of the world. We have come face to face with the truth that our spiritual forces as well as our material strength must be mobilized to meet the universal threat of godless communism and materialism, which seeks to destroy all freedoms and civilization itself.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we must go on the offensive in the cold war. To date our actions have been defensive and merely containment. Every action we have taken thus far has been only a reaction to a move initiated by the Soviets. The costly Berlin airlift was a reaction to the Russian blockade of American access to Berlin. The entry of American troops into Korea was a reaction to the Moscow-inspired invasion of South Korea.

We now have the opportunity to go on the offensive when we implement that provision of the mutual security law which provides for the formation of a Polish Legion, a Slovak Legion, and national legions of the other countries of Eastern Europe formed from the escapees from these countries and which provision also provides for positive aid to selected persons residing in iron-curtain countries. We must look toward the eventual freedom of the people enslaved by the Soviet Union. Our best exported product is the American Declaration of Independence. This is the way to end the cold war, to stop high taxes and high prices, and remove the burden of armaments from the backs of the American people.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the pending resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5684) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The question of whether or not a rule should be adopted on this bill I think needs no debate. Obviously this bill should come to the floor for consideration. I merely want to point out to the House, however, that the bill is one of the most important and one of the largest appropriation bills to be considered by the House this year, with the exception of the military appropriation bill. This bill carries an appropriation in the amount of $7,482,527,790. That is a tremendous amount of money.

The resolution also waives points of order, a technical request made by the committee, which was not objected to on the part of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most acute problems confronting the world today is that of surplus populations. There are approximately 8,000,000 people in the British and American zones of Germany who are there because they have been expelled from behind the iron curtain. Italy, if she is to stand on her feet, must find resettlement areas for the excess manpower plaguing her economy. Similarly, Austria, Greece, and the Netherlands must be relieved of surplus population.

This large number of people that cannot possibly be assimilated in the economy of those countries has provided a most fertile field in which to sow the seeds of communism. Recognizing this fact, the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the committee of conferees on H. R. 5113 in their report expressed the hope—more than that, they expressed the congressional intention that a part of the money which is provided for in this mutual security appropriation bill, $10,000,000, will be used for the purpose of attempting to organize an internationally concerted movement to resettle these people. Quite obviously, the United States cannot admit and support any appreciable number of immigrants. In that connection, I might say that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization is not willing to increase the quotas for aliens coming to the United States. However, we do recognize the fact that steps must be taken, and must be taken promptly to aid the immigrant-receiving and the emigration countries, in providing homes and jobs for these people where they are needed. Conferences have been held looking toward the erection of an international, intergovernmental organization, outside of the United Nations, composed of and administered solely by interested countries. We do not feel that the International Labor Organization, for example, has any concern with this problem, largely because it is a big, unwieldy organization of 64 nations, plus the fact that in that organization there are representatives of 5 iron-curtain countries. Much progress has been made. I take this opportunity to thank the Committee on Appropriations for writing into its report a paragraph which very clearly expresses the intention of the Congress of the United States to do something constructive toward the solution of this problem. I hope that this language is sufficiently strong to make it abundantly clear to the Economic Cooperation Administration that Congress meant what it said on three occasions, when it attempted to deal with this problem. I make that statement for this reason, that recently a religious organization in the United States found homes for 500 families in Uruguay. The ECA could not find the money to provide for the transportation for these people, but they did find a million dollars to turn over to the International Labor Organization for "study and research." If that organization concerns itself with this problem, then I am quite concerned that the interest heretofore manifested by Australia and Canada, both of which countries will take large numbers of immigrants, will be lost entirely, and the best customers for this business will have been lost.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield?

Mr. GARY. The subcommittee which handled this bill is fully cognizant of the magnitude of the problem which he has stated. We not only cover the matter in our report, but we had considerable discussion on it in the hearings. Mr. Bissell, head of the ECA, was asked why they had not given more attention to the problem? He said very frankly that they had interpreted the language of previous legislation to direct them to deal with the countries and to assist the countries in handling the problem——

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield at that point? I ask him to do so for this reason, that Mr. Bissell's explanation, or alibi, or whatever it is, is not well founded because the Congress did not indicate its desire that this problem be dealt with by or through international groups such as the ILO. The very clear language contained in the amendment to the Displaced Persons Act, section 16, to be more specific, provides for our participation in an organization consisting of emigrant-sending and immigrant-receiving countries, which means within the 20 or 21 nations interested in trying to bring about a solution of the problem.

Mr. GARY. What I was trying to say to the gentleman is that Mr. Bissell said, rightly, or wrongly, that they had construed the language that way, but he promised the committee that they would reconsider the entire problem and do what they could to work it out. He also is cognizant of the fact that it does have

a tremendous imprint on this entire program.

Mr. WALTER. Does the gentleman feel that legislation is necessary in order to spell out our intent, or does the gentleman feel that the language contained in the report is adequate?

Mr. GARY. I do not think it is necessary to spell out our intent. Since the authorizing legislation has authorized the expenditure of $10,000,000, we have discussed it very completely in the committee, and we have pointed out in our report that we think the authorities should do something about it. We feel that is sufficient.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I wish to compliment the gentleman for calling attention to this very grave problem of expellees. Unless this problem is solved along the lines indicated, we will have grave trouble in the reorganization of central Europe.

Mr WALTER I do not think there is any question about it.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I also wish to compliment the very distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] for his fine statement, and join with him in the position he takes in the matter.

Mr. WALTER. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE].

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, some remarkable hypocrites must have been in attendance at the recent Governor's Conference in Gatlinburg, Tenn. It was decided there, by unanimous vote of all governors in attendance, that in effect the 48 States had been losing their sovereign rights to the national Government and international organizations at too rapid a rate over the last 18 chaotic years.

In attendance at that meeting, I understand, was our own Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, and I also understand that he sided right in with the rest of the governors regarding the State's rights issues. Whether Governor Stevenson has had an honest change of heart, or whether this is just another self-serving move, it may be well to check into his record over the past decade and determine how he has formerly looked upon the State's rights issues.

Up until now it can hardly be disputed that Governor Stevenson has followed the philosophy of New Deal national socialism. During the time he was here in the service of the Federal Government, from 1941 through 1947, he acted variously as adviser, representative, and delegate to the Conference on International Organization in San Francisco, the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations in London, and the United States delegation of the General Assembly of the United Nations in London and again in New York. All his acts and associations demonstrated his unswerving devotion to the principles and tenets of New Deal socialism as advocated by President Roosevelt and President Truman. Governor Stevenson has consistently fought for more and more Federal controls and more and more international organizations. His association with Alger Hiss and his subsequent defense of this traitor evidences an alarming complacency and stupidity beyond reason. His veto of all antisubversive measures passed by a Republican-controlled State legislature indicates that while he may have been forced to regret his defense of Alger Hiss, he still is fearful lest an Illinois antisubversive committee should expose the subversive operations of more of his friends or political associates. Or perhaps it indicates that he is a believer in the fallacy that "if you don't look, it might go away."

Governor Stevenson has done little, if anything, to protect the sovereignity of the great State of Illinois since becoming associated with Illinois politics. Now this sudden reversal of position may be sincere, taking into account the fact that Stevenson may be counting on coming up for reelection next year. Being seasoned in the political arena, he doubtless realizes that the voters of our great State of Illinois are fed up with the surrender of their sovereign rights to the national socialistic government and various international organizations. Our citizens in Illinois have become aware of the "iron hand under the velvet glove" and want to examine closely any moves by the Federal Government to deluge them with more and more paternalistic gifts—which invariably turn out to be the kind of gifts for which they are presented a staggering bill later on.

Could it be that Governor Stevenson has at last noticed the direction in which the wind is blowing—and is veering politically in that direction?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] sponsored an amendment in the Committee on Foreign Affairs which resulted in introducing the authorization for appropriation which now comes before us as an appropriation. She is, I understand, unavoidably detained from reaching the floor, so I take the liberty of responding to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

My own interest in this particular problem stems from the fact that I have offered a bill to extend the policy we have followed in the displaced persons program, and to take some fair share of this surplus labor of the free nations of Europe which would prove to be a tremendously useful reservoir of workers for the United States which we need at this time.

As to the serious nature of this problem, which I think the House should be familiar with, because it will come up again, this is the beginning of what ought to be a real contribution to the solution of free Europe's problems. In Germany it is admitted that perhaps as nettling a problem as German Federal Government, which we are anxious to put on its feet in democratic terms, has to meet is the problem of 9,000,000 Germans who were expellees from the eastern provinces and borders, many living in refugee camps without work or a place to which they can turn their talents. Naturally it is a fertile field for demogogues to try to incite some government in Germany to recapture the eastern provinces by force. That is the German picture, and it is important to give that situation an opportunity for outlet in the way which we propose to begin by this bill to give an opportunity elsewhere in the world for effective workers.

In Italy one of the grave problems which absolutely hampers any form of recovery of the Italian economy is the existence of an estimated 2,000,000 surplus workers. Do not be fooled by the unemployment figures in Italy. The fact is there is overemployment in practically all Italian industries. A great many more are often employed in factories and other plants than are actually needed.

This is one of the most critical problems of our time. We feel and justly that we have done a fine job for free Europe under the ECA, yet we have not fully done it until we help them deal with this problem of surplus-working population. While at the same time helping other countries where effective labor power is very much needed.

Mr SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to make in order today the bill for foreign aid. The bill itself, of course, is privileged, and it would not be necessary to have a rule at all except for the fact that the bill was reported only yesterday, and, under the rules of the House, it would have to lie over for a couple of days unless we did have a rule for its consideration. There is also a provision waiving points of order which was just a precautionary matter, because we thought there might be in the bill possibly some matter that might be subject to a point of order.

On the bill itself you will recall that just 2 or 3 weeks ago this whole subject was thoroughly debated in the House when we passed the bill which authorized this appropriation. I doubt if the House will want to go into that discussion very much again. The subject has been settled by the House; we are committed to the appropriation by the authorization recently adopted, and I assume that it will be the desire and the purpose of the House to carry out the authorization heretofore made.

On the bill itself you will recall that under the authorization the great bulk of this money is provided for arms aid and for economic aid in Europe. There is $5,000,000,000 for arms aid to Europe and $1,000,000,000 for economic aid, which, as you know from the discussion

which took place heretofore, is really integrated, that billion dollars, into the arms preparation service; so that it is a misnomer to call it economic aid. Therefore, the greater bulk of this fund provided in this bill as authorized by the House within the past few weeks goes to support General Eisenhower in the program which he is carrying out there for the defense of Europe. I rather assume, therefore, that there will be little debate and little discussion and little objection to carrying out the will of the House as expressed in recent weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONVENTION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 257)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the obligations of the United States of America as a member of the International Labor Organization, I transmit herewith, for the enactment of legislation or such other action as the Congress may consider appropriate, an authentic text of a convention—No. 96—concerning fee-charging employment agencies—revised 1949—which was adopted by the International Labor Conference at its thirty-second session, held at Geneva from June 8 to July 2, 1949.

I transmit also the report of the Secretary of State with regard to the convention, together with a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Labor to the Secretary of State setting forth the coordinated view of the interested departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government with respect to the convention. It will be noted that it is the recommendation of those departments and agencies that, if the Congress considers compliance with the terms of the convention as appropriate, legislative consideration be given to part III of the convention, which relates to the regulation of fee-charging employment agencies, rather than to part II, which requires in general the progressive abolition of such agencies.

For action and advice with respect to American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for transmission to the governments of Alaska, Guam, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands in order that those governments may give consideration to the enactment of legislation or other action, I am sending texts of the convention to the Secretary of the Interior.

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 11, 1951.*

(Enclosures: 1. Authentic text of convention; 2. Report of the Secretary of State; 3. Letter from the Secretary of Labor (copy).)

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5684) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 4 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5684, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any subject that has been more fully debated before this Congress than the one which we are now considering, the mutual security program. The Congress has already recognized the fact that this is a mutual security measure and is no longer purely foreign aid.

Involved in the expenditure of these funds is the defense of the free world. If we are going to secure the freedom and peace of the world, we must have strong allies to help us. I doubt very seriously whether the United States of America can defend itself against the aggression of Soviet Russia if we permit Russia to gain access to the resources of the entire world and to control the other nations of the earth.

It was my privilege just a few months ago to visit Europe with a congressional group. We found that the Marshall plan program has had a tremendous effect on the recovery and rehabilitation of the European countries. I also had the privilege of visiting Europe in 1947. I want to say to you that the change since that visit has been absolutely astounding. Yes, with all of the progress that has been made it is easy to recognize the fact that even now those nations are not able to defend themselves against the forces of communism.

Our group witnessed maneuvers of Belgian troops in Brussels. We saw French troops maneuver in the French zone of Germany. We saw Italian troops maneuver in Italy. In every single instance the troops were equipped with matériel that had been furnished by the United States of America, and without that equipment they would have been impotent.

Those in authority said to us very frankly, "We have the manpower, we have the desire to defend our country, but we do not have the equipment. We have neither the factories with which we can manufacture the equipment nor the dollars with which to purchase it." Therefore, if you want European armies to help in the great task of defending Europe we, the United States of America, must furnish the equipment for those armies.

Certainly no one can estimate the importance of Europe to the free world today. Not only do they have a population of 300,000,000 people there, but they have tremendous resources of coal, iron, and steel which, if they were to fall into the hands of the enemy, would tremendously affect the balance of power that exists now between the Communists and the free nations of the world.

I know that there are a lot of people who will say, "Well, we have no objection to arming Europe, we have no objection to the military aid that is given to them, but you have in this bill large amounts for economic aid, and we think the time has come when we should stop our economic aid to Europe." I would agree with them absolutely but for the fact that the economic aid that we are giving today is completely integrated with the military program and is directed toward military channels. The purpose of the economic aid is to strengthen the military potential of the nations who are allied with us in this fight for freedom.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Is there any money provided in this bill for economic or military aid to Spain?

Mr. GARY. There is none directly appropriated.

Mr. MORANO. Is there indirectly?

Mr. GARY. There are some unallocated funds that might be used for that purpose.

Mr. MORANO. How much?

Mr. GARY. There is in the bill a sum of approximately $450,000,000 which is unallocated and can be used for Spain, Yugoslavia, Western Germany, or any other European country that the Joint Chiefs of Staff may see fit.

Mr. MORANO. And it could be used either militarily or economically?

Mr. GARY. They are military funds, but there is a transfer clause in the bill which would permit the use of 10 percent of the funds for economic aid.

Mr. MORANO. Can the distinguished gentleman from Virginia tell me what the reason was behind the committee's failure to put direct funds in this bill for Spain, either militarily or otherwise?

Mr. GARY. There was no request from the military authorities, from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, from the ECA, or from the State Department. To the contrary, we were told that these unallocated funds had been placed in the bill, which would take care of any situation that might arise in Spain and the other countries to which I referred.

Mr. MORANO. As I recall the authorization bill, it provided that all of Europe or any part of Europe we thought that we wanted to help was included in the authorization.

Mr. GARY. But the amounts authorized were based upon certain programs that had been worked out, and no program has been worked out thus far for Spain to the point where the Joint Chiefs of Staff or the State Department or the ECA have requested funds to implement that program.

Mr. MORANO. But there is a possibility that there will be money allocated out of the $450,000,000?

Mr. GARY. They can allocate those funds for that purpose as the program is developed. Those funds are in the bill and can be used for that purpose.

Mr. MORANO. Would the gentleman care to disclose his position with reference to the allocation to Spain?

Mr. GARY. I feel that we should leave the defense of the United States to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I would certainly agree to any recommendation that the Joint Chiefs of Staff might make in that respect.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman made a statement with respect to the juxtaposition of economic and military aid. I think there should be added to that, and I hope the gentleman will agree, the fact that in places like Burma, India, and elsewhere in south and southeast Asia and the islands of the western Pacific, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America there are enormous opportunities where American direct offensive action against communism absolutely requires economic aid, even if divorced from military aid. We must do that unless we are to leave over one billion people in the underdeveloped areas ripe to fall for Communist subversion if not external Communist aggression, because of their grave economic deprivations. Military preparation I am wholly for, but it is the defensive action against communism. It is economic action which is the decisive offensive weapon. In that way we truly by deeds show our determination for winning by peaceful means.

Mr. GARY. I assure the gentleman I will discuss those items when I get to those countries.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I believe the principal witness for the military before the gentleman's committee was General Olmsted. I served with General Olmsted in World War II. I have the highest regard for him. He combines good judgment, keen analysis, open-minded willingness to give weight to the views of others, firmness in principles, adroitness in negotiation, technical skill, indefatigable energy, and patriotic devotion to country—all of these fine qualities to a degree rarely found in any one man. I feel that the committee could reasonably and properly rely with confidence upon the representations made to the committee by General Olmsted.

I am happy to say that just this week his outstanding services to our country were recognized by his promotion to be a major general. I am very happy to have this opportunity to express my enthusiasm over the fact that this fine soldier has been willing again to make available to his country his unique talents in the field which now engages his attention.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. Of course, Secretary of Defense Lovett appeared before our committee and discussed policies, but this entire military program is under the command and in the charge of General Olmsted. May I say, as one member of the committee, that I was very greatly impressed by his grasp of the entire program. I agree with everything the gentleman has said. I think we are very fortunate that the military part of the mutual security program is under his direction.

As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the economic aid under this bill is no longer economic aid in the sense that it was under the Marshall plan. I say that for this reason—we have today a cooperative program in Europe under which the NATO countries are cooperating in the defense of that very important area. When I was in Europe in June of this year, we visited a plant in the Netherlands. It was located at the airport near the Hague. It was one of the most modern airplane manufacturing plants I have ever seen. It was a plant that would do credit to any company operating in the United States. I was told that before the plant was constructed, engineers were sent to the United States to observe the construction of our plants here and they built along modern lines. They are manufacturing Meteors at that plant. The Meteor is an English plane and the manufacturing was being done under license from England. The engines were being manufactured in the Rolls Royce plant in Belgium. In the Netherlands plant the frames were being built, and the planes were being assembled and rolled off of the production line as fighting planes to aid in the defense of Europe. Our country contributed $350,000 in economic aid to build that factory. By appropriating $350,000 for economic aid in that particular instance, what we did was to increase the potential of the free countries to build their own planes and strengthen their own defenses.

It is estimated that for every dollar in economic aid that we spend at the present time, we increase the war potential of the foreign nation to which the money is given from two to three dollars. As a matter of fact, we have already materially reduced the estimates of the potentials of the European countries for next year because of the decreases that have been made in the authorizing legislation.

Mr. Chairman, let me make a confession. I have had the privilege of serving as Chairman of two subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations and it has been my privilege to bring several bills to the floor of the House. This is the first time I have ever brought a bill to the floor in which there was not a substantial cut. I want to say to you very frankly, there is no substantial cut in this bill. But, I think there is a reason for it. Some of you may recall that when we were arguing the authorization legislation on the floor of the House, I came into the well and urged the Members of the Congress not to cut the authorizations, but to authorize the full amount requested. I then promised that our committee would go over the requests item by item and cut the bill wherever we thought it was possible to cut. I well remember that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] followed my request with the statement that he thought the House should not delegate its responsibility to the committees, but that proper cuts should be made then and there and the cuts were made by the House. I have no quarrel with that procedure. Frankly, I think in some instances, the cuts were a little too deep, and I am convinced that in the authorization legislation we cut out of this bill everything that we could safely cut, having in mind always the security of this Nation.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio

Mr. BENDER. I want to commend the gentleman for his fine work. I know his heart is in the right place and that he wants to do the right thing.

I would like to ask, in connection with this mutual assistance program, with the share of the United States approximately $7,480,000,000, what is the total of the program? How much more is the rest of the world, or our friends in this mutual aid program, providing in addition to what we are providing?

Mr. GARY. As far as the European program is concerned, we are contributing $6,094,000,000. It is estimated that the European countries will put into the program from 10 to 12 billion dollars during this year.

Mr. BENDER. In addition to the amount we are putting in?

Mr. GARY. In addition to the amount we are putting in.

Mr. BENDER. Does the gentleman have any figures as to what has been contributed by other countires so far as compared with our contributions?

Mr. GARY. Yes. Those figures are in the RECORD.

Mr. BENDER. I may be rather naive, or it may be difficult for me to explain to my constituents and to the gentleman's constituents as well, how it is that we are providing the lion's share of the appropriations when we find ourselves as a Nation owing more money than all the rest of the world combined. That is, our national debt is greater than the combined debt of all the rest of the world. How can we justify a program of this kind, on the basis of the contribution we are making, in light of that situation?

Mr. GARY. Only one way, and that is the consequences that we may face if we do not embark upon this program. I believe from the bottom of my heart that we are dealing today with the security of America, the very existence of America. If I did not think so I would not be here arguing for this bill.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not important, however, since this country provides the

greatest experiment and the most successful experiment in government, that we be careful and diligent in protecting our economy and not going busted in the process?

Mr. GARY. Certainly no one realizes the necessity of fiscal stability more than I do. I believe, however, that our economy can stand this program, and I fear that our economy will not survive without the program, because if we do not defend America we will lose it.

Mr. BENDER. What assurance do we have as a Congress that when this money is appropriated the expenditures will be made properly and carefully and that the money that is appropriated will not be wasted?

Mr. GARY. I am going to discuss that phase of it in just a few moments.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I am taking this opportunity in order that the RECORD may be clear at this point in the gentleman's speech, because it is a very important speech, coming from the chairman of this subcommittee, whose majority is assuming the responsibility of recommending this very large appropriation.

The chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, spoke with some pride of the fact that his subcommittee made no substantial reduction in the amount.

Mr. GARY. Not with pride, with apologies; but I was trying to give the reasons.

Mr. COUDERT. As you will; I will not quarrel about that. Is it not a fact that the original request that came down here several months ago was for something like $8,500,000,000?

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. COUDERT. Is it not a fact that the present bill carries new appropriations of some $7,400,000,000 or $7,500,000,000?

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. COUDERT. Is it not a fact that the $8,500,000,000 originally requested is the figure that has been constantly talked about in the press and that is necessarily the figure in the public mind as the original request?

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. COUDERT. Is it not a further fact—and of course it is a fact, I merely want to put it in the RECORD—that there is a carry-over of $816,000,000? So that in effect this bill is not a $7,500,000,000 bill but something like $8,300,000,000. And is it not a further fact that there is an additional $300,000,000 provided, I think, in the authorization of military equipment that may be used?

Mr. GARY. Surplus materials.

Mr. COUDERT. No; over and above, and outside of these figures. So, essentially, we are right back at the original $8,500,000,000 that the public believed the administration asked for.

Mr. GARY. No; the gentleman is wrong in that, because the authorizing legislation provided for the use of these carry-over funds and of the $300,000,000 to which the gentleman referred.

If the gentleman says that this bill by reason of the carry-over makes available approximately eight and one-half billions, which is true, he must by the same token say that the requests which were filed originally were not $8,500,000,000 but were $9,500,000,000 because the Congress cut the authorized expenditures $1,000,000,000. The actual authorized expenditures were cut from $8,500,000,000 to $7,500,000,000—speaking in round figures; and that $7,500,000,000 is what this committee has appropriated. It has not in any sense changed the carry-over provisions or the provision with reference to surplus materials as contained in the authorizing legislation.

Mr. COUDERT. My distinguished chairman and I are perfectly well aware of that.

Mr. GARY. I just want to keep the record straight while the gentleman is keeping it straight.

Mr. COUDERT. I am not questioning it. The gentleman and I are aware of the fact. I do not believe that the great majority of the Members of Congress are aware of the fact. The Members whom the gentleman is going to ask to vote this entire amount without any reduction of any kind for any purpose, and I am dead certain that the great mass of the public do not know that in effect this bill carries the magic figure of $8,500,000,000 or more.

Mr. GARY. It carries appropriations amounting to approximately $7,500,000,000, but it does make available for the program such funds as have been previously appropriated that have not been used; that is correct. Some of these funds have been obligated but have not been spent. By the same token it is doubtful whether this entire amount will be spent during this year, but the funds will be obligated.

Mr. COUDERT. But the fact is, is it not, that the reasonably diligent newspaper reader is laboring under the illusion that an $8,500,000,000 authorization was reduced to $7,500,000,000, and that he was getting a $7,500,000,000 appropriation; whereas, in truth and in fact, he is still going to be called upon to spend $8,500,000,000?

Mr. GARY. No, I cannot agree with the gentleman. The appropriation is for $7,500,000,000.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The authorizing legislation, as I understood it, authorized a reappropriation of the carry-over, but, as I understood the language in our bill, it did not in itself constitute a reappropriation of the carry-over.

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS. Therefore, it was my understanding that the gentleman's committee would review the appropriations that were requested for the carry-over portion of $800,000,000 plus with the same care that the gentleman would the rest of it?

Mr. GARY. And that has been done, I will say to the gentleman. Every dollar that is going to be spent has been taken into consideration and a careful review has been made.

Let me say that you cannot save money on military aid, or on economic aid either for that matter, by cutting this bill, and I will tell you why. We do not have a 1-year program for mutual security. We have a 3-year program. And that program, very frankly, instead of costing $7,500,000,000, which is provided by this bill, will probably cost nearly $20,000,000,000, because we will in all probability have to appropriate money next year and we will have to appropriate money the following year. It is a 3-year program. We hope that by the end of 3 years we will have built up the military strength of European nations to the point that we can then begin to withdraw our aid.

Since that is true, and you have a definite program mapped out by the Joint Chiefs of Staff with definite objectives, if you do not appropriate the money to accomplish those objectives this year, then you must appropriate it at some future time if the objectives are to be accomplished.

Moreover, this is a program upon which we should either embark adequately or not at all, for the simple fact that if we send materials to Europe and do not send them in sufficient quantity to protect Europe, obviously, if the countries should be overrun by the enemy, then the equipment and materials which we have furnished the European nations will fall into the hands of the enemy. Very frankly that is a calculated risk that we must take anyway. But the sooner we build up the defensive strength to protect that material the better off we will be.

The one thing that General Eisenhower emphasized throughout his conversations with our group in Europe was the importance of the time element.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I was interested in the distinguished gentleman's observation in answer to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and the assurance that careful scrutiny had been given this additional $800,000,000 carry-over as well as everything else. Does the gentleman refer to the 25-minute meeting in which the majority Members marked up this bill.

Mr. GARY. I refer to the hearings which covered a period of three full weeks, every day, from early in the morning to late in the afternoon, on one occasion until far into the night, and on Saturady. I do not know of any bill that has been more carefully considered as evidenced by the vast amount of testimony that we have taken.

I will say to the gentleman that I personally did not wait until the last minute of the mark-up which took place on Tuesday afternoon to decide what my recommendation would be. I had been considering the matter for three long weeks during our hearings. I considered it, in fact, when the authorization measure was before the House. I do not know

of any bill that has been more carefully considered than has this bill.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I would like to ask a question, because I, too, am a little naive on these vast financial problems. I would also like to state that some of my constituents are a little naive in that they feel that if we end the year and have a surplus in our budget, we do not go out and borrow more money from our friends to finance us during the ensuing year. Now the other day it was my privilege to hear the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] on the floor of this House make the statement that the Defense Department would end the present fiscal year, or had done so, with a carry-over of roughly $20,000,000,000 and it was expected that next year they would end with a carry-over of over $40,000,000,000. Now in my simple way it would seem to me that maybe some of that money could be used to finance this NATO program. Of course, I realize that is a simple approach, but maybe the gentleman can enlighten me so that I can enlighten my constituents.

Mr. GARY. May I say to the gentlewoman that there is a provision which will permit the transfer of some of those funds for this program, if it is necessary. So far as the carry-over of the Armed Services funds are concerned. I am not familiar with that situation, but I do know this: I know that those carry-overs do not mean as much as you think they do; it does not mean that you have a surplus of money. It takes a long time to build ships. It takes a long time to build tanks. You have to condition your factories. A large part of the equipment which will be purchased by this money, will not be delivered during this fiscal year, but it will not be delivered the next fiscal year unless we appropriate the money which will permit the authorities to enter into contracts for the manufacture of the material that they need. Therefore, when you have money on hand, it does not mean that that money has not been allocated. All it means is that the goods have not been delivered and that the money has not been spent. But, you do have obligations, and as the material is delivered that money will be spent to pay for it. You cannot maintain a continuous flow of goods unless you make contracts in advance.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman, but I think he will admit that the figures are rather staggering. A carry-over of $20,000,000,000, then $40,000,000,000, and in the near future perhaps $60,000,000,000 is rather staggering for the finite taxpayer who is asked to appropriate more and more all the time.

Mr. GARY. I will admit that most of the figures we deal with in this Congress are staggering. I have been staggered for the last 2 or 3 years by the tremendous figures under consideration, but we have a staggering problem of defending America.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know that some people are asking the question, "What contributions are the foreign nations making to this program? Frankly, I personally feel that several of the nations have been dragging their feet a little bit—I want to be perfectly fair in discussing these problems with the House—but let us consider that question. It is difficult for us to appreciate the viewpoint of the people of Europe for the simple fact that although our armies have engaged conflict on foreign soil and although we have suffered because of the death of loved ones in the two previous World Wars our generation has never witnessed the horrors of a war fought on our shores.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. It has been stated in the debate that the public has not been made aware of what the figures are in connection with this piece of legislation. I have in my hand an Associated Press release that is on the wire this morning and is on the wires now, as a matter of fact, for I just came from the lobby where these things are coming over the wire.

Associated Press, October 11: Administration leaders sought House approval today for an $8,299,255,096 foreign-aid money bill and a $4,440,559,420 military construction measure in a drive for congressional adjournment next week.

Then this additional paragraph:

Of the $8,299,255,096 made available by the bill, $7,482,527,790 represents new cash. The remaining $816,727,306 is a reappropriation of funds made available previously for the aid program but not yet spent. Unless reappropriated, it would have reverted to the Treasury.

If the people are reading the papers, they have ample information from that source.

Mr. GARY. Certainly there has not been any effort on the part of our committee to cover up one single dime. If there is a dime to be spent that is not made plain in our report and in the proceedings, I am willing to strike it out.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not want to take up the gentleman's time, but this same Associated Press release has the figures broken down by areas, and a great deal of other detailed information.

Mr. GARY. Which came out of our report.

As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for us to understand the position of these foreign nations. They have seen the destruction of war. The present generation have seen their homes destroyed. They have seen their fields laid waste. They have seen their country overrun by an enemy. Naturally, if it is possible to avoid it, they do not want to see it again.

Moreover, they realize that they cannot defend Europe without our help. Therefore, before they committed themselves too strongly to this mutual security program, they wanted to be certain that we would stand by them.

There are three things that have happened recently that have given heart to the people of Europe and at the same time have given great impetus to this program. The first was our action in Korea. Up until that time the people of Europe were not certain that we would fight for the defense of the free world. They knew that unless we did, the task was hopeless and they were not going to embark upon a hopeless task with the chance of being liquidated when conquered by the enemy. When they found out that we were determined to stand firmly by the free nations, then they resolved that they would stand with us.

The second event was the appointment of General Eisenhower to the command of the European forces. It was our privilege to visit various countries of Europe in June, and I think that every member in our group will tell you that wherever we went we found that there was the greatest admiration and respect for General Eisenhower and the greatest confidence in him. Nothing could have been done that would have given greater impetus to the mutual security program than the appointment of General Eisenhower.

The third thing is the arrival of military equipment and materials from the United States. As I just stated to the gentlewoman from New York, you cannot build these tanks, guns, and planes overnight. They have to be contracted for. You have to have factories. We promised the materials, but we could not deliver them because we had to make arrangements for their manufacture. Now, they are beginning to roll into Europe. That has increased the confidence of the people.

The countries of Europe are now unalterably committed to the mutual security program, and they know that there can be no turning back. In view of that fact, I think they realize that the maximum effort must be put forth, and I am confident that we can expect greater efforts in the future.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman just touched on a part of this matter in which I am interested. We have been fabricating and shipping out of this country continuously, and we have been for the past 7 or 8 years, materials made out of our natural resources such as our raw mineral resources. Our natural resources have been fabricated into machines of war and other machinery, which has been shipped out of this country. It is evident that some day the supplies of our raw materials will be decreased to the extent that we will be much concerned about it. It is high time that we were making some preparation to return to this country the scrap that we have scattered over the face of the earth, and which we are having difficulty now getting back into this country. The Korean Government today is selling scrap, but that scrap is not coming back to America. It is American scrap material gathered up as a result of the advance and retreat of the American Army. What,

if anything, is going to be done to make preparation now at a time when we are giving these machines away, and helping these people, which effort I, of course, want to contribute to, to get some of this scrap material back.

Mr. GARY. I agree with the gentleman. I think the waste of material and scrap after World War II was disgraceful. A program of that kind should be worked out, but, frankly, our committee has not gone into that question.

Mr. BONNER. Two ships that we lost at Okinawa, and other islands in the Pacific during World War II, are now being scrapped under contract. The scrap is not coming back to America. Yet, in America, we are crying for scrap. We are short of steel. Certainly, that is the situation which the Congress ought to give its attention to. The committee of which I have the honor to be the chairman is greatly concerned about this problem.

Mr. GARY. I hope the gentleman's committee will give very serious consideration to it, and see that adequate steps are taken to handle the problem.

Mr. BONNER. I do think that in the preparation of these various appropriation bills, the legislative bills, some clause should be included in them providing that we have first call upon available scrap of all types and kinds that is being scattered around the world today.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. One of the difficulties in Korea is the question of who owns the scrap. We sent it over, but the United Nations claims title to it. It might be helpful to have some provision in a bill somewhere that scrap which is developed out of materials furnished by the United States shall be the property of the United States.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. Information came to me yesterday that it is estimated by the armed services we should have recovered more than 50,000 tons of brass and other materials, but that we have only got 5 tons back, and that the Korean Government is buying it from natives at $6 a ton and selling it at $38 a ton. That is something that we should be interested in, and it is something which is of interest to those of us who are concerned about the welfare of this Nation.

Mr. GARY. I agree with the gentleman wholeheartedly. I hope his committee will give the matter very serious consideration and work out a constructive solution. I shall be very glad to cooperate toward that end.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. In the Mutual Security Act, under section 524, the President calls for the return of scrap.

Mr. GARY. The act covers it, but our committee has not considered that phase of the program.

Mr. BONNER. That may be true, but what steps have we taken?

Mr. GARY. I say, so far we have not considered the program.

Mr. BONNER. We are sending scrap to Japan and other places. The terrible part of it, some scrap has previously gone to Hong Kong.

Mr. GARY. The mutual security bill was not signed until October 10, so there has not been time to work out a program under it.

Mr. RABAUT. It is planned to do something about it. It is set forth in this act.

Mr. GARY. It is set forth in the act, and it is a matter which should be given careful and serious consideration.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to say to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. EGNNER] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] that instead of scrap material being returned to this country, according to the Department of Commerce figures, in the last 6 months we have increased the export of scrap metal from the United States 10 times over.

Mr GARY. Mr. Chairman, this bill is divided into three titles. The first covers Europe, which I have already discussed in some detail. Title I constitutes by far the greater part of the entire program. It covers $6,000,000,000 of the $7,500,000,000. However, this is a worldwide program. Russia is attacking on a world front, and if we are going to meet that attack we must be prepared to meet aggression wherever it raises its ugly head.

Title II refers to the Near East and Africa. Certainly it is not necessary for me to dwell upon the importance of that area to the free world. If Russia were to obtain control of the oil of Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia, they would have in that one item alone a weapon which would be most effective in subduing the free world.

Moreover, that section is the gateway between the east and the west. Every airline from the east to the west flies over it. Every ship from the east to the west must pass through the Suez Canal or make the long voyage around the tip of Africa. It is the land connection between Europe and Asia. It is strategic in this world conflict. Consequently, we recommend the appropriation of $556,250,000 for that area.

Title III covers Asia and the Pacific. Just one item alone should convince us of the importance of that area. It contains approximately one-third of the population of the world. It has approximately 500,000,000 people. It is estimated there are 2,200,000,000 people in the world today; that 800,000,000 reside in Russia, China, and the satellite nations, and 1,400,000,000 in the free world. If this area should pass to the Communist orbit either by subversion or conquest, it would change the balance of power in manpower to the point that there would be 1,300,000,000 people in the Communist orbit and only 900,000,000 in the free world. In addition to that, from this area comes 60 percent of the world's supply of tin, 95 percent of the world's supply of rubber, and all of the world's supply of jute. We cannot afford to lose the friendship of the peoples of this vast area.

I stated in the beginning that we have not made any substantial cuts in this bill. We have cut title III $45,000,000. Frankly, I do not consider that a substantial cut in view of the total amount in the bill. There is an agreement among the nations participating in the Korean conflict to help rehabilitate Korea at the end of the present hostilities. The various nations have agreed to contribute, subject of course to the approval of their respective governments, $250,000,000 to this program; our representatives have assumed, subject to the approval of Congress, $162,500,000 as our part of that program. The authorization bill authorized the transfer of $50,250,000 of certain unexpended balances for this purpose and in addition authorized an appropriation of $45,000,000. This would have made a total contribution at this time of $95,250,000 of our contemplated $165,000,000. These funds cannot be spent until the hostilities cease. No one knows when that will take place. Our committee felt under those circumstances that if we allowed the $50,250,000 that would be a sufficient amount to carry on the program until the next session of the Congress and then if an armistice has been agreed upon in Korea we can authorize such additional sums as may be justified. That war-torn country in which the tide of battle has changed daily from one section to another has probably seen greater destruction than any other part of the world, and you can well imagine that funds are going to be sorely needed to rehabilitate the land.

Just the other day I talked with a doctor whose son is now in Korea. He said that the one thing he saw in Korea that impressed him more than anything else was the tremendous number of children who are running around the streets, most of them absolutely naked, without clothes, without food, or, as Shakespeare would say, "sans everything."

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. I am, of course, impressed with the gentleman's heart-rending account of the tragic situation in Korea. Unfortunately, I do not think the gentleman has stuck to the facts sufficiently. I think the Members of the House will be interested in knowing that there is presently in operation a United Nations civilian aid that is carrying out all the possible relief and rehabilitation that can be carried on while hostilities are still going forward. This fund, therefore, has nothing to do with a program of relief and rehabilitation under existing circumstances.

When I originally asked the gentleman to yield, I did not realize what he was about to say. What he has in effect said is that the $50,000,000 carry-over is no more necessary than the $45,000,000 which the gentleman is taking out, because what he is leaving in is $50,000,000 carry-over which he says himself cannot

be used until the hostilities are terminated. Now, how in the world, if the gentleman is really interested in economy, if he has honestly and sincerely scrutinized this item, can he distinguish between the $45,000,000 and the $50,000,000, neither of which can be used until hostilities are over and the United Nations military assistance is terminated?

Mr. GARY. I hope I made that sufficiently plain for the other Members of the House. I am sorry the gentleman himself did not understand it. I was trying to point out the great need there is going to be for this rehabilitation program the very moment that hostilities cease and I related the conditions in Korea as evidence of the fact there would be a need at that time. I grant the gentleman that some relief is now being administered in Korea. It is being taken care of out of funds that are being appropriated for the military and for other purposes. But the moment hostilities cease there is going to be need for a general rehabilitation program. If we do not have funds available with which to start this program it will be delayed weeks, probably months. My statement was that our committee felt that the $50,000,000 would permit the program to start immediately; then as the program progresses, when we come back into session we can appropriate such amounts as may be necessary. To repeal the entire appropriation at this time will have another very serious effect, in my judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed for 15 minutes additional

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Is not the substance of the gentleman's argument then that even if the Korean hostilities should go on for another 6 months or for another 12 months, nonetheless the $50,000,000 should be actually appropriated so that this agency can continue to pay its staff of 73 people to stand by and mark time until maybe they can do something.

Mr. GARY. I want to point out to the gentleman the second reason I think this appropriation is important. Unless we make a substantial part of our contribution to this fund then we cannot expect other nations to make their contribution. If we make our contribution of $50,000,000, then I think we can call upon the other nations to contribute also.

Mr. Chairman, there remains title IV, which covers the American Republics. It is not necessary for me to explain the importance of this area, because of the strategic materials involved and because in that area you have the Panama Canal and other strategic points of defense. That program is a comparatively small one covering an appropriation of only $59,000,000.

Just one word with reference to the administration. Under the Mutual Security Act the administration has been greatly improved. We have set up an agency in the President's office to coordinate the military, economic, and technical assistance programs. I was delighted to read on yesterday the President's announcement that he would appoint as coordinator of this entire program the Honorable Averell Harriman. I do not know of anyone who is better qualified to handle this task by training and experience than Mr. Harriman. He has been associated with this program from the very beginning. At the time the Marshall plan was inaugurated he was Secretary of Commerce. He was taken from that important cabinet post and sent to Europe as a roving ambassador to administer this entire program in Europe.

Recently he has returned to this country and has been serving as advisor to the President on foreign affairs No one, in my judgment, is more familiar with the needs and with the opportunities of this program than Mr. Harriman. In my judgment he will make an able and outstanding administrator.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GROSS. This is the Harriman who is a Wall Street banker; is that correct?

Mr. GARY. This is the Honorable Averell Harriman, and I am quite certain the gentleman knows his connections.

For administrative expenses under the bill there was a request of $76,675,000. The Mutual Security Act abolishes the Economic Cooperation Administration and provides for the creation of a Mutual Security Administration. It further provides that the personnel of the new agency shall not exceed 90 percent of the personnel of the old. That cut of 10 percent had been taken into account in the request that was filed with the committee. The committee did not feel, therefore, that there should be further cuts in the administrative expenses requested for the Mutual Security Administration. We feel, however, that there could be cuts in the administrative expenses requested for the State Department and the Department of Defense; and, therefore, we have fixed a limitation of $75,000,000 in the bill for administrative expenses.

Mr. Chairman, that is the program we present to you. I think it is one of the most important programs that this Congress has faced. I trust that it will be the pleasure of the House to approve it as presented.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 60 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is to be devoutly hoped that this is the last appropriation bill at this session of Congress.

It is a bill designed to implement the recent authorization legislation known as the Mutual Security Act of 1951.

The over-all policy, constituting the heart of the matter under consideration was of course established by that act which, incidentally, only became law yesterday.

The amount to be appropriated is before us now.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, we are called upon to pass a bill carrying enormous sums of money.

Once again, we are called upon to make a heavy contribution to what the State Department calls "the attempt to correct the imbalance of power."

In plain language, Mr. Chairman, we are called upon to make available some $8,849,000,000 in addition to the $4,200,000,000 which has just been voted today, largely for military bases, and in addition to the $57,000,000,000 which was made available previously for our own Armed Forces—all in an attempt to recapture some of the military power which was ours at the end of World War II and which was literally thrown away as the result of policies pursued by the present administration.

Moreover, we are called upon to make that effort at price levels which add billions upon billions of dollars to the over-all cost.

It is really tragic when we stop to consider that 6 years ago we were the strongest military power in all history and had in our hands the power to assure almost any type of peace that we considered just and lasting.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, is a catch-all or one-package bill It provides for military aid. It provides for economic aid. It provides for so-called bilateral economic assistance under the Mutual Security Administration. It provides for so-called bilateral point 4 assistance under the State Department. It provides for so-called multilateral economic assistance by contributions on our part to various United Nations organizations.

It provides, as I have stated, about $8,849,000,000 to be paid to 60 different nations throughout the length and breadth of the world in which we live.

As has been indicated, the appropriation in this bill has been referred to as an appropriation of $7,482,000,000. There must be added to that figure, however, the sum of $816,000,000 of carryover from the fiscal year 1951 and, under section 526 of the authorization law, the sum of $550,000,000 in terms of equipment considered excess to our own needs, which is not included in the total carried in this bill.

In addition, I might mention that there is about $2,500,000,000 or the equivalent in counterpart funds in foreign currencies, $500,000,000 of which must under the terms of the authorization law be used for military aid, all of which, as far as I know, is available for that purpose if so desired.

Every cent authorized as a ceiling by the authorization law has been hastily approved for appropriation in this bill, except for the $45,000,000 referred to by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], which was requested for use by the United Nations Korean Reconstruction

Agency, and except for a small, rather incidental reduction in the amount requested for administrative expenditure.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks I insert at this point in the RECORD three tables. First, showing the authorizations by title; second, showing the authorizations by type; and, third, showing the authorizations by comparison, starting with the President's request and coming down to the present bill.

TABLE I.—*Authorizations, by title*

Title I—Europe.	
Military	$5,028,000,000
Economic	1,022,000,000
Total	6,050,000,000
Title II—Near East and Africa:	
Military	$396,250,000
Economic	160,000,000
Total	556,250,000
Title III—Asia and Pacific:	
Military	535,250,000
Economic:	
All but Korea	237,500,000
Korea	45,000,000
Subtotal (economic)	282,500,000
Total	817,750,000
Title IV—American Republics:	
Military	$38,150,000
Economic	21,250,000
Total	59,400,000
Grand total	7,483,400,000

TABLE II.—*Authorizations, by type*

	Military	Economic	Total
Title I	$5,028,000,000	$1,022,000,000	$6,050,000,000
Title II	396,250,000	160,000,000	556,250,000
Title III	535,250,000	282,500,000	817,750,000
Title IV	38,150,000	21,250,000	59,400,000
Total	5,997,650,000	1,485,750,000	7,483,400,000

TABLE III.—*Authorizations, by comparisons*

Item	President's request	House amounts	Senate amounts	Conference agreement	Conference agreement differences					
					More or less than request		More or less than House bill		More or less than Senate amendment	
					Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Title I—Europe.										
Military	$5,293,000,000	$5,028,000,000	$5,006,350,000	$5,028,000,000	$265,000,000 less	5.00 less	None		$21,650,000 more	0.43 more
Economic	1,675,000,000	[1]1,040,000,000	[1]880,500,000	1,022,000,000	653,000,000 less	38.98 less	$18,000,000 less	1.73 less	141,500,000 more	16.07 more
Total	6,968,000,000	6,068,000,000	5,886,850,000	6,050,000,000	918,000,000 less	13.17 less	18,000,000 less	.25 less	163,150,000 more	2.77 more
Title II—Near East and Africa:										
Military	415,000,000	415,000,000	396,250,000	396,250,000	18,750,000 less	4.51 less	18,750,000 less	4.51 less	None	
Economic	125,000,000	175,000,000	160,000,000	160,000,000	35,000,000 more	28.00 more	15,000,000 less	8.57 less	None	
Total	540,000,000	590,000,000	556,250,000	556,250,000	16,250,000 more	3.00 more	33,750,000 less	5.72 less	None	
Title III—Asia and Pacific:										
Military	555,000,000	530,000,000	535,250,000	535,250,000	19,750,000 less	3.55 less	5,250,000 more	.99 more	None	
Economic:										
All but Korea	265,500,000	237,500,000	178,750,000	237,500,000	25,000,000 less	9.52 less	None		58,750,000 more	32.86 more
Korea	112,500,000	11,250,000	69,750,000	45,000,000	67,500,000 less	60.00 less	33,750,000 more	300.00 more	24,750,000 less	35.48 less
Subtotal (economic)	375,000,000	248,750,000	248,500,000	282,500,000	92,500,000 less	24.66 less	33,750,000 more	13.56 more	34,000,000 more	13.68 more
Total	930,000,000	778,750,000	783,750,000	817,750,000	112,500,000 less	12.06 less	39,000,000 more	5.00 more	34,000,000 more	4.33 more
Title IV—American Republics:										
Military	40,000,000	40,000,000	38,150,000	38,150,000	1,850,000 less	4.62 less	1,850,000 less	4.62 less	None	
Economic	22,000,000	22,000,000	21,250,000	21,250,000	750,000 less	3.40 less	750,000 less	3.40 less	None	
Total	62,000,000	62,000,000	59,400,000	59,400,000	2,600,000 less	4.19 less	2,600,000 less	4.19 less	None	
Grand total	8,500,000,000	7,498,750,000	7,286,250,000	7,483,400,000	1,016,600,000 less	11.96 less	15,350,000 less	0.20 less	197,150,000 more	2.70 more

[1] Includes authorizations for strategic material development.

In considering the funds to be appropriated by this bill, it is important, Mr. Chairman, to keep in mind the great elasticity which has been provided.

For instance, up to 10 percent can be transferred under title 1 from military aid to economic aid or vice versa. Under title 2, up to 10 percent of the amount made available for military aid can be made available to any country in the near-eastern area, whether or not discussed in connection with the bill. Under title 3, there is a provision for the increase of funds by transfer for economic aid in Korea. Under the general provisions, it is provided that up to 10 percent of the funds in any title of the bill can be transferred to any other title in the bill.

As will be noted from the tables which I have inserted, title 1 applies to Europe and to about 17 different nations. A total of about $6,000,000,000 is carried in this title, including roughly $5,000,000,000 for military aid and $1,000,000,000 for economic aid, largely the result of the increased burden placed upon other nations in contributing to the over-all military picture.

Our military aid includes, among other things, vessels, aircraft, tanks, combat vehicles, motor transport vehicles, small arms and machine guns, artillery and naval guns, small arms and machine gun ammunition, and artillery and naval gun ammunition.

It is equipment for the troops in active service, which have been promised by our allies overseas under the so-called "mid-term defense plan" which contemplates, I believe, that the NATO nations overseas shall provide about 85 percent of the total manpower.

The committee has been furnished certain information showing the number of men under arms in terms of thousands of population in each country. It shows, also, the defense effort in dollars or their equivalent by each country overseas in terms of gross national product.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point in the RECORD two tables summarizing this information in large measure:

Men in active military service

	Per 1,000 of population 1951 (approximation)
Belgium	12.2
Denmark	6.3
France	17.8
Italy	6.5
Luxemburg	6.7
Netherlands	9.7
Norway	9.7
Portugal	10.6
United Kingdom	15.7
Europe, total	12.6
United States	21.2

Gross national product, total expenditure and defense expenditure of countries participating in the foreign-aid program, converted into United States fiscal years

[In millions of dollars]

	Gross national product	Fiscal year 1950, total Government expenditure	Defense expenditure		Gross national product	Fiscal year 1951,[1] total Government expenditure	Defense expenditure	
			Amounts	Percent of gross national product			Amounts	Percent of gross national product
NATO countries:								
Total	93,360	23,877	4,692	5.0	99,921	25,326	5,987	6.0
Belgium-Luxembourg	6,482	1,635	107	2.6	6,744	1,680	250	3.7
Denmark	2,979	408	45	1.5	3,385	447	56	1.7
France	21,439	6,756	1,394	6.5	24,368	7,620	2,235	8.2
Iceland	92	21			100	19		
Italy	13,819	2,494	475	3.4	15,200	2,776	650	4.3
Netherlands	4,891	1,339	210	4.3	5,458	1,480	280	5.0
Norway	1,698	387	49	2.9	1,988	489	66	3.3
Portugal	1,969	180	47	2.4				
United Kingdom	37,091	10,652	2,105	5.7	39,680	10,915	2,450	6.2
Germany	21,643	5,251	1,036	4.8	26,460	6,510	1,210	4.6
Germany plus NATO countries	115,003	29,128	5,728	5.0	126,381	31,836	7,197	5.7
Other European countries								
Austria	1,793	578	28	1.5	2,120	690	13	0.6
Greece	1,722	502	115	6.7	1,875	571	179	9.8
Turkey	2,794	516	175	6.3	3,477	743	192	5.7
Total, all European countries	121,312	30,724	6,046	5.0	133,713	33,843	7,581	5.7
Canada	15,949	2,399	451	2.8	17,105	2,901	933	5.5
United States	261,000	40,156	13,200	5.1	303,500	44,600	22,200	7.3

[1] Revised Sept. 17, 1951.

Economic aid under title I, as I have stated, is said to be required largely because of the additional burden which the military program places upon the allies overseas. It is justified in the hearings, country by country, largely on the basis of balance of payments.

Members will find a detailed table giving a picture of each one of these countries in terms of major statistics in connection with the discussion of each country in the hearings.

It is evident that the economic progress realized in recent years has been very great indeed.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. In the testimony with reference to military aid, was there evidence presented to your committee in a form showing the estimated cost of equipping a United States division as against a British, French, Turkish, or other division? Was there any evidence of that character given to you?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will say to the gentleman that I think we had no information along the specific line he suggests. Generally speaking, we were told that the amount requested for a given country overseas was determined by taking the number of men to be provided by that country for active service and applying to that number of men our own tables of organization and our our price level.

Mr. KEATING. It seemed to me that perhaps, unless such information would be considered restricted, it might be helpful and advisable if we had figures of that character. My distinct impression is that it would actually be a saving to United States taxpayers to equip certain forces of friendly countries, as against equipping our own forces, but I have no figures of a specific character regarding that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman and expect to have something more to say on that point later.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. In some of the testimony given earlier, and I do not think this is restricted, it was made clear that the tables of organization adopted by various units varied from the Belgians, who followed the United States table, to others which amounted to roughly 50 percent of the United States table, but that the average over the whole was roughly 75 percent of the American table of organization.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. We did not have testimony to that effect. The testimony before our committee was to the effect that, generally speaking, our tables of organization were used but that there were some departure from it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I think the record should be clear as to how much money we are appropriating in this bill. In the colloquy which occurred between the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], I think the impression was left that all we are appropriating is the amount authorized under the original authorization which was signed only yesterday by the President. Are we not also appropriating, in addition to that amount, $7,482,000,000, carry-overs that were not expended as of the 30th of June?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In my opinion, the answer to the gentleman's question is, "Yes." We are appropriating $7,482,000,000, and we are reappropriating funds that would otherwise revert to the Treasury in the amount of $816,000,000. On top of that the authorization law allows the transfer to the extent of $550,000,000, of material that is regarded as excess to our own needs.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Then can the gentleman state for the record the total amount as he had it that we are appropriating under this bill?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The total carried by this bill, if you add those three figures, is $8,849,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. And, if the gentleman will permit me, I would correct his statement that this is of the 30th of June, not the 31st.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman from Wisconsin has asked precisely the question I was going to ask except I notice here that you have this reappropriation from this other item you wanted to use of something like $816,000,000; does that mean that Congress was extra generous in its appropriation last year? Or how in the world do you have $816,000,000 left over? Or why was it not turned back to the Treasury as is usual?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman that the figures given me in this connection, show that as of June 30, 1951, there was something like $6,321,000,000 that had not been expended, and in addition $816,727,306 which had not been obligated.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is what I meant, obligated.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. For various reasons the responsible officials were not able to obligate the last mentioned sum within the fiscal year, and it is proposed to carry it forward into the fiscal year 1952 by the language of the bill now under consideration.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This may be repetition, but as I understand the gentleman, we have been considering here the appropriation bill for $7,482,000,000-odd, am I right about that?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is right.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But we also have under consideration here really, or we are including, we are going to spend, an additional eight-hundred-and-sixteen-million-odd dollars that as the gentleman has said is unobligated; is that right?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In addition thereto we have this $300,000,000 that I think the gentleman said can be transferred or will be transferred, which has to do with excess equipment.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Fighting equipment excess to our needs.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And $250,000,000 in addition thereto.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The amount that may be transferred as excess equipment is $550,000,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right, made up of two items, one of $300,000,000 and one of $250,000,000. So we really are considering, then, a bill providing for the expenditure of $8,848,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Eight billion eight hundred and forty-nine million dollars according to my figures.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Eight billion eight hundred and forty-nine million dollars and not just $7,482,000,000. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Did the evidence before the gentleman's committee indicate that these countries, which we are supporting, are making the progress they should be in raising military manpower?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It is hard to answer that question briefly. I may say to the gentleman, however, that in my opinion the progress is not wholly satisfactory, but that there has been considerable progress, particularly since the arrival of General Eisenhower on the scene of action. I think the tables to which I referred will give the gentleman some index of what their present contribution is.

Mr. GROSS. Then, the gentleman does not think the progress is satisfactory?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not think it is wholly satisfactory, but I think there has been substantial progress recently.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I caught the statement that the gentleman made that this included somewhere in the neighborhood of $300,000,000 worth of arms that were surplus to our needs. The gentleman from Massachusetts sat on the same subcommittee that I did when we were hearing requests for military appropriations and I am just curious as to whether he feels that we have $300,000,000 worth of arms we do not need in view of the huge request the military made and the demands they made for more and more arms and equipment?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will say to the gentleman that I did not get any inkling of that fact in the course of those 11 weeks that we were taking testimony together.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I did not either. The story they told is they did not have enough equipment for the men we have and the men we are going to have, and that we needed a lot of additional equipment. Now they come along and talk about giving away $300,000,000 worth of arms and equipment that are surplus. It just does not make sense.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman that there is $550,000,000 included for this purpose in two items in section 526 of the authorizing law. The first item dates from June 30, 1950, and the second is from June 30, 1951. The latter item amounts to $300,000,000. I am told that the military request was for $450,000,000 but for some reason those in charge of the authorizing legislation saw fit to cut that down from $450,000,000 to $300,000,000.

Mr. SCRIVNER. A war is being fought now in which our men need arms and equipment in Korea. All of the stuff is needed over there and it is not getting there when it is needed. It seems to lack logic to talk about turning over $300,000,000 worth of surplus arms and equipment when we do not have any unless this recent huge appropriation that we made is going to supply us with a surplus.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman tell us whether or not there is involved in this estimate the construction of ships to be delivered to these other countries or are we going to follow the policy of transferring ships that are already built, then provide the new ones for our own use?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Well, I am advised that there is a legislative restriction on the use of ships in the so-called mothball fleet of the Navy or the Maritime Commission or both and that, therefore, it is impossible to use the ships in those fleets which otherwise might be used for the naval program carried in this bill.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is not that limitation only for ships over 1,500 tons, and is it not contemplated that in the program of transfer of excess equipment for mutual security there will be ships or vessels—I do not know what you would call them—under 1,500 tons?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The prohibition, as I understand it, applies to all merchant ships. The gentleman may be right in respect to those in the Navy mothball fleet. I am not clear as to that.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Was any suggestion made by any majority member of this subcommittee that the law be amended so as to free the mothball fleet for transfer to meet the naval requirements?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The bill was marked up so rapidly I think there was hardly time for suggestions of that character. Specifically answering the question, I recall no such suggestion.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us briefly how the actual appropriation compares with the authorization?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have already tried to indicate that the actual appropriation recommended is identical with the full authorization except in two respects, first an item for the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, which is reduced by $45,000,000, and, second, a very minor reduction in the request for administrative expenditure.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. That limitation on administrative expenditures is not reflected in the over-all total, is it? I believe not.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Well, there is a limitation of $75,000,000 there, and I think the request was for $76,000,000.

Mr. COUDERT. My point is that that does not reduce the over-all appropriation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No. As presently written, it does not affect the overall total. It is simply a limitation within that total.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. With respect to these two items comprising $550,000,000, described as being transferred for excess equipment, does that mean that we have an excess amount of equipment, or does not that just mean a transfer of equipment that we are providing for these other countries? Is that not about all there is to it? It is not any second-hand equipment or anything of that kind. It is just a way of handling the problem, is it not?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not have the Mutual Defense Act for 1949 before me, but as I understand it there is authority to transfer equipment now on hand, which is considered to be excess to our needs, for the purpose of this program.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Following that question, does the gentleman have any information, or is he satisfied with respect to the productivity of arms and munitions in foreign countries, especially in the European countries? What are they doing with respect to the production of arms and munitions?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman from Iowa asked me a question along that line and I tried to answer it as briefly as I could. I am inserting certain information in the RECORD on that. I think the answer is that the results to date are not entirely satisfactory, but that there has been considerable progress, particularly since the arrival of General Eisenhower.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I realize that is true with respect to the management over there, but the question was in re-

gard to the production of arms and munitions.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have inserted in the RECORD certain tables that will show the manpower per thousand population, and the defense effort, in terms of gross national product for countries overseas as compared to our own figures. I think this information may be helpful to the gentlemen.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I wonder if the gentleman could clear up a point for me. It is my understanding that under the $56,000,000,000 appropriation that was just recently passed for national defense, 15 percent of that can be used for military needs in the NATO countries. Under this bill, of course, we have $6,000,000,000 that can be used for the same purpose. I wonder if the gentleman would comment on that.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have no recollection of the 15-percent provision to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. So the committee did not consider that?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Consideration of that possibility was, I think, prohibited by the elimination in conference of certain language which my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] had inserted in the House bill.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McVEY. I should like to make inquiry of the gentleman in regard to a situation that has puzzled me a little bit. We are discussing appropriations for mutual security, and naturally we are interested in whether the implication of the word "mutual" actually obtains in our relations with other countries. I understand that in the Selective Service Act of France there is a provision to the effect that the men drafted into the military service as privates cannot be used to fight beyond the soil of France. If we are sending our men deeply into Germany in order to protect France, I am wondering if we have mutual security when the Republic of France is not willing to let its men fight beyond the soil of their own country. Has the gentleman any information on this subject?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Of course, France has a good many men fighting in Indochina, and the Foreign Legion would clearly be an exception to the provision that the gentleman is suggesting here. I think at the moment there is some restriction on conscripted manpower.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. But the gentleman and others including myself, saw French soldiers, conscriptees, in the French Zone of Germany on active maneuvers. We observed them for a couple or 3 hours one afternoon. But I understand they cannot be sent into the colonies or outside of Europe or metropolitan France if they are conscriptees.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You can pick out things of that kind in respect to almost every country. That is why I say I do not think conditions can be called satisfactory as yet. On the other hand, substantial progress has been made all along the line, I think.

I have spoken of title I.

Title II applies to the Near East and Africa. It carries a total of $556,250,000, including $396,250,000 for military aid and $160,000,000 for economic aid. Military aid goes to several nations. Substantial relief is provided for the Arab refugees and for Israel. Technical assistance goes to other nations. The total number of nations affected under this title of the bill is 12.

Title III applies to the Far East and the Pacific. It deals with 12 nations and carries a total of $817,750,000, including $535,250,000 for military and $282,500,000 for economic aid. Military aid goes to several nations. There is a very substantial economic program provided for India and for Pakistan. There is technical assistance for the other nations involved.

Title IV applies to Latin America, 19 nations being involved. There is a request for $38,150,000 for a brand new military program and for $21,250,000 for economic aid in the form of technical assistance. The technical-assistance program is jacked up about 33 percent as compared with the last fiscal year. The so-called military program is entirely new and was very poorly justified.

Unexpended balances are to be added in nearly every case.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include at this point in the RECORD a table showing unobligated and unexpended balances as of June 30, 1951:

Mutual security—unexpended balances at close of fiscal year 1951

Description	Unliquidated obligations	Unobligated (net)	Total unexpended (including unobligated)
Title I Europe			
Military	$3,941,618,038	$566,253,233	$4,507,871,271
Economic	1,550,827,821	1,383,000	1,552,210,821
Total, title I	5,492,445,859	567,636,233	6,060,082,092
Title II Near East and Africa:			
Military	333,286,967	69,018,294	402,305,261
Economic	4,717,863		4,717,863
Total, title II	338,004,830	69,018,294	407,023,124
Title III Asia and Pacific:			
Military	284,545,106	121,396,298	405,941,404
Economic:			
Excluding Korea	139,839,592	4,721,246	144,560,838
Korea	57,809,922	50,200,888	108,010,810
Total, economic	197,649,514	54,922,134	252,571,648
Total, title III	482,194,620	179,318,432	661,513,052
Title IV American Republics:			
Military			
Economic	9,090,422	754,347	9,844,769
Total, title IV	9,090,422	754,347	9,844,769
Recapitulation, all titles:			
Military	4,559,450,111	759,667,825	5,319,117,936
Economic	1,762,285,620	57,050,481	1,819,345,101
Total, all titles	6,321,735,731	816,727,306	7,138,463,037

Administrative expenses, as has already been indicated, are requested in the amount of $76,000,000 as compared with $51,000,000 in the last fiscal year, an increase of 50 percent, although the increase in the total program apparently amounts to only about 3 percent.

I have a few observations of general character, Mr. Chairman, which I should like to refer to at this point.

First, I think the record makes it clear that economic aid as distinguished from technical assistance, and point 4 assistance, has been furnished to the point where we can say that the economic pump has been primed and is functioning. The military pump has not been primed, and it is vital that it should be.

Second, it appears from the record that all economic aid would be discontinued here and now except in respect to perhaps three or four countries were it not for the additional burden that is placed on our allies by calling upon them for military production.

Third, it seems clear that to the extent that orders for military end items can be placed overseas instead of in our own plants here at home we provide the nation overseas with dollars, we thereby cut down the possible need for economic aid to that country, we tend to make that nation self-sustaining, and we tend to build up the morale of its people.

Under present plans, there is very little production contemplated in the countries overseas. I think the matter is so important that it calls for a very thorough survey to see if we cannot get more cooperation, more production, cheaper production, and a very much reduced requirement for dollars from this country.

Fourth. There is very little aid by the World Bank, the Export-Import Bank, or by private sources contemplated in reference to the program requested for the European countries under title 1. It

seems to me that those possibilities should be stimulated so far as they reasonably can be, and that they, taken in connection with so-called infrastructure, that is, expenditures for fields and things of that character, which have to be developed abroad, may well point the way to a very substantial reduction in the estimate need for economic aid in the form of dollars.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. I think the gentleman is making a very important point, which I hope the Members of the House will consider very seriously in connection with the program for another year. The gentleman indicated, for instance, that in northern Italy and in Germany, there is excess labor and excess productive capacity. It might well be of great benefit to our own economy as well as to our own defense to make use of that excess-labor market and excess productive capacity in order to produce some of this equipment, which cannot be done under the budgets of the countries themselves.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is exactly the point I have in mind.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. Is it not a fact that some of the testimony before us from the economic witnesses indicated that many of the obstacles in the way of what the gentleman has been talking about were domestic and international political obstacles in Europe itself? In other words, the difficulty of transferring populations—excess populations to the country in need of the labor, and so on?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am sorry, but I did not get part of the gentleman's question.

Mr. COUDERT. I just wanted to call the gentleman's attention to testimony concerning the subject matter that he was just referring to, that some greater effort should be made to utilize presently not fully productive capacity abroad.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, my fifth observation is this:

It has been pointed out that the bill authorizes the transfer after June 30, 1951, of $300,000,000 worth of property, considered excess to our needs. The request from the military, as I understand it, was for $450,000,000. The request was reduced in the authorizing law to $300,000,000.

In my opinion, the full $450,000,000 should have been authorized, and the principle should be extended further in line with the proposal the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], to which I have referred, so that end items which are required either for our forces at home or for our allies abroad can be treated more or less in one pool, and be placed where they are most necessary at any given time.

If this principle had been put into effect in the authorizing legislation, it would have been possible to reduce materially the over-all funds carried in this bill.

Sixth. Legislation, if necessary, should be enacted to permit the transfer of ships out of the mothball fleets to which I have referred under this program, allowing us to replace them by new and modern construction in this country.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. I think the gentleman will find that in the authorizing legislation article 506 does allow of that transfer up to a total of a billion dollars. That would take care of some of these smaller ships that have been referred to; that is, ships under 1,500 tons. As that language was redrafted, it would allow the very thing the gentleman is advocating, up to a total of a billion dollars.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. But there must be reimbursement from funds appropriated pursuant to this act.

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is correct, but it does allow the transfer of an old ship and the construction of a new one under the reimbursed funds.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes. But it does not allow any reduction in this appropriation that otherwise might result.

Mr. HERTER. It does not do that.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will be gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I notice in the hearings the gentleman went into the dismantling of plants in Germany, for which I congratulate him. Can the gentleman tell us whether that situation has been stopped, so that we will not be unwisely encouraging that policy?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have always thought that policy, as put into effect, was a very great mistake. My understanding is that it has been discontinued and that it has been necessary to try to replace some of the plants that were dismantled

My seventh observation, Mr. Chairman, is this: It appears that the technical assistance program is divided between the Mutual Security Administration and the State Department From my point of view, I do not see what there is to be gained by this division. It seems to me to make for confusion and to make the handling of the program more difficult. I think that consideration should be given as we go along, if these programs are to be continued, to placing them under a single organization.

Eighth, with respect to the multilateral aid, it appears from the record that the United States is contributing more than its share to United Nations organizations. In one or two instances the share assumed is considerably larger than the limit that was imposed in the State Department appropriation bill this morning. It would also appear that there is danger of overlapping between the multilateral work and the bilateral work in the same fields in the same countries.

Mr. Chairman, the presentation to your committee left very much to be desired. In the first place, the hearings were carried on prior to the enactment into law of the authorization bill. As we all know, it only became law yesterday, and here we are on the floor within 24 hours considering appropriations to implement it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself ten additional minutes.

As a result, the justifications were changed repeatedly and almost overnight. We had different sets of figures presented, often failing to jibe with each other, or with other figures that the committee had received.

The great bulk of this bill, of course, is for the military, and we were forced to rely on figures presented by military representatives which, as far as I am concerned, often failed to inspire confidence.

In fact, when we got into figures which the ordinary individual can understand, the number of trucks, for example, to be made available for a given number of Armed Forces, the number seemed to be out of all reason.

As already indicated, the number of all items seems to be based usually on our own tables of organization, even though these would seem, offhand, to be excessive in respect to some of the countries overseas.

I think that some committee of the Congress should give our tables of organization careful consideration before another year.

A further great difficulty, of course, resulted from the fact that most of the important figures that we were furnished were given off the record. We had figures on the record; we would meet the next day and they would be off the record, and the third day we did not know whether they were on or off the record. Insofar as they were given off the record they, of course, serve no purpose whatsoever in presenting this bill to the House as a whole.

As an example of the philosophy of some of those who appeared before us, it was pointed out in one instance that the unit cost of planes in one country was very much more than the unit cost of the very same plane in another country. The witness consulted the department and came back the next day with the report that an error had been made; but he said not to worry about it because it would permit not the reduction of the appropriation, but the provision of more planes than had been requested.

I am constrained to add, Mr. Chairman, that consideration by the committee from my standpoint was also most unsatisfactory.

After 3 weeks of hearings with attendance at a very low ebb, we completed testimony at about 5 p. m. Monday afternoon. The bill was marked up the following afternoon, Tuesday, as I have indicated, with hardly a change in the authorizing legislation, and with no hearings whatsoever available for the subcommittee at the time. The bill was reported out by the full committee Wednesday afternoon, before the author-

izing bill became law, I think, with a report which nobody had read prior to the meeting, and with hearings which arrived a few minutes before the meeting, not even indexed, because of lack of time.

I do not think that this is the standard of responsibility expected by the country of the great Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr SEELY-BROWN. I have seen in recent weeks, and I believe we all have, statements in the press which would indicate that certain of the countries which are to receive this aid have fallen down on their own commitments. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me if there is any way in which we can assure our own people here at home that the efforts which we are willing to make—and I am one of those who believes that in our own national interest we must make this effort—is there any way we can assure our own people that our efforts will be matched by similar efforts on the part of the recipients of this aid?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. My impression is that the testimony in these hearings indicates that there has been substantial compliance with all commitments up to the present time. I do not know of any iron-clad assurance along the lines the gentleman suggests that can be given at this time

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I may say, if the gentleman will yield further, that this entire program will have a better reception not only here at home but also abroad if collective security begins to mean exactly what collective security should mean, namely, a mutual responsibility rather than just a one-way responsibility.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I agree with the gentleman and I think that works both ways.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It seems to me if the original authorization authorized the sum of $7,482,000,000 then this appropriation ought to stay within those figures. It occurs to me that the $816,000,000 ought to come out of this appropriation. It seems to me that we are sort of fooling the public by telling the public we have an authorization of $7,400,000,000, yet you bring out an appropriation bill wherein you say you are going to spend $7,480,000,000. Then the committee on the floor says that after all it is $8,400,000,000. Why not reduce it by $816,000,000?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman can offer an amendment to reduce the amount of course—I think the answer to his first question however is that the carry-over has already been authorized, and that the question therefore is one of reappropriation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Are we not sort of fooling the public with respect to this legislation then?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The facts should, of course, be fully presented.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. Is it not true that under the new method of appropriating which has been adopted by the Appropriations Committee contract authorizations have practically been cut out altogether and appropriations are now made each year, often for sums that cannot be expended for 2 or 3 years because of the long-nature character of the items being appropriated for?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr HERTER. Then you get a carry-over from year to year, particularly in the military field. It is a carry-over that used to be taken care of by contract authorizations?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Contract authorizations are now in fact approved as appropriations with the knowledge that they will not necessarily be spent in the next fiscal year.

Mr. VORYS Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. These are not merely unexpended funds, the $800,000,000. The unexpended funds run into the billions.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman is correct

Mr VORYS This is unobligated. This is money they could not think up anything for, even in the way of creating one of these forward obligations, therefore this $800,000,000 is not money that has already been obligated for forward use It is simply money that ought to have been fully explained to this committee as money that is needed and this gimmick about continuing carry-overs should mean merely in our own parlance that we are going to appropriate some funds for next year that we did not spend for anything last year.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman from Ohio has emphasized the thing I was trying to get across. This money is not even obligated.

Mr. VORYS. That is right.

Mr REES of Kansas It is not only unexpended, it has not been obligated.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It was authorized with respect to fiscal 1951 with the expectation it would be obligated in that year. It is now requested to be reappropriated with respect to fiscal 1952.

I want, if I may, to conclude these remarks, Mr. Chairman.

In my opinion, it is impossible to overemphasize the importance of this bill.

The issue before us is not a partisan issue, and I realize fully that it cuts across party lines on both sides of the aisle.

With the major objectives of the bill I have been and am in accord.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Eisenhower mission is vitally important not only to this country but to the entire free world.

I believe that the success or failure of that mission hung more or less in the balance when I was in Europe in June. Conditions since then have improved. There is a real chance of success. We must do nothing to jeopardize this tremendously important undertaking.

If successful, it should prove possible in the reasonably near future for our European allies to shoulder the principal burden overseas and to relieve us of the tremendous burden we are now shouldering.

As to the collateral features of this measure, I personally have very grave doubts. I have no confidence that the proposed policies will produce either allies or friends for this country in the long run.

I think it is vitally important that we appropriate enough to cover the principal objectives of this bill. I think it is equally important that we do not appropriate more than is necessary, because every unnecessary dollar increases the strain on our national economy.

A $256,000,000,000 debt; a deficit, already in the first quarter of this fiscal year of over $3,000,000,000; a dollar that has gone down some 50 percent in purchasing power; $32,000,000,000 sent abroad since the end of World War II; the impact of what we are doing in fiscal 1953, which it would appear we may start with a carry-over of something like $80,000,000,000—these and other factors emphasize the danger of "spending ourselves into destruction."

General Eisenhower in his recent wire to our able colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, recognized clearly the problem that confronts the Congress.

While stressing the vital importance of collective security, he said:

> We here clearly appreciate the necessity of careful congressional judgment in balancing the scale of aid against United States capacity. * * * It should be understood that no recommendation of mine is intended to urge upon the interested committees any expenditure that is beyond the United States capability to support during the critical years during which the current tensions may logically be expected to persist.

Mr Chairman, I shall support this bill on final passage.

There are, in my opinion, however, certain places where savings can be effected without in any way injuring this all important program, and I intend to support amendments of that character.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill about which the Congress and the country have been talking during this entire session.

No bill and no appropriation has been more fully discussed, or has been more frequently referred to. Wherever anyone wanted an appropriation—whether for a picket fence around a Federal housing project or for a half-billion dollar power dam, or anything anywhere in between—there has always been some one to say, "Oh, yes; Congress is spending vast sums upon the foreigners, but cannot spend this little amount on something we need here at home." Whenever anyone has wanted funds from the

Federal Treasury for any purpose; whenever any proposed appropriation has been brought before the House, they have always been ready to remind us that while we are pouring billions of dollars down the "sinkholes of Europe" we cannot appropriate even an infinitesimal part of that amount for the benefit of our own people.

Of course, such specious sophistry is without logic or reasoning. There is no connection whatever between the two. Such an argument advanced in any court of record in the country would be promptly and properly ruled out. It would be just as logical for a boy to say to his father, "Look how much money you are spending on shoes for the family here, and you will not even buy me a pocketknife," or "look at the money you are spending to replace the leaky roof on the house, and still you won't build a garage for my car."

Such reasoning is just as consistent and just as logical and just as germane as these efforts to bolster up lame arguments for the expenditure of public funds for any purpose under the sun by referring to money spent in Europe.

Such absurd comparisons weaken the cause for which proposed. Every proposition before this House, every proposal to appropriate money, must stand upon its own bottom, must be determined on its own merits. So under that rule, let us examine this bill purely on its merits.

In discussing the merits of the bill, and the justifications for the expenditures which it proposes, we are caught between the upper and lower millstones of editorial admonition laid down by metropolitan newspapers on the subject of passing out information to the public. On one hand they castigate public officials for presuming to withhold information on national defense and on the other hand, and sometimes in parallel columns, they decry warmongering and deprecate scare propaganda.

Apparently the only tenable plan would be to report the situation just as it is. With that in view let us consider the question before the Congress and the country. The one question with which the country is concerned today is national defense; how to establish and maintain enduring peace.

But as obvious and obtrusive as that problem is, it is difficult to convince the average citizen of its seriousness and its threat to our form of government. "Oh," they say, "it never has happened and it never will happen. Even if we have war we will make more money and live better." And in the First and Second World Wars that are literally true. Neither war touched our cities or our countryside except to enhance and prosper them. And when war was over not a bridge had been blown up or a railroad tie removed. Not a shingle on the roof or a brick in the chimney of any homestead or factory had been disturbed. So why concern ourselves about an enemy penetrating the seven seas and interfering with our settled mode of life? We are too busy, too prosperous. Why bother ourselves about such inconsequential things? And so, with ominous war clouds gathering all about us, we continue to live in a fool's paradise.

But seeing is believing. We saw Hitler, without provocation, without excuse, and without warning, send his planes over Rotterdam, and in 30 minutes reduce to rubble the entire business section of the city and leave piled in the debris the broken and shattered bodies of 50,000 people. Many in this Chamber saw Berlin before the war and many have seen it since the war. It was perhaps the most modern, the most prosperous, and the most beautiful city in the world. Today over a radius stretching 2½ miles in every direction from the Brandenburger Gate there is utter desolation. Not a building escaped.

Again, you will recall that we concluded the Japanese War by dropping one bomb in Hiroshima. In one incandescent minute a vast teeming city was incinerated and 130,000 people died.

Can it happen here? Can we trust our eyes? We have seen it happen. And just across the way a medieval nation is exerting every effort and exhausting every resource to prepare for war. Their munition factories and war plants are working feverishly day and night turning out tanks, planes, guns, and all the paraphernalia and accouterments of modern warfare.

Twice this month they have insolently detonated atomic bombs and announced to the world they were producing them in quantity. And it is well to remember that we are constantly improving implements of war, and the modern atomic bomb is as much ahead of the bomb we dropped on Hiroshima as a modern super eight is ahead of the model T car of that day. If the old model T bomb could wipe out a city and destroy 130,000 people what can be expected of those they are so significantly detonating across the way today?

What is it all leading up to? What is the purpose of those over there who have been getting ready for war while we slept? Nations no longer open hostilities with a declaration of war. The enemy does not send his calling card with the announcement that he will drop in on us at some definite future date. Under modern conditions the element of surprise is an important factor in military strategy. Suddenly, without notice, when we have been lulled into a fancied sense of security, he concentrates every available engine of murder and destruction on our most vulnerable centers. He knows as well as we that our strength is in production and our safety lies in our incomparable ability to produce. Through superior production we won both the First and Second World Wars. We were not ready. We had not expected to fight. We were not prepared to fight. But in the brief breathing spell afforded us by the intrepid defense of our European allies we were able to start production and supply not only our own armies and fleets but those of our allies as well. Our strength and our safety lies in our ability to produce. Our enemy knows that. And at the most unexpected moment clouds of aircraft sweeping over the North Pole could descend upon us, each plane with precise orders to attack specific targets. Every center of production in the United States is charted and cataloged in their files. They know far more about them than any Member on this floor knows. And they have classified them in the order of priority. Every major city, every plant and factory is on their maps and in their sealed orders. Their effort would be to destroy at the first attack our centers of production and distribution. Every city in the Nation would, the next morning, reflect the smoking ashes and windrows of death left by our bomb at Hiroshima.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, with this grim possibility before us, what is our defense?

We have no defense. There is no defense. Until recently it has been conceded that out of every 10 planes sent against us by a potential enemy, 7 planes would get through. We might, we thought, be able to intercept and destroy 3 out of the 10. But it was agreed that seven would get through and deliver their bombs on the target.

Today we must revise that estimate. With the development of the supersonic speed of the jet plane, we can no longer expect to stop even three. With the enemy plane traveling at the speed of 600 miles per hour and our defense planes 600 miles per hour, they would pass at 1,200 miles per hour. Only one blast would be possible and that would be practically ineffective. So the only possible interference would be the development of some mechanical defect, a bolt working loose, a fuel line clogging, or a melted bearing. In brief, for every 10 enemy planes launched, 10 enemy planes would make their target and leave 10 American Hiroshimas.

Of course, we would retaliate. Our planes would be instantly aloft and on their way to spread death and destruction on the enemy's territory. But what would that avail our shattered cities and our millions of dead? And with our flying fields and depots and manufactories blasted, how long could we provide bases and maintain service for the planes which returned?

This is the situation which may conceivably face us any day. How shall we meet it? There is only one way and that is to avoid war. We must not have another war. Even if we won we would have no place in which to celebrate that victory. There would be no avenue in any American city down which a triumphant Army could march. Every avenue would be clogged with the wreckage of the city. Even if a street could be found there would be no women and children to cheer and stand at attention as the flag went by. Atomic bombs take women and children as well as regiments and divisions.

We must not have another war. And the surest way to avoid war is to be so strong and have so many allies and friends that no enemy will dare attack us. We must have bases and strategic

materials and cooperation in every free country abroad as we had in the last war. Our friends must be equipped and munitioned and ready. And the money provided by this bill will do more to insure bases and materials and cooperation than any of the dollars we are spending for any other purpose.

Mr. Chairman, this is the bill which provides the money to pour down the "sinkholes of Europe." And this is the bill which does more than any other bill passed in this Congress, in proportion to the amount involved, to protect us against a war of extermination.

We do not propose to give this money to Europe out of any motive of altruistic philanthrophy. The American people are a generous people They have spent vast sums over many years serving their fellow men. But this money is for ourselves. It is as much in defense of our Nation as was the money paid for the powder and lead which drove the British back at Bunker Hill It is our best assurance of a lasting and enduring world peace.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], a member of this subcommittee.

Mr COUDERT. Mr Chairman, I have never actually had the experience, but I imagine that playing in a scrub baseball game in the Yankee Stadium an hour after the last game of the world series would be very like an appropriations debate on the floor of this House. Apparently it takes little more than a clearing of the throat of the first speaker on an appropriation bill to clear the floor of Members. That is somewhat understandable, particularly in this instance, because at best the members of your subcommittee appear here this afternoon as the blind leading the blind. We do not know any more about this bill or the administration of this bill or what is going to be done with the money than you do. If you will examine the record as the testimony came in to the committee you will find nothing but glittering generalities and long blank spaces where there was what we euphemistically call discussion off the record. Most of the discussion off the record is pretty meaningless, about as meaningless as that that is on the record. As a matter of fact, when they did tell us anything it could not go on the record, and even if we knew anything we could not tell you. Believe me, Mr. Chairman, your committee does not know anything more than you do.

It was apparent from the very first day of the hearings that the majority was going to accept every dollar that was asked for.

Let us see what the question is before us. There is only one. There is not any question about the policy involved here or the objectives to be sought. Rightly or wrongly, for better or for worse, the Congress has entered upon a policy, the Government is engaged in the execution of a policy represented by the Mutual Defense Assistance Acts of the last 2 or 3 years. I think it is worth trying myself. I voted for the authorization bill the other day.

But there is something that is just as important as the provisions of this Mutual Defense Assistance Act and just as important as the amounts of money and the numbers of arms and equipment that are sent abroad. Here we stand after twenty-odd years of American foreign policy confronted with bitterly tragic dilemma that either we risk blundering, unwittingly and unwillingly, into a war that nobody wants, and even the administration pretends it does not want it, blunder into it because of the frantic haste with which rearmament is suddenly thrust upon us and upon Western Europe, the frantic haste that has led to and is leading to violent propaganda to whip up the emotions of our people, stir emotions in order to help get the bills through and divert attention from past failures.

The other horn of the dilemma means wrecking beyond redemption of the free institutions of the United States, and therefore of the American Republic, by loading upon them, upon our people, a limited number of people with limited resources, unlimited obligations of such enormous size and burden as to threaten our very existence as a free people.

Who is going to make the choice? Who is going to draw the line as between the burden that we can properly, fairly, and successfully carry in executing a foreign aid program and at the same time carry out the enormous program for our domestic rearmament? It certainly is not the administration, Mr. Chairman. There is no central head of this administration. There is nothing but a congeries of departments and agencies, each one fighting like mad to get all the power it can get its hands on without the slightest regard to what any other agency may seek or whatever duplication or overlapping or competition there may be. The result of that is perfectly plain to anyone who has watched the scene over the last 5 or 6 years

There is only one agency that can conceivably exercise the over-all supervision of what happens to the national economy; there is only one agency that has control over expenditures of money, over deficit financing, over the operation of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, that prints all of these bits of paper—that, thank Heaven, the people still take as money, even though at half value—and that is the Congress of the United States. That, of course, means those of us who at this particular juncture in history happen to be sitting under the dome of the Capitol. Therefore, it is up to us to determine, and only we can determine, how much the American economy can stand over a period of years, in fact, without going completely broke, without destroying the liberties and freedoms that we are working for and which we believe in and which we are ready to lay down our lives for. In my humble opinion we have gone beyond the danger point. We have assumed burdens and obligations beyond the capacity of our limited people and our limited resources to continue indefinitely without dire consequences. Of course I am not referring alone to this foreign-aid bill. This is chicken feed compared to the great domestic rearmament program. We only the other day passed a $57,000,000,000 bill for the military. We only today completed action on another five- or six-billion-dollar military construction bill, and we have two or three billion more—and God knows how many more besides that—for atomic energy. All of this forms a single certain pattern. This bill comes on top of the pile.

It is our duty as Members of this Congress and trustees for the future of the American people not to spend one single dollar, first, more than is necessary for an objective; and, second, more than in our honest judgment the United States can carry without dangerously jeopardizing of our own freedoms and our own liberties at home.

Now, this is a bill that could easily be somewhat reduced It can be reduced on the floor of this House legitimately and properly, and I hope that amendments will be offered that will propose appropriate reductions If the majority members of this subcommittee had really studied and examined the bill conscientiously and fairly, there would have been substantial reductions A perfect illustration of what confronts you and what is in this bill is that matter of the UNRRA appropriation, United Nations Korea Relief This Agency came in there and asked originally for $69,000,000 plus $50,000 000, $119 000,000 altogether originally for an Agency that does not even come into operation until the military phase of the Korean war is over. Now that has no even happened yet The House Committee on Foreign Affairs, in its wisdom, reduced that amount to $11,000,600 but it did not touch the carry-over. The Senate jacked it up to $45 000,000, and it came out of conference with $45,000,000 Well, our distinguished chairman from Virginia, with his majority members, made the great and noble gesture of striking out the $45,000,000. That still leaves a reappropriation you are asked to make in the face of all the conflicting pressures for appropriations, of $50,000 000 to stay in somebody's pocket, presumably the President's pocket, or a United Nations agency pocket, until such time, in an indefinite future, peace comes to Korea and the work of permanent rehabilitations can get under way Now, there is an item of $50,000,000 that might just as well be stricken from the bill.

Mr KEATING Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. It had been my understanding that all of the appropriations for UNKRA had been struck out on the ground that they were not needed. Now, do I understand from the gentleman that it was simply reduced to $45,000,000, but there is still $50,000,000 in there?

Mr. COUDERT. There was $45,000,000 of new money carried in the bill as it came to the committee. The bill, however, renews the appropriation of last

year's $50,000,000, so there is $50,000,000 in the pot if you pass this bill without amendment. In other words, that is part of the carry-over of $816,000,000 which, in my humble judgment, represents something of a misrepresentation to the American people. We knew it was there, but the public did not.

Mr. KEATING. What is their possible reason for wanting to appropriate new money which cannot possibly be used until some future time?

Mr. COUDERT. I do not know of any reason. The gentleman will have to turn to higher sources than I to find an explanation of the inexplicable.

Then we have naval appropriations, for new naval procurement for the NATO nations. Yet there is not a harbor or a river in the United States that is not jammed from bank to bank with naval vessels resulting from the last war, all of which would be available "if." That was the answer when the naval witnesses were asked, "Why cannot you use those?" The answer was, first, that there must be a certificate of the Chief of Naval Operations that the vessel is surplus and not needed in the American naval mobilization program, and second, that we need new authorizing legislation. So they come in with a large program of new construction, rather than using existing ships.

I say that by striking out a substantial part of that unexpended carry-over balance we might exert pressure upon our administration to do what is necessary, to make some of the existing naval construction available to help out with vessels needed in the Mediterranean and North Atlantic, because that is apparently what they want.

Then there is the point that is more fundamental to me than anything else. Unfortunately, our hands now are tied. The Foreign Affairs Committee of this House carried in a bill that we voted for and passed a provision that I thought was of very great importance and that I hoped and believed would be helpful to our committee and to this House when we came to consider the actual money to be appropriated. Our own Armed Forces and the rearmament of Western Europe are all part of a single whole, they are one, it is a single pattern, it is a single picture. Everybody recognizes that. So again in an abundance of wisdom the Foreign Affairs Committee provided that up to about $5,000,000,000 of the heretofore appropriated Armed Forces funds here in the United States might be utilized for this foreign-aid military program—a matter of eminent good sense. Then unfortunately the Senate struck it out and our conferees failed to stand their ground and, as so often happens, a good thing in the House bill was lost.

The net effect of that is going to be that large numbers of American troops—we got the figures off the record—that are not earmarked for present commitment abroad, like the six divisions to Western Europe, are scheduled to remain here in the United States, again assuming that the Korean war does not expand very largely, fully equipped, with all the arms and equipment that the tables of organization call for, running up and down parade grounds and up and down roads and through some broken-down swamps in the United States with all this equipment.

All this equipment, all those tanks and guns are sitting here with divisions that are not earmarked for action until the great war comes, if ever. Yet we are having a new program of $5,000,000,000 of additional procurement to rearm the Eisenhower divisions in Western Europe. The most intelligent, the smartest thing this Congress could have done would have been to make the over-all military budget bear the burden or a substantial part of the burden of the rearmament of the divisions abroad.

One could go on discussing any number of details. There are all sorts of things in this bill, like the administrative expenses, that could have been safely cut down if the committee had been disposed to really look at them.

May I close with this note to my colleagues in the House, that in my humble judgment no greater responsibility rests upon us than that of maintaining the economic stability of the United States. A great many people pay lip service to it. But it is not lip service, Mr. Chairman, that matters. What matters is action, action to limit the outgo, action that will be consistent with the maintenance of economic stability in the United States and those institutions of freedom that mean so much to us. Within that limitation, foreign aid, yes, I am for it, it should be done. Beyond that limitation, foreign aid or any other aid, any other commitments, can be nothing but a boomerang that will cost us all heavily and perhaps fatally.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, billions for defense and billions for aid to other nations while our overcrowded school buildings are neglected.

When communities try to get some of the scarce materials to build new schools that will accommodate our growing school population, they are told that war plants and weapons come first, and that the need for educational facilities must wait.

Congress is in a mad dash to recess, but the hundreds of thousands of children who must herd together in poorly lighted and ill-ventilated shacks that are nothing more than slums are not so fortunate.

Authorities predict that at least 84,000 classrooms will be needed during the next 3 years—50,000 to house the increasing enrollment and 30,000 units for replacement.

Note the number that are, or will become obsolete—10,000 each year. At 40 pupils per classroom, this means that at least 400,000 children are now trying to study in buildings that are unhealthy and dangerous.

Early this year a large grammar school in my city was leveled by flames. I saw it burn. The fire mushroomed through the old brick structure in a matter of minutes, and the best efforts of a modernly equipped and skillful fire department could not save any part of it.

That hundreds of children escaped death or injury was described as a miracle. It was.

Every day in the year fire breaks out in some school building or buildings in the United States. Not all of the children get out in time. The records of the United States Office of Education verify these unhappy facts.

As a nation, we have often taken chances with unpreparedness.

We have too often relied upon the alarm clock of disaster to wake us up.

I do not believe that we should take this chance with our children.

Of course, we have such big issues to deal with these days, that we have not much time for the fundamentals.

In opposing the spread of communism, we are building up power through economic aid and military force. This is necessary but incomplete. The foundation of our faith is freedom of opportunity based upon widespread and improving education. It is the cornerstone of popular government. It is the one positive value that can bring all the peoples of this world to the cooperation that is required for survival and progress.

We cannot afford to sacrifice this, our one best hope, to the all-out demands of the State Department and the Department of Defense.

Our real strength is in the character and skill of the average American citizen. It will be weakened if we skimp on our schools, denying to our children who will be the citizens of tomorrow, the bright, healthy, and secure environment that will promote their physical, mental, and spiritual development.

The many firetraps of today that are miscalled schools are a menace to our children.

You and I may differ on various other aspects of the educational problem, but no one can oppose the right of every child to receive his schooling in a building that is clean, uncongested, and safe.

As a whole, the local governments and the States are doing their level best to provide adequate quarters for our school population, but they are handicapped by rising costs and the pressure of other obligations. They must look to the Federal Government for help because Washington is drawing off an increasingly larger share of the total tax revenue which would otherwise be devoted to local improvements. In its redistribution of this revenue, the central Government must not forget where it came from. If too much is spent outside this country, the primary needs of our own people will suffer.

The school children of the United States must not be called upon to sacrifice their health or endanger their lives because of our concentration on global problems. Defense must have priority, but not to the exclusion of our children and their requirements.

There was such a deferment on construction and neglect of maintenance during the depression of the 1930's and World War II, that our educational plant was fast becoming obsolete. Now we are in another crisis that threatens to forestall the replacements that should have

been made years ago. This increases the danger to the children.

In a typically small school district, the tax base is so restricted that the necessary bonds could not be issued or sold on a reasonable yield basis, making it impossible to go ahead with a program of constructing suitable schoolhouses. Even the States are finding it difficult to help out the localities.

The number of bills introduced in the Congress to provide for Federal participation in financing public-school construction shows that the serious shortage of school buildings in many parts of the country deserves national attention.

The Bureau of the Census has predicted that those in the 5-to-9-year-age group will increase 35 percent by 1955, as compared with 1947. The 10-to-14-year-age group will expand by 30 percent. This will mean additional new buildings over and above the vast need for replacing the old ones which should be condemned as dangerous to life and health.

Committees of the Congress have studied the proposed legislation at length. I believe that we should have the opportunity to take constructive action and help to relieve the shortage in school buildings, before we take a vacation that will last until next year.

The dangers inherent in our antiquated schoolhouses become worse with each passing day.

I do not want to pick up the paper and read the tragic story of youngsters who have paid with their lives because of our indifference.

Priority in the allocation of scarce materials is no excuse for jeopardizing the school children of the United States.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, my good friend the chairman of the subcommittee, when he was in the well a short time ago, paid a glowing tribute to the man who has been designated by the President as Administrator of this program. I regret very much that I must heartily disagree with him. There have been those of us on the Committee on Foreign Affairs who have for a long time believed that one of the things that we ought to be striving for, if it is at all attainable, would be a real bipartisan foreign policy. We are now considering a foreign-aid bill which, I believe, carries with it the implication at least that the administration of these funds ought to be on a bipartisan-policy basis. I believe that Averell Harriman has disqualified himself to be the Administrator of these funds. He is so partisan that just about a year ago he lost his head—I say he lost his head—when he addressed the American Federation of Labor in convention in Texas in 1950. At that convention Mr. Harriman made a bitter and unjustifiable attack on Senator TAFT, a great American. I refer now to an editorial after Harriman made his speech. This editorial appeared in the Washington Star and is entitled "Harriman: Politician."

Here is the language in the first paragraph:

> Averell Harriman's attack on Senator TAFT belongs under the heading of cheap—very cheap politics.

Referring again to that same editorial:

> To say as Mr. Harriman told the A. F. of L. assembly that the Ohio Senator has ignorantly been furthering the designs of the Kremlin is to resort to the shoddiest kind of political slander.

Yet, the President has asked this man to be the Administrator of the funds, which are going to be administered overseas.

Referring again to that same editorial:

> Mr. Harriman, with the President's approval, if not at his direction, has joined this partisan hue and cry, and in so doing he has forfeited any claim to respect or support as an instrument of bipartisan foreign policy.

The New York Times likewise and at the same time—and I will not take the time to read all of this—had this to say:

> The Communist objective would by his conduct have been thereby furthered.

In other words, Mr. Harriman is charging Mr. TAFT with playing cozy with the Communists. This is, indeed, cheap, dirty politics.

I ask you whether or not such an individual can be trusted to administer this fund. I am sure that many of us on the Foreign Affairs Committee had heavy hearts when we learned that he might be the Administrator, and I hope that the other body on the other side of this Capitol will reject his nomination, because he is unqualified and unfit to be Administrator of these funds.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I want to service notice that I intend to offer an amendment to cut the carry-over funds in title I, $300,000,000. My mind for the moment goes back to the hearings on the authorization bill that we conducted for several weeks, night and day. We attempted to bring some order out of chaos, as we listened to the testimony of those who were attempting to justify the authorization in the original bill. I am still confused, and as this bill comes before us I think many Members, as I am, are still confused about the amounts carried in the bill. They have not been justified at this time.

My amendment would reduce this carry-over, as I said, $300,000,000. It is my understanding that the unexpended balance, or the carry-over, is in excess of $556,000,000. My amendment, if adopted, would cut this unexpended balance by $266,000,000.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Did you make it clear that you were referring to the carry-over in title I alone?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes. My amendment applies only to title I.

I call attention to the fact that while I believe the entire $816,000,000 which is in this bill as carry-over, can be cut without disturbing the program, my amendment cuts it only $300,000,000, and in no way would disturb the program which has been announced and as we passed the authorization bill.

What my amendment would actually do would be to provide a total, with carry-over and the original amount in the bill, of $5,628,729,504, if this House approves the total amount asked in the bill. With all due respect to the members of the Appropriations Committee, I say that we are legislating carelessly and recklessly. In fact, I believe we are violating a sacred trust. If we are the zealous guardians of the taxpayers' money, the entire unexpended balance of 1951 should be eliminated. This bill contains, as I have said, a carry-over of more than $800,000,000, which would be available for spending in the 1952 fiscal year. The public is of the opinion that this foreign spending bill provides about $7,400,000,000, as announced by the President in this morning's press, after he had signed the authorization bill last evening. Now we find today that actually we are appropriating $8,400,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce the carry-over in title I $300,000,000. It is my understanding that this unexpended balance is $566,253,233 and if my amendment is adopted it would cut the unexpended balance to $266,253,233.

The request for new funds in title I is $5,072,476,271. My amendment does not disturb that figure. What the bill before us does, however, is to make available an unexpended balance of $566,253,233 or a total of $5,628,729,504. If this House approved the total amount asked in this bill, I say, with all due respect to members of the Appropriations Committee, that it is reckless and spendthrift; it is a breach of a sacred trust.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, my amendment in no way disturbs the 1952 program; it is merely reducing the carry-over by $300,000,000. If we were zealous guardians of the taxpayers' money the entire unexpended balance for 1951 should be eliminated. I would support such an amendment.

This bill contains a total carry-over in excess of $800,000,000, all of which would be available for spending in 1952. The public is of the opinion that this foreign-spending bill was for about $7,000,000,000, whereas it is in fact in excess of eight billion. It seems to me that it would have been more honest for the committee to let the unexpended balances lapse and then forthrightly to provide whatever amount was actually needed for the 1952 program.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat again that my amendment seeks only to return to the Treasury $300,000,000 of funds previously provided that admittedly could not be spent in fiscal 1951. In my judgment this bill should be cut $1,000,000,000, but since a majority of the House membership has been so completely propagandized into believing that the money to be appropriated will bring peace and security to the world, I have offered a very modest reduction, hoping that we might give the beleaguered taxpayer a little consideration.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, those who advocate and support foreign-spending bills constantly refer to alternatives and calculated risks to justify their positions. That is, of course, their right and privilege, but I submit that this bill and others with the same intent that are sure to follow present a threat to our own economy, the real basis of our strength upon which the free world relies today. Most Members are concerned about this threat at home, yet the majority go along and spend and spend and spend. How often do we hear it said in the cloakrooms: "I don't like this legislation, but"—

Mr. Chairman, at the end of this fiscal year we shall have the biggest peacetime deficit in history. We have a statutory debt limit of $275,000,000,000, and unless we apply the brakes to spending programs, it will have to be increased. Will the advocates of unlimited global spending sponsor legislation to raise our debt limitation? Civilian controls are here and in the near future they will be applied more drastically on the civilian economy. Materials shortages and manpower shortages are not far off. A most crushing tax bill will soon be passed, a bill, in fact which will not be sufficient to supply the demands in the bill before us. And where will this tax money come from? It will hit hardest the low-income earners and the biggest families.

Mr. Chairman, all the evidence indicates that Europe has recovered to a degree that it can carry on under its own steam. Production is far above the 1938 level and, with increased war production, those countries now receiving aid are in a sound position. Commerce Department statistics show that we have poured into Europe over $32,000,000,000 since the end of the war, and it will soon reach the staggering amount of $50,000,000,000 when we consider the amount provided in this bill and the materials that are now in the pipelines. Such a sum is sufficient to operate our Government for 1 year in normal times.

I do not think it can be denied that there is an excess plant capacity that has not been fully exploited and the greed and selfishness of the participating countries in refusing to relocate the millions of unemployed in Germany and Italy which would greatly increase their productivity. There is almost eight hundred million in this bill to expand European navies with new ships constructed in our own shipyards when we have a moth-ball fleet that is choking up the rivers in many of our port cities. I ask you who among the satellite countries of the world can challenge the existing Navies of Great Britain and the United States?

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to another important fact that there are so-called reserves in the fund provided by this bill that are not earmarked for any particular country. Apparently this is to take care of the possibility that other countries will enter the NATO organization and this "kitty" is to be flashed before their eyes as an inducement for them to defend themselves. I wonder why we do such things. It seems to me that it puts us in a very poor bargaining position with these countries since they will know that the bribe is already provided by the United States Congress. If these countries will eventually come into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization it would be far better to perfect their entry in it and then go to Congress and tell us what they will do for us if we give them some help instead of luring them with this free reserve fund that is waiting to be grabbed by the first entry. The time has come to give serious consideration to the full implications contained in this bill. I trust my amendment will prevail.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, when the pending bill is read for amendment later this afternoon I expect to offer an amendment which would simply earmark $10,000,000 of the $1,022,000,000 provided for economic and technical assistance to Europe, for the resettlement program contemplated in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended. The proposed amendment would read as follows:

At page 2, line 14, strike out "$1,022,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,012,000,000, and in addition $10,000,000 to carry out the provisions of section 115 (e) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended."

The Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, provides that:

The Administrator shall encourage arrangements among the participating countries in conjunction with the International Refugee Organization looking toward the largest practicable utilization of manpower available in any of the participating countries in furtherance of the accomplishment of the purposes of this title. The Administrator shall also encourage emigration from participating countries having permanent surplus manpower to areas, particularly underdeveloped and dependent areas, where such manpower can be effectively utilized.

In view of the fact that the International Refugee Organization is no longer in operation, I wish to call your attention to page 21 of the conference report on the Mutual Security Act of 1951 and specifically the following paragraph, with which I fully concur:

The committee of conference wishes to make clear its intent that none of the funds made available pursuant to the proviso should be allocated to any international organization which has in its membership any Communist, Communist-dominated or Communist-controlled country, to any subsidiary thereof, or to any agency created by or stemming from such organization. It is vital to the security of the United States and to the success of the surplus manpower emigration program that no international body with Communist influence receive any United States assistance for the purpose of such program. It is the expectation of the committee of conference that steps will be taken as quickly as possible to get the program moving and that the funds made available will be used.

The funds referred to by the conference committee for emigration of surplus manpower are in the amount of $10,000,000.

During the hearings on the pending appropriation bill, at page 416 of the printed hearings, with regard to the very problem with which my proposed amendment which I hope and expect will be adopted by the committee without opposition is concerned, I asked Mr. Bissell the following question concerning ECA taking some action to emigrate surplus manpower from Italy and received the following answer:

Mr. ROONEY. Do you or do you not propose to do something like that under the pending budget request?

Mr. BISSELL. That kind of activity, I think, sir, would be entirely appropriate, yes.

The American taxpayer and the Congress have been appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars to European countries, one particularly I have in mind is Italy, to help their economy. The populations of these countries have been increasing so rapidly and these countries are presently so overpopulated, that it seems to me that we are sending a great deal of the economic aid funds down the drain pipe. The economy of Italy is never going to be what it should be or become stabilized until a necessary percentage of the Italian people are resettled in South America, Australia, here, or in other countries. When we consider that in Italy there are 2,000,000 people unemployed, and that there are an equal number under employed, we must realize that these people are easy bait for the Communists and their propaganda. My amendment does not add a cent to the bill. The amount to be earmarked is only a drop in the bucket, gentlemen. This is a $7,500,000,000 appropriation bill. I am merely asking that $10,000,000 be earmarked for a vital program fully authorized by the Congress, which the Congress insists be carried out.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman's proposed amendment would in no way increase the total appropriation, would it?

Mr. ROONEY. Not at all. My amendment would reduce the amount $1,022,000 at page 2, line 14, to $1,012,000,000 and earmark $10,000,000, the difference in those amounts, for the purpose of which I speak.

Mr. KEATING. I gather that the gentleman's amendment is directed to the same problem which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] alerted us to in debate on the rule.

Mr. ROONEY. Exactly. It is problem with which the learned gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], chairman of the Immigration subcommittee of the great House Committee on the Judiciary is thoroughly familiar. I did not hear his remarks but I am sure he is in thorough accord with my amendment. I expect, I may say, that the chairman of our subcommittee, with the concurrence of the gentlemen on your side, will accept this proposed amendment at the time the bill is read for amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Personally, I feel it is a very constructive amendment and feel the same way the gentleman from

Pennsylvania does, e the result of the study which has been made in the Committee on the Judiciary on this problem.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us what the international relief organization is and who it is that would get this money, and how dependable they are?

Mr. ROONEY. I am advised that there will be lawfully created by the Department of State a small new organization which will work in conjunction with the various religious welfare organizations in order to effectively and immediately administer this program, and so that it is not administered by the International Labor Organization, which has Communist membership referred to in the conference report on the Mutual Security Act of 1951.

To further support the necessity of earmarking this $10,000,000, I quote from the committee's report on the pending bill:

The authorizing legislation provides that not more than $10,000,000 may be utilized for the emigration of surplus manpower. Witnesses of the agencies to administer the Mutual Sercurity Program agreed that the problem of excess manpower in some areas with a shortage in others was not only an obstacle to the success of the program but also that it was a problem subject to at least partial solution. In the specific cases of Italy it was agreed that until the overpopulation is drained off the nation will never be economically sound. Despite this situation it was also testified that currently there are no plans for using any of the funds authorized for the purpose of encouraging the emigration of surplus manpower to areas where such manpower is greatly needed. The present position of inaction seems to be in keeping neither with the intent of existing legislation nor the recognized situation. The commitee strongly urges that immediate steps be taken to develop a program aimed at the solution of this problem through direct negotiations with the countries involved.

I am sure this House wants something done and done immediately to resettle the surplus manpower of Italy and other overpopulated European countries, and that you will support the amendment I shall offer at the proper time.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the gentleman from Missouri, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] has left the floor, for it was his remarks that moved me to ask for time in this debate.

I think I clearly understood him to say that perhaps someone would come before the Committee today to raise the question that perhaps we spend a lot of money in the four corners of the earth but we do not take care of our people here at home. I rather took it from what he said and the manner in which he said it that it was said with some ridicule of those who might raise the question and who have been raising the question. I am going to raise the question today as to whether or not it is true that we are not taking care of our people at home and sending too much money to the four corners of the earth. I think it is true.

I have read the hearings on this bill and the testimony of the witnesses. I find that millions of dollars are being spent throughout the world for hospital facilities, and it is contemplated to send doctors and nurses and health teams to the various countries, to build up public health in Formosa, the Philippines, Indochina, Indonesia, Burma, Thailand, India, Pakistan, and other countries, to the extent of about $20,000,000, and that $52,000,000 is to be spent in those same countries for the development of agriculture, forestry, and fisheries; and as you go on down the line you find all kinds of figures.

As an example of whether or not we are taking care of our people at home, I want to refer again to the American Indians. The gentleman from Missouri said that those of us who raise the question of sending too much money abroad and not taking care of our people at home are generally doing so because we have some pet projects in our own district in which we are interested. I say to this Committee that I have no Indians in my district, but they are Americans and I am interested in them as I think every Member of this House is interested in them. They are our wards. We are their guardians. We are the ones who keep them on the reservations.

We hear complaints day in and day out that the Indian Bureau should be dispensed with. We hear of their having one employee for every 34 Indians is a bad situation. Until we take care of our Indians, until we begin to take care of our own people, we will not get rid of the Indian Bureau and the other agencies that are in this Government taking care of them. These are our people. We must take care of them.

Let me give you an example, and I will challenge you to go any place else in the world and see whether conditions exist there such as exist among the people whom we serve as guardians.

I take as an example the Papago Indians. Their tribes are in the State of Arizona. There are 7,303 full-blooded Indians of that tribe. There are two of those who are college graduates. The number of high-school graduates is 50. The number of elementary-school graduates is 300. The number of those unable to speak English is 2,210 and the number of illiterates is 2,950. Only about 35 percent of those, our wards, from 6 to 18 years of age, are in school. Let me tell you something further while we are talking about the millions of dollars that we are spending throughout the world on health and hospital facilities. Today the life expectancy of a Papago Indian is 17 years as against our 60. One out of four die at childbirth. The tubercular rate is 240 per 100,000 against 20 for the white man. I take that tribe only as an example. We have not been taking care of our own people, and yet we are spending billions of dollars around the world.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. The gentleman could not have said anything that could appeal more to me as I have worked on Indian affairs for very many years. I know his figures are accurate, and that what he says is true. I would like to suggest that the situation might be looked into. We have an Indian Bureau which has an overbalance of employees, rather than using that money for the Indians. The Committee on Indian Affairs could well investigate the extravagant waste of this Bureau. If we use the money available in the proper way, for the kind of help that the Indians need, we could get a great deal more for much less money right here at home.

Mr. BOW. I should say to the gentlewoman from Ohio that the Committee on Indian Affairs under the able leadership of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] has been looking into that. I am a member of that committee.

Mrs. BOLTON. I am aware of that.

Mr. BOW. It is our desire to eliminate the Indian Bureau. I should like to say in my opinion that present Commissioner Dillon Myer is doing a good job. Given a full hand and proper support, he will, I am sure, accomplish much. We could take a small percentage of the interest on the money that is being spent throughout the world, and we could rehabilitate the Indians and get rid of the Indian Bureau.

Mrs. BOLTON. If we took the money that is spent on the Bureau, that could be done.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Perhaps the gentleman from Missouri was raising the question of the lack of aid for these flood refugees out in the Middle West who received no help from this Congress last week.

Mr. BOW. That is perhaps true. I simply wanted to say this in closing. As I read the RECORD to see what the experts say, I am reminded of what Mr. William C. Foster, of ECA, said to the Senate Appropriations Committee on June 13, 1950, just 12 days before American boys died in Korea. Mr. Foster testified before that Appropriations Committee and said:

I am happy to tell the Appropriations Committee that, in my judgment the trend of events in South Korea is more favorable than it has been at any time since the liberation of that country in 1945. The reasons for optimism are military, political, and economic. It is my considered opinion that in the face of great difficulty the Government of the Republic of Korea is now steadily gaining strength in each of these three sections.

1. A rigorous training program has built up a well-disciplined army of 100,000 soldiers; one that is prepared to meet any challenge by North Korean forces; and one that has cleaned out the guerrilla bands in South Korea in one area after another.

This is typical of the misrepresentations we of the Congress have before us when called upon to make important decisions.

Let us keep America strong; let us take care of our own people.

We must build a great Air Force and a great Navy. Also keep our own moral standards strong. If we bankrupt this great Nation, we shall have nothing to defend.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARY. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I think this Subcommittee on Appropriations is to be congratulated on doing a good job. I wonder how many Members of the House understand the fact that what we are doing today is implementing the North Atlantic Treaty which is an agreement between the United States and 10 other countries of Western Europe and Canada in our own hemisphere. This agreement runs for a 20-year period. Under the Constitution, a treaty of this sort becomes the law of the land. Under article VI of the Constitution it states, "and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land." The House had nothing to do with the ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty, but the House does have a duty in implementing that treaty and seeing to it that the members comprising it are strong enough and able to take care of themselves. I listened to the remarks of my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, relative to what he had to say concerning Mr. Averell Harriman. Now, I do not know Mr. Harriman. He has been before our committee a number of times, and he has always proved to be an able and competent witness. I do know the gentleman from Wisconsin very well. He is a congenial companion; he is an able gentleman; he is honest and forthright in his views. However, he ought to keep in mind, and we should also, that as far as the appointment of Mr. Harriman is concerned, it is not our responsibility but it is the responsibility of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the Senate as a whole, to pass upon his nomination when and if it is presented to them.

I think as I look back on our history that our country would have been better off if we had followed the advice of Mr. Harriman over the years. There is no question but what he has been an able administrator; that he is interested in the affairs of government; and that if he is nominated and confirmed in this new position, which this House, by the way, has created, he will do an able, an honorable, and a creditable job.

Mr. Harriman has, in the Forrestal diaries, indicated a number of things which I think are pertinent and should be brought to the attention of this body. Mr. Forrestal at great length quotes Mr. Harriman as to what his views were on various matter on certain specific dates.

For example, on the 20th of April, 1945, Mr. Forrestal says this:

> I saw Averell Harriman, the American Ambassador to Russia, last night. He stated his strong apprehensions as to the future of our relations with Russia unless our entire attitude toward them became characterized by much greater firmness. He said that, using the fear of Germany as a stalking horse, they would continue on their program of setting up states around their borders which would follow the same ideology as the Russians. He said the outward thrust of communism was not dead and that we might well have to face an ideological warfare just as vigorous as fascism or nazism

On the 11th of May, 1945, Mr. Forrestal says:

> I had a meeting in my office this morning with Ambassador Harriman, Admiral Edwards, Vice Admiral Richard S. Edwards, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Vice Admiral Cooke, Charles M Cooke, Jr., Chief of Staff to Admiral King.
>
> Harriman said he thought it was time to come to a conclusion about the necessity for the early entrance of Russia into the Japanese war. He said he was satisfied they were determined to come in because of their requirements in the Far East He said the Russians, he believed, much more greatly feared a separate peace by ourselves with Japan than any fear of ourselves about their concluding such an arrangement. He said he thought it was important that we determine our policy as to a strong or weak China, that if China continued weak, Russian influence would move in quickly and toward ultimate domination. He said that there could be no illusion about anything such as a "free China" once the Russians got in, that the two or three hundred millions in that country would march when the Kremlin ordered.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, those are a few excerpts from the Forrestal diaries which indicate that in many respects Mr. Harriman, who has been attacked on the floor of this House today, is a man of understanding and did have a pretty good foresight into the future.

I should like also to call the attention of the House to a statement carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an insertion of remarks by the Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN, Senator from the State of New York. I quote as follows—this is Mr. Harriman's story of Yalta and reports on United States-Union of Soviet Socialist Republics relations during World War II:

> I returned to the United States to report to President Truman immediately after the conversation with Stalin and before Ambassador Hurley's report was prepared and dispatched. On April 19, I discussed Ambassador Hurley's report with Mr. E. F. Stanton, of the Far Eastern Affairs Division of the Department of State. Mr. Stanton's memorandum of that conversation is summarized as follows, on pages 97–98 of the volume United States Relations with China:
>
> "Mr. Harriman felt that General Hurley's report, while factually accurate, gave a too optimistic impression of Marshal Stalin's reactions. Mr. Harriman was certain that Marshal Stalin would not cooperate indefinitely with Chiang Kai-shek and that if and when Russian entered the conflict in the Far East he would make full use of, and would support, the Chinese Communists even to the extent of setting up a puppet government in Manchuria and possibly in North China, if Kuomintang-Communist differences had not been resolved by that time. He indicated that he had impressed on General Hurley the fact that statements made by Stalin endorsing our efforts in China did not necessarily mean that the Russians would not pursue whatever course of action seemed to them best to serve their interests
>
> "Mr. Harriman feared that Ambassador Hurley might give Chiang Kai-shek an overoptimistic account of his conversations with Stalin and he thought it might be advisable to suggest to General Hurley that he should be careful not to arouse unfounded expectations."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman wants to be very fair. I think he would be glad to know that the firm with which Mr. Harriman is identified, the firm of Brown Bros., Harriman & Co., has handled Marshall plan business totaling $89,970,640. Does the gentleman think that a man who has that connection should be administering this fund?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to my friend and colleague from Wisconsin that I have no knowledge of that particular matter. I think, though, that he has severed all his active business connections and is no longer an official of this company. I do think that if the gentleman does have full information that he should insert it in the RECORD, and I think he should also find out whether or not Mr Harriman who may have been associated with that outfit at one time or another is still associated with it. As I recall Mr. Harriman's history, it has been one of service to the Government since the middle 30's and I think he has been a good public servant and that he has contributed greatly to the welfare of this country.

I think further that his patriotism and his ability remain unchallenged.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS Mr. Chairman, much has been said here this afternoon concerning preparations for war.

In the name of the people we represent, I wonder how much longer we in Congress propose to permit a continuation of the double talk perpetrated on this Nation concerning American blood-letting in Korea.

At first, 1 year and 3 months ago, after the President reversed prevailing policy and committed our forces without consulting the people or Congress, it was officially labeled "a United Nations police action." But to our dead, returned for burial in military cemeteries, it was not even a United Nations police action on the headstones. It was blank space. Certainly a blank space was less insulting than inscribing United Nations police action, in view of the pitiful lack of help from that international organization which was spawned in San Francisco and hatched at Lake "Failure," N. Y.

Now, on orders from the White House, the Defense Department has decreed

that the word "Korea" is to be inscribed on the headstones.

Thus, about 15,000 American deaths and some 150,000 American casualties later, Truman's so-called United Nations police action has become, officially, just plain "Korea."

In announcing the edict, Secretary of Defense Lovett said, and I quote from his press release No. 1257–51 of September 20:

Use of the word "Korea" will satisfy official requirements and limitations.

What limitation? Are there any limitations as to American deaths? Are there any limitations as to American wounded? The flow of American blood in Korea is such as to necessitate a Nation-wide Red Cross drive for human blood to be shipped to the front.

But now we have the official word from Lovett that it is just plain "Korea"—to satisfy so-called limitations. At least that is what he said in the fourth paragraph of the press release referred to, but what do you suppose we find in the heading of the very same release? If you did not see the release, you will never guess. In the heading we find the word "war" as follows:

Grave markers of returned war dead to be inscribed to show Korean service.

But that is not all. Nine days later, on September 29, the same Defense Department issued another press release, No. 23, entitled "Korean War Dead Reterun." And here is the heading of that release:

Five hundred seventy-nine Korean war dead being returned to United States from Far East Command.

Seven of the five hundred and seventy-nine dead are from Iowa, including two from my home city of Waterloo.

But on the headstones of these dead it will be just plain "Korea" to satisfy what Lovett calls limitations.

In this contradiction, using "war" in one breath but not the next, the left hand apparently does not know what the right hand is doing. Rather than admit it is war, or call for a declaration of war, the administration resorts to trick words and phrases—first "a United Nations police action" and now just plain "Korea."

We can only conclude that nothing is sacred, not even our dead are exempt from administration subterfuge.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of asking some questions of the committee. I notice on page 5 of the report this language:

It was testified that no program has as yet been developed for the expenditure of $50,000,000 recommended for refugees coming into Israel, and it is hoped that no program will be embarked upon until the situation is thoroughly explored so that appropriated funds will be effectively expended.

That is a remarkable paragraph. This committee has provided $50,000,000 for relief of some sort in Israel, and in the report they admit that no program was submitted to them, that they have no idea how the money will be expended. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if he can tell the House how it happened that this $50,000,000 is provided and no program has been submitted?

Mr. GARY. I may say to the gentleman that in this respect the committee was simply following the direction of the Congress of the United States, and we recognize also that we are more or less a part of that body and that we should follow its edicts.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not criticizing the gentleman's committee. I agree with him that funds should be provided as authorized by the House.

Mr. GARY. The $50,000,000 was not included in the original request of the administration, but it was added to the authorization bill on the floor of the House.

Mr. COOLEY. It was added in committee.

Mr. GARY. I have no doubt that there will be an adequate program worked out for the expenditure of those funds, but the authorization bill was not signed until yesterday, so the departments have not had an opportunity to implement that bill by proper programs. But since the Congress had indicated its intention that at least $50,000,000 should be spent for that purpose, the committee felt that we should include it in the appropriation bill.

Mr. COOLEY. I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not criticizing the committee for providing funds authorized by the House. As I recall it, the administration did not recommend this amount. It was put in the bill by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and it was retained in the House, even after I had offered an amendment to strike it out.

I would just like to ask one or two more questions. At that time I made a statement to the effect that the information I had received indicated that this program contemplated an expenditure of $14,000 per Jewish family of five to be settled in Israel, whereas it only contemplated an expenditure of $200 to settle the Arab refugees on the Peninsula of Sinai. At that time many Members of the House seemed to be amazed at those figures. At that time I challenged the Committee on Foreign Affairs to give me better information. Now I want to know whether the Committee on Appropriations has been able to disprove the accuracy of the figures I used at that time.

Mr. GARY. There are approximately 800,000 Arab refugees in the Arab States. It is estimated that there will be approximately 200,000 Jewish refugees; $50,000,000 is appropriated for each program.

Mr. COOLEY. When the bill left the House we provided, as I recall, $23,500,000 for the Arabs and $23,500,000 for the Jews, and then the committee added $50,000,000 for the Jews but did not add $50,000,000 for the Arabs. What is in the bill now for the Jews and what is in the bill now for the Arabs?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. With respect to the number of refugees, there are more than 600,000 refugees in Israel, and they are coming in at the rate of 10,000 to 20,000 and as high as 30,000 a month, so that by the end of this year there will probably be more refugees to be taken care of by the $50,000,000 for refugees in Israel than there are to be taken care of by the $50,000,000 for the Arab refugees. That means less per Israel refugee than per Arab refugee.

Mr. COOLEY. Am I correct in saying when the bill left the House it had $73,500,000 authorized for Israel and $23,500,000 for Arab refugees, and now in the bill before us it provides $50,000,000 for Israel and $50,000,000 for the Arabs plus $14,950,000 from the $60,000,000 for technical assistance to Israel.

Mr. JUDD. There is $50,000,000 for refugees in each case. As I understand it, the amount for economic aid is still $23,500 in each case. Is that not right?

Mr. GARY. No; $14,950,000 to Israel for economic aid and the balance of the sixty is for the other countries, most of which are Arab countries.

Mr. JUDD. Then there has been a greater cut in the economic aid to Israel than in the economic aid to the Arab countries.

Mr. GARY. My recollection is that there is $6,000 difference between the amount appropriated to Israel and the amount appropriated to the Arab countries if you take all of the appropriations and add them together.

Mr COOLEY. The bill now provides $50,000,000 for the Arabs, whereas when the authorization went from the House it only provided $23,500,000; is that not right?

Mr. JUDD. No. It is $50,000,000 for House with $50,000,000 for the Arab refugees plus $23,500 economic aid for the Arab countries.

Mr. COOLEY. And the same thing for relief in Israel?

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. That would be $73 500,000 in each case.

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. Now it is $50,000,000 for the Jews and $50,000,000 for the Arabs.

Mr. JUDD. No. It is $50,000,000 for each of the two refugee programs; they are still equal. But both economic programs have been reduced in accordance with the cuts reported in the committee report. The figure of $60,000,000 remaining for economic aid in the Near East is not broken down in the report, but the statement of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] indicates the economic aid to Israel is reduced more than that to the Arab countries.

Mr. COOLEY. I want to ask the question one more time. Is any Member of the House in a position to disprove the accuracy of the information I gave to the House when I moved to strike out the $50,000,000?

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. At that time I questioned the figures the gentleman used. The gentleman used $2,800 as the figure of the cost of resettling one individual in Israel, or $14,000 for a family of five. I tried to trace down the origin of those figures. I find that in the planning of the Israeli Government they figured over a long term of years it would require a capital cost of approximately £1,000 for an individual to settle there. That is about one-fourth to one-fifth of the equivalent of the same thing in the United States. In other words, that represents housing, it represents land, and it represents the clothes that they wear, over a considerable period of years. This particular appropriation would come to about $152 per individual, rather than the figure the gentleman used.

Mr. COOLEY. One hundred and fifty-two dollars per person to settle them in Israel?

Mr. HERTER. That is right. That is all that would be provided in this $50,000,000.

Mr. COOLEY. Why, the transportation from place to place would be more than that. How are you going to resettle a man for $150?

Mr. HERTER. You only make a beginning at it. The rest has to be done by taxation.

Mr. COOLEY. The Israeli pound, according to my recollection, is worth $2.80, after devaluation. The gentleman has verified, rather than refuted, the figures I used. My figures were $2,800 per person or $14,000 per family of five in the over-all contemplated resettlement program.

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman implied that it was all in this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. I certainly did not intend to convey the impression that my information was to the effect that each Jewish family of five to be settled in Israel would receive $14,000 from the appropriation then being authorized and now being provided. I did intend to impress upon the House the fact that we were becoming a part of a very expensive program. Since no Member of the Foreign Affairs Committee has been able to refute the figures I used, and since no Member of the Appropriations Committee is now able to refute those figures, I must assume that my information was accurate, that is, that the over-all program contemplates ultimately an expenditure of $2,800 per Jewish refugee. I reiterate that that is an expensive program. As I understand the program for the resettlement of Arab refugees, it only contemplates an expenditure of $200 per person. This is just the beginning of a program of great magnitude. We are aiding the Jews of Israel, and we are aiding the Arabs who have been forced to leave their homes. Apparently we are playing both ends against the middle.

Too little is known about the problems involved in the Jewish-Arab world. It is most unfortunate that with such little information we are called upon to make such important decisions. We do not know whether this money will be used for machinery or for machine guns, or for food or fighting equipment. I repeat: No program has been provided and presented and yet we are appropriating $50,000,000. Usually when a legislative committee presents a bill to the House authorizing appropriations, we are told that after all it is merely an authorization, and we are assured that the Appropriations Committee will scrutinize the item carefully and will require appropriate justification. But here we are told that the Appropriations Committee proceeded without a program and apparently no effort has been made to justify the appropriation. No one seems to be able to tell us how the money will be used, nor are we even told that it is necessary. We are merely given an opportunity to approve or disapprove this item along with numerous other very important items.

I shall not offer an amendment to strike out this provision for the very good reason that I know the amendment would not prevail. I did, however, provide the membership of the House with an opportunity to express itself when I offered my amendment to strike out the authorization. The House worked its will, the amendment was defeated, and I must accept the decision. In taking the position I have taken, I have been prompted only by a sincere and conscientious desire to do the right thing. I do not believe that this appropriation, provided in this fashion, is in the interest of peace but rather is well calculated to aggravate an already very much aggravated situation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Will the gentleman try to explain what the gentleman from North Carolina has just tried to bring up here?

Mr. TABER. I would not undertake anything of that kind. I am not omniscient. I think anyone would have to be to do that.

After an experience of 4 years with the Foreign Economic operations and the military operations abroad, I have become convinced that it is almost impossible for any honest man and any patriot to support the sort of thing that has been brought in here today.

The figures are so large as to almost stagger one. Instead of the bill carrying the amount stated in the report, it makes available for expenditure the following amounts, totaling $8,849,327,000:

Committee report states total we must add	$7,482,527,000
Unobligated balance reappropriated	816,800,000
Add section 526 material	300,000,000
Minimum total of	8,599,327,000
Add section 526 material allocated but not delivered	250,000,000
Total	8,849,327,000

That fact alone would make one suspicious of it, but we have a history back of it.

In 1948 we were provided with a budget estimate for the ECA of $4,245,000,000 for 12 months—from April 1, 1948, to April 1, 1949. The Appropriations Committee after careful hearings provided the sum of $4,000,000,000 and extended the period it was to cover from 12 to 15 months, so that it would carry through to June 30, 1949.

When the ECA came before us, they had no plan. It was worked out while they were before the committee, and the committee had a very good idea of what the situation was and what might be done.

An attempt was made by those who did not understand it to increase it on the floor. That attempt was not successful, even though we were told, by those who prefer to call names to telling the truth, that we were breaking our pledges to foreign countries. On the last day of the session it was necessary, in order to get an agreement with the Senate, to provide that the funds might be made available by the President in 13½ months. At the request of the ECA, the President made the funds so available.

Instead of being used up or even obligated by May 15, 1949, the funds were not even obligated until the 1st of November 1949. The House can see now whether or not the Appropriations Committee knew what it was talking about.

The next year a budget estimate was submitted and October 6, 1949, was approved. The budget asked for $4,198,200,000; the Congress provided $3,628,390,000, and received the same sort of berating from some of the administration supporters. This time there was an enormous sum left over.

In 1950 a budget estimate was submitted for $3,100,000,000 and the amount appropriated was $2,250,000,000. Of this a very large amount was left over on July 1, 1951, notwithstanding transfers of enormous sums for other purposes.

This year the President requested $1,675,000,000, and the amount allowed by the committee is $1,022,000,000. All economic assistance items approved by the committee total $1,440,000,000.

The most ridiculous thing in the whole picture has been that they have asked, with a lesser activity in sight, for an increase in the administrative expenses from $52,000,000 to $78,000,000. There was a minor cut in the administrative expenses over-all of $1,675,000.

It is proposed to have just as large staffs in the set-up in Europe as the past year, when the activity cannot possibly be anywhere near as big. And there was also set up in the military end of the bill a reserve of $600,000,000.

To destroy all possible confidence that any patriotic citizen might have in this whole set-up, the President announced yesterday that he was nominating W. Averell Harriman to have charge of the whole operation.

Mr. Harriman comes to this position with a record of complete and total incompetence, which seems to be the requirement for an important "raw deal" appointment. He was a failure at Moscow as Ambassador; he was a failure as

Secretary of Commerce; he was a failure in charge of the European relief operations; he was a failure at Iran.

Must it be ever thus?

When the so-called Marshall plan was submitted to the House, I voted for it. When they came up and asked for funds, they had no plan, and the plan, whatever it was and such as it was, developed before the Appropriations Committee of the House, in 2 months of the most arduous hearings. I supported what I believed was desirable and necessary for a proper operation of it.

I have heretofore voted for the military assistance operations. I am satisfied that every single item in here is too large. I am satisfied that they could take a very considerable cut in every single item. I frankly do not believe that the proper effort is being put forth by our allies abroad.

They have a steel production more than 50 percent as big as our own. We should be able to get more cooperation out of them and should not have to furnish so many things. It should be possible for them to make all of the trucks that they would need, and if they are not able to make the important types of ammunition and munitions, they should be able to supply steel to us that we might make them. This would ease the economic assistance item because it would provide employment for their people.

Under all the circumstances, I would like to support it, but those who want to see this job done honestly, effectively, and efficiently have been so discouraged by the operations of the administration that they feel that those who are asking unconscionable amounts, and those who are trying to get funds out of the Treasury that cannot be justified in the slightest degree; that those who are in favor of incompetency in administration and have little thought for the financial solvency of the United States—and frankly we are being tested right to the breaking point now—that those people are the real isolationists; and that those who would like to see America maintain a position in the United States and in the world which will draw respect and confidence and try to cut the surplus recommendations out of the bill and try to be honest with the American people, are the ones who want to do the job right.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry to hear my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] make the attack he did upon Mr. Harriman; also the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] who made his attack upon Mr. Harriman.

It is the easiest thing in the world to be a critic. It is the easiest thing in the world to knock. Whenever I hear anybody knock it is the depravity of the human mind that makes its impression upon me. The easiest thing in the world for you and me is to go through life just like a river flowing along the lines of least resistance and knock, knock, knock; criticize, criticize, criticize; and have no constructive thought; say nothing good about anybody, and to pick out one act—assuming it was an act that should not have been made, and I am not saying that it was—but to pick out one act a person makes and then condemn their whole life for that.

My good friend from New York—and there is no one who admires and likes my friend more than I do, and he knows that comes from the sincerity of my heart—is a very strong character, and I admire him. But sometimes I think he uses language that he probably does not mean, particularly when it is language which is harsh.

He has said that Mr. Harriman is a complete failure in everything. According to what the gentleman from New York says, Mr. Harriman has not succeeded anywhere. I suggest that we ought to send the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to be Ambassador to Moscow. I would welcome him back on his arrival after the termination of his service. I wonder if he would have any better results than Averell Harriman did, or Admiral Kirk, who is just about rereturning.

Mr. Harriman has been one of the outstanding Americans of this generation. I do not know him personally; I have met him only a few times officially; I have heard him a few times in public sessions of the Committee on Public Affairs and once or twice in executive session, so I do not claim any close relationship with the gentleman. But I form my opinion about those I observe both through my contacts with them and observation of them otherwise.

Mr. Harriman was special representative to Russia; he was later Ambassador to Russia; he was later Secretary of Commerce; he was Marshall plan representative from 1948 on until he became special assistant on foreign affairs to the President of the United States, and his name has now been sent up, nominated by the President, for appointment as Director of Mutual Security, a position created in the authorization bill which preceded this appropriation bill.

Averell Harriman has been one of the outstanding men of his day and generation, a man of success in business, a man of success in Government, a man who has made many sacrifices in the interest of our country. It seems to me to be a favorite pastime of some people to criticize men simply because they are trying to serve our country under a Democratic administration. It was not so long ago when someone attacked bitterly—but it fell to the ground as a dud—that great American, General Marshall. It seems as though the road of those who want to render service to our country is a painful one of subjection to attack. This is attack; I do not call it a smear, because I could not consider my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] being a party to a smear. But I wish the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] had not asked the question of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that he did, something about $85,000,000 with the innuendo that Mr. Harriman got money out of some transactions for the Government; I wish he had not asked that question. I recognize the right of men to disagree, but unreasonable attack is another thing.

Furthermore, as I read the remarks Mr. Harriman made in Texas some time ago I did not place the same interpretation upon them with relation to another man who serves in another body—and I shall keep within the rules of the House; the remarks of Mr. Harriman were not an attack upon the motives of the gentleman; it was not an attack upon his intent, because no one could attack the patriotic motives or the intent of that gentleman. We are all good Americans even in our disagreements. I permit no one to attack the motives of anyone of my colleagues or the intent of any of my colleagues. I may disagree with the results that might flow from a certain position taken by a Member, but that is entirely different when one makes reference to the results that might flow rather than attacking the motives or the intent of a Member.

As I looked through Mr. Harriman's remarks there was no attack upon the motive or the intent of the gentleman whose name has been mentioned by another Member, there was an expression of opinion on his part as to the results that might flow from certain positions and certain actions. I submit, however, that that is entirely different from attacking a man's motive or attacking a man's intent. In any event, I am sorry this has developed, and I am glad to take the floor joining with my friend, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to defend the man—if defense is necessary—to speak well of him; I do not defend because he needs no defense—to speak well of a man who in my opinion is rendering an outstanding service for our country. I hope that he and others similarly situated will be immune to such attacks in the future, and that if made such attacks will not deter them in their willingness to render service to our country, that they will continue to give our country during this great world menace the benefit of their services.

In the case of Averell Harriman he is entitled to the thanks of the American people. The great majority of the American people, particularly those of independent mind will resent the attacks made on him today.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts will recognize me as one who has supported every phase of this mutual security program; yet I find myself here today greatly disturbed over President Truman's appointment of Mr. Harriman to administer the program. I say that because I have reviewed the speeches he has been making over a period of years. I oppose him because of the type of attacks he has made on the opposition party in this Nation.

This program should be bipartisan, if any program can be made such, and I maintain that the President of the United States has not chosen the right man to conduct the program. There is too much political bitterness in the heart of W. Averell Harriman to do the right kind of a job.

That is my position regarding him.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to make the observation that no matter who it is the President appoints to important positions, including such good Republicans as Paul G. Hoffman, Charles M. Spofford, who is with NATO in London, Warren G. Austin, or John Foster Dulles, they are not working for our best interests very long before they are attacked by the opposition party and its controlled press as being incompetent or tainted with communistic ideas.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time because I intend to offer a series of amendments. A series of amendments are necessary in order to accomplish one purpose. There are some $816,000,000-plus which are unobligated balances carried over to 1952.

A great deal has been said about that carry-over on the floor of the House today, but in the press of the Nation and in the propaganda issued by the administration this figure has been very conveniently forgotten. Actually this amount should be eliminated from the program, for the reason principally, if for no other reason, that the people have not been informed about it and for the further reason which has come out in the debate here this afternoon that the purpose for which this money will be used has not been brought out before the committee and was not explained in any way.

There are a great many different sources from which funds are available for various programs in the overseas administration conducted by the United States, so many, and so many different types, that no one knows how much we are spending overseas. I am on the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and we are considering whether a commission to study our overseas administration should be established The Secretary for the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Commission testified that the figure spent by the United States overseas over the past few years ranged from $40,000,000,000 to $100,000,000,000, depending upon whether you were in favor of overseas spending or against it. No one can either establish or disestablish such a figure, because the information is not available. I remember a CIO representative from the Panama Canal Zone who appeared before our committee. He came to Washington to try to find out what various administrative bodies were conducting the affairs down in the Canal Zone, and after 2 weeks of pretty vigorous work he testified that he still was unable to find out, just in that one little locality, what agencies we had there. The answer is, of course, that no study has really been made of this program and nobody knows what we are spending abroad, and yet here is another bill, separate from other bills, having to do with the same subject, and we are expected to vote all these vast sums of money. For example, in our $56,000,000,000 defense bill there was originally 11 percent of that sum, or some $6,000,000,000 set up that could be spent in these foreign countries for military aid. I understand that in conference that figure was cut to $1,000,000,000, and yet this figure of $5,000,000,000 still stands.

Now in my opinion the production remains the same. The United States production remains the same whether you tack it on to the $56,000,000,000, that we are going to purchase materials with, or whether that figure is going to be $70,000,000,000. The United States can produce only so much The military aid that is going to these foreign countries under this bill is going to have to come out of United States production. To me it is entirely a problem of our production and the apportionment of that production among ourselves and our allies abroad. Actually this $56,000,000,000 is a blank check, and anything you add to it is just a further blank check; it is purely an academic question, because our country cannot produce that amount of material in 1 year under our present program. They cannot even place the contracts, and with the situation this country is in today—and our Small Business Committee in its hearings throughout the country has brought this home forcefully—our production people cannot even get the contracts. You cannot spend $56,000,000,000 or allocate the contracts for defense in 1 year or a period of 2 or 3 years, and yet you want to add on another $6,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000. It is utterly ridiculous. You can put any figure in; you might as well make it $100,000,000,000. But, for my money I want to cut it down as much as possible and make it a little more realistic.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this bill described as the mutual security bill, provides for expenditure of more than $8,000,000,000 in foreign countries. Incidentally, the total authorizations under the bill approved by Congress a few days ago amounts to $7,483,400,000. The amount under this bill is almost a billion more.

Let us remind ourselves with matters regarding this measure. First, it is in addition to approximately $60,000,000,000 approved by this House only a few days ago to be used for defense purposes of all kinds, to be spent in this country, and a big share to be spent abroad. This further item of spending an additional $8,000,000,000, all in foreign countries, is above the billions already expended. Secondly, this bill is reported on October 10 and under consideration on October 11. That is not very much time for the Members to have a chance to look it over. So today, on October 11, this late in the session, and within a period of 5 or 6 hours, you drive through a bill to spend $8,000,000,000 of the people of this country, and to spend it where? It is to be spent in various parts of the world, all outside of the United States. It seems the House gets in a rather big hurry when expenditures away from here are under way. So, you appropriate at the rate of a billion and a half dollars per hour, with the admission that a good share is a very broad estimate, in fact a guess, to carry out plans and agreements already made on behalf of our country.

In all probability the expenditure of part of these funds may be required. For example, funds for rehabilitation of the people of south Korea that have been damaged by our own destruction—this amount incidentally is less than one-half of 1 percent of the total. There are other items, I am sure, that are laudable and should be approved.

Mr. Chairman, I have the highest respect for the committee in charge of this legislation. I think the expenditure of $8,000,000,000 on top of billions already expended this year for people all over the world, is out of line You ought to reduce it by at least 50 percent I remind you again the administration has more than $800,000,000 on hand. It is not only unexpended, but is not even obligated for this year If should have been returned to the Treasury. Think of the thousands of people you are going to send abroad to foreign countries to help spend a big share of this money. I notice, for example, that in one country, out of an item of $66,000,000 for assistance, $12,000,000 "is for American technicians and administrative talent" in a "country of low level of economic activity." American people are generous. They are sympathetic. There is a limit as to what they can stand Again, I remind you this is in addition to and above the billions already appropriated this year.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, namely.

MUTUAL SECURITY

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 (Public Law 165, approved October 10, 1951), as follows:

Military assistance, title I: For assistance authorized by section 101 (a) (1), $5,072,476,271, of which $44,476,271 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority granted in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, and extended in the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, 1951, to enter into contracts under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S C. 1571-1604); and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, shall remain available through June 30, 1952, and such unexpended balances of appropriations shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: On page 2, line 1, after "section 101 (a) (1)", strike out "$5,072,476,271" and insert "$4,506,223,038."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is the first of a series of

amendments which I mentioned. What this amendment does is to cut the figure of $5,000,000,000 by the amount of five-hundred-and-sixty-six-million-and-some-odd-thousands dollars, which is a carry-over balance to the year 1952. The reason for eliminating it is, as I previously said, that this figure was not publicized as being in the appropriations for the mutual-security program. As I understand it, after listening to the debate on the floor, there was no explanation made in the committee hearings as to just what this money would be used for. As a matter of fact, these are unallocated funds to be added on to the $5,000,000,000 that would be there already.

Aside from the actual funds that are available in this particular bill, there are at least $4,000,000,000 still unspent under the previous military-aid program, which are available for these foreign countries. On top of that, we have additional counterpart funds which are still unallocated and are available for various purposes in these European countries amounting to $2,400,000,000. Incidentally, on these counterpart funds, we just heard some testimony yesterday in our committee, the Bonner subcommittee which is studying the military procurement and supply question, on just how much money is still available and unallocated in these funds. That is one of the most serious things I have heard of in some time. This money is sitting there, waiting for somebody to figure out some method of spending it. It is just available there, waiting for somebody with a bright idea to come in and figure out how we can spend the money. There is $2,400,000,000 available of this amount. I again touch on the fact that the basic problem we are confronted with right now is production in this country. We cannot produce a sufficient amount to start to spend the $56,000,000,000 defense appropriation which we recently voted for. We cannot even contract for that amount of money. I do not think, judging from the hearings, and after listening to the debate, that anybody can tell what this $5,000,000,000 will be spent for at this time. I do know one thing, that the military supplies which will have to be bought with this $5,000,000,000 are going to come from the United States, from our factories and from our plants. So, it is just a further load. It seems to me that the proper way to have done it would have been exactly the way it was proposed in the original defense bill, where 11 percent of the $56,000,000,000 could have been allocated to foreign military aid to our allies. In that way, it would have been done in one bill. You would know what money you were going to spend. As a matter of fact, I suspect the $56,000,000,000 was voted actually with that in mind. This is just an additional $5,000,000,000 tacked on to the $56,000,000,000 bill that we thought covered the whole program for our military production in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, let there be no misunderstanding about what this amendment does. It cuts the appropriation for the most important program of the entire Mutual Security Act. This cuts the funds for the Eisenhower forces in Europe. It cuts the military funds. The gentleman from Missouri who proposed the amendment said he doubted whether anybody knew just exactly what this program calls for. I want to say to you that this program has been carefully planned. Every dollar of the money provided in this bill has been programed. Large parts of it have not been spent because they cannot be spent until the items are delivered. We certainly are not going out and pay people for materials before they are delivered, but it is necessary to contract for these materials so that they can be delivered in regular order.

Unfortunately, we cannot give this House all of the information that has been imparted to our committee concerning these programs, because some of it is secret information. Certainly the Members of the House do not want us to disclose to the enemy our defense plans. But I have in my possession a complete statement of the number of ships, the number of airplanes, the number of tanks, the amount of ammunition, even the amount of ammunition that is contemplated in this program. Now, if you cut the program you cut the number of airplanes; you cut the number of tanks; you cut the amount of ammunition. You cut the defense of the free world against communism.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Do you think we can actually contract for these items? Can American production actually let those contracts, and have they been let?

Mr. GARY. These contracts have not been let, because the money has not been appropriated, but they will be let within the fiscal year 1952.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, why is it that American businessmen in this country cannot even get military contracts at this time and have not been able to, yet we have passed a bill appropriating $56,000,000,000, and we have the money allocated, and yet they have not been contracted for.

Mr. GARY. A large number of businessmen are getting contracts at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee showed two things: First, that the representatives from abroad say that the manpower was available but the equipment was not. This would further cut down the equipment. Secondly, that the lead time ran up to as much as 18 months. If you cut the program now you are cutting yourself, because you will not get it at the end.

Mr. GARY. Exactly. General Eisenhower has insisted that the most important part of this program is to build up our strength as quickly as possible. Gentlemen, it may be later than we think. Certainly the sands of time are running on our defense program. If you want to retard that program, which we are trying to establish under General Eisenhower in Europe, vote for this amendment. If you do not, vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri) there were—ayes 61, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Page 2, line 7, after the word "appropriations", insert the following: "not to exceed $266,253,233."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I previously stated to the Committee the purpose of my cut and just what it would do.

The gentleman from Missouri offered an amendment to cut $566,000,000 which was the total carry-over in title I. My amendment would decrease that carry-over by $300,000,000, leaving a balance to be used for carry-over purposes of $266,253,233. I pointed out that so far as this cut is concerned, in my opinion it does not go deep enough; it is modest, and it will not in any way disturb the program that has been planned.

The Committee will recall that the total amount to be appropriated under the title was $5,072,476,271 for military purposes; and for economic and technical assistance $1,022,000,000. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment which I am offering, a cut of $300,000,000 in the carry-over funds will do no harm to this program. I urge its adoption.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This amendment is identical in every respect with the amendment we have just voted on except in the amount.

As the proponent of the amendment stated, the amendment you voted on a few moments ago would have reduced the appropriation by $566,000,000; this will reduce it by $300,000,000. This is the European program, it is the Eisenhower program, it is the program that is so vital to the defense of the free world; it is the program that is so vital to the defense of America. I ask the Members of the House to vote the amendment down.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am for this program. I believe in the importance of a program of military aid, and I am for this amendment.

This amendment does not strike out the whole carry-over; it simply reduces it by $300,000,000. The gentleman from Virginia, the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, stated that there is a

stockpile, or reserve, in this bill of $475,000,000 for Europe. That stockpile is referred to on the record in the hearings. General Olmsted said:

> There are discussions under way with several European and non-NATO countries which, as they eventuate into satisfactory arrangements or agreements, will provide the basis to enable them to put up their portion of the military forces.

Quoting further from the hearings:

> Mr. GARY. Do you have a tentative program for those countries?
>
> General OLMSTED. Only in the most general form, sir.

Later he said:

> This is a figure on which programs for planning purposes are pretty well crystallized and discussions are pretty well along.

This amendment will still leave $175,000,000 to meet any of those programs if they eventuate. If not, we would save the money, we will not need to spend it.

I want to point out, as I found out in our hearings, that this so-called stockpile is not a stockpile of weapons at all. I thought it was, when I first heard of it. I envisioned a big shed out behind General Eisenhower's headquarters full of planes, tanks, and guns, a stockpile of weapons that could be put around in various places in Europe if we made agreements with certain countries. This is strictly a paper stockpile, a bookkeeping reserve.

I am going to stick strictly to the rules about no revelation of what transpired in executive sessions, but if there is any Member of this body who cannot name over the countries that are referred to, then he has not been following the daily newspapers very closely.

By this amendment we are merely withholding from appropriation at this time some dollars that may be used for entering into procurement contracts if, as, and when some agreements are made that have not yet been made. Congress will be back here in 2½ months, and if some of those agreements are made I am sure, in view of the countries involved, we will promptly provide the wherewithal to go through with the agreements. Some people say we should appropriate this money as bait to these countries, to coax them into making agreements. Until disclosures were made today, from the other side of the aisle, of the amount of this "stockpile," I thought the amount was to be secret, both here and abroad, and therefore could not be used as bait. It seems to me now that it might be just as wise for us at this time, when some of those agreements seem to be lagging somewhat, to make it clear that we are not going to have appropriations floating around waiting for things that are as tentative as this.

Remember that in the authorization bill the excess material which has been discussed at some length was increased by $300,000,000 for the ensuing year. That provides $300,000,000 that was not available before for real military hardware that can be sent if it is needed under this program. In view of the excess, in view of the fact that we are merely taking out a part of a paper stockpile for reserve that is not now needed, we should cut down this appropriation. Some of us who are for this program are perplexed at the failure of the countries over there to show their wholehearted support of it, we are perplexed at our own financial problem; I think we should support this reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio said he is perplexed about this matter and that he is supporting the pending amendment. I am a little perplexed about his position in the premise. It has been my pleasure to serve with the very able gentleman for a long time on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and I know of no harder worker or a more efficient public servant. I am not surprised at my friend the gentleman from Wisconsin, who has introduced this amendment, because he would be perfectly frank with you if you asked him. He is always honest and frank; he is against the whole bill; he is just against it. You will remember that when the authorization was before the House he offered an amendment to cut it approximately $1,000,000,000.

But I want the House to go back a little and take into consideration the job that the House has done and that the conferees have done in this legislation. The President proposed a bill of about $8,500,000,000. The committee cut it about three-quarters of a billion dollars. The House cut the rest of it to make a billion-dollar cut. Now, the House conferees went over to the Senate, and we think we won a great battle over there for the House, because we took a stand and won on the question of the single agency—single administrator matter. We stood by the House figure and came back with most of it, and we had a unanimous report. One of the hardest-working conferees was the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Now, do not let this argument about unobligated funds fool you—something over $800,000,000 unobligated funds. One of the very reasons that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs cut this authorization as it did was because it took into consideration the existing unobligated funds, and do not forget that this program for 1952 is tied in with the 1951 program. For instance, in that program we have a provision for certain vehicles to be sent to General Eisenhower—certain automobiles and trucks and things of that kind—and certain military vehicles to be sent to Indochina. The 1952 program is built on the basis of the 1951 program. The 1952 program, for instance, would have spare parts and carburetors for the automobiles authorized in 1951. The 1952 program will include ammunition and parts for tanks authorized and provided for in the 1951 program for General Eisenhower.

Do not be fooled by this talk about unobligated funds lying up there in mothballs. This is a program for General Eisenhower. It is all tied in together.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Are not these funds also tied in with the program for 1953; that is, the objectives for 1953?

Mr. RICHARDS. There is no doubt about that. Now, you either like this program or you do not like it. You either want to tie this country up with the fight against communism or you do not want to do it. Now already the House has gone just about as far as it can go, I say, in all honesty, in all candor, in cutting this program a billion dollars from that requested by the President of the United States. Now let us not disrupt this thing, unless you are sure that the program is no good, or unless you are sure that General Eisenhower can be backed up in spite of this additional cut of funds.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Our purpose is not to prolong this program but to bring it to an end and get the American troops out of Europe.

Mr. RICHARDS. We want to get American troops out of Europe, just as General Eisenhower said he wanted to do, and if you are going to get them out, you are going to have to put Europe in a position to carry this load. One of the primary purposes of this bill is to back up General Eisenhower and put Europe in a position to carry this load.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I regret extremely that I find myself differing from the gentleman from Ohio, whom I admire tremendously, my senior on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, with respect to this amendment. I think you have got to go back a year or two to review what has been happening up to now and what the initial purpose of this bill was. I cannot quarrel with anybody in this House who disagrees with the whole program, who feels that the program is wrong, but when you begin whittling away at it, we are only whittling away at one thing: Either the program is in our own interest and security or it is not. When we begin whittling away on it we are whittling away at our own security interest, unless we know exactly what we are doing. What has happened up to date? The administration sent in a program and the Committee on Foreign Affairs cut that program by over $700,000,000 after examining the figures that were presented. Another cut was offered here on this floor of $350,000,000. I voted for that. I voted for that cut. With the figure that was submitted to us, and with the transferability which I thought could be effected as between items, I thought we could stand that cut.

There is another item that has not been mentioned at all. The conferees cut this program by another $150,000,000. They cut it by $150,000,000 by reducing the amount of excess that could be used in the program from the $450,-

000,000 which had been approved by the House to $300,000,000. So there was another cut of $150,000,00 in what was available for this program. In addition to that, there have been some smaller cuts.

This is just a whittling-away process which I would approve of thoroughly if we were convinced that it was an economy that was going to stick, but this program is not a program for last year and this year; it has another year or two to run. It is in our interest to see that that program is completed as soon as possible and naturally with as little money as possible, and as efficiently as possible, but as soon as possible because it is a straight security program and nothing but a security program.

The real problem presented to us here is how much we want to cut down on it and whether or not we are merely slowing up a program that we have agreed to and have agreed to support, and that ought to be pushed as fast as possible in order to take off our necks the threat that comes from Eastern Europe and Communist Russia.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

NO TIME TO RELAX HERE—FRENCH ELECTION LESSONS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, in all the well-inspired talk emanating from Washington Democratic sources, the Nation is beginning to relax its concern over foreign problems in the Western European area. There is so much emphasis placed upon the success of the Marshall plan in such countries as France and Italy, and so much reliance upon the organizational work of General Eisenhower in the Atlantic Pact countries that we are being lulled into a slumber which we hope will not end in a sharp awakening.

The elections of municipal officials in France which took place last week end should remind us that all is by no means well in the lands where we must look for help in the event of another tragic world conflict. The Communists remain the largest single party in the French Republic, despite the loss of some seats in local, town, and city councils. Communists cast 23.8 percent of the vote, a drop of 2.7 percent over the general elections of last summer: but the Socialists are still in third place, with a 17.2 percent total, an increase over their previous strength; and the radical Socialists also gained. Considerably more than 40 percent of the voters in France, therefore, have indicated a preference for economic views which are either at sharp variance with our own or are closer to the pattern of the British Labor Party in relatively milder socialistic approaches.

Conservative forces have gained some ground in both France and Italy, but we are a long way from being able to hail them as the rulers of their country's destiny in time of crisis. Let us not be misled into the belief that they will spring eagerly to our side in a war where they may be threatened with destruction. Self-reliance must still be our guide to the defense of the Americas.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there are two or three simple points I would like to make if I can. The first is that no one's figures on this program, so far as I have been able to determine during months of study, are firm or can be sustained and justified on the basis of definite evidence. The State Department cannot do it, the two committees cannot, nor any of their members. This program is still in a developing stage. These are only rough estimates. I recognize that frankly. The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee [Mr. RICHARDS] cut the bill three-fourths of a billion dollars in our committee and I opposed his cut at that time with the very same arguments that he has just presented here as the reasons why we should not now accept this further cut of $300,000,000 as proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin. The cuts like the original estimates are to some extent shots in the dark.

The second and important point is that we are committed to this program. The one thing we now have to keep before us above all others is that we must make it succeed. If it succeeds, it will be one of the best investments we have ever made. It will increase our security, so that within the reasonably near future, we can look forward to reducing this whole mobilization effort which forces us to appropriate $56,000,000,000 for our Armed Forces in one single year. To be able to reduce our own Armed Forces is the way, and the only way, to be able to make big savings.

If the program fails, and the countries affected are weakened and taken over one by one, then everything we have put into it, whether more or less, will be lost, and in my opinion we will lose our own solvency here at home just as surely as we are sitting here this afternoon. Therefore, I am not willing to do anything that may conceivably jeopardize the success of the program.

Third, to adopt this amendment will not save us any money; it can only defer the appropriation of it for a year at most. Thus it cannot, in my judgment, do us any good to adopt this amendment. It could conceivably do us harm, on two scores. One, if the refusal to make available the full amount were to delay for even a few days or weeks the full implementation of the program, it would harm us and prolong the period of greatest peril. Again, if for us to cut the appropriation might in the slightest degree, and however unjustifiably, shake the confidence of the people around the world whom we are trying to buck up and encourage, it would to that extent hurt us.

Therefore, I cannot see anything to be saved or gained by this cut, any more than I could see anything to be gained by the cut of the gentleman from South Carolina of $750,000,000, when the bill came before our committee. Everybody likes to point to a record of economy, including myself, but, I am not willing to jeopardize in the slightest degree the success of such a program to which we are committed. Vote against it entirely or else vote what is necessary to make it succeed. I would prefer to err in so critical a matter by making available more than events prove necessary, rather than less.

I must say a word about one other matter. I am disappointed at the appointment of Mr. Harriman as director of the mutual security program. He is a fine, high-minded gentleman and a thoroughly patriotic American citizen. He was one of the first men in America to get wise to the real nature and the threat of communism and he has fought it forthrightly. He will be unwavering against our enemies. But from what I have seen and learned of his work, he does not have enough of the organizational ability, and the tough, hard, firm decisiveness necessary to stand up against our friends and allies in this operation, that I think Paul Hoffman had. Therefore, I regret that appointment; it makes me less optimistic about the program's administration.

But that authority is in the hands of the President. We have put our hands to the plow.

We will not save anything by turning back under this amendment. We can conceivably jeopardize the success of the program. That would hurt the United States. Therefore, I must vote against this amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does not the gentleman think that if this amendment is adopted, instead of terminating this program in 1954, as we hope, and bringing about the withdrawal of American troops, it will prolong the program?

Mr. JUDD. It could prolong it, and, by weakening confidence here or elsewhere, make it less effective and efficient. Therefore, I think it could harm us and would not help us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot arrive at some agreement to close debate on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and pending amendments thereto close in 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if there is anyone in the House who accepts this statement that came just a moment ago from the other side that, if this bill went through as written, it would end this program in 1954 or any other year in the near future. Does anyone think this program of sending our dollars and men to serve the interests of other nations is going to end? Well, is he not just silly?

The argument that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] just made is the strangest I have ever heard. What did he say? He said:

There are only two or three things I would like to say at this point. The first is that no one's figures on this bill are definite or firm or can be sustained on the basis of evidence. The committee cannot, Mr. VORYS cannot, Mr. RICHARDS cannot, and the State Department cannot, and neither can any figures that I may have be sustained on the basis of evidence.

This program is still in a developing stage. These are only rough estimates. I recognize that frankly. The chairman of the committee himself cut the bill three-fourths of a billion dollars and, in the committee, I opposed his cut of three-fourths of a billion dollars in the bill, with the very same arguments and reasons that he is giving here as to why we should not now accept this cut of $300,000,000, as proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

To me the whole thing is that we are committed to this program.

* * * * *

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does not the gentleman think that, if this amendment is adopted, instead of terminating this program in 1954, as we hope, and bringing about the withdrawal of American troops, it will prolong the program?

Mr. JUDD. It could conceivably delay it and, by weakening the confidence here or elsewhere, make it less effective and efficient. Therefore, I think it could harm us and not help us.

Now, I respect the sincerity and the intellectual ability of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] than whom there is no more pleasing orator in either body. He appeals to the emotions because he thinks kindly toward all humanity.

Unfortunately, his own emotions lead him astray. What has just been quoted from his previous statement is an illustration of how illogical he can become.

Boiled down, his statement is that he favors this program—presumably, it is one to contain communism—but he frankly admits that there is no evidence in the record, that he knows of none—and he has been an advocate of the program and of the expenditures necessary to implement it from its very inception—which will justify the necessity of any given amount being appropriated to carry it out.

He tells us there is no evidence to justify the amount carried in the bill, to justify a larger or a lesser amount, and yet he says that any reduction in the amount asked will imperil the whole program

As well might he has said that he was going on a journey to some distant point; that he had no idea of what it would cost to get there, but that he wanted a thousand dollars, and that, if he did not have a thousand dollars, he would not be able to reach his destination—that, even though $500 might be ample to take him there and back.

Someone just picked a figure out of the air, and all of these internationalists, who have been giving away our resources, who have been sending our men to die in Korea, these folks who want to win the war in Korea by sending everything to Europe, they are all for anything that some one suggests we give to some other nation. To me that is just silly.

While our men are fighting in Korea, but by the administration prevented from winning that war, we send an army to Europe to carry on a program, the real purpose of which no one seems able to state.

Those who support this and similar appropriations, aside from general statements, never have given the people the slightest idea of just what they are trying to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the conference committee which considered the mutual defense assistance bill adopted one amendment which went unnoticed, which will save the country something like $500,000,000, if the spirit of the amendment is adhered to by those who administer the appropriations under the act. That was an amendment which prohibited the use of funds under this act for the payment of taxes to France.

It came to my knowledge that France intended to impose a direct tax of about 20 percent on all expenditures for construction purposes under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act.

One of our Army engineers was quoted in the Associated Press as stating that it was expected that the proposed tax would amount to something like $500,000,000. Only today I had a letter from an officer of the Armed Forces from which I am going to read excerpts:

I was much interested in your investigation of the matter of taxes and other costs being imposed on our Government referred to in the enclosed clipping from Stars and Stripes, our overseas newspaper.

I am now serving with the First Infantry Division in Germany. From friends who know France well, and from other sources, I am sure that France is literally bleeding the United States for fantastic costs for our efforts in defending that country from further attack.

I greatly fear that unless the Congress keeps a very sharp watch on defense expenditures in Europe that we will end up with a few buildings and a multitude of new European millionaires.

I can see no particular efforts being made to stop the trend toward getting the rich richer and the poor poorer, which has always characterized European economy.

You understand, of course, that I write you simply as a private citizen, not as a member of the Armed Forces.

That saving alone if executed as the members of the conference committee of this House expected it would be when adopted, would save more than the proposed amendment which is now before the House.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I might say that it was a teletype that involved some of the gentleman's researches on this which prompted action on this point. I congratulate the gentleman.

I also want to point out that the 10-percent transferability clause put in permits the absorption of this cut throughout the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired, all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 101, noes 136.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GARY and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 105, noes 134.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: On page 2, line 1, after the figure "(1)", strike out "$5,072,476,271" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,052,476,271."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is directed solely at the administrative expenditure in this program.

It is designed to take $20,000,000 out of the total requested for that purpose and to deduct that $20,000,000 from the over-all total carried by the bill.

If the amendment is adopted, the figure for administrative expenditures now appearing as a limitation on page 6 of the bill can be altered to conform, at the proper time.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me a table which shows for the fiscal years 1950, 1951, and 1952 the dollar cost for administrative expenditures for the Defense Department, for the ECA, or MSA, as the case may be, for the State Department, and so on.

It shows an aggregate requested in 1952 of $76,675,000 compared with actual obligations of $52,205,337 in fiscal 1951 and of $24,610,644 in 1950.

That is an increase of about 50 percent in the dollar request for fiscal 1952 as compared with 1951.

If we look at the number of personnel employed in those 3 years we find that there is requested a total of something like 14,425 people for fiscal 1952 as compared with 10,749 for fiscal 1951 and 4,832 for fiscal 1950. These figures reflect an increase of 40 percent, from 1951 to 1952, in addition to the military personnel which it is contemplated will be increased from 1,553 to 3,051 in 1951, or almost 100 percent.

If by way of comparison you look at the over-all cost of the military and economic programs in those years, we find the over-all figure of $7,482,000,000 for the fiscal year 1952 as compared with $7,213,000,000 for the fiscal year 1951, and $5,195,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950, the increase from 1951 to 1952 amounting to less than 3 percent.

In other words, for an over-all increase in administrative programs amounting to 3 percent as between the fiscal years 1951 and 1952 we are apparently asked

for an increase, both in dollars and in personnel, of 40 to 50 percent.

Moreover, the ECA staff overseas has been excessive, in my judgment, for several years.

The amendment which I suggest would reduce the request of $76,000,000 to $56,000,000, providing about $5,000,000 more than was provided in the fiscal year 1951, or an increase of about 10 percent.

I suggest that we make this reduction in this administrative expenditure and, small as it is, compared with the over-all totals we are considering, that we take the reduction off the over-all total carried by the bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in all fairness, I think this is the most serious amendment that has been offered to this bill up to this time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that the amount of the Budget estimate for administrative expenses was increased from $52,000,000 to $78,000,000 with a lessening activity to deal with?

Mr. GARY. No, not with a lessening activity, because the program is being stepped up militarily.

Mr. TABER. The ECA is being stepped down.

Mr. GARY. I am sorry I cannot yield because I have to get this point over, I think it is so very vital.

The figure which the gentleman seeks to amend deals entirely with the military. Therefore, the only thing you could take out of that would be your military expenses. The military administrative expenditures under this bill are $38,000,000. That estimate was furnished by the Department of Defense. If you reduce that $20,000,000 you will reduce it more than 50 percent. You will reduce it from $38,000,000 to $18,000,000. I do not know anything worse than having a program of this magnitude improperly administered. Why, by the trimming of $20,000,000 we might jeopardize the administration of a $6,000,000,000 expenditure.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Does the gentleman mean to say you cannot make a reduction in respect to all administrative expenditure either in this figure or in the other figure under title I, and with all the transfer clauses that are available effect a proper reduction in each category of administrative expenditures?

Mr. GARY. The military expenditures come out of the military funds. You are reducing the military funds $20,000,000. You state it is for the purpose of reducing the administrative expenses. I assume that the gentleman proposes later to offer an amendment to the limitation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I so stated; if this amendment is adopted.

Mr. GARY. The point I am making is that when you lop off $20,000,000 from the military appropriation, you are lopping $20,000,000 off military expenditures because the military expenditures only come out of those funds, and you will reduce the military expenditures in this instance by that amount.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Under the transfer clauses, it does not matter where you take it out, you can apportion it.

Mr. GARY. All of the transfer clauses are limited to 10 percent. Ten percent of the entire administrative expenses would be only $7,000,000, which would be less than the $20,000,000 the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This 10 percent is between the entire amount for military aid and the entire amount for economic aid under title I.

Mr. GARY. There are no separate appropriations in this bill of administrative funds. What the bill does is merely to limit the amount that they can use for administrative expenses out of the total amount appropriated. They estimated that the administrative expenditures under this bill would be $76,675,000. They took into consideration in arriving at that figure, the 10 percent reduction which the Senate placed in the Mutual Assistance Act for the new Mutual Assistance Administration.

I stated in my opening remarks that our committee felt that the estimates in the bill for administrative expenses were too high, and consequently we have put a limitation on the expenditures, and said instead of using $76,675,000, you cannot use more than $75,000,000. This amendment would cut $20,000,000 from the military expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH) there were—ayes 105, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Economic and technical assistance, title I: For assistance authorized by section 101 (a) (2), $1,022,000,000; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for carrying out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501-1522), shall remain available through June 30, 1952, and be consolidated with this appropriation;

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 2, line 14, strike out "$1,022,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$1,012,000,000, and in addition, $10,000,000 to carry out the provisions of section 115 (e) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, except that when determined by the Administrator such balance as cannot be effectively expended shall be merged with funds appropriated under section 101 (a) (2) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, as far as I am advised, that amendment is agreeable to the committee on both sides. We accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREEN. On page 2, line 12, after the word "appropriation" and before the semicolon, insert *"Provided,* That of the amount appropriated by this paragraph the amount of $200,000,000 shall be available for military assistance to Spain."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. GARY. Yes, I will reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] is recognized for 5 minutes. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] reserves the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to bring to the attention of the membership the exclusion, once again, of Spain in the consideration of mutual assistance or military assistance to that country in the defense of Europe.

We have heard from several speakers today that the purpose of this legislation is to build up a defense in Europe that will assure us of protection against the Communist hordes and the possibility that any day we may have to face a situation in Europe where the Communists will begin to march. How can you have a feeling of security when you exclude Spain?

Spain, with its natural fortifications, is one of the most important spots on the face of the globe today. This Congress has passed legislation authorizing a loan of $68,000,000 to Spain, and on several occasions in the past it has been the expression of the House to give aid and assistance to Spain because of its strategic military location. I am just wondering if this committee can give me any information on just how these funds that are classified as "unallocated funds" are going to be spent.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania that there is included in the pending bill an amount of $450,000,000 unallocated, which is to be used in connection with military aid to Spain, Yugoslavia, and Western Germany. At the present time, because of the regrettable fact that Spain is not a party to the North Atlantic Treaty and has not yet been formally certified as being of direct importance to the defense of the North Atlantic area, and since military negotiations have been underway—we have a number of military missions working in Spain at the present time—it was evidently decided by the executive branch to send up the budget estimates in the form contained in the pending bill. This was

in line with the restrictions contained in the authorization act. I might say to the gentleman that I fully and personally realize Spain's strategic importance since it has been pointed out to me on many occasions both here and abroad by our military leaders, and I also realize the intense hatred the Spanish people have for communism.

Mr. GREEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Will the gentleman from New York tell me whether or not the transfer clause in the bill would permit 10 percent of whatever was allocated to Spain to be used on economic assistance?

Mr. ROONEY. If it were certified that it was necessary under the provisions of the underlying authorization, that clause would become operative.

Mr. MORANO. I wish to compliment the gentleman for offering this amendment. I regret that a point of order has been made against it and I suppose the point of order will be sustained, but I am glad the gentleman in any case brought this matter up before the Committee.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is a very hard-working, able colleague on the Committee on the Armed Services. I wish to ask the gentleman if he has ever talked to any man in the military, and by that I include the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, who does not say that Spain is of very vital and strategic importance to us because it presents not only a base for landing and air fields, but a barrier because of the Pyrenees.

Mr. GREEN. The gentleman from Missouri is absolutely right. He knows as well as I that the military for the last 3 years have been stressing the importance of giving aid and assistance to Spain not primarily to help Spain but to help the United States. I do not think its value to the United States can be over emphasized.

Mr. SHORT. It is vitally necessary. Another question, if the gentleman will permit, can the gentleman name any country in this world, or in Europe for that matter with the possible exception of Switzerland and Turkey, that is more anti-Communist than Spain?

Mr. GREEN. I do not believe there is any country on the face of the earth that is more anti-Communist than Spain.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? He should yield to me at this point for he has overlooked the Republic of Ireland.

Mr. GREEN. That goes without saying.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I congratulate the gentleman for having brought this matter to the attention of the Congress. It is extremely unfortunate that our great committee, responsible for bringing this to the attention of this Nation, has not given us an opportunity to help ourselves by helping a nation which is so strongly anti-Communist as the distinguished gentleman from Missouri has said Spain is. I think the gentleman is to be congratulated on bringing this matter to our attention.

Mr. GREEN. I want to thank the gentleman and I do hope that it will not be too long before we all recognize the great importance of Spain in this matter of our defense.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. In that connection I ask consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, on May 21, 1951, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 109, expressing the sense of the Congress that Greece, Turkey, and Spain should be invited to become parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I think I can safely say that this resolution expressed the sentiment of the overwhelming majority of the Congress. It is thus a matter of some satisfaction to those of us who believe in congressional leadership in foreign affairs that the North Atlantic Council has recommended that Greece and Turkey be invited to become parties to the treaty and members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This action took place pursuant to the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Ottawa, Canada, September 15–20. I hope that in the near future the Council will see fit to recommend inviting Spain, too, into membership, particularly when the addition of Spain would add considerably to the collective strength now being mustered by Western Europe against the threat of communism. General Eisenhower, on October 10, told the new Executive Board of NATO that "the future of western civilization is at stake. The threat is great and the time is short." Spain stands ready to join in meeting that threat. The members of NATO must stand ready to forget political squabbles and act in the best interest of the North Atlantic area.

The CHAIRMAN. The first section of title I of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 provides authorization for appropriation for military assistance to European countries only in the following categories:

First. To countries party to the North Atlantic Treaty, and

Second. To countries determined by the President to be eligible for such assistance under conditions spelled out by the act.

The act does not authorize appropriations to be available for countries other than those in the categories indicated. The Chair understands that Spain is not a party to the North Atlantic Treaty, and that the President has not designated Spain as an eligible country.

Therefore, the amendment provides for an appropriation which has not been authorized by law, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: Page 2, line 14, after section 101 (a) (2), strike out "$1,022,000,000" and insert "$1,020,617,000."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that the amount has already been amended.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I could not hear the amendment read that was offered, but as I listened to its reading there is no cut in the figure or no change in the figure. Am I wrong about that?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not wrong about that. However, we have gone to the next section.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr GARY. The figure was cut $10,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN The point of order is overruled and the gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is a very small cut but it follows the pattern of those amendments I said I was going to propose earlier today. The amount is only $1,383,000, but it is part of the unobligated balance carried over to 1952.

There is one slight difference here. This applies to economic aid. It is very important at this point to realize, and I emphasize this again, that the counterpart funds that are already available in Europe add up to a balance of $2,400,000,000. There is no one who can figure out right now how to spend that $2,400,000,000. So, unless somebody can tell me what they are going to do with the $2,400,000,000 already available in counterpart funds, and what they are going to do with the additional amount appropriated in this bill, I shall insist on my amendment. As the matter stands, it is merely an invitation to everybody who has a boondoggling scheme figured out to present it to a particular government in Europe.

The committee obviously has not gone into this matter according to the statement of committee members on the floor today. The gentleman from Minnesota is to be congratulated for making this debate so very clear when he said that these figures do not mean anything. That is exactly the situation. These figures do not mean anything. As I said in my previous remarks, it could be a

hundred billion dollars, it would make no difference, because the committee has not gone into the figures. There has been no justification for them. It could be any figure at all. What I said before is the absolute truth. This is a blank check, it is just as much a blank check as the $56,000,000,000 you voted heretofore. That is why this Congress is called a rubber stamp Congress. The committees default on their job, they do not look into these figures, then they come before this body and offer a $56,000,000,000 appropriation bill, and add another $6,000,000,000 to it. The figures do not mean anything.

Mr. Chairman, I say that with a rubber stamp Congress giving out blank checks, you are going to wind up by issuing rubber checks because the Government will not be able to pay them.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is similar to amendments which have heretofore been offered except that it deals with the economic and technical assistance part of the program in title I, but it still deals with Europe. It reduces the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, we are told that every dollar you reduce economic assistance cuts $2 or $3 from the program of the country itself. The purpose of the economic program is to enable the other countries to do their part in defending Europe.

If you cut off these dollars, for every one you cut off you are losing two or three dollars in the joint effort. As a matter of fact, the economic part of this program has already been cut far more drastically by the authorizing legislation than has the military program.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Is it true that part of this money, particularly in counterpart funds, is for the purpose of encouraging the growing of cotton in Ethiopia?

Mr. GARY. I do not know, but I will say this: If it is in the interest of the defense of the United States of America to grow cotton in Ethiopia, I am for growing cotton in Ethiopia.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It is my understanding that that is actually taking place.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that if our objective is to get these people into a position so that they can produce the weapons with which to defend themselves at the earliest possible moment, then we have to give them economic aid?

Mr. GARY. Absolutely.

Mr. JUDD. And if we make this cut, we are only delaying the day when they can stand on their own feet?

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. And we have to send them out of our resources to the extent that we do not give them the tools and the machinery and the aid to help them develop their own resources.

Mr. GARY. Something has been said about a rubber-stamp Congress. I do not know of any subject that has been discussed more thoroughly by the Congress of the United States than the economic program in Europe. Not only has it been discussed, but numerous Members of this body have been to Europe to observe the program in operation, and the amazing part about the program thus far is its accomplishments. Is has accomplished far more than anyone ever dared to hope at the time we started the program. It has now reached the point that we are shifting the emphasis entirely, and it is no longer economic aid, but it is aid to enable the countries to develop their defense potential. Truly it is the most vital part of this program.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true also that it was partly because we were prepared to spend, if necessary, $17,000,000,000 for economic aid under the Marshall plan, that we were able to do the job with only $12,000,000,000; whereas if we had said "We will give you $12,000,000,000 and no more," it might well have cost us $20,000,000,000 and not have succeeded at that?

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is absolutely correct. This cut is a small one compared with the entire bill, but it will have vital consequences. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members to vote down the amendment.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman explain how the counterpart funds come about?

Mr. GARY. When we deliver material to a foreign nation we deliver it to the government of that nation. The government sells the material, and the proceeds collected from it are called counterpart funds, and they go into a separate fund which is maintained for the economic development of that country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri) there were—ayes 103, noes 172.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week. He might also elucidate whether or not it is going to be the last week.

Mr. McCORMACK. On the latter observation, I sincerely hope it is. I will do everything I can in concrete form to carry that hope into an actuality.

If we dispose of this bill today, when it is disposed of I shall ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn over until Monday.

As to the program for next week, on Monday the Consent Calendar will be called. There will be six suspensions, as follows:

H. R. 5426, the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1951.

H. R. 5411, amending the School Act, with reference to critical defense housing areas.

H. R. 5425, Air Force installations.

H. R. 5505, the Customs Simplification Act of 1951.

H. R. 5248, to suspend certain import duties on tungsten.

H. R. 5693, imposing certain duties on the importation of tuna fish.

If there is time left on Monday, we shall take up House Resolution 447, relating to the investigation of chemicals in food service, as conducted by the special committee of which the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] is chairman. I do not imagine much time will be consumed on that. Then there is H. R. 2574, the Federal Property and Administrative Services bill.

On Tuesday we will take up the conference report on the tax bill, which has been agreed to. Then there will be a continuation of the consideration of the railroad retirement bill, H. R. 3669, and the bill will be taken up under the 5-minute rule for amendment.

If we cannot dispose of the bill H. R. 2574, the Federal Property and Administrative Services bill, on Monday, I shall be constrained to program that to follow the consideration of the railroad retirement bill, because putting the latter bill down for Tuesday carries out an agreement I had made that unless some legislation of a priority nature came up, that bill would be taken up on Tuesday.

As to Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, as I have said, if the bill H. R 2574 is not disposed of on Monday, it will be the first order of business following the disposition of the railroad retirement bill. Then will follow the bill S. 2170, to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, if a rule is reported on it. There is also House Resolution 451, to amend the rules of the House of Representatives. This is to amend the rules to meet a situation created by the decision of the Supreme Court on quorums where less than a quorum of a committee is present

The Private Calendar will be called on Thursday, as heretofore agreed to by the House.

I make the usual reservation that any further program will be announced later. Of course, conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I have been requested to ask either the majority or minority leader, when do we go home?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] asked that question and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] gave the best answer he could.

The Clerk read as follows:

Economic and technical assistance, title III: For assistance authorized by section 302, $237,155,866; and in addition, unexpended balances of funds heretofore made available for carrying out the purposes of the China Area Aid Act of 1950 (22 U. S. C. 1547), shall remain available through June 30, 1952, and be consolidated with this appropriation

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 3, line 14, strike out "$237,155,866" and insert "$204,474,366."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reduces the item of $237,155,866 by $32,600,000. The intent of this amendment is to reduce the amount appropriated to India. Under this bill give them $65,000,000, of which $54,500,000 is for India and $11,000,000 is for Pakistan. Mind you I have the highest respect for the people of both of these countries. I know they need all the assistance that can be accorded them. I certainly do not single them out against any other countries. I offer the amendment because I think you have gone clear out of line in increasing funds for these countries.

Let us look at the situation for a moment. In 1950 you gave India $20,000—not millions. In 1951 the allocation was $193,000 In this bill you go all out for $54,500,000. Not only that—the United States of America let India have $90,000,000 in grain last year. With respect to Pakistan, you said she should have $11,000 in 1950. Today you want to give her $10,700,000. All in the world I am suggesting that we reduce the amount by thirty-two and a half million dollars. You will still be giving these countries many times more than you have allocated in any year before. Let me show you what you do in comparison with other countries. Look at Formosa, for example. Formosa is really in trouble. Last year the amount was $92,000,000. In this bill you have cut it to $81,000,000. We will look at another. You reduced that country by $10,000,000 from the 1950 appropriation.

Look at your hearings. It is said the funds are needed because of floods and droughts in that country. I am sure they are terrible. This great committee approved, without any difficulty, increases of millions of dollars for flood and drought relief. They did not reduce the amount requested by one of the departments of our Government. Incidentally, only one or two testified. So, in a few minutes you approve this item. I am not suggesting that we strike the item. Not at all—just reducing it thirty-two and a half million.

I am impressed by the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] that after all no one knows how much funds are needed for the various items outlined in the authorization bill. One thing is pretty sure—it will all be spent.

Mr. Chairman, as I have suggested you will approve this item with little questioning on the floor of this House. The situation seems a bit different when considering funds for alleviating a situation because of flood losses by the millions in the Middle West in our own country. I am not unappreciative for what has been done. I do remind you, however, those in charge of submitting relief that has been requested are taking plenty of time to determine how much money shall be further expended, and how it shall be expended, before the legislation is finally submitted. Rather interesting, is it not?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio who is so familiar with this whole problem.

Mr. VORYS. As a matter of fact, the amount the gentleman leaves in for India is more than double what was spent there for our economic and point 4 programs a year ago?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Why, it is six times as much, or at least five times as much, as we gave them last year.

Now, I realize that $32,500,000 does not mean much to send abroad, but it means a whole lot when you spend it at home among your own people. I am not crying for the folks at home, but I am just showing you the inconsistency of this thing.

I trust the amendment will be approved by this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this bill cuts the funds for economic assistance in title III, over $30,000,000. It is designed to reduce the appropriations for India and Pakistan. As I pointed out in my original discussion of this bill, this is an area of the world that is teeming with millions. There are in this area approximately 500,000,000 people, nearly one-third of the people of the earth. They hold the balance of power in manpower if nothing more. It is an area in which there are tremendous natural resources of strategic material. Sixty percent of the world's supply of tin comes from this area; 95 percent of the world's natural rubber, and all of the world's jute.

When you begin to whittle the programs of individual countries, you may destroy the program for area protection.

I hope that it will be the pleasure of the committee to vote down this amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a question of principle is involved in the amendment which is before us now to cut the allocation of economic aid to India and Pakistan, a question of such tremendous import for our future and for our own people that it must be spoken to.

That question is briefly this: Shall the United States, as its master strategy in the world, come out as a Nation which believes it can only resolve the conflict of freedom with the totalitarian communism of the Soviet Union through war, indeed, perhaps only through a preventive war after lining up many armed allies? Or, does the United States believe it can resolve this struggle by peaceful means by marshaling such overwhelming support for free institutions that they cannot be attacked with the remotest hope of success. We should not care about people necessarily saying nice things about us; we are not that childish—but what we should seek is the overwhelming will to fight for free institutions. We should seek so solid a foundation for representative republican governments—incidentally, that is a phrase that I hope my colleagues will vote—such as we have in India, which is in grave danger of toppling unless supported with economic aid—that the Politburo will know it is wasting its time there.

We just now invested $190,000,000, in round figures, in India to help them with wheat. Now we are trying to whittle down what is already a small program in the Mutual Security Act and make it even smaller.

Let me tell you why this program is small and why the analogy with the point 4 program is not apposite. The point 4 program is only for technical assistance. It is to send engineers and other technicians down there who can advise India on what to do with their natural resources and what they need to build, and so on.

The Indians say, and very properly so: "We have lots of engineers; we have excellent British engineers; we have excellent local engineers; we do not need too much of point 4 technical help—though we welcome it and have learned much from it, especially in agriculture. What we need, though, is assistance to build the dams, the irrigation works, the roads, and the transportation systems which if our people are ever to have a really higher standard of living these very technicians advise must be built, and they can only get it in that fashion."

The people of India are part of what is called the Columbo plan, which calls for the investment of about $6,000,000,000 in that general area of the world—south and southeast Asia—in the next 6 years; external investments to constitute about $2,800,000,000, of which India's share is, say, nearly two-thirds. So this program in the bill is but a small part so far as the real substantial raising of the standard of living of the people of India is concerned. It shows the importance that we in the United States should understand that if we are to win against communism we must win men's beliefs and convictions in areas where they do not begin to understand us when we talk about free elections and free speech and security rights, but only understand us today because their own standard of living is so low, that which goes into their stomach, that which affects their health, that they revere our ability to make and deliver goods. Unless we come to a realization of that and help these peoples to improve their standards of living, we will but feed Russian propaganda by confirmation that all we intend to do is to solve the struggle between freedom and communism by war.

I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES of Kansas) there were—ayes 87, noes 111.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of title III.

Mr. Chairman, I think what I shall say will be of particular interest to the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. In a moment I shall address a question to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. I would like to remind this body that when the discussion on the authorization bill which laid the basis for this appropriation, this Member raised what he thought was an important question in regard to whether there would be any aid given to Nationalist China. I asked whether those forces of Nationalist China now on Formosa and the mainland, willing to fight on our side in this struggle with Communist Soviet Russia, would be given our support. I was given assurance by two or three distinguished members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that such was contemplated in this bill. Now I read the words on page 5 of this report in which the list is given of the specific countries mentioned by the Appropriations Committee report and down near the last we see "Philippines, Formosa, and Korea."

I would like to raise the question as to why Nationalist China has been omitted. It is not an answer to say that Formosa is the same as Nationalist China when everyone of us knows that is not true. A little bit farther down in the report we read these words:

> In Formosa the Chinese Nationalists will be provided items of equipment which are needed to defend the island (Formosa) effectively against invasion.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] why this Member and others were given assurances that adequate assistance would be given, or at least some assistance would be given, to the loyal Chinese forces now on Formosa and also those guerrillas in China who are willing to fight for their freedom and ours.

Now, I read in this report the plain implication of this committee that only Formosa will be given aid and any aid given will be only to protect the island of Formosa from invasion.

Does anyone care to rise and defend such a policy as this? I would like to address the question to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. May I say to the gentleman that we appropriated for the Nationalist Chinese exactly what was carried in the authorization legislation. Of course, the Nationalist Chinese Government is now on Formosa. The funds that are appropriated will be used for the Nationalist Chinese there. This entire matter is one of strategy, and we have appropriated what has been requested by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the others who are handling this very important matter.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the gentleman mean that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have asked that our aid going to the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa can be used only to defend the Island of Formosa against invasion?

Mr. GARY. No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. But that is the wordage of this report.

Mr. GARY. They have asked for no appropriation for any other area. They did not ask for an appropriation for the Nationalists in China.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. We must recall that it obviously was the idea in the minds of the committee when the authorization bill was passed that these 360,000 effective troops now on the Island of Formosa, ready and willing to fight against the Communist aggressors, should be aided. Why do we have General Chase and this military mission in Formosa if we do not intend to prepare our friends to fight with us and for us in Korea?

The gentleman from Virginia very eloquently said a moment ago that time is running out. Let me remind my colleagues that we have a war on in Korea and time is running out in that war. It is time for us to decide whether we are going to continue this policy of—I started to use the word that I heard used by many American boys in uniform fighting in Korea—cowardly policy, they call it, of tying their hands and tying the hands of our Chinese allies. Let me remind you that every one of these Chinese troops could take the place of some American boy drafted from a farm, from out of school, or a work shop of this country. Think of it—360,000 of them ready to fight for us and their own freedom If this bill does not authorize aid to them, to prepare them for defense of the far-eastern area from further aggression, then this body will hear from this Member again on the subject, and in no uncertain terms.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to address my remarks also to the gentleman from Virginia. I think this is a very important matter because once before in an appropriation bill and the report thereon there was some language which dealt in similar manner with a subject, and later the State Department came before our committee and sought to justify its refusal to go beyond the specifically mentioned aspects of the authorization by saying it was merely following what it deemed to be the will of the Congress. Heretofore to the best of my knowledge we have not listed the countries by name in one of these aid bills.

The gentleman will remember that 2 years ago, in the military-aid bill, about $70,000,000 was provided for use in the "general area of China." It was intentionally put that way, so as to allow utmost leeway in its use. The gentleman will also remember that provision was made that the President did not have to report in the usual detail how he expended part of that money, because he had to have flexibility to use wherever advisable whatever means were necessary to defeat the enemy. Various types of aid to Formosa was one of the means, to the Philippines was another, to Indochina was another. We expected there would be other places and methods. I fear that this language, on page 5, which says that the specific countries to be aided are "India, Pakistan, Formosa," and so on, might be interpreted as meaning Congress intends that the appropriations can be used only in these geographical units, even though the most useful thing our Government might be able to do, if, for example, there should be an uprising against Communist invaders in mainland China, would be to give aid to that uprising. Our objective in the whole area is to prevent or defeat Communist aggression and expansion out there. So would the gentleman be willing to state for the RECORD where it says "Formosa" in the report, what the committee has in mind is "Free China, including Formosa"?

Mr GARY. I would like to say to the gentleman that the report is not the law. We simply are trying in the report to tell the House what request we approve. We have approved the request as presented to the committee. The question of whether this money shall be used in free China or on Formosa is a matter for the military, and there is nothing in this bill that would prevent them from using it as they see fit. That is a strategic question and one which I certainly am not competent to pass on and I shall not attempt to pass on.

Mr. JUDD. Would the gentleman agree that if the report mentions certain countries in that area—and does not mention other countries or any other activity in the case of Formosa than defending the island against invasion—it makes it at least likely that the military or the Mutual Security Agency will feel they have little flexibility for anything beyond those designated countries or operations?

Mr. GARY. There is nothing to limit it in the application of these funds. The requests were presented to us and the program was presented and we have approved that program. You will see in the hearings, and the gentleman from Ohio earlier today called attention to some language that was used in there, in which they said this was a very fluid program and would be changed to meet changing conditions. I do not know of anything that would handicap us any more in meeting the world threat today than to lay down a program which was as the laws of the Medes and Persians, and not subject to change.

Mr. JUDD. That is exactly what I believe, sir, and I am afraid you may have laid it down too specifically in a way that might prevent the change you desire.

Mr. GARY. I will say to the gentleman there was no attempt on the part of the committee to do that.

Mr. JUDD. Good.

Mr. GARY. And that language would not in any sense be binding in the way that he suggests.

Mr. JUDD. I was afraid it would. Language in the hearings certainly would not be binding, but in the committee report I think that they could rule it to be binding as indication of congressional intent. Would the gentleman not agree that when the committee used the word "Formosa," which is not a country, it had in mind "free China, including Formosa"? Is that not what it meant? or "Non-Communist China, including Formosa"?

Mr. GARY. We certainly have in mind the Nationalist Government of China; there is no question about that.

Mr. JUDD. That is what I wanted to know. Thank you.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contributions to United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, title III: For the United States contribution to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency as authorized by section 303, the unobligated balances of the appropriations heretofore made, and available during the fiscal year 1951, for assistance to Korea under authority of the Far Eastern Economic Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1543, 1551, 1552), shall remain available through June 30, 1952, and be consolidated with this appropriation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: On page 4, line 1, after the figure "1552", insert the words "to the extent of $10,000,000."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is directed to funds proposed to be made available to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency.

The purpose of the amendment is to reduce those funds from $50,000,000 to $10,000,000.

When the bill came to the committee there was included a request for $45,000,000 of new money plus a reappropriation of $50,000,000, making a total of $95,000,000 over all. The committee eliminated the new money but provided for the reappropriation of $50,000,000 to this agency.

It is crystal clear from the record that this agency is not in a position to carry out its functions at this time, and that it cannot carry out those functions until it takes over from the military.

It does maintain a staff of 73 persons, which is said to be engaged in planning.

During the 6-month period ending June 30, 1951, the total amount expended was just under $383,000, or at the rate of $766,000 for a full year.

My amendment does not, as it logically might, eliminate the whole of the reappropriation of $50,000,000. On the contrary, I am suggesting that we eliminate only $40,000,000, leaving $10,000,000 on hand against any possible emergency.

This House will be in session again early in January. I have already referred to the numerous transfer clauses which make for great elasticity in this whole program. There is a large amount of counterpart funds, I think the equivalent of $18,200,000, that could be made available if necessary.

I can see no possible reason why this amendment should not be agreed to with a saving for the time being of $40,000,000.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the matter I discussed in detail in my opening remarks. The program for the rehabilitation of Korea is an agreed program. We have agreed to enter into it with other nations. It is estimated that the program will cost $250,000,000. Our representatives have agreed to assume, as our part of the cost $162,500,000 subject, of course, to the approval of the Congress of the United States. They do not ask for the appropriation of that $162,500,000 at this time. They merely ask that, first, they be permitted to use the balance of $50,250,000 which they have on hand. In addition to that, they asked for $45,000,000 which makes a total of $95,000,000. We were told it was very vital that we appropriate these funds for two reasons. In the first place, they will be needed immediately if there is a cessation of hostilities in Korea. In the second place, they want to encourage the other countries to contribute their part to this program. Our committee felt it was not necessary to appropriate the entire amount. We struck out the $45,000,000 of new appropriation and recommend the $50,000,000. If you adopt this amendment you do not reduce the appropriated funds one penny, but you may have a situation where these funds are needed, and they will not be available. The money will not be spent unless there is a cessation of hostilities. You are not accomplishing anything by adopting this amendment, but we may do irreparable harm.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Does the gentleman mean to indicate that $40,000,000 is not $40,000,000?

Mr. GARY. I mean to say that it is not a part of the appropriated funds. The bill simply permits them to use balances that are on hand. So far as the actual amount appropriated in this bill you are not cutting that by one dime. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Committee defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH) there were ayes—139, noes—149.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 2. Appropriations in this act under the heading "Mutual Security" for economic and technical assistance, and allocations from any appropriations under such heading to the Director for Mutual Security or the Mutual Security Agency shall be available, without limitation on any authority conferred by the Mutual Security Act of 1951 or any act continued in effect thereby, for rents in the District of Columbia; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of such appropriations; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of not to exceed ten aircraft for use outside the continental limits of the United States and maintenance, operation, and hire of aircraft; purchase of not to exceed 50 passenger motor vehicles for use outside the continental limits of the United States and, in addition, passenger motor vehicles abroad may be exchanged or sold and replaced for an equal number of such vehicles; transportation of privately owned automobiles; entertainment within the United States (not to exceed $20,000); exchange of funds without regard to section 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543); loss by exchange; expenditures (not to exceed $50,000) of a confidential character other than entertainment provided that a certificate of the amount of each such expenditure, the nature of which it is considered inadvisable to specify, shall be made by the Director or Deputy Director of Mutual Security, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein specified, insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries; acquisition of temporary quarters outside the continental limits of the United States to house employees of the United States Government by rental (without regard to section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a)), lease, or construction and necessary repairs and alterations to such temporary quarters; health and accident insurance for foreign trainees and technicians while en route or absent from their own countries participating in activities authorized under the Mutual Security Act of 1951; actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes in the United States or elsewhere the remains of persons or members of the families of persons who may die while such persons are away from their homes participating in activities under the Mutual Security Act of 1951; and services of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for purposes of providing such services the Public Health Service may appoint not to exceed 20 officers in the Regular Corps to grades above that of senior assistant, but not above that of director, as otherwise authorized in accordance with section 711 of the act of July 1, 1944, as amended (42 U. S. C. 211a), and the Coast and Geodetic Survey may appoint for such purposes not to exceed 20 commissioned officers in addition to those otherwise authorized: *Provided*, That not to exceed $75,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the departments and agencies concerned with the administration of the programs provided for herein and no part of such amount shall be used to pay the salary of any civilian employee at a rate greater than that paid by the State Department for comparable work or services in the same area.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to burden this body with the rest of the amendments I had intended to propose to the appropriation bill for mutual security.

The attitude of this body toward my other amendments and the amendments offered by my colleagues has been amply expressed. I shall merely list the additional amendments for the sake of the record.

However, I cannot fail to comment upon the attitude of this House as expressed by its votes on these amendments

and point out wherein my attitude differs from the majority here voting.

I am in favor of economic and military aid to Europe. I have been in favor of such aid even before World War II broke out. I was termed a warmonger by certain of my friends, though somewhat facetiously, for this attitude. I followed my convictions by offering my body in World War II. I served in the Armed Forces 45 months. After the war I spoke constantly in favor of a bipartisan foreign policy, aid to Europe, the Marshall plan, aid to Turkey and Greece. I repeat I still feel that way.

I am fully aware that the press of this country will misrepresent my position, if they present it at all. This has already been done when I voted against the mutual-security bill which passed the House. However, in order to conduct the fight which I believe is the most important fight that confronts anyone in the legislative branch of Government I must run that risk. The fight I am referring to is the one for a responsible and independent legislature.

As I have said before, the committee which considered this bill sought no justification for the items which went to make up this tremendous sum we are about to vote upon. The $2,400,000,000 of counterpart funds are sitting waiting for bright schemes to spend it. Additional moneys previously appropriated for military and economic aid to Europe remain unspent. These unspent funds amount to almost $6,000,000,000 Nor are these unspent funds even contracted for in full as has been intimated, but noticeably not averred, on the floor.

In other words there is no emergency need for additional appropriations at this time, so even this excuse for the committee's failure to do its job is not available.

The gentleman from Minnesota summed it all up. "These figures do not mean anything; the chairman of the committee, the members of the committee, do not know whether they are high, low, or indifferent," he said.

And this Congress accepts such a report from its commitee. What in Heaven's name do you think the epithet "rubber-stamp" Congress means? What does the words "subservient legislature" mean?

Is the answer that the Members of this body are so afraid of the false information spread about the purpose and details of this bill that they are afraid to act independently and according to the dictates of their own consciences and to demand of the executive branch a detailed explanation of what all this money is needed for? Notice I said "detailed." I am not talking about fine motives and great general purposes, all of which I have predicated my remarks by saying I agree with.

Well, I am satisfied to bear the remarks that probably will be thrown at me, similar to those thrown at the distinguished, able and patriotic Senator from Illinois, Senator DOUGLAS.

The only salvation to this bill is that the Congress has already appropriated more money to spend for arms than our production and Armed Forces can absorb. The military aid to Europe is not dollars; it is arms from our factories; the dollars are simply the feeble measure to determine how much arms are going to go from our plants and factories to Europe.

We have already appropriated to the limit of our economy beyond it I may say. We do not have the plant capacity to produce or even contract for the amount of goods measured in our present dollar value voted for by this Congress. Ask any of your businessmen where the defense contracts are. Make an estimate of the plant capacity we have available for the production of arms and you begin to understand the stupidity of appropriating vast sums like $56,000,000,000 in such haste that we cannot even examine the details.

We can throw the money away, but can we spend it wisely? The Congress has a duty to go into these matters and this I submit it has not done.

I will vote against this bill. I hope it is defeated. There are plenty of funds patently available to keep the program moving for at least 6 months and that includes keeping the pipeline filled. Let us vote this completely unalayzed and unrealistic bill down, get to work and consider a realistic bill. We could have it ready by February. I want a mutual security appropriation, but I do not want anything where "The figures don't mean anything."

The following are the list of amendments I had intended to offer in addition to the two I previously offered:

Page 2, line 21, cut $69,018,294 from the figure in the bill.

Page 3, line 7, cut $124,396,298 from the figure in the bill.

Page 3, line 14, cut $4,721,246 from the figure in the bill.

Page 3, line 22, cut $45,200,888 by limiting the figure to $5,000,000.

Page 4, line 6, cut $754,347 from the figure in the bill.

These are all the unobligated balances carried over to 1952.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5684) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House, with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 222, nays 99, not voting 107, as follows:

[Roll No. 200]

YEAS—222

Abbitt	Furcolo	Miller, N. Y.
Addonizio	Gamble	Mills
Albert	Garmatz	Mitchell
Allen, Calif.	Gary	Morano
Angell	Gordon	Moulder
Aspinall	Granahan	Multer
Auchincloss	Granger	Murdock
Ayres	Grant	Murray, Tenn.
Bailey	Green	Norblad
Bakewell	Greenwood	O'Brien, Ill.
Barrett	Gwinn	O'Brien, Mich.
Bates, Mass.	Hale	O'Konski
Battle	Hall,	O'Neill
Beall	Edwin Arthur	Ostertag
Beckworth	Halleck	O'Toole
Bender	Hardy	Patman
Bennett, Fla.	Harris	Patten
Blatnik	Harrison, Va.	Patterson
Boggs, Del.	Hart	Philbin
Bolling	Havenner	Polk
Bolton	Hays, Ark.	Preston
Bonner	Hays, Ohio	Priest
Bosone	Hedrick	Prouty
Boykin	Herlong	Rabaut
Brown, Ga.	Herter	Radwan
Brownson	Heselton	Rains
Bryson	Hillings	Reams
Buchanan	Hinshaw	Rhodes
Burnside	Holmes	Richards
Burton	Hunter	Riehlman
Camp	Irving	Riley
Canfield	Jackson, Wash.	Rivers
Cannon	James	Roberts
Carlyle	Jarman	Robeson
Carnahan	Javits	Rodino
Case	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Chelf	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Chiperfield	Jones,	Rogers, Mass.
Chudoff	Hamilton C.	Rooney
Colmer	Jones,	Sadlak
Cooley	Woodrow W.	Sasscer
Cooper	Judd	Scott,
Corbett	Karsten, Mo.	Hugh D., Jr.
Cotton	Kean	Seely-Brown
Coudert	Keating	Sheppard
Crosser	Kee	Sieminski
Crumpacker	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Miss.
Cunningham	Kelly, N. Y.	Smith, Va.
Davis, Ga.	Kilday	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	King	Springer
Dawson	Kirwan	Staggers
DeGraffenried	Klein	Steed
Denny	Kluczynski	Stigler
Devereux	Lane	Tackett
Dollinger	Lanham	Talle
Donohue	Lantaff	Thomas
Donovan	LeCompte	Tollefson
Doughton	Lesinski	Trimble
Doyle	Lind	Van Zandt
Durham	Lyle	Vorys
Eberharter	McCarthy	Walter
Elliott	McConnell	Watts
Ellsworth	McCormack	Weichel
Engle	McGuire	Welch
Evins	McKinnon	Whitaker
Fallon	McMillan	Wickersham
Feighan	McMullen	Widnall
Fernandez	Machrowicz	Wier
Fine	Mack, Wash.	Wigglesworth
Fisher	Mahon	Williams, N. Y.
Flood	Mansfield	Willis
Forand	Marshall	Wolverton
Forrester	Martin, Mass.	Yorty
Frazier	Meader	Zablocki
Fugate	Merrow	
Fulton	Miller, Md.	

NAYS—99

Aandahl	Anderson, Calif.	Bennett, Mich.
Abernethy	Andrews	Bentsen
Adair	Arends	Berry
Allen, Ill.	Armstrong	Betts
Andersen,	Barden	Bishop
H Carl	Beamer	Bow

Bray	Hull	Shafer
Brehm	Jenison	Short
Budge	Jenkins	Simpson, Ill.
Buffett	Jensen	Simpson, Pa.
Burdick	Jonas	Sittler
Bush	Kearns	Smith, Kans.
Chenoweth	McGregor	Smith, Wis.
Church	McVey	Stanley
Clevenger	Martin, Iowa	Stockman
Cole, Kans.	Miller, Nebr.	Taber
Curtis, Mo	Morris	Thompson,
Curtis, Nebr.	Mumma	Mich.
Davis, Wis.	Nelson	Vail
Dolliver	Nicholson	Van Pelt
Dondero	Norrell	Velde
Dorn	O'Hara	Vursell
George	Passman	Wharton
Golden	Pickett	Wheeler
Graham	Potter	Whitten
Gross	Poulson	Williams, Miss.
Hagen	Rankin	Wilson, Ind.
Hand	Reece, Tenn.	Wilson, Tex.
Harden	Rees, Kans.	Winstead
Harrison, Wyo.	Rogers, Tex.	Withrow
Harvey	St George	Wolcott
Hill	Saylor	Wood, Ga.
Hoffman, Mich.	Schwabe	Wood, Idaho
Horan	Scudder	

NOT VOTING—107

Allen, La.	Ford	Miller, Calif.
Andresen,	Gathings	Morgan
August H	Gavin	Morrison
Anfuso	Goodwin	Morton
Baker	Gore	Murphy
Baring	Gregory	Murray, Wis.
Bates, Ky	Hall,	Perkins
Belcher	Leonard W.	Phillips
Blackney	Hebert	Poage
Boggs, La.	Heffernan	Powell
Bramblett	Heller	Price
Brooks	Hess	Quinn
Brown, Ohio	Hoeven	Ramsay
Buckley	Hoffman, Ill	Redden
Burleson	Holifield	Reed, Ill
Busbey	Hope	Reed, N Y.
Butler	Howell	Regan
Byrne, N Y.	Ikard	Ribicoff
Byrnes, Wis.	Jackson, Calif.	Roosevelt
Celler	Johnson	Sabath
Chatham	Kearney	Scott, Hardie
Clemente	Kennedy	Scrivner
Cole, N Y	Keogh	Secrest
Combs	Kerr	Sheehan
Cox	Kersten, Wis.	Shelley
Crawford	Kilburn	Sikes
Dague	Larcade	Sutton
Deane	Latham	Taylor
Delaney	Lovre	Teague
Dempsey	Lucas	Thompson, Tex.
Denton	McCulloch	Thornberry
D'Ewart	McDonough	Vinson
Dingell	McGrath	Werdel
Eaton	Mack, Ill.	Woodruff
Elston	Madden	Yates
Fenton	Magee	
Fogarty	Mason	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dague for, with Mr. Secrest against.

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Blackney, against.

Mr. Byrne of New York for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.

Mr. Denton for, with Mr. Busbey against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. August H. Andresen against.

Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. Sheehan against.

Mr. Madden for, with Mr. Scrivner against.

Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Butler against.

Mr. Kerr for, with Mr. Hoeven against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Lovre against.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Mr. Quinn for, with Mr. McDonough against.

Mr. Clemente for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Werdel against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Woodruff against.

Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Regan against.

Mr. Heller for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Perkins with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Goodwin.

Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. Murphy with Mr. Hess.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Baker.

Mr. McGrath with Mr. Hardie Scott.

Mr. Howell with Mr. Elston.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. D'Ewart.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Ribicoff with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Shelly with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Hope.

Mr. Yates with Mr. Jackson of California.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Deane with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

Mr. Gathings with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Cox with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Ford.

Mr. Magee with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Sutton with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Dingell with Br. Bramblett.

Mr. Redden with Mr. Phillips.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the bill be permitted to revise and extend their remarks, and that all Members have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight Saturday to file a report on the bill H. R. 5693.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PROPOSAL FOR CREATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ATOMIC ESPIONAGE

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, during the past week public announcement was made by the President to the effect that Russia had detonated another test atomic bomb—a fact later substantiated by Stalin, supplemented by what he deemed appropriate comment, thus answering decisively what has been a moot question and confirming the belief held—and voiced—by members of the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1948. Its knowledge of the extent of atomic espionage and its effectiveness gained through exhaustive investigations and hearings could lead to no other conclusion.

Following the impact of the Presidential announcements, the burning question naturally rises in the public mind as to the manner in which atomic information was obtained by Russia, and I am, therefore, constrained to introduce into the RECORD certain illuminating facts unearthed by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the Eightieth Congress, on which I had the honor to serve. This sketchy citation constitutes only a small part of the record but clearly evidences the vulnerability of trusted participants in atomic research and the astounding inadequacy of our security safeguards.

The committee subpenaed one Clarence W. Hiskey, a scientist, holding a captain's commission in the Army Reserve, and who had been employed on the Manhattan Project at the University of Chicago. The amazing feature of that employment is the fact that Hiskey, while attending the University of Wisconsin, was president of the Young Communist League. Later, while an instructor in chemistry at Columbia, from which post he was drawn for atomic research, he was an active member of the Young Communist Group. That an individual of such background of Communist affiliation was cleared for research service in connection with the supposedly most secret and precedent-shattering operation in world history—an operation involving the most dangerous and effective weapon ever conceived by human ingenuity—cannot possibly be justified or condoned.

At the University of Chicago, Hiskey became acquainted with one Prof. John Hitchcock Chapin, also engaged in atomic research. According to Chapin's testimony, Hiskey induced Chapin to meet at the Stevens Hotel in Chicago one Arthur Adams, a known Russian espionage agent, long under the scrutiny of our military intelligence.

Arthur Adams, while a member of the Amtorg organization, a Russian purchasing unit, was deported during the thirties because of his connection with a then operating Soviet espionage ring. He reentered the United States from Canada on a forged birth certificate and immediately resumed espionage activities. Military Intelligence and FBI were alerted to his presence and maintained constant surveillance, but according to the record they were under orders authorized by the State Department to make no arrest until Adams sought to leave the country. In the light of this sketchy background the significance of the meeting of the trio can be well imagined.

According to the sworn testimony of an FBI agent, material was thereafter delivered to Adams that was later repossessed by Military Intelligence, the content of which caused a high Manhattan Project official to exclaim, "My God, this is part of the atom-bomb formula."

According to further testimony of the same agent, Military Intelligence, suspicious of Hiskey, who had obtained deferment from military service to engage in atomic research, had him recalled to Army duty. He was ordered to a post in the Northwest Territory where he was

kept under surveillance and where a search of his effects revealed he was carrying classified atom bomb information in violation of security regulations.

Let me cite to you the nature of the testimony of Witness Hiskey before the committee:

The CHAIRMAN. Now, are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HISKEY. I would think that on advice of my counsel I shouldn't answer that question, because it would tend to degrade or incriminate me.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Hiskey, are you a Reserve officer?

Mr. HISKEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING In the military service at the present time?

Mr. HISKEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know an individual by the name of Arthur Adams?

Mr. HISKEY. Upon the advice of counsel I refuse to answer that question because it may tend to incriminate or degrade me.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you ever give Arthur Adams any information regarding the development of the atomic bomb in Lincoln Park in Chicago in the fall of 1943?

Mr HISKEY. Upon the advice of counsel I refuse to answer on the grounds it would tend to incriminate and degrade me.

Hiskey continued to give the routine Communist reply to every question that sought to obtain information with respect to his activities and associations throughout the hearing but his oft-repeated answer lent itself to but one interpretation.

Let me cite the testimony of Professor Chapin:

Mr. STRIPLING. Before you met Arthur Adams did you have any connection with Clarence Hiskey regarding Arthur Adams?

Mr. CHAPIN. Well, I was told that Arthur Adams was a Russian espionage agent—told by Hiskey.

Mr. STRIPLING What else did he tell you?

Mr. CHAPIN. I have to think now—he asked me if I would be willing to meet Arthur Adams at some future time.

Mr STRIPLING. What was your reply?

Mr. CHAPIN. After thinking about it awhile, I said, yes, I would be willing to meet him.

Mr. STRIPLING. Why did Hiskey want you to meet Arthur Adams?

Mr. CHAPIN. Well, to the best of my recollection it would be to discuss whether or not I should hand out any information to Adams on my work.

According to Chapin's testimony he met Adams at the behest of Hiskey twice, once in front of his apartment on Drexel Avenue and again at the Stevens Hotel where a discussion was held for an hour to an hour and a half. He claimed that he delivered no classified material to Adams on either occasion. But his protestations are entitled to slight credence in the light of the balance of his testimony and damaging contradictory evidence in the hearing record.

Mr. VAIL. I would like to fill in the blanks in the record with respect to your relationship with Hiskey. Do you recall just how they began?

Mr. CHAPIN. Yes, more or less; yes. My work at Columbia was related to Hiskey's and I got to know him at that time; but I do not think we had any relation outside of work until after he was assigned to Chicago.

Mr. VAIL. Where and when was the chord of sympathy established between Hiskey and yourself with respect to your views concerning Russia?

Mr. CHAPIN. I really do not know.

Mr. VAIL. There must have been at some time a bond established between you by reason of your mutual interest in Russia.

Mr. CHAPIN. Well, sure we were both interested in Russia.

Mr. VAIL. Certainly when Hiskey determined that you were susceptible to a suggestion that you meet with Arthur Adams it was based upon discussion that indicated to him that a mutual interest in Russia existed.

Mr CHAPIN It must have been. I mean, that seems logical.

Mr. VAIL. Well you must have been in a position where you inadvertently or otherwise dropped a remark that gave Hiskey some confidence in approaching you on the subject, otherwise he would be taking a terrific chance.

Mr. CHAPIN I think, knowing Hiskey's character—slightly anyway, I think in fact, I know that he did take a terrifically long chance.

Mr. VAIL Did you ever talk to anyone else and indicate a sympathy for Russia that could have been brought back to Hiskey?

Mr. CHAPIN. I do not know. I did not conceal my thoughts from anyone on any particular subject

Mr. VAIL. Well, it certainly would be illogical for Hiskey to at random select an individual associated with the project and suggest that he meet a Russian agent.

Mr. CHAPIN. It was obviously not at random but as I say, he was crazy to—I mean as I have said before, I am considerably mystified.

Mr. VAIL. He certainly was not crazy, because he struck pay dirt.

Mr. CHAPIN. Well, partially.

Mr VAIL. He knew the risk he was taking and he felt reasonably secure in taking that risk and I am trying to find out on what basis he premised the risk he took and you can help us out on that if you will.

Mr. CHAPIN I will. I mean I would but I honestly do not know.

Mr VAIL. Have you had the feeling that the secret of the atom bomb should be internationally shared?

Mr. CHAPIN Oh, I have made no secret of that Yes; I have always felt that probably it should.

Mr VAIL. But, in the light of our strained relationship with Russia now what would you say?

Mr. CHAPIN. I do not really think I do. I am not sure.

The above is only a small part of voluminous and shocking testimony that evidenced the character of the men who shared the secrets involved in atomic research Is it any wonder that Arthur Adams found his task a relatively easy one? The described circumstances give natural rise to questions in the public mind that demand straight answers. For example, why did military intelligence and the FBI permit Adams to slip through their fingers and escape the country with undoubtedly vital atomic information? Why did not the Manhattan project authorities carefuly screen those invited to participate in scientific research? Why did the Army dignify Hiskey by invoking his commission and restoring him to military service? Why did not the Army prosecute him in the knowledge of his activities and the discovery of classified atomic information in his personal effects while in the Northwest Territory? Why did the Army grant him an honorable discharge on July 5, 1949, knowing him to be a traitor to his country? Why was he awarded and permitted to retain a bronze star decoration for meritorius military service, said service consisting of a share in developing a soap that sudsed in cold water? Why is he now unpunished and teaching unmolested in an American college? Why is Chapin, whose testimony evidenced willing contact with a Russian agent and to whose word can be given slight credence, permitted to freely follow chosen civilian pursuits unmolested, his treasonable conduct forgotten—without searching investigation based upon his testimony? Here is a precious pair that can undoubtedly shed a measure of light on how Russia secured atomic information.

The records of the committee are replete with similar testimony and factual evidence involving numerous others including Alger Hiss, former high-ranking State Department official, now serving sentence in a Federal prison; Julian Wadleigh, State Department employee, admitted Communist and associate of Hiss; Dr. Edward U. Condon, former Director of the National Bureau of Standards, Russian sympathizer and collaborator; Steve Nelson, CIO official, Communist and espionage agent; Joseph Weinberg, Communist, the notorious Scientist X, who conspired with Nelson and others; Russian-born Gregory Silvermaster, former Chief Economist for the Maritime Board, Communist and espionage agent; William Ludwig Ullman, former major in the Army Air Corps and associate of Silvermaster; Victor Perlo, former Chief of the Statistical Analysis Branch of OPA, Communist and espionage agent; John Abt, former assistant general counsel of WPA; former chief counsel to the Senate Subcommittee on Education and Labor under Senator La Follette, general counsel of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Communist and espionage agent; Lee Pressman, former general counsel of the WPA, former general counsel of the CIO, Communist; Giovanni Lomanitz, associate professor of physics, Fisk University, employed on atomic research, radiation laboratory, University of California, Communist and espionage agent; David Joseph Bohm, professor of physics, Princeton University, employed on atomic research, radiation laboratory, University of California, Communist and espionage agent; Frank Friedman Oppenheimer, Communist Party member under alias of Frank Folsom, assistant professor, University of Minnesota, employed as research associate, Los Alamos, Oak Ridge, and radiation laboratory, University of California; Martin Kamen, associate professor of chemistry, Washington University, research chemist, Manhattan project; Nathan Witt, attorney, former assistant general counsel, NLRB, Communist; Irving David Fox, research associate, radiation laboratory, University of California, Communist.

These are but a few of the suspect individuals. There is a host of others under thoroughly justified suspicion.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has performed most commendable service in bringing subversive operations to light, but the scope of its labors is broad, its investigative personnel is limited and the evidence it has developed, though strongly presumptive of guilt, has never been used for actual prosecution except in the cases of Hiss and Remington, both of whom were convicted as perjurers and not specifically for espionage activity.

The Criminal Code, as amended, title 18, section 794, removes the protection of the statute of limitations on such offenses and provides appropriate penalties, including death for wartime espionage.

The Department of Justice acted in the Rosenberg case resulting on April 5, 1951, in the death penalty for Julius Rosenberg and Ethel Rosenberg, his wife, who are now awaiting execution. On the same date David Greenglass was sentenced to 15 years and Morton Sobel to 30 years and Harry Gold on December 9, 1950, was sentenced to 29 years in the Federal Penitentiary.

No effort should be spared that will insure similar exposure and prosecution of all others involved in atomic espionage. The public interest demands quick and aggressive action. The guilty should be brought to trial and punished in a manner befitting their heinous crime.

To that end, I am today introducing a resolution to create a select congressional committee, whose sole duty it shall be to search out, expose, and bring to book those persons responsible for the greatest criminal offense in history—traitorous Americans who betrayed a sacred trust in providing the enemy of the peace-loving world—an atheistic, merciless, power-thirsty nation, seeking world domination—with a weapon having a horribly destructive potential in terms of loss of life to the women and children of America and to other noncombatant civilians. It has been estimated that one enemy atomic raid could cause 3,000,000 deaths and as many injuries.

Through the intervening years since initiation of the Manhattan project the vital obligation of determining atomic espionage guilt has been discharged with full effectiveness by no governmental agency and, therefore, in the light of the Truman announcement, becomes an obvious and grave responsibility of this body before memories fail, records vanish, and the guilty die natural deaths. As the situation now stands no intensive investigation is known to be under way by any agency and a nebulous aura surrounds the operations of the atomic espionage ring.

The proposed select committee would concentrate on atomic espionage—there would be no wide diffusion of activity that limits the effectiveness of other agencies and the probability of successful accomplishment of its vital objective warrants unanimous adoption of the resolution.

The American public of today is entitled to know and American history should and must contain the complete record, identity and extent of aid rendered to an unfriendly foreign power by individuals whose traitorous villainy in supplying atomic information to promote Communist world rule constitutes the darkest page in the annals of our country.

THE LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF REPRESENTATIVE HALE BOGGS, OF LOUISIANA

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of the splendid legislative record of our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], and further that other Members have the privilege of extending their remarks on the same subject, following mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] has been persuaded by the citizenry of his State to stand for election as Governor of the Pelican State. As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I am extremely pleased that our colleague has been selected for this great honor. I can truthfully say—without qualification or mental reservation—that no member of the Committee on Ways and Means during my service on the committee has demonstrated greater energy, ability, and independence of judgment in support of the best interests of his constituents than has the gentleman from Louisiana. I am confident that only the call to greater public service would have motivated the gentleman from Louisiana in giving up his heavy responsibilities as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, even as a freshman Member of Congress, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] was assigned to the great Committee on Banking and Currency, a demonstration of confidence on the part of the Democratic Committee on Committees that in my recollection is almost without precedent. The gentleman from Louisiana, however, measured up fully to this heavy assignment. Upon his return to Congress after World War II, he resumed his service with the Committee on Banking and Currency until elected to the Committee on Ways and Means, where he has served with unusual ability and distinction. His rise has been rapid, his success great; and everything he has done as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means has justified the prediction of brilliant performance in still higher public office.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED.]

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I knew the gentleman from Louisiana before he was elected to the Committee on Ways and Means. I still recall with pride his leaving Congress to go on active duty with the Navy during World War II. From our service together on the Committee on Ways and Means and our attendance as representatives of the United States at the Inter-Parliamentary Union meetings of legislators from anti Communist nations, I can certify that the gentleman from Louisiana has a devotion to patriotic American ideals second to none. Although there have been some issues upon which we did not agree, the gentleman from Louisiana has earned for himself not only my own personal confidence and friendship, but the esteem of the other minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means as well.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I concur fully in the remarks of the gentleman from New York about the great ability, integrity, and patriotism of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House from a State which adjoins Louisiana, I have followed with keen interest the career of the gentleman from Louisiana, who has made an outstanding record during his few years as a Member of this body. It was to be expected that the people of his great State should wish to consider him for higher office. The members of the Committee on Ways and Means, regardless of party, can bear witness to his capacity, vitality and leadership. As chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Narcotics, he has sponsored the only legislation passed by the House of Representatives during this Congress which would effectively cope with the alarming increase in drug addiction among teen-agers and other segments of our population. I know that he will carry into whatever public office he may hold the same careful alertness for whatever is in the best interest of all the people.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I want to express my appreciation for the constant support of the work of our committee which has always been given us by the gentleman from Louisiana. Every time our committee needed public funds, or required a vote of confidence from the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Louisiana has given us his unqualified support. This record bespeaks a devotion to Americanism, freedom and democracy that no one could successfully challenge. He is undoubtedly one of the most vigorous foes of communism ever to sit in the House of Representatives.

In my opinion, HALE BOGGS has been one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives. His tireless energy, recognized ability unfailing courage, and deep conviction have earned for him the admiration and respect of his colleagues. I am glad to take this opportunity to express publicly my high

regard for the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this privilege of speaking on the legislative record of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS]. When I came to Congress as a new Member on January 3, 1949, it was my happy privilege to renew an acquaintanceship with HALE BOGGS that I had established many years earlier. I soon discovered that he was one of the outstanding Members of the House. I marveled at the broad information which he possessed, and at his skill as a legislator in this body.

To my mind HALE BOGGS represents the spirit of the growing southland. He realizes that his section of our great country has many possibilities that project themselves into the future. He realizes the challenges that exist. At the same time he is mindful of and responsive to the traditions of her past. As a matter of fact those traditions are inextricably woven into the fabric of his personality and of his entire makeup. His background is a part of those traditions.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] is a hard worker, Not only that, he is an independent thinker. He has impressed me as a man who does his own thinking about legislative matters, solicitous always of the advice and opinions of those he represents, and of his colleagues here, but as one who finally makes up his own mind, and who, once a decision is reached has the courage to fight for his convictions. His fine mind equips him to make the practical distinctions between fact and fancy, and to immediately recognize and assess a new or complex idea or proposition for its practical worth.

HALE BOGGS' industry, his fine mind, his inherent ability, his habit of independent thought, his practical commonsense approach to matters of the greatest involvement and complexity, his respect for the customs and traditions of peoples from all sections of our great country, his sense of history, his healthy middle-of-the-road attitude, all these, Mr. Speaker, have made of him a Congressman who is able and effective. His record here has been outstanding. His great personality has impressed itself upon the laws enacted here. His colleagues have been impressed by his fairness, and at the same time his ability to accomplish in the difficult field of lawmaking during these past years when the Russian Bear has cast its shadow over the minds of those who were formerly free men halfway around the globe.

HALE BOGGS is now, and has been throughout his legislative life, an advocate of national preparedness. He recognizes that this Nation must be strong. He realizes that strength is the only language that Russia understands. His efforts have been directed toward building up the armed might of this country against the evil day when the power-hungry world Communists, wherever located, and whether principals or satellites, may allow the zeal of their poisoned minds to goad them into a war with us. The strength produced through the leadership of the gentleman from Louisiana, and others of like mind here in the Congress is the only effective bulwark against communism, the only protective fortress for our liberties.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a summary of the high lights of the legislative record of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] during the Seventy-seventh, Eightieth, Eighty-first, and Eighty-second Congresses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

RECORD OF CONGRESSMAN HALE BOGGS

HALE BOGGS was elected to Congress in September 1940.

January 22, 1941: Boggs votes in favor of additional shipbuilding facilities. It is his first vote as a Congressman.

January 29, 1941: Boggs introduces a bill to make possible the construction of another bridge across the Mississippi River.

February 11, 1941: Boggs votes in favor of the hotly debated lend-lease appropriation of $7,000,000,000. Same day, lauds the work of the Dies committee investigating un-American activities. Consistently supports the work of this committee through the years

March 19, 1941: Boggs votes in favor of huge supplemental national-defense appropriation of $3,700,000,000.

March 22, 1941: Boggs attacks a pending cotton-storage measure as being harmful to the ports of the State.

April 2, 1941: Eight months before Pearl Harbor, Boggs votes in favor of investigating the progress of national defense.

April 14, 1941: Boggs demands that the South share in the defense program. Hits concentration of new war industry in the East. Says the South got only 3 percent of war contracts in the previous months.

May 13, 1941: Boggs votes in favor of fixing corn- and wheat-marketing quotas.

May 28, 1941: Boggs introduces a bill to study the feasibility of a deep water channel between New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico, a project dear to the hearts of those interested in improving port business

June 11, 1941: Boggs votes to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to include cotton and tobacco.

June 17, 1941: Boggs criticizes handling of war contracts. Says only 7 percent of war contracts have been placed in the South.

June 24, 1941: Years before public interest has been aroused, Boggs introduces a bill to prohibit members of subversive organizations from becoming members of labor unions.

August 6, 1941: Boggs introduces House Resolution 5502 to provide Federal aid for Louisiana and other States by amendments to the Social Security Act.

August 10, 1941: Boggs warns against giving aid to Russia without stringent conditions, showing complete understanding of Russian menace.

August 12, 1941: Five months before Pearl Harbor, isolationists agitation is so strong that the United States Army is almost crippled by failure to extend the draft. Boggs is in forefront of the fight to maintain a strong Army, casts his vote for extension of the draft. The measure passes by one vote (House Resolution 222).

September 25, 1941: Boggs proposes an amendment to the Sugar Act to place cane growers in an equal parity status with beet growers.

October 10, 1941: Boggs votes in favor of the second extra appropriation for the Armed Forces.

November 3, 1941. Boggs makes Nationwide radio address against St. Lawrence seaway. Had consistently opposed project. Again helps defeat project despite Truman support in 1951.

November 13, 1941: Boggs votes to amend the Neutrality Act and permit the arming of our merchant vessels to defend themselves against air and submarine attack.

November 28, 1941: Boggs votes in favor of measures to control inflation in wartime.

December 5, 1941: Two days before Pearl Harbor, Boggs votes in favor of the third extra appropriation for the Armed Forces.

December 8, 1941: Boggs hears President Roosevelt call for a declaration of war against Japan. Votes for the declaration.

December 11, 1941: Boggs votes in favor of a declaration of war against Germany and Italy.

January 2, 1942: OPA tells Boggs that sugar ceiling will be raised to $3.74. Boggs, as a member of the important Banking and Currency Committee of the House, has been the spokesman for the industry in matters of price ceilings.

February 17, 1942: Boggs votes for fifth extra appropriation for the Armed Forces.

March 11, 1942: Boggs votes in favor of continuing the investigation of un-American activities.

March 27, 1942: Boggs votes for increased flood-control appropriations.

April 21, 1942: Boggs plugs for a bill to bring small business into the defense program. Says small firms are being forced out of business.

June 3, 1942: Boggs votes for a declaration of war against Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania.

June 18, 1942. Boggs votes in favor of a bill increasing the size of the Navy.

June 23, 1942: Boggs votes in favor of appropriation bill for the Armed Forces.

July 23, 1942: Boggs introduces House Resolution 530, to suspend the action of the Maritime Commission in canceling a war contract of the Higgins Corp.

October 13, 1942: Boggs votes against a Federal anti-poll-tax bill as a violation of States' rights.

October 17, 1942: Boggs votes in favor of extending the draft to 18- and 19-year-olds to help build up Armed Forces for eventual victory.

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

February 18, 1947: Boggs votes to cite Communist Gerhardt Eisler for contempt of Congress. Later votes legal action against many other Communists, most of whom later served jail terms.

March 21, 1947: Boggs votes for extension of authority with respect to pricing and distribution of sugar. Also introduces a bill to make available to the public the complete voting records of all Congressman, House Resolution 2711.

March 27, 1947: Boggs and Senator FULBRIGHT offer a historic resolution in Congress, urging the anti-Communist nations of Europe to band together in a "United States of Europe." This resolution lays the groundwork for the Marshall plan, announced 2 months later, the mutual defense treaty known as the Atlantic Pact, the arms aid to Europe program and other measures to stop Russian aggression, now under the direction of General Eisenhower.

April 17, 1947: Boggs votes against the original Hartley labor bill. Says it was not constructive but destructive, and that it needs key amendments to improve it. When amendments are later offered to define labor's responsibility, ban secondary boycotts, and mass picketing and establish machinery for avoiding strikes in industry that affect public health and safety, he votes for the measure (the Taft-Hartley bill), then votes to override the President's veto.

April 28, 1947: Boggs attacks Republican-controlled Congress for curtailing funds for flood control, inland waterways, and cotton research.

April 30, 1947: Boggs votes in favor of extending relief to countries devastated by war, now ripe for Communist agitators.

May 1, 1947: Boggs sharply criticizes President Truman for freezing flood-control funds for the lower Mississippi Valley.

May 6, 1947: Boggs appears before a congressional committee to support the claims of oystermen for damages caused by the opening of the Bonnet Carre Spillway.

May 9, 1947: Boggs votes for aid to Greece and Turkey to enable them to cope with a Communist revolution and resist the threat of aggression of Russia.

May 16, 1947: Winston Churchill opens drive to achieve a United States of Europe, suggested in the resolution of March 27, by Boggs and Senator FULBRIGHT.

May 20, 1947: Boggs introduces House Resolution 3529 to prohibit members of subversive organizations from being members of labor organizations.

May 28, 1947: Boggs votes in favor of a proposal to increase funds for school lunches, rural electrification, and soil conservation.

June 25, 1947: The Marshall plan is announced 2 months after Boggs-Fulbright resolution.

June 10, 1947: General Marshall endorses United States of Europe resolution.

June 20, 1947: Boggs votes in favor of overriding President Truman's veto of the Taft-Hartley Labor-Management Relations Act.

June 25, 1947: Boggs introduces a bill to make every Congressman's voting record available to the press or to any group of 10 or more citizens. Such records are now available only to the Congressman himself.

July 2, 1947: Boggs offers an amendment to the civil functions appropriations bill to provide $1,200,000 for construction of levees in Jefferson Parish.

July 15, 1947: Boggs votes in favor of House Resolution 3813, to remove disloyal persons from the employ of the Government.

July 18, 1947: During balloting on House Resolution 3601, Boggs votes in favor of raising school lunch program funds from $45,000,000 to $75,000,000; to raise the appropriation for rural electrification by $25,000,000; and to increase payments to farmers for proper soil conservation practices.

July 21, 1947: Boggs votes against a Federal antipoll tax bill, one of President Truman's civil rights measures.

July 30, 1947: Boggs is named to a seven-man joint congressional committee to study housing problems in principal cities. Important legislation results from the committee's hearings.

October 18, 1947: Boggs appears before a congressional committee to urge the claims of oystermen for the rehabilitation of oyster beds destroyed by the opening of the Bonnet Carre Spillway.

December 15, 1947: Boggs votes in favor of emergency economic aid to Austria, China, France, and Italy to bolster those nations in their resistance to communism.

February 18, 1948: Boggs announces a Federal grant of $20,000 for the dredging of Bayou Segnette in Jefferson Parish. Project will eliminate hazards of stumps, trash, and low water that plague fishermen who bring their catch along the bayou to Westwego, La.

February 23, 1948: Boggs votes against a tax cut on the grounds that it discriminates against the community property laws of Louisiana. After proper amendments, he voted for reductions. Has consistently defeated efforts by Truman administration to change Louisiana community property system.

March 2, 1948: Boggs introduces a bill to confirm the title of the States to the tidelands.

March 5, 1948: Boggs introduces House Resolution 494, to create a committee of observers to attend a Parliamentary Congress for the Constitution of a United States of Europe.

March 9, 1948: Boggs votes in favor of a $200,000 appropriation to continue the investigation of un-American activities.

March 11, 1948: Boggs announces he will seek funds from the Federal Government for badly needed levee construction in east Jefferson Parish.

March 16, 1948: Boggs votes in favor of extending rent control.

March 23, 1948: Boggs votes in favor of the Marshall plan for economic aid to the anti-Communist nations of Western Europe.

March 24, 1948: Boggs introduces a bill to speed up the construction of housing.

March 25, 1948: Boggs introduces House Resolution 6017, to increase payments under the Social Security Act.

April 26, 1948: Boggs votes in favor of repealing unfair taxes on oleomargarine that unnecessarily raise the cost of living.

April 30, 1948: Boggs votes for resolution confirming the title of the States to the tidelands. Makes strong speech for measure on floor of the House of Representatives.

May 14, 1948: Boggs votes for consideration of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948, to require registration of Communists and Communist-front organization.

June 14, 1948: Boggs votes against a provision in the conference report on House Resolution 5883, reducing payments to farmers for proper soil-conservation practices. He feels soil conservation is of extreme importance and should be encouraged.

June 15, 1948: Boggs votes in favor of the Selective Service Act of 1948.

June 18, 1948: Action by Boggs kills plan to sell the Federal barge lines. Boggs feels such action would hurt small shippers and receivers in Louisiana and the Mississippi Valley.

July 4, 1948: Boggs, a Louisiana delegate to the Democratic National Convention, casts vote for Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, as Democratic nominee for President of the United States.

August 10, 1948: Boggs is named United States delegate to a meeting in Rome. Later leaves with group of Senators and Representatives of both parties to attend meeting of delegates.

August 23, 1948: Boggs reviews the session of Congress just ended. Points to the enactment of the Sugar Act as an aid to Louisiana farmers. Says the cities will benefit from slum clearance and housing legislation.

November 5, 1948: Boggs draws up a bill in the House of Representatives similar to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which provides for slum clearance and better housing, both in the cities and on the farm.

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

December 31, 1948: Congressman Boggs is urged unanimously by members of the Louisiana delegation for membership on the important Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. (Later he is elected to the post by fellow Democrats, receiving the greatest vote of any nominee.)

January 3, 1949: Boggs introduces two important bills in Congress; House Resolution 334, to confirm and establish the ownership by the States of the lands and resources in and beneath the navigable waters of the States; House Resolution 335, to increase Federal contributions to the old-age assistance programs of the States.

January 4, 1949: Boggs says he will introduce a bill in the new session of Congress to repeal unfair taxes on oleomargarine that unnecessarily increase the cost of living.

January 11, 1949: Boggs announces that hearings will be held on funds to improve flood protection in east Jefferson Parish. (The eventual outcome is a $5,000,000 Federal flood-control project in the parish.)

January 15, 1949: Boggs introduces a bill to confirm the title of the States to the tidelands.

January 17, 1949: Boggs introduces House Resolution 1517 to approve an interstate agreement for better use of Gulf coast fisheries.

February 4, 1949: Boggs introduces bills to assist the operation of the foreign trade zone at New Orleans.

February 9, 1949: Boggs votes in favor of a $200,000 appropriation to continue the investigation of un-American activities. Also votes to extend the reciprocal trade agreements which stimulate port commerce and foreign trade.

February 28, 1949: Boggs endorses Hoover Commission plan for saving money and improving efficiency in operations of the Federal Government.

March 9, 1949: Boggs introduces House Resolution 3358, to require the registration of Communist-front organizations.

March 10, 1949: Boggs introduces a bill to prohibit picketing of the Federal courts.

March 15, 1949: Boggs votes in favor of House Resolution 1731, extending rent control with local option.

March 24, 1949: The Agriculture Department, in answer to an inquiry from Congressman Boggs, says it will continue its policy in connection with the determination of deficits in the sugar-supplying areas, an announcement of great importance to the Louisiana sugar industry.

April 1, 1949: Boggs votes in favor of a bill repealing unfair taxes on oleomargarine.

April 4, 1949: Boggs votes in favor of aid to the anti-Communist Chiang Kai-shek Government of China.

April 12, 1949: Boggs votes in favor of extending the Marshall plan for the economic recovery of the anti-Communist nations of Europe.

April 26, 1949: Boggs votes to consider amendments to Taft-Hartley Act. Later votes for improvements in the act.

May 23, 1949: Boggs introduces House Resolution 4810, to repeal the wartime excise tax on furs, which is hurting trappers and others in the fur industry.

June 29, 1949: Boggs votes for the Housing Act of 1949. Opposes an attempt to kill low-rent housing. Favors a provision for the signing of non-Communist affidavits.

July 11, 1949: Boggs discusses the new housing bill. Says slum clearance is badly needed. Was the author of a provision in the bill for improving farm housing also.

July 13, 1949: Boggs votes in favor of amending the Rural Electrification Act to provide for rural telephone service.

July 17, 1949: Boggs introduces a bill to prohibit picketing of the Federal courts, a favorite propaganda device of Communists, intended to intimidate the judges. The measure later becomes law.

July 21, 1949: Boggs votes in favor of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

July 25, 1949: Boggs votes against a Federal anti-poll-tax bill, one of President Truman's civil-rights measures, on the grounds that it violates States' rights.

August 5, 1949: Boggs votes in favor of exempting intra-State transmission of natural gas from control by the Federal Power Commission, on grounds that it should be left to the States.

August 8, 1949: Boggs votes in favor of increasing minimum wages under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

August 18, 1949: Boggs votes against an attempt to reduce military aid by the United States to the anti-Communist nations of western Europe. Votes in favor of House Resolution 5895, the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949.

September 4, 1949: Boggs leaves for Sweden with outstanding group of Senators and

Representatives to represent the United States at a meeting of elected representatives of anti-Communist nations.

October 8, 1949: Boggs guides a bill through Congress assuring a pension for a Panama Canal worker who, through illness, missed being eligible for an annuity by a few days.

December 4, 1949: Boggs discusses the need for tax revision. Says the Louisiana fur industry is being discriminated against and that the wartime-excise taxes on furs should be revised. Later introduces a bill to that effect.

January 4, 1950: Boggs discusses his voting intentions in the Eighty-first Congress. Says there should be no new Federal taxes and a reduction of Federal spending. Supports the bipartisan Hoover Commission seeking greater economy and efficiency in Government Is against the President's civil-rights program. (Korean war later forces Boggs to revise his views of taxation, to finance the war and preparedness)

January 19, 1950· Boggs votes for House Resolution 5330, providing economic aid for Korea, 6 months before the invasion.

February 23, 1950· Boggs votes against President Truman's Fair Employment Practices Act—FEPC—on the grounds that it violates States' rights and would be harmful to race relations in the South.

March 7, 1950: Boggs votes in favor of House Resolution 2023, the highly controversial measure removing discriminatory taxes on oleomargarine Boggs is a coauthor of the bill, which finally becomes law after a struggle of many years

March 9, 1950: Boggs votes for a bill to provide for demonstration libraries in rural communities.

March 15, 1950· Boggs assails the basing-point system of determining prices Says it injures small business, discriminates against the South, and penalizes Louisiana by making difficult the development of new industries Boggs is joined in the fight by other members of the Louisiana delegation, including Senator RUSSELL LONG

March 22, 1950· Boggs votes in favor of House Resolution 7402, an act to provide better housing for the Nation

March 23, 1950. Boggs votes in favor of $150,000 appropriation to continue the investigation of un-American activities Has consistently supported this committee on appropriations, citing Communists for contempt in refusing to answer, and so forth.

March 31, 1950: Left-wing Congressman Vito Marcantonio, of New York, attacks Congressman Boggs after speech by Boggs calling attention to Marcantonio's pro-Communist voting record.

April 15, 1950. Boggs announces $5,000,000 Federal project to provide flood protection for the east bank of Jefferson Parish, which suffered millions in damages in two floods within 6 months. The project culminates a long fight to achieve flood protection for this growing area

May 19, 1950: Boggs votes in favor of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1950, which later provides more than $4,000,000 worth of Federal funds for highway work in Louisiana.

June 23, 1950: Boggs is appointed to a House committee to study methods of simplifying customs procedures, in order to stimulate port commerce and foreign trade.

June 29, 1950: Boggs presides over House of Representatives as it passes housing bill he helped draft after Nation-wide investigation.

July 19, 1950· Boggs votes to extend the program of military aid to the North Atlantic treaty nations, to help build their united defense against communism. General Eisenhower is later appointed to head the defense of Western Europe, made possible by this program.

July 24, 1950· Boggs helps to draft bill to improve protection against family distress due to death and old age

August 10, 1950: Boggs casts four important votes on the Defense Production Act, two months after the invasion of South Korea. Says the Korean war and preparedness program make it necessary to protect farmers, workers and businessmen against inflation.

August 20, 1950: Boggs votes in favor of House Resolution 9490, the Subversives Control and Communist Registration Act. Later President Truman vetoes the bill, but Boggs votes to over-ride the President's veto The measure becomes law. (Boggs was author of similar measure)

September 2, 1950· Boggs leaves with distinguished group of Senators and Congressmen from both parties to represent the United States at an international meeting of delegates from the parliament of the anti-Communist nations

September 29, 1950· Boggs addresses the American Sugar Cane League Declares that passage of the Sugar Act is essential for the protection of this important Louisiana industry. Later sponsors and votes for the act.

November 3, 1950: Boggs defends depletion allowance provision in income tax regulations in speech before Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association Says it encourages exploration and makes for higher employment in the industry. Says small independent operators cannot survive without tax allowances and every landowner in Louisiana would thereby be penalized. Also points out importance of industry in financing of education for Louisiana school children.

December 5, 1950: Boggs votes for a tax on excess profits growing out of the Korean war, and later sponsors amendment protecting small business and growing concerns against unfair treatment

December 7, 1950: Boggs votes in favor of housing legislation and local option rent control.

December 13, 1950· Boggs votes for emergency aid to Yugoslavia, the nation causing unrest and disruption in the Russian bloc of countries.

December 23, 1950: Boggs discloses that three huge corporations with defense contracts will consider Louisiana sites for their operations (Later, Kaiser Aluminum Co. and Chrysler tank engine producers decide to locate in Louisiana.)

EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

January 9, 1951: Boggs joins distinguished group of Representatives and Senators in resolution calling for exploration of methods to effect greater cooperation among Atlantic pact nations in preventing the spread of Russian communism.

January 15, 1951: Boggs introduces 13 bills in the Eighty-second Congress. Among them are·

House Resolution 1522, to increase the penalties against dope peddlers.

House Resolution 1523, to confirm and establish the titles of the States to the tidelands, which provide millions of dollars in revenues to the State.

House Resolution 1530, to have the legislative reference service compile and make available to newspapers and groups of citizens the voting records of all Congressmen. Such information is now available in usable form only to the Congressmen themselves.

House Resolution 1532, to provide dispensary treatment and hospitalization for retired enlisted personnel of the Armed Forces.

January 19, 1951: Boggs announces Michaud aircraft plant near New Orleans will be used by Chrysler Corp. for the manufacture of tank engines, employing thousands of workers. Took prominent part in early negotiations with Chrysler

April 3, 1951· Boggs induces the Aluminum Co. of America to consider a Louisiana site for a new defense plant. (Negotiations were still under way in October.) Had previously played a major role in bringing the new Kaiser aluminum plant, world's largest, to Louisiana. Same day, introduces House Resolution 3490, to stiffen the penalties that may be imposed against dope peddlers.

April 4, 1951: Boggs is named to head a Federal investigation into the illegal sale of narcotics. New laws will be recommended to crack down on dope peddlers. Later hearings attract Nation-wide attention and indignation as extent of illicit dope trade, particularly among teen-agers, is revealed.

April 13 1951: Boggs introduces House Resolution 3715, an amendment to the excess profits tax, providing a $25,000 exemption for small business and providing fair treatment for growing concerns On the same day, votes for Senate bill No 1, providing for extension of the draft and a program of universal military training.

May 1, 1951: Boggs introduces House Resolution 3908, to provide for deportation of aliens for violation of the marijuana laws. Bill is aimed at notorious racketeers, such as Carlos Marcellos.

June 17, 1951: Boggs reviews his work on the national tax bill. Says he opposed higher taxes on cigarettes and gasoline. Worked to continue the depletion allowance for the oil, gas, sulfur, and mineral industries. Says allowance encourages exploration and high payrolls Fought against an administration proposal discriminating against the Louisiana community property system between husbands and wives. Says electricity users were given a break.

July 17, 1951· House passes Boggs bill to increase penalties against dope peddlers and to protect young people from the vicious narcotics trade

July 30, 1951· Boggs makes a strong speech in House of Representatives in behalf of bill to confirm the ownership by the States of the tidelands. House passes bill by overwhelming majority.

August 1, 1951: Boggs introduces four important bills in Congress: House Resolution 5029, to increase penalties against persons gathering or delivering certain defense information to aid a foreign government in time of peace; House Resolution 5030, to prevent subversive individuals and organizations from appearing as surety for bail in criminal cases; House Resolution 5031, to compile and maintain a list of subversive organizations; House Resolution 5032, to provide that peacetime espionage may be punished by death, and for the detention and prosecution of Communists.

CURRITUCK BEACH LIGHTHOUSE RESERVATION, COROLLA, N. C.

Mr. BONNER. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5230) providing for the conveyance to the State of North Carolina of the Currituck Beach Lighthouse Reservation, Corolla, N. C., and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon payment to the United States of the sum of $3,000, the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of North Carolina all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all lands constituting the Currituck Beach Lighthouse Reservation, situated at Corolla, N. C., together with the buildings and other improvements thereon, saving and excepting therefrom a small, irregular

parcel of land, with ingress and egress thereto, containing about eighty-two one-hundredths of an acre, on which the lighthouse and two structures are located and maintained by the United States Coast Guard: *Provided, however*, That the instrument of conveyance shall contain such terms and conditions which will allow for the capture by the Federal Government of such property in the event such property is not used for muskrat experimentation and research, recreational, or other public purposes: *Provided further*, That the instrument of conveyance shall reserve to the Carolina-Virginia Coastal Highway Corp. such rights-of-way and easements connected therewith, under such toll-road contract, as are required for the construction, maintenance, and repair of said toll road: *Provided further*, That the instrument of conveyance shall reserve to the Virginia Electric & Power Co. a perpetual easement and right-of-way for an electric-distribution line from Duck to Caffeys Inlet along the Great Barrier Reef located in Currituck and Dare Counties, together with such easement rights and privileges for construction, operation, and maintenance of such pole and wire lines across the said Currituck Beach Lighthouse Reservation.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 11, strike the word "such"; strike all of lines 12, 13, and 14 to the colon therein and substitute in lieu thereof "necessary rights-of-way and easements as may be required for the construction, maintenance, and repair of a toll road across the Currituck Beach Lighthouse Reservation."

Page 2, line 17, after the word "right-of-way", insert "across the Currituck Beach Lighthouse Reservation as may be required."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE CONTROL ACT OF 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4550) to provide for the control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, and for other purposes, together with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after "atomic", insert "energy."

Page 2, line 6, strike out "material" and insert "materials."

Page 2, after line 23, insert:

"This act shall be administered in such a way as to bring about the fullest support for any resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations, supported by the United States, to prevent the shipment of certain commodities to areas under the control of governments engaged in hostilities in defiance of the United Nations."

Page 2, strike out all after line 23 over to and including line 8 on page 3 and insert:

"SEC. 102. Responsibility for giving effect to the purposes of this act shall be vested in the person occupying the senior position authorized by subsection (e) of section 406 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, or in any person who may hereafter be charged with principal responsibility for the administration of the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949. Such person is hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator.'"

Page 3, line 9, strike out "Mutual Defense Assistance Officer" and insert "Administrator."

Page 3, line 17, strike out "material," and insert "materials."

Page 3, line 25, strike out "determination" and insert "determinations."

Page 4, lines 2 and 3, strike out "Mutual Defense Assistance Officer" and insert "Administrator."

Page 4, line 16, strike out "Mutual Defense Assistance Officer" and insert "Administrator."

Page 6, line 17, strike out "Mutual Defense Assistance Officer" and insert "Administrator."

Page 7, line 12, strike out "Mutual Defense Assistance Officer" and insert "Administrator."

Page 8, line 2, strike out "(a), (c)," and insert "(c)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I intend to withdraw my reservation of objection, briefly, this is the Battle bill as it passed the House except for provisions to catch up with the mutual security bill as to the administration, is that not correct?

Mr. BATTLE. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS. I think if the gentleman would explain the provisions of the bill, it might be helpful at this time.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, on July 16, 1951, the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported H. R. 4550, a bill to provide for the control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, and for other purposes. The bill passed the House on August 2 by a voice vote.

The bill was reported to the Senate on August 21, and passed the Senate on August 28 by a vote of 55 to 16. As passed by the Senate, H. R. 4550, except for minor verbal changes, differs from the House bill in only two respects.

First, the Senate added an injunction that the act shall be administered so as to bring about the fullest support of any resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly, supported by the United States, to prevent shipments to areas controlled by governments engaged in hostilities in defiance of the United Nations. This addition is a wholly desirable one, and should, in my opinion, be willingly accepted by the House.

The second change relates to administration. The House bill provides for administration by an officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Until this appointment, the task will be assigned to the senior officer under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act. The Senate version, as explained in their report, provides for administration by this latter officer until the person charged with principal responsibility for the administration of the mutual security program takes over.

It is apparent that both Houses clearly recognize the intimate connection between the control program established by this bill and the program of foreign assistance and wish to have both programs administered in conjunction with each other.

The report of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate on this bill made clear its intentions in this respect:

It is the intention of the committee that the official who may be responsible for the administration of the aid programs under the pending legislation and, in particular, the man charged with giving effect to the main provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, as amended, shall be given responsibility under this act. Until such time as the proposed mutual-assistance program is approved, the present senior official responsible for administering the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 will be responsible for giving effect to this legislation.

I am sure that the House committee is in agreement with this statement.

Since passage of H. R. 4550 by House and Senate, the administration of foreign aid has been extensively reorganized. The Mutual Security Act of 1951 assigns the various foreign-aid programs among the State and Defense Departments and a new Mutual Security Agency. The programs are to be administered as parts of a unified program, and to that end the President is authorized to appoint in his Executive Office a Director for Mutual Security. The Director will, on behalf and subject to direction of the President, have primary responsibility for continuous supervision and general direction of foreign-aid programs.

This new Director for Mutual Security should properly assume the over-all responsibility for control of trade under H. R. 4550, and the Senate version of that bill will effectively confer that responsibility on this official. I recognize, of course, that his other duties under the Mutual Security Act would make it necessary for the day-to-day operations of the control program to be handled not by him personally but by one of his principal assistants. Final direction and responsibility, however, should be in the Director himself. I therefore suggest that the purposes of the bill can be achieved with the minimum of delay and without taking up the time of both Houses with a needless conference, if the Senate version is adopted.

I have conferred with representatives of the executive departments and agencies most directly concerned with the program provided for in this bill and informally, they concur in this interpretation of the Senate amendment.

Personally, I am most hopeful that this legislation will serve as the hard core of broader economic policies to attain the objective of giving our boys on the fighting front the most effective assistance possible as an augmentation of our direct military support and effort.

Mr. Speaker, I realize there are instances where we cannot expect to obtain cooperation from our friendly allies

to institute export controls which would deny themselves materials imported from the Soviet bloc upon which their defense efforts depend simply by the threat of withdrawing United States aid. In such cases policies and programs must be developed by the administrator which will help friendly countries to help themselves become less dependent upon the Soviet bloc.

In order that the export-control objectives of this bill can be accomplished therefore, it will be necessary for the Administrator to give guidance and coordinated leadership to the various United States agencies concerned with such related materials as transportation controls, financial controls of gold and foreign exchange, foreign procurement of materials needed both by the United States and the Soviet bloc, programs for developing alternative sources of supply of basic materials and other articles for which the free world is dependent on the bloc in greater or lesser degree, programs for developing alternative markets in the free world for important exports now flowing to the Soviet bloc, and various other related techniques which will be useful in promoting the export-control objectives of this bill.

If the bill is administered in the manner that is intended then the sanctions provided therein can and should be used effectively to promote these policies which are intended to increase the security of the United States and the free world and to develop further cooperative defense effort on which our freedom and existence may well depend.

For further thought along this line and for an interesting, helpful study on this highly important subject, I would like to call your attention to a document which is scheduled to be published in the next few days by Senator O'CONOR, of Maryland. Senator O'CONOR has made an outstanding contribution to the understanding and solution of this whole east-west trade problem, which will play such an important part in our fight against aggressive communism.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we are unanimous in concurring with the Senate amendments so this bill can be put in operation immediately.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman has received assurances I understand from the various executive agencies involved backing up the statement he has just made.

Mr. BATTLE. That is right.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just considered by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON TUNGSTEN

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tomorrow to file a report on the bill (H. R. 5248) relating to the suspension of duties on tungsten.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

CHICAGO INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR

Mr PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 331) authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Chicago International Trade Fair, to be held in Chicago, Ill., March 22 to April 6, 1952.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc, That the President of the United States is authorized to invite by proclamation or otherwise, or in such manner as he may deem proper, the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the Chicago International Trade Fair, to be held at Chicago, Ill, from March 22 to April 6, 1952, inclusive, for the purpose of exhibiting industrial products, machinery, equipment, supplies, and engineering; and the exhibiting of the newest developments in metals, plastics, chemicals, oils, textiles, and other manufactured products; and bringing together buyers and sellers for promotion of foreign and domestic trade and commerce in such products.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would merely like to express my own hope that this resolution will be passed. It is a simple resolution authorizing the President of the United States in his kindness to invite the various States of the Union, and foreign nations of the world to participate in this trade fair. As a representative or a neighbor of the great city of Chicago, I think we can offer you beauty and a spirit of enterprise. Personally, this is the kind of international cooperation that pleases me most. There is no financial obligation on the part of the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourns to meet on Monday next.

Mr. SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1450) to provide for the exchange of certain lands owned by the United States of America for certain privately owned lands.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr TRIMBLE. This bill passed the Senate unanimously and was reported out of our committee without a dissenting vote. It involves the exchange of a small tract of land in the District of Columbia, with a total area of about 3,300 square feet, in exchange for 2,500 square feet. There is no controversy about it It is simply to straighten out a parkway

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to adjust the boundary of the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway in connection with plans for providing a park-like treatment at the entrance to Georgetown and in connection with the future widening of Pennsylvania Avenue, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept on behalf of and without cost to the United States of America, from the owner thereof, unencumbered fee-simple title to the following-described parcel of land situated in the District of Columbia, and more particularly described as follows:

Part of lot 14, square 1194, as per plat recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in book 29, page 72, described as follows

Beginning for the same at the intersection of the easterly line of Twenty-eighth Street and the south line of M Street, said point of beginning being also the northwest corner of said lot 14; thence along the south line of M Street east seventy and ninety-five one-hundredths feet to the northeast corner of said lot 14; thence in a southwesterly direction along the arc of the circle, the radius of which is two hundred and no tenths feet, deflecting to the right an arc distance of seventy-one and two one-hundredths feet to the northerly line of Pennsylvania Avenue, thence along said northerly line of Pennsylvania Avenue north sixty-five degrees twenty minutes west forty-four and fifty one-hundredths feet to the easterly line of Twenty-eighth Street and the southwest corner of said lot 14; thence along said easterly line of Twenty-eighth Street north no degrees three minutes west forty-five and seventeen one-hundredths feet to the point

of beginning, containing three thousand three hundred twenty-two and forty-three one-hundredths square feet.

And upon acceptance of such title to such parcel of land, the Secretary of the Interior, acting for and on behalf of the United States of America, is authorized and directed to convey, without cost to the United States of America, to the grantor of the above-described tract of land, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to the following-described tract of land owned by the United States of America and located in the District of Columbia, more particularly described as follows:

Parts of lots 9 and 10, square 1194, as per plat recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in Book G. T. 2, at page 28, described as follows:

Beginning for the same at a point on the south line of M Street, said point of beginning being the northwest corner of lot 9 and running thence along the south line of M Street east thirty-nine and fifty-five one-hundredths feet to the northeast corner of lot 10; thence along the east line of said lot 10 south twenty-four feet; thence south twenty-eight degrees sixteen minutes fifty seconds west eighty-three and forty-seven one-hundredths feet to a point in the northerly line of Pennsylvania Avenue, said point being the southwest corner of said lot 9; thence along the west line of said lot 9 north ninety-seven and fifty-one one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning, containing two thousand four hundred two and eighty-six one-hundredths square feet.

The deeds of conveyance from the United States of America shall contain such conditions, covenants, or restrictions as the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, shall see fit to impose in connection with the future widening of Pennsylvania Avenue.

All land descriptions set forth in this act are in accordance with a plat of computation recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in survey book 161, page 309.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, I find it necessary to be absent part of the next week on official business, and I ask an indefinite leave of absence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

ABOLISH OPS CONTROLS ON MEAT

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a wire from the president of the local union of Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen in Pueblo, Colo., urging that all OPS controls on the livestock and packing industry and on slaughtering operations be removed at once. In this wire it is mentioned that unless these regulations are lifted promptly many employees of packing firms in that area will be out of work, as it is impossible for the packing companies to comply with present regulations and remain in business.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read this wire for the benefit of the Members of the House:

PUEBLO, COLO., *October 10, 1951.*

Hon. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C:

We ask your assistance in eliminating all OPS controls on livestock and on packing and slaughtering operations because packers are unable to buy and comply with regulations. This is forcing curtailment of operations and layoffs for our members thus forcing them into other industries at a lower labor rate than they now secure. We are now faced with further work curtailment and eventual closing of this plant unless relief is secured. Recent revision of regulations made to give packers relief have worked contrary to intent and made the purchase of livestock impossible at a compliance figure. Your cooperation is urgently solicited and advise as to action taken will be appreciated.

CHRIS STARCER,
President, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, No. 565.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time is here to begin to give relief to the packing industry before widespread unemployment results. I am receiving information from packers in my district that they cannot continue in business under present restrictions. I want to see these men keep their jobs, and I hope that at a very early date we may act to remove these regulations which have proved unworkable.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], who arranged to have set aside 1 hour for the purpose of memorializing General Pulaski and commemorating General Pulaski Day, has asked me to take over this time, as he is unavoidably detained.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Americans of Polish descent are commemorating today, the one hundred and seventy-second anniversary of the heroic death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the champion of freedom, who fought for it in the Old World and the New World, and who gave his life at the siege of Savannah, Ga., in 1779:

A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas October 11, 1951, marks the one hundred and seventy-second anniversary of the death of Count Casimir Pulaski, a Polish patriot who attained the rank of brigadier general in the Continental Army and laid down his life while fighting on American soil for the independence of our Nation; and

Whereas the passage of the years since General Pulaski's death has not dimmed the glory of his sacrifice or the luster of his fame; and

Whereas his selfless devotion to the cause of freedom stands today as a challenge to all men to work for freedom in all nations:

Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do hereby invite all Americans to observe Thursday, October 11, 1951, as General Pulaski's Memorial Day with ceremonies and I direct that the flag of the United States be displayed on all Government buildings on that day, in tribute to the memory of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

History tells us of General Pulaski's great love of liberty. In the service of his native country he fought valiantly for its liberation, and during that struggle saw his father and his brothers killed; saw his home and his property destroyed and confiscated, and finally driven out of his native land as an exile. His determination and love for freedom did not stop. When he learned of the American struggle for independence, he immediately volunteered and offered his services for the freedom of America.

Serving in the Continental Army, General Pulaski endured the hardships and deprivations as did George Washington.

General Pulaski used the remnants of his own personal fortune, estimated at about $50,000, to equip the men during the Revolutionary War. He is considered the father of the United States Cavalry. During the first 18 months of the Revolutionary War, our forces did not have a regular Cavalry Corps, and was only formed when Congress commissioned General Pulaski to organize one. His great knowledge and leadership upon sound military lines has created an outstanding cavalry that brought many victories to our Nation. His book for cavalrymen is still widely used in military academics.

General Pulaski was born of noble blood, reared in wealth and comfort, protected against the hard knocks of life; yet he chose to cast aside all these comforts of life and join the forces which fought the battle against oppression and tyranny.

Poland's position today is similar to what it was in Pulaski's time. Today, as then, she is under the heel of an oppressor; today she is not free, though Poland's loyal fighting men in World War II contributed their share in vanquishing the enemy of democracy—Nazi Germany. Today it is enslaved by Soviet Russia, its people are ruled against their will by puppets that were put down their throats by Stalin.

General Pulaski in his time held the plight of his own country uppermost in his mind, and when he offered his youth and his very life to the American cause, it was with the hope that by his deeds and sacrifices, he could win a strong ally for the Polish cause, which was so similar in ideals to the American one. Poland's cause today, 172 years after Pulaski's death, is again our cause.

The tragic death of this Polish and American hero did not erase his deeds from the memory of future generations, either in the old world or the new. By his great courage and his unceasing zeal with which he incited thousands of others, he contributed to the preservation of the Polish spirit.

Every time we gather to commemorate Pulaski, we manifest this same spirit. It is an occasion for us to remind our fellow Americans of the debt this country owes Poland for Pulaski and many other Poles contributing in making our Nation the greatest democracy in the world.

We must not forget Poland, for she is as in Pulaski's time, again under the heels of Russia, this time a Red Russia.

We must insist that Poland be liberated from the oppressors and regain her freedom with eastern boundaries returned to her and her recovered western lands to be a part of an independent and integral Polish Nation. American leadership should strive toward this end. No civilian people in Europe have been more brutally persecuted and double-crossed, or suffered greater losses, both in lives and materials, or more heartaches at the hands of the Axis supermen than has Poland.

We are the greatest and most powerful Nation on earth. As Winston Churchill stated, greatness and power carry with them definite responsibilities. It is our duty and obligation to collaborate with the other freedom-loving peoples of the world to establish and maintain peace for all men of good will.

In doing so, we shall keep faith with General Pulaski and the other great men who gave their lives and all, since the beginning of the history of our great country.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr FURCOLO].

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a privilege to join in honoring the memory of that splendid Polish patriot, General Pulaski

In the early days of the Republic, the name of Casimir Pulaski was a revered one. Attesting to this are the number of towns and countries throughout the whole length of the original Thirteen Colonies which bear his name and the many parks and streets in our large cities which honor him.

His story is that of a young man who made one of the greatest personal sacrifices of the War of the Revolution. He came to this country from his own distant land and offered his services to the struggling American Colonies and demonstrated great leadership, ability, and supreme loyalty to the American cause. He joined General Washington's army in 1777 and fought with valor and distinction. In 1779, during the Battle of Savannah, he gave his life for freedom.

The history of the Polish people is a glorious one—it is a record of valor unsurpassed, of courage without fear, and of honor. And so it is fitting today that in recalling General Pulaski's record, we pay tribute to him and his compatriots, Kosciusko and Sobieski and to the hundreds of thousands of Polish-Americans who have given their lives in all of America's struggles. Those noble patriots have, I am sure, inspired such present day heroes as Gen. Thaddeus Bor-Komorowski, commander in chief of the Polish forces in exile, who led the Warsaw uprising, Gen. Wladyslaw Anders as well as those countless unnamed others who are still in the Polish underground and who typify the true Polish spirit.

It has been said that the true measure of a people's greatness is in its fidelity to its native ideals. The Polish record in resisting the forces of oppression and tyranny in the face of almost insurmountable odds stands as a splendid example to the people of all races and all creeds.

Civilization is based upon a reign of peace and justice, and for this reason, America has been ennobled by the spiritual contributions of her citizens of Polish descent By being true to their culture and their creed, Americans of Polish ancestry cannot help being true to their country. Their love of Poland and their desire to make it free only enhance their love of America

In this hour of Poland's struggle, we can at least attempt to repay her by assisting her in every possible way to regain her liberties just as the Poles helped us to gain ours originally.

We must keep faith with our promises of the Atlantic Charter and it is our sacred duty to solemnly pledge ourselves to the memories of Poland's gallant heroes that we will not rest until the promises of freedom and independence given to the Polish Nation during World War II are redeemed. We in this country may have various differences, based on political, geographical, and other lines, but in the matter of freedom for Poland, it is encouraging and inspiring to note that we present a united front.

Mr. GORDON. Mr Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in 1776 there lived in Marseilles, France, an emigré from Poland. He was not an ordinary emigré. He was, rather, a political refugee possessing extraordinary courage and vision. He was just under 30, but he already had become a national figure in Poland. In many European countries his name, Casimir Pulaski, had become "a synonym for all that was pure in principle, heroic in action, knightly in bearing, and undying in devotion"—Jones, C. J , Casimir Pulaski, Savannah, 1871, page 13—to high ideals Born with rank and fortune, his early years were spent in the study of military science with a definite purpose in mind—to work for the redemption and liberation of Poland From 1768 to 1772 he fought, under the most adverse circumstances, the forces of alien darkness which were closing in on his beloved country In 1772 he was compelled at last to abandon rank, wealth, and citizenship and to flee Poland He wandered through the capitals of Europe, seeking aid in his fight against the Russian tyrants who had taken over his native land. In 1774 he arrived in France. Although he lived in that country for 2 years in a condition of downright penury, he also lived "in his own untarnished honor, in the grateful remembrance of his brave but unfortunate countrymen, in the sincere esteem of every lover of freedom"—Jones, in the work cited, page 14. During this period, Pulaski caught the clarion notes of our Declaration of Independence. He had heard of our war of independence. He perceived a new field in which he could vindicate with his sword the same principles—the same rights—he had fought for in Poland. Thanks to the intercession of Benjamin Franklin, Pulaski was able to arrange passage to America.

He had his baptism of fire in the fight for our independence at the Battle of Brandywine on September 11. Four days after this battle, the Continental Congress commissioned his a brigadier general.

The life of Casimir Pulaski during the next 3 years is known to every school child throughout the land. He played a heroic role in the battles at Trenton, Flemington, and at the siege of Savannah. In the last encounter, he fell, fatally wounded on October 9, 1779.

Pulaski was one of the heroic group of Polish lovers of liberty who came to this country at the time of our Revolution to serve the great cause in which they believed. They shared with us a firm faith in freedom—a faith which was a part of their Polish heritage. For the Poles this is not just an abstract faith. Generation after generation has reaffirmed it through personal sacrifice and courage. The history of freedom contains, besides Pulaski and Kosciusko, the names of many other illustrious Poles who have made enduring contributions. In 1683, for example, it was John Sobieski who staved off the onrush of the invading Turks at the gates of Vienna, thereby saving Western Europe and putting an end to Turkish expansion. In 1920, General Pilsudski literally chased the Bolsheviks back to Russia's natural borders. We are, in our times, familiar with the daring exploits of General Bor in Warsaw in 1944 against the Nazis and the remarkable contribution which General Anders made to Allied victories in Italy and elsewhere during World War II.

In paying tribute to Pulaski today, on the anniversary of his death, we do more than honor a man. We honor the tradition of Polish freedom of which his name is an illustrious and eternal part.

Mr GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today we honor the memory of one of the great heroes of our American Revolution. He died 172 years ago, but his fame remains undimmed in the annals of our history. His name holds a revered place in our hearts.

The American Revolution was not his fight by birth, but the cause of freedom everywhere was sacred to Gen. Casimir Pulaski. His entire life was devoted to that cause. The contributions he made here were of inestimable value to a young and struggling country, whose independence was very much in issue when he joined the battle ranks.

Fighting for freedom was neither strange nor new to General Pulaski when he came to America. His own beloved native land had been the scene of a bitter struggle for independence from the tyrannical domination of the Russian czars. General Pulaski had always been in the forefront of the rebellion.

In 1769, although born to a life of wealth and ease, Pulaski joined his father in the popular uprising against

the Russian puppet, King Stanislas. Without resources, without large organization, without adequate arms or men, the heroic band of patriots fought gallantly against ever-increasing odds. Finally the fatal day came, however, when General Pulaski had to decide whether to make a final desperate, suicidal stand, and be slaughtered with the remaining forces, or go abroad to seek help.

He chose the latter course, dispersing his men to await help and another opportunity to resist. He first sought aid for his cause in Prussia, then in Turkey. By that time he was a penniless refugee since the family estates had been ravaged. His father and brother had been killed, and another was being held prisoner. Countless relatives and friends had died for Poland's right to be free.

His path finally led to Paris where he met Benjamin Franklin, a man of similar tastes. Learning of the dire need for trained soldiers and leaders, Pulaski journeyed to the United States where he soon distinguished himself by his personal courage and brilliant tactical knowledge. He was commissioned a general in the American Army in command of a troop of cavalry. During the terrible winter at Valley Forge, he organized his men into an effective fighting group, and was then sent to Trenton to harass the British lines of communication between Philadelphia and New York.

Finally, on October 10, 1779, at Savannah, he was mortally wounded. His daring and courage had won him the admiration and respect of even his enemies. It is said that the British ceased firing when he was shot from his horse in order that he might be carried from the field for medical attention. The next day, however, on board an American ship carrying him to Charleston for further care, Gen. Casimir Pulaski died. He was buried at sea off the Georgia coast.

General Pulaski died as he had lived, in the midst of a fight for freedom.

Americans owe a debt of gratitude to him which can never be fully repaid. Our admiration for him is matched only by our love and respect for the country from which he came and whose spirit and love of liberty he typified. General Pulaski symbolized the fine characteristics which we have come to associate with the Polish people. Those qualities have never been more evident than in their present resistance to the Russian aggressors. The underground leaders in Poland today reveal again that spirit which can never be lost in that land although the actual possession of liberty has been rudely suppressed and denied by a ruthless neighbor. The day will come when Poland will again be free. God speed that day.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, this date, October 11, marks the one hundred and seventy-second anniversary of the heroic death on an American Revolutionary War battlefield of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

It is traditional that we here in the House of Representatives pause each year on this day to pay homage to the memory of Poland's illustrious fighter for freedom. Americans of Polish ancestry on this day assert and emphasize their pride of heritage stemming from Pulaski's deeds for Poland and our America.

General Pulaski was born in a country which throughout the centuries has guarded the eastern and southern borders of Christian civilization. Poland, in repelling the pressure of semibarbaric Moscow and the invasion of the wild Turks and Tartars, weakened her military strength, her creative power, and her ability to govern herself. She was already beset by her great enemy Russia, and her very existence was threatened, when young Pulaski joined his father who was a chief magistrate and a member of the nobility, and his two brothers in the war for Poland's independence. Together, with a group of patriots who loved their country more than life itself, they formed the Confederation of Bar, and fought to keep the Russians from overrunning their land. His father and one brother were killed, another brother captured, and young Pulaski became commander of the insurgent army, fighting against overwhelming odds until the partition of Poland.

Forced into exile, his sympathy for oppressed people and his hatred of tyranny led him to Benjamin Franklin in Paris, who was seeking aid for America in her war for independence.

Now known throughout Europe as a brilliant soldier and a fearless defender of liberty, Casimir Pulaski's offer of help was welcomed and he became a volunteer officer on Gen. George Washington's staff.

So from the battlefields of the old country, he came to fight on the battlefields of the new—but the cause was the same—the cause of freedom.

At the Battle of Brandywine, Count Pulaski demonstrated the value of cavalry so ably and distinguished himself so well that he was commissioned brigadier general by Congress and given command of the entire American Cavalry.

General Pulaski proved to be a spirited, courageous, young commander who fervently believed in the cause for which he was fighting. At the head of his men, in the thick of battle, he fought two long years for our Nation and contributed mightily to the winning of the Revolution.

The famous Pulaski Legion earned him the title "Father of American Cavalry" and made American history, for it became the model for the organization of the United States Cavalry.

At the age of 31, General Pulaski fell mortally wounded while charging through the British lines at the Battle of Savannah. He died on the brig *Wasp* on October 11, 1779, his body was lowered to a watery grave.

Casimir Pulaski died as he had lived: a hero, an arch enemy of tyranny, whose devotion to the cause of liberty and independence led him halfway across the world to fight and die so that America might be free.

Freedom-loving Americans are again saddened that Poland is once more in bondage, this time, as in Pulaski's day, shackled by the Russians and ruled by the Communist usurpers of the Kremlin. And because we Americans are on the side of liberty throughout the world, founded on true democracy as opposed to communism, and because Casimir Pulaski laid down his life for our own freedom, we are heart and soul on the side of the people of Poland, as they strive to rise from beneath the yoke of Communist tyranny. Let us bring back freedom to Pulaski's Poland and stop the advance of communism everywhere.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with my colleagues who today are paying tribute to the memory of Gen. Casimir Pulaski. He was a great son of Poland and a great American patriot. All freedom-loving Americans are acquainted with the deeds of this Polish hero who gave his life in our Nation's fight for liberty and independence. They know of his fruitless struggle for freedom in Poland when that country was partitioned by Germany, Russia, and Austria. They also know of his interest in the cause of American freedom and his arrival in the Thirteen Colonies to fight brilliantly at the side of George Washington. General Pulaski organized cavalry units and trained American men. History has come to call him the father of the American cavalry. All freedom-loving Americans also know of his supreme sacrifice at the Battle of Savannah in Georgia, where he was mortally wounded and died on October 11, 1779, at the age of 31.

Thus, General Pulaski inscribed his name in the heart and memory of every American. His name has become synonymous with freedom—a quality inherent in every person, particularly persons of Polish descent who have known so little of freedom during the last two centuries.

To honor the memory of Pulaski today is also to honor his brave compatriots, from his day to ours, who gave their lives that freedom may live. Poles all over the world were inspired by this ideal to fight. When Poland was overrun by Germany in 1939, the people took up arms and fought back bravely. They did not sell out their country at any time. They withstood hardships, suffered incarceration in prison camps, saw their families killed by invaders, their homes burned, their schools and churches destroyed, but not once did any of them flinch from the steadfastness to his ideal of freedom.

Even after Poland was overrun by Germans on one side and Russians on the other, the Poles continued their valiant struggle. At home, they organized the heroic underground army. Abroad, they formed armies of men from 16 to 60 and fought brilliantly in the battles of France, Trieste, and Monte Cassino, among others.

And mentioning Monte Cassino, it is just a month since I visited the town

of Monte Cassino and went to the very top of the mountain; I was en route to the United States from the Interparliamentary Union meeting held in Istanbul, Turkey. The ruins of the monastery, now partially restored, faced me and my thoughts reflected the heroic fighting, bleeding and dying Polish soldiers of the Third and Fifth Divisions who crawled up its rocky slopes and valiantly sacrificed all to dislodge the Nazis who were dug in along its heights repelling the Allied advance. Monte Cassino was taken by the Polish soldiers and it was one of the outstanding victories for the Allies in World War II. The magnitude of this accomplishment, especially after personally visiting this battleground and studying the attack plan, now outlined at the abbey, makes it more understandable why Monte Cassino will live forever as an inspiration to freedom-loving nations.

I walked a short distance to the Polish cemetery and stood in reverence among the many white headstones memorializing noble deeds of Polish soldiers who died for the Allied cause, and like their compatriot, General Pulaski, forfeited their lives for freedom.

In England, the Polish Air Force reorganized and carried on the fight in the air. Forty percent of these men, including the famous Suicide Squadron, lost their lives in the fight. Like Pulaski, they had youth and a future, but, like Pulaski, they cherished freedom above all else.

Altogether, more than 6,000,000 Poles gave their lives in this last war. However, on May 8, 1945, when all of Europe was rejoicing over the end of hostilities, the Poles could not share in the celebration. The Poles first to suffer the onslaught of the aggressor and fight him to the bitter end were now deprived of the very ideal for which they fought—freedom. They were overcome by a new power, a new kind of slavery known as communism. Their country was cut up and part of it was given to Russia as compensation for the latter's losses in the war. Poland, for all her sacrifices, was ignored. In fact now, Poles are being arrested and sent to Siberia as slave laborers. The horrible conditions in which the deported Polish people find themselves in Russia cannot be described. The tragedy of the Polish officers and soldiers taken by Russia as prisoners of war in 1939 is not describable either. The graves of about 15,000 Polish officers and soldiers, prisoners of war, murdered by the Soviets in Katyn in the spring of 1940, was discovered in 1943. The officers and soldiers with their hands tied in the back were shot in the back of their heads. The guilty of the Katyn crime have not yet been punished.

Pulaski would shudder in his grave if he knew that this was the justice meted out to a country and people loyal to the cause of freedom. If we are to pay loyal tribute to the memory of Pulaski today, we should dedicate ourselves to the preservation of the freedom for which he fought and died. We owe Pulaski a great debt, a debt we can help repay by helping Poland in her desperation today. Just as the torch of liberty burns in the heart of every American, so it flames in the hearts of all Poles. Let us by our actions reaffirm our faith in liberty by striving not only through words but deeds to liberate Poland. In this way we shall best commemorate and honor Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the biography of the gentleman we honor today is known to all. I reflect and conclude that in history some people never learn.

I suppose, as it was 2,000 years ago, it is now, and ever shall be, that the struggle in the organization of men is between the twin forces of liberty and authority. The fulcrum is justice.

Pulaski tried to elevate liberty so that it would at least match authority. Today, authority overbalances liberty.

To me, any man who rebels against oppressive authority is merely trying to bring liberty into balance. If we have too much liberty, anarchy results. If we have too much authority, tyranny results. The idea seems to be to keep these twin forces in balance as night is in balance with day.

Mr. Speaker, today I was honored to play host in the Speaker's dining room with my colleagues to General Bor-Komorowski, who is known to all for his stand in the Warsaw uprising in 1944, when Stalin promised aid in 6 days, but did not give it, and over 275,000 civilians were slaughtered.

We learn from czar to commissar that it is rather difficult for people in the east to keep liberty in balance with authority.

It is interesting also to note that the anniversary of the death of Pulaski comes the day before the anniversary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to commemorate on the floor of this House the memory of a gallant nation and of a gallant man. Poland is not lost. I am sure that in our lifetime she will be restored to freedom.

General Bor, Mr. Lerski, and all courageous souls who have faith and hope in better days, may your prayers for Poland and others suffering under oppressive Soviet tyranny be soon answered and that this great globe will spin with liberty and authority in balance. I trust today's passage of the mutual security bill, H. R. 5684, will be successful in this respect.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I like to read and reread the story of General Pulaski and all he meant to our own independence. Ever since I was a boy I have exalted him among the great of all time.

It is pleasing to me that my State of New Jersey has remembered the general in the development of one of its main arterial highways. My home city of Paterson has a beautiful Pulaski statue in one of its parks. Many thousands of men and women, boys and girls, whose ancestors came from the land of Pulaski are contributing to the upbuilding of my district. Their contribution to our Armed Forces is not excelled.

I wonder if the hundreds of folks in the National Capital who heard the girls of the Arfa Chorus sing American and Polish songs before the Pulaski statue on Pennsylvania Avenue 2 years ago will ever forget them. These girls, about 50 in number, come from Passaic City and environs and they have won national acclaim.

On this anniversary and that of Polish Constitution Day we are prone to condemn the sins of Yalta and their contribution to the new oppression of the Polish people. We speak of prayers and hopes, always urging the Poles to build up their resistance for the day when they will be again released from bondage.

On this very day, I think, we rendered something more than lip service when we passed the mutual security appropriation bill designed to build up and strengthen those countries of Europe united with us in a determination to maintain freedom against the sweep of communism. I cannot help but feel that when the news pierces the iron curtain into Poland its liberty-loving people will take new heart.

We remember, General Pulaski, we remember.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ].

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on August 23, 1951, President Harry S. Truman officially proclaimed this 11th day of October 1951 as General Pulaski's Memorial Day.

In that proclamation the President reminded us of the fact that Gen. Casimir Pulaski, a Polish patriot who attained the rank of brigadier general in our own Continental Army, laid down his life while fighting on American soil for the independence of our Nation.

The President then reminded us that the passage of the years since General Pulaski's death has not dimmed the glory of his sacrifice nor the luster of his fame, and that his selfless devotion to the cause of freedom stands today as a challenge to all men to work for freedom in all nations.

With those sentiments every red-blooded real American can agree. The cause of American liberty has time and again drawn the services of men of many other nations, and for these men we in America are and should be forever grateful.

General Pulaski was but one of a host of sons of Poland who sacrificed their lives for the cause of freedom and liberty in the United States and in all parts of the world wherever they are threatened. I think Pulaski himself well expressed the true feelings and sentiments of every Pole when he wrote to Congress:

> As I could not submit to stoop before the sovereigns of Europe, so I come to hazard all for the freedom of America; and, desirous of passing the rest of my life in a country truly free, and before settling as a citizen, to fight for liberty.

One hundred seventy-two years passed since his death on board of an American

fighting ship as a result of mortal wounds sustained in the battle of Savannah.

Since his death, countless of thousands of Poles and Americans of Polish extraction, have continued to sacrifice their lives that America and the world may be free. "For your liberty and ours," the motto of Gen. Casimir Pulaski has continued to be their motto. When our own Patrick Henry said in the Virgina House of Burgesses, "Give me liberty or give me death," he was saying only what had been on the lips of countless millions of Poles for a thousand years before him.

Casimir Pulaski was not merely one man. He was the heir to a noble heritage of generations of Poles who stood like sentinels at the gates of Europe defending liberty from the godless hordes of darkness

What can we do today to reward this great man who gave his life that we may be free? If he were alive today, I am sure I know what his answer would be. I can hear his voice today, saying to us: "What have my people done to deserve the cruel fate which Poland and its people are suffering today. They were always loyal to the principles which you hold so dearly in the United States. Why must Poland today suffer under the heel of Communist oppression? When will the free people of the world unfetter these shackles and return to Poles their most treasured hope and desire, freedom and liberty?"

Mr. Speaker, the United States can today be the shining star which will lead the world to a new freedom of all nations. Military might, important as it is, is not sufficient to achieve this leadership. It must be accompanied by a strength of principles and an unswerving determination to follow those principles without compromise.

We have frequently expressed our conviction that Poland and other enslaved nations should be free. But our action often belied the firmness of our conviction.

The source of the present troubles, not only of Poland, but of these United States and of the entire free world, can be traced to the unfortunate agreements of Yalta and Tehran.

There is no moral, legal, or logical reason in the world why the United States should not declare clearly and unequivocally that it no longer considers itself bound by these agreements.

Russia has already broken the spirit and word of these agreements by failing to give free elections to Poland. Why then do we hesitate? Is it because of some foolish idea that we can still do business or compromise with Stalin? Experience should have surely proven to us how utterly hopeless such thoughts are.

Several months ago I have introduced in this House a resolution calling for a forthright declaration that the United States no longer are bound by these agreements.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better way to show to the free people of the world that we really mean to put into effect the principles which he hold so dearly and which we profess so boldly.

I know of no better way than this of telling Stalin that the days of appeasement are over; that we will no longer tolerate his treachery and deceit, and that hereafter we will talk to him in the language which he seems to understand best, in firmness and in strength.

Mr. Speaker, I most fervently hope that before another Pulaski Day rolls along, we will have proceeded well along that path and that Poland, the homeland of General Casimir Pulaski, will again have shining upon it the sunlight of freedom and liberty.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, commemorating Casimir Pulaski Day on October 11, it would do us well to remind the citizens of the free world of the sacrifice and the stand that the people of the country of Poland have taken throughout the years

There is much in the work of General Pulaski that would do us well to remember and take cognizance of. Being a true lover of freedom and a great military genius and a brave man, he had many opportunities in Europe to join one force or another that tried to use him. In his day it was the Germans, the Austrians, and the Russians that carved up Poland, and one was trying to play the other two against the other one. Each of the autocrats made offers to General Pulaski that if he would join their forces he could be a big man in Europe. But he hated tyranny, whether it was Russian tyranny, German tyranny, or Austrian tyranny. It was all the same book, and he would make no deal with them whatsoever.

If we had taken the lesson of Pulaski in this last war, where we sided in with one devil in order to get rid of another devil, we would not be in the mess that we are in in the world today. In other words, if we had adopted the philosophy and the feeling of Casimir Pulaski that a dictator is a dictator, whether he be Austrian, German, or Russian, or any other nationality, he is to be detested, and no deals of any nature should be made with a dictator because you are simply inviting trouble.

Although it is 172 years ago that Pulaski gave his life in this country for freedom and the people of Poland, the true spirit of Pulaski is not dead in Europe. Of all the countries behind the iron curtain all you have to do is pick up the daily newspaper and you see many people with the spirit of Pulaski still living behind the iron curtain. I wonder how many of you realize how difficult it is for Communist Russia to man Communist-controlled Polish ships, because they cannot trust the Poles that they put on those ships, because they do not know when they are going to mutiny and when they are going to desert. All you have to do is pick up the press anywhere in our Nation today or throughout the world, and you will read where a Polish boy and a Polish girl got parts of dilapidated airplanes and put an airplane together and flew to Sweden to freedom. Or you pick up a newspaper and you read where a Polish crew had mutinied and they had tied up the captain of the ship and steered the ship toward a port of freedom in Sweden. All told, more than 500 important people in various walks of life have deserted from behind the iron curtain. What did they run away from? Did they run away from hardship? Did they run away from toil? Did they run away from cold? They did not. They only ran away because they knew that if they got to Sweden, if they got to America, if they got outside the iron curtain, then they would be in a position where they might join the forces of freedom throughout the world and fight again for their freedom.

Name me another country in the true spirit of Pulaski that has paid such a high price for its freedom as has the country that gave us Casimir Pulaski. In the last war they gave more than 8,000,000 dead. Just think of it. When you consider that before the war Poland was a country of some 32,000,000 people, and they gave 8,000,000 dead in the last war, it means that 25 percent of their population gave their lives. To them freedom was more important than life under slavery, whether it be Nazi slavery or Russian slavery.

The important thing to remember is that Poland tried to tell us way back in September of 1939 that Russian tyranny is just as despicable and just as brutal as German tyranny. But we did not listen in 1939, and what an awful price we are paying for that mistake today. So in honoring the memory of Casimir Pulaski, I think we should join forces with freedom-loving people all over the world. One of the things that we as Members of Congress can do in these United States of America is to see to it that these people who get away from behind the iron curtain and seek haven in a free world, not because they are running away from hardship but because they want to join forces with the freedom-loving people of the world and fight again and drive the enemy back from their shores and from their gates—I think that we as Members of Congress can do something; we can make it easier for these people who run away from behind the iron curtain to join the free forces of the world, make it easier for them to seek haven. Sometimes it is with tears in my eyes that I read of these various cases.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on Gen. Casimir Pulaski at this point in the RECORD and that they may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD commemorating General Pulaski Day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACHROWICZ). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF CASIMIR PULASKI.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that on this October 11 we pause to recall the anniversary of the death of a great patriot, and to pay tribute to the memory and life of Brig.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski, one of Poland's unforgettable heroes who sacrificed his life in our own struggle for independence during the Revolutionary War.

Mr. Speaker, liberty is a very fascinating and strange thing. It has drawn into its service throughout the centuries men with such patriotic devotion that the cause of history has often been altered by a few men dedicated to the cause of freedom and independence. The pages of our history are studded with the names of such patriots, and included amongst them will forever be found the name of Casimir Pulaski, a native of Poland but imbued so thoroughly with the spirit of liberty he joined the forces of our struggling colonies to assist them in attaining this priceless possession.

Because of his great service, as well as that of Kosciusko and others, a traditional bond of friendship has long been held by the American people for Poland. And that bond, I trust, will be more firmly cemented when our efforts to destroy the shackles of communism that now fetter her brave people and she will again take her rightful place in the family of nations as a free and independent country.

There seems to be a basic pattern, Mr. Speaker, woven into the minds and souls of all great patriots who despise oppression, regardless of their nativity, that when freedom is suppressed in one part of the world it can and does affect and become a danger to the rest of the world. Driven from his own homeland by its partitioning, he felt his place was with the colonies in America, then fighting for freedom from England. He felt this contribution would be of material aid in the eventual liberation of his own homeland. This opportunity came during and following World War I, and I take pride in the fact that I had a material part in bringing about the independence of Poland following that great struggle. I recall very clearly that I induced President Wilson not to enter into a separate peace with Austria-Hungary toward the end of that war. Had this been done, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the other small nations in Europe would never have realized their temporary independence from 1919 to 1939.

To me, one of the most disturbing and shameful elements in the constantly recurring struggles for power and domination in the Old World is the buffeting about of these small nations. They no sooner become fairly well established as independent nations when another monster rears his ugly head and brings degradation, death, and suffering to these unfortunate peoples. Poland and other small nations will again regain their independence. That is the goal of the free world. That is our purpose today in spending billions for the defense of freedom the world over. But there is one disturbing factor in our present program which I have dwelt on consistently for years. I deplore and fear the recommendations and activities of our various High Commissioners in occupied Germany looking to the rearmament of a revived Germany. There is no secret to the fact that nazism is again on the upsurge; that many of Hitler's leaders, having been spared the punishment they so fully deserved for their heinous crimes, are again gaining control of the so-called German government, and apparently with the blessing and encouragement of our representatives over there. The campaign to bring about the rearmament of Germany is in full swing, in the face of the specter of all the horrors an armed Germany has visited upon the peoples of the world. If we permit this Nation to again become a military might, the hopes of Poland and all small nations of Europe for freedom and liberty will again have vanished. It is for this reason that I have opposed, and shall continue to oppose, the rearming of Germany. In the interest of abiding peace, in memory of Casimir Pulaski and all other liberty-loving patriots, we must never again permit nazism, Hitlerism, or any totalitarian despotism to engulf minorities or small nations. Liberty and independence is the dream, the hope, the aspiration of all oppressed peoples. We can and we will insure it.

CASIMIR PULASKI: SOLDIER OF FREEDOM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today marks the one hundred and seventy-second anniversary of the death of a great Polish soldier of freedom. It is entirely appropriate that we Americans should commemorate this occasion, for the devotion of Casimir Pulaski to the fight for American independence was no less than his devotion to the liberation of his beloved Poland.

The story of Pulaski and his contributions to the founding of the United States is one that warrants telling and retelling. It occupies an honored position in the annals of American history and in the history of mankind's eternal struggle for freedom.

In 1776, during our war for independence, the Continental Congress dispatched emissaries to various parts of Europe for the purpose of securing moral and material support. They were also to enlist sympathizers who would be willing to fight for freedom and liberty in this country. At this same time, in mid-1776, Casimir Pulaski was living as a refugee Pole in Marseilles, whither he had gone after his flight from Poland in 1772 by way of Germany, Austria, Italy, and Turkey.

Since early youth his aim in life seems to have been to liberate his country, which had fallen under the control of Russian tyranny. Before he had become of age he had already begun his encounters with the arrogant Russian forces of occupation. With his small group of devoted Poles, Pulaski fought them in towns, in forests, and in monastic fortresses. In January 1770, he met the Russians in pitched battle at Czestochowa and won a signal victory against superior forces. But in the end, he was compelled to flee the country. He began a long and lonely odyssey in the hope of securing outside aid for Poland. Rebuffed at every turn, he found himself in 1776 in Marseilles, destitute and penniless.

It was there that the dejected Pulaski heard of the American War for Independence. Frustrated in his desire to free Poland, he decided to cast his lot with the fight for freedom then raging in the New World. However, arrangements were not easily made and there were delays. On October 17, he wrote Silas Deane, an American representative in France, stating that from the moment he had left Poland he had sought occasions to use his military talents for liberty, but that delays had resulted "in slowing the zeal which I have to contribute in my particular way to the success of the cause of English America."

Some time later, after Franklin had arrived in Paris, Pulaski went to see him in person and repeated his offer. The Quaker statesman was very favorably impressed by the young Pole who was then just 30 years old. Arrangements were made for his passage to America; he sailed on June 13, 1777, and 40 days later arrived in Boston. He carried a letter from Franklin to George Washington.

Count Pulaski, of Poland—

Read the letter—

an officer famed throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in defense of liberties of his country against the great invading powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia will have the honor of delivering this into your excellency's hands.

This letter was the beginning of a brilliant military career in the service of America. Less than 2 months after his landing at the Boston harbor he won his spurs on September 11, at the battle of Brandywine. On Washington's recommendation, the Continental Congress voted to commission him as brigadier general and commander of the horse. From then on, he added to his glory at Trenton, at Flemington, and finally at the siege of Savannah, where he was mortally wounded on October 9, 1779. Two days later, this brave soul passed away.

While Pulaski was serving and dying in the cause of American independence, his beloved Poland was being dismembered and despoiled by greedy neighbors. Invading tyrants were seeking to obliterate all traces of liberty and independence. But they did not comprehend the universal nature of freedom. They did not realize that uprooted in Poland, it would be carried by brave Polish sons like Pulaski, Kosciusko, and many others to whatever part of the world there was occasion to fight and die for the great cause of liberty. They did not realize, as contemporary tyrants fail to realize, that because of this universality of freedom, it shall never be driven from the earth. No matter how brutally it may be suppressed in a nation like Poland, after a time, it shall return again to drive out its suppressor.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Casimir Pulaski was born in Podolia—south central Poland—on March 4, 1747. He came from a wealthy, noble family. It was a family with a tradition for devotion to liberty and a willingness to fight for it. Casimir Pulaski inherited this great tradition to an extraordinary degree.

At the time of his birth, Poland found itself in an unenviable political situation; the country had become prey to envious neighbors; and during Pulaski's boyhood, he saw the national freedom of his country trampled upon by alien invaders and schemers. These left an indelible mark on his character which was to remain with him throughout his short but brilliant career.

In 1768, Casimir, his father and his brother Francis joined an organization called the Confederation, devoted to the liberation of Poland from the foreign yoke. They pledged their fortunes and their lives for the complete redemption of the freedom of their beloved fatherland. Between 1768 and 1772 he and his brother, as the moving spirit of the Confederation, organized and waged many battles against the regular troops of the dreaded Russian Czar. During those years, especially Casimir became a veritable terror to the established authority and the weakling Polish puppet King. In his last encounters against Russian forces, when he knew all was lost, he managed to escape to France by way of Germany. He then went to Turkey. Barely managing to evade the Russian agents who were on his trail, he escaped to France. For 2 years he lived from hand to mouth, on borrowed money or gifts from friends. Then a sudden turn of events in the New World opened new horizons before him.

The American War of Independence was in full swing in 1776 and representatives of the new Government were in Paris searching for sympathizers to join our fight for freedom. It was Benjamin Franklin who enlisted the young Pulaski.

The latter arrived in Boston in July 1777. During the next 2 years Pulaski won an honored place in American history as the father of our cavalry, as the commander of Pulaski Legion, as a hero of the Battles of Brandywine, of Trenton, and Flemington. His great career came to a glorious end when he was mortally wounded on October 11, 1779, at the seige of Savannah.

Among the distinguished Europeans who fought in our war for independence none gave a better account of himself than Pulaski. He and his illustrious compatriot, Kosciusko, won for the Polish people the eternal gratitude of the United States. Although neither man was able to fulfill his cherished dream of redeeming the independence of Poland, both served the cause of universal freedom by their contribution to the winning of the independence of this country.

Since the days of Pulaski and Kosciusko Poland's history has run an uneven and grim course. After its liberation at the end of World War I, after its creation as a strong independent state between western civilization and the East, black clouds once again gathered over Poland in 1939. In the fall of that year Poland was invaded, divided, and despoiled by the Nazis and the Soviets. Poles were deprived of their independence, deported, and driven into slavery by the millions. The best of their fighting forces were overwhelmed by the two invaders. Their captured officers, some 10,000 to 15,000 of them, were treacherously murdered by the Russians in the spring of 1941 at Katyn Forest, northwest of Moscow. During World War II the Polish underground continued to fight against fantastic odds. Other Poles, under General Anders, fought side by side with the Allied armies throughout the conflict.

The belief that they would one day regain their independence maintained the morale of the Polish people and their fighting forces through the darkest days of the war. Finally the hour of Allied victory came. The rejoicing in Poland, however, was short-lived. In place of Nazi domination came Communist tyranny. Once again the schemers and intriguers of a foreign power have destroyed the freedom of Poland. Once again the Polish people find themselves under the heel of alien oppression.

But Poland is not alone in this new period of tribulation. The thousands of Poles who keep alive in their hearts the love of freedom are brothers to people everywhere who believe in liberty. Some day, some way the oppression they now suffer will be lifted.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today we are commemorating the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died 172 years ago of battle wounds received in action while participating in the war for American independence.

General Pulaski was a great Polish soldier and patriot who sacrificed everything in fighting for the cause of Poland. His indomitable spirit and craving for liberty and freedom were not only confined to his homeland, but he contributed greatly to the success of Gen. George Washington's Revolutionary Army and also perfecting the United States cavalry.

General Pulaski was born of noble blood and enjoyed wealth and all the conveniences of life during his formative years. When he came to America, he used the remnants of his personal fortune to aid in equipping the men under his command during the revolution. Pulaski chose to battle for freedom in the New World, knowing that someday this new land would be the backbone of liberty and, in turn, would repay his native country for the services which he and other gallant Poles extended to the young Republic. He could see beneath the stars and stripes of our flag a haven and a home for millions of his countrymen to rally in future generations. He was right, as great numbers of Poles have come to enjoy the land whose freedom he consecrated with his blood.

General Pulaski fell in the smoke of battle as a young man of 31, and he died as he had lived, a hero and an enemy of tyranny. His memory and his soul go marching on, not only in the minds of his native Poland, but in the minds of all Americans who are grateful for the services which he and his countrymen rendered for America's cause.

Poland was one of the oldest nations on the European Continent. Her civilization and culture stood out in the foreground when some of her powerful enemies were only emerging from the state of primitive barbarity. During these centuries, the men, women, and children of Poland, by reason of their inherent thirst for freedom, suffered as few people in the history of the world suffered. They have truly been martyrs to the cause of freedom. It is with great satisfaction that the descendants of Poland can look back to the days when their motherland was the most powerful state in eastern Europe. Six centuries ago, the University of Cracow was the center of world culture. During these long years of Polish progress and prestige, the Polish nation is recorded as making great contributions toward the success of its sister nations and world progress and culture.

In 1772, by reason of powerful foreign intrigue, Poland suffered its first partition, with a loss of over one-third of its territories. The second partition took place in 1793, with a loss of over one-half of her remaining territory and millions of her population. During these partitions, the Polish nation was handicapped and curtailed from its great mission as a European power. During all of the intervening period until the First World War, Poland's sons and daughters bled for freedom time and again. The history of Poland since World War I is too fresh in the minds of people now living for repetition here today.

It is the spirit of men like Casimir Pulaski, whose memory we commemorate this afternoon, that has kept the spirit of a free Poland alive and active. That spirit will continue to dominate the minds of freemen everywhere. That spirit stands today like sentinels against the onrush of communistic tyranny, defending liberty from the Godless hordes of darkness and slavery.

Pulaski's body has gone to the ages, but his memory and soul will live on and on until Poland again enjoys freedom and independence.

A TRIBUTE TO GENERAL PULASKI

Mr ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, we pay tribute today to a hero of two continents, Gen. Kazimierz Pulaski, who crossed the Atlantic Ocean and gave his life on the battlefield at Savannah so that the people of the North American colonies may enjoy the independence and freedom which they sought and deserved.

The liberty and freedom for which he died are universal concepts. There are no boundaries, no distances, which can separate them into national or regional affairs. They belong by the laws of nature and of God to all men who are willing and able to accept both the privileges and the responsibilities which go with them. Their preservation, also, is everybody's business.

The man to whose memory we pay tribute today knew that. Lafayette, Kosciusko, Von Steuben, and many more men of other countries, and of other ages, knew it. They left their homelands and fought on foreign soil to defend liberty wherever it was threatened by forces of totalitarian dictators. They did not do it to gain fame or riches. They fought and died because they knew that an enemy of human freedom is not just an enemy of one group of men—but the enemy of mankind—and the free people of the world must stand together.

The foreign policy of our Nation is based on that principle. It can be summarized in the words of President Truman, who, speaking before a joint session of Congress, declared that it is the aim and intention of the United States to support the "free people who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures." The President added that "totalitarian regimes imposed on free peoples, by direct or indirect aggression, undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States." Such regimes should be replaced, with the help of our Nation, by the people living under them.

May a few moments of reflection on General Pulaski's heroic deeds imbue us anew with the determination to aid the sons of liberty wherever they are oppressed, and wherever their freedoms are threatened. The people of Poland, and of other Soviet dominated nations, must regain their freedom, and with our help throw off the shackles of the Communist regime which binds them today. The people of the free nations must continue to have the benefit of our aid and support in the event that they should be attacked by Communist aggressors. Our cause is just. With our unselfish consecration to our tasks, and with God's help, liberty and peace shall triumph.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this 11th day of October marks another anniversary of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, soldier, statesman, and leader among men, who gave his life in the cause of American independence.

General Pulaski was born and bred of the finest stock in Poland. Imbued with the spirit of freedom and of democracy, he fought for his own beloved country to the point of exhaustion and departed only when all hope for the time had vanished.

Turning toward the shores of America with the determination to aid the gallant American patriots, he joined General Washington and was assigned the task of establishing and leading the American cavalry. This dashing and courageous officer, in whom the early American cavalry found inspiration, took part in several important battles of the Revolution. He contributed mightily to the destruction of British dominance of the Colonies.

He paid with his life, the price which freedom and independence demanded of him, so that we of today could enjoy all of the latitude prescribed within the Constitution of the United States. His untimely passing, let us hope, will serve as an undying example of fervent and steadfast patriotism which entails the surrender of life itself in order that we may retain our independence, our freedom, and our self-respect.

With this heritage firmly established, let us on this day resolve to give our all for our beloved country. To follow General Pulaski's example makes life worth living; to refuse to do so or even to falter depreciates genuine Americanism so thoroughly exemplified in the sacrifice of this great American patriot. He has given all for us; his example compels us in turn to give everything we possess for the United States of America.

Today in this Chamber, as has been the custom of the past, the voices of the Representatives of the people rise to a high crescendo in the praise of General Pulaski's sacrifice, character, and patriotism, and throughout the length and breadth of this land a grateful people voice sentiments of undying gratitude to him who had the vision, the courage, and the willingness to sacrifice that freedom might live.

CASIMIR PULASKI: FIGHTER FOR FREEDOM

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, October 11, we commemorate the death of a great patriot, Casimir Pulaski.

Casimir Pulaski gave his life for the cause of American independence. He was one of those rare souls whose selfless devotion becomes a symbol for lovers of freedom everywhere.

Born to wealth and privilege, he sacrificed both in the struggle for the freedom of his native land. He fought always for principles and ideals. He sought no personal advantage, nor rewards, and he found none. His life is a story of reverses, defeats, privations, and disasters.

He was forced to leave his native land to save the lives of patriots whom he had led in a lost cause, the fight for Polish freedom. He became a fugitive, hounded from one country to another. In France he was thrown into prison for debt. Finally his friends bought his release and he set out for America with the support of Franklin, who recognized his value to the cause of the Revolution. By his ardor and military skill he won the confidence and respect of Washington. He encountered vexation, opposition, and discouragement in trying to put his ideals into effect, but with Washington's support he organized an independent cavalry command. At the age of 32 he was mortally wounded at the Battle of Savannah, and did not live to see the victory to which he had so materially contributed.

Our people have never forgotten the services and sacrifice of the young patriot. He might well occupy a still greater place in our history had he been spared for longer and fuller achievements commensurate with his genius and devotion. General Pulaski is a symbol of so many foreign-born who have died for the freedom we so cherish.

GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI, A GREAT PATRIOT

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure and privilege to be able to join with you and the membership of the House of Representatives in commemorating the life of that great patriot, Gen. Casimir Pulaski, and simultaneously to pay tribute to Polish patriots and Americans of Polish descent who have in peace as in war stood for and fought for the principles of freedom and human dignity.

Although all of us are familiar with the achievements of General Pulaski, I do want to review briefly some of the highlights of his life and career.

Born in Poland on March 4, 1746, Pulaski grew to manhood during one of the darkest periods of Poland's tragic history. When Pulaski and his freedom-loving compatriots were crushed by a cruel conspiracy against the fundamental rights of man, he managed to escape from his subjugated homeland and made his way to France. It was there that he met Benjamin Franklin, who, impressed by this young count and his deep love of freedom, enabled him, in 1777, to come to the United States of America, which was then a nation only 1 year old and struggling for survival.

Gen. George Washington recommended to the Congress that Pulaski be commissioned in the American Army. Impatient, however, and without waiting for confirmation of his commission, Pulaski served in the American Army as an ordinary volunteer. A few months later he was commissioned a brigadier general and placed in command of our cavalry forces. Later, however, with the permission of General Washington, he formed and commanded the renowned Polish Legion.

After more than 2 years of inspiring leadership and fearless fighting for American freedom, General Pulaski was mortally wounded at Savannah and died on October 11, 1779.

No words of mine could state the deep purpose which General Pulaski had in his heart as do his words in his last letter to Congress only 2 months before his tragic death. General Pulaski wrote at that time:

> I could not submit to stoop before the sovereigns of Europe, so I came here to hazard all for the freedom of America.

And since that day in October 1779, there has continued to be a very close bond between the people of the United States and the freedom-loving people of Poland. During the 170 years which have intervened, thousands of Americans of Polish extraction have shown that they, too, were willing "to hazard all for the freedom of America."

All Americans can be proud of the great example and contribution which General Pulaski made to humanity's ever-continuing fight for individual liberty and freedom.

It is to these great heroes such as General Pulaski that we of today must look for inspiration and guidance in meeting and combating the forces which are—by every means—endeavoring to undermine the basic foundation upon which liberty and justice are established.

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of the House the fact that today we celebrate the one hundred and seventy-second anniversary of the death of a brave patriot of foreign birth who gave his life that we might become a Nation. I refer to Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who was born in Poland in 1748. At an early age his military talent was manifested, and he became commander in chief of the Polish patriot forces in resisting invasion and partition of his native land by foreign armies.

Eventually he was driven into exile and came to the United States, where he joined Washington's Army in 1777. Pulaski fought bravely by Washington's side at Brandywine. In recognition of his bravery and his skill, he was appointed a brigadier general and Chief of Cavalry of the Colonial troops by act

of Congress. Later he fought at Germantown and through the heart-breaking engagements of the winters of 1777 and 1778. Later he raised a corps composed of mixed elements which was known as the Pulaski Legion. With this brave force, he defended Charleston in May 1779. Later in that year, on October 11, he fell mortally wounded and died at Savannah.

But for Pulaski, Tadeusz Kosciusko, Lafayette, Steuben, and other foreign patriots who had an abiding zeal and love for liberty, we might find ourselves today still a subject dominion of the British Empire. They came to our shores to fight, not for any rewards of a material nature—because there were none that the colonists could confer—but because they had a burning zeal for liberty and an abiding detestation of tyranny. So, Mr. Speaker, today, as free Americans, we owe a great debt to Pulaski and to Kosciusko and to Poland. It is a debt of which we should never be unmindful because today once again Poland suffers under oppression and brutality and needs our help and encouragement.

Mr. Speaker, it is especially befitting that we observe the anniversary of Pulaski's death today because, unfortunately, those who represented this Nation at Yalta were unmindful of the debt which we owe to Poland and to Polish patriots. At Yalta our representatives, in the person of the then President and his adviser, Alger Hiss, consented to a new partition of Poland. They agreed that the Communist hordes could oversweep that brave land. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk was then brought forth as the sacrificial offering to the Communist forces. If Premier Mikolajczyk then believed that it was possible for free government to coexist with communism, he was soon disabused. Today Mr. Mikolajczyk's presence in our midst should be a constant reminder of our weakness, our vacillation, and our lack of foresight as a result of which Poland today finds herself crushed in the steel vise of communism and shut off from the world by the iron curtain.

Mr. Speaker, if we need to be reminded anew of the courage of the Polish people and the heroes which they produce, we need only reflect on the brave deeds of General Anders and his army, who fought so bravely in Italy on the side of the Allies in the recent war, and of General Kor-Komarowski and his forces of liberation. But for our deception and vacillation, General Bor and his forces would have succeeded in expelling the Communists from Warsaw.

Mr. Speaker, the atrocities of Katyn Forest, where thousands of brave and patriotic Polish officers were slain in cold blood by the Communists and buried on the spot, should wake afresh in our memories the courage and gallantry of the Polish people and the suffering which they have endured in the name of freedom.

These recollections on the anniversary of the death of Pulaski should serve to cause us to determine anew that we will not rest in our crusade against communism until there exists once again as a member of the community of free nations a free, democratic Poland. To that end, I pledge my efforts. I hope that all of you, my colleagues, will join me.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tribute to Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski by Ignatius K. Werwinski, of South Bend, Ind., a lieutenant in the Officers' Reserve Corps, and former chairman of the United States Pulaski Sesquicentennial Commission:

UNDER OUR FLAG

(By Ignatius K. Werwinski)

Under our flag, purest, most potent emblem of law, order, Christian civilization that ever saluted the dawn, during the Revolutionary War, gave a life to a hero of two hemispheres, Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski

Under our flag, ne'er dropped in dust of defeat, fostered by revered father of the Revolution, the name of Brig. Gen Casimir Pulaski is imperishably written in letters of gold on the pages of American history, defying the ages.

Under our flag, floating in zephyrs of high heaven o'er the eternal capital of a republic, founded on the rock of righteousness, symbol of humanity's fondest, dearest hope, forever proclaiming justice, human brotherhood throughout the land, through the inspiration left us by Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Under our flag, unstained, untarnished, bejeweled, gleaming in darkest night, her triumphal march across the centuries a path of light. Who dare touch with profaning hand this sleepless majestic guardian of an ardent, strong, brave, free people, and under which flag Brig Gen Casimir Pulaski gave his life in Savannah, Ga., on October 11, 1779.

Under our flag, inspiration of a mighty race, mingling in sentiment of cherished children, native of her soil undefiled, and lovers of liberty from every clime, seeking naught but the common good, yearning to serve mankind 'neath sheltering aegis of the red, white, and blue, under which Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski fought.

Under our flag, immortalized by Washington, and under which flag fought Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, her beauteous folds spread from gulf to coast by Jefferson, borne aloft by Lincoln in strife of heroes that united as one a sisterhood of States and blended the blue and gray in fires of patriotism, preserving every star in the shining standard of national sovereignty. May Old Glory, under which Brig. Gen Casimir Pulaski fought and gave his life, in all the flood of time wave with undimmed radiance and increasing splendor over the fairest expanse of God's earth

Under our flag, precious, sublime inheritance, blessing of America's faith, power, unity, sanctified by patriot blood of our hero, Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski. We consecrate anew in o'erflowing measures our hearts, our eager, willing service of hand and brain to the defense and greater glory to our country for which Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski fought and gave his life.

Under our flag may the American people pay the due tribute to the memory of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski on the one hundred and seventy-second anniversary of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, Revolutionary War hero, by observing and commemorating the anniversary of his death.

Dedicated to the Sons of Revolution.

OCTOBER 11, 1951.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WELCH and to include a eulogy of one of his constituents.

Mr. ABERNETHY and to include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REAMS and to include an editorial.

Mr. MCGREGOR, in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL and to include an article entitled "Bucking the Lobby."

Mr. TABER to revise and extend his remarks in the Committee of the Whole and include a table prepared by himself.

Mr. WILLIAMS to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. JUDD, in two instances, and to include a letter.

Mr. O'HARA (at the request of Mr. JUDD) and to include a letter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT, in two instances.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make on this bill later and include tabular matter.

Mr. PATTERSON, in two instances, and to include two letters.

Mr. SCHWABE, in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, in two instances, in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. STEED and to include five resolutions adopted by the Forty-fifth Infantry Association.

Mr. HILLINGS (at the request of Mr. AYRES), in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AYRES and to include a letter.

Mr. MCDONOUGH (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. PRIEST and to include a speech delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and two newspaper editorials.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. HAVENNER) and to include a statement by an official of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. NORRELL (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include a letter.

Mr. RODINO with reference to Christopher Columbus.

Mr. CARNAHAN and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. ZABLOCKI (at the request of Mr. FLOOD) and to include a tribute to Christopher Columbus.

Mr. FLOOD, and to include a statement in support of the Polish resolution.

Mr. FLOOD, in three instances, and to include editorials.

Mr. ELLIOTT, in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1864. An act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; and

S 2080. An act for the relief of Inooka Kazumi.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BELCHER (at the request of Mr. SCHWABE), indefinitely, on account of recent death of his father.

Mr. REED of Illinois (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for 3 days, on account of official business.

Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. PATTEN, for an indefinite period, on account of committee business.

Mr. ALLEN of California, for himself from October 15 until November 1, 1951, on account of official and other business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.), the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, October 15, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

878. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Deputy Attorney General, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950," was taken from the Speaker's table, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4797. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 291 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949, section 2 of Act 152 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, and section 2 of Act 171 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, which included Maui County Waterworks Board, Kauai County Waterworks Board, and the Board of Water Supply, County of Hawaii, under the definition of "municipality" in the issuance of revenue bonds pursuant to the Revenue Bond Act of 1935; without amendment (Rept. No. 1128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3847. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue to school district No. 28, Ronan, Mont., a patent in fee to certain Indian land; without amendment (Rept. No. 1129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3995. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to transfer to the Department of the Navy certain land and improvements at Pass Christian, Miss.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'TOOLE: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 5490. A bill relating to the compensation of certain employees of the Panama Canal; with amendment (Rept. No. 1131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4467. A bill to incorporate the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1151). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 57. An act for the relief of Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 118. An act for the relief of Nouhad Ann Khoury; without amendment (Rept. No. 1133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 210. An act authorizing the naturalization of Jesus Juan Llanderal; with amendment (Rept. No. 1134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 519. An act for the relief of Moy Chin Shee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 575. An act for the relief of Robert Jose Toribio; without amendment (Rept. No. 1136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 582 An act for the relief of Emma Burr; without amendment (Rept. No. 1137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 635. An act for the relief of Hans Lenk; without amendment (Rept. No. 1138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 775. An act for the relief of Dr. Anthony M. Opisso; without amendment (Rept. No. 1139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 954. An act for the relief of Dr. Charles Gordon Rennick Sell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1048. An act for the relief of Myrtle Harding; without amendment (Rept. No. 1141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1274. An act for the relief of Vera Oumancoff; without amendment (Rept. No. 1142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1436. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller; without amendment (Rept. No. 1143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1640. An act for the relief of Cathy Dana Besser; without amendment (Rept. No. 1144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2007. An act for the relief of Sharon A. Gates; without amendment (Rept. No. 1145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2027. An act for the relief of Leo Kieve; without amendment (Rept. No. 1146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 800. A bill for the relief of Cindy Eberhardt; without amendment (Rept. No. 1147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 827. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manuel J. Casas and Mrs. Julia Nakpil Casas; with amendment (Rept. No. 1148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1628. A bill for the relief of Maria Szentgyorgyi Mayer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1857. A bill for the relief of James Yao; without amendment (Rept. No. 1150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. R. 5691. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Indiana of certain surplus real property situated in Marion County, Ind; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 5692. A bill to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Defense Materials Procurement Agency of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 5693 A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose certain duties upon the importation of tuna fish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R 5694. A bill to provide for the installation and maintenance of an electric lighting system on the south bank of the Delaware and Chesapeake Canal; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 5695. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, so as to extend the privilege of trial by jury to certain cases arising within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 5696 A bill to set aside the action of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with respect to the reassignment and integration of certain Fire Department personnel; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 5697. A bill to require that all officers of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be appointed on the basis of competitive civil-service examinations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr HARRISON of Wyoming.

H R. 5698. A bill to amend the act of September 25, 1950, so as to provide that the liability of the town of Mills, Wyo., to furnish sewerage service under such act shall not extend to future construction by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H R. 5699. A bill to authorize in certain cases the appointment of special counsel and investigators to assist grand juries in the exercise of their powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H R 5700. A bill to authorize in certain cases the appointment of special counsel and investigators to assist grand juries in the exercise of their powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 5701. A bill to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Defense Materials Procurement Agency of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 5702. A bill to extend to certain persons who served in the military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, the benefits of titles II, III, and

IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 5703. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the newspaper carrier boys of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

By Mr KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. Con Res. 168. Concurrent resolution expressing the hopes of the American people for the early liberation of the people of Albania from their present enslavement and for early restoration of their basic human rights and freedoms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H Res. 458. Resolution to print the prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., at the opening sessions of the House of Representatives of the United States from February 1, 1950, to the end of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VAIL:

H. Res. 459. Resolution creating a select committee to study and review the records of House committees and Government agencies in connection with the loss, release, or transmittal of atomic information to foreign governments, and to deal more effectively with the individuals responsible for such loss, release, or transmittal; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to revise the treaty of peace with Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to revise the treaty of peace with Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H R 5704. A bill for the relief of Giorgio De Biasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H R. 5705. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to Thomas Jones, of Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R 5706 A bill for the relief of Meiko Shindo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H R 5707. A bill for the relief of Joseph Wojciechowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5708. A bill for the relief of Adam Wojciechowski; to the Committee on the Ju iciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 5709. A bill for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered property losses as a result of the failure of the Big Porcupine Dam on the Fort Peck project, Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H R. 5710. A bill for the relief of Sportservice Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H R 5711. A bill for the relief of Erika Ruf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 5712. A bill for the relief of Nagarjibhai Premabhai Patel, Dahyabhai Nathubahi Patel, Ramubhai Nataubhai Patel, Dahyabhai Govindji Patel, Dahyabhai Muraji Patel, Dahya Jaram Patel, Manganlal Parbhubhai Patel, Naganlal Vasanju Patel, Shantilal Kuvarji Patel, and Nagarbhai Madhavbhai Patel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

463 By the SPEAKER: Petition of American War Dads Auxiliary, Kansas City, Mo., urging the use of all conscientious objectors in military services in noncombative positions, to the Committee on Armed Services.

464. Also, petition of American War Dads Auxiliary, Kansas City, Mo., urging the creation of adequate housing facilities for families of servicemen who wish to live near the training camps; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

465 Also, petition of American War Dads Auxiliary, Kansas City, Mo., relative to the release of information pertaining to United States commitments and special agreements with the Security Council of the United Nations regarding military assistance as well as full information as to the method of selection and the name of the present chairman of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

466. Also, petition of American War Dads Auxiliary, Kansas City, Mo., urging speedy and adequate aid for the midwestern rehabilitation program; to the Committee on Public Works.

467. Also, petition of American War Dads Auxiliary, Kansas City, Mo , urging the continuation of the Committee on Un-American Activities and to appropriate ample and adequate funds for its use; to the Committee on Rules.

468. Also, petition of St. Cloud Townsend Club No. 1, St. Cloud, Fla., vigorously protesting the proposed opening of welfare rolls to public exposure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

469. Also, petition of St. Petersburg Townsend Club No. 13, St. Petersburg, Fla., vigorously protesting the proposed opening of welfare rolls to public exposure; to the Committee on Ways and Means

470. Also, petition of Associated Townsend Clubs of Hillsborough County, Tarnpa, Fla., vigorously protesting the proposed opening of welfare rolls to public exposure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, October 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, to whom a thousand years are but as one day, while last life's ebbing hours make us bold and swift and brave to do Thy will. In this exalted Chamber of governance, we beseech Thee, pour the riches of Thy grace upon those who here stand in the Nation's name. Give them fairness of appraisal, poise amid confusion, the kindly heart nobility of goodness, and the simple faith in man that is more than coronets. Teach us so to live and so to toil, and so to play our part in this age on ages telling that we may face with clear conscience the gaze of our contemporaries and the judgment of posterity. We ask it in the name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 11, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 11, 1951, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1013. An act for the relief of Sister Monica Grant; and

S. 1499. An act for the relief of Georgette Sato.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1450) to provide for the exchange of certain lands owned by the United States of America for certain privately owned lands.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4550) to provide for the control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5230. An act providing for the conveyance to the State of North Carolina of the Currituck Beach Lighthouse Reservation, Corolla, N. C.;

H. R. 5650. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5684. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 331. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Chicago International Trade Fair, to be held in Chicago, Ill., March 22 to April 6, 1952.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2080) for the relief of Inooka Kazumi, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be

absent from the session of the Senate on Monday next to attend a funeral which means much to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the leave is granted.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HENDRICKSON was excused from attendance of the sessions of the Senate next week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THYE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate on Monday and Tuesday of next week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FERGUSON was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate on Monday, October 15, 1951.

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARTHY was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may transact routine business, including insertions in the RECORD, without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, is so ordered.

MEMORIAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the memorial of Louis L. Pfohl, of Buffalo, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing military training during peacetime, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLICATION OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE ROLLS—RESOLUTION OF PIERCE COUNTY (WIS.) TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of controversy in the Congress and throughout the country as a result of the debate on making public the names of persons on public assistance rolls.

I have received a letter from Oliver S. Youngman of the Pierce County Taxpayers Association in which that group has placed itself squarely on behalf of removal of the secrecy clauses in inspection of public relief rolls, and on behalf of full information, in order to help correct the many abuses which have cropped up.

I am glad to note incidentally that the Senate and House conferees have just adopted the so-called Jenner amendment under which the Federal requirement for secrecy will no longer obtain.

I present the resolution of the Pierce County (Wis.) Taxpayers Association for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas analysis of general relief rolls made in some localities indicate a laxity of waste and funds; and

Whereas indications are that further laxity and waste of funds would be uncovered if other welfare programs were objectively studied, in view of what already has been found in some general relief programs; and

Whereas certain public assistance rolls are now open to inspection; and

Whereas it is not the intention to deny aid to the needy, but to make administrative procedures open to public inspection; and

Whereas it is felt that responsible individuals and organizations should have the right to inspect all rol's Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That the Pierce County Taxpayers Association ask the State legislature, through its legislative representatives, to adopt a resolution requesting Congress to remove the secrecy clause covering the inspection of relief rolls, which would lead to tightening of administrative procedures, elimination of abuses, and the adoption of policies which will help to keep the undeserving off the rolls, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to our United States Senators and Representative in the House asking action to open all social-security rolls this session, if at all possible.

Adopted at River Falls, Wis., this 3d day of October 1951.

EXEMPTION OF POLICE AND FIRE RETIREMENT SYSTEMS FROM PROVISIONS OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE LAW—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted at the 1951 convention of the Minnesota Police and Peace Officers' Association, held in Mankato, Minn., on June 25–26, 1951, relating to the exemption of police- and fire-retirement systems from the provisions of the old-age and survivors insurance law, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there have been numerous attempts in recent years in the Congress of the United States and the various State legislatures to include police and fire retirement systems in the old-age and survivors insurance system; and

Whereas the benefits of social security are based largely upon the amount of wages earned rather than years of service and such a change would result in lessened benefits for all members of established systems, and

Whereas it is evident that such legislation if enacted would mean the eventual dissolution of police pensions and the abolishment of police-relief associations; and

Whereas, because of the hazardous nature of the services performed by police officers, it is imperative that they be afforded more adequate protection in their pension funds than is offered by social security; and

Whereas it is further evident that such a step would be detrimental to the best interests of the public welfare, since any curtailment of disability and retirement provisions of police pensions would seriously affect the morale of police officers services: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota Police and Peace Officers' Association in convention assembled at Mankato, Minn., go on record as being in favor of the exemptions of the police- and fire-retirement systems from the provisions of the old age and survivors insurance law, as now provided, and that we oppose any inclusion, or permissive legislation which by inference, would lead to inclusion, and that copies of this resolution be furnished our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

WILLIAM N. OATIS—RESOLUTION OF NEW JERSEY PRESS ASSOCIATION

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the New Jersey Press Association at its meeting on October 5, 1951, relating to the case of William N. Oatis.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

William N. Oatis, representing the Associated Press, was the last free reporter in Czechoslovakia, which had closed the iron curtain on every other free newsman.

William N. Oatis is a reputable, honest, American news reporter. For doing his job as an honest reporter, he is held in jail as a spy by the Soviet government of Czechoslovakia. This perversion of justice outrages the dignity of the free press everywhere in the world.

The New Jersey Press Association, representing all the newspapers in New Jersey, believes it is the responsibility of the United States Government to call the attention of the world to the tyranny of the Soviet officials of Czechoslovakia and to take every action possible for the release of William N. Oatis

The New Jersey Press Association therefore urges the United States Government to break off diplomatic and trade relations with Czechoslovakia, to cancel visas issued to Czechoslovak citizens, and to freeze the assets of Czechoslovakia in this country, until such time as William N. Oatis is freed.

EXECUTIVE ORDER RELATING TO SECURITY RESTRICTIONS—LETTER AND RESOLUTION FROM NEW JERSEY PRESS ASSOCIATION

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the New Jersey Press Association dated October 5, 1951, addressed to Hon. Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, together with a resolution adopted by the New Jersey Press Association on October 5, 1951, requesting President Truman to modify his Executive order relating to security restrictions.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 5, 1951.

His Excellency HARRY S TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith is a resolution which was passed unanimously today by the New Jersey Press Association at its thirtieth annual press institute at Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.

It is sincerely requested that you give this matter extremely careful thought.

The membership of this association, the oldest of its kind in continuous existence in this country, sincerely hopes you will very seriously consider taking the action recommended in the enclosed resolution.

Respectfully yours,
NEW JERSEY PRESS ASSOCIATION,
By HUGH N. BOYD, *President*.

Whereas President Truman has extended security restrictions to Federal civilian agencies by his Executive order; and

Whereas this arbitrary action denies the press its Constitutional right of access to information; and

Whereas this denial may inevitably lead to withholding of information from the public: Be it

Resolved, That the New Jersey Press Association use every appropriate method at its

disposal to demand that President Truman modify this Executive order so that the public may have news and information which is its right under the Constitution.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted.

By Mr. LEHMAN, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S 513 A bill to provide for a study of the mental and physical consequences of malnutrition and starvation suffered by prisoners of war and civilian internees during World War II, with amendments (Rept No. 945).

By Mr HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

H R. 3298 A bill to amend section 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with amendments (Rept. No 946).

By Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S 1368 A bill to amend the act relating to the small claims and conciliation branch of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 947).

By Mr HOLLAND, from the Committee on Public Works

H R 5593. A bill authorizing the Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority, hereby created, and its successors, to construct, maintain, and operate bridges over Sabine Lake, at or near Port Arthur, Tex; to construct, maintain, and operate all causeways, approaches, and appurtenances pertaining thereto, and to finance said objects by the issuance of bonds secured by the said properties and income and revenues, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 948).

EXPORT CONTROLS AND POLICIES IN EAST-WEST TRADE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (REPT. NO 944)

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I submit, pursuant to Senate Resolution 365 of the Eighty-first Congress, and Senate Resolution 56 of the Eighty-second Congress, authorizing a study and investigation of export policies and control regulations, a report on export controls and policies in East-West trade. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR (AS CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE ON EXPORT CONTROLS AND POLICIES)

Just about a year ago a merchant-marine engineer gave evidence before the Subcommittee on Maritime Matters concerning activities of American-flag ships in carrying petroleum products and other materials of strategic significance to Communist China. The testimony of this man and of others concerning goods passing through United States ports, referred only to a limited number of specific shipments but left the subcommittee with a rather clear impression that the particular trade described was but a small portion of the whole trade in strategic materials between western countries and Russia and her satellites.

Having had this glimpse of the manner in which the west was contributing to the war potential of the East, the Senate passed Senate Resolution 365 on December 21, 1950, authorizing an investigation and study of this subject and continued it by Senate Resolution 56 on February 1, 1951. Under this authority the Subcommittee on Export Controls and Policies today files a report of the work which it has done.

The Maritime Subcommittee in October and November and the Export Controls and Policies Subcommittee through the succeeding months conducted detailed examinations of specific transactions which, although not necessarily illegal, appeared frequently to be such as to jeopardize western security interests It soon became apparent, however, that endless study of the details of specific incidents would yield but little unless considered as a part of an examination of the entire world picture.

Of course, our first interest was in the operations and policies of United States Government agencies. By the 1st of March the domestic export controls had by one means or another become sufficiently broad in application both as to area and as to character of goods covered, and the Department of Commerce Orders T1 and T2 had very effectively removed American-flag ships from the China trade

However efficient the domestic export controls and policies may have become their true effectivness could be measured only in terms of ultimate effect on our enemies, present or potential The finest of export and shipping controls would be but an iron curtain around our own merchants if other western countries were to permit the shipment of strategic materials to the East or if American overseas operations did not support the purposes of our domestic controls. Rumors and reports were frequent and substantial that the West German export controls provided not a loophole but an open door through which critical materials were going to supply the Communist war machines

Accordingly, the subcommittee sent its investigator, Mr. Kenneth R. Hansen, to Western Germany in April of this year, to study the situation. At that time, Mr. Hansen's report which appears in the subcommittee report as appendix A, disclosed a shocking situation which had been permitted to exist in an area in which the United States Government had direct responsibility and authority. So effective was the shock of these disclosures that, according to the latest information, substantial steps have been taken by the High Commissioner's office and by the Federal Government of Germany to correct the situation. A State Department letter outlining some of these steps appears in the report as appendix B. It is gratifying to note the manner in which the authorities have sought to correct the deficiencies pointed out by the subcommittee.

It is difficult to justify or excuse the lack of productive activity and apparent lack of interest in this field by United States authorities in Germany, for a period which extended almost from the close of hostilities until the subcommittee investigation of the problem in April of this year.

Having aired the situation in Western Germany, and after calling for remedial action, the subcommittee next turned its interest to the Far East, certain areas of which had become notorious as channels through which the Chinese Communists were equipping and maintaining their war economy with western goods. Notable in this trade according to almost all reports were the British crown colony of Hong Kong and the Portuguese colony of Macao. They were not alone, however, for almost every area in the Far East was involved to a greater or lesser degree in legal trade which could not be justified in the light of the Korean conflict, or was a source or channel of illegal trade.

In order to get some true and undistorted facts of the situation the subcommittee sent Mr. Hansen to that area in June and July of this year. A report of what he found is attached to the subcommittee report as appendix C. Although it is yet too soon to evaluate the results of the subcommittee's activities in this field there has already been some improvement, but the road to adequate trade control still lies almost entirely ahead.

The subcommittee also studied the use of various western flag ships in trade with the Communist mainland, and found that, during the early part of this year at least, a large proportion of those known to be in the China trade were of Panamanian registry. That situation has now been changed by prompt action on the part of the Republic of Panama Correspondence relating to the new measures taken by Panama in compliance with the spirit of the United Nations embargo is attached to our report as appendix B.

I would like, if it were possible, to tell the Senate today that the West is no longer providing the military machines of the eastern bloc with materials which enhance their war potential Such is not the case, and the best that I can say at this time is that substantial portions of this trade have been curtailed and are under increasing control. The nations in the West are beginning to have an increased awareness of the need for fully coordinated trade control and manipulation in dealing with Russia and her satellites which have been functioning quite effectively as a closely knit trading unit

Several of the areas which have exhibited the most grievous laxity in export controls have been spurred to that necessary action compatible with our mutual security interests by legislative acts of this Congress and in some measure by the disclosures of this subcommittee. Provisions are now being made to render technical export control assistance to those countries which are most lacking in efficient export control machinery

Cooperative action by other western countries still leaves much to be desired, as indeed does the degree of coordination of activities and agency functions of our own executive branch. It is becoming apparent that further progress toward adequate export controls and policies will rely more and more on attacking the basic problems confronted by many areas which, for underlying political and economic reasons occasion policies and operations which allow the undesirable flow of materials strategic to the Communist bloc from the free nations. Export controls and policies are but a part, an important part, of the total defense measures necessary at this time.

I cannot too strongly urge that the executive branch of our Government by diligent effort, intelligent appreciation, and awareness of this problem which, as little as a year ago was a stepchild domestically and which has not yet been afforded full stature in United States Government operations abroad, press even more definitely for those measures which are still sorely lacking at a time when we are engaged in a deadly struggle with the forces of the Communist world.

I might add that this problem is one that can never be solved once and for all while this basic struggle remains between East and West. I trust that the recent legislation in this general field will be used effectively to aid our friends and circumvent our enemies in the never ending tug-of-trade war which accompanies such international strife.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 12, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2080) for the relief of Inooka Kazumi.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 2263. A bill for the relief of Balbina Borenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 2264. A bill for the relief of the city of Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2265. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2266. A bill to authorize and validate payments of periodic pay increases for temporary indefinite employees of the Department of the Navy within the period of March 17, 1947, to July 1, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2267. A bill to create a northern division in the western judicial district of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2268. A bill establishing a general policy and procedures with respect to payments to State and local governments on account of Federal real property and tangible personal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. IVES, Mr CLEMENTS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. HILL, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. LODGE):

S. 2269. A bill for the creation of the Commission To Study Relations Between the United States and Other North Atlantic Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 2270. A bill for the relief of John J. Hopkins; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CASE:

S. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of the Army to restore the white crosses or other religious markers which until recently were above the graves of the honored war dead at the National Memorial Cemetery in Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PAYMENTS TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ON FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for payments by the Federal Government to State and local governments on real property within those jurisdictions owned by the Federal Government. The bill was drafted by the executive office of the President and is the result of considerable study in recent years.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me, together with an explanation of the bill which was prepared by the Bureau of the Budget, and a statement of estimated expenditures, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the statement by the Senator from Minnesota, the statement prepared by the Bureau of the Budget, and statement of estimated expenditures will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2268) establishing a general policy and procedures with respect to payments to State and local governments on account of Federal real property and tangible personal property, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The statement prepared by Senator HUMPHREY, the explanation of the bill prepared by the Bureau of the Budget, and the statement of estimated expenditures are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY UPON INTRODUCING A BILL FOR THE TAX PAYMENTS TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ON FEDERAL REAL ESTATE

Local governments depend upon property taxation for more than half of their total revenues, so they are particularly concerned when the Federal Government acquires real estate and thereby removes it from the property tax base while at the same time activities associated with that Federal property frequently impose service burdens upon these local governments. This is a particularly urgent problem in view of the fact that the Federal Government is increasingly acquiring additional property in connection with our national defense program.

The Congress has in the past accepted responsibility for payments to local governments, but most agencies today are still without general authority to make payments on their properties. A uniform overall formulation is needed to provide uniform treatment wherever possible. The bill which I am introducing would replace more than twenty piecemeal provisions and should reduce the need for selective legislation such as the laws granting special aid to schools especially affected by the defense effort.

The Bureau of the Budget has recommended that annual payments by the Federal Government should be made on property acquired after January 1, 1946, except in cases where the Federal Government has made payment since that date or earlier or where special hardship exists. On that basis the estimated cost of the program would be about $32,000,000 a year. The level of expenditures after the first few years would be determined by the value and kind of future Federal property acquisitions. There will be some difference of opinion with regard to this cut-off date. I believe that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments should hold hearings and further discuss this detail. I am inclined to believe that the date should be earlier than 1946, since the Federal impact began in 1939 and 1940, but I am aware of the fact that to provide a cut-off date earlier than World War II would greatly increase the expenditure by the Federal Government.

My own experience as a mayor and as chairman last year of the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations has persuaded me that this problem is vital and should be acted upon as soon as possible. The integrity and independence of the local government is at stake. The bill is presented in the hope that it will provide a basis for further hearings and intelligent action. The adoption of a reasonable solution to the problem will help spread Government costs more equitably and, in my judgment, strengthen our Federal-State system of government. Unless the local government is strengthened the fabric of our democracy and our federal system of government is weakened.

EXPLANATION OF DRAFT BILL FOR PAYMENTS TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ON FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY

BACKGROUND

The problem of payments to State and local governments on account of Federal real property has received considerable attention for a number of years. It is not a new problem but one that has attracted renewed attention because of property acquisitions occasioned by the national defense program—acquisitions which in many instances take valuable properties off the property-tax rolls.

Existing statutory provisions for payments on Federal realty do not represent a clear-cut, uniform policy. On similar classes of property some agencies pay taxes, others make payments in lieu of taxes, and others make no payments. When control of a piece of property changes from one Federal agency to another the status of the property may change from full taxation or tax-equivalent payments to complete exemption, without any change in the purpose which the property serves. At every recent session of the Congress a score or more of bills has been introduced relating to this subject. Evidence of interest in this problem by federal governments elsewhere is seen in the inauguration by the Canadian Government, last year, of a plan for making payments to localities on account of Dominion property.

Tax losses to State and local governments resulting from Federal acquisitions of property was one of several questions in intergovernmental fiscal relations discussed at a conference arranged by the Secretary of the Treasury with the approval of the President and held April 21 and 22, 1949. In this conference the Federal Government was represented by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. State and local governments were represented by officers of several associations of State and local government officials. The Bureau of the Budget was asked to take the lead in an effort to work out a comprehensive set of recommendations on the subject of payments to State and local governments on account of Federal real property.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF BILL

The present draft bill embodies a set of recommendations reflecting comments and suggestions on earlier drafts received from various Federal departments and agencies—mainly those owning or using substantial quantities of real property. Extensive discussions have been held with staffs of most of the Federal departments and agencies concerned and on a general basis with staffs of the associations of State and local government officials that were represented at the April 1949 conference.

The payments which the bill would authorize would depend largely upon the use to which the property is put by the Federal Government. This approach takes into account the recommendations of the Federal Real Estate Board in its report on the subject in 1943, and also reflects the discussion at the Treasury conference of April 1949. The result is a classification of Federal properties without regard to departmental or agency control.

The basic objective of the bill is that of avoiding, as far as feasible, inequities between State and local taxpayers, on the one hand, and Federal taxpayers, on the other,

in the distribution of the tax burdens and governmental costs associated with Federal Government acquisition and use of real property. The bill reflects a general presumption that property-tax costs of property devoted to activities that are predominantly of national interest should be borne largely by Federal taxpayers whereas property-tax costs of activities that are chiefly of local interest and benefit might well be borne by local taxpayers. Application of these principles in the draft bill results in the division of Federal properties between a paying group and a nonpaying group, with transition payments available for some of the items in the latter category.

Formulation of standards that can be used throughout the Government is complicated by the tremendous variety of purposes for which the Federal Government owns and uses property. Classification of properties according to their use presents difficult problems, particularly for a bill which cannot enumerate all the individual kinds of properties or their uses but must rely upon a statement of broad standards and intentions. Although most parcels of property owned by the Federal Government can be classified rather definitely in accordance with the general guide lines proposed, many border-line cases will require a close examination of specific facts. This is not an uncommon situation in property taxation. It is intended that more specific guides will be provided in administrative regulations to be issued under the law.

It is anticipated that in many instances complex holdings will consist of a well-defined aggregate of properties closely associated with a particular Federal activity and that, in such cases, the predominate use to which the installation is put will govern the classification of the entire installation. However, some installations comprise a number of individually identifiable areas or segments which may be used for different purposes, and these areas or segments would be classified separately The treatment would depend upon the facts of each particular case.

The classification of properties under this bill will continue existing statutory provisions for payments to State and local governments for some groups of properties and preserve the exempt status of other groups. Existing revenue-sharing statutes, for example, will for the most part be left undisturbed and so will the provisions for payments in lieu of taxes on federally owned low-rent housing. Federal property used for any purpose for which privately owned property would be exempt under State laws will not be subject to any payments. Likewise, Federal property used for services to the local public, such as post offices, weather stations, and land offices, will remain exempt except for special assessments. Continuing exempt, except for special assessments and transitional payments, is a wide variety of miscellaneous properties such as prisons, cemeteries, and properties devoted to land utilization projects.

A special category of payments is authorized to cover exceptional cases in which local governments burdened by Federal activities are not able to obtain relief under the more general provisions of this legislation or from other sources.

The bill would not apply within the District of Columbia and the island possessions, which have usually been the subject of special arrangements adapted to their special relationships to the Federal Government.

OUTLINE OF THE BILL

The bill consists of introductory sections declaring the general policy, specifying a short title, and giving special definitions, followed by five titles as follows: Title I, Payments on Tax-Exempt Properties; Title II, Consent to State and Local Taxation; Title III, Consent to Special Assessments; Title IV, Payments to Local Governments Not Otherwise Compensated for Substantial Financial Burdens; Title V, General Provisions.

Titles I and II, taken together, would establish a classification of Federal properties as a basis for periodic payments to State and local governments, with separate standards of payment provided for each category of property. The categories and standards may be summarized as follows·

Three groups of properties subject to administratively determined payments:

(a) An inclusive group of properties serving national or broad regional interests, for which payments will be based primarily on an estimate of taxes, with adjustments for special services required, or furnished by, the Federal Government in connection with the properties For most of these properties, the estimate of taxes will be based on the value of the properties exclusive of improvements made or personal property added by the Federal Government after acquisition of the property. For commercial and industrial properties, however, the value of Federal improvements and tangible personal property will also be considered In any particular case payment of taxes upon properties now subject to taxation under other statutes may be continued, in place of administratively determined payments, if the policy of the act will be better served thereby.

(b) Resettlement and certain defense housing projects, for which full tax-equivalent payments, less offsets for services supplied by the Federal Government, will be made

(c) Other properties upon which, ultimately, no payments will be made under titles I and II after a period of diminishing transition payments

2. Two groups of properties exempt from all payments, other than special assessments and any hardship payments under title IV:

(a) Properties used for purposes for which properties under private ownership would be exempt from taxation.

(b) Properties used primarily for services to the local public.

3. Three groups of properties for which consent to State and local property taxation is given:

(a) Properties acquired by the Federal Government in connection with loans or contracts of insurance or guaranty, while held pending disposition.

(b) Properties leased or sold under conditional sale contracts to private persons.

(c) Properties now subject to taxation if the owning agency decides, in any particular case, that the policy of the act will be better served by permitting taxation to continue.

Title III consents to the levying of special assessments for local improvements for all classes of Federal real property covered by the bill

Title IV would give authority for payments to local governments not otherwise compensated for substantial financial burdens arising in connection with Federal real property or activities. These payments may relate to services provided to Federal property, to persons living on Federal property, or to persons employed on Federal property.

Title V provides for an administrative system in which the basic responsibility for all payments is lodged in the property-using or owning agencies, and responsibility for assuring uniformity of policy through issuance of regulations and interpretations is vested in a Commission.

Section 1, short title: The short title of the act is the "Act for payments to State and local governments on Federal real property."

Section 2, declaration of policy: The first subsection of the declaration of policy states the broad, general objective of the bill. This objective is to avoid, insofar as feasible, inequities in tax burdens between State-local and Federal taxpayers arising from the acquisition or use of property by the Federal Government. If Federal property holdings were distributed more or less evenly over the country, the burdens thereby imposed upon taxpayers of State and local governments would also be widely, and perhaps equitably, distributed if no payments were made on Federal property. Instead, Federal property tends to be concentrated in particular localities. These holdings may impose burdens upon the local taxpayers through reduction of the property tax base or through special requirements for local government service by Federal agencies. If the holdings are devoted mainly to national ends, it seems appropriate that the costs be spread over the taxpayers of the Nation. If, on the other hand, federally owned realty is intended to serve primarily the locality in which it is situated, there would be an inequitable burden imposed on Federal taxpayers if they not only paid for the Federal property but for local governmental costs as well. The objective of this bill therefore is to establish a system of payments which as far as possible will prevent these inequities from arising in connection with Federal property.

Subsection (b) is a policy declaration to State and local governments that, in consideration of the payments provided under this bill, there should be no denial to Federal property or its residents of the services ordinarily rendered by the State or local governments This policy declaration is intended to discourage the discriminations or special charges which some local governments establish against residents of Federal property. Although a pronouncement of this kind cannot by itself have a mandatory effect, a provision in subsection 101 (b) would preclude making payments under section 101 to State or local governments which deny their usual services to Federal property or the residents on Federal property.

Section 3, definitions: Some words and phrases used in the bill are defined restrictively or used in a special sense. Attention is called particularly to the following·

The definition of Federal real property excludes certain classes of real property to which the provisions of the bill are not intended to apply. The exclusions are (1) subsurface mineral rights if they are held by the Federal Government without title to surface rights, (2) all federally owned low-rent housing, and (3) public domain lands. Federal subsurface mineral rights ordinarily do not result in the imposition of any substantial burdens upon State and local governments. Furthermore, any valuations placed upon these rights for purposes of taxation or payments in lieu of taxes would necessarily be highly speculative. Federally owned low-rent housing projects are excluded in order that they may be treated on a par with locally owned projects. Under the Housing Act of 1949, payments in lieu of taxes may equal 10 percent of shelter rent. Public domain lands are excluded because the bill is concerned primarily with tax losses actually experienced. Revenue-sharing arrangements applying to public domain lands are not superseded.

Tangible personal property, wherever used in this bill, comprises only that tangible personal property which by reason of its attachment to real property has afixed location. Specifically, this has reference to machinery, equipment, boilers, transmission lines, and the like—property which in some jurisdictions might be considered realty and, in others, personalty even though it has a fixed location. Tangible personal property, as defined, does not include such movable items as vehicles, inventories, furniture, c · supplies.

State and States includes each State and Territory. It does not include the District of Columbia nor Puerto Rico. The intention is to exclude from the scope of this bill all property of the Federal Government which

is located within the District of Columbia and in island possessions, since these have usually been the subject of special arrangements.

Local government includes any political subdivision of a State. It does not include the District of Columbia or local units in island possessions.

Tax as used throughout the bill, except in title IV, means only a levy according to value on real property or tangible personal property with fixed location: For purposes of title IV, this restriction upon the meaning of the word is removed, so that "tax" would have whatever meaning it is given by State or local law in the jurisdiction concerned.

TITLE I—PAYMENTS ON TAX-EXEMPT PROPERTIES

Immunity from State and local taxation is retained for all types of Federal properties classified under this title, except for the option in subsection 101 (c) to continue tax payments upon certain properties, but administratively determined payments are provided for three main subcategories of these properties

Section 101, payments on certain properties serving national interests: (a) This section, in general, authorizes payments upon Federal properties not specifically treated elsewhere in the bill. Properties excluded from the provisions of this section consist of—

(1) Resettlement and certain defense housing properties (upon which tax-equivalent payments are authorized by section 102); properties continued exempt from permanent payments by section 103; and properties acquired through foreclosure, or properties under contracts of lease or conditional sale (these properties being subjected to taxation by title II).

(2) Property acquired or constructed prior to January 1, 1946, will not be eligible for payments under section 101 unless taxes, payments in lieu of taxes, or shared revenues have been paid to the applicant government on account of the property since that date. This cut-off date would permit payments in connection with those World War II properties still held by the Government which were previously the basis of Federal payments, but would provide no payments on many of the wartime acquisitions. The use of a cut-off date reflects a presumption that adjustments for the exempt status of older Federal properties have been made through the process of tax capitalization. To make payments on account of Federal properties acquired before some reasonably recent date would bestow windfalls on many present owners of taxable property who purchased their properties at prices which already reflected the local tax readjustments necessitated by Federal removal of other properties from the tax roll. Other cut-off dates considered during the drafting of the bill were September 8, 1939, the date of declaration of a national emergency prior to World War II, and July 1, 1950, approximately the beginning of the Korean campaign and the present mobilization effort. The payments are not to be retroactive; the date is employed only to identify properties on which future payments will be authorized. The same cut-off date is also applied in determining eligibility for transition payments under section 104. Allowing older Federal properties to be eligible for payments under section 101 if they have been subject to payments of some kind since the cut-off date recognizes that when property is withdrawn from uses for which revenue sharing is authorized, or when other Federal payments on account of the property are stopped, the effect upon the local government is much the same as if the property were removed from private taxable ownership.

(3) Property which has never been in private taxable ownership will not be eligible for payments under section 101 unless, since the cut-off date, there have been revenue-sharing payments or payments in lieu of taxes made upon it. An exception to this general provision is made when the applicant government has come into existence since the date of enactment of the bill. In such cases, the requirement that payments of some sort must formerly have been made is waived.

(b) Since the properties included in this section serve primarily national or broad regional interests, the bill provides for at least part of the tax cost of the real property and tangible personal property used for these activities to be borne by Federal taxpayers. A State or local government would not be eligible for payments, however, if it discriminates against Federal property or the residents on Federal property in the way in which it provides, or fails to provide, the usual governmental services.

The payments proposed for this broad category will be based upon the following considerations:

(1) Taxes collected upon the property for the last 2 years during which it was in private ownership. If the property was tax-delinquent before its acquisition by the Federal Government, the taxes charged against it might be discounted in some measure in estimating the tax loss. In the case of property which has been in Federal ownership for more than 5 years, these facts may be omitted to avoid the difficulty of searching old tax records to ascertain the amount of taxes charged and whether there was delinquency.

(2) Revenue losses to a State or local government which may have resulted from the cessation of revenue-sharing or payments in lieu of taxes on particular Federal properties. Property formerly subject to revenue-sharing, but removed from that status because of a change in the use made of the property or for other reasons, might be eligible for payments under section 101.

(3) Adjustment of the estimated tax loss on acquired property periodically to current tax rates and assessed valuations, but this is not required oftener than once in 5 years. In effect this merely means determining approximately what the current taxes would be on the property exclusive of improvements made by the Federal Government after acquisition of the property. The bill provides for applying the effective tax rate to a valuation estimated by the Federal owning or administering agency, the effective rate is used to adjust for differences between the assessed and fair values of taxable properties generally in any taxing jurisdictions.

(4) In the case of properties used for commercial or industrial purposes, an amount determined by applying the average effective tax rate to the value of improvements made to such property and of tangible personal property added to such property by the Federal Government. The amount determined under this paragraph, however, is limited to 10 times the tax equivalent on the property exclusive of Federal improvements and Federal tangible personal property, as determined for purposes of paragraph (3) of subsection 101 (b). The ceiling on the amount of any payment based on Federal improvements or tangible personal property might be lowered in any particular case by the general proviso at the end of section 101 that no payment shall be a greater amount than will constitute a reasonable contribution by the Federal Government to the support of an adequate level of local government services.

(5) Additional expenditures which may be imposed upon the State or local government for providing services to the Federal Government or the residents on Federal property.

(6) The value of any local-type services provided by the Federal Government as an incident to its activities. This value is to be measured by the cost to the State or local government of rendering like services. This may warrant a credit against the payment otherwise computed.

(7) Any other facts relevant to a fair determination. The factors listed in subsection 101 (b) do not constitute a formula, but are intended to represent the considerations upon which the amount of a payment will be based. In some cases only one of these factors will be relevant to a determination for a specific piece of Federal property. In other cases several of the listed factors will be germane. In some cases there will be facts other than those listed in this subsection which should be taken into account in adapting the provisions of this bill to a particular Federal property ownership situation, in order to carry out the policy of this legislation. However, since this title is intended to operate within the framework of a property-tax system, it is not intended that "other facts relevant" will include indirect benefits to the locality such as larger payrolls, increased consumer expenditures, and larger collections from sales and income taxes which might be attributable to Federal activities

Subsection 101 (b) contains an "antiwindfall" provision to prevent payment of unreasonably large amounts to particular local governments. It is recognized that many large Federal installations are situated in areas which may be sparsely populated, contain little privately owned taxable property, have very limited needs for governmental services, and these needs may actually be reduced by the presence of the Federal installation. Although the factors specified for consideration in arriving at the amount of any individual payment appear to be sufficiently comprehensive to preclude payments excessive in relation to the reasonable needs of the local government, the proviso at the end of subsection 101 (b) makes that intent explicit.

(c) Subsection 101 (c) authorizes the continuance of actual tax payments, rather than administrative payments, for individual properties which any Federal statute has previously made subject to State or local taxation, if the owning agency and the Commission agree that the policy of the act will be better served thereby. In jurisdictions where the limits on borrowing authority, for instance, depend upon the assessed value of all taxable property, removal of such property as that of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation from its taxable status might create difficult local financing problems. In some instances it may be more convenient for the Federal agency, as well as the local governments, to continue existing tax arrangements. Some properties previously subject to taxation might fall into the categories of properties acquired by the Federal Government in connection with loans or contracts of insurance or guaranty, or properties under lease or sale contracts. These categories are made subject to taxation by title II, and subsection 101 (c) would not apply to them.

(d) The provisions of this bill are applicable to TVA nonpower properties on which no payments are now made, but no change is made in the present provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act for payments of a percentage of gross power proceeds to State and local governments where TVA power properties are located. The provisions of the proposed bill would apply, however, to nonpower properties of TVA acquired after the specified cut-off date.

(e) Any payments made under section 101 of the bill to the State or local governments of Arizona or Nevada in connection with properties in the Boulder Canyon project would be deducted from the $300,000 now being paid annually to each of these States under the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1940.

Section 102, housing properties: (a) Included in section 102 are the federally owned

housing properties constructed under (1) the rural resettlement or rehabilitation projects, and (2) the various defense housing acts. These include, in addition to housing properties operated by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, housing properties transferred from that agency to other agencies, and housing constructed under the specified acts by or for other Federal agencies. The provisions of this section would not apply to housing in these categories located within the District of Columbia where payments in lieu of taxes on such housing would continue under authority in the Lanham Act, which to this extent would not be repealed by this bill.

(b) The payments provided by this section approximate the taxes that would be paid upon the real property if it were not exempt from taxation, less a credit for any services performed by the Federal Government that are ordinarily provided by the State or local government. The amount of any deduction is to be based upon the cost to the State or local government for rendering like services.

This section continues essentially the present provisions for the resettlement and the Lanham Act housing properties, and extends these provisions to similar properties now exempt. The bill proposes to make payments only upon application by the State and local governments, whereas the present payments are made without application. The criterion for determining the deduction for services is new.

As indicated on page 5 above, federally owned low-rent housing properties are excluded from the bill, thus leaving present arrangements for these properties unchanged.

Section 103, exemptions: (a) Paragraph (a) provides exemption from payments under title I for Federal properties which, if privately owned and similarly used, would be exempt from taxation under the constitution or laws of the State in which the property is located.

(b) Paragraph (b) exempts any Federal property used primarily for services to the local public, such as courthouses and post offices, on the assumption that the tax cost of such property should in the main be borne by State and local taxpayers rather than by Federal taxpayers. This is not to deny that there is a national interest in the use of these properties, but it is assumed that the local-service aspect predominates.

(c) Paragraph (c) exempts property acquired for the various land conservation programs—land utilization projects, the national forests, national parks and monuments, and fish and wildlife refuges. With respect to such property, however, section 104 provides for declining payments during a transition period of 10 years.

(d) Paragraph (d) designates and exempts from payments a list of miscellaneous properties for which exemption appears warranted on various grounds. Among these properties are prisons, hospitals, certain aids to air and water navigation, and properties used in police and regulatory activities. For the properties exempted by paragraph (d), however, declining payments during a transition period of 10 years are provided in section 104.

Section 104, transition payments: (a) Transition payments are provided for certain properties which will be exempt from continuing payments under this bill. The temporary payments will give State or local governments a definite period of time in which to adjust their finances to the removal of the property from the tax rolls or from uses which have made the property subject to revenue-sharing or payments in lieu of taxes. No transition payments will be made on (1) properties used or held primarily for purposes for which property under private ownership would be exempt from taxation under the constitution or laws of the State of location; (2) properties used or held primarily for services to the local public, or (3) properties which have not been subject to taxes, payments in lieu of taxes, or shared revenue payments since January 1, 1946. Acquisition of property for the various land conservation programs includes exchanges by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior as well as purchases or gifts. Although exchanges may result in little or no net change in the Federal acreage, particular local governments may be adversely affected. Hence, this type of acquisition is included and transition payments might be made on properties acquired through exchange

(b) Declining payments under section 104 will be made in accordance with a schedule based upon the average taxes, payment in lieu of taxes, or shared revenue payment received by the applicant government on account of the property in the 2 years prior to the change in ownership or use which resulted in its eligibility for payments under this section. Starting at the level of the previous average payment, the transition payments decline every second year by one-fifth of that amount and cease 10 years after the change in ownership or use Payments will not be retroactive with respect to the years in which properties were held prior to the effective date of this act. Thus, for eligible properties which have been held for 4 years as of the effective date, transition payments will be made for 6 years.

(c) In the case of properties subject to revenue-sharing arrangements, e g , national forests, payments under this section will be reduced by the amount of revenue-sharing payments made under any other statute. This arrangement is intended to integrate the provisions of this bill with existing revenue-sharing statutes without disturbing the permanent application of those laws

TITLE II—CONSENT TO STATE AND LOCAL TAXATION

This title grants consent to State and local governments to impose property taxes on three general classes of Federal property: (1) Property acquired by the Government to protect its financial interest in connection with loans or contracts of insurance or guaranty; (2) property which is leased or sold by conditional sale to taxable persons and is not otherwise subject to State or local taxation; and (3) property subject to taxation under laws superseded by this bill with respect to which the owning agency decides (with the approval of the Commission) that taxes should continue to be paid

Consent to State and local taxation is not a new policy. Many statutes already authorize property taxes, in the same manner and to the same extent as on privately owned property, upon the federally owned property of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other lending agencies. The provisions of this bill would have the effect of narrowing the range of Federal properties subject to taxation, since the RFC, for instance, would in the future make tax-equivalent administrative payments unless the agency and the Commission agreed to continue payment of taxes on particular properties. The bill would, however, for the classes of properties subject to taxation, include tangible personal property with fixed location, and this would in some instances constitute an extension of the present consent.

Section 201 provides for taxation of properties acquired by the Federal Government through foreclosure of loans or loan guaranties while held pending disposition or until put to permanent use by the Federal Government. This group will include the property acquired by the Federal lending agencies which is now subject to taxation under various statutes governing these agencies. This provision will also apply to other Federal agencies which may acquire property through foreclosure but do not now have authority to pay taxes. This section provides that those foreclosed properties which remain in Federal ownership and are converted to a permanent use shall then be reclassified and become subject to payments, or become exempt, according to their permanent use.

The section provides that foreclosed properties in the possession of the Federal Government shall be subjected to any special tax treatment accorded similar property in private ownership. This is intended to take care of situations such as those which might arise in connection with Rural Electrification Administration properties In some taxing jurisdictions these properties may be exempt from property taxes or subject to special tax treatment in place of ordinary property taxes This section would permit continuation of the same treatment while the property was held by the Federal Government pending disposition.

Language of subsection 201(b) is intended to protect the Federal Government from over-assessment by providing that Federal property may not be assessed at a larger percentage of true value than is used in valuing property generally in the jurisdiction imposing the tax. If it should be necessary to withhold payment of taxes pending negotiation of the assessment, or for other reasons, the Federal Government will not be subject to penalties for late payment, nor may its property be subjected to any lien, foreclosure, or other proceedings. It appears that such an immunity from penalties would extend to the Federal Government even if it were not expressly provided in the bill, but the saving clause is included to avoid possible controversy with local officials Under some circumstances, however, payment of penalties might be to the advantage of the Federal Government Therefore, the subsection makes such payment optional with the owning agency

Section 202 permits taxation of the Federal interest in property under lease or conditional sale The protections against over-assessment and penalties appearing in section 201 are repeated in section 202. This section would not affect leasing arrangements, such as those under the Flood Control Act of 1941, which provide for sharing the lease revenues with State or local governments Neither would it apply to leased housing properties covered by section 102 of this bill.

TITLE III—CONSENT TO SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS

Section 301, properties subject to special assessments Section 301 grants consent to State and local governments to levy special assessments for local improvements on all Federal real property except those properties devoted to uses which are exempt from special assessments under private ownership. Such assessments, properly employed, are essentially land-service charges for particular improvements which enhance the value of the property.

A requirement attached to the consent is that the Federal Government shall be accorded the same rights and privileges in approving, rejecting, or contesting local improvements as are available to owners of private property.

Consent to special assessments is not a new policy for the Federal Government. All real property of the RFC, for example, is now subject to special assessments for local improvements.

A provision similar to those in title II is intended to protect the Federal Government against penalties and proceedings against the property.

TITLE IV—PAYMENTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR SUBSTANTIAL FINANCIAL BURDENS NOT OTHERWISE COMPENSATED

This title authorizes the Commission to establish, when and if it deems desirable, a

supplementary system of payments in certain types of cases. This system would be used when special circumstances surrounding the ownership and use of particular pieces of Federal property result in the imposition upon local governments of burdens for which relief is not provided by other titles of this bill or by other statutes. Primary reliance in carrying out the purposes and policies of the act would be placed upon those titles which use the property tax as the chief basis for determining payments. Whether or not any supplementary system of payments will be required can be determined only on the basis of actual experience under this legislation. Should such a need become evident, the inclusion of title IV would provide the necessary authority and flexibility.

The types of cases which might be dealt with, if necessary, by special payments of the kind authorized in title IV include the following:

(1) Cases in which the employees on a Federal property make their residence in a neighboring community where the resulting increase in population is not accompanied by a proportionate increase in tax revenue;

(2) Cases in which there is intensified use of existing Federal property acquired before the cut-off date of January 1, 1946, provided in title I, since this more intensive use of the property may create new local government problems;

(3) Cases in which special circumstances create some Federal responsibility for helping to finance local government in connection with properties otherwise exempt from payments under section 103;

(4) Cases in which payments made under title I or II are found to be inadequate to discharge the Federal responsibility.

Subsection 401 (b) requires that, as a condition of eligibility for payments, the applicant government must make a reasonable tax effort and avail itself of any other financial assistance to which it might be entitled.

This subsection contains a list of factors to be considered in arriving at equitable payments. To promote uniformity among the owning agencies in the application of these provisions, the Commission in its regulations is to specify or recommend the relative weights to be given to the factors. In addition to considering additional local expenditures necessary to provide services to the Federal Government, to persons living on Federal property, and to persons employed on Federal property, a number of offsetting factors are considered. These include the taxes, payments in lieu of taxes, or shared revenues made available to the applicant local government, directly or indirectly, by the Federal Government, and taxes paid directly or indirectly by persons living or employed on Federal property, or taxes paid in connection with any property, trade, business, occupation, or transaction on the Federal property. Other relevant facts may also be considered.

In title I, where the payments are more closely related to the property-tax system, the offsets which would act to reduce the size of Federal payments are for the most part limited to the value of local-type services provided by the Federal Government. Title II gives consent to the taxation of certain Federal properties in the same manner as if they were in private taxable ownership, and since a private taxpayer would not be entitled to any reduction in his tax because of direct or indirect benefits to the taxing jurisdiction attributable to the use he makes of his property, it is consistent for the Federal Government not to reduce its tax payments by any such offsets. Under title IV, however, where any payments made to particular jurisdictions might be in excess of the taxes for which a private owner of similar property would be liable, it seems appropriate to assess broadly the impact of Federal property ownership and activities upon the local government concerned.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 501. Commission for Payments to State and Local Governments on Federal Real Property: (a) The primary administrative responsibility under this bill is lodged in the agencies holding or using Federal property. However, to promote a uniform interpretation and application of the Government-wide policy, the bill provides for the issuance of rules and regulations by a three-member Commission composed of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Administrator of General Services. The rules and regulations will prescribe policies, standards, and procedures under which the owning agencies will carry out the functions under the bill. The Commission may review, insofar as it deems necessary, the determinations of the property-owning agencies with respect to classification of their properties and the amount of their payments, and advise or consult with them on questions of interpretation of the law and regulations. These arrangements are intended to insure a reasonable amount of uniformity throughout the Government in the application of statutory provisions which are designed to be flexible enough to permit the use of discretion by owning agencies in arriving at equitable payments over a wide range of situations.

(b) As a basis for evaluating the operation and effects of the legislation, provision is made for annual reports by the Commission to the President, and for a more extensive report, with recommendations, to be submitted to the President not later than 5 years after the effective date of the act for transmittal to the Congess.

(c) The Commission is authorized to appoint a director who will employ, supervise, and fix the compensation of necessary personnel. Members of the Commission may make available to the Commission, on a temporary basis, staff of their respective agencies.

(d) Each Federal agency is directed to carry out the rules and regulations promulgated by the Commission and may issue such orders and regulations relative to its own operations as may be desirable.

Section 502, advisory committee: Section 502 provides for the establishment of a committee to advise the Commission with respect to administration of the act. The committee is to consist of not more than 20 members representing the public, Federal agencies, and national associations of State and local government officials. This advisory committee can be of much assistance in the early period during which this legislation is being put into effect, and also on a continuing basis to consider issues as they arise.

Section 503, applications for payments: (a) Payments under title I of this bill will be made to State and local governments only upon application. In this application each government will presumably be required to supply necessary supporting data to aid the Federal agency in making its final determination. Applications may be made by a governmental unit directly or through the office administering its tax on real property.

(b) Payments under title IV, if authorized by the Commission, will be made to local governments and only upon application filed in accordance with the rules and regulations.

(c) Section 503 provides also that unless an application is filed each year for which there might be payments under title I or title IV, there will be no liability for that year at any subsequent time. It is contemplated that simple renewal forms will be made available (and provision is made for such forms in sec. 501). The applications are to be filed for the tax year under the property tax laws of each particular State or local government.

Section 504, determination and method of payment: The chief objective of the arrangements embodied in this section is to place responsibility for making payments in the hands of personnel best acquainted with the individual properties and in a position to take into account local laws and practices and to evaluate the service burdens imposed and the offsetting services rendered by the Federal Government.

(a) The question whether a property is subject to payments under this act or under other statutes is to be determined by its Federal ownership and use as of the first day of the tax year of the State or local government concerned. The determination and any payment under this law is to be made by the Federal agency which has jurisdiction over the property on that date.

(b) Upon application by a State or local government, each agency will decide the amount of the payment, if any, under title I and title IV. Decisions on applications for payments, and any payments based upon such applications are to be made by the eighth month of the tax year to which the payments apply, or by the date fixed by State or local law for payment of taxes if that date is later. The determinations of the owning agencies are final. Payments may be made to the appropriate tax-collection officer in the local jurisdiction or to any other officer designated by State law. Although the payments are intended to be for the use of the applicant government, the Act is not to be construed as limiting the authority of any State with respect to its local governments.

(c) Payments are to be made by each Federal agency from its own appropriations or other available funds. Any overpayment is to be offset against payments otherwise due the same State or local government in subsequent years.

Section 505, applicability: (a) Inauguration of a general system of payments on account of Federl real property will involve considerable work, of course, during the first year or two of operation especially. In order to permit adequate preparations and to spread the administrative load which the Commission and the property-owning agencies will have to carry, applications for payments under title I will not be accepted until 1 year following enactment of the bill. This will provide a period of at least 20 months between the effective date of the act and the date when the first payments need to be made.

(b) New tax payments required by this bill will not begin before the second tax year which begins after enactment of the act.

(c) Any payments in lieu of taxes or any tax payments required under existing legislation will continue to be paid until payments begin under this bill. Thus there should be neither overlapping nor gaps in integrating this general act with any existing legislation providing payments on account of Federal property.

(d) Special assessments for local improvements will be payable beginning immediately after enactment of the bill.

(e) The dates for receiving applications and making payments under title IV will be fixed by the Commission if it decides to exercise its authority under that title.

Section 506, authorization for appropriations: The bill assumes that expenditures under its provisions will be required of the affected agencies, and it provides authorization for appropriations to cover necessary expenditures.

Section 507, exemption from Administrative Procedure Act: Payments under title I and title IV of this bill are to be administratively determined and presumably would

be governed by the Administrative Procedure Act in the absence of a specific exemption. Since these payments are to be made as a matter of grace and provision is made for a coordinating commission, as well as for a representative advisory committee, it is not necessary to subject the decisions of the Federal agencies to judicial review and the other formal procedures of the Administrative Procedure Act. It would be inappropriate to apply these procedural requirements to the consent to taxation and special assessments in titles II and III. Accordingly, all functions performed under this bill are to be exempt from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended, except as to the public information requirements of section 3 of that act. The applicable section specifies the kinds of rules that agencies shall state or publish, requires that appropriate matters of official record shall be made available to properly interested persons, and requires that ruling and orders either be published or otherwise made available to public inspection.

Section 508, repeal and savings provisions: The intent of this legislation is to provide a comprehensive system of payments on Federal property as a substitute for the various existing statutes applying to individual agencies. The preamble of this bill is intended to affirm the immunity to State or local taxation for all Federal property to which this bill applies except for the classes of property with respect to which immunity is waived under title II and title III. Consequently it is necessary to repeal portions of a number of laws which affirm the immunity of the Federal Government from property taxes or which waive such immunity or provide for payments in lieu of taxes. It is also necessary to indicate the statutes under which payments are being made which will not be repealed. Subsection 508 (a) (1) contains the citations to the statutes that would be affected by repeal, and subsection 508 (a) (2) contains the citations to the revenue-sharing and other laws that would not be affected by this bill. Certain revenue-sharing laws which apply only to public domain lands have not been listed, since such lands are excluded by definition from the Federal property to which this bill applies. Subsection 508 (b) repeals a section of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress (20 U. S. C. 237), which provides payments in lieu of taxes to certain school districts on account of Federal property acquisition. The citations to the United States Code of the statutes listed in subsection 508 (a) 1, 2, are included here with an identification of the agencies or types of properties involved.

Acts or parts of acts affected by repeal provisions: Farmers Home Corporation, Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U. S. C. 1024a, b); Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation (12 U. S. C. 1020f (a)); Federal Intermediate Credit Banks (12 U. S. C 1111); production credit corporations (12 U. S. C. 1138c); Home Owners' Loan Corporation payments under National Housing Act (12 U. S. C. 1463 (c)); Federal Housing Administration (12 U. S. C. 1706, 1714); Federal National Mortgage Association (12 U. S C. 1719); Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation (12 U. S. C. 1725e); titles VI, VII, VIII of the National Housing Act (12 U. S. C. 1741, 1747j, 1748f); Reconstruction Finance Corporation (15 U. S C. 607); Commodity Credit Corporation (15 U. S. C. 713a-5); Columbia Basin project (16 U. S C. 835c-1); Veterans' Administration, loan-guaranty program (38 U. S. C. 694j (a) (6)); Resettlement of rural-rehabilitation projects constructed under NIRA and Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 (40 U. S. C. 432-433); surplus property of Government corporations (41 U. S. C. 239a (9)); title I, Housing Act of 1949 (slum clearance and urban redevelopment) (42 U S. C. 1456 (c) (3)); Lanham Act Housing (42 U. S. C. 1546); Atomic Energy Commission (42 U. S. C. 1809 (b)); Inland Waterways Corporation (49 U. S. C. 153f).

Acts or parts of acts not to be repealed: Payments to counties, submarginal land program, Farm Tenant Act (7 U. S. C. 1012); payments to States, national forests fund (16 U. S. C. 500); payments in lieu of taxes, Superior National Forest (16 U. S. C. 577g); payments to counties, Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 U. S. C. 715s); payments to States, licenses under Federal Power Act (16 U. S. C 810); payments to States and counties, TVA (16 U. S. C. 831l); school construction, federally affected areas (20 U. S. C. 251-280); maintenance and operation of schools, federally affected areas (20 U. S. C. 236-244); payments to States, Mineral Leasing Act for acquired lands (30 U. S. C. 355); payments to States, Flood Control Act (33 U. S. C. 701c-3); payments to Arizona and Nevada, Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (43 U. S. C. 618a (c)); payments to Alaska under Alaska game law (48 U. S. C. 199K); payment of taxes by Alien Property Custodian (50 U. S. C. App. 36); payments to school funds, Arizona and New Mexico (36 Stat. 562, 573); payments to Oklahoma, Osage Indian royalties (41 Stat. 1250).

Section 509, separability: This section contains the customary provision to the effect that the invalidity of any provision of the act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance shall not affect the remainder of the act nor the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances.

Section 510, effective date: The act is to become effective on the date of its enactment.

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES UNDER THE PROPOSED BILL FOR PAYMENTS TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ON FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY

The bill contains a cut-off date of January 1, 1946, which would in general preclude administratively determined payments upon properties acquired by the Federal Government before that date. The cutoff date does not apply, however, in the case of those properties which have since that date been subject to Federal payments of some sort. Neither does the cutoff date apply to those titles of the bill which authorize the payment of taxes, the payment of special assessments, or the supplementary system of payments in cases involving burdens not otherwise compensated.

Annual expenditures under the bill in the early years of its operation will be determined largely by the cutoff date selected. Federal property-owning agencies were asked to furnish cost estimates based on each of three possible cutoff dates—January 1, 1946, and also September 8, 1939, and July 1, 1950. For purposes of the estimates, the agencies were asked to assume property holdings as they actually were at the end of the fiscal year 1950, and also to assume that the bill was enacted several years earlier, so that all parts would have been in full operation in that fiscal year. The agency replies are summarized in the following table. The estimates are necessarily rough, since they depend on estimates of property values, local tax rates, and other factors. In addition, they omit some properties upon which payments might be made. No estimates are included for the supplementary system of payments authorized by title IV of the bill. Any estimates for that title would be highly speculative, since the supplementary system would not come into operation automatically upon enactment of the bill, but rather would be inaugurated at the option of the Commission and used only to the extent that experience proved such payments to be necessary. Because of these and other limitations upon the data, the figures should be interpreted as indicating only the general order of magnitude of expenditures under the proposed legislation.

The specific estimates of expenditures in the attached table are based on information furnished by the agencies before insertion in section 101 (b) (4) of the first proviso, which sets a ceiling on amounts to be paid on account of Federal improvements and tangible personal property. Further information from the agencies indicates that with the 1946 cutoff date this proviso might reduce the total amount shown in the table for title I by something over $2,000,000. Although in the time available the agencies were not asked to furnish similar information based on the other cutoff dates, a rough estimate suggests that the ceiling might reduce payments by about $1,000,000 with the 1950 cutoff date and by about $25,000,000 with the 1939 cutoff date. These revisions are reflected in the table.

The amounts estimated by the Department of Defense are shown separately. They indicate a larger total of new expenditures under the proposed bill than for all other agencies combined.

Estimated annual expenditures under the proposed bill for payments to State and local governments on Federal real property if the act had been effective during the fiscal year 1950

[In millions]

Basis of expenditures	Estimated expenditures based on cut-off date in—		
	1939	1946	1950
Title I (administratively determined payments			
Department of Defense	$92.8	$6 3	$3.3
Other agencies	38.4	24.3	18.5
Less adjustment for limit on payments on certain improvements [1]	−25.0	−2.0	−1.0
Total, title I	106 2	28 6	20 8
Title II (taxation):			
Department of Defense	20.0	20.0	20.0
Other agencies	1.4	1.4	1.4
Total, title II	21.4	21.4	21.4
Title III (special assessments):			
Department of Defense	[2]	[2]	[2]
Other agencies	.4	.4	.4
Total, title III	.4	.4	.4
Title IV (supplementary system of payments)	[2]	[2]	[2]
Administrative expense:			
Department of Defense	1.8	.8	.4
Other agencies	1.1	.8	.4
Total, administrative expense	2.9	1.6	.8
Expenditures under proposed bill:			
Department of Defense	114.6	27.1	23.7
Other agencies	41.3	26.9	20.7
Less adjustment for limit on payments on certain improvements (title I) [1]	−25.0	−2.0	−1.0
Total, expenditures under proposed bill	130.9	52.0	43.4
Expenditures under laws superseded by proposed bill:			
Department of Defense	1.0	1.0	1.0
Other agencies	18.7	18.7	18 7
Total, expenditures under superseded laws	19.7	19.7	19 7
Expenditures under proposed bill less expenditures under superseded laws:			
Department of Defense	113.6	26.1	22.7
Other agencies	22 6	8.2	2.0
Less adjustment for limit on payments on certain improvements (title I) [1]	−25.0	−2 0	−1.0
Total, expenditures under proposed bill less expenditures under superseded laws	111.2	32.3	23.7

[1] See preceding text for explanation.
[2] Not available.

COMMISSION TO STUDY RELATIONS BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND OTHER NORTH ATLANTIC NATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], myself and 21 other Senators of both political parties, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the creation of a temporary, nonpartisan commission, patterned after the Hoover Commission, "to study relations between the United States and other North Atlantic nations."

Many of us feel there is urgent necessity for more effective operation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to assure the strongest possible defense and the fullest possible return on the American taxpayer's dollar. The proposal we are introducing today has great constructive potentialities. The commission we are proposing be established could be of immense value to our country. It could, for example, formulate practical suggestions for achieving more effective operation of NATO, thereby reducing the heavy burden on the American taxpayer. It would provide wider participation of Congress and the public in this vital area of our foreign policy. It would improve public understanding of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, its problems and our relations with its other members. It could assure greater harmony within the United States regarding these relationships.

We believe this bill also will give further assurance to our citizens that Congress is alert to the need and is doing all that it can to insure that high taxes for mutual security are producing the best possible results.

I am happy to announce that this bill has broad bipartisan support, including that of seven members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Joining with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and me in cosponsoring the bill are the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], my colleague the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2269) for the creation of the Commission To Study Relations Between the United States and Other North Atlantic Nations, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. Recognizing that the United States has joined with other Nations of the North Atlantic community, within the framework of the United Nations, in an effort to secure peace and prosperity in the world; recognizing the difficulties under which the North Atlantic Treaty Organization now operates and the need for a more effective operation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; recognizing that in order to accomplish the common aims of these Nations in the North Atlantic Community the relationship between these Nations should be developed and enlarged, recognizing the importance of securing the economies and saving to the American taxpayer which can be derived from such a developed and enlarged relationship, from the greater cooperative effort resulting therefrom, and from a more effective operation of the organization; and recognizing that shipments to NATO from the United States must arrive on time and in the stipulated quantities; and recognizing that the public should be better informed and have greater participation in the formation of policies with respect to the North Atlantic community, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that there should be created a commission composed of private citizens and public officials to make a thorough study of the interrelated problems existing between the United States and the other nations of the North Atlantic community, to consider ways and means of achieving a more effective operation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as well as the economies obtainable therefrom, and closer cooperation between the United States and the other North Atlantic community nations within the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and having in mind the obligations and responsibilities of the United States as a member of that organization; and to submit to Congress a report on its findings and recommendations.

CREATION OF THE COMMISSION TO STUDY RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER NORTH ATLANTIC NATIONS

SEC 2. In order to achieve the purpose of section 1 of this act, there is hereby established a nonpartisan commission to be known as the Commission To Study Relations Between the United States and Other North Atlantic Nations (in this act referred to as the Commission).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from among the officers of the executive branch of the Government, and two from private life.

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate, and two from private life.

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(b) Of each class of two members mentioned in subsection (a), not more than one member shall be from any one political party.

(c) Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) The term of each appointed Commissioner shall be for the duration of the Commission as set for in section (8) herein.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION—QUORUM

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) The members of the Commission who are officers in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any (notwithstanding sec. 6 of the act of May 10, 1916, as amended, relating to dual employment (5 U. S. C, sec. 58)), as is necessary to make his aggregate salary $15,000; and they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC 6 (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949. The Commission also may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act entitled "An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government services, and for other purposes," approved August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C., sec. 22a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provision of section 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to make a thorough study of the

interrelated problems existing between the United States and the other nations of the North Atlantic Community, to consider ways and means of achieving a more effective operation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as well as the economies obtainable therefrom, and closer cooperation between the United States and the other North Atlantic Community Nations in accomplishing the purpose of the North Atlantic Treaty without impairing the obligations and responsibilities the United States has undertaken in the Charter of the United Nations, and to submit to Congress a report on its findings and recommendations.

(b) The Commission shall submit to the Congress on or before March 1, 1952, an interim report of its study. A final report of the Commission containing its full findings and its recommendations shall be submitted not later than March 1, 1953.

(c) Ninety days after the submission to the Congress of the final report provided in section 8 (b) the Commission shall cease to exist unless otherwise continued by Congress.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. (a) The Commission, or any member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such member.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission upon request made by the chairman or vice chairman, if possession of such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics by the Commission will not endanger the common defense and security.

(c) The Commission is hereby authorized and empowered to secure and establish sufficient office facilities and procure supplies as are necessary to carry out the work of the Commission. All expenses for carrying out the provisions of the act shall be paid from the appropriation provided in section (7) herein.

PRINTING OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 69, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS, RELATING TO CERTAIN VIEWS ON MILITARY SITUATION IN FAR EAST

Mr. BRIDGES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 222), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate document room, 8,000 copies of the individual views of certain members of the Joint Committee on Armed Services and Foreign Relations of the Senate relating to the military situation in the Far East (S. Doc. No. 69, 82d Cong.).

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 5230. An act providing for the conveyance to the State of North Carolina of the Currituck Beach Lighthouse Reservation, Corolla, N. C.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 5650. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5684. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 331. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Chicago International Trade Fair, to be held in Chicago, Ill., March 22 to April 6, 1952; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix as follows:

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Address delivered by Hon. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, before the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks in St. Louis, Mo., with reference to problems confronting banks and bank supervisors.

Joint statement and letters of Charles A. Boswell and Lewis A. Moore, in connection with National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address on the subject The Strength of Free Men, delivered by Hon. Richard C. Patterson, Jr., United States Minister to Switzerland, at Union College, Barbourville, Ky., on September 24, 1951.

By Mr McMAHON:

Editorial entitled "Threat and Promise," published in the Christian Century of October 3, 1951, referring to a recent speech made by Senator McMAHON on the future military policy of the United States.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

Statement and editorial from the Cedar Rapids Gazette, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, describing the philanthropic activities of the El Kahir Chanters, of the El Kahir Temple, AAONMS.

By Mr. BENTON:

Article entitled "Is the Medal of Honor Being Cheapened?" written by Harold G. Stagg, and published in the American Legion Magazine for October 1951.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Article entitled "Allapattah Lions Kick Field Goal for Uncle Sam," published in the Miami Herald on Sunday, September 23, 1951, describing activities in improving the relationship between the United States and the people of Yugoslavia.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Article entitled "Baptist Brotherhood Is Told of Albania's King by Grant," published in an Augusta (Ga) newspaper, with reference to an address by Hugh G. Grant to the First Baptist Brotherhood, recounting his experiences in Albania.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Broadcast by George Grimm from Station WCCO recounting the burial in Isle, Minn., of Marine Sgt. Paul Moose, an Indian killed in Korea.

Article entitled "Let's Look at Record on Demobilization," published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of September 8, 1951, with reference to the demobilization of American Armed Forces after World War II.

THE ITALIAN TREATY

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I urge that our Government redouble its efforts to bring about a revision of the Italian treaty. Today, Columbus Day, when the world is reminded of the great debt we owe to the land from which came the discoverer of America, we are informed that Russia will insist upon retaining the drastic terms now included in the Italian Treaty. The Kremlin realizes that the people of Italy are essentially anti-Communist.

At San Francisco recently the United States and almost fifty other countries signed the Japanese Treaty. That treaty establishing a peace of reconciliation gives the Japanese people an opportunity to join the world community on a basis of honorable equality.

Following the San Francisco conference the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Great Britain, and France decided to transform completely their relationship with the Federal Republic of Western Germany. They announced that the aim of their three Governments was to include a democratic Germany, on a basis of equality, in a continental European community to form a part of a constantly developing Atlantic community. Thus, in recent weeks decisions of major importance have been made to restore our chief enemies of World War II to positions of equal partnership with the free world.

This policy of reconciliation with Japan and Germany is commendable but it contrasts ironically with the disadvantageous situation in which our friend and ally, Italy, now finds itself as a result of the peace treaty concluded in 1947. Long before Japan and Germany were still stubbornly resisting our assaults in two hemispheres, the Italian people had earned the right of becoming our cobelligerents and had entered the struggle against the German forces.

Our policy toward Italy has differed sharply toward defeated Germany and Japan. Yet strangely enough, it is Italy, our associate during the war and our formal military ally since the conclusion of the North Atlantic Treaty in April 1949, which now suffers from an unfair and unjust peace treaty while Germany and Japan are being afforded much kinder treatment.

It is ridiculous that such a respected member of the western community should suffer from any dishonorable stigma imposed by an outdated peace pact. The time has clearly arrived to revise the Italian Treaty.

The deficiencies in the treaty which ought to be corrected are, generally speaking, of three types. First, and what may well be the most important from the Italian point of view, are the moral. Second are the territorial. And third, the military. The moral defects of the Italian peace treaty are not only painful to Italian national pride, but they are obviously incompatible with Italy's status as an equal partner in the western democratic community and as an ally in the North Atlantic defensive coalition.

Italy has been our military ally in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization since 1949, and is a participant in General Eisenhower's Western European army. Italy is also a benefactor of our military aid program. In a word, the Italians, with our assistance, are striving valiantly to become good North Atlantic soldiers. But I regret to say that the endeavors of the Italian armed forces are seriously handicapped by the treaty imposed upon it.

The treaty severely curbs Italy's defense potential and cripples her efforts to contribute to cooperative security. By its terms the Italian frontiers are practically demilitarized for a distance of 12 miles; scientific experimentation with or construction of atomic weapons or guided missiles is forbidden; and guns with a range of over 18 miles—which is not a great distance as modern warfare goes—are banned.

Italy's armed forces are drastically limited. The navy is restricted to a size permitting little more than patrolling activities. A maximum quota of 25,000 men for all its services is imposed. The Army is set at a size of 185,000 troops, plus 65,000 carabinieri or national police. The Air Force is permitted only a trifling 200 fighter planes, and no bombers. Imagine trying to resist modern aggression with these token forces.

In view of the pressing necessity of strengthening the Western World by every available means, I strongly urge that the United States quicken its efforts to reach agreement with the other treaty signatories on the terms of revision. Thus we can demonstrate to the world the high regard we have for the Italian nation. The American people, concerned as they always are with the principles of right and justice, most certainly desire prompt revision. Congress, therefore, as the representative of the people, can well lend its power and prestige to this righteous cause. It will make all of us proud to give to Italy today the sort of treaty which events, unfortunately, prevented it from receiving in 1947.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I feel that before the conference report is taken up for discussion there should be a quorum call, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Butler, Md.	Fulbright	McFarland
Butler, Nebr.	George	McKellar
Cain	Hayden	Monroney
Carlson	Hendrickson	Murray
Case	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Chavez	Hill	O'Mahoney
Connally	Humphrey	Saltonstall
Cordon	Ives	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Knowland	Stennis
Ecton	Langer	Taft
Ellender	Lehman	Wiley
Ferguson	Lodge	Williams
Flanders	McCarran	Young

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr JENNER], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate

After a little delay Mr. BENTON, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FREAR, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. THYE, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WELKER entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952—CHANGE OF CONFEREE

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has been ill, as all of us know, and still is ill. He has previously been appointed a conferee on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes. He probably will not be here during the remainder of the session.

I am happy to hear that the junior Senator from Nebraska is much better, and I hope he will soon be in his usual excellent health. He is a fine man, and I regret very much that he is not here.

I now ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] be appointed a conferee in the place of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] on the bill H. R. 5215.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair appoints the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] in place of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Chair.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the conference report on the Department of Defense appropriation bill is the unfinished business.

I should like to point out briefly that the bill which is now before the Senate in the form of a conference report represents a reduction below the bill as it passed the Senate by $2,568,441,600. The budget estimates which were considered by the Senate Committee on Appropriations and by the Senate amounted to $57,679,625,700. The bill which the conferees report and which the House has accepted amounts to $56,939,568,030, representing, as I say, a cut of more than $2,500,000,000 below the amount which was approved by the Senate. This, of course, includes certain reductions which were made by the Senate, the 2½ percent general reduction and the reduction of $70,000,000 for research and development. In other words, I feel that the conferees have scrutinized this bill with the greatest of care, and the measure now presented by the conferees represents a sum which in the judgment of conferees on the part of the House and on the part of the Senate, and apparently of both Houses, the minimum sum which ought to be appropriated at this time.

I shall be very happy to answer any questions that may be asked by any Members of the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming regarding the so-called Van Zandt amendment. I understand it has been changed in the conference. The Senate did not adopt it, but the House had adopted it, and a compromise was reached affecting the discharge of Inactive Reserve and enlisted men.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator will remember that this amendment, which

was inserted on the floor of the House, applied only to the inactive reservists who were involuntarily called, and it provided for their discharge at any and all events after 12 months, if they had had 12 months' service in World War II. The testimony which was presented to the committee by the Department of Defense, and particularly by the Army, was unanimous in emphasizing that this rigidity would have had serious effects in impairing the strength and effectiveness of the armed services. The Department of Defense was most earnest in requesting that the amendment be omitted. But, as I stated on the floor of the Senate when the matter was under consideration, the Committee on Appropriations felt that the Department should make some concessions, that it was important to release as many men as possible, particularly those who had served in World War II. It was our feeling, as I think was well expressed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] during one of the colloquies here with respect to this question, that the present military operation should be carried on by soldiers of this generation rather than by soldiers of the last generation. It was, however, represented to the conferees, and it was their unanimous judgment in the end, that to impose an inflexible rule upon the Department with respect to officers would have been too dangerous.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I understand, the officers were included in the original Van Zandt amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The officers were included in the original Van Zandt amendment. So we finally compromised upon a 16-month service for enlisted personnel. They will be discharged at the end of 16 months' service, and the regular 17-month rule will apply to officers. That is the effect of the compromise provision.

Mr. MONRONEY. There is no guaranty in the bill, however, as to the 17-month period; it is merely the policy of the Department of Defense as publicly announced, is it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendment as it was agreed to in the conference reads as follows:

(b) No part of any appropriation contained in this act for "Pay and allowances" of military personnel shall be expended for the pay or allowances, accruing after November 30, 1951, of any enlisted member of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve who served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending September 2, 1945, if such member shall have served on active duty for a period of 16 months or more after June 26, 1950, unless such member shall have voluntarily consented to remain on active duty.

So that this is a directive with respect to enlisted men, not a directive with respect to officers; but the policy which has been followed, and which is being followed, without variation, as I understand, has been to release officers after 17 months, if they wish to be released.

Mr. MONRONEY. The provision would not apply to the National Guard units now on duty, nor to the active reservists who have been recalled, would it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Van Zandt amendment as introduced on the floor of the House did not apply to those categories.

Mr. MONRONEY. It did not apply to them, so it was not a matter in conference. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It never was in conference.

Mr. MONRONEY. And it could not possibly have been reached in the appropriation bill as it came to the conferees. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. I may say that all the conferees have entertained the hope that the Armed Services Committees of both Houses would continue their study of the matter, and that if further legislation should be necessary it would be enacted. The House Committee on Armed Services has already been making such a study.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. CAIN. If my friend from Wyoming will permit me, I should like to say that the Armed Services Committee has very recently been informed by the military services that none of them has any intention, beyond January 1, of recalling any inactive enlisted reservists. I thought that statement would provide a considerable amount of satisfaction.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad that the Senator from Washington has reminded me that that is the situation.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman in regard to the proviso which is proposed in the amendment to take the place of the amendment of the Senate numbered 8. Reading from page 3 of the report, the proviso is:

Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for expenditures in connection with recruitment advertising, including sponsorship of radio and television shows by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force.

Do I correctly understand that this prevents the use of these funds for paid-space advertising in magazines and newspapers?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It does; yes.

Mr. CASE. It, however, would not interfere with informational activities within the amount of $10,950,000 included in the same paragraph, provided such informational activities by military personnel results in getting some free space in the newspapers, would it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; it would not.

Mr. CASE. It would let them send out news releases and anything that they could get the papers to print for nothing, is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. I have one other question. The Senator from Wyoming will recall that during the consideration of the bill I had suggested a penny-pinching amendment to save 1 percent on the total amounts involved in the bill, that the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] had offered an amendment to save 5 percent, and that as the result of various conferences with the Senator and others, the amendment was modified to make a 2½ percent over-all reduction; and now I understand that the bill as reported makes a reduction of an even larger amount than 2½ percent. My question runs to the application of that reduction.

Is that a reduction in the $5,000,000,000 fund which was indicated to be for expansion of the Air Force, as suggested by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], or is it a reduction applicable to all items, and generally throughout the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; it is a reduction of several items throughout the bill, including the air-power amendment, which constitutes the bulk of the reduction.

Mr. CASE. A large part of that applies to the so-called $5,000,000,000 figure?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Most of it. The 2½-percent reduction which was accepted by the Appropriations Committee would have amounted to a little over a billion and a half dollars in terms of the bill as it passed the Senate, the appropriations contained in which were, of course, greater than those in the bill as passed by the House. The House conferees felt that since 49 percent of the total appropriation was devoted to major procurement items, the reduction in that form should not be agreed to. The House conferees were opposed to it from the very beginning. But the Senate conferees were very glad to agree to certain reductions in other items, particularly to the reduction in the amendment with reference to air power.

To be perfectly frank with the Senate, I think I should point out that the result of the discussions in the committee and on the floor with respect to the development of air power has been that the Department of Defense has now undertaken to prepare a budget for presentation at the next session of Congress with respect to air power, both for the Navy and the Air Force. In this bill there is $1,000,000,000, one-third of which is for the Navy and two-thirds of which is for the Air Force.

I may say that it is the intention of the committee to continue its scrutiny of other items in the bill. There will be a continuous survey of expenditures in order that we may be certain that every possible reduction may be made, not in an inflexible way, but in a selective way.

Mr. CASE. I realize that the problem of conferees on a big money bill is always difficult and it generally requires compromise. I am not disposed to quarrel with the way the conference has worked it out. I think the conferees have doubtless done the best they could under all the circumstances.

I do want to express appreciation of the fact that a study is to be undertaken for adjusting our program to an

expansion of the Air Force. I think that is consistent with the conviction of Members of Congress generally and it is what I personally would hope would come to pass.

I also wish to express appreciation of what the Senator from Wyoming has just said with reference to specific reductions. We always have a problem in military appropriations because of the large amounts of money that it is necessary for the military to spend. A soldier is trained to accomplish a mission; he is not trained to save money, nor is he trained as a financier. When we are dealing with the problem of Government financing which we have at this time, it does become important that somewhere along the line we should try to save what money we can by making no unnecessary or improvident expenditures in military activities as well as in any other field. In the administration of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, it is difficult to write into law the formulae which will say to an officer that he must try to avoid an unnecessary trip in connection with the normal operation of a military installation, or to try to avoid waste by preventing the destruction of Government property, or in connection with heating, or repairs and other ordinary maintenance.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. All of us who have had any connection either with service in the Army, Navy, or Air Force, or who have participated as members of the Appropriations Committee, as the Senator from South Dakota has done for many years on the House side, know that there are inevitable wastes in the military service. It is always a matter of hurry and wait. Men are gathered together in a great hurry, then sent to a post, and then they wait for orders. The appropriations subcommittee on the Armed Services, and the Armed Services Committee, both are very much concerned about this matter. I hope the Department of Defense will continue to do what it has been doing, namely, to seek constantly for ways and means of eliminating wasteful procedures.

I am particularly concerned about the elimination of wasteful representations with respect to the need for items and the need for men. It is common in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force for officers to ask for more than they need because they expect an inevitable reduction.

I assure the Senator that our committee will do its best to bring all these expenditures down to rock bottom. It will be our intention to maintain a continuous survey of the preparation of the new budget. We have already undertaken a survey of outstanding contract authority and the liquidation of it, for example. We have asked for full reports, in order that we may cut down the expenditure of funds previously authorized if the objective is no longer necessary, particularly as a result of the development of new weapons.

Mr CASE. That is certainly commendable. I had hoped that there might be some remnant of our amendment for an over-all saving to impress upon all branches of the service the desirability of occasionally returning some money to the Treasury in the form of an unexpended balance. While it is not always possible to pinpoint where a reduction is to be made, if we can inculcate in those who spend the funds the desirability of saving where they can, it would be a very good thing.

I appreciate what the Senator has stated as to plans already made for a continuous survey, and also for a study of unexpended balances.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota brought a question into my mind and also a thought which I should like to express.

We are constantly faced with the fact that Members of the Senate serving on several committees must attend this committee meeting and that committee meeting, and, therefore, we cannot devote as much time to a specific question as we would like to do or as we should do in order to keep abreast of the situation and keep ourselves acquainted with what is transpiring in connection with certain functions of the military for which we might have been responsible to a certain extent when we approved the budget.

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming who is presenting the conference report from early spring until the appropriation bill was approved by the full committee has spent endless days in hearing witnesses and studying the appropriation. Some of the funds appropriated will be earmarked to be expended within the next 18 months. Some of them will be for the construction of military installations. Another item will be for airplanes These funds are oftentimes earmarked and obligated over a period of a great number of months.

It was that which led me to the strong conviction that there should be established a committee, with a competent and able staff, which could proceed to follow these funds from the day the Congress made them available until the completed machine, whether it were an airplane or some other type of equipment, was put into the field ready for use. Only in that way I believe will we know whether the enthusiasm of the Army to get their work accomplished has been such that it has foolishly expended funds, or whether we have had an administration of the funds in such a prudent manner that we have actually gotten a dollar's worth for every taxpayer's dollar made available and appropriated.

I know that the Committee on Appropriations, of which the Senator from Wyoming is one member, and a senior member, have agreed upon the establishment of a staff of auditors and examiners, who can follow the expenditures of the funds from the day the first dollar is made available to the military, or some other division of the Government now engaged in the development of the great defense of the United States, in order that when the Congress returns and reexamines the question of appropriations in connection with another appropriation bill, the staff and the committee which have been charged with this particular investigational work can lay before the Senate a most detailed statement of how the funds have been expended. As a result of such procedure we will have a greater knowledge of whether we are getting economy in the various branches of the Government, or whether there is a waste of the taxpayers' dollars.

The Senator from South Dakota, when he raised his question, brought to my mind again the long, detailed study which had to be made when the Joint Chiefs of Staff and representatives of the Defense Department and all the procuring agencies of the various branches of the Government, sat before the committee day after day, week after week, and into the months, in order that we might develop what is in the appropriation program.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Minnesota put his finger on the crux of the problem when he used the word "prudent." In connection with the military, it is difficult to direct the word "prudent" to an operation in a hot battle or campaign; but in a semimobilization such as we now have, domestic operations, at least, are more in the nature of housekeeping than of conducting a campaign. Certainly the word "prudent" would be a good one to inculcate in the minds of those who expend the funds of the Defense Department.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield

Mr. O'MAHONEY. First, Mr. President, I desire to compliment the Senator from Minnesota for the thought which he has developed. He has been most helpful, not only throughout the hearings on the bill and the action of the subcommittee on the bill itself, but in urging a continuous survey of expenditures. The committee has been authorized to expand the staff, and I am sure the work will be carried on.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield on that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like also to call to the attention of the Senator from Wyoming a fact with which I know he is familiar, that there is a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services which is constantly looking into waste and extravagance, and endeavoring to assist in order to see that contracts are carried out efficiently. I have in mind especially the subject of tin, as well as copper, as to which the work of the committee resulted in large savings.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe I referred to that earlier in the day.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. With regard to the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Service, I should like to state

that I feel that that fills an entirely different sphere of inquiry from that of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, the Committee on Armed Services has a different function from that of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is the responsibility of the Committee on Appropriations to make sure that the money Congress makes available to the Department of Defense is as wisely expended as it possibly can be.

Mr. FERGUSON. And also to determine whether or not the Department of Defense needs a certain amount of money.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What the Senator from Michigan says recalls the inquiry of the Senator from South Dakota regarding the amendment which was written in conference with respect to expenditures for advertising. The Senator from Michigan and I had called to our attention, after the committee hearings, the proposed expenditure of some funds allegedly for recruiting, which we felt had not been sufficiently justified during the hearings.

Mr. President, I wish to make the RECORD clear on that point. There was widespread misunderstanding throughout the country because it was thought that our criticism was directed at radio and television alone. It was not directed to those media alone. It was directed to some of the pamphlets and booklets printed on expensive glazed paper, which the Department of Defense itself was circulating. It had reference also to advertisements in the slick-paper magazines and others.

When I say that, I desire to make it clear that the budget justifications which were submitted to us by the Navy, for example, showed that 1,650 radio stations throughout the United States were patriotically cooperating and furnishing time to carry information with respect to defense activities without any charge at all. No payment was made by the Navy, except the minimum union-scale wages for the personnel in the radio stations.

I feel that the radio, the television, the newspapers, and the magazines are to be complimented for what they have done. But the evidence before the committee showed that volunteers were not being brought into the service by this advertising. The Selective Service System produces the manpower for all three services and, having produced the manpower, it was discovered that in many instances the Navy and the Air Force gathered up men and, just prior to induction, listed them as volunteers. It was not a matter of real volunteering at all.

Therefore it will be the purpose of the committee, as I have already discussed it with the Senator from Michigan, to call a hearing, in which we shall go at length into this whole matter. We refrained from cutting off some $900,000 of 1951 funds as yet unexpended, because we did not want to do injustice to any good, sensible contracts which have hitherto been made.

It was pointed out upon the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], during the debate upon the pending bill, that he had heard a program called The Shadow, which was sponsored by one of the services allegedly for the purpose of securing recruits. It was the feeling of the committee that such a program was a useless effort. We felt that every expenditure should be scrutinized in the greatest detail.

Mr. FERGUSON. I inquire whether or not a larger staff is now in the making, which would justify the hopes of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Michigan, and other Senators who sponsored that amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So far as I know, it has not yet been acted upon, but it will certainly not be overlooked.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that if such a staff were organized we could make a survey of the advertising item?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is quite true.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no doubt that the advertising media—and that includes the agencies—have given of their time freely in many cases.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate the further explanation of the distinguished Senator on the advertising question. As I understood, the action of the Senate was to eliminate the so-called "big-name" programs in radio and television. However, the action was not directed at the ordinary advertising which has been done throughout history by the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. During World War II we staffed the Navy and the Marine Corps entirely through voluntary enlistments, which were largely the result of advertising. I do not mean the big, flossy, slick-paper advertisements, but advertising in small country weeklies and small-town newspapers, which brought in the men and provided the soldiers and sailors of World War II.

It is oversimplification to say that we do not need any advertising, when we are spending nearly $60,000,000,000 a year for other defense purposes, and ignoring the selection of volunteer manpower. There is a great deal of volunteer manpower which comes in long before the draft boards get ready to pick it up. I sincerely hope that in the study which the committee is to make, the possibility of getting more and more men by voluntary means, and through good, economical advertising, will be investigated most carefully. A volunteer soldier is a good soldier. A man who is willing to volunteer to fight in Korea today will make a good soldier. If we ignore the possibilities of advertising, I think we indulge in oversimplification to the extreme.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I assure the Senator that every aspect of the question will be examined.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I did not understand the intention of the conferees. What is to exclude all advertising for the purpose of securing recruits?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. I may say that the bill contains for this purpose the sum of $3,100,000, of which $1,000,000 was to be expended in Army areas and $2,100,000 in other areas. That was a reduction below the appropriation for the fiscal year 1951, when the appropriation for Army areas was some $1,000,000, and for other areas $5,067,000.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Were those appropriations for recruitment purposes?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. They are for recruiting expenses. The feeling of the committee, based upon the evidence before the Appropriations Committee on the supplemental bill—evidence from the Selective Service Administration—was that volunteering is not now appearing upon the scene. The fact of the matter is that even the Marine Corps is no longer receiving volunteers. We must not confuse the present situation with the conditions which existed during World War II. In World War II we had been attacked. Now we are engaged in a Korean operation; and frankness compels us all to admit that our manpower is not particularly interested in volunteering to go to Korea.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, this illustrates one of the great dilemmas in which the free world finds itself. People nowhere want war, and the more intelligent they are the less they want war. Our problem is to find a way to prevent a third world war, and to prevent aggression, with the least use of American manpower.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, I had understood that in certain cases, notably the cases of those who are not subject to the draft, as, for example, in the building up of the women's groups and groups of specialists, the advertising recruitment program filled a very vital need, and that it had been successful in those cases.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No showing was made before the committee in that connection. It is our intention, as I have already stated, to make a survey of the entire situation. If the Department of Defense can make a case for that sort of expenditure, then I am sure the committee will not object to the inclusion of an appropriate sum in the next supplemental or deficiency bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it the intention that the funds which are still available in this fiscal year may be used on worthwhile programs? In other words, is there to be any curtailment of the funds now available?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The curtailment applies to the funds in this bill, and only such funds.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it expected that the funds available for the current operating budget will be expended?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is the current operating budget.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I mean funds which are already available for these purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator means to ask what the effect will be upon the unexpended balances of the 1951 appropriation, I will say that it was certainly my understanding, and I think the understanding of the other conferees, that the proposed survey should be made, so that we may be sure that such funds are wisely expended. No Member of the House or Senate wants money expended merely for the glamour of laying it out.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to ask one further question. With respect to the funds which are available and unexpended at the present time, is there any restriction in this bill on their expenditure?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no restriction in this bill on their expenditure, but I certainly expect the Department of Defense carefully to comb all proposals for the expenditure of such funds so as to make sure that they are not wastefully expended.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent next week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say that that does not mean absence today. If the Senator from Massachusetts will halt in his exit from the Chamber, I wish to reserve the right to object. His absence is being approved only for next week, and not for today. I want his presence here on the floor to sustain this bill. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the Senator from Massachusetts were very active in the preliminary discussions with regard to developing air power.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say to the Senator from Wyoming that I expect to be here today. I appreciate his friendly interest in my presence. I am glad that the bill contains amounts which ought to give us the type of air power which we need. I hope that the Appropriations Committee will continue building up its staff to the point where it can exercise supervision and observation for 365 days in the year of the way in which these moneys are being spent. This is the largest single expenditure of the Federal Government. If we are to obtain economy, we must obtain it in connection with our defense appropriations.

I think we ought to develop in the Appropriations Committee a procedure similar to the one which has been developed so effectively in the Finance Committee, where we have our own congressional experts who challenge the witnesses from the executive branch on every single contention they make. I think that procedure before the Finance Committee is perhaps the most intelligent procedure we have in Congress, and I should like to see that procedure adapted to the Appropriations Committee. I believe that we could save not only millions, but probably billions of dollars if that procedure were adopted. So I am very glad to have this opportunity to commend the Senator from Wyoming for reporting a bill which I think will do big things for American military strength.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. HENDRICKSON addressed the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I desire to speak in support of the proposed program for a more careful checking of military appropriations, and I commend the distinguished chairman of the committee, who has so ably presented the conference report, for his activities in that regard.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Florida is very kind. I wish the RECORD to show that the bill was under constant supervision by the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations from the 7th day of June until the 28th day of August, and to the extent of our ability we went over practically every item in the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Gladly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to get to that precise point, because I am afraid that, with his characteristic modesty, the Senator from Wyoming may not have stated with sufficient vigor in the RECORD the fact that a very large saving—larger than perhaps is understood by the general public—has been made on the budgeted requests.

In order that the saving and the size of it may clearly appear in the RECORD I wish to state my understanding of the situation and ask the Senator from Wyoming if that understanding is correct.

First, it is correct, is it not, that the conference report shows a saving of approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars on the budgeted amount?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The appropriations proposed by the conference report in individual items are under those in the original bill as reported to the Senate by some $4,164,000,000. They are under the bill as it passed the Senate, including the reductions which were voted, by $2,568,441,600. The budget estimate was $57,679,625,700. The bill as reported by the conference committee contains $56,939,568,030. That includes $1,000,000,000 of nonbudgeted funds, which were put in the bill expressly for the purpose of providing an expansion of American air power.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. What I wanted to have appear clearly in the RECORD was, first, that the actual reduction below the budgeted amount now to be appropriated under the conference report is substantially three-quarters of a billion dollars.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Florida is quite right.

Mr. HOLLAND. But the amount actually saved from the budgeted items is a billion dollars more. Therefore, the total reduction of appropriations for the budgeted items is $1,750,000,000, due to the fact that the Senator from Wyoming and his able committee, with the approval of the two Houses, have insisted upon an unbudgeted appropriation of $1,000,000,000 for stepping up the effort to increase as quickly as possible the strength of the Air Force and of the air arm of the Navy. Therefore, the fact is, if the understanding of the Senator from Florida is correct, that, because of the joint labors of the two committees, which are entitled to the greatest credit, and the joint decisions of the two Houses, the actual reduction in the appropriations recommended by the budget amount to $1,750,000,000, as shown in the conference report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Florida is correct. I am grateful to him for having emphasized the point.

However, I believe that the committee should not claim exclusive credit for economy in this matter. The Secretary of Defense, Robert Lovett, who, as Under Secretary of the Department of Defense during the incumbency of General Marshall, had charge of the budgeted items, was most careful in the examination of all budget requests. He and his staff in the Department of Defense did an extraordinary job. The Senator will remember that I pointed out on the floor, when I reported the bill from the committee, that the various divisions of the three armed services, when called upon last December to estimate their needs, submitted to the Secretary of Defense requests which totaled $104,000,000,000.

The Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, after a thorough survey, cut the total down to $60,650,000,000, of which a substantial portion, approximately $4,000,000,000, was to be provided for military public works, which were only recently presented. Therefore Secretary Lovett and the Bureau of the Budget are also entitled to credit for attempting to hold the expenditures to a minimum.

Mr. HOLLAND. In expressing my own appreciation, which is very great indeed, to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, I want to make it very clear that I thoroughly support him and the decision of both Houses to the effect that we must make greater speed in building up our air power. The inclusion of the added $1,000,000,000 for that purpose is proof sufficient of the earnestness of Congress that the air power of the Nation shall be built up as rapidly as possible.

However, the Senator from Florida is particularly desirous, in these days when the public is watching with such real anxiety the question of economy in public spending that there be a record made of the fact that the real saving accomplished by the two committees and the two Houses, by this final action on the items covered by the budget, of which the Senator from Wyoming began a study many months ago, is $1,750,000,000. The information should be heartening to the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very kind.

Mr. President, if there are no other questions, I hope we shall be able to vote on the adoption of the conference report. Does the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] desire to ask a question?

Mr. CAIN. I wish to obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I did not want to interrupt the Senator from Washington, but I should like to ask a few questions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my desire is to secure action upon the conference report. There is first the motion to approve the conference report. Then I shall have to make a technical motion to approve amendment No. 50, which was in technical disagreement.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate more than a minute or two. I do not want to interrupt the Senator from Washington. Perhaps the Senator from Wyoming covered the point in his remarks when I was called out of the Chamber on one or two occasions. It has been stressed to me that it is necessary to get volunteers for the technical services, because many of the persons involved are not subject to the draft. Has the Senator from Wyoming referred to that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I pointed out that there is on hand $900,000 as an unexpended balance of the appropriation of 1951, and that the committee felt that the amount is ample for all necessary expenditures.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is not restricted?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is unrestricted. We were careful not to restrict it in this bill. The committee did see innumerable examples of pamphlet publicity, published on highly glazed paper, the value of which was rather questioned by the committee.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND SPEECH BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wish to say to my friend the very distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who has an important conference report in hand and wishes to have it adopted, that my reason for speaking at this time is that our Presiding Officer, the Vice President of the United States, is known to be a very busy man and not always available in this Chamber. Because of his willingness to accommodate my wish to make reference to him, I am anxious to express my appreciation for that indulgence. I think I shall not take more than 20 minutes to present this matter.

Mr. President, the Defense Department announced on Wednesday that American battle casualties in Korea had reached the total of 89,382. This figure represented an increase of 1,732 battle casualties over the total of one short week ago. Of the present total, 15,063 Americans are reported as having been killed or dead as a result of wounds.

I should say parenthetically, Mr. Vice President, that there is to be a relationship between this reference to American casualties and to yourself, although that will not become clear for several minutes yet.

The Defense Department's weekly summary listed 12,365 Americans as being missing in action. Of this number, 151 are presumed by the Defense Establishment to be dead. I merely wish to point out in passing that any such assumption is, to my mind, totally misleading, unrealistic, and a pure guess. If anyone bothers to read the testimony offered by the military services during the hearings held last spring by the two committees, sitting jointly, it is clear that the Allies have no accurate information of any kind to cover the military personnel who are presently missing in action in Korea. A reasonable, although sad, presumption by competent military authorities is that a large number of the total of those who have been reported as being missing in action are dead.

It is common knowledge that our enemy has thus far refused to discuss the question of prisoners in the cease-fire talks which have been held periodically in Korea during recent months. The question of prisoners is obviously on the allied agenda, but the Communists have a habit of restricting discussions to a single item until it has been disposed of. The only question discussed in Korea thus far that I know anything about has been that which covers the line of demarcation to be observed if a cease-fire order is agreed to.

In my opinion, Mr. President, the Defense Department should draw no conclusions about the status of the thousands of individuals who are missing in action until the facts are available in each individual case.

It is worthy of mention that the Defense Department's casualty announcement was generally reported by the press on its middle pages. I think it ought to be required that every casualty announcement be carried in a box on the front page of every newspaper in the United States. If there is any other question or development about which every American ought to be more conscious, I do not know what it could possibly be. At the rate of our present casualty progress, our American battle casualties alone will soon reach and pass 100,000 in an undeclared war.

It would be of great benefit if a weekly summary of all casualties, allied, enemy, and civilian, were published constantly on the front pages of the American press and referred to repeatedly by every radio and television station and network. If we measure our activity by the amount of blood which is drenching Korea, we certainly shall do a more effective job in searching for ways in which to successfully conclude the war in Korea. Our allies have contributed approximately 10 percent to the total fighting strength in Korea. This ought to mean that those allies have suffered about 9,000 battle casualties. We are told that hundreds of thousands of the enemy have been killed or wounded. It was reported months ago that 10 percent of the Korean civilian population had suffered casualties in one way or another. This 10 percent represents approximately three million casualties. The total of all casualties would constitute gory reading on the front pages of the American press, but out of that reading might come an expressed determination by our Nation that unless a cease-fire agreement is promptly reached in Korea, the allied forces are to be provided with the men, ammunition, and the weapons required to secure a military victory in Korea.

Mr. President, although we too seldom find any reference to American battle casualties on the front pages of our papers, we can find, as you will agree, almost anything else there.

On Tuesday of this week in California, the distinguished President of the Senate, the Vice President of the United States, delivered an address before 1,800 guests at the $200,000—$100-a-plate Western States fund-raising dinner at the Hollywood Palladium. The Los Angeles Examiner did the courteous and agreeable thing by placing on its front page a good healthy-looking picture of the Vice President and a story about his speech, by Carl Greenberg. I enjoyed the picture, but I thought the story did not do justice to the Vice President. I want to think that the Vice President gave his $100-a-plate friends more to think about than was reported by the press.

In looking this morning at the Vice President—and I ought to say that certainly he has always been uniformly courteous and considerate of me in the 5 years since I have been in this Chamber—I am reminded of something which one of his predecessors, Aaron Burr, said a good many years ago. Obviously I make no suggestion of any kind that that Vice President of a bygone day and our Vice President of today ought to be joined as a team; but I think something that Mr. Burr said decades ago is worthy of repetition. It was this:

> If the Constitution be destined ever to perish by the sacrilegious hands of the demagog or the usurper, which God avert, its expiring agonies will be witnessed on this floor.

Mr. President, I think it a great pity, sir, that you, as the Vice President, are no longer permitted to speak on the floor of the Senate. My own memory book, which is rich and full, includes many a ringing speech by you, who now are the President of the Senate, when you were the senior Senator from Kentucky. As the Senator from Kentucky, the present Vice President was always willing to do battle on any public question. It was his custom to state his case and welcome any attacks from any source on it. Although I often disagreed with his position when he was the majority leader, I never questioned his courage or resourcefulness. He stood forward, to my mind, as an often gallant and always sturdy and fair opponent. I wish it were now possible for him to climb down from his pedestal, to join us in this American battle pit. I can but wish that he would offer us from this floor

every word of what he said on Tuesday in Hollywood.

In Hollywood, he challenged my party, so we learn from the story appearing in the press, to come up with an acceptable substitute for the foreign policy enunciated by Truman, Barkley, and Acheson. He said out there that the Republicans have all kinds of foreign policies, but that none of them look alike. He went on to relate that the only thing they shared in common was isolationism.

How, let me ask my friends on both sides of the aisle, can a Member of this body respond to such an allegation, unfounded as I believe it to be, except in the presence of the person who made it?

Mr. Vice President, it would be good, sir, to have you come on down to the floor and make that statement. Out in Hollywood your friends paid $100 a plate to listen to you make a speech. They had no opportunity, and probably had no inclination, to question your attack on my party, of which I am as proud as any group of the opposition could ever be proud of their party. If it can be arranged for you, sir, to stand again among us, the country would benefit, I think, from a real debate on foreign policy, because both sides would be under questioning and attack in regard to our Nation's foreign policy.

In California, sir, it was not necessary for you to say very much. You were able to mesmerize, or at least that is said by way of compliment, sir, and get cheers from a group of those who, I think, were gullible Americans, by saying of Harry S. Truman and yourself:

> We will stand on our record next year. We won't go snooping through back alleys in garbage cans for our campaign material.

Mr. Vice President, I do not know that that was your language, but that is the language which was reported as a quotation in the Los Angeles Examiner, and it was, sir, the first reason for my feeling that someone who had any self-respect for himself as a Member of the Senate and as a member of the Republican Party had to offer his own opinion regarding that quoted phrase. The third quotation, which I noticed with considerable interest, was this:

> We ask the people for another lease of power, to preserve democracy.

Mr. Vice President, I get right down to brass tacks, sir. The administration's political management of the war in Korea, insofar as the Senator from Washington is concerned, is certainly to be an issue, and a proper issue, in next year's campaign. Did you mean in Hollywood, sir, to say that the issue of the Korean war, in which, as I have related, there have already been 89,000 casualties, with 12,000-plus missing in action, who may be dead, or in some worse state—did you, sir, as reported by the press from Los Angeles, mean to say that this issue came from some garbage can and out of some dark alley? I do not believe a single American who has any respect or concern for the future will agree with any such contention. You complimented me personally in California, Mr. Vice President, by referring to the Cain policy as being one among many Republican policies. I want you to come on down here, Mr. Vice President, and tell me what relationship the Cain policy has to isolationism. I simply want a chance to prove how absolutely wrong you have become. All I want to say, Mr. Vice President, is that I wish you could come to this floor and tell the Senate—which means the country, too—what you did mean by saying that your party is not going to look for campaign issues next year in some garbage can in a back alley.

Mr. Vice President, I can compliment you, sir, in many ways. I do it sincerely. I consider you to be of great experience, and possessing a considerable amount of wisdom in some ways. I am, sir, your junior by perhaps three decades. It would be a very difficult but admittedly a delightful task for the junior Senator from Washington to attempt to tangle with the Vice President on the floor of the Senate about the question of what constitutes an issue—and in what garbage can; but I should like to have that chance, and to argue with the Vice President of the United States about our Nation's foreign policy.

The Vice President, gentlemen, has a far greater authority and prestige than that possessed by the junior Senator from Washington. Under the cloak of his title—and I mean him no disrespect, but I want the American people to know that there are two sides to any story, and that they should not listen to a man merely because he has a title, but should ask him a few questions—under the cloak of a great title, that of the Vice President of the United States, the individual possessed of that title can be impressive in Hollywood, even though he talks about garbage cans instead of talking about blood as it drenches the soil of Korea.

I want to ask the Vice President about the maintenance of the enemy's sanctuary in Manchuria, which was not referred to, so far as I know, before 1,800 Americans at a $100-a-plate dinner in Hollywood last Tuesday. I want to ask about the maintenance of an enemy sanctuary in Manchuria, from which we run the totally unnecessary risk of being assaulted by great numbers of enemy aircraft, to the end that 89,000 casualties will have grown as a Christmas present to far more than 100,000.

The Truman-Barkley-Acheson policy is responsible in very large part for this build-up, and no person can be more aware of this than the Vice President of the United States. I want to determine if I can what the Vice President thinks about the maintenance of an enemy sanctuary, through most of the war in northeastern Korea.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. CAIN. If I am permitted to do so, without losing the floor, I should be most glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would the Senator amplify the statement which he has just made, that the Truman-Barkley-Acheson policy is responsible for the enemy build-up in Manchuria?

Mr. CAIN. Yes. Will my friend, the junior Senator from Oklahoma, whom I respect and like, merely wait a few minutes until this statement has been offered to the Vice President? For at that time I would deeply relish an opportunity to answer his question, because I think there is an extremely good answer to it; and perhaps we can start this afternoon on the floor of the Senate to do what ought to be done, rather than out in Hollywood—to talk about our Nation's business.

I want to determine, gentlemen, what the Vice President thinks about the maintenance of an enemy sanctuary through most of the war in northeastern Korea; and I know that the Senator from Oklahoma is worried about a good answer to this question, as much as am I. Rashin, as the Vice President and every Member of this Senate ought to know, has been a large enemy supply depot since the Korean conflict began almost 16 months ago. It is in Korea. Too many of the dead and wounded to whom I made reference when first I began these remarks are, in the opinion of the Senator from Washington—who assumes his responsibility here where it can be attacked—too many of the dead and wounded are dead and mutilated because of the Truman-Barkley-Acheson policy.

In California the Vice President said:

> We ask the people for another lease of power.

I wonder if this means, if a cease-fire is not agreed to, that Rashin is to remain undestroyed in the next year of the war, as it has been undestroyed largely for 16 months, to the detriment of American soldiers and with the result of increasing the flow of blood which drenches the soil of Korea.

If the Vice President could come down to the floor and be made available for attack and questions for what he said in Hollywood, I should like to ask him about the Truman-Barkley-Acheson leadership, which has prevailed upon fifty-odd nations, allied friends of ours, to contribute only about 10 percent of the blood and the dead and the sorrow in 16 months of war.

It may be that my great Nation will make up its own mind, as it has the right to do, to return to office those who have been in control of our foreign policy for a good long time; but I wonder whether that would mean that Americans generally want the United States of America not only to do its share with respect to any burden, but to carry too large a share of everybody else's burden as well.

I want to argue, gentlemen, with the Vice President about his fear, and that of the administration, of Russia. I want him to explain to the Senate, if that is possible, what in heaven's name has America to be frightened of from Russia or from any other source? It has to my mind been this fear which has undeniably kept the allied forces from attempting to carry out the United Nations mission to defeat our enemies and to restore independence and unity to Korea.

I may be wrong, but certainly I want those in authority to prove me and others of like mind wrong. How tragic

it is, that after months and months of war, we still find it imperative to ask, Where are we headed? After 7 weeks of hearings held by the two committees sitting jointly, it became apparent to the Nation that the administration was waging such a war in Korea as the administration thought would be acceptable to the Kremlin. I do not have to support that statement to anybody who has read any considerable portion of those hearings. In each and every instance we were told, "We cannot do this, because it might involve us with Russia," with whom we were not fighting. While these decisions kept us from fighting and destroying, if and wher possible, the enemies with whom we were fighting, namely, the North Koreans and the Red Chinese. Out of our fear, the enemy we fight has been given an unanticipated opportunity to marshall his forces for assaults against us of a size and intensity never experienced before.

In his wind-up in Hollywood, the Vice President said, in a voice rising in pitch and with obvious emotion, or so it was related by Carl Greenberg:

We ask the American people in 1952 and 1956 and all the years to come to learn the truth and render their verdict as they have in the last two decades. We'll get the truth to them next year.

I do not know whether that is an accurate question. On that point the Vice President will speak for himself. But the significance of the quotation, as reported, is that the Vice President of the United States said to 1,800 persons who had paid $100 a plate, "We will bring you the truth next year."

If the Vice President could climb down from his dais the American people would not have to wait until next year to get the truth. Our Nation has been too long without much of the truth, or so the Senator from Washington sincerely believes. Now is the time to discuss the truth in all its aspects in this battle pit of ours. A part of that truth is contained within the covers of a report written by eight members of the joint committee and made available to the Nation many weeks ago. No person alive has ever heard the Vice President discuss or attempt to destroy the substance of that report. I should like to have him come to the floor and try to do it this afternoon. If it takes a change in the rules of the Senate to make that possible, the Senator from Washington is obviously in favor of such a change.

Mr. President, because I have no intention of keeping from the people any information which I have, I want to read the news story by Carl Greenberg. It will take only a minute. I shall then conclude with one paragraph to which I have given considerable thought.

Mr. Carl Greenberg writes as follows:

Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY last night declared that he and President Truman will go before the voters again in 1952 to ask for "another lease of power."

BARKLEY'S surprise statement to 1,800 guests at the $200,000, $100-a-plate Western States' fund raising dinner at the Hollywood Palladium was construed as a virtual announcement of the reelection candidacy of Truman and BARKLEY.

DECLARATION

As he concluded the text of a prepared address, BARKLEY, voice rising in pitch and with obvious emotion, declared:

"No President and Vice President ever have worked more closely together than Harry S. Truman and I.

"We will stand on our record next year.

"We won't go snooping through back alleys in garbage cans for our campaign material.

"We ask the people for another lease of power, to preserve democracy."

OPENING GUN

The Vice President's speech had all the earmarks of the opening gun in the 1952 congressional campaign.

He said that he first spoke here in 1936 and California went Republican. The next time he spoke, it went Democratic, then Republican again—"and next year is our year."

BARKLEY defended the Truman administration's foreign policy and, in a heavy attack on the Republican leadership challenged the GOP to come up with an acceptable substitute for that enunciated by Truman and Secretary of State Acheson.

HITS GOP

He said the Republicans have all kinds of foreign policies:

"The Cain policy, the Malone policy, the Capehart-Jenner policy, the Wherry policy, and the Taft foreign policy and none of them look alike."

"They remind me of the man who was running for coroner and who saw 25 pictures of Judas Iscariot."

This, Mr. Vice President, is the second reference which impels me to attempt to do, with restrained language, what I am undertaking to do at this time.

The Vice President said:

They remind me of the man who was running for coroner and who saw 25 pictures of Judas Iscariot. He said:

"None of them look alike, but they all look like my opponent."

BARKLEY declared that the Republicans' foreign policies "all look like isolationism."

The Vice President then went beyond 1952, saying that:

"We ask the American people in 1952 and 1956 and all the years to come to learn the truth and render their verdict as they have in the last two decades. We'll get the truth to them next year."

In California the Vice President of the United States said that the different foreign policies which are being discussed by the minority party reminded him of Judas Iscariot. I say to you, Mr. Vice President, since when have patriots become connected or associated with or characterized by any inference to the words and the meaning of "betrayal"? The Vice President, seemingly, got away with such an unholy and unintelligible reference in Hollywood, but I take it that he would not dare on the floor of the United States Senate to associate with Judas Iscariot any such group of Republicans, who are Americans. The Senator from Washington would relish seeing him try it.

Now if the Senator from Washington can be of service to the Senator from Oklahoma, or any other Senator, in answering questions with reference to the war in Korea, he will be pleased to do so.

Mr. MONRONEY. I presume the resolution offered by the Senator from Washington some time ago is his method of preventing the build-up of Chinese Communist bases in Manchuria. I imagine that is his idea of the way to prevent the defeat of our forces. I wonder if any other members of his party have associated themselves with that method.

Mr. CAIN. A few minutes ago the Senator from Oklahoma asked this question, in substance:

"What did the Senator from Washington mean when he charged the administration with a very large share of the responsibility for the enemy's build-up in Korea?"

Mr MONRONEY. I do not think I said "a very large share." I think I said "the responsibility."

Mr. CAIN. It is a total responsibility. That question posed by my friend from Oklahoma is dissimilar from his recent question in which he asks whether other Members on this side of the aisle have been associated with my offering a resolution last April, which if adopted would mean that the Senator from Oklahoma would have to start to become interested in the war and to assume some responsibility for it if we declared war against the enemy.

Let me answer the Senator's first question first.

I think it was on the 13th day of January, though I stand to be corrected, that the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff decided the time had come to destroy attacking enemy aircraft wherever their bases might be or by whatever means were necessary to track them to their lairs and destroy them.

The story unfolds like this; and I do not know, nor do I care at the moment, how anyone else feels about it, but I have been nauseated ever since the story came forth in all its details. There are certain other members of the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, sitting jointly, now present, and they know I speak the truth literally.

As a result of the agreement reached by the President and the Secretary of State and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to destroy these enemy aircraft, the Secretary of State was directed—it was not suggested to him; he was directed by the President and by the Joint Chiefs of Staff—to advise every nation with whom America was joined in actual fighting in Korea of what America intended to do. He was not directed to ask their opinions; he was directed merely to tell them what the United States, as the command authority, the delegation having come from the United Nations, had determined was in the best interests of freedom everywhere. The Secretary of State has never yet given an adequate answer as to why he exercised that judgment which resulted in his advising some of the nations with whom we were associated in the war, but not other nations.

I think I am not disclosing any secret when I say that, as all of us recall, the Secretary of State decided that it was sufficient to the assignment to advise only six nations. The Greeks were never advised of America's intention. The Turks, who proportionately have spilled more blood than anyone else in Korea, outside of the United States and the South Koreans, were not advised. The

Senator can make his own guess, and it is likely to be a pretty reliable one, as to which nations were advised.

What happened? These nations said, "We don't like it. It is likely to lead to further trouble, and be very awkward. We are completely against it." End of the story.

We sit around here many times and say, "Why do we not take the advice of the military when we are involved in a war?" Every military leader worthy of the name, beginning last January, as Gen. Douglas MacArthur had pleaded for the same effort months ago, said, "Destroy the enemy's aircraft, or he will have a chance to destroy you before this war is over."

Having once made up our minds as Americans, under the most competent military advice we could get, that it was necessary to try to destroy the enemy's sanctuary in Manchuria, we promptly did no such thing.

Mr. President, if that is not a complete and satisfactory answer to the Senator from Oklahoma as to why the administration is responsible for permitting the enemy to build up an air force from a few planes to several thousand, I do not know what the answer is.

Mr. President, I could tell a similar story about Rashin. It was bombed once under the command of General MacArthur, before the State Department found out about it. Let no one think I am not telling the truth literally, because all this is set forth in the hearings of the two committees. As soon as the State Department discovered that we had made one air attack against Rashin, they said, "You cannot do that, because the Russians are only 17 miles away." So, until the latter part of August, when Rashin was bombed again, it was permitted to exist as a sanctuary in the enemy's own country, in the country of North Korea, to the end that a great many men we talk about trying to help will not need our help, because they are never coming home again.

We are asked why the administration can be charged with any responsibility in these matters? I asked a leading military authority a while ago, and a very honest and frank man he was, why Rashin was bombed in late August. He said, "During those 7 weeks of hearings held by you Members of the Congress"—and that means the only voice the people have left—"it appeared that you did not want us to let the enemy know he had a sanctuary. So we gave him a second bombing to get him a little off balance."

Mr. President, permit me to make one or two more references, if I may, about this place called Rashin. It is situated 17 miles from territory which is presently occupied by the Russians, and the State Department said, "Because of the clouds, because of the uncertainty, we are likely to get over into Russian territory and drop bombs on them rather than on Rashin."

That sounded like a fairly reasonable story, except that we do not assume that there is fog every day over Korea, and except that a man now dead, a really fine patriot, who offered the joint committee testimony, said, "Though I do not think the United States should go it alone, I think we ought to have our allies," he said, "I believe deeply"—and this was months ago—"that the organization of a naval blockade against the enemy, Red China, would help us shorten the spilling of blood in Korea."

The name of that man was Forrest Sherman. He died when he was pretty close to reaching an agreement with the Iberian Peninsula, which is the western end of the Mediterranean, to make our western European line relatively safe for freedom.

Mr. President, I raise this question, and then pass from it: What do we hear about the pending agreement between Spain and the United States since Forrest Sherman unfortunately died? We hear little I am inclined to believe that matters are worse rather than better, because the sought-after agreement is nowhere in sight.

I shall respond to the Senator from Oklahoma immediately, but I do wish to say, because it is related to this whole discussion, that I asked Admiral Sherman, as did other members of the committee, Democrats and Republicans, "Is it not possible to use your naval guns to destroy Rashin from the sea? You would not run any risk of jeopardizing our relationship with Russia, would you?" The answer was, "Senator, of course, we could do it."

I have too much respect for the Air Force of this country not to assume that it can, if it desires, obliterate Rashin If it is said that that is a little risky, we should reflect that, as Forrest Sherman said, we have always had a great United States Navy.

Mr. President, Admiral Sherman was a man who died possessed of his pride. Many Americans, if we use the war in Korea as an example, outside of those who are fighting that war, have lost their pride and much of their self-respect. Otherwise they would begin to insist that we destroy our enemy's power to fight another day.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With respect to Rashin and its proximity to the Russian border, I will ask the Senator, as a member of the joint committee, in the light of the fact that the State Department for some mysterious reason refused to permit the bombing of Rashin and the supply depots and dumps there, if it is not true that every bit of expert testimony we had from the commanders of the Air Forces in that vicinity, and other military men, was to the effect that there was no question whatsoever that they could bomb Rashin with complete freedom from any encroachment on Russian territory, that it was not only technically possible, but that it posed no particular problem whatsoever from the standpoint of dropping bombs on Rashin. Was not that the expert testimony about that matter?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as I said to the Vice President a short time ago, one of the big issues in the campaign of 1952 is going to be the political, not the military, management of the war in Korea. The Senator from Iowa could not be more correct. There was no man who was considered by anyone to be a military authority who did not say, under oath, "Of course, we might not be able to fly missions against Rashin, an enemy supply base, every day; but if given the green light, there would be no Rashin in a very short time."

There are Americans who profess to believe that the military have been running our war for 16 months. The Senator from Iowa has just mentioned one instance which proves the contrary. It was our political management which has maintained Rashin as a supply sanctuary available to a ruthless enemy, for the better part of 16 months.

A few minutes ago, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr MONRONEY] asked me, as I understood him, if any other member of the Republican Party had associated himself with my resolution to declare war on our enemies.

Mr. MONRONEY Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr CAIN I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY The Senator from Washington was criticizing our distinguished Vice President for saying that the Republican Party was a party of many foreign policies.

Mr. CAIN That is correct.

Mr MONRONEY The distinguished Senator from Washington stated that the administration was responsible for the enemy bases in Manchuria. I was asking if other members of his party had supported the distinguished Senator's policy of wiping out those bases by a declaration of war How else could we destroy those bases?

Mr CAIN How else could we destroy the bases in Manchuria?

Mr MONRONEY Without declaring war against Red China. The Senator was honest enough to pose the real question.

Mr. CAIN. Yes; and I take it the Senator from Oklahoma is equally as honest. Otherwise we would not waste any time talking.

In answer to that question, I say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, go back to the White House and the Secretary of State and ask them, if they share his view, whether it was proper for them to recommend, without a declaration of war, destroying enemy air bases in Manchuria last January, and to say now that it could not be done without an open declaration of war.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator has switched his proposition. He was discussing enemy build-up bases in Manchuria.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. What he is talking about today is the theory of "hot pursuit." I believe that is what the Joint Chiefs of Staff call it.

Mr. CAIN. That is the name.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Washington was criticizing the administration because of the establishment of vast enemy bases in Manchuria. I do not believe that they could be wiped out unless we were to follow the policy of the

distinguished Senator from Washington, which calls for an all-out declaration of war.

When the Vice President says that the Republican Party is a party of many foreign policies, I think the Senator himself, by his resolution, points out that it is a party of many foreign policies.

Mr. CAIN. There are a great many thoughts on this side of the aisle about various foreign policies. All that means is that seemingly there is but one foreign policy on the other side, which, as related to Korea, constitutes—as others than myself have said—"Operation Killer," or the pursuit of a policy which has as its only mission the shedding of someone else's blood, forgetting the blood which is necessarily shed at the same time on our side.

A moment ago I was unfair. I did not mean to criticize all Democrats. There must be a determination among Americans—which include thousands upon thousands of Democrats as well as Republicans—to evolve a policy which will result in the termination of the conflict in Korea, which, by virtue of the political management imposed upon it for many months, obviously has not gone anywhere, and is not going anywhere.

The Senator from Washington still feels as he felt on April 17, when he introduced a resolution calling for a declaration of war against America's enemies. Perhaps that was not the proper thing to do. Perhaps a Member of the United States Senate should not acknowledge the fact that America is at war with two very difficult and ruthless enemies.

The Senator from Washington has not attempted to solicit the assistance of individual Senators in pushing the declaration-of-war resolution which he introduced. That was done under my own responsibility. I was only hopeful that the Foreign Relations Committee, consisting of both Democrats and Republicans, to whom the resolution was referred, would give the subject the consideration to which it was entitled. I remain hopeful that the committee will.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does not the Senator feel a bit inconsistent when he points to the administration's responsibility for 87,000 casualties, and at the same time is the author of a resolution which would expand the war to an entire subcontinent?

Mr. CAIN. That is the dilemma in which we find ourselves. The Senator from Oklahoma is saying, "Let us not have a declaration of war because, per se, it will increase the number of casualties. Let us go on with an undeclared war, which will kill fewer people; let us go on with a war which is not going anywhere. Let us go on with a war which has no end." In the course of time the casualties will be 10 times what they would be as the result of an honest, forthright declaration against those who seek to destroy us, and getting the job over with.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator mentioned 87,000 casualties. Those do not include the 60,000 or 70,000 mentioned by General Marshall, who suffered loss of arms or legs from freezing and various other conditions. They were not actually wounded in battle, but they were casualties. Instead of 87,000, the total number would probably be around 160,000 or 170,000.

Mr. CAIN. I should not labor the point, but the Senator from Nevada is entitled to a fuller answer than he himself has given. When one begins to think in terms of casualties, if he has a soul or conscience he must be horrified. When Americans become horrified and indignant, then, for a change, they will begin to think and demand that we win the war in Korea or get out.

The facts, as I understand them, are about as follows: We have had directly almost 90,000 battle casualties. We read nothing in our newspapers about the casualties of our allies. Our allies have furnished approximately 10 percent of the total personnel fighting on the Allied side in Korea. Because they are as brave and venturesome as we are, we assume that they have suffered a proportionate share of casualties. If we have lost 90,000, they have lost 9,000, or a total of practically 100,000. We claim that we have killed hundreds of thousands of the enemy. It was generally agreed 4 or 5 months ago that 10 percent of the Korean population were casualties in one form or another. Judged by population, Korea is the twelfth largest country on the face of the earth. Very few Americans know that. There are, or were, approximately 30,000,000 Koreans. Apart from the number of direct battle casualties, as the list stood months ago, 3,000,000 civilian human beings suffered casualties.

The fact is not often discussed, but it is true that the Korean war is perhaps the bloodiest war, all factors considered, in all history. Unless we get a cease-fire order in the very near future, the blood which has been spilled thus far must be as nothing compared with the bath which is likely to drench all society everywhere. My own feeling is that the war's potential has become worse every day the war has been permitted to proceed without any direction or political leadership.

A few months ago I felt strongly that the Soviet had no concern with America's battles, as of that time, with Red China and with North Korea. Of course, I might have been very wrong. I feel that Russia has been encouraged to become more and more concerned with a war with respect to which, under American political leadership, we have indicated that we have no intention of trying to reach a military conclusion. The other day Gen. Omar Bradley said, as some us have mentioned—he was speaking to the troops of the Ninth Division, I believe—"If the cease-fire talks break down, we Allied people have the ability to reach a military conclusion." I wish that Gen. Omar Bradley would give the American Nation his reasons for that reference. We are entitled to know. Of course, I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. We are really in a war which our boys in Korea are not allowed to win but which they dare not lose. The testimony to which I referred in my question was the testimony given by General Marshall at the MacArthur hearings. At that time we had approximately 62,000 acknowledged battle casualties. He said that there was a total of approximately 150,000 casualties, including frozen feet and arms.

It seems to the junior Senator from Nevada that whether an arm is frozen, or rendered useless, or is shot off, does not make very much difference to the owner of the arm. If our officials are still concealing the extent of battle casualties, and they are in proportion to what had been concealed from the general public at that time, we may have as many as 200,000 casualties at this time.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Nevada has placed an emphasis on this question which I do not share. He referred to concealing figures on casualties. Out of my own experience, because I sit on the committee which studies the problem, I feel that the Military Establishment has had no desire to conceal any figures. It is true that the less those figures are circulated, the less inclined will be the Nation to think about them.

However, I do have some very accurate information for the Senator. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, sat consistently through all the 7 weeks of hearings, has indicated to me that as of last May it was established that there were approximately 70,000 battle casualties, which is generally the only category one reads about these days. He stated further that there were approximately 70,000 nonbattle casualties. Of course, some of the nonbattle disabilities are as serious as the loss of an arm or a leg, while others are merely a brief encounter with influenza or pneumonia, or something of that character.

Mr. MALONE. Or frozen feet.

Mr. CAIN. Yes. It would not be correct to say that any large proportion of our nonbattle casualties are not returned to a useful civilian life, but we must understand that a considerable number have outlived their usefulness as a result of suffering nonbattle disabilities.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. MALONE. So far as nonbattle casualties are concerned, whether they go back into battle and come home later, there may be at this time, instead of 90,000, as the Senator estimates, nearly twice that number necessary to be cared for to a greater or lesser degree, and whose earning power will be impaired because of their having suffered disabilities in this war.

I wish to emphasize this: When we read day after day that the casualties are 60,000, 70,000, and even 87,000, no emphasis is placed on the fact that these are only battle casualties, and that the total casualties are probably twice the number reported.

Mr. CAIN. When only half an effort is made we get only half of a result. The Senator from Washington understands fully, out of his own brief experience, what our Nation felt about World War II. From the minute my Nation declared war on its enemies, we were committed to pursue victory until we had gotten to Berlin and forced the enemy to quit.

The big trouble with this war—and it is a war that must be of concern to Democrats as well as Republicans, and Americans generally—is that we have never known exactly where we are going. If I raised the question now as to where we are headed in Korea, no one could tell me that there is a Berlin to which we are trying to get. We have no goal and no objective.

A short time ago there was an argument as to what sort of gravestone should be placed over the young men who died in Korea. Apparently the law with respect to gravestones does not recognize an undeclared war. Therefore, those boys were required to be buried without any reference on their gravestones as to where they had lost their lives.

However, I have one happy note. There must be some mothers and fathers, and the young men themselves, in the Senate this afternoon. During the course of last week the Committee on Armed Services had a long briefing, during which the quartermaster and the supply people of the Military Establishment brought along models who were wearing the type of clothes that will be sent to our military people—our allies as well—in Korea. I want to say by way of praise to the military people that the clothes for this war are very much better clothes than were worn during the last war, only a few years ago. I have become convinced that the Military Establishment is prepared to have winter clothing of the proper quality and in sufficient quantity available for distribution in Korea, which is to be made more certain and successful by reason of the improvement of our transport system in Korea in the past year. Our young sons and friends who suffered so much because of the lack of equipment a year ago, as they now go into the second winter of our undeclared war can be generally certain that in terms of the necessities of life—clothing, shelter, and food—they will be well taken care of.

Mr. President, this has been an important time for the Senator from Washington, who has implied nothing personal in any respect about anyone. He has been talking about his country and what he believes its needs are. He has merely been suggesting that statements ought to be carefully weighed by important people in far places, for they should be open to attack in this battle pit, where reasonable notice can be taken of them.

I deeply appreciated the points raised this afternoon by my friend the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who is concerned about the various kinds of Republican foreign policies. I hope they will all get together and march in the direction of victory. Goodness knows, we really need it.

I read with interest a recent speech by a very good friend of mine, who serves with me on the Armed Services Committee, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. He is a good, sturdy, gallant American, and a Democrat. Yes, he is from the State of Texas.

According to newspaper reports, he stated that the time has come to use atomic energy as a tactical weapon in Korea. If he said it, then two persons have said it. I believe others have stated it also. Let us only use whatever weapons are required to bring our enemies to their knees and to restore unification to Korea. If we do not do for the Koreans what we told them we were going to do for them in the first place, by the time the war and bloodstream has run its course there will not be any Korea left to unify. No man can get up and say that is a wrong conclusion. Just a lot of us have no intention of stuffing Korea into the garbage can the Vice President was talking about last Tuesday in Hollywood.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in addition to the serious problems affecting the defense agency in the building of our armed services, I do want to take 2 or 3 minutes of the time of the Senate to discuss another phase of the problem, which is becoming more serious each day. I refer to the problem of building adequate school facilities for the school children of America.

I have some figures which have been furnished to me by the Bureau of Education. They show that in 1940 the national enrollment through the twelfth grade, which is through high school, amounted to 28,230,000, and in 1950 that had increased to 29,000,000. The estimate is that for 1960 the figure will be 37,138,000. The figures are given for each 2-year period from 1940 through 1960. It is estimated that the enrollment will show an increase of 8,908,000, or 31.6 percent, by 1960. In my State of California, for the same period of time, it is estimated that the enrollments in schools will show a 97.7-percent increase.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the table from which I have been reading.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	National enrollment (through twelfth grade)	Cumulative biennial increase [1]		California enrollment (through twelfth grade)	Cumulative biennial increase [1]	
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent
School year ending—						
1940	28, 230, 000			1, 185, 000		
1942	27, 351, 000	−879, 000	−3 1	1, 226, 000	41, 000	3. 5
1944	26, 115, 000	−2, 115, 000	−7 5	1, 286, 000	101, 000	8 5
1946	26, 289, 000	−1, 941, 000	−6 9	1, 430, 000	245, 000	20 7
1948	27, 134, 000	−1, 096, 000	−3 9	1, 506, 000	321, 000	27. 1
1950	29, 000, 000	770, 000	2 7	1, 614, 000	429, 000	36 2
1952	30, 636, 000	2, 406, 000	8 5	1, 816, 000	631, 000	53 2
1954	33, 861, 000	5, 631, 000	19 9	2, 018, 000	833, 000	70. 3
1956	36, 159, 000	7, 929, 900	28 1	2, 175, 000	990, 000	83 5
1958	37, 186, 000	8, 956, 000	31 7	2, 283, 000	1, 098, 000	92. 7
1960	37, 138, 000	8, 908, 000	31 6	2, 343, 000	1, 158, 000	97. 7
Average annual increase		445, 400	1. 6		57, 900	4. 9

[1] Increase in enrollment since 1940.
Minus sign denotes decrease.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the problem which has been faced by the school districts, not only in California but elsewhere, has been that with the opening of defense plants and military installations, workers and, in many cases, servicemen come to those areas and bring their families, and often have with them children of school age.

The other day I pointed out on the floor of the Senate that in California there are numerous communities where school classes now are on a part-time basis because they cannot take care of the educational needs of the American youth there to the extent of making available to them a full, normal school day. In addition, they have had to use for schoolroom purposes, the living rooms of private homes, and certain other buildings in those communities.

Mr. President, the Office of Education has estimated that the amount of carbon steel which will be required to meet the existing school needs throughout the United States, on the basis of the requests which now are in the Office of Education, will be, for the first quarter of 1952, 255,400 tons. The allocations of carbon steel by the NPA authorities to the Office of Education, for distribution throughout the 48 States of the

Union to meet these educational needs, amounts to only 81,000 tons.

In addition, I also have some figures showing the priority classification, the number of projects, the total carbon-steel requirements, and a breakdown of the total requirements in order to meet the existing educational needs of the country for the first quarter of 1952. I ask unanimous consent that those figures also be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the figures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

School construction program—carbon steel requirements, first quarter, 1952

	Number of projects	Tons of carbon steel required	Allocation first quarter 1952, (tons)
A. Underway projects	2,314	88,900	
B. Postponed construction	1,621	116,400	
C. Proposed first quarter starts [1]	672	50,100	
D. Total projects	4,607	255,400	81,000

[1] Represents only projects on hand as of Oct. 1, 1951.

Total new starts for first quarter equals 2,253 projects requiring 167,000 tons of steel.

Distribution, by priority classification, of controlled materials requirements for school construction for the first quarter of 1952 (for materials on which tentative program determinations are being appealed)

	Number of projects	Quantities of materials required				
		Total carbon steel	Structural steel	Steel plates	Brass mill products	Wire mill products
		Tons [1]	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
Priority classification 1	256	10,120	2,844	284	125,000	146,000
Priority classification 2	318	20,754	5,832	582	256,000	300,000
Priority classification 3	11	83	23	2	1,000	1,000
Priority classification 4	17	452	127	13	6,000	7,000
Priority classification 5	1,140	52,241	14,680	1,461	645,000	754,000
Priority classification 6	670	26,337	7,401	738	325,000	380,000
Priority classification 7	1,231	79,379	22,305	2,222	980,000	1,149,000
Priority classification 8	964	66,022	18,552	1,848	812,000	953,000
Total	4,607	255,388	71,764	7,150	3,150,000	3,690,000

[1] Distribution of total carbon steel between higher education and other educational institutions is as follows: Priority classification 1, higher education, 11.1 percent, other, 88.9 percent; priority classification 2, higher education, 18.9 percent, other, 81.1 percent, priority classification 3, higher education, 54.2 percent, other, 45.8 percent; priority classification 4, higher education, 11.1 percent, other, 88.9 percent, priority classification 5, higher education, 31.6 percent, other, 68.4 percent; priority classification 6, higher education, 31.5 percent, other, 68.5 percent; priority classification 7, higher education, 6.2 percent, other 93.8 percent; priority classification 8, higher education, 10.9 percent, other, 89.1 percent, total for all classifications, higher education, 16.4 percent, other, 83.6 percent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Finally, Mr. President, I have before me some information showing the California school-construction program, alone, the projects which now are under way, and the "new starts" which have been proposed.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I fully recognize the importance of our defense effort and the need to make steel available for the construction of military equipment, but I submit that the National Production Authorities and the executive branch of the Government should resurvey the allocations of steel for educational needs, because we cannot afford to have in many areas and many sections of this great country of ours a situation in which we have a breakdown of the educational system because adequate school facilities do not exist. I point out that part of the strength of our Nation, which will be needed in meeting whatever challenges may confront us in the future, will depend upon our having an adequate educational system.

In the cases I have outlined Federal Government funds are not required. The local school districts and the local people have assumed obligations under local bond issues or other financing. The need is most pressing. In many instances they are prepared to issue contracts or, as a matter of fact, in many instances bids have been accepted for the needed school construction. For the RECORD, I could cite innumerable instances in California where the contracts have been awarded and the need exists for additional school construction, but the school-construction program is held up because it is impossible to obtain a fair allocation of steel, even though the steel required for that purpose is but an infinitesimal part of the total production of steel in the United States.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to commend the Senator from California for his remarks. He is pointing out exactly the situation which also exists in Kansas, although probably to a lesser degree because Kansas is smaller than California. Nevertheless the condition which the Senator from California has set forth as existing in California is also prevalent in Kansas, and, I am sure, also in many of the other States of the Union. School districts and the various city organizations have joined in repeated requests for a resurvey of the drastic needs and requirements for the construction of additional school facilities, inasmuch as in many cases the children in the lower age groups simply have outgrown the available school facilities, and bond issues have been voted for the purpose of constructing additional educational facilities, but construction has been held up because of a lack of steel, and those connected with the projects have virtually no hope in regard to when, if at any time before the end of next year, they will be able to obtain allocations for the steel which is so badly needed for those purposes.

So I wish to commend the Senator from California for emphasizing this matter to the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Kansas. Although I have referred to the situation in California, where, in view of the great increase in population, the situation perhaps is more acute than in other areas, yet I have asked the Office of Education to give me the figures on a Nation-wide basis, because I am just as much interested in seeing to it that the children in any of the other States of the Union will not be handicapped in respect to receiving educational opportunities because of a lack of steel under the allocations.

Although the strength of the United States in facing the dangers which lie ahead, of course, depends upon an adequate and substantial armed force, yet I have a strong feeling that in the final analysis the future of our country and its strength depend upon our coming generations; and we should not handicap them in this way.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to assure the Senator from California that Michigan faces very much the same problem that California does, although probably not to so great an extent because the population of Michigan has not increased so rapidly as has that of California. Nevertheless, in Michigan we do have a very serious problem in respect to obtaining the steel needed for the construction of schools. Many of the school children are compelled to attend only one session of school a day, because of a lack of space in the existing school buildings.

I feel, as does the Senator from California, that if the steel allocations were rescreened it would be possible to obtain sufficient steel to build enough school facilities to take care of the educational needs.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, Michigan is one of the great industrial States of the Union, and, of course, is deeply involved in our war-production effort. I have no doubt in my own mind that in Michigan there are many areas where the situation is just as acute as that in the State of California. So I join the Senator from Michigan in calling this matter to the attention of the NPA.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the junior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. Like my colleague, I have had a number of situations called to my attention, in regard to the acute need for steel for educational building in our State. This morning Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and Mr. Manly Fleischmann, Administrator of the National Production Authority, appeared before a joint meeting of the House and the Senate Banking and Currency Committees and Small Business Committees. At that time this matter was discussed. Ques-

tions were put by a number of the members of the committees to Mr. Fleischmann The very situation the Senator from California has mentioned was pointed out to him. He registered his understanding of it. It was also pointed out to him that the defense requirements for steel should be given the strictest sort of screening and reexamination, in order to be sure that no steel is lying idle.

I am sure the Senator from California would agree with me that at this time when our Nation's safety is threatened there should be no slowing down of the production of military items; that, if anything, we should build our strength faster as a means of insuring our national survival and heading off, if we can, an atomic war. So it seems to me that the important question is to make certain that in this vast and complex job of allocating material no material lies idle at this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I quite agree with the junior Senator from Michigan that we do not want to slow down our national effort, but I believe, on the basis of the figures which I have seen, that to date the amount of steel which is going into actual munition and armament manufacture is still a relatively small part of our total steel production. I am merely pointing out that I think that of the other priorities with which they are faced education should be among the highest, because our machines of war are becoming far more complex, radar equipment and all other types of equipment have come into use, and if we fall down on the job of education, we shall not only be affecting the future peacetime development of our Nation, but I think we shall also be adversely affecting our potential to operate the more complicated machines of war with which we are now dealing.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. I think the Senator is entirely correct in suggesting that of the steel available for the civil economy a very high priority should be allotted to education.

I should like to add to the point which the Senator made by saying that the population has increased sharply in the past 10 years, and the percentage of young children becoming of school age today has been affected and increased by the fact that we did have a war and we had parents going away to war. Now, and for the next few years, there will be a load which will not be merely temporary but which will represent a permanent increase in our school population. It must be taken care of.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5054, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
October 5, 1951.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50 to the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC 630. In order more effectively to administer the programs and functions of the Department of Defense, the President, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in the interest of national defense, may authorize within the Office of the Secretary of Defense ten temporary positions for the fiscal year 1952 to be placed in grades GS-17 and GS-18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 in accordance with the procedures and standards of that Act. Not more than five of these positions shall be in grade GS-18. Such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that act, and not more than four of these positions may be filled by promotion."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am about to make a technical motion in respect to amendment No. 50, which because of the rules of the House must be treated separately. This amendment, which was added in the Senate, authorized the employment of 15 persons in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. In the conference it was cut down to 10. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD, immediately following the vote, certain material from the report and letters with respect to the treatment of flight pay of the United States airmen.

There being no objection, the material in the form of a statement by Mr. O'MAHONEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The flight-pay amendment as it was adopted by the Senate read as follows:

"SEC. 634. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of flight pay to personnel whose assigned duties do not involve actual combat missions or do not involve flight in excess of 20 hours per month."

For this language the conferees have substituted the following:

"SEC. 633. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of flight pay to personnel whose actual assigned duties do not involve operational or training flights."

It was the purpose of the conferees to make it clear that flight pay should accrue only to those officers and enlisted personnel who are performing a specific duty in the planes. In other words, it was the desire to make certain that no military personnel shall have the opportunity of flying in Air Force planes merely for the purpose of collecting flight pay. The language which was adopted by the conferees, we think, makes this clear.

It is the contention of Secretary Finletter of the Department of Air and of Gen Hoyt S Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, that flight pay is allowed only for the performance of specific duty and that administrative officers must qualify for flight pay in order to keep in touch with the rapid development of air power. This is set forth in the following letters which were addressed to me by Secretary Finletter and by General Vandenberg:

SEPTEMBER 20, 1951.

Hon JOSEPH C O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Armed Services, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have seen General Vandenberg's letter of September 18, 1951, to you on the subject of hazard and incentive pay for the Air Force. A similar letter was addressed to Mr. MAHON.

I want to make it entirely clear that the Air Force does not permit officers or airmen to draw flying pay for riding in an aircraft as passengers. Every officer and airman who draws flying pay does so because he is performing a specific duty in the airplane at the time. This duty is a necessary part of his training for actual flying in combat or in support of combat operations. To repeat: There is no such thing as flying people around merely for the purpose of enabling them to qualify technically for flying pay. The jobs which the officers and airmen perform while they are flying are regulated in detail by Air Force regulations. The purpose of these regulations is to avoid any abuses of the system and I am assured by the Chief of Staff that in practice these regulations are scrupulously observed and no abuses are tolerated.

I will not comment on the other matters covered by General Vandenberg's letter—the 100 hours a year minimum, the need for our maintaining a mobilization potential, and the like—as these are covered adequately in the general's letter.

I shall be very glad, if you deem it advisable, to appear at any time and testify to the above. The same also applies, of course, to General Vandenberg and anyone else in the Air Force whom you might wish to call.

I am addressing a similar letter to Chairman MAHON, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Armed Services.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS K. FINLETTER.

SEPTEMBER 18, 1951.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Armed Services Subcommittee,
Senate Appropriations Committee,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: The Senate amendment to fiscal year 1952 appropriations act would, if finally enacted into law, create new and serious difficulties in the administration and operation of the Air Force. I know that you have a complete knowledge of this subject and that other members of the Armed Services Subcommittee are also well informed as a result of the thoroughness of the hearings on military expenditures which you have conducted. But the consequences of hasty action, resulting from a lack of understanding on the part of others, could be so unfortunate that I must express some of the reasons for my concern.

The obvious intent and desire of the sponsor and those who voted for the amendment is to effect an economy in the operations of Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps aviation. However, I want to outline for you just how this amendment, in actual operations, will have exactly the opposite effect from that

desired by the Senate and will in fact impair the current effort to increase the air capabilities of our country.

The Air Force has provided in its fiscal year 1952 budget program for an end-year pilot strength of 52,400 and 13,100 other rated (navigators, bombardiers, and observers). Our actual requirements for sustained combat operations are considerably higher and, if war should occur by June 30, 1952, we would be hard-pressed to carry out our assigned combat missions. However, these figures reflect our most realistic capabilities during this fiscal year, and represent a considered risk minimum which should be improved as soon as additional aircraft and facilities permit Our capability to maintain this rated personnel strength proficient and ready for immediate combat operations is based upon the flight requirement necessary for flight proficiency which is, in the case of pilots, 100 hours a year. Of this total, 20 hours must be by instrument and 15 hours by night While a higher flight requirement would be beneficial and desirable, we could not, even if additional appropriations were made available, raise this total to 240 hours per year as required by the amendment. It is neither economically sound nor actually possible with the aircraft and bases which the Air Force will have available during the current and the next fiscal year. Hence, the only alternative would be to remove from flying status a sufficient number of pilots to enable the balance, utilizing to the maximum capacity available aircraft and facilities, to meet the 20-hour flight requirement It is estimated the effect of such action would be to eliminate in excess of 10,000 pilots from our active-duty inventory. This, in turn, would further aggravate our pilot deficiency with respect to conducting sustained combat operations. To me, this is by far the most serious aspect of the proposed amendment.

The Air Force would be incapable of rapid expansion upon the outbreak of war and could not replace combat attrition in the early months of the war. Under the present system of maintaining flight proficiency, pilots currently on administrative duties would, in the event of war, be rapidly relieved by reserves and civilians and assigned to combat-flying duties. If these pilots have not been flying, they will require refreshing. This refresher training would require 125 hours of flying and, even under a war acceleration and assuming needed facilities and aircraft available, would require at least 3 months. These would be three very vital months after the outbreak of war, they could lose the war.

As you know, it has been our policy to order removal from flying status those pilots who fail to show the necessary enthusiasm and determination to gain the experience and maintain the degree of skill our standards require If many pilots were to be deprived of flight pay simply because it is now impossible to allow all of them to fly 20 hours each month, fewer pilots, particularly among those of the higher grades who must also perform heavy administrative duties, would continue to make the intense extra effort required to maintain military flying ability. The morale of those who remained would also be seriously damaged by a withdrawal of recognition for their professional achievements and qualifications as capable airmen.

Many pilots now in combat in Korea were discharging heavy administrative responsibilities in addition to their flying duties a few months ago Many pilots having combat assignments today will have administrative assignments a few months from now. These men now in combat are just as interested in the future effects of this amendment as anyone else, and they will be just as puzzled concerning how it could be equitably administered

Decisions that certain "duties" required flying more than 20 hours per month while other "duties" required flying less than 20 hours per month would, in many cases, have to be arbitrary The amendment in question would create constant disagreements, interpretations, and reinterpretations concerning who should get the so-called flying assignments, which assignments should be classified "flying" and which should be "nonflying" It would be virtually impossible to administer and from the morale viewpoint most damaging Units en route to actual combat areas, as well as those deployed to Alaska and the Northeast, often cannot fly an average of 20 hours per pilot per month. Squadrons are sometimes grounded temporarily because of airplane difficulties. Pilots traveling to a combat assignment could easily fail to qualify for flight status for 1 or 2 months. I am sure you can appreciate the administrative and morale difficulties inherent in these situations.

Another area of service which would be completely disrupted by the amendment would be the Air Reserve and Air National Guard. Our Reserves are now expected to fly about 1 week end per month to maintain their proficiency. To meet a requirement of 20 hours per month would require our reservists to fly at least every week end per month, which is not only unreasonable but aircraft and facilities are not available to support such a program.

The impression created during the Senate debate is unfortunate and is having a disturbing effect. Allegations of corruption and abuses were made, yet no specific charges or incidents were cited. Not only does the Air Force scrupulously comply with the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and Executive Order No. 10152 of August 1950, but it imposes substantially increased requirements which all flying personnel must meet in order to remain on flying status. I believe the evidence you so ably presented in opposition to the amendment substantiates this contention If any specific instances can be cited wherein we have failed in this respect, we would welcome such information and I assure you immediate corrective action will be taken.

I am sure you will agree that the adverse effects of this amendment could be so serious as to justify my requesting that you bring these facts and others of which you are so well aware to the attention of any who might help to avoid the consequences I have described. It is my view that those who proposed and supported the amendment in question did so because of misinformation and misunderstandings, which no one could correct at once but which might be corrected now. I have confidence that this will be accomplished.

I shall be glad to appear personally before your subcommittee or the joint conferees to present such additional information as you or any other member may desire.

Sincerely,

HOYT S VANDENBERG,
Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see pp 12983–12987, House proceedings, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 10, 1951.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be adopted. I think the Chair had better lay before the Senate the action of the House on the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The Chair may state that that is not generally done until the conference report has been agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to speak on the motion

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Action, of course, comes first on the conference report, and then the Senate will vote on the amendments which are in disagreement.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr FERGUSON. Mr President, I desire to raise a question in connection with the conference report, and to ask that it be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well; that is the pending question.

Mr. FERGUSON. That appears to be the only action the Senator from Michigan can take at the present time, in order to obtain the relief to which he feels he is entitled and to which the Senate is entitled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the conference report be rejected, because it is the only action which can be taken at this time, in order to reach the objective which I think the Senate of the United States should reach That is the restoration of the so-called Byrd publicity amendment.

It was indicated that this conference report was signed by all the conferees. I know is was reported in order by the clerk, but I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that three members of the conference on the part of the House did not approve the conference report in relation to action in dropping one of the Senate amendments. Three of the Senate conferees likewise did not accept the conference report because of its deletion of Senate amendment numbered 106, which is the publicity amendment.

Mr. President, Senate amendment 106 is section 605 of this appropriation bill as it was reported from committee and passed the Senate without objection. The Senate conferees have receded from the amendment and it is not in the bill as it lies before us as a conference report. I want to read it to the Senate at

this time so there will be no misunderstanding of the issue before us:

SEC 605. No part of the money appropriated by this act to any department or made available for expenditure by any corporation contained in this act which is in excess of 75 percent of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the aggregate budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by such department or corporation during such fiscal year in the performance of—

(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public informaton publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2) No person whose only performance of the functions described in (1) or (2) of the preceding sentence is in activities necessary for the enforcement of law, promotion of safety of human life, dissemination of weather information, or scientific experimentation, or whose compensation is paid from funds appropriated specifically for International Information and Educational Activities shall be deemed to be engaged in the performance of the functions so described

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is that the Byrd amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the so-called Byrd amendment, sponsored by by the senior Senator from Virginia and myself. The Senator from Virginia and the senior Senator from Michigan sponsored a similar amendment in connection with each of the other appropriations acts. It was omitted from the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act but was later made retroactively applicable to that law by a provision in the first supplemental appropriation bill.

To boil it down, Mr. President, this amendment was an attempt by Congress to limit the use of funds for publicity and propaganda activities to 75 percent of the amount asked in the budget estimates. There were exceptions. One of the exceptions was for the benefit of what we call the Voice of America in the State Department, so that it could function without hindrance. All the ramifications of the Voice of America were exempted from the operation of this particular amendment. So, with specified exceptions, the amendment applied a 25-percent cut against the budget estimates for publicity and propaganda activities in the various departments covered by the bill. That included appropriations for the State Department, and also for the Department of Commerce and the Department of Justice. I find nowhere that the Commerce Department has objected to this amendment; I find nowhere that the Department of Justice has objected. There has been no objection from any of the other departments or agencies to whom similar restrictions have been applied. The only resistance comes from the State Department, which indicates that here, for some special reason, we have touched a very sore spot.

I am, indeed, very sorry that the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is not able to be on the floor because of a very serious illness in his family. I know how strongly he feels about this particular amendment. The Senator from Michigan has on many occasions discussed with him the question involved. It has been a thorn in the side of both Houses of Congress for many years.

As far back as 1913 a statute was passed barring public-relations activities except as specifically authorized. Later, an attempt was made to limit this activity by saying it was illegal to use the money for lobbying purposes. Neither has been effective because we could not tell when a department would use any number of its employees on propaganda work, giving out information to the public So we find that the rule has been violated many, many times. The distinguished Senator from Virginia and other Members of the Senate felt there was only one way to reach this problem, and that was to try to cut down on the amount of money available to the propaganda machines of the various departments and bureaus of the Government. We figured that the way to do that was to cut down 25 percent from the budget estimates, which gave ample room for the legitimate services of public information

Mr SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts

Mr SALTONSTALL Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator yielding I joined him in his work on this item for a reason which I should like to bring to his attention. I do not think he has mentioned it In the Treasury appropriation bill, Public Law 111, this clause was included. In the independent offices appropriation bill, Public Law 137, it was included. In the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, Public Law 136, it was included. In the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, Public Law 135, it was included, and I am informed that it was included in the Department of Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill. In other words, the paragraph which the Senator is discussing, which he urged, and on which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and I joined him, is in every other major appropriation bill.

I should also like to invite attention to the fact that the following provision was incorporated in the first supplemental appropriation bill.

Any funds provided by this act shall not be available for compensation of persons performing domestic information functions or related supporting functions in excess of 50 percent of the amount provided herein.

I also invite attention to the fact that on October 10, 1951, Representative SMITH of Wisconsin offered a similar amendment to the second suplemental appropriation bill, and Representative MAHON agreed to put it in the bill So that when it is taken out of this bill it is made the one exception of all the appropriation bills this year. For that reason the Senator from Michigan is being consistent in what he is now trying to do.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL Mr President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that I joined in supporting the provision which has just been referred to by the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Massachusetts I thought it was an excellent way to approach this troublesome question that so many of us have heard about and as to which so many discordant notes have developed. I should like to ask this question. Do I understand correctly that the amendment has been stricken out by the conferees?

Mr FERGUSON The entire amendment has been stricken out.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. It is completely eliminated

Mr FERGUSON Yes.

Mr SCHOEPPEL. Can the Senator from Michigan point out in what way, logically and honestly, with that amendment retained, the department affected b this bill would actually have been curtailed?

Mr FERGUSON. He cannot.

Mr MOODY. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr FERGUSON. I yield to my colleague

Mr. MOODY. I am confident my distinguished colleague is interested with me in keeping the channels of information open between our foreign policy and the people If the Senator will recall, and I am sure he does, a week ago there was widespread criticism of a security order which was issued by the President of the United States As the Senator knows, I personally disagreed with the wording of that order. I felt that while the President and his adviser, Mr. Short, were trying to handle a very difficult problem, the problem of keeping our military information away from the enemy, while, at the same time, keeping the channels of information open, it had been done in an inadvisable way I suggested at the time that some of the more experienced Washington newspapermen should be called in to advise on the question.

I merely want to say to my senior colleague, for whom I have great respect, as he knows, that it seems to me at this time, when there is so much controversy about the foreign policy of the United States, when there is in the Senate severe criticism of that policy, that when any organization in the country, such as a business men's organization, the Detroit Board of Commerce, the American Legion, or the Veterans of Foreign Wars

request information there should be persons on hand to make factual reports to them. As the junior Senator from Kentucky said a few weeks ago, if they want reports they cannot get them from the elevator boys at the State Department. There must be competent persons to provide them.

I think the distinguished Senator may remember that one of the chief officials of this particular agency accompanied the Senator and myself on a trip abroad for the purpose of helping to provide more information about the foreign policy of the United States. It seems to me it would be very, very bad business to chop away, for the sake of saving a very small amount of money, the men whose responsibility it is to keep the channels of information open between the Department of State and the people If our foreign policy is wrong, it should be changed; and the way it should be changed is to have the information laid before the American people so that they can question the men who represent the department and by their questions record their objections to the policy. If it is right, the people have a right to know that, too. They have a right, in either event, to ask questions and to have those questions answered.

Mr FERGUSON. I recognize the fact that the junior Senator from Michigan does not always agree with the senior Senator on questions of economy, and we are now discussing a question of economy. But as the Senator from Virginia said in one of his remarks when this amendment was first being offered on another bill, "I well recognize the need for the dissemination of information. I have no objection to it. It is my belief that the additional reduction would not in any way affect the legitimate efforts of agencies in disseminating information and answering requests from Members of Congress and the public generally"

Mr MOODY. Mr President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. In a moment. There is no attempt here to interfere with the State Department's replying when it receives a letter from the Board of Commerce of Detroit or of any other city. When we consider the millions of dollars which are appropriated for clerk hire and other help, when we consider that this amendment leaves 75 percent of the funds requested for public information, we can realize that there is certainly plenty of money provided to cover any such dissemination of news as is desired, either to Members of Congress or to the public generally.

Before I yield, I should like to read from the report of the Senate committee which put this amendment in the bill, so that it will be in the RECORD at this place as making absolutely clear what this amendment is designed to accomplish:

> The committee recommends an amendment to limit the number of information specialists. This amendment has been included in several other appropriation bills. In recommending this amendment, the committee has made several changes to cover peculiar situations that exist within the departments covered by this bill.

To digress for a moment, the pending bill covers not only the State Department, but it covers the Department of Commerce and the Department of Justice as well. Each of the departments required certain exemptions.

I read further from the report:

> The committee agrees with the objectives of the amendment, which is to curtail the publicizing of the departments.

That is the point, "the publicizing of the departments."

> However, the committee believes that it is not the intent of the amendment to curtail the dissemination of information which is necessary for enforcement of law by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Immigration and Naturalization Service; the promotion of safety of human life by such agencies as the Civil Aeronautics Administration; the dissemination of weather information; or, scientific experimentation by such agencies as the National Bureau of Standards and the Coast and Geodetic Survey. The committee believes that it is entirely proper for a department to issue scientific and technical bulletins and publications in various fields which are devoted to keeping the public informed of changes in those fields However, the committee admonishes the departments that its intent is to cut down the flood of publicity releases now being sent out by the departments

Now I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr MOODY. Mr President, I am not questioning the intent of the senior Senator from Michigan or the senior Senator from Virginia I am merely pointing out to the Senator from Michigan that it is not possible to provide an adequate service of information without having information officers to attend to it.

The opinion of the conferees representing the Senate, headed by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the judgment of a majority of the conferees was that this conference report should be adopted as it stands, and that the item under discussion should be left in the report. I would submit to the Senator that if he is interested in keeping the channels of information open, and not blocking them at a time when our Nation's safety is threatened, I am sure he will agree that it is not wise at all to overturn the judgment of the large majority of the conferees representing the Senate and the House, and in the closing days of the session send the whole bill back to conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. The senior Senator from Michigan has stated that this report was not approved by all the conferees.

Mr. MOODY. I did not say it was.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I indicated before, three Senators disagreed to the report so far as the item I am discussing is concerned, and three of the House conferees likewise dissented.

Mr. MOODY. I said it was agreed to by a majority of the conferees representing the House and the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is obviously correct; otherwise it would not be before the Senate.

Mr. President, today the Senate adopted a conference report cutting the appropriation for public relations in the Military Establishment from $16,000,000 to $10,000,000. As the Senator from Massachusetts has pointed out, it has been a consistent policy of this Congress to limit expenditures for public relations. There is no distinction between the Federal Security Agency, or any other departments of the Government, and the State Department, so far as this function is concerned. We are not interfering with the Voice of America. As a matter of fact, we are interfering only slightly with the use of money to publicize a department, and not at all with necessary public information actitivies. But here, in the State Department, we seem to have touched a very sore spot. Why, Mr. President?

James Reston, who wrote an article which appeared in the New York Times a few days ago, and which was placed in the RECORD, has indicated clearly what is happening and why the issue is raised now. If the President's order goes into effect, as he has indicated he desires that it shall, to restrict the information that is to go to the public, the department should have no need for this 25 percent which we would eliminate, because the order will classify, as security, not only those things which actually pertain to the security of the country, but it will also keep secret from the people of the United States matters which it does not want the public to know, information which might be embarrassing, as the OPS supplement to the President's order said.

Mr MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. In a moment. There was recently revealed an example of this juggling of information in proceedings before the Internal Security Subcommittee, of which the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada is the chairman We could not get a transcript of a certain conference in the State Department which was of vital interest to the committee. The Subcommittee on Internal Security sits in open session and takes sworn testimony It asked for this transcript but it could not get the recorded facts. It does get statements from the State Department's publicity mill disputing the testimony of witnesses, and in effect calling them perjurers. But the representatives of those making those statements do not come and testify about the same set of facts.

Here is the point, Mr. President. It appears that when a release makes good or favorable publicity for the State Department, the people of the United States will get it through Department channels, as they got one last night. However, that release did not even sustain what the Department thought it would sustain. No wonder Congress has felt righteous wrath about what is going on in the various departments.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to point out to the Senator that he is shifting back and forth from the security order to the pending question. As he knows, I do not question the intent behind the security order, but I do question the execution of it. The order should be reexamined and changed. But does it not

leave an entirely misleading impression to say that the purpose of the division here involved is merely to publicize the State Department? I am sure the Senator well knows the work that is being done, for example, by the organization under Mr. Ben Crosby, who, as the Senator knows, is a war veteran, with a great war record. He is not a publicity seeker at all. He and his group are men who are contacting or are contacted by reputable organizations, by no means all of which agree with the foreign policies of the United States. These men serve as contacts for women's clubs, veterans' organizations, business clubs, labor organizations and others who desire to get information on various points regarding our foreign policy.

As the Senator knows, or should know, when a representative of that group goes out and makes a statement before any organization of that sort, he is subjected to questioning. He cannot go out and simply make a propaganda statement. Representatives of the Department are questioned both publicly and privately by representatives of the organizations before which they are appearing.

The Senator asked what the distinction was between the Department of Defense and the Department of State. There have been political attacks, as the Senator well knows, upon the Department of State and upon the foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, those subjects have become highly controversial.

Only the other day, when we had before us the nomination of a very able American, Chester Bowles, to be Ambassador to India, we heard him attacked heavily. What was the burden of the attacks? The burden was that more career men in the Foreign Service ought to be appointed to ambassadorships.

I might point out to the Senator that that is the very same Foreign Service which has often been attacked here. For more than a year some of the same Senators who were then criticizing that appointment and demanding reappointment of Foreign Service officers have been among those tearing down the confidence of the people in that same Foreign Service.

I think this issue is perfectly clear. If we want channels of information open, let us keep them open. Let us not clog them, either by misguided security views, or by eliminating from the Department those who are serving as a conduit of information to organizations outside.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Michigan realizes that the man in charge of public relations in one of the divisions of the State Department is a close personal friend of the senior Senator from Michigan. When it comes to a question of principle, such as is involved here, and when it comes to limiting appropriations in line with a principle with respect to one bill and not all bills, the senior Senator from Michigan cannot allow his principles to be sacrified because the head of one of the bureaus in the Department, whom he would personally trust, is involved. When it comes to the question of the amount of money which is to be spent in the particular Department, there are supervisors over him.

It is now stated on the floor of the Senate that there is a political attack upon the State Department. Apparently the subcommittee of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], which is hearing sworn testimony that certainly reflects upon the State Department, is now being accused of making a political attack upon the State Department. I know of no basis for calling that committee's work a political attack. What that particular subcommittee is trying to do is to present the facts to the American people as to what took place with respect to a certain organization which at one time was perfectly proper and had a good cause, but which was penetrated for the purpose of making it follow a certain line, which would be detrimental to the United States.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. In a moment.

Senators who voted against confirming the nomination of Chester Bowles are accused of having done so from purely political motives. I say that that is not a fact. It is a sad day when loyal Americans cannot raise their voices without being accused of political motives when they criticize a certain foreign policy.

I started to make reference to what Jim Reston, of the New York Times, has said Let us see what happens at some of these meetings, and let us find out whether the Department is really anxious to keep the channels of information clear and give the people of America all the facts.

Reference has been made to conferences where the public, or representatives of public groups, come in to discuss policy matters with representatives of the State Department. I want to know how various individuals receive invitations to come to Washington. I want to know who selects the individuals who come here and receive spoon-fed information from this Department. That is the real issue—spoon feeding. When a congressional subcommittee such as the Security Subcommittee wants information with respect to what is taking place in the Department, it cannot obtain such information. I will show other examples of how this Department controls the information that goes out. But when there is something for which the Department wants wide and favorable circulation all stops are out. That, Mr. President, is spoon feeding, and that is what I am protesting That is what Congress is objecting to when it seeks to limit publicity and public relations activities to straightforward responses to public inquiries.

Now listen to what is going on in the very Department under discussion today, the Department whose spokesmen are trying to get more money from Congress for what is called the dissemination of news. Let me tell the Senate how this Department disseminates news.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. In just a moment.

I read from the New York Times an article by James Reston to which I have referred. The dispatch is dated Washington, October 2:

> Several events of the last few weeks indicate why the press and radio have been slightly skeptical of President Truman's recent order authorizing Federal civilian agencies to withhold information from the public for security reasons.

We are accused of wanting to reduce this appropriation because we do not agree with the foreign policy of the United States. The foreign policy of the United States was not involved in connection with other bills, nor is it involved in this case, because we allow the Department, through the Voice of America, to disseminate all the information it wishes

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the senior Senator from Michigan yield to the junior Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FERGUSON. In just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The charge has been made that I am acting only from political motives. I want to show the facts on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. In a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr MOODY. I did not say that the Senator was actuated by purely political motives, if he will pardon my saying so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is out of order.

Mr. FERGUSON. I read from the article by James Reston:

> WASHINGTON, October 2 —Several events of the last few weeks indicate why the press and radio have been slightly skeptical of President Truman's recent order authorizing Federal civilian agencies to withhold information from the public for security reasons.
>
> Among these events were the following.
>
> 1 At the recent meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Ottawa, Secretary of State Dean Acheson not only opposed publication of limited and officially edited summaries of the general debate on the world situation, as proposed by public-relations officers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, but also opposed publication of the agenda of the meeting Incidentally, the official agenda had already been published when he opposed publication of it.

This is the Department which is shedding crocodile tears because the United States Congress is cutting off funds which are alleged to be necessary in order that the Department may give the public the news as to what is going on in the State Department. Jim Reston is accurate in this report, it is undisputed. The Department did not even want to publish that which it had already given out. The President says that no one should print anything merely because it is given to him by a high public official. He should decide for himself whether or not it should be published, and should pay no attention to the material which comes from the departments, because, says the President, if they do they will publish something which is wrong, or something which is against the interests of the United States Government.

It is said that the Department wants to give the people the news. Did it give the people the news about the Ottawa conference? Is the Department going to call to Washington representatives of boards of commerce and of labor organizations and give them the news some time later? Back in October of 1949 representatives of labor organizations were called to the State Department for briefing upon foreign policy, and for advice on certain phases of foreign policy. Do Senators suppose that the Internal Security Committee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], could obtain such information? No. It has demanded it, but it cannot obtain it.

I want to go on and show that the Department wishes to operate a propaganda machine and not an information machine:

2. The State Department placed a "restricted" stamp on a catalog of the names and hotel addresses of the delegates at the recent Japanese Peace Treaty Conference in San Francisco. This prevented reporters from getting the list until other delegations, objecting to the ruling, made the list public.

3. The White House recently blocked publication of a report by one of its own top officials because the report was critical of some aspects of the administration's rearmament effort, and presumably because it coincided with the dismissal of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

4. The Treasury Department recently held back news of irregularity in the Internal Revenue Bureau in St. Louis until compelled to acknowledge the problem by disclosure on Capitol Hill.

The Senator from Michigan could talk at length on that case, in which the evidence was secreted. Just yesterday the top man from that office of the Internal Revenue Bureau was indicted. We have a scandal out in San Francisco, and we have had them in other cities. When the people of this country learn all the facts they will decide whether or not we should cut something out of these appropriations for spoon-feeding public information.

I go now to an analysis of some of these situations. Mr. Reston writes:

There were some security angles to the Ottawa conference that had to be handled carefully—although it is doubtful if any NATO military scheme can be put into effect in Europe without the Communists, who are part of almost every continental army, knowing all about it—but in the main that conference dealt with several basic criticisms of United States policy, which our officials did not particularly want publicized.

Therefore, at Ottawa, a strict security policy was invoked. The following week, however, Premier Alcide de Gasperi, of Italy, came to Washington, and the Government wanted publicity.

Now we are beginning to see how this machine really works. One time it wants to silence public information. But the next time it wants the trumpets to blow. And so the wheels of news dissemination are made to turn. It is a major function, to be sure. That is why they do not want the Congress to enforce a 25-percent cut in the budget estimate. I continue to read:

So the big information machine was put to work. Background press conferences were held all over the place; communiques, speeches, statements of approval were issued galore. Officials who wouldn't look at a reporter in Ottawa were suddenly amiable and even loquacious on those aspects of the visit they thought would impress opinion in Italy.

MATTER OF NEWS VALUE

Just why this visit was more newsworthy than the visit of the Canadian Prime Minister Louis S. St. Laurent a few days later was not clear, but in the De Gasperi case the administration decided to make news while on the other visit—during which Mr. St. Laurent made the decidedly newsworthy suggestion that Canada build the St. Lawrence seaway herself if necessary—the administration gave him short shrift and even sent Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan to the airport to meet him.

They felt that would be sufficient news—not what he had to say, but that General Vaughan had met him.

In short, there is a widespread suspicion here that the administration tinkers with the news over and above the requirements of security, and partly as a result of the rearmament program, partly in response to Congress' emphasis on security regulations, is now more security-minded than anybody except the Russians.

Of course, Congress is security-minded now. It cannot forget the Hiss case. It cannot forget some of the other cases. Of course, it is security-minded.

Mr. President, we want to give the Department of State, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Commerce sufficient money to operate efficiently in the public interest. But must we accept these programs as necessary?

Mr. President, let me reemphasize that this limitation was placed in the bill by the committee. It was approved by the Senate, without objection. It is a subject of consistent policy. There was disagreement in conference. Four of the conference members on the Senate side were in favor of adopting the report without this amendment in it. Three of the Senate members were against that action, insisting on its retention. For the House, four were in favor of adopting the report, without the amendment, and three were against it.

We now find ourselves in the position where there is only one thing we can do in order that we may reinsert the amendment. We must send the bill back to conference, and that can be accomplished only by rejecting the conference report. It is the intention of the senior Senator from Michigan, as soon as a vote can be taken—and if it is sent back—to move that the new conferees on the part of the Senate go back into conference and agree to all other items as they have previously been agreed upon by the conferees, but to disagree to the taking out of this particular amendment.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to say that as a Washington correspondent, as well as a Senator, I have been critical of some of the same points which the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan has mentioned.

However, I want to tell him that the particular agency he is now speaking of reducing is an agency which I believe is fulfilling an excellent function in the public interest.

He mentioned the fact that a member of the agency is his close friend. I would, of course, expect to take the action which he thinks is the right action whether his friend is a member of the agency or not.

I brought up the division of Mr. Crosby merely to impress the senior Senator from Michigan with the fact that the agency of which he is speaking does not meet the description which he is giving of it. It is devoted to giving the public information, not propaganda.

I may add that I did not say that the senior Senator from Michigan was motivated only by politics. I said that there have been political attacks on the State Department made on the floor of the Senate. I am sure the senior Senator from Michigan must have heard some of those attacks. I do not believe that he would dispute that point.

Mr. FERGUSON. The senior Senator from Michigan not only heard attacks made upon the State Department, but he has made some of them.

Mr. MOODY. Then, why did the senior Senator from Michigan contradict my statement?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not dispute the statement that the State Department has been attacked. I believe that many of their policies are wrong.

Mr. MOODY. That is the very point I am trying to make. The best way for the American people to find out whether they agree with the policies—and I may say that with some of the policies I have not always agreed, either—the best way to determine whether they should be changed, or whether they should be retained, is to keep the channels of information open between this agency and the people. The various organizations around the country which are sending in requests for information cannot be answered by a clerk. They cannot be answered by an elevator boy, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] pointed out the other day. They must be handled by competent people.

The senior Senator from Michigan must know that not only his own friend, but others of similar caliber down there, are providing on a factual basis information which is requested. I do not believe the senior Senator from Michigan would dispute that fact.

If they are not providing information on a factual basis they are certainly laying themselves wide open to be questioned.

I notice that the senior Senator from Michigan is picking up the Reston article. In most respects it was a good article, but the statements in it do not apply to this particular situation. If we undermine the ability of the division in the State Department to answer inquiries of the American people we are serving to clog up the channels of information between our foreign policy makers and the public, to whom the makers of our foreign policy are responsible. I cannot see why the conference report should be rejected at this time after this matter has been considered by both Houses of

Congress and by the committee of conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, Mr. Crosby is the head of only one segment of this activity, namely, the public liaison division in the office of public affairs. He has 47 employees under him. The question is whether the Department can reduce its functions by 25 percent.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the senior Senator from Michigan yield to junior Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. What my colleague has referred to is not the question. I referred to Mr. Crosby only because I know that he is known by both the senior Senator from Michigan and myself. Mr. Crosby is not one who answers to the description of the propagandists and the befuddlers whom the senior Senator from Michigan apparently would like the Senate to believe are handling this situation in this Department. If my colleague will talk to some of the other gentlemen there, I feel sure that he will find that they are equal in caliber to Mr. Crosby

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan read from the article by Mr. Reston and referred to him as an authority, and he believes what Mr. Reston said. The Senator knows from his personal knowledge what has occurred in the case of the Internal Security Committee, in connection with this matter. On all occasions when we have attempted to obtain information, we have been given only such information as is believed to be favorable to the administration as in the case of the meeting at the White House regarding military aid to China. In that case they gave out only what they were forced to give out and as a result of publication of the diary of the late Senator Vandenberg. Only the information which that diary forced them to give out in regard to the meetings at the White House was given out. Only after Mr. Stassen kept notes and gave his version and only after Mr. Lattimore and Mr. Russell demanded that the paper be released, was it released.

While I stand here on the floor of the Senate debating this matter, the Internal Security Committee is hearing Professor Colegrove, who has a good memory of what took place at those meetings. We have to rely upon his testimony, and that of others who are not subject to discipline or reprisals as Government employees.

Mr. President, "Scotty" Reston is correct when he says that those in charge of the information agencies in the executive departments and agencies in many cases release only information which is favorable to the administration. Mr. Reston cites certain cases of that sort. Of course, what he complains about is not true in all cases; neither is it always true that the information officers give out only information which is favorable to the administration, for sometimes they are forced to give out information which is not favorable to the administration.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask several questions, if I may.

Is it not true that the Voice of America is not affected by this amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is not affected at all by it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, the information going from the United States to other countries is not affected in any way by this amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not also true that in the Appropriations Committee we have been trying very hard to reduce the expenditures of the Government which are not immediately connected with or concerned with our security and our defense?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not also true that we have done that, in part, because of the enormous appropriation bill of $56,000,000,000 which has just gone through the Senate?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not also true that for every other department and agency the 25-percent cut in the publicity and information division was accepted without complaint, so far as we know?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They may not have liked it, but they did not complain actively, did they?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. The same is true of the Department of Commerce and the Department of Justice, which are covered in this bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They have not complained about this matter, have they?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; they have not.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. All of us want the information which is issued to be as accurate as possible, but we must, insofar as we possibly can, reduce governmental expenditures on the civil side of the Government?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Without going into the question of whether the information or propaganda is correct or incorrect or is political or is not political, the point is that it is necessary to make what in this case is a very small cut, but, as a matter of principle, to make all possible reductions in the appropriations for the various agencies of our Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. A principal is involved.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, this amendment received bipartisan support. On the other side of the aisle, the Senator from Virginia and a number of his distinguished colleagues voted for this amendment and favored it, and distinguished Senators on this side of the aisle also were in favor of it. It was adopted on this bill without objection. On the only record vote taken with respect to this amendment on another bill it prevailed by a vote of 63 to 10.

However, now, for the first time, we are told that it is political in its implications and is being urged by those who do not like the State Department. That is why I have raised some of these questions.

Oh, yes, Mr. President; some may call this a political matter, and some persons may say that we have no proof that the administration wishes to conceal all information not favorable to it, and is willing to release only the information which is favorable to it. But just remember how Mr. Jessup took to Guam a stenographer who listened behind a screen and took notes. She was a Government employee, she was paid by Government funds, and thus the people of the United States paid for the taking of those notes. However, were those notes released when that stenographer and that group returned to the United States? No, Mr. President; those in charge released the information to one or two newspapers which they thought could put it up as a trial balloon and at a time when they figured the release of the information was important to the administration. Then, finally, the MacArthur hearings were able to obtain a deleted transcript. The transcript which the administration's officials released to the press contained things which were not even allowed to be given to the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at their joint meeting.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. The senior Senator from Michigan has said several times that I have accused him of being political about this matter. I simply wish to set him straight.

I said that he must have heard in the Senate political attacks made on the State Department. There have been many attacks of that sort. Probably more misinformation has been spread in this general area of foreign policy than has been spread about any other public issue existing today. A great deal of controversy has existed about it, and a great deal of misinformation has been bandied about regarding our foreign policy. I feel quite sure that the senior Senator from Michigan would not deny that.

It happens to be my opinion that it is vitally important that men of the type of Mr. Crosby be available to organizations such as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, women's organizations, labor organizations, and other organizations which frequently make inquiries in regard to specific points in connection with the foreign policy of the United States.

I am glad to hear that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] wants to keep the channels of information open. I am sure he does. He says that all of us want to reduce the civil expenses of the Government, because of the great load of military expenditures; and all of us do want to do that.

However, in the case of a situation in which there has been so much controversy and in connection with which so many misleading statements have been

made, I do not believe we should reduce the ability of the American people to find out, by inquiry and reply, what the policy is and where it can be criticized.

I should like to add, if I may, that as a working Washington newspaperman, I knew a little, at least, about the way that those who were writing news for the people back home obtain the news when they need to get points of information very quickly. It is true that in Washington there are information agencies which, in my opinion, could be severely curtailed. However, I feel that in the area of foreign policy, about which so many inquiries are properly made, the quick availability of information is important to the American people. When a Washington newspaper reporter is asked by his newspaper or by his syndicate to check on a certain piece of information, he is not generally able to call the Secretary of State or the Assistant Secretary of State. On occasion he may be able to do so; but ordinarily, in the case of the average piece of information, he must call an information officer.

I may say to the senior Senator from my State that any information officer who tries to "bunk" a reporter in this town will not last very long, because reporters recognize that very quickly.

As to the complaints made by "Scotty" Reston, let me say that of course there are instances of that sort. I was very glad that the senior Senator from Michigan had that article printed in the RECORD the other day, because those instances should be corrected.

However, the fact remains that in this area of foreign policy, where so much misinformation has been spread, and where there is such an urgent need to keep open the channels of information, we in the Senate should not act to clog them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, after the 25-percent reduction is made, there will be plenty left to finance the release of legitimate news and replies to public inquiries. Even with only 75 percent of the money requested there will be available to these departments considerable amount to spend on trial balloons, and send out the information when they think the proper time has arrived for the public to receive it, and what they want the public to receive.

One would think that the only office in the State Department which gives any news or information or propaganda is the one which calls in the American Legion, the labor unions, and the chambers of commerce. I do not know what news they get, but I do know that a committee of the Senate cannot get the news, even though they request it through the chairman of the committee, as we have been doing in the past.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there are many things which have been said by the able Senator from Michigan with which I can wholeheartedly concur. I am not going to take the floor this afternoon to enter into a discussion wherein I shall defend the State Department. If there is any Senator on this floor who has been more shot at by the State Department than the senior Senator from Nevada, I should like to know who he is—shot at, not only by the State Department and those employed by the State Department, but by those who are on the outside who perhaps are favored by the State Department. That is not the issue. If it were, I would be in a different position.

There are many things that can be said about what goes on in the State Department But, Mr. President, what is involved before the Senate now is an appropriation bill which was passed by both Houses, which was then sent to conference, and which now stands before the Senate, after the conference, by a majority vote of both sides of the conference table, has agreed to it, and after the House of Representatives, the House, where the bill originated, has agreed to it

What is involved? How much is involved? Remember, Mr. President, this bill carries a 10-percent cut which applies all the way through. It applies to the State Department, it applies to the personnel in that Department. That is not in dispute. That stands and is a fixed part of the bill. How much is involved?

Let me recite the history regarding the consideration of the bill by the conference committee On five occasions we met in conference on the items contained in the bill. Every item submitted to the conference was studied. The Senate conferees receded on several amendments The House conferees receded on more than were receded on by the Senate conferees. On the third meeting of the conferees we came to the item now being discussed, and on that occasion undoubtedly an impasse was encountered. We adjourned, but before doing so the Senator from Michigan, in his zeal—and he is zealous; there is no question about the Senator's zeal in anything he undertakes—in his zeal to carry out a principle, undoubtedly, he agreed to take 12½ percent, and so we came back into the fourth meeting of the conferees with an impasse of 12½ percent in this particular item. The Senator was adamant on 12½ percent.

What would 12½ percent mean in the way of figures? After effecting a 25-percent cut in information specialists, the Senator from Michigan, as I have said, in conference was agreeable to 12½ percent. We had already effected a 10-percent cut, as I have stated, and that is in the bill. So it meant an additional cut of 2½ percent. For the State Department this involves only seven employees—seven employes, or $35,000. The bill carries more than $1,000,000,000—$1,043,000,000.

Are we to reach an impasse and turn down a bill making appropriations for the State Department, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Judiciary because of seven persons who might be eliminated, and a cut of $35,000? It simply did not seem to the chairman of the conference committee that that was worth while, although in principle I want to say now, and I will say it with my dying breath, I think there should be a cut and some action should be taken to prevent this everlasting increase of employees in the various departments, who are engaged in little more than sending out information, some of it of a twisted nature.

I am not going to recede from this position. I do not take issue with the Senator from Michigan on many things he says, but the situation is presented, after the Congress has been in session continuously, for nearly 10 months, of having an impasse created between the two Houses on a great appropriation bill when all that is involved is $35,000 and seven individuals As one of the four conferees on the part of the Senate, I voted to break the impasse. The House has adopted the report, and it is now before the Senate.

Mr. President, we cannot afford to send the report back to conference and thereby hold the Senate of the United States and the Congress for God knows how long; because if the bill goes back to conference, it goes back with every item in dispute, and where shall we be then?

That is all I have to say on this question I regret that I must take issue with the Senator from Michigan, because in many respects we stand together. In many thoughts we are together. In many ideas we are together. But I cannot go along with him on this matter, because he does not stand on ground sufficiently solid to justify sending the bill back to conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan feels that there is no more solid ground in the world than is the solid granite of principle. Whether it be 7 employees or whether it be 7,000 employees, there is a principle involved. The Senate voted to place the amendment in the bill. The Senator from Michigan did offer a compromise in the conference, to break a deadlock. But, Mr. President, that offer of mine in the conference would not have compromised the principle; it would have upheld the principle, even though the amount involved was small.

I have taken the Senate floor to ask the Senate that it send the bill back to conference, because it is on the basis of principle that it should go back. Have we come to the time when we must yield to expediency? Must we yield to our desires for adjournment? Must we sacrifice principle? Must we tie our ship of state to a drifting buoy? No, Mr. President; we must stand upon principle. In the case of every other Department and agencies we cut the amount of money available for propaganda purposes. Under no principle of logic or reason can it be said that we should not now take it from the three agencies involved in this bill.

Again let me say that while an offer of compromise on dollars was made in the conference, it was not made on principle. And let me emphasize also that while we have been talking about the State Department because that is the source of resistance, the Departments of Commerce and Justice are equally affected by this amendment in this bill.

I am sure that if the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] were permitted to be present on the floor today, he, too, would raise his voice for the principle which is involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, we asked for the yeas and nays. I thought they were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They were not ordered; there was not a sufficient second.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan withhold for a moment his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. FERGUSON. I withhold it.

ACCUSATIONS AGAINST THE MEAT INDUSTRY BY EDWARD P. MORGAN

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, for the past several weeks I have noted the press releases being issued by the Enforcement Director of the Office of Price Stabilization.

This official, Edward P. Morgan by name, has, in what I think is in an irresponsible manner, accused American businessmen of threatening to destroy the price control program.

In what I consider to be a high-handed fashion, this same Mr. Morgan has threatened to jail American businessmen who do not comply with the directives of his agency.

The latest outburst from this gentleman was on October 6, when he stated that—

> There are affirmative efforts by the meat industry to sabotage the entire stabilization program.

He accused cattlemen and processors of a number of violations.

None of the "alleged violations," Morgan said, "can be minimized or characterized as inconsequential." He stated that injunctions were being sought in Federal courts throughout the country against several hundred of the alleged violators. He described as "most uncooperative, the attitude of the American Meat Institute."

The meat institute in Chicago, according to the Associated Press, replied that—

> Time, and not loose talk and mischievous allegations will prove that everything wrong with the meat is the result of the Office of Price Stabilization's own price control regulations which threaten complete disruption of the consumers' meat supply in legal trade channels.

I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that Mr. Morgan is indulging in the technique, now attempted to be made in certain quarters, of defaming any person or group who opposes them.

If Mr. Morgan knows any violations of the law as an enforcement official, I am sure all of us would like to see him immediately proceed to prove those violations in a court of law and punish the violators. Let him refrain from indulging in these attacks.

This technique of not naming people and accusing groups by the use of the word "they" should cease.

I recall just a brief few months ago when this same Mr. Edward Morgan was general counsel of the so-called Tydings committee to investigate the infiltration of Communists into the State Department.

As general counsel of that committee it was incumbent upon this Mr. Morgan to determine the veracity or the falsity of the charges leveled against the State Department.

Was he as belligerent? Was he as militant then as he is now? No, indeed; he was not. I recall that on the Senate floor on July 24, 1950, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 8, on pages 10811 to 10820, there was much discussion of certain tactics of leaving out of the printed text part of the testimony and proceedings, and as a Senator said at the time (page 10813), "I shall not characterize such methods because I think they speak for themselves."

Did not Earl Browder, the leader of the Communist Party of the United States, publicly announce that he was using that committee as a "transmission belt for Communist propaganda"? Did he not get away with much of it even though Mr. Morgan was general counsel of the committee?

Did Mr. Morgan, as general counsel of the committee, allow the known Communists to appear before that committee and to commit flagrant contempt of Congress for which they were cited? Did Mr. Morgan so phrase his legal questions, so lay the legal foundation, that these contempt citations would be upheld in the courts of law? Many think he did not. When these cases of Browder and Field were brought into the courts it was demonstrated that a proper foundation had not been laid by the committee's general counsel, Mr. Edward P. Morgan. As a matter of fact, the courts found that Mr. Browder was most cooperative with Mr. Morgan.

Did this now bellicose individual, who is threatening American businessmen, threaten the Communists when they were before him? No; the record is clear.

My memory extends back to the Pearl Harbor affair. Many called it the whitewash investigation. Who participated as counsel in that hearing? Was it not Edward P. Morgan? Did he dig in and present all the facts? There have been grave doubts expressed as to that.

I for one am glad that the American Meat Institute, Inc., is not as cooperative with Mr. Morgan as was Earl Browder. Let Mr. Morgan talk less and bring these cases into the open, into the courts, and get busy. Let him cease to charge unidentified groups of American citizens. Let him refrain from accusing the great cattle and packing industry of the United States. Let Mr. Morgan put it on the line if he has the facts as to violations, or admit that he is just talking.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an Associated Press article entitled "OPS Aides Say Meat Rules Are Violated."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPS AIDES SAY MEAT RULES ARE VIOLATED

NEW YORK, October 6.—Thirty-eight percent of the Nation's slaughterers are violating meat controls, says the Office of Price Stabilization's enforcement director.

The official, Edward P. Morgan, adds that there are affirmative efforts by the meat industry "to sabotage the entire stabilization program."

Mr Morgan told a news conference here yesterday that the OPS drive that began September 25 against illegal slaughtering practices has uncovered 532 violators among 1,445 plants visited by OPS agents

He said there are more than 10,000 slaughterers in the country.

Violations of meat control regulations, Mr. Morgan said, included the buying of cattle and selling of meat at above ceiling prices, tie-in sales, false weighing, upgraded and unmarked meat, and falsification of and failure to keep proper records.

None of the alleged violations, Morgan said, "can be minimized or characterized as inconsequential."

Mr. Morgan said injunctions are being sought in Federal courts throughout the country against several hundred of the alleged violators, many accused of more than one irregularity

The enforcement official described as "most uncooperative" the attitude of the American Meat Institute, Inc., a major trade association with headquarters in Chicago.

Mr Morgan said the institute and the National Independent Meat Packers' Association were trying to destroy the price-control program.

The meat institute in Chicago replied that "time and not loose talk and mischievous allegations will prove that everything wrong with meat is the result of the OPS' own price control regulations which threaten complete disruption of the consumers' meat supply in legal trade channels."

Earlier, the packers' association said "there is a reasonably adequate supply of meat and the people ought to be getting it." The association said restrictive price control keeps meat off the market.

CLEANER AIR WEEK

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] was called away on official business, and I ask unanimous consent, on his behalf, to place in the RECORD a letter and to read a very brief statement prepared by him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The statement is as follows:

As governor of Pennsylvania I heartily endorsed an observance of Cleaner Air Week last year, and it was gratifying to have a very great many cities and towns throughout the State participate in the program.

This year the event is being planned to cover even a wider scope of activities. It will serve as a starting point for year-round air-pollution control by soliciting the cooperation of public officials, chambers of commerce, and other civic organizations, industries, building owners, and householders. I commend Cleaner Air Week as a contribution to better living and more efficient use of our fuel resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a letter from Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer, endorsing Cleaner Air Week.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, August 14, 1951.

Mr. CHARLES N. HOWISON,
National Chairman, Cleaner Air Week Committee, Air Pollution and Smoke Prevention Association of America, Cincinnati, Ohio.

DEAR MR. HOWISON. I am happy to endorse the objectives of Cleaner Air Week and to urge the adoption of measures which have proved to be effective in preventing air pollution. In the elimination of smoke, ash, and industrial fumes and gases, there occurs an outstanding example of the way in which business interests and public interests join together.

Installation of equipment to prevent or reduce air pollution can result in substantial reductions of costs to industry. I refer to the visible costs of such items as fuel, factory upkeep and maintenance—including cleaning of buildings—as well as such hidden costs as time lost through absenteeism or illness on the job caused by noxious fumes.

We cannot afford, especially at this time, such a waste of materials and energy I hope that interest aroused during Cleaner Air Week will carry on throughout the year and result in continuing and increasing success in achieving your objectives.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Benton	Hayden	McKellar
Brewster	Hendrickson	McMahon
Butler, Md.	Hennings	Millikin
Butler, Nebr.	Hickenlooper	Moody
Cain	Hill	Murray
Capehart	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Holland	Robertson
Case	Humphrey	Russell
Chavez	Hunt	Saltonstall
Clements	Ives	Schoeppel
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Kerr	Sparkman
Ecton	Knowland	Stennis
Ellender	Lehman	Thye
Ferguson	Lodge	Underwood
Flanders	Magnuson	Welker
Frear	Malone	Williams
Fulbright	McCarran	Young
George	McFarland	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report on the appropriation bill for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, and the judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. FERGUSON asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there is now only one way in which the Senate can insist upon keeping amendment numbered 106 in the bill. That is by rejecting the conference report from which the amendment has been dropped. This is substantially the same amendment as was enacted in all the other general appropriation bills. The amendment would reduce by 25 percent the appropriation for public relations specialists, with certain exceptions, such as the Voice of America.

This amendment was offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the senior Senator from Michigan. The only way it can be taken back to conference and restored is by means of a "nay" vote on the question of agreeing to the conference report.

The Senator from Michigan feels that we should try once more to adhere to the principle that there should be a reduction in the public-relations activities covered by the pending bill. This principle has been carried out in connection with each of the other regular appropriation bills, and even in the two supplemental bills, by the inclusion of a similar provision. Therefore I hope that the principle may be maintained, and that the conference report will be rejected.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this question involves a return to conference of the appropriation bill for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, and the judiciary. There were 108 items in dispute. All of them have been settled by the conferees except one item, with respect to which a majority of the conferees agreed.

If the bill goes back to conference, all the items will be in dispute, and no one can tell when or if the bill may come back to the House and Senate again.

Only seven positions and $35,000 are involved. I say that by way of explanation The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] agreed to a compromise of 12½ percent as against 25 percent.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have sought to indicate that was a compromise on percentages, to break a deadlock, and not a compromise on principle such as is abandonment of the limitation.

Mr. McCARRAN. There are 283 positions of this kind in the State Department. A 10-percent reduction would cut them to 255 positions. A 12½-percent cut would reduce them to 248 positions. Hence, there are only 7 positions involved, and $35,000. To send this bill, carrying $1,043,000,000 back to conference, when it is not known when it could come out of conference again, seems to me to be out of line.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also true that there are activities in the Department of Commerce and in the Justice Department which would also be affected; and, therefore, it is not a cut of only seven positions?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. There are two positions in the Department of Commerce, and not more than one or two in the Department of Justice.

Mr. FERGUSON. In conference, still acting on principle, the Senator from Michigan did offer a reduction of 12½ percent, instead of 25 percent. That offer was not accepted Four of the seven Senate members of the conference committee approved of the conference report. The same number of House Members approved the report. All that we can do now is to send the bill back to conference and insist that the amendment stay in the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to state that the conference report was approved by the House on yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr HAYDEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from land [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE], and Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr NEELY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr NEELY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maine would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "nay," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea".

On this vote the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—31

Benton	Humphrey	Moody
Chavez	Hunt	Murray
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Kefauver	Russell
Ellender	Kerr	Smathers
Frear	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
George	Magnuson	Sparkman
Hennings	McCarran	Stennis
Hill	McFarland	Underwood
Hoey	McKellar	
Holland	McMahon	

NAYS—27

Brewster	Ecton	Malone
Butler, Md.	Ferguson	Millikin
Butler, Nebr.	Flanders	Robertson
Cain	Fulbright	Saltonstall
Capehart	Hendrickson	Schoeppel
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Thye
Case	Ives	Welker
Cordon	Knowland	Williams
Dworshak	Lodge	Young

NOT VOTING—38

Aiken	Bridges	Duff
Anderson	Byrd	Eastland
Bennett	Dirksen	Gillette
Bricker	Douglas	Green
Hayden	Maybank	Pastore
Jenner	McCarthy	Smith, Maine
Johnson, Colo.	McClellan	Smith, N. J.
Johnson, Tex.	Monroney	Taft
Kem	Morse	Tobey
Kilgore	Mundt	Watkins
Langer	Neely	Wherry
Long	Nixon	Wiley
Martin	O'Conor	

So the report was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to explain my vote of a moment ago. I notice that mine was the only Democratic vote against the conference report, so I think that that very unusual alinement calls for an explanation of the vote. I am now informed there was another.

I voted against the report to protest against and to show my disapproval of amendment No. 25. I wish to remind the Senate that we had a very difficult battle over the program of information and educational activities, as the Senate will recall, and it was especially on the student exchange program, increasing the amount of appropriation for this over-all activity of information and exchange from $63,000,000 to $85,000,000, that we upset the Committee on Appropriations by a very large vote—a vote, as I remember, of 52 to 16.

However, when the bill went to conference, of course, the conferees on the part of the Senate were composed of the same Senators who had cut this program in the committee of the Senate. The conferees agreed to retain $6,500,000, which was the amount appropriated by the House. The Senate conferees, seemingly, were unable to make any compromise whatever. Apparently they were unable to get $1 more than the House had provided, which is a rather unusual situation to say the least. Ordinarily there is some kind of a compromise and some substantial amount is provided above or below the figure which is in controversy.

I only wish to say that I feel this is a very poor compromise, indeed, it is no compromise at all. We have lost all we had gained after a long fight on the floor of the Senate.

I should like to say another word about the exchange program. I have considered it at great length. Yesterday I had a long discussion with the head of the organization, CARE, Mr. French, who stated unequivocally that the exchange program is one of the more effective we have in combating communism. I am amazed at some of the people who profess a great interest in our international relations and who are very concerned about communism, and yet are unwilling to support this kind of program or, to any great extent, the program known as point 4. It seems to me they are taking inconsistent positions. I firmly believe that the two most effective programs the Government now has, which are both on too small a scale, are what are known as the point 4 program and the exchange of persons program. I think they are the two programs which enable the peoples of foreign nations to become acquainted with us, and to appreciate and understand what the United States is trying to do in the international picture. When we deal with governments, as we do in the ECA, which I think is necessary in Europe, I do not think we reach the people. I can well understand why the people of France and Italy have no idea of what this country has done for them, because we did not deal with them directly; we dealt with their governments.

I profoundly regret that the conference saw fit to accept this very substantial cut. I consider it a very great setback to the effort to bring about better international relations between this country and other countries of the world. It is extremely discouraging to have the conferees of the Senate give up the hard-won fruits of a long struggle in the Senate on behalf of the exchange program.

I am distressed about whether this country will ever be able to have the rest of the world understand our motives and purposes in international relations. I cannot be very optimistic about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 4740, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U S
October 11, 1951

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 79 to the bill (H R. 4740) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes," and concur therein with an amendment, as follows. In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,125,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 103, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 602. No representative of the United States Government in any international organization hereafter shall make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ percent of the budget of any international organization for which the appropriation for the United States contribution is contained in this act: *Provided*, That in exceptional circumstances necessitating a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ percent of the budget, a commitment requiring a United States appropriation of a larger proportion may be made after consultation by United States representatives in the organization or other appropriate officials of the Department of State with the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives: *Provided, however*, That this section shall not apply to the United States representatives to the inter-American organizations.

"No representative of the United States Government to any international organization of which the United States is not now a member shall, unless specifically authorized in an appropriation act or other law, make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ percent of the budget of such international organization."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 104½, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 604. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that

would be provided by a ratio of 1 such employee to 115, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That excess factors arising from unusal requirements approved by the President may be used in applying a different ratio, but in no instance shall the number be in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of 1 such employee to 85, or a part thereof full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation, job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training, committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners, wage administration, and processing, recording, and reporting. *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to personnel work concerning employees of the Foreign Service of the United States"

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 107, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendent insert

"SEC. 606 The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place two positions in grade GS-18, and seven positions in grade GS-17, in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, and such positions shall be in lieu of any positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation previously allocated under section 505 The compensation of the Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation hereafter shall be $17,500 per annum

"The Secretary of State hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place the position of Director, Office of Budget and Finance, in grade GS-17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent

"The Secretary of Commerce hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place the position of Director, Office of Budget and Management, in grade GS-17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent"

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 79, 103, 104½, and 107.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Nevada. I did not hear the number of the last amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. It was No. 107.

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AND RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1347, Calendar No. 842, amending the Railroad Retirement Act, and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1347) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill S. 1347, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say that of course we do not expect to dispose of this bill this afternoon; it is now too late to act on it today.

In accordance with previous anouncements, if a conference report, which of course is a privileged matter, is ready to be taken up on Monday, the railroad retirement bill will then be temporarily laid aside, for the purpose of the consideration of such a conference report.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO SUBMIT REPORTS DURING THE RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr McFARLAND Mr President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess of the Senate the Appropriations Committee be authorized to submit reports on any bills pending before it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

READJUSTMENT OF SIZE AND WEIGHT LIMITATIONS ON FOURTH-CLASS (PARCEL POST) MAIL

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1335) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail, which were, on page 1, line 6, strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty"; on page 1, line 9, strike out "third- or fourth-class" and insert "second-, third-, or fourth-class"; on page 1, line 11, strike out "third- or fourth-class" and insert "second-, third-, or fourth-class", and on page 2, line 7, after "books", insert "or (5) mailed in the United States, including the District of Columbia, for delivery by any Army or Fleet post office or in any Territory or possession of the United States, including the Canal Zone and Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, or mailed at any Army or Fleet post office or in any Territory or possession of the United States, including the Canal Zone and Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, for delivery in the United States, including the District of Columbia, or any Army or Fleet post office or any Territory or possession thereof, including the Canal Zone and Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. BUTLER of Maryland conferees on the part of the Senate.

INVESTIGATION OF PERSONNEL NEEDS AND PRACTICES OF GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 206, Calendar 891. I understand that this resolution was discussed a few days ago, at which time there was some opposition by Senators on the other side of the aisle, who wished to look further into the resolution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the request of the Senator from South Carolina, let me say that the resolution was discussed at the very beginning of the session the other day. At that time no Senator who knew about the resolution was in the Chamber, and the resolution involves an increase by $145,000 in the limit of expenditures for the investigation. I asked the Senator from Arizona whether he would be willing to have the resolution placed on the calendar, and he was willing to do so, and did so.

I now understand from the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from South Carolina, and other Senators that the resolution was reported unanimously by the committee, and that all Senators are in favor of adoption of the resolution, and that it should be adopted.

So I have no objection to having the resolution considered at this time

The PRESIDING OFFICER The Senator from South Carolina has requested unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 206, Calendar No. 891.

Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and subsequently from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, in line 9, after the word "by", to strike out "$225,000" and insert "$145,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the first section of Senate Resolution 53, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to February 19, 1951 (authorizing an investigation of the personnel needs and practices of the various governmental department and agencies), is amended by striking out "January 31, 1952" wherever it appears in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1952"

SEC. 2. The limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased by $145,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

THE FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNISM—TACTICS OF THE DAILY WORKER

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from time immemorial aggressive nations have resorted to the principle of "divide and conquer" in order to weaken and destroy their enemies. In their mad lust for world conquest, the Red leaders are no exception to this rule.

As Americans facing an hour of deepest crisis, it is incumbent upon us to

present a firm, united front against the common foe, both from within and without. The fight against communism is no matter of petty partisanship. What shall it profit a man if he gain some slight advantage for his party, and lose the respect of his countrymen by sacrificing the interest of his nation and the freedom of the world? Let there be no mistake. The Communists are quick to reap advantage from such short-sighted partisanship.

Is there an acid test of such misguided statesmanship? There is one sure-fire method. An ancient Latin poet once said, "I fear the Greeks, even when they bring gifts." So I say today, "beware the Communist Daily Worker when it lavishes praises and proffers its support." Indeed I would think twice—nay a dozen times, if I were ever the subject of Communist acclaim. Fortunately, this has not been my experience. In fact, I am proud to state that I am one of the major targets of the Red smear apparatus.

In one of its recent sessions, the Senate Internal-Security Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, heard the sworn testimony of Louis F. Budenz, a former leading Communist. The subcommittee has made no findings as to the individuals mentioned in this testimony. It prefers to reserve its judgment until all the evidence is in. Certain elements have chosen another course. They have preferred to impugn the motives and character of this witness without waiting for the full facts. With what result? The Daily Worker has seized upon this attempt to discredit Budenz, the star witness in the trial of the 11 Communist leaders, by demanding "a rehearing by the Supreme Court of the infamous Smith Act decision and an end to the administration's arrests of Communists."

Mr. President, you cannot have your cake and eat it. The Government cannot build its case against the Communists upon the fully substantiated testimony of Mr. Budenz and then have some of its spokesmen turn around and denounce his as a perjuror. Such actions provide valuable grist for the Red mill of communism.

I therefore take this occasion to place into the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a few recent articles from the Communist Daily Worker, so that those who are really concerned about the danger we face and who realize the necessity of a united front against the common enemy may read and profit thereby.

I ask that there be inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks an article from the Daily Worker of September 25, 1951, page 3.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALLACE SAYS HE SUPPORTED CHIANG IN 1944

The newspaper bias which once greeted Henry Wallace was conspicuously absent yesterday as the press headlined his claim that he had supported the Fascist dictator, Chiang Kai-shek, back in 1944 Wallace, former Vice President and defector from the Progressive Party, made his statement in a letter to President Truman, in which he wished the latter "health and strength in shouldering the tremendous burdens ahead."

Wallace's letter attempted to defend the Truman administration against the Republican claim that Democratic weakness had permitted China to go Communist.

Wallace, who for a brief period proclaimed himself a friend of the Chinese people, told Truman he had now come to believe that his (Wallace's) pro-Chiang stand in 1944 was a "sound judgment."

Some observers took the position that Wallace's letter, made public in Washington after Truman turned it over to Vice President BARKLEY, "for use in such ways as you deem appropriate," indicated that the former Vice President would support the President for reelection.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks an article from the Daily Worker of September 25, 1951, page 1.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR LEHMAN READS CHARGES SENATORS HELPED BUDENZ LIE

WASHINGTON, September 24.—Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN (Democrat, New York) today read aloud to the Senate a series of newspaper articles which had accused the Senate Internal Security Committee of helping stool-pigeon Louis Budenz to lie about a State Department official.

The articles, by Columnist Joseph Alsop, charged the committee "led" Budenz into self-contradictory testimony that the State Department aide was a Communist.

LEHMAN took the hard way of getting the articles into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD after Senators OWEN BREWSTER (Republican, Maine) and HERMAN WELKER (Republican, Idaho) blocked his request for unanimous consent to have them published in the Appendix.

LEHMAN had made a similar request 10 days ago, but it was blocked by WELKER when Security Committee Chairman PAT MCCARRAN (Democrat, Nevada) complained that Alsop had accused him of "subornation of perjury."

MCCARRAN was not on the floor today, but BREWSTER and WELKER spoke up in his behalf. WELKER said the articles were scurrilous and BREWSTER denounced them as an unfair attack on MCCARRAN's integrity.

LEHMAN did not repeat his earlier demand that the Senate investigate Alsop's implication that MCCARRAN's committee deliberately sought false testimony.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks an article from the Daily Worker of September 27, page 3.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAMONT BACKS MOVE TO PROBE BUDENZ' LIES

Corliss Lamont, author of the Independent Mind, yesterday expressed his support for the demand by Senator HERBERT LEHMAN, Democrat, New York, that the Senate investigate the smear testimony given by stool pigeon Louis Budenz to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Lamont expressed his stand in a letter to Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, Nevada, in which he said:

"You treat very lightly the unwarranted suggestion of the subcommittee's counsel that two letters (from the Institute of Pacific Relations' files) initialed 'C L from E. C. C.' were written to me. But that suggestion remained uncorrected in the minds of everyone who was at the hearing in question and went uncorrected in the subcommittee's records. It would have remained that way had I not pointed out in my protest to you that C. L. was Clayton Lane, a former official of the Institute.

"On the assumption that C. L. was myself, your counsel proceeded to draw from ex-Communist Louis Budenz a long statement falsely branding me as a Communist. I support Senator LEHMAN and President Truman in urging that your subcommittee thoroughly investigate the reliability of this character, Budenz, whose overheated imagination persists in conjuring up fantastic accusations against innocent persons."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that there be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article from the Daily Worker of September 28, 1951, page 5.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR LOVE—OUR PLEDGE

A letter is on the desk before us addressed to John Gates, editor of the Daily Worker.

The letter asks him to state his views on a certain magazine article

But John Gates—GI, fighter against Franco, working class leader—can't do that today He is in a Federal jail down in Atlanta, Ga. It seems that John Gates was found guilty of conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, a crude, ignorant and lying frameup. They had no evidence for this Nazi-style charge It was the twisted testimony of the notorious careerist and hired Government stoolie, Louis Budenz, combined with the loaded justice of rigged juries and rigged judges, which sent John Gates to prison for 5 years.

Today, millions of Americans are beginning to wake up to the fact that this Budenz is an unscrupulous rumor-monger who will say what the McCarrans and McCarthys want him to say. His memory expands all the time to meet the needs of the most reactionary pro-Fascist forces in the United States of America

If Budenz's tales about prominent anti-Communist personalities in the Government are demonstrably false, how much falser were his hopped-up inventions at the Foley Square trial.

We think of John Gates all the time down in that prison. We think of him especially today. Today is his birthday. We pledge never to cease the fight to get him and his fellow-victims out. We send him our love. We think all his friends would want to do the same in wires and letters—Federal Prison, Atlanta, Ga.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks an article from the Daily Worker of September, 30, 1951, page 5.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUDENZ HOAX

The halo around the stool pigeon Louis Budenz is showing large cracks these days and an increasing number of people are holding their nose at mention of his name.

Last week Columnist Joseph Alsop, in the New York Herald Tribune, charged Budenz had given demonstrably false testimony against a member of the State Department, John Vincent Carter. He also charged that the Senate subcommittee headed by Senator MCCARRAN (the JOE MCCARTHY of the Democratic Party) had led Budenz into presenting false testimony.

The administration, its supporters, and others are rightfully furious at the way the McCarthys and McCarrans used Budenz to assassinate the character of members where Budenz got his start in gutter testimony.

It was the administration itself, through its Justice Department, which gave Budenz the opportunity to assassinate the character not only of individuals but of an entire political party, the Communist Party.

Is anyone so naive as to think that the Budenz who engages in demonstrably false truths about administration figures, was telling the truth at Foley Square about the party which he betrayed for a cushy job?

The demand of Senator LEHMAN for a probe of the charge against MCCARRAN'S committee and testimony of Budenz should be backed to the hilt by everyone concerned with the Bill of Rights. So should Senator BENTON'S resolution to oust Senator MCCARTHY and the current drive to repeal the McCarran law

And surely those who will think more deeply about this question and who will recognize that the Budenz of MCCARTHY and MCCARRAN is the same Budenz of Foley Square, will also call for a rehearing by the Supreme Court of the infamous Smith Act decision and an end to the administration's arrests of Communists and other working-class leaders

Mr MCCARRAN I ask that there be inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks an article from the Daily Worker of October 1, 1951, page 5.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDENZ-FOLEY SQUARE AND NOW

We are now cautiously reaching a state in our United States of America where it is no longer considered treason to disbelieve the well-paid, lying fantasies of Louis Budenz and other stool pigeons

The Budenzes, Bentleys, and Whittaker Chambers' have made an awfully good thing out of the informer's racket.

And like all others of that stripe, they are in no danger of running out of material since their fertile and conscienceless imaginations can always dish up new revelations and new names to fit the needs of their bosses

The Budenz who was hired by the Truman administration to frame the Communist Party leaders at Foley Square has now become a menace in the hands of the McCarran-McCarthy mobsters riding wildly in Washington

The New Republic this week (October 1) states editorially "His (Wallace) report substantiates the grave and important charge of Joseph Alsop that Budenz perjured himself before the Senate Committee in accusing Vincent and not the Committee presided over by Pat McCarran is guilty of subordination"

Harold Ickes, in the same issue, notes that the Budenz-Bentley careerism is connected with the decision of the Vinson faction on the United States Supreme Court to cripple the Bill of Rights by outlawing the teaching and advocacy of unorthodox views. He writes

"Even the Supreme Court, as was shown by its regrettable decision in the case of the 11 Communists, with only Justices Black and Douglas dissenting, has apparently been affected by the thought-terrorists and their supporting claque of professional former Communists under the leadership of such undesirable persons as Budenz and Bentley"

The editor of the New York Compass dares Budenz to sue him as he calls him a perjurer Senator LEHMAN urges a senatorial probe of the Budenz-McCarran tactic in smearing certain Truman-State Department agents like John Carter Vincent

And Mr Arthur Krock of the New York Times, a hardened reactionary if ever there was one, notes that in the lexicon of the raving witchhunters, a Communist is anyone mentioned unfavorably by Senator MCCARTHY; a patriot is any ex-Communist before a congressional inquiry, and an effort to reduce the budget, is service to Russia.

Indeed, America has been pushed far and fast since Attorney General McGrath framed the indictment and jailings at Foley Square with one Louis Budenz as the star for the prosecution. For it was at Foley Square that Budenz invented his political forgery that when the Communists say peace, they mean war, when they say democracy, they mean tyranny, etc.

Now this Budenz chicanery about Aesopian language is being applied on a broad and ruthless scale in Washington, the effort to have peace is appeasement, criticism of our refusal to deal with 450,000,000 Chinese people is called being duped by Moscow, recognition of the fact that China has ditched Chiang Kai-shek is conspiracy to betray America to Moscow (MCCARTHY'S charge against General Marshall), etc, etc.

Communist leaders are in prison; others face similar political trials in October, others are in jail without bail—all on the basis of exactly this style of Budenz-Smith Act frame-ups

If Budenz did not hesitate to turn his tainted weapons against the targets of Senator MCCARTHY, what is there for the American people to believe in his Foley Square inventions?

The widest public support should be given to the Benton resolution to investigate the fitness of Senator MCCARTHY to sit in the Senate, as well as to Senator LEHMAN'S proposal of a probe of the Budenz-McCarran testimony

But if America is not to lose its democratic heritage to a raging McCarthyite terrorism blacking out all criticism, dissent, or questioning, then there must be a determination to halt the "thought control" and Smith Act arrests which have brought the future of the Bill of Rights into graver question than at any time in our history

There should be a realization by all citizens, regardless of political views, that when the jailed Communist leaders petition in October for a Supreme Court rehearing of their Smith Act conviction, they are in fact challenging the thought terrorism which makes criticism of the budget, service to Moscow and disagreement with McCarran, McCarthy, and Louis Budenz treason to the U S A

EXCHANGE OF PRISONERS OF WAR SUGGESTED AS PRELIMINARY TO RESUMPTION OF KOREAN PEACE NEGOTIATIONS

Mr KNOWLAND Mr President, it was about a year ago at this time that I was in Korea and had the opportunity of going to Hamhung, Pyongyang and other areas in northern Korea The cold season is fast approaching in that area of the world I can personally testify that it becomes bitterly cold from certainly the 1st of November on During the past week, members of the Armed Services Committee had the opportunity of seeing certain types of winter clothing which is now supplied to the American forces in that area, or which will be supplied, to meet winter requirements. But the fact remains that American troops who are now prisoners of war of the Chinese Communists or of the North Korean Communists will, of course, not be given an issue of winter clothing by their captors.

I certainly hope that the executive branch of the Government and the military authorities have constantly in mind that there are approximately 10,000 Americans who are missing in action, a number of whom, at least, may be prisoners of war. It seems to me that in the pending negotiations the United Nations forces could very well take the position, not only with respect to United States forces who may be prisoners of war, but also, of course, to any of the other United Nations forces who may be prisoners of war, that steps should be taken for an exchange of prisoners.

It seems to me it would not be unreasonable as a test of the good faith—if they have any—of the Chinese Communists and the North Korean Communists that as a condition precedent to the carrying on of future negotiations, there should be an exchange of our prisoners in their hands, and of course, requiring an equal exchange of their prisoners who are in our hands. I do not like to see another winter approach without major efforts being made to bring about an exchange of prisoners of war who have been taken from the forces of the United States of America or the forces of our United Nations allies, or indeed to the forces of our associates, the Republic of Korea, and who may be in the hands of the Chinese Communists or North Korean Communists We, of course, must be prepared under those circumstances to exchange an equal number of the Chinese Communists or North Korean Communists who are in our hands. I believe that such a move would have the support of the American Congress and of the American people, and would restore to their comrades and compatriots those men who have sacrificed so much, some of whom at least have spent one winter as prisoners of the Communists.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations of postmasters, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CONFIRMATION OF POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations on the Executive Calendar of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, as in executive session, and that the President be notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF TELFORD TAYLOR TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall not make any point about taking up the nomination of Mr. Telford Taylor, but it is a matter in which many people are very much interested.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I am not asking that the nomination be taken up, but I should like to ask the majority leader if we may expect early action on it.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, some Senators have indicated that they would like to be present when all three

of the nominations on the Executive Calendar are taken up, so I agreed that all the nominations should go over until Monday.

Mr. SPARKMAN. All I wanted was some assurance that early action would be taken on them.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that the majority leader's assurance of early action covered not only the nomination of Mr. Taylor, but the nominations of Mr. Cook and Mr. Harl to be members of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation?

Mr. McFARLAND. Request has been made by Senators who desire to be present, and I have agreed that the nominations should all go over until Monday.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator refers to the three nominations?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it the intention that they be taken up in the near future?

Mr. McFARLAND. I assume they will be taken up Monday.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the majority leader.

INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES POST OFFICE AT VANCOUVER, WASH.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution directing the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate the administration of the Vancouver, Wash., post office, with special reference to the recent trial and acquittal of 14 employees charged with conspiracy to defraud the Government by collusive bidding. I ask that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 223), submitted by Mr. CAIN, was received and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows.

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the policies, operations, administration, and personnel of the United States Post Office, Vancouver, Wash., including the relationship of the Post Office Department thereto, during the period August 1, 1942, through January 10, 1951. Such study and investigation shall be made with particular emphasis on the circumstances culminating in the indictment, on September 20, 1950, and subsequent acquittal, on September 20, 1951, in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, of 14 employees of such post office for conspiracy to defraud the United States Government and the Post Office Department. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the situation in the Vancouver, Wash., post office, to which this resolution refers, has given substantial reason for a thoroughgoing investigation to determine to what extent a serious injustice has been committed. The facts, briefly, are as follows:

On September 20, 1950, 14 employees were charged by the Post Office Department with conspiracy to defraud the Government by collusive bidding on mounted motor contracts serving the Vancouver area, and with having committed sabotage on contract equipment.

The basis of the conspiracy charge was that all bids were identical, a practice, which, I am informed, is general throughout the postal service, and is followed by approximately 6,000 carriers.

The sabotage charge alleged that contract equipment was willfully damaged. I have been informed that the motor equipment dated back to the period from 1935 to 1942. The equipment had apparently been discarded and was placed back in operation by a junk dealer. Because of the hundreds of stops made on delivery routes, motor equipment receives hard use, and the employees stated that the breakdowns were the result of using old equipment.

The punitive action taken by the department consisted of discharges and demotions. Nine of the persons involved were veterans, and their cases were appealed to the Civil Service Commission.

Before the civil service hearings were held the Department obtained indictments by a grand jury charging the 14 employees with collusive bidding and sabotage. The trial began in Federal court on September 5, and concluded on September 20, 1951.

The jury acquitted all 14 on all counts of the indictment.

This case has given rise to much unfavorable comment both by the public and in the press. This criticism was predicated on the belief that the Government's case was weak and flimsy and was, perhaps, influenced by political or other considerations.

Particularly significant in this respect is the statement of the presiding judge in his charge to the jury. After reviewing the facts of the case, the court made the following unequivocal statement:

> Now, ladies and gentleman, you cannot make a crime out of that, at least not in my court. You certainly cannot make a felony out of it; at least not before me.

Mr. President, because of the importance of the court's charge to the jury in throwing light upon this case, I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the court's instructions to the jury were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TACOMA, WASH., *September 20, 1951.*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON, SOUTHERN DIVISION

United States of America, plaintiff v. *Edmond J. Belisle, et al, defendants* (No C-16114)

COURT'S INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY

The COURT. The Government in this case, like in every criminal case, has the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt the material allegations of the indictment under which the defendants have been charged.

This means such a doubt as would cause the average reasonable person to hesitate in making an important decision in his or her own affairs.

The charge here is under the conspiracy statute. It is not charged that any crime, what we call a substantive crime, has been committed. It is charged the defendants conspired to do something. It is not charged that they conspired to violate some statute. That is not an unusual situation in Federal practice, where a group of people is charged with conspiring to violate some statute. For instance, under the old prohibition law, in many cases involving rum-running and selling, in the rum-running and selling business persons were charged with conspiracy to violate the National Prohibition Act

There is no particular statute here the violation of which these defendants are charged. They are charged, on the contrary, with seeking to interfere and hamper the Government in obtaining competitive bids for automobiles needed at Vancouver.

That opens up a pretty broad field. The statute reads that when two or more persons conspire to defraud the Government they may be prosecuted under the conspiracy statute.

Those words "defraud the Government," by court decisions, have been broadened to include interference with or hampering any legitimate Government activity

It was the desire of the Post Office Department down here at Vancouver to obtain competitive bids, so the Government charges, for these automobiles, and the Government charges that these defendants conspired to interfere with that by collusive bidding, by making and submitting collusive bids—I am reading from the indictment—to furnish motor vehicles; second, by depriving and attempting to deprive the Post Office Department of the benefit of competitive bidding to furnish motor vehicles; and, third, by discouraging, intimidating, or threatening others from submitting bids or from entering into contracts to furnish motor vehicles.

That is what we are trying. That is what you are trying. We are not trying any alleged conspiracy to sabotage the Spady equipment, much less the allegation that the Spady equipment was sabotaged That comes in merely in connection with the Government's proof in support of its charges, the three that I have read

As I say, in this case, like in any other criminal case, the Government has the burden of proof. The Government must satisfy you, beyond a reasonable doubt, before you may find these defendants, or any of them, guilty of the charge that they entered into a conspiracy

Mr Sager made a very good statement of that in his opening remarks, about what conspiracy is. I doubt if I can say it as well as he did It is a combination of two or more people to do something unlawful. It has been described as a partnership in crime.

Just because all 14 of these people are charged does not mean you must find them all guilty or all not guilty. It takes only two to make a conspiracy, and you could find any two of these people guilty, if you think the evidence justifies that, and find the other 12 are not guilty, or you can find as to any 2 or more.

You have got a situation here which also calls for comment, about people who come in, so it is charged, who come into the alleged conspiracy after it started. The charge is that this conspiracy started away back in 1942, in August of 1942, and that it continued through January 10, 1951. As to those who were not mounted carriers at the time, according to the Government's theory, and who became mounted carriers later, it is the Government's theory that they became parties to the conspiracy; they joined it.

The law as to that is, as Mr. Sager stated, that anyone who joins a conspiracy at any time during its life, knowing full well that such conspiracy is going on, and who makes himself a party to it is as liable as if he were one of the original members.

Then, too, there has been some reference to the law of conspiracy, about acting in secret. Once a conspiracy has been established, all who are parties to it are bound by the acts of all others, like the law of partnership. Also, after a conspiracy has been

established, and while it is in existence, the statements of any conspirators are, in legal effect, the statements of all.

Therefore, before you can find these defendants or any of them guilty, you must first find, beyond a reasonable doubt, that there was a conspiracy down there and that these people, if you find them guilty and if you do find there was a conspiracy, were parties to it. If you are not satisfied of that beyond a reasonable doubt, it will be equally your duty to return a verdict of not guilty.

If a conspiracy did exist and you so find, then you will proceed to your next proposition. In what respect did the conspirators conspire to defraud the United States?

There are three charges as to that here. The Government does not have to prove all three of them. It could make out a case if it just proved one, any one—I read them to you a moment ago—and that, too, would have to be established to your satisfaction beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty.

The law of conspiracy also has an element—in this country, not in the old country from which we got it, but in this country the law of conspiracy has the element of requiring the commission of overt acts. When we transplanted the law of conspiracy to this country we added that feature to it.

If there is a conspiracy, the theory of the law is that some one of the conspirators must do something in furtherance of the conspiracy, and that we call an overt act. My recollection is that the philosophy of that was to permit conspirators to withdraw before they actually did anything in furtherance of the conspiracy.

A great deal of this indictment, which you will have with you in your jury room for your reference, a great deal of the typing has to do with the enumeration of alleged overt acts There are 14 of them There has been really no point made about them here

If there was a conspiracy, if you so find, and if you find, in accordance with the allegations of the indictment, that the conspiracy was of the sort alleged here, in one or more of the three items alleged, that will be sufficient. As to overt acts, there is no point made here.

Theoretically, it is the duty of the Government to establish one or more of them beyond a reasonable doubt, but as I say, there is no point made as to that I do not want you to get confused. I want you to confine yourselves to whether there was a conspiracy and whether it was of the sort alleged here.

That brings me to what I consider to be the crux of this case. It has not been stressed as much as some of the other features in the arguments of the lawyers.

It is a serious matter to charge a group of men like the defendants here with having committed the crime of conspiracy. That is a felony and, while it is no concern of yours what the punishment should be—that would be my problem, if you find them guilty—an additional burden when a felony is involved, because it is punishable severely, is put on the Government when it charges a felony There are a whole lot of offenses that we know as misdemeanors, offenses, for instances, that are regulatory in nature, where all the Government needs to do is to prove that a man committed the act charged.

A typical instance of that would be the Indian liquor laws with which the Federal judges are certainly bedeviled. If a man is charged with selling liquor to an Indian, it does not do him any good to come in and say, "I thought he was a Filipino. I never saw the fellow before and he came up and asked me for a pint of whisky and he told me he needed it badly, and I wanted to accommodate him, and I sold it to him cheap and I thought he was a Filipino." That does not do him any good. If he is an Indian, he is out of luck.

Now, very seriously, that is not true with this kind of a charge. In connection with this kind of a charge, the Government must prove the act here of conspiracy, and that it is the sort alleged, but it must prove that it was done and that it was entered into with criminal intent, what we call specific criminal intent.

Even though you find these defendants guilty of the conspiracy charged, the commission of overt acts, you may not find them guilty unless you also find, beyond a reasonable doubt, that they entered into the conspiracy with specific criminal intent.

That means a great deal more than the charge in this case, because we have here what, to me, is a strange situation. This trouble broke out down here at Vancouver with a change in postmasters. Things were going along—I don't know just how to use the word, because the Government's theory appears to be that things had not been all right But, anyhow, these particular difficulties broke out beginning with a change in the administration down there, and, so far as anything I have heard here is concerned, these defendants had no knowledge whatever during the period from 1942, when it is alleged this conspiracy began, and 1949, when the new postmaster came in—they had no idea they were doing anything wrong The then postmaster, Mr. Blythe, a very fine man, as you can see, came here and said he knew everything he was doing was legal; he thought it was not only within the regulations, but it was in the interest of the Government He said further, as I understand, that the people in Washington understood, just as fully as he did, what was going on and that they not only approved it but it was what they wanted.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you cannot make a crime out of that, at least you cannot in my court You certainly cannot make a felony out of it, at least you cannot before me

That brings me back to the matter of criminal intent If a man does not know he is doing something wrong, he does not have criminal intent. If what he is doing he thinks is all right and his principal with whom he is dealing believes it is all right and thinks it is all right, it is not a crime, even though, in fact, technically, it is wrong, because it lacks the necessary ingredient of criminal intent You have got to be doing something with a bad motive, with a bad heart You have got to know you are doing wrong to be guilty of a felony, at least this type of a felony, in my opinion That did not exist here during the period of Blythe's administration

That is my view of it. You can reject it. That is a question of fact, one of the things that you have to pass on. You cannot find these defendants, or any of them, guilty unless you find, in addition to the conspiracy, if you find one existed, they did what they were doing, knowing it was wrong, and with specific criminal intent

There is one charge here of collusion, by making and submitting collusive bids, and I will just say a word about that.

Collusion implies secrecy. The mere making of identical bids, in and of itself, is not collusive bidding. It is identical bidding, but it is not collusive bidding Collusive bidding is when you are asking a group of people to come in and bid, and they fool you; they pretend to be bidding and competing, rather, when in fact they are not, and they are dishonest. That is collusive bidding. That is, in the very essence, the word "collusion."

Your verdict must be unanimous. You will have one form of verdict here. It explains itself to you, I think.

You will take the exhibits with you to the jury room and give them what weight you feel they are entitled to, along with the other evidence you have heard here from the witness stand.

You are the exclusive judges of the credibility of the witnesses and of the weight and value of their testimony.

I did not intend to mislead you about what I said about the period of the Blythe administration. This indictment covers the period from 1942 to 1951. Of course, if you find a conspiracy existed, as charged, of the sort charged, and that it was with criminal intent, intent to defraud the Government, at any time during that period, you would find the defendants guilty, any two or more that may be found by you to be involved in that

The thirteenth, or alternate juror, is excused from further consideration of this case. I want to thank all of you for the patient attention you have given to this long case, and the lawyers, too, have tried it like good lawyers and gentlemen.

Swear the bailiffs.

(Bailiffs sworn)

Following the practice of this court, I will appoint Mr. Ham as foreman of the jury.

Do not begin deliberating, ladies and gentlemen, until we send you the exhibits I have a special reason for that We will send them to you within 5 minutes

(The jury thereupon retired)

The COURT You gentlemen for the defense, the rules provide that you be given an opportunity to object to the instructions out of the presence of the jury State your objections.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. The defendants have no objections or exceptions

The COURT Send the exhibits to the jury room and direct the jury to begin its deliberations.

Mr. CAIN. On September 21, 1951, the day following the acquittal, the Vancouver Columbian and Sun published an editorial in which the general criticism of this case was summarized as follows:

NEW DEAL FOR POST OFFICE

The acquittal of the 14 defendants in the post-office trial at Tacoma is a vindication of the faith in them which most citizens of this community have steadily maintained From the outset of the trial it was fairly obvious that the Government's case was of a weak and flimsy nature This was emphasized by the frank remarks from the judge who was evidently disgusted with the prosecution's arguments.

It is hard to understand why the Government attorneys and inspectors should go to such great lengths to get these long-time postal employees when the case against them was so poor. Was it a matter of persecution, instead of prosecution?

Certainly the 14 Vancouver citizens have had a year of intense pain and strain while the clouds of suspicion hovered over their heads The suffering which they and their families underwent can only be partially ameliorated by the action of the jury in proclaiming their innocence.

As to the future of the Vancouver post office, we see little chance of the resumption of harmonious relations that are so necessary for its efficient operation as long as the present acting postmaster retains his post. Without in the least casting any reflection on Dan Hallowell's personal integrity or ability, it seems to us that the situation in which he finds himself has become untenable.

A new deal at the Vancouver post office is clearly in order.

The Vancouver Columbian and Sun published a series of articles during the trial which well summarized the case and the proceedings. In order that the entire story may be available to the Senate and to the Committee on Post Office

and Civil Service in deciding the merits of this investigation, I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Vancouver (Wash.) Columbian and Sun of September 5, 1951]

TACOMA, September 5.—The trial of 14 Vancouver postal employees got under way here today. In rapid-fire order Federal Judge Claude McCullough directed the selection of a jury, the opening arguments by attorneys for the Government and the defense, and had the first witness on the stand before noon.

Political undertones were heard by the jury of eight men and four women shortly after the trial started. After Harry Sager, Government attorney, reviewed charges of collusion in bidding for post-office contracts and willfully damaging automobiles under contract to the post office, Claude Snider, attorney for the 14 men, hinted at political maneuvering resulting in the handling of contracts and in the bringing of charges against the men.

ALLEGATIONS HINTED

Snider said he would show Acting Postmaster Dan Hallowell was selected by the local central committee and that Jack Spady, owner of the cars claimed to have been willfully damaged by some of the 14 men, was a member of the central committee.

Snider added, "by a peculiar circumstance his bid (Spady's) was slightly less than the others." Snider was referring to Spady's successful bid to supply cars for the carrier routes.

The jury which will hear the case was selected in 45 minutes and includes one man from Camas, eight from Tacoma, and three others. The Clark County representative on the jury is Hamond V. Thorne, a Camas grocer.

TWO CHALLENGES ALLOWED

The judge directed the selection of the jurors and permitted each attorney to challenge two prospective jurors. The trial opened at 10 a. m., and the jury was selected by 10:45.

In his opening arguments Government Attorney Harry Sager charged that at least two of the men intentionally mistreated the Spady cars by racing the motors, engaging the clutch when the motor was turning over rapidly, and by permitting them to run when unnecessary. He also said he would show that the men presented like bids and said he would prove that they had discussed and agreed upon the size of their bids in an attempt to defraud the Government when bidding for carrier contracts.

Snider, in his reply, said he would show that the cars in question were old models and were subject to unexpected breakdowns. He said some of the cars were 1935 and 1936 models and did not conform to post-office regulations.

Snider also said he would show that if the 14 men did agree on fixed bids it was the fault of the Post Office Department and not the fault of the defendants. He said that on several occasions when the men presented their bids the Post Office Department had written to the postmaster that one bid was out of line and he should be asked to bring his bid back in line.

INSTANCES CITED

Snider said that specifically in 1944 several letters were written by the Postmaster General because one of the bids was $20 higher than the other. He said the men finally decided to avoid this problem by agreeing on their bids before presenting them.

The first witness, Eugene H Ritter, assistant postmaster here since January 1 and a local post-office employee since 1942, was called to the stand shortly before noon. Ritter did not present testimony for the Government, but was busy identifying post-office records for the judge and the attorneys when the court recessed at noon.

[From the Vancouver (Wash.) Columbian and Sun of September 6, 1951]

TACOMA, September 6.—The age of the autos used by the Vancouver post office under rental contract drew special attention from Federal Judge Claude McColloch today as the trial of 14 Vancouver postal employees moved into its second day.

Acting Postmaster Dan Hallowell took the stand this morning as a Government witness and under questioning reviewed events leading up to the postal inspection which resulted in charges of collusion brought against the men. He was twice interrupted by the judge.

JURIST QUERIES

As Hallowell described how rental car bids were obtained and went into detail on complaints turned in by carriers after Jack Spady's cars were used on the routes in March 1950, a series of memos were introduced as evidence.

In one of these, one of the two Spady cars was described as a 1935 coupe. At this point the judge interrupted.

"Do you mean a 1935 car?" he asked.

"Yes," Hallowell answered.

The judge nodded and said, "And this is 1950"—the date of the memo.

The series of memos were introduced into evidence by the Government and detailed the breakdowns on the two Spady cars during the 3-month period from March to June 1950. They presumably supported Hallowell's statement that he believed Carl Mudge, one of the defendants and an unsuccessful bidder for a rental car contract, had intentionally damaged the cars while driving them on his route

Hallowell explained that in February 1950 a letter from the Post Office Department in Washington, D. C., instructed him to interest outsiders in bidding on the rental contracts. He said carriers had up to that time supplied the rental cars and that the going rate was $1,500.

TAKES LOWER BID

Spady's bid of $1,345 was selected over a competing bid by Mudge of $1,439 at his recommendation, he said. He also revealed through questioning that Mudge changed his bid in 5 minutes before the bids were closed on the one-car contract.

Hallowell said Mudge told him after the contract was awarded to Spady that the service would suffer if the Spady car was used and that Mudge said he had ordered a new model car to fulfill the contract if he had received it.

Hallowell said that as reports of breakdowns in the operation of the Spady car were turned in, Spady was informed. He said Spady said he would supply a different car in the near future.

BREAKDOWN REPORTED

He pointed out that Mudge was driving the car and that Mudge had bid for the route and won it on the basis of seniority. During the month of March, while Mudge was driving the car had four clutch breakdowns, damaged a gasket, and needed repair for failure of the windshield wiper, horn, and other mechanical failures.

After hearing the detailed testimony and just prior to calling a court recess this noon the judge turned to Hallowell and said, "I get the impression you feel that it is your duty to award a contract to the lowest bidder regardless of the age of the car."

He continued, "Is this the way you feel, if a 1935 car was offered for a lower bid than a new model that the bid should go to the lowest bidder?"

AFFIRMS STAND

Hallowell answered, "Yes, I do."

The operation of rental cars on carrier routes and history of post-office dealings with carriers and outside bidders was reviewed yesterday in statements by the attorneys and Government witnesses.

ALLEGATION MADE

The post office began having trouble with its cars breaking down only after Jack Spady was awarded the contract on mounted carrier vehicles by the Post Office Department in 1949, when a motor route became open, the Government charged yesterday in opening its case against 14 former employees of the Vancouver post office accused of conspiring to defraud the United States and the Post Office Department by collusive bidding on motorized vehicles.

Up until this time, Harry Sager, Government attorney, told the jurors only carriers had entered and obtained the contracts. Reason for this, he maintained was that no publicity in the newspapers had been given the calls for bids, only notices were those posted in the local post office and the branch offices.

When Dan Hallowell became acting postmaster on July 1, 1949, he made an effort to give wide publicity to the bid calls, going through the telephone directory and notifying garages and businesses he thought would be interested, Sager said. Among the phone calls in reply to his attempts was one from Spady who subsequently was awarded one hourly and one annual contract on his low bid, said to be $1,000 or $1,100.

CASUALTY RATE HIGH

After the contract went into effect, the attorney said, the clutches on the vehicles began to burn out and other troubles developed that called for repairs. In one case four clutches burned out in 1 month, he declared.

Two of the defendants, Carl Mudge and Ray Keelan, were specifically charged with operating the cars contracted for in such a manner as to damage them while driving them on the mail routes.

Prior to this time, the bids of the carriers were identical, Sager further charged. On one occasion when the Post Office Department considered the bids too high he said, and advised the Acting Postmaster that an effort should be made to obtain lower ones, Cory Galbraith, then assistant postmaster and in charge of the bids, wrote back that outsiders were not interested in entering estimates. The Government attorney maintained that Galbraith made no effort to obtain outside bidders nor publicize the calls.

In dealing with the charges of collusion by the Government, Claude Snider, attorney for the 14 post-office employees, asserted that on many occasions when there was a divergence in the bids entered, the Department would notify the local postmaster of this fact and request that the higher bid be brought down so it would be more in line with the others. He set out to prove his contentions in his questioning of the Government's witness later in the day.

NO INTEREST SHOWN

He declared that auto dealers to be called to the stand will show that they did receive notice of the calls from time to time from the former postmaster, Ned Blythe, or his assistants but that there was little interest and few entered bids.

Post Office Department contracts with motorized carriers were admitted and testimony by the present assistant postmaster heard yesterday as groundwork was laid by the

Government in its case against the Vancouver men.

Eugene H Ritter, an employee of the Post Office Department since January 1, 1942, and assistant postmaster since last January, replacing Galbraith, took the stand shortly before noon and was still undergoing questioning when court recessed at 4 o'clock.

GIVES DETAILS

Post office contracts dating back to 1942 submitted by the United States attorney, were admitted after identification by Ritter. He explained how the bids were awarded, stating the postmaster handled the advertising of the bids, usually circulating a typewritten call. These, he said, were posted in the lobby of the post office. Some of the contracts were for passenger cars and others for trucks depending on the vehicles needed on the routes at the time. The men leased their own cars to the post office and drove them on their mail routes, furnishing the gas and oil.

Edmund Belisle, E. H B. Carson, and Walter Strong entered identical bids of $840 for providing vehicles in August 1942, according to the post-office records. In March 1944 identical bids of $1,080 were submitted by Strong, Carson, DuRose, Keelan, Mudge, and Winsor, it was brought out. Three of the employees, DuRose, Mudge, and Winsor, on another call for bids in July 1946, submitted like bids of $1,200 to furnish the vehicles and in December 1946, identical quotations of $1,300 were entered on passenger cars by Carson, Malone, Officer, Strong, and Whitsitt.

RECORDS CITED

Again in 1947, proposals calling for a truck for weekday deliveries and another for six passenger cars to be used 6 hours a day 6 days a week brought bids of $1,200 from Carson, Keelan, Malone, and Officer, the contract read in court stated

Between July 13-14, 1950, Belisle, DuRose, Keelan, Malone, Officer, and Whitsitt submitted bids of $1,025 on passenger cars, Jeffrey entered a bid of $1,020 on a half-ton panel truck and Winsor a bid of $1,024 on a half-ton truck.

A letter was read by Sager signed by Keelan, dated July, 1950, notifying the department that he would refuse to continue to operate his car under the contract that he didn't think the bids should be so low. He said the bid was entered by someone else in his absence and that he could not afford to drive his car under that contract and wanted either to enter a new bid or drive another auto. He was allowed to cancel his contract, Ritter testified, but he said he could not recall whether or not Keelan submitted another bid

JUDGE SHOOTS QUERY

A question by Judge McColloch who asked if the Government followed this procedure on bidding generally throughout the country, brought Claude Snider, defense attorney, and his associate Leo McGavick, to their feet. Sager answered only: "Well—there is some dispute as to that"

The case moved on into facts on cross-examination of Ritter by Snider. The witness, who said he had worked under Galbraith, who was then assistant postmaster, testified that the postmaster handled the calls for bids. His assistant did it in the absence of the postmaster or if requested to do so by his superior.

Going into the method of advertising for bids, it was brought out that this meant posting the call on the bulletin board in the lobby of the post office or soliciting the bids.

NO PAID ADVERTISING

Paid advertising, Ritter told the court, is against the regulations unless authorized by the department. This has never been given during his tenure, he said. The calls for bids, he went on, are posted in the lobby, in the workrooms and in all the classified stations of which he said there are five or six. It is not mandatory for the mounted carriers to furnish their own vehicles, Ritter said in answer to a query by Judge McColloch.

At Snider's request, Ritter described the lobby of the Vancouver post office stating where the bulletin boards are located in relation to the offices of the superintendent of mails, the postmaster, and the service windows including the more than 400 private boxes.

The bulletin boards, glassed and locked, have been maintained ever since he has worked at the post office, Ritter stated. He said he had never heard any of the inspectors complain about the calls for bids being posted there. He has posted the calls on numerous occasions in the past and had posted a couple of the calls now in controversy, he said.

OUTSIDE BIDS SUBMITTED

Referring to one of the contracts admitted as evidence in which seven of the defendants submitted like bids of $1,025, while Jeffrey entered a bid of $1,020 and Winsor, $1,024, Snider brought out in testimony that outside bids had been submitted at the same time Ritter, however, stated that he could not recall from memory who they were from.

RECORDS ALLEGEDLY REMOVED

Snider, in hammering home on this point was told by the witness that the postal inspectors had removed all of the records from the local post office He had none of the bids in his possession and hadn't had them since becoming assistant postmaster last January, Ritter asserted

Neither was there a letter in his files from the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General dated September 1944 suggesting that a bid submitted by Chester Winsor for $1,200 be lowered in order that it would be comparable to three others entered at $1,080, Ritter testified He said he thought that "this was the time that Winsor submitted another bid but that he couldn't say until he saw the record"

Snider read a letter from the former postmaster, Ned Blythe, in answer to the Department's suggestion recommending that the bid be allowed to stand due to the type of mail route involved However, the Department did not agree to this and again asked that Winsor be contacted in regard to lowering his bid

"As a result of this correspondence between the postmaster and the Assistant Postmaster General didn't Winsor lower his bid?" Snider asked the witness

Ritter answered that "this was correct."

WANT ORIGINAL

A copy of the letter to the local office from the Department was shown to Ritter who testified that no such communication had ever been in his files and Sager was requested by Snider to produce the original. The Government attorney agreed to do this "if they have it."

Ritter in answer to another question by Snider stated that it was usually the practice of the carriers to put new cars on the motorized routes. He said there had been no interference with the delivery of the mail because of breakdowns in past years and that he could recall only one or two such incidents since the war.

The cars, which were provided by Jack Spady on his contract with the post office were "quite old cars," Ritter replied.

He was prevented from answering the question as to "what vintage" they were by the judge who interrupted to state that Spady must first be questioned before that testimony could be admitted.

THREE FURNISHED NOW

Three cars are presently provided by post-office employees, Ritter told the court, two are provided under contract in Portland and Spady now furnishes five vehicles.

On redirect examination by Sager, Ritter asserted that route inspections are made by the superintendent of mails or his foreman. The mileage, the number of stops that must be made on the route, and the amount of mail delivered is checked in this way, he said. Ritter, who said he served as a clerk under Galbraith while he was assistant postmaster, testified that during the tenure of former Postmaster Blythe the bids were made out in the office of the superintendent of mails, Ralph Carson, now deceased. After 1946, Ritter stated, the assistant postmaster took care of this duty. Ritter said he himself had handled one or two calls under Blythe's or Galbraith's direction.

TRAILS DIVERGE

A slight disagreement arose between Sager and his witness on one occasion after Ritter testified in answer to the Government attorney's question concerning postal regulations. Ritter stated that the regulations in the office of the local post office declare "it is desirable to obtain bids from the regular carriers" but that outside bids can be accepted

Shown another document of postal regulations by Sager, Ritter admitted he "could find nothing like that in there" but maintained that the instructions to which he referred are in the post office in Vancouver

Sager, declaring that if a bid complied with specifications anyone could obtain a contract, read department instructions which state that "a canvass should be made among post-office employees as well as outside bidders"

This brought an objection by Snider to the line of questioning. He remarked that he didn't think Sager should be permitted to "cross-examine his own witness" Asked by Judge McColloch if he disagreed with his witness' testimony Sager answered that he did, "that anyone could bid" on the carriers.

Continuing his questioning, Sager had Ritter again describe the lobby of the Vancouver post office and locate the bulletin boards on which the notices for calls were posted as related to the entrance and the service windows

Two movable boards were mounted on either side of the entrance and the bulletin board where the calls were posted were in the north corner, Ritter testified.

TO HEAR EACH MAN

In answer to another question by Snider, the witness asserted that the bulletin boards were still being used for posting notices just as always

Snider has indicated he intends to put each of the 14 defendants on the stand, although they are being tried as a group instead of separately.

Many are accompanied by their wives. Seven were in court yesterday and more were expected to join their husbands later in the trial. Those who are now in Tacoma are Mrs. Edmond Belisle, Mrs. Delbert L. Echtle, Mrs. William DuRose, Mrs Earl N. Malone, Mrs Chester Winsor, Mrs Glenn Officer, Mrs. Cory Galbraith, and Mrs Carl Mudge. Acting Postmaster Dan Hallowell was in court but not called as a witness yesterday as was Jack Spady.

Named as defendants are Cory M Galbraith, former assistant postmaster, Edmond J. Belisle, former superintendent of mails; Edward H. B. Carson, assistant superintendent of mails; Walter W. Strong; Leo J. Belisle; William J. DuRose; Delbert L. Echtle; David D. Jeffrey; Earl N Malone, Glenn Officer; Phil P. Whitsitt; Chester Winsor; Carl R. Mudge; and Ray M. Keelan.

[From the Vancouver (Wash.) Columbian and Sun of September 7, 1951]

TACOMA, September 7—Rumblings of a feud between Acting Postmaster Dan Hallo-

well and the Vancouver local of the Letter Carriers Association and squabbles over political appointments were revealed this morning and yesterday afternoon as the trial of 14 Vancouver postal employees continued here.

Meanwhile, the Government continued to present testimony from Hallowell and Jack Spady, Jr., owner of the rental cars claimed to have been sabotaged by some of the carriers, as the trial moved toward a week-end recess. Court rumors this afternoon were that the Federal Judge Claude McColloch would recess the trial later today until Tuesday morning.

Hallowell completed 2 days on the witness stand this morning after undergoing aggressive cross-examination by handsome Defense Attorney Leo McGavick McGavick's questions probed deeply into a long series of reported conflicts between Hallowell and the letter carriers

ARGUMENT ALLEGED

It was under this questioning that a dispute between the post office and the Vancouver police over double parking and a subsequent agreement was aired. The police had objected to double parking by the carriers in downtown deliveries, Hallowell explained, and after a meeting with them it was agreed to have carrier's cars identified.

Testimony on this dispute was given yesterday and was revived today by McGavick. Through his questioning he sought to force Hallowell to admit that the men would not have objected to cardboard signs identifying the cars but did object to the use of permanent metal plates.

SPADY ON STAND

The Government's second major witness took the stand late this morning when Spady was called by Government Attorney Harry Sager. Through Spady's testimony the history of his ownership of the two cars claimed to have been sabotaged was traced.

Spady revealed that the 1935 coupe had been owned by his sister and was purchased by him 4 months before renting it to the Post Office Department for the carriers' use

The second car, which has been identified only as an Olds sedan, was purchased from the Neal Motor Car Co. of Woodland 3 weeks before renting it to the post office.

Spady testified that after being awarded the contract for the two cars he invited Hallowell, Cory M Galbraith, one of the defendants and former assistant postmaster, and Edmond J Belisle, also a defendant and former superintendent of mails, over to inspect the cars

He said he explained to the trio that he planned to replace the Olds sedan with a 1939 model sedan as soon as it could be gotten ready The 1939 sedan, he said, was a larger car.

SAYS O. K SECURED

He said while they were inspecting the two cars Belisle told him "the cars would do very well and get them into service right away"

Spady said later during the visit Belisle had told him "some of the carriers won't be very well pleased over you getting the contract but that he—Belisle—didn't know what they could do about it."

Under questioning by Sager, Spady also testified that after the cars were put into operation and complaints and mechanical failures began to come in he took the cars to be tested and both passed the State safety test.

FIFTEEN CLUTCHES BLOOIE

He said during the 3 months 15 clutches were taken out of the two cars, and added that he had tagged each of them and put them away.

Spady was on the stand this noon when court recessed for lunch and had not yet been cross-examined.

Hallowell began his long session on the stand yesterday morning and after giving testimony under questioning by Sager was cross-examined by McGavick and then questioned in redirect examination by Sager.

FEUD IMPLIED

Politics and an implied feud between the acting postmaster and the local letter carriers' association entered the testimony yesterday at the trial of the 14 Vancouver post-office employees accused of conspiracy to defraud the Government by submitting collusive bids on "mounted carrier" vehicles and by attempting to deprive the Department of competitive bidding

Dan Hallowell, acting postmaster, at the Vancouver office, denied political trading entered into the awarding of the bids to Jack Spady in February 1950, during vigorous cross-examination by Leo McGavick, who is associated with Claude Snider in the defense of the 14 Vancouver men

A barrage of questions was shot at Hallowell, who was on the stand the greater part of the day, by the defense attorney and when court recessed the post office official though maintaining his calm demeanor, appeared weary

JOBS POLITICAL

In leading up to his intimation of political "backscratching" McGavick brought out in his queries the former positions held by Hallowell for the past 20 years The latter affirmed that his various posts with the Government had been political appointments

He replied, in answer to McGavick, that he had known Jack Spady since the general election in 1948. They are both Democrats, he said, and as such were interested in the campaign

Spady was a member of the central committee at the time Hallowell was appointed acting postmaster, McGavick brought out in his line of questioning, but Hallowell denied he had won his appointment through Spady

OWED NOTHING

The query as to whether it was not true he felt obligated to award the contracts to Spady brought a quick denial from Hallowell, who declared he owed Jack Spady nothing The fact that they were both Democrats, he said, had nothing to do with bidding on the vehicles. He said Spady was merely a friend or was before he got into this mess

He denied that he had talked over the contracts with Spady prior to his appointment as acting postmaster and said they had first discussed the possibility of the contracts after February 13, at the time the call for bids was issued This was after the first notice of the invitations appeared in the paper, according to the witness. Spady was sent a printed notice along with other garage owners whose names were taken from the directory

Hallowell said he did not call the operators by phone and ask them to bid Spady, he answered, was the only one who called him on the phone in regard to the bids.

PLEADS IGNORANCE

Asked if he had known that outside bidders had never been interested in entering proposals on the post office contracts, Hallowell answered that he did not know this and felt it his duty as postmaster to give the call for bids wide publicity

He said he could not discriminate because Spady was a Democrat. Hallowell got a chuckle from the spectators when he added that if Democrats can't enter bids then half the people in the country can't.

McGavick switched his questioning to the reaction of the local letter carriers' association to Hallowell's appointment, asking the witness if he had not been aware that this group had disapproved and had wanted another man named. Hallowell admitted that this came to his attention.

DENIAL MADE

Asked if his order demanding that the mounted carriers put metal stickers bearing the words "U. S Mail" on their cars had not caused bad feeling between him and the union members, he stated he didn't think so.

McGavick then brought out that this controversy had been taken up by the men with the Washington department where the postmaster's order was countermanded. Hallowell testified he called the leaders into his office to tell them they had won their case but denied he had said "you've won the first round" He emphasized his firm "that is not true" by striking the desk with his hand. Neither did he say "you've won this case," he said

Shown a copy of his order issued to the contract carriers, shown to him by McGavick, Hallowell said he would be willing to say it was an authetic copy but appeared surprised to learn that the order stated that the metal stickers were to be placed on the sides of the cars He stated he did not specify this but had ordered that they be mounted on the rear and the front of the carriers' cars.

COST IS MINOR

The post-office regulations call for cardboard stickers being placed on the cars while the drivers are delivering the mail, it was brought out Hallowell pointed out that the metal stickers he had ordered cost only 50 cents each"

Led back to an asserted conversation with Cory Galbraith, then assistant postmaster, in March 1950, in Hallowell's office, the witness testified he may have told Galbraith he was getting rumors or suspected that "the boys are going to try to sabotage the Spady cars"

He did not say, in answer to Galbraith's suggestion that the men be warned of this, "No, let them hang themselves," the postmaster declared

The defense attorney continued to push this line of questioning, pulling out all the stops His most sarcastically posed question was countered with another question by Hallowell who asked the attorney "who would want the vehicles sabotaged?"

DENIAL STRONG

"And who would want them (the men) hung?" McGavick shot back

Pressed further, Hallowell said he may have told his assistant that he had heard such rumors but vehemently denied he had made such a reply.

He could not recall that Galbraith had suggested warning the men of the rumors but admitted that the assistant might have made that remark

McGavick then switched to the age of the Spady cars contracted for, asking the postmaster if it was mandatory that the bid lowest in dollars and regardless of the equipment be accepted.

"I believe that is a fact," Hallowell answered, "that the postmaster is told by the department to recommend the lowest bid entered"

AGE FACTOR BOTHERSOME

It would be hard to know, he answered the attorney, whether a car of a certain age would be suitable or not suitable and he again countered the attorney's pressure on this point by asking McGavick "How are you going to know that a car of a certain age is suitable or not?"

Hallowell then stated that the bid on the car on the hourly rate had already been awarded to Spady before it was seen by the postmaster.

Asked by McGavick if he had not known that the Post Office Department regulations called for a space of 65 inches behind the driver's seat, Hallowell answered that the coupe furnished by Spady was to be driven only for special delivery mail and that the

reason it had been used on mounted routes was because the cars being operated on them kept breaking down.

McGavick's question as to whether the postmaster had known that on one occasion a man who was resting his hand on one of the Spady vehicles had suffered the shock of "going right through it" brought a laugh from Hallowell. He remarked that "it was a bit ridiculous" and declared he had never heard of it.

CAN'T TESTIFY

McGavick turned to Hallowell's earlier statements in which he charged that Ray Keelan, one of the drivers, had burned out four clutches in 1 day on a Spady car he drove on his route. The postmaster said he could not testify as to whether or not the clutches had been old ones or new. Concerning a clutch allegedly burned out shortly after Hallowell left Keelan on one occasion, Hallowell answered that he had no written report on this incident and that he thought he had been advised of it by the assistant postmaster or the superintendent of mails.

McGavick jumped on this answer and peppered questions at his witness which finally brought the admittance from Hallowell that "he couldn't swear to it, that was what I was told."

He remarked with some weariness "I'm trying to tell you the truth" when the attorney snapped that "the truth was wanted on the matter."

He admitted that he could have been in error as to the particular incident which brought a quick query from the attorney as to whether the postmaster "couldn't be in error about the other three."

"I thought it was four," Hallowell retorted.

COURT DISMISSES

Asked if he would be surprised to learn that the clutch wasn't burned out but had only heated up and was driven away by Spady, Hallowell asked the attorney if he knew for a fact that the clutch hadn't been burned out.

Court was dismissed at this point until 10 o'clock Friday morning.

During the morning session, under direct examination, the Government attorney, Harry Sager, went into the question of bids with the postmaster. Hallowell testified that on June 22, 1950, the Government directed him to cancel bids and call for new ones.

A letter from the inspectors recommended this, Hallowell said, saying it would be advantageous to the Department if outside bids were called. Spady's bid was not terminable at this time as under Government regulations bids cannot be canceled without the vehicle owner's consent until 6 months after the contract becomes effective.

After 4 months, however, the contract may be canceled if the owner agrees. Spady refused to cancel his bid, according to Hallowell, and the 6 months' period elapsed before his contract was voided.

BIDS ARE ADVERTISED

Contracts at this time were all held by carriers with the exception of Spady. Bids were readvertised and the opening date set for June 15, 1950. Submitted were bids from J. S Howes, Portland contractor, who specializes in furnishing vehicles for post-office use; Harold K. Tickler, Portland letter carrier; Spady brothers; and Walter Snoen, a local letter carrier. Howes offered to provide from one to five panel trucks at 6½ hours a day, week days, for $1,200 each per annum. Spady offered five panel trucks at $1,174 and four passenger cars for the same sum; Tickler's bid on the trucks was $1,397.20 each and passenger cars at $1,182.30. Snoen bid $1,080 for a panel truck. Hallowell said he approved the latter bid and recommended that it be accepted.

It was at this time Ray Keelan, who had entered a bid of $1,045 on a passenger vehicle, asked that his offer be withdrawn, according to Hallowell, saying he wasn't present when "they had decided on the price" and that he couldn't afford to drive his car at that amount. The bid, the postmaster testified, was then awarded to Phil Whitsitt as next in line under his seniority rights.

The bids of William DuRose, Keelan, Earl Malone, and Glenn Officer all quoted $1,025, it was brought out.

BIDS CITED

Spady's next bid, Hallowell said, after his contract was canceled at the end of the 6-month period, quoted a price of $960 for a passenger car. Keelan proposed a bid of $1,400 and Harold Tickler, the Portland carrier, $1,300.

On this occasion, September of 1950, Spady was awarded the contract on his low bid, the postmaster testified.

Hallowell reported grumbling from the carriers started shortly after Spady became a successful bidder on the post-office vehicles. He told of a conversation he had had with William DuRose in May of 1950 when the latter assertedly asked the postmaster if "we're going to get any more of that damned Spady junk."

When Hallowell replied that "anyone could bid who chose to," the employee, according to the postmaster, answered that "we never allowed those fellows to bid before." When queried as to how this could be prevented, Hallowell testified that DuRose made no reply.

CONVERSATION RECALLED

Hallowell recalled another conversation he said he had with Ed Delisle concerning the breakdown of the Spady cars. Asked if he were sure that the vehicles were not being deliberately sabotaged, Belisle replied that he didn't think so. When Hallowell remarked that it looked suspicious to him, Belisle, the postmaster testified, answered "that this was hard to prove "

The official said in July 1950 he took one of the Spady cars to the State patrol to have it checked over. This was done and an approved sticker put on the vehicle saying it had passed inspection, according to the witness.

Questioned as to his troubles with Keelan, the postmaster said he had had a plenty of experience along this line and added that this employee had burned out four clutches in 1 day. He told of other instances in which Keelan had broken down. On one such occasion, he went on, he himself had hurried to the scene and waited for Spady to come to fix the vehicle. After a long delay he said he called Spady who claimed he had never been notified that the car was in trouble. Checking later with Galbraith, then assistant postmaster, Hallowell said he learned that Galbraith had forgotten to call the Spady office.

UNITED STATES LOSES ROUND

During a court recess Judge Claude McCulloch ruled against the Government in its attempt to have admitted to evidence a letter from Milton Notthrop, post office inspector with the Department in Washington concerning the investigation of the alleged sabotage of the Spady cars by two post office employees.

The judge asserted that the final paragraph in the communication was so argumentative that he would rule against it.

"The testimony," he remarked "would not be permissible from his lips and I don't think it should be permissible in a letter."

The magistrate made no ruling on a scrapbook kept by the former postmaster Ned Blythe, and containing clippings of news relating to the post office, which was submitted in evidence by the Government.

During a recess, Sager explained that he wanted to show that up until Hallowell took office there had been no clippings entered showing paid advertisements for bids, stating they would be opened at a certain hour.

That bids were to be opened had been mentioned in news columns and these clippings entered in the scrapbook was admitted, but Sager said there were no legal ads included After Hallowell became postmaster, the legal advertising clippings appeared, the attorney said.

SEES POSSIBLE OMISSION

"Supposing Blythe's secretary left some of them out?" the judge queried. "I've been trying to get my secretary to keep up my scrapbook for years without success."

Sager answered that of course this could be possible and the matter rested there.

The interest in this trial felt by post office employees in other communities is indicated by the presence of many who are attending court each day. About 15 or 20 carriers from the Tacoma-Seattle area listened to the testimony yesterday including George Barnett, Bellingham, State president of the National Association of Letter Carriers.

A former Vancouver resident is serving as court reporter for Judge McColloch. He is Ira Holcomb, now of Portland, who was court reporter for Judge Hall in Clark superior court for many years.

[From the Vancouver (Wash) Columbian and Sun of September 10, 1951]

Trial of Vancouverites in Federal court at Tacoma in the post-office conspiracy case was in recess today as the court took time out. But it will resume Tuesday and it might last for weeks yet. First 3 days of the case were ended Friday by week-end adjournment

A $1,200 claim against the Government filed by Jack Spady for alleged damages to cars leased to the local post office was revealed Friday afternoon in cross-examination of this witness by Claude Snider, attorney for the 14 ex-post-office employees charged with conspiring to defraud the Government. He brought out in his questioning that the demand for compensation specified $169 64 for burned-out clutches and $844.73 for other damages.

CASE DRAWS CROWD

The Federal courtroom in Tacoma was packed during the afternoon with visiting post-office employees from Portland, Seattle, Tacoma, and other areas. Many of the spectators were members of the National Association of Letter Carriers whose officials are keenly watching the trial's progress. Its outcome, it is felt, will have far-reaching effects that could apply to post offices all over the country.

Slender, wiry Jack Spady, who was undergoing rapid-fire interrogation when court recessed Friday, side-stepped the attorney's queries as to the number of clutch jobs the amount he is seeking represented. He declared he couldn't "answer the question in that way." Asked if it were not true that the claim covered clutches assertedly burned out on four different dates in March 1950 (the month the Government has charged Carl Mudge drove a Spady car), the witness answered that he did not know whether the damage was attributable to Mudge, Keelan, or Joe Bloke. It makes no difference to him who was responsible for it, he said.

GIVES NO NAMES

Asked if it were not correct that the only claims filed were for damages allegedly caused by Ray Keelan and Mudge, Spady answered that he had mentioned the names of no men.

"Isn't it true that you filed a claim for $169.64 involving Mudge and $844.73, involving Keelan?" Snider asked. Spady answered again that he did not think he had mentioned names. Directed to tell the jury the items on which his claim was based, he re-

plied that he had given only the time the damage had occurred, the amount of the damage and the cost of the labor.

Snider, offering to refresh his witness' memory, quoted the dates, demanding to know if Mudge had not driven the Spady car on the specified times This brought an answer of "could be" from the man on the stand

"Then the balance must pertain to Keelan, is that correct?" the attorney asked. The witness gave the same reply

ANSWER DEMANDED

Continuing to press Spady on these points, Snider demanded an answer as to whether the car owner's claim covered more than the four dates in March, but the witness replied that he had brought no copy of the claim. He could recall only that his requisition was for $1,200 for damages covering clutches and two engines

Snider requested that the Government attorney produce the claim when it was disclosed that it was not among the records in his possession

Continuing on this line of questioning, Snider demanded to know when the claim had been prepared and was told about 6 months prior It was turned in to the acting postmaster at the Vancouver office, Spady said. He answered that the claim has not yet been allowed

Snider then asked his witness if this matter was one of the items he took care of when back in Washington recently

DENIES CONTACT MADE

Spady's answer was no, that he had contacted nobody in the Washington, D. C., Post Office Department in regard to this.

Cross-examined on his earlier testimony that he had purchased 13 1942 Ford station wagons from the Interior Department on a block bid, which were put into service when Keelan started driving Spady-leased cars, the witness declined to tell the price he had paid for the vehicles and was upheld in his refusal by the court.

Spady observed that he did not consider this anyone's business but his own, and Snider appealed to the court, asking the witness be required to answer this question. Judge Claude McCulloch, however, replied that he felt this matter had nothing to do with the case at bar and that he would sustain an objection if it were made.

Harry Sager, Government attorney, who had not done so previously, then offered an objection to the question.

CARS HELD SOUND

In direct examination earlier in the afternoon by Sager, concerning these vehicles, Spady had testified that the station wagons used by the post office had been completely checked over by his mechanics before they were put into service He described them as being in good condition except for the bodies. Some of the veneer was not in good shape, but the cars were mechanically sound, Spady had declared

Snider devoted a considerable part of his cross-examination to the condition of the cars put into service by the Spady company and to the type of replacements used in repairing the damages allegedly done to the vehicles He intimated in his line of questioning that breakdowns were still continuing on the Spady cars due to their age.

Asked if it were not true that old cars were inclined to break down more frequently than the newer models, Spady agreed, but added that this should not be true when the parts were replaced with new merchandise.

TECHNICAL POINTS CITED

"Isn't it true that a new part will not last in an old car that has had many years' usage?" Snider queried.

This would be correct in some cases, for instance, in replacing a bearing in a rear-end assembly, the witness observed, but he maintained that when a new clutch was installed it should give the same service it would in a new car.

On direct examination by the Government attorney, Spady had testified that rebuilt pressure plates were used in repairing the damaged clutches but that the clutch plates themselves were new and that new fabric facings had been used. All dealers, the witness had remarked, used the rebuilt pressure plates, "even the Ford Motor Co"

Snider pressed the witness further on this observation, but Spady reiterated his claims as to the rebuilt equipment A driver should obtain 40,000 miles of service from each clutch, the witness maintained

Asked to explain what was meant by "fabric" facings, Spady said he could not say what ingredients are used in the facings.

SAYS TROUBLE AGGRAVATED

Although agreeing that a clutch would get terrific usage on one of the long carrier routes having 600 or more stops, this would not account for the clutch troubles that have occurred, he insisted

He had found, he said, that some of the carriers had never replaced a clutch in their vehicles.

He scoffed at an incident brought up by Snider of a carrier's resting hand plunging through the hood of one of the Spady-leased cars as being "far-fetched"

The hood, Spady declared, never did give way He explained that this happened on a portion of the quarter panel in back of the 1935 Plymouth coupe in the controversy where "there was no denying that a hole had rusted through"

"MUST HAVE FORCED HOLE"

"Someone deliberately opened it up," the witness declared. "A man had to either pick it out or kick it out where it was located"

This resulted in an exchange between Snider and the witness as to where and how this incident had occurred and after Snider asked "if it were not true that he (Spady) had turned over old, rusty, worn-out equipment for post office use."

Asked if the Oldsmobile leased to the post office and driven by Mudge was not presently "out at Spady's junk yard," the witness replied that he did not know Snider, in his questioning, however, elicited the fact that this car is no longer being operated by the Post Office Department, nor by the Spady brothers Neither are the station wagons now being driven, it was brought out.

Snider described the vehicles as having gone "to the great beyond for ancient cars."

ACQUAINTANCE CASUAL?

Snider opened up in the cross-examination of the witness on the latter's political activities He was a member of the executive committee of the county organization, Spady answered, adding quickly that he "also was a member of the school board"

He said he hadn't known Dan Hallowell, acting postmaster, "too well" He had seen him on numerous occasions, but not very frequently, Spady testified

He denied that he had discussed the business of the post office bids with Hallowell before the call was issued and testified that he was never present when the bids were opened

Going into this phase of the case, Snider was told that the Spady brothers had provided the Oldsmobile on his contract approved with the local post office for use only until the 1939 Dodge, which was offered in the contract, could be put into readiness. He submitted his bid on a Chrysler product, he answered.

NO HURRY SEEN

Asked if it were not true that it took his mechanics 3 weeks from the time the contract was awarded until the day the Dodge was put into shape for use, Spady answered that he had been given permission to use the Olds in the meantime and that there was no sweat in getting the other car ready.

He affirmed, in answer to further questions by Snider, that Cory Galbraith, then assistant postmaster, had always treated him courteously and pleasantly, but asserted that he was reluctant to say yes to the same query pertaining to Ed Belisle, the superintendent of mails Pressed further on this answer, Spady said on numerous occasions he had not received the cooperation he thought he should from that official "Belisle certainly knew he didn't replace clutches in his own car every day," the witness observed, "yet when I told him about those things I didn't get any cooperation"

When explaining routes and the location of the mailboxes, Belisle's attitude was more cordial, Spady indicated He added that his only interest in talking to Belisle was to voice his opinion to the man in charge.

TROUBLE FOLLOWS TROUBLE

Leading back to the question of the car breakdowns, Snider asked his witness if it were not true that on one occasion when a second car was sent out to rescue a stalled Spady vehicle in the Heights area the replacement broke down en route, the car owner replied that this could have happened

Asked what record had been kept on the 15 clutches he contends were burned out in his vehicles, Spady said these were handled by the mechanics and were carried on the shop orders He replied that he had some of the records relating to the various days on which the cars were worked on.

He testified that the cars used on the regular postoffice routes were not used by his company when out of service in the evening and answered that he had not noticed in his last check that any deductions had been made on the cars operated on the hourly rate due to their being out of service.

DUAL SERVICE SEEN

On redirect examination by Sager after Snider had finished with his interrogations, Spady said there was nothing in the contract with the Government that prevented his using the leased cars for company business after the vehicles were out of post-office service each night

The witness told of intimations he had of approaching troubles gleaned in various conversations with post-office officials, in answering questions posed by Sager during direct examination earlier Friday afternoon

Galbraith, on one occasion, Spady said, had remarked "Well, Spady, I hope you are successful in this bid, but I question as to how the carriers will take care of your cars?"

OMINOUS NOTE ALLEGED

Another time, he testified, Edward Carson, former assistant superintendent of mails, had made the observation that "a man in Longview (an outside bidder) had bought all new Willys Jeeps but it still didn't stop this trouble" Spady repeated a third ominous remark as coming from William Du Rose who, Spady asserted, declared "they'd better not give me one of Spady's cars to drive."

The first major breakdown of one of his cars, he continued, occurred the second day after the Olds was put into service, when the clutch went out. Examined, the plate was found to be discolored from intense heat and the facing burned out, he said.

When the clutch disasters continued, Spady said the damaged equipment was sent to other motor companies for repairs and installation. He listed these as Marion Motors, Monroe and Boma, and a shop in Salmon Creek. The foreman of the State highway department and the foreman at the county shops were both called in to observe the burned-out equipment, he continued.

ENGINES BURNED OUT

In addition to damaged clutches, two engines in the car driven by Ray Keelan were burned up, the witness told the jury. These motors, he said, had gotten so hot that the sleeves in the cylinders had burned up and cracked the valves.

He turned five of the damaged clutches over to the postal inspectors, he said.

Spady testified that the present repairs on vehicles under contract to the post office were of a maintenance nature and concerned batteries, windshield swipes, lights, and "things to be expected."

Guesses as to how long the trial would continue ranged from 10 additional days to 3 weeks. The Government has more than 20 witnesses it may put on the stand and the attorney has indicated that he has four more days of testimony to offer. It is expected that the questioning of the two post-office inspectors, R. L. Kerr and S. J. Schwartz, will entail lengthy direct and cross examination.

[From the Vancouver (Wash.) Columbian and Sun of September 11, 1951]

TACOMA, September 11.—Under steady prodding from Federal Judge Claude McColloch the trial of 14 Vancouver postal employees started its second week at a brisk pace here this morning.

The judge, making obvious his impatience with the slow-moving trial, interrupted both Government and defense attorneys to question witnesses directly and urged Government attorney Claude Sager to speed up the presentation of testimony.

JURIST IMPATIENT

At one point, McColloch asked Sager how many more witnesses he expected to have. Sager answered, "Eleven more."

When asked the nature of their testimony, Sager said it would take three more days. The judge answered, "Oh no, I can't allow that. Shorten it up."

Six witnesses took the stand this morning and the judge kept the trial moving through the lunch period with no indication when he would grant a recess. Among the witnesses were two mechanics, a private detective, two Vancouver postal employees, and Roy Spady, brother of Jack Spady, Jr.

MECHANIC TESTIFIES

Testimony from George Foster, a mechanic employed by Jack Spady, Jr., and from Richard L. Witacher, Portland garage operator, resulted in a lesson in auto mechanics for the interested jury.

Both men under questioning described the operation of the clutch and told how they could be damaged. Four of the clutches taken out of Spady cars rented to the post office were introduced as evidence and identified by Foster and Witacher.

Under questioning by the judge, Foster said he knew of two ways to sabotage a car. One way, he said, would be to drain the radiator and race the motor for a long period of time. The second way would be to race the motor for 2 or 3 hours, he said.

Witacher, when he took the stand, said a car could be sabotaged by driving it up to a wall and engaging and disengaging the clutch with the motor racing or by racing the motor while engaging the clutch repeatedly.

Carl Vraspir, route 1, box 53, Orchards, was called to the stand and testified that he was a private detective and former Clark County deputy sheriff and had been employed by Spady to watch Carl Mudge for 3 days in March 1950.

EMPLOYEE TRAILED

Vraspir said he followed Mudge on March 29, 30, and 31. He said he followed the car driven by Mudge and observed him driving at a high rate of speed, racing the motor at stops, heard a continual clashing of gears, and noted that the taillight was on at all times.

This happened on the 3 days he followed Mudge, he said, but did not happen when "another man" drove the same car on March 29.

He said he had made a written report to Spady and the report was introduced as evidence.

The judge took the report and through his questioning revealed that Vraspir in the report said the "car wasn't given actual or outright abuse."

Vraspir, in the report, said Mudge may have been a poor driver but that he would not report that he had damaged the car.

Testimony by Victor Peterson, post office general foreman and postal employee since 1936, named two of the defendants, David D. Jeffery and Ray M. Keelan.

QUERY RECITED

Peterson said he heard someone in the mail room ask Keelan one day "how many cars are you going through today?" He said Keelan's only answer was a shrug of the shoulders.

He also said he recalled Jeffery saying one day "something about having to bid lower because of the Spady bids," and that "the carriers were taking a beating on the bids."

Maryann Simmons, the second postal employee to take the stand, testified that when Mudge became ill it was rumored that he was sick with carbon monoxide poisoning from the cars. She said they checked with his doctor and found he was not suffering from carbon monoxide and that a notice to that effect was posted on the post office bulletin board.

[From the Vancouver (Wash.) Columbian and Sun of September 12, 1951]

TACOMA, September 12.—Defense Attorney Claude Snider moved to have the charges of sabotage and collusion against 14 Vancouver postal employees dismissed at noon today as the Government completed its presentation of testimony against the men in Federal court here.

Federal Judge Claude McColloch has taken the motion under advisement.

McColloch dismissed the jury until 10 a. m. tomorrow and was to hear arguments by both attorneys on Snider's motion at 2 p. m. this afternoon. Snider, in his formal motion, claimed that the Government had failed directly or indirectly to prove its charges and that the charges against the 14 men should be dismissed and that they should be acquitted.

Government Attorney Harry Sager called five witnesses to the stand this morning. They included three Vancouver garagemen, a service-station operator, and S. K. Schwartz, a postal inspector.

DEFENDANT AILING

Meanwhile, one of the defendants, Glenn Officer, was excused from being present at the trial today on the recommendation of a doctor.

Officer, the doctor's statement said, suffered a stroke last October, and the attack had reoccurred yesterday afternoon. The doctor recommended a day's rest.

Snider, after presenting the statement, told the judge that he and Officer were willing to proceed with the trial with the defendant absent. McColloch ordered the trial to continue.

The three garagemen each testified to the work they had done to Jack Spady, Jr., cars which broke down while under rental contract and described the possible causes for those breakdowns.

The men were Roy Altig, of 315 East Eighteenth Street, a mechanic for Marion Motors; Homer Church, of route 5, box 114, a mechanic for 44 years now employed by H. & H. Garage; and Arthur M. Knutson, former service manager for Grandy Motor Co.

JOB TOUGH, BUT—

The three men agreed that automobiles on postal routes were "probably given the hardest wear" of any type delivery car, but each, under questioning, said a newly installed clutch should not wear out within 2 to 5 days.

Altig said he would estimate that a properly installed clutch would wear out "perhaps 35 percent sooner" in a mail-route car.

Church under questioning by Sager said that clutches he had taken from Spady cars being driven by the postal employees were burned blue and that the grease was "packed hard." He said this was not normal wear and was probably caused by slipping the clutch.

Carl Jenson, operator of the Columbia service station in Vancouver, recalled two conversations he had had with William DuRose, one of the defendants.

Jenson explained that he serviced with oil and gas the cars Spady rented to the post office. He said while talking to DuRose on May 8, 1950, about installing a mail box DuRose asked him how he (Jenson) got along with Spady.

STATEMENT ALLEGED

Jenson said that shortly after that DuRose said to him, "Well, it won't be long before they (postal employees) will wreck every automobile those Democratic —— put on the route."

Yesterday afternoon Sager called R. L. Karr and this morning called Schwartz to the stand. The two postal inspectors reviewed their investigation of the charges against the 14 men and under questioning placed special emphasis on how that investigation was carried out.

REMARK CITED

Jenson also testified that on May 23, 1950, DuRose had said to him, "They were going to get that Democratic —— out of the front office." He said he understood DuRose to be talking about Dan Hallowell, acting postmaster.

Under cross-examination Jenson admitted that up until 2 weeks ago he did not know DuRose by name. However, when asked to do so he was able to point out DuRose correctly from the 13 defendants present.

THEY DIDN'T JIBE

Photographs submitted to the court of the 1939 Oldsmobile, formerly on contract to the local post office and now out of service and in Spady Brothers' wrecking yard presented a high point in yesterday's testimony when it was revealed that both the plaintiffs and the defense had obtained shots of the vehicle at different hours last Saturday and that they did not correspond.

During the afternoon, most of which was devoted to the testimony of R. L. Karr, post-office inspector, the defense attempted to bring out in cross-examination that signed statements taken from the 14 defendants last September were obtained under duress—denied by Karr—and the Government continued to bang away on its charges of sabotage of post-office equipment by two of the men.

Pictures introduced by Claude Snider, taken Saturday morning of the Olds, showed the car minus one or two wheels and bearing a growth of trailing vines. The photo admittedly taken by a photographer around noon at request and in the presence of Karr, depicted the auto equipped with its four wheels and the greenery missing.

The defense picture apparently came as a surprise to Karr, who was being cross-examined by Leo McGavick, associated with Snider in the defense of the post-office employees.

WHAT GOES ON

Referring to the picture offered by the plaintiffs, McGavick whipped out the second photo taken earlier that day, asking his witness "if the car looked like that when you saw it Saturday?"

Karr answered it didn't look like the car he saw. If it was the same auto, he agreed, someone must have made some changes.

"Someone had to put the wheels on it from the time I saw it until the time you say you saw it," the inspector answered.

Asked to compare the photos, Karr said he recognized the Olds as the one he had put through the testing station on a previous occasion He failed to recognize other cars near the Olds in the picture shown him by McGavick as the same ones that had been nearby when Karr took his shot later that morning

McGavick's sardonic, "Is it because you don't want to remember?" brought a quick objection from the Government attorney, Harry Sager, and was sustained by the court.

Karr's reluctance to identify the auto's location as being the same appeared to be dispelled when shown an enlargement of the defense picture. As near as he could tell, the Olds was in the same spot as was shown in his own photo, he testified

He replied, however, that it had no hind wheel on it in this picture, when asked by McGavick to describe the vehicle The car had its wheels on when he saw it, he said.

VINE VANISHES

McGavick called his attention to the vine growing on the car which brought the rejoinder from the witness that he hadn't seen any vine and that the car in the picture he was viewing "looked like it had a whole tree growing out of it"

This brought a chuckle from the audience

Karr admitted that had he known the car had been, as McGavick put it, "dressed up" before he took the picture he would not have brought his photo into court

"All I know is that I went down (to Vancouver) and took a picture of the Olds as it stood in Spady's lot," Karr observed

He said he did not know when the car had been taken out of service at the local post office nor where it had "ended up" Saturday was the first time he had had a chance to look at it since it was no longer in use, he testified.

ONE MUST WAIT

Federal Judge Claude McColloch denied admittance of the defense picture at this time stating it could be presented when the defense presented its case

The trial progressed rapidly yesterday afternoon, the judge pushing the testimony along when it slowed down at any time

The magistrate, emphasizing his earlier remark that he "wanted to shorten the case," directed Harry Sager, Government attorney, to complete his list of witnesses on Wednesday and called for an earlier session of court for this morning For the first time since the trial started last Wednesday, he postponed his usual 4 o'clock recess for half an hour and continued court an additional 35 minutes at noon

Advising plaintiff's attorney that according to his count, Sager should have four more witnesses to put on the stand, Judge McColloch asserted. "I want you to finish up tomorrow"

ABUSE ALLEGED

Inspector Karr, who came in for extensive questioning by Sager during the afternoon session, told the jury of the alleged abuse given the Spady-leased cars by Carl Mudge and Ray Keelan, two of the defendants, asserting he and S. G. Schwartz, another inspector, had followed one of the men on his route to check him on the handling of the vehicle. Karr said he had driven the 1935 Plymouth early in August for several miles and found the car to be in good condition. The brakes, he asserted were in good working order and the gears shifted easily. He had driven a 1942 Ford station wagon after it was in Church's garage for clutch repairs, to Grandy's Motor Co. for a second examination before it was returned to Jack Spady, Karr continued

He experienced no difficulty, he said, there was good adjustment and the car was operating well. It was put back into service that day and 2 days later a call came to Acting Postmaster Dan Hallowell, that the clutch was "on the blink"

DETERIORATION SEEN

He said he drove the station wagon again at that time, accompanied by Hallowell and Ed Belisle, superintendent of mails, and found that it was difficult to shift and that there was a noticeable slip in the clutch

Questioned as to the contracts then in effect at the post office, an examination of the records there disclosed that all in force on the mounted routes were in the same amount, $1,500, although the routes ranged from 11 6 miles to 33 miles, he went on. Asked by the judge if one of the routes was not 50 miles in length, as he said had been stated in a letter, Karr answered that there were none of that length at that time

RATE SEEMED HIGH

A computation of the mileage showed that some of the men were being paid in excess of 30 cents a mile He said he thought the average minimum to be 12½ to 14 cents.

As the rural carriers were allowed only 8 cents per mile, it made the rate of the mounted carriers appear to be exorbitant, the postal inspector continued, and it was recommended that the contracts be canceled and another call issued. This was done the latter part of June 1950, he said

New bids were called for with five coming in on passenger cars at $1,025, one truck quotation at $1,020, and another for $1,024.

Karr testified that during the time Carl Mudge was ill and in the hospital, the repairs of the cars were all of a minor nature until August when we had another epidemic of clutch trouble These involved cars being driven by Ray Keelan, Karr remarked He told of one instance, on August 17, 1950, when four clutches went out on a 22-mile route

CHECKS ON DRIVER

Two of the cars were sent to the H & H Garage for repairs, where they were observed by him and by Schwartz Continuing his testimony, Karr stated he obtained the clutch from station wagon No 10 before having the vehicle repaired and returned to Spady's After it was replaced in service of the post office he remained in sight and watched Keelan pack up the car with the mail and start on his route, Karr said

He recounted incidents of other burned-out clutches and identified these parts in court A work order submitted by Sager and identified as having been signed at Grandy's Motor Co for repairs, was admitted in evidence by Judge McColloch.

IT GOT HOT

One clutch, taken from one of the cars driven by Keelan at Grandy's, had been so hot that the bolts fastening the pressure plate to the flywheel were welded, Karr told the jury The part, too, was brought forward and identified by the inspector

Karr, upon Sager's questioning, told of following Keelan on his route on September 6, 1950, where the latter was observed at times from the distance of a block and at another time from a porch some 30 feet distant Keelan, according to Karr, was operating the 1935 Plymouth which he handled very roughly.

Asked for further explanation, the inspector said the motor was constantly raced at a high speed while the vehicle was halted, that the driver stopped with a jerk and started with a leap, the spinning wheels hurling gravel into the air.

SEES SMOKE

When Keelan stopped before the residence where Karr had stationed himself, the latter said he could see smoke coming from under the vehicle The noise of the car could be heard for at least a block, he declared.

After observing the driver for about 3 hours, Karr continued that he was picked up by Inspector Schwartz, both returning to the post office Some 15 minutes later, he said, a call came to the postmaster that the Plymouth had stopped and would no longer run.

When asked by Sager if he had seen the car from time to time since, Karr replied that he had taken a photograph of the auto last Saturday afternoon along with a picture of the 1939 Olds, the 1939 Dodge, and a Ford station wagon. The four pictures were introduced by the Government attorney and the court told that the Dodge and Plymouth were still in service, the station wagon had been sold to Joe Ramsey, route 5, Vancouver, who had brought it back to Spady's to be photographed, and the Olds was in the wrecking yard.

UNAWARE OF PICTURE?

The inspector said, in answer to Defense Attorney Snider's queries, that he had not learned of the disposition of the 1939 Oldsmobile until it had come out in previous testimony that it was presently in the wrecking yard Asked as to what the condition of the car was in the morning, he replied that he had not seen it at that time He testified in answer to further questions by Snider that the wheels of the auto were intact when he saw it, but that the outside of the car had been wiped off at his request.

He replied that he didn't think Jack Spady knew the picture was going to be taken Saturday

The four pictures admitted as evidence and passed around to the jurors, Sager turned his questioning to an interview with the 14 employees now on trial in September 1950, in which Karr said, each man was questioned individually by the two inspectors. Each was told the purpose of the interviews—to investigate the damage to the motor vehicles—and the matter was discussed while Schwartz made notes

Asked if they desired to give written statements on the points discussed, Karr declared there were no objections voiced by the men. Some said they'd be glad to give a statement, the inspector said

STATEMENTS TAKEN

These sworn statements, he continued, were taken over a period from September 6 to 18 and were typed up in the presence of each employee The original was handed to the carrier and a carbon copy retained by Karr

When some of the points were questioned by the men they were told to make any changes they desired in their own handwriting and to initial them No threats were made, no promises given, nor were any inducements offered, the inspector declared

The 14 statements were submitted by the plaintiffs as evidence and the defense attorneys asked by Judge McCulloch if they wished to admit the signatures. These papers were passed to each of the defendants for identification of his name

JUST FRIENDLY CHATS

Leo McGavick, on cross-examination of the inspector, asked with considerable sarcasm if the interviews with the men had been "just a friendly conversation."

"I would say so," the witness answered, "we were just trying to determine the facts."

Continuing in his previous vein, McGavick asked if the inspectors had not already made up their minds—if they had not already "formed their opinions as to how the clutches had burned out." Karr replied that it had been necessary to interview all of the men which brought up the question of the manner in which the talks were handled by the postal inspectors.

At Karr's denial that he had lost his temper McGavick demanded to know if it were not true that Schwartz had been compelled to interfere on several occasions to quiet his partner Karr's answer was that he could not recall having been stopped by Schwartz.

DENIAL ISSUED

"Did not you walk up and down before each man shooting questions at him like a lawyer," McGavick demanded "and when he did not sign did not both of you clam up and would not say a word? Is not that right?"

Karr denied these tactics were employed, asserting that none of the employees were told to sign the statements. He said he "absolutely did not tell them to sign or else—" as suggested by the attorney.

The letter carriers union was again drawn into the testimony by McGavick's line of questioning, the inspector relating, when asked if he knew where the investigation started, that a letter from R B Kremers, assistant secretary of the letter carriers' association, had been addressed to the Post Office Department in Washington and that this file had been forwarded to Seattle

Asked by McGavick if he knew how Kremers happened to request the investigation, Karr replied that he had understood the men in the Vancouver office had asked for it.

ORDER IRKSOME?

McGavick referred to the metal plate incident when the local carriers were directed to mount the tabs bearing the words "U. S. mail," on the front and rear ends of their cars. "Wasn't it true," the attorney queried, "that Karr had trouble over this request?"

Karr answered that he saw no reason why a man who drove a Chrysler car could not afford to put a metal tab on the vehicle. This brought a reminder from McGavick that the Post Office Department had overruled Karr's opinion, to which Karr disagreed, observing that the Department had ruled against the carriers being required to pay for the metal plates out of their own funds. He said he still thought it was a good idea.

Turning to the types of contracts let by post offices all over the country McGavick demanded to know if it were not correct that some of the offices in Karr's own territory have contracts embracing the same amount on bids. Sager's objection to this question on grounds that the situation in other post offices would not apply to the case being heard, was overruled by the court and Karr was directed to answer.

The letting of contracts was the duty of the postmaster and was between him and the Post Office Department, the inspector answered. Asked if he didn't run into the same sort of facts in all post offices, Karr declared it was the first time it had come to his attention in his district.

ATTORNEY PROBES

Going back to a previous subject, the attorney continued his questioning regarding the statements signed by the 14 defendants and when Karr testified that each of the men was advised that he didn't have to place his signature on the paper if he didn't want to, a dissenting murmur was plainly heard in the courtroom from members of the audience.

Karr explained that Inspector Schwartz typed out portions of the notes he had taken in the interviews and had discussed these items with the men. He repeated that none of the men had been asked to sign.

"Is it not a fact that Ray Keelan said they were not the facts and that we wouldn't sign," McGavick asked the witness. "And is it not true that you advanced on him with your two fists?"

Karr denied this with some heat declaring this was "absolutely not true." Keelan did not object to signing nor was he threatened in any way, the witness snapped.

He added, with a laugh, that he didn't go around trying to pick fights with people.

He entered a denial to a question as to whether Keelan had not been called in and sworn after his statement had been obtained and asked if Edward Carson was not called in later by phone to be sworn, answered "he had no recollection of such a thing happening."

REMARK DENIED

A remark attributed to Karr that "the letter carriers were getting too big for their britches" was not true, the inspector told the attorney. The statement referred to, Karr said, came about in a conversation between Schwartz and Leo Belisle after the statements were taken. Belisle (Leo) was in a talkative and aggressive mood, the witness stated, and had remarked that they were going to have to put the acting postmaster in his place.

"Now, Leo Belisle is a letter carrier and as such has certain duties, none of them administrative," the inspector asserted. "Schwartz did direct certain remarks that Leo Belisle himself was getting too big for his britches but at no time did either of us bring the association into the case."

Asked by McGavick if he or Schwartz had not remarked to Ed Carson that "the letter carriers had asked for an investigation and now they would get one that they'd long remember," Karr also had an explanation of this report.

SURPRISE SEEN

Such a statement, he thought, was made to Leo Belisle, who he said remarked that he was surprised that they were going into the case, that he thought they (the inspectors) had closed the case after writing to Hallowell about it.

He told them, Karr testified, that they'd asked for an investigation and that the inspectors were making one

"I don't think I put in that form," he said, "but I did tell Belisle that we were making an investigation and that we didn't make them by correspondence"

Back to the matter of the alleged sabotage of the leased cars, McGavick attempted to establish that the autos had been driven by Spady employees after they left the service of the post office each night.

At the inspector's reply that he could not say whether this was correct, McGavick asked him if, as an investigator in a criminal case, he wouldn't try to find out if the cars were being used by someone else.

IGNORANCE CLAIMED

Referring to Jack Spady's $1,200 claim against the Government for car repairs and damages to clutches, the attorney brought out from the witness that the latter did not know the number of repairs claimed or what damage was represented by the amount. He was out of town at the time the claim was prepared, Karr said.

"This wouldn't be of any interest to you as an inspector, would it?" the attorney said scathingly. Sager's objection to this line of questioning was sustained by Judge McColloch.

Earl M. Herman, a post office employee for 15 years in various positions and superintendent of mails since last January, put on the stand by the Government in the late afternoon, brought records from the post office route inspection sheets showing the time check and distances made on the routes, the number of miles included and the number of boxes serviced.

EVIDENCE ADMITTED

A summary of 29 sheets showing the dates of the vehicle contracts of the carriers, their names, the length of the routes, the possible and actual stops and the total distances involved, were submitted as evidence and admitted by the court.

Victor Peterson, general foreman at the Vancouver post office, was recalled to the stand for cross-examination shortly before court recessed yesterday afternoon.

(From the Vancouver (Wash.) Columbian and Sun of September 13, 1951)

TACOMA, September 13 —The first witness for the defense took the stand this morning in the trial of 14 Vancouver post-office employees in Federal court here while the defense motion for the dismissal of charges remained under study by Federal Judge Claude McColloch

McColloch heard arguments for the dismissal of the charges yesterday afternoon and has declined to make a decision one way or the other at this time.

BLYTHE ON STAND

Ned Blythe, retired Vancouver postmaster, occupied the witness stand most of the morning as the defense opened its case. He was questioned by defense Attorney Leo McGavick

Asked by McGavick if he ever felt surprised over receiving identical bids from carriers for rental car contracts, Blythe said, "No, I took them for granted."

He added he knew the carriers talked the bids over among themselves and recalled incidences when the post-office department requested uniform bids.

EXPLANATION DETAILED

He explained at length several attempts to interest outside firms in bidding for the rental car contracts and said when no response came from his letters he called Vancouver firms and was told "they weren't interested."

When asked by McGavick if the carriers were attempting to block outsiders from entering bids, Blythe said, "Never heard of such a thing"

He said there was "no great rush of enthusiasm even on the part of the employees" to present bids and that they had to be encouraged to do so.

SEES NOTHING UNUSUAL

Under cross-examination by Government attorney Harry Sager, Blythe maintained that there was nothing unusual about the identical bids. At one point when asked if he knew the carriers were discussing their bids, he said, "we expected them to. The department directed us to see that bids were similar."

Sager then pointed his questions toward the lack of advertising for bids and asked Blythe if he were a former newspaperman and was he on good terms with the daily paper in Vancouver. To which Blythe answered "Yes."

NO CLIPPINGS ON CARS

Sager then introduced a clipping book kept while Blythe was postmaster and after scanning it Blythe admitted it did not contain clippings about bids on rental cars

Sager then introduced copies of bids for the years 1944, 1946, and 1948 and Blythe admitted that in each case they were identical and that each year the bids increased However, he said cost of operating the route cars was terrific in the later years.

Sager then introduced records showing that three of the defendants, Carl Mudge, William DuRose, and Chester Windsor, had canceled their rental car contracts at the annual rate of $1,200 in July and August,

1948, and had then submitted and were awarded $1,500 bids when bids were opened on the three routes.

QUERY STUDIED

Sager then asked if he (Blythe) would still say the carriers weren't anxious to hold contracts Blythe thought over the question carefully before replying, "They weren't anxious to bid and lose money"

When Defense Attorney McGavick resumed questioning the witness, he introduced correspondence from the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General and Blythe. In one of these addressed to Blythe he was asked to encourage Chester Windsor to lower his bid and "bring it more in line"

Another, written by Blythe, said "my solicitations among outside firms for bids brought only a merry ha-ha when I told them the hourly rates prevailing"

GALBRAITH NEXT

Also called to the stand this morning was Cory M Galbraith, one of the defendants and former assistant postmaster Galbraith was still on the stand when court recessed at noon However, he had already testified that he and Dan Hallowell, acting postmaster, had discussed possible sabotage to the Jack Spady, Jr, cars

Galbraith said Hallowell called him into the office one day to ask if he had heard rumors of sabotage He said he replied, "No he hadn't and that Hallowell then told him that they had proof"

Galbraith testified that he said they should warn the men and Hallowell replied, "No, let them go as far as they like and maybe they'll hang themselves"

ONE EXCUSED

Galbraith had not been turned over for cross-examination when court recessed at noon

The third witness of the morning was excused by Judge Claude McColloch after it was discovered that records wanted by Sager were missing He was Jennings Andrews, superintendent of the McLoughlin Heights substation His summons did not request the records, he said

JUDGE DISSENTS

Federal Judge Claude McColloch took a divergent view of the Government's case straight down the line yesterday afternoon in hearing the arguments presented by both sides on a motion for acquittal made just before noon by Defense Attorney Claude Snider, but the magistrate failed to grant the motion at the close of court

Asserting that he would reserve his decision on the motion, he directed that the defense be prepared to put on its case at 10 o'clock Thursday morning Judge McColloch remarked he felt neither prepared nor inclined to give his decision at this time, and left the bench.

In the 2 hours of argument, Harry Sager, Government attorney, plugged doggedly away on his charges of conspiracy by the 14 Vancouver post-office employees to defraud the United States Government and the Post Office Department and was slapped down by Judge McColloch on every turn.

SPECIFICATIONS "LOUSY"

The judge termed the Post Office Department's wording relating to the contracts for leased vehicles as "the lousiest specifications" he had ever seen in his life When Sager pointed out that this was not the fault of the plaintiffs, the judge shot back, "Yes; but it makes your case harder."

He disagreed with the Government attorney's definition of "collusive" when Sager, in his argument to have the motion for acquittal denied, reiterated that the men had gotten together on their bids on vehicles for use by mounted carriers. Unless Sager, the judge told him, could prove that this act had been kept secret during the period covered by the indictments (August 19, 1942–January 10, 1951) the attorney couldn't prove conspiracy on the part of the accused men.

Remarking to Sager, "Let's you and I try to agree what 'collusive' means," Judge McColloch advised him that it pertained to the secret and concealed maneuverings by two or more persons in such a way as to deceive another

JURIST UNCONVINCED

Sager's observation that the interference with the Spady contract was proof of conspiracy against the Government brought the reply from the bench that the attorney "would have to convince me of one conspiracy and prove another"

From 1942 on, Sager pointed out, the bids were all identical and constantly increasing He reminded that even when the carriers became aware that there was an investigation in progress that out of nine bids entered there was only a difference of $4 in them.

"What's wrong with that?" the judge retorted

To Sager's reply that this showed the bids were collusive, the judge harked back to his former declaration as to the meaning, under the law, of the word "collusive" "Were these bids secret and concealed?" he queried

"The meetings were secret," the Government attorney answered, "and the men say in their signed statements that they meant to keep Spady out of the competition"

DIFFERENCE SHARP

"Isn't that what you wanted—competition?" was the judge's instant rejoinder

"Do you maintain," he went on, "that from 1942 to the time you state in your indictment that it was a matter of great secrecy that they were bidding the same amount after discussing it?"

Then he told the attorney "Unless you establish that, your view and mine on the law are entirely different

"Unless you can prove that this was kept secret from Mr Blythe (the former postmaster) all those years, then you can't prove a conspiracy," he asserted

He remarked that identical bids were being made all the time, but that to be designated as "collusive" they must be made in secrecy and with the intent to deceive.

CAN'T SEE CONNECTION

When Sager read a portion of a statement taken by the postal inspectors from Cory Galbraith, then assistant postmaster, in which the latter admitted that he had not thoroughly publicized the invitation for bids, the court asked "how this involved the carriers?"

"It's almost laughable," the judge added, "to say that the carriers had any responsibility for Galbraith's actions"

Judge McColloch went on to say that conspiracy was harder to prove in the Supreme Court than it formerly had been, that "very radical changes had occurred" that placed a greater burden on the prosecuting attorneys to prove such charges.

He questioned Sager further on the latter's contention that the damage suffered by the Spady leased cars deprived the Post Office Department of the benefits of competitive bidding

The sabotage of the vehicles was for the purpose of freezing out any outside bidders, the attorney told the court.

"That would be in the future, wouldn't it?" the judge queried.

EXHIBIT CITED

He pointed out that one of the plaintiffs' exhibits, the regulations on invitations for bids had specifically stated that the contracts should be made preferably with the carriers and that other regulations submitted by the Government for evidence directed the postmaster "to solicit and canvass the carriers."

Reverting back to the matter of collusive bids, the court remarked that he was interested to find how little law there is on this in the statutes.

"I thought I could turn to the books and find all sorts of statutes referring to collusive or identical bids and was amazed to find there were none," Judge McColloch observed.

BID FORM BLASTED

He prefaced his criticism of the Department's specifications regarding vehicle contracts by pointing out that the Post Office correspondence did not call for sealed, competitive bids but merely stated that the bid should be awarded to the lowest bidder He added the words "and best bid" to which Sager disagreed, explaining that law specifies only the lowest bidder.

Did Sager mean to say, the judge demanded, that in an instance where a 1950 vehicle was offered on a bid contract against a lower bid on a 1935 Plymouth, it was mandatory that the older car be chosen?

At Sager's affirmative reply, the magistrate declared he had never seen such "lousy specifications" in his life.

"I don't think you can hold that there was no evidence that the Spady equipment wasn't serviceable," the attorney remarked

"This hasn't anything to do with the charges in the indictment, whether the equipment was serviceable or not," the judge retorted.

COURT HOLDS FIRE

Returning to the charges of sabotage, Sager declared that all the other defendants were aiding and abetting them Judge McColloch asked the attorney to whom he referred by "them" and the latter designated Ray Keelan and Carl Mudge When Sager mentioned remarks made by Keelan in his signed statement the court replied that he would have something to say regarding those statements later.

Sager read a statement signed by Leo Belisle in which the latter admitted he had fought the Spady bids, declaring he knew they would cause trouble. He said he thought as much effort as possible should be brought to bear to get rid of them In another portion of the document Belisle had admitted the men had gotten together on their bids

A statement by William DuRose included the remark that he didn't think it was right for some —— —— to come in here—that it made us work for him and not the Government DuRose said, according to the statement read by Sager, that he had not gotten together with the other carriers except in one instance, at the home of Earl Malone.

CAN'T SEE WRONG

"What's wrong with that?" the judge asked "It had been going on for years and the postmaster knew it"

"You keep seeing wrong where I don't," Judge McColloch continued, when the attorney referred to an incident where one of the men, contemplating buying a new car, went to Ed Belisle, then superintendent of mails, and requested assurance, which was given, that he would again get the bid on his route.

"Why did Mr. Blythe approve of this all those years?" the judge queried "To these men, he was the United States Government and if he passed on anything it was law to the men."

Sager replied that he didn't know, that maybe the postmaster was in cahoots with the men.

WHY NOT?

"Then why didn't you indict him?" the judge instantly snapped back with a tinge of anger.

The attorney murmured that he didn't know the answer to that but presumed that there was not enough evidence to prove it.

"If I worked for many years for a man and then another man came in that I didn't get along with, would that mean that the activities and customs I had followed under the first man were all wrong?" the Federal judge asked.

Sager replied that he thought that criminal intent was something that the jury must determine after hearing all the evidence.

"Do you think that these men thought they were doing wrong all those years?" the judge continued When the attorney answered in the affirmative, giving his opinion on the matter, the judge replied, "That's too thin."

Neither Sager nor the inspectors could answer Judge McColloch as to whether they had proof that all of the defendants had been employed by the local post office since 1942.

Judge McColloch asked the Government attorney if he contended that when new men, who may have been employed since that date, did what the rest of the carriers had been doing for years, they became a party to a conspiracy. Sager asserted: "If they knowingly joined a conspiracy then they became a part of that conspiracy."

JUDGE CRITICAL

Upon listening to a portion of a statement in which one of the defendants admitted the men met to discuss the best way of competing with the Spady bid, which Sager declared to be a conspiracy, the judge reminded that the carriers contend they were trying to give the Government a good deal

"You say the charges (on bids) were too much in earlier years and too low in later years," the court observed.

When Sager continued his argument to back up his charges of conspiracy, the magistrate remarked: "Then I never saw conspirators who operated in the open as much as these fellows did."

He again pointed out that conspiracy implied secrecy. When Sager moved to enlarge on his contentions of conspiracy relating to sabotage of the leased vehicles, the court reminded that "only two persons were involved in that charge by the Government."

Leo McGavik, one of the defense attorneys, presented the argument on the motion for acquittal entered earlier in the day. Declaring that the Government's testimony failed to show evidence of the criminal charges brought against the men in the indictment, he pointed out that the bids were not competitive in that they were not all for the same route but that each man had entered a separate bid on the route that had been assigned to him.

CASES CITED

He cited numerous cases to support the defense contention that the Government had failed to prove conspiracy, emphasizing that the conclusion drawn was that the evidence must exclude every other hypothesis to establish guilt. He referred to evidence previously entered of two instances in 1944 when correspondence was received from the Washington Department requesting the local postmaster to have a bid that was higher than the rest brought down so it would be more in line.

Testimony, McGavick continued, also showed that Chester Winsor, the employee concerned, did lower his bid subsequent to the exchange of letters.

There had been no testimony to show that the men had tried to keep out outside bidders, the attorney told the court, and on the contrary it had been disclosed that there had been outside bidders but that their estimates were too high and they failed to obtain the contract.

NO CONSPIRACY SEEN

He observed that the strongest remark made by the former assistant postmaster, Cory Galbraith, in his written statement, was that he had been remiss in pushing the outside bids. This did not show that he conspired, McGavick asserted.

"The worst evidence," McGavick continued, "was that they had a meeting to discuss what to put in the bids and they knew that if they didn't they'd be beat down anyhow."

As to the Government's charges of discouraging outside bids and "intimidating and threatening," where was the evidence to prove it, the attorney asked.

The judge interrupted to inquire if the attorney was in possession of proof that all the defendants were employed at the post office during the period the Government charges they conspired to defraud, but this was not known by McGavik.

PRACTICE LONG-STANDING

The attorney went over the indictment point by point concerning the charges of collusion, observing that the similar bids had been entered by the men for years and that the indictment itself shows it was in practice in 1942.

"When the bids were all canceled on one occasion by the Government it was because they were all too high," McGavick told the court, and the Department wanted lower ones.

"They weren't complaining about the identical bids," he declared, "they just wanted lower bids."

The men, he went on, knew they had to meet competition and knew they were going to have only one delivery a day under the new postal regulations, so they knocked off $500 in order to use their own cars and have good equipment.

PROOF HELD LACKING

Referring to the charges of sabotage against two of the employees, McGavick said this would be up to the Government to prove. The defense he said, contends that the clutch troubles were due to old equipment and poor installations.

He reminded that the testimony of a private detective, hired by Jack Spady to follow one of the carriers on his route, had not reported that the car had been actually abused or that the driver's handling of the vehicle was of malicious intent.

Judge McColloch pointed out at this point that Keelan, in his signed statement, had admitted that he did. The court added that the two men were not charged in the Government indictment with damaging Spady equipment.

INSPECTOR QUIZZED

S. G. Schwartz, Portland, an inspector with the Post Office Department, came in for rigid cross examination by Claude Snider before noon yesterday, who brought out in his questions that the inspectors had had only one report of clutch damage since September 6, 1950, a statement the defense is expected to go into more thoroughly when it begins its case.

Schwartz testified that Acting Postmaster Hallowell had reported that the local post office was having only minor difficulties and breakdowns.

Presented with a stack of slips, by Snider, and asked to look them over, the inspector stated the first one was dated in June and the last one November 28. Asked how many reports of breakdowns had come to his attention since November 30, Schwartz replied only that Hallowell had come to him recently and told him that the post office was having difficulties.

Asked if he had any information regarding Spady canceling his contract, Schwartz answered in the negative. Snider then asked if any request had been made concerning the contract until after the trial had been completed.

LET-UP SEEN

"I think I told Hallowell," the inspector answered, "that Spady should keep his cars in service and not let them slide."

Asked by the judge what he meant by the expression "let them slide," the inspector replied that Spady had been in Washington and that he, Schwartz, thought the service might become a little lax.

Switching his line of questioning, Snider asked the inspector if he had not, in a conversation with Mrs. DuRose, stated that her husband's trouble "was his own fault; that if he had cooperated with the post-office inspectors, it wouldn't have happened." This was denied by the witness who also denied that a proposal had been made regarding a plea of guilty being entered by the defendants "under certain circumstances."

"Wasn't it within your knowledge that they were told that if they entered a guilty plea that they might be able to return to the post-office service within a few years?" that attorney asked.

DENIAL MADE

This was not true, Schwartz replied, adding that he did tell Hallowell that he thought some of the defendants "were foolish to string along with the others"

He denied that any pressure was brought to bear on the defendants in obtaining their statements and declared he could not recall accusing one of the men of lying but that if he thought this to be a fact "he would probably say it."

In preparing to hear the arguments of the attorneys yesterday afternoon, Judge McColloch excused the jury until 10 o'clock this morning As he did not give a decision on the defense motion for acquittal, it is expected that the defense will open its case at this time.

Glenn Officer, who was excused from the courtroom due to illness was said to be resting comfortably today and was scheduled to return to the trial this morning.

[From the Vancouver (Wash.) Columbian and Sun of September 14, 1951]

TACOMA, September 14.—The trial of 14 Vancouver postal employees will be recessed later this afternoon until Tuesday morning, Federal Judge Claude McColloch said today.

Meanwhile, four defense witnesses were on the stand this morning as the trial began its seventh day, and McColloch once again chided attorneys on both sides for the slow progress they were making.

JURIST WEARIES

He interrupted testimony this morning with the warning "not to drag this case so."

"You're wearing everybody out," he said.

Five Vancouver post-office employees were on the stand today, including two of the defendants. The witnesses were Edward H. B. Carson and Leo T. Belisle, both defendants; and Walter Strong, finance clerk; Jennings Andrews, McLoughlin Heights substation superintendent of mails; and Lawrence Settles, a postal employee since 1926 and a mounted carrier since 1948.

Under questioning by Defense Attorney Claude Snider, Carson told of Carl Mudge, one of the defendants coming to him when he was assistant superintendent of mails because of the Jack Spady, Jr., rental-contract cars not working properly.

Carson said he stepped into the car, started the motor, set the hand brake, put the car in gear, and then stepped out of the car. He told the jury that the car continued to idle and that he understood that to mean the clutch was slipping.

USE IT ANYWAY

Carson said he called Spady and was told that the second gear was probably bad but that a replacement was not available and to go ahead and use the car.

Carson was also on the stand when the judge acted as his own court jester.

Under cross-examination by Government Attorney Harry Sager, he was asked if any of the carriers drove old cars.

He said that one carrier did. When asked what model it was, he said he couldn't remember, but thought it was the year of the big freeze.

The judge brought smiles to the courtroom by saying quickly, "That was in 1894."

Carson was able to identify the car as a 1938 model and said the carrier had bought a new car in 1949.

DISCUSSIONS ADMITTED

Carson, Belisle, Strong, and Settles each admitted discussing their bids for rental-car contracts with other carriers under questioning by both Snider and Sager.

Belisle's testimony explained how the bid was arrived at. He said the carriers tried to figure out the average cost over the years and inquired in other parts of the country to learn typical costs. He explained that the difference in length of routes made no difference in the various bids because each car was expected to be on the road the same length of time during a year.

DENY AGREEMENT MADE

All three denied reaching any agreement on bids in their meetings and discussions with other carriers. They said they had tried to learn what a fair bid would be by talking it over but that no one was bound by any agreement.

Sager asked Belisle if it wasn't true that when it became known that Spady was going to bid that the carriers lowered their bids He said it was.

WANTED BETTER CARS

He explained that the carriers wanted to drive cars in better condition than those offered by Spady and had lowered their bids to meet the competition and to protect the Government from the junk equipment.

He said also that the only time there was ever any secrecy about what the carriers would bid was the "last time." "They were careful not to let certain parties know because they thought if they did the carriers would probably be underbid."

Settles, under cross-examination, admitted after being shown a copy of his signed statement, he had heard employees say, "What are you going to do to the Spady cars today," and "He will be sorry he ever got that contract."

He said he could not recall who had made the statements

ON STAND AT NOON

Settles was on the stand when court recessed at noon

Andrews appeared on the stand for only a short period after being flown to Vancouver last night by the Letter Carriers Association to pick up carbon copies of breakdown reports filed at the McLoughlin Heights substation.

He explained how these reports were made and used The judge then instructed the attorneys to study the reports during the noon hour and to proceed with another witness.

Under cross-examination, Andrews admitted he was a candidate for postmaster. After a question by the defense attorney, however, he explained that he had merely informed the Democratic Committee that he was available and that he had taken no action.

VIEWS DIFFER

Two Vancouver postmasters sat on opposite sides of the court room yesterday as the trial continued, with the defense unfolding testimony it anticipates will puncture the charges brought against the 14 defendants. Ned Blythe, now retired, who served the city as postmaster for many years, and Dan Hallowell, appointed to that post in July, 1949, listened soberly to the examination of the three witnesses who were put on the stand during the afternoon, with divided thoughts—one seeing them as conspirators against the Government and the other contemptuous of the accusations brought against the men who served under him for many years.

They heard, undoubtedly with clashing opinions, the testimony of tall, studious looking Cory Galbraith, assistant postmaster until his suspension last December, Edmond Belisle, former superintendent of mails, and Edward H. B. Carson, former assistant superintendent of mails, all long-time employees, answer questions of counsels for the defense and undergo prodding cross-examination by the Government attorney.

GALBRAITH RETURNS

Galbraith, who began his testimony before noon yesterday, was put back on the stand after court reconvened, for additional questioning by Leo McGavick, one of the defense attorneys. Carson had just been called up for interrogation by Claude Snider when court recessed late in the afternoon, as the attorney asked his witness to enumerate the factors taken in consideration when bids were submitted on carrier vehicles

Remarks made by the court during the afternoon indicated that there might be some doubt as to whether the sworn statements taken from the 14 defendants last September by the post-office inspectors will be allowed to remain in evidence. They were previously admitted over the objections of the defense counsel

McGavik was halted in his questioning of Galbraith concerning remarks made in his statement by Judge McColloch who interrupted the attorney as the latter asked Galbraith if he wanted to explain any of his statements.

POINTS TO CASE

The judge directed that the attorneys, for both the Government and the defense, familiarize themselves with a certain case brought by the Government and previously decided in the United States Supreme Court.

The decision held that statements taken from defendants after commission of an offense and involving other defendants was not admissible but were hearsay. Judge McColloch refused to permit any further interrogation regarding the 14 statements until after he had discussed the matter with the attorneys.

Delving into a different subject, McGavik asked his witness if he had ever been requested to discourage outside bids and Galbraith replied in the negative Neither had he ever made a suggestion to any of the defendants that they get together or with any post-office employee or anyone else for the purpose of discouraging outside bids, Galbraith declared.

He testified, in answer to McGavik, that he had always tried to carry out the regulations of the Post Office Department. Asked if he had ever heard any of the defendants or any post-office employee enter into a plan to damage or wreck motor vehicles belonging to outside bidders, the former assistant postmaster answered, "No, he had not."

TESTIMONY RECALLED

Under cross-examination, Harry Sager, who is prosecuting the case for the Government, harked back to Galbraith's forenoon testimony when he had asserted that he had been assured by Dan Hallowell that all charges would be dropped against Galbraith if the latter would retire. He had stated that he had done this on December 31, 1950.

Asked by Sager if he could recall having asked the acting postmaster to intercede for him with the postal inspectors, Galbraith replied that he had told Hallowell that if it would be of any assistance he, Galbraith, would go to the two officials. Hallowell had answered, according to Galbraith, that it might be a good idea.

He could not recall having been urged by the postmaster to go see the inspectors and said he could not remember Hallowell saying he had written a letter in Galbraith's behalf and had done all he could for him.

OFFER ALLEGED

Queried as to whether Hallowell had not recommended that no action or that minor action be taken in relation to Galbraith, the witness said he thought that was right. He reiterated that the postmaster had told him that if he retired, the matter would be dropped.

"Did you know that at the time Hallowell talked to you, that if you had not voluntarily resigned, the disciplinary action contemplated by the Department was for your demotion to a clerk?" Sager asked.

"Did you know that it was due to Hallowell's intercession in your behalf that you were allowed to retire?" the attorney continued.

Galbraith said he was not cognizant of what the Department's disciplinary action would be at the time Hallowell "suggested that he retire."

The witness said he realized that disciplinary action had to come from Washington, in answer to another query by the Government attorney, and that he did not know that Hallowell was trying to help him.

HE POSTED NOTICES

Quizzed by the attorney as to his duties prior to the retirement of the former postmaster, Ned Blythe, Galbraith said he looked after the posting of the invitations when he was requested to. He posted the notices and saw that the proper forms were in the office of the superintendent of mails.

He did not know the men were getting together to discuss their bids he declared, although he knew that the bids were identical. Asked when he had learned that the men were "getting together," Galbraith said he could not recall. The bids had been identical ever since he had become assistant postmaster in 1940, he went on.

"This never occurred to you even though you knew that the length of the routes varied?" the attorney asked with some sarcasm.

Queried further as to this, Galbraith said he supposed the men asked one another what they were planning to bid on the routes and that one would disclose to another that he intended to quote a certain amount The identical bids could have arisen from the ordinary course of their conversations, he observed

DISCUSSIONS HELD LIKELY

"They probably talked it over, their desks were all near together," he added.

Galbraith repeated, under cross-examination, that he had approached outside dealers during his tenure as assistant postmaster in an attempt to interest them in bids. He named two such visits as being to the Wright-Grandy Co. and Huntspergers. The attorney tried to pin his witness down as to whom he spoke at the two auto companies but Galbraith said he did not know their identities He told the men, he testified, that the post office wanted cars for delivery service and asked if they would be interested. He advised them where to get the forms to fill out and information on the routes, the witness said.

COULD HAVE RETIRED

On redirect examination by McGavick, Galbraith who said he is 63 years old, said he could have retired anytime after his sixtieth birthday with 30 years service. He had previously planned to retire this summer after having served for 40 years with the Department, he said.

He said the question of who occupied the post of postmaster did not concern him, which brought a rapid query from Sager if

Galbraith himself was a candidate for that appointment at the time Hallowell got the job. Galbraith answered that he had not been a candidate.

Edmond Belisle, an employee of the post office since 1921, serving as a curb carrier and working up to superintendent of mails during that period, was the next witness put on by the defense. A veteran of World War I, he told the jury he was lacking only 3 months of having credit of 30 years' service due to his veterans' status and would have retired in 2 years at the age of 55.

INCIDENT RECOUNTED

Questioned by Snider, he recounted an incident during the time he was a "curb server" in 1930 when the two bids entered on vehicle contracts were dissimilar. Reminding that this was during the depression years, Belisle said his bid was $40 on the annual contract while that of another carrier was $5 higher. The latter lowered his bid to the same amount as Belisle's at the direction of the Post Office Department, the witness told the court.

He told of the high costs of operating the equipment and said there were times when the men "definitely went into the hole" on them. The highest bid he ever entered, he said, was for $840.

AGREEMENT DENIED

Referring to the "overt act" in 1942 Belisle is accused of by the Government indictment, when he, Carson, and Walter Strong entered identical bids of $840 per annum, the witness told Snider that he had known approximately what the other men's figures would be. They never entered into any agreement as to what their quotations would be.

Questioned by Snider as to the mail routes, under his supervision, he testified that these are checked early in October each year by him and one of the foremen, the activities of all the carriers surveyed, his stops checked and the amount of mail delivered. A report is subsequently made to the Department. In between these annual surveys, the districts in the rapidly growing city become overpopulated and in many cases the routes must be rechecked and changes made.

ROUTES FLUCTUATE

Asked if any carrier was given assurance as to the number of miles he would be required to cover, the former post-office superintendent replied that this would be impossible as the routes vary in a matter of a few months. "This frequently happens," Galbraith said. The routes could not be arranged on a mileage basis, he said, but according to the number of stops they contain.

Going into the matter of the awarding of the contracts and the Spady bids, Belisle testified that he had nothing to do with approving the contracts, but that he had opened the bids on occasion. He said he did not recall a bid submitted by Carl Mudge on a carrier route.

CAR DILAPIDATED

He told of going to the Spady yard with the acting postmaster after that concern had won the contract to supply two vehicles in March 1950 and of observing the cars. The 1935 Plymouth, Belisle said, had no brakes, which was called to the attention of Jack Spady. He was assured that the car would be put into A-1 condition before being put into service and that new tires and other accessories would be installed.

Belisle testified that he had remarked that the vehicle "looked all right to him." He related a subsequent conversation, with Spady and Hallowell present, at which time Spady explained that he was having trouble getting the 1939 Dodge, contracted to the post office, ready for service and asked that the 1935 Plymouth be used on the route for a few days. The extension of time was granted, according to Belisle.

He denied that he and Galbraith had later told the acting postmaster they had decided to cancel the Spady contract, declaring that neither of them had authority to do this.

NOT UP TO SPECIFICATIONS

Asked by Snider to enlarge on this, Belisle related he had brought to the attention of Hallowell that Spady hadn't lived up to his agreement to put the Dodge into service in a few days. He had also pointed out that the Plymouth coupe being used in place of the Dodge was not up to the post office specifications that call for 65 cubic feet behind the driver's seat.

They told the postmaster that due to these derelictions, they thought the contract should be canceled. Belisle denied he had ever told the postmaster "he had lost confidence in him," a remark attributed to the superintendent of mails by Hallowell in the latter's testimony earlier in the trial.

Getting around to the breakdowns of the Spady cars, the witness said Hallowell became very angry when Belisle told him that employees driving the cars were complaining of these incidents. After arousing his superior's ire, Belisle said he no longer made these reports but made memorandums of his own.

Asked if he had these memos, Belisle replied that the inspectors had taken them. He estimated that there were two to three such memos each week.

JUST FOLLOWING PATTERN

Going back to the year the indictment charges Belisle with collusion on his bidding, Snider inquired if the witness thought there was anything improper in the identical bids. This pattern had been set by the department itself, Belisle answered, adding he had learned this due to his former experience when a carrier had been directed to lower his bid to conform with the one entered by Belisle.

He had never thought there was anything improper about the bids nor had he ever had a thought that the vehicles were being improperly handled, he reiterated in reply to his interrogator.

Cross-examination of the suspended superintendent of mails was long and thorough by Government Attorney Sager who attempted to break down the witness' previous testimony and to bring out that Belisle was both cognizant of the alleged collusion on bids entered by the carriers and of the deliberate damaging of the Spady autos.

HE JUST GOT CURIOUS

Plugging away on the allegations of sabotage, Sager asked the witness if his suspicions had not been aroused when Keelan burned out four clutches in 1 day but Belisle answered that this had only aroused his curiosity as to the serviceability of the Spady equipment.

Shown four slips made out by Ray Keelan on August 17, 1950, all relating to the burned out clutches, Belisle said he had reported the mishaps and had recommended deductions in his contract for the time the vehicles had been out of service.

"Can you still say that you had no suspicions that those cars were being abused?" the attorney prodded.

WITNESS HESITATES

Belisle answered with some hesitation that he "could have had." Then he added that "he didn't believe he had"—that the matter was in the hands of the inspectors then anyway.

Asked if he had said anything to either Hallowell or the inspectors, he answered that he had not. After Hallowell had shown anger at his reports about the Spady equipment he had kept his own counsel, the witness indicated.

A letter admittedly written to Inspector R. L. Karr, by the superintendent of mails about a week after this incident, was introduced by the Government and admitted. Read aloud by Sager, it told of the number of failures of the Spady cars and of how the men had to wait on their routes for substitutes to deliver the mail. In it, Belisle denied the charges of sabotage against the carriers and declared that he could truthfully say that he had never heard any remarks made by the men about sabotaging the vehicles.

DENIAL MADE

A sentence in which he told the inspector he would post the department regulations pertaining to destruction of goverment property brought another question from the attorney and a denial from the witness. "Was it because you were suspicious of these constant breakdowns that you posted these rules and regulations?" Sager had demanded.

He brought out in further pressing the witness that it became the procedure to make deductions from the Spady contracts when the cars were out of service due to breakdowns but that the carriers who drove their own vehicles were not docked in this method.

Sager, continuing this line of that on the date the four clutches questioning, elicited from Belisle went out in the car operated by Keelan, deductions of from 30 to 45 minutes had been recommended and approved by him in each instance.

Asked if he had discussed with Keelan at any time whether or not the latter was abusing the cars, Belisle said he had not.

"You simply took them as they came in and approved them and recommended them?" the attorney demanded.

He did, Belisle answered.

SCHEDULE EXPLAINED

On redirect examination of Belisle, Snider questioned him further on the question of the schedule following on the time of the carriers driving their own vehicles. Belisle explained that in event one of their vehicles broke down, he would complete his route after it was repaired, putting in his full time before returning to the post office. The carrier was off schedule and the mail delayed but there was no loss of time, he said.

In the matter of the breakdowns of the Spady cars, he went on, the Government loses, as the car is completely out of service and a substitute carrier has to go out and complete the mail delivery.

[From the Vancouver (Wash.) Columbian and Sun of September 17, 1951]

TACOMA, September 17.—The 14 indicted Vancouver post office employees were girding themselves today for the continuation of their trial on charges of conspiracy to defraud the Government which tomorrow will enter its eighth day in Federal court in Tacoma. Court was in recess today upon authorization of Judge Claude McColloch, Portand, visiting judge, hearing the case in the absence of Judge Charles H. Leavy, who on Friday dismissed the jurors until Tuesday morning at 10 o'clock.

Weary defendants and the wives of the majority of the men who accompanied their husbands to Tacoma, all beginning to show the strain of the long trial, welcomed the 3-day break as an opportunity to take it easy and rest up for the concluding days of the hearings.

THIRTEEN FOR DEFENSE

So far, the defense has put on 13 witnesses since it began presenting testimony Thursday morning it hopes will refute the Government's charges against the 14 Vancouverites. Eight of these witnesses were members of the accused group and five were nondefendants. One of the latter, Hew Milhollin,

was a character witness for several of the men.

Defendants to be heard this week, if plans of defense counsel are not changed by Judge McColloch—who is showing impatience with the trial's slow progress—are Glenn Officer, William DuRose, and Phil Whitsitt. One man has been excused because of illness.

KEELAN ON STAND AT RECESS

Those who have already testified are Cory Galbraith, Edmond Belisle, Edward H B. Carson, Walter Strong, Leo Belisle, Delbert Echtle, Carl Mudge and Ray Keelan. The latter was being questioned by Claude Snider when court recessed Friday for the 3-day period.

Nondefendants who have testified for the defense are Ned Blythe, former postmaster of Vancouver for 13 years, Jennings Andrews, present superintendent of mails of the McLoughlin Heights substation; Lawrence Settles, a regular mounted carrier for the post office since last December; Virginia Carson, wife of one of the defendants, and Milhollin, Vancouver insurance agent. Milhollin appeared as a character witness for Mudge, Officer, and William DuRose. He testified he had known the three men for many years and that they were good, law abiding citizens with excellent reputations.

Under cross-examination by Harry Sager, attorney for the prosecution, when asked if Milhollin had discussed their reputations with others in Vancouver, he replied that he had and that everyone "thought it was such a shame that they had been accused—that they hated to see this happen to men with such good reputations"

NONE IS CLIENT

He answered that none of the three defendants was his client, when this question was posed by the attorney.

The testimony of Mrs Carson was brief and had to do with photographs she testified she took September 8 of the 1939 Oldsmobile that has figured prominently in the trial, now out of service with the post office and parked in the Spady wrecking yard.

Carl Mudge was on the stand the greater part of the afternoon and his testimony was straightforward and unhesitating The prosecution failed to rattle him in cross-examination although it was plain to see it angered him at times. He answered questions in a strong and determined voice and although admitting frankly that the carriers had discussed the costs of operating their vehicles in connection with bids entered and that possibly they did discuss what they were going to bid, he denied vehemently that anyone knew his contemplated quotation.

REPLY SHARP

"My own wife didn't know what I was going to bid," he snapped at Sager.

Mudge, under direct examination by Claude Snider, told the court of his service with the local post office from 1920 to 1950, and of being discharged in December 1950, as the result of the investigation by postal inspectors

He suffered a cerebral hemorrhage in April 1950, a condition which he feels was contributed to by the fumes he said he inhaled during the month he drove one of the Spady cars.

Prefacing his answer as to why he became ill with the remark that he "wasn't a doctor" he continued that he was sick every day from the fumes in the Spady-leased '39 Dodge, would have headaches and be dizzy when he got home from the office.

TROUBLE ALL HIS

He testified that only three clutches burned out the month he drove the Spady vehicles, March 1950, and that he was the only carrier during that period who had operated one of the Spady cars.

This question reverts back to earlier questioning of Jack Spady who disclosed, under cross-examination by the defense, that he had put in a claim to the Government for $1,200, $169.64 of which represented four clutches burned out in March.

In prior testimony Friday by Lawrence Settles, a present mounted carrier, who served as a substitute for Mudge on occasions, on redirect examination by Snider had told of hitting a marker while driving his route, damaging the car. He was sent a bill for $25 for repairs, he said, which he had not yet paid. Queried further, Settles said this mishap was described as a burned-out clutch in the report made of it.

In continuing his story on the stand, Mudge told of entering his first bid on post-office contracts in 1942 for $900, stating he could not remember whether there were similar bids at the time.

REFUSED TO CUT

He said contracts of Strong, Belisle, and Carson were then in effect at $840 and that he, Mudge, had been advised that his bid was considered excessive. That it should be reduced. He refused to do this, he said, and had declared that his bid would be higher if a call for new ones was issued

Mudge asserted there was no secrecy about the discussion of the bids but he was firm in his denial that the carriers had talked over ways to freeze out outside bidders or that they had attempted to monopolize the contracts

He went on to state that an article in the postal records sets the maximum bid at $1,500 for leasing vehicles (the amount entered by nine of the defendants in 1948) and reminded the court of the increased costs of operating a car and the skyrocket costs of repairs. He operated his truck on a 6-day basis, 8 hours a day, he said, which meant paying time and a half for work on the car in any garage after hours.

DISCUSSIONS ADMITTED

Of course, the men discussed these rising costs, Mudge continued in his replies to Snider's questions, and although the witness stated he had no definite knowledge that the postmaster was aware of this, he added that as there had been no secrecy about their conversations, he assumed the postmaster knew of them

He described the three Spady cars he drove, a '39 Olds, a '35 Plymouth, and a '39 Dodge, telling of how he refused to drive the Olds the first day it was assigned to him when he found the locks and stop light on the car did not work He drove his own car on the route instead, he said, and once again when the Spady equipment failed. He refused to do this the third time, Mudge asserted, saying he couldn't afford to drive his own car when the Spady vehicles failed when he couldn't afford to operate his auto under the prevailing contract at that time.

IN SECOND ONLY

He complained that the clutch of the Olds was "soft," that it shifted with difficulty, and that he could shift it only into second or reverse. He had to drive it that way all day, he said.

He reported this and the Plymouth was assigned to his route while the Olds was taken out for repairs, he continued. The gears in the Plymouth were "very stiff," Mudge said, but he drove it for 15 days without incident until it "quit" on March 15 when his route was half completed. He said he notified the superintendent of mails and sat in his car until a substitute car was sent out.

The following day, he went on, the Plymouth was reassigned to him. Asked how the vehicle drove, Mudge replied "like any 1935 car would that has been driven probably 100,000 miles."

On March 23, slipping of the gears became progressively worse, the witness continued, and the Plymouth finally stopped altogether. He reported to his superior that he thought the clutch was worn out.

TELLS OF TROUBLES

Jack Spady came out on this occasion, Mudge recounted, and brought the replacement. He told of another occasion when the Plymouth refused to start and how he had tried to push it to "get it going," and still another time when the car started smoking so badly that he "thought it was going to catch on fire"

On the latter occasion, the witness went on, he waited for 1 hour before a Spady man came. In this interim, the car had cooled down, and the mechanic declared there was nothing wrong with it, accusing Mudge of driving with his brake on. Mudge stated he reported this to his superintendent of mail, who said that in view of the mechanic's opinion, that there was nothing wrong with the auto, to go ahead and drive it.

Mudge said the mechanic followed in his own car for some 10 blocks and that on swinging back along his route he found the Spady panel truck bearing the mechanic, stalled and waiting for help.

BALKS AGAIN

Later the car he was operating failed, so he locked it up and reported again to his superior, he said, saying he thought the clutch had gone out

The witness told the jury of other Spady-car troubles, the Dodge dying when he halted for a stop light and refusing to start, and of the occasion when Jack Spady accompanied his mechanic to the scene of a breakdown.

THREATS ALLEGED

The contractor, according to Mudge, shouted, "We have you now," upon approaching, and accused him of "deliberately sabotaging this car" When Spady threatened, "We'll get your job," Mudge asserted he had demanded that these remarks be put in writing and that there "would be a court case over it"

Mudge testified that the local carriers association had requested the investigation and asked for a further explanation of this organization by the court, explained that it was a branch of the National Association of Letter Carriers, affiliated with the A. F. of L.

Queried as to the charges made by plaintiffs, that he drove leased vehicles at excessive speed, Mudge replied that he did drive rapidly on long stretches on his route in order to clear out the fumes from the auto. As the longest stretch was only 4 or 5 blocks in length, he added, it would be difficult to obtain very much speed.

This was taken up by Sager on cross-examination, who asked if the fumes Mudge complained of were not caused by "burning clutches" The witness denied this with a tinge of disgust. They were fumes from the transmission, he insisted.

EXAMINES CLUTCHES

Asked to look at the damaged clutches admitted to evidence last week at request of the Government, Mudge examined them carefully The facing in one, he said, was in "pretty fair shape and looks like it has been slipped" Another he described as "definitely burned," a third had some facing on it and "could have slipped," he asserted The damage, he summed up, could have been "the result of malfunction of the car, or it could be burned."

Confronted with another defunct clutch, Mudge observed it looked as though it was burned but refused to say definitely.

Sager turned his questions to the time Mudge withdrew his bid moments before they were to be opened in the office of the superintendent of mails on February 20, 1950

(at the time sealed bids from Jack Spady were delivered), and submitted another estimate.

BID TORN UP

Asked where the first bid was, Mudge replied that he had torn it up. Queried as to what price it quoted, the witness answered $1,500, then testified that his second bid was for fourteen hundred "and something."

He denied that he had changed his bid because he learned that Spady was in the running, asserting that he knew that Spady was bidding before entering his first bid.

Sager's attempt to learn the identities of the carriers who attended a meeting at the David Jeffery home between February 1 to 20, 1950, failed with this witness as it has with the rest of the defendants who have been on the stand. Mudge could remember who was there no better than the others. He just knew "that David Jeffery was there," he said.

CAN'T AGREE

Asked if it were not true that the men had assembled to discuss the Spady bid, the witness replied that he couldn't "go along with you there."

He remarked there had been quite a bit of discussion as to how they were going to deliver the mail "with the equipment Spady would put into service," and continued hammering on this observation by Sager brought no further admittance. When pressed again as to what the men had talked about, Mudge volunteered that they had discussed at great length a proposal for setting up a cooperative service station and garage where the men might secure gas, oil, and repairs at a price that would make it possible for them to enter lower bids on post-office contracts and "still break even."

Quizzed as to other occasions, Mudge said he could't recall whether he had discussed bids with other carriers, asserting that "possibly" this had occurred. They discussed the lowest estimate they could enter and break even, he remarked, but no one agreed he was going to bid a certain amount, Mudge reiterated.

"I didn't know what any one was going to bid before they were opened," he declared.

BIDDER CHANGES MIND

Again bringing up the incident of his eleventh hour bid withdrawal, Sager tried to draw admittance from the witness that this had been done in an attempt to freeze out the Spady bid on the contracts.

Mudge, asserting he had lowered his first estimate to "underbid Spady" said he did this when he found out what he was "going to have to drive" under a Spady contract.

Both Mudge and Ray Keelan, who followed the former to the stand, and who with Mudge is accused of deliberately damaging the Spady vehicles, have testified that they knew they were being followed by investigators on their routes.

Keelan, a native Vancourverite and an employee of the post office since his graduation from Vancouver High School in 1935, told the jury he had first served as a "utility" carriers' day off on all of the 15 routes then in the city. He said he used Phil Whitsitt's car until 1944 when he bought his own car and obtained his first annual contract as a mounted carrier.

RECOUNTS TROUBLES

His testimony, too, went into his experiences with the Spady cars he drove during August 1950, telling of times he could not start the 1939 Dodge assigned to him, and how he had used his own car on the route when he could not get the 1935 Plymouth to back up when he put it in reverse.

The Dodge, he said, had to be pushed to get it going, then roared off with sputtering motor. Because the brakes were inadequate, he said it was necessary for him to keep his foot on the pedal at all times as it had to be pushed clear to the floor in order to catch.

He testified that he had had two breakdowns prior to August 17, the date he is accused of burning out four clutches. Keelan, on the other hand, declares that the clutches were worn out and that the replacements, too, were worn out and wouldn't adjust.

HARD SHIFT ALLEGED

Recounting the events of the fateful day, Keelan said he started out with a 1942 station wagon which "was very hard to shift." The engine, he said, was not running smoothly and the car vibrated when he stepped on the clutch When he noted that the clutch was stuck, he said he called the acting postmaster, Dan Hallowell, who came out and later Jack Spady arrived. Hallowell, according to Keelan, drove the car down the road, then remained in the vehicle while Keelan drove. Shortly after Hallowell left him, Keelan continued, the motor began to heat up and fumes started billowing into the auto. He reported this to the superintendent of mails who advised him to go ahead and use the car if he thought he could drive it. Later the same thing happened and was reported. This time Jack Spady came out with a replacement and drove off in the Dodge, the witness continued.

The motor in this car, too, died on him, according to Keelan, who said this occurrence brought forth jeers from men working nearby as to "where he got that pile of junk" as he pushed the stalled vehicle.

ANOTHER CAR FAILS

Another replacement was sent out, he related, adding that he noted the motor in this auto was racing out of proportion to the speed it was being driven. Trouble again developed, the witness said, and was duly reported to the postmaster, bringing forth the query from that official "for —— sake, what's happened now?" Hallowell later asked him, Keelan said, if he was a mechanic.

The witness said he left this auto on his route and finished his delivery on foot. The car was later towed back to the postoffice.

Keelan swore that he had done nothing to cause the vehicles to become unserviceable and that he had driven them just as he drove his own auto.

He told of additional clutch troubles, on other occasions later that month, once with the '39 Dodge.

CANNOT EXPLAIN MILEAGE

He denied that he had ever driven a Spady vehicle at any time after it was left at the postoffice at night and could give no explanation of the 400 miles run up on the speedometer in a 3-day period. His route, he testified, is 18 miles long.

He explained an episode of starting on his route late, formerly brought out in the testimony of R. L. Karr, postal inspector, as having been due to a heavy mail run when it had taken 2 hours to load up, and because of car trouble. The car kept slipping out of low, and he had been forced to drive it in second over the route, he said. It "stuck" at Twenty-seventh and Main, he said, and refused to move.

PHOTOS IDENTIFIED

Virginia Carson, wife of Edward Carson, one of the defendants, identified photographs of the 1939 Olds and other Spady vehicles still in use by the post office, as having been taken by her on Saturday morning, September 8. She testified that she had given the photographs to another party to enlarge.

Questioned by Sager, she said she knew the cars well as being Spady vehicles but said she could not state their make as she was just a housewife. Asked why she had two of the photographs of the Spady cars enlarged, she answered, "Just to show what they were like." The photograph of the Oldsmobile, parked in the Spady lot, was snapped from where she stood outside the fence on the old Pacific Highway, she said.

Delbert Echtle, next on the stand for the defense, said he had been a carrier since 1936, beginning as a temporary worker and later becoming a permanent employee. He obtained a parcel-post route in 1948, he said, and later started bidding on the routes.

DISCUSSION HELD

Having no idea as to the contracts, he testified that he had discussed the prevailing bids with other carriers, as he was uncertain what to ask.

Asked if he had entered into an agreement with any of the men as to any specified amount, he said that he had not, nor at the same time was there any concealment of the amount he was going to bid, he added.

He, too, declared that he had never tried to intimidate outside bidders, or "conspired, or unlawfully agreed to deprive the Government of competitive bidding." Nor had any of the men, he testified.

Asked on cross-examination if he had known about the four clutches allegedly burned out by Keelan, the witness said that he considered these mishaps due to "poor equipment."

"You think it's poor equipment if a man burns out four clutches in 1 day of normal driving?" the Government attorney prodded.

"The clutches could have been faulty before," answered Echtle. "I do not think it was due to abuse of the car "

OBJECTION SUSTAINED

Sager's query to the effect that if "damage to the cars was deliberate, this would be intimidation, wouldn't it?" brought a quick objection by Snider as being argumentative, which was sustained by the court.

Queried about the identical bids of $1,500 in 1948 by nine of the carriers, Echtle among them, the witness answered that he had asked the other drivers what the rate was. He learned, he said, that this was $1,500.

"It was common knowledge that we were all going to bid $1,500," Echtle observed.

Reminded by Sager that the prevailing contracts of $1,200 had been terminated by the men, Echtle frankly admitted that he "knew they were being cancelled for a higher bid." This was well known among the carriers, he said.

Quizzed as to the meeting at the home of Earl Malone in July of 1950, Echtle failed to remember who was there. He "thought some of the defendants were present," though he couldn't say which ones. The witness said he heard no price mentioned in regards to bids soon to come up. The men discussed the contracts, he admitted, with the "truck group" and "car group" forming separate huddles, but no price was mentioned, he maintained.

COULD BE COINCIDENCE

Asked if he considered it just coincidence that the men subsequently submitted identical bids of $1,080, Echtle replied that he "guessed it could be."

To the attorney's query as to whether the men had met at the Jeffrey home to discuss the Spady bids, Echtle answered no, that it was to discuss "Spady equipment."

One never knew what situation would develop from day to day on Spady cars, the witness observed.

In between court sessions, it is getting to be a long wait for everyone.

GROUP RENTS HOUSE

Some of the couples are staying in hotels, others in motels or with friends in the city. Eight of the defendants and their wives have rented a house for the duration of the trial, Mr. and Mrs. Carl Mudge, Mr. and Mrs. Leo Belisle, Mr. and Mrs. David Jeffrey, and Mr.

and Mrs. Edward H B. Carson. The William DuRose's are next door with friends.

The rented place has been designated the "ghost house" due to its antique filled interior dating back to another era. Despite the gravity of their situation, and the tension under which they have lived, the wives have attempted—as wives will—to make their stay in Tacoma, as normal as possible to relieve the strain of their court-filled days.

When the birthday of one of the men, Carl Mudge, occurred at the end of the week, it was observed in as much of a "home atmosphere" as was possible and the "ghost house" was the scene of a celebration of sorts, with the guests served ice cream and the usual candle-decorated cake.

[From the Vancouver (Wash.) Columbian and Sun of September 18, 1951]

TACOMA, September 18.—A parade of character witnesses from Vancouver took the stand at Federal court here today to testify to the good reputations of the 14 Vancouver postal employees charged with conspiracy.

After nine had testified, Federal Judge Claude McColloch directed the defense to move to other testimony and a large party of Vancouverites, who had come to testify in favor of the men, did not reach the stand. Other witnesses appearing before court recessed for lunch at noon included four of the defendants

WELL-KNOWN MEN

The character witnesses included several prominent city and county office holders and others well-known in Clark County. The witnesses included Harry Diamond, Vancouver chief of police; Sheriff Clarence McKay, Clark County sheriff, Ray Woolf, Clark County commissioner, Ronald DuFresne, former county coroner, Rev Ralph Larson, Vancouver minister, John Hogg, former Vancouver mayor, Carl Gunz, S P & S Railroad official, Richard Larson, a Vancouver florist, and Col Charles Eggen

Ray Keelan, one of the defendants, in a continuation of Friday afternoon testimony, took the stand when the trial resumed this morning. Three other defendants followed him today. They were Earl N Malone, Glen Officer, and David Jeffrey

Each of the defendants denied making agreements with other carriers as to the amount of their bids and denied they attempted to "freeze out" outside bidders. All admitted discussing the bids freely with other carriers at meetings in the Malone home and in the post office but testified that they discussed costs and not the amount of the bid

Keelan, under questioning by defense attorney Claude Snider, went into further detail on the reported 395 miles shown on the speedometer of a Spady car he drove on his route over a 3-day period. He said that in normal operation the car should show about 108 miles.

CAN'T EXPLAIN

Keelan said he could not explain the extra mileage unless the car were driven after hours when it was in Spady's possession. He said that on two occasions he believed it had been, but admitted this was not the 3-day period in question

He said that one time when he picked up the Spady car in the morning he found bits of lumber and earth in the car that had not been there the night before. On another occasion, he said, the empty mail sacks he had left in the car overnight were rearranged when he picked up the car in the morning.

Under cross-examination by Government Attorney Harry Sager, Keelan was asked about a blank bid he had given Officer in which he permitted Officer to fill in the amount.

Keelan admitted filling out the bid form and leaving the space for the amount blank. He said he was going on vacation and asked Officer to turn in the bid for him. He said he told Officer to fill it in with these words, "Oh, a thousand dollars, or anything."

Asked why he didn't fill it in himself, Keelan replied, "I didn't want to bid higher for I knew it wouldn't go through."

When Officer came to the stand the defense questioned him about this Keelan bid. Officer pointed out that Keelan was about to leave on his vacation and when he decided upon the amount of his own bid he filled in Keelan's for the same amount

Officer testified from a chair below the witness stand. Before he took the stand his attorney pointed out to the court that Officer had suffered a stroke a year ago and was not in good health.

IT'S SURPRISING

Under cross-examination he admitted it was "surprising that all the bids came to the same amount," but pointed out that the carriers had always discussed the bids openly in order to form their estimates of what the costs would be for operating a car on the mail routes

Malone was questioned by Defense Attorney Leo McGavick and said his health was not too good and that he has a cancer. He said he didn't know if anyone organized the meeting held at his home in July 1950, and had merely offered his home as a place for the men to meet. Malone said that the bids of $1,020 that followed that meeting resulted from the belief among the carriers that they would have to bid about $1,000 and lose money if they were going to drive their own cars on the routes. He said the carriers weren't trying to keep outside bidders out, but merely wanted to drive their own cars.

Under cross-examination Malone was asked how many Spady clutches he had burned out. He answered, "None."

Asked how many clutches he had burned out in his own 1941 car during the past 5 years, he said, "Four or five."

Jeffery was the last witness to come to the stand this morning and was giving testimony when the court recessed for lunch. Jeffery is the youngest of the 14 defendants and has been a post-office employee since 1941. His first and only bid on rental car contracts was made in July 1950, following the meeting at Malone's house.

GIVES DETAILS

Under questioning he gave further details about a conversation with Roy Spady, brother of Jack Spady, Jr., about the Spady cars.

Jeffery said he had gone to see Roy Spady to ask him if Jack was going to bid on the route he was driving because he planned to order a new car but didn't think he could afford to if he had to meet a competitive Spady bid

Jeffery told the court that Roy asked him about the route and he had replied the car driven over that route would get hard use.

He said he also told Roy he wouldn't want anyone else driving his car on that route.

DENIAL ENTERED

After describing how he arrived at his first bid, that is, estimates of costs, repairs, depreciation, Jeffery denied earlier testimony that he had asked Edmond Belisle, one of the defendants and former superintendent of mails, for assurance that he would win the bid

Jeffery said he asked Belisle for assurance that he would win the route asisgnment, not the bid, and when being told the route was his, he ordered the new car.

Jeffery had not been cross-examined when the court recessed shortly after noon today.

[From the Vancouver (Wash.) Columbian and Sun of September 19, 1951]

TACOMA, September 19.—The defense suffered two setbacks today as the trial of 14 Vancouver postal employees came to a false finish in Federal court here.

After the defense completed presentation of its testimony and the jury heard the rebuttal by Government Attorney Harry Sager, the defense moved for acquittal and asked, if that motion failed, that statements taken from the 14 defendants not be admitted as evidence.

LETS UNITED STATES MAKE POINT

Federal Judge Claude McColloch, in a strong statement aimed at the Government's case, denied the motion for acquittal and admitted the statements

He said "I have strong views about this case. I want to give you [the Government] every opportunity to present all the evidence you want to. I will let it [the case] go to the jury and they [the statements] will be permitted to stay in."

"But," he added, "I won't say what I'll do afterward."

Courtroom observers pointed out that the judge, who has been obviously impatient with the Government in this trial, even though the jury found the 14 men guilty, could acquit the men of the charges

McColloch turned his back to the courtroom and the jury box as he made his ruling. As he spoke, several of the jurors listened intently while others moved restlessly in their chairs

CASE REOPENED

After hearing his ruling, defense attorneys asked if they could then reopen the case and go over each of the statements. This was approved by the judge and two of the statements were reviewed before the court recessed at lunch

Defense Attorney Leo McGavick called Cory M Galbraith, one of the defendants and former assistant postmaster, and Edward H B. Carson, a second defendant and assistant superintendent of mails, to the stand.

HOSTILITY ALLEGED

Under questioning the two reviewed how the statements were taken by the postal inspectors and described the atmosphere of the questioning as not friendly and dictatorial

Under cross-examination by Sager read the statement signed by each man paragraph by paragraph, asking them to point out where they were inaccurate or varied from what they had told the inspectors

Galbraith summed up the two defendants' attitude toward the wording of the statements by saying he didn't like the way it was written. He admitted that when the statement was taken he didn't offer to change it.

MAY GO BACK FAR

When questioned after court recessed this noon, McGavick said he and Claude Snider were uncertain about how many of the statements they would have examined in court, possibly all of them

The trial reached its false finish at 10 30 this morning after 2 defense witnesses had been on the stand. The 2 witnesses were Gustav Forfman of Seattle, chief mechanic for motor vehicles at the post office there, and Rubin B Kremers, of Washington, D. C., assistant secretary of the National Association of Letter Carriers

Forfman qualified as an expert and told the court he was in charge of post office vehicles for 19 cities in the northwest portion of the State.

CAN'T TELL WHY

He examined the clutches and pointed out wear and possible flaws in several of them which, he said, would have caused them to burn out. He said that since the entire clutch assembly was not present it was impossible to determine why the clutch had failed.

Under cross examination, Forfman said there was no way to estimate how much service a replacement clutch should give

because there were so many other factors involved in relation to the rest of the car.

He pointed out one clutch which he said was not properly adjusted when it was installed and said a properly installed clutch might fail shortly after it was put into use if it carried heavy loads, or if the car brakes were applied often enough to cause friction, and, he admitted, if the clutch were being slipped by the driver

OUT OF RENTAL CARS

The clutches in question were those taken from the Jack Spady, Jr. rental contract cars in 1950 and were admitted as evidence in the trial

Kremers caused a small stir in court while on the stand by saying, over the objections of Sager, that A. R Gehman, assistant director of motor vehicle service for the Post Office Department, had been viewing the trial since its start He pointed out that Gehman had not been called to the stand by the Government and was not in the court room this morning.

NOT LIKE USUAL UNION

Kremers described the Letter Carriers Association as unlike the normal union in that it was interested in postal service as well as postal employees and that membership was voluntary. He said his work with the union was to investigate carrier complaints.

Kremers testified that carriers all over the country turned in identical bids and that in several negotiations between himself and the Post Office Department high bids had been lowered at the request of the post office so that all were identical.

The last defendant in the widely talked about case went on the stand yesterday afternoon as the defense moved to conclusion of its case which was expected to go to the jury sometime today. Only 2, possible 3, witnesses remained to be questioned by defense counsel. It is understood, after which the Government had the opportunity to present testimony in rebuttal to that of the defendants. The arguments of the attorneys then were to ensue which were to be followed by the court's instructions to the jury

Judge Claude McColloch pushed the testimony along rapidly Tuesday and at one point cut short the testimony of one of the defendants, Phil Whitsitt, telling defense counsel to "go ahead and finish it up" and directing that counsel interrogate as to whether the witness had "ever conspired" and the other questions that have been put to each defendant as he winds up his testimony.

THAT'S THAT

At another point in the afternoon, the jurist demanded that the final defendant be put on the stand and when the defense attempted to make a remark, interrupted to snap briskly, "I don't care about that—I want to hear the last defendant."

During the morning session, Judge McColloch halted the long line of character witnesses who came to Tacoma to vouch for the reputations of the various men, telling defense attorneys that one character witness for each man was sufficient.

Those who were in court to testify in behalf of the men but who were not heard due to the magistrate's ruling were Mayor Vern Ander on, George Hutton, city commissioner; John Camp Jr., Leland Morrow, former sheriff of Clark County; and Albert Forgey, State chaplain of the American Legion.

GRANDY ON STAND

On the stand when court recessed at 4:30 o'clock was George Grandy, Ford dealer in Vancouver, who, under direct examination by Claude Snider, testified that he had been approached in years past by both Ned Blythe, former postmaster, and Ralph Carson, former superintendent of mails, now deceased, in relation to entering bids on post-office-vehicle contracts. He had always refused, Grandy said, as his company, then Wright & Grandy, were not interested in this type of business.

Asked on cross-examination by Harry Sager, Government attorney, if it was not true that he had told the post-office inspectors on Monday that he had no recollection of ever being approached, Grandy said this was not true.

DOESN'T RECALL

He said the inspectors had asked him if he recalled having talked to Cory Galbraith on this subject and that he had replied "not to his knowledge" He had since remembered, Grandy testified, that it was Ralph Carson, then superintendent of mails, with whom he had discussed the bids. Quizzed by Sager, if he had told the inspectors that it was someone else he had talked to, Grandy accused the attorney of "trying to confuse him"

"I told them," he said, "that we had been approached at various times on the routes and had been asked to bid on certain routes then open"

He declared that he had advised the inspectors at their Monday session that he had discussed the routes with both Blythe and Carson.

WITNESS CROSS-EXAMINED

David Jeffrey resumed the stand when court reconvened after the noon recess yesterday, for continued cross-examination by Sager who directed his witness' attention to the meeting held at his home the latter part of February 1950. This get-together, Jeffrey told the court, was after the first bid had been awarded to Jack Spady on post office contracts and prior to the next call for bids on a route that had formerly been assigned to Walter Strong who had been promoted to a supervisory job

Jeffrey couldn't remember who arranged for the meeting and testified that someone had asked if the men could assemble at his home He could not recall who attended but said the session was open to all post office employees who wanted to attend. He said he thought some of the foot carriers were there but could not be sure.

He couldn't recall for sure whether the Spady contracts were discussed and said he did not know the purpose for which the meeting had been called as he had not spearheaded it

He could recall only that the operating expenses of the cars were talked over and that the proposal to launch a cooperative service station had come up for discussion.

CLOW TESTIFIES

Ellsworth Clow, manager of the McCoy Auto Co. and a partner in the concern, was next on the stand, and testified that he had been invited to enter bids early in July 1944 on post office contracts. His company was not interested, he said, and did not submit bids.

Under cross-examination, Clow said he had gotten the call through the mail and that it should now be in his files unless it had been destroyed in the recent move of the company from the old building He told the attorney for the plaintiffs that he had not been requested by the defense to bring the notice to court.

Asked when he had been approached concerning the invitation, Clow replied that William DuRose and Leo Belisle had come to him when the post office matter had first come up and had asked Clow if he had a copy of the notice. He had looked it up, he said, and had found it in his files.

DU ROSE TAKES STAND

The twelfth defendant put on the stand, William DuRose, a regular post office employee since 1936, and a substitute for 9 years prior, was questioned as to a conversation he had with Carl Jenson, a witness for the Government, who last week had testified to alleged inflammatory statements made to him by DuRose. The latter, declaring that he was aware that Jenson at that time had a contract with Jack Spady to furnish gasoline for the Spady vehicles, tagged as untrue the remark attributed to him about getting rid of that Democratic —— in the front office, stating that he, himself, was a Democrat and that his wife had taken an active part in the activities of that party in the city.

Neither had he made any statements to Jenson in relation to wrecking every automobile those Democratic —— put on the route, DuRose vowed. His talks with Jenson, the witness testified, had progressed no further than a request that Jenson put up a mail box on the route the witness served.

DENIES RIFT

DuRose continued that he had never had any trouble with Dan Hallowell, acting postmaster. He added that he did tell that official on one occasion, in connection with a talk about the parking space at the post office, that "if we get any more of that Spady junk we won't have room to park any of the cars"

He went on to say that he had held about seven contracts with the local post office during his years as a mounted carrier Asked by Judge McColloch when the custom started of the carriers leasing their own cars, DuRose could give no definite answer. This brought an observation from the jurist that "they just growed, like Topsy." The witness agreed that this was probably correct.

POINTS TO COST CLIMB

Pointing out the rising costs during the years he has entered bids, DuRose told the court that he paid $950 for the first truck he purchased to drive on his route as compared to $2,400 for the last vehicle. The employees have to pay full price for gas, which has risen steadily in price, he continued. Repairs, for which he formerly paid $1 50 an hour are now $4, he reminded.

Queried as to his mechanical troubles while operating his car he said he had burned, then changed this to worn out, two or three clutches over the years.

Asked by defense counsel if he had put in a claim to the Government for these repairs, DuRose snorted "No, I didn't put in a claim. That was my own responsibility, not the Government's."

AVERAGE SALARY CITED

Judge McColloch interposed a question as to what the average salary of the carriers was and was told about $3,800 a year.

Sager, on cross-examination, quizzed the witness as to how the bids were predicated on costs and brought out that they were not computed on the cost per mile but on the hours the cars were used He admitted that his car was halted in the downtown district while he delivered parcel-post packages to the merchants but contended that the vehicle cost as much to operate standing still as it did running, based on depreciation On the curb routes in the residential districts, he said, the cars were never halted but were running the entire time the route was being serviced.

Delving into the question of the meetings held at the homes of two of the defendants, as he has with each defendant under cross-examination, Sager again tried to bring out who had attended and failed. The meeting, insisted DuRose, was called, as far as he could understand, to give Spady competition.

"That's what they wanted and that's what we were giving them," he said shortly.

NO AGREEMENT

He said there had been no agreement among the men as to the amount to be en-

tered on their bids but said they had always discussed the costs of operating the vehicles among themselves. "This was merely shop talk," he said.

Queried as to why the other carriers didn't bid on his route, he answered that the bidder would have to furnish a car and that it would cost the other carrier as much as it did him, DuRose, to operate the vehicle.

He stuck to his contention, under searching cross-examination, that the meeting at the Jeffrey home was not to underbid Spady but only to give him competition

Taking up the meeting at the Malone place, upon Sager's interrogation, the witness stated that this had been called for the purpose of discussing reducing their costs. They talked over the possible cooperative arrangement and also the practicability of buying a fleet of cars for use at the post office DuRose told the court. He could not recall any conversation about the Spady bids, he said, but added they discussed a foul-smelling Spady car.

SPADY GOT 'EM

Asked by the judge if the contracts of the men had been canceled at the time of their suspension, DuRose answered with feeling, "Yes, Spady got 'em all."

Questioned further on this statement, by Sager, DuRose stated that he had received a letter from the post office telling him that his contract was canceled as of a certain date in 1950.

He admitted, at another question by the prosecution, that a Portland man, J. S. Howes, had been awarded a contract at that time, and on redirect examination by Snider testified that he had heard no complaint voiced from the employees about the Howes' vehicles. They were 1950 models, DuRose stated

Chester Winsor, a regular postal employee since October 1941, was put on the stand next by the defense and came in for lengthy cross-examination by Sager.

TELLS OF EARLIER BIDS

Questioned by Snider, regarding his bids on the post office contracts, brought out that his first was submitted in 1942 on a curb route He told of a later bid, entered in 1944, while working in McLoughlin Heights, in which he quoted a price of $1,200. This was rejected by the Post Office Department, Winsor testified, and he was advised by Ralph Carson, then superintendent of mails, that he had been directed to tell the employee to get his bid in line with the others.

His route at that time covered the sprawling housing project with 7,500 possible stops, the witness went on. He was working 10 or 12 hours a day and his actual stops were averaging from 250 to 300 daily Due to these factors, he said, he felt that his bid of $1,200 was reasonable, but that he had reduced it when advised to by Carson.

SAYS HE GOT IN LINE

In December 1944 he submitted a bid of $1,260 and the same thing happened, Winsor continued He was told to get in line and he lowered his quotation to $1,080, the same as the other prevailing bids, he asserted.

As chairman of the legislative division of the local branch of the National Association of Letter Carriers', Winsor went on to state that he had studied a government report relating to government contracts and this was subsequently discussed at a meeting of the union.

He and DuRose, appointed by the members to take the matter up with Postmaster Blythe, told the latter that the carriers were dissatisfied with the present contracts and wanted to cancel them and enter new bids calling for $1,500 a year. This was decided by the men when they learned that similar costs of Government operations in other localities were $1,514, Winsor disclosed.

The postmaster said he would refer the matter to Washington and an answer subsequently arrived permitting the men to cancel their bids. A new call was to be issued which would become effective in August 1948, according to the witness. These bids were later revoked by the Department the witness testified, and quotations of $1,024 were next submitted by the carriers

BID FORESEEN

Asked why they lowered their bids at this time, Winsor replied he had reason to believe that Spady was going to bid on the contracts.

"Nothing I'd seen nor heard about the Spady equipment was good," he averred

He added that the Spady junk presented mental hazards to the drivers as they constantly feared breakdowns They had different attitudes when at the wheels of clean, smoothly operating equipment, Winsor observed

The mounting costs of operating their cars was considerably discussed by the men, the witness went on, which had brought up the question of leasing a filling station on a cooperative basis He said he had never driven any of the Spady equipment and replied, in answer to Snider's questions, that he had never suggested to anyone that the Spady cars be abused He also declared he had never entered into an agreement with any of the men on the amount of his bid.

MEMORY IN ERROR

The prosecution quizzed the witness on his bids during the years, getting a reply that the first one entered in 1942, had been for $420, or $35 per month. Shown a contract by Sager covering his bid that year, quoting $600, Winsor said that his recollection of his initial amount had been in error.

His next quotation was $900, and in 1943, $1,200, which was later changed to $1,080 when the former was rejected by the Department with the request for Winsor to lower it. In 1946, he testified, he entered a bid of $1,200 along with the other carriers

Queried by Sager as to the performance of his 1937 Ford he used on his route until he purchased a new panel truck in 1947, Winsor answered that it worked after he put in several new back ends, new transmissions, and a dozen or so clutches He reminded the attorney that new vehicles could not be obtained during the war years

He did not recall any substitute carrier who drove his car having any burned-out clutches, he replied, when this question was shot at him by Sager.

Interrogated exhaustively by Sager as to the two meetings he attended at the homes of carriers, Winsor could not remember that they discussed what to do about the Spady bids, as suggested by the attorney, but declared that the costs of operating their own vehicles had claimed the interest of those attending.

SEVERAL MEETINGS HELD

Judge McColloch interrupted to inquire how many meetings of this kind had been held and Winsor replied only two house meetings but on a further question by the jurist, replied that when the branch was smaller they met in the houses of members quite frequently.

"Did the fact that the bids were being advertised have anything to do with this meeting?" Sager inquired.

"It may have been—indirectly—but I wouldn't state that the Spady equipment was discussed," the witness answered.

Winsor reminded his questioner that he had already testified to this question adding, "Mr. Sager, I don't lie."

Sager continued slugging away on this line of questioning and finally elicited the reply from his witness that it may have been discussed but I don't recall definitely

COULD BID ANEW

Switching his questions back to the bids of $1,500 that were canceled by the Department, the witness testified that Washington notified Postmaster Blythe that the men could get together and enter new ones. This information was contained in a letter dated June or July 1948, which Winsor said he did not have.

He was then shown a letter by Sager, dated July 28, 1948, which the attorney attempted to wring from the witness was that received by Blythe in response to the postmaster's letter to Washington. Winsor was loath to definitely state this to be true but observed that he thought it was and the communication was offered in evidence

Sager tried to bring out in further questioning that the men whose contracts were terminable in 1948 under post-office regulations, did so at once and that a few months later when the rest of the contracts held by the carriers became cancellable under the regulation terms, they too, did so.

COUNSEL POUNCES

Upon Winsor's acquiescence that he thought this was so, Sager pounced. Wasn't this because the matter had been discussed and decided upon before the men ever notified the postmaster, the attorney demanded.

Winsor replied that the matter had come up in the branch meeting and that he had been authorized to call all the carriers together to talk over the cost of operation. This had been discussed openly in the union meeting, he reiterated

The postmaster, Winsor continued, had told them to cancel their bids in effect if they wanted more money and to put in new ones This would then be taken up with the Department

Pressing the group of cancellations upon the witness, the attorney pointed out that some were revoked by the men over a 12-day period, demanding to know if this wasn't the result of the men getting together to talk the matter over and then deciding what to do?

"We evidently did," Winsor replied.

"Didn't you determine that you would rebid at $1,500 in June?" the attorney prodded

This was denied by the witness who declared that there was nothing said as to what the men would rebid on the contracts. However, "if we canceled the lower bid," he pointed out, "it certainly wouldn't be feasible to submit a still lower one."

Asked if it was his contention that the men arrived at the identical bids without discussion, Winsor answered that he, personally, had made no secret of what he intended to ask and said he probably told Phil Whitsitt he would enter a quotation of $1,500 Whitsitt worked at a desk next to his, Winsor remarked. He added he also probably told some of the carriers at the Heights, but asked if any of the men had volunteered similar information, the witness answered in the negative

PLANS YARDSTICK

Stating again that the bids were discussed at the union meeting, Winsor thought he might have remarked that if the Government could pay $1,514 in other parts of the country that he was going to ask for $1,500.

Asked if any of the other employees had said they could do the same, he replied that as the incident had taken place 3 years ago, he couldn't remember whether anything of that sort had been said or not.

Asked by the prosecutor if Carl Mudge had not been told to "bid on the contracts even if he had to bid at a loss" and that the other carriers would make it up, the witness, reserving that he "knew where you got that statement," denied that it was true.

HAD FOUR CONTRACTS

Phil Whitsitt, the last defendant to be put on the stand, testifying that he had been employed by the post office since July 1941, said he was assigned a carrier route after returning from service with the Armed Forces, and that since then had submitted four bids on contracts, and was awarded three.

He disclosed that he is president of the local branch of the carriers' association and explained that the organization had been set up for two purposes—for the welfare of the carriers and to further the welfare of the postal service.

Questioned on the cancellation of the bids of $1,200 for the purpose of entering higher estimates, Whitsitt testified he was not eligible to terminate his contract when the rest of the men did. Later, he said, someone phoned him and asked if he planned to cancel and enter a higher bid and he replied that he would do so.

He declared he did not consider that $1,500 to be enough remuneration for the job.

CITES WOUND

Asked why he had subsequently lowered his bid of $1,500 to $1,200, he told the court it was a personal matter; that he had been wounded on Saipan in World War II and couldn't work a walking route.

He would have had to retire with small compensation, he said, if he had not quoted the lower figure.

At this point in the direct examination Judge McCulloch ordered the defense to wind up its questioning of the witness. Whitsitt swore, in answer to the final questions, that he had never conspired to defraud the Post Office Department and that he had not encouraged anyone to abuse the Spady vehicles.

Cross-examination, however, was more lengthy. Asked if he had ever warned his fellow workers against damaging the Spady equipment, the witness said that he had, when he learned of rumors to the effect that Jack Spady was going to accuse the men of this. The president of the local told the court he had cautioned the employees at a meeting "never, under any condition, to hurt the cars."

HEARD RUMORS ONLY

He continued that he had never heard that Mudge or Keelan were accused of this offense and testified that he had heard the general rumors from the other carriers.

He denied that there had ever been an "understanding" that only the carriers would bid on the routes and then told the Government attorney that "theoretically a man could cancel his contract but actually he couldn't."

Asked for an explanation, the witness remarked: "When they saw fit we canceled; when they didn't we didn't cancel."

HAD CHOICE, BUT—

"Anytime a man tried to bid higher and was not satisfied with what the others were bidding," the witness continued, "he could go back to footwalking."

He was told this by the former superintendent of mails, Ralph Carson, Whitsitt went on, and, pressed by Sager, told an alleged incident when Mudge, feeling he was operating his car at a loss, attempted to cancel his contract.

"A notice went up," Whitsitt asserted, advertising his route. In other words, "he could go back to his foot route."

Questioned about the two meetings that have figured in all of Sager's interrogation of the defendants, Whitsitt stated that they were arranged to "call the Post Office Department's attention to the Spady equipment and leave the decision up to them."

Admitting he entered a bid of $1,025 on his route, following a meeting at the Malone home, along with four other carriers, he denied that he knew at the time what the others were planning to enter.

INFORMATION SOUGHT

"It was the general policy to try to find out what the lowest bid would be as we knew we would be beaten down if one was any higher than the rest," he declared.

He said he couldn't recall whether or not he had revealed to anyone that he was going to bid $1,025 but that "if anyone had asked, he probably would have told him."

Asked by Sager if the meeting had not been called to discuss what to do about the Spady cars, Whitsitt answered, "I think so; yes."

DRAWS LINE

He would have been agreeable to driving an "outside" car, he further remarked, but not a Spady car.

"If he had furnished good equipment, I would have been glad to drive a Spady car," he added.

He admitted the men talked over these problems but couldn't recall arriving at identical bids on the cars either by agreement or discussion.

He repeated that he had formerly testified that the men "may have arrived at some conclusion after the discussion but not an agreement."

Quizzed further by plaintiff's attorney, Whitsitt asserted that it "was his opinion that the meeting was called to discuss the type of vehicle being furnished."

[From the Vancouver (Wash.) Columbian and Sun of September 20, 1951]

(By Jessie Rody)

TACOMA, September 20.—The trial of 14 Vancouver postal employees moved rapidly toward a decision in Federal court here today with the strong possibility that it would be in the hands of the jury before nightfall.

The defense completed its testimony yesterday afternoon, Government Attorney Harry Sager finished the summation of the Government's case at 11.15 this morning, and the defense attorneys will complete their summation early this afternoon.

SPEED-UP PRESSED

Federal Judge Claude McColloch will then instruct the jurors on points of law involved and closet them for their decision. He speeded up the wind-up of the case yesterday by setting a 2-hour time limit on summations by attorneys for each side.

The judge figured strongly in the arguments of the attorneys today as each sought to establish the legal definition of conspiracy. As the arguments progressed it appeared that the Government's case may stand or fall over the definition of this word. The judge is expected to give the jurors the definition which will guide them in their decision in his instructions.

McColloch indicated again yesterday that he may play an important role in the final decision. This came after all testimony had been presented when plans for presenting the arguments were being made.

The attorneys were called up before the bench for the discussion of these final arrangements as the more than 2-week trial moved into its final stage. Judge McColloch declined to accede to Sager's request for an indication of some of the factors the jurist intends to include in his instructions to the jury, at the same time observing that he did not disapprove of the requested instructions that Sager had submitted.

Say anything he wanted to the jury, the judge told the Government attorney, and he wouldn't be interrupted.

AX SEEMS POISED

Then Judge McColloch added: "I may disagree with you very much when I give my instructions to the jury, but you may say what you please."

The magistrate stated his instructions would be oral and in them he would "reserve the right to comment on both the law and the facts."

Sager defined a conspiracy as an agreement to do an unlawful act either openly or tacitly. He said that in this case it would be an effort to defraud the Government by an overt act and that even though one of the conspirators may be innocent of an overt act if he is in an agreement with others and they commit such an act then he also becomes guilty.

MUST WEIGH SEPARATELY

He warned the jurors, however, that even though the charges against the 14 men had been joined into one trial each man's guilt or innocence must be weighed separately.

Continuing with his legal definitions, Sager said an act causing the Government a monetary loss in this case would be a fraud and that any interference in the lawful functions of the Government would also be a fraud.

Claude Snider, meanwhile, opened the summation for the defense. Leo McGavick was to complete the summary this afternoon when the trial resumed.

GIVES DEFINITION

Snider defined a conspiracy as an attempt to secret or conceal an attempt to deceive. He said Sager's definition of a conspiracy would make it the same as an agreement.

Snider then pointed out that the men made no attempt to conceal their identical bids and that the practice was encouraged by the Post Office.

Both attorneys opened their arguments with an apology to the jury for the length of time it has taken to present the case and the jurors listened intently to their summations.

Determination of the fate of the 14 Vancouver post-office employees was not far off as the court recessed yesterday afternoon in Tacoma's Federal court with the case slated to go to the jury sometime today, barring an unforeseen development.

Testimony in the long trial ended at 3:30 o'clock after a 10-day parade of witnesses to the stand for both Government and the defense and the attorneys prepared to start their arguments this morning.

SEVEN TAKE STAND

The earlier part of the afternoon was devoted to the questioning and cross-examination of seven of the defendants regarding their sworn statements given to post-office inspectors last September, after Judge Claude McColloch permitted the defense to reopen its case just before noon yesterday for this purpose.

On the stand during the afternoon were Leo Belisle, Carl Mudge, Chester Winsor, William DuRose, Ray Keelan, Phil Whitsitt, and David Jeffrey. Prior to the noon recess, Cory Galbraith and Edward H. B. Carson were interrogated.

Upon completion of the testimony of the carriers, each of whom underwent rigid and drawn-out cross-examination from the prosecution in an effort to break down their contentions, the defense indicated that no more defendants would be put on the stand. Harry Sager, Government attorney, told the court he had no rebuttal.

GET 2 HOURS EACH

Asked if he was prepared to give his argument, Sager replied he would like a little more time to complete his preparations and court was adjourned until 9:30 o'clock Thursday morning.

The judge has given the prosecution and defense alike 2 hours in which to deliver their arguments. He suggested that the defense restate its motion for acquittal of each and all of the defendants and when his formality was completed asserted that he would reserve his decision until the case was taken to the jury.

If the men are acquitted, it is assumed that their suspensions from the post office

following their indictments, would be removed. Appeals of the men now pending before civil service and departmental boards, would probably come up for review before those bodies.

After the charges were filed last December against the 14 men, five were discharged outright, Edmond Belisle, Carl Mudge, Ray Keelan and William DuRose. Others, through disciplinary action, lost their seniority rights, had their pay reduced, some had their contracts canceled and were forbidden to enter bids for a certain period of time or were demoted to "foot carriers."

ALL FINALLY SUSPENDED

After the indictments were returned against the men, all were suspended pending outcome of the trial.

The nine employees who are veterans appealed their cases to the Civil Service Commission and the nonveterans have an appeal pending before an inner departmental board. The veterans in the group are Ed Belisle, Carl Mudge, William DuRose, Earl Malone and Walter Strong, all of whom fought in the first World War, Delbert Echtle, David Jeffrey, Ray Keelan, and Phil Whitsitt who saw service in World War II.

THREE RETIRE

Cory Galbraith, former assistant postmaster, resigned in December after 39 years with the local office Mudge, Glenn Officer, and Malone have taken disability retirement since their suspensions, it is understood

Conviction of the charges brought against them is punishable by imprisonment, a fine, or both.

Admittance of the statements in evidence yesterday at the insistence of the attorney for the Government, prolonged the trial which was expected to reach the jury on Wednesday, and sent the majority of the defendants back on the stand for additional testimony.

In admitting these exhibits, Judge McColloch remarked that Sager would be in "reversible error in insisting that they be permitted to stay in." The papers will be taken to the jury room by the jurors for perusal when they retire to deliberate

In putting the accused men back on the stand, each was queried by the defense as to the methods used by the inspectors in taking them and each testified that he had been highly nervous, under great tension and that the interviews, had been far from "friendly talks" as the inspectors had previously testified.

SEES "THIRD DEGREE"

Leo Belisle compared the interviews to a "third degree." He declared that Inspector R. L. Karr had become extremely irate on two occasions, once stating that "he didn't want to hear the word politics again" and another time labeling one of Belisle's answers as "damned lie."

Belisle said they gave his statement under great strain and that he was frightened.

Asked by Sager, under cross-examination, if he hadn't read the statement upon its being presented to him by Inspector S. G. Schwartz, who took notes during the conversations with the men and prepared the statements from these, Belisle answered that he thought there were some paragraphs contained in his that he didn't think he had said.

NO ENCOURAGEMENT SEEN

Hadn't he been invited by the inspectors to correct any errors? the attorney queried, but Belisle answered that the corrections hadn't been encouraged.

Sager read aloud portions of the statement, one in which Belisle was quoted as having said he'd worked hard in the carriers' union, and that he had fought the Spady bids as he didn't think they were doing them any good.

Asked by Sager if he denied this remark, Belisle admitted that it was substance of what he had said.

Queried if he had not said two shop foremen had told him the Spady cars were not serviceable, the witness declared that it wasn't his statement but one that had been written by the inspector.

"You made it, didn't you?" Sager demanded.

"There is no man who can't hit gravel under conditions like that," the witness answered.

TIME WASTE ALLEGED

At one point Belisle, at repeated questioning, remarked that they were wasting time going back over the same thing which brought a rejoinder from Sager that if Belisle would answer the questions put to him quickly and without evasion, the time wouldn't be wasted.

Questioned as to the authenticity of another remark, that the fellows were so mad about the Spady equipment they were willing to sabotage them, Belisle replied "when you're not clear-minded you don't think clearly. I probably would have admitted murder"

He went on to testify that he had repeatedly warned the men not to do a thing to the cars. He said he had once brought this up with Reuben Kremers, state secretary of the National Letter Carriers' Association, at a dinner. Kremers, according to Belisle, also cautioned the men about damaging the leased cars, telling them that the union couldn't do a thing for them if they did anything of this kind.

DENIES STATEMENT

Belisle, questioned on the four clutches the Government charges Keelan burned out in 1 day, declared he "definitely" did not say that this had been deliberate

"You've never seen the Spady equipment," he told the attorney. "If you had seen the water leaking out of the radiators all the time, the tires going flat, you'd understand what we were up against"

Here the witness gave a summary of all the troubles he said the men had with the vehicles.

The attorney took the witness over his statement step by step before he finished his questioning.

Under redirect questioning by the defense, he said he had not felt that he had any choice about signing the statement handed to him, as the inspectors were his supervisors. He said he had been given no chance to study it and repeated that it contained several paragraphs he doesn't remember seeing at the time.

MUDGE IS NEXT

Carl Mudge, next to take the stand, told how he had been called to the acting postmaster's office where he waited some 25 minutes before being called in before Karr and Schwartz.

They seemed exercised because he was active in the National Association of Letter Carriers, Mudge testified, which brought a snort from Inspector Karr, and a shake of his head, a gesture that was repeated by the official on numerous occasions during the testimony of the defendants about their statements.

Karr had remarked, according to the witness, that the union "was getting too big for its britches." He had also been accused by the inspector, Mudge stated, of driving an overheated car.

Upon further questions by defense counsel, Mudge stated he wouldn't say that he had been asked to sign the paper, that "it was just put before him."

PSYCHOLOGY CITED

"There was a psychological factor involved," the witness said. "When a lowly foot carrier, who is not an important person, is confronted by two important inspectors, he usually does what he is told."

When the Government attorney took over for cross-examination he pointed out a correction Mudge had made on his statement in his own handwriting, inserting the word "competitive" in place of another word. This indicated, Sager pointed out, that Mudge had read the report and had taken advantage of the inspectors' invitation to the men to make any changes they desired in their statements

It was his opinion, Mudge stated, that the inspectors had taken the remarks the men had made and interpreted them to suit themselves and convey their own impressions.

DURESS HINTED

Mudge admitted that he had understood he was being sworn, then added "You might swear to a false statement under duress"

Under continued questioning, going over each paragraph of the interview, Mudge admitted that the report was not a false statement but said it contained false impressions.

The judge broke in at this point to say he would have to take this in hand

"I'm not going to sit here and listen to this forever Give him the statement, and let him pick out what he didn't say," the jurist ordered with some impatience as Sager prepared to go over the statement sentence by sentence

Ray Keelan testified that he was confused and bewildered and that he didn't know what the inspectors were getting at when he was called before them He charged that one of the officials came at him with both fists at one point in the interview, an accusation that brought forth another quiet snort from Inspector Karr.

TOO NERVOUS TO READ

Asked by the defense if he had seen the statement after it was prepared, the witness replied that he was so nervous that he couldn't read it. He was threatened with loss of his job when he didn't sign, he said, and when this failed to get the desired results, Keelan continued, the inspectors settled back in their chairs with the observation that they could sit here a day or a month.

He finally signed, he testified, and next day attempted to recontact the inspectors, in order to repudiate his statement. They wouldn't see him, Keelan stated.

WAS TOLD TO KEEP MUM

Asked why he had wanted to repudiate it, Keelan replied that he hadn't been able to read it, due to his nervousness. He had been told by the officials not to mention the incident to anyone, he said.

Quizzed by Sager as to what part of the statement was not true, Keelan said he had been so confused that he had not given his correct term of service with the armed service, missing it by a year.

Sager referred to a portion of the statement in which Keelan purportedly stated that he realized his treatment of the Spady cars had not been to the owner's best interest and that he would "be willing to reimburse him if he could do so on installments."

The witness declared he had not put it that way—that he had prefaced this remark with the words "if it were true" he would pay for them. He declared he didn't know whether or not the clutches were burned out, that he was not a mechanic.

PLEADS LACK OF KNOWLEDGE

Asked by Sager if, in making out his official report to the superintendent of mails as to the four incidents, he had not listed them as clutches, the witness, reiterating that he was not a mechanic, replied that he "just put down anything," that he didn't know what the trouble was.

David Jeffrey, too, testified, that the talk with the inspectors passed from the friendly conversation field 5 minutes after it started. Karr, Jeffrey asserted, stood before him and shook his finger in his face and told him he was lying.

Schwartz tapped his colleague on the shoulder at one point and remarked that Jeffrey was telling the truth, the latter continued, upon which Karr subsided. It was not long, the witness added, before the official was following his previous tactics, however.

Jeffrey said it was not until the interview was finished that he learned that Schwartz had been taking notes and had written "his own version of what was said" He protested that the statement wasn't in his own language, and asserted he had pointed out several sentences with which he had disagreed. He was told to go ahead and correct them, but as he felt it would be useless, he had not done so, the witness told the jury

Sager reminded the defendant that he had made corrections in connection with his remark that he needed $1,200 to break even on his route Jeffrey had inserted the word "about" before the figure, the attorney brought out.

Regarding another purported remark, that he "had heard the carriers were taking clutches out of the Spady cars," Jeffrey said he had actually told his questioners that he "couldn't deny it but that he hadn't heard it" He had insisted that this be changed, he said. Jeffrey said he did not realize he was making a sworn statement.

DISCLAIMS WORDING

"I would have been willing to have given them a written statement if I could have written it myself but those aren't my words," the witness protested.

Another defendant, Chester Winsor, declared that he was told by Edmond Belisle to report to the postmaster's office but he could not learn for what purpose. Belisle had replied, "I can't tell you" when queried as to the reason for the summons Arriving in the office of Dan Hallowell, he was told to wait by Karr who came out of another office. He waited about an hour, Winsor said.

The conversation was at first friendly and "then got rough," the witness testified. Karr, Winsor said, became vexed when he wouldn't admit that the complaints made to the carriers' union were "superficial," and "tried to pin his ears back"

THIRD DEGREE AGAIN

Winsor, who stated he had had 3 years' police experience, testified that the methods followed were comparable to the third degree. He was told to sign the statement which was put before him, and was given no copy nor told that it would be used against him.

His cross-examination by Sager was brief and ended abruptly after an exchange of remarks in relation to the word "pokey"

Sager opened his line of questioning as to Winsor's police background and brought out that he had been a special officer patrolling the docks during the war. Asked if he had signed his statement under oath, the witness replied that he had and answered he realized the effect of his statement. He asserted that three remarks contained in the report were not as he had given them to the inspectors but said he had been so befuddled at the time that he didn't know what was in the statement.

ATTORNEY SURPRISED

"What was the matter, why were you so befuddled, did you think they would throw you in the pokey?" the attorney queried.

Winsor's failure to comprehend the word "pokey" brought forth an expression of surprise from Sager that a police officer had never heard this expression.

A brief exchange of remarks followed and Sager ceased his cross-examination abruptly with a short "that's all" to the witness.

William DuRose who replaced Winsor on the stand, testified that he had been questioned by the inspectors for 5 hours. Karr opened his interview by observing "we've got all this dope about you and this Spady equipment," DuRose told the court. He was as guilty as hell, the witness testified that Karr had accused when DuRose stated he didn't know anything.

DEMAND ALLEGED

Karr pulled out his credential card on him after he gave his statement, DuRose went on, remarking "Are you going to sign it or not?"

Under cross-examination DuRose testified that he hadn't complained to any of the postal officials about the treatment he had allegedly received, nor did he remonstrate with Edward Carson, then assistant superintendent of mails.

Asked if he hadn't participated in the heated argument he referred to, DuRose answered with the question, "Wouldn't you?"

Admonishing him to answer the questions put to him, Sager then read a portion of DuRose's statement in which he was quoted as saying he didn't think it right for some —— —— to come in here and underbid us.

The witness replied that he was so upset and nervous he didn't know what he said.

The inspectors told him that they had no charges against him, Phil Whitsitt testified under defense questioning They told him their case was completed and that what he said would have no bearing, he went on.

When shown his prepared statement, he pointed out a few discrepancies, and they told him these were not important as they weren't going to use it anyway, he told the jury.

DOESN'T RECALL BEING SWORN

He said he couldn't remember to this day that he had been sworn He said, however, that he had read the report when it was handed him.

Sager, cross-examining, asked the witness who had told him his statement would not be used He answered that this was the impression he had gained—that they weren't going to use it.

He referred to an error in his statement relating to the length of time that he had been a carrier and, asked if he considered this important, Whitsitt replied in the negative, but added that as long as they intended using the report that it should have been correct and accurate.

Had he been aware that the paper he had signed was a sworn statement, he went on, he would have changed the errors.

Defense counsel did not call Malone, Officer Edmond Belisle, nor Delbert Echtle to the stand and indicated that they had completed their list of witnesses.

LIMITATION PUT

Sager pointed out to the court that the defense hadn't put all the defendants on the stand and asked about cross-examining the remaining four.

Judge McColloch replied that in a heavy trial such as this we have to be limited. He said he had heard the Government attorney's cross-examination of the other defendants and understood what he was doing.

[From the Vancouver (Wash.) Columbian and Sun of September 21, 1951]

(By Jessie Rody)

TACOMA, September 21.—Fourteen Vancouver post-office employees, under Government indictment, were cleared of charges of conspiracy to defraud the United States Government and the Post Office Department by a jury last night in Federal court here.

Vindication was won by Edmond J. Belisle, Cory M. Galbraith, Edward H. B Carson, Walter W. Strong, Leo T. Belisle, William J. DuRose, Delbert L. Echtle, David D. Jeffrey, Ray M. Keelan, Earl N. Malone, Carl E. Mudge, Glenn Officer, Phil P. Whitsitt, and Chester Winsor.

REINSTATEMENT LOOMS

For most of them the victory may mean reinstatement as of suspension date last spring (a few have retired).

The separate verdicts finding each man innocent of the felony came 1 year to the day after charges placed against them resulted in indictments, September 20, 1950.

The verdict was reached at 8 30 o'clock after 3 hours' deliberation The courtroom was tense as the jurors filed back to their seats and Federal Judge Claude C McColloch returned to the bench The jurist directed that regardless of the decision, there was to be no demonstration, and an electric stillness settled over the courtroom as the deputy clerk accepted the verdict from the foreman, Ellsworth Ham, of Tacoma, and read the jury's findings which acquitted the Vancouverites of the accusations brought against them.

EMOTIONS TAUT

The face of each defendant, etched with lines of fatigue and tension, relaxed perceptibly as his name was read with the words "not guilty" following.

One of the wives wept quietly during the reading of the verdicts and tears stood in the eyes of many of the spectators, postal employees from Tacoma and other cities, and representatives of the letter carriers' union, who have been present during the 2-week trial.

The news was received quietly in the courtroom, as the judge wished, and it was not until the men and their wives had filed into the hall that they gave vent to their feelings Most of the women were crying openly as they left the courtroom and many of the defendants were unashamedly wiping their eyes, but they were tears of relief and happiness.

SOME NOT PRESENT

Harry Sager, Government attorney, was present when the verdict was returned, but neither of the two post-office inspectors, among the Government's star witnesses, were on hand Acting Postmaster Dan Hallowell was not in court.

Word that the jury had reached a verdict came to the courtroom shortly before 8 o'clock and Defense Attorney Claude Snider started rounding up the defendants, part of whom were waiting in the hall outside.

Conversations between the wives and others who had returned to the Federal building to hear the outcome of the carefully watched case ceased abruptly as the defendants took their places, and tension that could be felt like a blow replaced the former informal atmosphere

Glenn Officer, one of the defendants, who has been in ill health since suffering a stroke a year ago, and who has had several fainting spells since the trial started, partially collapsed after he reached the hall, but recovered shortly afterward and was able to proceed to his hotel.

Many of the defendants headed for phones or the telegraph office to send word of their acquittal to waiting friends and relatives at home.

TIME OUT FOR DINNER

The case that opened in Federal court on September 5 went to the jury at 4 o'clock yesterday afternoon. They deliberated until 6 o'clock, then went out to dinner, returning to the Federal building at 7 30 o'clock. An hour later they signaled they had reached their decision.

MAGISTRATE OUTSPOKEN

The magistrate, who had warned the Government attorney on Wednesday that his instructions to the jury might not agree with Sager's arguments, plainly stated his opinion in his 20-minute talk in which he followed up a previous statement that he would reserve the right to comment on both the law and the facts

First Judge McColloch discussed the charges against the men telling the jurors that the defendants' guilt must be established beyond a reasonable doubt.

Speaking quietly and in a low voice, the magistrate said the charges against the post-office employees was criminal conspiracy. They were not accused of conspiring to violate some statute but, on the contrary, with seeking to interfere and hamper the Government in obtaining competitive bids.

FIELD BROAD

This opened up a pretty broad field, Judge McColloch remarked. The statute says, he went on, that when two or more persons conspire to defraud the Government they can be prosecuted under the conspiracy statute.

He read the indictments against the men in which they were accused of conspiring to defraud the Government on three counts, by submitting collusive bids to furnish motor vehicles for use of the post office, by depriving and attempting to deprive the Post Office Department of the benefits of competitive bidding for furnishing motor vehicles, and by discouraging and intimidating and preventing others from entering into such contracts.

In a list of 14 overt acts alleged by the Government, two of the employees were accused of deliberately damaging equipment leased by the Spady company.

Concerning the charges of sabotage, the judge emphasized that they were not being tried on alleged conspiracy to sabotage the Spady vehicles, but that these acts were included in the indictment merely as a matter of proof in the Government charges.

STRESSES MEANING

He referred again to the meaning of the word "conspiracy," stating it to be an agreement between two or more persons to do an unlawful act either openly or in concealment, and then told the jurors that although there were 14 defendants in the case this did not mean that all of them must be found guilty. Two or more could be convicted and the other 12 found innocent, the judge said.

He reminded that the charges of conspiracy against the post-office employees went back to 1942.

"The Government contends," he continued, "that the men who were not mounted carriers at that time but who later obtained routes became a part of the conspiracy if they joined it with knowledge that it was going on."

"Once a conspiracy has been established," Judge McColloch told the jury, "the statements of any conspirators are the statements of all."

"So before you find any of them guilty beyond a reasonable doubt," he asserted, "you must first find that there was a conspiracy and that they became a part of it.

"If you find this to be true, then you should return a verdict of guilty."

STEPS OUTLINED

They must then determine in what respects the men conspired to defraud, the magistrate went on. The Government, he pointed out, listed three charges, but it was not necessary, he said, to find the defendants guilty of all three. They could be convicted of one of the charges.

If it was a conspiracy, he said, then under the theory of the law some one of the group must commit an overt act A great deal of the indictment had to do with overt acts, he pointed out, adding that 14 were listed.

Having finished with his instructions regarding the law, the magistrate went on to what he said he considered to be the crux of the case.

WANTS CLEAR PROOF

"It is a serious matter to charge a group of men such as these men that are here with conspiracy," said Judge McColloch. "This is a felony and is punishable severely." (Conviction carries a term of imprisonment up to 5 years, a $10,000 fine or both.)

Remarking that an additional burden is put on the Government when it charges a felony, Judge McColloch stated: "In this kind of a charge the Government must prove not only the acts alleged but that it was entered into with criminal intent.

"Even though the defendants were to be found guilty of these overt acts, you also must find that they entered into this conspiracy with criminal intent."

He went on to say that the trouble at the post office had broken out with the change in postmasters.

"Before that things seemed to be going along in a way that the Government now states it does not think was all right," the judge went on.

CHANGE BROUGHT FUSS

"The men had no idea whatever from 1942 to 1951, the time covered in the indictments, that there was anything wrong with the way they were handling their bids."

It was not until the new postmaster took over that there was a suggestion of wrong doing, Judge McColloch stated.

Elaborating on this, the jurist reminded that the former postmaster, Ned Blythe, whom he referred to as being a fine man, had testified on the stand that he had known what was going on and that the people in Washington had known what was going on and had never disapproved it.

And here Judge McColloch raised his voice for the first time during his talk.

JUDGE OUTSPOKEN

"Now, ladies and gentlemen," he said, "you can't make a crime out of that—at least not in my court. You can't make a felony out of it—at least not before me," he said.

"If a man doesn't know he is doing something wrong, with full knowledge and a bad heart, then he does not have criminal intent."

Were the jury to find the defendants guilty of conspiracy, he emphasized, then in addition it would have to find that the defendants participated in the conspiracy while knowing that this was wrong It would further have to find that they did so with criminal intent.

Speaking of the alleged collusive bidding, the magistrate said.

"Collusive bidding is when you ask a group of people to come in and bid and they fool you. They pretend to be bidding when in fact they are not" "Identical bids," he added, "are not collusive bids."

PUTS IT UP TO JURY

He closed his remarks by telling the jurors that they were the exclusive judges of the guilt or innocence of the men.

"If you find that a conspiracy existed and that they were engaged in this conspiracy with criminal intent to defraud the Government during the period from 1942 to 1951, then you are to find two or more of them guilty."

The majority of the weary defendants and their wives were planning to remain in Tacoma overnight and return to Vancouver Friday.

R B Kremers, secretary of the National Association of Letter Carriers, who came here from Washington, D. C, to attend the trial of the post office carriers, said that a civil service hearing will be held in Vancouver on Thursday, which he had requested.

The eleventh regional director district, in Seattle, already has advised him, Kremers said, that six of the men who were suspended on March 2, 1951, will be ordered restored to duty as of that date. This group includes Ray Keelan, Glenn Officer, Delbert Echtle, David Jeffery, Walter Strong, and Phil Whitsitt, all veterans, whose appeals were pending, along with the other veterans before the civil service commission.

The nonveterans have an appeal pending before an inner departmental board in Washington. Kremers said he assumed that this would be heard very shortly.

Mr. CAIN. Finally, Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from one of the defense attorneys, addressed to the president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, which, I believe, offers additional substantive evidence to warrant this investigation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McMULLEN, SNIDER & McMULLEN,
Vancouver, Wash., September 22, 1951.

Mr. WILLIAM C. DOHERTY,
President, National Association of Letter Carriers, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR DOHERTY: I wish to express to you thanks for the opportunity to have been associated in the defense of a number of the postal employees of the Vancouver post office. While it is always gratifying to a lawyer to have participated in a trial which terminated satisfactorily, this case gave me more personal satisfaction than any in which I have been associated for the reason that I have known practically all of the employees for many years and hold them in very high regard I have always felt that the recent charges and indictments were the grossest kind of injustice, and they should not have been subjected to the uncertainty, worry, and anguish that necessarily follows when being confronted with such a situation.

It was also very gratifying to me to be associated with Mr. Leo McGavick, of Tacoma, an attorney of many years' experience, whose reputation and success have heretofore been well established. It was equally a pleasure to have been associated with Wallace B. Hager, a young attorney who was admitted to practice slightly in excess of a year ago, whose personal characteristics are such that time will assure his success. His assistance was of tremendous value to us. The success of the counsel, however, could not have been so definitely assured without the wholehearted support of your organization. You not only furnished legal services to those employees who are members of your organization but to four members who were supervisors and for that reason were not at the present time members of your organization. Your having taken under your protective wing the other supervisors was an act for which your organization may be commended.

The services rendered by Mr. Kremers were outstanding. Not only was there made available a very full and complete file containing invaluable information, but his knowledge of the facts during the process of the trial was of great assistance. He was permitted to occupy a place at the counsel table where we received the benefit of his knowledge and experience regarding postal regulations and customs which was of tremendous assistance. His knowledge of the facts was also of great assistance in the attempt to classify the great ramification of facts and testimony which, by necessity, are found in a case involving so many defendants and activities in the local post office covering many years

of operation. The services rendered not only helped contribute to the success of this particular endeavor but will redound to the benefit of other members of the association and other employees of the postal department throughout the United States for years to come. The fact that the local men charged, as well as the national organization, had the wholehearted support of the postal employees throughout the entire area of western Washington was evidenced by the fact that there were a great number of representatives throughout western Washington in attendance at the trial throughout the long and grueling contest.

It is my understanding that a hearing before the Civil Service Commission of the charges filed within the Department will be heard shortly, and I am confident that Mr. Kremers can procure for these men further vindications to which they are entitled.

Experience in this case would indicate that postal employees should be given some further protection against the powers that apparently, under the regulations, can be invoked by members of the inspection service. It should be the purpose of the inspection department not only to assure the proper and efficient service in the Post Office Department but to protect the reputation and standing of employees within that service After the charges were filed some of the employees, one I have known for many years, conferred with me relative to the charges with the view that they might determine the nature of the proceedings and defend themselves against charges which they felt, and which appeared to me, to be unjustified At that time I called one of the inspectors, to whom had been assigned the investigation of this case, and inquired as to the nature of the evidence upon which they expected to rely in proof of the charges which the inspectors had filed. I was advised definitely that such information was not available either to the employees or to their attorney or representative, that they had been interviewed about the situation and that together with the charges filed should be sufficient basis upon which they could prepare an answer. They plainly indicated that what has been regarded as a constitutional right of an American citizen, to be confronted by his accusers and by evidence being presented, was not available.

In answering these charges before the Department, none of the men charged knew whether they were relying upon statements or affidavits or whether the evidence consisted simply of statements made by the inspectors Their procedure would be somewhat identical with having a matter presented in court with the defendants, their attorneys and witnesses excluded during the prosecution of the plaintiff's case and then expect them to present to the court or jury a defense of the charges, statements, and evidence introduced against them

While it is essential that the Post Office Department have some degree of latitude in determining the suitability of employees, it is equally essential that the rights of employees, accumulated over many years of faithful service, should be guarded and protected I trust that there can be procured either a change in regulation and procedure or in the attitude of those interested in the filing and prosecution of charges as will bring the practice better in line with the recognized constitutional rights of those involved.

I wish to express to you, Mr. Kremers, the Assistant Secretary, your executive board, and your entire membership my personal gratitude for the cooperation which has been displayed in this matter. I am also authorized to convey to you the extreme gratitude of the employees who were charged, their families and friends, and, as a matter of fact, the overwhelming majority of the citizens of Vancouver and Clark County.

Very truly yours,

CLAUDE C. SNIDER.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, October 15, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 12 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

James Anderson Ralph, Joiner, Ark., in place of A. M. Ford, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Norman R. Brown, Arroyo Grande, Calif., in place of L J Grisingher, resigned.

Karl W. Traylor, Blairsden, Calif., in place of Mary Ferrari, resigned

Ella Kaye Curran, Bostonia, Calif., in place of W M Wright, retired.

Clifford A Ham, Colton, Calif., in place of F. A. Salman, declined.

Oliver A. Thorson, Darwin, Calif., in place of V. H. Carpenter, resigned.

Winston S Oaks, Lakeside, Calif., in place of T F. Helm, retired

Bernard T Finnin, Mojave, Calif., in place of R L. Turner, resigned.

Marshall G. Winn, Philo, Calif., in place of G A. Reilly, retired.

Worth Keene, Seal Beach, Calif, in place of J J Jones, Sr., resigned.

Marvin H Moest, Warner Springs, Calif., in place of E. J. Koch, resigned.

COLORADO

Roy P Barrowman, Berthoud, Colo., in place of W E Rogers, retired.

Leslie Wilkinson, Cripple Creek, Colo., in place of Vernon Peiffer, retired.

Frank G. Harbour, Woodland Park, Colo., in place of G. M Carroll, retired.

GEORGIA

Walter A. Johnson, Mount Berry, Ga., in place of M. G. Keown, retired.

IDAHO

Elsie E. Moore, Donnelly, Idaho, in place of M M Howe, retired.

Lloyd J. Passey, Paris, Idaho, in place of H. L. Spencer, retired.

ILLINOIS

Richard K Weller, Chatsworth, Ill, in place of R. V. McGreal, transferred.

Leonard J. Ries, Henry, Ill., in place of F. L Wright, transferred.

Sorrell A Hukill, Homewood, Ill, in place of W. H. Cato, retired.

KANSAS

Dallas G Worrell, Gridley, Kans., in place of W. F. Varvel, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Homer D Allen, Oneida, Ky., in place of S. B. Gilbert, deceased.

MARYLAND

Homer C. Shaffer, Crellin, Md., in place of E. F. Colaw, retired.

MICHIGAN

Ruth A. Howe, Houghton Point, Mich., office established November 1, 1949.

MINNESOTA

Robert C. Hillyer, Backus, Minn., in place of W. F. Gregory, deceased.

Lester E. Sullivan, Madelia, Minn., in place of Henry Hillesheim, retired.

Rodney C. Shogren, Shafer, Minn., in place of L. R. Martinson, resigned.

MISSOURI

Dixie E. Myers, Green Ridge, Mo., in place of F. E. Ream, retired.

John W. Nelson, Versailles, Mo., in place of J. M Earp, deceased

Warren H. Feldman, Stanberry, Mo., in place of M. E. Enyart, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Robert J Noce, Englishtown, N. J., in place of E H. McDonald, transferred.

Clifford C. Emens, Monmouth Junction, N. J., in place of Annie Lester, retired.

Bernard M Degnan, Orange, N. J., in place of Charles Ippolito, retired.

Joseph P. LaPorta, Williamstown, N. J, in place of L. A. Martinelli, deceased.

NEW YORK

Harold C Shannon, Alexandria Bay, N Y, in place of F F. Cornwall, retired.

Marjorie A Dibble, Bloomville, N. Y., in place of M L. Cleveland, retired

Jack J. Powers, Montgomery, N. Y., in place of C. W Schmitt, transferred

Catherine V Paczkowski, Turin, N. Y, in place of D. B Kentner, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Nell B McDonald, Cameron, N. C, in place of Thurla Cole, deceased

Lawson A Foll, Mount Pleasant, N C., in place of K. M Cook, retired.

OHIO

Paul A Miller, Jackson, Ohio, in place of Thomas Kyer, deceased.

Walter G Sawyer, Lockbourne, Ohio, in place of W A Sawyer, deceased

Walter E. Bennett, Okeana, Ohio, in place of Elsie Bennett, deceased

OKLAHOMA

Herbert Wayne Hendren, Fargo, Okla, in place of J W Bonar, resigned

Sedric D. Cowell, Mounds, Okla, in place of J A Waggoner, retired.

OREGON

Arthur B Scarset, Camp White, Oreg., Office established June 16, 1949.

Charles W. Garlick, Gladstone, Oreg., in place of G M. Ely, retired.

Vella A Harlan, McNary, Oreg., Office established September 1, 1949.

Russell F Cooper, Sutherlin, Oreg., in place of H. W Chenoweth, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Joseph J. Habeeb, Chinchilla, Pa, in place of J F Moran, declined

Natalie G Landenberger, Holmes, Pa, in place of F H Filbert, removed.

Guy V Kingree, Jr, Smoketown, Pa., in place of G L. Brookmyer, resigned

Dean L Musick, Youngstown, Pa, in place of G. V. Shawley, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Richard T Zimmerman, Fordtown, Tenn., in place of C. R Irvin, deceased.

TEXAS

Alba A Hall, Roby, Tex, in place of S L. Hall, retired.

UTAH

Robert M Birdzell, Wendover, Utah. Office reestablished November 1, 1947.

VIRGINIA

Robert E. Denny, Bluemont, Va., in place of O C Osburn, retired

Coleman A Doss, Hurt, Va, in place of H. O. Shields, declined.

WASHINGTON

Richard B. Dahlager, Algona, Wash., in place of C. E. Googe, retired.
William K. Wuesthoff, Davenport, Wash., in place of J. J. Peak, retired.
Donald J. Auvil, Entiat, Wash., in place of Robert Kinzel, retired.
Asa Wayman Perkins, Garfield, Wash., in place of Ralph Gildea, transferred.
Howard W. Sievers, Lynwood, Wash. Office, established June 16, 1948.
Owen M. Lade, Sumas, Wash., in place of W. C. Adkins, transferred.

WEST VIRGINIA

Rena P. Lane, Elbert, W. Va., in place of D. L. Lester, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Clayton B. Hesslink, Cedar Grove, Wis., in place of J K. Hesselink, transferred.
Leonard T. Goetz, Manawa, Wis., in place of John Lindow, retired.
Jack J. Morgenthaler, Springbrook, Wis., in place of M. E. Odekirk, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 12 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Max A. Burleson, Guin.
James R. Levy, Ozark.

ALASKA

Doris V. Richard, Annette.

CALIFORNIA

Kenneth S Lewis, Carmichael.
Anton J Blatnick, Cucamonga
Owen S. Beck, Farmington.
Ethel I Maddix, Friant
Terrence O Thomson, Holt.
Peter M Murray, Livermore.
Marie L Maher, North Palm Springs.
Adrian C Firman, Puente
Carl T Erickson, Sebastopol.
Fred B. Niswonger, Weed.

COLORADO

Ellen I Colclazier, Loretto.

CONNECTICUT

William J Phelan, Waterbury
Lucy N. Leonard, Watertown.

FLORIDA

John M. Ayers, Altha.
Norman F. Easton, Gibsonton.

GEORGIA

Hillyer C King, Athens.
James C. Lipham, Bowdon.
John Preston Whigham, Eastman.
Ennis L Brooks, Edison.
Edwin Parker Dodge, Nahunta.
Elizabeth M Gray, Poulan.
Hugh D. Crook, Senoia.

IOWA

Arnold A. Benda, Brooklyn.
Lois Kathryn Allison, Carnarvon.
Robert J. Cavanagh, Delmar.
Eugene R. Wilbur, Randalia.

KANSAS

William J. Nelson, Natoma.

MAINE

Dennis R. Swan, Locke Mills.
Germaine H. Martel, Mechanic Falls.

MARYLAND

Woodrow B. Lippy, Manchester.
Charles W. Jones, Millington.

MASSACHUSETTS

Joseph E. McCumber, Nutting Lake.
Henry A. Duffy, South Attleboro.
Andrew J. Moran, Westport.

MICHIGAN

Anna L. Shepard, Alba.
Bernie J. Moorman, Barryton.
Lloyd Fred Porter, Bedford.
Chester W. Silkworth, Brooklyn.
Alvin F. Janowiak, Filer City.
Glenn W. Koontz, McMillan.
James E. McCracken, Pullman.
Percy H. McDonald, Richland.
Lloyd V. Preiss, Rockland.
Roy L. Wyckoff, Sheridan.
Robert W. Braun, South Range.
Erwin D. Clippard, Utica.
Clyde Bowman, White Cloud.

MINNESOTA

Stella M. Madsen, Bethel.
Norbert V. Honer, Cold Spring.
Nestor C Sybilrud, Glenville.
Maurice P. Dahlheim, Hector.
Ernest W. Ipsen, Le Sueur.
Roger W Corchran, Medford.
Al Buse, Red Lake Falls.
Burt E. Walker, Stephen.

MISSISSIPPI

Walter G Watkins, Gholson.
James W. Terrell, Pass Christian.
Grover K. Tanner, Pelahatchie.
Marion F. Howard, Poplarville.
John C. Graves, Jr., Roxie.
Allie B. Collins, Valden.

NEBRASKA

Gertrude M Wesierski, Ashton.
James J Vanderloop, Cedar Rapids.
Delmer Vandewege, Firth
Fredric J Stevens, Hartington.
Jesse J. Cromie, Kimball.
Norman F. Hansen, Tilden.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Russell V. Hawes, Pittsburg.
Francis V Kelleher, Westville.

NEW YORK

John M Quealy, Addison.
Joseph S Dempsey, Sr., Bolivar.
Francis J Schweigert, East Greenbush.
Milton S Hubbard, Jefferson.
Archibald G McLellan, Ogdensburg.
Samuel J. Bertuzzi, Oneonta.
Joseph F. Connelly, Schenectady.
Harold R. Martin, Schoharie.

NORTH CAROLINA

Richard D Dixon, Edenton.
Edward L. Best, Louisburg.
Rupert R. Rawls, Oak City.
Robert L Harrison, Spencer.

OHIO

Michael E Sullivan, Leetonia.
Thomas H Dearth, Londonderry.
Ray Edward Bayer, Perrysburg.

OKLAHOMA

Grace R. Heard, Cleveland.
Maynard E. Shelite, Freedom.

OREGON

Marie P. Balliew, Charleston.
Clarence E. Thomas, Deer Island.
Alta Geneva Brattain, Forth Klamath.

PENNSYLVANIA

Sarah C. Bassler, Brockton.
Ralph M. Arney, Centre Hall.
Harvey O. Eck, Emmaus.
Elizabeth M. Murphy, Hokendauqua.
Carl A. Truance, Rossiter.
George D. Hoffman, Shillington.
Ralph Lubinski, Waymart.
Kenneth J. Austin, Wellsboro.

PUERTO RICO

Margaret R. Keith, Aguirre.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Joseph J. Ropp, Manning.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Burdette W. P. Oakley, Mount Vernon.
Harvey J. Hullinger, Vivian.

TENNESSEE

Robert L. Van Eaton, Newbern.

TEXAS

E B. Lee, Bessmay.
William F. Schwenke, Coupland.
Daniel R. Walsworth, O'Brien.
Elfay L. Orts, Paige.
Elmo M Vickers, Pleasanton.

UTAH

John C Green, Jr., Park City.

VERMONT

Stanley J Pekalski, Bennington.
George F. Lawrence, Jr, Manchester.
Michael D'Agostino, Sheldon Springs.
Theresa I Kallahan, Wells.

VIRGINIA

Thomas B Simpkins, Aylett.
Herbert S. Hulvey, Fort Defiance.

WASHINGTON

Anthony C. Klotz, Burien.

WEST VIRGINIA

Juanita J. Dixon, Longacre.
Nathan W. Meadows, Rhodell.

WYOMING

Ruth A Arbogast, Sunrise.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, October 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whose keeping are the destinies of men and nations, endue with Thy wisdom our fallible minds. We come to Thee at the noontide hour when, from the Nation's beginning, our fathers have turned aside to seek Thy face. In disturbing days, strengthen us with the assurance that in the supreme tests only the soul is decisive and that only the spirit can save the flesh. Even as the busy tribes of humanity, with all their cares and fears, are carried swiftly onward with the flood of this tempestuous day, lead us who seek a sense of Thy presence to still waters and green pastures, where in some quiet shrine of devotion we may be reassured of those values which are excellent and permanent and which assert their sovereignty in all life's changing scenes. In the Redeemer's name, we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 12, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the

President had approved and signed the following acts:

On October 12, 1951:

S. 1994 An act to authorize the use of the incompleted submarine *Ulua* as a target for explosive tests, and for other purposes; and

S 2080. An act for the relief of Inooka Kazumi

On October 13, 1951:

S 283 An act for the relief of Akiko Mitsuhata,

S 1775 An act for the relief of Heinz Harald Patterson, and

S 2231. An act to effect entry of a minor child adopted or to be adopted by a United States citizen.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be granted leave of the Senate to be absent from the sessions of the Senate this week:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] for the entire week.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] for today and through Wednesday.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] for today and through Thursday.

The senior Senator from New York, myself, from 5 p. m. on Thursday through the remainder of the week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the leaves are granted.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Florida [Mr HOLLAND] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr RUSSELL] be excused from attending the sessions of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. GEORGE, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, RENEGOTIATION BOARD (S Doc. No 77)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of $1,500,000, for the Renegotiation Board, fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REVISION OF A PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (S. Doc. No. 78)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a revision of a proposed supplemental appropriation, involving an increase of $35,247,000, for the military functions of the Department of Defense, fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying paper), to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REVISION OF PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, PAYMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS (S. DOC. No 79)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revision of a proposed supplemental appropriation, involving an increase of $1,274,504.88, for payment of claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION (S Doc No. 80)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of $300,000, for the Federal Trade Commission, fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying paper), to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT RELATING TO VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 62 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 198), as amended (32 U. S C., 1946 ed., sec. 4c), to include the Virgin Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services

PUNISHMENT FOR KILLING OR ASSAULTING CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFICERS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to include, within the provisions of law providing punishment for killing or assaulting Federal officers on official duty, officers and employees of the Federal Security Agency engaged in enforcing the food and drug or public health laws of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Public Forum, of St. Petersburg, Fla., protesting against the opening of welfare rolls to public exposure, which was referred to the Committee on Finance

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS—RESOLUTIONS OF GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, GATLINBURG, TENN.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the Forty-third Governors' Conference, held at Gatlinburg, Tenn., Wednesday, October 3, 1951, relating to civil defense, and so forth.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS AFFECTING FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS ADOPTED BY THE FORTY-THIRD GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE AT GATLINBURG, TENN., ON WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1951

CIVIL DEFENSE

In view of unsettled world conditions today, an effectively operated civil-defense program is essential as a first line of security for the Nation In case of enemy attack, all levels of government—Federal, State, and local—must be prepared to cope with the situation by means of adequate civil defense.

Because civil defense is an integral part of our national security, the governors' conference recognizes that guidance and overall planning should come from the national government through appropriate channels, including the civil-defense establishment and the Department of Defense. However, the governors' conference also wishes to state its conviction that the State governments and the governors in particular have a special responsibility to cooperate with the Federal authorities in dealing with civil defense problems and to implement Federal policies and interstate civil defense compacts in order to protect the lives and homes, the farms and industries of our people.

In order to achieve a state of readiness, virtually all of the States have recently enacted basic civil-defense legislation and have established the necessary organization for civil defense Many of the States have ratified compacts among themselves for effective interstate cooperation and mutual assistance in civil-defense activities. However, State and local civil defense programs have been hampered by the failure of Congress to appropriate funds adequate for cooperative Federal-State civil-defense operations and stockpiling.

The governors' conference urges that the Congress of the United States promptly make adequate provision for a well-conceived civil-defense program We further recommend that all States which have not done so take immediate action to ratify the uniform interstate civil-defense compact as developed by the Council of State Governments and the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

In order that the enrollment of civil-defense forces may be facilitated, the governors' conference also urges that the Congress enact pending measures for indemnification of duly constituted civil-defense personnel who voluntarily assume civil-defense duties and who may be injured or killed in the performance of their duties Such indemnification should be financed entirely by the Federal Government.

INTERSTATE COMPACTS

Many governmental problems that transcend State lines require common solutions by the States working together within regions and throughout the country Any lack of cooperation results inevitably in the transfer to the Federal Government of powers, duties, and functions which are State responsibilities Much recent progress has been made by the States cooperating through the mechanism of interstate compacts, and a large number of such compacts were ratified at the 1951 State legislative sessions However, the States on occasion have been delayed in securing congressional consent to the detailed and specific agreements entered into among the States.

Therefore, the governors' conference strongly urges that the Congress take prompt action granting consent to interstate compacts now pending before it, and that in the future there be enacted general consent in advance legislation permitting the States to enter into agreements among themselves in broad fields of action for which the States have primary responsibility under our Federal Constitution.

EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

The governors' conference recalls the extreme difficulty which the States encountered in securing the return of the State employment services following their temporary federalization during World War II. We now note there is legislation pending in Congress, H. R. 5044, which would permanently transfer the State employment services to the United States Department of Labor. The governors' conference is strongly opposed to any Federal legislation designed to accomplish this purpose.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

The governors' conference has taken no position on the advisability of propriety of publicizing welfare rolls. The governors' conference is, however, unanimous in declaring that the publicizing of welfare rolls is a matter for determination by the individual States.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

The last four meetings of the governors' conference have recommended passage of statehood bills for Hawaii and Alaska. The governors' conference again urges prompt action by the Congress to permit these two Territories to achieve statehood.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

The Attorney General's Conference on Organized Crime, the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, and the American Bar Association Commission on Organized Crime have produced reports analyzing the problem of crime control and pointing to remedies. Some States have taken action to strengthen State and local law enforcement.

In order that States may be assisted in taking steps to control such organized crime as may exist within their borders, the governors' conference requests the drafting committee of the Council of State Governments to prepare specific drafts of suggested State legislation designed to remedy any present deficiencies.

We insist, however, that the prime responsibility for the elimination of such evils as may exist lies in the vigilance of local law-enforcement officials.

It is the sense of the governors' conference that public concern for local law enforcement should be invigorated by every legitimate means to combat the sinister menace of commercialized crime.

CRITICAL MATERIALS

Resolved, That the problem of procurement and allocation of critical materials, including particularly structural steel for hospitals, schools, public institutions, and highways, be referred to the executive committee of the governors' conference with a request that, consistent with the requirements of the national defense, appropriate action be taken looking toward the furnishing of such materials to the several States as quickly as practicable.

A motion made by Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll, of New Jersey, seconded by Gov. James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, and passed unanimously by the governors' conference at the executive business session on October 3, 1951:

I move that the chairman of the governors' conference be authorized to appoint a special committee to confer with appropriate committees of the Congress of the United States for the purpose of securing the creation of a commission and appropriate formula. Designed to promote a return to a working federalism with an accompanying clarification and simplification in the Federal-State and local relations, insuring a substantial reduction in the total cost of administering Government while promoting greater efficiency and better service to the public and between various levels of Government.

EXTENSION OF SECURITY RESTRICTIONS TO FEDERAL CIVILIAN AGENCIES—RESOLUTION OF NEW JERSEY PRESS ASSOCIATION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Friday, October 5, the New Jersey Press Association unanimously adopted a resolution with regard to the recent Executive order of the President extending security restrictions to Federal civilian agencies. I present the resolution for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas President Truman has extended security restrictions to Federal civilian agencies by his Executive order; and

Whereas this arbitrary action denies the press its constitutional right of access to information; and

Whereas this denial may inevitably lead to withholding of information from the public: Be it

Resolved, That the New Jersey Press Association use every appropriate method at its disposal to demand that President Truman modify this Executive order so that the public may have news and information which is its right under the Constitution.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 1117. A bill for the creation of a Commission on Congressional Salaries, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 949); and

S. 2077. A bill to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept No 950).

By Mr McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H R 1672. A bill for the relief of Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association (Rept. No 952); and

H R. 2207 A bill for the relief of Numa A. Winstead (Rept. No 953).

By Mr McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1839 A bill for the relief of Willy Giroud (Rept No. 954).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1292 A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the criminal penalty provided for persons convicted of gathering or delivering certain defense information to aid a foreign government in time of peace (Rept No 955).

By Mr McCARRAN (for Mr. HENDRICKSON), from the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 968. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to mutual military aid in an emergency; without amendment (Rept. No. 951).

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S 1135. A bill to provide a recruitment procedure for the competitive civil service in order to insure selection of personnel on the basis of open competition and merit, and for other purposes, with amendments (Rept. No. 956).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H R. 4808. A bill to provide for the granting of an easement for a public road through the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge in Dare County, N. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 958).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 2271. A bill for the relief of Carol Ann Hutchins (Sybille Schubert); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 2272. A bill for the relief of Donald Grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 2273. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for Mr. HENDRICKSON):

S 2274. A bill for the relief of Ruth Sonin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2275. A bill for the relief of Isador Strulovici and his wife, Bery, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. O'CONOR:

Address delivered before the Brooklyn Traffic Club by Mr. Charles R Seal, Director of the Bureau of Water Carriers and Freight Forwarders of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

An editorial from the Washington Post of October 14, 1951, discussing the recent action of the Republic of Panama in denying charters to certain merchant vessels.

By Mr. McCARRAN.

An article relating to trading in gold, written by Fulton Lewis, Jr., published in the Washington Times-Herald of September 16, 1951, under the heading of "Washington report"

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

(For Mr HENDRICKSON.) Correspondence between regional director, Wage and Hour Public Contracts Division of the United States Department of Labor, and the Bayonne Times, of Bayonne, N J., regarding a petition for approval of wage increases

Article entitled "Doctor Points Way on Free Care Issue," published in the New York Times of October 7, 1951.

By Mr. IVES:

Letter regarding relations with Scandinavia, written by Benjamin H. Namm to the editor of the New York Times, and published in the Times on October 13, 1951.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Editorial entitled "That Social Security Kitty," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of October 6, 1951, relating to the social-security fund.

Statement by Dr. Leonard A. Scheele regarding shortage of nurses in tuberculosis hospitals

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

Letter from a constituent discussing the Korean war.

LETTERS ON RURAL PUBLIC LIBRARY DEMONSTRATION SERVICE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received letters from the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative and from the Wisconsin Congress of Parents and Teachers endorsing Senate bill 1452, the revised bill for demonstration of library service in rural areas.

The State of Wisconsin has long been interested in this subject and has done much pioneering in this rural library field. I am hoping that this legislation can be brought up very shortly for consideration on the floor.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD these two significant letters which I have received—the first from the distinguished executive secretary of the Wisconsin

Council of Agriculture Cooperative, Milo K. Swanton; the second, from Mrs. Robert Schumpert, legislative chairman of the Wisconsin Congress of Parent-Teachers.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF
AGRICULTURE COOPERATIVE,
Madison, Wis., October 5, 1951.

Hon ALEXANDER WILEY,
Member of the Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This is to call your attention to Senate bill 1452 and to present our position with respect to it We would like to see the bill pass. We look upon library services as being one of the basic and important alles to the improvement of rural life in America.

At the recent Nation-wide Rural Life Conference we gave much emphasis to the need for building up and improving rural library services as a means of counteracting today's detrimental "isms" and as an influence that can restore stability to the rural home wherein a revival of the lost art of good reading should and can constitute a major stabilizing influence.

We are convinced that the bill does not involve Federal control. Senate bill 1452 requires that the State free library commission must submit a plan for library development In other words, State autonomy is provided In our State 750,000 rural people are without library service. Senate bill 1452 is designed primarily for the purpose of meeting this lack of rural service Another good feature of the bill is the fact that it places responsibility for the raising of library funds locally as a requirement for any Federal allotment.

Coming back to my previous statement concerning the battle of the "isms," I feel now, more than ever, that library services constitute a valuable ally in the building of a strong, sound, and dependable public opinion that can resist subversive influences and at the same time help to marshal constructive forces of minds and morals as a powerful yet peaceful alternative to the type of world tension and confusions that are abroad in the world today. The program of rural library extension which can be brought about from an appropriation of this kind will result in constructive influences of inestimable value. Therefore, I sincerely recommend your support of Senate bill 1452.

Sincerely yours,

MILO K. SWANTON,
Executive Secretary.

WISCONSIN CONGRESS
OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS,
Madison, Wis., October 10, 1951.

The Honorable Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are writing you concerning bill 1452, the library-service bill.

According to recent word, the Senate Committee on Labor and Welfare has recommended this legislation. We urge that you give it your full support. Since the Senate passed a similar library bill last session, we know that you are aware of the importance of this measure for a largely rural State such as ours. The bill will provide an initial allotment of $40,000 for Wisconsin plus an estimated $141,493 on the basis of its rural population.

Our organization, interested primarily in education and child welfare, is keenly aware of what accessibility of good reading means to a community. We know that the success of democracy is dependent upon an informed electorate and that libraries will furnish sources of information to the public. We have seen a State-supported demonstration library project working out successfully for two of our counties.

We need Federal support to help initiate more library services in our rural areas.

We ask you to vote for bill 1452.

Very truly yours,

GRACE SCHUMPERT
(Mrs. Robert Schumpert),
Legislative Chairman.

LETTER FROM MILWAUKEE SCHOOL DIRECTORS ON STEEL ALLOCATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am sure that there is not a man in the Senate who would deny for one moment the fact that the Nation's school system has a tremendous responsibility in this critical period in handling the swollen enrollments of youngsters now reaching school age.

I am sure, too, that there is not a man in the Senate who would deny for one moment the fact that the whole future of America depends upon these little tots. If we educate them adequately, if we train them to meet the responsibilities which will be theirs in the America of tomorrow, we need have little fear as to how they will measure up to our ideals.

One of the really unfortunate situations is that America's school plant is so terribly obsolete. Our children are being trained today in many instances in schools which were inadequate 20 years ago, often in rickety firetraps with poor plumbing, poor lighting, poor ventilation; buildings are not adequate for one-third of their present enrollment. In some States, building has not been so far behind the expanded number of students, but in almost all of the States of the Union, a great amount of construction is vitally necessary. In probably no State are present buildings really adequate and located in the right areas to meet changes in population

In face of this urgent need, it is an unfortunate fact that sufficient steel has not been allocated by the defense agencies for school repair and construction. This seems incredible in view of the fact that steel seems to be made available for a host of unnecessary items and in view of the fact that the entire school-construction needs of this Nation could be met by 1 percent of the national steel production for each quarter.

To some extent, this situation also prevails in delayed highway construction where numerous bridge projects are being held up for lack of adequate steel.

I am indeed hoping that the defense agencies will wake up to this situation and provide more steel for these essential purposes. I do not underestimate for one moment the clamor which reaches them for steel for various and sundry purposes. And I recognize that the steel pool, so to speak, is becoming increasingly tight in view of the defense emergency. However, certainly, schools and yes, highways, should have their basic needs met.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an excellent letter which I have received from the secretary-business manager of the Milwaukee Board of School Directors. It is illustrative of a great many well deserving appeals which have come to me from other educational authorities throughout my State. I endorse emphatically the views expressed.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD OF SCHOOL DIRECTORS,
Milwaukee, Wis., October 11, 1951.

Hon ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
The Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: At a recent conference of the National Council on Schoolhouse Construction, members of the council heard the startling fact that while 3,300,000 tons of steel (or 15 percent of the total 21,000,000 tons allocated by the National Production Authority for the fourth quarter of 1951 for all purposes) had been allocated for automobiles, only 100,000 tons (one-half of 1 percent of the total 21,000,000 tons) had been allocated for school construction The outlook for needed new school buildings is dismal because the small amount of steel allocated for schools will barely complete projects now under construction.

Everyone connected with education is acutely aware of the fact that there is a great need for new school buildings to house the increasing school population I am sure that you, too, are probably aware of this need Speaking for our own community I can truthfully say that at no time in the 20 years during which I have been connected with the Milwaukee public-school system have we been faced with such an acute school housing shortage We are now in the midst of a very extensive building program—to my knowledge, the most extensive the Milwaukee Board of School Directors has ever undertaken at one time. We now have several sorely needed buildings under construction; construction work on several others, equally badly needed, will, we hope, be started soon. Unless the projects are completed without further delay we are definitely going to be faced with a school housing shortage even greater than the acute shortage which already exists in our community. However, these projects cannot be completed unless we get the needed steel.

Milwaukee of course is only one community where there is definitely a need for additional school facilities and where a shortage of steel will seriously handicap school-building construction This situation also prevails elsewhere in our State and in many other communities throughout the United States.

There is evidence that steel is available for needed schools without handicapping defense, but the difficulty seems to lie in obtaining recognition by the National Production Authority of the need of adequate schools. Education is a definite part of the over-all defense effort and an investment in the future of our country, and the proper housing of our school children is important for effective education. It is the opinion of school authorities that if only 1 percent of the national steel production each quarter would be allocated for the schools, America could meet its educational plant needs.

We realize that the Office of Education cannot do anything under present limitations. However, perhaps men like Manly Fleischmann, Administrator of the National Production Board, and Charles E. Wilson, Chairman of the Defense Production Authority, can do something to alleviate the acute shortage of steel for the schools. If they are unable to do anything about the matter, then congressional action is needed.

Would you please see what you can do to promote a more adequate allocation of

steel for schoolhouse construction. As stated above, it is felt that the allocation of only 1 percent of the national steel production each quarter would take care of the school needs. Your determined effort to attain this end will, I am sure, be very much appreciated by the folks "back home" in many parts of the United States.

Very truly yours,

W. E RILLING,
Secretary-Business Manager.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR KNOWLAND ON BECOMING A GRANDFATHER

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I rise to extend my hand across the aisle, to pay a compliment to the achievements of the very senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. At the age of 43 he is, I believe, the most junior in years of any of the senior Senators of this body. I think the Senate should have official notice that now, at that tender age, he has become a grandfather. Not alone is he the youngest grandfather sitting in this body today, but so far as my research is able to discover he is the youngest grandfather, at least in the modern history of this body. If any other Senator has other information on this subject, I shall be glad to correct the RECORD, but in any event, my congratulations, and I am sure the congratulations of the entire Senate, to Grandpa KNOWLAND and his fine family.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. MOODY. I am very glad to yield.

Mr KNOWLAND. I merely wish to express my appreciation to my good friend from Michigan for his very kind remarks. I may say it shows what life in the Senate does to one, because it is only a matter of a mere 6 years ago that I came into this body, at that time the youngest Member of the Senate. Now, 6 years later, I am a grandfather.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I understand the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Michigan related to our good friend from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I want to pay tribute to the great grandfather of this distinguished granddaughter, who happens to be here visiting his son, the senior Senator from California. When we were in California to sign the Japanese Treaty Senator KNOWLAND'S father, who was a former Representative in Congress, received us most graciously and certainly convinced us of the hospitality of California. So I congratulate the sire and the great-grandsire on the arrival of this youngster. May she grow up and render distinguished service to this country as her grandfather, the present Senator from California, and her great-grandfather have done.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a moment ago something was said about Grandfather KNOWLAND, our highly esteemed and beloved associate. I served in the House of Representatives with former Representative Knowland, Great-Grandfather Knowland of the youngest KNOWLAND. He is still living and one of the finest men I ever knew. I do not think I ever knew a more perfect or a more delightful and congenial gentleman than the father of our present senior Senator from California. He made a great legislator and was esteemed by all. He was one of the best men we had in the House at that time. It is true he was a Republican, but one of the best in the House. He was one of the best Republicans I ever knew. I take pleasure in saying this about the father of our distinguished colleague from California. I congratulate them all on the addition to their great family.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brewster	George	Monroney
Capehart	Hayden	Murray
Carlson	Hill	Neely
Case	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Clements	Hunt	Schoeppel
Connally	Ives	Smith, N J.
Cordon	Johnston, S C.	Smith, N. C
Dirksen	Knowland	Sparkman
Douglas	Lehman	Underwood
Dworshak	Maybank	Wiley
Ecton	McFarland	Young
Ellender	McKellar	
Fulbright	McMahon	

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the funeral of a relative.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate

After a little delay, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr GREEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs SMITH of Maine, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WILLIAMS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

AMENDMENT OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AND THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1347) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee which conducted hearings on this bill and prepared the revised draft, I think it might be appropriate for me to speak at not too great length on the bill and the problems of railroad retirement.

As all of us know, we really created two systems of old-age security in 1935, one for the railroad workers and another for a much larger group of covered occupations Although the first Railroad Retirement Act was declared unconstitutional, it was replaced by another act in 1937 So we have had these two systems going along parallel to each other now for almost 15 years.

The Railroad Retirement Act was originally passed not only to provide future protection for those who would become aged, but also to reinforce and in a sense bail out the private pension plans which the railroads had established on their systems prior to 1935. A great many of the railroads had individual plans, but during the depression the solvency of these plans was threatened, and the older workers under the seniority system tended to stay on in order to increase their earnings, with the result that, under the seniority system, the bulk of the effects of the depression fell upon the younger workers. The result was that the Railroad Retirement Act was passed to provide annuities not merely for those who would pay contributions into the system and would become aged in the future, but also to provide annuities for those who were at the moment aged and who had not paid contributions in the Federal system in the past. In other words, the railroad-retirement system assumed from the very beginning the liability of payments to the large number of aged railroad workers who had grown up in the industry. Many of these people had thought they

were partially protected by private funds, only to find this protection largely removed. They would have been in a very difficult position if they could have received benefits only in proportion to their payments into the social-security system which was not started until 1935, or, in its second form, until 1937. This is one reason why the contributions under the railroad retirement system have always been much greater than the contributions under the social security system.

At present both the railways and the workers are assessed 6 percent of wages paid up to $300 a month, or a total of 12 percent, whereas the contributions under social security are only 1½ percent upon each, a total of 3 percent, and even at their maximum, many years in the future, will not rise above 3¼ percent upon each, or a total of 6½ percent. In other words, the railroad retirement system started with this liability which it assumed, and because of that initial liability and because the rates of benefit for retired railroad workers were in excess of those provided under social security, the rate of contributions has always been much greater for railroad retirement than for social security.

When in the last session of Congress we revised the Social Security Act, we not only increased the benefits under that system but we also still further divorced the benefits from an actuarial relationship to individual contributions. We put the social security system much more closely in conformity with needs rather than basing it upon prior contributions, with the result that we greatly increased benefits for survivors and for wives. Consequently the benefits under the social security system for survivors now tend to be in excess of what the benefits under railroad retirement are for survivors. Social security also provides a wife's benefit or spouse's benefit, whereas the railroad retirement does not provide a spouse's benefit or a wife benefit at all. Accordingly, there is presented a situation in which people inside the railroad retirement system who pay very much greater contributions than are paid under social security have no protection, no added allowance for wives, and less protection in the case of survivors than those under the social-security system itself.

These facts plus the increase in the cost of living, making existing benefits less adequate to meet current living costs, has created a very widespread demand for an improvement or rather for an increase in benefits under railroad retirement, and varying plans were drafted, introduced, and considered by the subcommittee.

One plan, Senate bill 1347, drew its chief popular support from the so-called nonoperating unions, namely, the shop crafts, the clerks, the section hands, and other unions. Another bill drew its support primarily from four operating unions; and other bills were introduced by private pension organizations. In general, the difference between the bills of the nonoperating brotherhoods and of the operating brotherhoods could be summarized approximately as follows: The nonoperating brotherhoods wanted a liberal spouse's benefit with a maximum monthly payment of $50. They wanted an approximate 75-percent increase in the benefits for surviving widows and children, a 13.8-percent increase for annuitants, and a 15-percent increase for pensioners.

They wanted to get the funds for these added benefits from three sources: First, they wanted to increase the tax base from $300 a month to $400 a month. Then to provide that workers on the railroads who were employed for less than 10 years, and who, either before that or after that, were in occupations covered by the Social Security Act, would be treated not as being under both railroad retirement and social security, which would be the present system of getting dual benefits, but would receive single benefits under social security; that they would receive the social-security system of benefits, and in turn the railroad-retirement system would transfer to social security the amounts which they would have paid into social security had they been covered under that system from the very beginning, retaining for railroad retirement the difference between the contributions under social security and the contributions under railroad retirement. That was the second source of funds.

The third source of funds which was proposed was a work clause to disqualify from the benefits those aged annuitants who in outside occupations received more than $50 a month. That is the disqualification which prevails in social security, and it was proposed to extend it to railroad retirement.

The four operating brotherhoods wanted to provide first a 16⅔ percent increase in annuities and pensions, but they did not wish to provide an increase for survivors or a spouse's benefit, they did not wish to increase the tax base, nor did they wish to have either the proposed transfer to social security or a work clause disqualifying those receiving over $50 a month. There were also certain other proposals.

The committee worked hard on this matter. The hearings are before us, and I hope the copies will be distributed. It will be observed that it is a volume of approximately 600 pages. We had a number of actuarial studies and estimates made. We finally decided we would propose a 15-percent increase in annuities and pensions for the retired workers; and we would propose a 33⅓-percent increase in survivors' benefits, but with the proviso that in no case would the survivor's benefit under railroad retirement be less than the survivor's benefit under social security.

We introduced a modification of the wife's or spouse's benefits equal to 50 percent of the employee's benefit with a maximum of $40 a month instead of the $50 a month which had been originally requested. We felt that it was unsafe to increase benefits without also increasing the financial resources of the fund. There had been in the past increases in the scale of benefits to retired railroad workers, in one case accompanied by an increase in contributions, and in another case not accompanied by an increase in contributions, and these tended to turn out actuarially sound, even though the actuaries had predicted in advance that that would not be the result.

The railroad retirement fund in the past has had good luck because the increase in the scale of wages brought employees nearer to the $300 maximum, and because of increasing contributions to the fund, so that the last increase in benefits, which was not accompanied by an increase in the rate of contributions, turned out actuarily, to the surprise of many people, to be all right. Certainly I do not think it wise to trust fortune too far, to depend again on the continued upward drift in earnings to make increases in benefits. Therefore the subcommittee sought to make savings and economies which would permit the proposed increase in the scale of benefits to be paid.

The first, and, I imagine, the chief, point of controversy between the nonoperating and the operating unions was increasing the tax base from $300 a month to $350 a month instead of to $400, as the nonoperating unions had originally urged. For this reason it is estimated that there will be brought into the fund in gross revenues approximately $50,000,000 a year more; that is, it is estimated that there are $600,000,000 in wages and salaries which fall within the bracket from $300 to $400 a month, and that $400,000,000 of this amount is in the $300 to $350 level. Since the rate of taxation is 12½ percent, this will bring in annually approximately $50,000,000.

It is estimated that the added benefits which will be created by thus raising the benefit base as well as the tax base will be somewhere between $20,000,000 and $25,000,000 a year, thus producing a net saving to the fund of approximately from $20,000,000 to $30,000,00 per annum. Since the total taxable payroll is at present approximately $5,300,000,000, this will amount to about one-half of 1 percent. In other words, without increasing the rate of taxation, a net added revenue of about one-half of 1 percent is obtained, which could be used to help finance the benefits.

We rejected the idea that if a retired worker earned more than $50 a month in employment covered by the Social Security Act he should be disqualified from benefits. Very frankly, I think that in the future we shall have to reconsider that provision in the social-security law, because both the Railroad Retirement Act and the social-security law were passed in a period of unemployment and depression when one of the purposes was to take off the labor market the aged workers so that the younger workers could get jobs. This was particularly the case with railroads, where seniority resulted in bumping off younger workers. We are certainly not now in a period of surplus labor; we are in a period of labor shortage.

One of the big problems we have is being able to utilize the services of aged workers. The subcommittee did not want to add to the aggravation of this problem by putting into the bill a provision that if a worker received more

than $50 a month in outside earnings, he would be disqualified from receiving benefits, particularly when he had made such large contributions out of his own earnings toward his own protection. Therefore, this feature was rejected and so the work clause is not contained in the measure. The bill helps to finance the system by an exchange provision with social security. It provides that where workers have been employed on a railway system for less than 10 years, the benefits they will receive will not be determined under the railroad retirement formula, but will be determined under the social-security formula. The railroad-retirement formula is 2½ percent a year multiplied by the number of years of service, and it is, therefore, very closely tied to the past earnings of the workers.

The social-security formula does not bear a very close relationship to the past earnings of the worker, but it is based more on the idea of need, and it does not have too much of the individual insurance element in it.

So the bill provides that the workers who have been employed for less than 10 years are to receive the benefits which they would have received had they been under social security, and the railroad-retirement system is then to turn over to social security the amounts which the workers and their employers would have contributed had they been under social security during the entire time. Conversely, there is an exchange in the opposite direction for those who have been employed for more than 10 years.

The total long-time level cost which the actuaries estimate under the bill is 14.06 percent of payroll. The maximum contributions will be 12½ percent. There is a gap between the two. It is not so great a gap as would have been provided, I believe, under the bill suggested by the four operating brotherhoods, but it is a gap It is my judgment that the whole question of the time provisions of the railroad-retirement system and the relationships of the railroad-retirement system to social security should be considered by a joint congressional committee. We shall have time enough to do that even if our estimates—and they are very conservative—that this bill will cost 14.06 percent are true. Even if the estimates are true, and I believe they are the best estimates we can get, the existing fund of close to $2,500,000,000 would not be exhausted in 30 years. So that we have, roughly, until 1990, or close to 1990, before we will be in our most difficult position.

But, nevertheless, I think we should begin relatively early to study both the railroad-retirement fund itself and its relationships to the social-security system and see if any degree of integration can be effected between them and the degree to which dual benefits can be eliminated and a broader coverage with resulting reduction in costs obtained. If the bill in its present form should be passed by the Senate, it is my intention to seek action on Senate Concurrent Resolution 51, to provide for such a joint study.

I think that is approximately all I wish to say, Mr. President, except this——

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. I understand that the operating groups feel that the increase in the tax base which the Senator has suggested is not fair to them, that the increase comes from the operating brotherhoods, and they feel that would not be exactly fair.

If the bill were amended to change the base from $350 to $300, I should like to ask the Senator if that would not be a sufficient base to effectively carry out the the program, at least until there is time to make a more extensive study of the problem. After such a study we could then agree on a base which would be fair and just to all concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should be reluctant to accept that proposal, for a number of reasons. In the first place, I think it is apparent that a larger annual revenue is needed in order to meet the increased benefits. I do not like to vote increased benefits without seeing some increased revenue coming in. No one desires an increase in the rate of taxation. No one wants to go above 12½ percent. That is about the maximum.

I believe it is proper, however, to increase the base, for several reasons. In the first place, the money is needed. In the second place, while those drawing from $300 to $350 will pay more, they will also be receiving wives' benefits which they do not now receive; there will be increased annuities for the aged, and an increase of one-third in survivors' benefits. In other words, the benefits as well as the contributions are going up.

Another point is that there has always been a differential between the maximum paid under railroad retirement and the maximum paid under social security. Prior to 1950 the maximum under social security was $250 a month, the maximum under railroad retirement was $300, and hence there was $50 more of earnings protected under railroad retirement than was protected under social security. Now the social-security maximum has gone up to $300, and it would seem to me fair to continue this $50 differential by raising the railroad retirement figure to $350.

The Senator from Montana has put his finger on the real difference in the house of labor. The operating unions do not want to have the tax base raised to $350. I do not like to raise the tax base, but to my mind it is a necessary price which must be paid for raising the benefits.

I should like to point out, also, that the committee recommendation for an increase in the tax base of from $300 a month to $350 a month was an attempt to enable those urging an increase up to $400 a month and those opposing any increase at all to reach an agreement.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the need for the legislation now being considered. I did not have the opportunity of attending the hearings, and the bill is highly technical, but it seems to me that in the interest of having the proposed legislation enacted at this session of the Congress it would be wiser to accept the $300 base rather than insist on the $350 base, because, otherwise, it might result in having the bill blocked in the House or in conference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My own belief is that the need for increased benefits on the part of those who are already on the annuity rolls and the need for added survivors' benefits, in view of the increase in living costs, is apparent. There is such a need for increased benefits that the question of the tax base will turn out to be relatively less important. I think that any group which holds up the passage of such a bill merely because it does not want an increase in the tax base will be putting itself in a very disadvantageous position before the members of the group.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator gave some figures a little while ago showing the increased charge on the fund by the proposed legislation, which, I think, was 14 06 percent. Am I right in assuming that that was based on an increase in the tax base from $300 to $350?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; and if it were not for that, the cost would be nearer 14½ percent of payroll.

Mr. LEHMAN Am I not correct in the statement that, while there has been some difference among some of the railway unions as to the tax base, and possibly some other minor questions, there has been no difference, and there is no difference today in the feeling that there must be an increase in the pensions, annuities, and in the amounts paid to survivors, to widows and children?

Mr DOUGLAS. We are all agreed that there should be an increase in the benefits of pensioners and annuitants. The operating unions are more concerned with the planned increase across the board and are not enthusiastic about a wives' benefit

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, of course that was intended as an emergency proposal, in order to secure the passage of the proposed legislation at this session. The proponents indicated that they had no doubt that later more careful study would be given to the subject, and a full and complete bill would be worked out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. With respect to the increase in tax base, it is interesting that in 1937, when the present act was passed, 98 percent of the payroll of the railroads was taxable under the $300 maximum. So that the $300 maximum took in virtually the entire payroll. Now only 84 percent of the railroad payroll is covered by the $300 maximum. If we raise the level from $300 to $350, we will cover only approximately 92 percent of the payroll, so we are still leaving 8 percent of the payroll untaxed, whereas the

$300 provision left 16 percent of the payroll untaxed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. My reason for asking questions is that there is some difference of opinion between the operating and nonoperating brotherhoods. That being the case, am I not correct in stating that the subcommittee has been considering the pending bill, with amendments to the bill, for a period of not less than 6 months?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true. We began our hearings the 27th of April, conducted them to the middle of May, studied the matter all through the summer, and brought out our bill in September, and have been having incessant conferences with interested parties during the entire time.

Mr. LEHMAN. If that is so, as of course it is, is it not pretty clearly established that if we are to recognize the need for higher pensions and annuities and survivors' benefits, a bill containing provisions similar to those of the pending bill, is absolutely essential, and that we cannot finance the plan with any degree of actuarial security save on the basis proposed?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is my feeling. It is my feeling, first, that we need at this session an extension of the benefits under the system of railroad retirement and, second, that it is unsound merely to vote the benefits without providing some additional revenue which will help to meet the payment of the benefits.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact, too, that the subcommittee, of which I am not a member, which spent months considering this matter, and the full committee of which I am a member, were in substantial agreement on the need for legislation of the type proposed, increasing the pensions and annuities and the survivors' benefits?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from New York is correct. It may be that the Senator from Illinois, because he has labored on this matter, has accentuated the differences between the various groups. Those differences are real, but I believe every one is agreed to an increase, roughly, of 15 percent in the benefits of annuitants and pensioners, and in rough agreement on an increase of one-third in benefits to survivors, that that is the point of agreement.

The nonoperating unions emphasize the need for a spouse's benefit. Then, in order to get added funds for that, and also to meet some of the other costs, they want to introduce the economy of transferring the short-time workers to social security and raising the tax base to get an added net gain of about $25,000,000 a year.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. LEHMAN. Since the need for increased annuities, pensions, and survivors' benefits has been so clearly established, and, further, since that need has been recognized by both the operating and the nonoperating brotherhoods, it seems to me highly essential that at this session Congress enact a bill effectuating those increased benefits. It appears to me that while we must recognize the differences which now exist, they are relatively so small in comparison to the benefits which would result from the passage of this bill that I am very strongly in favor of its enactment at this session of the Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I was struck by a couple of sentences in the committee report. On page 7 we find the following language.

> The greatest sufferers from the present wave of price inflation are those people who are trying to exist on a fixed income, such as pensions and annuities They are trying to get along on a fixed number of dollars each month And these dollars are buying less and less as the cost of the basic necessities of life soars higher and higher.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois is known as one of the outstanding economists of the country. I should like to have his opinion on what the future holds in store if we raise the level of retirement benefits and pension benefits generally. Does that foreshadow a rise in freight rates and passenger rates, with a resultant contribution to the spiral of inflation generally, with the possibility that a year or 2 years from now we shall have to come back and take further action in order to reach the higher level which the spiral produces?

Mr. DOUGLAS There is no increase in the rate of taxation in the committee bill The only increase which comes is from the raising of the tax base from $300 to $350 a month That will bring in an added $50,000,000 a year, half of which will be contributed by the workers and half by the railroads. The railroads will contribute an added $25,000,000 a year.

The total wage bill at present is about $6,000,000,000, I believe So this would amount to something less than one-half of 1 percent of the wage bill, and therefore appreciably less than one-half of 1 percent of operating costs So I do not believe that the program will contribute to inflation.

Furthermore, it must be remembered that there has been built up a reserve of about $2,500,000,000 out of past contributions of the railroads and of the men. So in a sense we are contributing to workers the added protection which we thought we had accorded them when the act was originally passed. However, the protection has been made less adequate by the increase in the cost of living, over which they have had no control. So they are drawing on funds which they themselves have helped to contribute to meet contingencies which neither they nor the Congress anticipated.

Mr. CASE. I think it is beyond argument that the increase in living costs means that the dollar protection which was supposedly provided in prior legislation would not today provide the protection in goods or in living comforts which was anticipated at the time of the prior enactment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. That is unquestionably true. Does the Senator feel that the reserves can be drawn upon without impairment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not want to have the reserves treated in a cavalier fashion. I want to have them continue for a relatively long period of time. That is why I do not want to finance the increase in benefits exclusively from the existing reserves. All I am saying is that even with an estimated cost of 14.06 percent and contributions of 12½ percent, the reserves will last for approximately 30 years. Long before the expiration of that time—in fact, I think within the next 5 or 6 years—we should look over the entire system, in connection with social security, and see if there is not some way by which we can reduce the average charges while maintaining benefits.

Mr CASE In that connection, what the Senator has just said reminds me of another sentence in the report, which refers to the change in the tax base from the present maximum of $300 a month to the new maximum of $350. Then follows this sentence:

> This preserves the historic difference between the tax base of the social-security system and the tax base of the railroad-retirement system

The remark which the Senator has just made would suggest to me that possibly he saw in a general review and survey of the whole situation the possibility that the two might be drawn closer together. However, this sentence rather suggests that the pending legislation would preserve the historic difference. Would the Senator care to comment on that situation?

Mr. DOUGLAS I think it is quite possible that instead of $350 a month being too high for railroad workers, $300 a month may be too low for those covered by social security.

Mr. CASE. It certainly is true that those who get an annuity or pension benefit based upon the tax base of a salary up to $100 a month under present conditions receive an inadequate return so far as meeting living costs is concerned. Pension benefits must be supplemented in some other way.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, the railroad benefit has always been tied much more closely to individual earnings, namely, 2½ percent of average earnings multiplied by the number of years of employment. So the railroad benefits have both been tied more closely to previous earnings, and have been larger in amount, than the straight old-age annuities to persons under social security. Social security has provided survivors' benefits which at the moment are in excess of railroad survivors' benefits; also the spouse's benefit, which the railroad system has not had at all. But so far as concerns the basic pension or annuity for retired workers, the railroad benefits have always been in excess of those under social security. It would

be very difficult to integrate the two systems.

Mr. CASE. If the Senator from Illinois will indulge me for one further question, he as a member of the committee may be conversant with the provisions of the bill which the House has passed. I am not. Can the Senator say—perhaps he has already said it, when I was not in the Chamber; if not, I would appreciate a statement for the RECORD—what constitutes the essential difference between the approach in the Senate bill and the approach in the bill passed by the House? What will be the issue in conference?

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I understand, the House committee bill provides a 15-percent increase in benefits to pensioners and annuitants. A similar provision is contained in the Senate committee bill. The House bill also provides an increase of 33⅓ percent for survivors. The Senate bill contains a similar provision. The two bills are identical up to that point.

Beyond that we add a spouse's benefit equivalent to half the employee's benefit, up to $40 a month. Then, to provide added revenue, we raise the tax base from $300 to $350. In addition, we provide for a transfer between social security and railroad retirement, under which a short-time worker, who has been employed for less than 10 years, is transferred to social security; with a converse adjustment in the accounts of those who have been employed for more than 10 years.

Mr. CASE. Of course, it is impossible to predict what will happen in conference, but I am interested in knowing whether or not the Senator from Illinois has any information which would bear upon the probability that the conferees will reach an agreement before the adjournment of this session of Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois is neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but he will say that an agreement such as that is devoutly to be wished.

If the Senator from South Dakota will turn to page 12 of the committee report, he will see some estimates on costs. The estimated cost under the House bill is 14.71 percent. The estimated cost under the Senate bill is 14 06 percent. In other words, we make very real savings from the increase in the tax base and from the transfer into social security.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate very much the observations of the Senator from Illinois. My question with regard to the conference was not in any way an attempt to lead the Senator on.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand.

Mr. CASE. I was thinking about the probable adjournment of Congress and the possibility of reaching some agreement on a bill. If action is to be taken it would be desirable, if possible, to complete action promptly so that the conference could take action and the conference report be acted upon before the adjournment of the session.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The House is due to take action on its measure tomorrow. I hope very much we can get an agreement and obtain passage of a bill on the subject before we adjourn.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments may be considered en bloc and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With the reservation that any Senator may offer an amendment to any committee amendment?

Mr DOUGLAS. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc and agreed to, with the understanding that any Senator may have the right to offer amendments to the committee amendments. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments, agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

On page 2, line 8, before the word "by", to insert "and"; in line 11, after the word "phrase", to strike out the semicolon and "and by striking out the next to the last sentence of such subsection (a)"; after line 16, to strike out:

"SEC 4 Subsection (d) of section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 as amended, is amended by inserting in the first sentence '(i)' after 'individual' and by changing the period at the end of the first sentence to a comma and inserting after the comma the following. 'or (ii) is receiving an annuity under paragraph 1, 2 or 3 of subsection (a), or under paragraph 4 or 5 thereof after attaining age sixty-five, is under the age of seventy-five, and shall earn more than $50 in "wages" or be charged with more than $50 in "net earnings" from self-employment", or (iii) is receiving an annuity under paragraph 4 or 5 of subsection (a), is under the age of sixty-five, and shall earn more than $100 in "wages" or be charged with more than $100 in "net earnings from self-employment" '"

And in lieu thereof to insert:

"SEC 4 Section 4 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase 'sixty days' in subsection (k) thereof the phrase 'six months' "

On page 3, after line 12, to strike out:

"(e) For the purpose of this section and of subsection (i) of section 5, 'wages' shall mean wages as defined in section 209 of the Social Security Act, without regard to subsection (a) thereof; and 'net earnings from self-employment' shall be determined as provided in section 211 (a) of the Social Security Act and charged to correspond to the provisions of section 203 (c) of that act."

In line 20, to reletter the subsection from "(f)" to "(e)"; on page 4, line 6, after the word "than", to strike out "$50" and insert "$40"; in line 12, after the word "subsection", to insert *"Provided further,* That, if the annuity of the individual is awarded pursuant to a joint and survivor election, the spouse's annuity shall be computed or recomputed as though such individual had not made a joint and survivor election:"; on page 5, line 1, after the word "this", to strike out "subsection" and insert "third proviso"; in line 6, to reletter the subsection from "(g)" to "(f)"; in line 22, to reletter the subsection from "(h)" to "(g)"; in the same line, after the word "subsection", to strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)"; in line 24, after "(d)", to strike out "with regard to service, 'wages' and 'net earnings from self-employment' "; on page 6, line 14, after the word "to", where it occurs the first time, to strike out " "2 80" " and insert " "2.76" "; in the same line, after the word "to", where it occurs the second time, to strike out " "2 00" " and insert " "2 07" "; in line 15, after the word "to", to strike out " "1 40" " and insert " "1.38" "; in line 22, before the word "by", to insert "and"; on page 7, line 12, after the word "pension" to insert: "as reduced pursuant to clause (i) or clause (ii) of this paragraph: *Provided, however,* That, in the case of any individual receiving or entitled to receive an annuity or pension on the day prior to the date of enactment of this proviso, the reductions required by this paragraph shall not operate to reduce the sum of (A) the retirement annuity or pension of the individual, (B) the spouse's annuity, if any, and (C) the benefits under the Social Security Act which the individual and his family receive or are entitled to receive on the basis of his wages, to an amount less than such sum was before the enactment of this paragraph.' "

On page 8, line 2, after the word "of", to strike out "400" and insert "350"; in line 7, after the word "to", to strike out " "sections" " and insert " "section"; in line 8, after the word "(b)", to strike out "(4)"; in line 9, after the word "to", where it occurs the first time, to strike out " "$4 10" " and insert " "$4 14" "; in line 10, before the word "and", to strike out " "$68" " and insert " "$69" "; in line 24, after "(f)" to insert "and (g) (2)"; on page 9, line 3, after the numeral "5", to strike out "(1)" and insert "(l)", in line 16, after the word " "she" " to strike out "and by substituting for the phrase "an annuity for each month equal to three-fourths of the employee's basic amount" the following: "a survivor's insurance annuity: *Provided, however,*" and insert "by striking out the phrase "three-fourths of"; and by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon, and by inserting after the colon the following. "; in line 24, after the word "subsection", to strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)", on page 10, line 1, after the word "the", to strike out "survivor's" and insert "widow's or widower's"; ine line 5, after the word "by", to strike out "substitute for the phrase "an annuity for each month equal to three-fourths of the employee's basic amount" the following: "a survivor's insurance annuity:" and insert "striking out the phrase "three-fourths of": and by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and inserting after the colon the following:"; in line 13, after the word "subsection", to strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)"; in line 14, after the word "the", to strike out "survivor's" and insert "widow's current", in line 19, after the word "phrase", to strike out " "an annuity for each month equal to one-half of the employee's basic amount' the following: 'a survivor's insurance annuity: *Provided, however,* That if the employee is survived by more than one child entitled to an annuity hereunder, each such child's annuity shall be (i) two-thirds of a survivor's insurance annuity plus (ii) one-third of a survivor's insurance annuity divided by the number of such children' " and insert " "one-half" the phrase "two-thirds." "

On page 11, line 6, after the word "phrase", to strike out " "an annuity for each month equal to one-half of the employee's basic amount" the phrase "a survivor's insurance annuity" " and insert " "one-half" the phrase "two-thirds" "; in line 10, after the word "by", to strike out "striking out all after the phrase 'whose death' and substituting the following: 'the same two or more children are entitled to annuities for a month under subsection (c), any application of each such child shall be deemed to be filed with respect to the death of only that one

of such employees from whom may be derived a survivor's insurance annuity for each child under subsection (c) in an amount equal to or in excess of that which may be derived from any other of such employees.'" and insert "substituting for the phrase "one-half" the phrase "two-thirds" "; in line 23, after the word "the", to strike out "word" and insert "phrase"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "'widow'" and insert "'widow.'", in line 24, after the word "this", to strike out "word" and insert "phrase', in the same line, after the word "appears" to insert "in the first sentence, and after the phrase "widow," wherever this phrase appears in the fourth sentence, and"; on page 12, line 3, after the word "sentence" to strike out "'twelve times the survivor's insurance annuity" for "eight times the employee's basic amount"; by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following: "Upon the death, on or after the first day of the month next following the month of enactment hereof of a completely or partially insured employee who will have died leaving a widow, widower, child, or parent who would on proper application therefor be entitled to an annuity under this section for the month in which such death occurred, there shall be paid a lump sum of four times the survivor's insurance annuity to the person or persons in the order provided in this paragraph"; by inserting before "would" in the fourth sentence thereof the following, "of twelve times the survivor's insurance annuity", by inserting in that sentence "widower," after the word "widow," wherever it appears, and by substituting in that sentence the phrase "eight times the survivor's insurance annuity" for the phrase "such lump sum" wherever it appears" and insert "for the word "eight" the word "ten"; on page 13, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "$400" and insert "$350"; in line 3, after the word "to", to strike out "other" and insert "others", in line 7, after the word "benefits", to strike out "paid" and insert "which", in line 8, after "(k)", to insert "(1)", in the same line, after the word "section", to insert "are paid", in line 14, after "(k)" to insert "(1)"; on page 14, line 7, to strike out "annuity" and insert "annuity"; after line 7, to insert,

"(3) In the case of any individual receiving or entitled to receive an annuity under this section on the day prior to the date of enactment of the provisions of this paragraph, the application of paragraph (2) of this subsection to such individual shall not operate to reduce the sum of (A) the annuity under this section of such individual, (B) the retirement annuity, if any, of such individual, and (C) the benefits under the Social Security Act which such individual receives or is entitled to receive, to an amount less than such sum was before the enactment of the provisions of this paragraph"

In line 22, after the word "section" to strike out "the total of annuities payable for a month with respect to the death of an employee, after any adjustment pursuant to subsection (g) (2) and after any deductions under subsection (1), is more than $40 and exceeds an amount equal to 2⅔ times a survivor's insurance annuity, such total of annuities shall, subject to the provisos in subsection (e) of section 3 and in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, be reduced proportionately to such amount or to $40, whichever is greater. Whenever according to the provisions of this section the total of annuities payable for a month with respect to the death of an employee is less than $20 such total shall, prior to any adjustment pursuant to subsection (g) (2) and prior to any deductions under subsection (1), be increased proportionately to $20" and insert "as to annuities, payable for a month with respect to the death of an employee, the total of annuities is more than $30 and exceeds either (a) $160, or (b) an amount equal to two and two-thirds times such employee's basic amount, whichever of such amounts is the lesser, such total of annuities shall, prior to any deductions under subsection (1), be reduced to such lesser amount or to $30, whichever is greater. Whenever such total of annuities is less than $14, such total shall, prior to any deductions under subsection (1), be increased to $14" After line 20, to strike out:

"SEC 21. (a) Subsection (i) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out subdivision (ii) of paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(ii) is under the age of 75 and will have earned more than $50 in "wages" or will have been charged with more than $50 in "net earnings from self-employment", or'

"(b) Such subsection (i) is further amended by striking out subdivision (iii) thereof and by redesignating subdivision (iv) as subdivision (iii)"

And in lieu thereof to insert:

"SEC 21. Subdivision (ii) of paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended, by substituting '$50' for '$25.'"

On page 17, after line 13, to strike out:

"(b) Paragraph (2) of the said subsection (k) is amended by changing '1950' to '1956', by inserting after the word 'awards' where it first appears the following, 'and in administering the proviso in section 3 (c) of this act', by substituting 'Federal Security Administrator' for 'Social Security Board', and by striking out from said paragraph (2) all after the phrase 'such legislative changes as' and substituting the following, 'would be necessary to place the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund in the same position in which it would have been if service as an employee after December 31, 1936, had been included in the term "employment" as defined in the Social Security Act and in the Federal Insurance Contributions Act'"

And in lieu thereof to insert:

"(b) Subsection (k) (2) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting the following

"'(2) (A) The Board and the Federal Security Administrator shall determine, no later than January 1, 1954, the amount which would place the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund (hereafter termed "trust fund") in the same position in which it would have been at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, if service as an employee after December 31, 1936, had been included in the term "employment" as defined in the Social Security Act and in the Federal Insurance Contributions Act.

"'(B) On January 1, 1954, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and at the close of each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, the Board and the Federal Security Administrator shall determine, and the Board shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for transfer from the railroad retirement account (hereafter termed "retirement account") to the trust fund, interest for such fiscal year at the rate specified in subparagraph (D) on the amount determined under subparagraph (A) less the sum of all offsets made under subparagraph (C).

"'(C) At the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Board and the Federal Security Administrator shall determine the amount, if any, which if added to or subtracted from the trust fund would place such trust fund in the same position in which it would have been if service as an employee after December 31, 1936, had been included in the term "employment" as defined in the Social Security Act and in the Federal Insurance Contributions Act. For the purposes of this subparagraph, the amount determined under subparagraph (A), less such offsets as have theretofore been made under this subparagraph, and the amount determined under subparagraph (B) for the fiscal year under consideration shall be deemed to be part of the trust fund Such determination shall be made no later than June 15, following the close of the fiscal year. If such amount is to be added to the trust fund, the Board shall, within 10 days after the determination, certify such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury for transfer from the retirement account to the trust fund, if such amount is to be subtracted from the trust fund, the Administrator shall, within 10 days after the determination, certify such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury for transfer from the trust fund to the retirement account. The amount so certified shall further include interest (at the rate determined in subparagraph (D) for the fiscal year under consideration) payable from the close of such fiscal year until the date of certification In the event the Administrator is required under the provisions of this subparagraph to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury an amount to be transferred to the retirement account from the trust fund, the Administrator, in lieu of such certification, may offset the amount determined under the first sentence of this subparagraph against the amount determined in subparagraph (A) as diminished by any prior offsets and the offset shall be made to be effective as of the first day of the fiscal year following the fiscal year under consideration

"'(D) For the purposes of subparagraphs (B) and (C), for any fiscal year, the rate of interest to be used shall be equal to the average rate of interest, computed as of May 31 preceding the close of such fiscal year, borne by all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt, except that where such average rate is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent, the rate of interest shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent next lower than such average rate

"'(E) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer to the Trust Fund from the Retirement Account or to the Retirement Account from the Trust Fund, as the case may be, such amounts as, from time to time, may be determined by the Board and the Federal Security Administrator pursuant to the provisions of subparagraphs (B) and (C) of this subsection, and certified by the Board or the Administrator for transfer from the Retirement Account or from the Trust Fund'"

On page 21, line 20, after the word "pension", to strike out "began For the purposes of subsections (b) and (1) (1) (iii) of this section, the term 'widow' shall include a woman who has been divorced from the employee if she (A) is the mother of his son or daughter, (B) legally adopted his son or daughter while she was married to him and while such son or daughter was under the age of 18, or (C) was married to him at the time both of them legally adopted a child under the age of 18; and if she received from the employee (pursuant to agreement or court order) at least one-half of her support at the time of the employee's death, and the child in her care referred to in subsection (b) is the child described in clauses (A), (B), and (C) entitled to a survivor's insurance annuity under subsection (c) with respect to the death of such employee;"." and insert "began'"; on page 22, line 14, after the word "uncle", to strike out "by substituting in subdivision (iii) for the phrase "shall have been wholly dependent upon and supported at the time of his death by' the phrase 'shall have received at least one-half of his support from'; by changing the semicolon after the phrase 'is claimed' in said subdivision (iii) to a period

and striking out the portion of the sentence following that phrase." and insert "and by amending subdivision (iii) to read as follows: '(iii) a "parent" shall have received, at the time of the death of the employee to whom the relationship of parent is claimed, at least one-half of his support from such employee.'."; on page 23, line 11, after the word "subsection", to strike out "(g)" and insert "(f); after line 24, to strike out:

"(c) Paragraph (6) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking '(a) after '209' and by inserting after the word 'Act', the following: ', and, in addition (i) "self-employment income" as defined in section 211 (b) of that act and (ii) wages deemed to have been paid under section 217 (a) of that act on account of military service which is not creditable under section 4 of this act.'"

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

"(c) Paragraph (6) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(6) The term "wages" shall mean wages as defined in section 209 of the Social Security Act (except that for the purposes of section 5 (1) (1) (ii) of this act such wages shall be determined without regard to subsection (a) of said sec. 209). In addition, the term shall include (i) "self-employment income" as defined in section 211 (b) of the Social Security Act (and in determining "self-employment income" the "net earnings from self-employment" shall be determined as provided in section 211 (a) of such act and changed to correspond with the provisions of section 203 (e) of such act), and (ii) wages deemed to have been paid under section 217 (a) of the Social Security Act on account of military service which is not creditable under section 4 of this act'"

On page 26, line 4, after the word "over", to strike out "$400" and insert "$350"; in line 18, after the word "quarters", to strike out "after" and insert "beginning with"; after line 23, to strike out:

"(g) Paragraph (10) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting the phrase '"survivor's insurance annuity"' for the phrase '"basic amount"' wherever this phrase appears; by substituting in subdivisions (i) and (ii) of said paragraph '$100' for '$75'; by substituting for '$250' in subdivision (i) the following: '$400 if wages are not included in the average monthly remuneration, or $300 if wages are included'; and by striking out from subdivision (i) all the language after the phrase 'plus (C)', up to and including the phrase 'or more', and by substituting for said language the following: '$1 for each of his years of service after 1936'; by substituting in said subdivision (i) '$20' for '$10' wherever the latter figures appear; by substituting in subdivision (ii) of said paragraph the phrase 'the survivor's insurance annuity' for the phrases 'the amount computed under his subdivision' and 'such amount'; by substituting '$35' for '$33.33', and for '$25' and substituting '$15' for '$13.33' and '$300' for '$250', and by striking out the phrase 'four-thirds of'."

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

"(g) Paragraph (10) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting in subdivision (i) for '$250' the following: '$350 if wages are not included in the average monthly remuneration, or $300 if wages are included'; by substituting in said subdivision (i) '$14' for '$10'; and by substituting '$300' for '$250' in subdivision (ii) thereof."

On page 28, line 8, after the numerals "1951", to insert "for services rendered after such date"; in line 10, after the word "figures" to strike out "$400" and insert "$350"; in line 19, after the word "of", to strike out "retirement and"; in line 20, after the word "the", to strike out "monthly compensation and average monthly remuneration" and insert "basic amount"; in line 22, after the word "recomputed", to strike out "but shall be increased to the next highest multiple of $1"; in line 24, after the numeral "3", to insert "4"; in line 25, after the word "act", to strike out "and the elimination of the language in section (3) (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act"; on page 29, line 2, after the word "part", to insert "on or", in the same line, after the word "the", to insert "date of"; after line 3, to strike out:

"(c) The amendments made by sections 4 and 21 with respect to 'wages' and 'net earnings from self-employment' shall not apply to 'wages' from service, or to 'net earnings from self-employment' in which an individual (other than a disability annuitant under the age of 65) in receipt of an annuity on the enactment date hereof was engaged on such date without forfeiting the annuity."

In line 11, to reletter the subsection from "(d)" to "(c)"; in line 13, after the word "occurring", to insert "on or"; in the same line, after the word "the", to insert "date of", after line 13, to strike out:

"(c) With respect to retirement and survivor annuities currently payable and awarded under the Railroad Retirement Act prior to the enactment of this act to, and with respect to the death of, individuals who have completed less than 10 years of service, and with respect to spouses of such individuals during such individuals' lifetime, the amendments made by this act shall apply in the same manner as to, and with respect to the death of, individuals who have completed 10 years of service."

After line 22, to insert:

"(d) In the case of any retirement or survivor annuity awarded under the Railroad Retirement Acts prior to the date of enactment of this act and currently payable, if such annuity was awarded to, or with respect to the death of, any individual who has completed less than 10 years of service, then the amendments made by this act shall apply with respect to such annuity as if such individual had met the requirement of 10 years of service which is imposed as a condition to benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended by this act In addition, the spouse of any such individual shall not, during such individual's lifetime, be barred from a spouse's annuity under such act by reason of the fact that such individual has completed less than 10 years of service.

"(e) Where the parent of a deceased employee has, prior to the date of enactment of this act, been awarded a survivor annuity under the railroad retirement acts which is currently payable, the entitlement of such parent to a survivor's annuity in accordance with the amendments made by this act shall be determined without regard to whether or not such employee died leaving a 'widow' or 'widower,' as defined in this act"

On page 31, line 8, after the word "the", to insert "month of"; in line 13, after the word "spouse", to insert "as used in this act", in line 15, after the word "under", to strike out "that" and insert "the Railroad Retirement"; in the same line, after the word "act", to insert "of 1935"; on page 32, after line 2, to strike out:

(j) All recertifications required by reason of the provisions of this act other than section 10 shall be made without application therefor. Recomputations pursuant to sections 9 and 10 of this act shall be made only upon application therefor in such manner and form, and filed within such time as the Railroad Retirement Board may prescribe."

And in lieu thereof to insert:

"(j) All recertifications by the Railroad Retirement Board required by reason of the provisions of this act other than section 10 shall be made without application therefor. Recertifications pursuant to section 10 of this act shall be made only upon application therefor in such manner and form and filed within such time as the Railroad Retirement Board may prescribe."

And after line 16, to insert:

"AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

"SEC 28. Section 1 (k) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of the first paragraph thereof the following: *"Provided further*, That any calendar day on which no remuneration is payable to or accrues to an employee solely because of the application to him of mileage or work restrictions agreed upon in schedule agreements between employers and employees or solely because he is standing by for or laying over between regularly assigned trips or tours of duty shall not be considered either a day of unemployment or a day of sickness

"SEC 29 Subsection (a-1) of section 4 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by striking out all of subsections (iii) and (iv) thereof

"SEC 30 The provisions of sections 28 and 29 of this act shall become effective with respect to registration periods beginning on and after January 1, 1952"

So as to make the bill read:

"Be it enacted, etc, That section 1 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting in the last sentence of subsection (f) thereof the phrase 'one hundred twenty-six' for the phrase 'fifty-four' and by adding after subsection (p) thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(q) The terms 'Social Security Act' and 'Social Security Act, as amended' shall mean the Social Security Act as amended in 1950."

"SEC 2. Subsection (a) of section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting in the first sentence thereof, after 'enactment date,' the following: 'and shall have completed 10 years of service,'; and by inserting in the first sentence of paragraph 5 of said subsection a period after the phrase 'regular employment' and striking out all of that sentence following that phrase.

"SEC 3 Subsection (c) of section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase 'sixty days', the phrase 'six months'

"SEC. 4. Section 4 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase 'sixty days' in subsection (k) thereof the phrase 'six months'

"SEC 5. Section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by adding after subsection (d) thereof the following new subsections:

"'(e) Spouse's annuity: The spouse of an individual, if—

"'(1) such individual has been awarded an annuity under subsection (a) or a pension under section 6 and has attained the age of 65, and

"'(ii) such spouse has attained the age of 65 or in the case of a wife, has in her care (individually or jointly with her husband) a child who, if her husband were then to die, would be entitled to a child's annuity under subsection (c) of section 5 of this act,

shall be entitled to a spouse's annuity equal to one-half of such individual's annuity or pension, but not more than $40 *Provided, however*, That if the annuity of the individual is awarded under paragraph 3 of subsection (a), the spouse's annuity shall be computed or recomputed as though such individual had been awarded the annuity to which he would have been entitled under paragraph 1 of said subsection: *Provided further*, That, if the annuity of the individual is awarded pursuant to a joint and survivor

election, the spouse's annuity shall be computed or recomputed as though such individual had not made a joint and survivor election: *And provided further*, That any spouse's annuity shall be reduced by the amount of any annuity and the amount of any monthly insurance benefit, other than a wife's or husband's insurance benefit, to which such spouse is entitled, or on proper application would be entitled, under subsection (a) of this section or subsection (d) of section 5 of this act or section 202 of the Social Security Act, except that if such spouse is disentitled to a wife's or husband's insurance benefit, or has had such benefit reduced, by reason of subsection (k) of section 202 of the Social Security Act, the reduction pursuant to this third proviso shall be only in the amount by which such spouse's monthly insurance benefit under said act exceeds the wife's or husband's insurance benefit to which such spouse would have been entitled under that act but for said subsection (k).

"'(f) For the purposes of this act, the term "spouse" shall mean the wife or husband of a retirement annuitant or pensioner who (i) was married to such annuitant or pensioner for a period of not less than 3 years immediately preceding the day on which the application for a spouse's annuity is filed, or is the parent of such annuitant's or pensioner's son or daughter, if, as of the day on which the application for a spouse's annuity is filed, such wife or husband and such annuitant or pensioner were members of the same household, or such wife or husband was receiving regular contributions from such annuitant or pensioner toward her or his support, or such annuitant or pensioner has been ordered by any court to contribute to the support of such wife or husband; and (ii) in the case of a husband, was receiving at least one-half of his support from his wife at the time his wife's retirement annuity or pension began.

"'(g) The spouse's annuity provided in subsection (e) shall, with respect to any month, be subject to the same provisions of subsection (d) as the individual's annuity, and, in addition, the spouse's annuity shall not be payable for any month if the individual's annuity is not payable for such month (or, in the case of a pensioner, would not be payable if the pension were an annuity) by reason of the provisions of said subsection (d). Such spouse's annuity shall cease at the end of the month preceding the month in which (i) the spouse or the individual dies, (ii) the spouse and the individual are absolutely divorced, or (iii), in the case of a wife under age 65, she no longer has in her care a child who, if her husband were then to die, would be entitled to an annuity under subsection (c) of section 5 of this act.'

"SEC 6 Subsection (a) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by changing '2 40' to '2 76', '1 80' to '2 07', and '1.20' to '1.38'; and by striking out the phrase 'next 1 50' and substituting for said phrase the following 'remainder of his "monthly compensation."'

"SEC. 7 Subsection (b) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting (in each instance in the parenthetic phrase of par (1)) 'his "monthly compensation"' for '$300'; and by striking out all of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following paragraph:

"'The retirement annuity or pension of an individual, and the annuity of his spouse, if any, shall be reduced, beginning with the month in which such individual is, or on proper application would be, entitled to an old-age insurance benefit under the Social Security Act, as follows: (i) in the case of the individual's retirement annuity, by that portion of such annuity which is based on his years of service and compensation before 1937, or by the amount of such old age insurance benefit, whichever is less, (ii) in the case of the individual's pension, by the amount of such old-age insurance benefit, and (iii) in the case of the spouse's annuity, to one-half the individual's retirement annuity or pension as reduced pursuant to clause (i) or clause (ii) of this paragraph: *Provided, however*, That, in the case of any individual receiving or entitled to receive an annuity or pension on the day prior to the date of enactment of this proviso, the reductions required by this paragraph shall not operate to reduce the sum of (A) the retirement annuity or pension of the individual, (B) the spouse's annuity, if any, and (C) the benefits under the Social Security Act which the individual and his family receive or are entitled to receive on the basis of his wages, to an amount less than such sum was before the enactment of this paragraph.'

"SEC. 8. Subsection (c) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting in the last sentence thereof after '$300' the following 'through the calendar year 1951, and in excess of $350 thereafter,'.

"SEC 9 Subsection (c) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out the phrase 'and not less than 5 years of service'; by changing the phrase 'subsection 2 (a) (3)' to 'section 2 (a) 3 or the last paragraph of section 3 (b)'; by changing '$3.60' to '$4 14', and '$60' to '$69'; and by changing the period at the end of the subsection to a colon and inserting after the colon the following: *'Provided, however*, That if for any entire month in which an annuity accrues and is payable under this act the annuity to which an employee is entitled under this act (or would have been entitled except for a reduction pursuant to sec 2 (a) 3 or a joint and survivor election), together with his or her spouse's annuity, if any, or the total of survivor annuities under this act deriving from the same employee, is less than the amount, or the additional amount, which would have been payable to all persons for such month under the Social Security Act (deeming completely and partially insured individuals to be fully and currently insured, respectively, and disregarding any possible deductions under subsec (f) and (g) (2) of sec 203 thereof) if such employee's service as an employee after December 31, 1936, were included in the term "employment" as defined in that act and quarters of coverage were determined in accordance with section 5 (1) (4) of this act, such annuity or annuities, shall be increased proportionately to a total of such amount or such additional amount'

"SEC 10. Section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out subsection (h) thereof.

"SEC. 11. Subsection (i) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by redesignating it as subsection (h).

"SEC 12 Subsection (a) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting 'and Widower's' after 'Widow's'; by inserting 'or widower' after 'widow', by inserting 'or his' after 'her', by inserting 'or he' after 'she', by striking out the phrase 'three-fourths of'; and by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon, and by inserting after the colon the following: *'Provided, however*, That if in the month preceding the employee's death the spouse of such employee was entitled to a spouse's annuity under subsection (e) of section 2 in an amount greater than the widow's or widower's insurance annuity, the widow's or widower's insurance annuity shall be increased to such greater amount.'

"SEC. 13. Subsection (b) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out the phrase 'three-fourths of'; and by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and inserting after the colon the following: *'Provided, however*, That if in the month preceding the employee's death the spouse of such employee was entitled to a spouse's annuity under subsection (e) of section 2 in an amount greater than the widow's current insurance annuity, the widow's current insurance annuity shall be increased to such greater amount'

"SEC. 14 Subsection (c) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase 'one-half' the phrase 'two-thirds'

"SEC 15 Subsection (d) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting, ', no widower,' after 'widow'; and by substituting for the phrase 'one-half' the phrase 'two-thirds.'

"SEC 16 Subsection (e) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase 'one-half' the phrase 'two-thirds'

"SEC 17 Subsection (f) (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting 'widower,' after the phrase 'widow,' where this phrase first appears in the first sentence, and after the phrase 'widow,' wherever this phrase appears in the fourth sentence, and by substituting in the first sentence for the word 'eight' the word 'ten.'

"SEC 18 Subsection (f) (2) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting ', widower,' after the word 'widow' wherever this word appears; by inserting 'or her' after the words 'his' and 'him' wherever these words appear, by inserting after '$300' the following, 'through the calendar year 1951 and $350 thereafter'; by inserting immediately before ', or to others' in the first sentence the following ', and to others deriving from him or her, during his or her life,', by changing the period at the end of said subsection to a comma and by inserting after the comma the following 'except that the deductions of the benefits which, pursuant to subsection (k) (1) of this section, are paid under section 202 of the Social Security Act, during the life of the employee to him or to her and to others deriving from him or her, shall be limited to such portions of such benefits as are payable solely by reason of the inclusion of service as an employee in "employment" pursuant to said subsection (k) (1)'

"SEC 19 Subsection (g) (2) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) If an individual is entitled to more than one annuity for a month under this section, such individual shall be entitled only to that one of such annuities for a month which is equal to or exceeds any other such annuity. If an individual is entitled to an annuity for a month under this section and is entitled, or would be so entitled on proper application therefor, for such month to an insurance benefit under section 202 of the Social Security Act, the annuity of such individual for such month under this section shall be only in the amount by which it exceeds such insurance benefit. If an individual is entitled to any annuity for a month under this section and also to a retirement annuity, the annuity of such individual for a month under this section shall be only in the amount by which it exceeds such retirement annuity.

"'(3) In the case of any individual receiving or entitled to receive an annuity under this section on the day prior to the date of enactment of the provisions of this paragraph, the application of paragraph (2) of this subsection to such individual shall not operate to reduce the sum of (A) the an-

nuity under this section of such individual, (B) the retirement annuity, if any, of such individual, and (C) the benefits under the Social Security Act which such individual receives or is entitled to receive, to an amount less than such sum was before the enactment of the provisions of this paragraph.'

"SEC 20. Subsection (h) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(h) Maximum and minimum annuity totals Whenever according to the provisions of this section as to annuities, payable for a month with respect to the death of an employee, the total of annuities is more than $30 and exceeds either (a) $160, or (b) an amount equal to two and two-thirds times such employee's basic amount, whichever of such amounts is the lesser, such total of annuities shall, prior to any deductions under subsection (i), be reduced to such lesser amount or to $30, whichever is greater. Whenever such total of annuities is less than $14, such total shall, prior to any deductions under subsection (i), be increased to $14.'"

SEC 21 Subdivision (ii) of paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended, by substituting "$50" for "$25."

SEC 22 Subsection (j) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out all of the third sentence thereof after the phrase "the month in which" (including the proviso), and substituting the following "eligibility therefor was otherwise acquired, but not earlier than the first day of the sixth month before the month in which the application was filed."

SEC 23 (a) Paragraph (1) of subsection (k) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting "(i)" after the word "determining" and by inserting in said paragraph after the word "Act" where it first appears the following: "to an employee who will have completed less than 10 years of service and to others deriving from him or her during his or her life and with respect to his or her death, and lump-sum death payments with respect to the death of such employee, and (ii) insurance benefits with respect to the death of an employee who will have completed 10 years of service"; by striking in said paragraph after "1947," the following: "to a widow, parent, or surviving child,"; by inserting before the word "occurring" the phrase "of such an employee", by inserting after the phrase "such date" the following ", and for the purposes of section 203 of that act", by substituting in said paragraph "210 (a) (10)" for "209 (b) (9)", and by inserting at the end of such paragraph (1) the following sentence "In the application of the Social Security Act pursuant to this paragraph to service as an employee, all service as defined in section 1 (c) of this act shall be deemed to have been performed within the United States."

"(b) Subsection (k) (2) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting the following:

"'(2) A) The Board and the Federal Security Administrator shall determine, no later than January 1, 1954, the amount which would place the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund (hereafter termed "Trust Fund") in the same position in which it would have been at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, if service as an employee after December 31, 1936, had been included in the term "employment" as defined in the Social Security Act and in the Federal Insurance Contributions Act.

"'(B) On January 1, 1954, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and at the close of each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, the Board and the Federal Security Administrator shall determine, and the Board shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for transfer from the Railroad Retirement Account (hereafter termed "Retirement Account") to the Trust Fund, interest for such fiscal year at the rate specified in subparagraph (D) on the amount determined under subparagraph (A) less the sum of all offsets made under subparagraph (C).

"'(C) At the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Board and the Federal Security Administrator shall determine the amount, if any, which if added to or subtracted from the Trust Fund would place such Trust Fund in the same position in which it would have been if service as an employee after December 31, 1936, had been included in the term "employment" as defined in the Social Security Act and in the Federal Insurance Contributions Act For the purposes of this subparagraph, the amount determined under subparagraph (A), less such offsets as have theretofore been made under this subparagraph, and the amount determined under subparagraph (B) for the fiscal year under consideration shall be deemed to be part of the Trust Fund. Such determination shall be made no later than June 15, following the close of the fiscal year. If such amount is to be added to the Trust Fund, the Board shall, within 10 days after the determination, certify such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury for transfer from the Retirement Account to the Trust Fund; if such amount is to be subtracted from the Trust Fund, the Administrator shall, within 10 days after the determination, certify such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury for transfer from the Trust Fund to the Retirement Account The amount so certified shall further include interest (at the rate determined in subparagraph (D) for the fiscal year under consideration) payable from the close of such fiscal year until the date of certification In the event the Administrator is required under the provisions of this subparagraph to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury an amount to be transferred to the Retirement Account from the Trust Fund, the Administrator, in lieu of such certification, may offset the amount determined under the first sentence of this subparagraph against the amount determined in subparagraph (A) as diminished by any prior offsets and the offset shall be made to be effective as of the first day of the fiscal year following the fiscal year under consideration

"'(D) For the purposes of subparagraphs (B) and (C), for any fiscal year, the rate of interest to be used shall be equal to the average rate of interest, computed as of May 31, preceding the close of such fiscal year, borne by all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt, except that where such average rate is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent, the rate of interest shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent next lower than such average rate.

"'(E) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer to the Trust Fund from the Retirement Account or to the Retirement Account from the Trust Fund, as the case may be, such amounts as, from time to time, may be determined by the Board and the Federal Security Administrator pursuant to the provisions of subparagraphs (B) and (C) of this subsection, and certified by the Board or the Administrator for transfer from the Retirement Account or from the Trust Fund.'

"SEC. 24. (a) (1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting '"widower",' after '"widow",' where this word first appears, by substituting '216 (c), (e), and (g)' for '209 (j) and (k)', and by substituting '202 (h)' for '202 (f)'

"(2) The said paragraph (1) is further amended by striking out subdivision (i) thereof and inserting in lieu of such subdivision the following:

"'(i) a "widow" or "widower" shall have been living with the employee at the time of the employee's death, a widower shall have received at least one-half of his support from his wife employee at the time of her death or he shall have received at least one-half of his support from his wife employee at the time her retirement annuity or pension began.'

"(3) The said paragraph (1) is further amended by inserting in subdivision (ii) after the phrase 'such death' the following: 'by other than a step parent, grand parent, aunt, or uncle', and by amending subdivision (iii) to read as follows: '(iii) a "parent" shall have received, at the time of the death of the employee to whom the relationship of parent is claimed, at least one-half of his support from such employee.'.

"(4) Paragraph (1) of the said subsection (1) is further amended by substituting for all the matter which follows subdivision (iii) the following 'A "widow" or "widower" shall be deemed to have been living with the employee if the conditions set forth in section 216 (h) (2) or (3), whichever is applicable, of the Social Security Act are fulfilled. A "child" shall be deemed to have been dependent upon a parent if the conditions set forth in section 202 (d) (3), (4), or (5) of the Social Security Act are fulfilled (a partially insured mother being deemed currently incured). In determining for purposes of this section and subsection (f) of section 2 whether an applicant is the wife, husband, widow, widower, child, or parent of an employee as claimed, the rules set forth in section 216 (h) (1) of the Social Security Act shall be applied;'.

"(b) Paragraph (4) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting after the table the following: 'If upon computation of the compensation quarters of coverage in accordance with the above table an employee is found to lack a completely or partially insured status which he would have if compensation paid in a calendar year were presumed to have been paid in equal proportions with respect to all months in the year in which the employee will have been in service as an employee, such presumption shall be made.'

"(c) Paragraph (6) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(6) The term "wages" shall mean wages as defined in section 209 of the Social Security Act (except that for the purposes of section 5 (i) (1) (ii) of this act such wages shall be determined without regard to subsection (a) of said section 209). In addition, the term shall include (i) "self-employment income" as defined in section 211 (b) of the Social Security Act (and in determining "self-employment income" the "net earnings from self-employment" shall be determined as provided in section 211 (a) of such act and charged to correspond with the provisions of section 203 (e) of such act), and (ii) wages deemed to have been paid under section 217 (a) of the Social Security Act on account of military service which is not creditable under section 4 of this act.'

"(d) Paragraph (7) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting before the word 'had' the phrase 'completed 10 years of service and will have'; and by inserting in the parenthetical phrase in subdivision (1), after the word 'quarter' the following: 'which is not a quarter of coverage and.'

"(e) Paragraph (8) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of

1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(8) An employee will have been "partially insured" at the time of his death, whether before or after the enactment of this section, if it appears to the satisfaction of the Board that he will have completed 10 years of service and will have had (i) a current connection with the railroad industry; and (ii) six or more quarters of coverage in the period ending with the quarter in which he will have died or in which a retirement annuity will have begun to accrue to him and beginning with the third calendar year next preceding the year in which such event occurs.'

"(f) Paragraph (9) of subsection (i) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by changing the language before the first proviso to read as follows:

"'(9) An employee's "average monthly remuneration" shall mean the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the sum of (i) the compensation paid to him after 1936 and before the quarter in which he will have died, eliminating any excess over $300 for any calendar month through 1951, and any excess over $350 for any calendar month after 1951, and (ii) if such compensation for any calendar year is less than $3,600 and the average monthly remuneration computed on compensation alone is less than $300 and the employee has earned in such calendar year "wages" as defined in paragraph (6) hereof, such wages, in an amount not to exceed the difference between the compensation for such year and $3,600, by (B) three times the number of quarters elapsing after 1936 and before the quarter in which he will have died'"; by inserting in the second proviso after the word 'quarter' the following: 'which is not a quarter of coverage and'; and by changing the period at the end of said proviso to a colon and adding the following: *'And provided further*, That if the exclusion from the divisor of all quarters beginning with the first quarter in which the employee was completely insured and had attained the age of 65 and the exclusion from the dividend of all compensation and wages with respect to such quarters would result in a higher average monthly remuneration, such quarters, compensation and wages shall be so excluded.'

"(g) Paragraph (10) of subsection (i) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting in subdivision (i) for '$250' the following: '$350 if wages are not included in the average monthly remuneration, or $300 if wages are included'; by substituting in said subdivision (i) '$14' for '$10'; and by substituting '$300' for '$250' in subdivision (ii) thereof.

"SEC. 25. Section 17 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out 'subsection (b) of.'

"AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

"SEC. 26 Sections 1500, 1501 (a), 1510, and 1520 of the Railroad Retirement Tax Act are amended, effective with respect to compensation paid after December 31, 1951, for services rendered after such date, by substituting for the figures '$300', wherever they appear in said sections, the figures '$350.'

"EFFECTIVE DATES

"SEC. 27 (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided the amendments made by this act shall take effect with respect to benefits accruing under the Railroad Retirement Acts and the Social Security Act after the last day of the month in which this act is enacted, irrespective of when service or employment occurred or compensation or wages were earned: *Provided, however*, That in the recomputation pursuant to this act of survivor annuities heretofore awarded, the basic amount shall not be recomputed.

"(b) The amendments made by sections 3, 4, and 22 of this act shall apply to benefits awarded in whole or in part on or after the date of enactment of this act.

"(c) The amendments made by sections 17 and 18 of this act shall take effect with respect of deaths occurring on or after the date of enactment of this act.

"(d) In the case of any retirement or survivor annuity awarded under the railroad retirement acts prior to the date of enactment of this act and currently payable, if such annuity was awarded to, or with respect to the death of, any individual who has completed less than 10 years of service, then the amendments made by this act shall apply with respect to such annuity as if such individual had met the requirement of 10 years of service which is imposed as a condition to benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended by this act. In addition, the spouse of any such individual shall not, during such individual's lifetime, be barred from a spouse's annuity under such act by reason of the fact that such individual has completed less than 10 years of service.

"(e) Where the parent of a deceased employee has, prior to the date of enactment of this act, been awarded a survivor annuity under the railroad retirement acts which is currently payable, the entitlement of such parent to a survivor's annuity in accordance with the amendments made by this act shall be determined without regard to whether or not such employee died leaving a "widow" or "widower," as defined in this act.

"(f) All joint and survivor annuities heretofore and hereafter awarded shall, notwithstanding the provisions of law under which the election of the joint and survivor annuity was made, be increased to the amount that would have been payable had no election been made, if the spouse for whom the election was made predeceased the individual who made the election; such increased annuity shall, subject to the provisions of section 2 (c) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, begin to accrue on the first of the calendar month following the calendar month in which the spouse died but not before the calendar month next following the month of enactment hereof.

"(g) All pensions due in months following the first calendar month after the month of enactment hereof, shall be increased by 15 percent

"(h) The increase in retirement annuities provided by this act shall apply also to annuities heretofore awarded under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935, and the term "spouse" as used in this act shall include the wife or husband of an employee who has been awarded an annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935. The provisions of this act shall not apply to annuities heretofore paid under the railroad retirement acts in lump sums equal to their commuted values.

"(i) The annuity of the spouse of an employee who has been awarded an annuity under section 3 (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 or under section 2 (a) 2 (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 prior to its amendment by Public Law 572, Seventy-ninth Congress, shall, subject to the provisions of this act, be one-half the annuity such employee would have received had the annuity been awarded at age 65.

"(j) All recertifications by the Railroad Retirement Board required by reason of the provisions of this act other than section 10 shall be made without application therefor. Recertifications pursuant to section 10 of this act shall be made only upon application therefor in such manner and form, and filed within such time as the Railroad Retirement Board may prescribe.

"AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

"SEC. 28. Section 1 (k) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of the first paragraph thereof the following: *'Provided further*, That any calendar day on which no remuneration is payable to or accrues to an employee solely because of the application to him of mileage or work restrictions agreed upon in schedule agreements between employers and employees or solely because he is standing by for or laying over between regularly assigned trips or tours of duty shall not be considered either a day of unemployment or a day of sickness.'

"SEC. 29. Subsection (a-1) of section 4 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by striking out all of subsections (iii) and (iv) thereof.

"SEC. 30. The provisions of sections 28 and 29 of this act shall become effective with respect to registration periods beginning on and after January 1, 1952."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. CASE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the suggestion of the absence of a quorum may be withdrawn and that the order for the call of the roll may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendments to the bill having been agreed to en bloc, the question is, Are there any further amendments to be offered to the bill?

If there are no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1347) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and for other purposes."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S 467. An act to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota; and

S. 509. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718d), as amended.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1335) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, Mr. BURNSIDE, and Mr. REES of Kansas were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S 537 An act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934;

S 1450. An act to provide for the exchange of certain lands owned by the United States of America for certain privately owned lands;

H R 732. An act for the relief of Konstontios N Bellos;

H R 782. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Siegfried Oberdorfer;

H R 794. An act for the relief of Arthur E. Hackett,

H R 824. An act for the relief of Luisa Monti,

H R 1087. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," to empower the courts to remit or mitigate forfeitures under the Indian liquor laws;

H R 1100 An act for the relief of Eugenio Bellini,

H R 1119 An act for the relief of Mario DiFilippo,

H R 1252 An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs Miroslav Kudrat;

H R 1413 An act for the relief of Franz Geyling,

H R 1596 An act for the relief of N H. Kelley, Bernice Kelley, Clyde D. Farquhar, and Gladys Farquhar,

H R 1696 An act for the relief of Jack Warner and family;

H R 1908 An act for the relief of Helena Jange Chinn,

H R 2210 An act for the relief of Hye Pah Kung;

H R 2322 An act to authorize the improvement of East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla ,

H R 2684. An act to provide for the sale, transfer, or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida,

H R 3221 An act for the relief of Joji Ikeda, a minor,

H R 3424 An act for the relief of Yumi Horiuchi,

H R 3430 An act for the relief of the estate of Nora B Kennedy, deceased, and Mrs Ann R Norton;

H R 4154 An act for the relief of the estate of Jake Jones, deceased,

H R 4205 An act to provide retirement benefits for the Chief of the Dental Division of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, and for other purposes;

H R 4270 An act for the relief of the estate of Jennie Gayle, deceased;

H R 4271 An act for the relief of Mr and Mrs Richard G Adams and legal guardian of Dorothy Margaret Adams;

H R 4550 An act to provide for the control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, and for other purposes;

H R 4693. An act to amend section 77, subsection (c) (3), of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended,

H R 4740 An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

H R 4931. An act for the relief of Lewyt Corp ; and

H R 5054. An act making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 15, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S 537 An act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934, and

S 1450. An act to provide for the exchange of certain lands owned by the United States of America for certain privately owned lands.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON RAILROAD RETIREMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there is a companion measure to the bill just passed, Senate Concurrent Resolution 51, setting up a joint Senate-House committee to study the railroad retirement fund and the relationship between that fund and the social-security system and such changes as may be needed in the railroad retirement system and the social-security system. That concurrent resolution has been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

I have talked with the chairman of that committee, and it is my understanding that it is acceptable to the chairman of the committee that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the concurrent resolution. If unanimous consent to that effect is obtained—and I now make the request—it is my purpose to have stricken from the concurrent resolution the provision authorizing an expenditure in that connection, and then to arrange to have the funds taken care of by later action of the Committee on Rules and Administration

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr President, as I understand the concurrent resolution, it provides that a joint committee consisting of three members of the House Committee on Education and Labor and three members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be designated to study the railroad retirement legislation. The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration because the concurrent resolution carries an authorization of an expenditure of $50,000. I would have no objection if we could have an understanding that the part of the concurrent resolution authorizing the expenditure of $50,000 be stricken from the measure; and that matter can be taken up later.

However, insofar as creating the joint committee is concerned, I have no objection at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask whether this matter comes subject to objection.

Mr. HAYDEN. The question is on giving unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from the further consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That request has been made.

Mr. HAYDEN. I wish to have an understanding arrived at that if the committee is discharged from the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, the provision of the concurrent resolution authorizing the expenditure of $50,000 from the contingent funds of the House and the Senate will be stricken out.

Mr DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will my colleague yield at this point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN Let me say that I think this is a highly laudable undertaking, I think such a joint committee is absolutely necessary. Almost everyone is aware of the fact that there has been a difference of opinion between the operating personnel and the nonoperating personnel of the railroads, and we have the question of how high the rates in the tax bill should go, and what the proper base should be, in view of the additional burden imposed upon the floor.

I have said before that I think an adequate staff of actuaries should be appointed to look into this matter, as well as into the social-security system. Such a proposal was made a few years ago, but the proposed committee was never created. The appointment of such a committee is overdue at the present time, because I doubt very much whether we can carry on a program of this magnitude and not court disaster unless we can ascertain whether the plan is on good ground.

I say to my colleague from Illinois that I think this is a very worth-while undertaking, and I believe it should have been begun long ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr President, I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois a question

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to have the Senator from Georgia do so.

Mr GEORGE Does the concurrent resolution call for an investigation of the social-security system?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Only insofar as it relates to the railroad-retirement system. The study would be centered primarily upon railroad retirement.

Mr. GEORGE. It is not intended, is it, to have a review of the Social Security Act?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Only insofar as it touches railroad retirement.

Mr. GEORGE. The social-security system does not affect the railroad-retirement system at all, as those systems now stand.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, not as they now stand, except that there is under the present act a correlation with social security in the computation of survivor benefits and a possibility that a person may obtain dual benefits by qualifying both under the Railroad Retirement Act and also under the Social Security Act, so as to receive benefits under both acts.

Mr. GEORGE. That would be true; but the two systems are not interlocked in any way.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. However, it may well be that economies for both the systems could be obtained if we could reduce the amount of the

payments which constitute dual benefits.

It is also true that in the amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act which has been adopted in the bill just passed, workers employed for less than 10 years under the Railroad Retirement Act will, if Senate bill 1347 becomes a law, be transferred to Social Security and will receive, not railroad-retirement benefits but social-security benefits, and the social-security system in turn will have turned over to it the contributions which the workers and employers would have made to social security had they been originally under it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if there is to be a study of the Social Security Act as such, then certainly members of the committees of the House and of the Senate having jurisdiction of that subject ought to be on this committee, if it is to be a joint committee study of the subject.

Mr DOUGLAS. I may say we have this problem of split jurisdiction, in that the Senate Finance Committee and its corresponding committee in the House have, of course, supervision and jurisdiction over the social-security system. The railroad-retirement system on the other hand is handled by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

This is primarily a study of the railroad-retirement system, and not a study of the social-security system. Therefore, we thought it proper to have the study conducted by the committees which have jurisdiction. But we can say this, that wherever changes are considered in the social-security system, of course, the Senate Finance Committee and the corresponding committee of the House will be consulted. We do not intend to move without consulting those bodies.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to have that understood, Mr. President.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. I have no objection to a study by the two labor committees. The Committees on Labor and Education, as I understand, will conduct the studies.

Mr. DOUGLAS The parallel committee in the House is the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, both the House Ways and Means and Finance Committees will be engaged in a further study of social security in 1952, also, and I have no objection if it touches only incidentally the social-security system in the way the Senator describes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do we have the understanding, or an assurance, by the Senator from Illinois, agreeing to the suggestion made by the Senator from Arizona before consent is given, that the $50,000 appropriation feature will be stricken by amendment, so that that may be considered later, and separately by the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be very happy to give that assurance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a unanimous consent request to discharge the Committee on Rules and Administration from the further consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 51. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution (S Con. Res. 51).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 51) establishing a Joint Committee on Rail-Road Retirement Legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I now ask that section 4 (b), on pages 3 and 4 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 51 be stricken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois to amend the concurrent resolution as indicated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the resolution (S. Con. Res. 51), as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee on railroad retirement legislation, hereinafter called the "joint committee," to be composed of three members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and to be appointed by the chairman of that committee, and three members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and to be appointed by the chairman of that committee Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee, and it is hereby authorized and directed, to make a full and complete factfinding study and investigation of the Railroad Retirement Act, and of such related problems as it may deem proper, with a view toward ascertaining what changes should be made in such act. The joint committee shall determine the scope of such study and investigation, without limitation thereon, and the following shall be given consideration:

1. The character and amount of present benefits and the estimated cost of providing such benefits.

2. The existing relationships between the system established by the Railroad Retirement Act and the old-age and survivors insurance system.

3. The changes that should be made in the character and amount of benefits to be provided workers subject to the Railroad Retirement Act and the estimated cost of providing such benefits.

4. Any changes that should be made in the existing relationships between the system established by the Railroad Retirement Act and the old-age and survivors insurance system with a view to simplifying administration, eliminating inequities and anomalies as regards benefits to workers whose earnings are included in whole or in part under either system, and strengthening the financial base for benefits to be provided under one system without impairing the financial base underlying benefits provided under the other system.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-second Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-second Congress, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable and, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 503 (B) OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3298) to amend section 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I, for a few moments, wish to discuss this bill, and first to offer on behalf of the committee an amendment which is made necessary by a mistake in the original title of this bill. The title of the act should be amended to read: "An act to amend section 303 (c) and section 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title will be amended, after the bill is passed. The Senator may send the amendment to the desk.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am sure this bill does not need a great deal of discussion, and I shall be very brief in my remarks concerning it. The committee report on the bill describes exactly what this bill is designed to accomplish. First, it provides a statutory definition of a "prescription" drug. It expressly forbids the sale of prescription drugs without a prescription. It specifies how prescription drugs are to be labeled, both at the time of interstate shipment and at the time of ultimate dispensing, and it prohibits unauthorized refilling of prescriptions for them. In other words I may say to the Senate that the purpose of this bill is to tighten up the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, insofar as it pertains to prescription drugs containing habit-forming and dangerous ingredients.

Under the present law there is some ambiguity as to "prescription drugs," which has a particular legend to it. We

add a cautionary legend to that label. There has been a ruling of the Administrator which has caused great confusion in the drug trade, both in the dispensing areas and in the manufacturing areas. This bill clarifies that point of law.

Further than that, it provides for more express control over dangerous drugs and habit-forming drugs. I should like to remind the Senate that one of the serious problems of today grows out of the use of the so-called phenolbarbital drugs. This bill provides that no such drug can be sold without a prescription. There may be a refill of a prescription provided authorization is given by the physician. It strengthens the hand of the Food and Drug Administration in the control of this very serious problem which has repeatedly been brought to the attention of the American people.

I might also say, Mr. President, that all the groups interested in amending the Food and Drug Act for the purpose of improving it and strengthening it have joined together in support of the measure. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, after extensive hearings. It was passed by the House of Representatives after extensive hearings before the House committee and after debate on the floor of the House.

I am convinced that the measure, if enacted, will provide greater protection to the public health. It certainly will dissolve and remove from the area of conflict and debate many regulations and administrative rulings on the part of the Food and Drug Administration. The bill provides for better control over the shipment in interstate commerce of habit-forming and dangerous drugs. It will clothe the Food and Drug Administration with authority to effectuate a more meaningful control of some of the preparations which have been a cause of injury to the public health.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, as many Members of the Senate are aware, received some of his early technical training in South Dakota. His distinguished father established a drug store in that State, and his brother now operates it. I should like to ask if the members of the drug trade generally were aware of the consideration of this bill by the committee.

Mr HUMPHREY. Indeed, they were, and they were all given adequate opportunity to testify. The National Association of Retail Druggists, the American Pharmaceutical Association, the American Medical Association, the American Proprietary Association—every association in the profession of pharmacy and medicine was permitted to testify and did testify in support of the bill.

Mr. CASE. In the hearings held by the Senate committee?

Mr HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. I believe the Senator has said that the bill comes before the Senate with the unanimous support of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendments.

The amendments were, on page 3, line 4, after the word "by", to strike out "mail or otherwise without examination of the patient" and insert "mail"; in line 11, after the word "the", to strike out "production" and insert "protection"; in line 20, after the word "sentence", to strike out "or any other statement which represents or implies that the dispensing of the drug without the prescription of a licensed practitioner"; on page 4, after line 6, to insert:

SEC. 2 Subsection (c) of section 303 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "or (4) for having violated section 301 (b), (c) or (k) by failure to comply with section 502 (f) in respect to an article received in interstate commerce to which neither section 503 (a) nor section 503 (b) (1) is applicable, if the delivery or proffered delivery was made in good faith and the labeling at the time thereof contained the same directions for use and warning statements as were contained in the labeling at the time of such receipt of such article."

And in line 19, to change the section number from "2" to "3."

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to offer an amendment with regard to changing the title of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER That does not have to be done at this time.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to amend the title so as to read "An act to amend sections 303 (c) and 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in order that Members of the Senate may have a full understanding of the measure, I ask unanimous consent that the committee report, which is very descriptive of the bill and its purposes, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 946) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to whom was referred the bill (H R. 3298) to amend section 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

(1) On page 3, line 5, strike out the words "or otherwise without examination of the patient" and insert in lieu thereof a comma.

(2) On page 3, lines 19–22, strike out the words "or any other statement which represents or implies that the dispensing of the drug without the prescription of a licensed practitioner is prohibited."

(3) On page 4, between lines 5 and 6, insert a new section 2, to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 303 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period a semicolon and the following: 'or (4) for having violated section 301 (b), (c), or (k) by failure to comply with section 502 (f) in respect to an article received in interstate commerce to which neither section 503 (a) nor section 503 (b) (1) is applicable, if the delivery or proffered delivery was made in good faith and the labeling at the time thereof contained the same directions for use and warning statements as were contained in the labeling at the time of such receipt of such article'."

On page 4, line 6, strike out the figure "2" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "3."

INTRODUCTION

This bill amends the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to deal more directly and realistically with the labeling and dispensing of drugs that may be sold only upon the prescription of licensed practitioners. It has a twofold objective: (1) to protect the public from abuses in the sale of potent prescription drugs; and (2) to relieve retail pharmacists and the public from burdensome and unnecessary restrictions on the dispensing of drugs that are safe for use without the supervision of a physician. The committee believes that the bill, as amended, will serve to eliminate much confusion and dissatisfaction caused by ambiguities in the present provisions of the act, and will benefit drug manufacturers, retail druggists, medical practitioners, and the public.

In its consideration of this bill, the committee has had the benefit of careful study of its provisions by its standing Subcommittee on Health. The subcommittee carefully and thoroughly explored the need for such legislation at this time, and examined the manner in which the provisions of the bill are adapted to deal with the serious problems which have been shown to exist in connection with the labeling and dispensing of both "prescription" and "over-the-counter" drugs Hearings on the bill were held before the subcommittee from September 11 through September 13, 1951. Favorable action on the bill was urged at the hearing by the Federal Security Administrator and by the Food and Drug Administration, the agency of the Government that administers and enforces the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. In addition, virtually all segments of the drug industry, including the principal associations of drug manufacturers, the retail druggists, and the licensed pharmacists, were represented at the hearing and submitted testimony which clearly shows that this bill is necessary legislation and will do much to make the act a fairer and more effective instrument for protecting the public against abuses in the labeling and dispensing of drugs. A representative of the American Medical Association testified at the hearing in support of the bill.

The hearing held before the subcommittee developed the fact that while there was virtually unanimity of opinion of those who testified as to the need for basic changes in the law governing the labeling and dispensing of the "prescription" drugs, there were two principal issues in controversy.

1. The first area of controversy was over a proposal to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to list by name or class the "dangerous" drugs that may be sold only on prescription The subcommittee had before it for consideration at the time of the hearing, not only this bill, which has been passed by the House of Representatives, but also the companion Senate bill (S. 1186),

and amendments in the nature of a substitute therefor, introduced by Senator HUMPHREY. The principal difference between the bill as passed by the House of Representatives and Senator HUMPHREY'S amendments in the nature of a substitute, had to do with the requirement under which, as part of the definition of so-called dangerous drugs, an administrative determination would have been necessary thus to classify a drug. The amendments in the nature of a substitute for S 1186 also set forth detailed procedures, including administrative hearings to be followed in connection with the making of administrative determinations referred to, together with provisions for judicial review of such determinations.

Prior to the hearing, the provisions for administrative listing of so-called dangerous drugs were vigorously supported by the National Association of Retail Druggists, and equally vigorously opposed by the several associations of drug manufacturers, including the American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association, the American Drug Manufacturers Association, and the Proprietary Association. At the hearing, however, a statement was submitted on behalf of all four of these associations, indicating an agreement on their part that the controversial provisions for administrative listing of so-called dangerous drugs might be eliminated. The four associations, at the same time, proposed two new amendments to the bill This agreement had the effect of eliminating one of the principal areas of controversy, particularly in view of the fact that the subcommittee was assured by the Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Security Administrator that the bill, while not in their view the best solution, would be workable in the form proposed under the agreement. The subcommittee recommended to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, therefore, that the provisions of the House bill which omit the administrative listing provisions, rather than the provisions of the amendments in the nature of a substitute for S 1186 which include such provisions, be favorably reported to the Senate. The subcommittee further recommended, in reporting favorably on the House bill, that the bill be amended to include the two amendments proposed by the associations of retail druggists and drug manufacturers under the agreement referred to above. The intent and effect of these amendments are discussed hereafter in this report.

2 The other principal area of controversy which developed at the hearing arose with respect to certain language of the bill which was objected to by the representative of a firm engaged in selling through the mail to epileptic patients living throughout the United States a medication comprised principally of phenobarbital. Although the language in question was included in the legislation as originally introduced in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, in the bill as reported to the House of Representatives by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and in the bill as passed in the House of Representatives, no issue had been raised concerning this language prior to the hearing before the subcommittee. The subcommittee, however, felt that the language might safely be omitted from the bill. Accordingly, it proposed, and the committee recommends, that this language be stricken. The effect of this amendment is discussed elsewhere in this report.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

As has been pointed out, the bill amends the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so that its provisions will be better adapted to deal realistically with the labeling and dispensing of drugs that may be sold only upon the prescription of licensed practitioners. Its provisions are remedial in the sense that they are intended to protect the public from abuses in the sale of potent prescription medicines. They will also relieve retail pharmacists of unnecessary restrictions on the dispensing of drugs that are safe for use without medical supervision.

Prescription drugs

The bill provides a statutory definition of prescription drugs; it expressly forbids their sale without a prescription; it specifies how they are to be labeled both at the time of interstate shipment and at the time of ultimate dispensing; and it prohibits unauthorized refilling of prescriptions for them.

There are three classes of drugs covered by the statutory definition. The first includes the habit-forming drugs subject to section 502 (d) of the present statute. These are such drugs as the barbiturates. The third class includes all new drugs restricted to prescription sale by effective new-drug applications under section 505 of the present statute There is no controversy whatever about these two classes. The second class includes any drug which "because of its toxicity or other potentiality for harmful effect, or the method of its use, or the collateral measures necessary to its use, is not safe for use except under the supervision of a practitioner licensed by law to administer such drugs"

This definition of so-called dangerous drugs is contained in paragraph (b) (1) (B) of the bill. It is substantially the same as the administrative definition now contained in the regulations issued by the Federal Security Administrator under the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. The proposed definition, however, omits the reference to efficacious for use, as well as safe for use, without the supervision of a medical practitioner in order to be eligible for over-the-counter sale. This omission is not intended to mean that the only matter to be considered in applying the definition is whether or not a particular drug is poisonous.

The word "safe," as used in the definition, is intended to have its ordinary meaning. For example, nontoxic drugs like quinidine sulfate, intended for heart disease, or penicillin, for infections, are not safe for self-medication because their unsupervised use may indirectly cause injury or death. The language of the definition clearly shows that toxicity is only one factor to be considered by the courts in determining whether a particular drug is safe for use without medical supervision. The definition requires the court to consider also other potentialities for harmful effect, the method by which the drug is used, and the collateral measures that may be necessary in order to use the drug safely. When this language is given judicial interpretation consistent with the over-all purpose of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to protect the public health it will effectively restrict to prescription sale all drugs that require professional supervision for their use.

In order to give this general definition a more precise meaning so that it may be applied with greater uniformity by the drug trade the Administrator can exercise the authority he has under section 701 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to issue interpretative regulations. It is to be understood that the inclusion of the statutory definition does not, of course, in any way derogate from the Administrator's authority to interpret and enforce the definition through the issuance of any regulations necessary or appropriate to protect the public from indiscriminate dispensing of drugs over the counter when they may be unsafe for use without the supervision of a practitioner licensed by law to administer such drugs.

As previously stated, the committee considered S. 1186 together with H. R. 3298. S. 1186 would have authorized the Federal Security Administrator to list by name or class the drugs which he considered within the statutory definition. The grant of such administrative authority was objected to as an unnecessary regulation of the drug industry, and the committee concluded that administrative listing is not necessary at this time. It was felt that the statutory definition, together with the authority to make interpretative regulations, could bring an end to the existing confusion in drug labeling and that uniformity can be achieved through cooperative efforts of the drug industry and the Food and Drug Administration working under the statutory plan. If the present confusion is not ended by this legislation, it will then be time enough to consider the need for the administrative listing approach.

All drugs covered by the three classifications of prescription drugs must bear a label containing the statement "Federal law prohibits dispensing without prescription." This gives the retail druggist clear notice that he will be in violation of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act if he dispenses any drugs so labeled without a prescription. This bill also specifies what information must be contained upon the label of the package dispensed to the patient. That label must contain the name and address of the dispenser, the serial number and date of the prescription or of its filling, the name of the prescriber, and, if stated in the prescription, the name of the patient, and the directions for use and cautionary statements, if any, contained in the prescription.

This bill strengthens the controls over the habit-forming barbiturates. The problems of misuse of these drugs to the detriment of the public—especially of young people are growing and must be controlled in the public interest The bill requires that they be sold only on prescription and forbids unauthorized refills of prescriptions for them. In this, it is a definite and clear step forward. It is felt, however, that these drugs pose a special problem not common to all drugs because they are desired by addicts for nonmedical use. This will call for their special treatment, and the committee wishes it understood that in recommending the passage of this bill, as amended, it does so with the knowledge that further legislative consideration must be given to adequate barbiturate controls.

The bill does not relieve any person from any requirements of law, now existing or hereafter adopted, with respect to drugs covered by the narcotics control laws Paragraph (5) of section 1 makes this clear.

Oral prescriptions

The present law does not recognize the practice of dispensing drugs on oral prescriptions. The committee feels that in this respect the law needs modification and clarification for the convenience of the public, the retail druggist, and the physician. The filling and refilling of prescriptions upon oral or telephone orders with proper safeguards should be permitted, and this bill gives statutory recognition to the practice of telephone dispensing. It permits oral prescriptions for all drugs. However, in the case of habit-forming drugs, dangerous drugs, and new drugs limited to prescription sale, an oral prescription would have to be reduce promptly to writing and kept on file by the pharmacist. The oral order may be communicated to the dispenser by the prescriber himself or under his express authority.

Oral prescriptions for habit-forming drugs

The committee believes that the term "oral prescription," as used in the bill in connection with habit-forming drugs to which section 502 (d) of the act applies, should be given a construction which will assure that these drugs are used only upon the express order of a practitioner licensed by law to administer them. In fact, certain of these drugs, such as narcotics subject to

the Harrison Narcotics Act may be dispensed only on a written prescription of a licensed practitioner, and this requirement is expressly preserved by the bill. (See par. (5) of the new sec. 503 (b).) The public interest clearly requires that other habit-forming drugs be dispensed and used only under the close and immediate supervision of a licensed practitioner. Accordingly, it is the intention of the committee that the term "oral prescription," as applied to these drugs, means an order communicated orally to the pharmacist by a practitioner licensed by law to administer such drugs, expressly prescribing such a drug, which is reduced promptly to writing and filed by the pharmacist The Food and Drug Administration, within the limitations of its staffing can check pharmacists' records to make sure that all habit-forming drugs sold are accounted for by prescriptions on file. The pharmacist, before he dispenses any such drug on oral order, must obtain satisfactory evidence, on the basis of consultation with the licensed practitioner or otherwise, that the order has been expressly authorized in each case by such practitioner.

The Federal Security Agency may adopt regulations needed for the efficient enforcement of this provision, and may find it desirable to require special records for any habit-forming drugs dispensed so that pharmacists and enforcement officials alike can readily detect any possible abuses of the oral prescription privilege extended for such drugs.

Refilling prescriptions

The bill, as amended, deals expressly with the troublesome problem of refilling prescriptions. Under the present law a drug dispensed by refilling a prescription without the knowledge or consent of the prescriber is misbranded and the dispenser is liable to criminal prosecution The committee concluded that these provisions are too stringent and should be modified. There is no reason why the law should prohibit the refilling of prescriptions for drugs that are not dangerous and are suitable for use by a layman without medical supervision. The bill provides that prescriptions for such drugs may be freely refilled But, here again, as to drugs which are habit-forming, or which are dangerous, or which are restricted by new drug applications to use under medical supervision, the bill requires that prescriptions may be refilled only with the prescriber's express authorization This authorization may be either written or oral, but if it is given orally the dispenser must promptly reduce it to writing and keep it on file

The provisions relating to the refilling of prescriptions are needed to meet a serious public-health problem which has arisen from the indiscriminate refilling of prescriptions for dangerous and habit-forming drugs. A witness for the Food and Drug Administration cited cases in which death had occurred as a consequence of unauthorized prescription refills. The use of dangerous and habit-forming drugs must be under the supervision of the prescribing physician. This bill is intended to require that the licensed practitioner, if he has not authorized the refill in writing, be consulted by the pharmacist and the refill be authorized by such practitioner before any prescription for a drug that is limited to prescription sale may be refilled.

EFFECT OF COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

Amendment (1) was proposed by a firm engaged in selling through the mails to epileptic patients living throughout the United States a medication comprised principally of phenobarbital. Other provisions of the bill, to which the firm did not object, clarify and simplify the provisions of existing law regarding the labeling, sale, and dispensing of habit-forming and other dangerous drugs that should be sold only on prescription. These provisions are adequate to enable the Food and Drug Administration to compel such firms through appropriate court action, if necessary, to operate in a manner consistent with the public interest. The committee is aware of the obvious dangers to the public interest in the sale of barbiturates, including phenobarbital, without immediate and close medical supervision The Food and Drug Administration has a responsibility in connection with the elimination of such dangers. This bill greatly strengthens the Administration's hand in discharging that responsibility.

The other two amendments were proposed by the combined drug trade in a statement signed by the National Association of Retail Druggists, the American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association, the American Drug Manufacturers Association, and the Proprietary Association.

Amendment (2) was recommended because the associations felt the language it strikes out was of uncertain meaning and added nothing of importance to the bill. In any event, should a person place a statement on the label of a drug entirely safe for self-medication representing or implying that dispensing it without a prescription is prohibited by Federal law, that drug would be misbranded under the provision of law, section 502 (a), which forbids false or misleading labeling statements. Striking the language objected to does not relieve any manufacturer, regardless of the way in which he does business, from compliance with the requirement of section 502 (f) that all drugs not limited to prescription sale must bear adequate warnings and adequate directions for use telling the purchasing public what the drug is to be used for and how it is to be taken to accomplish the beneficial effects it is intended to have

Amendment (3) was proposed to emphasize the fact that the responsibility for preparing adequate directions for use and appropriate warnings against misuse in the labeling of drugs that may be sold without a prescription is upon the manufacturer and not the retail druggist. It does nothing more than free the retail druggist of responsibility for supplementing the labeling of some manufacturers' drugs to give the public adequate directions for use and warnings against misuse The druggist could rely in good faith upon the manufacturers' labeling for compliance with these requirements of the existing law The amendment offers the druggist no protection against violations which arise if he sells a dangerous drug covered by paragraph (1) of the bill without meeting the prescription requirements.

Amendment (4) is a technical renumbering amendment

EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 3 of the amended bill provides that its provisions shall take effect 6 months after the date of its enactment. This postponement of the effective date is considered necessary to permit manufacturers to meet the new labeling requirements

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

Section 1 of the bill amends the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by substituting for subsection (b) of section 503, relating to the labeling and dispensing of prescription drugs, a new subsection defining drugs that may be dispensed only on prescription and specifying the conditions under which such drugs may be dispensed.

Prescription drugs

Under paragraph (1) of the new subsection (b) prescription drugs are defined as drugs intended for use by man which fall within any one of three different categories. In limiting prescription drugs to those intended for use by man this new subsection differs from the present law, which refers to prescription drugs to include not only those dispensed on prescription of physicians and dentists, but also those dispensed on prescirption of a veterinarian. Under the committee bill, drugs intended for use under the supervision of a veterinarian will not require a prescription, although it will be possible under section 502 (f) to exempt such drugs from adequate directions for use if they are to be used by or under the supervision of a veterinarian. In the absence of any exempting regulations, these drugs will be subject to the labeling and dispensing requirements of the act applicable to over-the-counter drugs

The three categories of prescription drugs defined as such in the bill are: (a) Habit-forming drugs to which section 502 (d) of the act relating to drugs containing any narcotic or hypnotic substance, including barbituric acid, or habit-forming chemical derivatives thereof, is applicable, (b) drugs which, because of their toxicity or other potentiality for harmful effect, or the methods of their use, or the collateral measures necessary to their use, are not safe for use except under the supervision of a practitioner licensed by law to administer such drugs; or (c) drugs which are limited by an effective application under section 505 of the act, relating to new drugs, to use under professional supervision.

Included in the first of these three categories are not only the habit-forming narcotics and chemical derivatives thereof, but also barbituric acid and its habit-forming derivatives, such as amytal, phenobarbital, pentobarbital, and the like. This category includes all of the drugs and derivatives thereof specified in section 502 (d) of the act and the regulations thereunder. Dispensing of these drugs must not only comply with the provisions of the bill, but also must conform to the requirements of that section, and the interstate label must bear the name and quantity or proportion of the habit-forming drug or derivatives and in juxtaposition therewith the statement. "Warning—May be habit forming"

The second category of prescription drugs, defined in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) of the new subsection (b), includes the so-called dangerous drugs. As noted elsewhere in this report, the phrase "not safe," as used in this subparagraph, is intended to have its ordinary meaning. Furthermore, in determining whether a drug is safe for use without medical supervision, there must be taken into consideration not only the drug's toxicity, but also other potentialities for harmful effect, the method by which it is used, and the collateral measures necessary to its safe use The broad language of the definition contained in this subparagraph is intended to comprehend all drugs that in fact should be administered under medical supervision in order to insure their safe use Such difficult border-line cases as may arise under this definition can be dealt with under the interpretative and rule-making power provided for in section 701 (a) of the act

The third category of drugs defined as "prescription" drugs includes all new drugs restricted to prescription sale by effective new drug applications under section 505 of the act

Written and oral prescriptions and refills

Paragraph (1) of the new subsection (b) also provides that a "prescription" drug (any drug falling in any one of the three categories referred to above) shall be dispensed with (1) upon a written prescription of a practitioner licensed by law to administer such drug, or (2) upon an oral prescription of such a practitioner, communicated by him or under his express authority to the pharmacist, if such prescription is promptly reduced to writing and filed by the pharmacist, or (3) by refilling any such written or oral prescription if such refilling is authorized by or under

the express authority of the practitioner either in the original prescription or by oral order, which is reduced promptly to writing and filed by the pharmacist. The provisions with respect to oral prescriptions and refills do not apply, however, in the case of narcotics subject to the Internal Revenue Code (Harrison Narcotic Act), since subparagraph (5) of the new subsection (b) expressly safeguards the provisions of that act, and under those provisions and the regulations of the Bureau of Narcotics such drugs may be dispensed only on written prescription. Also, as pointed out elsewhere, with respect to other habit-forming drugs, oral prescriptions and refills are limited to situations in which the pharmacist obtains satisfactory evidence, on the basis of consultation with a licensed practitioner or otherwise, that the prescription or refill has been expressly authorized by such practitioner. A violation of the prescription requirements of paragraph (1) of the new subsection (b) is, under the provisions of this paragraph, deemed to be an act which results in the drug being misbranded while held for sale.

Labeling of prescription drugs

Paragraph (2) of the new subsection (b) provides that a drug dispensed on prescription shall be exempt from the provisions of the act relating to the misbranding of drugs except those which specify that a drug shall be deemed to be misbranded if its labeling is false or misleading in any particular (sec. 502 (a)), if it is an imitation of another drug or is offered for sale under the name of another drug (sec. 502 (i) (2) and (3)), if it is, or purports to be, or is represented as a drug composed wholly or partly of insulin or of penicillin or certain other antibiotics except under certain conditions (sec. 502 (k) and (l)). These provisions continue to apply to any drug subject to the act, whether sold over the counter or on prescription. Similarly, the packaging requirements set forth in section 502 (g) and (h) apply to all such drugs. Prescription drugs must, however, bear at the time of dispensing a label containing the name and address of the dispenser, the serial number and the date of the prescription or of its filling, the name of the practitioner, if stated in the prescription, the name of the patient, and the directions for use and cautionary statements, if any, stated in the prescription. The exemption provided for by this paragraph does not apply to any drug dispensed in the course of the conduct of a business of dispensing drugs pursuant to diagnosis by mail, or to a drug dispensed in violation of paragraph (1) of the subsection.

Exempt narcotics and similar drugs

Under paragraph (3) of the new subsection (b) the Administrator may by regulation remove habit-forming drugs, as defined in section 502 (d), and new drugs, from the prescription requirements contained in paragraph (1) of the subsection when these requirements are not necessary for the protection of the public health.

Prescription legend

Paragraph (4) of the new subsection requires that, in addition to the labeling requirements in the case of prescription drugs specified in paragraph (2) of the subsection, the interstate label on such drugs must bear the statement "Caution: Federal law prohibits dispensing without prescription." On the other hand, over-the-counter drugs are forbidden to bear a label containing this caution statement. A prescription drug, the label on which does not bear the specified caution statement, is deemed to be misbranded. So, too, is an over-the-counter drug, the label on which bears this or a substantially similar statement.

Narcotics and marijuana

Paragraph (5) of the new subsection provides that compliance with the requirements of the bill does not relieve any person from any other requirement prescribed by or under authority of law with respect to drugs now or hereafter within the classifications defined in the Harrison Narcotic Act (sec. 3220 of the Internal Revenue Code, 26 U. S. C. 3220), or marijuana, as defined in section 3238 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U. S. C. 3238 (b)).

Good faith defense for retail druggists

Section 2 of the bill amends section 303 of the act, which specifies the penalties applicable to violations of the act. It adds to the several defenses available under subsection (c) of section 303 a new defense which has the effect of relieving from liability because of misbranding under section 502 (f) of the act any dispenser who makes delivery or proffers delivery of a drug in good faith if the labeling on such drug at the time of such delivery or proffered delivery contained the same directions for use and warning statements as were contained in the labeling at the time of receipt of the drug by such dispenser. This defense, however, is not applicable in the case of a drug which, in accordance with the practice of the trade, is to be processed, labeled, or repacked in substantial quantities at establishments other than those where originally processed or packed, and is not applicable to a prescription drug.

Effective date

Section 3 contains an effective date provision In order to enable the drug industry to adapt its operations to the requirements specified in the bill, and to give the Food and Drug Administration time in which to develop procedures necessary to implement administration of the bill, it is provided that the provisions of the bill will not go into effect until 6 months have elapsed after the date of its enactment.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection 4 of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in the existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (Existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman).

"FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG AND COSMETIC ACT

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 303. (a) Any person who violates any of the provisions of section 301 shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall on conviction thereof be subject to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or a fine of not more than $1,000, or both such imprisonment and fine; but if the violation is committed after a conviction of such person under this section has become final such person shall be subject to imprisonment for not more than 3 years, or a fine of not more than $10,000, or both such imprisonment and fine.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, in case of a violation of any of the provisions of section 301, with intent to defraud or mislead, the penalty shall be imprisonment for not more than 3 years, or a fine of not more than $10,000, or both such imprisonment and fine.

"(c) No person shall be subject to the penalties of subsection (a) of this section, (1) for having received in interstate commerce any article and delivered it or proffered delivery of it, if such delivery or proffer was made in good faith, unless he refuses to furnish on request of an officer or employee duly designated by the Administrator the name and address of the person from whom he purchased or received such article and copies of all documents, if any there be, pertaining to the delivery of the article to him; or (2) for having violated section 301 (a) or (d), if he establishes a guaranty or undertaking signed by, and containing the name and address of, the person residing in the United States from whom he received in good faith the article, to the effect, in case of an alleged violation of section 301 (a), that such article is not adulterated or misbranded, within the meaning of this act, designating this act, or to the effect, in case of an alleged violation of section 301 (d), that such article is not an article which may not, under the provisions of section 404 or 505, be introduced into interstate commerce; or (3) for having violated section 301 (a), where the violation exists because the article is adulterated by reason of containing a coal-tar color not from a batch certified in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Administrator under this act, if such person establishes a guaranty or undertaking signed by, and containing the name and address of, the manufacturer of the coal-tar color, to the effect that such color was from a batch certified in accordance with the applicable regulations promulgated by the Administrator under this act; *or (4) for having violated section 301 (b), (c) or (k) by failure to comply with section 502 (f) in respect to an article received in interstate commerce to which neither section 503 (a) nor section 503 (b) (1) is applicable, if the delivery or proffered delivery was made in good faith and the labeling at the time thereof contained the same directions for use and warning statements as were contained in the labeling at the time of such receipt of such article.*

"EXEMPTIONS IN CASE OF DRUGS AND DEVICES

"SEC. 503. (a) The Administrator is hereby directed to promulgate regulations exempting from any labeling or packing requirement of this act drugs and devices which are, in accordance with the practice of the trade, to be processed, labeled, or repacked in substantial quantities at establishments other than those where originally processed or packed, on condition that such drugs and devices are not adulterated or misbranded under the provisions of this act upon removal from such processing, labeling, or repacking establishment.

"[(b) A drug dispensed on a written prescription signed by a physician, dentist, or veterinarian (except a drug dispensed in the course of the conduct of a business of dispensing drugs pursuant to diagnosis by mail), shall if—

"(1) such physician, dentist, or veterinarian is licensed by law to administer such drug, and

"(2) such drug bears a label containing the name and place of business of the dispenser, the serial number and date of such prescription, and the name of such physician, dentist, or veterinarian,

be exempt from the requirements of section 502 (b) and (e) and (in case such prescription is marked by the writer thereof as not refillable or its refilling is prohibited by law) of section 502 (d).]

"(b) (1) A drug intended for use by man which—

"(A) is a habit-forming drug to which section 502 (d) applies; or

"(B) because of its toxicity or other potentially for harmful effect, or the methods of its use, or the collateral measures necessary to its use, is not safe for use except under the supervision of a practitioner licensed by law to administer such drug; or

"(C) is limited by an effective application under section 505 to use under the professional supervision of a practitioner licensed by law to administer such drug,

shall be dispensed only (i) upon a written prescription of a practitioner licensed by law to administer such drug, or (ii) upon an oral prescription of such practitioner which is reduced promptly to writing by the pharmacist, or (iii) by refilling any such written or oral prescription if such refilling is authorized by the prescriber either in the original

prescription or by oral order which is reduced promptly to writing and filed by the pharmacist. The act of dispensing a drug contrary to the provisions of this paragraph shall be deemed to be an act which results in the drug being misbranded while held for sale

"(2) Any drug dispensed by filling or refilling a written or oral prescription of a practitioner licensed by law to administer such drug shall be exempt from the requirements of section 502, except paragraphs (a), (1) (2) and (3), (k), and (l), and the packaging requirements of paragraphs (g) and (h), if the drug bears a label containing the name and address of the dispenser, the serial number and date of the prescription or of its filling, the name of the prescriber, and, if stated in the prescription, the name of the patient, and the directions for use and cautionary statements, if any, contained in such prescription. This exemption shall not apply to any drug dispensed in the course of the conduct of a business of dispensing drugs pursuant to diagnosis by mail, or to a drug dispensed in violation of paragraph (1) of this subsection

"(3) The Administrator may by regulation remove drugs subject to section 502 (d) and section 505 from the requirements of paragraph (1) of this subsection when such requirements are not necessary for the protection of the public health.

"(4) A drug which is subject to paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be deemed to be misbranded if at any time prior to dispensing its label fails to bear the statement 'Caution Federal law prohibits dispensing without prescription' A drug to which paragraph (1) of this subsection does not apply shall be deemed to be misbranded it at any time prior to dispensing its label bears the caution statement quoted in the preceding sentence

"(5) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to relieve any person from any requirement prescribed by or under authority of law with respect to drugs now included or which may hereafter be included within the classifications stated in section 3220 of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U. S C 3220), or to marihuana as defined in section 3238 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U. S. C. 3238 (b))"

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. IVES conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1764) to authorize the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force to settle, pay, adjust, and compromise certain claims for damages and for salvage and towage and to execute releases, certifications, and reports with respect thereto, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I originally thought it would take longer to pass the railroad retirement bill than it has taken, so that I have not given notice of a program in advance, thinking that I might do so today.

It is our thought to consider next House bill 2094, Calendar No. 694, authorizing the making of grants for hospital facilities, and so forth, and, after that, Calendar No. 592, Senate bill 1976, to provide for home rule in the District of Columbia. I wanted to make the latter bill the unfinished business, but the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] has some remarks to make, and then I should like to have the Executive Calendar considered. Then, because of the work of committees, we should probably go over until tomorrow, after the disposal of the Executive Calendar.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr CAPEHART. I should like to ask the able majority leader a question. I expect to be absent a few days this week, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. Is there any chance that the Senate might take up Calendar No. 745, Senate bill 2104, to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, or Calendar No. 795, Senate bill 2180, to provide for slaughter quotas and allocations of livestock?

Mr. McFARLAND. Unless the House is going to act on the bills we have already sent to that body, there is not much advantage in taking up those bills.

Mr CAPEHART. I thought that possibly we might take up this afternoon Calendar No. 795, Senate bill 2180, the slaughtering-quota bill

Mr. McFARLAND. I would have to give notice in order to do that. I see the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] shakes his head.

The senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr THYE] is very much interested in the fats-and-oils bill. He could not be present today. We shall have to work out a schedule for those bills later, if there is a chance to dispose of them during this session.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, the able majority leader thinks there is no use acting on them unless the House is going to do likewise.

Mr. McFARLAND. It would not do any good.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE. May I say that any proposal to bring up the slaughtering quota bill would bring up some legislative problems. It would only delay the program, particularly if the House is not going to act on it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it the purpose, after the able Senator from Nevada finishes his remarks, to consider the Executive Calendar?

Mr. McFARLAND. I thought we would do so. Then if there is any Senator who does not want to have considered and disposed of the bill which I mentioned, we will let it go over until tomorrow, because I have not given notice of it, and I think Senators are entitled to notice.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I ask how long the Senator from Nevada expects to occupy the floor?

Mr. McCARRAN. Possibly from 30 to 40 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think the Senate referred to the home-rule bill a while ago. There are several bills in conference in connection with which I happen to be one of the conferees.

Mr. McFARLAND. The conference report on the tax bill will be ready tomorrow, I hope. I trust that we shall be able to take up an appropriation bill by Wednesday, anyway. I do not believe we shall reach the home-rule bill tomorrow. I wanted to give notice of the consideraiton of a few bills.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am in conference this afternoon. I am interested in both bills which the Senator has mentioned.

Mr CASE Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE. May we have a clear understanding of just what the Senator's proposal is? As I understand, the next step would be to make Calendar No. 694, House bill 2094, the hospital bill, the pending business, but to lay it aside for the consideration of the Executive Calendar It would not be necessary to lay it aside The Senate could merely go into executive session, and after that take up H. R. 2094, which would then be the unfinished business.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. CASE. To be laid aside if the conference report on the tax bill shall be brought before the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr CASE. And then be further laid aside if an appropriation bill is brought before the Senate. Then, on completion of that business, the Senate would proceed to the consideraiton of Senate bill 1976, the District of Columbia home-rule bill, would it?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona to ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately approve the nominations of Mr. Cook, of Ohio, and Mr. Harl, of Colorado, to be members of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Mr. McFARLAND. All those nominations will be taken up when the Senate goes into executive session. There was objection to taking up part of the Executive Calendar, without taking it all up.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to inquire whether the Senator has any word from the House of Representatives as to what action may be taken before the

Congress adjourns on the matter of rewriting the so-called Capehart amendment. The Senate acted on this matter more than a week ago. It acted in a spirit of urgency. So far as I know, no action has yet been taken on it in the House, and while I am not criticizing the other body, I should like to call to the attention of the majority leader the fact that there was agreement in the Senate by a large majority that this amendment is of vital necessity in the effort to prevent inflation in the months to come. I hope something may be done to get action. Can the Senator give me any information on that point?

Mr. McFARLAND. I cannot give the Senator any information regarding the matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the House Committee on Banking and Currency has approved the bill by a vote of 15 to 7, and the chairman of the committee has petitioned the Committee on Rules for a rule.

Mr. McFARLAND. That has been the situation for several days.

Mr. MOODY. I am well aware of that.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, with reference to the proposed legislation regarding fats and oils and the slaughtering quotas, I heartily agree with the Senator from Arizona and commend him for his statement, because Senators who are absent today and who probably will be absent tomorrow are vitally interested in certain phases of those bills. I thoroughly agree that they should not be considered until notice is given.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. In view of the reference which has been made to a possible meeting of the Committee on Rules of the House, or at least the fact that the so-called Capehart amendment is pending in the other body and awaiting a rule, while recognizing that I have no authority to speak for anyone in the House, and do not have official information, I was informally told, in connection with an entirely different matter, that there was a prospect that there would be no further meetings of the Committee on Rules of the House before adjournment. If there are to be no further meetings of the Committee on Rules of the House, obviously no rule will be provided for the bill amending the Capehart amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I had preferred not to make any announcement in regard to what the House might or might not do. I felt that that was a matter for them to decide.

Mr. CASE. I realize that, and my information is certainly in the realm of hearsay, but the statement was made to me in connection with a collateral matter.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I have heard the same rumor the Senator from South Dakota has just recounted. I am hoping it is not true, and that action will be taken on the subject. The Senate acted on it as an urgent matter. Changing this provision of the law was urged vigorously by those whose responsibility it is to hold the line against inflation.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to say to the able Senator from Michigan that I join with him in urging that the House take action, but I also call his attention to the fact that I am certain he fully understands that in the Committee on Banking and Currency and in the Rules Committee of the House and in the House generally, the members of his party have a great majority of the votes, and they can do anything in the House they desire at any time they want to do it.

GRANTS FOR HOSPITAL FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2094, Calendar No. 694.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2094) to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is now the unfinished business.

A REALISTIC POLICY WITH RESPECT TO GOLD

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in 1948, 1949, and 1951 I introduced bills designed to restore to American citizens the right to possess, buy, or sell gold at whatever price was current in the markets, without restriction by the Federal Government. On September 28, 1951, the International Monetary Fund announced that it would cease to press for uniform regulations between countries governing the internal purchase and sale of gold. Thus the matter of permitting the operation of an unrestricted market for gold in the United States was placed definitely at the doorstep of the Treasury Department.

Much important financial history has passed between early 1948 and the present time. Many precedents have been shattered, and many traditions have been broken. Fortunately the tradition of gold as the ultimate settler of international accounts remains valid.

In 1948, when my bill was first introduced, this country had just emerged from a major war. We anticipated a period of peace. It was in 1948 that commodity prices at wholesale and prices paid by consumers reached a peak from which they declined for almost 2 years. Sensitive prices of basic raw materials reached a peak at the end of 1947. It was not until the middle of 1950 and the start of an undeclared world war that prices began to advance. All the time that prices were declining the money supply of the United States continued to expand in response to the Treasury policy of monetizing the public debt, accomplished by the purchasing by the Federal Reserve banks of all securities tendered by the public at a price established by the Treasury and Federal Reserve System acting jointly.

Some monetary economists have the effrontery to advocate an immediate return to gold redemption at $35 per ounce which, if done, would enable a small group of individuals to withdraw gold and resell it at higher prices and thus restrict the credit and money supply in such a way as to retard the United States Government in borrowing and paying for the defense of this country.

Since 1948, when I first introduced my bill to permit an unrestricted market for gold, there has been persistent pressure for a higher price for newly mined gold on the part of the principal producing countries outside the United States. In one way or another these countries have granted relief to their miners.

In May 1950 the International Monetary Fund rejected proposals by the South African Government that the official price of gold should be raised and that gold producers should be allowed to sell half of their output in any available market at premium prices. In March 1951 the fund announced that the system of purchases and sales of gold for industrial uses was not satisfactory and directed its staff to study the situation. At that time the South African sales of semiprocessed gold were about 40 percent of current production. The Belgian Congo and the French colonies sell their entire output of gold on the internal markets. Canadian producers have received a subsidy from their Government. The United States operator was and is now restricted to the open-market sale of gold in its natural state, chiefly placer gold, in quantities so small that it could not be controlled.

The United States producer of gold is the only one in the world who has not had the benefit of open-market prices for gold sold for industrial uses. Users of gold today are being subsidized by the gold-mine operators on the basis of prices fixed in 1933 and unchanged since 1934. No other country has treated its gold miners in this fashion. In the United States, there is no record of prices for other commodities being fixed on the basis of 1934 costs and selling prices. Certainly the gold miner has been discriminated against. At the same time, the increased production of gold in the United States, largely as a byproduct of other minerals, has substantially aided the war effort by reducing the cost of the base metals for which the mining operation was undertaken. The comparatively small increased production of gold in 1950 compared to 1949 certainly was not due to any encouragement from our Government. Why has the Treasury been so niggardly in its consideration of domestic miners?

Inflationary pressures existing in most countries were reflected in a gradually rising price for gold bars in various mar-

kets of the world. Prices of gold bars in Switzerland rose from the equivalent of $44 per fine ounce in early 1948 to more than $50 in 1949. Quotations for Portugal, Italy, and France showed approximately the same magnitude of rise. Gold prices in Bombay, Hong Kong, and Macao were then, and still are, considerably higher. But during the final quarter of 1949 the European price dropped precipitately, and was stabilized at about $38 per fine ounce in mid-1950, just before the beginning of the war in Korea reversed the trend of gold prices.

Throughout 1950 and 1951 prices of gold rose from $37 per fine ounce in Switzerland in May 1950 to about $42 per fine ounce in early 1951. Quotations for early October 1951 fluctuated between $39 and $40 per fine ounce, still substantially above the United States price of $35.

The fall in the price of gold occurred at the same time as the general revaluation of currencies which became effective at the end of September 1949. Currencies of some 30 countries were involved, the majority of which were devalued about 30 percent.

The devaluations of September 1949 were the equivalent of an increase in the price of gold of 44 percent in the sterling area, the principal producing center for gold Working costs per ton of ore milled increased considerably, due to increased wages and higher materials and equipment costs.

The United States made no attempt to adjust the price of gold to these changes in foreign prices and apparently the Treasury does not wish to ascertain whether the new relationship is a natural one This could be determined readily through the operation of an unrestricted market for gold

When my bill was first introduced in 1948 the United States had a huge export surplus. In 1951 we have a large import surplus. Instead of gold coming into this country it is moving out in large quantities.

Most of us have observed that we have to carry more money in our pockets than we did 10 years ago or 20 years ago. Prices are higher and we have to keep more working capital or liquid assets within reach Aggregates of business balance sheets show that businesses now have to keep much larger amounts of cash and working capital on hand than they did one or two decades ago. Nations have had the same experience; they need larger balances of internationally acceptable assets in order to settle the national accounts.

Nearly a decade after the International Monetary Fund was organized, we recognize that there are only two internationally acceptable currencies: Gold and the United States dollar, so long as it is convertible into gold. As international trade increases, as specialization increases, and as population grows, with a rising standard of living, each country requires more working capital, just as each individual and each business must have more working capital than in the past.

The world inventory of monetary gold that was sufficient at some time in the past is not sufficient today. Encouragement must be given to the gold mining industry to produce more gold, the only acceptable international currency. This would be one of the greatest contributions to international trade and would go far toward eliminating so-called dollar shortages and other phrases coined to describe an unbalance of payments. More gold will be produced when its price is competitive in the open market, with steel or petroleum, or shoes.

The United States is acting as banker for the world to the extent that our banks owe $7,000,000,000 to foreigners in contrast to $1,000,000,000 of claims on foreigners. This distribution subjects the gold supply of the United States to severe strains and runs which should be avoided in the interests of a sound domestic currency.

Much harm can be done to the currency and credit system by irresponsible runs on the gold supply. These runs are sufficiently dangerous during periods of peace as to be very unsettling in their effects upon exchanges and trade.

The fact that the ratio of gold to currency and bank deposits, or to currency, bank deposits and the public debt, is as large or larger now than at the beginning of World War I, cannot conceal the fact of the huge dollar amount of expansion of money or money substitutes that are not covered by gold. Demand deposits and currency not covered by gold were $11,300,000,000 at the end of 1916 and seldom exceeded $20,000,000,000 to 1940. The total was $95,000,000,000 at the end of 1950. Total deposits and currency not covered by gold increased from $21,600,000,000 in 1916 to $154,200,000,000 at the end of 1950, while total deposits, currency, and net public and private debt not covered by gold increased from $103,700,000,000 to $615,400,000,000 These figures, potential claims upon gold, are astronomical, and no ratio comparisons can disguise their stupendous total compared with our monetary gold stock of less than $22,000,000,000 Also it should be borne in mind that the ratios of gold coverage so often cited are about one-half as great as the coverage at the beginning of World War II.

At the end of May 1951 the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe released a report which argued for the upward revaluation of European currencies in terms of the United States dollar. This was a reversal of the action mentioned above which resulted in a general reduction of the same group of currencies on September 18, 1949, of about 30.5 percent. The United States Secretary of the Treasury expressed opposition to the proposed change.

The suggestion of the Commission implies that either (1) European currencies have improved in value since September 18, 1949, or (2) that the United States dollar has declined substantially in value, or perhaps a combination of both. The steady export of gold from the United States and the increase in the monetary reserves of European countries would support the belief that both influences have been important.

The suggestion of the European experts for an upward revaluation of currencies in terms of the United States dollar implies that the United States price for the purchase of gold—$35 per fine ounce—is too low. Instead of a general upward revision by most European countries, the same result could be obtained by an increase in the price of gold on the part of the United States.

The United States could take the time to determine the correct relationship between the currencies by permitting an unrestricted market for gold to be operated in the United States This could soon demonstrate which currencies were overvalued and which were undervalued.

The United States Treasury has persistently opposed change in the monetary field unless and until forced to take action by the pressure of public opinion. It held on to the wartime pattern of interest rates until inflation all but overwhelmed us. It opposed curbs on the lending power of banks until we were almost inundated under a tidal wave of money. It has held to the 1934 price of gold long after this has been abandoned by almost every country in the world. Maynard Keynes and Harry White who designed the structure of the International Monetary Fund are now dead. The International Monetary Fund admits its inability to control sales of gold at the unrealistic price of $35 an ounce. Yet the Treasury finds no merit in an open market for gold.

Must the Treasury of the United States always lag a decade behind public opinion in the country and in the world? It is time that we had action and leadership for currency stability, instead of constant pressure for monetary expansion

One of the outstanding commentators, and, to my mind, the dean of commentators, and editors in America, Mr. Fulton Lewis, in his Washington Report under date of March 20, 1951, set forth in his characteristic and forceful fashion the subject matter I have disclosed here today. Among other things, Mr. Lewis stated:

> Gold has gone to war Since Korea, world buying and selling in gold has risen to feverish pitch, and, as usual the United States is holding the bag
>
> More gold left the United States during 1950 than at any time since 1945, official Treasury Department figures reveal. The reason is simple

Then that able commentator gives a complete history of the whole transaction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Fulton Lewis, published under date of March 20, 1951, be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of March 20, 1951]

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

Gold has gone to war. Since Korea, world buying and selling in gold has risen to a feverish pitch, and as usual the United States is holding the bag.

More gold left the United States during 1950 than at any time since 1945, official

Treasury Department figures reveal. The reason is simple.

International traders in gold can buy the precious metal from the United States Government at $35 per ounce, ship it abroad for a nominal sum and sell it on the open market for $57 per ounce. Sold in foreign black markets, it brings an even better price.

During 1950 the Government lost $1,727,300,000 in gold exports. The rate of outgo for 1951 is higher.

War scares always jazz up the gold trading market. Rich and poor alike lose faith in paper currency, especially in countries where governments are none too stable. The scramble is to convert currency into gold and bury it in the back yard.

In one instance, recently, a gold smuggler had outfitted his automobile with accessories made of pure gold to disguise movement of his hoard across the Mexican border.

Hoarding gold in the United States is forbidden In many other countries, however, paper money can be exchanged for gold, and this is where foreign governments benefit from the low United States gold price.

Great Britain bought $1,020,000,000 worth of gold from the United States last year at $35 an ounce; Mexico purchased $118,200,000 worth; Canada $100,000,000

Resold by these nations to private buyers and other governments at $57 an ounce, United States gold brought these nations additional paper money for purchasing United States goods

In France, where the franc has lost its buying power at an even faster rate than the dollar lost it here, buying gold is a major business At the start of World War I the franc was worth five to one United States dollar; now it it worth 350 to $1

Smart Frenchmen who invested as much as a million francs in gold prior to or during the war would today have increased their investment 63 percent on the increase in gold value per ounce alone, to say nothing of having avoided the huge deflation in the value of the franc.

The real brisk business in gold buying and selling, however, is in Tangier, Morocco. Here a few smart traders came up with the idea of issuing gold certificates, which is forbidden in the United States.

The certificates are issued by banks based on private gold holdings in the vaults and strong boxes A bank customer in Tangier or Zurich, Switzerland, including Americans as well as other foreigners, can call for the gold certificates as soon as they deposit the gold in the vault. Bought at $35 an ounce, the gold entitles holders to certificates on a $57-an-ounce basis.

The gold certificates are transferable, negotiable and can be issued in the name of the bearer or purchaser. Thus persons can acquire gold without tax officials learning the real identity of the owner. So far no foreign government has declared the gold certificates illegal.

United States Embassy officials and other Americans abroad are not overlooking the gold buying spree. Paid by United States Treasury checks, United States employees have pooled their dollars to buy United States gold at $35 an ounce, have it shipped to Switzerland or France and resold at $57 an ounce.

They worked the scheme behind the cover of a foreign trader. By dealing in gold, francs or other foreign currencies can be secured cheaper than when purchased with United States paper or silver money.

Gold talks loudest in the black market, and a trader with metal or gold certificates can collect huge premiums in foreign currency for buying up goods abroad. On a big scale the transactions can harm international money policies.

A congressional committee has staff investigators studying gold transactions both by individual foreign traders and by our own Government. So far, despite the billion-dollar loss in gold during 1950, Secretary of the Treasury John Snyder has not been heard from.

Nor has there been any crackdown on individual gold peddlers in this country.

Occasionally the Customs Bureau nabs a private individual trying to leave the country laden with gold. These occurrences are proof that a gold black market flourishes inside the United States despite the fact that personal possession of gold is illegal.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Let me say that the address on this subject by the distinguished Senator from Nevada is another example to me of his statesmanship, for it is my own conviction that if any one single thing could be said to be the cause of the world's economic troubles today, aside from war, it is the unrealistic position the Treasury maintains in regard to the price of gold. It is a position which we pay for with dollars that have to be raised by taxes.

I wonder whether the Senator from Nevada will agree with me that if we had a realistic position with respect to gold, it would lessen the demands on the Treasury for giving dollars to other countries in a vain attempt to balance their budgets.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in addition to what I have said, which confirms what the able Senator from South Dakota has just said, I join him wholeheartedly in his expression on this subject.

Mr CASE. I thank the Senator from Nevada for his remarks, and I thank him for the able address he has delivered to the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Benton	Hendrickson	Monroney
Brewster	Hennings	Moody
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hill	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Neely
Capehart	Humphrey	O'Conor
Carlson	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Case	Ives	Pastore
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Clements	Kerr	Schoeppel
Connally	Kilgore	Smathers
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Magnuson	Sparkman
Eastland	Maybank	Stennis
Ecton	McCarran	Underwood
Ellender	McCarthy	Watkins
Fulbright	McFarland	Wiley
George	McKellar	Williams
Green	McMahon	Young
Hayden	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

HOUSING PREFERENCES TO VETERANS OF THE KOREAN CONFLICT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, with reference to the bill (S. 2244) to amend certain housing legislation to grant preferences to veterans of the Korean conflict, I ask unanimous consent to have added to the list of its sponsors the names of all of the members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, namely, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

I also ask unanimous consent that I may, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 2244) to amend certain housing legislation to grant preferences to veterans of the Korean conflict, and to submit a report (No. 957) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have consulted with my friends on the other side of the aisle. First, I want to compliment the Senator from South Carolina for reporting the bill. It is important that GI's have this privilege, and if the Senator wants to have his bill considered now, and if it would only take a few moments to discuss it, I am sure there will be no objection.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am most grateful to the distinguished majority leader. I submitted the request for the reason that all that this bill would do, as the distinguished Senators who are members of the Committee on Banking and Currency realize, would be to place Korean veterans, in respect to housing, on the same basis with World War II veterans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the first request will be granted. Is there objection to the request for unanimous consent to report the bill, without amendment, and submit a report thereon?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand the Senator to say that this bill is unanimously supported by all members of the committee?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct. Everyone of the Members, from both sides of the aisle, consented to act as cosponsors of the bill. That includes the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who are present at this time. It also includes the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who is absent.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in view of that circumstance, I certainly have no objection. I should like to know whether this bill or a companion bill has been passed by the House.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to my distinguished friend that it has not been passed by the House. One of the reasons for my wishing to have it considered at

this time is that Representative SPENCE, chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, has advised me that both sides of the aisle in the House would like to have the bill passed and sent to the House, so they might act on it before the House adjourns.

Mr. CASE. I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like to know whether, immediately after we pass this bill, which has not been placed on the calendar as yet, we may take up another bill which has been on the calender for months, and which has been studied for months by the Judiciary Committee. It is a bill which is designed to provide that the widow of a judge shall have the right to a living, a right to sustenance after her husband, the judge, may have passed on. It is one of the most important bills ever presented to the Senate. The committee has studied it for months, and we would like to have it passed at this session of the Congress, in order that the judges of America, who sit in judgment on the property and personal rights of individuals, may sit at ease, knowing that after they have passed away, their widows may be taken care of by the Government to which the judges gave so much of their lives and of their time.

In view of the fact that the majority leader is so kind as to agree that there may be considered a bill which has not even come to the calendar and has not been printed on the calendar, and which I favor, will he not now agrees to take up the bill mentioned by me?

Mr. McFARLAND. The bill of which the distinguished Senator is speaking has been objected to by a number of Senators. We would have to give notice and have quorum calls. There should be given at least a day's notice.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator give a day's notice at this time?

Mr. McFARLAND. The policy committee has not cleared that bill. The bills we are taking up are bills which the policy committee has cleared. I do not want to assume the full responsibility of the order in which they are taken up

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not want to take exception to the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, but surely we are not going to rest on the judgment of the policy committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is my duty to take up such matters with the policy committee before I give consent. I think there is sufficient work to last us a couple of days, anyway.

Mr McCARRAN. The bill which I am speaking of will make the work shorter.

Mr. O'CONOR. Is it not true that the request made by the Senator from Nevada was concurred in unanimously by representatives of the American Bar Association who have expressed themselves wholeheartedly in favor of the measure?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is true.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not speaking against the bill, but I know there are a number of Senators on both sides of the aisle who feel that the widows of judges should be in the same position as are the widows of any other officials working for the Government. There is considerable opposition to the bill, and I cannot take it up and have it disposed of in this manner.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am pleading with the majority leader for something which is really meritorious.

Mr. McFARLAND. Some Members feel that persons who are working for $5,000 a year should have their widows taken care of in the same manner. Some Senators on the other side of the aisle have told me they were going to fight it, and I have been told the same thing by Members on this side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report on Senate bill 2244 is received.

Mr MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate bill 2244 to amend certain housing legislation to grant preferences to veterans of the Korean conflict.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2244) to amend certain housing legislation to grant preferences to veterans of the Korean conflict.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE. Reserving the right to object, is it limited to housing?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That paragraph (14) of section 2 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 388, as amended; 42 U. S. C. 1402) is amended to read as follows:

"(14) the term 'veteran' shall mean a person who has served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time (i) on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, (ii) on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to November 11, 1918, or (iii) on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date thereafter as shall be determined by the President, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable The term 'serviceman' shall mean a person in the active military or naval service of the United States who has served therein at any time (i) on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, (ii) on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to November 11, 1918, or ((iii) on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date thereafter as shall be determined by the President"

SEC 2. The act of October 14, 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1125, as amended; 42 U S C. 1521), is hereby amended (i) by striking out in paragraph (c) of section 505 and in paragraph (c) of section 602 the phrase "of World War II" wherever such phrase occurs; and (ii) by striking out in paragraph (b) of section 601 the phrase "during World War II", and substituting therefor the words "at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, or on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date thereafter as shall be determined by the President."

SEC 3. Public Law 65, Eighty-first Congress (63 Stat. 68), is hereby amended by adding, after the phrase "July 26, 1947,", in section 2 thereof, the phrase "or on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date thereafter as shall be determined by the President."

SEC 4. The National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the phrase "of World War II" wherever it occurs in paragraph (b) of section 213, and by adding the following proviso before the period at the end of said paragraph: " : *Provided*, That for purposes of this section the word 'veteran' shall mean a person who has served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, or on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date thereafter as shall be determined by the President."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George W Falta, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for the division No. 1, district of Alaska;

Myles J. Lane, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York, vice Irving H. Saypol, resigned;

Edmund Port, of New York, to be United States attorney for the northern district of New York, vice Irving J. Higbee, resigned; and

Francis Xavier Chapbedos, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 4, district of Alaska, vice Frank Barr, resigned.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports, the clerk will state the first nomination on the Executive Calendar.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Telford Taylor, of New York, to be Administrator of the Small Defense Plants Administration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I find it a little disagreeable to oppose the nomination of General Taylor. I first met General Taylor at Nuremberg, Germany, when he was with real distinction presiding over the war crimes trials. His name has been submitted to the Senate as the new Administrator of the Small Defense Plants Administration. In the committee at the time the subject was under consideration, I made the suggestion that when the section was written into the Defense Production Act to make funds and credits available to stimulate contracts with reference to the smaller plants of the country, those who offered the bill and brought it in as a separate measure in the first instance wrote certain qualifications into it which

are found in section 714, paragraph 83. It is there provided that the management of the Administration shall be vested in an Administrator who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall be a person of outstanding qualifications, known to be familiar and sympathetic with small-business needs and problems.

That is certainly explicit language, and those who offered the proposed legislation indicated that they wanted a man to preside over the destinies of the Small Defense Plants Administration who was outstanding in that field, who was familiar with small-business needs and problems, and who was sympathetic to them.

Mr. President, General Taylor appeared before the committee. There was a very gracious hearing and a very kindly discussion. I rely entirely upon his own testimony. He said that when he graduated from college he spent 1 year as an instructor in history and political science. Thereafter he came to Washington and became engaged in governmental affairs of a sort. For one period he was identified in a legal capacity with the Department of the Interior. For a number of years he was one of the solicitor's staff in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. For a time he was general counsel of the Federal Communications Commission, and at long last he found his way into uniform, beginning as a major and ultimately becoming a brigadier general.

I must say that as a lawyer he commends himself and he has indicated both aggressiveness and ability. But by his own testimony he has indicated that he has not the slightest familiarity with business, either large or small. He did not have any time, as a matter of fact, because he spent 1 year instructing college classes, and thereafter joined the governmental forces and remained there until he returned from Germany in 1949. He retired to New York City and established an independent law practice. He testified before the committee that his practice consisted mainly of work in the communications field, in seeking to assist educational institutions in securing high frequencies in the television field.

I stated to members of the committee that if they undertook to approve this nomination it was, in my judgment, a clearly illegal act. I know of no way of interpreting the legislative language of the act except to come to the inevitable conclusion that what is desired is an administrator who is qualified and who has familiarity with small-business needs and problems. This is the law. It is a law and not a simple Senate resolution. The bill passed the Senate and went to the House, and the House finally concurred in it. For the life of me I do not understand how we can repudiate the provisions of the law and deal unfairly with the House of Representatives. If the President was familiar with and was properly informed about the qualifications prescribed by the law, he clearly went beyond their scope in ever sending the nomination to the Senate.

The only reason urged why this nomination should be confirmed is that the position will last for only 8 months and then will have to be filled by reappointment and reconfirmation. The salary is $17,500 a year. It has been contended that six or seven or more men have been approached with respect to accepting the responsibility of the position, but because of the short tenure, they have refused to do so.

Mr. President, that does not excuse this body for violating the very language upon which it solemnly passed, and upon which the House of Representatives passed, before it was engrossed upon the statute books of the Nation. I admonish my colleagues in the Senate that in my considered judgment they depart from the letter and the spirit of the law if they confirm the nomination of a man who, by his own testimony before the committee which had jurisdiction of the nomination, indicated that he had no business experience, either in the field of small business or in the field of large business.

Mr. President, I felt in duty bound and in conscience bound to say something about this nomination. I shall not press for a record vote, but for myself I desire to be on record, because I am not going to be a party to a repudiation of the clear intent and purpose of a law which had the sanction of the Senate and the sanction of the House, and was signed by the President of the United States.

In the first instance, the President should have examined into General Taylor's qualifications. He never should have sent his name to the Senate.

I reaffirm what I said at the outset, that it is rather disagreeable to me to take the position I am assuming because General Taylor is a fine gentleman, and he has accomplished much in his particular field. He developed a great military reputation for himself. But notwithstanding all those matters, and all the encomiums which might be heaped upon him, a very precise and definite qualification has been written into the statute, and it would be singular indeed if this body should take the leadership in setting aside its own action, because we still have the House of Representatives to deal with.

Every item in the substantive law must have had some appeal for those who voted for it in the first instance in the other body, and while we have a right, and have the exclusive right, under the Constitution, to advise and consent to nominations, yet, in all conscience, I think it would be a singular procedure to confirm this nomination.

Mr. President, I therefore rest the case upon what I have said, that I think that if this nomination is confirmed it will be definitely illegal, in my judgment, because of the specific qualifications which the Senate demanded in an administrator for an endeavor that will involve $100,000,000 in credit, and probably $50,000,000 in cash.

It is no excuse to say "We can get no one else." Then it is up to the Chief Executive to look further, and to be more diligent in the search to find someone who will meet the qualifications, and who will take the position, even though it will last for only 8 months.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder why the Senator does not ask for a yea-and-nay vote, feeling as he does.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the first place, if I must be candid about it, I know there are a number of Senators absent on both sides of the aisle, and I certainly did not wish to prejudice any Senator on that score. However, I hope the nomination will go back to the President, and that he will make an extended search to find someone who can qualify under the provisions laid down in the law.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, first let me say that I did not recommend Gen. Telford Taylor to the President for the position to which he has been appointed. As a matter of fact, I had no particular recommendation except that the best man possible be found. I made it known that, for my part, I wanted to see a man selected who did have in mind and in heart the welfare of the small businesses of America.

The law in which the qualifications are set forth was enacted on July 31 last. We have now come to October 15. The small businesses of the country were greatly pleased when the provision referred to by the Senator from Illinois became law, because they saw at long last hope of getting some relief and fair recognition and equitable treatment with reference to obtaining critical and scarce materials, obtaining Government contracts, and having the chance to participate properly in our mobilization program.

Mr. President, I happen to know that an earnest effort was made to find a man who had large manufacturing experience, to find a man who would be willing to leave his business and come to Washington, and I know that not one but several were approached with that in mind. It is not so strange that in these particular times a man who has a successful, going business, would turn down an opportunity to come to Washington to work for the Government, and leave his business perhaps to conduct itself and face hazards at a time when business is particularly good.

Finally, after a long time, the name of General Taylor was sent to the Senate. I have never met him until a day or two before his name was sent to the Senate. In fact, it was the date when he came from New York to talk to the President when I first met him.

The Senator from Illinois is exactly correct when he says that General Taylor made a good impression upon our committee. I am sure the Senator will agree with me that the committee as a whole felt that if a suitable man, experienced in manufacturing, could be found, it would be better. But I submit that under the circumstances the President has done just about the best he could, within the time available, to get a man who could organize this agency in behalf of small business, and start it operating.

After all, time is running. As the Senator from Illinois correctly stated, the act as it is written is due to expire on June 30 of next year. The time is short, and everyone approached with the idea of accepting this position must have in mind the fact that he will have only a short time in which to prove the worthwhileness of this agency, if it is to be extended beyond June 30, 1952, and every day we delay in confirming this nomination, the shorter will become the time in which he can prove that.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr LANGER. What is the population of Alabama?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is a little more than 3,000,000.

Mr. LANGER. I take it there are thousands of businessmen in Alabama familiar with small business.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct. As I understand, somewhere in the neighborhood of 95 percent of the business in Alabama is small business.

Mr. LANGER. Could not the distinguished Senator recommend to the President someone from Alabama who could qualify under the statute?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. As a matter of fact, I started my remarks by saying that I did not recommend Mr. Taylor. There were about three men in the State of Alabama who manifested an interest in this matter, and I said to them very frankly that I was submitting their names to the White House, with their records, and each one knew I was submitting all of them for the consideration of the White House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr DIRKSEN. The Senator from Alabama has certainly made a fair statement, and for the sake of the RECORD I wonder if the Senator will respond to two questions. The first is, the Senator will agree, will he not, that the law says that the Administrator shall have familiarity with small business? It does not say that he "should" have it or "might" have it, it says he "shall" have it. I believe the Senator will agree to that.

Secondly, I think he will agree that after the testimony and the biographical sketch submitted by General Taylor to the Committee on Banking and Currency, it was a fair and reasonable assumption that it was not business experience the general had had.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I agree with the able Senator in both statements. In fact, I think it might be well to read just what the statute says:

> The management of the Administration shall be vested in an Administrator who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be a person of outstanding qualifications known to be familiar and sympathetic with small-business needs and problems.

It would be better if we had a man who had actually been engaged in the manufacturing business, but I submit that the law does not require it. I certainly believe that I am familiar with and sympathetic toward the problems of small business. I have had no manufacturing experience, but I believe I have tangled with enough of these problems as chairman of the Small Business Committee so that I know what the problems of small business are. I am sympathetic with them. I will concede that in the course of the testimony General Taylor very frankly admitted that he had had slight connection with small-business problems. However, the distinguished Senator from Illinois will recall that I questioned him as to his understanding of the act itself, and what he understood the main problems of small business to be. I think he gave a good answer. I asked him what his purpose would be in administering the act, and I think he certainly demonstrated his sympathy. Under the circumstances, I believe that the nomination of General Taylor should be confirmed.

In my opinion there can be little doubt that General Taylor possesses the executive attributes which would assure the successful carrying out of this undertaking The steady advance of his career in Government testifies to his ability to assume and discharge heavy responsibilities. As general counsel of the Federal Communications Commission, as Special Assistant to the Attorney General, and as the chief prosecutor of Nazi war criminals at Nuremberg following the return of Justice Jackson to this country, General Taylor exhibited a degree of broad administrative competence which I do not believe can be questioned. His years in the Department of Justice and his familiarity with the methods of German cartelists have given him a background which he can draw upon to combat one of the most pressing of all small-business problems—the growing threat of monopoly.

I think it should be borne in mind that the primary qualification of the head of a Government agency is administrative ability, which, in essence, is simply being able to exercise sound judgment and to pursue with vigor the policies and programs which, in this instance, have been so specifically set forth by the Congress in the legislation establishing the Small Defense Plants Administration.

As chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, I have come to realize that there is nothing mysterious about the problems of small business in an economy dominated by a defense-mobilization program. They are easy to grasp. Small manufacturers need more Government contracts, both prime and subcontracts, than they have been getting. Small manufacturers need a claimant agency to make certain that their share of the available supply of scarce materials is a fair one. Many small manufacturers engaged in defense or essential civilian production require easier access to lines of credit. These are the chief problems of small business today.

Just as in the last war, Congress has established a legislative mechanism for helping to solve these small-business problems. It has, in Public Law 96, defined the problems and stated specifically what avenues of approach shall be taken to solve them. The man selected to discharge these responsibilities must work within this legislative framework. He will also have as guideposts the accomplishments and, yes, even the mistakes of the predecessor agency in the field, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which served small business so advantageously during the last war.

In casting my committee vote in favor of the approval of General Taylor for this post, I did so with the conviction that a man had been found, after a careful search lasting 2 months, who has the intelligence, the force of character, and the highly desirable previous experience in top positions in the executive branch to manage and direct an agency devoted to the welfare of American small business.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a biographical sketch of General Taylor.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Who's Who in America, vol. 25, 1948–49, p. 2447]

Taylor, Telford, lawyer; born Schenectady, N. Y., February 24, 1908; son of John Bellamy and Marcia Estabrook (Jones) Taylor, bachelor of arts, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., 1928, master of arts, 1932; bachelor of laws, Harvard, 1932, married Mary Eleanor Walker, July 2, 1937; children: Joan Penderell, Ellen Estabrook Instructor, history and political science, Williams College, 1928–29; law clerk to United States circuit judge, New York, 1932–33, assistant solicitor, United States Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., 1933–34, senior attorney, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, 1934–35; associate counsel, United States Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, 1935–39, special assistant to Attorney General of United States, 1939–40; general counsel, Federal Communications Commission, 1940–42 Commander, major, Military Intelligence Service, United States Army, October 1942; lieutenant colonel, General Staff Corps, March 1943; colonel, General Staff Corps (assigned as military intelligence officer, European Theater Operations, April 1943–May 1945), September 1944, member, staff of chief of counsel and representative of United States for prosecution of war criminals, June 1945–October 1946, brigadier general, April 1946, United States chief of counsel for war crimes, Office of Military Government (United States) since October 1946. Awarded Distinguished Service Medal, April 1945. Member, Theta Delta Chi Democrat. Author several law review and encyclopedia articles Home. 218 Jones Bridge Road, Chevy Chase, Md. Office: Chief of Counsel, APO 124A, care postmaster, New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise in very wholehearted support of the nomination of General Taylor. I have known him for a long time, and he has had wide experience in government, in public life, and in the legal profession. Because he has been so active in the legal profession he has come into contact with many of the problems which face businessmen, both small-business men and the operators of large business enterprises. He was counsel to the Federal Communications Commission, at which time he, of course, came into contact with many of the problems of small business. He was counsel during the investigation which the then Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce carried on

respecting the railroads. He became familiar with the operations of the great railroad systems and of the smaller railroad systems.

He was chief prosecutor at the Nuremberg trials, and had under him a very large organization, which he administered with great ability and success.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I would rather complete my statement, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Since then General Taylor has been a successful lawyer. His law practice has reached into the domain of both large business and small business.

We talk about business experience and manufacturing experience, but I wonder whether my colleagues in the Senate realize how many of the leaders of great industrial corporations, including the United States Steel Corp., were not previously practical manufacturers, merchants, or financiers. They came into their high positions by reason of the fact that they were successful and capable lawyers.

I think, too, that I should point out that a very large proportion of the men who sit in this body have had little or no manufacturing or business experience; and yet they deal every day with the broadest, the most important problems related to finance, to manufacturing, to fiscal policies, and to merchandising, and they do it successfully, even though they lack the definite, direct contact which the manufacturer might have with problems of trade.

Mr. President, I consider Telford Taylor a man of the highest character. He is courageous; he is resourceful; and he is a man of absolute integrity. I was one of those who recommended the appointment of Telford Taylor to the President, and I am glad and proud that I did so. I did so with complete conviction that Mr. Taylor would serve his country and the cause of the small-business man with sympathy, understanding, and enthusiasm, as well as with efficiency. He has not sought this position. This is one of the instances in which the position has sought the man. He has been reluctant to accept appointment, because service at the head of this organization means transplanting his family and the surrender of a law practice which he has built up and which is successful and profitable. Yet he has been willing, under persuasion—and I was one of those who persuaded him to accept this appointment—to sacrifice his personal interests in order to serve the small-business men and women throughout the land, as well as his country.

I do not believe that I am boastful when I say that I have had reasonable success as a businessman and that I have had reasonable success as an executive and administrator. Because of the experience I have had in such activities, which brought me in contact with thousands of men, and which required me to evaluate their ability, character, tact, firmness, and honesty, I am willing to say without qualification that I know no man who would serve the cause he is undertaking or his Nation with greater success or greater distinction than Gen. Telford Taylor. I very much hope that his nomination will be confirmed by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am not acquainted with the distinguished Gen. Telford Taylor, but I do know that Congress passed a law. If the Senate is going to cast aside the very recommendation and qualification specified in the law, what is the use of our passing any laws at all?

Here is a man who has had absolutely no experience with small business. I have in my hand what is written about him in Who's Who in America. I will read it to the Senate:

Taylor, Telford, lawyer. Born, Schenectady, N. Y., February 24, 1908; son of John Bellamy and Marcia Estabrook (Jones) Taylor; bachelor of arts, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., 1928; master of arts, 1932; bachelor of laws, Harvard, 1932; married Mary Eleanor Walker, July 2, 1937; children: Joan Penderell, Ellen Estabrook. Instructor, history and political science, Williams College, 1928–29.

Then he became a law clerk to United States circuit judge, New York, 1932–33; Assistant Solicitor, United States Department of Interior, Washington, D. C., 1933–34; senior attorney, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, 1934–35.

I do not know whether he is so incompetent that he is fired every year. Apparently he was fired every year from his various department jobs. I cannot tell about that. I am taking the word of my distinguished friend from New York, in whom I have great confidence, when he says he is a very fine man. Therefore, I take it he is worthy of promotion.

Then he became associate counsel, United States Senate Committee on Commerce, 1935–39; special assistant to the Attorney General, 1939–40. Then he became general counsel to the Federal Communications Commission, 1940–42.

He was commissioned a major in the Military Intelligence Service, United States Army, October 1942; lieutenant colonel, General Staff Corps, March 1943; colonel, General Staff Corps (assigned as military intelligence officer, European Theater operations, April 1943–May 1945), September 1944; member of staff of Chief of Counsel and representative of United States for prosecution of war criminals, June 1945 to October 1946; brigadier general, April 1946; United States Chief of Counsel for War Crimes, Office of Military Government—United States—since October 1946. Awarded Distinguished Service Medal, April 1945. Member of Theta Delta Chi. Democrat. Author of several law review and encyclopedia articles. Home: 218 Jones Bridge Road, Chevy Chase, Md.; Office, Chief of Counsel, APO 124–A, care postmaster, New York.

I am sorry that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who occupied the chair a moment ago, is not present. He will bear me out when I say that Gen. Telford Taylor, as I understand, is very much interested in railroads. Is that true?

Mr. LEHMAN. No. I said he was counsel of the investigation of railroads carried on by the Committee on Interstate Commerce. He never had any railroad experience.

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for having read the statement from Who's Who. He has read a record of which any man could be very proud. It is a record which very few people of Gen. Telford Taylor's age could equal. Merely because he has not operated a store or a bank or a factory does not mean that he has not come in contact and has not become familiar with the problems of business. What business experience did Woodrow Wilson, Grover Cleveland, or Calvin Coolidge have before they became President?

Mr. LANGER. It is not a question of whether Woodrow Wilson, Grover Cleveland, or Calvin Coolidge made good Presidents or whether they did not make good Presidents. The point is that the Senate passed a statute which specified that the post be filled by someone who has familiarity with the problems of small business. My distinguished colleague from Alabama says that he recommended three first-class men from Alabama. Certainly out of the large population of Alabama one man could have been found who would be qualified under the statute.

We are interested in the statute. We want to know whether the Senate will carry out its own statute which provides that the man to be appointed to this post must have certain qualifications. The man to be appointed must have those qualifications if we are to carry out the provisions of the law.

Supposing the statute said that the man must be a lawyer, and the President nominated a man who was not a lawyer. Do any Senators believe that the Senate would confirm such a man

I have no personal feeling about it. So far as I am concerned, he is probably a fine gentleman, but I shall vote against confirming his nomination, and I shall demand that the terms of the statute be carried out.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from North Dakota has put his finger on a point which I should like to stress. It is the point which the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] had previously brought out. In other words, the statute says:

The management of the Administration shall be vested in an Administrator who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be a person of outstanding qualifications known to be familiar and sympathetic with small-business needs and problems.

That Mr. Taylor is a man of outstanding qualifications in a general way I believe would be granted by all who met him in Nuremberg or became acquainted with his work in other respects. However, on the statement of the Senator from Illinois as to whether or not Mr. Taylor is familiar and sympathetic with small-business needs and problems, as the statute reads, even Mr. Taylor has admitted that he has not been connected with business in any way, let alone with small business.

With all due respect to what the able Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] has said about the general qualifications of Mr. Taylor, what an estimable gentleman he is, and what positions he may have filled in a legal way, the statute says that the man appointed to this position should be familiar with and sympathetic to small-business needs and problems. Mr. Taylor has admitted that he has had no connection with business, let alone with small business. The argument of the Senator from New York, brilliantly as it may have been presented, misses the point.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, so as to keep the RECORD straight, my good friend from New York indicated that General Taylor had engaged in a lucrative law practice, if I remember his words correctly. The fact of the matter is that when General Taylor got out of college he became identified with government, and he was in government until 1949. He did not return to New York until 1949. That is just about 2 years ago. He returned to New York in 1949 for the purpose of setting up an independent law practice. It could be lucrative. I would not know. However, I doubt very much, from legal standards with which I am familiar, that it would constitute long experience in the practice of law. So whatever identity he had with business, he obtained through governmental eyes; and that is not what the act prescribes. The act calls for someone who has some familiarity with small business; and it does not say "should"; it says "shall."

Feeble as my talents are in the labyrinthine field of the English language, I think I know what the word "shall" means; and it is a mandate upon the President and it is a mandate upon the Senate.

If there is in this body someone who wishes to violate the spirit and the letter of the act, that is quite all right; but I wish to make the case on the ground that it would be illegal for the Senate to confirm the nomination and would be in contravention of the clear purpose, intent, and design of the statute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOODY in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the nomination now under consideration.

At the outset I wish to admit that I have some misgivings as to whether Mr. Taylor fits the qualifications and the blueprint which have been established in regard to the position for which he has been nominated.

I did not know this distinguished gentleman whose nomination was sent to the Senate by the President, who has the sole right and responsibility of filling this position, pursuant to the law. The nomination was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee.

Of course, I am aware that much time has elapsed since the measure creating this office became law and up to the time when we first had an opportunity to act upon the nomination of General Taylor.

Probably I am going to be a little more charitable than was my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois. Mr. Taylor admitted rather freely that he did not have experience with business, either large or small. However, in response to direct questioning he indicated his sympathy with the small-business man, who we hope is going to be specifically aided by means of the law which is now on the statute books.

I recognize that the law says "sympathetic." Probably Mr. Taylor by some stretch of the imagination can qualify under that provision.

There is one phase of the matter which gives me a little hope. As I said at the outset, I am not happy about this nomination, insofar as concerns fitting the blueprint which Congress has established. Mr. Taylor is an army man, whose experience has been in the military side of life. He has made some exceedingly rapid advancements, all of which I am sure have been justly deserved. However, I wish to point out one thing which I think is very significant and about which the small-business people all over the United States are seriously concerned: Because of the defense picture, the military are in the saddle, and rightfully so, since they are charged with the defense of the Nation. As a result, particularly in view of the accelerated defense program, everything is subordinated to the requirements of the military; and the military, in their procurement policies and in many other ramifications which they are called upon to pursue, have been taking the position—and again rightfully so, I must say—that primarily they must look out for the defense of the country. Small-business people by the thousands have appeared before various Members of the Senate at meetings of the respective committees, and have stated that they have been seriously disturbed in regard to what their future life may be, not only because of the critical material shortages, but also because of some of the procurement policies which have been announced by the military, and which mean either life or death to thousands upon thousands of small businesses throughout the length and breadth of the land, unless—and this is why I speak briefly this afternoon in reference to this nomination—General Taylor, who has been a military man, who has advanced rather rapidly in the military picture, has the ability, the judgment, the foresight, and, yes, let us say, the courage, to go to the military and say to them, in respect to their procurement policies, "I head a responsible agency of the Government which has been created by a great majority of the Senate and the House of Representatives; and I want you men, who are responsible, so far as possible, to see to it that you do not choke off small business and do not take an unsympathetic attitude toward the part that small business throughout the United States plays in the economic life of my Nation and yours."

It is upon that point that I am hopeful, let me say, that General Taylor, because of his military experience and background, will have a little more sympathetic understanding in regard to whipping the military into line.

I do not desire to be understood as being critical of the military, but I wish to say—and this afternoon on the floor of the Senate and in the Senate committees there are Members who know this very well—that businessmen have come before the committees, pleading for their life blood. It seems to me that to some extent their difficulties have arisen because of a hard-and-fast policy of favoring the large industrial companies. If Mr. Taylor can with some understanding and with the courage which I think he has the possibility of exercising, insist that small businesses be taken care of, wherever those small businesses may be located, that might be of some assistance to that segment of our economy.

I was quite well aware of the fact that General Taylor had no business experience, either in big business or in small business. In response to questions by some of the Senators, he did say that in his law practice he did not find big business breaking in his door in an attempt to avail itself of his services. Therefore, from that response I understand that he began rather modestly in that respect. However, he limited his business experience and his business connections to television and radio activities as they relate to the advertising field. Perhaps that gives us a general view of his background.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, Mr. President, I am not exactly embarrassed by the nomination, but I question whether the nominee meets the qualifications which have been prescribed by statute. Yet, because of the delay and the uncertainty which will ensue if we do not confirm this nomination, I am willing to have the Senate confirm the nomination of someone who in this position will at least have a sympathetic understanding of the problem and will work to that end.

On that score, and on that score alone, Mr. President, reluctantly I am willing to support the nomination, in the hope that General Taylor will do whatever he thinks is the right and the courageous thing to do in protecting the small-business segment of our economy, which is wondering what tomorrow and, yes, what next year will bring forth in connection with the accelerated defense program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota withhold temporarily his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CASE. Yes; I withhold it temporarily, Mr. President.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a few remarks on the pending nomination.

Having been the original chairman of the Special Committee on Small Business, I became very familiar with the problems of small business during

the recent war and, prior to that, during the depression.

It seems to me that the man whose nomination is now before the Senate, who has been named to head the small business agency, is highly qualified for that position. It does not seem to me to be necessary to have at the head of that agency a man who has been engaged in business all his life. Very frequently we find that officers of some of the large corporations are lawyers who are not particularly experienced in business or in handling the problems of small business.

I remember, at the time when we set up the Smaller War Plants Corporation how great was the need for an organization such as the Small Defense Plants Administration to assist small business in getting into war production.

It was as a result of the activities of the original Special Committee on Small Business that we were able to mobilize into the war-production program thousands and thousands of small-business concerns. After we began that movement, we had no difficulty in inducing the procurement officers to cooperate with the committee in its activities. I remember very well how well the Navy Department assisted us in that movement at that time.

It seems to me that Telford Taylor who has been nominated for this office is highly qualified. He has had considerable experience in setting up new agencies, staffing them and organizing the program to be carried out. Therefore I am anxious to support his nomination, and I think the Senate would be making a mistake if it did not confirm it.

Mr. CASE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Telford Taylor to be Administrator of the Small Defense Plants Administration?

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent on official business.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] would vote "yea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the funeral of a relative.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—41

Benton	Humphrey	Neely
Capehart	Hunt	O'Conor
Chavez	Ives	O'Mahoney
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Connally	Kilgore	Robertson
Douglas	Lehman	Schoeppel
Ellender	Magnuson	Smathers
Fulbright	Maybank	Smith, Maine
George	McFarland	Smith, N. C.
Green	McKellar	Sparkman
Hayden	McMahon	Stennis
Hennings	Monroney	Underwood
Hill	Moody	Young
Hoey	Murray	

NAYS—20

Brewster	Dirksen	McCarthy
Bricker	Dworshak	Millikin
Butler, Md.	Eastland	Smith, N. J.
Butler, Nebr.	Ecton	Watkins
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Wiley
Case	Knowland	Williams
Cordon	Langer	

NOT VOTING—35

Aiken	Byrd	Flanders
Anderson	Cain	Frear
Bennett	Duff	Gillette
Bridges	Ferguson	Hendrickson
Holland	Long	Russell
Jenner	Malone	Saltonstall
Johnson, Colo.	Martin	Taft
Johnson, Tex.	McCarran	Thye
Kefauver	McClellan	Tobey
Kem	Morse	Welker
Kerr	Mundt	Wherry
Lodge	Nixon	

So the nomination of Telford Taylor to be Administrator of the Small Defense Plants Administration was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the remaining nominations on the Executive Calendar.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Henry Earl Cook to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maple T. Harl to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM CORRECTION OF MILITARY OR NAVAL RECORDS—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the motion for a moment?

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to make a motion to reconsider the vote by which House bill 1181, to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records, was passed on Thursday. It may well be that tomorrow I can withdraw the motion, but I make the motion at this time to reconsider the vote by which House bill 1181 was passed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Senate is still in executive session.

Mr. CAPEHART. What I am doing is making the motion and giving notice.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Senator will enter his motion as in legislative session, there will be no objection to entering the motion, I am sure.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in legislative session, to make a motion to reconsider the vote by which House bill 1181 was passed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator mean he wishes to enter a motion?

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to enter the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the bill gone to the House?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know whether it has or not. I know that I

am within my rights in making the motion, or entering the motion.

Mr. McFARLAND. We can return to legislative session if there is to be any controversy. I have no objection to doing that. I am not trying to keep the Senator from entering his motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's motion can be entered.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, does that require unanimous consent?

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senate is now in executive session. I am willing that the Senate resume legislative session.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think we can get the matter straightened out tomorrow.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to know what the bill is about.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I handled the bill on the floor. I shall be glad to explain it if the Chair wishes me to do so at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may explain the bill.

Mr. HUNT. This bill——

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senate now in legislative session?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the action by which it passed H. R. 1181.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having gone to the House the rule requires that such a motion be accompanied by a motion to have the bill returned to the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. I make such a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Indiana. [Putting the question.]

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, all that the Senator from Indiana is doing is entering the motion. There is unfinished business before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the entry of the motion will not affect the status of the unfinished business.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Presiding Officer was about to put the motion at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is to request the House to return the bill to the Senate.

Mr. HUNT. Does a Senator have a right to object to such a procedure?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He may vote against the motion.

Mr. HUNT. Is the motion open to debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe the matter can be very easily straightened out tomorrow. Two amendments were eliminated from the bill when it was passed, in the absence of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. He is not present today, but will return to the Senate tomorrow. I assure the Senator from Wyoming that there will be no difficulty about it. It is merely a matter of courtesy, and I should like to have permission to enter my motion to reconsider the action by which the bill passed the Senate.

Mr. HUNT. I have no objection.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am just as anxious as the Senator from Wyoming to dispose of the matter. There will be no speeches on it so far as my colleague and I are concerned.

Mr. HUNT. I believe the Senator from Indiana is laboring under a misapprehension, because the amendments were stricken with the permission of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. The junior Senator from Indiana was contacted, and it was agreeable to him to have the amendments stricken.

Mr. CAPEHART. Perhaps he did not quite understand what happened. I assure the Senate that the matter will be handled promptly tomorrow and that the bill will not be delayed for more than 24 hours.

Mr. HUNT. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUNT. How long after a bill passes the Senate can a motion to reconsider be valid?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two days in which the Senate is in actual session.

Mr. HUNT I believe the bill was passed on Thursday or Friday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion can be made either today or tomorrow.

Mr CAPEHART. If the motion can be made tomorrow, I withdraw my motion, provided that I may enter it today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule requires that a motion to withdraw the bill from the House be made when a motion to reconsider is entered. However, the rule can be suspended by unanimous consent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as entered, but that it need not necessarily be made until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I shall not object, but I should like to say to the Senate that this action will waste time. The junior Senator from Indiana gave us his permission to withdraw the two amendments. The action was taken by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. I assure the senior Senator from Indiana that he is laboring under a misapprehension. I see no reason why the bill should be returned from the House and why we should spend some time on it tomorrow. However, I shall not object.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 16, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 15 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

Walter W. Wensinger
Edwin A. Pollock

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Verne J. McCaul

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 15 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

Telford Taylor, of New York, to be Administrator, Small Defense Plants Administration.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

MEMBERS, BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION, FOR TERMS OF 6 YEARS FROM SEPTEMBER 6, 1951

Henry Earl Cook, of Ohio.
Maple T. Harl, of Colorado.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art the inspiration of everything that gives meaning, worth and strength to our lives, grant that in these moments of prayer we may develop new and larger capacities of insight, endurance and understanding to live the joyous and victorious life of harmony with Thy divine spirit.

Inspire us with freedom from fear and help us to gain the mastery over all the dark moods of doubt and defeatism which would dwarf and enslave us and eclipse our faith.

May each day be radiant with a sense of Thy guiding presence and sustaining power as we seek to minister unto needy humanity with all its physical sufferings and moral agony, its heartaches and nameless longings. We pray that we may give ourselves more wholeheartedly and devotedly to the glorious task of building a finer social order and may it not simply be the old social order, patched up and plastered over, but a truly new one wherein dwelleth the righteousness, the good will, and the brotherly spirit of the Prince of Peace.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 11, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 732. An act for the relief of Konstontios N. Bellos,

H. R. 782. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Siegfried Oberdorfer;

H. R 794 An act for the relief of Arthur E. Hackett,

H. R. 824. An act for the relief of Luisa Monti;

H. R 1087 An act to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," to empower the courts to remit or mitigate forfeitures under the Indian liquor laws;

H R. 1100. An act for the relief of Eugenio Bellini,

H. R. 1119. An act for the relief of Mario DiFilippo.

H R 1252 An act for the relief of Mr and Mrs. Miroslav Kudrat;

H. R 1413. An act for the relief of Franz Geyling;

H. R 1596. An act for the relief of N. H. Kelley, Bernice Kelley, Clyde Farquhar, and Gladys Farquhar;

H. R. 1696 An act for the relief of Jack Warner and family;

H R. 1764 An act to authorize the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force to settle, pay, adjust, and compromise certain claims for damages and for salvage and towage and to execute releases, certifications, and reports with respect thereto, and for other purposes.

H R. 1908 An act for the relief of Helena Jange Chinn;

H. R 2210. An act for the relief of Hye Pah Kung,

H. R. 2322. An act to authorize the improvement of East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla.;

H. R 2684 An act to provide for the sale, transfer, or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida;

H. R. 3221. An act for the relief of Joji Ikeda, a minor,

H R. 3424. An act for the relief of Yumi Horiuchi;

H R 3430 An act for the relief of the estate of Nora B Kennedy, deceased, and Mrs Ann R Norton;

H R 4154 An act for the relief of the estate of Jake Jones, deceased.

H R. 4205 An act to provide retirement benefits for the Chief of the Dental Division of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4270 An act for the relief of the estate of Jennie Gayle, deceased,

H R 4271. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Richard G. Adams and legal guardian of Dorothy Margaret Adams;

H. R 4693 An act to amend section 77, subsection (c) (3), of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and

H. R. 4931. An act for the relief of Lewyt Corp.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 971 An act for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne;

H. R. 1181. An act to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records;

H. R. 1215. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes;

H R. 1216. An act to authorize the President to convey and assign all equipment contained in or appertaining to the United States Army Provisional Philippine Scout Hospital at Fort McKinley, Philippines, to the Republic of the Philippines and to assist by grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain Philippine Scouts hospitalized therein;

H R 1236 An act for the relief of Rhoda Akiko Nishiyama;

H R. 3376. An act for the relief of Margaret K N. Miller; and

H. R 5131. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike System and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S 43. An act for the relief of Joseph Flury Paluy;

S. 64. An act for the relief of Helen Dick;

S 183. An act for the relief of Elfriede Ehrhardt Otto,

S 366. An act for the relief of Stanislas d'Erceville,

S. 440 An act for the relief of Evangelos and Michael Dumas;

S 471. An act for the relief of Ai Mei Yu and Ai Mei Chen,

S 527. An act for the relief of Youichi Nobori;

S 605. An act for the relief of Constance Chin Hung;

S. 639. An act for the relief of Motoi Kano;

S 640. An act for the relief of Isamu Furuta;

S 664 An act to amend section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law," and for other purposes;

S 690 An act to permit certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of Canton, S Dak., for park, recreation, airport, or other public purposes, to be leased by it so long as the income therefrom is used for such purposes;

S 740. An act for the relief of Albert Walton;

S. 811. An act for the relief of Mitsuko Sakata Lord;

S 821. An act for the relief of Wong Woo, also known as William Curtis,

S 828 An act for the relief of Berta Gomes Leite;

S 839 An act for the relief of Alice Ibrahim, Hannan Ibrahim, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roselleen Schut;

S 895. An act for the relief of Dr. Yau Shun Leung;

S 904. An act for the relief of Roy Y. Shiomi,

S. 914. An act for the relief of Masako Miyazaki;

S 931. An act for the relief of Bernard Kenji Tachibana;

S. 971. An act for the relief of Ralph Albrecht Hsiao.

S. 985. An act for the relief of Agnes Anderson;

S. 1052. An act for the relief of Maria Rhee;

S. 1120. An act for the relief of Misao Konishi;

S 1212. An act to amend section 2113 of title 18 of the United States Code;

S 1236 An act for the relief of Kim Song Nore;

S. 1256. An act for the relief of Barbara Ann Koppius;

S. 1280. An act for the relief of the minor child, Peng-siu Mei;

S. 1311. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Yellowstone River;

S. 1323 An act for the relief of Francisca Quinones;

S 1339 An act for the relief of Doctor Chai Chang Choi;

S. 1401. An act for the relief of Lore A. M Hennessey;

S. 1448 An act for the relief of Robert William Lauber;

S 1462 An act for the relief of Joseph Boris Tchertkoff;

S 1482 An act for the relief of the town of Mount Desert, Maine;

S. 1604 An act for the relief of Truman W McCullough,

S 1622 An act to amend section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946;

S 1668 An act for the relief of Pansy E Pendergrass;

S 1662 An act for the relief of Daniel J Crowley;

S 1770 An act to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, and eliminate certain exemptions therefrom,

S. 1819. An act for the relief of Wolfgang Vogel,

S 1909 An act for the relief of Henry Bongart and Evelyn Bongart,

S 1911. An act for the relief of Michael David Liu, a minor,

S 1934 An act for the relief of Ascanio Collodel;

S 1938 An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental contract or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes,

S 1949 An act for the relief of Hattie Truax Graham, formerly Hattie Truax;

S 2042 An act to extend certain privileges to representatives of member states on the Council of the Organization of American States.

S 2095. An act for the relief of Joe Kosaka,

S. 2233 An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended; and

S Con. Res 36 Concurrent Resolution authorizing the appointment of 14 Members of Congress to participate in a public discussion of problems of common interest with representatives of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S 537 An act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934; and

S Con Res 39. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1335) entitled "An act to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. BUTLER of Maryland to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the Senator

from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] be appointed conferee on the bill (H. R. 5215) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes"; vice the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], excused.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4740) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 79, 103, 104½ and 107 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5054) entitled "An act making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 50 to the above-entitled bill.

THE FLAG OF THE CONFEDERACY

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on a standard in my room across the corridor is an American flag. And on the walls is a picture of Robert E. Lee. It has been there for more than a quarter of a century. And just under it is a Confederate flag.

The first flag I ever owned as a boy was a Confederate flag. It was fashioned and stitched painfully, lovingly by a very wonderful woman who entrusted it to me along with admonitions which have remained with me through life.

My family, like many another pioneer family, fought for the American flag when it had only 13 stars. And under the Stars and Bars, along with legions of other conscientious men, they marched with Lee and rode with Jackson and died at Shiloh.

The American flag is today the symbol of the greatest and most enlightened Nation on earth. The Confederate flag is but a treasured memory, a relic of a day long past, of a cause which no longer stirs the hearts of men.

But it is a sacred relic and it is to be regretted that newspapers are referring to it as an emblem of political controversy.

In the language of Father Ryan, the poet of the lost cause, let us leave it to its honored place in history:

> Furl that banner, softly, slowly,
> Treat it gently—it is holy,
> Touch it not—unfold it never,
> Let it droop there, furled forever.

FLANNEL-MOUTHED SPEECH

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take violent exception to the flannel-mouthed speech which was made by a certain diplomat of a European nation now touring the country. He said that the motion-picture industry is responsible for ruining the standing of America in the eyes of the people of Europe because they picture us as a nation of Hopalong Cassidys. I think Hopalong Cassidy is a pretty good symbol of Americanism. I would rather see Hopalong Cassidy be the symbol and inspiration of our work in Europe than to see us fall under the influence of what is now capitalizing on our help today. Hopalong Cassidy is away ahead of Joe Stalin, Molotov, and Andrei Gromyko. I think it is time that these bold experts that come from over across for more handouts and talk this way were silenced and thrown out of the country for hurting American institutions. Such foreign diplomats add insult to injury when they come in here asking alms and then bite the hands that feed them.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. TACKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. BOLTON addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CARS FOR AMPUTEES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article in yesterday's Sunday Star entitled "Spies of the Spirrt—Heartbreak Ridge," written by the beloved Chaplain of the Senate, Rev. Frederick Harris.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article describing the heartbreaks of Heartbreak Ridge in Korea, and the gallantry and discouragement of the men. It describes all those men have given to the world.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that there has gone down to the White House a bill—the so-called amputee car bill—to take care of paraplegics and the blind as well as the amputees. We do not have very much more time. How much I hope that bill will be signed. It was "heartbreak hill" for those boys, who, terribly disabled, had to come, and they did, to the Capitol to secure that legislation. It went through pretty promptly on the House side but on the other side it was terribly slow. It is hard to understand why the veterans' bills are passed late in the session—every other legislation comes first—the badly maimed come last. Eight billions passed for military aid. Billions upon billions for tanks and other matériel of war for distribution. And this bill is only a few millions for rehabilitation and construction purposes for those disabled in our services—yes, men who are our responsibility.

If we adjourn soon, it is important that the bill come back to the House for an overriding of the veto, if there should be a veto. However, I do not believe the President will veto that bill. It is a great rehabilitation measure. Why, oh why, Mr. Speaker did this legislation finally pass so late? The men at Heartbreak Ridge were not late. They went into action at once, ill-equipped though they were—some to live only a few hours—some to be injured almost immediately. A short time for men in battle to die or be mutilated—too long for so many who were carried to a supposedly grateful country and Congress to try to make them better.

The article is as follows:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—HEARTBREAK RIDGE

(By Frederick Brown Harris, pastor, Foundry Methodist Church; Chaplain, U. S. Senate)

Heartbreak Ridge is a range of hills now being lifted into sharp visibility for all the world. It focuses the heartbreak of all men of good will on this terrestrial ball. It is a new height in the geography of valor. It is a fresh landmark of a courage which is fear that has said its prayers.

Historians have listed the decisive battles on which, across the centuries, has hung the fate of nations. Such is the struggle now raging on the strategic soil of Korea. That ancient land, long centuries before the grandeur that was Rome and the glory that was Greece, was called the Land of the Morning Calm. It was here that, in June of the mid-twentieth-century year, the aggressor launched his perfidious blow. In this murderous attack a supreme hour struck for the free world and, also, for the physical and mental slaves behind the iron bars shutting out the light of truth. In the instant decision of the United States which made it possible for the United Nations to

unloose the fateful lightning of its terrible swift sword, the final failure of tyranny was sealed. A supine surrender in Korea would have given the green light to atheistic materialism in its attempt to achieve world dominion.

Freedom's sons, as unprepared for such an onslaught as were the farmers at Bunker Hill, hurled their quickly mobilized might against the pagan hordes. Their valor was freedom's pledge to the startled and fear-haunted world that they shall not pass. The cost of the struggling months since then, immortalized by exploits of intrepid daring matching any page of history, is vividly symbolized by the poignant designation, Heartbreak Ridge. The Heartbreak Battle of Korea will live forever bracketed with Thermopylae and with Tours, turning point in the northern sweep of Islam. If there comes from the reeling, smarting, numerically overwhelming foe an agreement for a cease-fire, it will be because before Heartbreak Ridge and up its slopes, under conditions which stagger the imagination to conceive—

These died in war that we in peace might live.
These gave their best so we our best could give.

These two words, Heartbreak Ridge, repeated these days untold thousands of times by the press and radio reports from Korea, stab us with the consciousness that while here at home—God forgive—many have engaged in a selfish orgy of money-grabbing, while corruption has defiled public life, some of the finest chapters of American gallantry have been written in blood and tears, in peril and pain. As back and forth has surged the bloody struggle, these young Americans with their comrades of other nations and the dauntless patriots of South Korea have written a new epic in humanity's progression to its promised land.

But Heartbreak Ridge is not just a series of hills on one battered peninsula under eastern skies. Heartbreak Ridge runs across the yearning hopes of all men who hate coercion and love freedom. The awful truth, that is enough to break the heart of men and angels, is that a monstrous power has arisen, bent on halting man's march to a beckoning earth of peace and plenty. The present holocaust and any further blood-letting and devastation truly can be designated, as Winston Churchill in his massive memoirs tags World War II, "the unnecessary war." That is the heartbreak of it, it is all so wickedly unnecessary.

The rainbow of hope arching Heartbreak Ridge is that "There is no irresistible tide that is carrying man to destruction. The evil forces at work are man-made and they can be man-changed." Heartbreak Ridge runs across a world filled with all the ingredients for a new earth. Science now points the way to lift the levels of living in all the planet to undreamed heights. The astronomical sums now being poured out for war could be channeled into projects which quickly would remove the glaring weaknesses and inequalities which the fallacious assumptions of communism exploit. If senseless war could but give way to what is now at least glimpsed by America's point 4, then greater economic well-being would result throughout the world—today's trickle would become a torrent. Even from the Heartbreak Ridge of contemporary despair it is an antidote for pessimism to hear a voice like that of the president of Harvard, speaking to thousands of scientists before him, and through them to a listening world. As a recognized thinker and scientist, he declares his conviction that the dreaded new world war is by no means inevitable; that it will be avoided; that the areas of cooperation among peoples across all lines steadily will increase, and that, furthermore, before the century closes man will draw from the sun all energy and power that he needs for his expanding life, hitching his wagon of progress to that blazing star; and that fresh water, distilled from the oceans, will make it possible for every barren wilderness to blossom as the rose.

This is a conquest in which there is no taint of imperialism. It is the radiant vision of thos who fight at Heartbreak Ridge, for they desire nothing for themselves that they do not want for all the earth. They fight as truly for the future of Russia and of China as for their own. They fight that heartbreak may change to daybreak everywhere, as the shadowed world rolls out of darkness into light, for

"We men of earth have here the stuff
Of Paradise—we have enough!
We need no other stones to build
The stairs into the Unfulfilled—
No other ivory for the doors—
No other marble for the floors—
No other cedar for the beam
And dome of man's immortal dream."

The fulfillment of this fair dream will be the final victory of the global Heartbreak Ridge.

THE TAX BILL

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, probably next month millions of Americans will start paying more taxes to the Federal Government from their personal income. Nearly everybody agrees that this is necessary in order to fulfill our obligation to protect our freedoms and sovereignty and maintain a stable economy.

I must express my own disappointment at the provisions of the tax measure which will be presented to the House and Senate tomorrow for final congressional action.

In the first place, it raises only about one-half of what is needed at this time, thereby violating the pay-as-you-go concept;

Secondly, it places a disproportionate burden on the lower income groups, thus violating the principle of taxation based upon ability to pay;

Thirdly, it fails to close some glaring loopholes and, in fact, experience will show that it has opened additional ones;

Furthermore, it indirectly attacks our social security system in permitting States to make public the names of recipients of relief. This is a radical departure, without hearings and proper consideration, from the system which has successfully worked for twelve years.

However, each Member of both Houses must resolve his own conscience, in view of all circumstances, whether it is better to accept this unsatisfactory measure or take a chance on having no tax increase at all.

PARCEL-POST REGULATIONS

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1335) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail, with an amendment of the House thereto, insist on the House amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MURRAY of Tennessee, BURNSIDE, and REES of Kansas.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication from the Clerk of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

OCTOBER 15, 1951.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the office of the Clerk at 11 44, on October 13, 1951, said to contain a veto on H. R. 2459.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

OLLIE O. EVANS, JR.—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC NO. 258)

The SPEAKER laid before the House, the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my approval H. R. 2459, a bill for the relief of Ollie O. Evans, Jr.

This bill states "That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes,' approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765–769), are hereby waived in favor of Ollie O. Evans, Jr., for compensation for disability allegedly caused by his employment as a member of the Civilian Conservation Corps in Jones County, Miss., in 1936."

Mr. Evans' claim "is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Department of Labor (Bureau of Employees' Compensation) not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act."

There is evidence in the accompanying committee reports that the intent of H. R. 2459 is merely to remove the existing statutory time bar to Mr. Evans' claim. A serious ambiguity which brings this intent into question is presented, however, by the language of the enactment, which authorizes consideration of the claim under the remaining provisions of the act (the Federal Employees Compensation Act), when such mandate is considered in the light of the facts and law bearing on Mr. Evans' claim.

Mr. Evans has never filed a claim for compensation with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation of the Department of Labor under the Compensation Act. It is indicated in the accompanying committee report that Mr. Evans incurred a bronchial infection as a result of an attack of pneumonia while

serving as a member of the Civilian Conservation Corps at a camp near Laurel, Miss., in 1936.

Mr. Evans' claim for compensation, if any, in connection with his Civilian Conservation Corps service, would arise not under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, but under the act of June 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 321), which extended to members of the corps the limited compensation benefits which were made available to employees of the Federal Civil Works Administration under the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351). Under the provisions of the latter two statutes, compensation benefits to members of the Civilian Conservation Corps are authorized only where disability results from "traumatic injury," which is refined as "injury by accident causing damage or harm to the physical structure of the body and shall not include a disease in any form except as it shall naturally result from the injury." Inasmuch as the available facts indicate the origin of Mr. Evans' disability to be the disease of pneumonia rather than traumatic injury, relief would in all probability not be available to him on the basis heretofore established by the Congress for members of the Civilian Conservation Corps, even if the statute of limitations were waived as to the act of June 28, 1937 (supra).

The enrolled enactment refers, however, to the "remaining provisions" of Federal Employees' Compensation Act, which includes provisions authorizing compensation for civilian employees of the Government for the results of disease which is employment-connected. Such reference raises the possibility that the Congress intended not only to waive the provisions of that act relating to the time for filing claims but also to create a substantive right under that act to receive compensation for disease. Special treatment of a single claimant by applying to him the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act in a manner not otherwise available to such claimant, or to other former members of the Civilian Conservation Corps who are similarly situated, would, in my opinion, constitute unfair and discriminatory legislation.

For the reasons stated, I am unable to approve this bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 13, 1951.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

By unanimous consent, the bill and message were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

PARTICIPATION IN OLYMPIC GAMES BY MILITARY PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the first bill (H. R. 1184) to authorize the training for, attendance at, and participation in, Olympic games by military personnel, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4027) to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish and maintain in the Virgin Islands of the United States an agricultural research and extension service program. In carrying out the program authorized by this act the Secretary shall utilize the agencies, facilities, and employees of the Department of Agriculture, and may cooperate with the government of the Virgin Islands, and other public and private organizations and individuals in the Virgin Islands and elsewhere

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to transfer to the United States Department of Agriculture such part of the functions, property, personnel, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations of the agricultural experiment stations in the Virgin Islands as may be agreed upon between the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. The moneys appropriated in pursuance of this act shall also be available for the purchase and rental of land and the construction or acquisition of buildings, for the equipment and maintenance of such buildings, purchase and rental of passenger-carrying automobiles, employment of persons in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and for printing and disseminating the results of research, and such other expenditures as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this act shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, sums appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Agriculture, and may be allocated to such agencies of the Department as are concerned with the administration of the program of the Virgin Islands.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COORDINATED LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL PROGRAM IN THE CITY OF BOSTON

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 254, to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1732) to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii and Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the second sentence of section 4 of the National School Lunch Act approved June 4, 1946 (Public Law No 396, 79th Cong., 60 Stat. 230), is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary shall apportion among the States during each fiscal year not less than 75 percent of the aforesaid funds made available for such year for supplying agricultural commodities and other foods under the provisions of this act, except that the total of such apportionments of funds for use in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall not exceed 3 percent of the funds appropriated for agricultural commodities and other foods for the school-lunch program."

(b) The last sentence of section 5 of such act is amended to read as follows: "The total of such funds apportioned for nonfood assistance for use in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall not exceed 3 percent of the funds appropriated for nonfood assistance in accordance with the provisions of this act."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That (a) the second sentence of section 4 of the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C., sec. 1753) is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary shall apportion among the States during each fiscal year not less than 75 percent of the aforesaid funds made available for such year for supplying agricultural commodities and other foods under the provisions of this act. The total of such apportionments of funds for use in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall not exceed 3 percent of the funds appropriated for agricultural commodities and other foods for the school-lunch program; except that in the case of the first apportionments of funds from any annual or supplemental appropriation (and only in such case), the apportionment for Puerto Rico, and the apportionment for the Virgin Islands, shall be not less than that amount which will result in an allotment per child of school age equal to the allotment per child of school age in the State (other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands) having the lowest per capita income among the States participating in such first apportionments."

"(b) The last sentence of section 5 of such act (42 U. S. C., sec. 1754) is amended to read as follows: 'Apportionments of funds for use in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands for nonfood assistance shall be determined subject to the provisions of the third sentence of section 4.'

"(c) The amendments made by this act shall be effective only with respect to sums appropriated after the date on which this act is enacted."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MADISON COUNTY, ILL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1949) to retrocede to the State of Illinois jurisdiction over 154.2 acres of land used in connection with the Chain of Rocks Canal, Madison County, Ill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That the United States hereby retrocedes to the State of Illinois jurisdiction over the following-described land.

All that parcel of land, comprising approximately one hundred fifty-four and two-tenths acres, acquired by the United States for use in connection with the Granite City Engineer Depot over which jurisdiction was ceded to the United States by the act of the General Assembly of Illinois approved June 30, 1923 (Laws of Illinois, 1923, page 628), as amended by the act of the General Assembly of Illinois approved July 17, 1941 (Laws of Illinois, 1941, page 1302), and over which jurisdiction was accepted by communication dated April 16, 1943, addressed to the Governor of the State of Illinois, signed by the Secretary of War, and received in the office of the Governor on April 19, 1943, and which parcel of land, now used in connection with the Chain of Rocks Canal, is as shown on map designated as GC-1 and dated May 15, 1947, on file in the Office of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army.

SEC 2 The retrocession of jurisdiction provided for in section 1 of this act shall take effect upon acceptance thereof by the State of Illinois.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE OF WILDLIFE REFUGE LANDS IN MINNESOTA

The Clerk called the bill (S 467) to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to convey any lands and improvements, or interests therein, of the United States within the Talcot National Wildlife Refuge or the Beltrami Wildlife Management Area to the State of Minnesota in exchange for other lands and improvements, or interests therein, of equal value, which he deems chiefly valuable for migratory bird management purposes.

SEC. 2 Any lands acquired by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to this act, if located within or adjacent to an existing wildlife refuge or reservation, shall immediately become a part of such refuge or reservation and shall be administered under the laws and regulations applicable thereto; and if not so located, may be administered as migratory waterfowl management areas, refuges, reservations, or breeding grounds in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 10, 1934, as amended (60 Stat. 1080), and acts supplementary thereto.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIGRATORY BIRD HUNTING STAMP ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 509) to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718d), as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718d), as amended is further amended by deleting the number "90" and inserting in lieu thereof the number "85" and subsection (b) of said section 4 is amended by inserting the words "in enforcing and" immediately after the words "The remainder shall be available for expenses" as they appear therein.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That is the last bill eligible on the Consent Calendar.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 201]

Adair	Furcolo	Murphy
Albert	Gore	Murray, Wis.
Allen, Calif.	Gross	O'Neill
Allen, La.	Hand	Patman
Anfuso	Hays, Ark	Patten
Angell	Hébert	Phillips
Baring	Heller	Potter
Bates, Ky.	Herlong	Powell
Battle	Hess	Quinn
Beall	Hoffman, Mich	Reams
Bender	Holifield	Redden
Bentsen	Howell	Regan
Blackney	Irving	Ribicoff
Boggs, La.	Jackson, Calif.	Richards
Bonner	James	Roosevelt
Bow	Johnson	Sabath
Bramblett	Judd	Scott, Hardie
Brown, Ohio	Kean	Scott, Hugh D, Jr
Buckley	Kearney	Shafer
Busbey	Kearns	Shelley
Butler	Kelley, Pa	Sikes
Byrnes, Wis.	Kelly, N. Y.	Stanley
Carlyle	Kennedy	Taber
Case	Keogh	Taylor
Celler	Kersten, Wis.	Teague
Chatham	Kilburn	Thompson, Mich.
Chudoff	Klein	Thompson, Tex.
Cole, N. Y.	Lantaff	Thornberry
Combs	Larcade	Vail
Cooley	Latham	Velde
Crawford	Lesinski	Vorys
Dague	Lucas	Walter
Deane	McConnell	Watts
Delaney	McKinnon	Werdel
Dempsey	Mack, Ill.	Whitaker
Denton	Madden	Widnall
D'Ewart	Mason	Wilson, Tex
Dollinger	Meader	Wolcott
Dondero	Miller, Calif.	Wood, Ga.
Dorn	Miller, N. Y.	
Eaton	Morgan	
Fine	Morrison	
Ford	Morton	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 303 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION OF FLOOD VICTIMS IN THE MIDWEST

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, October 4, the House passed House Joint Resolution 341 making $115,000,000 available for relief and rehabilitation in the flood area of the Midwest. Added to funds already appropriated or otherwise available this will make a total of over $250,000,000 that can be used for relief and rehabilitation of flood victims in this area—the most generous provisions that Congress has ever made for flood relief and rehabilitation in the Nation's history.

The Appropriations Committee did everything in its power to assist the victims of this great disaster, and as I have said before, it leaned over backwards to be certain that sufficient funds were placed at the disposal of the regularly established agencies of the Government for the relief and assistance of victims of this flood. The special subcommittee held full and extensive hearings on this flood disaster, hearing all witnesses that requested to be heard, and giving them all of the time they needed to testify. These hearings were so complete that just before they were closed, the chief witness, Colonel Howse of the Office of Defense Mobilization stated, and I quote:

I have never been accorded more courtesy or a fairer or a more impartial hearing in all of my experience.

Despite all of this I was astonished to read an article which appeared in the Kansas City Times on Saturday, October 6, 1951, in which Colonel Howse sharply criticizes the House and the House Appropriations Subcommittee, claiming that the bill does absolutely nothing for the "largest number of persons stricken by the flood—the little people who have been left with nothing but despair."

For reasons best known to himself, Colonel Howse is now attempting to advocate in public what he did not advocate before our subcommittee. When he appeared before us in support of his program he professed no concern whatsoever relative to the humanitarian aspects of the disaster. Although the President in his message to the Congress stated that there are two reasons why the Nation must act to restore the stricken regions to economic health—the first being humanitarian and the second restoration of productivity—Colonel Howse stated that the humanitarian principle was not present in his program so far as he was concerned—pages 111 and 112 of the hearings.

Colonel Howse now professes to be greatly disturbed over the misery of the little fellow with the modest income, although the indemnification proposal he presented to the subcommittee included no relief for the flood victim who lost all of his household belongings and personal possessions in the flood. When he testified on this subject, he said, and I quote from page 35 of the hearings:

It is not intended to reimburse the home owner for household goods, furniture, or personal possession * * *. If I can restate the principle of the indemnification pro-

gram, it very simply is to rehabilitate productive plant. It is not in any sense of the word to compensate for the general losses that occurred during the flood.

Elsewhere in the article Colonel Howse is quoted as saying:

I sincerely hope that it is not too late to develop a plan under which Federal funds, supplemented by matching funds on some scale by the State and county, can be disbursed by existing State and county agencies to individuals in distress.

How Colonel Howse hopes to accomplish this objective is not clear because he indicated definitely to the subcommittee that the State and local governments could not participate in the indemnification program. The following statement to this subject appears on page 55 of the hearings:

Now, the States have certain constitutional limitations as to the manner in which they can or cannot use funds. I believe it is rather clearly established now that neither of the principal States concerned, Kansas or Missouri, could participate in the indemnification program to individuals.

Another statement in this article, which is attributed to Colonel Howse, is concerned with the justifications presented to our subcommittee that Colonel Howse is quoted as saying weighed 50 pounds. Now I do not know whether the data submitted to us weighed 50 pounds or not because the Appropriations Committee is not in the habit of weighing the justifications it receives to determine their value. The committee is much more interested in the extent to which the justifications explain and support the budget requests than it is in how much they weigh.

As a matter of fact a very small part of the justifications was devoted to an explanation of the budget request of $400,000,000, the greater part of it consisting of lengthy and bulky exhibits such as public laws that were already in the hands of the subcommittee, and minutes of meetings consisting of scores of pages that should have been briefed for the subcommittee if they were to have been submitted as part of the justifications.

Probably Colonel Howse, no matter how conscientious he may have been in this matter, did not familiarize himself with the preparation of justifications that are submitted to the Appropriations Committee in the usual course of business by the several agencies and departments of the Government. The following answer appears on page 236 of the hearings in response to a question about the delay in holding hearings which had been made an issue the early part of September in spite of the fact that the justifications were not received by the subcommittee until Monday, September 19, less than 48 hours before the hearings were started:

I will say to you very candidly, I honestly do not see how this committee could have been more cooperative than they have been. I am satisfied that a great deal of the delay in getting started can reasonably be charged to us because of our inexperience in this kind of disaster.

Time and time again during the hearings Colonel Howse was unable to give the subcommittee adequate supporting information relative to the several parts of his program and the following excerpt from the hearings is typical of his answer.

Page 50 of the hearings:

Mr. NORRELL. All right. Now, what is the basic legal authority for the program proposed by House Document No. 228? I would like to get the law under which you propose to operate.

Mr. HOWSE. Well, I do not believe I know what House Document No. 228 is.

House Document No. 228 is the message from the President of the United States relative to the Midwest flood disaster including the budget request for the $400,000,000 and was the basis of the whole proceedings before the committee.

Page 68 of the hearings:

Mr NORRELL. How do you propose to administer this program so as not to serve as an inducement for indiscriminate investments in property subject to recurring floods?

Mr. HOWSE. Well——

Mr NORRELL. You can't do it, can you?

Mr. HOWSE I think so, but I can't tell you now.

Page 69 of the hearings:

Mr. WHITTEN. And I believe that you stated earlier that this request for an appropriation of $400,000,000 represents your best judgment Now do I understand correctly that you don't know how much the States have spent up until now on this problem?

Mr. HOWSE. Well, I don't know exactly.

Page 85 of the hearings:

Mr. WHITTEN. What is it that you are asking of this committee on flood-control insurance?

Mr. HOWSE. I think we are asking $50,000,000

Mr. WHITTEN Where is your program?

Mr. HOWSE. There is no program presented.

Mr. WHITTEN. In other words, you are asking us to turn over to you $50,000,000 to work out a program to suit yourself We have no authority to do it—but forgetting that for the moment—you are asking us to give you $50,000,000 and telling us, "We will work something out."

Mr. HOWSE. Yes.

It is obvious to me that Colonel Howse's actions indicate quite clearly that he is more interested in getting an appropriation of $400,000,000 dollars with no strings attached than he is in providing needed assistance to victims in the flood area through existing agencies of Government which, because of their past experience in disasters of this kind, are well qualified to administer a satisfactory program of relief and rehabilitation.

Evidently Colonel Howse's handling of the problem is far from satisfactory to some of the citizens of the State of Missouri who are directly concerned with this situation. I have a statement from the chairman of the Missouri Flood Rehabiliation Advisory Committee criticizing Colonel Howse's tactics which I should like to place in the RECORD at this point:

As officers of the Missouri Flood Rehabilitation Advisory Committee we are at a loss to understand the wholly unwarranted criticism leveled at Missouri by A. E. Howse, of the Office of Defense Mobilization during the executive hearings before the House Appropriations Subcommittee in Washington.

Everything within the means and legal limitations of the State was done to help alleviate the suffering and damage following the greatest flood disaster in this State on July 13.

This State flood rehabilitation committee was appointed by Governor Smith as requested by Mr. Howse. We held meetings and Mr. Howse appeared before us. We met jointly with the Kansas committee representatives as arranged by Howse. We have repeatedly, right from the very beginning, asked Mr. Howse to tell us what he thought Missouri should do. We felt he could best tell us, since he was dispatched to the scene and was supposed to have the greatest knowledge of the over-all disaster area and problem.

We had the full and active support of Governor Smith in all of our activities.

Despite our pleas for information and help as to what the State of Missouri should do within its limitations Mr. Howse failed to make any suggestions. He apparently was more concerned in getting support from Missouri for a $400,000,000 congressional appropriation which he and he alone, would control and spend.

The early meetings of the Missouri committee were devoted entirely to accumulating facts and information concerning the flood damage as requested by Mr. Howse. Despite the fact copies of committee reports were in Howse's offices, both in Kansas City and Washington, his staff in Kansas City wanted to send a large C-47 airplane to Jefferson City to pick up the report already in their office.

Contrary to what Mr Howse told the Appropriations Subcommittee meeting in executive session, Col Albert Hillix, president of the Kansas City police board, reports that the police there have had only praise from commercial and industrial leaders throughout Kansas City for the fine police work during the flood. Mr. Howse's misunderstanding of a program intended to aid those caught in the flood is to be regretted On various occasions he chose to display his determination to achieve absolute and undisputed control of moneys requested of Congress

It is further regretted Mr. Howse, because of his rule or ruin thinking and tactics, felt called upon to make wholly unwarranted and unfounded charges against Missouri and Kansas.

The National Guard in Missouri was called out immediately upon being officially requested by the mayor of Kansas City following action by the city council of that city in declaring a state of emergency.

Mr. Howse made it plain to all concerned in Missouri that he, and he alone, would present Missouri's case to the House committee in secret session. Despite this fact Governor Smith sent this committee's vice-chairman, Agriculture Commissioner Robert T. Thornburg, to Washington to make sure the committee understood Missouri's problems and position.

We in Missouri were not concerned as to what Federal agency was going to administer the flood rehabilitation program. But that appeared to be Mr. Howse's principal concern.

Information was presented to Mr Howse clearly demonstrating Missouri had done all within its legal limitations to help out in the flooded areas. Every effort was made to cooperate fully with Mr. Howse. Thus his statements to the closed session of the House subcommittee are all the more amazing and difficult to understand unless he is seeking to cover up for his failure to impress the congressional group sufficiently to warrant Federal aid for this flood-stricken midwestern area.

We in Missouri sincerely hope Congress will not permit Mr. Howse's selfish interest to detract from the real need for flood rehabilitation aid in this four-State area.

BUFORD G. HAMILTON,
Director, Division of Health of Missouri, Chairman, Missouri Flood Rehabilitation Advisory Committee.

ARMED FORCES RESERVE ACT OF 1951

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules, and pass the bill (H. R. 5426) relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

That this act may be cited as the "Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1951."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Sections
Part I.	Definitions	101
Part II	Reserve components generally	201-261
	Chapter 1. Mission and general organization	201-217
	Chapter 2 Appointments and enlistments	218-233
	Chapter 3. Duty and release from duty	234-240
	Chapter 4 Pay, allowances, and benefits	241-246
	Chapter 5 Civil employment	247-248
	Chapter 6 Discharges	249-250
	Chapter 7. Administration	251 261
Part III	Reserve components of the Army	301-304
Part IV.	Reserve components of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard	401-414
Part V.	Naval Militia	501-504
Part VI.	Reserve components of the Air Force	601-603
Part VII.	National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States	701-714
Part VIII.	Appropriations, repeals, amendments, and miscellaneous provisions	801-813

PART I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC 101 When used in this act—

(a) "Duty" means military service of any nature under orders or authorization issued by competent authority

(b) "Active duty" means full-time duty in the active military service of the United States, other than active duty for training.

(c) "Active duty for training" means full-time duty in the active military service of the United States for training purposes.

(d) "Inactive-duty training" means any of the training, instruction, duty, appropriate duties, or equivalent training, instruction, duty, appropriate duties, or hazardous duty, performed with or without compensation by members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States as may be prescribed by the appropriate Secretary pursuant to section 501 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, or any other provision of law, and in addition thereto includes the performance of special additional duties, as may be authorized by competent authority, by such members on a voluntary basis in connection with the prescribed training or maintenance activities of the unit to which the members are assigned. Work or study performed by such members of the reserve components in connection with correspondence courses of the Armed Forces of the United States shall be deemed inactive-duty training for which compensation is not authorized under the provisions of section 501 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended. Any inactive-duty training performed by members of the National Guard of the United States or of the Air National Guard of the United States, while in their status as members of the National Guard or Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia pursuant to section 92 of the National Defense Act, as amended, or pursuant to any other provision of law, shall be deemed to be inactive-duty training in the service of the United States as members of one of the Reserve components specified in section 202 of this act.

(e) "Armed Forces of the United States" means the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including all components thereof.

(f) "Member of a Reserve component" means a person appointed or enlisted as a Reserve of an Armed Force of the United States or a person transferred pursuant to law to any of the Reserve components specified in section 202 of this act: *Provided*, That no person shall be a member of the National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States unless he first be duly enlisted or appointed in the National Guard or the Air National Guard of the appropriate State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, pursuant to law.

(g) "Officer" unless otherwise specified, means a commissioned o warrant officer, permanent or temporary.

(h) "Appropriate Secretary" means—

(1) the Secretary of the Army with respect to the Army;

(2) the Secretary of the Navy with respect to the Navy and Marine Corps and, when the Coast Guard is operating as a service in the Navy, the Coast Guard;

(3) the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to the Air Force; or

(4) the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, when the Coast Guard is operating as a service in the Treasury Department

(i) "Competent authority" means any authority designated by the appropriate Secretary.

(j) "Partial mobilization" means that action taken by the Congress or the President pursuant to any provision of law, to effect the entry into the active military service of the United States of such units and members thereof, or of such members not assigned to units organized for the purpose of serving as such, of any Reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States as are required to effect a limited expansion of the active Armed Forces of the United States.

PART II—RESERVE COMPONENTS GENERALLY

CHAPTER 1—MISSION AND GENERAL ORGANIZATION

SEC. 201. (a) The Congress hereby declares that the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States are maintained for the purpose of providing trained units and qualified individuals to be available for active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States in time of war or national emergency, and at such other times as the national security may require, to meet the requirements of the Armed Forces of the United States in excess of those of the Regular components thereof, during and after the period needed for procurement and training of additional trained units and qualified individuals to achieve the planned mobilization.

(b) The Congress further declares, in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, and the Air National Guard, as an integral part of the first-line defenses of this Nation, be at all times maintained and assured. It is the intent of the Congress that whenever Congress shall determine that units and organizations are needed for the national security in excess of those of the Regular components of the ground forces and the air forces, the National Guard of the United States, and the Air National Guard of the United States, or such part thereof as may be necessary, together with such units of the other reserve components as are necessary for a balanced force, shall be ordered into the active military service of the United States and continued therein so long as such necessity exists.

SEC. 202 The Reserve components are—

(a) The National Guard of the United States;

(b) The Army Reserve;

(c) The Naval Reserve;

(d) The Marine Corps Reserve;

(e) The Air National Guard of the United States;

(f) The Air Force Reserve; and

(g) The Coast Guard Reserve.

SEC 203 The Congress shall prescribe the maximum numerical strength of each of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States *Provided*, That in the absence thereof such maximum numerical strength shall be prescribed by the President

SEC 204 There shall be within each Armed Force of the United States a Ready Reserve, a Standby Reserve, and a Retired Reserve.

SEC 205 The Ready Reserve consists of those units or members of the Reserve components, or both, available for prompt entry into the active military service of the United States in any expansion of the active Armed Forces of the United States in time of war, or in time of national emergency declared by the Congress or proclaimed by the President, or when otherwise authorized by law

SEC 206. The Standby Reserve consists of those units or members of the Reserve components, or both, available for involuntary employment in the expansion of the active Armed Forces of the United States only in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress, or when otherwise authorized by law.

SEC. 207. (a) The Retired Reserve consists of those members of the Reserve components whose names are placed on Reserve retired lists established pursuant to subsection (b) of this section.

(b) In accordance with regulations prescribed by the appropriate Secretary Reserve retired lists shall be established upon which will be placed the names of those members of the Reserve components who make application therefor, if otherwise qualified. Such Reserve retired lists shall be in addition to the Army of the United States Retired List, the Air Force of the United States Retired List, and the United States Naval Reserve Retired List authorized pursuant to section 301 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, as amended.

(c) Members of the Retired Reserve may, if qualified, be ordered to active duty involuntarily, but only in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress or when otherwise authorized by law

SEC 208. (a) A member of the Reserve components required to serve therein pursuant to subsection (d) of section 4 or other section of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, or by any other provision of law, shall be placed in the Ready Reserve of his Armed Force without his consent for the remainder of his required term of service unless (1) he has served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for not less than 4 years, or (2) he has served for not less than 12 months on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to section 21 of the

Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, and, in addition thereto, has served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for not less than 12 months between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, inclusive: *Provided*, That no person may be assigned or transferred to the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States unless he first enlists or is appointed, as the case may be, in the National Guard or Air National Guard of the appropriate State, Territory, or District of Columbia. Except in time of war, or in time of national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress or proclaimed by the President, any such member who has completed 36 months of satisfactory participation in an accredited training program in the Ready Reserve, as prescribed by the appropriate Secretary, shall upon his request be transferred to the Standby Reserve for the remainder of his required term of service: *Provided*, That no such member of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States may be so transferred without the consent of the Governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia concerned.

(b) A person transferred to a Reserve component of an Armed Force of the United States pursuant to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, shall, if qualified and accepted, be permitted to enlist or accept an appointment in such Armed Force of the United States as he may elect (except that consent of the appropriate Secretaries shall be required for enlistment or appointment as a Reserve of another Armed Force of the United States) and to participate in such programs as are authorized for such Armed Force of the United States, including but not limited to—

(1) active duty;

(2) service as a cadet or midshipman of the United States Military Academy, United States Naval Academy, or United States Coast Guard Academy;

(3) participation in an officer candidate program, including a Reserve Officer Training Corps program, under an agreement to accept a commission if tendered; and

(4) service as a midshipman in the Naval Reserve at the United States Merchant Marine Academy or at a maritime academy of a State approved by the Secretary of the Navy, under an agreement to accept a commission in an Armed Force of the United States, if tendered.

(c) Upon any enlistment or appointment in the Armed Force of the United States pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, the member shall be required to perform the remaining period of his required term of service in the Armed Force of the United States in which such enlistment or appointment is made, or in any other Armed Force of the United States in which subsequently enlisted or appointed.

(d) All periods of participation in the programs enumerated in subsection (b) of this section shall be credited against periods of service required pursuant to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, but no period of time shall be credited more than once.

(e) Nothing in this section shall be construed to reduce, limit, or modify any period of service which any person may undertake to perform pursuant to any enlistment or appointment or agreement, including an agreement entered into prior to, or at the time of, entering a program enumerated in subsection (b) of this section.

SEC. 209. (a) Any member of the Reserve components may, at any time upon his request, be placed in the Ready Reserve if otherwise qualified.

(b) Units and members of the National Guard of the United States and Air National Guard of the United States shall be in the Ready Reserve of the Army and the Air Force, respectively.

(c) Members of units organized for the purpose of serving as such which are designated as units of the Ready Reserve shall be in the Ready Reserve.

(d) Any member of the Reserve components in an active status on the effective date of this act may be placed in the Ready Reserve. Any such member (1) who has served or serves on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for not less than 4 years; or (2) who has served or serves as a member of one or more Reserve components subsequent to September 2, 1945, for not less than 8 years; or (3) who has served for not less than 12 months on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, inclusive, and in addition thereto has served or serves on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for not less than 12 months subsequent to June 25, 1950; shall, when not on active duty, be placed in the Standby Reserve upon his application: *Provided*, That no member of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States shall be so placed without the consent of the Governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia concerned.

(e) Members of the Reserve components placed in the Ready Reserve may be transferred to the Standby or Retired Reserve by competent authority in accordance with such regulations (including conditions and limitations) as the appropriate Secretary may prescribe: *Provided*, That no member of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States shall be so transferred without the consent of the Governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia concerned.

SEC. 210. All members of the Reserve components who are not in the Ready or Retired Reserve shall be in the Standby Reserve.

SEC. 211. (a) Within the Standby Reserve, an inactive status list shall be maintained. When deemed by competent authority to be in the best interests of the service concerned, members of the Standby Reserve who are unable to participate in prescribed training may, if qualified, be transferred to the inactive status list, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the appropriate Secretary. Such regulations shall provide for the return of such members to an active status under such conditions as the appropriate Secretary shall prescribe.

(b) Members of the Reserve components on an inactive status list shall not be eligible for pay, promotion, or award of retirement point credits under Title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, as amended.

SEC. 212. (a) Each member of the Reserve components shall be in an active, inactive, or retired status.

(b) Members of a Standby Reserve, except those on an inactive status list, and all members of a Ready Reserve, shall be in an active status.

(c) Members of a Standby Reserve on an inactive status list shall be in an inactive status.

(d) Members of the Retired Reserve shall be in a retired status.

SEC. 213. (a) Every person who is a member of a Reserve component on the effective date of this act shall be deemed, without further action, to retain his active, inactive, or retired status in his Reserve component. Any such member in an honorary Reserve status or an honorary Retired Reserve status when this act takes effect shall be placed in the Retired Reserve of the appropriate Armed Force of the United States.

(b) Any person who is on the honorary retired list of the Naval Reserve or the Marine Corps Reserve when this act takes effect shall be placed in the Retired Reserve of the appropriate Armed Force of the United States.

SEC. 214. Except in the case of the National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States, each Reserve component shall be divided into training categories according to the types and degrees of training including the number and duration of drills or equivalent duties to be completed in stated periods of time, as the appropriate Secretary prescribes. The designation of such training categories shall be the same for each Armed Force of the United States and the same within the Ready Reserve and the Standby Reserve.

SEC. 215. Except as provided in sections 5 and 81 of the National Defense Act, as amended, or any other provision of law, the organization, operation, administration, training, maintenance, and supply of each Reserve component shall be integrated with the organization, operation, administration, training, maintenance, and supply of the Regular component of the Armed Force of the United States of which it is a component.

SEC. 216. (a) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the appropriate Secretary, enlisted members of the Reserve components may, with their consent, be selected for training as officer candidates, and members so selected shall be designated as officer candidates for the period of such training: *Provided*, That when not in the active military service of the United States, no member of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States shall be so selected, or designated, without the consent of the Governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia concerned.

(b) Subject to any limitations imposed on the authorized numerical strength of each Reserve component, the allowance of officers and enlisted personnel in the various ranks, grades, and ratings shall be the number determined by the appropriate Secretary to be necessary to provide for planned mobilization requirements. In order to insure an adequate, continuing strength of Reserve personnel, the appropriate Secretary shall review his determinations not less than once annually and revise them as he deems necessary. No member of a Reserve component shall be involuntarily reduced in his permanent rank, grade, or rating as a result of such a determination.

SEC 217. (a) The appropriate Secretary shall establish an adequate and equitable system for the promotion of members of the Reserve components in an active status. Such promotion system shall, insofar as practicable, be similar to that provided for members of the Regular component of the appropriate Armed Force of the United States. Promotion policies for officers of the Reserve components shall be based upon the mobilization requirements of the appropriate Armed Force of the United States in order to provide qualified officers in each grade, at ages suitable to their assignments and in numbers commensurate with mobilization needs. In order that vigorous Reserve forces may be maintained, necessary leadership encouraged, and a steady flow of promotion provided, such promotion systems shall provide for forced attrition to the extent necessary.

(b) The relative precedence of Reserve officers and Regular officers shall be determined in accordance with their respective dates of rank and grade.

(c) That where, heretofore or hereafter, the position on the lineal list of officers of a regular component of the Armed Forces of the United States has been adjusted by giving constructive service for time spent in technical or professional education or training, the same adjustment shall be made for Reserve officers holding similar assignments or having an equivalent classification or

designation. The appropriate Secretary shall take all necessary action to carry out the provisions of this subsection and this subsection shall be effective immediately upon enactment of this Act.

CHAPTER 2—APPOINTMENTS AND ENLISTMENTS

SEC 218. (a) Subject to the limitation that no person, other than a person who has had prior service in the Armed Forces of the United States or the National Security Training Corps, shall be appointed or enlisted as a Reserve in the Armed Forces of the United States who is not a citizen of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or who has not made a declaration of intent to become a citizen thereof, the appropriate Secretary shall, except as otherwise provided by law prescribe physical, mental, moral, professional, and age qualifications for appointment or enlistment of Reserve members of the Armed Forces of the United States. No person shall be appointed as a Reserve officer in any of the Armed Forces of the United States who is under the age of 18 years.

(b) Women may be appointed or enlisted as Reserves in the Armed Forces of the United States for service in the Army Reserve, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Air Force Reserve, as appropriate, in the same grades, ranks, and ratings, as are authorized for women in the Regular component of the appropriate Armed Force of the United States Women may be appointed or enlisted in the Coast Guard Reserve as provided in section 762, title 14, United States Code. Any female former officer or enlisted woman of an Armed Force of the United States may, if otherwise qualified, be appointed or enlisted as a Reserve in that Armed Force of the United States in the highest rank, grade, or rating satisfactorily held by her on active duty.

(c) Except in the case of Adjutants General and Assistant Adjutants General of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, a person wno has not held an appointment as a commissioned officer in any of the Armed Forces of the United States, or any component thereof, may not be appointed as a commissioned officer in a grade higher than major or lieutenant commander in any of the Armed Forces of the United States except upon the recommendation of a board of officers convened by the appropriate Secretary.

SEC 219 The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall make all appointments of Reserves in general or flag officer grades.

SEC 220 The President shall make all appointments of Reserves in commissioned grades below general or flag officer grades

SEC. 221. The appropriate Secretary shall make all appointments of Reserves in warrant officer grades.

SEC 222 All Reserve commissioned officers shall serve during the pleasure of the President.

SEC 223 To become an officer of a reserve component an individual shall be appointed as a Reserve commissioned officer or Reserve warrant officer of an Armed Force of the United States in a grade corresponding to one of the grades of the Regular components of that Armed Force of the United States and subscribe to the oath prescribed by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (5 U. S. C. 16): *Provided*, That no person shall become a member of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States in a commissioned officer or warrant officer grade, hereunder, unless he first be appointed to and federally recognized in the same commissioned or warrant officer grade in the National Guard or Air National Guard in the appropriate State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

SEC. 224. Reserve warrant officers shall serve during the pleasure of the appropriate Secretary.

SEC. 225. After the effective date of this Act, all appointments of Reserve officers shall be for an indefinite term. All officers now holding appointments in the National Guard of the United States, or the Officers' Reserve Corps, or the Naval Reserve, or the Marine Corps Reserve, or the Air National Guard of the United States, or the Air Force Reserve, or the Coast Guard Reserve shall be considered to hold such appointments as Reserve officers, as the case may be, in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, or Coast Guard, as appropriate. Each such officer shall hold his appointment for an indefinite term in lieu of the term of his current appointment unless he shall, within 6 months after written notification by competent authority which shall be given within 6 months from the effective date of this Act, expressly decline to have his current appointment continued for an indefinite term, in which case the term of his current appointment shall not be affected by this section. All persons now enlisted in the National Guard of the United States, or the Enlisted Reserve Corps, or the Naval Reserve, or the Marine Corps Reserve, or the Air National Guard of the United States, or the Air Force Reserve, or the Coast Guard Reserve shall be considered to be enlisted as Reserves in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, or Coast Guard, as appropriate, without change in the periods of their current enlistments

SEC. 226 When not on active duty all members of the Reserve components, except members of the Retired Reserve, shall be given physical examination at least once every 4 years, or more often as the appropriate Secretary deems necessary, and shall be required to submit reports of physical condition annually.

SEC 227 Except as otherwise provided by law, the appropriate Secretary may provide for the honorable discharge, or transfer to an inactive or retired status, of members of the Reserve components who are found not physically qualified for active duty: *Provided*, That no member of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States may be so transferred without the consent of the governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia concerned. In determining physical qualifications for active duty, due consideration shall be given to the character of the duty to which the member may be assigned in the event he should be ordered to active duty pursuant to law. No member of a Reserve component shall be retained on an inactive status list for a period in excess of 12 months by reason of a physical disqualification.

SEC 228 (a) Except as otherwise provided by law and subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, enlisted members of the Reserve components shall be enlisted for such periods as the appropriate Secretary prescribes.

(b) Unless sooner terminated by the appropriate Secretary, all enlistments as Reserves in the Armed Forces of the United States, in force at the beginning of a war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress or at the beginning of a national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President or entered into during the existence of war or such national emergency, which otherwise would expire, shall continue in force until 6 months after the termination of the war or national emergency, whichever is later.

(c) In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress, or in time of national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President, the period of service of any member of a Reserve component who has been transferred thereto pursuant to law, unless sooner terminated by the appropriate Secretary, shall, if such period of service otherwise would expire, be extended until 6 months after the termination of the war or national emergency, whichever is later.

SEC. 229 To become an enlisted member of a Reserve component an individual shall be enlisted as a Reserve of an Armed Force of the United States and subscribe to the oath prescribed by section 8 of the Act of May 5, 1950, as amended, or be transferred to a Reserve component pursuant to law: *Provided*, That no person shall become an enlisted member of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States, hereunder, unless he first be duly enlisted in the National Guard or Air National Guard of the appropriate State, Territory, or the District of Columbia and is a member of a federally recognized unit or organization thereof in the same grade.

SEC. 230 Except as otherwise provided by this act, no person shall be a member of more than one Reserve component at the same time.

SEC. 231. (a) When an enlisted member of a Reserve component is designated as an officer candidate for temporary service in such category, his enlistment or period of service therein is extended by such period as he may remain in such officer candidate status beyond the normal expiration date thereof.

(b) No person while designated an officer candidate pursuant to this act shall participate in any Reserve Officer Training Corps program of the Armed Forces of the United States.

SEC. 232. Any Reserve officer whose age exceeds the maximum age prescribed for his grade and classification may be separated, or retained in or transferred to an active, inactive, or, upon his application, a retired status, as the appropriate Secretary may prescribe: *Provided*, That no officer of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States shall be so retained or transferred without the consent of the Governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia concerned

SEC. 233 Persons who are otherwise qualified but who have physical defects, which as determined by the appropriate Secretary will not interfere with the performance of general or special duties to which they may be assigned, may be appointed or enlisted as Reserves in any of the Armed Forces of the United States.

CHAPTER 3—DUTY AND RELEASE FROM DUTY

SEC. 234. (a) In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress or when otherwise authorized by law, any unit and the members thereof, or any member not assigned to a unit organized for the purpose of serving as such, of any Reserve component may, by competent authority, be ordered to active duty involuntarily for the duration of the war or national emergency and for 6 months thereafter, but members in an inactive or retired status shall not be ordered to active duty without their consent unless the appropriate Secretary determines that no qualified members of the Ready Reserve or members of the Standby Reserve in an active status in the required category are readily available.

(b) In time of national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President or when otherwise authorized by law, any unit and the members thereof, or any member not assigned to a unit organized for the purpose of serving as such, of the Ready Reserve of any Reserve component may, by competent authority, be ordered to and required to perform active duty involuntarily for a period not to exceed 24 consecutive months: *Provided*, That Congress shall determine the number of members of the Reserve components necessary for the national security to be ordered to active duty, pursuant to this subsection prior to the exercise of the authority contained in this subsection.

(c) At any time, any unit and the members thereof, or any member not assigned to a unit organized for the purpose of serving as such, in an active status in any Reserve component may, by competent authority, be ordered to and required to perform active duty or active duty for training, without his consent, for not to exceed 15 days annually: *Provided*, That units and members of the National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States shall not be ordered to or required to serve on active duty in the service of the United States pursuant to this subsection without the consent of the Governor of the State or Territory concerned, or the Commanding General of the District of Columbia National Guard.

(d) A member of a Reserve component may, by competent authority, be ordered to active duty or active duty for training at any time with his consent: *Provided*, That no member of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States shall be so ordered without the consent of the Governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia concerned.

(e) A member of a Reserve component ordered into the active military service of the United States will be allowed a reasonable period of time between the date he is alerted for active duty and the date on which he is required to enter upon active duty. Such period shall be at least 30 days unless military conditions as determined by the appropriate Secretary do not permit.

(f) In any expansion of the active Armed Forces of the United States which requires the ordering into the active military service involuntarily of individual officers of the Reserve components who are not members of units organized for the purpose of serving as such, it shall be the policy to utilize to the greatest practicable extent the services of qualified and available officers of the Reserve components in all grades in accordance with the requirements of branch, grade, and specialty.

(g) Insofar as practicable, in any expansion of the active Armed Forces of the United States which requires that units and members of the Reserve components be ordered into the active military service of the United States, members of units organized and trained for the purpose of serving as a unit shall be ordered involuntarily into active duty only with their units. This shall not be interpreted as prohibiting the reassignment of personnel of such units after being ordered into the active military service of the United States.

SEC. 235. Members of the Reserve components may with their consent, and in the case of the members of the National Guard of the United States and Air National Guard of the United States with the consent of the governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia concerned, be ordered to or retained on active duty to perform duties in connection with organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the Reserve components. Hereafter, members ordered into the active military service of the United States under the provisions of this section shall be so ordered in the grade and status held by them in the Reserve of their Armed Force, and shall, while so serving, continue to be eligible for promotion in the Reserve of their Armed Force, if otherwise qualified. For the purpose of insuring that members of the Reserve components ordered to or retained on duty under this section receive periodic refresher training in the various categories for which individually qualified, the appropriate Secretary may order those members to duty with any of the Armed Forces of the United States or the components thereof, or otherwise as he sees fit

SEC. 236. (a) In order that members of the Reserve components may remain on or be ordered to active duty voluntarily for terms of service of definite duration, the appropriate Secretary may, except in time of war hereafter declared by the Congress, enter into standard written agreements with members of the Reserve components for periods of active duty not to exceed 5 years. Upon expiration of an agreement for active duty, a new agreement may be effected pursuant to this section. Each agreement shall provide that the member shall not be released from active duty involuntarily during the period of the agreement,

(1) by reason of a reduction in numerical strength of the military personnel of the Armed Force of the United States concerned unless his release is in accordance with the recommendation of a board of officers appointed by competent authority to determine the members to be released from active duty under regulations prescribed by the appropriate Secretary; or

(2) for reasons other than that prescribed in paragraph (1) above without an opportunity to be heard by a board of officers prior to such release, unless such release from active duty is pursuant to sentence of courts-martial, unexplained absence without leave of 3 months duration, final conviction and sentence to confinement in a Federal or State penitentiary or correctional institution.

(b) Any member involuntarily released from active duty prior to the expiration of the period of service under his agreement (except when such release is pursuant to sentence of courts-martial, or unexplained absence without leave of 3 months duration, or final conviction and sentence to confinement in a Federal or State penitentiary or correctional institution, or when such release is due to a physical disability resulting from the member's intentional misconduct or willful neglect, or when the member is eligible for retirement pay or severance pay under any other provision of law, or when he is placed on a temporary disability retired list, or when he is released for the purpose of accepting a Regular commission) shall be entitled to receive an amount equal to 1 month's pay and allowances multiplied by the number of years (including any pro rata part thereof) remaining as the unexpired period of his agreement for active duty, such amount to be in addition to any pay and allowances which he may otherwise be entitled to receive. Computation of amounts payable by reason of termination of each such agreement shall be based on the basic pay, special pay, and allowances to which the member concerned is entitled at the time of his release from active duty. Fractions of a month less than 15 days shall be disregarded and 15 days or more shall be counted as 1 month.

(c) A member of a Reserve component who enters into a written agreement under this section shall be obligated to serve for the full period of active duty specified in the written agreement.

(d) No person shall be offered a written agreement under this section unless the period of active duty specified in the agreement exceeds by at least 12 months any period of obligated or involuntary active duty to which he is otherwise liable.

(e) Agreements entered into pursuant to this section shall be as uniform as practicable, and shall be subject to such standards and policies as the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury for the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy) may prescribe.

(f) This section shall be effective upon enactment of this Act.

SEC 237. In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress or in time of national emergency proclaimed by the President after the effective date of this Act, a member of a Reserve component whose period of active duty expires under an agreement entered into pursuant to section 236 of this Act may be retained on active duty involuntarily in accordance with law.

SEC. 238. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, members of the Reserve components now or hereafter serving on active duty may, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the appropriate Secretary, be detailed or assigned to any duty authorized by law for officers and enlisted members of a Regular component of the Armed Forces of the United States.

SEC. 239. When units or members of the Reserve components are ordered to active duty during a period of partial mobilization, the appropriate Secretary shall continue to maintain mobilization forces by planning and budgeting to insure the continued organization and training of the Reserve components not mobilized, and, consistent with the approved joint mobilization plans, to utilize to the fullest extent practicable the Federal facilities vacated by mobilized units.

SEC. 240. (a) Except as otherwise provided by this Act, the appropriate Secretary may release any member of the Reserve components from active duty or active duty for training at any time.

(b) In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress, or in time of national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President, a member of a Reserve component who is serving on active duty, shall not be released from active duty except on the approved recommendation of a board of officers convened by competent authority if he requests such action: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not be applicable to any Armed Force during a period of demobilization or reduction in strength of any such Armed Force.

CHAPTER 4—PAY, ALLOWANCES, AND BENEFITS

SEC. 241 Subject to the provisions of this Act, members of the Reserve components may be ordered to active duty, active duty for training, or other duty with pay and allowances as provided by law, or, with their consent, without pay. Duty without pay shall be counted for all purposes the same as like duty with pay.

SEC. 242. Members of the Reserve components retained or continued on active duty or active duty for training pursuant to law after the expiration of their term of service are entitled to pay and allowances while on such duty except to the extent that forfeiture thereof is adjudged by an approved sentence of a court martial or nonjudicial punishment by a commanding officer, or unless otherwise in a nonpay status pursuant to law

SEC 243. When employed on active duty or on active duty for training with pay and when engaged in authorized travel to and from such duty, enlisted members of the Reserve components designated as officer candidates shall have the pay and allowances of their enlisted grade, but not less than the pay and allowances of pay grade E-2 under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC 244. (a) An officer of a Reserve component or of the Army of the United States without component or the Air Force of the United States without component shall be entitled to an initial sum not to exceed $200 as reimbursement for the purchase of required uniforms and equipment, either—

(1) upon first reporting for active duty for a period in excess of 90 days; or

(2) upon completion, as a member of a Reserve component, of not less than 14 days active duty or active duty for training; or

(3) after the performance of 14 periods of not less than 2 hours' duration each, of inactive-duty training as a member of the

Ready Reserve of a Reserve component: *Provided*, That only duty requiring the wearing of the uniform shall be counted for the purpose of this section: *Provided further*, That any initial uniform reimbursement or allowance heretofore or hereafter received as an officer under the provisions of any other law shall be a bar to the entitlement for any initial sum authorized under the provisions of this section: *And provided further*, That any individual who has served on active duty as an officer of a Regular component of the Armed Forces of the United States may not be qualified for entitlement under this section by duty performed within 2 years after separation from such Regular component.

(b) An officer of a Reserve component shall be entitled to an additional sum of not to exceed $50 for reimbursement for the purchase of required uniforms and equipment, upon completion of each period after the date of enactment of this Act of 4 years of satisfactory Federal service as prescribed in title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, as amended, performed in an active status in a Reserve component and which shall include at least 28 days of active duty or active duty for training: *Provided*, That any period of active duty or active duty for training for a period in excess of 90 days shall be excluded in determining the period of 4 years required for eligibility under this subsection: *Provided further*, That a person who receives or has heretofore received a uniform reimbursement or allowance as an officer shall not be entitled to the reimbursement provided in this subsection until the expiration of not less than 4 years from the date of entitlement to the last reimbursement or allowance: *And provided further*, That, until 4 years after the date of enactment hereof, an officer may elect to receive the uniform reimbursement not to exceed $50 to which he may be entitled under existing regulations issued pursuant to section 302 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, or section 11 of the act of August 4, 1942, as amended.

(c) An officer of a Reserve component or of the Army of the United States without component or of the Air Force of the United States without component entering on active duty or active duty for training on or after June 25, 1950, shall be entitled, for each time of such entry or reentry on active duty or active duty for training of more than 90 days' duration to a further sum not to exceed $100 as reimbursement for additional uniforms and equipment required on such duty: *Provided*, That the reimbursement provided by this subsection shall not be payable to any officer who, under any provision of law, has received an initial uniform reimbursement or allowance in excess of $200 during his current tour of active duty or within a period of 2 years prior to entering on his current tour of active duty: *Provided further*, That the reimbursement provided in this subsection shall not be payable to any officer entering on active duty or active duty for training within 2 years after completing a previous period of active duty or active duty for training of more than 90 days' duration.

(d) The receipt of a uniform and equipment reimbursement as an officer of one of the Reserve components shall be a bar to entitlement to a uniform reimbursement upon transfer to or appointment in another, except where a different uniform is required: *Provided*, That reimbursement for uniforms and equipment upon transfer to or appointment in another Reserve component within the limits and under the conditions prescribed by subsections (a) and (c) of this section may be made in accordance with regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is operating as a service in the Treasury Department.

SEC. 245. Section 501 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended, by substituting a comma for the colon immediately preceding the proviso in subsection (a) thereof, and inserting the following: "and additionally, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, enlisted members of the above services shall be entitled to rations in kind, or a portion thereof, when the instruction or duty period or periods concerned total eight or more hours in any one calendar day'".

SEC. 246. (a) All provisions of law applicable to the Organized Reserve Corps or the Air Force Reserve, and to the members thereof and their dependents and beneficiaries, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, shall be applicable to the Army Reserve and to the Air Force Reserve referred to in this act, respectively, and to the members thereof and their dependents and beneficiaries. All provisions of law applicable to the Officers Reserve Corps and to the members thereof or to officers of the Air Force Reserve, and their dependents and beneficiaries, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, shall be applicable to officers of the Army Reserve and the Air Force Reserve referred to in this Act, respectively, and their dependents and beneficiaries. All provisions of law applicable to the Enlisted Reserve Corps and to the members thereof or to enlisted members of the Air Force Reserve, and their dependents and beneficiaries, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, shall be applicable to enlisted members of the Army Reserve and the Air Force Reserve referred to in this Act, respectively, and their dependents and beneficiaries.

(b) All provisions of law applicable to the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, or the Coast Guard Reserve (other than temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve), and to the members thereof and their dependents and beneficiaries, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, shall be applicable to the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and of the Coast Guard Reserve (other than temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve) referred to in this Act, respectively, and to the members thereof and their dependents and beneficiaries. All provisions of law applicable to officers of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, or of the Coast Guard Reserve (other than temporary officers of the Coast Guard Reserve), and their dependents and beneficiaries, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, shall be applicable to officers of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and of the Coast Guard Reserve (other than temporary officers of the Coast Guard Reserve) referred to in this act, respectively, and their dependents and beneficiaries. All provisions of law applicable to enlisted members of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, or Coast Guard Reserve (other than temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve), and their dependents and beneficiaries, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, shall be applicable to enlisted members of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and of the Coast Guard Reserve (other than temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve) referred to in this Act, respectively, and their dependents and beneficiaries.

(c) All laws applicable to commissioned, warrant, or enlisted members of the National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States, and to their beneficiaries and dependents, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, shall be applicable to commissioned, warrant, and enlisted members, respectively, of the National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States referred to in this Act, and to their beneficiaries and dependents.

CHAPTER 5—CIVIL EMPLOYMENT

SEC 247. When not on active duty, members of the Reserve components shall not be held or considered to be officers or employees of the United States, or persons holding any office of profit or trust or discharging any official function under or in connection with any department or agency of the United States, solely by reason of their appointments, oaths, commissions, or status as such, or any duties or functions performed or pay and allowances received as such.

SEC. 248. Members of the Reserve components, subject to the approval of the appropriate Secretary, may accept civil employment with and compensation therefor from any foreign government or any concern which is controlled in whole or in part by a foreign government.

CHAPTER 6—SEPARATION

SEC. 249. Subject to the provisions of this act, the discharge of commissioned officers of the Reserve components shall be effected at the pleasure of the President, and the discharge of other members of the Reserve components shall be in accordance with regulations promulgated by the appropriate Secretary.

SEC. 250. (a) An officer of the Reserve components who has completed 3 years of commissioned service shall not be involuntarily discharged or separated except pursuant to the approved recommendation of a board of officers convened by competent authority or the approved sentence of a court martial: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to separation effected under subsection (b) of this section or section 232 of this act.

(b) The President or the appropriate Secretary may drop from the rolls any member of the Reserve components who has been absent without authority from his place of duty for a period of 3 months or more, or who, having been found guilty by the civil authorities of any offense, is finally sentenced to confinement in a Federal or State penitentiary or correctional institution

(c) A member of a Reserve component discharged or separated for cause other than as specified in subsection (b) of this section shall be given a discharge under honorable conditions unless—

(1) a discharge under conditions other than honorable is effected pursuant to the approved sentence of a court martial or the approved findings of a board of officers convened by competent authority, or

(2) the member consents to a discharge under conditions other than honorable with waiver of court martial or board proceedings.

CHAPTER 7—ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 251. There shall be no discrimination between and among members of the Regular and Reserve components in the administration of laws applicable to both Regulars and Reserves.

SEC. 252. The Secretary of the Treasury with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Navy, and, subject to such standards, policies, and procedures as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force shall make and publish such regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Insofar as practicable, the regulations for all the Reserve components shall be uniform.

SEC. 253. Each of the Armed Forces of the United States shall have officer members of its Reserve components on active duty, at the seat of the Government and at such headquarters as are charged with responsibility for Reserve affairs, in addition to those authorized pursuant to the provisions of sections 5 and 81 of the National Defense Act, as amended, or any other provision of law, within such numbers and in such grades and duty assignments as the appropriate Secretary shall prescribe, to assist and participate in the preparation and administration of all policies and regulations affecting their Reserve component. While so serving such offi-

cers shall be considered as additional numbers of the staff with which serving.

SEC. 254. The appropriate Secretary shall detail such members of the Regular and Reserve components as may be necessary for effectively developing, training, instructing, and administering the Reserve components.

SEC. 255. (a) All boards convened for the appointment, promotion, demotion, involuntary release from active duty, discharge, or retirement of members of the Reserve components shall include appropriate numbers of members of the reserve components.

(b) The members of all boards convened for selection for promotion or for the discharge or demotion of members of the Reserve components shall be senior to the members under consideration.

SEC. 256 (a) The appropriate Secretary shall, for the support of the Reserve components, make available to each Reserve component such supplies, equipment, and facilities of the Armed Forces of the United States as he considers necessary.

(b) The appropriate Secretary or his authorized representative may issue supplies and equipment of the appropriate armed force of the United States to the Reserve components without charging the cost or value thereof, or any expenses in connection therewith, against or in any way affecting the appropriation provided for the Reserve components: *Provided*, That the appropriate Secretary finds it to be in the best interests of the United States to issue such equipment and supplies. *And provided further*, That any such equipment and supplies so furnished may, pursuant to this section, be repossessed or redistributed as the appropriate Secretary may prescribe. This subsection shall not apply to supplies and equipment issued to the National Guard and Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, under sections 67 and 84, National Defense Act, as amended, but applies to supplies and equipment issued in addition thereto.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal, limit, or modify in any manner the provisions of sections 67 and 84, National Defense Act, as amended.

(d) It is the sense of the Congress that the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 be implemented immediately upon the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 257. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall designate an Assistant Secretary of Defense who shall, in addition to other duties, have the principal responsibility for all Reserve affairs of the Department of Defense. The Secretary of each military department and, when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury, or, as such Secretary may prescribe for his department, the Under Secretary or an Assistant Secretary of such department, shall, in addition to other duties, have the principal responsibility for supervision of all activities of the reserve components under the jurisdiction of that department.

(b) The Secretary of each military department and, when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury shall designate a general or flag officer of each Armed Force of the United States therein who shall be directly responsible for Reserve affairs to the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard, as appropriate.

SEC. 258. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of the Secretary of Defense a Reserve Forces Policy Board consisting of—

(i) a civilian chairman appointed by the Secretary of Defense;

(ii) the Secretary, the Under Secretary, or an Assistant Secretary of each military department designated pursuant to section 257 (a) of this Act;

(iii) one Regular officer from each military department designated by the appropriate Secretary;

(iv) four Reserve officers appointed by the Secretary of Defense upon recommendation of the Secretary of the Army, two of whom shall be members of the National Guard of the United States and two of whom shall be members of the Army Reserve;

(v) four Reserve officers appointed by the Secretary of Defense upon recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy, two of whom shall be members of the Naval Reserve and two of whom shall be members of the Marine Corps Reserve;

(vi) four Reserve officers appointed by the Secretary of Defense upon recommendation of the Secretary of the Air Force, two of whom shall be members of the Air National Guard of the United States and two of whom shall be members of the Air Force Reserve; and

(vii) a Reserve officer of general or flag officer grade appointed by the chairman of the Board with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, who shall act as military adviser to the chairman and shall serve as executive officer of the Board without vote.

(b) When the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury may designate a Regular or Reserve officer of the Coast Guard to serve with the Reserve Forces Policy Board but he shall not be a voting member.

(c) The Reserve Forces Policy Board, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Defense designated pursuant to section 257 (a) of this Act, shall be the principal policy adviser to the Secretary of Defense on matters pertaining to the reserve components.

(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or modify in any manner the functions of the committees on reserve policies established pursuant to section 5 of the National Defense Act, as amended, or by this act: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent a member of those committees from serving as a member of the Reserve Forces Policy Board

(e) The semiannual report of the Secretary of Defense as required by the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, shall contain a chapter which shall be a report of the Reserve Forces Policy Board on the status of the reserve programs of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 259. Each Armed Force of the United States shall maintain adequate and current personnel records of each member of its reserve components, indicating the physical condition, dependency status, military qualifications, availability, and such other data as the appropriate Secretary may prescribe.

SEC 260. (a) Prior to February 1, 1952, the Secretary of Defense is directed to submit to the Congress adequate and equitable legislative recommendations, as uniform as practicable for all the Armed Forces of the United States recognizing the inherent difference between the Armed Forces, for the promotion of Reserves, which shall conform as nearly as practicable to the system for the promotion of Regular members of that Armed Force, including recommendations concerning precedence (date of rank), forced attrition, distribution in grades, and constructive credit.

(b) Prior to February 1, 1952, the Secretary of Defense is directed to submit to the Congress adequate and equitable legislative recommendations, for the equalization of benefits between and among Regulars and Reserves of the Armed Forces of the United States.

SEC. 261. The Secretary of Defense is directed to require the complete and up-to-date dissemination of information of interest to the reserve components and to the public in general.

PART III—RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMY

SEC. 301. The Organized Reserve Corps is renamed and shall be known as the Army Reserve.

SEC. 302. The National Guard of the United States and the Army Reserve are reserve components of the Army. All officers and enlisted members of the National Guard of the United States and all officers and enlisted members of the Army Reserve are Reserve officers and Reserve enlisted members, respectively, of the Army.

SEC. 303 The Army Reserve includes all Reserve officers and Reserve enlisted members of the Army other than those who are members of the National Guard of the United States

SEC 304 Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws now or hereafter applicable to male officers and former officers of the Army Reserve, to enlisted men and former enlisted men of the Army Reserve, and to their dependents and beneficiaries shall in like cases be applicable respectively to female Reserve officers and female former Reserve officers of the Army Reserve, to Reserve enlisted women and former Reserve enlisted women of the Army Reserve, and to their dependents and beneficiaries except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the female persons in the Army Reserve The husbands of women members of the Army Reserve shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for over half of their support, and the children of such members shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their mother for over half of their support.

PART IV—RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD

SEC 401. The Naval Reserve is the reserve component of the Navy.

SEC 402 The Marine Corps Reserve is the reserve component of the Marine Corps.

SEC. 403. The Coast Guard Reserve is the reserve component of the Coast Guard

SEC. 404 The Naval Reserve shall be organized, administered, trained, and supplied under the direction of the Chief of Naval Operations. The bureaus and offices of the Navy shall hold the same relation and responsibility to the Naval Reserve as they do to the Regular Establishment.

SEC 405 The Marine Corps Reserve shall be organized, administered, trained, and supplied under the direction of the Commandant of the Marine Corps. The departments and offices of the Marine Corps shall hold the same relation and responsibility to the Marine Corps Reserve as they do to the Regular Establishment.

SEC 406. The Coast Guard Reserve shall be organized, administered, trained, and supplied under the direction of the Commandant of the Coast Guard The departments and offices of the Coast Guard shall hold the same relation and responsibility to the Coast Guard Reserve as they do to the Regular Establishment.

SEC. 407. For the purpose of considering, recommending, and reporting to the appropriate Secretary on reserve policy matters, there shall be convened at least annually, at the seat of government, a Naval Reserve Policy Board, a Marine Corps Reserve Policy Board, and a Coast Guard Reserve Policy Board At least half of the members of each such Reserve policy board shall be officers of the appropriate reserve component.

SEC 408. The act of March 17, 1949 (ch 23; 63 Stat. 14), is amended by striking out the first proviso thereof.

SEC 409. The Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe a suitable flag to be known as the Naval Reserve flag. This flag may be flown by seagoing merchant vessels—

(a) Documented under the laws of the United States, which have been designated by the Secretary of the Navy under such regulations as he may prescribe as suitable for

service as naval auxiliaries in time of war, and

(b) The master or commanding officer and not less than 50 percent of the other licensed officers of which are members of the Navy or Naval Reserve.

SEC. 410. The Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe a suitable pennant to be known as the Naval Reserve yacht pennant. This pennant may be flown by yachts and similar-type vessels—

(a) Documented under the laws of the United States, which have been designated by the Secretary of the Navy under such regulations as he may prescribe as suitable for service as naval auxiliaries in time of war, and

(b) The captain or owner of which is a member of the Navy or Naval Reserve.

SEC 411. In time of national emergency declared by the President or by the Congress and in time of war, the President is authorized to appoint qualified persons (including persons who hold no Regular or Reserve status) as temporary officers in the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve in any of the several commissioned officer grades, and persons so appointed may be ordered to active duty for such periods of time as the President may prescribe The appointment of such a temporary officer, if not sooner vacated, shall continue during the national emergency or war in which the appointment was made and for 6 months thereafter. All such temporary appointments may be vacated at any time by the President. Temporary officers so appointed may, upon application, and, if selected, be commissioned as a Regular or Reserve officer of the Armed Force of the United States in which he served as provided by law.

SEC 412 Temporary members now or hereafter enrolled in the Coast Guard Reserve are excluded from the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 413 Section 310 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Members of the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve who have performed a total of not less than 30 years' active Federal service, or who have had not less than 20 years' active Federal service, the last 10 years of which shall have been performed during the 11 years immediately preceding their transfer to a retired Reserve; may be placed in a retired Reserve upon their request

"(b) Except while on active duty, personnel transferred to a Retired Reserve as provided by this section shall be entitled to pay at the rate of 50 per centum of their active-duty rate of pay.

"(c) If a performance of duty for which commended occurred not later than December 31, 1946, officers specially commended for a performance of duty in actual combat with the enemy by the head of the executive department under whose jurisdiction such duty was performed shall be advanced to the next higher grade when placed in a Retired Reserve. However, officers heretofore holding rank or grade on the honorary retired lists of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve or hereafter holding rank or grade in a Retired Reserve pursuant to this section above captain in the Naval Reserve or above colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve solely by virtue of such commendation, if hereafter recalled to active duty, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be recalled either in the rank or grade to which they would otherwise be entitled had they not been accorded higher rank or grade by virtue of such commendation, or in the rank or grade held by them in a Retired Reserve.

"(d) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable to any person who is not a member of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve on the effective date of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1951.

"(e) The provisions of this section shall terminate 20 years from the effective date of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1951, but such termination shall not affect any accrued rights to retired pay.

"(f) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as prohibiting any person eligible for retirement under the provisions of this section from retiring under the provisions of any other law under which he may be eligible."

SEC 414. Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws now or hereafter applicable to male officers and former officers of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve; to enlisted men and former enlisted men of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve, and to their dependents and beneficiaries shall in like cases be applicable respectively to female Reserve officers and female former Reserve officers of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve, as appropriate, to Reserve enlisted women and former Reserve enlisted women of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve, as appropriate, and to their dependents and beneficiaries except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the female persons. The husbands of women members of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for over half of their support, and the children of such members shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their mother for over half of their support.

PART V—THE NAVAL MILITIA

SEC 501 The Naval Militia consists of the Naval Militia of the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia

SEC 502 The Secretary of the Navy may appoint any officer or enlisted member of the Naval Militia to the rank, grade, or rating for which qualified in the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve

SEC 503 When ordered to active duty in the service of the United States, members of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve who are members of the Naval Militia of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia shall stand relieved from all service or duty in the Naval Militia from the active duty date of the orders and for so long as they remain on active duty

SEC. 504. Such vessels, material, armament, equipment, and other facilities of the Navy and Marine Corps as are or may be made available to the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve may also be made available in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy for issue or loan to the several States, Territories, or the District of Columbia for the use of the Naval Militia if—

(a) at least 95 per centum of the personnel of the portion or unit of the Naval Militia to which such facilities would be made available are members of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve, and

(b) the organization, administration, and training of the Naval Militia conform to standards prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

PART VI—RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE AIR FORCE

SEC 601. The Air National Guard of the United States and the Air Force Reserve are Reserve components of the Air Force. All officers and enlisted members of the Air National Guard of the United States and all officers and enlisted members of the Air Force Reserve are Reserve officers and Reserve enlisted members, respectively, of the Air Force.

SEC. 602. The Air Force Reserve includes all Reserve officers and Reserve enlisted members of the Air Force other than those who are members of the Air National Guard of the United States.

SEC. 603. Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws now or hereafter applicable to male officers and former officers of the Air Force Reserve, to enlisted men and former enlisted men of the Air Force Reserve, and to their dependents and beneficiaries shall in like cases be applicable respectively to female Reserve officers and female former Reserve officers of the Air Force Reserve, to Reserve enlisted women and former Reserve enlisted women of the Air Force Reserve, and to their dependents and beneficiaries except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the female persons in the Air Force Reserve. The husbands of women members of the Air Force Reserve shall not be considered dependent unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for over half of their support, and the children of such members shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their mother for over half of their support.

PART VII—THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 701. The National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States are reserve components of the Army and the Air Force, respectively, and references in this act, in the absence of express provision otherwise, are to be construed accordingly. Whenever joint reference is made to the National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States on any matter of common concern together with reference to the Army and Air Force or other component thereof, the reference in the case of the National Guard of the United States shall be construed to be to the Army and in the case of the Air National Guard of the United States to be to the Air Force

SEC 702 (a) The National Guard of the United States shall consist of all federally recognized units, organizations, and members of the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, who, in addition to their status as such, are Reserves of the Army in the same commissioned, warrant, or enlisted grade as they hold in the National Guard of the several States, Territories, or the District of Columbia

(b) The Air National Guard of the United States shall consist of all federally recognized units, organizations, and members of the Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, who in addition to their status as such, are Reserves of the Air Force in the same commissioned, warrant, or enlisted grade as they hold in the Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, or the District of Columbia.

SEC 703. (a) To be federally recognized, a member of the National Guard or Air National Guard of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia must be a member of a federally recognized unit or other federally recognized subdivision of the National Guard or Air National Guard, respectively, and possess the qualifications prescribed by the appropriate Secretary for the grade, branch, position, and type of unit or other subdivision involved, and, in the case of officers, successfully pass the examination prescribed by section 75, National Defense Act, as amended.

(b) Upon being federally recognized, those officers who do not hold appointments as Reserve officers of the appropriate Armed Force of the United States shall be appointed as Reserve officers of the appropriate Armed Force of the United States in the same grade in which they hold appointments in the National Guard or Air National Guard of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, for service as a member of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States, as appropriate: *Provided*, That the acceptance of an appoint-

ment in the same grade and branch as a Reserve officer of the Armed Force of the United States concerned, by an officer of the National Guard or Air National Guard of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, shall not operate to vacate his State, Territory, or District of Columbia National Guard or Air National Guard office.

SEC 704 The appropriate Secretary may by regulation authorize the temporary extension of Federal recognition to any officer of the National Guard or Air National Guard who shall have successfully passed the examination prescribed in section 75 of the National Defense Act, as amended, pending final determination of his eligibility for, and his appointment as, a Reserve officer of the Army or Air Force in the grade concerned. If and when so appointed the appointment shall be dated as of, shall be considered to have been accepted on, and shall be deemed to have been effective from, the date of such recognition. However, a temporary extension of Federal recognition shall be granted only when the officer takes oath that during such recognition he will perform all Federal duties and obligations required of him the same as though he were appointed as a Reserve officer of the Army or Air Force in the same grade. Such temporary recognition may be withdrawn at any time and if not sooner withdrawn or replaced by permanent recognition upon appointment as a Reserve officer in the same grade, it shall automatically terminate 6 months after its effective date *Provided*, That temporary extension of Federal recognition may, as provided in this section, be granted to Reserve officers pending final determination of their eligibility for such Federal recognition.

SEC. 705 (a) Whenever a member of the Army Reserve or of the Air Force Reserve becomes a federally recognized officer of the National Guard or Air National Guard of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, in the same grade in which he is appointed as a Reserve officer of the appropriate Armed Force of the United States, he becomes a member of the National Guard of the United States or of the Air National Guard of the United States and ceases to be a member of the Army Reserve or of the Air Force Reserve.

(b) Whenever a member of the Army Reserve or of the Air Force Reserve is duly enlisted in the National Guard or Air National Guard of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, and is a member of a federally recognized unit or organization thereof, in the same grade in which he is a Reserve of the appropriate Armed Force of the United States, he becomes a member of the National Guard of the United States or of the Air National Guard of the United States and ceases to be a member of the Army Reserve or of the Air Force Reserve.

SEC. 706. Under such regulations as the appropriate Secretary may prescribe, and with the consent of the Governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia concerned, a member of the National Guard of the United States or of the Air National Guard of the United States may be transferred in grade at any time to the Army Reserve or the Air Force Reserve, and such transfer shall terminate his federally recognized National Guard or Air National Guard status. Upon the transfer of any person whose service has been honorable, from the National Guard of the United States or from the Air National Guard of the United States to the Army Reserve or to the Air Force Reserve, he shall be eligible for promotion to the highest permanent grade previously held in the Army or any component thereof or in the Air Force or any component thereof.

SEC. 707. Unless discharged from his appointment or enlistment as a Reserve officer or Reserve enlisted member, respectively, whenever a member of the National Guard of the United States or of the Air National Guard of the United States ceases to hold a status as a federally recognized member of the National Guard or of the Air National Guard of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, he becomes a member of the Army Reserve or of the Air Force Reserve and ceases to be a member of the National Guard of the United States or of the Air National Guard of the United States

SEC. 708. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, warrant officers and enlisted members of the National Guard of the United States and of the Air National Guard of the United States may, without affecting such status, hold appointments as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army or of the Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant or first lieutenant without vacating their warrant or enlisted grades and ratings in the National Guard or Air National Guard of the appropriate State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

SEC 709. Except when ordered thereto in accordance with law, members of the National Guard of the United States and of the Air National Guard of the United States shall not be on active duty in the service of the United States. When not on active duty in the service of the United States they shall be administered, armed, uniformed, equipped, and trained in their status as members of the National Guard and Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia.

SEC 710 When ordered to active duty in the service of the United States, members of the National Guard of the United States and of the Air National Guard of the United States shall stand relieved from duty in the National Guard and Air National Guard of their respective States, Territories, and the District of Columbia from the active-duty date of the orders and for so long as they remain on active duty in the service of the United States. During such active duty in the service of the United States they shall be subject to the laws and regulations applicable to members of the Army and Air Force.

SEC 711. Upon ordering any portion of the National Guard of the United States or of the Air National Guard of the United States into the active military service of the United States, the President may relieve the State, Territory, or District of Columbia concerned of such accountability and liability under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe for any United States property theretofore issued to it for the use of such portion of the National Guard of the United States or of the Air National Guard of the United States

SEC 712 (a) During the initial mobilization, insofar as practicable, the organization of units of the National Guard of the United States and of the Air National Guard of the United States existing at the date of an order to active Federal service shall be maintained intact.

(b) Upon being relieved from active duty, insofar as practicable, units, organizations, and individuals shall be returned to the National Guard and Air National Guard in their respective States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, together with sufficient arms and equipment as determined by the appropriate Secretary to accomplish their peacetime mission.

SEC. 713. (a) When officers and enlisted members of the National Guard of the United States or of the Air National Guard of the United States are ordered into Federal service they shall be ordered to active duty in their status as Reserve officers and Reserve enlisted members of the Army or Air Force.

(b) When the National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States is ordered into the active military service of the United States officers of the National Guard and of the Air National Guard who do not hold appointments as Reserve officers of the Army or Air Force may be so appointed by the President in the same grade and branch held by them in the National Guard or Air National Guard.

SEC. 714. For the purposes of all laws now or hereafter enacted providing benefits for members of the National Guard of the United States and of the Air National Guard of the United States and their dependents and beneficiaries—

(a) All military training, duties, and service performed by members of the National Guard of the United States or members of the Air National Guard of the United States while in their status as members of the National Guard or Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, for which they are entitled by law to receive pay from the United States, shall be considered military training, duties, and service in the service of the United States performed by them as Reserve members of the Army or Air Force.

(b) The full-time training or other full-time duty performed by members of the National Guard of the United States or members of the Air National Guard of the United States while in their status as members of the National Guard or Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia pursuant to sections 94, 97, 99, and 113 of the National Defense Act, as amended, for which they are entitled to receive pay from the United States or without pay as provided in section 241 of this act shall be considered active duty for training in the service of the United States as Reserve members of the Army or Air Force: *Provided*, That from the date of enactment of this act such duty for a period of 30 days or more shall be considered active service as members of the Armed Forces for the purposes of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 963) as amended (37 U S C. 31a et seq).

(c) The inactive-duty training performed by members of the National Guard of the United States or members of the Air National Guard of the United States while in their status as members of the National Guard or Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia under regulations prescribed by the appropriate Secretary pursuant to section 92 of the National Defense Act, as amended, or other express provision shall be considered inactive-duty training in the service of the United States as Reserve members of the Army or Air Force.

PART VIII—APPROPRIATIONS, REPEALS, AMENDMENTS, AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 802. Except as otherwise specifically provided, this shall become effective on the first day of the sixth month following the month of enactment.

SEC 803 The following acts and parts of acts are repealed.

The Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, except for the first proviso of section 1, section 3, and section 5 of title I, all provisions of title II, and sections 304 and 310 of title III. Notwithstanding the repeal of section 4 of title I of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, the Fleet Reserve established by said act shall be composed of persons transferred thereto in accordance with title II of said act, as amended, including citizens of the Philippine Islands who were in the naval service on July 4, 1946, or who having been discharged from the naval service on or prior to that date, reenlisted therein subsequent to July 4, 1946, but before the expiration of 3 months following discharge. The unrepealed provisions of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, shall continue to apply to the Marine Corps as well as the Navy.

The act of March 17, 1941 (ch. 19, 55 Stat. 43, as amended, 34 U. S. C. 855c-2).

Section 1 of the act of December 18, 1942 (56 Stat. 1066; 34 U. S. C. 853c–5).

The act of January 20, 1942 (ch. 12, 56 Stat. 10; 34 U. S. C. 853a–1).

Title 14, United States Code, sections 751, 752, 753, and 759.

Sections 37, 37a, 38, 55a, 55b, 70, 73, and 111 of the National Defense Act, as amended.

The second paragraph of section 58 of the National Defense Act, as amended (32 U S C. 4a).

Paragraph (b) of section 71 of the National Defense Act, as amended (32 U S C 4b).

The last paragraph of section 75 of the National Defense Act, as amended (32 U. S. C. 113).

The second sentence of section 77 of the National Defense Act, as amended (32 U. S. C. 114)

That portion of section 109 of the National Defense Act, as amended, which precedes the final proviso of the section (32 U. S. C 143).

Section 11 of the act of August 4, 1942 (56 Stat. 738, as amended, 34 U. S C. 850j).

Sections 2, 3, and 4 of the act of December 4, 1942 (56 Stat. 1039–1040, 10 U. S. C. 904b, c, and d)

Section 117 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 47, as amended; 10 U. S. C. 377).

Sections 109 and 310 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 362 and 374; 10 U S. C. 378, 5 U. S. C. 627i).

SEC. 804. The third and fourth paragraphs under the subheading "Ordnance Stores and Equipment for Reserve Officers' Training Corps" of the act of May 12, 1917 (40 Stat. 72), as amended (10 U. S. C. 371 and 371b), are further amended by striking out the words "Officers' Reserve Corps or Enlisted Reserve Corps" wherever they appear therein and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "reserve components of the Armed Forces" and by inserting in the third paragraph after the word "ordered" where it first appears the words "to active duty for training, or active duty, or"

SEC. 805 The Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended (10 U. S. C. 374–377), is further amended as follows:

(a) Section 115 is amended to read: "Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws and regulations now or hereafter applicable to commissioned officers and former commissioned officers of the Army Reserve and to their dependents and beneficiaries, shall, in like cases, be applicable respectively to commissioned officers and former commissioned officers of the Army Nurse Corps Section and the Women's Medical Specialist Corps Section of the Army Reserve and to their dependents and beneficiaries"

(b) Section 116 is amended to read: "Appointments of Reserve officers for service in the Army Nurse Corps Section and the Women's Medical Specialist Corps Section of the Army Reserve may be made in such grades and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years and who possess such physical and other qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army: *Provided*, That female officers appointed pursuant to the act of June 22, 1944, and honorably separated from the service thereafter may, if otherwise qualified, be appointed as Reserve officers in the highest grade satisfactorily held by them in active service"

SEC. 806 The National Defense Act, as amended, is further amended as follows.

(a) Section 69, as amended (32 U. S. C. 124), is further amended by striking out the words "and in the National Guard of the United States."

(b) Section 72, as amended (32 U. S. C. 125), is further amended by striking out the words "and the National Guard of the United States"

(c) Section 76, as amended (32 U. S. C. 115), is further amended by striking out the words "and he shall be discharged from the National Guard of the United States" in the second sentence thereof and the words "and his appointment in the National Guard of the United States may be terminated" in the third sentence thereof.

(d) Section 78, as amended (32 U. S. C. 132, 133, 134), is further amended by striking out the words "and in the National Guard of the United States" in paragraph 1 thereof, and by striking out the words "or the National Guard of the United States" in paragraph 2 thereof.

(e) Section 81, as amended (32 U S C. 172 and 175), is further amended by striking out the words "The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, by selection from lists of officers of the National Guard of the United States recommended as suitable for such appointment by their respective governors, and who have had 10 or more years commissioned service in the active National Guard, at least 5 of which have been in the line, and who have attained at least the grade of colonel The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall hold office for 4 years unless sooner removed for cause, and shall be eligible to succeed himself, and when 64 years of age shall cease to hold such office. Upon accepting his office, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall be appointed a major general in the National Guard of the United States, and commissioned in the Army of the United States, and while so serving he shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a major general, provided by law, but shall not be entitled to retirement or retired pay" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, by selection from lists of officers of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States recommended as suitable for such appointment by their respective governors, and who have had 10 or more years commissioned service in the active National Guard or Air National Guard or any combination thereof, and who have attained at least the grade of colonel. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall hold office for 4 years unless sooner removed for cause, and shall be eligible to succeed himself, and when 64 years of age shall cease to hold such office. Upon accepting his office, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall be appointed as a Reserve Officer of the appropriate Armed Force in the grade of major general and shall be a member of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States, as appropriate," in paragraph 1 thereof, and by striking out the words "hold appointments in" and inserting in lieu thereof the following words: "are members of" in paragraph 2 thereof, and by inserting after the word "States" where it first appears in paragraph 3 thereof, the words "or the Air National Guard of the United States,", and after the word "section" in the last sentence of said paragraph insert the words "and section 5, National Defense Act, as amended,", and in the same sentence after the word "States" by inserting the words "or Air National Guard of the United States", and by striking the period at the end of the sentence and adding the words "or Air National Guard"

(f) The seventh paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 513), is further amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and substituting a colon and adding the following: "*Provided further*, That persons may be appointed as Reserve officers of the Army or the Air Force in time of war."

(g) Section 55, as amended (10 U. S. C. 421, 423, 424, 425), is further amended by deleting all of the section except the last sentence thereof; and the last sentence of section 55, as amended, is further amended by deleting the comma first appearing therein and the words "whether" and "or the Enlisted Reserve Corps", and by inserting after the words "Regular Army" the words "or in the Regular Air Force."

SEC. 807. (a) Subsection (b) of section 2 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 is amended by inserting after the words "in any of the components of the Army;" the words "all persons appointed or enlisted as Reserves of the Army, including persons transferred to such status under any provision of law;".

(b) Section 301 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 is amended—

(1) by striking out the words "Organized Reserve Corps" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Army Reserve"; and

(2) by inserting after the words "above-named components," the words "all persons appointed or enlisted as Reserves of the Army, including persons tranferred to such status under any provision of law,"

SEC. 808 Section 5 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended (34 U. S. C. 853c), is further amended by striking out the words "Naval Reserve, including those on the honorary retired list created by section 309, title III, of this act or who may have been retired," and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve"

SEC 809 All provisions of law which refer to appointment or enlistment in or transfer to any of the Reserve components shall be deemed to refer to appointment or enlistment as a Reserve or transfer to such status in the appropriate Armed Force of the United States. All provisions of law which refer to persons enlisted or appointed in or transferred to any of the Reserve components shall be deemed to refer to persons appointed or enlisted as Reserves or transferred to such status in the appropriate Armed Force of the United States.

SEC 810 Any right accrued or any proceeding commenced before this act takes effect is not affected by the provisions of this act, but all procedure thereafter taken shall conform to the provisions of this act.

SEC. 811 (a) Nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal, limit, or modify, in any manner, the authority to order persons or units to active military service or training pursuant to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended.

(b) Except as otherwise specifically provided herein, nothing in this act shall be construed as changing existing laws pertaining to the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

SEC 812 Except as otherwise provided in this act, no back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued under the provisions of this act for any period prior to the effective date thereof.

SEC. 813. Section 4 (d) (3) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "appointed in the Armed Forces" where first appearing therein and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "appointed, under any provision of law, in the Armed Forces, including the reserve components thereof,".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill, which is urgently needed by the Congress and by the country. Mr. Speaker, we present to the House this morning a bill which seeks to organize the Reserve components of the Armed Services, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard. No one knows better than I, and no one feels more keenly than I feel about the abuses that have grown up in the Reserve system. No one feels more strongly than I feel about the shameful manner in which the Reserves in many instances have been called back to active duty in the Korean war. The record is replete with criticisms of and abuses in the manner by which these Reserves were called back into the service. The Department of Defense came down, and was very candid with the subcommittee, and told the subcommittee that it knew that the program had not been handled as it should have been handled, and it wanted a bill looking into the future, which would correct the abuses, iron out the injustices, and provide that such things as we have witnessed in the past 12 months should not reoccur in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not of recent origin. At least 2 years ago, the Reserve components realized that some bill should be written to properly organize our Reserve forces, and make them workable, and give them the proper importance in our defense establishment. Accordingly, the Civilian Components Policy Board was set up a year and a half ago. It functioned in the Pentagon building. Our good friend, Mel Maas, who lies sick today in the hospital and cannot be here on this occasion, worked untiringly that a proper bill might be brought to the committees of the Congress, and to the floor of the House. In due course, the Department of Defense presented us with a bill which bore the stamp of approval of the Civilian Components Policy Board In the course of hearings, which lasted almost 2 months, our committee called in all of the organized interested groups from the Reserves and from the patriotic groups We asked them to sit down with us in the committee room, and go over the bill, which we propose to you here in Congress today, line by line and paragraph by paragraph, and tell us whether or not it was the kind of bill they wanted to live under in the future. They came before the committee. They suggested amendments. Your committee wrote 90 major amendments into the bill Therefore, the bill has been rewritten by the Committee on Armed Services of the House. When we come here today, we give you a bill for the first time in the history of this country to organize the Reserve components, which bears the endorsement of every one of these groups. Just within almost the moment, Mr. Speaker, I received a wire from the American Legion National Convention in Miami. It is as follows:

MIAMI, FLA., *October 15, 1951.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,

New House Office Building:

The American Legion strongly urges passage of H. R. 5426, which we believe would go a long way toward correcting the abuses that have existed in the conduct of Reserve affairs. In addition, we believe the bill provides a sound basis for an efficient reserve program which is so essential to our national security.

MILES D KENNEDY,
Director, National Legislative Commission, the American Legion.

Within the last 10 minutes I received a letter from the National Guard Association endorsing the bill and wholeheartedly urging its passage. That letter is as follows:

NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D C, October 15, 1951.

Hon OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D C.

DEAR MR BROOKS: I am authorized to advise that the National Guard Association of the United States supports and endorses H R. 5426, a bill relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and known by the short title: "Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1951"

It would please this organization and the National Guard to have H R 5426 enacted during the first session of the Eighty-second Congress.

Respectfully yours,

ALLAN G CRIST,
Acting Executive Assistant.

Then I have a strong letter from the Reserve Officers Association, which is signed by E. A Evans, executive director, and Melvin J. Maas, chairman of the legislative committee, which reads as follows:

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D C, October 11, 1951

Hon OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D C

DEAR MR. BROOKS H R 5426 (Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1951) has been reported out unanimously by the House Armed Services Committee

This bill, as presently written, has the complete support of this association It will go far in preventing future injustices and inequities against the reservists, and it is therefore most urgent that it receive consideration during this session of Congress. Its passage now would greatly facilitate its prompt consideration by the Senate after the first of the year.

Your help in seeking prompt and favorable action on this bill—so badly needed by the Reserves of this Nation—would be sincerely appreciated.

Yours very sincerely,

E A EVANS,
Executive Director.
MELVIN J MAAS,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

I also have a letter from the AMVETS to the same purport, just as strong urging the immediate passage of this bill. That letter is as follows:

AMVETS,
Washington, D C, October 12, 1951.

The Honorable OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D C.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: AMVETS urge speedy consideration and enactment at this time by the House of Representatives of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1951, proposed by H. R. 5426.

We are happy to know that the bill has been given an open rule for Monday, October 15, 1951.

Recently, the Congress authorized over $56,000,000,000 to provide planes, ships, tanks, guns, and other materiel and to pay other costs of the Defense Department Reality of the human element should not be overlooked.

Planes, ships, and guns are the fists and striking force of the defense fighter, it is true, and muscles and sinews result from volunteers and selective service But it must be recognized that the fighter's backbone is made up of the vertebrae of the combined Reserve components of the Armed Forces. We need a whole fighter.

The concept of a unified and uniform Reserve program dates from the concept of unification of the Armed Forces Extensive hearings have been held by the House Armed Services Committee They made preliminary studies, later considered different bills and finally reported H R 5426 In the committee report (No. 1066), the purposes of the proposed legislation are stated to be: to implement the Universal Military Training and Selective Service Act, to utilize Reserve components more effectively, to maintain a strong Reserve force, and to place all Reserve components on an equal basis

AMVETS recommend immediate passage of H R. 5426 by the House of Representatives.

Very respectfully yours,

CHARLES H SLAYMAN, Jr.,
National Legislative Director,
AMVETS.

So when I come before you today I emphasize that every organization that has to operate under this bill desires its immediate passage. It is vital to the Reserves of the United States.

You ask, What does this bill contain, that it has the unanimous approval of all the patriotic and Reserve groups in the United States, as well as the Department of Defense? I will tell you briefly what it contains. It contains a general reorganization of your Reserve components. In the first place, we set up in the future a requirement that the head of the Reserve components in the Defense Department shall consist of an Assistant Secretary of Defense Then we set up the requirement that in each of the branches of the service, Army, Navy, Air, and Coast Guard, the head of the Reserve department shall be an Assistant Secretary in each of those Departments. Then, when you come down to the actual operation, we require under this bill that an officer of at least flag rank, or general rank, whose major duties shall be Reserve work, shall be in charge of the Reserve program.

Then, under that organization we hope to follow and obtain a workable Reserve program with proper emphasis on importance of the Reserve program of the future.

We provide in this bill, Mr. Speaker, for three classifications of Reserves. We provide that there shall be the Ready Reserves, the Standby Reserves, and the Retired Reserves. The Ready Reserve is the Reserve who, for a certain period of time, is eligible to be called out during a limited emergency, such as you have in Korea. We provide incentives so that that Reserve may go to work and, by participating in the Reserve program, may graduate from the Ready Reserve classification and go within 3 years to the Standby Reserve classification. When he goes into that classification we provide that that reservist shall never be called out except in time of all-out war or an emergency which the Congress itself has proclaimed is equivalent to

all-out war. So in the future, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the reservists will be in the Ready Reserves for 3 years, if he works hard, subject to being called out when there is a limited crisis; but after that he is, to all intents and purposes, short of all-out war, he will go out of the Reserve program. During that 3-year period, when he will hold himself available, his employer knows that he is subject to call. When he is out of that he can go ahead, get married, rear the family, build the home, borrow money, go into business, and he will have the assurance that he will not be subject to call with every passing emergency that may come along.

Further than that, that employer will know that when he employes a reservist in the future, if he is in the Standby Reserves, he will not be subject to being called out, and to all intents and purposes he will be a permanent employee of the employer.

The bill is extremely important, because it provides so many things that the reservist needs and he needs immediately; for instance, take the matter of uniform allowances: We provide in this bill that the reservist upon doing certain reserve training shall be entitled to $200 for uniform allowance, and later if he is called into active duty he will be given another $100 for uniform allowance; so these reservists will be fairly treated then they are called into active duty. We have another provision which provides that after they have served for 4 years they shall be entitled to an additional $50 for uniforms, which is badly needed.

We provide also one thing which the reservists want and want immediately, and that is a contract provision; they are all demanding it. They think it is one of the way by which our present troubles can be ironed out. Under this contract provision, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the proper branch of the service may offer to the reservist and make contract with him to go into the service for as long as 5 years and he will receive the pay of the rank for which he is called into service. If for any reason that contract is abrogated before the end of the 5-year period we provide liquidated damages, and he will receive 1 month's pay for every year that the contract is shortened. That means a great deal to these people. For instance, the Secretary of Air could go down to the University of North Carolina and say: "We need a professor here for a particular type of aeronautical work, and if we could get that man for 2 years we could give him a contract." The University of North Carolina can say: "We can afford to let that man have a leave of absence for 2 years. He may go into the Air Force if we know we shall have him back at the end of 2 years." So they both sign a written contract and then at the end of 2 years he comes back to his original post of duty. We think that as a result of that contract provision the services of many of these men can be secured, that the men will be more willing to come into active duty if they know their service will be for a limited time. We feel there will be no friction, but perfect accord, cooperation, and agreement between the reservists and the service in the handling of these contracts.

The reservists are very anxious that this provision be written into law at the earliest possible moment.

There is one more matter I think I should touch upon and that is a matter by which the regular reservists may be called into service. We provide that the President of the United States can proclaim an emergency which he thinks is severe enough to call into service the Ready Reserve. After he does that, the matter comes to Congress. Congress considers the proclamation and decides how many men are to be called into service. So you have the executive department proclaiming that the emergency exists, but the legislative department saying how many men shall be called into active service.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. How long do these Reserves have to stay in after they are called? As long as the emergency lasts?

Mr. BROOKS. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] to answer that question.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. For the information of the gentleman from Louisiana, and to answer the inquiry of the gentleman from Massachusetts, under existing law the inactive volunteer reservists must serve 17 months and the Active or Organized Reserves 24 months. Under the provisions of this bill when they are called into service in such an emergency as all-out war they serve for the duration plus 6 months.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I think that answers the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say one more thing: This act takes effect 6 months after its passage except for certain provisions like the contract provision that they want right away. It is something very important to them, and it is urgent that we get it through as soon as possible. I may be unusually hopeful, but I think if we can get this bill through today and send it over to the Senate—we have kept in touch through liaison with the Senate—there is a possibility of getting this thing through before we recess. It is important that it become law as quickly as possible.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was going to address a meeting of the American Legion today. I called them up and told them that the gentleman's bill was coming up for consideration. They said, "Stay where you are." They want this legislation.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentlewoman. There is no organization that has worked harder or in more perfect cooperation with the committee than has the American Legion and it is certainly entitled to our thanks.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill as most measures, is compromise legislation. We all know you have to give and take in order to enact any bill into law.

This bill, after not only many weeks and months of intensive and exhaustive hearings in this Congress but similar to other measures that have been considered for many years, was not produced hastily. It was carefully considered by a subcommittee and unanimously reported by that committee. However, I doubt if there is one individual member of our committee who would not change perhaps in some minor aspects the provisions of this bill. There are certain aspects of it which I do not like.

First, I think it is just a little premature in one respect. That is, it is predicated upon the assumption that we now have universal military training. We do not. It is stated that the purpose of the legislation is, first, to implement the Universal Military Training and Service Act. Well, what we really did last spring when we extended the Draft Act and voted the President the authority to call out any National Guard unit or reserve component at his own discretion, whether Congress was in session or not, was to unite with the extension of the draft the UMT which merely gave the President the power to set up a commission to make a study and report within 4 months before October 29 this year. I understand that commission has finished with its studies and has written a report. It has not yet been made public. It will be made public this week or before the 29th of this month. Then before the UMT becomes law the Congress of the United States, the Armed Services Committees of both the House and Senate, will have forty-five legislative days in which to study their recommendations. We can accept them in toto, we can modify them in any manner we may see fit, or we may reject them altogether. So I do not like legislation based upon something which really does not exist at this time. UMT is not law, although the American people have been fed up on a lot of false propaganda in an effort to convince the public that it is. Congress must first take positive and affirmative action on the commission's report before it becomes law.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I am glad the gentleman brought up that point and in connection with the point on the basis of letters that I have received and all of us have received from our constituents now in the service under the Inactive and Active Reserves, I have heard it repeatedly said that they shall never join the Reserves again.

Is this a voluntary bill or is it constructed on the basis that we are going to have compulsory Reserves?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say to the gentleman that the bill is so drafted and framed it will operate perfectly, whether there is a UMT or not. We have to be fair with our Reserves, whether we have the UMT or not.

Mr. SHORT. I quite agree with the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WIER. If I could, I would like to get the answer to my question: Is this compulsory or is it voluntary Reserves?

Mr. SHORT. It is both.

Mr. Speaker, another thing I do not like about this measure is that no one can predict what the cost will be. General Edwards, in his letter of transmittal to the Speaker of the House, our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, said on page 62 of the report:

Cost and budget data: It is not possible to estimate the fiscal effect of this proposed bill.

Now the third thing I do not like about it is it gives the President tremendous powers, perhaps not excessive powers, but the bill clearly states at the bottom of page 25, line 15:

(b) In time of national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President or when otherwise authorized by law, any unit and the members thereof, or any member not assigned to a unit organized for the purpose of serving as such, of the Ready Reserve of any Reserve component may, by competent authority, be ordered to and required to perform active duty involuntarily for a period not to exceed 24 consecutive months—

Mr. Speaker, these are broad and frightening powers, but I want to be perfectly fair. Our committee was wise in writing out this provision, giving us sort of a negative veto, or putting the brake on the Executive—

Provided, That Congress shall determine the number of members of the Reserve components necessary for the national security to be ordered to active duty, pursuant to this subsection prior to the exercise of the authority contained in this subsection.

So, Congress does have power to control the number of men that shall be called, just as we have the power over appropriations, of course.

Mr HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Would that action to be taken by the Congress be required to be taken in advance of the Presidential order, or subsequent to it?

Mr. SHORT. In advance of the Presidential order, I am glad to say, which makes it, I think, a good safeguard.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. To be more specific, we should say that the Congress shall authorize the President to call so many Reserves, and he can only call that number.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct. In closing, I want to say this to the Members of the House: In the past there has been some friction between the Regulars and our Reserves, and perhaps there is still some little ill feeling or hostility existing, but I think most of that feeling has been abolished or eliminated. This is the first time, as has been pointed out, that the National Defense Establishment or our Regular forces have agreed with our National Guard, the Air National Guard, the Reserve components, their veterans organizations, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the AMVETS; all of them have agreed on this legislation and consider it necessary in order to do away with many injustices and inequities that were suffered since the outbreak of the conflict in Korea. Of couse this bill will not correct past mistakes, but let us hope it will prevent their reoccurrence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to yield to one of the hard-working members of our committee, a man who made a remarkable record in both World Wars, who has always been tremendously interested in the Reserves, who is an able reservist himself, and who knows perhaps as much about this problem as any man in or out of Congress, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], 10 minutes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is only natural that I support H. R. 5426, the Armed Forces Reserve bill, which I regard as the Reserve bill of rights.

In discussing the bill, there are several points which I would like to bring to the attention of the House, because in my opinion all of us should be fully informed of the necessity for this legislation.

To begin with, it should be definitely understood that when this bill becomes law, its provisions will do nothing to atone for, or correct, past abuses under the present Reserve program. As a matter of fact, this proposed law will not become effective until 6 months after its enactment. Therefore, by that time all the Reserves who have been victims of shameful treatment by the Department of Defense will be separated from service unless they volunteer to remain on active duty. This bill is therefore a bill of rights for the Reserve of the future.

Another very important point is the fact that in previous laws affecting Reserves, Congress has always given wide latitude to military authorities in administering the law, with the result that the discretion used was not always in the best interest of Reserve personnel. I could cite many specific instances where a branch of the armed services adopted a policy, gave it wide publicity, and then rescinded it within a period of a few weeks, disregarding the interest and welfare of the Reserves concerned

For example, about this time last year, the Department of the Army announced a point system for the purpose of making possible the rotation of personnel for domestic and overseas service. It is freely said that the point program was announced solely for the purpose of quieting a lot of criticism on the eve of a political campaign. It is interesting to recall that after the troops in the field had been informed of the point program, and the politicial campaign was over, it was quietly laid aside and nothing further was ever heard of it. Therefore, you have a striking example of the use of discretionary authority when Congress refrains from spelling out its intentions, as to what should and should not be done with the Reserves of this Nation.

In this bill, I am pleased to report that Congress has spelled out every provision in detail, and in so doing, we are restricting the Department of Defense to an absolute minimum in the use of its discretionary powers. We are making it mandatory that the Reserves of this country in the future be treated in strict accordance with the provisions as they are spelled out in this legislation.

To guarantee that the will of Congress is carried out to the letter, this bill provides that a Reserve Forces Policy Board be established for the purpose of being the principal policy adviser to the Secretary of Defense on matters pertaining to the Reserve components.

This Board shall be composed of a civilian chairman, together with the Secretary, and an under or assistant secretary representing each military department From the Regular Establishment, one officer will represent each military department. However, from the Reserve standpoint, two Reserve officers will represent the National Guard, and two Reserve officers from each of the following: Army Reserve, Navy Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard of the United States.

In addition, a nonvoting Reserve officer of general- or flag-officer rank will act as executive officer of the Board. The Coast Guard Reserve will be represented by a Reserve officer who will not have a vote, since the recommendations of the Board and the decisions of the Secretary of Defense thereon are in no way binding on the Treasury Department, which has jurisdiction over the Coast Guard in peacetime.

You will note from this composition of the Reserve Forces Policy Board that the Reserve officers have the controlling vote, which means that any policy recommended by the Board will be truly in the best interests of Reserve personnel. Another factor about the Reserve Forces Policy Board is that the Reserve members on that Board cannot be arbitrarily removed if they assert their right to disagree to any recommendations submitted by the Department of Defense In other words, they can report direct to Congress if, in their opinion, the will of Congress is being ignored. Therefore, Congress, as the representative of the American people, retains its control over Reserve affairs.

Probably one of the most important benefits to be derived by the country as a whole from the enactment of this bill is the economy that will result from such a forward-looking Reserve program. We all know that the 1952 budget calls for an over-all amount of nearly $72,000,000,000 and of that sum about $57,000,000,000 is for military expenditures. It is predicted that next year's budget will be greater and that the military portion of it will be increased accordingly.

With the military taking such a large percentage of the budget, and with economists telling us that we have reached

the limit in military expenditures, the strictest economy possible must be practiced. In other words, we must stretch the military dollar as far as possible.

I think it is universally agreed that for years to come, we are going to be faced with the absolute necessity of retaining a strong military force, and we all know that requires billions of dollars annually. Then, too, we have hope that world conditions will improve to the extent that we will be able to shrink the Regular military establishments and depend upon the Reserves as a reservoir of trained manpower.

Let me explain the economy that will result from this bill. At the present time it costs $10,000 a year to maintain one member of our Armed Forces on active duty; while on the other hand when the full intent of this program is in effect, the average cost of maintaining a Reserve on inactive duty will be $434 annually. Therefore if world conditions permit shrinkage of the Regular establishments, their personnel will be discharged or will become members of Reserve units on inactive duty. The result will be that instead of costing the taxpayers $10,000 annually to maintain a member of the Regular establishment his place will be filled by a Reserve on inactive duty subject to immediate call whose annual average cost to the taxpayer will be $434.

I think you will agree that this legislation will actually reduce defense expenditures and permit a greater spread of the defense dollar. As a matter of fact, if world conditions permit, this legislation will effect a savings to the American taxpayers that could amount to billions of dollars annually.

In conclusion, as a Reserve myself for 34 years and at the present time commanding a Reserve brigade, I want to repeat again this measure is a bill of rights for Reserves in the future. It does nothing to correct the abuses and the shameful treatment accorded Reserve personnel by the Department of Defense. I am going to vote for this bill, but I do not want my support of this legislation interpreted as an act of forgiveness on my part. I intend with all the vigor I possess, to fight against a repetition of the deplorable treatment that Reserve personnel has received the past several months and for which no redress is now possible because the victims of such outrageous conduct were completely ignored as their protests fell on deaf ears. Frankly, those in the Department of Defense charged with the administration of Reserve policies since the beginning of the Korean war should hang their heads in shame.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania to say that this Advisory Board on the high echelon would have Reserve officers on it who would not be subject to transfer, if their views happened to clash with the high command.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Can the gentleman tell us how they would be appointed? Are they appointed for a term?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. They are appointed for a term and are on active duty only when the Board meets, with the exception of the general or flag officer who acts as executive officer and who will be on active duty. As I have said, the others will be on active duty only when the Board meets, and then on a per diem basis.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I thank the gentleman very much. This great committee deserves to be commended for bringing out a bill which is badly needed.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the remarks that the gentleman just made. I have been greatly disturbed at the administration of the Reserve program. Do I understand that if this bill is enacted, it will prevent in the future a repetition of the type of thing we have encountered with regard to the Reserves last year?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It certainly will. As I said during the course of these remarks, we spell out everything in this bill We leave practically nothing in the way of discretionary authority to the Department of Defense. We tell them what to do and through the Reserve Forces Policy Board the Congress will be kept informed as to whether or not the Department of Defense is treating the reservists of this country as we provide in this bill.

Mr. KEATING. This is legislation which is badly needed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment highly the chairman of the subcommittee, and to commend them for bringing to the floor of the House a bill that has the unanimous approval of the committee—a unanimous approval which came after weeks of careful and thorough study. There are many of us who have been disturbed about the Reserve program. This bill will, so far as the future is concerned, accomplish a legislative situation through which the mistakes of the past cannot be repeated. The Reserve program was not handled as Congress intended nor in the manner the reservists had a right to expect. It was the thought of almost every Member of Congress, that the Reserve components, particularly the Inactive Reserves, would not be called out except in the case of an all-out emergency.

This bill has the complete support of the Reserve Officers Association and the National Guard. It will go far in preventing future injustices and inequities against the Reserves. It is therefore most urgent that it receive prompt and favorable consideration in the House, in order that it may pass on to final enactment at this session.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker it hardly seems necessary for me to add my voice to those who have already spoken concerning the injustices and inequities which have been visited upon our reservists because of the blundering, indiscriminate ordering to active duty of reservists following the aggression in Korea.

In the past year there has been much written and said in criticism of the military departments and their recall programs for reservists. I will not attempt at this time to reiterate those criticisms for the mistakes made are all too apparent.

There can be no doubt that the Armed Forces were negligent in keeping up to date on the status of individual reservists. Records have been entirely inadequate. Moreover, even more fundamental than the lack of efficient administration of the Reserve components has been the failure of the Nation's military leaders to provide for the contingency of a partial mobilization. This lack of a plan for partial mobilization has brought about the unfortunate situation whereby inactive and volunteer reservists have been called to active duty indiscriminately and before the members of the Organized Reserve.

Now, I am the first to recognize and admit that the military services have done an outstanding job in getting men and matériel to the combat zone, but I also recognize, and the entire Nation knows, that this has been done at the expense of heartaches, broken homes, closed businesses, and lost jobs on the part of reservists.

Mr. Speaker, we must recognize that what has been done cannot be readily undone. We must also recognize that it gains us little to belabor the Department of Defense for what has happened in the past. Now, we must look to the future. It is our duty as representatives of the people to insure that such inequities and injustices as have been perpetrated are never again visited on American citizens.

How can we best do this?

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1951. I was a member of the subcommittee which wrote this bill. I sat in daily attendance with representatives of every prominent Reserve and veterans' organization while this bill was studied, written, and rewritten, paragraph by paragraph and line by line. The subcommittee did not pass from one portion of the bill to another until we had substantial agreement between those gathered around the table. And it must be remembered that those representatives who collaborated in writing the bill represent the veterans and reservists who must live with this bill and serve thereunder. They are satisfied with the legislation. They endorse it wholeheartedly. They urge its speedy enactment.

The legislation does four things: It implements the Universal Military

Training and Service Act, it provides for the more effective utilization of the Reserve components, it assures the maintenance of a strong and vigorous Reserve force, and it places all of the Reserve components of the United States Armed Forces on an equal basis.

The best feature of this bill is that it insures each reservist a position in a category where he knows exactly what his status is to be. The draftee or universal military trainee who has completed his training or service knows he must spend a minimum of 3 years in the Ready Reserve. This category of the Reserve will be available for immediate employment in any expansion of the Armed Forces in times of national peril. If, during these 3 years, he participates in a training program satisfactorily, he may, at his request, be transferred to the Standby Reserve where he will not be available for call except after a declaration of war, or in time of national emergency declared by the Congress.

The bill has many, many other excellent features too numerous for me to mention in the time allotted me on this occasion. But I would like to mention a few

For officers it provides across the board equal uniform allowances. It provides service contracts whereby a person may enter upon active duty voluntarily with a guaranty of how long he may stay on active duty, and, in this connection, provides liquidated damages in the event that the military department concerned terminates his contract at an earlier date. It provides common Federal appointments for National Guard officers and thus relieves an administrative burden heretofore placed upon them because of their National Guard status.

Every safeguard is provided for the administration of the Reserve compoments A high-level Reserve Forces Policy Board within the Department of Defense is written into law. This Board will be the principal policy adviser to the Secretary of Defense on Reserve affairs Further, there is designated a general or flag officer in each military department to be responsible for Reserve affairs within his armed force. And further, there shall be, under the provisions of the bill, an Assistant Secretary of each military department whose principal responsibility will be the affairs of the Reserve components within his department.

Mr Speaker, our reservists have suffered in the past 16 months because of the haphazard administration in the military departments. This bill, which has been reported to the House unanimously by the Armed Services Committee, will not afford immediate relief for the present reservists, but it will insure a positive and coordinated Reserve program for the future security of this Nation Heretofore, and especially under the present Reserve system, we had no definite and determinate plan with respect to reservists. This bill is designed to replace confusion and disorganization with a systematic, preconcerted Reserve policy.

Mr BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr DEGRAFFENRIED], who has worked long and faithfully on the committee on this bill

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Speaker, I am for this bill. As has been previously said, it cannot remedy all of the defects in connection with the hardships in the Reserves at this time. In other words, we cannot unscramble what they have already done with one swoop, to take effect immediately; but it is a permanent program that will prevent this from ever happening again.

I wish this bill could take effect where it would stop calling in inactive reservists, in the manner they have been calling them in, immediately, but that cannot be done. We cannot do that because of the rotation plan in Korea. We must have replacements over there. The rotation plan has had such magnificent effect on the morale of the troops in Korea that we cannot allow anything to interfere with that rotation plan. Therefore, we must have time to set up this program. We cannot let it take effect immediately as far as recalling reservists because it will interfere with that rotation plan. But as a permanent setup, I believe it is a good bill and a bill that is worthy of the support of the Members of this House. Under the provisions of this bill after July 1, 1953, no member of the Standby or Inactive Reserves can be recalled without a declaration of national emergency by the Congress and even the members of the Ready Reserves can only be recalled in such numbers as may be fixed hereafter by the Congress after the declaration of a national emergency by the President.

Mr BROOKS. Mr Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr CLEMENTE].

Mr CLEMENTE. Mr Speaker, I was a member of the special subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, under the able leadership of a real friend of the Reserves, Mr. BROOKS, of Louisiana, which wrote H R 5426, now being considered by the House This is a magnificent beginning and a firm basis from which future Reserve legislation can spring

I do not wish to take the time of the Members in reiterating what has already been said Rather, I would point to one provision of this bill because I feel it is one of the finest pieces of legislation affecting reservists which has been reported to the House since I have been a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have had some experience with the Reserve components, having been a Reserve officer for the past 22 years. I was a member of a Reserve component before World War II and trained with a unit in order to increase my proficiency. During the war I served on active duty for over 5 years Therefore, I feel that I am qualified to speak to the House at this time on what I think reservists want in legislation of this kind.

I would like to speak of section 236 of the bill. In order to stimulate the voluntary participation of reservists on extended active duty, this provision provides for the Secretaries of the departments to offer standard written agreements to reservists covering periods of active duty up to 5 years. Probably the greatest deterrent to voluntary active duty for extended periods is the uncertainty of the individual as to a period for which he will be retained by the Armed Forces of which he is a member. The active-duty contracts provided by this section of the bill will alleviate this condition by providing severance pay equal to 1 month of pay for each year not served for those released prior to the expiration of the contractual period of active duty. Of course, in return for this protection, the reservist must obligate himself to remain on active duty for the contract period. However, this section of the bill provides that a board of officers will determine the members to be released from active duty in the case of a reduction in the numerical strength of the military personnel of the Armed Forces. So you see that each reservist who comes to active duty and serves under the contractual provisions of this section of the bill is protected in every way. Upon entrance on active duty, he has a definite term to serve He can therefore make such plans as are necessary in civilian life for his absence while serving with the Armed Forces. Furthermore, if he must be released before the end of his contractual term, such release can only be effected upon the recommendation of a board of officers and, in addition thereto, the bill provides liquidated damages for a release before the end of the contractual term.

Prior to the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, a large portion of the standing Air Force establishment consisted of reservists who were voluntarily serving on extended active duty. The other Armed Forces had similar personnel on active duty Whenever it became necessary to reduce the strengths of the Armed Forces, reservists were among the first to be released, with the resulting disruption of their plans and careers. Such persons were forced, unexpectedly and on short notice, to seek other employment and otherwise readjust their lives It is to avoid the recurrence of such situations, as well as to meet the present needs for active duty personnel, that this bill provides for active duty contracts.

I believe that the use of these contracts will, in a large measure, alleviate the need to resort to involuntary orders to active duty and, in addition, will provide a measure of security to those reservists needed on active duty in peacetime to enable the Armed Forces to attain their authorized strengths.

Because the committee felt that this contract authority was of prime importance, it was made immediately available by the terms of the bill, although other provisions of the bill do not go into effect until 6 months after its enactment.

Mr Speaker, as a Reserve officer and a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I am of the opinion that this provision of the bill is of prime importance and one which reservists have long awaited.

Limitations on time preclude me from going into many of the other provisions of this worth-while legislation, but I join with the other members of the Armed Services Committee and the representatives of the Reserve and veterans' organizations in urging its enactment today.

Mr. BROOKS Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to serve throughout the day and night meetings of the members of the subcommittee which has made a very conscientious and a very thorough study of this entire bill. I am for the bill. I have no hesitancy in recommending it favorably to every Member of this House.

Amongst the reasons why I recommend this bill to your favorable attention and recommend that you vote unanimously for it is that during the several weeks that the subcommittee of Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, which was studying this bill had sit with us around the committee table, not only the official representatives of the Office of the Secretary of Defense but also a representative from each the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marines, the Coast Guard, but also we had sit with us around that conference table the national representatives of each of the military Reserve organizations, to wit: the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marines, the Coast Guard, and the National Guard This bill H R. 5426, has been properly designated as the Magna Carta of the military Reserves

Yes, my colleague, it comes to this floor with the already given cordial approval of the Department of Defense as well as the cordial approval of each of the national offices of the Reserves of the Army, the Air Force, the Marines, the Coast Guard, the Navy, and the National Guard.

As every individual of the human species has limitation and makes progress as a result of experiment and error, so your subcommittee in the preparation of this bill came face to face with some conditions affecting the present Reserves which were not satisfactory. But these were conditions in the past or existing in the present This bill cannot correct the past errors and injustices so far as their past occurrence is concerned, but these same inequities, injustices, and errors of our military, dealing with the Reserve Forces, will not occur again This is because H R. 5426 spells out in word and text how the Reserve individually and in a group shall be treated. Never again will any individual Reserve or group of Reserve components be called into the Armed Forces in such a state of uncertainty as to how long he or they shall have to serve or under what conditions they may be recalled or promoted or discharged. Therefore, this bill spells out the establishment of a Ready Reserve, a Standby Reserve, and a Retired Reserve.

First, as to the Ready Reserve: It will consist of those units or members of the Reserve components, or both, ready for active service in the expansion of the active Armed Forces in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress or in time of national emergency proclaimed by the President, or when otherwise authorized by law. Order to active duty during a Presidentially declared emergency cannot be made, however, until the Congress shall determine the number of Reserves who may be called.

The Standby Reserve will consist of those units or members of the Reserve components, or both, available for involuntary active duty only when authorized by action of the Congress. Again, in a few years, after the program is well under way, there will be two principal classes of individuals in the Standby Reserve

The Retired Reserve will consist of those members of the Reserve components who, having completed long and distinguished service in the Reserve components, voluntarily retain memberships as reservists Members of the Retired Reserve and persons on the inactive-status list may, if qualified, be ordered to active duty involuntarily only in time of war or national emergency declared by Congress or when authorized by law, and then only when there are no qualified members in the same category in the Ready Reserve or the active portion of the Standby Reserve.

Since my distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], and my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] have already gone into much detail in the premises, I will not now use all my time.

Mr. BROOKS Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the subcommittee which conducted hearings, which lasted about 6 weeks, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], I subscribe to this bill and consider it a measure that is not only highly necessary from the standpoint of correcting the conditions surrounding the Reserves since the Korean war, but likewise in that in the long run it will strengthen the security and military strength of this Nation. I am therefore supporting this measure.

Mr. SHORT. Mr Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I submitted three amendments to the committee this morning to protect the rights of the Reservists and prevent their being given dishonorable discharges without ever being given a hearing. This bill, without these amendments, would be unthinkable. The committee accepted my amendments. This bill as amended is a great improvement for the Reserves and National Guard. It is, I believe, a workable bill. But, as I stated, there was one joker in it which gave the President of the United States or any of the three secretaries the right to give a Reserve or guard officer or enlisted man a dishonorable discharge without hearing or even without notice. I called the President of the Reserve Officers Association, and of the National Guard Association; they said they were against that dictatorian and un-American provision. The matter was brought to the attention of the committee and they very kindly included amendments which are in the bill now which will take care of this objection.

The reservists and National Guard men have certainly needed some protection from the unfair manner in which they have been treated. I do not think this bill is a good improvement; I think it is a bill that is going to remedy many of the past evils, but it certainly would not have remedied those past evils by setting up a star chamber proceeding in the American Army under which they could dishonorably discharge a reservist or guardsman without even a hearing or notice. I know that this body would not have passed this bill unless the safeguards which are included in the amendments which I have offered and which have been accepted.

Mr SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this bill satisfies a need that is long overdue I trust it will pass the House overwhelmingly. The Armed Services Subcommittee, of which I am a member, held extensive hearings on this measure. It heard the representatives of every organization interested. After the hearings were completed the representatives of the Reserve organizations were permitted to sit in the committee room while the subcommittee redrafted the entire bill. The committee received from and adopted many valuable suggestions of the various Reserve organizations. As I understand it this bill in its present form has the endorsement of all Reserve organizations. It corrects many of the inequities heretofore in the Reserve program.

Unfortunately it will not help those who have suffered from past mistakes and faulty administration. It is a measure for the future only. Although I would like to have seen a better bill, I am both pleased and amazed it is as good as it is. As has been said, it is truly a "bill of rights" for the reservists of the future.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to this legislation, since it is designed to prevent further misunderstandings relating to Reserve components in the future. The thing that is of real importance is to relieve and correct as far as can be done now, at this late date, a wrong that has been permitted against the thousands of Reserves who are in active service in all parts of the world. The committee, by this legislation, has not dealt with that problem at all. I realize that all kinds of excuses are given as to how and why these unfair conditions, and in many cases hardships, have been permitted to occur.

Mr. Speaker, this committee ought to submit legislation that will deal directly

with the release of all Reserves now serving in the Armed Forces. The legislation should be in line with a bill I submitted to this committee on July 11, 1951, being H. R. 4767. You have admitted the unfair situation that exists. Then why not proceed to correct it now? The House has already recognized the merits of my proposal by adopting an amendment to the Military Appropriation Act, H. R. 5054. This is an amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr VAN ZANDT], who just addressed the House The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] is an outstanding authority on military affairs He has seen active service in two wars He is past commander of the VFW of the United States. Incidentally, his amendment was approved by a big majority of this House.

I would like to submit the provisions of my bill as an amendment to the pending legislation. I realize that under the rule by which the bill is brought before us a Member will be ruled out of order if amendments are submitted from the floor.

My proposal is an amendment to section 21 of the Military Training and Service Act. It provides as follows:

(a) Until July 1, 1953, and subject to the limitations imposed by section 2 of this act, the President shall be authorized to order into the active military or naval service of the United States for a period of not to exceed 24 consecutive months, with or without their consent, any or all members and units of any or all Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States and retired personnel of the Regular Armed Forces.

(b) Unless he is sooner released under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned, any member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States who is now or may hereafter be ordered to active duty pursuant to this section, shall upon completion of 12 or more months of active duty since June 25, 1950, if he makes application therefore to the Secretary of the branch of service in which he is serving, be released from active duty and shall not thereafter be ordered to active duty for periods in excess of 30 days without his consent except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress.

Mr Speaker, my proposal is fair It is equitable If approved it will relieve many, many hardships now existing in hundreds of homes in this country. You will observe that, under my measure, the reservist may serve 2 years unless he requests a release. If so, then he can be released after 12 months' service If a man does not want to be released he will remain in the service. Do not forget a good share of these reservists have already served many months overseas. And do not forget that amendment does not exempt these reservists, in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by Congress.

Mr SHORT. Mr Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE].

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter here from Col. Armon H. Bost, of Tulsa, Okla., dated October 13, 1951. Colonel Bost was the commanding officer of the Three Hundred and Sixth Logistical Command at Camp McCoy, Wis., and he probably knows more than any other man about the disgraceful manner in which the inactive reservists are treated. His letter follows.

TULSA, OKLA., *October 13, 1951.*

Hon. GEORGE SCHWABE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D C

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHWABE I have delayed writing several weeks concerning a very distressing situation involving the unit which I commanded at Camp McCoy, Wis., from the day of its induction, last year, until the day of my release on September 9, 1951 Since my return to Tulsa and my resumption of business I have steadfastly believed that the condition existing relative to the number of months' service required for officers of the unit would be clarified by the Department of Army Instead the situation has gone from the ridiculous to the sublime with the result that the morale has completely broken from the standpoint of most officers, and the suspense and anxiety on the part of the families has been very severe Officers are still being alerted for overseas—several from this unit—although they are clearly qualified with the intent UMT law and would be released from active duty at the end of 17 months' service This 17 months' period will be completed February 15, 1952, but in spite of this, and with only 4 months of service remaining, Three Hundred and Sixth officers are still ordered to the various ports of embarkation awaiting shipment overseas One officer of this unit was alerted this week for shipment overseas in February 1952

I have had long and detailed experience with personnel handling in the Army (much of my experience in World War II was in that line) and I have continually felt that this situation would be cleared up long before now At this late date it appears no nearer a solution than it was last July, when the first request for clarification was made

As you know, the Three Hundred and Sixth was not a unit of long standing prior to its alerting for active duty, in fact it did not even exist prior to August 4, 1950 On that date it was activated and filled to capacity with volunteer and inactive officers and enlisted men Every man was ordered involuntarily into the unit A few days later I was told the unit was being alerted for active duty, and on August 17, 1950, the alert was confirmed officially. During this 13-day period no man was trained, assigned to a job, nor in any manner participated in matters normally covered by the Active Reserve In spite of all this, we were classified as Active Reserve and the officers of the unit are now facing a 24-month tour of duty instead of the 17-month tour for which they are qualified if they were recalled as individuals The Army recognized this, insofar as the enlisted men were concerned, and set up a policy authorizing the release of our men who were assigned to active units after July 25, 1950. It was placed into effect, and of the 159 enlisted men originally called to active duty with the Three Hundred and Sixth all but 25 have been released The remainder will be released in November In other words, the precedent has already been established with the Three Hundred and Sixth qualifying all personnel for release, but the policy has not been recognized in its entirety for the officers in the command.

I have worked closely with the Reserve Officers Association, and on September 28 was advised by Col. C. M. Boyer, of R O A., that all Army commanders were being instructed, on that day, to screen out officers involuntarily assigned to active units after July 25, 1951, and subsequently ordered to active duty. This word has apparently been muddled somewhere along the line, as officers of the Three Hundred and Sixth are still being ordered to ports of embarkation and others are still being alerted.

All officers concerned are residents of Tulsa or northeastern Oklahoma, and we are looking to you for strong and determined action in meeting with this situation and getting it cleared up The original alert, 1 year ago, was sufficient shock and sacrifice for the families of the officers of the Three Hundred and Sixth without further aggravating the situation by the complete gross indifference and complete lack of consistency on the part of the Department of Army Will you please give me a full report at your earliest opportunity, so that I may know what steps to take next for the officers of my previous command.

Sincerely yours,

ARMON H BOST

I quote with emphasis the following language from Colonel Bost's letter

Officers are still being alerted for overseas—several from this unit—although they are clearly qualified within the intent UMT law and would be released from active duty at the end of 17 months' service This 17 months' period will be completed February 15, 1952, but in spite of this, and with only 4 months of service remaining, Three Hundred and Sixth officers are still ordered to the various ports of embarkation awaiting shipment overseas One officer of this unit was alerted this week for shipment overseas in February 1952

Who can answer this?

Mr VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr SCHWABE. I yield

Mr VAN ZANDT. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the following sleeper contained in Public Law 51, Eighty-second Congress, which reads as follows:

Unless he is sooner released under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Military Department concerned, any member of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve who served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, inclusive, who is now or may hereafter be ordered to active duty pursuant to this section, shall, upon completion of 17 or more months of active duty since June 25, 1950, if he makes application therefor to the Secretary of the branch of service in which he is serving, be released from active duty and shall not thereafter be ordered to active duty for periods in excess of 30 days without his consent except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress *Provided*, That the foregoing shall not apply to any member of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve ordered to active duty whose rating or specialty is found by the Secretary of the Military Department concerned to be critical and whose release to inactive duty prior to the period for which he was ordered to active duty would impair the efficiency of the Military Department concerned.

Mr. SCHWABE. I sincerely trust that the other body will immediately act favorably on this bill, H. R. 5426, and that it will become a law before this session of Congress adjourns.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], a member of the subcommittee, who has worked very hard on this legislation.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the time allotted to me I could not, of course, fully express my point of view on the 76 pages that comprise this bill.

This bill has been called the Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, of the reservists. It is no panacea, because even under the provisions of this bill a civilian at heart will not remain necessarily a civilian in fact. In fact, no legislation can be devised which will give personal security when the military security of our country is threatened. This bill is, however, an affirmative step in the right direction. It presents an opportunity for fair treatment and equality between individuals and between the various services. It establishes a more effective Reserve organization; it spells out in detail the degree of responsibility that a young man has to his country so that he will have an opportunity to plan his life. It requires the Secretary of Defense to disseminate complete and up-to-date information of interest to the Reserves and to the public in general, which should relieve, in the future, much of the confusion that existed heretofore because of a lack of such information. It provides active-duty contracts up to 5 years, which should relieve much of the uncertainty of the individual as to the period for which he will be retained in the Armed Forces. If this bill is passed and administered wisely, it will give the Reserves more reassurance and know what is expected of them. It is hoped that in the near future this bill will permit us to reduce the size of our standing Armed Forces and the tremendous cost required to sustain them. I believe this bill should have the unanimous support of the House.

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is news when man bites dog. It is bigger news when the hard-pressed American taxpayer gets a break. Therefore, I want to call the attention of the House membership to two big breaks which recently came to J. Overburdened Taxpayer by courtesy of the United States Navy.

History proves that we Americans at the end of any war naively believe that there will never be another war and proceed with unthinking abandon to dismantle the military machine which we have built up at such a high cost of treasure, suffering, and life.

After World War I, we scrapped our fleet. Not only obsolescent types, but new vessels on the ways. This saturnalia of destruction and disarmament hastened World War II. Instead of maintaining mastery of the seas—as we could have done—we turned it over to the British and the Japanese. By that act Pearl Harbor became inevitable.

There were those who after World War II contended that since Russia had no fleet we needed none. Fortunately, they did not have their way. The Navy developed a substitute that saved the day. Obviously, we could not afford the manpower needed to keep all of our fleet units in commission. Was the only alternative to sink them or to leave them to rust? Many thought so. But the Navy thought otherwise. The technique of mothballing was devised. Our largest and most costly ships were sealed in a protective, airtight covering and the interior compartments were pumped dry of moisture, which causes corroding rust. Now that the international situation has deteriorated to such an extent that we must build up our defense potential, we find the Navy ready. In 30 days a ship can be taken out of mothballs. By the time she is once again put in commission, there is ready to man her a trained, experienced ship's company, most of whom have been ordered to active duty from the ranks of the Naval Reserve. Since the beginning of Korean hostilities 3 battleships, 3 cruisers, 8 large, 1 light, and 6 small carriers, 78 destroyers and destroyer escorts, and 19 submarines have been taken out of mothballs, manned with crews, and are now guarding the highways of ocean commerce and strategic areas from the Persian Gulf to Korea and from the Aleutians to Australia against Communist aggression.

If the ships now being taken out of mothballs had been scuttled after World War II, as was done after World War I, the cost of building them today would be more than twice what it was prior to and during World War II. So, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the Navy's foresight in believing that we would need our fleet in the future and its ingenuity in developing the mothballing process, credit the hard-pressed American taxpayer with one tax break.

The taxpayer got another break in the Naval Air Reserve. The Naval and Marine Air Reserves are the fleet's modern minutemen. We, as a nation, cannot afford a full-time military service adequate to our needs in the event of attack. In the modern world enemies do not give warning. They strike overnight. We learned that at Pearl Harbor. Since we are a nonmilitaristic Nation and since the luxury of a standing Regular military service adequate to our needs in the event of attack is something which we cannot afford, we must look to a trained and ready Reserve to protect us in that event.

Mr. Speaker, a reserve does not consist merely of a roster of names. Names alone mean nothing unless they have the technical skill and training to perform the duties which they will be called upon to discharge in the event of all-out war.

The Naval and Marine Air Reserve meets this twofold requirement. After the Korean emergency with only 24 hours' notice, 3,000 of the Naval and Marine Corps air reservists were called to active duty. Within 24 hours of receiving their orders 98 percent of those who were directed to active duty had reported aboard their stations and were ready. The other 2 percent were returning from vacations or business trips. There were 3,104 of these week-end warriors who answered the call. Of this number 728 were officers and 2,376 were enlisted personnel. Remember, Mr. Speaker, these were normal civilians earning their living just as your neighbor around the corner. Within their ranks were butchers, bakers, professional men, and salesmen. They left their jobs and families to answer the call in our national emergency. They proved themselves in the crucible of war in Korea. In June of 1951 every third air strike against the Communist enemy was flown by a Naval and Marine Corps air reservist. In that same month 46.22 percent of all combat sorties flown against the enemy were flown by Naval and Marine Corps aircraft. In the month of June we had three aircraft carriers in action in Korean waters. Of the Air Groups serving aboard these carriers 50 percent of the *Princeton's* were reservists, 90 percent of the *Boxer's* were reservists, and 100 percent of the *Bon Homme Richard's* were reservists. The enemy learned about the week-end warriors to his sorrow. At the end of World War II the Naval and Marine Air Corps had 45,000 Reserve pilots and 200,000 Reserve aviation enlisted personnel on active duty. The Navy Department was determined not to allow this reservoir of trained manpower to be dissipated. They resolved that this valuable asset should be retained as an entity in the event of war and should continue their training. The answer was the Naval and Marine Corps Air Reserve training program.

At the present time there are in commission throughout the Nation from coast to coast and from border to border 28 Naval air training stations and 38 outlying facilities. The Navy did not ask their reserve air personnel to come to them. The mountain came to Mohammed. At these various localities throughout the country there are facilities where the week-end warriors can keep their hand in and retain their proficiency. There are outlying facilities located in cities where there is no regular Naval air station. On week ends personnel from the nearest Naval air stations bring aircraft to the outlying localities so that Naval and Marine Corps aviators from the immediate vicinities can come there and get their training.

Trained manpower is strength. Still available for call if needed are over 40,000 trained Naval and Marine air reservists and more than 11,000 trained support personnel. Translated into fighting strength this means 475 combat units ready, willing, and able to repel any enemy who might attack us.

The cost of maintaining a trained ready reserve Naval and Marine Corps combat squadron is approximately one-sixth of what the cost would be if all of them were on active duty.

Seven-tenths of the earth's surface is water. Wherever there is deep water, a carrier can sail. Wherever a carrier can sail, a naval or marine aviator can attack the enemy. Through control of the seaways of the earth we can compensate for our numerical inferiority on manpower. The most important element in maintaining this potential is the Naval Air Reserve training program.

The Naval Air Reserve is not a static organization. They do not rely solely upon World War II veterans. Consistently they are procuring new hands, new talent, new aviators. The Naval Air Cadet training program turns out a new supply of pilots every year. When these pilots receive their wings of gold and have completed 18 months of basic and advanced flight training and have served with the fleet, they return to their home base and become enrolled in a local Naval Air Reserve training unit. When these young Naval aviators depart from active duty, the Navy League, the civilian arm

of the Navy, concerns itself with finding them employment in localities where there is a Naval air station and where they can retain their proficiency.

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering H. R. 5426, the new bill reported out of the Committee on Armed Services for the reserve components of the armed forces. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Naval and Marine Corps Air Reserve training program provides a model after which all reserve components can pattern themselves. Truly, Mr. Speaker, in the Naval and Marine Corps Air Reserve we have a tremendous asset at bargain cost.

So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say that our Nation and the American taxpayer is twice beholden to the United States Navy and the Marine Corps for two defense bargains in the mothball fleet and in the Naval and Marine Corps Air Reserve.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H. R. 5426, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 457 was laid on the table.

AMENDING PUBLIC LAWS NOS. 815 AND 874 WITH RESPECT TO SCHOOLS IN CRITICAL DEFENSE HOUSING AREAS

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 5411) to amend Public Laws Nos. 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense housing areas, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 3 of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, 81st Cong.), is amended by striking out subsection (e) and redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively.

(b) The subsection of such section herein redesignated as subsection (e) is amended to read as follows:

"ADJUSTMENT FOR CERTAIN DECREASES IN FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

"(e) Whenever the Commissioner determines that—

"(1) a local educational agency has made preparations to provide during a fiscal year free public education to a certain number of children to whom subsection (a) or (b) applies, and

"(2) such preparations were in his judgment reasonable in the light of the information available to such agency at the time such preparations were made; and

"(3) such number has been substantially reduced by reason of a decrease in or cessation of Federal activities or by reason of a failure of any of such activities to occur, the amount (if any) to which such agency is otherwise entitled under this section for such year shall be increased to the amount to which, in the judgment of the Commissioner, such agency would have been entitled but for such decrease in or cessation of Federal activities or the failure of such activities to occur, minus any reduction in current expenditures for such year which the Commissioner determines that such agency has effected, or reasonably should have effected, by reason of such decrease in or cessation of Federal activities or the failure of such activities to occur."

SEC. 2. (a) The parenthetical matter contained in clause (B) of section 4 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows: "(not counting as available for such purpose either payments under section 2 or 10 of this act, or funds from local sources required to meet current expenditures necessary to provide free public education to other children) "

(b) Section 4 (a) of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The determinations whether an increase has occurred for purposes of clause (1) hereof and whether such increase meets the 10 percent requirement contained in such clause (or the 15 percent requirements under subsection (d)), for any fiscal year, shall be made on the basis of estimates by the Commissioner made prior to the close of such year, except that the foregoing provisions of this sentence shall not affect the entitlement of an agency to payments under this section to which it would be entitled but for such provisions."

SEC. 3. Clause (A) of subsection (c) of section 4 of such act is amended by inserting "in the case of subsection (b) of this section," immediately after "(A)."

SEC 4. Section 4 of such act is further amended by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f) and by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"ADJUSTMENT FOR CERTAIN DECREASES IN FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

"(e) Whenever the Commissioner determines that—

"(1) a local educational agency has made preparations to provide during a fiscal year free public education for a certain number of children to whom subsection (a) applies;

"(2) such preparations were in his judgment reasonable in the light of the information available to such agency at the time such preparations were made; and

"(3) such number has been substantially reduced by reason of a decrease in or cessation of Federal activities or by reason of a failure of any of such activities to occur, the amount (if any) to which such agency is otherwise entitled under this section for such year shall be increased to the amount to which, in the judgment of the Commissioner, such agency would have been entitled but for such decrease in or cessation of Federal activities or the failure of such activities to occur, minus any reduction in current expenditures for such year which the Commissioner determines that such agency has effected, or reasonably should have effected, by reason of such decrease in or cessation of Federal activities or the failure of such activities to occur "

SEC. 5 (a) Subsection (a) of section 5 of such act is amended by striking out "section 2, 3, or 4" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 2, 3, 4, or 10."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 5 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"CERTIFICATION AND PAYMENT

"(b) The Commissioner shall from time to time (but not less often than twice each fiscal year) certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each local educational agency, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, the amount which the Commissioner estimates such agency is entitled to receive under this act for the period for which such payment is to be made. The amount so certified for any period shall be reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which he finds that the amount paid to the agency under this act for any prior period (whether or not in the same fiscal year) was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to it for such prior period. Upon receipt of such certification, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the local educational agency in accordance with such certification."

(c) Subsection (d) of section 8 of such act is repealed

SEC 6. Section 6 of such act is amended by striking out the second sentence and inserting the following in lieu thereof: "In any case in which the Commissioner makes such arrangements for the provision of free public education in facilities situated on Federal property, he may also make temporary arrangements for providing free public education in such facilities for children residing in any area adjacent to such property with a parent employed on such property, but only if the Commissioner determines that the provision of such education is appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act and the need therefor is of temporary duration, and only if it is his judgment, after he has consulted with the appropriate State educational agency, that no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for such children. To the maximum extent practicable, education provided under this section shall be comparable to free public education provided for children in comparable communities in the State "

SEC 7. The second sentence of section 9 (1) of such act is amended to read as follows: "Such term includes real property leased from the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force or from the Atomic Energy Commission under section 805 or 810 of the National Housing Act, as amended, for the purpose of title VIII of such act."

SEC. 8. Such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"CRITICAL DEFENSE HOUSING AREAS

"SEC 10 (a) If the Commissioner determines for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1951, or the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, that—

"(1) the amount (if any) payable under the other provisions of this act with respect to free public education to a local educational agency the school district of which includes part or all of a critical defense housing area, together with the funds available for such purpose from other Federal, State, and local sources, is less than the current expenditures required to provide suitable free public education in such school district; and

"(2) provision of such education in such school district is required in connection with national defense activities in the area, and

"(3) such local educational agency is making a reasonable tax effort and is exercising due diligence in availing itself of State and other financial assistance available for the purpose,

he may provide the additional financial assistance necessary to enable such agency to make the current expenditures required for suitable free public education in such district for such year, upon such terms and in such amounts (subject to the provisions of this section) as the Commissioner may consider to be in the public interest, but such additional assistance may not exceed the portion of such current expenditures which the Commissioner estimates to be attributable to the national defense activities in the area and not to be recovered by the local educational agency from other sources, including payments by the United States under any other provisions of this act or any other law. All determinations by the Commissioner under this section shall be made only after consultation with the State educational agency and the local educational agency.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary

to carry out the provisions of this section, including the administration thereof.

"(c) For purposes of this section—

"(1) the determination of the current expenditures necessary to provide suitable free public education shall be made by the Commissioner after considering the current expenditures per child in providing free public education in those school districts in the same State which, in the judgment of the Commissioner, are most nearly comparable to the school district of the local educational agency for which the determination is being made;

"(2) the term 'critical defense housing area' means (A) any area determined to be such pursuant to section 101 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 (Public Law 139, 82d Cong.), and (B) any area which the President declares would be determined to be such if the term 'community services' (as used in such section 101) included free public education and the term 'community facilities' (as used in such sec. 101) included facilities required for free public education;

"(3) the term 'national defense activities' shall have the same meaning as when used in title III of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951."

SEC. 9. (a) The act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, 81st Cong.), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE III—CRITICAL DEFENSE HOUSING AREAS

"ADDITIONAL PAYMENTS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 301. (a) If the Commissioner determines, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1951, or the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, that—

"(1) the amount (if any) otherwise payable under this act to the appropriate local educational agency, the school district of which includes part or all of a critical defense housing area, together with the funds available for such purpose from other Federal, State, and local sources, is less than the amount necessary to provide the minimum facilities required for free public education in such school district for the year for which the determination is made or for the succeeding fiscal year; and

"(2) provision of such facilities is required in connection with national defense activities in the area; and

"(3) such agency is making a reasonable tax effort and is exercising due diligence in availing itself of State and other financial assistance available for the purpose,

he may provide the additional financial assistance necessary to enable such agency to provide the minimum facilities required for free public education in such school district, upon such terms and in such amounts (subject to the provisions of this section) as the Commissioner may consider in the public interest, but such additional assistance may not exceed the portion of the cost of such facilities which the Commissioner estimates is attributable to the national defense activities in the area and not to be recovered by the local educational agency from other sources, including payments by the United States under any other provisions of this act or any other law. If the Commissioner determines that even with such additional assistance such local educational agency is demonstrably unable to provide such minimum facilities, he may make arrangements for constructing or otherwise providing the minimum facilities required for free public education in such school district, but only to the extent required in connection with the national defense activities in the area.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, including the administration thereof; except that after June 30, 1953, no agreement may be made to extend assistance under this section and no construction of facilities by the United States may be begun or arrangements for the provision of facilities made.

"(c) For purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'critical defense housing area' means (A) any area determined to be such pursuant to section 101 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 (Public Law 139, Eighty-second Congress), and (B) any area which the President declares would be determined to be such if the term 'community services' (as used in such section 101) included free public education and the term 'community facilities' (as used in such section 101) included facilities required for free public education;

"(2) the term 'national defense activities' shall have the same meaning as when used in title III of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951.

"(d) In carrying out his functions under the last sentence of subsection (a) the Commissioner shall have all the authority given the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (and be subject to the restrictions imposed on him thereby) by sections 305, 306, 307, 309, and 310 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 No facilities provided under such sentence, and no facilities provided under section 204, shall be made available for operation by a local educational agency except upon assurance by such agency that the school facilities of such agency will be available to children for whose education contributions are provided under this title or title II on the same terms, in accordance with the laws of the State in which the school district of such agency is situated, as they are available to other children in such school district. Any facility provided under such sentence or under section 204 which is not made available for operation by a local educational agency, and which is situated in a community in which the laws of a State are generally applicable, shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be made available to the children for whose education it shall have been provided in accordance with the laws of such State. All determinations by the Commissioner under this section shall be made only after consultation with the State educational agency and the local educational agency.

"(e) No payment may be made to any local educational agency under subsection (a) except upon application therefor filed in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner and meeting the requirements of section 205 (b) (1).

"(f) In the case of any local educational agency to which payments are made under this section, or to which facilities provided under this section are made available with reasonable assurance, as determined by the Commissioner, that such agency will have the right to use such facilities for the remainder of the estimated usable life of such facilities, that portion of the maximum amount which such agency would otherwise be entitled to receive under section 202 of this act which has not been expended or obligated under section 205 as of the time such payments are made or facilities made available, shall be reduced by the amount of such payment, or by the cost to the United States of such facilities, as the case may be."

(b) Section 209 (a) of such act is amended by inserting "or title III" after this title".

(c) Section 209 (b) of such act is amended by inserting "or title III" after this title".

(d) The second sentence of section 210 (1) of such act is amended to read as follows: "Such term includes real property leased from the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force or from the Atomic Energy Commission under section 805 or 810 of the National Housing Act, as amended, for the purpose of title VIII of such act."

SEC. 10. The amendments made by sections 1 through 7 of this act shall be effective as of July 1, 1951.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker I demand a second.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 5411, is a bill consisting of amendments to Public Laws Nos. 874 and 815 passed by the last Congress.

The first group of amendments in the bill consist principally of administrative corrections; in other words, they are situations where the Administrator has found that the language and formula provided in the original act was not workable and in some instances resulted in a hardship on the Government because it was made necessary for the Government to attempt to recover funds that were not recoverable.

At this time I want to say this about the Administrator, Dr. Lindman, who has administered these two acts, that during my entire term in Congress I have never known of a finer Administrator or one who sought more diligently to find the real intent and meaning of language placed in the bills by the committee to the extent that when questions arose, and there was some question in his mind, he would come to the committee and ask the committee to discuss them and give him their interpretation.

I say that because I think it is due Dr. Lindman in the first place, and, in the second place, it certainly is unusual for me to get up and praise the operations of an administrator downtown, because I have had my troubles with many of them, especially those who spend so much of their time trying to expound congressional language instead of looking for its real meaning. But I think Dr. Lindman has done a marvelous job on these laws.

I might add, further, that not one single complaint from the entire United States has been registered against his admiinstration of the act, and there were some 1,400 different school operations, about 1,100 under Public Law 874 and 258, I think, under Public Law 815.

The committee attempted to work out solutions to the problems that confronted him, and we think we did a pretty good job. The principal and important part of this bill, H. R. 5411, is the amendment that brings Public Law 815 into line with the Housing bill which we passed some time ago. Many of you will recall that there was some discussion on the floor at that time because of the fact that the Committee on Banking and currency had incorporated a school construction program in the housing bill. Well, at the present time we have enough departments fingering

in the school operations. We have just completed an investigation which shows there is about three and one-half billion dollars being spent in the field of education by the various agencies of this Government in every conceivable form and manner. We did not feel that it was wise to add one more to that.

At that time I made the commitment to the House that the Committee on Education and Labor would set about to work out a solution of that problem so that it would not be necessary to wait a year and establish the average daily attendance record of children before they could enter the public schools. So in this amendment we have made it possible to begin construction of the school buildings when they begin the construction of the housing project, and in that way the school building will be available when the children arrive. That was of considerable concern to the other body, and as I mentioned previously on the floor of the House, they called me before the conferees and I made the commitment to them that the Committee on Education and Labor would put forth its best efforts to gear the law to the housing bill.

I do not know of any specific provision in the bill that needs particular explanation. I will mention another amendment that was brought to the attention of the committee by the Air Force. They found, in some instances, that they had at camps on-base children and off-base children, and in some instances the parents were unable at a particular time to get quarters on the base, and therefore it made it necessary for them to enter the children in one school and then when they got quarters on the base, to be entered in another school. So it was necessary to write some discretionary provisions in the bill to take care of that kind of a situation and insure that in every State of the Union, in these establishments, there would be public schools, comparable to schools in comparable communities, available to the children to go to without working any hardship on the child by changing schools two or three times in the same term.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CAMP. May I ask the gentleman of there is any provision in this bill which changes Public Law 874 so that a school system which heretofore has been and which is now eligible for assistance because of the impact of Federal children will be prevented from that, of if there is any change in this amendment which makes the qualification of the school any different from what it was before?

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman has asked a rather general question, but I can answer it this way. The gentleman has mentioned the problem in his district to me at several times. I have discussed his problem with the administrative people and I am satisfied that the provisions of this bill will not work any undue hardship on any school in the gentleman's district. There is a provision in H. R. 5411 which changes the so-called lag payments. The Administrator found it was impractical to operate the set-up as it was previously and originally written into the law. We also found that it encouraged the State either to be lazy about providing funds or not provide them at all. So we changed the provision of the so-called lag payments to the States and that, in my opinion, makes the bill more workable and will not work a hardship on any district that was entitled to receive funds under the provisions of Public Law 874.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In Oklahoma we have eight areas where there are Navy, Army, and Air Force installations. Three of them are permanent and five are considered peacetime bases. They will increase the enrollment in our schools by several hundred. Will this give any assistance to those communities?

Mr. BARDEN. That was the basis for the passage of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, just situations such as that, which had created impacts on communities far beyond the ability of the taxable property in those communities to carry the load. Section 2 of Public Law 874 was in the nature of compensation for the existence of nontaxable property. The amendments we have here to Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 have a little bit changed the philosophy of that bill, for the simple reason we had to gear it to the emergency-housing program and take care of an existing emergency and need. So while it is not exactly on a compensatory basis with the housing feature, the principle involved is the same. It is to relieve tension and stress on the local public schools and to be sure that the public schools are available for all children regardless of where they may be stationed by the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I have about covered the principal amendments. There is another amendment which strikes subsection (d) from section 8 of Public Law 874. In the writing of this law, it was the unanimous request of all the armed services to get out of the school business. They insisted that they wanted their budget to be an honest budget that was an objective budget, that spoke the truth and carried appropriations only for military purposes not for education. They do not want to get into the school operation business. The Army, the Navy, the Air Corps, the Marine Corps, and then the Joint Defenses joined in the request. Public Law 874 in section 8 (d) prohibited the use of any funds by any agency other than the Atomic Energy Commission for any purpose expressed in the bill. It has developed that some situations could arise at bases, some of them with as much as one hundred or one hundred and twenty-five thousand acres, where there is a problem in getting the children to the school bus, so we felt that was probably a little severe. Under any circumstances, it would take an additional specific appropriation for any agency other than the Office of Education to carry out any function as set out in the bill.

When Congress enacts a law like Public Law 874 making general provision for the discharge of certain Federal responsibilities and puts authority to administer the law in a single agency, in this case the Office of Education, the normal assumption is that appropriations for carrying out the law will be made to that agency and that appropriations will not be made to other Government agencies for the same things as are provided for in the general law—or if made will not be used. This principle of statutory interpretation is an obvious and a necessary one, since otherwise there would be endless duplication of functions and appropriations as between many Government agencies. The reason why we wrote this principle specifically into Public Law 874 when it was first enacted and why we now ask the House to repeal the specific prohibition and to leave the matter to general principles of statutory interpretation will be clear when we look at the history and the purposes of this legislation.

Public Law 874 was developed after extensive hearings and investigations out in the areas where the problems actually exist by two subcommittees of the House Committee on Education and Labor and a detailed consideration of the problem for approximately 9 months by the committee. Field investigations were conducted in 23 locations in 16 States and testimony was received from approximately 600 witnesses from 42 States. As a result of these studies and investigations, members of the two subcommittees and the full committee came to the unanimous conclusion that various activities of the several agencies of the Federal Government impose serious financial burdens on local educational agencies and that it should be the policy of the Federal Government to compensate local educational agencies for such burdens. This statement of policy was enacted into Public Law 874.

Prior to the passage of the act there had been no consistent Federal policy regarding the provision of financial assistance to those communities which were seriously overburdened by Federal activities. The investigation of our two subcommittees revealed that 12 different Federal agencies had been given authority by Congress to provide some type of Federal assistance to school districts affected by their activities. Those programs differed between agencies in the amount of assistance provided and the basis on which Federal assistance was given, in the administrative arrangements for administering the programs, and in the legislative provisions which authorized the programs. They found that the result of this situation was a duplication between programs in some instances and an exclusion of some schools urgently in need from any types of benefits whatever or from certain kinds of benefits. The committee

reached the conclusion that there should be a uniform Federal policy regarding this matter, and that the program should be administered by one Federal agency so that all school districts would receive uniform treatment under uniform procedures and so that duplication in costs and duplication in administrative arrangements would be avoided. Consolidation of these various programs into one uniform program was urgently requested and strongly supported by almost all the Federal representatives who testified before the committee both in the hearings held in Washington and in the field, including the representatives of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Public Law 874 not only established a single unified program of assistance to federally affected areas but it also gave the Commissioner of Education exclusive responsibility for administering the program.

Because consolidation of these functions—and appropriations for them—was so important to achieving the purposes of the act, and because the functions and appropriations had previously been so widely dispersed among Federal agencies, the Congress provided in subsection (c) of section 8 of Public Law 874 for transfer to the Office of Education of all appropriations already made for the then current fiscal year to other agencies for the same purposes, and in subsection (d), which this amendment would repeal, specifically forbade other agencies from using current or future appropriations for these purposes. The single exception was the Atomic Energy Commission which was so special in its requirements of secrecy and so forth as to justify exceptional treatment.

The prohibitory language used in subsection (d) has caused some difficulty, particularly as regards activities on military posts in isolated areas. It was never intended that the officers in charge of these posts would be prevented by subsection (d) from doing the numerous every day little things they have authority to do in aid of the welfare of persons living on the post, or from meeting emergencies that may from time to time arise. What was intended was that the general principle of nonduplication of activities and appropriations be observed.

It would be extremely difficult to rewrite subsection (d) so as to make all the various specific exceptions which would be required to prevent the subsection from hamstringing the normal functioning of a Federal installation. Rather than this, the proper way is to repeal the subsection and leave the matter to the generally accepted principles of statutory interpretation which safeguard against the waste of money and confusion which result from duplication of functions and appropriations among Government agencies.

I want to make it absolutely clear that the striking of subsection (d) of section 8 should not be regarded as an invitation to the Department of Defense or other Federal agencies to request funds to set up a dual system of providing educational services for children living on Federal property or stationed on or near isolated Federal projects. The striking of this subsection in no way alters the basic policy embodied in the act that the program of assistance made necessary by Federal activities should be administered on a uniform basis by one Federal agency. I am sure the House concurs that this policy is sound, has worked well, and should be continued.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Of course, we are all interested in accomplishing the main objective of the bill here, but I am wondering since the objective of the original bill was to get these departments out of the school business, if there will not be an inclination here now on the part of the departments themselves to go back into the school business, and whether we will not find the various agencies and the military installations themselves coming in and setting up their own school facilities. Will the gentleman comment on that phase of the matter?

Mr. BARDEN. It takes money to do that. The only safeguard is the same safeguard that existed prior to the passage of Public Law 815, and Public Law 874, and that is the Committee on Appropriations. I cannot conceive of the Committee on Appropriations granting specific appropriations to duplicate a service which is already being rendered. In some instances, we have to rely on the safeguard of the Committee on Appropriations, as well as the integrity of the departments in justifying needs for money as well as its use.

Mr. COLMER. If I understand the gentleman, it is proposed that this provision striking this section out, would make it possible in those hardship cases, where existing facilities were not available, for them to come before the Committee on Appropriations and get money to operate in those particular cases?

Mr. BARDEN. There are not supposed to be any hardship cases and there will not be any hardship cases. They could not even trump up an excuse for an appropriation, for a specific appropriation, for the simple reason that Public Law 815 provides the building, and Public Law 874 provides the fund for the operation. Now I know of the tendency upon the part of some, because it has been brought to my attention in North Carolina—I have never learned how to map programs, which would fit some commanding generals. They take the attitude, or at least some of them, that there is no limit to their power, and there should not be any restriction upon their discretion. But I think we will have to work out some limit to it because it was the plan, and outline, and desire, and intention of the Committee on Education and Labor that those schools established in the various States should be established in accordance with State laws and the State constitution, and should become a part of the State educational plan, and should not be guided off on some tangent or attempt to set up an entirely new school system. I do know there is a tendency to do that. When it is done, then you simply harm your State educational system and accomplish no good.

Mr. COLMER. I do not want to impose upon my good friend's good nature too long, but if there are to be no hardship cases, then why repeal this section?

Mr. BARDEN. I will try to give the gentleman my reason in this way. It is most difficult for the Committee on Education and Labor to foresee all of the problems that might confront a commanding officer on his base. It might be possible to doctor it up, but in the removal of subsection (d), there is no license, authority, or even any condonement of any expenditure of a single dollar of funds except such as the general finds are legal, proper, and necessary on the base over which he has command. There is no intention of anything else. The removal of it simply makes it possible on these larger bases, if they want to assemble the children at the gate rather than having school busses from outside running all over the base. Then I think it would be rather unsafe for the Committee on Education and Labor to take charge of the situation inside the base that heretofore the Armed Services Committee has had supervision and control over.

Mr. COLMER. Then, finally the gentleman sees no case now where the repeal of section (d) would effect the normal and orderly administration of the basic law as it has heretofore been administered.

Mr. BARDEN. The answer is "No." But I do know that now some of the commanding officers are assembling the children at the base gate. I do not know how they do it. I do not know whether it is by construction of the law that exists or not.

We wrote into Public Law 815 the requirement that the schools should be constructed in line with the laws of the State in which they were located. In Public Law 874 we put language in there which we thought was clear and which I still think is clear, but I am not so sure that some other folks think it is clear. I read from section 6 of that law relating to on-base public schools:

> The Commissioner shall make such arrangements (other than arrangements with respect to the acquisition of land, the erection of facilities, interest on debt service) for each school, as may be necessary to provide free public education for such children. To the maximum extent practicable, such education shall be comparable to the free public education provided for children in comparable communities in the States.

That is clear enough to my mind that if a general wants to operate a school on the base, if there are no taxable funds available, and the Commissioner makes the funds available, it is perfectly clear to my mind that the Congress intended that those schools on that base should be operated in line with the schools in the rest of the State, and comparable to the communities in the rest of the State and certainly was not intended to be an invitation to any commanding officer to become a crusader. If next year we have to make clearer language, we can do so. As a matter of fact, I think this law expires in 1953, and at that time we will have an opportunity to see just how they have operated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRISON of Virginia). The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina and his committee for laboring hard and working out a most difficult problem. I think he has done a good job.

Mr. BARDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Is there any provision in this bill to allow expenditure of these funds in States where the State laws allow the expenditure of State funds for transportation of non-public-school children?

Mr. BARDEN. No, sir. There is no provision in this law and never has been a provision in this law for the expenditure of Federal funds for that purpose. We simply turn the funds over to local school authorities to spend for providing public schools.

Mr. FOGARTY. This law does prohibit the expenditure of public funds in States where the State laws provide that State funds can be expended for that.

Mr. BARDEN No, sir. There is no prohibition in here against spending for transportation or against transportation. The money is turned over to a local agency and that was the thing that we worked so hard to do, to keep any management, control, and direction of the schools out of Washington. We therefore provide for turning this money over to the local school agencies and the local school agencies expend it and function just as any other comparable school agency in the State would.

Mr. FOGARTY. Where the State law allows the expenditure of State funds for transportation of non-public-school children in those States, in those States would any of these Federal funds be used for that purpose?

Mr. BARDEN. I do not say it could be used for it; there certainly is no license for it or prohibition against it other than this, that these funds are given to the local school agency for the operation and maintenance of the public schools. What a local school agency might do I am unable to anticipate. They might do something in line wtih State law and it might be carried on all right; I do not know anything about that We do not propose to take over the State or local agency. They can still do what they please with their own money. We do not have any provision in here that does anything other than provide these funds in the nature of aid to the local public school agency to be used for the public schools. That is all 874 does, except it provides for funds for on-base schools to the Commissioner when there is no local school agency and no local school board for its operation, or where State funds may not be spent on Federal property. These schools were intended to be the same kind of public schools operated off base.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. Let us be specific about this. It has been whispered, if not noised, around on the floor of this House for the last 2 weeks, that there was phraseology in this bill that precluded the use of Federal funds in any of these defense-housing areas for the purpose of transporting children whose parents wanted to send them to parochial schools. I specifically should like to ask the gentleman whether or not in his opinion Federal funds could be used in such an instance if such a case arose.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman means the Federal funds provided in this bill?

Mr. DONOVAN. That is right.

Mr. BARDEN. I can answer the gentleman just as specifically as my mind will permit. There is not one single dollar earmarked in this bill for any purpose other than for the public-school system Now, that is as specific as I know how to state it.

Mr. McCARTHY Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr BARDEN I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. If I understand it, then, in any State which under State law does not discriminate in regard to the transportation of children to nonpublic schools your committee will insist on discrimination?

Mr. BARDEN. Either the gentleman did not listen or I must have been very vague. In the first place we do not propose to discriminate against anyone nor do I consider the public schools a discriminatory set-up; and second, we have not a thing in the world to do with the State transportation system. And wrote no law that would interfere with it.

Mr. McCARTHY. You provide no money appropriated under this authority can be used to transport these children to non-public schools.

Mr. BARDEN. Provided what?

Mr. McCARTHY. Is that not the answer the gentleman just gave that not a dime appropriated under the authority of this act can be used for anything but public schools?

Mr. BARDEN. I said there was not a dime that would be appropriated as the result of this bill that was not intended for public schools and that was not directed by this bill to be spent on the public-school systems through the local school boards.

Mr. McCARTHY. So the transportation of the children to nonpublic schools is not included. Now, the bill says nothing about eliminating segregated schools in States which have such systems. What we have here is a pattern which insists upon discrimination where we do not have it and which underwrites it where we do have it.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman is just wrong in that respect. Of course he is entitled to his idea. The word "discrimination" simply has no place in this discussion.

If the gentleman knows any better way to handle public funds, the taxpayers' money, than for this body to funnel it to local school authorities, upon whose shoulders rest the responsibility and upon whose backs rests the tax burden, then I would like for him to make some suggestions. The Committee on Education and Labor could not find any better solution.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have appeared before the gentleman's committee on Federal aid to education bills before. If this bill were considered under the open rules of the House and read for amendment I think I might be able to make some suggestions with reference to amendments. This extends the whole authority to critical defense housing areas.

Mr BARDEN. Yes; the two bills together.

Mr McCARTHY. When this bill passed before, the impact school district bill, these same provisions applied. So we have a quantitative difference today. We are now extending it into critical defense housing areas. Before the war is over no one knows how many areas in this country are going to be critical areas. We have here a quantitative factor which should be taken into account, the matter and the extent to which this kind of education aid may extend.

Mr. BARDEN. The idea in extending it to the critical-housing areas was not mine originally. It simply arose as the result of the several-billion-dollar bill we passed here some time ago. In some communities you are bringing in something like two or three thousand houses. In those houses you are going to have children. There would not be any tax source there to provide schools. We did not know any better solution than to gear this school-aid fund to the housing bill in such a way that when they start driving nails in the houses they could start driving nails in school buildings and have the school built and ready instead of having to wait until they could establish an average daily attendance. If this is ugly and wrong, I do not so construe it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. McCARTHY. Just one more question. Has the Senate taken any action? Is there any great urgency in passing this bill under suspension of the rules today, or would it be possible to have it considered under a rule which would permit time to discuss these things?

Mr. BARDEN. It depends on how fast they move. I would say to the gentleman there would not be any great emergency in it if the housing did not move. If housing begins to move then there will be a great emergency. I do not know whether the gentleman has seen kids going to school in barns and broken-down sheds or not, but I have. If they are going to move with the housing program then the only thing we can do would be to move with the school-building program.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Can we be as specific now about States which have segregated school systems as between white and Negro children? So far as this bill is concerned the money will be permitted to be used separately for white and Negro schools will it not?

Mr. BARDEN. I can be as specific about that as I can about anything on God's earth, and that is, I am firmly of this conviction that the question of segregation of schools in North Carolina or South Carolina is no more the business of the gentleman from New York than it would be of mine as to what New York does in that field, each State has its problems and is in a better position to solve them than either the gentleman from New York or myself. When we wrote this bill we tried to put language in there that we would not appear to assume that we had all the intelligence in the world, not that. We simply tried to get up a school system that would operate without friction in the State in which it was located, and become an integral part of that State, and not put on any of these crusading programs that some folks are so anxious to establish in this country. My idea is that each individual State is in the best position to solve its own racial problem.

Mr. JAVITS. This is Federal money, yet it can be used for the purposes of segregated public schools; is that not correct?

Mr. BARDEN. I hope it will be in those States where the State law provides for segregation in public schools, and I will say to the gentleman if I thought it was not going to be so, you would not see me standing here talking for the bill. I am definitely more concerned with the happy existence of the races of this country than the gentleman is, and I know 10 times as much about it.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think the gentleman really means that when he thinks it over. Whether the gentleman agrees with me or not I cannot agree that the gentleman has any greater solicitude—as much if the gentleman wishes but no more—for the good relationship between all our people of diverse strains than I have.

Mr. BARDEN. I know I mean that; I know that. I have heard the gentleman harp on that too much on the floor with too little success. You stir up dissension and settle nothing.

Mr. JAVITS. And I think my position against segregation, on grounds of color, in the Army and in other public activities has been taken quite rightly under the Constitution.

Mr. BARDEN. Thank God for the Constitution. We can stand up here and jaw at each other if we want to. If we did not have a Constitution we might not have that privilege. Let us not be too eager to twist or expand it.

Mr. JAVITS. I certainly join in thankfulness for the right of full debate under our Constitution.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. This has reference, aside from the debate that has been going on here, to Public Law 815 and 874. You have in this what I think is a discrimination, in that you set a date June 30, 1939, where any school district, having a population in excess of 35,000, shall not be entitled to certain proceeds until they have increased the amount not 3 percent, but 5 and 10 percent Has the committee made any study as to the possibility of that?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes, we have. We made a careful study, and we found that we simply had to cut off somewhere, just like we do when we fix other dates. You have to fix a date somewhere. I took the gentleman's suggestion and I appreciate his position. I think to some extent that situation will be taken care of, but if we were to amend it in accordance with the gentleman's bill that he introduced, there is a rough estimate, a rather crude estimate, that it might cost around $15 000,000 without any appreciable amount of good to come from it.

Mr ROGERS of Colorado. The bill the gentleman has reference to is my bill, H R 4139.

Mr. BARDEN. Yes, and I will say to the gentleman that he has been most diligent in trying to get this thing through, and if we can work it out without disturbing the structure of the bill, I will work with him, because he certainly deserves it, as hard as he has worked with the problem I am quite sure if your folks knew as much as I do about your active interest in this matter they would be both grateful and appreciative.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr McCORMACK Bringing the matter as clearly as possible to the Members of the House, in connection with the repeal of paragraph (d) of section 8 of Public Law 874, if the rules are suspended and the bill passed in accordance with the amendment, that brings it back to the law that existed prior to the passage of Public Law 874; is that correct?

Mr. BARDEN. Insofar as the funds provided under this bill are concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, if funds are appropriated for the Defense Establishment, and they desire, they can transport children to both public schools and nonpublic schools from military establishments.

Mr. BARDEN. Well, I would say to the gentleman that it was not the intention of the committee members who concurred in this amendment to do that. It is not my intention to do it. I think the gentleman is well enough informed to know that this subject has been kicked around long enough and to know that that is a field that he has hesitated for 25 years to introduce any legislation on, and as bold and brilliant as the gentleman from Massachusetts is, why should I try to be bolder and more brilliant to try to solve it at this time?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts has not said anything about the brilliancy of the gentleman from Massachusetts, which he is not possessed of.

Mr. BARDEN. There are a lot of questions about that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will say that the gentleman from North Carolina is brilliant, so I will make out the gentleman's case for him, but I will have to confess I am not. But, if paragraph (d) of section 8 of Public Law 874 is repealed, then it brings it back to the law that existed prior to the passage of Public Law 874 in relation to paragraph (d).

Mr BARDEN. Prior to the passage of Public Law 874 the armed services got appropriations for schools And paragraph "d" had no "relations."

Mr. McCORMACK. I am trying to help out The gentleman can answer a simple question "Yes" or "No"

Mr. BARDEN No, I do not think it carries it all the way back, because the gentleman is trying to say that we are duplicating appropriations. The basic law is that it would take specific appropriations. The removal of section "d" does not constitute an authorization for any appropriation whatever

Mr McCORMACK. But there is the authority in law for it This will bring it back to the situation where if Congress in its wisdom desires to do so it can appropriate it

Mr. BARDEN. Congress in its wisdom can always appropriate money for whatever purposes it wants to appropriate it for within the limits of the Constitution. But I will say this to the gentleman. If the gentleman is trying to inquire as to whether or not those who are offering this amendment intended that the law should be changed by any history or background or any precedent set for the utilization of public funds for transportation to private schools, then there certainly was no such idea either in my head or in the heads of those who concurred with me in this amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Without inquiring as to what the gentleman's intention is, the repeal of subsection (d) brings it back to the law as it existed prior to the enactment of Public Law 874? That is a simple question

Mr. BARDEN. I do not know why the gentleman, if it is as simple as that, persists in indulging in simple questions, however, it is not quite that simple. What the gentleman is trying to get me to say is that by doing this we are approving the use of funds for private schools. I say to the gentleman that is exactly the opposite from what I intended or those who concurred with me in this amendment and the House should know this before it votes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's suspicions go too far.

Mr. BARDEN. No; I am not suspicious. I fear the gentleman bespeaks his own mind. I am being very frank.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is in a very suspicious frame of mind in relation to the gentleman from Massachusetts on this. Someday I am going to take the floor and tell an interesting story about three members of the

NEA who are misrepresenting an agreement they made with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the late chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, as the result of which Mr. KENNEDY introduced the bill he did introduce. It was as a result of an agreement with three prominent members of the NEA, and someday we are going to tell about it.

Mr. BARDEN. Wait a minute; I have the floor.

Mr. McCORMACK. So the gentleman is very suspicious.

Mr. BARDEN. You listen to me and get your mind off of "suspicions."

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I will listen to you.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman has never had to remind me of any agreement I made with him.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I did not say the gentleman.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not have to be reminded. I remember my agreements and keep them. And every Member of this House knows that I am not only frank but direct and have been so with you.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not say the gentleman, I said three members of the NEA.

Mr. BARDEN. Why all this "suspicious" business around here? Let us stick to the subject.

Mr. McCORMACK. The repeal of subsection (d) brings it back to the law that existed prior to the passage of Public Law 874; is that correct?

Mr. BARDEN. I regret that it is necessary to go back to the A B C's of legislation, but it has been my interpretation that when you repeal a paragraph it is repealed. There is no license granted by its being repealed. Do not misunderstand that. There is no license. The Congress can proceed if it sees fit.

Mr. McCORMACK. But there is authority for the appropriation of funds?

Mr BARDEN. As I have said several times before we are not giving any authority for anything by repealing subsection (d).

Mr. JENSEN. Mr Speaker, I am opposed to the passage of H. R. 5411 for the same reasons I opposed the request for $25,000,000 of the taxpayers money to furnish water-purification plants, sewage-treatment plants, recreational facilities, and so forth, for cities where defense establishments are located On September 28 last, officials of the Federal Security Agency appeared before our Appropriations Committee to justify the budget request for the above-mentioned purposes. I questioned Mr. Miles as follows:

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF CRITICAL AREAS

Mr JENSEN. Mr Miles, what would be your c nservative estimate of the number of defense areas in which these facilities would be built?

Mr. MILES. My guess would be that within the next month we would have designated somewhere between 35 and 50 areas.

Mr. JENSEN How about within the next 2 years?

Mr. MILES. Within the next 2 years would be more difficult to predict. I would guess that the number of critical areas might run as high as 100.

Mr. JENSEN. In those areas you purpose to furnish the needed community facilities for which we have a responsibility; that is, your agency, for water-purification plants, sewage-treatment plans, hospitals, health, facilities, day care, and recreational facilities. Is that right?

Mr. MILES. Yes.

ESTIMATED ULTIMATE COST OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Mr. JENSEN. A reasonable estimate on all of those things, knowing that many of these are in large towns and communities and in heavily populated centers, would be about $10,000,000 for each area; would it not?

Mr. MILES. I believe, sir, in many instances the areas would require very little in the way of help.

Mr JENSEN. You said they would require very little in the way of help?

Mr. MILES. In the way of Federal funds from this appropriation.

Mr. JENSEN. What would you say would be a conservative estimate then on the average amount of money that we should spend in these 200 areas?

Mr MILES That is very difficult to say, sir. I do not know. You could divide the $60,000,000 that is available by 200

Mr JENSEN. The $60,000,000 has no part to play in this question at all, because we know that is just a drop in the bucket.

If you spent even a million dollars in these places, and certainly you would average more than that, you would have $200,000,000 right there That would be the least you could possibly spend That much buys almost nothing today when you start buying and building water-purification plants, sewage-treatment plants, hospitals, health facilities, day care, and recreational facilities We know that you cannot do anything that would be of any consequence for any town or any defense area for a million dollars

So there you have $200,000,000 I am satisfied that it would cost at least $5,000,000. There you have a billion dollars You talk about $60,000,000; let us not think about that at all I would not care to even give that a thought This is just the beginning

In each one of these areas, I presume it is proposed to set up rent control?

RENT CONTROL IN CRITICAL AREAS

Mr. MILES The list of critical areas for rent-control purposes may vary from the list of critical areas for the purposes of Public Law 139

Mr. JENSEN We usually impose rent control That has been the custom anyway in defense areas I notice in your statement you say: "To date, however, due to shortage of mortgage money and other factors, few new houses have been built as a result of private initiative in the 42 areas which were designated as critical and in which credit restrictions were relaxed to encourage housing construction"

Why do you suppose that was?

Mr MILES. Well, sir, in many areas which have been designated as critical, there are not many contractors who are in the business of speculative building—building for later resale.

Let us take, for example, the area surrounding Camp Leonard Wood out in Missouri. There are very few, if any, contractors who are in the business in that area of building houses——

Mr. JENSEN. Now, Mr Miles, I have been in the business, and whenever my partner, or my old friend whom I called a partner because I was in the lumber business and he was the contractor, heard of a job any place within a radius of a couple of hundred miles that he might get, or a contract was to be let, he was there, along with about 40 or 50 other contractors.

So, just because there are very few contractors in that area—Kansas City and Springfield are right in that area—does not prove anything so far as the ability of people to build private houses or houses with private money.

We might as well lay the cards on the table. The fellows are not building because private money will not invest in home building where rent control is imposed. I have been right in the middle of that.

And you would not invest your money in building homes in areas where you knew that you were going to have a loss because you could not charge enough rent.

Mr MILES. Not having any money, I would not know; but I think you are probably right.

UNDESIRABLE ASPECTS OF PROVIDING FACILITIES WITH FEDERAL FUNDS

Mr JENSEN Two of us, my friend So, when we enter into things like this, where the Government starts building, we are going to furnish them with water-purification plants, furnish them sewers, sewage-treatment works, furnish them hospitals, health facilities, day care, and recreation I wonder if we are not providing a little bit of heaven for the folks that stayed home

So, as long as we do that, it is possible that some folks are not going to hate war at all Too many of us—I will put it that way—are not going to hate war As long as we make it so nice for those who stay at home it will be all right And, on the face of it, they think they are prosperous, too The day is coming when all of it has to be paid So, let us not make it too easy a thing for we folks who stay at home Let us make it a little bit tough for ourselves and then we will not want wars, and we will not be sending our boys all over the world to fight and die, yes, to fight and die while we live in more comfort because sweet Uncle Sam is going to take care of us

He is going to make this a heavenly place because we are going to furnish everything for the folks that do not have to fight and die. So, let us make it tough for the folks that stay at home Just as tough as we have to Let them have a taste of war, too, while the boys are fighting in Korea and all over the world, if this thing keeps on

Just what are the businessmen that are going to profit by these great Government installations in their respective localities contributing to this, contributing to help pay for all these nice things that we are going to furnish them and which brings business to them? Just what are they paying? What they are doing is making plenty of profit

* * * * *

Mr JENSEN I agree, Mr. Miles, that you must believe that the local communities where these defense establishments will be located or are located would in most instances, not all but most, provide all these facilities for which you are requesting money here today. You are doing it legally, properly, because the Congress told you to do it. We passed the law and you are just carrying it out. So do not think I am bearing down on you particularly You are just here because you have to be here.

Mr. MILES. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. But I will venture that there is a great majority of these towns where these definite facilities are located where the people themselves would furnish all the necessary facilities, the water and everything else, the hospitals, and the rest of the things that you are asking for here, all the needed recreation centers and child-day centers that could presently be furnished if the Federal Government would keep out of their business.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. All time has expired.

The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 5411, as amended?

Mr. McCARTHY. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McCARTHY) there were—ayes 145, noes 18.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and eleven Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors. The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 257, nays 55, not voting 116, as follows:

[Roll No. 202]

YEAS—257

Aandahl	Engle	McDonough
Abbitt	Evins	McGrath
Abernethy	Feighan	McGregor
Albert	Fenton	McKinnon
Allen, Ill.	Fernandez	McMillan
Andersen, H Carl	Fisher	McMullen
	Fogarty	McVey
Anderson, Calif	Foland	Mack, Wash
Andrews	Forrester	Magee
Arends	Frazier	Mahon
Aspinall	Fugate	Mansfield
Auchincloss	Gamble	Martin, Iowa
Ayres	Garmatz	Martin, Mass
Bailey	Gary	Merrow
Baker	Gathings	Miller, Md.
Barden	Gavin	Miller, Nebr.
Bates, Mass.	George	Mills
Battle	Golden	Mitchell
Beamer	Goodwin	Morris
Beckworth	Graham	Morton
Belcher	Granger	Multer
Bennett, Fla	Grant	Mumma
Bennett, Mich.	Green	Murdock
Berry	Greenwood	Murray, Tenn.
Betts	Gregory	Nelson
Bishop	Gwinn	Nicholson
Boggs, Del.	Hagen	Norblad
Bolling	Hale	Norrell
Bolton	Hall, Leonard W.	Ostertag
Bosone		Perkins
Bray	Halleck	Pickett
Brehm	Harden	Poage
Brooks	Hardy	Polk
Brown, Ga.	Harris	Poulson
Brownson	Harrison, Va.	Preston
Bryson	Harrison, Wyo.	Price
Buchanan	Harvey	Priest
Budge	Havenner	Prouty
Buffett	Hays, Ark.	Rabaut
Burleson	Hedrick	Radwan
Burnside	Herter	Rains
Burton	Hill	Ramsay
Bush	Hinshaw	Rankin
Camp	Hoeven	Reece, Tenn.
Cannon	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, Ill
Carnahan	Holmes	Reed, N Y.
Chelf	Hope	Rees, Kans.
Chenoweth	Horan	Rhodes
Chiperfield	Hull	Richards
Church	Hunter	Riehlman
Clemente	Ikard	Riley
Clevenger	Jackson, Wash.	Roberts
Cole, Kans.	James	Robeson
Colmer	Jarman	Rogers, Colo.
Cooper	Jenison	Rogers, Fla.
Cotton	Jenkins	Rogers, Tex.
Cox	Jonas	St George
Crosser	Jones, Ala.	Sasscer
Crumpacker	Jones, Hamilton C.	Saylor
Cunningham		Schwabe
Curtis, Mo	Jones, Woodrow W.	Scrivner
Curtis, Nebr.		Scudder
Davis, Ga	Karsten, Mo.	Secrest
Davis, Tenn.	Keating	Sheppard
Davis, Wis	Kee	Short
DeGraffenried	Kerr	Simpson, Pa.
Denny	Kilday	Sittler
Devereux	King	Smith, Kans.
Dolliver	Kirwan	Smith, Miss.
Doughton	Lanham	Smith, Va.
Doyle	LeCompte	Smith, Wis.
Durham	Lesinski	Spence
Eaton	Lind	Springer
Eberharter	Lovre	Staggers
Elliott	Lyle	Steed
Ellsworth	McCormack	Stigler
Elston	McCulloch	Stockman
Sutton	Vorys	Wigglesworth
Tackett	Weichel	Williams, Miss.
Talle	Welch	Williams, N. Y.
Thomas	Wharton	Willis
Tollefson	Wheeler	Wilson, Ind.
Trimble	Whitaker	Winstead
Vail	Whitten	Wolverton
Van Pelt	Wickersham	Wood, Idaho
Van Zandt	Widnall	Woodruff
Vinson	Wier	Yorty

NAYS—55

Addonizio	Gordon	Moulder
Andresen, August H.	Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.
	Gross	O'Brien, Mich.
Bakewell	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Hara
Barrett		O'Konski
Blatnik	Hart	O'Toole
Byrne, N. Y.	Hays, Ohio	Patterson
Canfield	Heffernan	Philbin
Celler	Heselton	Rodino
Corbett	Hillings	Rogers, Mass.
Coudert	Javits	Rooney
Dawson	Jensen	Sadlak
Dingell	Kluczynski	Scely-Brown
Donohue	Lane	Sheehan
Donovan	McCarthy	Sieminski
Fallon	McGuire	Vursell
Flood	Machrowicz	Withrow
Fulton	Marshall	Yates
Furcolo	Morano	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—116

Adair	Fine	Murray Wis.
Allen, Calif.	Ford	O'Neill
Allen, La.	Gore	Passman
Anfuso	Hand	Patman
Angell	Hebert	Patten
Armstrong	Heller	Phillips
Baring	Herlong	Potter
Bates, Ky.	Hess	Powell
Beall	Hoffman, Mich	Quinn
Bender	Holifield	Reams
Bentsen	Howell	Redden
Blackney	Irving	Regan
Boggs, La.	Jackson, Calif	Ribicoff
Bonner	Johnson	Rivers
Bow	Jones, Mo.	Roosevelt
Boykin	Judd	Sabath
Bramblett	Kean	Scott, Hardie
Brown, Ohio	Kearney	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Buckley	Kearns	
Burdick	Kelley Pa	Shafer
Busbey	Kelly, N Y.	Shelley
Butler	Kennedy	Sikes
Byrnes, Wis.	Keogh	Simpson, Ill.
Carlyle	Kersten, Wis.	Stanley
Case	Kilburn	Taber
Chatham	Klein	Taylor
Chudoff	Lantaff	Teague
Cole, N. Y.	Larcade	Thompson, Mich
Combs	Latham	
Cooley	Lucas	Thompson, Tex.
Crawford	McConnell	Thornberry
Dague	Mack, Ill	Velde
Deane	Madden	Walter
Delaney	Mason	Watts
Dempsey	Meader	Werdel
Denton	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Tex
D'Ewart	Miller, N. Y.	Wolcott
Dollinger	Morgan	Wood, Ga.
Dondero	Morrison	
Dorn	Murphy	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Shafer and Mr. Busbey for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Beall and Mr. Sikes for, with Mrs. Kelly, of New York, against.

Mr Boykin and Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Dollinger against.

Mr. Cooley and Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. O'Neill against.

Mr. Jones of Missouri and Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Larcade and Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Wood of Georgia and Mr. Regan for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Wolcott and Mr. Johnson for, with Mr. Chudoff against.

Mr. Teague and Mr. Deane for, with Mr. Ribicoff against.

Mr. Patten and Mr. Thornberry for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Hébert and Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Morrison and Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Chatham and Mr. Lantaff for, with Mr. Murphy against.

Mr. Allen of Louisiana and Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr Boggs of Louisiana and Mr. Carlyle for, with Mr. Butler against.

Mr Patman and Mr. Thompson of Texas for, with Mr. Fine against.

Mr. McConnell and Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Heller against.

Mr. Bow and Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Anfuso against.

Mr Velde and Mr. Bates of Kentucky for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. Judd and Mr. Dague for, with Mr. Howell against.

Mr. Kearns and Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Sabath against.

Until further notice:

Mr Baring with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Quinn with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Combs with Mr Cole of New York.
Mr. Bentsen with Mr Kilburn.
Mr. Irving with Mr Hand
Mr. Madden with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Case.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Lucas with Mr Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Stanley with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. BYRNE of New York and Mr. DAWSON changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PROUTY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, House Resolution 440 was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill S. 2170.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTIONS AT AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rule and pass the bill (H. R. 5425) to authorize construction at Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Air Force, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, is hereby authorized to establish or develop installations and facilities by the construction, conversion, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities, as follows:

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, N. J.: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, hazards removal, communications facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop facilities, administrative and

supporting facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, and shops, $50,972,000.

Sioux City Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids facilities, operational facilities, family housing, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, and medical facilities, $1,746,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif.: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communication and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop facilities, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, and shops, $18,801,000.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act but not to exceed $71,519,000.

SEC. 3. Any project authorized by this act may be prosecuted under direct appropriations or authority to enter into contracts in lieu of such appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill makes in order the appropriation that was passed a few days ago for these various sites. In other words, we have appropriated the money and it was in the appropriation bill. This is the authorization.

It became necessary to make this change in the public works bill due to certain factors that developed in three designated areas. All we are doing now is to grant an authorization for three substitute air bases for which we have already appropriated money. I think the House thoroughly understands the situation.

Mr. Speaker, if there are no questions, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me why you changed from Offutt Field, Omaha, to Sioux City?

Mr. VINSON. The reason for that was upon examination of the use for which Omaha base was to be put, it was found by an engineering survey that there is what is known as a radar echo, and it being a field in which there would have to be instrument landings, it made it very dangerous.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, the terrain is not suitable, is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. That is right. But, I might modify that by saying that the terrain might have been suitable for certain types of aircraft, but it was not suitable for the purpose which it was intended to be used.

Mr. GROSS. But, it was suitable when the authorization bill came in, was it not?

Mr. VINSON. Well, they thought it was at that time, but they changed their opinion after an engineering survey.

Mr. GROSS. What changed the terrain in the short time between the time when the authorization bill was brought in and passed, and the time that you have come here with this bill? Did they change the topography of the land out there in that time?

Mr. VINSON. No, it is not the character of the land—it is the use for which the base is to be put.

Mr. GROSS. The point I want to make is that here we are getting more of the mistakes of the Air Force.

Mr. VINSON. That may be true.

Mr. GROSS. Just as you got down at Grandview, Mo., and you will find that out.

Mr. VINSON. I might add that by this change we are reducing the total authorizations for the three bases by $617,000. Of course, that is $617,000 saved.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the committee has very succinctly stated the situation, but not for the RECORD; I think perhaps we should elaborate just a little more. This particular measure has to do with reprograming of three Air Force sites. As the chairman stated, the money has already been authorized. It has really been appropriated. This is merely to authorize these changes in sites, and the result is a net reduction of $617,000. The first change made was in transferring from the Friendship Airport between Washington, D. C., and Baltimore to McGuire Air Force Base at Wrightstown, N. J., which calls for an expenditure of $50,972,000. That is more than the installation at Friendship would have cost, but construction will be a 25-year permanent or semipermanent type of construction instead of a 10-year temporary construction as was proposed at Friendship. It was also learned upon reexamination that to establish this aerial embarkation depot at Friendship would seriously interfere with commercial airplane service. In other words, it would endanger the lives not only of the men in our armed services, but also the civilians.

Another point which was brought out by the Secretary of the Air Force is that the facilities at McGuire are in close proximity to an Army base, and much saving will result in travel costs for men who are shipped overseas by air. The Army transferred 450 acres of Government-owned land to the Department of the Air Force at McGuire, which is suited to meet their present requirements. That is the first proposition. I might say that I think the Department of the Air Force was just a little embarrassed when they had to come back to our committee to ask for these changes. We wondered why they had miscalculated, or had not correctly surveyed, or had not gone into the matter thoroughly and properly. Certainly an item which involves the spending of $50,000,000 should be most carefully considered. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that while it was embarrassing to them, it was refreshing at least to me to find out that here was one branch of our armed services, which does not claim infallibility and which has been modest enough to come before our committee and frankly admit that they had made a mistake.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. For the benefit of the House, it may be considered that the Military Subcommittee on Appropriations went into these three items and earmarked the money for the items as contained in this bill, and there will be no need for any further action upon the part of the Subcommittee on Appropriations or the House, in order to complete this transaction, earmarked as the Armed Forces Subcommittee has now earmarked the funds.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman from Kansas for that valuable contribution. I am glad to know that the members of his committee agree with the entire membership of the Committee on Armed Services concerning all three of these items.

I will take just a moment to mention the other two items.

The second item is an authorization for the expenditure of $1,746,000 for the construction of air defense facilities, interceptor fighter planes, at Sioux City, Iowa, instead of Offutt Field, Omaha, Nebr. It was discovered on more minute and thorough examination that the base at Sioux City was better suited for this particular type of aircraft than Omaha. They certainly miscalculated when they figured that a 10,000-foot runway at Omaha would cost only $3,600,000 additional, and later learned that the existing airways when extended to 10,000 feet would cost over $7,000,000.

The last item concerns an Air Force base out in California. It was originally decided to construct this field at Fresno, Calif., but later the mayor of the city objected, and of course our Air Force tries to go to territory where they are welcome, in order to increase the morale of the troops and their efficiency, and will result in larger reenlistments. So they consider not only the operational and economical features, but the question of the good will of the public and building the morale of the enlisted men.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I would like to add to the very able statement the gentleman is making the fact that while there is a change in specific locality in these three cases with reference to the Air Force, the general area is still retained, and the base would still be in the general area, in all three cases.

Mr. SHORT. I am very glad the gentleman has brought out that significant point. They are not distantly removed from the spot where they were originally intended to be established. They are in the general area. But on reexamination, and because of certain local factors, human and economic, because of certain geographical and meteorological factors, particularly as far as the terrain at some of the bases is concerned, I think the Air Force was wise in asking for thse changes. They were frank and honest, and Secretary Finletter fully justified this piece of legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to see the committee and the Air Force admitting that mistakes have been made. I am not opposed to this bill. I am delighted to see $617,000 saved, but I wish they would go a little further and rectify the error they are making at Grand View, Mo.

Mr. SHORT. Well, that matter was debated thoroughly on two different occasions and has already been disposed of. I imagine we will have to let that mistake go, if it were a mistake, and profit by it in the future. It would be a mistake not to pass this bill.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman mentioned that the Air Force had changed its mind about Hammer Field because of the objection of the major; and the reason given was the matter of good will. The Air Force stated that it did not wish to go into an area where its personnel were not wanted. I believe that was not the point. The city commissioners objected unanimously on the ground that it would seriously inconvenience and perhaps completely interrupt, air lines in their commercial operations, which have been using Hammer Field for several years since the city of Fresno took it over as a municipal airport. Also, it would obstruct, to a great extent, the normal growth of the city, and would require the condemnation of very expensive residential land, valued in many instances at $2,000 an acre, and more.

For these reasons the city commission objected.

Mr. SHORT. I am sure the gentleman who is familiar with that locality much more than I or any other member of the committee, is correct in giving us these two very good additional reasons for changing the establishment from Hammer Field to Fairfield. I do not want to criticize the local people in Fresno.

Mr. HUNTER. It was not that the people in the area were objecting to the presence of Air Force personnel; I believe the Air Force had the good will of the people of Fresno during World War II, and that attitude has not changed.

Mr. SHORT. It was an economic rather than a social reason; I am glad to be corrected. I was giving the reasons sent down by the Assistant Secretary for Air.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. I am very pleased, of course, that the Air Force and the Committee on the Armed Services have brought in this bill which will provide in part at least for the reactivation of the Sioux City Air Base. After all, the Government has an investment there of $13,500,000, and we have been urging for a long time that the Air Force make this base available. I am very happy, of course, to know that we are at least going to have an all-weather interceptor wing there. I think the House should know that Offutt Field is only 100 miles from the Sioux City Air Base, so the needed facilities are not going to be jeopardized in any way as far as the transfer is concerned.

Mr. SHORT. I know that Sioux City had a rather large air base in World War II; in fact, my brother was an officer in the Air Force and was stationed there for several weeks, and he enjoyed it very much. I am glad the gentleman is pleased with the action taken by our committee. This legislation is worthy and much needed.

Mr. Speaker, there are no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, there are no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken, and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

CUSTOMS SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 1951

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 5505) to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE AND EFFECTIVE DATE

SECTION 1 This act may be cited as the "Customs Simplification Act of 1951" and shall be effective, except as otherwise specifically provided for, on and after the thirtieth day following the date of its enactment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sec. 1. Short title and effective date.
Sec. 2. Antidumping and countervailing duties.
Sec. 3. Repeal of special marking requirements.
Sec. 4. Repeal of certain obsolete reciprocal provisions
Sec. 5 American goods returned.
Sec. 6 Free entry provisions for travelers.
Sec. 7. Free entry for noncommercial exhibitions.
Sec. 8 Temporary free entry for samples and other articles under bond
Sec. 9 Supplies and equipment for vessels and aircraft.
Sec. 10 Draw-back on export of imports not ordered.
Sec. 11. Administrative exemptions.
Sec. 12. International traffic and rescue work.
Sec 13 Value.
Sec. 14. Signing and delivery of manifests.
Sec. 15. Certified invoices and informal entries.
Sec. 16. Verification of documents.
Sec. 17. Amendment of entries and duties on undervaluation
Sec. 18 Commingled merchandise.
Sec. 19. Correction of errors and mistakes.
Sec. 20. Conversion of currency.
Sec. 21. Customs supervision.
Sec. 22. Conversion of processing taxes to import taxes.
Sec. 23. Saving clause.
Sec. 24. Relation to GATT.

ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTIES

SEC. 2. (a) Section 201 (a) of the Antidumping Act, 1921 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 160 (a)), is amended by inserting "or retarded" after "is prevented."

(b) Section 202 (a) of the Antidumping Act, 1921 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 19, sec. 161 (a)), is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding "less an amount equal to any countervailing duty imposed on the merchandise by reason of a payment or bestowal of a bounty or grant."

(c) Section 303 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U S C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1303) is amended by inserting after "Corporation shall" in the first sentence the words "through multiple official rates of its exchange in terms of United States dollars, or otherwise," and by changing the period at the end of the first sentence to a comma and adding "less an amount equal to any special dumping duty imposed on the merchandise. Such countervailing duty shall be imposed only if the Secretary of the Treasury shall determine, after such investigation as he deems necessary, that an industry in the United States is being or is likely to be injured, or is prevented or retarded from being established, by reason of the importation into the United States of articles or merchandise of the class or kind in respect of which the bounty or grant is paid or bestowed The exemption of any exported article or merchandise from a duty or tax imposed on like articles or merchandise when destined for consumption in the country of origin or exportation, or the refunding of such a duty or tax, shall not be deemed to constitute a payment or bestowal of a bounty or grant within the meaning of this section"

REPEAL OF SPECIAL MARKING REQUIREMENTS

SEC 3 (a) Paragraphs 28, 354, 355, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, and 1553 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1001, pars. 28, 354, 355, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, and 1553) are amended as follows:

Paragraph 28 is amended by deleting from subparagraph (f) "the immediate container and".

Paragraph 354 is amended by deleting the second proviso

Paragraphs 355, 357, 358, 359, 360, and 361 are amended by deleting the provisos

Paragraph 1553 is amended by deleting both provisos.

(b) Section 2934 of the Revised Statutes (U. S C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 134) is repealed.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN OBSOLETE RECIPROCAL PROVISIONS

SEC 4. (a) Paragraph 812 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U S C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec 1001, par 812) is amended by deleting the proviso relating to the importation of spirits in certain containers.

(b) Section 320 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U S C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec 1320) relating to reciprocal agreements covering advertising matter, is repealed.

AMERICAN GOODS RETURNED

SEC. 5 Paragraph 1615 (i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1201, par. 1615 (f)), is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "When because of the destruction of customs records or for other cause it is impracticable to establish whether draw-back was allowed, or to determine the amount of draw-back allowed, on a reimported article excepted under subparagraph (e), there shall be assessed thereon an amount of duty equal to the estimated draw-back and internal-revenue tax which would be allowable or refundable if the imported merchandise used in the manufacture or production of the reimported article were dutiable or taxable at the rate applicable to such merchandise on the date of importation, but in no case more than the duty and tax that would apply if the article were originally imported. In order to facilitate the ascertainment and collection of the duty provided for in this subparagraph, the Secretary of the

Treasury is authorized to ascertain and specify the amounts of duty equal to draw-back or internal-revenue tax which shall be applied to articles or classes or kinds of articles, and to exempt from the assessment of duty articles or classes or kinds of articles excepted under subparagraph (e) with respect to which the collection of such duty involves expense and inconvenience to the Government which is disproportionate to the probable amount of such duty."

FREE ENTRY PROVISIONS FOR TRAVELERS

SEC. 6. Paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1201, par. 1798), is further amended to read as follows:

"PAR. 1798. (a) Professional books, implements, and tools of trade, occupation, or employment, when imported by or for the account of any person arriving in the United States by whom or for whose account they were taken abroad.

"(b) In the case of any person arriving in the United States who is not a returning resident thereof—

"(1) wearing apparel, articles of personal adornment, toilet articles, and similar personal effects; all the foregoing, if actually owned by and in the possession of such person abroad at the time of or prior to his departure for the United States, and if appropriate for his own personal use and intended only for such use and not for any other person nor for sale;

"(2) automobiles, trailers, aircraft, motorcycles, bicycles, baby carriages, boats, horse-drawn conveyances, horses, and similar means of transportation, and the usual equipment accompanying the foregoing; any of the foregoing imported in connection with the arrival of such person and to be used in the United States only for the transportation of such person, his family and guests, and such incidental carriage of articles as may be appropriate to his personal use of the conveyance; and

"(3) not exceeding $200 in value of articles accompanying such a person who is in transit to a place outside United States customs territory and who will take the articles with him to such place.

"(c) In the case of any person arriving in the United States who is a returning resident thereof—

"(1) all personal and household effects taken abroad by him or for his account and brought back by him or for his account, and

"(2) articles (including not more than 1 wine gallon of alcoholic beverages and not more than 100 cigars) acquired abroad as an incident of the journey from which he is returning, for his personal or household use, but not imported for the account of any other person nor intended for sale, if declared in accordance with regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury, up to but not exceeding in aggregate value—

"(A) $200, if such person arrives from a contiguous country which maintains a free zone or free port (see subparagraph (d)), or arrives from any other country after having remained beyond the territorial limits of the United States for a period of not less than 48 hours, and in either case has not claimed an exemption under this subdivision (A) within the 30 days immediately preceding his arrival; and

"(B) $300 in addition, if such person has remained beyond the territorial limits of the United States for a period of not less than 12 days and has not claimed an exemption under this subdivision (B) within the 6 months immediately preceding his arrival.

"(d) In the case of persons arriving from a contiguous country which maintains a free zone or free port, if the Secretary of the Treasury deems it necessary in the public interest and to facilitate enforcement of the requirement that the exemption shall apply only to articles acquired as an incident of the foreign journey, he shall prescribe by special regulation or instruction, the application of which may be restricted to one or more ports of entry, that the exemption authorized by subdivision (2) (A) of subparagraph (c) shall be allowed only to residents who have remained beyond the territorial limits of the United States for not less than a specified period, not to exceed 24 hours, and after the expiration of 90 days after the date of such regulation or instruction allowance of the said exemption shall be subject to the limitation so prescribed

"(e) All articles exempted by this paragraph from the payment of duty shall be exempt also from the payment of any internal-revenue tax imposed on or by reason of importation.

"(f) If any jewelry or similar articles of personal adornment having a value of $300 or more which have been exempted from duty under subdivision (1) of subparagraph (b) or any article which has been exempted from duty under subdivision (2) (B) of subparagraph (c) is sold within 3 years after the date of importation, or if any article which has been exempted from duty under subdivision (2) of subparagraph (b) is sold within 1 year after the date of importation, without prior payment to the United States of the duty which would have been payable at the time of entry if the article had been entered without the benefit of this paragraph, such article, or its value (to be recovered from the importer), shall be subject to forfeiture. A sale pursuant to a judicial order or in liquidation of the estate of a decedent shall not be subject to the provisions of this subparagraph

"(g) The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe methods and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this paragraph. No exemption provided for in this paragraph shall be applied to any article which is not declared in accordance with such regulations."

FREE ENTRY FOR NONCOMMERCIAL EXHIBITIONS

SEC. 7 (a) Paragraph 1809 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1201, par. 1809) is amended by inserting "within 5 years after the date of entry hereunder" after "used contrary to this provision" and by inserting "within such 5-year period" after "at any time."

(b) The conditions of any bond in force on the effective date of this act in respect of articles previously entered under the provisions of paragraph 1809 or the corresponding provisions of any tariff act prior to the Tariff Act of 1930 shall be deemed to have been satisfied upon the effective date of this act or upon the expiration of 5 years from the date such articles were entered, whichever is later, except with respect to any violation which has occurred or which shall have occurred before such time.

TEMPORARY FREE ENTRY FOR SAMPLES AND OTHER ARTICLES UNDER BOND

SEC. 8. (a) (1) The part of section 308 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 19, sec. 1308), preceding the numbered items is amended to read as follows: "The following articles, when not imported for sale or for sale on approval, may be admitted into the United States under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, without the payment of duty, under bond for their exportation within 6 months from the date of importation, which period, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, may be extended, upon application, for one or more further periods which, when added to the initial 6 months, shall not exceed a total of 3 years:".

(2) This amendment shall be effective with respect to articles imported before or after this section becomes effective but shall not be effective with respect to any article for which the 6-month period, or a lawful extension thereof, has expired before the effective date of this amendment.

(b) Section 308 (5) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1308 (5)), is further amended to read as follows:

"(5) Automobiles, motorcycles, bicycles, airplanes, airships, balloons, boats, racing shells, and similar vehicles and craft, and horses, and the usual equipment of the foregoing; all the foregoing which are brought temporarily into the United States by nonresidents for the purpose of taking part in races or other specific contests";

SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT FOR VESSELS AND AIRCRAFT

SEC. 9. (a) Section 309 (a) and 309 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1309 (a), (b)), relating to articles for certain vessels and aircraft, are further amended to read as follows:

"(a) Exemption from duties and taxes: Articles of foreign or domestic origin may be withdrawn, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, from any customs bonded warehouse or from continuous customs custody elsewhere than in a bonded warehouse, free of duty and internal-revenue tax, or from any internal-revenue bonded warehouse from any brewery or from any winery premises or bonded premises for the storage of wine, free of internal-revenue tax—

"(1) for supplies (not including equipment) of (A) vessels of war or public aircraft of the United States, (B) vessels of the United States employed in the fisheries or in the whaling business, or actually engaged in foreign trade or trade between the Atlantic and Pacific ports of the United States or between the United States and any of its possessions, or (C) aircraft registered in the United States and actually engaged in foreign trade or trade between the United States and any of its possessions; or

"(2) for supplies (including equipment) or repair of (A) vessels of war of any foreign nation, or (B) foreign vessels employed in the fisheries or in the whaling business, or actually engaged in foreign trade or trade between the United States and any of its possessions, where such trade by foreign vessels is permitted; or

"(3) for supplies (including equipment), ground equipment, maintenance, or repair of aircraft registered in any foreign country and actually engaged in foreign trade or trade between the United States and any of its possessions, where trade by foreign aircraft is permitted. With respect to articles for ground equipment, the exemption hereunder shall apply only to duties and to taxes imposed upon or by reason of importation

"(b) Drawback: Articles withdrawn from bonded warehouses, bonded manufacturing warehouses, or continuous customs custody elsewhere than in a bonded warehouse and articles of domestic manufacture or production, laden as supplies upon any such vessel or aircraft of the United States or laden as supplies (including equipment) upon, or used in the maintenance or repair of, any such foreign vessel or aircraft, shall be considered to be exported within the meaning of the drawback provisions of this chapter."

(b) Section 317 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 19, sec. 1317), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The shipment or delivery of any merchandise for use as supplies (including equipment) upon, or in the maintenance or repair of any vessel or aircraft described in subsection (a) (2) (A) and (B), or (a) (3) (A), of section 309 of this act, or for use as ground equipment for any aircraft described in subsection (a) (3) (A) of section 309 shall be deemed an exportation within the meaning of the customs and internal-revenue laws applicable to the exportation of such merchandise without the payment of duty

or internal-revenue tax With respect to merchandise for use as ground equipment, such shipment or delivery shall not be deemed an exportation within the meaning of the internal-revenue laws relating to taxes other than those imposed upon or by reason of importation"

DRAWBACK ON EXPORT OF IMPORTS NOT ORDERED

SEC. 10 (a) Section 313 (c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S C, 1946 edition, title 19, sec 1313 (c)), is further amended by inserting "or shaped without the consent of the consignee" after "sample or specifications" and by substituting "ninety days" for "thirty days"

(b) Section 313 (i) (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U S C., 1946 edition, title 19, sec 1313 (i) (2)), is further amended by inserting ", or shipment without the consignee's consent," after "sample or specifications."

ADMINISTRATIVE EXEMPTIONS

SEC 11 Section 321 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S C., 1946 ed, title 19, sec 1321), is amended to read as follows

"SEC 321 Administrative exemptions

"(a) Subject to such exceptions and under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, collectors shall disregard any difference of less than $5 between the total estimated duties or taxes deposited, or the total duties or taxes tentatively assessed, with respect to any entry of merchandise and the total amount of duties or taxes actually accruing thereon

"(b) Subject to such exceptions and under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, articles (not including alcoholic beverages, manufactured tobacco, snuff, cigars, or cigarettes) shall be admitted free of duty and of any tax imposed on or by reason of importation in the following cases:

"(1) When the articles are on the person or in the accompanying baggage of an individual arriving in the United States who is not entitled to any exemption from duty or tax under paragraph 1798 (c) (2) of this act and the aggregate value of such articles is not over $10, if the articles are intended for the personal or household use of such individual and not for sale, or $5 in any other case. This exemption shall not be allowed to any person more than once in one day

"(2) When the articles are imported otherwise than on the person or in the accompanying baggage of an individual arriving in the United States and the aggregate value of all articles in the shipment is not over $10, if the articles are intended for the personal or household use of the consignee and not for sale, or $5 in any other case. The privilege of this subdivision shall not be granted to any c o d. shipment or in any case in which merchandise covered by a single order or contract is forwarded in separate lots to secure the benefit of this subdivision.

"(c) The purpose of this section is to avoid expense and inconvenience to the Government disproportionate to the amount of revenue that would otherwise be collected Therefore, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized by regulations to diminish any dollar amount specified heretofore in this section and to prescribe exceptions to any exemption provided for in this section whenever he finds that such diminutions or exceptions are consistent with the purpose above stated, or are for any reason necessary to protect the revenue or to prevent unlawful importations."

INTERNATIONAL TRAFFIC AND RESCUE WORK

SEC. 12 The Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is further amended by adding immediately following section 321 (U. S. C, 1946 edition, title 19, sec. 1321) a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 322. International traffic and rescue work.

"(a) Vehicles and other instruments of international traffic, of any class specified by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be granted the customary exceptions from the application of the customs laws to such extent and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed in regulations or instructions of the Secretary of the Treasury

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury may provide by regulations or special instructions for the admission, without entry and without the payment of any duty or tax imposed upon or by reason of importation, of—

"(1) aircraft, equipment, supplies, and spare parts for use in searches, rescues, investigations, repairs, and salvage in connection with accidental damage to aircraft,

"(2) fire-fighting and rescue and relief equipment and supplies for emergent temporary use in connection with conflagrations, and

"(3) rescue and relief equipment and supplies for emergent temporary use in connection with floods and other disasters.

Any articles admitted under the authority of this subsection and used otherwise than for a purpose herein expressed, or not exported in such time and manner as may be prescribed in the regulations or instructions herein authorized, shall be forfeited to the United States"

VALUE

SEC. 13. (a) Section 402 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U S. C, 1946 ed, title 19, sec 1402), is further amended to read as follows.

"SEC 402 Value.

(a) BASIS Except as otherwise specifically provided for, the value of imported merchandise for the purposes of this act shall be—

"(1) the export value,

"(2) if the export value cannot be ascertained satisfactorily, then the United States value,

"(3) if neither the export value nor the United States value can be ascertained satisfactorily, then the comparative value,

"(4) if neither the export value, the United States value nor the comparative value can be ascertained satisfactorily, then the constructed value; or

"(5) in the case of an article with respect to which there is in effect under section 336 a rate of duty based upon the American selling price of a domestic article, then the American selling price of such domestic article.

"(b) Export value The export value of imported merchandise shall be the market value or the price, at the time of exportation to the United States of the merchandise undergoing appraisement, at which such or similar merchandise is freely sold or offered for sale in the principal markets of the country of exportation, in the usual wholesale quantities and in the ordinary course of trade, for exportation to the United States, plus, when not included in such price, the cost of all containers and coverings of whatever nature and all other charges and expenses incidental to placing the merchandise in condition, packed ready for shipment to the United States.

"(c) United States value: The United States value of imported merchandise shall be the price, at the time of exportation to the United States of the merchandise undergoing appraisement, at which such or similar merchandise is freely sold or offered for sale in the principal market of the United States for domestic consumption, packed ready for delivery, in the usual wholesale quantities and in the ordinary course of trade, with allowances made for—

"(1) any commission paid or agreed to be paid on merchandise secured otherwise than by purchase; or, on merchandise secured by purchase or agreement to purchase, the addition for profit and general expenses usually made by sellers in such market on imported merchandise of the same class or kind as the merchandise undergoing appraisement;

"(2) the usual costs of transportation and insurance and other usual expenses from the place of shipment to the place of delivery, not including any expense provided for in (1); and

"(3) the ordinary customs duties and Federal taxes estimated to be payable on such or similar merchandise by reason of its importation or for which vendors at wholesale in the United States are ordinarily liable.

"If such or similar merchandise was not so sold or offered at the time of exportation of the merchandise undergoing appraisement, the United States value shall be ascertained or estimated, subject to the foregoing specifications of this subsection, from the price at which such or similar merchandise is freely sold or offered for sale at the earliest date after such time of exportation but before the expiration of 90 days after the importation of the merchandise undergoing appraisement

"(d) Comparative value The comparative value of imported merchandise shall be the equivalent of the export value as nearly as such equivalent may be ascertained or estimated on the basis of the export or United States value of other merchandise from the same country which is comparable in construction and use with the merchandise undergoing appraisement, with appropriate adjustments for differences in size, material, construction, texture, or other differences

"(e) Constructed value: The constructed value of imported merchandise shall be the sum of—

"(1) the cost of materials and of fabrication or other processing of any kind employed in producing such or similar merchandise, at a time preceding the date of exportation of the merchandise undergoing appraisement which would ordinarily permit the production of that particular merchandise in the ordinary course of business;

"(2) an addition for general expenses and profit equal to that which producers in the country of production whose products are exported to the United States usually add in sales, in the usual wholesale quantities and in the ordinary course of trade, of merchandise of the same general class or kind as the merchandise undergoing appraisement; and

"(3) the cost of all containers and coverings of whatever nature, and all other charges and expenses incidental to placing the merchandise undergoing appraisement in condition, packed ready for shipment to the United States.

"(f) American selling price: The American selling price of any article manufactured or produced in the United States shall be the price, including the cost of all containers and coverings of whatever nature and all other charges and expenses incident to placing the merchandise in condition packed ready for delivery, at which such article is freely sold or offered for sale for domestic consumption in the principal market of the United States, in the ordinary course of trade and in the usual wholesale quantities, or the price that the manufacturer, producer, or owner would have received or was willing to receive for such merchandise when sold for domestic consumption in the ordinary course of trade and in the usual wholesale quantities, at the time of exportation of the imported article.

"(g) Taxes: The value of imported merchandise ascertained or estimated in accordance with this section shall not include the amount of any internal tax, applicable within the country of origin or exportation, from which the merchandise undergoing appraisemenat has been exempted or has been or will be relieved by means of refund.

"(h) Definitions: As used in this section, the following terms shall have the meanings respectively indicated:

"(1) 'Freely sold or offered for sale'—sold or offered to all purchasers at wholesale without restrictions as to the disposition or use of the merchandise by the purchaser, except restrictions as to such disposition or use which (A) are imposed or required by law, or (B) limit the price at which or the territory in which the merchandise may be resold, or (C) do not substantially affect the value of the merchandise to usual purchasers at wholesale.

"(2) 'Ordinary course of trade'—the conditions and practices which, for a reasonable time prior to the exportation of the merchandise undergoing appraisement, have been normal in the trade under consideration with respect to merchandise of the same class or kind as the merchandise undergoing appraisement.

"(3) 'Purchasers at wholesale'—purchasers who buy in the usual wholesale quantities for industrial use or for resale otherwise than at retail; or, if there are no such purchasers, then all other purchasers for resale who buy in the usual wholesale quantities; or, if there are no purchasers in either of the foregoing categories, then all other purchasers who buy in the usual wholesale quantities.

"(4) 'Such or similar merchandise'—the merchandise undergoing appraisement shall be considered 'such' merchandise, and other merchandise shall be considered 'such' merchandise if—

"(A) it is identical in physical characteristics and was produced in the same country by the same person, or

"(B) when no value meeting the requirements of the definition of value under consideration can be ascertained or estimated under (A), the merchandise is identical in physical characteristics and was produced by another person in the same country.

Merchandise shall be considered 'similar' to the merchandise undergoing appraisement if it is not within the foregoing definition of 'such' merchandise but—

"(C) it was produced in the same country as the merchandise undergoing appraisement, by the same person, of like materials, is used for the same purpose, and is of approximately equal commercial value, or

"(D) when no value meeting the requirements of the definition of value under consideration can be ascertained or estimated under (C), the merchandise is correspondingly similar and was produced by another person in the same country.

"(5) 'Usual wholesale quantities'—the quantities usually sold in the class of transactions in which the greater aggregate quantity of the 'such or similar merchandise,' in respect of which value is being ascertained or estimated, is sold in the market under consideration."

(b) Paragraph 27 (c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1001, par. 27 (c)), is amended by changing "subdivision (g)" to "subdivision (f)" and by changing "subdivision (e)" to "subdivision (c)."

(c) Paragraph 28 (c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1001, par. 28 (c)), is amended by changing "subdivision (g)" to "subdivision (f)" and by changing "subdivision (e)" to "subdivision (c)."

(d) Section 336 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1336 (b)), is amended by changing "section 402 (g)" to "section 402 (f)."

SIGNING AND DELIVERY OF MANIFESTS

SEC. 14. Section 431 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1431) is amended by designating the matter now therein as subsection (a) and by adding a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) Whenever a manifest of articles or persons on board an aircraft is required for customs purposes to be signed, or produced or delivered to a customs officer, the manifest may be signed, produced, or delivered by the pilot or person in charge of the aircraft, or by any other authorized agent of the owner or operator of the aircraft, subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. If any irregularity of omission or commission occurs in any way in respect of any such manifest, the owner or operator of the aircraft shall be liable for any fine or penalty prescribed by law in respect of such irregularity."

CERTIFIED INVOICES AND INFORMAL ENTRIES

SEC. 15. (a) Section 482 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1482 (a)) is amended by substituting "required pursuant to section 484 (b) of this act to be certified" for "covering merchandise exceeding $100 in value" in the first clause.

(b) Section 498 (a) (1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec 1498 (a) (1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Merchandise, imported in the mails or otherwise, when the aggregate value of the shipment does not exceed such amount, not greater than $250, as the Secretary of the Treasury shall specify in the regulations, and the specified amount may vary for different classes or kinds of merchandise or different classes of transactions;".

(c) Section 498 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1498 (a)) is further amended by deleting the word "and" at the end of subdivision (10); by deleting the period at the end of subdivision (11) and substituting therefor "; and"; and by adding after subdivision (11) a new subdivision to read as follows:

"(12) Merchandise within the provisions of paragraph 1631 of this act."

VERIFICATION OF DOCUMENTS

SEC 16 Section 486 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1486) is amended by changing the caption to read "Administration of oaths—Verifications of documents" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The Secretary of the Treasury may by regulation prescribe that any document required by any law administered by the Customs Service to be under oath may be verified by a written declaration in such form as he shall prescribe, such declaration to be in lieu of the oath otherwise required."

AMENDMENT OF ENTRIES AND DUTIES ON UNDERVALUATION

SEC. 17. (a) Section 487 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1487) is amended by deleting therefrom ", or at any time before the invoice of the merchandise has come under the observation of the appraiser for the purpose of appraisement,".

(b) Section 489 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1489) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 489. Undervaluation—unauthentic claim of antiquity

"(a) If the final appraised value of any article of imported merchandise subject to an ad valorem rate of duty or to a duty based upon or regulated in any manner by the value thereof shall exceed the entered value, and if the consignee shall have failed to furnish the appraiser, before that officer has signed his report of value to the collector, all information required by customs officers which is relevant to the value of the merchandise and available to him at the time of entry or within a reasonable time thereafter, and all such information that is so available to the person, if any, in whose behalf the entry was made, there shall be levied, collected, and paid, in addition to any other duties imposed by law on such merchandise, a special duty of 1 percent of the total final appraised value thereof for each 1 percent that such final appraised value exceeds the value declared in the entry. Such special duty shall apply only to the particular article or articles in each invoice that are so advanced in value upon final appraisement, and shall not be imposed upon any article upon which the amount of duty imposed by law on account of the final appraised value does not exceed the amount of duty that would have been imposed if the final appraised value had not exceeded the entered value.

"(b) The liquidation in which such special duty is assessed shall be subject to the protest and review procedure provided for in sections 514 and 515 of this act, but such special duty shall not be remitted nor the payment thereof in any way avoided except upon an administrative decision under section 515 that the special duties were erroneously assessed or upon a finding by the United States Customs Court, after due assignment and determination pursuant to section 515, and under such rules as the Court may prescribe, that the entry of the merchandise at a less value than its final appraised value was without any culpable negligence or intention to conceal or misrepresent the facts of the case or to deceive the appraiser as to the value of the merchandise.

"(c) The special duty imposed by subsection (a) shall not be construed to be penal. It shall not be refunded by reason of exportation of the merchandise, nor shall it be subject to the benefit of drawback. All special or additional duties, penalties, or forfeitures applicable to merchandise entered in connection with a certified invoice shall be applicable alike to merchandise entered in connection with a seller's or shipper's invoice or a statement in the form of an invoice.

"(d) Furniture described in paragraph 1811 of section 201 of this act shall enter the United States at ports which shall be designated by the Secretary of the Treasury for this purpose. If any article described in said paragraph 1811 and imported for sale is rejected as unauthentic in respect to the antiquity claimed as a basis for free entry, there shall be imposed, collected, and paid on such article, unless exported under customs supervision, a duty of 25 percent of the value of such article in addition to any other duty imposed by law upon such article."

(c) Section 501 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., Supp. II, title 19, sec. 1501), is further amended by changing the period at the end of the first sentence to a comma and by inserting thereafter "or (3) in any case, if the consignee, his agent, or his attorney requests such notice in writing before appraisement, setting forth a substantial reason or reasons for requesting the notice.", and by deleting the third sentence of the section.

(d) Section 503 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1503) is amended by deleting "the entered value or" and ", whichever is higher" from subsection (a), by deleting subsection (b), and by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(e) The act of July 12, 1932 (ch. 473, 47 Stat. 657; U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1503a), is repealed.

(f) Section 562 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1562), is further amended by changing the third sentence to read as follows: "The basis for the assessment of duties on such merchandise so withdrawn for consumption

shall be the adjusted final appraised value, and if the rate of duty is based upon or regulated in any manner by the value of the merchandise, such rate shall be based upon or regulated by such adjusted final appraised value."

COMMINGLED MERCHANDISE

SEC 18. Section 508 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U S C, 1946 ed, title 19, sec. 1508) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 508 Commingling of goods.

"(a) Whenever dutiable merchandise and merchandise which is free of duty or merchandise subject to different rates of duty are so packed together or mingled that the quantity or value of each class of such merchandise cannot be readily ascertained by the customs officers (without physical segregation of the shipment or the contents of any entire package thereof), by one or more of the following means: (1) Examination of a representative sample, (2) occasional verification of packing lists or other documents filed at the time of entry, or (3) evidence showing performance of commercial settlement tests generally accepted in the trade and filed in such time and manner as may be prescribed by regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury, and if the consignee or his agent shall not segregate the merchandise pursuant to subsection (b), then the whole of such merchandise shall be subject to the highest rate of duty applicable to any part thereof

"(b) Every segregation of merchandise made pursuant to this section shall be accomplished by the consignee or his agent at the risk and expense of the consignee within 20 days after the date of personal delivery or mailing by the collector of written notice to the consignee that the merchandise is commingled Every such segregation shall be accomplished under customs supervision, and the compensation and expenses of the supervising customs officers shall be reimbursed to the Government by the consignee under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe

"(c) The foregoing provisions of this section shall not apply with respect to any part of a shipment if the consignee or his agent shall furnish to the collector, in such time and manner as may be prescribed by regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury, satisfactory proof (1) that such part (A) is commercially negligible, (B) is not capable of segregation without excessive cost, and (C) will not be segregated prior to its use in a manufacturing process or otherwise, and (2) that the commingling was not intended to avoid the payment of lawful duties or any part thereof. Any merchandise with respect to which such proof is furnished shall be considered for all customs purposes as a part of the merchandise, subject to the next lower rate of duty (including a free rate), with which it is commingled"

CORRECTION OF ERRORS AND MISTAKES

SEC. 19 Section 520 (c) (1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U S C, 1946 ed., title 19, sec 1520 (c) (1)), is further amended to read as follows:

"(1) A clerical error, mistake of fact, or other inadvertence not amounting to an error in the construction of a law, adverse to the importer and manifest from the record or established by documentary evidence, in any entry, liquidation, appraisement, or other customs transaction, when the error, mistake, or inadvertence is brought to the attention of the customs service within 1 year after the date of entry, appraisement, or transaction, or within 60 days after liquidation or exaction when the liquidation or exaction is made more than 10 months after the date of the entry, appraisement, or transaction; or"

CONVERSION OF CURRENCY

SEC. 20. (a) Section 25 of the Act of August 27, 1894, as amended and reenacted (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 31, sec. 372 (a)), is repealed, and section 522 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 31, sec. 372) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 522 Conversion of currency.

"(a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall keep current a published list of the par values, expressed in United States dollars, of the several foreign currencies maintained pursuant to the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund, or pursuant to any other international agreement to which the United States is a party. For the purposes of all provisions of the customs laws, whenever it is necessary to convert into an amount expressed in currency of the United States any amount expressed in a foreign currency for which such a par value was maintained for the date as of which the value or cost requiring conversion is to be determined, such conversion, except as specified in subsection (d), shall be made at such par value

"(b) If no such par value was so maintained for such date, the conversion shall be made at the buying rate for the foreign currency in the New York market at noon on the date as of which the value or cost requiring conversion is to be determined, or, if banks are generally closed on such date in New York City, then the buying rate at noon on the last preceding business day. For the purposes of this subsection, such buying rate shall be the buying rate for cable transfers payable in the foreign currency in which the amount to be converted is expressed, and shall be determined by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall make it public at such times and to such extent as he shall deem necessary. In ascertaining such buying rate, such Federal Reserve bank may in its discretion (1) take into consideration the last ascertainable transactions and quotations, whether direct or through exchange of other currencies, and (2) if there is no market buying rate for such cable transfers, calculate such rate from actual transactions and quotations in demand or time bills of exchange or from the last ascertainable transactions and quotations outside the United States in or for exchange payable in United States currency or other currency.

"(c) If, pursuant to subsection (b), the Federal Reserve Bank of New York certifies more than one rate of exchange for a particular foreign currency for any date the conversion for customs purposes of amounts expressed in that currency for that date shall be made by applying the applicable rate or rates so certified which reflect effectively the value of that foreign currency in commercial transactions.

"(d) When, apart from normal variation between buying and selling rates, there are one or more rates of exchange in addition to the par value for any foreign currency listed pursuant to subsection (a), the list shall so indicate. When rules governing the conversion of such foreign currencies have been formulated pursuant to an international agreement to which the United States is a party, the Secretary of the Treasury shall issue regulations in conformity with such rules, and the conversion for customs purposes of amounts expressed in such currencies into amounts expressed in currency of the United States shall thereafter be in accordance with such regulations so long as they are in effect. If no regulations are in effect and applicable to the conversion of such a currency, one or more rates of exchange in addition to the par value may be certified in the manner set forth in subsection (b) and the par value and any certified rates shall be applied in the manner prescribed in subsection (c)."

(b) Section 481 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S C., 1946 ed, title 19, sec. 1481 (a)) is amended by deleting subparagraph (7) and by renumbering subparagraphs (8), (9), and (10) as (7), (8), and (9).

CUSTOMS SUPERVISION

SEC 21. The Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is further amended by adding following section 645 (U. S. C, 1946 ed, title 19, sec. 1645) a new section 646 reading as follows:

"SEC 646 Customs supervision.

"Wherever in this act any action or thing is required to be done or maintained under the supervision of customs officials, such supervision may be direct and continuous or by occasional verification as may be required by regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury, or, in the absence of such regulations for a particular case, as the principal customs officer concerned shall direct"

CONVERSION OF PROCESSING TAXES TO IMPORT TAXES

SEC 22. (a) As soon as each proper rate can be determined by the United States Tariff Commission, that Commission shall certify to the President the respective rate or rates of import tax for copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels which the Commission estimates to be reasonably equivalent in respect of each such commodity to the relevant tax imposed on the date of the enactment of this act under section 2470 of the Internal Revenue Code (U S. C, 1946 ed., title 26, sec. 2470) on the first domestic processing of coconut oil and palm-kernel oil, respectively The certified rates shall be proclaimed by the President, and on and after the thirtieth day after the date all the certified rates have been so proclaimed the amendments of law specified hereafter in this section shall be effective, with the proclaimed rates inserted in the redesignated and amended section 2491 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code in the respective blank spaces following the descriptions of the products for which the rate shall have been proclaimed

(b) Section 2470 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (U. S C., 1946 ed, title 26, sec. 2470 (b)) is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding "or (3) with respect to any commodity, or product of a commodity, upon which an import tax has been paid under chapter 22"

(c) (1) Section 2491 (c), (d), (e), (f) of the Internal Revenue Code (U. S C., 1946 ed, title 26, sec 2491 (c), (d), (e), (f)) are amended to read as follows

"(c) (1) Coconut oil, palm oil, and palm-kernel oil, fatty acids derived from any of the foregoing oils, and salts of any of the foregoing (whether or not such oils, fatty acids, or salts have been refined, sulfonated, sulfated, hydrogenated, or otherwise processed), 3 cents per pound.

"(2) There shall be imposed (in addition to the tax prescribed in paragraph (1)) on coconut oil a tax of 2 cents per pound, except that the additional tax imposed by this paragraph shall not apply when it is established, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, that the imported product (A) is wholly the production of the Philippine Republic or of any possession of the United States, or (B) was produced wholly from materials the growth or production of the Philippine Republic or of any possession of the United States. The additional tax imposed by this paragraph shall not apply after July 3, 1974.

"(3) Whenever the President, after consultation with the President of the Philippine Republic, finds that adequate supplies of neither copra nor coconut oil, the product of the Philippine Republic, are readily avail-

able for processing in the United States, he shall so proclaim, and after the date of such proclamation the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection and of paragraph (2) of subsection (e) shall be suspended until the expiration of 30 days after he proclaims that, after consultation with the President of the Philippine Republic, he has found that such adequate supplies are so readily available.

"(d) Any commodity, not provided for heretofore in this section, 10 percent or more of the quantity by weight of which consists of, or is derived directly or indirectly from, one or more of the products specified above in this section, a tax at the rate or rates per pound equal to that proportion of the rate or rates prescribed in this section in respect of such product or products which the quantity by weight of the imported commodity, consisting of or derived from such product or products, bears to the total weight of the imported commodity; but there shall not be taxable under this subsection any commodity (other than an oil, fat, or grease, and other than products resulting from processing seeds without full commercial extraction of the oil content), by reason of the presence therein of an oil, fat, or grease which is a natural component of such commodity and has never had a separate existence as an oil, fat or grease;

"(e) (1) Hempseed, 1.24 cents per pound; perilla seed, 1.38 cents per pound, kapok seed, 2 cents per pound; rapeseed, 2 cents per pound; sesame seed, 1.18 cents per pound; and copra, per pound; palm nuts, per pound; and palm-nut kernels, per pound;

"(2) There shall be imposed (in addition to the tax prescribed in par. (1)) on copra a tax of per pound, except that the additional tax imposed by this paragraph shall not apply when it is established, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, that the imported product (A) is wholly the production of the Philippine Republic or of any possession of the United States, or (B) was produced wholly from materials the growth or production of the Philippine Republic or of any possession of the United States. The additional tax imposed by this paragraph shall not apply after July 3, 1974.

"(f) The tax imposed under subsection (b) shall not apply to rapeseed oil imported to be used in the manufacture of rubber substitutes or lubricating oil, and the tax imposed under subsection (c) (1) shall not apply to palm oil imported to be used in the manufacture of iron or steel products, tin plate, or terneplate. The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe methods and regulations to carry out this subsection."

(2) Section 2491 of the Internal Revenue Code (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 26, sec. 2491) is further amended by adding a new subsection (h) reading as follows.

"(h) No drawback in respect of any tax imposed by this section shall be allowed under any provision of law on the exportation of any byproduct resulting from the production of coconut oil or palm-kernel oil in the United States."

(d) Section 2493 of the Internal Revenue Code (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 26, sec. 2493) is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a semicolon and adding new paragraphs to read as follows:

"(4) for the purposes of the Philippine Trade Act of 1946 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 22, sec. 1251–1360), the term 'ordinary customs duty' shall not include any tax prescribed in section 2491 (c) or (d), or in section 2491 (e) with respect to copra, palm nuts, or palm-nut kernels, and the term 'internal tax' shall include such taxes;

"(5) the taxes imposed on oils and derivative products under section 2491 (c) and on copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels under section 2491 (e) shall not be subject to modification under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1351)."

(e) Section 2492 of the Internal Revenue Code (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 26, sec. 2492) is amended by deleting the date "August 21, 1936," and by inserting in place thereof the words "the date of the proclamation provided for in section 22 (a) of the Customs Simplification Act of 1951,".

SAVING CLAUSE

SEC. 23. Except as may be otherwise provided for in this act, the repeal of existing law or modifications thereof embraced in this act shall not affect any act done, or any right accruing or accrued, or any suit or proceeding had or commenced in any civil or criminal case prior to such repeal or modification, but all liabilities under such laws shall continue, except as otherwise specifically provided in this act, and may be enforced in the same manner as if such repeal or modification had not been made.

RELATION TO GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

SEC. 24. The enactment of this act shall not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of the executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr REED of New York. Mr Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr Speaker, H. R. 5505, the pending bill, is entitled "The Customs Simplification Act of 1951." It represents the collective best judgment of the Committee on Ways and Means on recommendations of the Treasury Department which were included in a draft of legislation which I introduced at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury on January 15, 1951.

I introduced H. R. 1535 in order to provide a basis for hearings on and consideration and discussion of problems of customs administration which had been studied by a number of the executive departments and agencies. There had been no legislative revision of customs procedural requirements since 1938, so the committee decided to limit the scope of its consideration to simplification of customs procedures and essential related matters, and not to take into account proposals for substantive modifications of the tariff laws or of the internal organization of the Bureau of Customs.

Hearings on simplification of customs administration began on August 6 and were completed September 19. At these hearings appeared representatives of the Treasury Department, Department of Commerce, Economic Cooperation Administration, and the Department of State. Secretary of Commerce Sawyer testified:

The delays, uncertainties, and irksome formalities existing under present law hamper the actual carrying through of desirable import transactions, and particularly discourage new and smaller business firms. It is my view that once the desirable level of duty protection has been determined, as authorized by the Congress, all other barriers discriminations against imports at or within our borders should be minimized. H. R. 1535 is the product of expert and experienced persons both in business and in Government who were trying to reach just that result. I believe you will find that they succeeded very well and I strongly urge your favorable consideration of their efforts.

Reports were received from the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense in support of enactment of customs simplification. The Bureau of the Budget advised the Committee that enactment of customs simplification legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

The need for customs simplification was acknowledged by all nongovernmental witnesses who appeared at the hearings, as well. These witnesses included spokesmen for domestic producers, importers, customs brokers, customs attorneys, and representatives of American labor and agriculture. In all, more than 50 witnesses were scheduled and the hearings run to more than 700 pages. Everybody who expressed an interest in customs simplification was given the opportunity to be heard.

The principal criticism of the original bill, H. R. 1535, was that it, in certain respects, would have modified somewhat the level of protection available to certain American industries. Still other industries expressed a fear that changing present methods of valuation might ultimately be adverse to their interests. After reviewing all the testimony, your committee decided to eliminate these controversial provisions and H. R. 5505, introduced by me as a committee bill, is a genuine simplification bill, which effects valuable and necessary changes in customs procedure.

It does not propose any changes in classifications or rates of duty. It will not impair the protection which our tariff laws afford to any American industry. The bill will effect improvements by facilitating economical and efficient administration of the customs laws, by untangling the procedural red tape which now hampers the honest importer, by eliminating inequities, and by eliminating obsolete and unnecessary provisions and making other provisions more simple and logical.

Most of the major provisions in this bill originated with recommendations of a private firm of management consultants, McKinsey & Co. This firm was employed to make a study in the fiscal year 1948, Congress having made funds available in the Treasury Department appropriation. The firm was given two main objectives: First, to determine how the cost of customs operations could be reduced compatible with the required service; and second, to ascertain whether the service rendered by customs could be improved. The Treasury Department studied McKinsey & Co.'s recommendations and came up with some further ideas of its own. The analysis at page 77 of the hearings shows that 21 specific recommendations of McKinsey & Co. were incorporated in H. R. 1535, and

another has been added by the committee to H. R. 5505, making 22 in all. This last is the provision eliminating notarization of customs documents and permitting them to be executed subject to penalties of perjury.

As I have already stated, the need for customs simplification was acknowledged by all witnesses who appeared before the committee. Their testimony on the provisions now contained in H. R. 5505 differed, in general, only in technical and drafting details. Revision of the administrative and procedural provisions of the customs laws is overdue, having been done only once since enactment of the Tariff Act of 1930. That was by the Customs Administrative Act of 1938, which was not nearly so extensive in scope or ambitious in purpose as the present bill.

The changes in valuation procedures which are proposed in section 13 of this bill would make more improvements than any other part. Wherever the amount of duty to be collected is dependent in any way on value, the customs service has to appraise imported goods and find out what they are worth. The existing law tells in great detail how this should be done. In general, the appraiser must attempt to find two values for every importation, and one of them calls on him to ascertain transactions in the country of origin between persons who may have nothing to do with the business of exporting merchandise to the United States. The difficulties created by such a system are obvious. In some cases even more is required of the appraiser. He must ascertain the cost of labor and materials to produce the imported article in the country of origin. The bill seeks to eliminate these foreign investigations so far as possible and authorize appraisers to assess values, unhampered by technicalities, from transactions in the import trade of the United States, which will necessarily be known to them or ascertainable without special investigation.

McKinsey & Co. pointed out the many difficulties that customs had in getting proper conversion rates so that values stated in foreign currencies could be converted into dollars. Section 20 of the bill will encourage the use of stable par values for conversion and will tell how the Bureau of Customs is to proceed when multiple-rate currencies and other unorthodox exchange practices have to be dealt with.

Another highly important section is section 17, which will eliminate the roundabout paper work and inequities connected with the present section 489 of the Tariff Act, which imposes a heavy special duty in case the importer states too low a value when he enters his merchandise in the customhouse, even though his mistake is entirely innocent.

Some of the provisions in the original bill paralleled some of the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which is now being applied in the United States on a provisional basis when not inconsistent with existing legislation. Your committee struck out provisions to eliminate the use of American selling price as a basis of valuation, to eliminate an asserted discrimination in the Internal Revenue Code against imported distilled spirits, and to reduce certain taxes on imported oleomargarine, filled cheese, and adulterated butter to the level of like taxes on domestic products.

Your committee did not believe that these provisions effected simplification or would improve customs administration if included in the law. Those who believe in the American selling price method of valuation, that is, the appraisal of imported merchandise according to the selling price of competing merchandise of domestic origin, may rest assured that the bill leaves American selling price entirely as it was.

Other provisions in the earlier bill which paralleled certain provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade were retained because these provisions would further the object of simplification and are justified on their merits. Some witnesses went so far in their dislike of the general agreement as to seem to say that your committee should eliminate any provision, no matter how meritorious, if it was recommended by the general agreement.

This would have required us to strike from the bill many of the most valuable provisions which qualified witnesses recommended for reasons entirely unconnected with the general agreement. No matter how much one may dislike the general agreement, it seems strange that anyone should argue that a provision is bad and should be eliminated for no better reason than that it appeared to be good to those who negotiated the agreement. On the other hand, to insure that no erroneous interpretation should be given to the committee's recommendation that this bill be enacted, a section was added expressly stating that enactment was not to be construed to indicate either the approval or disapproval by the Congress of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Of the two amendments to H. R. 5505 one is clerical, and the other will make it clear that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to apply countervailing duties against imports which obtain the benefit of bounties or grants conferred through the working of multiple-rate currency exchange systems. It is not intended to establish any conclusive presumption that a bounty or grant is conferred whenever a multiple-rate system exists, nor to prescribe any particular formula for ascertaining the amount of the bounty or grant.

This bill is a much needed and long overdue move to clear paths through the thickets of customs procedure, and to introduce businesslike methods in a field where hitherto they have been too often absent. There is nothing in this bill to endanger the interests of any American industry or any importer, and it is entirely procedural in nature. All we ask is that this House consider it fairly on its merits, and we are confident that if that is done no serious objection can be found to any part.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support H. R. 5505, known as the Customs Simplification Act of 1951.

In order to promote the efficiency of the Bureau of Customs and in order to reduce its cost of operation to the taxpayers and improve its services to the public, the Republican Eightieth Congress appropriated a special fund to enable the Bureau of Customs to retain the services of an outside management firm in order to make a study and present recommendations for achieving these desirable objectives. The firm of McKinsey & Co. of New York was retained to do this job, and the objectives of the survey were stated to this management firm as follows:

> To study the operations of the Bureau of Customs and the Customs Service with a view to promoting the efficiency of operations to the end of performing the duties and responsibilities with which the Customs Service is charged by law and in a manner that will protect the revenues and afford the greatest degree of service to the public. The end objective is to accomplish these results with the greatest degree of economy and the least possible cost to the Government.

After completing its study McKinsey & Co. submitted a detailed report and analysis which contained many suggestions and specific recommendations for legislative changes to improve and simplify our customs procedure.

But, Mr. Speaker, instead of presenting a bill to the Ways and Means Committee consisting of only legislative proposals for improving our customs procedure for which the Congress specifically appropriated money paid for by the taxpayers, the Treasury Department, in concert with and under the guiding hand of the State Department, submitted to the committee a bill which was designed primarily to clear the way for the eventual full acceptance by this country of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, known as GATT, negotiated by the State Department in 1947 under the reciprocal-trade program. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the fact, as established by cross-examination of the State Department witness during the public hearings, is that if it had been enacted as originally presented to the committee, the so-called customs-simplification bill would have brought all our laws, with one lone exception, into conformity with the requirements of the provisions of GATT and also therefore with many of the provisions of the notorious ITO Charter.

Let me explain this important point more fully, Mr. Speaker, not only because it is pertinent to the consideration of this legislation, but also because it is a valuable lesson in the under-cover technique frequently resorted to by the executive departments in their dealings with the Congress.

Back in 1947 the State Department invited 19 foreign countries to take part in the negotiation of a multilateral trade agreement at Geneva, Switzerland. During the course of the negotiations several new countries were added and the result was that 23 countries participated in the final negotiations. Tariff reductions and concessions were conducted bilaterally on a product-by-product basis and the various bilateral agree-

ments were combined to form a single General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, known as GATT. GATT has never, however, become fully operative because the agreement does not enter into full force until 30 days after instruments of acceptance have been deposited with the Secretary General of the United Nations by signatory governments that account for 85 percent of the total external trade of the territories of governments which signed the final act of the Geneva Conference.

Although President Truman proclaimed the Geneva agreement in effect provisionally as of January 1, 1948, he has been prevented from making full acceptance because certain of the general provisions of GATT are in direct conflict with provisions of our statutory laws enacted by the Congress.

A direct attempt to overcome these provisions was made by the State Department in the Eighty-first Congress when it submitted the ITO Charter to the Congress for approval. Since the objectives sought by the Geneva agreement closely parallel those sought in the Charter for an International Trade Organization, known as the ITO, most of the general provisions of the Geneva agreement are identical with or similar to, corresponding provisions of the ITO Charter. Thus, had the ITO Charter been approved by the Congress, either by a joint resolution or in the form of a treaty, our statutory laws which are in conflict with the provisions of GATT and the ITO would have been eliminated.

But the Eighty-first Congress refused to even bring the ITO Charter to the floor for consideration by the House, and it has consequently been withdrawn by the State Department.

So, Mr. Speaker, reviewing the situation in brief we find that GATT cannot be fully accepted by this country until some basic changes are made in certain of our statutory laws. And we find secondly that the ITO Charter containing these changes has already once been flatly rejected by the Congress. This then was the dilemna facing the State Department when out of the gloom came the smart idea to clothe approval of GATT in the appealing raiment of customs simplification. It was as simple as that because everyone favored customs simplification and the Republican Eightieth Congress had even appropriated funds for this very purpose. And so a bill was presented to the committee which if enacted would have abolished the American selling price, inserted the word "materially" in the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921, reduced the taxes on imported oleomargarine, filled cheese, and adulterated butter, reduced the duty on imported distilled spirits, and made other amendments to our laws in order to bring them into conformity with the provisions of GATT.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this attempt to use customs simplification as a vehicle for paving the way for acceptance of GATT was a shameful subterfuge and indeed a shocking misuse of the funds appropriated by the Congress. It is small wonder that the people of this country, and many Members of this House, have long ago lost faith in the integrity of the executive departments.

The result of this attempt to secure congressional approval of GATT through the back door was that the Ways and Means Committee was deluged with requests from industry groups all over the country wishing to be heard in opposition to the bill as originally prepared. As a consequence long and expensive public hearings had to be held.

And yet it would have been a simple matter for the Treasury Department to have prepared a bill dealing only with customs simplification matters as intended by the Congress. If this had been done, legislation to improve our customs procedure would have been adopted long ago.

As the result of the efforts of Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee I am now able to report, however, that most of the provisions bringing our laws in compliance with GATT and the ITO Charter have been eliminated and in fact H. R. 5505 contains a section specifically stating that this bill is not to be construed as any indication of approval by the Congress of GATT.

Although H. R. 5505, as reported by the committee has thus been substantially improved, it still contains two sections which are more akin to approval of GATT than to customs simplification. These are sections 20 and 22.

Section 20 provides in general that the primary standard for determining the conversion rates for foreign currencies will be the International Monetary Fund rather than our own Federal Reserve bank. Among the witnesses who appeared before the committee in opposition to changing our present procedures and tying our conversion methods to the International Monetary Fund were the National Grange, the National Renderer's Association, and the National Labor Management Council of Foreign Trade. These witnesses pointed out that this highly technical provision is not a question of customs simplification; that its principal purpose is to remove a conflict in our laws with the provisions of GATT, and that under the present world conditions the International Monetary Fund will continue to have little success in determining realistic currency rates.

The other section of H. R. 5505 which should be deleted in order to improve the bill is section 22, the purpose of which again is primarily to make our laws conform to the provisions of GATT—article III—and to the ITO charter—article 18. This section of the bill provides in general for converting into import taxes the processing taxes imposed on coconut, palm, and palm-kernel oils under section 2470 of the Internal Revenue Code and for the imposition of equivalent import taxes on materials from which these oils are produced. The transfer of the administration and collection of these taxes from the Bureau of Internal Revenue to the Customs Bureau will obviously not result in any customs simplification, and this transfer represents a surrender to the administration of these taxes to the State Department which under the present administration will, of course, continue to maneuver to have them removed.

If these two sections were eliminated I believe, Mr. Speaker, that H. R. 5505 would represent a most meritorious improvement in the administration of our customs laws. A detailed description of the other provisions of the bill are set forth in the committee report, and I do not believe that any Member of the House can take issue with them. For this reason I shall support this bill because I believe that sections 20 and 22 will be corrected by the other body.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, while all of H. R. 5505 is important and necessary to simplify customs procedures, there is one section which outweighs any of the others. This is section 13, which tells how customs appraisers are to find the value of imported merchandise They have to do this whenever a schedule of the tariff act states a rate of duty as a percentage of value or as a percentage of value plus something else, or whenever there is a specific duty with rates differing according to different value brackets. There can be no doubt that the difficulties that customs has had in appraising merchandise have greatly hampered the service in liquidating duties and determining the amount of duty owed with any promptness, and have made it extremely difficult for importers to tell beforehand how much duty is going to be assessed on any particular shipment. As things now are, importers often have to sell their merchandise before they know what the duty will be, so that if the duty is higher than they expect they are unable to pass the difference on to the buyer. This makes importation a needlessly risky business.

The present law requires the customs appraiser to ascertain, if he can, both the foreign value, which is the price at which such or similar merchandise is freely offered to all purchasers for domestic consumption in the country of origin, in the usual wholesale quantities. He must also determine export value, which is the freely offered price to all purchasers for export to the United States. He may be prevented by various technical rules from ascertaining either or both of these values, but if he can ascertain both, he must apply the one which is higher. If he can ascertain one alone, he must apply that one. If he can ascertain neither, he must endeavor to ascertain the United States value, which is the freely offered price of such or similar imported merchandise in the markets of the United States. If he cannot ascertain this either, he must find the cost of production, which starts with the cost of labor and materials.

If the appraiser can get satisfactory information from the importer, of course, he does so and the appraisement can be completed promptly, but there are very many cases where he must request

a foreign-value investigation to ascertain the foreign value which, as the definition shows, is dependent on transactions in a foreign country between parties other than those who export merchandise to the United States. It is no easy job for him to ascertain cost of production either. It is extremely difficult to segregate the cost of producing a particular product even with the improved accounting methods used in this country. This is doubly the case when the cost is incurred abroad. The appraiser is further hampered by various technical rules such as, for example, one which prevents him from considering as freely offered any price which is not open to all the world, even though most businessmen even in this country offer lower prices to wholesalers. Furthermore, the courts have held that any limitation on resale or reuse prevents the price from being freely offered. The appraiser is also handicapped by uncertainty as to whether, if he must appraise according to foreign value, he should include internal taxes in the country of origin which do not apply to products which are exported. Since importers of British products were successful in having the courts exclude British purchasing tax from the foreign value, no one knows to what extent the internal taxes of other countries should also be excluded. Another difficulty the appraiser encounters is that although the statute says that offers must be made "in the usual wholesale quantities," the courts have required him to consider as usual the greatest number of individual transactions and not the transactions in which the largest quantity of merchandise moved.

The most sweeping change which the bill proposes would be eliminate "foreign value" entirely and make the export value the preferred method whenever it can be ascertained This single measure will remove at one stroke the greatest single cause of litigation, expense, and delay in customs appraisement. The appraiser will be able to confine his consideration to transactions in the foreign trade of the United States which either come under his observation, or which he can easily ascertain. Some people seem to be afraid that this change would permit foreign exporters to reduce the duty applicable to their products by assigning lower prices for export to the United States. This was not the view of most of the qualified witnesses who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, for even Mr. Anthony, representing the American Tariff League, conceded the desirability of getting rid of foreign value—page 422 of the hearings. It would seem that if eliminating foreign value would afford foreign exporters an opportunity to minimize their duties which the present law does not afford, the American Tariff League would have objected to it. The fact is, of course, that the change will make no difference. At present, any foreign shipper could easily prevent the customs appraisers from finding a foreign value by imposing immaterial restrictions on resale in the country of origin or by limiting the class of purchasers to whom he offered to sell. Of course, foreign shippers usually want to realize the best possible prices, and to reduce their duties by reducing prices would be a self-stultifying procedure. In some cases they have a motive to fix special prices for export to the United States which are lower than their prices generally. Our antidumping law, which is an effective and well-drafted statute, covers this situation, and the only change made in it by the bill is to tighten it up If there is need for further protection against dumping it should be obtained through a further tightening of the dumping law and not by making more complex and difficult the ordinary routine process of appraising merchandise which is not under suspicion of dumping.

The bill will make it easier to ascertain export value by eliminating the technical restrictions I have mentioned. If export value cannot be ascertained, it will make it easier to ascertain United States value by permitting customs appraisers to defer appraisement in the case of new merchandise to see what price it realizes in the United States. At present, a new or prototype shipment cannot be appraised according to United States value because there is no freely offered price available in the United States at the time the shipment was exported.

The bill adds a new method known as comparative value to be used if neither export value nor United States value can be ascertained. This is based on sales or offers of comparable merchandise. For example, appraisement of a filing cabinet having four drawers might under this section be based on sales of a cabinet with three drawers.

The method of value known as constructed value is the final residual method in the bill, and it is substantially the same as the one now known as cost of production, which was not considered to be a very accurate name, and by making other methods more freely available, this bill will cause this residual method to be very rarely used.

The committee added a provision defining American selling price and assuring that it would be used in all cases where it is now employed. Many of such objections to section 13 as the committee heard were predicated on a wish to retain American selling price, and the committee's amendment removes the reason for these objections.

Other objections were based on the fact that the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade contained certain general standards for customs valuation which the signatory parties recognized as universally valid, such as, for example, that values should not be arbitrary or fictitious. The Treasury acknowledged in its analysis which it submitted with the bill that section 13, if enacted, would conform to the General Agreement. This was sufficient to condemn section 13 in the eyes of some witnesses. They wished the Ways and Means Committee, without any inquiry as to whether section 13 was meritorious in and of itself, to condemn it simply because it brought our law into conformity with the GATT standards. I do not think this body should apply any such standard in deciding what our customs laws should contain. Apparently the idea was that if the State Department agreed at an international conference that value should not be arbitrary or fictitious, it was incumbent on Congress to insist that values shall be arbitrary and fictitious. Such persons overlooked entirely that section 13 was not based on the vague and general requirements of the GATT but on the four specific and detailed recommendations of McKinsey & Co. which were incorporated in volume 4 of its survey. Section 13 was also the result of a very careful analysis by appraisers and other technical personnel of the customs service to locate the causes of their difficulties and recommend ways of removing them.

Mr. Speaker, the rules should be suspended and the bill passed because these changes in method of valuation of goods for customs purposes would result in greater efficiency and economy and will relieve importers of risk and red tape prevailing under existing law.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, section 20 of H. R. 5505 enjoys the distinction of being the most misunderstood section of the bill and also the section which has been most unjustly criticized. For these reasons, I ask the House to indulge me for a few moments in attempting to clarify and explain it.

For more than 12 years now the customs service has been over its ears in difficulty with the problem of currency conversion. When the appraiser fixes a value of imported merchandise derived from sales or offers in a foreign currency, he must report the value in that currency. The collector of customs must convert the value to dollars before he can determine how much duty is owing To aid collectors in doing this, a statute of 1894 required the Secretary of the Treasury to publish the gold content of foreign coins. As the gold content of American money was declared by law, the conversion was a mere arithmetical computation. However, it became apparent in the twenties that the nominal or alleged gold content of foreign money might have no relation to its value in the marts of trade. Accordingly, section 52 of the Tariff Act of 1930 requires that whenever the buying rate of the foreign money in New York varies by more than 5 percent from the rate determined on the gold content basis, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York shall certify to the Treasury Department what the buying rate is and the Treasury shall employ this certified rate for conversion purposes.

During and after World War II we had a new crop of unorthodox currency practices with which our law was little equipped to cope. Some currencies have many different rates for different purposes and some have none at all that can be ascertained. In some cases it took the customs service as long as 10 years to ascertain what buying rate was proper. The Supreme Court in 1945 in

Barr against United States decided that whenever a country had more than one conversion rate officially employed, the customs was required to use the rate which reflected most effectively the value of the currency in transactions dealing in merchandise such as the merchandise under consideration.

In 1948 the Ways and Means Committee reported and the House of Representatives passed a bill to aid the customs service by permitting the Secretary of the Treasury to fix upon a single conversion rate to be employed for all purposes. McKinsey & Co. recommended enactment of this bill. However, the other body did not pass it and it did not become law.

It is unnecessary for me to tell this House that the Secretary's quarterly list of the gold content of foreign coin, which he still publishes quarterly pursuant to law, is now useless for all customs purposes. At present, the Federal Reserve bank, accordingly, has to certify rates from day to day for almost all currencies, including those which are well stabilized and have an established par value. This is an unnecessary burden on the bank. Because of daily minute fluctuations, the New York buying rate, even when a currency maintains its par value, is almost never precisely at par. Thus, during fiscal 1951 the Australian pound, which had a par value of 224.000, fluctuated from 223.1739 to 223.0079. Customs had to publish these minute variations from day to day and customs officers had to ascertain what they were before they could liquidate entries of Australian merchandise. So it was with many other countries.

Section 20 of the bill seeks to release the Secretary of the Treasury from his useless quarterly act of publishing the gold content of foreign coins. Instead, the Secretary is to publish and to use the par values established pursuant to the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund, as the basic conversion method. This will enable the Secretary to publish fixed figures which will remain stable for long periods because it is the practice of most countries having fund pars to maintain these pars in commercial transactions. Except for minute fractional variations, the rate employed for conversion purposes with respect to these countries will be just as at present. But a country may elect to be a no-par country or not to belong to the fund at all. In that event, we are no worse off, because subsections (b) and (c) of section 20 reiterate and, indeed, strengthen the requirement of existing law that actual commercial buying rates shall then be employed. This includes multiple rates when a country makes use of them. The bill expressly states the rule as announced in the Barr decision. If any country has a fund par but fails to maintain it, under subsection (d) of section 20 the customs service will automatically switch to the certified basis.

From the point of view of simplifying customs administration, the chief advantage to be derived from section 20 of the bill is that it makes it unnecessary to ascertain, certify and publish daily buying rates for countries which are well known to maintain stabilized currencies. The references in the bill to the International Monetary Fund are simply recognition of an existing fact, that it is through the fund and pursuant to the fund articles that par values are established and made known. The bill confers no power on the fund that it does not already possess. The only change is that the par values which are established and maintained pursuant to its articles are made use of directly instead of indirectly through the roundabout procedure of a certification by the bank. While if a par is not maintained, or if the country is not a member of the fund, or, being a member, has not established a par value, the buying rate is to be certified by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York just as at present.

Countries having exchange controls usually require their exporters to surrender to a government agency the dollar proceeds of their sales. They then—unless maintaining a fund par—decide in their own unfettered discretion how much local currency they will pay for the surrendered dollars. This in turn determines the buying rate on the New York market Thus, the Supreme Court's decision in the Barr case has put it outside the power of the Treasury Department or any other agency of Government under existing law to have a single thing to say as to what the conversion rate shall be. But under this bill, if a country desires to have our customs employ a par value recognized and approved by the fund, this country has something to say about it. Consequently, the bill removes us from the position of having nothing to say about conversion rates to be applied in administering our own customs to a situation where, through the fund, we have something to say. It remains true that, just as at present, under the bill a foreign country which chooses not to maintain a fund par can determine unilaterally the conversion rate which our customs service will employ, just exactly as the case is at present. If a rate is employed commercially, for our customs to insist on substituting some other rate for conversion purposes would be to punish our importer for the monetary sins of the foreign country over which he has no control.

The only other argument the Committee on Ways and Means has heard against the substance of section 20 was that it had something to do with the GATT. However, the GATT really added nothing to the situation, but only recognized existing facts. Whether or not there were any GATT, par values established pursuant to the International Monetary Fund would, when actually maintained, be the basis of our currency conversion under existing law as much as under the bill.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, this is a very personal and a very important piece of legislation as far as certain classes of people are concerned. By that I mean it is very important to those who import and export commodities in this country, and that in itself is a very big business. It involves millions upon millions of dollars, and employs hundreds upon hundreds of people, but the average person does not know very much about it, and is not very much concerned with it This bill came before the Ways and Means Committee with a very real purpose. The idea was to simplify the rules and regulations that now control importations and exportations. These rules are archaic. They are old. They have been the same rules for many years. It was time for us to have some simplification.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I know the gentleman has been very assiduous in trying to protect the industries of this country from competition from abroad, and I have worked with him on some of those projects I would like to ask if there is anything in this bill that will further weaken the position of industry in this country, especially handicraft, such as pottery and glassware.

Mr. JENKINS. I cannot answer the gentleman in one word. If I could I would say, "No, there is not," but when this legislation came before the Ways and Means Committee we who have been protectionists, in other words, we Republicans, were very suspicious, believing it would be what the gentleman had indicated; that it might go further and might encourage the importation of commodities to the disadvantage of our own industries. But, after long consideration and after the appearance of many lawyers and other competent men who represented companies who imported goods, we decided that this legislation should be passed, because its purpose was not to flood our markets with commodities from cheap labor countries

There is a statement on page 2 of the report that is very succinct and will support what I have said and will be an answer to the question of the gentleman. This is what it says:

> The bill does not propose any changes in classification or rates of duty.

The bill itself in the last paragraph contains the following language:

> The enactment of this act shall not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by Congress of the executive agreements known as the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thought that took care of the situation, but I just wanted the gentleman to reassure me, knowing his long experience with tariffs.

Mr JENKINS. I assure the gentleman that that is what we tried to do

When this bill came before us it had in it a great many sections. I dare say that more than half of the volume of the bill was stricken out, because these lawyers who deal with this business had come in well armed and were able to show that under the language of those sections the bill would have been more than a simplification bill. It would have

been a tariff-reduction bill. And in fairness to the Democrats on the committee, it developed that they themselves had only one purpose in mind, and that was to simplify the entry of goods into this country.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr BEAMER. Would the gentleman answer one question? You talk about the entry of certain goods into the country. I had hoped that if this bill did not come up under suspension of the rules I might offer an amendment at the end of the bill, to add a new section, No. 25:

No product originating in or shipped from the country of Czechoslovakia shall be allowed entry into the United States until correspondent William N. Oatis is restored to freedom by that country.

I had hoped to make some comment in regard to it.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, if H. R. 5505 had not come to the House under suspension of rules, I would have offered the following amendment to the customs simplification bill:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"SEC 25 No product originating in or shipped from the country of Czechoslovakia shall be allowed entry into the United States until newspaper correspondent William N. Oatis is restored to freedom by that country."

In August the Congress passed House Concurrent Resolution 140 in behalf of William Oatis and still this American newsman remains in a rotting prison in that Communist-dominated country. It indeed was unfortunate that the President and the State Department did nothing in behalf of this American citizen until forced to do so by the Congress. I often asked the question, "Of whom is the State Department afraid?" and the impatient letters from the many red-blooded Americans throughout the country continue to ask the same question about the apparent attitude of President Truman.

History is full of recorded instances in which a firm attitude by the President secured immediate release of American nationals held in another country on some charge. Since the Executive department of our Government has not shown this same firmness and determination, I was hopeful that this amendment on H. R. 5505 would provide the due force of law that, in turn, would make effective the intent of Congress when it passed House Joint Concurrent Resolution 140 which I submitted.

Mr. Truman must answer whether or not he is indifferent to the fate of an American citizen or influenced by the legalistic confusions of Dean Acheson.

In either event, something more concrete must be done to free Oatis—not in the next 10 years, but immediately. Some of the intent of House Concurrent Resolution 140 has been put into effect and it is estimated that Oatis' imprisonment is costing Czechoslovakia $3,500,000 worth of business each month at the present time. This is a step in the right direction but more must be done and it must be done without delay.

Perhaps, as one editorial—Indianapolis Star, October 11, 1951—indicated, if President Truman can be convinced that he is losing votes by allowing Oatis to remain in jail, he might be persuaded to take positive action. That appears to be the President's sole guide to action.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I will just take a minute to answer the gentleman. We went before the Rules Committee and that committee gave us a rule under which this bill could be considered. It was decided, however, that although this is a matter of importance that it was necessary to have it acted upon promptly, and therefore we asked that the bill be considered under the rule of suspension. I think the gentleman's amendment might have been germane if we had a rule permitting amendments, because it does deal with importations. As far as I am concerned, I would be in sympathy with the gentleman's amendment. I have been much interested in the great injustice that has been done to Mr. Oatis.

Mr. BEAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENKINS. Further, I wish to say that early in the hearings my suspicions were pretty well formed that the State Department wanted to insert into this bill some language that would enable the State Department to control, through the machinations of what we call GATT, the General Agreements on Trade and Tariffs. The State Department sent one of its most able men, Mr. Brown, who appeared before the committee and went into the matter thoroughly. I think that he sensed the feeling of the committee both Republicans and Democrats and then he decided to abandon any attempt to make a tariff reduction out of a simplification bill. I hope that this bill will prove to be just what we intend that it should be—a simplification bill and not a tariff reduction bill.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. As I understand the question now before the House is to suspend the rules with an amendment designed to take care of a practice indulged in by some countries of revaluing their currency in connection with declarations, so as to change the schedules of payment that are made in connection with import duties. That is a practice that affects a number of different industries, and particularly the wool industry which, according to representatives from my district, need further protection. I am delighted to know that the amendment is in the bill.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; I am glad to assure the gentleman that that has been done. That is what is known as the Simpson amendment. Several Members have asked me today whether or not the Simpson amendment would be included. It has been included and it is a very worthy amendment. I think I can assure the Republicans who have stood with me and other protestants on the Ways and Means Committee for years that we can safely vote for this bill with the idea in mind that there has been no purpose on the part of anybody to tear down in this bill any protection that the American producers should have.

AN AFFRONT TO THE PRESS AND A DISSERVICE TO THE PEOPLE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, Newspaper Week has just passed, and while on the one hand voices were raised praising the stature and high caliber of our free American press, an equal clamor of protest swept the country against a Presidential order affecting that freedom at its very source.

A law, no matter how well written or well intentioned, can be no better than its administration. The same holds true of Executive orders. The scope for widespread and dangerous abuse of the latest order authorizing censorship of legitimate news by civilian agencies of the Government is unlimited. It can easily be used as a cover-up for bureaucratic inefficiency and inside chicanery. The President at a press conference struck out at leaks of critical information of potential value to the enemy, but these so-called leaks had all been given out by press agents or officials of the Government departments, who presumably were in a position to know their importance.

The remedy for the existing situation, if the President felt some action was necessary, was not a resort to such drastic, sweeping grants of authority. The officials who offended should have been called in and reprimanded. Instead the President lashed out at the press in a defensive burst of temper.

The emphasis during the ticklish, half-war, half-emergency situation in which we find ourselves should be all on the other side: the people should be told everything that can possibly be released. The American people are mature and perfectly capable of conducting themselves in a sane, rational fashion when faced with the possibilities of atomic war. But to cry wolf and clamp down on any legitimate appraisal of our state of preparedness and of the need for civilian regulation of our lives is foolish in the extreme since people cannot be expected to cooperate unless they are shown valid reasons for their sacrifices.

This latest Executive order is an affront to the American press and a disservice to the American people. It was subjected to well-merited criticism by the Associated Press Managing Editors Association. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of their unanimously adopted resolution on this subject:

AN INSTRUMENT OF NEWS SUPPRESSION

(Text of a resolution adopted unanimously by the Associated Press Managing Editors Association at San Francisco)

The Associated Press Managing Editors Association opposes as a dangerous instrument of news suppression the President's Executive order of September 25, 1951, extending the

cloak of military secrecy to the civilian establishments of the Government.

Free people have the right to the fullest information about conduct of their own government. They can safely consent to its abridgment only on the plainest demonstration of national peril. Even then, any curtailment of this right to which they do consent must be so plainly prescribed and so narrowly limited that safety from external aggression is not bought at the internal risk of secret government.

That this is a time of national peril none would dispute. It is, however, a peril that can be met as it was met in World War II, without the sacrifice of essential freedoms. Information useful to the enemy can be withheld without depriving the American people of the information about their government that they must have to preserve intact the democratic process.

The September 25 executive order and memorandum relating to minimum standards for classifying and handling security information in the executive branch of the Government, whatever motive may have inspired it, is not drawn with sufficient precision to avoid risks of secrecy to which no free government ought to expose its people. Among deficiencies instantly apparent are these:

1. The order proposes to set up standards of security to guide the civilian agencies of government, but it fails to define closely the classification terms that it employs and it furnishes to untrained government personnel, to which it entrusts the largest responsibility, no clear guide by which they may govern their official acts.

2 Agencies, according to the President's statement, must show affirmatively that disclosure of the information would harm national security, but no authority to which this showing must be made in advance of classification, is prescribed.

3. The National Security Council is given broad review powers, but the machinery and method by which this review is to be accomplished is not prescribed and no means is set forth by which an immediate review of classification decisions can be obtained.

4. Citizens are enjoined to support the classifications decided upon. They do not participate directly, or through any representatives, in the making of the initial classifications. They have no authority to which they can appeal but the authority which made the classification in the first place. They have no means of discovering for themselves or through proper representative agencies what information is being withheld or if decisions to withhold information have been wisely made. At no stage in the operation of the classification system is there provision by which a hearing may be given to those who desire to have the interests of information weighed against the interests of security.

5. Heads of the civilian departments, agencies, and bureaus are given the broadest powers to delegate a classification authority that frequently has been abused by the military establishments even when administered by the most experienced and competent personnel

6. The Government of the United States, during World War II, found it inadvisable to entrust any such power to civilian or military agencies, without the safeguard and the check of the Office of War Information and of the Office of Censorship, established to protect the people against concealment or news suppression.

Whatever respect now exists for the top secret, secret, confidential, and restricted classifications used by the Department of Defense and State will not long survive the indiscriminate use of these labels by civilian departments. Security as a result will be endangered rather than safeguarded.

This Executive order has been issued without any showing of necessity.

It has been promulgated without the careful public discussion and honest debate that ought to precede any departure from democratic methods.

It has been drawn without regard for the lessons of World War II when the Government achieved a workable compromise of the sometimes conflicting claims of complete information and absolute security.

This Executive order should be rescinded. If the need for some system of classification can be demonstrated, there should be a reexamination of the whole problem of achieving in the civilian departments a system of security consistent with the right of the people to be informed fully about their Government.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

REVENUE ACT OF 1951

Mr. DOUGHTON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4473) to provide revenue and for other purposes.

SUSPENDING CERTAIN IMPORT DUTIES ON TUNGSTEN

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 5248) to suspend certain import duties on tungsten, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the duties imposed by subparagraphs (c), (g), and (h) of paragraph 302 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and the duties on articles containing more than 50 percent of tungsten or tungsten carbide imposed by subparagraph (b) of paragraph 316 of such act, shall not apply with respect to articles entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the period beginning with the day following the date of the enactment of this act and ending at whichever of the following times is the earlier. (1) the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the day following the date of the enactment of this act, or (2) the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950: *Provided*, That when, for any one calendar month during such period, the average market price of tungsten (high-grade tungsten concentrate, f. o. b. mine) for that month has been below $63 per short ton unit of tungsten trioxide, the Tariff Commission, within 15 days after the conclusion of such calendar month, shall so advise the President, and the President shall, by proclamation, not later than 20 days after he has been so advised by the Tariff Commission, revoke such suspension of the duties imposed under subparagraphs (c), (g), and (h) of paragraph 302 and subparagraph (b) of paragraph 316 of the Tariff Act of 1930, such revocation to be effective with respect to articles entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption after the date of such proclamation.

In determining the average market price of tungsten for each calendar month, the Tariff Commission is hereby authorized to base its findings upon the average monthly price of tungsten (high-grade tungsten concentrate, f. o. b. mine) reported by the Engineering and Mining Journal's "Metal and Mineral Markets" (or where two or more such average monthly prices are so reported, upon the average of such prices).

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced the bill, H R. 5248, at the request of the Defense Production Administrator In a letter dated July 27, 1951, Mr. Fleischmann, the DPA Administrator, sent up a draft of legislation which had been approved by the Director of Defense Mobilization and the Bureau of the Budget. He urged that such legislation be enacted by the Congress at the earliest possible date.

The bill would suspend for a period of 2 years the present duty of about $8 a short-ton unit on tungsten ore imported from foreign countries. The committee amendment would insure domestic tungsten producers against possible injury by providing for reinstatement of the duty in the event the price of tungsten should fall below $63 a short-ton unit. The $63-per-short-ton-unit price is more than 100 percent higher than the price prevailing before the Korean invasion.

I looked into this matter very carefully before introducing the bill because the largest domestic producer of tungsten in the United States is located in Vance County, N. C. Although producers of tungsten seem to be of the opinion that suspension of the duties now in effect will not appreciably increase the flow of tungsten into the United States from foreign countries, they would be satisfied to have the legislation enacted with the provision for reinstatement of the duty in the event prices fall substantially below present levels. Such similar assurances were given to producers of copper and lead when the legislation temporarily suspending the duties on those metals was enacted by the Congress, this appeared to be a reasonable request.

Mr. Speaker, tungsten is admittedly in short supply. It is of great importance in the defense program The Government has guaranteed to domestic producers a support price of $63 per ton for a period of 5 years. The Government has also embarked on a program to encourage exploration for tungsten by underwriting 75 percent of the cost.

Although the Government is not required to pay the duty on tungsten imported for the military stockpile, the present duty of $8 per ton makes it difficult for private importers to compete in the world market for the available supplies in foreign countries. Foreign producers who wish to maintain an American market will be given some added incentive to sell to American private enterprise since the removal of the

duty will increase the price which importers can afford to pay and still be in a position to sell at the domestic ceiling of $65 per short-ton unit. By suspending the duties, American importers will be in a position to encourage expansion of foreign production through furnishing financial assistance by way of loans or advances made in connection with purchase contracts.

No one can assure that suspension of the duty will, in fact, ease our critical shortage of tungsten, but it was the view of the Committee on Ways and Means that we should not allow anything to remain in the existing law which might retard, even to the slightest degree, the supply of this vital metal.

Mr. Speaker, the bill should be passed without delay.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Is it not a fact that the gentleman from North Carolina received a letter from the largest tungsten producer in the United States saying that the bill with the amendment which the committee adopted would do no harm to the domestic tungsten producers?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is correct. The domestic producers are not optimistic about the effects that will result from the enactment of this bill, but they are not opposed to it. As I mentioned, tungsten is in short supply and is very important in our national defense effort.

Mr. MILLS. It was certainly the opinion of the committee that the bill would do no harm to domestic producers and might result in some good.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It might result in some good, yes. There are no minority views filed and, so far as I know, there is no objection among the membership of our committee to the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 5248 is to suspend the import duties on tungsten ores or concentrates, tungsten metal, tungsten carbide, and other combinations of tungsten. The suspension will be effective during the period beginning with the day following the date of enactment of the bill and ending with the expiration of 2 years from such date of enactment, or the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, whichever is earlier. The committee amendment also provides that the President shall revoke the suspension of duties when, for any one calendar month, the average market price of high-grade tungsten concentrate for that month has been below the $63 per short-ton unit of tungsten trioxide, the price established for Government purchases under the program to encourage the expansion of tungsten production.

I am supporting this legislation because since Korea the demand for tungsten in the United States has increased rapidly while supplies of the metal from China, which is the largest producer, have been cut off. Present and estimated future supplies of tungsten from both foreign and domestic sources fall short of meeting the requirements of military and essential civilian production and are not adequate to meet needed additions to our stockpile.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, our Nation's tungsten position is little short of desperate and the best that can be said for this legislation is that it may possibly offer foreign producers who wish to maintain an American market some incentive to sell to American private enterprise by increasing the price which importers can afford to pay and still be in a position to sell in the domestic ceiling.

The really significant aspect of this legislation is why our supply of tungsten is below the danger point and who is to blame for this deplorable situation. The answer to these questions has been supplied by the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services which has submitted a report entitled "Twenty-seventh Report of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate, under the authority of Senate Resolution 18, Eighty-second Congress."

This report tells a terrible story of bureaucratic bungling typical of the Truman administration. I quote from this report:

TUNGSTEN, 1951

I INTRODUCTION

On occasion the operations of some of the Federal agencies bear an unfortunate resemblance to a children's game of blind man's buff—with all the players blindfolded.

Two or more bureaus with separate but related functions will grope for each other in the dark They will stumble over obstacles, paw at thin air, or just stand still in bewilderment. Usually, they get farther and farther apart as their search for each other becomes more frantic

Finally, somebody is tagged as "it," and the blindfolds are removed for a few precious minutes of daylight It is then discovered that what the players have tagged is the public welfare When the agencies are defense agencies, "it" turns out to be the Nation's security.

Such is the story of tungsten.

Here were two agencies—the Munitions Board and the Department of the Army. Each was the child of a parent organization, the Nation's Defense Establishment Each had an important defense responsibility involving a vital metal—tungsten Each had the clear obligation to work together for the national security.

Yet, though both were housed in the same building, these two agencies, so far as tungsten problems were concerned, acted as though they had never been introduced. They might as well have been separated by impenetrable barriers and thousands of miles instead of thin partitions and a few steps down a corridor.

The Army had an important program—the development of armor-piercing shells—which required large amounts of tungsten. The Munitions Board had the responsibility of stockpiling the metal lest America's supplies be suddenly cut off.

It would be difficult to picture a situation crying more loudly for the closest cooperation. The armor-piercing shell development, the so-called core program, was a foundation stone of the Nation's military plans. The stockpiling was absolutely essential since the major sources of tungsten were overseas, particularly in China, and could readily be cut off.

The two agencies had merely to get together, decide how much was needed, and ask Congress for the appropriations.

And yet, for nearly 3 years no one, absolutely no one, informed the Munitions Board of the amount of tungsten required for the Army's core program, and the Board made no effort to find out about it The two agencies seem to have been playing blind man's buff.

Meanwhile, nobody was storing up tungsten

When they finally got together, it was too late. China, the principal source, was just about ready to fall into the hands of the Communists

* * * * *

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Our Nation's tungsten position is little short of desperate

Almost overnight, we have been cut off from our major sources of this metal which is so essential in peace and so vital in war. Those sources are the rich reserves of the Far East which we have lost through the Communist conquest of China, the bloody conflict in Korea, and the ceaseless guerrilla fighting in southeast Asia.

At the same time, our tungsten coffers, which should have been filled to the high-water mark against just such a contingency, are down to the danger point We face the lean years without the comforting fat we should have accumulated in the days of plenty.

The price we will pay for our sins of omission will be high—very high

We can increase our production; we can dip into our stockpiles; we can buy from what is left of the free world But the harsh, inescapable fact is that we can foresee nothing short of a miracle that will produce enough tungsten for the combined essential needs of ourselves and our allies.

This gloomy picture flows in large part from the inexcusable failure of two agencies—both part of the same organizational set-up, both housed in the same building—to work together effectively in determining the requirements for tungsten in its largest military use—the core program We are referring to the Munitions Board and the Department of the Army

The facts of the situation are clear and unmistakable.

The Army had a program to develop high-velocity, armor-piercing shells with tungsten cores These were the projectiles which had proven themselves in the Battle of the Bulge and upon which were based a large share of the military's antitank tactics.

At the same time, the Munitions Board was charged with the responsibility of piling up stocks of strategic materials to see this country through an emergency period. That responsibility was stated directly by Congress when it passed the Stockpile Act of 1946.

Meanwhile, the supplies of tungsten were available almost for the asking. Prices were either declining or, in periods when they were rising, rising much less rapidly than other strategic materials China, with reserves which could supply the needs of the entire world, was under the control of a friendly government.

Nothing was needed but agreement—agreement and activity.

Yet, incredible as it may seem, these two agencies did not get together on the question. The Army neglected to tell the Munitions Board about its core requirements and the Board neglected to take any step to find out about it Each acted as though the other were a distant—and somewhat unpopular—cousin.

This "see nothing, do nothing, speak nothing" attitude has jeopardized one of this country's more important defense programs—the development of armor-piercing shells.

During most of the period under discussion, the Munitions Board operated on the basis of stockpile objectives which were set in 1944 and bore no relationship to tungsten cores for shells. Even so, it made no purchase commitments until August 1948, and that commitment was grudging.

The 1944 objective was not changed until late in 1948 when a larger, though still inadequate, goal was set. But actually, the picture was still far from encouraging. The Board's efforts to stockpile tungsten were slow and halting and at no time did acquisitions catch up to schedules.

It is true that stockpile objectives were raised again in July 1950, and still again in November of the same year. But stockpile objectives are a far cry from stockpiles of tungsten By the time realistic goals had been set, demand had risen and supply had fallen and the world market had experienced a sharp price increase.

In addition to bureaucratic blindness on the stockpile objectives, there are other reasons for our currently bad tungsten position. One was the failure of the Munitions Board to reexamine specifications. As a result, precious tungsten was rejected because it did not meet the standards of normal times. It was not until 6 months after the start of the Korean war that the Board advised GSA to buy lower-grade metal which could be brought up to par by retreatment in the United States.

Another contributing factor was the failure of the Board to make up its mind upon the storing of semifinished products like ferrotungsten, metal powder, and carbide. For years, it had been advised by experts in the strongest possible terms to take this step. Yet, there was no attempt until October 1950, even to acquire the facts upon which an intelligent decision could be based.

While the Munitions Board dawdled idly over the tungsten stockpile, the Army played its own game of hide-and-seek with a potentially valuable proposal. It was the offer of a new process devised by Mr. K C. Li, Wah Chang Corp., for the production of tungsten carbide

Mr Li, considered by many to be the outstanding expert in the tungsten field, stated that his process would save both tungsten and time in the manufacture of tungsten carbide That was probably his great mistake The Army may have been interested in saving tungsten, as we have no evidence to the contrary. But it certainly was not interested in saving time.

After 2½ years of study, the Army concluded that the samples submitted by Mr. Li were too small for conclusive results. It requested larger samples and, after an additional 6 months, came to the conclusion that the process was "economically undesirable"

The subcommittee is not fighting the battle for the tungsten carbide production process advanced by Mr. Li. But it does feel that on a subject matter of such great importance, it would have been possible to reach a conclusion in less than 3 years. It is doubtful whether we would have that much leeway on the battlefield.

The Li incident is typical of the slow, back and forth, up and down, in and out approach of the defense agencies to the challenge presented by the shortage of tungsten. It is difficult to discern anything resembling a program between the sluggish coils of bureaucratic red tape.

Taking into consideration all the circumstances, reasonable men would expect the United States Government to have a policy for stimulating both domestic and foreign production. However, reasonable men are frequently disappointed in their expectations. There is very little in the line of a well-rounded domestic program and less than that—in fact, nothing—in the line of a foreign program.

The domestic program is based primarily on the establishment of a high ceiling price of $65 a short-ton unit and a 5-year Government guaranteed floor plan of $63 a short-ton unit. Both the Office of Price Stabilization and the General Services Administration opposed the application of this price range to all mines but were unsuccessful in their efforts. Both ultimately had to capitulate to the views of the Defense Minerals Administration. The wisdom of their capitulation is open to question in view of the statement of Dr. Boyd, Administrator of the Defense Minerals Administration, in his letter of June 5 that the "$65 price is considerably in excess of any floor price necessary to encourage the expanded production from projects we then had under consideration"

It is too early to pass final judgment on the effectiveness of the domestic program. But at a later date, the subcommittee will undertake a further survey to determine how the results compare with those achieved in World War II under more flexible policies.

Apparently, the Defense Minerals Administration has been too preoccupied with domestic problems to formulate a foreign program Purchases from abroad are on a hit-or-miss basis and conducted by a number of companies in no position to stimulate production. Furthermore, foreign prices are so high it has been almost impossible for any new purchases to be made within the limits of our ceiling prices. Undoubtedly, foreign prices have been kept higher than necessary to stimulate production abroad by our own high ceiling and floor prices As a consequence, the cost of our preparedness program will have been increased unnecessarily for years to come

The subcommittee believes that the failure to inaugurate a comprehensive foreign buying program has needlessly threatened our preparedness program. It is our opinion that steps should be taken at once to make the United States Government the sole importer of tungsten Only thus could we coordinate our foreign buying with a view to an expansion of production through agreements with other governments.

I have gone into this in great detail, not that I am going to oppose the bill, because we must have this tungsten, but the blood is on the hands of this Congress if we do not do it. We simply have to do it. But this indictment of the Federal agencies by another body and for which we are not responsible, indicates the laxness of the defense organization in time of war.

Mr. ENGLE Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE I would very much appreciate it if the gentleman would explain to the House how this bill is going to increase the total amount of tungsten coming into this country, because I understand the stockpiling people here in this country now buy without reference to the import duty and in addition buy without reference to the ceiling price. In the light of those two facts, and I believe they are facts, how is relieving this import duty but still keeping importations under the ceiling price going to increase the amount of tungsten imported?

Mr. REED of New York. I think you will find that each member of the committee will tell you, if you were to inquire of each of them, that it is only a legislative leap in the dark. We do not know that it will increase the importations, but the situation is so desperate that if there is any possibility that it will increase the supply of tungsten then we ought to take this action.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. At the same time, the committee is convinced that the bill will not do harm to domestic producers.

Mr. REED of New York. That is what the domestic producers have told us, at least.

Mr. ENGLE. If the gentleman will yield further, may I observe that domestic producers as far as I know are not concerned particularly about the bill except that it is a precedent that may come into operation later.

I especially want to commend the committee on adopting the amendment it did and which, I understand, was offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr EBERHARTER], a member of the committee.

Mr EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] devoted most of his talk to criticism of the actions of the administration in the past for not sufficiently stockpiling tungsten. I deplore the fact that we do not have a sufficient stockpile of tungsten. I think everybody interested in the welfare of our country deplores that fact. But, I do not think that now is the time to take up the time of the House criticizing something which altogether cannot be blamed upon the administration. I have before me, figures which show that the responsibility largely rests upon the Congress of the United States in that it failed to follow the recommendations of the President in appropriating sufficient money for this stockpile program.

Mr. Speaker, in 1947, the President recommended $250,000,000 for stockpiling. The Congress of the United States only appropriated $100,000,000. In other words, the Congress of the United States cut his recommendation $150,000,000 in 1947. In 1948, it cut the President's recommendation $50,000,000. In 1949, it cut his recommendation $60,000,000. In 1950, it cut his recommendation $39,000,000, and even in 1950 and 1951 they cut his recommendation $36,400,000.

Mr. Speaker, I deplore the fact the same as every Member, as I said before, that we do not have sufficient tungsten. I just do not think we ought to blame everything on the administration, and those who were in charge of the stockpiling program. Some blame attaches to this Congress. I am happy to say, that because the stockpile program was not in good order, a few months ago a change was made in the responsibility for the program, and we are hoping for better results in the future. The simple fact is that we are in a very bad way. That is well known, and I am not divulging any secrets when I say that. We

must do everything possible to correct the situation. This measure is one, and I am happy that both sides are supporting it, which might correct the situation. There is no guaranty of it. Nobody who appeared, the administration or those interests who appeared in favor of the bill, guaranteed that it would have results, but it was said there is a possibility that there may be some good results from it. It behooves us, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, at this time, to take any step which possibly might be of benefit in helping to preserve our country, our sovereignty, our freedom, and liberties so that we may go forward toward the establishment of a truly civilized world.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The table referred to is as follows:

Stockpile budget authorizations, fiscal years 1947–51

[In millions]

	New appropriations
Fiscal year 1947:	
Presidential recommendation	$250.0
Enacted Aug 8, 1946	100 0
Total	150.0
Fiscal year 1948:	
Presidential recommendation	150.0
Enacted July 30, 1947	100 0
	50.0
Fiscal year 1949:	
Presidential recommendation:	
Regular	285 0
Supplemental	40 0
Total	325.0
Enacted June 25, 1948	225 0
Enacted June 23, 1949	40.0
Total	265.0
	60.0
Fiscal year 1950:	
Presidential recommendation	314 0
Enacted June 30, 1949	275.0
	39.0
Fiscal year 1951:	
Presidential recommendation:	
Regular	400.0
First supplemental	[1] 600.0
Second supplemental	1,834.9
Total	2,834.9
Enacted Sept. 6, 1950	365.0
Enacted Sept. 27, 1950	[1] 598.6
Enacted Jan. 6, 1951	1,834.9
Total	2,798.5
	36.4
Total recommended 1947–1951	3,873.9
Enacted 1947–1951	3,538.5
Total	335.4

[1] Includes $26 for the reactivation of National Industrial Reserve.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, this measure, I think, it all right. But, I do not think it will do very much good, nor do I think it will do any harm at the present time. Let us get our facts straightened out on this metal and matter of stockpiling. In 1940, there was not a pound of tungsten produced in America. There was not a mine in operation in this country. The old stockpile subcommittee of the old Military Affairs Committee went to the President at that time and asked for a couple of million dollars, I believe, out of his emergency funds to open up the Yellow Pines Mine, which at that time the State geologists out there said was good grade ore. But any way we opened it up, then we started a very intense program to find out where we could find some tungsten in this country.

We developed and opened five or six mines. One of the largest producing mines is at the edge of the Roanoke River, between North Carolina and Virginia. Every mine in this country operated from 1946 to present date. We bought and put into the stockpile every pound of tungsten ore produced in this country. We also contracted for all of the tungsten we could contract for off shore.

Now, what is the situation? It simply was not delivered by China. Contrary to some of the things that have been stated, the Chairman of the Munitions Board reports to the subcommittee every 30 days, and the report has come to that committee continuously for some time in the past. When they were about to stop stockpiling tungsten, in 1946 and 1947 we went to them and asked them to continue stockpiling tungsten, and they did continue to stockpile and buy every pound of tungsten that was produced in this country, and it kept the mines open. Thank God we did that, because if we had not you would be in bad shape today, because Mr. Chiang Kai-shek simply did not deliver on his contract. Where did the other come from? A little came from Korea. We know what the situation has been there ever since the Japanese took it over. It has been in a state of confusion and nothing has been produced. A few pounds have been coming in here and there, but it has been small compared to what we need.

Now, when we criticize, let us criticize on the basis of some reason for it. I do not believe anybody could be held responsible today because the tungsten simply did not exist. It did not exist in the world. If anybody can prove to the contrary, very well, but I think I know what I am talking about.

This domestic program which we set up in this country is satisfactory to our producers. It is the only one, I believe with the possible exception of one other, that has been signed by the Defense Production Board since the passage of the Defense Production Act more than 14 months ago. It is ridiculous. Something has to be done if we expect to get domestic production in this country. Lead and zinc and manganese are in just about as bad shape as tungsten. Why all the talk about tungsten today? It has become one of the most important metals. It is high B. t. u. resistant, and that is important. All or many atomic-energy operations require high B. t. u.-resistant metal. Tungsten is one of them. So I believe that this measure today will probably stimulate some exploration to find some mines somewhere in the Western Hemisphere. I certainly hope it will. I think it is worth the price. We will only lose the import duty, which is around $7.93. The importer is going to get the world price for whatever he can find today, which is $84 per ton of tungsten trioxide. With reference to our domestic producers, when the world price of tungsten was $84 a ton they went down and signed a contract for $63 a ton. Now that is real patriotism. Whenever they get into a jam we should support them as we did in 1947 to keep the mines open and producing.

You western people should be concerned about this. I have no mines down in my section, but I have spent much of my time in this House in an effort to try to keep the strategic stockpile up to a position where we would be safe.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. I do not like to stand here and criticize, but I like to do somethink about putting the stockpile in a position where it will be of some help when we need it. We did not get all the money requested, but the Congress has been very fair, always supported this program. Once or twice we have been cut; I do not remember the exact amounts. I suppose the gentleman is correct in his figures, but we have not been cut very much because this was one measure that was passed unanimously by the House in 1946 and passed by the Senate without a single vote against the bill, and it has worked very well. That is the act of 1946. We are going to feel the pinch next year; there is going to be very little metal in this country for domestic use, and we are going to really feel the pinch about 12 months from now. We are going to wish we had done something about it.

The gentleman from California and I made an investigation and met with the Chief Executive a few months ago to try to solve this problem and see if we could not do something about it. He set up the agency under Mr. Jess Larson, a very conscientious man, and a very good choice, and also Mr. Young, who knows as much about mining as any man in this country. If we support them they will really get the program going and keep people off of us here whenever they want a keg of nails or a few pounds of steel; if they do not have the power under the recent order setting up this agency we should give it to them by law.

The result of this program is that today we have built up a stockpile since

1946 that is worth probably $6,000,000,000. If we want to sell it tomorrow we could easily sell it for $6,000,000,000. It has cost us somewhere between $2,500,000,000 and $3,000,000,000, but we can sell tomorrow if we want to at $5,000,000,000 or $6,000,000,000. It has not been a bad investment. So before we become so critical let us do something constructive, because this is the very heart of our defense program. Material is not only scarce and hard to contract for here in America but you find about the same situation in any part of the world.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, usually when we consider reducing a duty we expect that the public that buys the goods concerned will be able to buy them cheaper, and, conversely, when we increase a duty we do it for the purpose usually of increasing the production of goods here at home, in other words, we give some protection to the domestic producer in the hope that he will be able, through the operation of the free-enterprise system, to produce more of the goods and help us take care of our needs. Here, however, we are today considering taking the duty off a material which we need vitally in this hour of war and we are taking it off right in the face of a certainty that as a result of taking it off we will not get any more tungsten from abroad.

You should know that as of today we have a department of our Government, quite properly in view of the dangerous situation in the world, buying tungsten wherever it can get it and paying whatever is required. That tungsten is brought in here and included in our stockpile which, unhappily, is too low. Taking this duty off, of course, will not affect that matter, because Mr. Larson, I believe, heads that branch of the Government. He is, I am informed, doing a good job in buying tungsten and paying whatever is necessary. I wonder, then, just why we are here, how it is that by removing the duty we will help the great potential source of tungsten so vital to the welfare of our country, how will we improve the domestic production? Can we improve it by removing this duty? For we must remember that out of our own soil must come the tungsten which we must have in the event of an all-out war when the potential sources from overseas are gone to us.

I see nothing in this bill that will bring into the country an additional pound of tungsten, unless, as is stated on page 4 of the report:

> It is expected also with suspension of duties, American importers will be in position to encourage expansion of foreign production through furnishing technical assistance by way of loans or advances made in connection with purchase contracts.

I do not know just what that means. It means probably to advance money to some foreigner to improve production in his own mines, to which my answer is: Why not advance that additional money right here at home and encourage the production right here?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am interested in what the gentleman has had to say just now because in Beaverhead County, Mont., they have uncovered what I think may well turn out to be the biggest tungsten deposit in this country. I wanted to ask the gentleman from North Carolina about that but unfortunately his time was so limited that I could not. Will the gentleman tell us what can be done to encourage these small mine operators down there who develop their properties to such an extent they can overcome the difficulty which I understand exists due to the fact that two outfits, the Wah Jung Co. and the Vanadium Corp. of America, have processes which allow them to refine tungsten to such a degree they can get the Government guaranty of $63 a ton, whereas the smaller producer will get $25 to $30 a ton?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I do not know the answer to that question, but I do know that right here within our own country we can solve a problem of that nature and if we know the ore is here, as we do, we can handle economic problems far easier than we can to send our money abroad and spend it abroad in an attempt to develop a source overseas.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Previously I asked the gentleman from New York if he could state why a foreign producer would sell on the American domestic market when the stockpile is already buying without reference to ceiling price and without reference to duty? I cannot understand why any foreign producer would try to sell on the domestic market when he knows the stockpile people are buying all the tungsten they can get and are buying it without regard to ceiling price and without regard to duty.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Of course, he is not going to sell it for domestic use. He is going to sell it for stockpiling and get whatever price the Government will pay, which is not limited to the $63 a ton.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reference is made in the report to the International Materials Conference. I do not know much about that, but I do know it is an international group which has authority to allocate strategic materials, including tungsten, among the different nations of the world. I do not know just what that conference will do to the tungsten which we have on hand or which we may get later on, but I do know that that conference does have the authority to take from the United States tungsten which we have on hand and allocate it to some other country, a member of the International Materials Conference. We should know more about that. We have, it is stated in the report, assurance that the allotment to the United States, if you please, by this International Materials Conference will exceed any possible domestic production. Does that mean that this international group will permit us to import or just what does it mean? I want to know. I want my country to get, if at all possible, all of the tungsten it needs domestically and I believe we can do so if we will first of all encourage production here.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to make this statement. All of us who believe in a protective tariff brought out in the hearings that it would take on an average about $25 to $30 to produce a ton of tungsten where it can be produced and we felt if we have this provision in the bill which provides that if in any month it falls below $63 a ton or unit we have a price there that whenever the commodity can be bought for less than $63 a ton, the duty would go up.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Yes. That is a protection for the American producer at the price of $63 per ton.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend the committee for bringing this bill to the House. I think it is a proper bill. I think it is one that should be enacted.

But, I want to take this time to comment upon a similar matter. For the past 10 years I have had pending a bill to impose a duty upon the importation of tung oil, which is also a strategic war material and upon which this country has been dependent for many years on foreign sources. Several years ago I succeeded with the cooperation of the Committee on Agriculture, in convincing the Congress that some day we were going to be dependent upon Russia, our potential enemy, for this strategic material, and that we would be unable to get it. That is where we are today. Now tung oil trees grow in China. They grow along the coastal plain from Florida to Texas on the Gulf of Mexico in this country. That is the only place it will grow in this country.

The Congress gave a support price for this material because it believed that we were going to be dependent upon Russia. It has now developed that we are dependent upon Russia for the excess of our needs over the domestic production.

We all realize that in normal times in this country we cannot compete with coolie labor in China for the production of tung oil. Therefore, if this were an open rule, if the parliamentary procedure were different here, I would ask this House to impose a duty upon tung oil in this bill. I have endeavored to get such an amendment on another bill that preceded this one, without success. The amendment that I have asked for would

simply do for tung oil what this bill does for tungsten. It would provide that only in the event the domestic price of tung oil fell below the support price would the duty of 7 cents be imposed. In other words, both the Treasury and the United States and the national defense would be protected by the imposition of such a duty and by the adoption of such an amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to follow this up. I have a bill pending now before the Committee on Ways and Means. I am sorry we could not get it in this bill under the proper procedure, but we should have it in the future.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Can the gentleman tell me the qualification that makes tung oil especially valuable?

Mr. COLMER. Tung oil is the finest drying oil known. It is used extensively in waterproofing electrical equipment. The Navy alone uses all of the tung oil produced in this country. Therefore it is a strategic material.

If time permitted I would like to go back into the history of the thing just briefly how we started producing tung oil. We started growing tung-oil trees in this country in World War I when we were dependent upon China. We revived it in World War II. It will cease again before World War III if we do not give it some protection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked, as I know the other Members were, when they read on the news ticker today that a gas explosion in the Bunker Mine of the Trotter Coal Co., near Morgantown, W. Va., had killed, at last report, 10 miners. I know that we all pray that later reports will not add to the death list.

The dead are residents of my district and I send to their bereaved families my deepest and most personal condolences. I know that my colleagues join with me in paying their respects to these people who are suffering so greatly today.

Those who go down in our mines to bring out the coal for our homes and our industries are courageous and patriotic Americans. They labor hard in our earth so that we may have warmth and the power to keep our transportation and industries running.

We have made great strides in providing better and safer working conditions for those who form so vital a part of our labor. But disasters such as we have had today in Morgantown bring forcefully to our attention again the need for continual reexamination of our mine-safety laws and the other acts which contribute to the well-being and safety of our miners. It is too late to do anything after the disaster has occurred. Congress should give immediate attention to legislation now pending in committee to amend and strengthen our present laws.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 5248?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPORTATION OF TUNA FISH

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 5693) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose certain duties upon the importation of tuna fish, and for other purposes, with amendments as reported by the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) paragraph 717 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(d) Tuna fish, fresh or frozen, whether or not packed in ice, and whether or not whole, 3 cents per pound."

(b) Paragraph 1756 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is amended by striking out "Sea herring, smelts, and tuna fish" and by inserting in lieu thereof "Sea herring and smelts."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply only to tuna fish entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, on or after the thirtieth day after the date of the enactment of this act, and prior to April 1, 1953.

SEC. 2. The United States Tariff Commission is directed to undertake an investigation of the competitive position of the domestic tuna industry, including the effect of imports of fresh or frozen tuna fish on the livelihood of American fishermen, and to report the results of its investigation to the Congress on or before January 1, 1953. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearings to interested parties. The report of the Commission shall indicate the facts relative to the production, trade, and consumption of tuna fish in the United States, shall take into account all relevant factors affecting the domestic economy, including the interests of consumers, processors, and producers, and shall indicate the effect upon the competitive position of the domestic tuna industry of the rate of duty imposed by this act, so as to assist the Congress in determining what change, if any, shall be made in such rate of duty.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall make a comprehensive study of the long-range position of the domestic tuna industry and recommend such measures as may be appropriate to promote necessary adjustments so that the industry may achieve and maintain a sound position in the domestic economy. In making his study the Secretary of the Interior shall consult with other interested officers and agencies of the Government and may seek information and advice from any other source he deems appropriate. A report of his study and recommendations shall be submitted to the Congress on or before January 1, 1953.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HOLMES. I demand a second, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the critical situation of the domestic tuna-fishing industry was first called to my attention by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], the gentlemen from California [Mr. KING and Mr. MCKINNON], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES]. Since eight bills had then been introduced to impose a tariff on fresh or frozen tuna, and since several members of the committee were engaged in the conference on the tax bill, I decided to establish a subcommittee to look into the problem. This subcommittee, with the able and distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP] as chairman, conducted hearings to receive the report that had been requested from the Tariff Commission, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Interior Department, and the Department of State.

After reviewing all the bills that had been introduced and the testimony at the hearings, the subcommittee unanimously recommended to the Committee on Ways and Means that legislation be enacted to provide a temporary duty on fresh or frozen tuna fish of 3 cents per pound pending the completion of exhaustive studies of the domestic tuna industry by the Tariff Commission and the Department of the Interior.

As set forth in the committee report on the pending bill, the Department of State appreciates "the unique nature of the situation, the compelling prima facie case of injury shown in this case, the temporary character of the duty and the basic studies which are to be undertaken," and accordingly the Department concludes that the proposals contained in H. R. 5693 are not unreasonable.

Since prompt action is necessary if the needed relief is to be effective, this bill should be passed without delay.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP] to explain the provisions of the bill in greater detail.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, the situation confronting the domestic tuna fish industry was very thoroughly canvassed by our subcommittee. At the outset I wish to thank every member of it for the fine work that was done.

Our investigation shows that the consumption of tuna fish in this country has grown very rapidly, as has the amount of tuna which domestic fishermen have been able to catch. But since the end of the last war, since 1945 to be exact, the importation of this fish has grown from 15,000,000 pounds until this year it will reach more than 80,000,000 pounds. Tuna fish is on the free list. There are no trade agreements, or other treaties which interfere with our imposition of some tariff or some import duty on it. We found that last year, our own fisheries produced some 400,000,000 pounds but because of the growing importations, one by one these fishing vessels have tied up at the docks until now of the 235 ships that are engaged in this trade, all but 3 or 4 are tied up. The price of fresh or frozen tuna has dropped from 31 cents per pound in 1939 to below 15 cents at the present time. At the present price, which has been forced

down by these importations, our domestic tuna fishing fleet cannot go out to sea. So they are tied up in their home ports.

The result will be, unless we have fish brought into this country from foreign countries, the supply will be endangered, and also if this protection is not granted or something is not done, we may find our tuna fishing industry destroyed.

These vessels of the tuna fishing fleet cost anywhere from $100,000 to upward of a million dollars each. They are built especially for tuna fishing, and cannot be used in other types of fishing.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman say whether this drop in the price was in the retail price?

Mr. CAMP. I will get to that point.

Tuna fish is not consumed as a fresh fish. All the tuna fish imported into this country, or produced by our domestic fisheries, is used in canning. The product is all canned. We have an import duty of 45 percent ad valorem on canned tuna fish in oil. That was lowered to 22½ percent under a treaty we made with Mexico, but the Mexican Treaty expired on January 1 of this year so it has restored this 45 percent ad valorem rate. There is a 12½ percent ad valorem rate on tuna fish canned in any other way than in oil. There is no other way that we know of that it has ever been canned except in brine. Since the Mexican Treaty expired, the importations of tuna fish in oil has very greatly dropped. The importations of this tuna fish in brine has rapidly increased about 400 percent in 6 months. We had a Tariff Commission representative with us in this study. We had the Department of the Interior representatives from the Fish and Wildlife Division, who by the way are making an intensive study in the tuna fishing industry. They have ships now in the North Atlantic area, where they have found sufficient schools of tuna to lead them to believe that an industry may be built there. We had also with us representatives of the Department of State. There were six bills, none of which provided a rate of tariff less than 5 cents per pound. After we had studied the proposition, we thought that some rate which would insure enough importations to keep the canneries going and at the same time, if possible, protect our domestic fishing fleet, should be established, and we arrived at the figure of 3 cents a pound. This bill provides that this rate shall be imposed 30 days after the passage of the bill, and expire on April 1, 1953. In the meantime we are directing the Tariff Commission and the Department of the Interior to make a complete study of this situation and to report back to the Congress on January 1, 1953. By having this rate imposed they can get some idea of how much it does protect the domestic industry including the canners. They can tell us whether it is too much or whether it is too little. It gives them a better basis for study by having the imposition of this tariff than they would otherwise have.

Mr. Speaker, there are others who are interested in this subject and who are acquainted with it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. You say that the price of tuna fish has dropped from 39 to 15 cents a can?

Mr. CAMP. No, sir. I said from 31 cents a pound in 1939 to 15 cents a pound at the present time. It takes about 2.3 pounds of this raw or frozen tuna fish to make a pound of canned tuna.

Mr. GROSS. What I am getting at, is the consumer of this country getting the benefit of this terrific drop in price?

Mr. CAMP. Well, this is the price to the canners. That is one of the studies which we shall have to make.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McKINNON. During the last 5 years, while the cost of living of all food products has increased by 19 percent, the price of canned tuna has declined by 16 percent.

Mr. GROSS. At retail?

Mr. McKINNON. At retail; yes, sir. It is one food product that is going down in price with all other food products going up in price.

Mr. CAMP. Most of the canners of tuna fish are along the Pacific coast. There are some 45 canners in the country. Most of them are in California. Some are in Washington and Oregon. There is one in South Carolina, and a new one being built at the present time in Mississippi

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. Is it not a fact that when the committee set this specific duty of 3 cents a pound on fresh and frozen tuna it was endeavoring to the best of its knowledge to hold the balance between the fishermen and the fishing fleets of our country and a chance of doing any business and at the same time not jeopardizing it by increasing the price of canned tuna?

Mr. CAMP. Exactly so. That is exactly the situation. With the advice of these experts who were with us we thought this was as high as we could go without perhaps causing an increase in the price of canned tuna to the people. But we felt that this might protect the domestic fleets. In fact, representatives of the fishermen said that they think they can go back to sea if we give them this protection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is saying that this will not increase the price to the consumer?

Mr. CAMP. We do not think it will, but, of course, as I told you, that is a study that has to be made. I thank the gentleman for his contribution in asking me that question.

There are many complications in a matter of this kind. We are getting 45 percent of these fish from Japan. Twenty-six or twenty-seven percent is coming from Peru. I think Costa Rica is next in importance, and we are getting some from Canada. But if we expect to insure a domestic supply, which you see is threefold, we must do something to get that fleet back to work.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to see a bill of this importance to certain segments of the fishing industry passed under a suspension of the rules, because it is admitted that it requires a lot of further study, and it has to do with an infant industry that has been growing and increasing through the years and is developing very rapidly. Unfortunately, there is a sectional question that enters into it. I know how we all dislike sectional things, and that is one reason I think this bill should not be passed under a suspension of the rules, but should be given further study.

The whole industry is relatively young; and, as has been said before, principally in California and on the west coast. What is not generally known and what is apparently not fully appreciated by the committee that I am sure is giving this matter very serious study, is that there is an important branch of this infant industry springing up on the eastern seaboard. There are several important producers of canned tuna along the North Atlantic and central Atlantic coast. Two or more of them happen to be located in my own district, so I have some personal knowledge of their problems. There is no tuna catching industry on the east coast.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Tuna fishing is a great sport off the coast of Maine, and many tuna are caught.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I know, but they are not caught commercially as I gather not only from a hurried study of this bill, but from my work as a member of the Fish and Wildlife Subcommittee. As I understand, and I am very glad to be corrected if my understanding is wrong, while tuna is an important item in sport fishing, there is no continuous supply of tuna moving into eastern ports brought in by American-owned ships and American bottoms on the Atlantic seaboard. The result is that these packers are dependent on tuna from South America, and they have had a very successful and rapidly developing industry which is particularly important to many of our packers along the coast, because it fills in the gap when local supplies of fish, oysters, and crabs are not available. This bill would inevitably tend to increase the cost of sea food when we are trying to bring it down. As has been stated, probably the real trouble with that industry is the fact that the salt brine packed tuna is admitted too easily. I think that has had more to do with hurting the tuna market and reducing demand because the inferior product

tends to discourage people from buying tuna and also has upset the market far more than the bringing in of fresh tuna.

It may be that something should be done for fishermen on the west coast, but I submit that we also have to think about the processors and the many working people who earn their livelihood out of the sea food packing plants on the east coast.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. McKINNON. I agree with the gentleman that we should think about all segments of the industry, but I would point out to the gentleman that if the tuna canning industry did not have the 45 percent ad valorem duty they would be driven out of business by the Japanese, Peruvians, and other importers of canned tuna; they would put the industry completely out of business. They had almost done that in 1950 when we increased the tariff from 22 percent to 45 percent. The effect of that was an immediate decrease of foreign shipments which had been taking the domestic market away from the fishermen. What is fair for the cannery is fair also for the fishermen themselves and what we are asking is not a tariff increase to 45 percent ad valorem but only to a little over 18 percent ad valorem.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I agree that protection is needed for processed tuna. My trouble is that some of our people have not had their day in court as to the effect of a duty on fresh tuna and that is why I do not like to see this bill passed at this time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read from a letter I received from a substantial producer in Maryland with reference to the passage of this bill:

> We are opposed to the passage of H. R. 5693 because the infant tuna packing industry on the Atlantic Coast must depend on imported tuna, frozen and unprocessed, for practically its entire supply. No local supply of any consequence is now available on this coast, and, if eventually it is determined that tuna can be caught in sufficient quantities it will be several years before the proper tuna boats can be provided to justify the industry. Frozen tuna delivered to our plant costs us the same as that which the west coast canners pay. With the proposed duty in effect we will be out of competition with other segments of the industry, or, our suppliers will be forced out of business because of the reduction in the net price to them.
>
> Our tuna is purchased from the west coast of South America, shipped frozen and unprocessed to us in American ships and processed by our labor.
>
> Under the above circumstances, we feel it is unfair to penalize and destroy our tuna industry on the Atlantic coast by imposing the $60 per ton import duty proposed in H. R 5693.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that when this bill was brought before the House we would have the support of every Member present and that we would all get behind this very worth-while measure.

Some time ago when the impact on this industry became apparent I made some personal study of the situation and wrote a letter to the President of the United States. He replied that there was no way in which his office could assist, that legislation was necessary in order to cope with the condition. I then took the matter up with the State Department to find out if the passage of a tariff on tuna would interfere with any international agreement or treaty that might be pending. I was informed by the Secretary that it would not.

So I prepared and introduced a bill and the bill which we have before us is patterned after the bill I introduced. The bill I introduced provided for 5 cents a pound tariff on fresh and frozen tuna. The committee in its wisdom saw fit to reduce that amount to 3 cents. I believe that this tariff will give some protection to this industry. On the Pacific coast our fishermen have harvested as high as $12,000,000 worth of tuna a year. I was not aware that the tuna industry was developing on the Atlantic coast, as indicated by my friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER], but, in my opinion, this law will assist and aid the industry on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCUDDER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I say to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] who took the floor a moment ago that when he remarked that at the present time they are paying the same price for the import of tuna that we pay in our own canneries on the west coast the same would pertain in the future under this bill as in the past. They would still pay the same price on the east coast at the canneries that they pay on the west coast. I believe that his canneries are unduly alarmed. There would be no difference in what is paid by the canneries for the fish from South America.

Mr. SCUDDER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. The only thing it would do would be to help develop the tuna fishing industry, which would materially benefit his own district.

Mr. SCUDDER. That is right.

I support H. R. 5693, the passage of which will have a stabilizing effect, I am sure, on the tuna industry of the Pacific coast.

On September 12, I introduced H. R. 5308, which provided for a 5-cent-per-pound tax on imported fresh and frozen tuna. The committee bill which you are now considering, introduced by the chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Tuna Imports, Mr. CAMP, provides for a tariff of 3 cents per pound, and specified that the act shall be in effect until April 1, 1953.

Under this bill the United States Tariff Commission is directed to undertake an investigation of the competitive position of the domestic tuna industry, including the effect of imports of fresh and frozen tuna on the livelihood of American fishermen, and to report the results of its investigation to the Congress on or before January 1, 1953.

Early this year my attention was called to the havoc that was being wrought upon the fishing industry on the Pacific coast by the importation of tuna fish. The tuna fishing and canning industry is a comparatively young industry, having a start in California about 30 years ago. At the present time they employ upward of 20,000 people in this industry and the annual catch is valued at $12,000,000. Last year the catch amounted to 360,000,000 pounds.

I am informed that the imports have increased 1400 percent during the past 5 years. Imports during the first 7 months of this year amounted to 28,000,000 pounds. Half of this amount, 14,000,000 pounds, came in during the month of July alone.

The condition has become so bad on the Pacific coast that during the last 10 days the fishermen have had to set up markets of their own in order to dispose of some of their catch. This is not a proper function of the fishermen and they do not desire to invade the wholesale and retail fish business. Furthermore, the fresh sales is but a drop in the bucket, so to speak. Tuna is primarily a canning fish and must be disposed of for canning purposes.

When this situation came to my attention, I directed a letter to the President of the United States asking that this importation of fish be reviewed in the light of the escape clause in the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in order that adjustments be made to protect the industry. I received this reply:

> AUGUST 31, 1951.
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCUDDER: The President has asked me to reply to your letter of August 23 regarding imports of frozen tuna.
>
> I am informed that frozen and fresh tuna may be imported free of duty under the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930. Therefore the escape clause provision of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 is not applicable and congressional action is necessary if duty is to be imposed.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> JOHN R. STEELMAN.

I then took the matter up with the State Department to find out if a law exacting a tariff on tuna fish would violate any entry provisions as contained in existing treaties with foreign countries, and was advised that it would not. Therefore, I introduced H. R. 5308 on September 12, the day the House of Representatives came back into session after a short recess. I know of no legal obstacle that will stand in the way of enactment of this legislation.

I have had hundreds of letters asking that this legislation be passed and I respectfully urge the Congress to expedite this bill so that relief may become available to this hard-hit industry. Your favorable vote on this legislation will be appreciated by thousands of hard-working Americans who are engaged in the production of food during the critical period of our country's history.

I desire to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter from Thomas M. Erwin,

chairman, Committee on Fish and Game, of the California Assembly, also a letter of transmittal from Mrs. Harry Bienick, of Crescent City, enclosing a petition of some 500 people in Del Norte County alone petitioning Congress for the passage of this bill.

I also desire to insert a resolution from the Del Norte County Board of Supervisors.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCUDDER. The letters and resolution are as follows:

ASSEMBLY,
CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE,
October 8, 1951.

HON HUBERT B SCUDDER,
Congressman, First District,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D C

DEAR MR SCUDDER: On October 1, 1951, my committee on fish and game held a meeting with the tuna people in San Diego, Calif. At this meeting, we heard testimony from boat owners, banks, labor, fishermen, boat builders, and many others.

The testimony clearly indicated that unless some action is taken immediately, to protect the tuna industry from frozen tuna imports, particularly from Japan and Peru, the entire industry faces wholesale bankruptcy.

The committee has unanimously recommended that I contact all of California's elected representatives and request them to do everything possible to see that this large industry is protected from these imports.

Sincerely,
THOMAS M ERWIN, *Chairman.*

CRESCENT CITY, CALIF., *October 9, 1951.*

HON HUBERT SCUDDER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR SCUDDER: Enclosed herewith are five petitions which have been circulated in Del Norte County to support the request for assistance from Washington on the vital subject of tuna importations, and other problems confronting our fisheries industries. Another petition, unfortunately misplaced, contains the signatures of county businessmen which would bring number of names to over 500. It is with full confidence that we submit these petitions to you to offer support in the effort you are making to increase the United States fisheries industry rather than to decrease them by encouraging vast importations that offer unfair competition to us.

We are fishermen's wives from Crescent City Port who have actually circulated these petitions to give support to our friends who are working to help us in keeping our livelihood.

My husband owns the *Phyllis B*, and installed a Diesel motor himself which was very costly, in spite of his own labor. To date he cannot sell one single tuna in this port. We have five children, two in grammar school and one in high school, and we hope to give them all secondary as well as college education. With the picture of tuna and other imports today, this may not be possible. Mrs. Verne Hagar, Mrs. Bill Oheisler, Mrs. Leo Kosarek, Mrs. Ace Crook, Mrs Sam Mattola, and myself have circulated these petitions and respectfully submit them to you as evidence of our support.

Sincerely,
Mrs. HARRY BIENICK.

Resolution 395

Resolution memorializing Congress to place a tariff upon importation of foreign fish

Whereas the county of Del Norte and vicinity is devoted in great part to commercial fishing, particularly for the taking of tuna or albacore, commercially; and

Whereas a great number of citizens and residents of said county have considerable investment in fishing boats and equipment and gain their livelihood in the fishing industry, and

Whereas it appears that local fishermen are compelled to compete with foreign countries or noncitizens in said industry and that there is imported a great amount of said sea products into the United States to the end that such competition will become confiscatory and, if continued, will ultimately end in the loss of the fisheries along the coast of California unless a tariff is placed upon imports of said sea products. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Del Norte that Congress be memoralized to place a suitable and adequate tariff on importation of said sea products in a sufficient amount to equalize prices of foreign and domestic fish.

Passed by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Del Norte this first day of October, 1951

Ayes Joseph A Miller, V K Meedom, Fred D Haight, Kyle G Grey. Nays None. Absent: George E Lujon

FRED D. HAIGHT,
Chairman of the Board Pro tempore.

Attest:
EMMA COOPER,
Clerk of Said Board.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] said that the tuna fishing industry is a new industry. That is true. But, despite the fact that it is a new industry it is America's largest foodfish industry. The amount of tuna caught by American fishermen and landed at American canneries last year totaled 360,000,000 pounds. That was 4,000,000 pounds more than all the salmon that were landed on Alaskan, Pacific, and Atlantic seaboards combined. The pack of approximately 9,000,000 cases of tuna which was made in this country last year was valued wholesale at $112,000,000, which was $4,000,000 more than the total value of the Nation's salmon pack. The catching and packing of tuna is today the largest food fishing industry in the United States. That industry has been considerably handicapped in recent months by tremendous receipts of tuna imported from Japan. Tuna imported from Japan constitutes 29.34 percent of all the tuna that was sold in the United States last year. Our fishermen simply cannot compete with tuna imported from Japan where the wage of fishermen is 60 to 90 cents a day—not 60 to 90 cents an hour, but 60 to 90 cents a day.

Now, the tuna that comes into this country arrives in three forms: Part of it comes in the fresh and frozen state and is canned in American canneries. These fresh- and frozen-fish shipments amount to about 25,000,000 pounds a year. Then other tuna that comes into the country is packed in oil. The tuna packed in oil in 1949 totaled about 1,700,000 cases. After the tariff was increased on tuna in oil these shipments decreased to 500,000 cases a year. Now there is another kind of tuna coming in. This is the tuna packed in brine.

One of the most serious threats to the prosperity of and employment in the American tuna industry is the rapid increase in imports of this tuna that is canned in brine.

When the tariff on tuna canned in oil was raised to 45 percent ad valorem, the Japanese tuna industry sought ways to get around this 45-percent tariff. Instead of packing their tuna in oil, they began packing it in brine.

Tuna packed in brine can, under existing laws, come into this country by paying a duty of only 12 percent on value as against 45 percent on tuna in oil. Japanese tuna packed in brine is arriving in the United States from Japan in ever-increasing quantities.

In 1949, for example, the Japanese shipped only 3,700 cases of tuna canned in brine into the United States. In 1950 she shipped in more than 18,000 cases and in the first 6 months of this year alone 82,028 cases. This means that Japan probably will ship 160,000 or more cases of tuna in brine into this country this year.

Whereas imports of fresh and frozen tuna injure the fishermen who operate the boats, the importation of canned tuna in brine affects the cannery workers as well as the fishermen and thereby does twofold damage.

I realize that the committee did not provide for an increased tariff on tuna in brine in this bill and could not do so due to certain difficulties relating to international treaties. Under the rule which this bill is being considered here today Members are barred from offering any amendment to the bill.

I do hope that the Senate, under its rules, can amend the bill to include in it a duty on tuna in brine so that these growing imports, which threaten the employment of both fishermen and cannery workers, may be stopped or at least decreased.

If the bill cannot be so amended in the Senate, I hope that the study of tuna problems, which this bill authorizes, will result in recommendations that the tariff on tuna in brine be raised to the 45-percent level, now imposed on tuna canned in oil. Such a provision would be of great help to both the fishermen and to the cannery workers also.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. The statistics for 1939 on fresh or frozen alone show an importation of around 14,500,000 pounds, and for the first 7 months of the year 1951 better than 45,000,000 pounds. When the year is completed they anticipate it will be 80,000,000 pounds of fresh or frozen alone.

Mr. MACK of Washington. May I bring up one other point? I think it is very important that this survey be made and that the committee, if possible, give consideration next year to the

imposition of a duty on the tuna in brine in order to keep that canned product, which injures both the fisherman and the cannery worker, out of this country.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Does not the gentleman think that is really the problem, that this tuna in brine is increasing, rather than it would be cured by a tax on fresh fish?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I think we should have both a tariff on the fresh and frozen fish and a tariff on the tuna in brine. The tuna in brine hurts the American worker in two ways. In the first place, tuna in brine, because it is a cheaper and lower priced product, will undersell tuna in oil, and take away canned-fish markets enjoyed now by American canners. Also, many housewives may buy the tuna in brine, not knowing there is a difference between tuna in brine and tuna in oil, and finding the brine tuna inferior become disgusted with the product and as a result may cease using tuna at all. That would injure the entire industry.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I commend the Committee on Ways and Means for its action in bringing this measure to the floor of the House so expeditiously. The immediate attention and consideration which is given to this problem merits the appreciation of the fishing industry. The measure is a meritorious one much needed by an important segment of our fishing industry. I trust the House will act favorably upon the measure.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKINNON].

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the value of time during the closing days of this session, and while I shall not take long in explaining the merits of this bill, I do earnestly seek your support for a typical American industry that will probably live or die by your action today.

The tuna industry is in serious condition. As these pictures show, the majority of the fleet is laid up at the dock, and thousands of American citizens are out of work and have no immediate prospects of returning to their livelihood.

The source of the trouble is simple. More tuna has been made available to the United States tuna market than it can absorb, the principle increase coming from foreign imports.

In 1946, for instance, there were 4,167 tons of tuna imported on a raw-fish basis. In 1947, this rose to 9,204 tons. In 1949 there was a sharp increase to 20,606 tons. In 1950, the increase was even sharper, up to 56,712 tons. To date, the imports have been half again as much as those of 1950, and the most dependable indications are that imports for 1952 will set new records over those of 1951. In 1946, foreign imports amounted to 6 percent of the United States market. In 1951, they are running at the rate of 26 percent. In the past 5 years, raw-tuna imports have increased by 20 times.

These imports come chiefly from Peru and Japan, where the standard of living makes it impossible for the American tuna industry to compete. Peru, for instance, pays such low wages that tuna brought to dockside represents about one-fifth the American cost.

This bill proposes a stop-gap tariff of 3 cents a pound, pending a complete study and investigation by the Tariff Commission and the Division of Fisheries and Wildlife of the Department of Interior. As you will note, these agencies are directed in this bill to report their findings to Congress and the President by January 1, 1953; and that the 3-cent tariff expires on April 1, 1953. This bill, therefore, allows sufficient time for Congress to take appropriate action in early 1953, after a long-term study by the Tariff Commission and the Department of Interior are able to suggest the most dependable facts and remedies, so as to keep alive our own American industry while at the same time leaving some of the market for other countries.

In future legislation, it is likely that some sliding tariff scale will be advisable, so as to assure foreign countries a market here, while at the same time guaranteeing American fishermen protection against being put out of business completely. Such a program will encourage trade between nations, and enable Japan to earn dollars, for instance, and at the same time provide the American fisherman with sufficient encouragement to invest in advertising and merchandising toward the further development of a bigger tuna market.

The industry is beginning steps now in this direction. They have voted an assessment per ton, which will result in substantially more than $500,000 a year to implement a program of sales promotion for canned tuna throughout the Nation. Thus, while they are asking for your help in a modest tariff protection, they are using their own funds and efforts to alleviate their problem in creating a bigger market.

With due pride, may I point out that tuna is a delicious product, highly nutritious, tasty and available at very reasonable prices. Since January of 1947, the general index of food prices in the United States has increased by 19 percent. In the same length of time the wholesale price of canned tuna has gone down by 16 percent, thanks to the ingenuity of the industry. Translated into terms with which the housewife is acquainted, this means that tuna can be purchased at about 60 cents per pound, which is considerably cheaper than any other competitive meat product. Since there is no bone, fat, nor waste, everything in the can may be eaten and is delicious.

The American housewife is realizing this more every day. The market for canned tuna has doubled in the past 4 years, and the outlook is favorable for a larger market and lower prices—if something can be done now to keep the competitive value of an American tuna industry.

The tuna fishermen ask no special protection or favors, but if they are to remain a strong and vigorous section of the food suppliers of this Nation, they will have to have protection similar to that given the other parts of the United States food industry, for the same reason that the American standard of living makes it impossible for our producers to compete with lower standards of living abroad. Recognition has been given this problem with all other frozen fish products of any consequence, tuna and shrimp being the only exceptions. Tariff protection is provided practically all agricultural products.

I earnestly seek your interest and help, for the plight of the tuna fisherman is serious and is deserving of the same consideration given other American food producers.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know whether any of the sonic equipment, which has been purchased with ECA money for foreign fisheries has been used for the tuna fleets of the foreigners?

Mr. McKINNON. I cannot answer the question of the gentleman. I will say that we know a great deal of American capital is going into Ecuador and Peru and certain other countries, which are using cheap labor to bring tuna back into this country at a very small cost, and we are putting thousands of American workingmen out of jobs by a process which I do not think is fair or what we desire.

Mr. GROSS. I do not think the gentleman got my question. Does he know whether any of this expensive sonic equipment that we have purchased through the ECA has been given to foreign fishing fleets and is being used for the catching of tuna to come back in competition with the American markets?

Mr. McKINNON. To the best of my knowledge that has not happened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the committee for bringing up a bill, which is going to help somebody in the United States, and particularly to help the fishermen who go down to the sea in ships. I hope this bill passes. I am going to vote for it. I wish that those who did not listen to me 2 or 3 weeks ago when I spoke on the twine bill will listen to me today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any more requests for time on this side, and rather than extend the debate, I yield back the balance of the time remaining on this side.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from California [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, we are considering today the livelihood of 25,000 workers and their families in the Amer-

ican tuna industry. These people are faced with a crisis over which they have no control. The question is whether Congress will provide them with the minimum amount of relief to enable a longer range study of their problems to be made by the agencies of the Government which are responsible for the tariff and the fisheries policies of the country.

I am especially gratified that the Committee on Ways and Means has responded so forthrightly to the plea of the domestic tuna-fishing industry. Although the pending bill would provide a 3-cents per pound duty on fresh or frozen tuna, which is now admitted free of duty, I had introduced a bill for a permanent 5-cents-per-pound tariff on fresh or frozen tuna fish. The 5-cents-per-pound duty provided by my bill would be the equivalent of only a 30-percent ad valorem rate on the canned product which under present law has the benefit of a 45-percent ad valorem tariff

This is the present situation in the domestic tuna industry which seemed to me to justify at least the 5-cents-per-pound duty. First, the price received by domestic fishermen for their tuna catch is now less than 50 percent of what it was in 1948. Albacore, a species of tuna, is now bringing 15 cents per pound while 3 years ago at this time it was selling for 28 cents per pound. And it is not just a coincidence that the ratio of imports to domestic production has increased from 2.8 percent in 1948 to 26.7 percent in 1951.

And you do not have to take just my word for it. According to the representatives of the Branch of Commercial Fisheries in the Department of the Interior:

> Our investigation of the tuna fish situation has led us to believe that it faces a very critical situation at the present time.

Out of about 235 clippers along the Pacific coast, about 200 are now idle and will remain idle for the rest of this year whatever we do here. These ships cannot readily be converted to any other usage. And then there are the many smaller ships, as many as 3,000 small vessels in the albacore fleet and the less numerous purse seiners, which have over the years earned their livelihood primarily in tuna fishing.

So as I say, from my standpoint the permanent 5 cents per pound duty seems reasonable. The Committee on Ways and Means, however, thought that other considerations required a more cautious approach to the imposition of a tariff on fresh or frozen tuna.

I should like to reemphasize my appreciation for the promptness with which this legislation has been prepared and reported. Just a week after hearings began the bill is being debated on the floor of the House. Under this bill, the domestic tuna fishing industry will receive a minimum temporary level of protection pending a thorough study of the long-range relation between domestic production, consumption, and importation of tuna.

I also want to make it clear that the critical position of the domestic tuna fishing industry is not the result of the trade-agreements program because fresh and frozen tuna have never before been subject to duty. The flood of imports is rather the use of more modern methods of fishing and refrigeration which has enabled foreign countries to ship in four and five times more tuna than they have ever done before.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not, before closing, pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for his leadership in coping with the problem of tuna imports. At the same time that he was bearing the heavy load in the conference on the 1951 revenue bill, affecting all sections of the country, he still was able to give consideration to this problem of principal immediate significance to the west coast. As always, his tireless energy and great leadership are a constant inspiration and challenge for all of us who have had the privilege of serving under him as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5693 should be passed without delay.

Mr. GAVIN Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the very fine statement he is making, and also the fact that it is very interesting to note a great many on the gentleman's side are talking about a protective tariff to protect American industry. I hope when some other particular matter comes up concerning industry in my great State of Pennsylvania that the same gentlemen who are talking about protective tariffs today will assume the same position they are assuming today. I expect to vote for the bill, and agree with what the gentleman is saying. I am glad to see a reinterest on your side in protective tariffs to protect American industry. .

Mr. KING. I might say to the gentleman it may seem somewhat unusual but in the interest of consistency, I might point out that in questioning members of the administrative agencies during the committee hearings on this legislation, it was not known by any of those present that any other industry today had faced not only serious injury but almost complete elimination from the field of American industry because of this unusual and rare instance of a product being admitted duty free and now flooding the market to the point that almost 26 percent of the total consumption of the product in this country is imported from Japan and South America.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 5693?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed

EFFECT OF USE OF CHEMICALS, COMPOUNDS AND SYNTHETICS IN PREPARATION AND PACKAGING OF COSMETICS

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 447) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That House Resolution 74, Eighty-second Congress, is amended by adding after the words "H. Res 323," in the fourth line, a comma and the following language: "and an investigation and study of the nature, extent, and effect of the use of chemicals, compounds, and synthetics in the production, processing, preparation, and packaging of cosmetics to determine the effect of the use of such chemicals, compounds, and synthetics upon the health and welfare of the Nation,".

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, this extends the authority which has previously been granted by the Congress to the Delaney committee including in their investigation the effect of the use of chemical compounds and synthetics in the production of cosmetics. As far as I know it comes with the unanimous approval of all concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California, [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members of the House I may state that this amends the original resolution that created the so-called Delaney committee which had the responsibility of investigating the presence of poisons brought into foods, and adulterants through insecticides, fertilizers, or through the processing of foods. The committee has met on numerous occasions, had many meetings, both here in Washington and in other parts of the United States. They have developed a rather extensive study of the need for some corrective legislation which will eventually be recommended.

One part of the committee's study that was not authorized in the original resolution was the authority to investigate chemicals, plants, and synthetics in the production, processing, preparation, and packaging of cosmetics. The committee's attention was called to the need for such investigation by a recent letter from the Federal Security Agency, Food and Drug Administration, in which it was recited that there was danger to the health and welfare of those using certain types of hair waves, and cold permanent waves. Another instance was certain nail polish which was found to be detrimental and injurious to women who used it. In other instances there were shampoos which were injurious not only to the hair but also to the eyes. The committee is now asking that this additional authority be granted by the adoption of this resolution which the committee itself is unanimously in accord with. I trust that the House will see the benefit of adopting it and approving it.

In this connection I insert a letter received by the committee from John L.

Harvey, Associate Commissioner of Food and Drugs:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., September 13, 1951.

Mr. VINCENT A. KLEINFELD,
Counsel, House Select Committee To Investigate Chemicals in Foods, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR KLEINFELD: More than 10 years ago there developed in the cosmetic industry a determined effort to produce methods of curling hair which eliminated the elaborate machinery, discomfort, and costly procedures then involved in permanent waves. In San Francisco a company managed by an individual who is primarily an engineer and inventor developed an apparatus fitting on the head and hair which eliminated the heating devices used for permanent waves. The ingenuity and know-how expended in developing the mechanical features of the apparatus were extensive, but the materials and solutions used in connection with it were selected because of their properties for assisting in the curling process without any investigation or study of the possible injurious or toxic effect of such solutions. The heatless permanent wave method thus developed was sold on a franchise basis to beauty salons throughout the United States. The heatless waves were cheaper, less time-consuming, and more pleasant to take.

Shortly after national distribution was effected, a death was reported from Atlanta, Ga., which occurred while the subject was being given a heatless wave in a beauty shop. Tests then made indicated that the solutions were unsafe and likely to cause injury. Thereafter it was necessary to institute over 200 seizure actions to remove the outstanding stocks of the offending wave materials from the market and prevent further injury to the public.

About 8 or 9 years ago the styles in hair arrangement for women resulted in a widespread adoption of what has been facetiously called the "washerwoman hair-do," which involved piling the hair on top of the head and arranging it neatly so that it would remain in such arrangement for an indefinite period. Among the esthetic draw-backs to this hair arrangement were the stray locks on the back of the neck which did not conform to the arrangement and were left dangling in a more or less untidy effect. To meet the crying need thus created, an immediate popularity developed for some kind of adhesive material which would affix these stray locks in an upward direction and attach them to the remainder of the upswept hair. To fill this need, a Chicago manufacturer created locks-up hair lacquer pads. These were in the form of a cotton pad impregnated with a lacquer substance which, when brushed upward around the hair-do, increased the tidiness of the arrangement by gluing the hair to the rest of the arrangement. In applying the lacquer pads they necessarily came in contact with the skin and scalp adjacent to the hair.

This development occurred during wartime when there was a scarcity of lacquer materials, shellac, varnish, resins, and glue. Apparently the first product was entirely successful and created an enormous demand. Subsequent batches of manufacture employed unknown and untested adhesive materials, synthetic resins, etc., and the result of that hasty improvising was that hundreds of women throughout the United States suffered significant injury by reason of the poisonous nature of the resins used, which created a contact dermatitis and other painful and disfiguring complications. As a result of regulatory activity of this administration, the product was eventually removed from the market; but not until a great deal of damage had occurred.

About 4 years ago numerous complaints were received from women whose fingers had been significantly injured as a result of using lacquers marketed in the form of fingernail coatings. Again the ingredients employed were different kinds of newly developed products related to synthetic rubber and no adequate testing was undertaken prior to marketing the coatings to determine whether they might have any propensity for injury. These products are exceedingly complex organic chemicals, more in the nature of mixtures than specific entities, and the only practical approach to evaluating their properties for harm is adequate tests on lower animals or human beings. Because of the complex chemical character of the ingredients, it was very difficult to determine the precise nature of the offending constituents and it became necessary to regard each batch or lot as an entity unto itself and to undertake individual testing. Again, lack of adequate pretesting and experimenting on the public with unknown chemicals resulted in substantial injury to many users of this type of cosmetic. Finally, by belated study and experimentation, manufacturers were able to produce satisfactory articles without deleterious ingredients.

During the month of August 1951, the product of two shampoo manufacturers has been found to contain ingredients which are significantly dangerous when introduced into the human eyes. Both of these products employ polyoxyethylene group surface active agents together with a quaternary compound as the active principles of the so-called dry shampoo. The two manufacturers had acquired wide distribution but had received a considerable number of complaints from customers whose eyes had been injured by inadvertent contact with the shampoo material. Pharmacological tests on animals made by this Administration confirmed the dangerous character of the material when introduced into the eye, and demonstrated that the products have the property of producing an opacity of the cornea which impairs the eyesight for a persistent period of time if not permanently. Accidentally getting shampoo material into the eye is such a common occurrence in the experience of everyone that such occurrence is consistent with the conditions that are customary or usual in shampooing the hair.

After an initial seizure in each instance, these manufacturers agreed voluntarily to remove their products from the market and to attempt to devise suitable substitutes. In neither instance had any pretesting whatsoever been conducted by the shampoo manufacturers, notwithstanding the fact that data are generally available which would suggest the extreme likelihood that such ingredients would be dangerous. Again these ingredients, particularly the polyoxyethylene compound, are in the nature of a mixture rather than a chemical entity and the effects of one batch may not be safely forecast from tests made upon another unless the entire group of possible compounds is tested and found innocuous.

These incidents represent some of the high lights of distribution of dangerous cosmetics without adequate pretesting safeguards that have shown up in the last decade. Other less extensive and dramatic instances of similar nature have occurred. Cosmetics by their very nature are chemical in character or represent a combination of chemicals. New cosmetics are the result of using new chemicals or well-known chemicals in different and new combinations. It seems absolutely essential in the interest of public safety that there be mandatory requirements for adequate pretesting and adequate manufacturing controls of products of this nature. It is abundantly evident that manufacturers generally do not undertake sufficient investigations of the possible injury hazards before placing such products on the market. Many large manufacturers do undertake appropriate tests. For example, the shampoo products of the nature just described were studied by some manufacturers and rejected, after which they were adopted and employed by other manufacturers in reckless ignorance or wanton disregard of the available facts.

The foregoing may be of interest to the members of the Select Committee of the House as collateral to the subject matter of chemical additives in foods which they are considering.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. HARVEY,
Associate Commissioner of Foods and Drugs.

I may state for the benefit of the Members of the House that the purpose of this investigation is two-fold: To find if any injurious or deleterious material is introduced into foods through the use of insecticides and fertilizers, also to investigate cosmetics; and also to referee and investigate the arbitrary action on the part of the Food and Drug Administration in administering laws now under their jurisdiction and eventually recommend legislation to correct those things.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to inquire of the gentleman to what extent his committee went into the question of hazards or possible harm to human beings coming from the use of fertilizers not properly regulated as to content?

Mr. McDONOUGH. There has been considerable done along those lines. If the gentleman will get a copy of the hearings from the committee, he will find we looked into fertilizers quite thoroughly.

Mr. BAILEY. What do you propose to do about them?

Mr. McDONOUGH. The committee has not made a recommendation on legislation as yet. As soon as the committee hearings are completed we expect to make some recommendation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK].

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, in this connection I merely wish to say that there was a shampoo preparation that came on the market during the month of August 1951 which made quite a hit with a lot of people who had dandruff and other scalp conditions. They thought they received tremendous relief from this shampoo, but they finally found that it was causing irritation. Also, a great many people in the country who used it developed a blurring of the cornea of the eyes. When the manufacturers of these preparations were contacted and their attention called to these harmful effects they admitted that possibly it would cause an irritation of the eyes, and immediately took their preparations off the market. I cite that as just one example of the need for studying the effect of the

use of dangerous chemicals in cosmetics and shampoos.

Not long ago our attention was called to the fact that certain preparations used in colored nail polish irritated the fingers and nails, in some instances infections were caused and even the nails had to be lanced to relieve the infection.

I am wholly in favor of this resolution and think it is very important and very essential that the American people should find out just what these chemicals are and what they do to the users.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 454 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H R 2574) to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LYLE Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. Speaker, the bill made in order by this resolution seeks to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and to authorize the Comptroller General to look into the books and records of those people who have contracts with the Government which were negotiated without advertising. As I understand, there will be some amendments offered in the Committee of the Whole. Other than that there is no objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for time on this side.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2574) to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2574, with Mr. BATTLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to draw the attention of the House to the wonderful work that has been done by the particular subcommittee out of which this bill was reported, known familiarly as the Hardy subcommittee. It typifies the sort of work that can be done by a subcommittee in the matter of the many investigations they have made I think the House is aware of them. They are suggesting here legislation in view of their investigations which will make it impossible for some of these things to occur again which they have investigated.

I want to say that of all the subcommittees it has been my privilege to know I think we have had the largest amount of agreement in this subcommittee that I have seen in my experience in the Congress I do not know of one report put out by this subcommittee that had a dissenting vote attached thereto.

Mr Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], the chairman of this subcommittee, to use as he sees fit.

Mr HARDY. Mr Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would amend two basic statutes governing Government procurement It affects only those contracts negotiated without advertising and would require that such contract contain a provision authorizing the Comptroller General to inspect the pertinent books and records of contractors and subcontractors. I want to repeat that it relates only to contracts which are negotiated without advertising

I can see no valid reason why anyone who understands the intent and purpose of this legislation should oppose it. There has, however, been considerable misunderstanding, which I feel certain will be cleared up by a simple explanation of what this bill will do.

Some Members of the House have spoken to me concerning the possibility that this legislation might affect the finality of renegotiation settlements. This bill has no bearing whatever on the Renegotation Act, and I want the record to clearly show that there is absolutely nothing in this bill intended to change in any manner existing law insofar as concerns the finality of renegotiation settlements. The Renegotiation Act of 1951 established the Renegotiation Board and assigned to it the function of renegotiating contracts for the purpose of eliminating excessive profits. This is an entirely separate and distinct operation from the audits performed by the General Accounting Office.

There have been some suggestions, too, that this bill might be construed as authorizing the General Accounting Office to superimpose its judgment as to what constitutes excessive profits on the judgment of renegotiation officials. Again, let me state clearly that there is nothing in this bill which can be construed as an authorization or even an indication that the GAO is to undertake any such prerogatives. The Comptroller General has no power to second-guess a renegotiation settlement, and this bill would give him none. Of course, if in the course of the examinations regularly performed by the GAO it should find a renegotiation settlement so unreasonable and so unconscionable as to suggest possible fraud or bad faith, the Comptroller General would, naturally, bring such a transaction to the attention of the Congress in an appropriate report. I cannot conceive of the possibility that anyone would expect the Comptroller General to do otherwise.

There has been some suggestion that the representatives of GAO would be in a position to disclose Government information from the contractors' books and records to competitors of the contractors. I see no reasonable basis for such a fear. At the present time the General Accounting Office does get to see many contractors' books and records. I am advised that in 9 out of 10 cases, contractors voluntarily make their records available for inspection by GAO upon request. This has been going on for years, and I have heard of no single instance where the GAO has violated its trust, or has used the information secured from the contractors' books for other than the authorized duties of the General Accounting Office

This brings up another point. As I have indicated, the authority contained in this bill is really only necessary to over those cases where the contractors refuse to permit the General Accounting Office to inspect their books and records. As I have already pointed out, the vast majority of contractors do make their books available on a voluntary basis when requested. Thus, this bill would affect that comparative few contractors who now refuse the agent of the Congress permission to see their records. It would be compulsory upon them. It seems logical to me to suppose that there is greater need for the GAO to see the records of those few who do not wish to make them available on a voluntary basis than it is to see the records of those who readily comply. To put it bluntly, those with nothing to hide have nothing to fear by opening their books to the General Accounting Office.

There has also been some indication of a feeling on the part of certain contractors that the General Accounting Office will come in to examine their books and records many years after their contracts have been completed. I am assured that such a fear is, likewise, groundless, and that modern accounting practices and an able staff of accountants and auditors have enabled the GAO to keep their general audit work current within a matter of months.

I want to point out, also, that the audit which GAO performs is directed primarily to the accounts of the accountable officers of the Government, and not to the contractors themselves. The GAO is required by law to take exceptions against accountable officers for erroneous or illegal payments. In 1947,

the Congress enacted a law which provided that in the absence of fraud, no exceptions could be taken by GAO in the accounts of accountable officers unless they were taken within 3 years of receipt of the account in the General Accounting Office. So, for all practical purposes, there would be little chance or occasion for GAO ever to request an inspection of contractors' books and records after this 3-year period.

Let me state very frankly that my main purpose in offering this bill was to place on the statute books a law which will act as a deterrent to improprieties in the negotiation of Government contracts. It would be impossible for GAO to inspect even a major part of the books and records of contractors having negotiated contracts with the Government.

The Comptroller General did not ask for this bill. Let me tell you how it came about. Authority for negotiating all types of contracts without advertising has not always been available to Government procurement officers. Normal peacetime procedures generally require competitive bidding, but during times of emergency procurement by negotiation becomes necessary. Authority to dispense with prior advertising during World War II was included in the provisions of the First War Powers Act of 1941. In the dying days of the last Congress extension of that act was under consideration by the House, and I proposed the inclusion of a practically identical provision in contracts affected under that law. My amendment to the First War Powers Act of 1941 was unanimously adopted. At that time I thought that most contracts negotiated without advertising during the present emergency would be consummated under that act. Subsequently, in the course of procurement studies being made by my Subcommittee on Government Operations, it was learned that procurement officers did not have to rely upon the First War Powers Act for negotiating contracts without advertising but could utilize provisions in the Armed Services Procurement Act, which act did not contain the provision now under consideration. In order to plug this loophole the bill before you was offered.

In normal times, competitive bidding generally operates as a brake on the price which a contractor can demand from the Government for his goods and services. However, these are not normal times, and it should be obvious to all of us concerned with the expenditure of billions of dollars for national defense that we must establish every reasonable safeguard against waste and extravagance in the spending of these vast sums. Under conditions as they now exist, competitive bidding has little or no effect upon contracts which are negotiated without advertising. As a result, when a contract is being negotiated, here is a typical illustration of what usually happens: A contractor with years of experience comes to the conference table accompanied by a highly competent accountant and equally competent lawyer. The Government representative on the other side of the table will, in a great majority of cases, be at a tremendous disadvantage, from the standpoint of both training and experience, no matter how conscientious and honest he may be. So, aside from any intentional liberality on the part of the Government contracting officer, there is every chance in the world that the Government will come out on the short end of the deal. This bill would at least enable the agent of the Congress to check the transaction, both from the Government records and the contractors' books.

I would like to mention one or two typical situations in which the authority of this bill would play an effective part. It is common practice today to provide in a contract for construction work a fixed overhead rate, either as a proportion of direct labor costs or as a lump sum amount. This figure is fixed as a binding obligation between the Government and the contractor. It is supposed to be based upon the experience of the contractor in performing similar work in the past.

If in the course of checking the accounts of the accountable officer, the GAO found a situation indicating that the amount of overhead charged under the Government contract was a great deal higher than the amount paid under a private contract for the same work, it would then obviously be desirable for the General Accounting Office to look behind the rate which had been established. Bear in mind that the GAO would not be able, under this bill even, to disturb in any way the overhead rate fixed by the parties themselves. But, if it should find that the rates were excessive, it could, and undoubtedly would, bring the facts to the attention of the contracting officer, and possibly in an extreme case, it might call attention of the Congress to the situation.

During the last war, there were cases where contractors held both fixed-price and cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts covering similar items or services, both contracts being performed simultaneously and in the same plant. In several cases it was found that the contractor was charging to the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract expenses which should have been charged to the fixed-price contract. In that way he was being reimbursed for expenses which should have been paid out of his own pocket. Such a practice may, or may not, have been intentional. But in any event, there would be little or no chance of detecting such a practice, unless the General Accounting Office has access to the contractors' books and records.

In certain contracts today there is inserted what is called a price-redetermination clause. Whenever the Government contracting officer is uncertain with respect to the price fixed in a negotiated contract, either by reason of the nature of the work to be performed or otherwise, he is required by regulation to insert this provision, which authorizes to a limited degree an increase or decrease in the price payable under the contract as the work progresses or after it has been completed. All too often, however, little or no detailed examination of the contractors' costs is made by the administrative official who undertakes to redetermine the price. Knowledge that the GAO may later examine these books and records cannot help but make for more careful operations by the Government's contracting officers.

Another vivid example of how this authority would enable the GAO to do an effective job involves a study which my Subcommittee on Government Operations has been making on pricing practices in the procurement of automotive parts. We found one situation where the Government was buying parts from an automobile dealer who, in turn, was getting them from a parts distributor who, in turn, was getting them from a small tool shop. Naturally, the price paid by the Government included profits upon profits and completely wasteful administrative and handling costs. It would be difficult, if not impossible, for GAO to detect such a situation without the right afforded in this bill.

In conclusion, I repeat that this bill does not add to the present audit authority of the General Accounting Office; it does not impair, in any way, the finality of renegotiation settlements; it does not affect any contractors who, heretofore, have been cooperative with the General Accounting Office with respect to making their books and records available; and it will not give a contractor's cost or price information to his competitors.

The major purposes of this bill are twofold: One, to give the Comptroller General the proper tools to do the job the Congress has instructed him to do; and, two, to provide a deterrent to improprieties and wastefulness in the negotiation of contracts.

Recalling again that a similar provision was added unanimously by the Congress to the First War Powers Act of 1941, I sincerely hope that this bill, which merely carries into our general procurement statutes the same principle, will, likewise, be unanimously approved.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am glad the gentleman made the statement he did, because I was a little bit concerned that it might have an effect on the Renegotiating Act which is now in effect. I might say that the Committee on Ways and Means is very much concerned about that act and its application at the present time. A special committee of the Committee on Ways and Means has been appointed to delve into the operation of that act and whether it will be a success as presently written. But, I am glad to see that the gentleman is also interested along the same line.

Now I would like to ask one question: Does this refer to contracts that have been made in the past?

Mr. HARDY. It could not refer to contracts that have been made in the past, because it requires the insertion of a clause in contracts.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I see. I notice that you give power to the Comptroller General.

Mr. HARDY. It does not give him power to inspect the books and records, but requires that a clause be inserted in the contracts permitting him to inspect.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Is it not true that this same language or practically the same language is contained in the Renegotiation Act that we have at the present time?

Mr. HARDY. Not in the Renegotiation Act. This same language is included in the War Powers Act, and it was incorporated in the War Powers Act in the closing days of the last Congress when the War Powers Act was up for extension.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. As my friend from Virginia knows, when this matter was on the Consent Calendar a few weeks ago I objected at that time to its passage because I had a question in my own mind as to whether or not this legislation might result in preventing the decision of the Renegotiation Board being final on renegotiation of these war contracts. Subsequent to that time I made a further study of the matter and I am thoroughly convinced in my own mind, especially so in the light of what the gentleman from Virginia said here on the floor today, that it will not at all disturb the finality of the decision of the Renegotiation Board. What the gentleman from Virginia and the committee, as I understand, are endeavoring to do, you are endeavoring to pursue a situation that may be fraudulent, for example, so that the General Accounting Office might look into that question, but not for the purpose of upsetting a decision made by the Renegotiation Board.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman is right, with this exception that I think should be clearly understood, that there are a lot of other situations besides those involving fraud which might be uncovered.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Virginia did not hear me perhaps. I said an example would be fraud.

Mr. HARDY. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Is the procedure that is proposed today with respect to the unadvertised contracts now in practice so far as advertised contracts are concerned?

Mr. HARDY. No. In an advertised contract there is a fixed price which is arrived at as the result of competitive bidding. Quite obviously there the only concern we have is in connection with supplying the item at that cost. But there is no competition in a negotiated contract.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. In other words, this will apply to the unadvertised contracts only?

Mr. HARDY. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. There is nothing in existing law that requires the insertion of such a clause in the advertised contracts?

Mr. HARDY. No; not in the advertised contracts.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is the requirement about the advertising of negotiated contracts?

Mr. HARDY. You do not advertise for a negotiated contract as a rule.

Mr. GROSS. Advertising, I say.

Mr. HARDY. Advertising has to do with contracts that are submitted in bid form.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but not all of them are advertised today?

Mr. HARDY. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. There is no requirement for advertising?

Mr. HARDY. Under the emergency provisions a contract can be negotiated without advertisement, and that is just the type of contract we are trying to deal with here.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. My basic question is this: Under contracts entered into apart from those connected with the emergency, is there a requirement for advertising or is there some discretion vested in the contracting officer?

Mr. HARDY. I do not know just what the gentleman means.

Mr. KEATING. I am uncertain what the law is on the subject of advertising for contracts, but normally, apart from any emergency provisions, does the ordinary contracting officer have to advertise, or does he have discretion?

Mr. HARDY. In normal times most contracts are advertised. There are a number of exceptions in which negotiation is permitted even in peacetime. In an emergency, the negotiated contracts are permissible because of the necessity for speed primarily.

Mr. KEATING. This legislation is directed primarily to those contracts which it is necessary to enter into because of emergency conditions?

Mr. HARDY. Primarily, that is the case, but it would still apply to other contracts in peacetime which are negotiated without advertising.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I would like to ask the question whether it would be well to have a provision which would limit the time so that a contractor might reasonably close his records after a period of, say, 3 years. I would like to offer an amendment to that effect.

Mr. HARDY. I do not think that is necessary for the reason that the General Accounting Office is primarily concerned with settling the accounts of the accountable officers of the Government, and it is restricted by law to a 3-year period with respect to disallowing any erroneous payments on the part of accountable officers. For that reason, I scarcely think that the General Accounting Office would come in, and want to examine the books of a contractor after a period in excess of 3 years.

Mr. BURTON. Would it not therefore be well to insert a brief amendment on page 2 reading something like this: "For a period of 3 years after the final settlement." That would not be restrictive to any extent on the legislation which is now pending and would enable a firm to know just what to expect and so close its records.

Mr. HARDY. I do not think that is necessary. I do not have any strong feeling about it and so far as I am personally concerned, it would be agreeable to me.

Mr. BURTON. If there is no objection, then I would like to submit such an amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question for my information?

Mr. HARDY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. When did we begin the practice of negotiated contracts? Was it during the Second World War?

Mr. HARDY. We have had that practice in effect over a long period of time during emergencies.

Mr. MURDOCK. But, it became prominent during the Second World War?

Mr. HARDY. During the Second World War, it became unusually prominent, I would say to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not a fact that about 64 percent of all the defense work today is on the basis of negotiated contracts?

Mr. HARDY. I am not certain of the figures; it sounds a little high, but it is a relatively high figure.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman a moment ago suggested an amendment limiting this to 3 years. Does the gentleman mean to say that he would subscribe to that in view of the great number of contracts that are going out on a negotiated basis, and in view of the inability of the Comptroller General to investigate these innumerable contracts. I should think it ought to be a 5-year proposition or a minimum of 5 years.

Mr. HARDY. The only basis upon which I would be willing to agree to such an amendment would be if it is within 3 years after the final settlement under the contract. I think it should be within 3 years after the final settlement under the contract if you are to provide any limitation at all, but personally I do not think that is necessary. A good many Members have spoken to me about that particular provision.

Mr KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. This legislation by its terms would be broad enough, I take it, to cover any contracts entered into with any foreign corporations in connection with construction overseas. For instance, in France, we have been told by various sources, there might be some skulduggery in connection with that.

Mr. HARDY. I think I know what is on the gentleman's mind. I will say to the gentleman that if there is anything wrong, the bill which is before the House is broad enough to cover those contracts.

The gentleman is anticipating the committee amendment that has to do with that particular point. The bill as written would be all-inclusive, and would not provide any exemption. There is a committee amendment which was adopted by the committee and which will be presented at the proper time.

Mr. KEATING. Which will restrict it?

Mr. HARDY. Which will provide authority for the head of a department to exempt a foreign contract, supplying goods or services overseas, if he finds it is necessary to do so in order to effect a procurement.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman think that is desirable, from the standpoint of the interest of the United States?

Mr. HARDY. Well, if you are overseas and you have to procure an item, and you cannot procure it without making that exception, I think the contracting officer should have that authority.

Mr. KEATING. I have been a procurement officer overseas, and although it may have interfered with my procurement, I think I would have welcomed such a provision as a protection to the United States taxpayers.

Mr. HARDY. I think it would be a protection, but at the same time it might be a strong deterrent to the procurement of an item which was necessary.

Mr. KEATING. That is probably true.

Mr. HARDY. Let me again remind you the major purposes of this bill are twofold. One is to give the Comptroller General the proper tools to do the job that Congress has instructed him to do. And second, it is to provide a deterrent to improprieties and wastefullness in negotiation of contracts. This Congress approved a similar amendment to the War Powers Act in the closing days of the last Congress unanimously. I hope we will approve this bill unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, the minority members on this side of the aisle have no objections to this bill. We feel it is a constructive piece of legislation.

The two amendments, one to the Federal Property Administration Act of 1941 and the other to the Armed Services Procurement Act giving certain authority to the General Accounting Office, are involved in this bill. This will permit the General Accounting Office to check the books of certain companies and ascertain whether or not there has been any fraud in overcharges. We are in agreement with that provision of the bill as it now stands. However, I do feel there will be objection on this side to an amendment that was suggested a moment ago by the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. HARDY] which would limit this provision to industries in our own country, or contractors in the United States or its Territories. We will take that up when the amendment is offered.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, some years ago it was my privilege to be in the position of vice chairman of a joint committee of the House and Senate, the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, in which some of these questions came up. I think the Committee on Expenditures, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Armed Services, jointly and severally, could save the Government a great deal of money if they would follow one of the recommendations of that board. That is, to bring about some uniformity in the bookkeeping that is required of the various contractors.

During World War II we found that it was necessary for them to keep four or five sets of books on practically every contract that they had in the factory. One of those sets of books, of course, was for the Securities and Exchange Commission in connection with their annual statement. Another was for the purpose of the Treasury Department, Bureau of Internal Revenue, which has its own rules and regulations as to how you set up books. Another one, of course, was for the Air Force. Another one was for the Navy, because they had different rules. If you want to save the Government some money, you can do away with a lot of time if the Ways and Means Committee, the Committee on Expenditures, and the Committee on Armed Services will get together and provide for a one-way set of books that can be kept for all purposes.

That will really save some money. If you do not believe it go into the offices of any of the big manufacturers handling defense contracts and look at the hundreds and hundreds, and even thousands of bookkeepers they have to have in order to try to keep things straight for all these different Government agencies; it is perfectly terrific, all very discouraging to the management of these companies because while they are bound to carry out their contracts, the General Accounting Office, of course, must decide as to whether or not a given expenditure is in accordance with law; then the Bureau of Internal Revenue will come along and say, "Well, while the GAO says it is all right, we say you cannot put it in for tax purposes." Then when it comes to the renegotiation of contracts there are various conceptions as to whether or not a specific item is allowable for purposes of renegotiation.

I want to tell you that a great many of these manufacturers came into the Aviation Policy Board I mentioned some time ago and practically tore the hair out of their heads trying to get us to bring some sense to this whole proceeding of miscellaneous bookkeeping. I think you can readily see how difficult it is for them to comply with the various rules and regulations of the various agencies of the Government and still avoid violation of either laws or regulations. Most of these people have no intention, specifically the old-line people, of going out and committing fraud; no reputable company of long standing in the United States is knowingly going to commit fraud against the United States. I think, however, you can understand that it takes not only a corps of accountants, four or five separate corps of accountants, but it takes a flock of lawyers along with each set of accountants to try to follow along and keep within the law as it respects this or that as laws and regulations affect bookkeeping. I hope the Committee on Expenditures of which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] is chairman, and the Ways and Means Committee, of which I see the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] here, and the Armed Services Committee can get together and save the Government a lot of money by doing away with the necessity for multiple systems of accounting. It would be a great boon not only to the country but a great saving to our country in the work that is being done in national defense.

Mr. Chairman, the recommendations of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board of the Eightieth Congress on this subject are as follows:

62. The National Military Establishment, in collaboration with the General Accounting Office and the Bureau of Internal Revenue should be directed (after examining the views of organizations capable of reflecting industry's difficulties under present accounting practices) to establish a single set of rules applying to audit and determination of costs under contracts of the National Military Establishment, and in agreement with the General Accounting Office, prescribe the normal time for completing the audit and the issuance of a suitable certificate or other form of final clearance (except for fraud).

There exist three different Government regulations under which costs of Government contracts are determined They emanate separately from the Army, Navy, Bureau of Internal Revenue, and General Accounting Office.

The decisions of the Comptroller General often place an entirely different interpretation on what constitutes allowable costs. No manual is available to contractors outlining basis for decisions. Such decisions are given after the cost has been incurred; disallowances are retroactive in effect, penalizing the contractor.

Resulting complications make it desirable to establish a definitive uniform policy with respect to costs and expenses allowable under Government contracts, eliminating different interpretations by three Government agencies.

Proper function of General Accounting Office should be a review of settlement procedure and final audit, rather than duplication of audit and administrative interpretation of contracts.

The cost-plus-fixed-fee contract must continue for highly technical research and long-range developments, cost of which cannot be predetermined for bid purposes under fixed-price contracts, but the contracting agency should be able to change objectives and methods of performance for such contracts to meet changes in military needs occuring as effort progresses.

All companies must subject themselves to audit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue for income-tax assessment. The taxpayer can be best served if other procurement agencies of Government (Army, Navy, and Air Force) agree to accept the principles of the Internal Revenue Code for determination of allowable costs.

63. The Congress should enact legislation authorizing contract termination procedure for peacetime procurement, similar to the procedure provided for in the Contract Settlement Act of 1944.

The Contract Settlement Act of 1944 permitted the Government to accomplish an outstanding task in terminating and liqui-

dating of World War II commitments. So far as the aircraft manufacturing industry is concerned, it is believed that those commitments were thoroughly and efficiently settled. Without new legislation, industry will return to the confused legal situation which existed between World War I and World War II. In that period question prevailed as to whether any settlement by agreement could be made, or, if made, could withstand the General Accounting Office rulings.

Present joint procurement regulations of the Air Force and Army provide for a so-called formula settlement of contracts. Formula settlements were tried prior to enactment of the Contract Settlement Act and found unsatisfactory both to industry and the services. The only effect of the formula is to predetermine percentage and amount of profit to be allowed on the termination portion. This is rarely a source of disagreement. Real source of disagreement and, therefore, of delay and possible litigation is almost always the question of whether certain items of cost are applicable. Under a formula settlement, or any settlement procedure other than negotiation, there develops strong tendency to excessive detail over the many thousands of items of cost going into claims. As a result, there are often differences of opinion.

Validity of a negotiated termination agreement is comparable to that of a negotiated procurement contract. Insofar as contracts for aeronautical equipment are concerned, it is desirable that negotiation be recognized as a usual means of Government contracting and settlement of Government obligations.

Authority to negotiate final settlement is particularly important insofar as industry's subcontractor and supplier claims are concerned Unless the prime contractor is certain the settlement he negotiates is final, he will delay settlements with subcontractors.

Provisions should be made for immediate partial payments on termination claims. This is a financial necessity to both prime and subcontractors: first, because of the large values involved in many prime contracts in relation to the contractor's working capital, second, because in the preliminary stages of preparing a termination claim, supporting material is not in shape to be readily acceptable as collateral for a commercial banking loan

Many contractors are working with minimum floor space. There is also considerable responsibility and liability connected with storage, preservation and accounting for raw material, equipment, semifinished parts, and other inventory items supporting a termination claim It is important that Government-owned property be removed from facilities at earliest date.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the Mutual Security Act one of our colleagues who advocated the passage of the bill stated that the figures in the bill meant nothing. I want to point out just how accurate this statement was in view of the testimony of Charles Wilson and Manly Fleischmann Friday, October 12, 1951, before the joint Senate and House Small Business and Banking and Currency Committees.

First let us review the appropriations this House has voted for military expenditures on top of the funds previously appropriated and unexpended.

The carry-over for the Defense Department is $37,000,000,000.

We just voted an additional $57,000,000,000.

For military construction we just voted $5,000,000,000.

For foreign military aid—which I must remind everyone comes out of our production, the dollars are merely the measure of what production we give—$6,000,000,000,

Unspent moneys for foreign military aid previously appropriated, $4,780,000,000.

Unspent counterpart funds which could be used for military spending, $2,400,000,000.

A total of $112,180,000,000.

Now some of this will not be spent for production from our factories. Some will go for salaries, transportation and other items. However, by far the greater proportion will and is supposed to go for items which our factories will produce. I would like to know what the estimates on this are? It is interesting to note that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] states that the estimates of the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget are that only about $40,000,000,000 of their $95,000,000,000 can be spent during the current fiscal year.

The other money is required for long lead time items, which will not be delivered and, therefore, will not be paid for during the current fiscal year (p. 12687, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Friday, October 5, 1951).

Mr. Wilson in his testimony referred to said:

> During the period from June 1950 to October 1951 we quadrupled the quarterly rate of military deliveries To reach our peaks we must double that rate We must go from $5,000,000,000 of quarterly deliveries to a rate of $10,000,000,000 per quarter. Counting all of the goods in process which do not show as completed deliveries, I would estimate that we are now using materials for military goods at a rate near $8,000,000,000 per quarter.
>
> I believe we can reach our deliveries peak on schedule early in 1953 If we do, it will bring us $50,000,000,000 worth of military goods per year which I outlined as an objective nearly a year ago.

In other words the best we can produce from our factories in the current fiscal year is about $30,000,000,000 worth of goods for the military, yet we have appropriated around $100,000,000,000. The next year the best we will do is around $40,000,000,000. Then by the third fiscal year we will be up to $50,000,000,000. In other words two and probably three sessions of Congress will have met and adjourned before the moneys we have appropriated will be used up.

What is the result of this hasty action upon the part of the Congress? Mr. Fleischmann, testifying right after Mr. Wilson, told us the result In answering certain questions Mr. Fleischmann said, "Oh, we screen the military's demands." When asked what this meant he said we list only the "real" needs of the military, first.

In other words the Congress by failing to study and find out what the "real" needs of the military are has by default permitted Mr. Fleischmann and others in the executive branch to perform this task.

Actually, by voting these vast sums of money which have no relationship to the reality of what our national production is capable of we have merely said to the Military Establishment, "Buy anything and everything you want, foolishly, extravagantly and then keep the change." The change being of course double the amount the limits of our production will permit them to spend.

Not only has this Congress by its actions of appropriating these vast and unrealistic sums of money earned itself the epithet of rubber stamp, but it has also set a course to violate the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

What wisdom our founding forefathers had. How farseeing they were. Yet even their cold words set out beyond equivocation are disregarded.

Under section 8, article I, of the Constitution—section 133, House Rules and Manual—it states under the powers of Congress as follows:

> To raise and support armies, but no appropriations of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years

The wisdom behind this constitutional provision arose from a knowledge of history where time and again the military organizations in a society bled the society white at a time of emotional crisis when the society became either fearful of its existence or wild with desires of conquest. Yes, I would say it is wise to vote as much money as we can use for our defense for this year and the next, perhaps. But let us assume that next year and the year after the Congress then meeting will have the wisdom to take the next logical step. It may be that their wisdom will be a little greater, being more removed from these hysterical days.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, there being no further requests for time, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and Mr. COOPER having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. BATTLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2574) to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, had directed him to report that the Committee had come to no resolution thereon.

MOUNT OLIVET CEMETERY ASSOCIATION, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3954) to authorize the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, to grant and convey to Salt Lake City, Utah, a portion of the lands heretofore granted to such association by the United States, which is on the Speaker's table.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, this bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It was placed on the Consent Calendar, but was not reached today. It has been cleared with the leadership on both sides and there is no objection to it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is simply an exchange of land for cemetery purposes?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right. It would permit the transfer of about 2 acres for another public purpose while retaining the remainder of the 50 acres for cemetery purposes. All local interests have agreed and are satisfied.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, is hereby authorized to grant and convey to Salt Lake City, a municipal corporation of the State of Utah, the unrestricted fee-simple title to a tract of land situated in the southwest corner of the Mount Olivet Cemetery, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the southwest corner of the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association property (said point being one hundred feet north of the original southwest corner of the Fort Douglas Military Reservation, and in the north line of Sunnyside Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah); running thence north no degrees no minutes twenty-eight seconds east along the west line of the cemetery property three hundred sixty-two and sixty-seven one-hundredths feet; thence southeasterly along a six hundred eighty-nine and fifty one-hundredths feet radius curve to the right, tangent to which bears south sixty-five degrees seven minutes seven seconds east a distance of two hundred eighty and twenty-two one-hundredths feet to a point of reverse curve; thence along a six hundred ten and fifteen one-hundredths feet radius curve to the left, tangent to which bears south forty-one degrees forty-nine minutes fifty-nine seconds east, a distance of four hundred twenty-five and ninety-one one-hundredths feet to a point in the south line of the cemetery property which is the north line of Sunnyside Avenue, thence south eighty-nine degrees fifty-nine minutes fifty seconds west along said line five hundred ninety-one and fifty-eight one-hundredths feet to a point of beginning, containing two and eighteen one-hundredths acres.

The reversion or reverter to the United States if such land shall cease to be used as a cemetery for the burial of the dead is, as to the tract of land described in the first sentence, hereby waived This act shall not alter or affect Mount Olivet Cemetery Association's ownership of, or its rights and privileges with respect to, the remainder of the lands heretofore granted to it by the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEPHEN FOSTER MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 308, authorizing the President to proclaim January 13 of each year as Stephen Foster Memorial Day.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas Stephen Collins Foster has become a national expression of democracy through his clear and simple embodiment of American tradition in his world-famous lyrics; and

Whereas Stephen Collins Foster was signally honored by being the first musician elected to the National Hall of Fame in New York City, and

Whereas the following States have honored Stephen Collins Foster in the construction of memorials: Pennsylvania—Foster Hall, University of Pittsburgh; Indiana—Lilly Hall, Indianapolis, Michigan—Ford Village, Dearborn, Kentucky—Old Kentucky Home, Bardstown, and Florida—Stephen Foster Memorial, on the Suwannee River at White Springs; and

Whereas the songs of Stephen Collins Foster belong to the people and are the musical essence of democracy, so that he is now recognized as the father of American folk music and the true interpreter of the fundamental spirit of music; and

Whereas Stephen Collins Foster symbolizes in his works the unity of mankind through music; and

Whereas the National Federation of Music Clubs at its biennial convention in Salt Lake City, Utah, on May 13, 1951, and the Florida Federation of Music Clubs at Miami, Fla., on April 10, 1951, have endorsed and joined with the Florida Stephen Foster Memorial Corporation's request for the designation of January 13, the day on which the spirit of his music became immortal, as Stephen Foster Memorial Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized to issue a proclamation designating January 13 of each year as Stephen Foster Memorial Day, and calling upon the people throughout the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies, pilgrimages to his shrines, and musical programs featuring his compositions

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1038) relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Smithsonian Institution and its constituent bureaus, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, lines 2 and 3, strike out "one or more of the daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia" and insert "the Federal Register."

Page 3, line 14, strike out "public."

Page 3, line 16, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

Page 3, line 17, strike out "ten" and insert "five."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain these amendments?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, these are amendments to a bill giving police authority to the guards at the Smithsonian Institution. Such authority was given in the case of the Library of Congress in a bill passed during the last Congress.

The amendments provide that instead of having the regulations published in one or more daily papers to have them published in the Federal Register. There are two other amendments, one of which decreases the maximum fine from $10,000 to $5,000 and the maximum terms of imprisonment from 10 years to 5 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS R CHADBOURNE

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R 971) for the relief of Louis R Chadbourne, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out all after "Massachusetts", down to and including "1945" in line 10, and insert "a sum equal to the amount he would have received as retirement pay from the date of his release from active duty to March 1, 1949, had he been retired on the date of his release from active duty, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for such pay."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, FINAL REPORT, RECORD, AND FORECAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, since my first report on this session to the people of my district we have begun to see more clearly the sacrifices which will be called for to maintain our national security, peace, and free institutions.

FOREIGN POLICY

During the past months the American people have been called upon again to make a great decision. The character of the negotiations for a cease-fire in Korea and the impossible claims for propaganda purposes made by the Communist Chinese and North Koreans have

compelled us alternatively to break off and resume negotiations. Though these have been hard decisions the people have supported Gen. Ridgway, confident in the fact that in dealing with the Communists we must neither be misled nor frustrated by chicanery or delay and judge the situation only on the facts. There is expectation of a cease-fire in Korea and we want one. We must also be fully prepared to move in any direction required by the situation.

The people have just backed a large mutual security program ($7,300,000,000) both of military and economic assistance, and finally have noted a signal victory for our foreign policy in the overwhelming approval of the peace treaty with Japan at San Francisco with 46 countries for and only 3 Communist countries against signing this treaty. Equally important is the fact that seven countries of south and southeast Asia joined the other free nations in approving the Japanese Peace Treaty, and that the efforts of the Soviet bloc to obstruct and delay were suppressed with the overwhelming support of the nations represented at the conference.

Our major foreign problem aside from repelling the aggression by force, continues to be to head off or counteract internal subversion. Here we are constantly challenged by the fact that a great deal of social and economic reform is needed in depressed areas and yet is difficult to attain under existing conditions. Education, economic reconstruction and development and technical aid can form the seedbed for domestic changes in such areas. We must do all we can to eliminate conditions of oppression and injustice and to bring about conditions of hope, improvement and justice.

FAR EAST

The Far East continues with Germany to be the focal point of the Communist drive at the moment.

The struggle in Korea is at least as important as any struggle we have ever undertaken for it represents an effort to keep the peace against aggression before a major war can start and therefor to discourage those who are playing with the idea of aggressive war. I remain opposed to the admission of Communist China to the United Nations and joined in introducing H. Con. Res. 231 on June 6 declaring that this in no case must be the price of a Korean ceasefire and also calling for the popular choice of a government on Formosa, now the seat of the Republic of China.

The participation of other United Nations forces in the Korean fighting—aside from the valiant South Koreans—is still limited though British, Australian, Greek, Turkish, and Puerto Rican forces have made great contributions. But we must remember that most of the United Nations are still fighting towering economic difficulties which we are trying to help them with, are preparing their own defenses against communism as in Western Europe—NATO—and that at least one, France, is fighting a full-scale war against the Communists in Indochina.

Our far-eastern policy continues to require concentration upon a mutual-defense arrangement for the whole Pacific area—a Pacific pact—and upon an economic-development program for the whole area—a Far East recovery program. Steps toward the Pacific Pact have already been taken by the mutual-defense agreements concluded between the United States and the Philippine Republic, with Australia and New Zealand and with the new post-treaty Japan. Now all the other free people in the Far East—Indochina, Malaya, Thailand, Burma, India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Afghanistan—need to be tied together for their mutual defense in a suitable defense compact. The Mutual Security Act for this fiscal year provides $237,500,000 for economic aid alone and $535,250,000 for military aid in this area. This is the beginning of an economic development and military-aid program but still does not get the benefit of organized self-help and mutual cooperation among the far-eastern states themselves. This is a result which I believe we must continue to seek to attain.

India remains a difficult factor in this area, having abstained from signing the Japanese Peace Treaty but I believed the recent United States food aid to India of $190,000,000 which I helped to sponsor has done much good. India belongs with the free peoples and will aline herself with them despite the vicissitudes of the hour. The important point is to maintain the stability of constitutional government there.

EUROPE

Real progress is being made in the defense of Europe through the Atlantic Pact but much remains to be done and every effort is being made to stir up the laggards. The Mutual Security Act for this fiscal year carries $5,028,000,000 for military and $1,022,000,000 for economic aid to Europe Europe's problem is not manpower for defense but military equipment for its manpower. Such equipment is just beginning to flow over there. It is openly and widely considered that the next few years are the most dangerous for Europe. The answer is not, therefore, to quit but rather to accelerate our preparations and to try to bring the objective date nearer. It is for this reason that I have supported so actively the whole mutual-security program. We are now emphasizing military aid 5 to 1—by the figures—and ending the European recovery Program (Marshall plan). I believe we must do what we are doing on military aid, but that we cannot afford to cut so much on economic aid as to lay open great underdeveloped areas of the free world to Communist propaganda.

GERMANY

A resolution has passed the Congress ending the state of war with Germany. I voted "present" on this resolution in order to lend point to my warnings to my colleagues that it was premature. I urged that we be more sure than we are about what part the people of West Germany will play in the defense of Europe, how they will deal with the surge of former Nazi elements into high positions in government, business, and society, the controls they will exercise over the shipment of strategic materials behind the iron curtain from West Germany and the extent to which justice would prevail in restitution and indemnification to the victims of Hitler, thousands of whom are now American citizens. Gen. Eisenhower summed up the position that I have advocated on the German question when he spoke of "an earned equality on the part of that nation," in his address before the Members of Congress in February.

I shall continue this policy of vigilance with respect to Germany with full recognition of the enormous part Germany can play in the economic and defensive power of Europe. I am anxious to see granted on a reciprocal basis all powers which are earned by the German people. There is much discussion of unification between West and East Germany but knowing Communist chicanery as we do we cannot permit the understandable desire of Germans for unification to be used as a bargaining point by the Soviets to make the whole of Germany a satellite state. The unification of Germany cannot be isolated from other West-East issues.

NEAR EAST AND ISRAEL

The defense of this area is vital to the national security of the United States. It is vulnerable because of the feudal social conditions which are rife through the area, the high rates of illiteracy, depressed economic conditions, fanatical leadership in high places, and low state of health which prevails. It is also very attractive to the Communists because it has enormous oil resources. The failure of Great Britain and Iran to agree on oil and Egypt's defiance of the United Nations Security Council and struggle with Britain on the Suez Canal and Sudan shows the great conflict in this area.

The admission of Greece and Turkey, with their effective and strong military defenses, into the Atlantic Pact establishes the basis for defense of this area. Israel is the hard core of defense and democracy in the other areas of the Near East. She is having tremendous difficulty absorbing an immigration which has already almost doubled her population in only 3 years. Accordingly I supported and worked for economic assistance to Israel which was just granted in the Mutual Security Act in the sum of $50,000,000 for refugee aid and a shared part of $160,000,000 for economic development in the whole Near East area, including also the Arab States. I have also supported and worked for equivalent aid for the Arab refugees and Arab people recognizing that the Near East is a unit. Our first object in this area must be peace between Israel and the Arab States and mutual development. We will gain it only by constructive action and not by being intimidated into doing injustice to Israel by Arab fanaticism.

IRELAND

The Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, reported favorably at long last the Fogarty resolution seeking Irish unification. When brought up for consideration the House of Representatives refused consideration though I spoke for and voted for it. I believe

the text of the resolution did not suit the House and this requires a new effort as the basic sentiment is, I believe, in sympathy with Irish unification as being in our best tradition.

OTHER FOREIGN POLICY SITUATIONS

The release of Robert Vogeler, a United States citizen, who had been imprisoned by the Communist Hungarian government, showed that the Communist governments are susceptible to world opinion and to countermeasures. I fought for Mr. Vogeler and was very gratified by his release. He is a living witness of the implacable cruelty of Communist dictatorship. In conjunction with the successful efforts to free Robert Vogeler, I continued to work for the release of Cardinal Mindszenty and the cardinal's successor, Archbishop Groesz, for whose release I sponsored a resolution of protest (H. Res 325).

The problem of Spain has proved a very trying one, particularly in view of the aid given to Yugoslavia, a Communist country, while Spain is a Falangist country, both dictatorships. Aid to Spain is thought to be justified on the basis of her strategic position and military assistance. These must be weighed against the active opposition of the Western European allies upon whom we heavily rely in the NATO, particularly Great Britain and France. Spain should be first passed on for admission into the Council of Europe at Strasbourg and the Organization for European Economic Cooperation and that is the basis upon which proper terms can be made with Spain for any aid to be extended.

PRICES AND CONTROLS

Amendments to the price-and-wage control law were adopted in July. These weakened rather than strengthened the law, in my view. Agricultural prices, underlying the cost of food, continued to receive preferential treatment in price stabilization. I sought to freeze agricultural prices the same as other prices, but without success. Other amendments are giving guaranteed profit margins to distributors and to manufacturers and special provisions embargoing the import of fats and oils, cheese and other dairy products introduce new elements of inflation in the price-control situation. The failure of efforts to roll back the prices of meat to the consumer by 10 percent and to impose quotas on slaughterers to control black markets in meat, both of which efforts I supported, further discourage the outlook for strong price and wage stabilization.

I am convinced that working people would be glad to hold the wage line if the price line were held, but are prevented from doing so by the weak price controls. I shall continue my fight for a strong and effective control program.

The Consumer's Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics is now at an all-time high of 186 (1935–49=100) with an index figure of 227 for foods. This is the most disturbing sign of inflation danger ahead on our domestic horizon and demands urgent correction.

RENT CONTROL AND HOUSING

I stated in my previous report that I consider New York State rent control as giving greater protection than the people of New York could get under the present or any Federal rent control law likely to be enacted currently. This is proved in the extension of the Federal rent-control law.

Decontrol of areas (except for military defense areas) was not only made easier but a new rent increase factor was introduced permitting landlords to get 120 percent of their 1947 rents with a credit for voluntary rent increases taken by the tenant other than for increased services since that time. This is in addition to the fair net operating income rent increase formula which still continues in the Federal rent control law and has resulted in widespread rent increases.

I was successful in carrying over in substance my maintenance of services amendment in these new Federal rent-control provisions which has been responsible for blocking many improper rent increases.

My congressional rent clinics continue to function throughout our district in accordance with the published schedule, under the chairmanship of Hyman W. Sobell, Esq., and serviced by the volunteer lawyers who are doing such fine work on rent problems without charge.

The publicly assisted low-rent housing program for which I fought in 1949 called for the construction of 135,000 public-housing units a year for 6 years Due to materials shortages resulting from defense mobilization the President recommended a cut to 75,000 of such units for the coming year and congressional committees cut it to 50,000 units. By an unexpected and untimely move it was further cut in the House of Representatives to only 5,000 units. The essential minimum for New York City alone was 15,000 units for the year 1951–52. After an extended and spirited struggle, featured by a splendid mass meeting in the city council chamber of New York (which I had the privilege of addressing), we were successful in restoring the 50,000 unit figure for this fiscal year. This should allow 10,000 units for our city which, though far from adequate, is yet gratifying as compared with the prospects but a short time ago.

ARMED SERVICES

The main problem has arisen in connection with the handling of reservists. It has been felt that the armed services have called many of such men without due regard for family or economic obligations or, in some cases, fitness for service. Also, it was alleged that no assignments for many in which they were really needed were available. Finally, the policy on reservists retention had been very unsettled despite the provisions in the draft law calling for the release from duty of reservists after 17 months of service unless retention is demanded in the national interest. The law has now been amended to provide for mandatory release for reservist enlisted men in 16 months if they have served a year or more in World War II, but the 17-months service still obtains for Reserve officers recalled to duty with 24 months for those in recalled organized units.

I have helped many reservists and their families with these problems and will continue to do so.

I testified before the committee considering the Armed Forces Reserve Act, just passed, urging that adequate consideration be given in recall and release to dependency status, hardship and reserve status.

The new law creates Ready, Standby, and Retired Reserves. Only the first group is subject to call-up in emergencies declared by the President; the others, only in the event of war. Into the Ready Reserve will go those in organized units and draftees who have served for 2 years; the latter will remain in Ready Reserve for 6 years, which may be shortened to 3 years by satisfactory training with an organized unit. Four-year enlistees would pass directly into the Standby Reserve. Anyone who had served 1 year in World War II and 1 year in the Korean action would be transferred into the Standby Reserve as would those who have served 8 years in a reserve component since September 2, 1945.

The problem of citizenship for aliens serving in the Armed Forces is important. Three years service is now required to make an alien eligible, while only 90 days service was required during World War II. I am doing my utmost to get this period reduced.

The West Point expulsion scandal has shocked all Americans. High character on the part of our professional military leaders is vital to national defense and national morale. No cadet involved was appointed from our district. I feel that all cases of this character should be considered individually and on their merits without wholesale condemnation or clearance.

The contemplated size of our Armed Forces remains the same—3,500,000—and efforts are now going forward to determine its adequacy to the problems of modern defense in terms of air power and atomic weapons. These may well have a most constructive effect on the size of the Armed Forces we need, their cost and effectiveness. I shall support full modernization of the armed services.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

I have supported civilian defense which I consider to be vital to effective national defense and have also worked for efforts to get Federal help to construct underground parking garages so important to New York, which could be used as defense shelters. The House of Representatives recently cut civilian-defense appropriations by 85 percent—cuts which I strongly opposed. I shall continue this fight to get adequate civilian defense; otherwise our civilian population is dangerously vulnerable to atomic and other new weapons.

VETERANS

Bills were passed recently in the House of Representatives increasing benefits for disabled veterans and their dependents and also widows and survivors' and beneficiaries' pensions. In addition allowable earnings for beneficiaries were increased but these bills have not yet had favorable action in the Senate. I supported also a bill to provide an in-

crease in compensation from $65 to $120 a month for veterans over 65 with nonservice-connected disability and requiring an attendant. The President vetoed this bill but it was passed over his veto.

I am supporting legislation to extend GI educational benefits to children of World War II veterans killed in action; also to extend to veterans of the conflict in Korea the same benefits under the GI bill as those enjoyed by World War II veterans.

I joined others of my colleagues in an effort to prevent the Veterans' Administration regional office in New York dealing with national life insurance and death claims from being moved to Philadelphia.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Since my last report the fight for the elimination of segregation and discrimination in the armed services has been marked by a major success—the elimination of all segregated units abroad. Although segregation has been eliminated in many camps in the United States, it still persists in some. The effort to abolish it universally continues.

The House rejected recently my amendment to prohibit segregation and discrimination in community facilities in defense housing, but I am endeavoring to secure these provisions through administrative means. I was compelled to vote against a bill to help communities with defense installations to meet their added school problems for the same reason—segregated schools—though it was a measure I would otherwise have supported.

A major defect in the Internal Security Act—the McCarran Act—was the prohibition of entry into this country of persons who as children were forced to affiliate themselves with Nazi, Communist, and similar organizations in order to stay alive. This overstringent provision was keeping out some worth-while potential citizens. The law was relaxed recently to permit the entry of those in this category. It demonstrated what I had contended about this act when I opposed it—that it is unnecessarily strict for any legitimate objective.

BUDGET AND TAXES

For the current fiscal year $57,200,000,000 is being appropriated directly for the armed services plus an additional amount of approximately $17,500,000,000 for other national and mutual security programs and the Korean conflict. Other Government programs, including veterans' benefits will require about $20,000,000,000 in appropriations. Actual expenditures, however, for all these purposes will probably be about $68,400,000,000 in the current fiscal year 1951–52.

Our people wish to be on a pay-as-we-go basis for defense mobilization. With the national debt at $257,386,206,535—$1,659 per capita—this certainly seems only fair to our children and to our country's future.

The President had suggested a total of $10,000,000,000 in new income taxes and the closing of tax loopholes. The House-passed tax bill proposed to raise $7,200,000,000. The compromise tax bill passed will raise an estimated $5,700,000,000 and is made up as follows: An increase in personal income taxes of generally 11¾ percent of existing rates (11 percent for taxable incomes of $2,000 or less), which will cause normal withholding to be 20 percent instead of 18 percent as at present; corporate income taxes are generally increased from 47 percent to 52 percent; the percentage used for computation of excess-profits taxes is increased from 62 percent to 70 percent and the base on which figured is raised; and additional excise taxes are imposed on liquor, gasoline, cigarettes, and certain electrical appliances, while such items as baby oil and admissions to civic and community concerts, including the Metropolitan Opera, are exempt from excise tax.

Persons over 65 can claim an exemption on their income taxes for all medical expenses up to a limit of $2,500 a person or $5,000 for each married couple. Persons who qualify as single heads of households can receive half of the income-splitting benefits now authorized for married persons. Corporation taxes are to be levied on mutual-savings banks and building and loan associations after interest payments to depositors and 12-percent reserves, as well as on undistributed, unallocated income of nonexempt farm purchasing and marketing cooperatives. The Congress rejected a 20-percent withholding tax on dividends, interest payments, and royalties.

I endeavored to have included in the tax-increase bill my measures—H. R. 1284 and 2818—to equalize the tax burden on those on retirement pensions, with those receiving social security by granting a $2,000 exemption and by giving the physically handicapped the same additional $600 exemption now extended to the blind. However, the Committee on Ways and Means rejected these proposals on the ground that they were only considering ways to increase revenue.

A great many people have written me about economy in Government and keeping nondefense expenditures to an essential minimum. I have supported large cuts in rivers and harbors, conservation payments, and agricultural price support appropriations which would have saved hundreds of millions of dollars. I am not supporting cuts to deprive us of needed medical research, public health, or veterans' services or to jeopardize fair treatment for post office and other Federal employees. I believe this is false economy and these savings are meager compared with what could be saved where economy is justified. I do not consider armed-services appropriations inviolate and I propose that demonstrated waste and inefficiency in these appropriations too should show in cuts.

OLDER WORKERS AND SOCIAL SECURITY

On July 9, I introduced the National Act Against Age Discrimination in Employment to deal with the problem of older workers. It seeks to prevent discrimination in hiring of workers over 45 due to age. The bill has aroused an enormous interest in the country and I have pursued it diligently with respect to the hiring practices of the local governments and the Federal Government. I have also demanded that the Defense Mobilizer, the National Production Administration, and other defense agencies give special attention to employment of older workers.

No action has been taken on increasing social-security benefits or extending the system further as it covers today only about one-half of the American people. I believe that this situation will and should be corrected.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

In order to reduce the Post Office's $500,000,000 deficit at a time of unprecedented budgets and to cover increased costs of operation, increases in postal rates calculated to raise $117,000,000 are being made. The increase for postal cards is 2 cents, and for second- and third-class mails (newspapers, periodicals, and advertising, but not books) is 30 percent at 10 percent a year and an increase to 1½ cents per item, respectively.

During the debate on the measure to increase postage rates, I attempted to insert an amendment providing for the restoration of the postal services curtailed last year, but unfortunately this move did not succeed. I will, however, continue my fight for adequate postal services. I am also endeavoring to secure enlarged post office facilities for our community as many of the present post offices are undersized and overtaxed.

Legislation to increase the pay of post office workers generally by a flat $400 per annum and to eliminate the first two automatic grades has been passed, and the pay of classified civil-service workers has been raised 10 percent, with a minimum of $300 and a maximum of $800. I supported this legislation vigorously for workers who have only the Government to look to for justice. The amount of the increase is even now not adequate to deal with the cost of living but it will help.

Graduated leave is replacing the other leave provisions for post office and civil-service workers, with a minimum of 13 days for those who have served up to 3 years and a maximum of 26 days for those who have served over 15 years. Sick leave is fixed at 13 days annually.

Other civil-service problems relate to the need of increased retirement benefits for civil-service workers and the freeze on permanent appointments or promotions. I shall do all I can to help resolve these problems favorably to the Federal employees affected.

LABOR

Workers as the best example of the benefits inherent in the American system are extremely important to the defense effort. Their presence on defense mobilization agencies at home and in our diplomatic and economic agencies overseas is an important element in our strength. It should be encouraged in every way.

I opposed the amendment to the price and wage control legislation which sought to reduce the position of labor on the Wage Stabilization Board as I consider the equal tripartite representation of management, labor, and the public to be essential to the hopes of labor-management cooperation.

The Railroad Retirement Act was amended increasing payments to pensioners and annuitants by 15 percent and to survivors by 33⅓ percent.

In the closing days of the session, Congress enacted a labor-supported amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act to dispense with union shop elections and to legalize certain union shop agreements made necessary by a recent Supreme Court decision.

IMMIGRATION

In an article published in the New York Times Sunday magazine (July 8, 1951) and later condensed and reprinted in the Catholic Digest (September 1951) I outlined a plan to provide for the admission of alien workers possessing skills needed in the United States, with a priority for the surplus working force of those European nations cooperating in the European Recovery and Mutual Security Programs. To implement this plan I sponsored the Selective Immigration Act of 1951. Domestic unemployment is down to the almost irreducible minimum in our defense mobilization program and several million additional workers will be needed in the next few years Strategic balance with the population of the Soviet Union in the next 20 years requires a better immigration policy.

MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES

Disquieting revelations of corruption in Government and of slackness in the moral and ethical standards of officials have been coming out in volume. So, too, have charges and countercharges about Communist influences in Government. First, we should be clear that the great mass of Government officials are unaffected and function as loyal public servants Second, while casting the rotten apples out of the barrel and supporting all legitimate investigations we should be careful to apply the time-honored safeguards of our society that no one is guilty until so proven and that punishment—swift and severe when merited—should follow, not precede, such proof

I have dealt with community problems concerning improvement of schools and playgrounds, traffic conditions, abatement of nuisances and the incidence of crimes of violence. In the latter, I have had the full cooperation of the police authorities of the Thirtieth and Thirty-fourth precincts. The correction of conditions is not easy but close cooperation between good citizens, public officials, and the police authorities can do much to help. Crime cannot stand up against an aroused community.

Conservation of national resources is vital to our survival and our future. I opposed the tidelands bill which passed the House of Representatives granting the offshore oil reserves to the States, as I believe only in the Federal establishment can they be made to serve best the people's interest.

Administration of the antitrust laws does not seem to have done much to preserve and develop small business while big business has developed its size and productivity. Accordingly, I have joined with Senator MORSE, of Oregon to introduce legislation for a national commission to review the antitrust laws.

My campaign to get Americans to vote has continued. We cannot afford a society where only 40 percent of eligible Americans normally vote in congressional elections and only 50 percent in Presidential elections I am also working toward the same end through my efforts to get broadcasting and televising of major debates in the Congress.

CONCLUSION

At a time of world crisis we have cause for deep concern yet the strength of our country and the character of our people give us real reason for optimism. In the days ahead we shall be sustained and we shall succeed because our free institutions are deeply imbedded in our hearts and we continue to have abiding faith in the human values.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

VETERANS LEGISLATION AND ADJOURNMENT

Mrs ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I really rise to ask what the program is for the week and what the possibility or probability of adjournment is I personally am not anxious to adjourn until certain legislation is passed, and I shall do everything in my power to prevent it, if I can, until this legislation, which has passed, is signed by the President And I hope the other Members will also.

Mr. PRIEST. The majority leader is not present on the floor at the moment, and, of course, I cannot tell the gentlewoman, as much as I wish that I might, when we will adjourn. We plan to adjourn when we finish our program and, as far as bills that are already at the White House awaiting Presidential signature, the program of the Congress, of course, is not dependent upon that particular situation We just intend to adjourn when we finish this program, and that is the most definite answer I can give to the gentlewoman at this time. We are moving along pretty well today, and if we keep going at this pace we ought to finish the program rather shortly.

Mrs ROGERS of Massachusetts Does the gentleman have any idea whether the bills at the White House will be signed by the President or not?

Mr. PRIEST I am sorry to say to the gentlewoman that I do not have any idea on that particular subject.

Mrs ROGERS of Massachusetts. You see, Mr. Speaker, I am greatly disturbed that our veterans legislation is so late in being passed. I think some three or four bills were signed by the President on Saturday. There is a bill for the cruelly disabled, the amputees, the blind, the paraplegics, that is still on his desk. The information has not gone out, but I believe the President will sign the bill. He vetoed it 2 years ago and I think he vetoed it because of recommendations from a man who did not understand it. I find a great many do not understand the legislation. It costs only a few millions. We sent $8,000,000,000 abroad for military and economic aid only a few days ago. We spend billions and billions of dollars in the construction of tanks and everything connected with the military, missles that have unfortunately wounded the very boys that have come to the Capitol day after day and week after week in order to try to secure their legislation. They were wounded on Heartbreak Ridge in Korea. It has been "Heartbreak" Capitol Hill. Delays and rebuffs have been their lot. The House has passed that legislation several times, and the Senate, unfortunately, belatedly passed it. I think there was a great misunderstanding there about the legislation; misunderstanding as to how much it does for these men in the way of rehabilitation. Of course, they cannot understand why their legislation to reconstruct them is not passed primarily, nor can I when most all the legislation for destruction is passed so quickly. And legislation for almost everything under the sun.

I know the House has passed that legislation and so has the Senate. We are in good position. I wonder if the Members of the House will not suggest to the President how much it will do for those men. Those men to whom we owe so much—those men that were sent to war It will give them a new objective, a new life. It opens a new world to them. The paraplegics of World War II thought they were hopelessly bedridden but when the car bill first passed they got out of bed. When they secured the automobile they were able to go out and get jobs.

In England, Mr. Speaker, the British give their paraplegics automobiles and $150 a month for their upkeep. They do more than we do for them. They go to and from their work in their automobiles. That is true of the amputees who now have cars. They have gotten jobs. I was talking only today by telephone to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles of Massachusetts. He spoke of their record for safety and their record for fine, constructive work, because they have the transportation to use to and from that work. If the Members will all join in explaining to the President the importance of signing that bill, I am sure he will do it Every Member here has amputees and blind and paraplegics in his district Please, please help them.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS OF OUR GOVERNMENT ARE KIDDING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ABOUT FANTASTIC WEAPONS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr Speaker, recently there has been in high places much irresponsible talk about fantastic weapons, when the fact is that most all of them are either on the drawing board or in experimental stages. The lag between the drawing board, experimental stage, and availability for actual use against the enemy in many cases may stretch to several years.

Those in high places who are guilty of this irresponsible talk about the imme-

diate availability of atomic tactical weapons and long-range guided missiles equipped with atomic warheads, are either greatly misinformed, or they are deliberately misleading the American people. In my opinion, these statements are being made for political purposes because in almost every instance they come from persons either seeking reelection or promotion to a higher office.

These irresponsible statements have caused the American people to believe that we have these fantastic weapons and that they are available immediately. Let us take the average American mother who has heard about these fantastic weapons and their immediate availability. One mother with two sons in Korea recently wrote me as follows:

Mr. Dean says the war in Korea could be won or ended by using atomic weapons. Then why in the earth are they not used? Use anything to stop this Korean war. I think we are war weary as our leaders continue to sacrifice our boys with little prospect of a clear-cut victory in the long run.

These sentiments expressed by a mother with two sons in Korea are echoed by millions of Americans.

I think that someone in the Department of Defense should have gumption enough to tell the American people why we do not use the A-bomb in Korea, instead of making bullying threats. Why does not someone in the Department of Defense tell the American people that the Russian military leaders know that we have the A-bomb ready for use, and for that reason they are not providing a target for us by allowing the Chinese Reds to mass their forces and military supplies in one place.

The truth of the matter is the Reds never permit any great concentration of troops, equipment, or supplies to the extent that an A-bomb would be effective. On the other hand, they assemble small units that can be destroyed with the conventional type bomb, thus eliminating the use of the A-bomb on our part. Meanwhile, we are keeping our present supply of A-bombs intact and preserving them for use on real atomic targets. At the same time, our use of the conventional type bomb represents a tremendous saving in dollars and cents over the A-bomb, whose supply is scarce and whose use is not practical because of lack of atomic targets.

While I may be criticized for questioning the statement about these fantastic weapons, for the sake of the American people I want them to know that we do not have the tactical weapons or the long-range guided missile with the atomic war head. We are months away from having them and in some cases, years.

We are working on the atomic-powered submarine, the atomic-powered aircraft, and the atomic artillery shell, but they are still in the laboratories, or on an experimental basis. The plain fact is that we do not have them fully developed and ready for use.

This push-buttonitis psychology that persons in high positions of government are using on the America: people is downright dishonest, and it is about time that some of these irresponsible persons stop talking about fantastic weapons, while they have their eyes on the next election. By so doing, they will lift the American people out of the sea of bewilderment and confusion that they find themselves in today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANE in four instances, in three to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK and to include an address given by the Honorable JOHN T. WOOD before the United States Flag Committee in New York City on October 10.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WICKERSHAM in five instances and include addresses on soil conservation.

Mr. GORDON on resolution 331.

Mr. MAGEE.

Mr. BOLLING and to include extraneous matter

Mr. PRICE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONAS in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCVEY and to include an editorial.

Mr. DENNY and to include a letter appearing in the Washington Post.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois and to include an editorial appearing in the Jacksonville (Ill.) Journal.

Mr. JENSEN in two instances; to include in one resolutions passed by the Iowa Vocational Agricultural Teachers Association, and in the other a letter.

Mr. VORYS.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM and to include an address.

Mr. SHEEHAN.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in three instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and Mr. WOOD of Idaho in two instances each, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr MILLER of Nebraska and to include excerpts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts.

Mr. WILSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. PICKETT) and to include an editorial.

Mr. WIER and to include an article from the Saturday Evening Post of October 6.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD in two instances and to include various excerpts.

Mr. KEATING to extend his remarks at the conclusion of debate on H. R. 5505 and to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. AYRES and to include a copy of a bill.

Mr. VORYS.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. PRIEST).

Mr. MCGUIRE (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include an article on the Honorable James A. Farley.

Mr. ENGLE (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HINSHAW to revise and extend the remarks he made today in the Committee of the Whole and in the House, and in one instance to include excerpts from an official document.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BARING, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 43. An act for the relief of Joseph Flury Paluy, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 64 An act for the relief of Helen Dick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 183. An act for the relief of Elfriede Ehrhardt Otto, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 366. An act for the relief of Stanislas d'Erceville; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 440. An act for the relief of Evangelos and Michael Dumas, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 471. An act for the relief of Ai Mei Yu and Ai Mei Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 527. An act for the relief of Youichi Nobori, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 605. An act for the relief of Constance Chin Hung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 639. An act for the relief of Motoi Kano, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 640. An act for the relief of Isamu Furuta, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 664 An act to amend section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law", and for other purposes, to the Committee on the District of Columbia

S 690. An act to permit certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of Canton, S. Dak., for park, recreation, airport, or other public purposes, to be leased by it so long as the income therefrom is used for such purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S 740. An act for the relief of Albert Walton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 811. An act for the relief of Mitsuko Sakata Lord, to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 821 An act for the relief of Wong Woo, also known as William Curtis; to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 828 An act for the relief of Berta Gomes Leite; to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 839 An act for the relief of Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roselleen Schut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 895. An act for the relief of Dr. Yau Shun Leung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 904. An act for the relief of Roy Y. Shiomi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 914 An act for the relief of Masako Miyazaki, to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 931 An act for the relief of Bernard Kenji Tachibana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 971. An act for the relief of Ralph Albrecht Hsiao; to the Committee on the Judiciary

S. 985. An act for the relief of Agnes Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1052. An act for the relief of Maria Rhee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1120. An act for the relief of Misao Konishi, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 1212. An act to amend section 2113 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1236. An act for the relief of Kim Song Nore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1256. An act for the relief of Barbara Ann Koppius; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 1280. An act for the relief of the minor child, Peng-siu Mei; to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 1323 An act for the relief of Francisca Quinones, to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 1339 An act for the relief of Dr. Chai Cahng Choi, to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 1401 An act for the relief of Lore A M. Hennessey, to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 1448 An act for the relief of Robert William Lauber, to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 1462 An act for the relief of Joseph Boris Tchertkoff, to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 1482 An act for the relief of the town of Mount Desert, Maine, to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 1604 An act for the relief of Truman W. McCullough; to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 1622 An act to amend section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946, to the Committee on Public Works.

S 1668 An act for the relief of Pansy E. Pendergass, to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 1682 An act for the relief of Daniel J. Crowley, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 1770 An act to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, and eliminate certain exemptions therefrom, to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 1819 An act for the relief of Wolfgang Vogel, to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 1909 An act for the relief of Henry Bongart and Evelyn Bongart, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 1911. An act for the relief of Michael David Liu, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 1934 An act for the relief of Ascanio Collodel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 1938 An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental contract or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Public Works

S 1949 An act for the relief of Hattie Truax Graham, formerly Hattie Truax, to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 2042 An act to extend certain privileges to representatives of member states on the Council of the Organization of American States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S 2095 An act for the relief of Joe Kosaka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S Con Res. 36. Concurrent resolution authorizing the appointment of 14 Members of Congress to participate in a public discussion of problems of common interest with representatives of the Consulative Assembly of the Council of Europe, to the Committee on Rules.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 732. An act for the relief of Konstontios N. Bellos;

H. R. 782. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Siegfried Oberdorfer;

H. R. 794. An act for the relief of Arthur E. Hackett;

H. R. 824. An act for the relief of Luisa Monti;

H R. 1087. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," to empower the courts to remit or mitigate forfeitures under the Indian liquor laws;

H R. 1100. An act for the relief of Eugenio Bellini;

H R 1119. An act for the relief of Mario DiFilippo;

H R 1252 An act for the relief of Mr and Mrs Miroslav Kudrat,

H R. 1413 An act for the relief of Franz Geyling,

H R 1596 An act for the relief of N. H. Kelley, Bernice Kelley, Clyde D. Farquhar, and Gladys Farquhar,

H R 1696. An act for the relief of Jack Warner and family,

H R 1764 An act to authorize the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force to settle, pay, adjust, and compromise certain claims for damages and for salvage and towage and to execute releases, certifications, and reports with respect thereto, and for other purposes,

H R 1908 An act for the relief of Helena Jange Chinn,

H R 2210. An act for the relief of Hye Pah Kung,

H R 2322 An act to authorize the improvement of East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla.,

H R 2684 An act to provide for the sale, transfer, or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida,

H R 3221 An act for the relief of Joji Ikeda, a minor,

H R 3424 An act for the relief of Yumi Horiuchi,

H R 3430 An act for the relief of the estate of Nora B Kennedy, deceased, and Mrs. Ann R Norton;

H R 4154 An act for the relief of the estate of Jake Jones, deceased,

H R 4205 An act to provide retirement benefits for the Chief of the Dental Division of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, and for other purposes,

H R 4270 An act for the relief of the estate of Jennie Gayle, deceased,

H R 4271 An act for the relief of Mr and Mrs Richard G. Adams and legal guardian of Dorothy Margaret Adams,

H R 4550. An act to provide for the control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, and for other purposes;

H R 4693. An act to amend section 77, subsection (c) (3), of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended,

H R 4740 An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes,

H R 4931. An act for the relief of Lewyt Corp; and

H. R. 5054. An act making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 537. An act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934; and

S. 1450. An act to provide for the exchange of certain lands owned by the United States of America for certain privately owned lands.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 16, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

879. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 62 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat 198), as amended (32 U S C, 1946 ed, sec 4c), to include the Virgin Islands", to the Committee on Armed Services

880 A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 66, Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia, as amended", to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

881. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to approve repayment contract negotiated with the Irrigation districts comprising the Owyhee Federal reclamation project, Idaho-Oregon, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes", to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

882 A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Frenchtown irrigation district, Montana, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes", to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

883 A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Malta Irrigation district and the Glasgow irrigation district, to authorize their execution by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes", to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

884 A letter from the Acting Deputy Attorney General, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 12 of the Clayton Act with respect to transfer of civil actions brought under the antitrust laws"; to the Committee on the Judiciary

885 A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to include, within the provisions of law providing punishment for killing or assaulting Federal officers on official duty, officers and employees of the Federal Security Agency engaged in enforcing the food and drug or public health laws of the United States", to the Committee on the Judiciary.

886 A letter from the Chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting a report by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation covering refunds and credits of internal-revenue taxes for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1947 and 1948, pursuant to section 3777 of the Internal Revenue Code (H Doc No. 259); to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

887. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of October 11, 1951, the following bills were reported on October 12, 1951:

Mr. CAMP: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5693. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose certain duties upon the importation of tuna fish, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5248. A bill to suspend certain import duties on tungsten; with amendment (Rept. No. 1152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3589. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works; with amendment (Rept. No. 1160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1482. An act for the relief of the town of Mount Desert, Maine; without amendment (Rept. No. 1161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 401. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5633. A bill to approve a contract negotiated with the irrigation districts on the Owyhee Federal project, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No 1177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5680. A bill to amend the act of October 5, 1949 (Public Law 322, 81st Cong), as amended, so as to extend the time of permits covering lands located on the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee of conference. H. R 4473. A bill to provide revenue and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 1179). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H R. 5511. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1181. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1182. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H R. 2150. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 1183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3554. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 308. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim January 13 of each year as Stephen Foster Memorial Day; without amendment (Rept. No. 1185). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2170. An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary S. 1970. An act for the relief of Louis E. Gabel, without amendment (Rept. No. 1154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1161. A bill for the relief of Kenneth McRight; without amendment (Rept. No. 1155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H R. 1267. A bill to reimburse the Stamey Construction Co. and/or the Oklahoma Paving Co., as their interests appear, with amendment (Rept. No. 1156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H R. 2662. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Thelma A Nolen, with amendment (Rept. No. 1157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H R. 3375 A bill for the relief of Mrs Orinda Josephine Quigley; without amendment (Rept No 1158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary H R 4558. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alberta S Rozanski; without amendment (Rept. No. 1159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1974. A bill for the relief of Mary Gemma Kawamura; with amendment (Rept. No. 1162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R 2593. A bill for the relief of Alice Ibrahim Hanna Ibrahim, Yacoub Mayouf Muhammad Elliyan, Afifeh Michail Jiries Issa Matar, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut, with amendment (Rept. No. 1163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2775. A bill for the relief of Anneliese Barbara Vollrath and Mrs. Margarete Elise Vollrath; without amendment (Rept. No. 1164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H R. 2833. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Bing and Nina Bing; without amendment (Rept. No. 1165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3569. A bill for the relief of Louis Campbell Boyd; without amendment (Rept. No. 1166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3600. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alexander Symeonidis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3668. A bill for the relief of David Yeh, with amendment (Rept. No. 1168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R 3877 A bill for the relief of Erlinda Maria Bowers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H R. 3971. A bill for the relief of Esther Park; without amendment (Rept. No. 1170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3985 A bill for the relief of Hai Soon Lee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R 4130 A bill for the relief of Caroline Wu; without amendment (Rept. No. 1172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM Committee on the Judiciary. H. R 4876. A bill for the relief of Francesco Fratalia, without amendment (Rept. No. 1173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H R 4877. A bill for the relief of Mrs Margherita Caroli; with amendment (Rept. No. 1174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr WILSON of Texas Committee on the Judiciary. H R 5397 A bill for the relief of Mrs Dora Troost; with amendment (Rept. No 1175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H R 5713 A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide that low middling seven-eighths-inch cotton shall be the standard grade for the purposes of determining parity and price support for the 1952 cotton crop, to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H R 5714 A bill directing the Administrator of National Production Authority to allocate enough steel for school construction; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KILDAY

H. R. 5715 A bill to amend sections 201(a), 301(e), 302(f), 302(g), 508, 527, and 528 of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMULLEN:

H. R. 5716. A bill to suppress unfair and fraudulent practices in the marketing of floricultural products in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 5717. A bill to provide uniform rates of pension for veterans of the Indian Wars; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 5718. A bill to amend section 503(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARING:
H R 5719. A bill to finance the exploration, development, production, and production expansion of critical and strategic minerals and metals within the United States, its Territories and insular possessions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.
By Mr. MANSFIELD:
H R 5720 A bill to outlaw the Communist Party and similar organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary
By Mr. HILLINGS:
H R 5721. A bill to suspend the running of the statutes of limitations applicable to offenses involving performance of official duties by Government officers and employees during periods of Government service of the officer or employee concerned; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr O'TOOLE·
H R 5722 A bill relating to the compensation of certain employees of the Canal Zone Postal Service, to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries
By Mr RICHARDS
H R 5723 A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs
By Mr PRIEST:
H J Res 345 Joint resolution to provide additional compensation for congressional officers and employees who have had 30 years' continuous service, to the Committee on House Administration
By Mr COOLEY·
H Res. 460 Resolution amending House Resolution 99, to the Committee on Rules

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows.

By Mr DOYLE
H R 5724 A bill for the relief of Mrs Sakiye Kuwahara, to the committee on the Judiciary
By Mr McCARTHY
H R 5725 A bill for the relief of Frederick A Richardson, to the Committee on the Judiciary
By Mr McMILLAN
H R 5726 A bill for the relief of Judith Le Bovit (nee Bretan), to the Committee on the Judiciary
By Mr O'TOOLE (by request)·
H R 5727 A bill for the relief of Manuel Joao d Carvalho Nunes; to the Committee on the Judiciary
By Mr POULSON·
H R 5728 A bill for the relief of William F Friedman, to the Committee on the Judiciary
By Mr RABAUT·
H R 5729 A bill for the relief of Theodore Karam, to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. REAMS:
H R 5730 A bill for the relief of William Lund Main; to the Committee on the Judiciary
By Mr. BYRNE of New York:
H Res 461. Resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H R 4290) for the relief of Keddie Resort, Inc , to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

471. By Mr. HART: Petition of the New Jersey Press Association urging that President Truman modify Executive order extending security restrictions to Federal civilian agencies so that the public may have news and information which is its right under the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
472 By Mr. SHEEHAN: Petition of Edison Park Chamber of Commerce, Chicago, Ill., going on record as unqualifiedly opposed to the further undermining of our national stamina and integrity by the waste and corruption of Government in Washington, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.
473 By the SPEAKER· Petition of St. Petersburg Townsend Club, No 1, St Petersburg, Fla , vigorously protesting the proposed opening of welfare rolls to public exposure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
474 Also petition of Public Forum of St. Petersburg, St Petersburg, Fla , vigorously protesting the proposed opening of welfare rolls to public exposure, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, October 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess

The Chaplain, Rev Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, the might of them that put their trust in Thee, amid all the subtle dangers that beset us save us from the fatal folly of attempting to rely upon our own strength. In a world so uncertain about many things we are sure of no light but Thine, no refuge but in Thee. The din of words, freighted with malice and suspicion and threatened aggression, assails our ears. Grant us an inner calm, undisturbed by any outward commotion. We beseech Thee, give us courage to seek the truth honestly and the reverence to follow humbly the kindly light that leads us on. Thou hast created us to be Thy temples May the holy places of our inner lives harbor nothing unworthy of our high calling in Thee We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 15, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 15, 1951, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1464) for the relief of Peter Therkelsen Kirwan and Ernest O'Gorman Kirwan.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CLEMENTS was excused from attending the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RUSSELL was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO DISCUSS PROBLEMS WITH THE CONSULTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to announce some appointments under Senate Resolution 215, authorizing the Chair to appoint seven Members of the Senate to visit Europe and attend, in a consultative capacity, the Council of Europe. The Chair is not ready to announce the entire seven, but he wishes to announce a portion of the committee which he will select. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] will be chairman. The Chair also appoints the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. The Chair will announce the other appointments later.

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM CORRECTION OF MILITARY OR NAVAL RECORDS—WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should like to withdraw the motion I entered yesterday to reconsider the vote by which House bill 1181 was passed. I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw the entry of that motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and transact routine business, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE CAUSED BY NAVAL VESSELS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the settlement of claims for damage caused by naval vessels, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE CAUSED TO NAVY DEPARTMENT PROPERTY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the settlement of claims for damage caused to Navy Department property, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report), to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF ADVANCE PLANNING PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of the advance planning program, dated June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S 1912. A bill to provide for conveyance of certain land to the city of New Orleans; with an amendment (Rept. No. 959).

By Mr McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H R. 5684 A bill making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept No. 960); and

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept No. 961).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S 544. A bill for the relief of Joseph Rossabi, Corrine Rossabi, Mayer Rossabi, and Morris Rossabi (Rept. No 964);

S. 560 A bill for the relief of Dr. Louis S K Yuan (Rept. No. 965);

S 589 A bill for the relief of Sister Edeltrudis Sailer (Rept. No. 966);

S. 750. A bill for the relief of Edward Chi-Kan Lam (Rept No. 967);

S 1045. A bill for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer (Rept. No. 968);

S 1097. A bill for the relief of the estate of Carlos M. Cochran (Rept. No. 969);

S. 1359. A bill for the relief of Virgine Zartarian (also known as Vergin Zartarian) (Rept. No. 970);

S. 1560 A bill for the relief of Camilla Pintos (Rept. No 971);

S 1620 A bill for the relief of Tory Lee Eakin (Rept No. 972);

S 1636. A bill for the relief of Theodore Alexander Vlandy (Rept. No. 973);

S 1683. A bill for the relief of Carlos Tannoya (Rept. No. 974);

S 1925. A bill for the relief of Gregory Joseph Coles (Rept. No 975);

S 1931. A bill for the relief of Joyce Jacqualyn Johnson (Rept. No. 976);

S. 1980 A bill for the relief of Adelheid Wichman (now Adelheid Waltschies) (Rept. No 977);

S 2160. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to admit persons committed by State courts to Federal penal and correctional institutions when facilities are available (Rept. No 978);

S 2172. A bill for the relief of Mieko Takamine (Rept. No 979);

S 2198 A bill to amend section 1708 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the theft or receipt of stolen mail matter generally (Rept No. 980),

S. 2228 A bill for the relief of William Elden Joslin (Rept No. 981),

S 2271. A bill for the relief of Carol Ann Hutchins (Sybille Schubert) (Rept. No. 982);

H. R. 596 A bill for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska (Rept No. 983);

H R 610. A bill for the relief of Dr. Stanislaus Garstka and Dr. Marthewan Garstka (Rept. No. 984);

H. R. 658 A bill for the relief of Harold W. Britton (Rept. No. 985);

H R 853 A bill for the relief of Maximilian Otto Ricker-Huetter and Mrs. Eugenia Ricker-Huetter (Rept No. 986),

H R. 884 A bill for the relief of Johanna A Stoots (Rept. No 987);

H R. 980. A bill for the relief of Kikue Uchida (Rept No. 988);

H. R 1457 A bill for the relief of Antranik Ayanian (Rept. No. 989);

H R 1851 A bill for the relief of Ark Ping Jee Nong (Ngon) (Rept. No. 990);

H. R 2176 A bill for the relief of the Fort Pierce Port District (Rept. No. 991);

H. R. 2290. A bill for the relief of Ralph Ambrose Thrall and Minnie Hazell Thrall (Rept No. 992);

H. R. 2506. A bill for the relief of Masunari Saito and Isao Saito (Rept. No. 993);

H R. 2547. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko Ito (Rept No. 994);

H. R. 2632. A bill providing for the permanent residence of Sisters Adalgisa Bellagamba, Maria Rina Montecchio, Anna Taricco, Maria Caterina Crevani, Elizabeth Baggio, Rosa Portale, Lorenzina D'Amico, Assunta Bonfiglio, Maria D'Amico, Lorenzina Scellato, Luigia Andreina Fratelli, Elena Montecchio, and Maria Bellesso (Rept. No. 995);

H. R. 2791. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Richard E. Deane (Rept. No. 996);

H. R. 3281. A bill for the relief of Fanny Tsihrintge Papan (Rept. No. 997);

H. R. 4035. A bill for the relief of Donald I. Hamrock, Robert N. Lensch, Russell E. Ryan, and Helen P. Stewart (Rept No 998);

H R. 4181. A bill for the relief of Leroy Peebles (Rept. No. 999);

H. R. 4567. A bill for the relief of Roy Sakai (Rept. No. 1000);

H. R. 4922. A bill for the relief of Patricia Ann Eddings (Rept. No. 1002);

H. R. 4929. A bill for the relief of Michael Bernard (Cervera) (Rept. No. 1003);

H. R. 4940. A bill for the relief of Suzie Ballard (Rept. No. 1004);

H. R. 4945. A bill to authorize the use of appropriations for refunding moneys erroneously received and covered for the refund of forfeited bail (Rept. No. 1005);

H. R. 4969. A bill for the relief of Susa Yukiko Thomason (Rept. No. 1006); and

H. R. 5104. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Inge L Cuetis (Rept No 1007).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment.

S. 430. A bill for the relief of Mark G. Rushmann (Rept. No. 1008);

S 465 A bill for the relief of Oswald A. Drica-Minieris (Rept. No. 1009);

S. 993. A bill for the relief of Robert Wendell Tadlock (Rept No. 1010),

S 1255. A bill for the relief of Leopold Kahn, Jr. (Rept No. 1011),

S 1709 A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1012);

S 1932. A bill to authorize the establishment of facilities necessary for the detention of aliens in the administration and enforcement of the immigration laws, and for other purposes (Rept. No 1013),

S. 2041 A bill for the relief of Meiko Shindo (Rept. No. 1014);

S 2054 A bill for the relief of Tomizo Naito (Rept No 1015);

S 2119 A bill for the relief of Claudia Tanaka (Rept. No 1016); and

S 2165 A bill to prevent unauthorized acceptance or wearing of foreign decorations by officers of the United States (Rept. No 1017)

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1538 A bill for the relief of O. E. Hambleton (Rept No 1018);

S 2039 A bill to prohibit the display of the flag of the United Nations or any other national or international flag in place of or in a position equal or superior to that of the flag of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No 1019); and

H R 3899 A bill to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes (Rept. No 1020).

By Mr McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 4930. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Craft (Rept. No 1021).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment.

H. R. 4687. A bill to provide for the withholding of certain patents that might be detrimental to the national security, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1001);

ANN ARBOR CONSTRUCTION CO.—REFERENCE OF S. 122 TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably an original resolution providing reference of the bill (S. 122) for the Ann Arbor Construction Co., to the Court of Claims, and I submit a report (No 962) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 224) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 122) for the relief of the Ann Arbor Construction Co, now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2276. A bill for the relief of Louis Rachid Habib; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S 2277. A bill for the relief of Nicholas J. and Elizabeth Miura, and

S. 2278. A bill for the relief of Michael Lemos and his wife, Katina Lemos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TERMINATION OF STATE OF WAR WITH GERMANY—AMENDMENT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 289) to terminate the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany, to strike from the joint resolution as reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, the committee amendment attached to that joint resolution. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a short statement in connection with the amendment

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table, and, without objection, the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, this amendment is the so-called Wiley amendment, designed to open up to new adjudication certain cases of enemy property vested by the Alien Property Custodian and settled by agreement and stipulation.

My amendment would strike this rider—this extraneous and incredible rider—from the declaration of peace with Germany.

I hope the majority leadership will bring up this vital joint resolution bringing to an end the state of war with Germany. I hope the Senate will be given an opportunity affirmatively to strike this rider from the joint resolution, and thus permit the Halbach—I. G. Farben case, to be considered by the judiciary committee as a private bill, which it properly is. I might say at this point, on the basis of the facts in my possession,

that I would certainly vote against such a bill. But in any event, such a proposal has no conceivable place in a joint resolution covering the highest exercise of legislative authority in the jurisdiction of Congress—a declaration of peace.

I hope this matter will come up before us so that we may have an opportunity to erase this shameful rider from the joint resolution and pass the resolution.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial from this morning's Washington Post and a column by Walter Winchell, both bearing on this subject.

There being no objection, the editorial and column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISCHIEVOUS RIDER

A most extraordinary—and, in our judgment, mischievous—rider has been tacked onto the House joint resolution ending the state of war between the United States and Germany The rider, introduced by Senator WILEY, approved by the Foreign Relations Committee and due to come up in the Senate this week, provides that any citizen whose property was seized during the war by the Alien Property Custodian without a court trial to determine its enemy status and who entered into an agreement accepting compensation and relinquishing any further claim to the property may now institute a suit in court to have the settlement set aside and to recover the property or to receive additional compensation for it The rider is irrelevant to the essential business of the joint resolution. And it would invite complicated litigation on issues long ago settled in good faith after patient negotiation

Although the rider would reopen a number of settled cases involving complicated facts and millions of dollars, its intended special beneficiary would be a single individual, Ernest K Halbach, whose stock in the General Dyestuffs Corp., of which he was president, was seized by the Alien Property Custodian on the ground that it was, in fact, owned and controlled by I. G Farben of Germany. Mr. Halbach filed a suit for return of the stock, as he had every right to do; but when the suit came up for trial, he and his attorneys agreed to a settlement out of court under which he received $550,000. Apparently he believed that this was as much as he could hope to obtain from a court decision at the time.

In 1951, however—6 years later—he brought another suit charging that he had entered into the settlement as a result of duress and coercion by the Government. The charge appears to be flimsy, considering the high character of the Assistant Attorney General who negotiated the settlement and the Alien Property Custodian who approved it, nevertheless, Mr. Halbach has every right to have it considered in court and to have the final settlement set aside if he can prove that it was made under duress That case is now being heard But the effect of the Wiley rider would be to enable Mr Halbach to have the settlement set aside without any showing of duress and coercion.

Generally speaking, out-of-court settlements reached fairly and in good faith ought not to be upset in this cavalier fashion For one thing, a trial on the merits undertaken years later is very difficult to conduct: Witnesses may have died or disappeared, recollection of events may have dimmed, even vital documents may no longer be available. In the second place, the avoidance of needless litigation through reasonable compromise out of court is discouraged if settlements can be revoked whenever one of the parties becomes dissatisfied with them.

MR. AND MRS. UNITED STATES

(By Walter Winchell)

Did you know that there is a man so powerful that he can have a peace declaration between the United States and a major nation amended to include himself? If you were told that there was a representative of a foreign trust for 15 years, who had officially been declared to be engaged in breaking the Allied blockade at the beginning of the war (and that this man then was paid $36,000 a year during the war by the United States Alien Property Custodian, plus $1,800 in Christmas bonuses, plus incentive bonuses of from $15,000 to $26,000 a year, totaling in 8 years $558,600) would you rub your eyes? If, in addition, he was retired at a pension of $18,000 a year, would you continue to wonder?

Well, that's nothing This same remarkable man, Ernest K Halbach, was paid $557,550 by the United States Government for his enemy-controlled shares. According to the Department of Justice, Halbach made over 150 percent on an investment of $210,000. Now Halbach's powerful friends have succeeded in getting Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, to espouse a special amendment as part of the peace declaration with Germany, by which the United States Government would be unable to plead that payment to Halbach was a bar to a future suit by him

The German trust he represented was the I G Farben The American companies with which he was affiliated are the General Aniline & Film Corp and the General Dyestuff Corp The whole thing adds up to the worst scandal in American history, and its climax is the brazen attempt to amend Joint Resolution 289 (the termination of war with Germany) to allow Halbach to bring suit in a case he himself settled, according to official Department of Justice files, at a terrific profit

The case is replete with mysterious features According to official records Leo T. Crowley, Alien Property Custodian, charged that the United States Government had used coercion and duress on Halbach to get the $557,550 settlement—which settlement netted Halbach 150-percent profit. Then, when Mr Crowley was examined under oath (on April 3, 1951), he reversed himself and withdrew his charge of coercion Yet Mr Crowley himself had originally authorized seizure of the Halbach stock, and James E Markham, deputy custodian, testified as late as April 24, 1951, that the seizure was justified, as enemy-owned, and that the settlement reached was a fair one.

What neither Mr. Crowley nor Mr Markham explain is how the ex-representative of the German cartels was so valuable that, notwithstanding that they seized his stock—the Alien Property Office paid him a total of $558,600 in 6 years—four of them war years—and that the General Dyestuff Corp then voluntarily voted Halbach an $18,000 a year pension Eisenhower, Marshall, Bradley, Nimitz, Halsey, and Joe Doax performed greater services for less.

According to official records, Halbach (as far back as 1926) gave control of General Dyestuff Corp to I G. Farben and Farben-connected companies. Say the official Government records. "None of the GDC stockholders, Halbach included, ever owned their stock outright. Their stock was always subject to option agreements restricting the free sale or transfer of the stock and which provided for purchase from the holder at fixed prices and under fixed conditions. These option agreements were the means by which the I. G Farben continuously retrieved control of the stock, allowing the current holder merely an interest of, at most, $100 per share.

"Thereafter, in 1940 and 1941 two successive stock dividends were declared, each for 50 percent. The end result was that Mr. Halbach's holdings were increased by 125 percent to 4,725 shares—shares for which he had made a total investment of $210,000, and for which, by the option, he could be bought out for $100 per share, or $472,500. When he settled his claim (against the U. S. Government) he was actually netting over 150-percent profit on his total investment of $210,000 "

But that is not enough for Mr. Halbach. On January 23, 1951, 6 years later, after settling with the United States Government and agreeing not to sue, Halbach filed a motion to reopen the case to set aside the release and settlement on the ground that the United States had used coercion. Coercion to the tune of $558,600 in salaries, $557,550 in purchase price—and an $18,000 pension

Under ordinary circumstances, the law is absolute that a settlement and a covenant not to sue is final. When Mr Crowley's charges of duress collapsed, this would, ordinarily end Halbach's last chance. But listen to the amendment of the declaration of peace with Germany offered by Senator WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, which, by a curious circumstance, is also the home State of Mr Leo T. Crowley, Democrat.

It reads "Any citizen whose property was acquired by vesting or otherwise by the Alien Property Custodian may within 1 year of the effective date of this resolution institute suit to remove such property, and no agreement, compromise or release executed by such citizen during the state of war shall be pleaded in bar of such suit A claimant hereunder shall not be required as a condition precedent of instituting such suit to tender back any benefit or consideration received by him in connection with any release, compromise or agreement executed by him, but the court shall, in its final judgment, make such order as it shall deem equitable."

The Department of Justice has stated its position: "The amendment should be taken up as a private bill. It is designed to give relief to one individual, Ernest K Halbach " And who is this man? This is the answer: From the Kilgore committee "After the outbreak of war in the fall of 1939, Halbach zealously guarded Farben's interests In January 1940, Halbach went to Italy to confer with Farben officials on ways and means for Farben to evade the British blockade. On this and other occasions, Halbach worked out a program for supplying the Farben agents in South America with dyestuffs which they were no longer able to import from Germany. When these firms were placed on the British statutory or American proclaimed lists, Halbach shipped the dyestuff to consignees who were dummies for the Farben sales outfits "

Senator CONNALLY is reported to have laughed at the first suggestion that this amendment be included in the joint resolution as a ridiculous personal bill attached to a great historical document But when the bill came out—the cruel joke is that the joker was in.

This is more than the greatest scandal in American history It is sacrilege against the tomb of the Unknown Soldier * * * Every phase of it should be investigated to the last whisper.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952 NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following notice in writing.

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R 5684) making appropriations for mutual security

for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely, on page 2, between lines 24 and 25, insert:

"ASSISTANCE TO SPAIN

"For economic, technical, and military assistance, in the discretion of the President under the general objectives set forth in the declaration of policy contained in the titles of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 and the Mutual Security Act of 1951, for Spain, $100,000,000."

Mr. McCARRAN also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5684, making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

INVESTIGATION OF MARYLAND SENATORIAL ELECTION OF 1950—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. DOC. NO. 81)

Mr JENNER. Mr President, as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document my individual views on the investigation made by that committee of the Maryland senatorial election of 1950

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUBLICATION OF HEARINGS ON FAR EASTERN QUESTION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief announcement.

We have heard a great deal in the past couple of years about the lack of bipartisan policy concerning the Far East. Last night in Detroit our esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as I read his speech, referred to the lack of consultation by the majority with the minority party concerning our policy in the Far East.

This morning it was voted in the Committee on Foreign Relations that the 1,600 pages of executive hearings on far eastern policy before that committee would be opened up for public inspection. It is planned to follow the technique that was used in the so-called MacArthur hearings. In other words, the record will be submitted to the State Department and to the Department of Defense, on a consultative basis, they to advise us what they regard as being of a classified nature.

The committee reserves to itself, however, the right to release such portions of the testimony as it may deem advisable, and each member of the committee will have furnished to him on the 3d of January the full unexpurgated record, and also the record as it is suggested for printing by the staff of the committee. Thirty days thereafter the committee will vote on any changes which have been suggested, and the report will be released.

I believe this is a long step forward in getting before the people the facts with respect to the far eastern situation. I am one of those who believe that perhaps we have spent too much time heretofore in examining what is past instead of looking toward the future, but if there are those who persist in engaging in that activity, it is my desire that the facts be made available, and I am very happy to say that, with practically full attendance of the membership, the committee was unanimous this morning in voting to make all 1,600 pages of the record of the hearings available for public inspection, and we will ascertain whether the Senate of the United States was consulted or whether it was not.

Mr. BREWSTER Mr President, the Senator from Maine is very happy to associate himself with the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut in welcoming this revelation, although it seems to be a somewhat belated recognition of the fact that the American people, under our system, are entitled to the facts and the truth. This is a recognition that the American people are profoundly stirred, not only about the future and the boys dying in Korea, but about the past—how they got into Korea, and what were the episodes leading up to that action. The American people want to know why 500,000,000 Chinese were lost to us, after 50 years of American policy under every President and every Secretary of State to keep China free and independent, for which we fought the Second World War under the leadership of Cordell Hull, because he would not bend the knee to Japanese aggression Yet in the 5 years since the war, as a result of policies which were almost exclusively in the control of the administration now in power, we lost those 500,000,000 Chinese to communism.

Certainly it is very desirable that the American people should know what transpired. We have in the records of the Senate the statement repeatedly made by the late highly respected Senator Vandenberg of Michigan, that at no time, with a single exception, was he consulted on the formulation and initiation of the policies which in 5 years have lost the fruits of 50 years of American policy since John Hay.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair reminds both the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Maine that the Senate is engaged in the transaction of routine business, and that debate is not in order. The Chair did not know that the Senator from Connecticut intended to make a speech. The Chair thought the Senator from Connecticut was placing something in the RECORD. The Senate is still in the process of transacting routine business by unanimous consent. No provision is made for debate.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate that. I did not understand. I shall terminate myself very quickly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not ask the Senator from Maine to terminate himself. [Laughter.]

Mr. BREWSTER. I did not realize the situation.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maine may have 10 minutes.

Mr BREWSTER. Five minutes will be sufficient.

Mr. McMAHON. Five minutes, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Chair interrupted me in full flight. [Laughter.]

Mr McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. Certainly.

Mr McMAHON. Flight of fancy.

Mr BREWSTER. Whether or not it is a flight of fancy will in some measure be determined by the revelations, for which the Senator from Connecticut has now provided, which may be made. I think it is a very constructive step, and I hope it indicates that as time goes on, through the troubled years which are undoubtedly ahead, there will be more and more frequent consultation between the executive departments and the committees of Congress having jurisdiction.

I think the statement of the Senator from Connecticut is a step in that direction. The Senator from Maine regrets that the Senator from Connecticut wants to wipe out all memory of the past. One can understand why this administration might like to wipe out the memory of the past

Mr McMAHON Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr BREWSTER. Certainly

Mr McMAHON The Senator from Maine is flying right in the face of what the Senator from Connecticut is trying to do, which is to lay bare the past, and to demonstrate that the speeches which have been made by the Senator from Maine and his colleagues on his side of the aisle, to the effect that the Senate was not consulted, are belied by the 1,600 pages spread through 60 volumes of committee reports.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Connecticut did not note that my reference was to the comment of the Senator from Connecticut in his initial statement that he rather deprecated the discussion of the past He thought it was unnecessary, superfluous, and a waste of time.

The American people are now obviously aroused and demanding knowledge. As the Senator from Maine stated, the Senator from Connecticut has made this somewhat belated recognition of the situation, in which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee unanimously concurred It indicates that even on the other side of the aisle progress is being made in permitting the American people to be enlightened.

Mr. McMAHON Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON The delightful ability of the Senator from Maine to express a situation was never better illustrated than in the exhibition we have just had. The Senator from Connecticut was of the opinion that so long as we were going to spend so much time examining the past, it was imperative that all the facts within our control be laid bare. I understand that the Senator from Maine

joined in that determination this morning.

I will say to the Senator from Maine that it was a determination that could have been brought about by any member of the committee. In fact, as long as 6 months ago I challenged the minority on this floor to open up those executive committee reports. It was not until this morning that my patience, having been sorely tried, at last was rewarded. I made the motion to open up the reports, so they will be made available to the public. That is the most important thing. We shall have to let the record speak for itself.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Connecticut will also agree that when we came to the revelation of which he speaks, we discovered the very interesting fact that the first time the committee began to keep complete records of the consultations between the Foreign Relations Committee and the executive department was at the incoming of the Eightieth Congress, which, as I recall, was not under the control of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. Just a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Maine has expired.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to point out, in answer to the remarks of the Senator from Maine, who talks about no record being kept before the Eightieth Congress, that that was the first Congress which functioned under the Reorganization Act, which made the keeping of committee records obligatory—and a very good thing it was. We have Patrick J. Hurley on record; and we shall make his statements public, too.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Address on the subject Highway Safety, delivered by him at the Virginia Highway Conference at Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va., on October 16, 1951.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

Address delivered by Senator TAFT at the Founders Day Republican banquet held in Detroit, Mich., on October 15, 1951.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Statement prepared by him relative to Senate bill 2167, providing for the abolishment of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the repeal of the so-called Wheeler-Howard Act, introduced on September 22, 1951, by Mr. MALONE

By Mr. WILEY:

Statements prepared by him and article entitled "Revolution in the Classroom," written by William A Buck, and published in the September, 1951, issue of Think, dealing with visual education.

By Mr MAYBANK:

Address by William McC. Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, before the seventy-seventh annual convention of the American Bankers' Association, at Chicago, Ill., on October 2, 1951.

By Mr. HILL:

Editorial entitled "The Business of Schools," published in Business Week for October 13, 1951.

By Mr. IVES:

Letter entitled "Psychological Weapon Urged To Tame Kremlin," written by J. Anthony Marcus and published in the October 13, 1951, issue of the New York World-Telegram and Sun.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

Article entitled "London Dentists Say 9 out of 10 School Children Are Denied Dental Care Under British Nationalized Health Services," published in the Washington Post of October 16, 1951, bearing upon the results of socialized medicine in Great Britain.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Editorial entitled "One Out, One To Go," published in the October 15, 1951, issue of the Journal-Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del., dealing with the recent resignation of William M. Boyle, Jr., and the case of Guy Gabrielson.

REQUEST FOR REPRINTING OF MISCELLANEOUS MATERIALS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain materials which I am now completing in my office. I should like to have these materials printed, as to be specified, in the Appendix of the RECORD prior to adjournment and in the final edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which will be published following the adjournment or recess of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONDOLENCES TO THE PEOPLE OF PAKISTAN ON THE ASSASSINATION OF THEIR PREMIER, LIAQUAT ALI KHAN

Mr WILEY Mr. President, I want to convey my sincerest sympathy to the people of Pakistan on the assassination of their Premier, Liaquat Ali Khan

I should like to say just a few words regarding the whole pattern of assassinations which have recently occurred in the Near East and elsewhere in the world

It is very clear to everyone concerned that the entire history of that area has been changed, and changed for the worse by a series of assassinations The assassination of the King of Jordan, King Abdullah; the assassination of the Premier Razmara of Iran; the assassination of Ghandi, of India; and the assassination of the Premier of Pakistan are all a part of a series of terroristic acts which have robbed those countries of some of their finest leadership.

No one can forget that it was a bullet fired at an Archduke of Austria in Sarajevo which precipitated World War I; and while that war might have come without the assassination it is clear that the bullet was fatal to the hopes for peace in the Balkan powder keg.

Pakistan, as a new nation, has been making splendid contributions to the world family. We welcome Pakistan as a sister nation. We are glad to see the great progressive steps she has taken in the short time since she became independent.

As ranking Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee, I had heard the brilliant speech made by Sir Zafrulla Khan, her foreign minister, in San Francisco. We heard there the words of a great philosopher of the East who spoke with the analogies and the proverbs of his land and his people. He spoke with courage and faith. He spoke in words of beauty and tenderness which every Moslem, Christian, Hindu, Buddhist could appreciate.

Pakistan is a leader among the Moslem nations. Because she is young, she finds herself needing every leader whom she possesses. We mourn the loss of her Premier.

But most important we mourn this terroristic act. We of the West, we who believe in Anglo-Saxon fair play, we who believe in the right of every man to hold an opinion and to voice that opinion without fear of physical violence, are shocked at this whole pattern.

The entire Iranian situation would not be such as it is today if Premier Razmara had still lived. The situation in Egypt would differ if assassinations had not occurred there.

Mr. President, I ask the question, What is to be done about this series of assassinations? The answer is obvious. Every country in the world must take hold and smash the terroristic fanatic minorities which have caused these assassinations Every country in the world must take particular vigilance that the crafty Russian agents in their midst do not fan the flames which lead to assassinations.

The pattern is, "If we cannot make you think our way, we will kill you."

Wherever an act of assassination occurs, we may be assured that Joe Stalin benefits because communism thrives on such violence, whereas the American way, the free way, thrives on fair play and nonviolence, and the right of each of us to do our own thinking freely, without fear, and to express our convictions without fear.

We cannot permit more assassinations to occur, and when I say "we," I mean every country. France had witnessed a series of assassinations in her history, as did other countries of Europe. Gradually, however, they have diminished such acts. Now it is up to the newer nations, the nations which have only recently won their freedom to take similar hold, and to learn the way of free speech and a free press. We plead with them to end this terrorism, not just for their own interest but for the interests of all the world which desperately needs peace, which needs enlightened leadership and which needs to find the answer to violence and assassination.

So, Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate, I express sincere sympathy to the people of Pakistan in the loss of a great statesman. I am sure all other Members of the Senate will join with me.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 971) for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1038) relating to the policing of the buildings

and grounds of the Smithsonian Institution and its constituent bureaus.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1732. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 1949. An act to retrocede to the State of Illinois jurisdiction over 154$\frac{3}{10}$ acres of land used in connection with the Chain of Rocks Canal, Madison County, Ill.;

H. R. 3954. An act to authorize the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, to grant and convey to Salt Lake City, Utah, a portion of the lands heretofore granted to such association by the United States;

H. R. 4027. An act to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 5248. An act to suspend certain import duties on tungsten;

H R. 5411. An act to amend Public Laws Nos. 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense housing areas, and for other purposes;

H. R 5425. An act to authorize construction at Air Force installations, and for other purposes;

H R. 5426. An act relating to the reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States,

H. R 5505. An act to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5693. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose certain duties upon the importation of tuna fish, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim January 13 of each year as Stephen Foster Memorial Day.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

By unanimous consent, the following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 1732. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands; and

H. R. 5411. An act to amend Public Laws Nos. 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense housing areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 1949. An act to retrocede to the State of Illinois jurisdiction over 154$\frac{2}{10}$ acres of land used in connection with the Chain of Rocks Canal, Madison County, Ill.;

H. R. 5425. An act to authorize construction at Air Force installations, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5426. An act relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3954. An act to authorize the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, to grant and convey to Salt Lake City, Utah, a portion of the lands heretofore granted to such association by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4027. An act to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 5248. An act to suspend certain import duties on tungsten;

H. R. 5505. An act to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5693. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose certain duties upon the importation of tuna fish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim January 13 of each year as Stephen Foster Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) authorizing the President to proclaim January 13 of each year as Stephen Foster Memorial Day, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 963) thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF CONSERVATORS TO CONSERVE THE ASSETS OF CERTAIN PERSONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 11) to provide for the appointment of conservators to conserve the assets of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, not amounting to unsoundness of mind, or physical incapacity, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 11) to provide for the appointment of conservators to conserve the assets of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, not amounting to unsoundness of mind, or physical incapacity, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That if an adult person residing in or having property in the District of Columbia is unable, by reason of advanced age, mental weakness (not amounting to unsoundness of mind), or physical incapacity properly to care for his property, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia may, upon his petition or the sworn petition of one or more of his relatives or any other person or persons, appoint some fit person to be conservator of his property.

"SEC. 2. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall fix a time and place for a hearing thereon; and shall cause at least fourteen days' notice thereof to be given to the person for whom a conservator is sought to be appointed, if he is not the petitioner, and to such other persons as the court shall direct. The petition shall include, among other things—

"(1) the reasons for the appointment of a conservator;

"(2) the name and address of the person for whom the conservator is sought;

"(3) the date and place of his birth, if known; and

"(4) the names and addresses of the nearest known heirs at law, or the next of kin, if any.

The court in its discretion may appoint some distinterested person to act as guardian ad litem in any proceeding hereunder. Upon a finding that the person for whom the conservator is sought is incapable of caring for his property, the court shall appoint a conservator who shall have the charge and management of the property of such person subject to the direction of the court.

"SEC. 3. Such conservator before entering upon the discharge of his duties shall execute an undertaking with surety to be approved by the court in such maximum amount as the court may order, conditioned on the faithful performance of his duties as such conservator; and he shall have control of the estate, real and personal, of the person for whom he has been appointed conservator, with power to collect all debts due such person, and upon authority of the court to adjust and settle all accounts owing by him, and to sue and be sued in his representative capacity. He shall apply such part of the annual income and such part of the principal of the estate of such person as the court may authorize to the support of such person and the maintenance and education of his family and children; and shall in all other respects perform the same duties and have the same rights and powers with respect to the property of such person as have guardians of the estates of infants.

"SEC. 4. When any person for whom a conservator has been appointed under the provisions of this Act shall become competent to manage his property, he may apply to such court to have such conservator discharged and to be restored to the care and control of his property. If the court finds him to be competent, an order shall be entered restoring the care and control of his property to such person. The court shall have the same powers with respect to the property of any person for whom a conservator has been appointed as it has with respect to the property of infants under guardianships.

"SEC 5. Upon filing of a petition as provided by this act the court may, with or without notice or hearing, appoint a temporary conservator of the estate of any person hereunder, if it deems such action necessary for the protection of such estate, subject to the provisions for an undertaking contained in section 3 hereof. Such temporary conservator shall serve only until such time as a permanent conservator can be appointed or until sooner discharged

"SEC 6 The court, in its discretion, may at any time order that the conservator or some other person shall be responsible for the personal welfare of the person whose property is under conservatorship. In such event the conservator or such other person, subject to the direction and control of the civil division of the court, shall have the same powers and duties with respect to the personal welfare of the said person as have the guardians of the persons of infants under guardianships.

"SEC 7 Lis pendens: Upon the filing of a petition hereunder, a certified copy of such petition may be filed for record in the office of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia. If a conservator be appointed on such petition, all contracts, except for necessaries, and all transfers of real and personal property made by the ward after such filing and before the termination of the conservatorship shall be void."

And the House agree to the same.

That the title of the bill be amended to read as follows: "An Act to provide for the appointment of conservators to conserve the assets and provide for the personal welfare of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, not amounting to unsoundness of mind, or physical incapacity."

JOHN O. PASTORE,
WILLIS SMITH,
JOHN M. BUTLER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

OREN HARRIS,
T. G. ABERNETHY,
JOSEPH P O'HARA,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I should like to make an explanation of the report

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Was the conference report unanimous?

Mr. PASTORE. It was.

Mr SALTONSTALL Does the Senator feel that we should call for a quorum, or are the amendments minor in nature and unanimously agreed to?

Mr PASTORE They are minor in character, and, if anything, I think they strengthen the bill as passed by the Senate. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], who is a minority member of the committee, agrees.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in view of that attitude, I ask unanimous consent to have the explanation printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of the bill as passed by the Senate on November 27, 1950, was to provide for the appointment of conservators to manage the property of persons who by reason of advanced age, mental weakness (not amounting to unsoundness of mind), or physical incapacity, are incompetent to care for their property. For the Senate bill the House substituted a bill with the same objectives, but with considerable changes in language

The conference in effect substituted a new bill for both the House and Senate versions. The principal provisions of the substitute bill provide for the appointment of conservators upon the filing of a petition with the court Upon the finding of the court thereon that an adult person residing or having property in the District of Columbia is unable, by reason of advanced age, mental weakness (not amounting to unsoundness of mind), or physical incapacity properly to care for his property, the court may appoint some fit person to be conservator of his property.

The bill specifies the minimum information which must be contained in such petition. It gives the court power to order the conservator to be responsible for the personal welfare of such person as well as his property, and makes any transactions by the incompetent, after filing of a petition, void. The bill provides procedures for the discharge of a conservator in the event the person under conservatorship becomes competent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' LEAVE ACT OF 1949

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 657) to amend and clarify the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, and for other purposes, which were, on page 3, to strike out lines 3 to 12, inclusive; on page 3, line 13, to strike out "SEC. 6." and insert "SEC. 5."; on page 3, line 13, after "who", to insert "after the enactment of this act"; on page 3, line 17, after "duties", to insert "existing at the time such leave was granted"; on page 3, strike all after line 17, over to and including line 8, on page 4, and on page 4, line 9, to strike out "SEC. 8." and insert "SEC. 6."

Mr. PASTORE obtained the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the Senate is considering amendments of the House in which the Senator asks the Senate to concur?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL Would the Senator from Rhode Island be willing to explain the amendment?

Mr PASTORE. Yes. This bill as it passed the Senate on June 21, 1951, amended the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949 to allow additional accumulation of sick leave; to permit the use of not more than 3 days of sick leave for personal reasons; allow the transfer of sick leave upon promotion, and protect the tenure of teachers granted leave without pay

The House amended the Senate bill as follows:

First. Struck all of section 5, which was designed to correct the inequity which arose when a teacher takes leave on a Friday or Monday; in such circumstances she also loses pay for the Saturday and Sunday following or preceding the leave. It seems clear that the provision is entirely too broad.

Second. Amended section 6 to limit reinstatement rights of teachers who have been on leave without pay to those whose leave without pay begins after the effective date of the act. The House version inadvertently omitted the words ", in accordance with the rules of the Board of Education and," after the word "duties" in section 6.

Third Struck all of section 7, which was designed to allow teachers on leave without pay to deposit in the retirement fund an amount that would have been deducted were they working. Many teachers have been on leave without pay for periods up to 10 years, and it is felt that the provisions of the Senate bill were excessively generous. The matter is covered in H. R. 3860, which passed the House and is pending in the Senate District Committee.

The subcommittee agrees that the House amendments are desirable improvements in the bill as passed by the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The amendments are technical in nature and make the bill more operative and perhaps clarify the subject a little better than did the Senate bill?

Mr. PASTORE. That is not exactly correct. As a matter of fact, the bill as originally passed by the Senate was a little too broad and too generous. The House amendments are somewhat restrictive. If anything, they strengthen the bill as passed by the Senate.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6, and concur in the amendment of the House numbered 4, with an amendment adding before the words "existing at the time such leave was granted", the words "in accordance with the rules of the Board of Education."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY ACT OF 1947

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 945) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, which were, on page 2, line 16, after "SEC. 5." to insert "(a)"; and on page 4, after line 24, to insert:

(b) Section 6 of such act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(as) Every permanent and probationary teacher, librarian, research assistant, counselor, and instructor in the teachers colleges who—

"(1) was in the employ of the Board of Education on June 30, 1947,

"(2) had a master's degree on June 30, 1947,

"(3) had been granted credit for not more than 5 years' previous experience in schools other than public schools of the District of Columbia, and

"(4) had a salary of less than $3,500 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948,

shall receive, effective as of July 1, 1947, in lieu of the salary received on and after such date, a salary of $3,000, plus $100 for each year of previous experience in schools other than public schools of the District of Columbia for which credit had theretofore been granted by the Board of Education, together with annual increases thereafter in accordance with sections 5 and 7 of this act."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr President, this bill as passed by the Senate on May 4, 1951, made certain changes in the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947. It created a new position of chief examiner for colored schools; it granted certain benefits to teachers now in the public schools who did not actually possess master's degrees but who had demonstrated by experience or other training that they had the equivalent to a master's degree; it created a salary grade of assistants, consultants, and supervisors; it increased the probationary period from 1 to 2 years, and eliminated the requirement that teachers must produce evidence of successful teaching at the end of 5 years in order to be eligible for annual increases.

The subcommittee agrees that the House amendments are desirable improvements in the bill as it passed the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it correct to say that the House amendments are agreeable to the Senator from Rhode Island, and that they tighten up the provisions of the bill, instead of making them more generous?

Mr. PASTORE. In a sense they tighten them up a little, but actually they make the provisions more effective

and easier to operate. They tighten them up somewhat.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They are administrative provisions which are helpful, rather than harmful.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

The House amended the Senate bill by adding a new subsection (b) to section 5, which is designed to correct an inequity in the present District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947. Under present law, teachers whose work is satisfactory are given a credit upon appointment of $100 additional salary for every year of teaching experience. In the case of teachers already on the rolls when the Salary Act of 1947 became effective, credit was given only for years of service in schools of the District of Columbia. Teachers appointed subsequent to passage of the act received a credit of $100 for each year of teaching service—up to five—approved by the Board of Education. In consequence, a teacher on the rolls in 1947 with one year of teaching service in the District and four years of approved service outside the District received a credit of only $100. A new teacher entering the service after the effective date of the act, with five years approved experience outside the District, does receive five years of credit. A certain group of teachers are therefore prejudiced by reason of the fact that they were employed by the District before the act was passed. The House amendment would correct this by allowing the Board of Education to give credit "for not more than 5 years' previous experience in schools other than public schools of the District of Columbia."

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

GRANTS FOR HOSPITAL FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2094) to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Benton	Frear	Kerr
Brewster	Fulbright	Kilgore
Bricker	George	Knowland
Butler, Md	Green	Langer
Butler, Nebr.	Hayden	Lehman
Capehart	Hendrickson	Magnuson
Carlson	Hennings	Malone
Case	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Chavez	Hill	McCarran
Connally	Hoey	McFarland
Cordon	Holland	McKellar
Dirksen	Humphrey	McMahon
Dworshak	Hunt	Millikin
Eastland	Ives	Monroney
Ecton	Jenner	Moody
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Morse
Ferguson	Kefauver	Murray
Neely	Smathers	Underwood
O'Conor	Smith, Maine	Watkins
O'Mahoney	Smith, N. J.	Wiley
Pastore	Smith, N. C.	Williams
Robertson	Sparkman	Young
Saltonstall	Stennis	
Schoeppel	Taft	

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on August 7, 1946, Public Law 648 became law. This act in its original form authorized an expenditure of $35,000,000 for the construction of a hospital center in the District of Columbia and for assistance to hospitals which were unable or unwilling to participate in the plans for a proposed hospital center. By amendment on the floor of the House, the latter provision was stricken out, although the amount of the authorized expenditure remained unchanged.

The purpose of House bill 2094 proposing an amendment to the act is to authorize assistance to the hospitals not participating in the hospital center. It is presently estimated that the center will cost approximately $21,700,000; the balance of the original authorization of $35,000,000 will therefore be available for the purposes of this act.

The design of the proposed amendment to the act, Mr. President, is that the hospitals in the District of Columbia, in order to be eligible for the benefits of the amendment, must contribute 50 percent of the cost of construction of new facilities. The remaining 50 percent is to be advanced by the Federal Works Administration, and 30 percent of this 50 percent, or 15 percent of the total cost of construction, is to be repaid by the District of Columbia in installments of 3 percent annually for 33⅓ years, without interest.

The testimony before the committee conclusively demonstrated the urgent need for additional hospital facilities in the District of Columbia and the impossibility of obtaining such additional facilities without the incentives supplied by the proposed amendment.

The Hill-Burton Act has provided little relief for the District of Columbia, first because the per capita income in the District of Columbia is high and the benefits to the District of Columbia under the Hill-Burton Act are, therefore, low; and, second, because the hospitals in the District of Columbia are largely responsible for serving the outlying population, which is almost as numerous as the population of the District of Columbia, but for which no credit under the Hill-Burton Act is available.

Furthermore, the population of Washington consists of approximately 20 percent Federal employees, and the contribution provided by the amendment for hospital construction is a proper recognition of the interest of the Federal Government in the welfare of its employees.

The only objection raised to the bill, which was unanimously reported by the full committee, was on the ground that the bill violates the provision in regard to separation between church and state, and, therefore, the first amendment to the Constitution. It is the feeling of the committee that this objection is clearly without merit. The hospitals which will be eligible treat patients without regard to their religious beliefs, and no attempt is made to use these institutions as an instrument for propagating any religious faith.

Mr President, at this juncture I may say that various representatives of the hospitals which are intended to benefit under this amendment appeared before the committee. I should like at this time to read certain of the testimony given at the hearing, because I think it will be of interest to the Members of this body, and that it weighs pretty heavily on the argument which is being made that the bill violates the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Typical of the statements made before the committee is that of Paul B. Cromelin, chairman of the board of trustees of Sibley Memorial Hospital. In the main Mr. Cromelin testified that new and added facilities are absolutely needed in the District. The District of Columbia has a population of about 802,000, but the hospitals also service the metropolitan area, which has about 1,400,000 population.

In other words, it must be abundantly clear to Members of the Senate that the metropolitan population of the District of Columbia which is being serviced by the hospitals of the District of Columbia, and which would be the limits within which the benefits of the Hill-Burton Act could be given——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. What about hospitals throughout the United States? Are there not other cities and towns which need hospitals, as well as the District of Columbia?

Mr. PASTORE. Of course there are.

Mr. CONNALLY. This bill is restricted to the District of Columbia, which is a rich city. It ought to be able to raise its own funds for hospitals within the District. The bill would provide authority to make grants to private agencies. What is that for? Who are the private grantees?

Mr. PASTORE. The private grantees?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes. To whom is this money to be given?

Mr. PASTORE. It is to be given to the four hospitals, and I shall be glad to enumerate them for the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; the Senator need not do that. How about new organizations?

Mr. PASTORE. New organizations could come under it, too.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I think this bill ought to be defeated. It would open up the whole field of making grants for the purpose of increasing the number of hospitals, when there are already a great many hospitals in the city. The city is rich. It is practically free from taxation by the Federal Government. Apparently the desire is to establish some sort of bureau to hand out money—first to this one, then to that one, and then to the other one. I think the bill ought to be defeated, and I shall vote against it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will bear with me for a moment, I think we overplay the idea that the District of Columbia is a rich district. To be sure, there are many Federal employees living within the District, and it is necessary to start with the premise that they are not permanent residents of the District of Columbia, and therefore the voluntary hospitals in the District have been having a very difficult job of getting endowments and contributions—a more difficult job than other cities in the various States of the Union have—simply because there is not in the District of Columbia the pride of residence. People go to a hospital; those who can afford to pay do so, but those who cannot afford to pay cannot receive the medical attention they need, unless something is done to expand the facilities presently existing in the District of Columbia. It is a rich District of Columbia, but there is not that pride of belonging; and until there is such a pride, it will be impossible to get the necessary contributions, such as are given in the various cities and towns of the State of Texas and of the State of Rhode Island.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator would build up this program on pride. Is that the idea?

Mr. PASTORE. On pride and upon mercy.

Mr. CONNALLY. We have a good deal of pride and mercy, but how about money? It will take money to carry on this program.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. The money comes out of the Treasury. It is collected from all the people of the United States. The Senator would tax all the people of the United States in order to be in a position to make free gifts, to be handed out to certain private agencies and concerns. I want to tell the Senator that the supply of money is going to be exhausted after awhile, and that this city is able to support the hospitals of the District. This city is rich. The District of Columbia may make appropriations if it wants to now, but I refuse to take money out of the Federal Treasury for the District of Columbia, when it is not similarly taken out of the Treasury for other cities throughout the United States that need hospitals, and that probably need them worse than does the District of Columbia

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will bear with me for another moment, I may say that in 1946, when the original act was passed—not as reported by the committee of the House, but as passed on the floor of the House—there was authorized the appropriation of $35,000,000 with which to build a hospital center or a health center in the District of Columbia. That is the law today. The commitments under that law are up to $21,700,000. All this bill seeks to do is to rectify an inequity which was allowed to come into being at that time, by merely making it possible now for the other hospitals of the District of Columbia to participate in the benefits of that authorization. We are not authorizing further money. We are merely allowing other hospitals in this community, which are nonprofit, voluntary hospitals, to participate in the benefits of that authorization

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr PASTORE. I yield

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Why have they not come forward to obtain the money under that act, then?

Mr. PASTORE. Under what act?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Under the act about which the Senator is speaking, under which an authorization of $35,000,000 was provided.

Mr. PASTORE. Because they were omitted from the benefits of the act when it was passed in 1946.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In what way?

Mr. PASTORE. Because the bill was amended in the House, and they were deleted from the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. A health center was provided for, and they could apply for money through the health center and get it, could they not?

Mr. PASTORE. If they wanted to join the health center.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. But they did not do it, is that correct? They wanted the Federal Government to give the money directly to them, denominational institutions. Is that not a fact? That is what I am opposing. They can apply for the money and get it now, but they will not come through the health center as all the others are doing.

Mr. LANGER. And they are getting the money without interest, are they not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, they are getting the money without interest.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator from South Carolina will bear with me for a moment, in the Eighty-first Congress—and I hope the Senator does not consider me impertinent in bringing up this matter—in the Eighty-first Congress, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] introduced Senate bill 1273; and this is the way the bill read:

> To make grants to private agencies, in cash or in land or other property.

In the explanation of the bill, particularly line 13, it says:

> The term "private agency" shall mean any nonprofit private agency operating hospital facilities in the District of Columbia

Therefore, Mr. President, when the Senator from South Carolina was a Member of this body and I was not, he introduced the same bill that is being considered by the Senate today.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I introduced that bill only for the purpose of getting the subject before the committee, in order that the committee might study it; and, so far as I am concerned, having studied it, I am against the pending bill I hope it will be defeated, because it will set a precedent in the United States which will worry every Senator. Mr. President, I invite Senators to observe whether my prediction does not come true.

Mr HUNT Mr President, will the Senator yield, for a question?

Mr PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr HUNT. I am much intrigued by the statement of the Senator from Rhode Island, which I think is entirely erroneous, to the effect that moneys granted under the Hill-Burton Act are not subject to interest, and this particular item also would not be subject to interest. The distinguished Senator, in making his statement—and I made the same error when I handled this bill for the Senator a week ago—said, "without interest."

Let me say the text of the statement that Hill-Burton funds granted to any State for hospitalization bear no interest is in error, whether the funds be granted to organizations in the State of North Dakota or in the State of Wyoming or in the State of South Carolina or to people in the Senator's State of Rhode Island. So I think the importance of that idea that it is to be without interest should be debunked, so to speak, for it simply is not correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if I may reply to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The Senator from Rhode Island has the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. We have a very special, unique, particular, and specific situation in the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia cannot be classified

as a city. It is not classified as a State. The District of Columbia is the responsibility of the Congress. We have a responsibility to meet here, and when it is suggested that we are doing something for the District of Columbia which we are not doing for other cities in the States of the Union, I think we are stretching the point a little bit too far. If we are to argue at this point that the giving of this assistance to voluntary nonprofit hospitals in the District of Columbia is a violation of the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States, which has to do with the separation of church and State, then in order to be consistent in our argument we must maintain that the Hill-Burton Act is unconstitutional, because, as I understand the Hill-Burton Act, it gives Federal grants to the various States to be used by nonprofit hospitals in order to expand their facilities or to build new ones.

Insofar as the violation of the Constitution of the United States is concerned, that suggestion has no place here, because we went over that hump a long time ago, when in 1946, we passed the Hill-Burton Act. Today in any State of the Union, under the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act, any committee organized under the auspices of the State can allocate to the various hospitals the benefits they require in order to build up their facilities.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator knows very well that if Texas or South Carolina or any other State takes advantage of the Hill-Burton Act the State has to raise a certain amount of money. The Hill-Burton Act provides for the contribution of only a portion, and for the money they receive they have to pay interest, while under the bill we are discussing the entire sum goes to the District of Columbia.

Mr. PASTORE. That is not exactly correct.

Mr. LANGER. Why not?

Mr. PASTORE. I will explain it to the Senator Under the Hill-Burton Act, the hospital itself puts up 50 percent. There is a graduated scale. The institution itself pays a part of the cost and the Federal Government supplies the rest in a Federal grant. So the identical principle is carried out. The private agency puts up 50 percent of the money, the United States Government puts up the other 50 percent, and 15 percent of the hundred percent is paid back by the District of Columbia to the United States Treasury over a period of 33⅓ years. Therefore, we have joint participation in order to expand hospital facilities to bring care, comfort, and convalescence to people who cannot otherwise receive such benefits.

Mr. LANGER. Why could they not get the care here as well as in any State of the Union. We construct a great army installation, or we build a town at Fort Peck, where thousands and thousands of employees must be located. Just because we put them there, would the Senator say that the United States Government should permit them to be treated free of charge?

Mr. PASTORE. They do not get treated free of charge unless they are indigent.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator says we are going to take care of all these people because they need help.

Mr. PASTORE. All I am saying to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota is that the responsibility of providing these facilities is not primarily, exclusively, and alone that of the nonprofit hospitals. They have been organized to give care to sick people, without profit. They cannot expand their facilities today. There are many persons who need hospital care and cannot get it The hospitals are willing to expand, they are willing to put up half the money, and now we hear it said, "No, you cannot do this act of mercy because we have to put up 50 percent of the money."

Mr. LANGER. I think the Senator is mistaken in what he is saying

Mr PASTORE. I do not think I am mistaken.

Mr O'CONOR Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. O'CONOR Is it not a fact that in the District of Columbia there has been a crying need for expanded hospital facilities and that those persons who have been in a position to observe realize that long since the existing hospital facilities have not been sufficient to cope with the needs of the people of the District?

Mr PASTORE If the Senator will bear with me for a moment, I should like to read from the testimony before the committee given by Mr. Paul Cromelin, who is chairman of the board of trustees of the Sibley Memorial Hospital. So far as I know, he receives no compensation for the duties he performs as such. I may be incorrect in that statement.

Mr. O'CONOR Let me say that the Sibley Memorial Hospital is an excellent hospital, under excellent direction, and that it has performed a magnificent work.

Mr PASTORE Let me read the testimony which guided the subcommittee in reaching the conclusions which it reached:

We have a 350-bed hospital. I suppose we would be denominated as a creature of the Methodist Church by reason of the fact that a majority of the board of trustees of our institution are Methodists, and we come under the Women's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church which conducts a number of orphanages, schools, colleges, and hospitals, and so forth throughout North America.

Our buildings are old. Our oldest building is an old type of construction approximately 50 years of age There are constant repairs, and we have for a number of years been trying to formulate some plan whereby we could have a modern building and modern institution there.

We are located at North Capitol and M Streets NW., which is approximately 10 squares north of the Capitol, and we are in an area that by reason of the terminal yards and the railroad and industrial plants and so forth immediately to our east, we have a great many dispensary cases that are brought into the hospital, approximately 10,000 during last year.

A record has been kept of the amount that we received from them, and in those cases we have received less than 50 cents——

Senator PASTORE. Is your institution a profit or a nonprofit one?

Mr CROMELIN It is a nonprofit hospital.

Senator PASTORE And do you feel that expansion and new construction will have to be made at your institution or at your hospital in order to meet the needs of the community?

Mr CROMELIN We feel that it is absolutely essential

Senator PASTORE And do you feel that you can make this appropriate expansion whether or not you have planned it, without this assistance?

Mr CROMELIN I can say to you that it will be absolutely impossible Whether or not we are going to be able to raise the 50 percent afterward is one problem, but certainly we cannot even undertake it unless we have some assistance of some sort.

Senator PASTORE Let me get this straight on the record You are saying that there is a definite need for improvement of your facilities"

Mr CROMELIN. Yes, sir. We have our plans drawn Our plans were drawn 5 years ago at a cost of approximately $20,000 to $25,000. We own the ground. We have the existing antiquated buildings

Senator PASTORE With the needs of the community as patronized by you, or as this community patronizes you, is that absolutely necessary that this expansion be effected?

Mr. CROMELIN In my opinion, undoubtedly.

Senator PASTORE. And the third point is that this expansion cannot be effected unless you get this help from the Federal Government?

Mr CROMELIN That is my opinion, sir. Now the statement was previously made as to whether or not we are a religious institution by reason of the fact that we are sponsored by the Methodist Church.

Senator PASTORE Do you have any qualms here that there is any violation of the Constitution of the United States of America?

Mr. CROMELIN No, sir, and I want to show you that we are a charitable institution, that what we are interested in is to administer to the sick, and it so happens that a survey was made of our institution a few years ago, a number of years ago, and the ratio is approximately the same today as to just what religious denomination we did serve.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield

Mr. O'CONOR. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island very much, because he has answered directly the point which I had in mind. I desire to ask him another question, but before doing so, I should like to say that while the Senator from Rhode Island has read testimony to the effect that this particular institution is under the Methodist Church, may the Senator from Maryland say that a great number of the people of his State and adjoining States have been treated at the Sibley Hospital, and never once have they been asked as to their religion, and they have never been excluded by reason of their color. On the contrary, Sibley Hospital has given generously and charitably, and, I may say, at a great saving to the Federal Government.

That leads me to the question which I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island, who has been a very successful governor of his State. Is it not true that throughout the country institutions of this kind have actually saved the Government large amounts of money by reason of the fact that they have operated as nonprofit institutions and have given service without cost?

Mr. PASTORE. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that, after all, ministering to the sick is a public responsibility and a community responsibility. In the District of Columbia there is no State legislature and no municipal form of government and no semblance of home rule, on whom would the responsibility fall? If all the nonprofit hospitals in the District of Columbia decided to close tomorrow, the Congress of the United States would have to begin to build hospitals in this community if the Congress were to meet its responsibility. Here we have these well-established hospitals which cater to all the people.

Mr. O'CONOR. The Senator from Rhode Island is undoubtedly correct. The cost which would be levied on the people of the District if these hospitals were not continued in operation would be staggering. I place no stock in the contention as to the religious question, because, while these hospitals administer to the indigent and the helpless, they are not giving the patients any religious instruction.

Mr. PASTORE. To build a 350-bed hospital today would cost about $6,000,000 Does the Senator from Maryland know what the allotment is to the District of Columbia under the Hill-Burton Act?

Mr. O'CONOR. How much is it?

Mr. PASTORE. No less than about $250,000, and no more than $450,000, when the appropriation was $150,000,000 for the entire country. Therefore, we are saying to the District, "You satisfy yourselves under the Hill-Burton Act, which gives you no more than $450,000 a year, to extend facilities in the District which would run into the millions of dollars."

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. O'CONOR. I was very much impressed by the statement of the Senator from Rhode Island that there is not in the District, as there is in other municipalities, what he very properly and very accurately described as "pride of citizenship." It is to be understood that there are a great many citizens in the District who are of the very finest, but, on the other hand, there is a large transient population.

Is it not a fact, and has not the Senator from Rhode Island ascertained, that, unlike the situation in a number of other municipalities throughout the country, in the District of Columbia there has not been the great number of bequests, grants, or gifts from large employers and from industrial organizations, such as the hospitals in the States are able to get?

Mr. PASTORE. As a matter of fact, there is hardly any industry in the District of Columbia, to begin with. Then, as the Senator has said, there are many transient employees who have come to the District of Columbia, but they do not have the equivalent of the pride of citizenship which the Senator and I have seen in our own bailiwicks. Persons come to Washington to work here, and in many instances perhaps they make contributions to the Community Chests back home, and pay their taxes back home, and pay hardly anything into the Community Chest or by way of taxes here. Therefore, the hospitals in the District find it doubly hard to carry on. If all patients were actually compelled to pay for the services rendered by the hospitals, the result would be that the hospitals would be only for the rich, and the poor would not have any place to go.

Mr. O'CONOR The Federal Government is perhaps the largest employer in this community, is it not?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct; and I should like to add that there is in the District an estimated population of about 800,000, but the hospitals are serving a metropolitan population of more than 1,400,000.

Mr. O'CONOR. If the Senator will allow me to say so, I think he has made an excellent presentation and a persuasive argument, and I indeed hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. PASTORE. When Congress went along with the idea of giving $21,000,000 to the hospital center, which was a very meritorious and worth-while project in itself, we recognized that federally we had to participate in building up the hospital facilities in the District of Columbia. All the pending bill does is to do complete equity by allowing the grants remaining, in the sum of about $13,000,000, to the other voluntary nonprofit hospitals in this community which are perfectly willing to house the sick and treat them. They are saying to the Federal Government, "We will put up half the money to provide for the sick in the District of Columbia." Whose responsibility is it? If it is not the responsibility of the Congress of the United States toward the District of Columbia, I should like to know whose it is.

Mr. O'CONOR. Unless it is done in the manner in which the Senator from Rhode Island and the committee describe, it will not be done, because in the past, as experience has shown, it has been impossible to do it in other ways. I agree entirely with what the Senator has said as to the urgency of the situation, and as to the fact that what is proposed is the best method by which this desirable result can be accomplished.

Mr. PASTORE. When the representatives of the hospitals came before the committee two questions were immediately raised, first, whether there was need for the facilities, and, second, whether they could build them without Federal grants.

The first question was answered in the affirmative; it was proved that they need the facilities. To the second question, they all replied that unless they received the money sought they could not complete their plants and provide the new facilities. That is the question. It is my fervent hope and wish that the Senate will allow these voluntary hospitals to share in this plan, this well-thought-out and sensible plan, one that is not extravagant in any sense of the word.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. Would the Senator say there was any differentiation whatsoever in the type of treatment patients receive at the private hospitals, as compared with the hospital centers of the cities?

Mr. PASTORE. Of course not.

Mr. HUNT. It is all exactly the same type of treatment?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. HUNT. On the same standard?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. HUNT. Would the Senator further say that he agrees with me that to a certain extent the type of treatment or standard of treatment and the degree of treatment received by patients has some relationship to the physical equipment of a hospital?

Mr. PASTORE. Decidedly so.

Mr. HUNT. Would the Senator say that these private hospitals have always taken every patient who wished to be admitted, regardless of his color, regardless of his creed, or of his race, and that the fact that he needed hospitalization was the sole and guiding reason why he was or was not admitted?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. HUNT. Can the Senator give me any reason in justice why these hospitals are not as much entitled to Hill-Burton money as is the hospital center?

Mr. PASTORE. They are just as much entitled, but the point is that because of the very complexion of the District of Columbia, the Hill-Burton formula is a very strange one in this jurisdiction. First of all, it is predicated upon the population of the State, and, secondly, upon the per capita wealth of the State. When we boil the formula down to a practicality, as it applies to the District of Columbia, we find that the District receives annually about $300,000. That does not even scratch the surface.

Mr. HUNT. No one can disagree with the statement that the governmental functions of the District of Columbia are entirely different from those of any other governmental organization in the United States. There can be no question about it.

Mr. PASTORE. No; of course not.

Mr. HUNT. Therefore a different formula is needed to treat a different situation under the Hill-Burton Act, and I am very hopeful that the position of the Senator from Rhode Island will pervail, because I can see absolutely no reason why hospitals in this city, which are all rendering the same type of service, should not all be treated alike.

Mr. PASTORE. Let me add that we went over that hump in 1946 when we allowed the Hospital Center to be established. True enough, it has not yet been built, and the site has not been chosen,

but $21,700,000 has been committed. When we recognized the need and recognized the efficacy of allowing Federal grants to carry out that program, certainly we committed the Congress of the United States to provide for hospital facilities in the District of Columbia.

Are we going to restrict the appropriation to a few who join the Health Center, or are we going to make it available to all nonprofit hospitals? I ask, where are we to establish the line of mercy? Why are the people who go to the Methodist hospital or the Catholic hospital any different from people who go to any other hospital?

Mr. HUNT. Does the Senator think the Senate of the United States ought to show preference to any type of hospital that is rendering the same type of service?

Mr. PASTORE In my thought, all we have to consider is that a hospital is nonprofit, that it is voluntary, and that it will minister to the want of any race, color, or creed. That is how we justify ourselves under the Constitution of the United States of America.

Mr. HUNT. We have exactly the same obligation to them all.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. Cromelin said:

In that area there were 6,840 patients served Of that number, 3,027, or less than half, were Protestants. The total number of Protestants was 3,027, Roman Catholics, 1,074, and of the Protestants that were served, 189 happened to be Methodists. We had 124 Baptists, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Christians, Episcopalians, United Brethren, Congregationalists, 275 of the Jewish faith, Syrians, Greeks, Mormons, Chinese, Christian Scientists, Nazarenes One thousand nine hundred and three, unfortunately, were of no religious faith.

What does that prove? Does it prove the drawing of a religious line, or does it prove that there has been mercy for all, regardless of race, color, or creed?

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names.

Benton	Ives	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Saltonstall
Butler, Nebr.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Carlson	Kefauver	Smith, N J
Case	Langer	Smith, N C
Chavez	Lehman	Sparkman
Dworshak	Magnuson	Stennis
Ellender	McCarran	Taft
Ferguson	McFarland	Underwood
George	McMahon	Wiley
Hennings	Monroney	Williams
Hill	Moody	
Humphrey	Neely	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I want every person to know that I am in favor of hospitals anywhere and everywhere. I should like to see hospitals built within the District, within my State and within other States, sufficient in number to care for all the people who need hospitalization. But that is not the question before us today.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the principle involved in this bill is wrong. The committee report of the bill states that it would permit the Federal Works Administration to extend assistance in the construction of new hospital facilities, not to exceed 50 percent of the cost of such projects. Of the amount advanced by the Federal Works Administration, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia would be required to repay 30 percent in 33⅓ annual installments of 3 percent without interest.

Money has been paid into the Federal Treasury by people of many different religious beliefs and faiths. These people thought that such money, when they paid it in the form of taxes, was to operate the Government of the United States, and was not to be taken from the Treasury and expended for church hospitals. If such a practice as this is allowed, faith with the American people will have been broken.

This bill would set a precedent in regard to grants to hospitals. The hospitals in the District of Columbia up to this time have received, under the Hill-Burton Act, $1,375,000 or $275,000 a year. Let us distinguish the various acts. We have the Hill-Burton Act, which provides money to be given to hospitals. We then have another act establishing what is known as the health center in Washington. That is in addition to the Hill-Burton Act.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Is there not a large sum of money presently available through the health center program in the District of Columbia?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I refer to Public Law 649, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the last section of which reads:

For carrying out the purposes of this act—

Speaking of the Health Service—

including administrative expenses, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated during the period ending June 30, 1952, the sum of $35,000,000, to be appropriated at such times and in such amounts as the Congress shall determine.

The Congress set up a health center within the District of Columbia. The question rises in my mind, why have these institutions not come to the health center? The money is there.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KERR. That is in addition to the money available through the Hill-Burton Act, is it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. And that is for the current fiscal year, is it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. Most of it is still unexpended, is it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct, according to my understanding.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not a fact that the District of Columbia, under the program developed through the Hill-Burton Act, would receive only about $300,000, as against North Carolina, which would receive $6,000,000 in 1 year?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In answer to the Senator from Rhode Island, I may say that under the Hill-Burton Act there is taken into consideration the population and the per capita wealth in a particular locality, wherever it may be, whether in a State or in the District of Columbia. Does that answer the question?

Mr. PASTORE. Not adequately.

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina That is the formula of the Hill-Burton Act.

Mr. PASTORE. The fact of the matter is that the whole formula was developed taking into consideration the State situation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That was taken into consideration, because it was found that States whose per capita wealth was very low could not properly care for the people within the State, and for that reason the formula was written into the law known as the Hill-Burton Act.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Then the Senator takes the position, does he not, that $300,000 a year is adequate to expand the facilities for hospital care in the District of Columbia?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to remind the Senator that there is also a Health Center. There is an authorization of $35,000,000 more for the purpose of taking care of the situation within the District.

Furthermore, the record shows that the Federal Government has been most liberal with the people of the District of Columbia in the construction of hospitals. The Federal Government contributed 70 percent of the cost of Georgetown Hospital. The Federal Government contributed 70 percent of the cost of George Washington Hospital.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Do I understand correctly that the Federal Government has already contributed 70 percent to both George Washington and Georgetown Hospitals?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. And is that also true——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the Senator will permit me to finish, the Federal Government contributed 100 percent of the cost of Freedmen's Hospital, and will contribute 70 percent of the cost of the Hospital Center, which will amount to about $21,000,000.

Mr. CASE. Did those contributions come out of the Federal Treasury or out of the treasury of the District of Columbia?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Federal Government contributed the amounts I have spoken of, to the extent of 70 percent.

Mr. CASE. My reason for wanting to establish that point is that I understand also that there are indigent patients, and that the hospitals receive $9 a day for the care of such patients. Could the Senator advise me with certainty about that?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is the Senator's question the question of who pays the cost?

Mr. CASE. I understand that in the case of indigent patients in the District of Columbia, the District Government pays $9 per day for the care of such patients at these hospitals.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from South Dakota is on the District of Columbia Committee with me, and I agree with him. My understanding is that $9 a day is paid for such patients.

Mr. CASE. That is the information I was given by another Member of the Congress who had gone into the matter.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. As I understand, the Senator from South Carolina is taking the position that because the Government has granted all this money to hospital facilities there is no need of any further grants. Is the Senator talking about the principle of granting money?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No. I wish the Federal Government were able to grant to the State of South Carolina the money that we need to build hospitals. I wish it could grant to every State in the Union enough money to build necessary hospitals. But if it cannot do so, and we start out giving money to the District of Columbia, what is going to happen? If this bill is enacted into law, every State in the Union could justly come before Congress and say, "We are entitled to the same treatment that you have given to the District of Columbia." Is not that true?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield. But will the Senator answer that question?

Mr. PASTORE. I will answer it. I cannot follow the Senator's argument. He says that the Government has given 70 percent to the George Washington Hospital, 100 percent to Freedmen's Hospital, and also $35,000,000 to the Health Center. He is opposed to the bill because he thinks the precedent is bad. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am opposed to it because of the precedent we are setting. Let the hospitals apply to the Health Center and get the money. Let them go through the proper channels as other hospitals do within the States. It is true that the District of Columbia is different from any State in the Union.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator know that at the time the Health Center was established, in the very bill that was reported from the committee the amendment on which we are acting today was a part of the bill and was stricken out on the floor of the House?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It was stricken out. Why was it stricken out?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Because they thought it should not be in the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator realize that the House has now passed it?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I realize that, but there is still a great deal of opposition to it in the House.

Mr. PASTORE. Would not the Senator say that the purpose was possibly to rectify a wrong?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No. I think we shall be doing a wrong at this time if we pass this type of bill.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Can the Senator give me the slightest justification for the additional provision for money over and beyond that which is available under the Hill-Burton Act and that which is available under the act which provides that the money can be had through the Health Center?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe the hospitals should apply to the Health Center to get the money.

Mr. KERR. I got the impression from reading the amendment that if it is adopted the Federal Government would be paying 100 percent of the cost of a new hospital to be established by a private agency.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I was coming to that. The way it is written there may be a little joker in it. I do not know whether it is so intended, but it looks like a joker.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. There can be no question in anyone's mind that the formula as worked out—and it is so stated in the bill and in the report—provides that the voluntary agency shall put up 50 percent of the money. If a hospital is to cost $100,000, the hospital puts up $50,000 and the United States Government puts up the other $50,000, and the District pays back $15,000 over a period of 33⅓ years. The Senator can strain the language all he wants to, but he cannot change that formula.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Would the Senator from Rhode Island object to striking out this proviso? If what he says is correct, it is not necessary to have the proviso.

Mr. PASTORE. What proviso?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. This proviso:

Provided further, That, except in the case of the construction and equipment of a new hospital, no such grant shall be made to any private agency unless such private agency shall obligate itself to pay at least 50 percent of the cost of any project for which such grant is made.

Mr. PASTORE. What does that mean?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is what I want to know. Why is that proviso in the bill?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The only way the Senator can interpret that proviso is that it means that in the case of the construction of a new hospital that 50-percent provision would not apply.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That would be my interpretation of it. Why not strike out that proviso?

Mr. KERR. Unless that is the intent of the amendment, is it not a fact that the entire amendment is not needed?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct. If that is not true, what is the necessity for the amendment?

Mr. PASTORE. I think it would do us all good to read the language of the act——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have plenty of time; I will read it.

Mr. PASTORE. Read it from the beginning.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that I am about to read from Public Law 648, Seventy-ninth Congress, which is printed in the report on pages 6 and 7. I will read the entire act.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KERR. As I read the proviso, which the Senator from South Carolina has cited, it makes it possible, where a hospital is already operating for the Government to make a 100-percent grant to it up to the point where that which the hospital had when the Government started would not be more than 50 percent of the entire project.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is what it says.

Mr. KERR. As the Senator reads I should appreciate his calling specific attention to that point, if it means what I understand it means.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We are amending a law which is already

in existence. This is not the Hill-Burton Act; this is another "giving" act, between the Hill-Burton Act and the bill we are discussing at the present time. I read from Public Law 648:

That in order to provide more adequate hospital facilities in the District of Columbia the Federal Works Administration is authorized to acquire land, construct buildings, and make grants to private agencies and to these ends is empowered—

We are going to let them acquire land. Some hospitals wanted to start new ones—

to acquire land, construct buildings, and make grants to private agencies and to these ends is empowered—

(a) to acquire prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General (without regard to secs 1136, as amended, and 3709 of the Revised Statutes) improved or unimproved lands or interests in lands in the District of Columbia by purchase, donation, exchange, or condemnation (including proceedings under the acts of Aug 1, 1888 (25 Stat 357), Mar 1, 1929 (45 Stat 1415), and Feb 26, 1931 (46 Stat 1421)) for such hospital facilities

Mr KERR Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield

Mr KERR The effect of the amendment which has been read into the bill, if passed, would be to add to the program already in effect whereby the Federal Works Administration is authorized to acquire land and construct buildings to the point where it would be able to acquire land, construct buildings, and make grants to private agencies

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As Senators will notice also, in the other measure facilities in the District are referred to. Then there is the language, "acquire land, construct buildings, and make grants to private agencies", which is not in the present law.

Mr PASTORE. That is what I asked the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Private agencies are included That is what I am objecting to more than anything else in the bill.

Mr PASTORE. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator will turn to line 20, page 2, he will find a definition and explanation of what a private agency is, namely:

As used in this act, the term "private agencies" shall mean any nonprofit private agencies operating hospital facilities in the District of Columbia.

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true, and as I said in the beginning, how many hospitals operate for a profit? Name some of them. There are very few.

I read further:

(b) by contract or otherwise without regard to sections 1136, as amended, and 3709 of the Revised Statutes, and section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), prior to approval of title by the Attorney General, to make surveys and investigations—

Remember, they already have the authority—

to plan, design, and construct hospital facilities in the District of Columbia on lands or interests in lands acquired under the provisions of subsection (a) hereof or on other lands of the United States which may be available (the transfers of which for this purpose by the Federal agency having jurisdiction thereof are hereby authorized notwithstanding any other provision of law), provide proper approaches thereto, utilities, and procure necessary materials, supplies, articles, equipment, and machinery, and do all things in connection therewith to carry out the provisions of this act,

Bear in mind that down to that point the law is already on the statute books. But those interested do not want to get the money provided under the terms of that law They want it to go directly to the private agencies. Is that not true?

Mr. PASTORE That is correct.

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is what I am saying We are asked to establish a precedent which would cause trouble, not once, but many, many times.

Let me read the amendment being suggested. This is an amendment to the present, existing law:

(c) To make grants to private agencies in cash, or in land or other property (which the Administrator is hereby authorized to acquire for such purpose by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise) upon such terms and in such amounts or of such value as the Administrator may deem to be in the public interest to enable such private agencies to make surveys and investigations—

They are going to do the investigating—

to plan, to design, construct, remodel, relocate, rebuild, renovate, extend, equip, furnish—

That refers to anything they desire to buy and put in the building—

furnish, or repair hospital facilities in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That in no event shall the amount or value of the grant exceed 50 percent of the value of the hospital plant of a private agency as improved with the aid of such grant—

Now we come to the next amendment. Why is it necessary to adopt it if it does not mean we are to give the hospitals affected a hundred percent?—

Provided further, That, except in the case of the construction and equipment of a new hospital, no such grant shall be made to any private agency unless such private agency shall obligate itself to pay at least 50 percent of the cost of any project for which such grant is made.

What is the necessity of that?

Mr PASTORE. It is merely explanatory, if the Senator is asking me.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The only trouble is that the Government constructs the hospitals We find in the proposal the words "new construction." One provision deals with extension and the other with construction. There is first the language "to plan, design, construct, remodel, relocate, rebuild, renovate, extend, equip, furnish."

What else would the Senator desire to have included?

Mr. PASTORE. That relates first to a situation where there is an existing hospital, and in the second instance where a new one is built.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It does not say that.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma

Mr KERR. Is it not a fact that under the first part of the amendment the Federal Government would be directed to give to any private agency now operating a hospital so much money that the Government would pay a hundred percent of the cost of doubling the hospital?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It certainly raises the question.

Mr KERR When that had been done, the same hospital would be eligible to receive another 100 percent more to double it again.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There can be no question about that.

Mr. PASTORE Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield

Mr. PASTORE. I do not see how the Senator could possibly read that into the bill, or make any such interpretation. It merely says that when they extend, or remodel, the extension program shall be paid off 50 percent by the hospital and 50 percent by the Federal Government.

Mr KERR Not at all. If the Senator from South Carolina will yield, I will read it.

Mr. PASTORE Very well; read it.

Mr KERR. It reads:

Provided, That in no event shall the amount or value of the grant—

Mr PASTORE That is correct.

Mr KERR Now, wait a minute—

Provided, That in no event shall the amount or value of the grant exceed 50 percent of the value of the hospital plant of a private agency as improved——

Mr. PASTORE "As improved"

Mr. KERR. If 50 percent of the value of the hospital plant as improved has been paid, that means that a hundred percent of the improvement has been paid, if the improvement is equal to the old plant before the improvement started. It has to be that way.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. There have been many suggestions that the proceedings of Congress should be televised. We have just witnessed one of the best arguments to illustrate the interest which would follow the public's seeing the synchronization of the gestures of the two able Senators who have just been speaking. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I read further:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whether relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real or other property by the United States or to other

matters, the Federal Works Administrator, with respect to any hospital facilities acquired or constructed under the provisions of this act, is authorized to enter into leases with private agencies for the operation and maintenance of such hospital facilities—

That is what we do not want. That is what we are trying to get out from under. We do not want any contract. That is the law now, but they are going to build it under their way of building.

Speaking of this law, it reads—

is authorized to enter into leases with private agencies for the operation and maintenance of such hospital facilities or usable separable portions thereof upon such terms, including the period of any such leases—

We might need them in case of war—

annual rentals, provision for joint use of facilities, provisions for operation, maintenance, repair, and replacement of buildings, equipment, machinery, and furnishings, and appropriate security to assure the performance of any such leases, and to sell for cash or credit or to convey in exchange for other properties any such hospital facilities or usable separable portion thereof to private agencies on such terms as may be deemed by the Administrator to be in the public interest—

We turn the money loose. No one checks it to see where it is going—

Provided, That all hospitals participating in such center shall be required either to convey to the Government, free and clear of all incumbrance, the land and buildings now held by them or to sell the same at such prices as is agreed to and approved by the Federal Works Administrator and to pay the proceeds thereof to the Government at the option of the Federal Works Agency.

It looks as though they can come forward and get it, but they will be subject to a little control.

SEC. 3 In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Federal Works Administrator shall provide a hospital center of such size and design as he shall deem feasible and economical of operation

SEC 4. In carrying out the provisions of this act the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to utilize the services of or to act through the United States Public Health Service in the Federal Security Agency, the Federal Works Agency, and any other department or agency of the United States, and any funds appropriated pursuant to this act shall be available for transfer to such department or agency in reimbursement thereof.

SEC 5. Thirty percent of the net amount expended by the Federal Works Administrator under this act shall be charged against the District of Columbia and shall be repaid to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The following language is proposed to be stricken: "at such times and in such amounts, without interest, as the Congress shall hereafter determine."

The following language is proposed to be inserted in lieu thereof: "at the annual rate, without interest, of 3 percent of such 30 percent."

Reading further:

The District of Columbia shall be entitled to 30 percent of the sale price of any of the properties sold by the Federal Works Administrator under section 2 of this act, other than properties the value of which is deducted from the gross amount expended to determine the net amount upon which the 30 percent to be charged against the District of Columbia is computed, and the District of Columbia shall also be entitled to receive 30 percent of any rentals received from the leasing of any of the hospital facilities acquired or constructed by the Federal Works Administrator under this act. The amounts which may be due the District hereunder shall be credited on the amount owed the Government by the District of Columbia until such obligation of the District is discharged in full.

SEC. 6. For carrying out the purposes of this act, including administrative expenses, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated during the period ending June 30, 1952, the sum of $35,000,000 to be appropriated at such times and in such amounts as the Congress shall determine.

The pending bill would change the law. Mr. President, the money is still available. If the hospitals need to extend their facilities so badly, why is it that they have not come forward and asked for the money? The reason they have not done so is that they do not want to come under the hospital center. They want the money to come directly to them. That is where I think we are treading upon dangerous ground. If we pass this bill, why should we not go into the State of South Carolina and say to the Baptist hospital there, the Methodist hospital there, or any other denominational hospital there: "We will give the money directly to you." In that case the State of South Carolina would not have to approve the grant. It would not have to go through the State. That is the question. In other words, does our Constitution prohibit the mixing of church and state? What is it but mixing of church and state if the Federal Government takes taxpayers' money and gives it directly to a denominational institution?

One of the institutions affected by this bill is a Methodist institution. I went to a Methodist college. If it had not been for the kindness of the college in lending me the money to go to school, I probably would not have finished the college course. A Methodist institution would come in under the bill. However, that fact does not prevent my saying it is all wrong to do so. I know also that the Methodist conference as a whole is on record against such legislation. I know that the Southern Baptist Convention went on record against the mixing of church and state.

I know that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], a coauthor of the Hill-Burton Act, will verify my statement when I say that $3,000,000 in grants went to Alabama and that the Methodists in that State refused to accept such money on the ground that it was a mixing of church and state.

It should also be pointed out that an argument in support of the bill is that the hospitals which are to benefit from it are nonprofit hospitals. That is true of almost all hospitals. However, when the bill was debated on the floor of the House of Representatives it was shown that the average charge of the so-called nonprofit hospitals in the District was approximately $16 a day.

Mr. President, the private hospitals involved in the bill had an opportunity to come into the Hospital Center, as proposed by the act approved on August 7, 1946. Where have they been since August 7, 1946. If hospitals were needed so badly in the District, why have they not come forward and asked for the money?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. Why have they not asked for the money under what program?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Under the Hospital Center. If they could qualify under the rules and regulations they could get the money.

Mr. PASTORE. But they would have to give up their property to the Federal Administrator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Oh, they would have to give up something to get it, but if they are so interested in the people who are suffering in the District of Columbia, would it not be much better to do so than to hold the property in their name? By turning over the property to the Hospital Center they could provide the facilities which are needed Why have they not done so since 1946?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr PASTORE. Does the Senator from South Carolina take the position that they should not be entitled to these advantages because they do not want to give up their property to the Federal Government?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I contend that the proposal is in direct conflict with the Constitution of the United States with respect to mixing of church and State, because it would give money directly to a church institution.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true whether it is a Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Catholic, or any other kind of institution.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Is that not exactly what we are doing with Federal money under the Hill-Burton Act?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The money does not go directly to the institutions. It goes to the States. The States set up an organization. The money is not given directly to the institutions.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. What does the Senator from South Carolina mean when he says that we give the money to the State? It is not given to the State. An advisory council is set up in the State and the money goes directly to the hospital facilities.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There is an advisory council in the Hospital Center in the District of Columbia. These hospitals can go to the Hospital

Center and get the money. Why have they not done so?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator from South Carolina understand that the Hospital Center is not an agency through which money is given to private institutions operating hospital facilities in the District of Columbia, but that the Hospital Center is a center which was created under the original act of 1946?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have read the law.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator from South Carolina permit me to finish.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; I am yielding to the Senator from Rhode Island. I did not have to yield to him, but I did.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island. When the Senator from Rhode Island is not talking I am talking.

Mr. PASTORE. I shall talk plenty. What I am saying is that when the Hospital Center was provided for under the original act the benefits were not extended to the private agencies we are now talking about. The private agencies were omitted. There is nothing in the law to compel private hospitals to get the benefits. The Hospital Center is an establishment of three hospitals, the Garfield, the Episcopal Eye, Ear, and Throat, and another hospital, and in the shadow of one another they give this clinical service. There is nothing in the act which requires any private agency to go to them.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If a hospital applies in accordance with the act it can get the money, but it must give up something in order to get the money. If it were to give up something and were to get the money, it could give service to suffering humanity in the District of Columbia.

Mr. PASTORE Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr PASTORE . It is not a question of giving up something, but a question of giving up everything. It is necessary for a hospital to hand over its property to the Federal Government in order to get any money from the hospital center. The Methodist hospital, the Presbyterian hospital, and other hospitals do not want to do it I do not blame them at all.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No; they want to get money from the Government without any strings tied to the money at all. Of course, we cannot blame them for their attitude, but it is up to Congress to say whether or not that shall be done.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I have some questions about the bill. Although I have not participated in the debate thus far, I should like to make clear for the RECORD that, so far as I am concerned, I see no difference between a contribution by the Federal Government through State agencies to private hospitals and a contribution under the pending bill. In times gone by I have defended the expenditure of Federal funds for schools on Indian reservations, where the schools had in some instances been sponsored by Protestant Churches, and in other instances by the Catholic Church. I have taken the position repeatedly that if it had not been for those institutions, many Indian children would have been deprived of an education; and I have been grateful that there are schools conducted under church auspices, whether Protestant or Catholic, to provide for the schooling of Indians who otherwise would be deprived of schooling.

I have not felt that under the circumstances attaching to it, there was any infringement of the Constitution; nor have I been of the opinion that there is any infringement of the Constitution under the Hill-Burton Act. In other words, if the Hill-Burton Act permits, as it has in my own State, Federal funds to go in some instances to Protestant hospitals, or in other instances to Catholic hospitals, I am not bothered about that; and I am not bothered by that phase of this bill.

However, the phase of the pending bill which does bother me is that by means of this bill we shall be making a special case of the District of Columbia and shall be setting up grants on a basis not available to any State. If we do that, I wonder whether in that respect we shall be establishing a precedent, following which the States will ask for the same advantageous opportunity of obtaining additional Federal funds which this bill would offer to hospitals in the District of Columbia.

Mr PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me, to permit me to answer that observation by the Senator from South Dakota?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Rhode Island, for that purpose?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course, Mr. President, in reaching that conclusion, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota must take into account the fact that the District of Columbia is in a very peculiar and unusual condition. In my State when we had trouble with the hospital situation, the State of Rhode Island appropriated money, not to take over the hospitals, but to supplement the income of the hospitals, in order that they could render proper service to the people of that community.

In this case, where else can the people of the District of Columbia go to obtain the needed assistance?

Mr. CASE. In this case the money should come from the District of Columbia.

Mr. PASTORE. A part of it does; 30 percent of the money must come from the District of Columbia. However, Senators must admit that the District of Columbia turns to the Congress for a part of its support. The Congress has that responsibility. We cannot turn our backs upon that responsibility, and say to the people of the District of Columbia, "Because you are not a State and we will not allow you to become a State, and because you are not a city and we will not allow you to become a city, and because you do not have home rule and we will not allow you to have home rule, we will deny you any assistance."

Mr. CASE. Of course, I am hopeful that before the day is over we shall take up the home-rule bill for the District of Columbia.

Mr. PASTORE. I am hopeful of that, too. However, in the meantime we must act on this measure in the proper way.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the private hospitals involved in this bill had an opportunity to come into the Hospital Center as proposed by the act approved August 7, 1946, Public Law 648 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. That project has not been completed, but $21,000,000 has been earmarked for the Hospital Center—in other words, $21,000,000 of the $35,000,000. The hospitals affected by the bill are Sibley Memorial, Providence, Casualty, and Homeopathic. They did not see fit to come under the Hospital Act, but they desire to take advantage of the opportunity to participate in the grants.

The proponents of the bill also argue that inasmuch as the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia includes nearby areas of Virginia and Maryland, sufficient hospital facilities are not available to take care of the population of the area. However, it should be pointed out that Maryland has received $4,177,000 under the Hill-Burton program, and Virginia has received $10,670,000 under the Hill-Burton program.

In the belief that religious liberty for all our citizens depends upon adherence to the constitutional principle of the separation of church and state, I think public assistance should be confined to publicly owned and publicly administered hospitals.

In the case of this bill, I shall agree with the Senator from South Dakota. He has made the point that by the enactment of this bill we would be changing the formula, so to speak, and would be making a new arrangement, in which the States would expect to participate. That is true, and such an arrangement would give us plenty of headaches. Mr. President, reference has been made to the House of Representatives. This bill was debated in the House. I shall read now from page 9225 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 31 of this year. At that point there was debate on this measure in the House. From that debate I read the following:

> Mr. ABERNETHY. In answer to the gentleman from Indiana, the Congress has already recognized that situation.

He was referring to the fact that the States which have the same problem would call for appropriations.

I read further from the debate in the House of Representatives.

The Congress has authorized the construction of a hospital center for the District, and that law has been passed The Congress has also appropriated 70 percent of all the dollars that went into Georgetown Hospital, the Congress appropriated and gave to George Washington University 70 percent of all the dollars that went into that hospital, and it constructed Freedmen's Hospital 100 percent. So the Congress has already recognised that situation and has contributed dollar after dollar after dollar after dollar for hospital purposes in the District of Columbia, and we think there ought to be an end to it at some time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes. I do not think the gentleman from Indiana needs to worry about the Congress not contributing to the hospitals of the District of Columbia. If we had towns at home with a population of a million people that got as much money out of the Federal till through the avenues just elucidated by the gentleman from Mississippi, we would be mighty well off. Let me say this to you, too. You talk about charity hospitals Sure, they do charity work. I did charity work in my little hospital, $40,000 in 10 years, and I marked it off the books. Every hospital does some charity work, and do not forget, too, that when you go into a hospital in the District of Columbia that the average charge is $16.11. That is what they charge whether your secretary goes or whether you go in as a patient. You pay an average of $16 11. My goodness, out in Kimball, Nebr., I thought I was lucky to get $5 a day. Well, it is different now. Many of the hospitals make money.

I read further from the debate which occurred in the House of Representatives:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Well, I hope they will. I did not vote for the hospital center bill, because I did not feel that some of the provisions in it were proper. We spent 4½ hours debating it in the House where 109 Members voted against it. Some $21,000,000 have been earmarked for the hospital center. We have these hospitals coming in, and they need money, but in the process of getting it, it seems to me that the people of the District of Columbia ought to be treated just as we treat our folks back home.

So, Mr. President, why should we enact a special measure for the District of Columbia in regard to hospitalization? Why make a different arrangement for the District of Columbia, in connection with the giving of Federal funds, in addition to the funds provided for the hospital center, which already has been arranged for, and which will receive $35,000,000 from the Federal Government? That amount is just $35,000,000 more than we have given to the various States, on a pro rata basis.

I continue the quotation from the speech of Representative MILLER:

We would say, "Yes, there is money available here, but you are going to have to pay it back over a period of 25 years in equal installments " What is wrong with that? You do it at home. Why should we not do it here?

I am fearful that we in Congress do something to people. We take away something from them when we do everything for them. We give them this and we give them that. We destroy that self-confidence, that ability to do something for themselves. Certainly in the case of these strong church institutions that can go out and raise money, and have done it—

Mr. President, that is what was done in Alabama, when they were offered $3,000,000. The Methodists of the South got together and said, "We will raise the money to build the hospitals."

Certainly in the case of these strong church institutions that can go out and raise money, and have done it, and God bless them, they have done a great job in the hospital field, and they ought to continue to do it. I doubt if the Congress should permit these fine religious institutions to put their hand into the public till and say, "We are going to get some tax money and we are not going to pay anything back," then I think that proposition is wrong; deadly wrong.

Ninety percent of the funds that have been allocated under the Hill-Burton Act went to city hospitals, county hospitals, or State hospitals. It seems to me that twelve million for the hospitals is too liberal. The principle is wrong.

I say if they want to get this money, then let the people of the District of Columbia pay back the money that is going to come under this bill When you start doing these things, what about the loss of our strength of character? What about the generations that are going to follow us? Because we are borrowing this money from all the people in the United States. What about our grandchildren, when the bill is due? You and I are saddling them with a debt and an obligation such as we have never seen before.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not need to talk about the generations to come. He can talk about the children that are here today, not our children's children.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska Certainly; I do not think we ought to be raiding the Federal Treasury to meet community needs. That is what it amounts to when you come down to this bill. There are certain intimate duties and responsibilities that citizens should assume This is one This Congress should not break down these responsibilities.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY Mr. Chairman, this bill ought not to pass in its present form. I dislike very much to find myself in disagreement with my majority leader, the author of the bill. I am very fond of him. I can appreciate his interest in the legislation and the sincere manner in which he has approached it Nevertheless, in all good conscience and to satisfy my own convictions, I feel that I should take the well of the House and oppose passage of the bill in its present form.

This legislation is new to many of you. It has a very long history running over a period of about 6½ or 7 years. The legislation was originally introduced by the former Senator from Maryland, Mr. Tydings. After holding hearings the Senate committee reported out a hospital bill which provided for the establishment of a hospital center in the form of a corporate body, permitting many hospitals in the District of Columbia to participate in the hospital center.

After the bill passed it came over to the House, and the proponents thought they had done so well that they would go a little further and seek more free Federal money. So they changed the form of the bill. They eliminated the corporate feature and provided for a direct Federal grant from the Federal Works Administrator for the establishment of a hospital center to be under the control of the Federal Government.

Having made very satisfactory progress in that field some of the private hospitals, and I cannot blame them, felt that they should get in on the gifts, so they came in and were included in the bill.

The bill came to the floor of the House in 1945, and the very provisions, almost in identical words, which you are asked to pass here today for the benefit of private hospitals, were defeated by the House of Representatives. Since that day there has been a very vigorous effort carried on by the proponents to get the private hospitals in under the cover of a direct Federal grant from the taxpayers of the 48 States.

The hospital center which is now authorized and which will be very largely paid for by the Federal Government will sooner or later become a part of the hospital facilities for the people of the District of Columbia. I do not knov why it has not been constructed. The authorization is on the books. I understand they are just waiting to take over some particular piece of naval property as a site, and the reason it has not been constructed is because they do not seem to be able to get that property.

There is one question to be decided and that is whether or not in addition to the benefits of the Hill-Burton Act—the only source that the people in your own State have to look to for Federal money for hospitals—you are willing to make additional moneys available to the District of Columbia which your people in your own States and districts contribute in the form of taxes.

I pointed out a moment ago in answer to the gentleman from Indiana that the Congress has certainly met its responsibility, if it has any responsibility, in building hospitals for the people in the District of Columbia. The Federal Government contributed 70 percent of every dollar that went into the construction of Georgetown Hospital. The people paid and the Federal Government contributed 70 percent of every dollar that was put into the George Washington Hospital. Your people paid that. The Federal Government contributed every dollar that went into the construction of Freedmen's Hospital, and your people paid for that. Your people will also pay to the extent of approximately $20,000,000 that which will go into the construction of the hospital center and only a small portion of that will be returned to the Federal Treasury.

It is not a very pleasant task to oppose legislation sponsored by close friend.

I can say the same thing, Mr. President.

On the other hand, I have a very deep feeling about this matter. I am as familiar with it as any Member of the House because I have sat on this committee for about 8½ or 9 years and during 7 years of that time this legislation has been before the committee. In the original instance this legislation was referred to a subcommittee of which I was for a long time chairman, but for some reason when the same bill was referred this time it was not referred to my Committee on Health and Education. It occurs to me that is where a bill of this kind should be referred.

Mr. ABERNETHY again says:

Well, I hope my friend is correct, but the report that was filed before came from the Committee on Health and Education. That is what the report shows.

Now, this is what those of us who oppose this bill propose to do, and I think it is more than fair. I honestly believe that more than fair. I do not feel that the Federal Government, by any stretch of the imagination, is duty bound to make any contribution whatsoever to these hospitals. I do not feel that the Federal Government, by any stretch of the imagination, is in duty

bound to loan one dollar for the construction of these hospitals, but as a compromise of the whole problem—and I concede it is a compromise—the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr MILLER] and I intend to sponsor an amendment which will make available a Federal loan for the purposes in the bill. We propose to offer an amendment which will loan to them your money without a dime interest—not a dime. It is to be repaid over a period of 25 years. I think that is more than fair

Mr. President, I wonder if they would agree to that at this time—take the money, pay it back over a term of 29 years, with no interest; simply use the money and pay it back. It seems as if that would be very fair. Why would not that be fair under the circumstances of the case? If they need the money so badly, let them borrow it and pay it back, with no interest. Would the Senator object to that?

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator asking me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. My answer is that, after all, we have go to look to our obligation in the first place——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is an obligation.

Mr. PASTORE. I think it is the obligation of the community to give to the people the proper hospital facilities required in order to treat the sick. In the District of Columbia these fine institutions—Methodist, Catholic, and other denominations—are rendering a great service on a nonprofit basis to the people of this community. Once we have established the obligation, it strikes me that if these private hospitals were not doing the fine work they are doing today, we would have to step in and possibly take them over or take over the duties they are performing and build hospitals which would cost a great deal more money than we would be called upon to spend if we proceeded in accordance with the provisions of this bill. They are not coming to us with their hats in their hands. They are asking Congress to share in the responsibility which is ours. Some Senators seem to take the attitude that they are trying to reach out and get something. They would not come to us unless they had to. That strikes me as being the philosophy behind their attitude; they are not begging; they are saying to us, "We need to expand and the expansions are necessary. There are more persons who require hospital beds than we have beds to supply. We are willing to expand our facilities, but we do not have the money to do it by ourselves, so we are asking you to share in this responsibility."

That is what I think we need in this country—a little more sharing of responsibility.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It looks as if the people who are paying taxes in far away California will never see a hospital here and probably will not know that there are any; but they pay taxes for them.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The only suggestion I would make, and I think the Senator would probably agree with me, is to give them home rule. I think the Senator would be the first one——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am not for that; the Senator from Rhode Island knows that without my saying anything about it. I would be willing to vote for the bill if the Senator would put in the words "any State."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The States already have had provision made for them.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Not under the broad principles contained in this bill. A small amount of money goes to each State and it is prorated according to the wealth and population. Hospitals are needed in South Carolina much more than they are needed in the District of Columbia. The same is true of some other States. If the Senator will so amend the bill that any State in the Union can be made equally eligible for money for hospitals, I will vote for the bill, but I shall not vote for anything that dishes out something different to the District of Columbia than that which is given to people in the States of the Union.

Mr. PASTORE. Did we not do that in connection with the Health Center in 1946?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We went a step further and gave the people of the District something in addition to what was given to the States. The Senator is now asking for more, and he will be back again asking for more. This is just a starter.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator admit that there is a relationship between the Congress of the United States and the District of Columbia that does not exist with reference to the communities in other States of the Nation We of the Congress have held a grip financially and otherwise upon the District of Columbia. The people of the District of Columbia have been clamoring for years and years to be allowed to operate their own business, and we have said, "No, no; we will not give you that power. We expect to retain it in the Congress of the United States." Because of that position, does not the Senator think we have a moral obligation to meet our responsibilities as we should meet them?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Congress of the United States through the Hill-Burton Act, gave the District money for hospitals. We have also appropriated $35,000,000 for a health center in the District.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again on that point?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The formula of the Hill-Burton Act has been worked out in such a way that the people of the District of Columbia do not get substantial benefits. I do not know what the population of North Carolina is, but I doubt very much——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator mean South Carolina?

Mr. PASTORE. I am talking about North Carolina. I do not know what the population of North Carolina is, but under the Hill-Burton Act it receives $6,000,000 a year. That would build a 350-bed hospital in the District of Columbia which serves 1,400,000 residents of the metropolitan area.

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Virginia counts some of those people in connection with getting some money for herself.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, but they come to the hospitals in the District

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. But money for hospitals is paid to Maryland and Virginia.

Mr. PASTORE. But people living in that area come to the hospitals in the District of Columbia because that is where they work. They may be living on the outskirts of the city, in Virginia, but they come to the hospitals here, and the hospitals have been taking in those people at a loss

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They go to hospitals outside of the District, too.

Mr. PASTORE. Perhaps they do. The District of Columbia receives $300,000 a year under the Hill-Burton Act, as against $6,000,000 that goes to North Carolina.

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is due to the factors of per capita wealth and population.

Mr. PASTORE. That is exactly true.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is the reason for the payment to North Carolina. As I said a few moments ago, if the pending bill is passed, another measure will be forthcoming, seeking another $25,000,000, and then another bill will be coming in for what is left over I have always noticed that when there is anything left over, when there is a surplus, somebody always grabs for it When I was governor of my State I built up a surplus, and when I was about to leave the governor's office there was a surplus in the treasury of about $15,000,000. Does the Senator know what I did with that surplus before I left office?

Mr. PASTORE I do not.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I called in all the bonds, and paid off all the indebtedness of the State so far as I possibly could. I knew that if I did not there would be many people or communities wanting the money. If the Health Center here had used up the $35,000,000 made available, it would have been a little bit harder for the Senator from Rhode Island to come before the Senate and ask for an additional appropriation. He would have hesitated a little.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. But when the Health Center said, "We need only $21,000,000, or approximately that," and did not use that, but left it over, then certain hospitals began to say, "That money is available; we would like to have it, and we would like to get it without going through the Health Center, or having anything to do with it. We would like to get it and not have to pay any interest. We would like to get it and build a new hospital."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I have the highest respect and admiration for the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, especially for what he did during the time he served as governor of his State, and I would be the last one in the world to be dispensing promiscuously money which belonged to the taxpayers of the country; but that is not exactly the question before the Senate. It is not a question of throwing away the money of the people. What I am saying is that there must first be established the fact that there is a need. If we were convinced that there is no need for additional hospital facilities in the District of Columbia, naturally the Senator's position would be correct.

Second, if we felt that the private agencies could meet the need without coming to Congress, we should vote against the bill. But if we establish the fact that there is a need, and if we establish the fact that we cannot meet the need unless we expand the facilities, and that they cannot be expanded under the revenues accruing to the institutions at the present time, then it is incumbent upon the Congress to meet the need, if it cares to do so.

I am not saying we must hand out the taxpayers' money promiscuously. But if the bill provides for the health and welfare of the people of the District of Columbia and if more beds for the sick are needed, why do we talk about $13,000,000 meaning so much when we are actually giving billions away to people in other parts of the world? Why is the health of American people not just as important as the health of people in any other area of the world?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad the Senator mentioned that. So far as I am concerned, I am one who did not vote to give money to people in the other parts of the world. I did not vote to give the money of the American people to other nations when we needed it at home, and I am not going to vote to appropriate for hospitals in the District money which could be spent for a similar purpose in other places where it is more needed.

Mr. President, why do I say that? The Federal Government owes to every State, so far as health is concerned, the same obligation it owes to the District of Columbia. The very object of the Hill-Burton Act was to help people build hospitals who could not build them themselves because of the economic conditions existing in the community.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. For that reason it will be found in many States of the Union, not only in my State, but in many of the States, that hospital facilities are needed twice as badly as they are needed in the District of Columbia, so far as beds are concerned.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. If more hospital beds are needed in the Senator's State, his State has the authority, under the Constitution, to impose taxes in order to meet that need, but the people of the District of Columbia have no right to impose taxes. They have to come to the Congress. We cannot compare the relationship between a private hospital and a State and a private hospital and the District of Columbia. In the District the people must look to Congress for money to build hospitals, as the people look to their States elsewhere in the Union. The people of the District of Columbia have no right to impose taxes. They have no right to rule themselves, because we rule them, and consequently they have to look to Congress to enact their laws.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Rhode Island is on the Committee on the District of Columbia, as I am, and I see other members of the District Committee present in the Chamber at this time. When the District sends in its annual budget, it is scrutinized by the committee; the committee looks into it to see what the needs of the District are, for hospitals, and for all other purposes. Estimates and recommendations are submitted to the committee, and we then pass on them, as do State legislatures.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. When we passed upon the estimates this year, did we take into consideration the request now made? Did we approve this request this year? No. I do not blame the hospitals for asking for the appropriation. I myself would like to get a million dollars. I could start up a little institution somewhere and provide myself with a salary.

Mr. PASTORE. How would the Senator get the millon dollars?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to get it from the Federal Government, as those interested in this bill want to get it. I should like to build an institution in my State.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator made an observation about the right of the people of the District to come to the committees of Congress and submit their budgets to the Congress.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They do that every year.

Mr. PASTORE. I have been a Member of the Congress only about 9 months. I have been a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and it has amazed me to observe how backward the people in the District of Columbia are insofar as progressive legislation is concerned. Time and time again proposed legislation is introduced, extensive hearings are held, we determine the fact that certain legislation would be for the betterment and for the welfare of the people of the District, but what happens? A bill is reported to the Senate, and it goes to the Consent Calendar, which means that unless every single Member of the Senate agrees to it, the bill does not become law.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Oh, no; wait a minute.

Mr. PASTORE. One objection to the bill kills it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true as to a call of the Consent Calendar. But how did the Senator get the pending bill brought up? I objected to it.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator objected to it, and I made a special request of the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is the way all bills are brought up in the Senate.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator will admit, will he not, that it is a very extraordinary circumstance that this bill came up for open debate?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The bill before us?

Mr. PASTORE. As long as I have been here, this is the first time such a thing has happened.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Wait a minute. Does the Senator mean to apply that statement to any bill?

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator will permit me, my experience in this body has been that all legislation affecting the District of Columbia must run the gantlet of the Senate calendar; and if there is one objection, we must forget the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. This bill is treated the same as any other measure is treated. It can be taken up at any time by a majority vote.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that this proposed legislation takes the same course that all other legislation takes?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct. The same rules of the Senate apply to it as to any other legislation.

Mr. KERR. Any legislation which is reported from any committee goes to the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. And it is called with the other bills on the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. KERR. If any Senator objects, it is not passed by unanimous consent, but can be taken up on motion of any Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. That applies to any other legislation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask the Senator one further question. My good friend from Rhode Island has talked about the needs of the District of Columbia as such. Does a single dollar of

the money provided by this amendment go to the District of Columbia as such?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It goes to private institutions.

Mr. KERR. Within the District of Columbia?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes

Mr. KERR. It has nothing whatever to do with the Government of the District of Columbia, or with the discharge by the Government of the District of Columbia of its obligation to the people within the District The money entirely bypasses the District of Columbia Government, does it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PASTORE Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. KERR. Let me finish. Is my statement correct?

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr KERR. Therefore this proposed legislation involves a direct grant from the Federal Government to a private agency.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr KERR. A private agency within the District of Columbia

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield

Mr PASTORE In refutation of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma——

Mr KERR. Mr President, a point of order

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it

Mr KERR. I did not make a statement to be refuted I simply asked the distinguished Senator from South Carolina a question

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr PASTORE. Let me say to the dstinguished Senator from South Carolina that the District does have an interest in this bill The people of the District do have an interest in the bill. In the first place, 30 percent of the 50 percent which is paid by the Congress must be repaid by the District of Columbia. What is the purpose of the grant? To build hospitals in the District of Columbia. For whom? For the people who live in the District Of course the District of Columbia is interested, and of course the people of the District of Columbia are going to benefit from the program. Who is going to lie in these beds? Who is going to go to the clinics, if not the people who live in the District of Columbia? I never heard of such an argument.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma never heard of such a thing as the Federal Government making a direct grant to a private agency, and bypassing the government of a State or of the District of Columbia. The Senator from Rhode Island talks about never having heard of such an argument.

Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KERR. What are the private agencies eligible under this proposal?

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I can tell the Senator in a moment. They are listed in my manuscript.

The hospitals affected by the pending bill are Sibley Memorial, Providence, Casualty, and Homeopathic.

Mr. KERR. Can the Senator identify them further? They are private institutions, are they not?

Mr. PASTORE Private, nonprofit institutions.

Mr KERR They are private agencies—agencies of whom?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is a question. I am not here arguing any particular hospital or any particular individual, but I am arguing that I do not think the money ought to go direct——

Mr KERR From the Federal Government to a private agency

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct. I believe that this bill represents a little too much in addition to the Hill-Burton Act, and in addition to the $35,000,000 from the Federal Government That is my position

Various witnesses appeared before us in regard to this particular bill. I should like to read some of the testimony of Glenn L Archer He is the executive director of Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State. He made the statement from which I shall read. The statement was made before the Committee on the District of Columbia.

My name is Glenn L. Archer I am executive director of Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State, an organization with members in every part of the Nation, and including persons of many faiths and creeds who are united on the single principle of separation of church and State—a principle which was woven into the very fabric of our Government at the birth of the American Republic. I am here to express our alarm at the threat to religious liberty which we see in the bill H R 2094 now being considered by the honorable Senators of this committee.

Concern for public welfare has been advanced as a compelling reason for the introduction of the hospital grants bill, but actually its passage would work a disservice to the most vital interests, not only of the people of the District of Columbia, but of the people of the United States as a whole.

For the American people no boon is more precious than the boon of liberty The pending bill would, by allocating tax funds for the support of sectarian institutions, seriously undermine our liberty Because I believe that consequences of the greatest evil would flow from the adoption of this defective measure, I should like to review the situation as I see it.

First of all, it is appropriate to consider the fact that the passage of H R 2094 without amendment would inevitably give rise to serious and protracted litigation testing its constitutionality. Such litigation might, to the casual observer, take on the appearance of a contest between religious groups, but, regardless of appearances, such litigation would actually be a contest between those Americans of many faiths who uphold the separation of church and State and those groups which seek to make that great guaranty of religious liberty a dead letter in American law today. Surely the increasing frequency with which freedom-loving citizens are forced to resort to the courts for enforcement of the first amendment is a tragedy of our time.

Proponents of H. R 2094 have pointed to certain appropriations made under the Hill-Burton Act as a precedent for the new measure, which would use public funds to aid private and denominational hospitals in the District of Columbia. They overlook the fact that the Hill-Burton Act was passed before the United States Supreme Court handed down its memorable decision in the Everson and McCollum cases of 1947 and 1948, in both of which the Court maintained that—

"Neither a State nor the Federal Government can set up a church Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion"

Mr. President, I am acting under quite a handicap here this afternoon. I have three bills in conference. I came into the Chamber from a conference and started the discussion on the pending bill under those circumstances I am glad to say that the committee is continuing its work. I hope it will accomplish something this afternoon, in regard to the postal pay bill, and also reach some compromise on the postal rate bill.

My friend from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] smiles. He is in the same position I am in. He is also on the conference committee. The conferees might do better in our absence We can never tell. We might be the fly in the ointment, so to speak We might keep the conferees from reaching a rightful conclusion.

Now, it is an indisputable fact that religious hospitals, like religious schools, are maintained for the greater glory of the faith of those who operate them, and, consequently, are sectarian institutions within the meaning of these Supreme Court decisions. Of course, such hospitals, like the denominational schools, also perform certain functions which may be described as "secular" or connected with "public" interests, but this fact does not divert them from their primary and distinctive purpose of propagating religion. The owners and administrators of such hospitals have themselves admitted the truth of this contention.

Mr McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from South Carolina quoted from a legal opinion.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I quoted from two cases.

Mr McMAHON. What is the opinion from which the Senator read?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It was from the McCollum case.

Mr. McMAHON. The McCollum case, and also the Everson case, which was the New Jersey bus case?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course the Senator from South Carolina realizes that the question presented in the McCollum case is not the question at issue here, does he not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Of course, no two cases are exactly alike, as the Senator from Connecticut well knows. That is what causes lawyers to go into court. If the facts were always the same in every case, we would have no lawsuits.

Mr. McMAHON. I agree with the Senator from South Carolina in that respect. In the instant case I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from South Carolina to the Supreme Court case of *Bradfield* v. *Roberts* (175 U. S. 292). I am sure the Senator from South Carolina recalls that it was not a case involving a hospital, but the teaching of religion on released time, which was the question presented in the McCollum case.

Attesting to the present-day vitality of Bradfield against Roberts, the Supreme Court of Mississippi, in 1950, relied on Bradfield against Roberts to determine the constitutionality of a State grant to a religious affiliated hospital. The case is that of *Craig* v. *Mercy Hospital* (45 So. 2d 809 (1950)), in which the court declared:

> The case of *Bradfield* v. *Roberts* (175 U. S. 291, 20 S. Ct. 121, 44 L. ed. 168) is decisive of the question of whether or not a hospital chartered to care for the sick, as the limited object of its creation as in the case of Mercy Hospital-Street Memorial, could receive a grant of aid from the Federal Government under a contract between the District of Columbia and the directors of the hospital, composed of a monastic order or sisterhood of the Catholic Church, without being a violation of article 1 of the amendments of the Federal Constitution providing that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion. * * *" And the facts there involved make applicable the principles there announced so as to make the grant, as in the case now before us, a valid one. This case is cited to show that the doctrine of the separation of church and state is not violated, and also as authority for the proposition that the charter powers of a corporation control, and not the religious beliefs of its stockholders, as to whether it is operated in a secular activity.

If the Senator from South Carolina will indulge me further, I should like to invite his attention to a Kentucky case.

In 1949 the Court of Appeals of Kentucky likewise had an occasion to rule upon the constitutionality of an appropriation to a religious-affiliated hospital. In the case of *Kentucky Building Commission* v. *Effron* (220. S. W. 2d 836), the court declared:

> It is well settled that a private agency may be utilized as the pipeline through which a public expenditure is made, the test being not who receives the money, but the character of the use for which it is expended.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The fact that members of the governing boards of these hospitals, which perform a recognized public service to all people regardless of faith or creed, are all of one religious faith does not signify that the money allotted the hospitals is to aid their particular denomination. On the contrary, the governing boards of such hospitals are but the channels through which the funds flow Courts will look at the use to which these funds are put rather than the conduits through which they run. If that use is a public one and is calculated to aid all people in the State, it will not be held in contravention of article 5 merely because the hospitals carry the name or are governed by the members of a particular faith.

Of course there is no religious activity involved in cutting out someone's appendix, provided that one does not apply as a test the religious affiliation of the person before starting to operate on his appendix.

Under the school-lunch law we give school lunches to all children. We do it on the basis of the fact that they are children and because the State is interested in sound and healthy bodies and sound and healthy minds. The children get the milk. I do not know that there is any particular religion in a glass of milk.

A child is given a glass of milk not because he attends school A, B, or C, but because the State has an interest in the physical welfare of the child.

In the New Jersey bus case, the Supreme Court examined the first amendment and came to the conclusion that transporting children to a school run by the religious did not impinge upon the first amendment to the Constitution. The Court pointed out that the State had an interest in getting the child safely to school. In other words, it felt that it would be ridiculous to say to Johnny Jones, "You go to a parochial school, and therefore you must walk over the ice. You may be killed, but that is all right. However, your sister Mary goes to a public school. Therefore, we will transport her to school."

I am wondering, in view of the decisions of the Supreme Court, whether it has not been universally held that the people who run the hospitals are not to be examined and looked at for their religious affiliation, but rather whether or not the institution treats everyone, regardless of race or creed.

I appreciate the Senator's indulging me in his time. As I understand, the Methodist hospital, the Episcopal Hospital, and the Catholic hospital involved do not ask the Senator from South Carolina or anyone else, when he comes to the door, "What is your religion? What is your color? What is your creed? What is your race?" Rather, he is asked, "Are you sick? Do you need attention? Can we help you?" I suppose no one denies that that is the essence of the religion of Christ. There is nothing sectarian in it. Certainly the courts have universally recognized that fact.

So in this debate I wish we could drop this nonsensical argument—at least, it seems so to me—that some question of a violation of the first amendment of the Constitution is involved in this matter. I assure the Senator that the courts have said that no such question is involved.

I should like to make another point, if the Senator will permit me to do so. I realize that I am speaking in his time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad to have the Senator proceed.

Mr. McMAHON. That point is this: The Senator has said, in effect, "Why do not they go into the hospital center?" I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that we do not want all the hospitals in one location; it is much better to have them distributed geographically. I believe the testimony which was presented before the Senator's committee demonstrated—and it is a fact—that the location of more than 600 hospital beds in one place is not conductive to the most economical and most efficient hospital management. I wish to commend that argument to the Senator, namely, that it would be much better for us to have our hospitals spread out, at this time, which all of us realize might be a time of attack.

I thought it worthwhile to bring those two matters to the Senator's attention, because when we are involved in this commendable effort to relieve the sick and aid the needy poor, this effort to assist fine-minded and high-minded people in a glorious work, I think it is most unhappy for us to mix up that work with the prohibition of the first amendment to the Constitution, as that amendment has been interpreted by the courts.

I thank the Senator very much for yielding to me.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I can see a difference between the statement of facts in regard to the bus case and the statement of facts in regard to the case now before the Senate.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield

Mr. KERR. It is not the purpose of this measure to provide Federal funds for the operation of a charity hospital; the hospitals are not operated free of charge, simply because some one is poor. Is not that a fact?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; the hospitals are not operated on a charity basis.

Mr KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me, to permit me to make a unanimous-consent request, namely, that I may be permitted to suggest the absence of a quorum, and that thereafter the Senator from South Carolina shall have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield for that purpose?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, Mr President, if I may do so without losing the floor. I ask unanimous consent to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I shall not object, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut will state it.

Mr. McMAHON. Has any business been transacted since the last quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No business has been transacted since the last quorum call.

Mr. McMAHON. Then, is a quorum call in order at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If unanimous consent is given, a quorum call may be had at this time.

Is there objection?

Mr. McMAHON. I do not object.

Mr. KERR. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that thereafter the Senator from South Carolina shall have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Benton	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Brewster	Hill	Moody
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Butler, Md	Holland	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Neely
Capehart	Hunt	O'Conor
Carlson	Ives	O'Mahoney
Case	Jenner	Pastore
Chavez	Johnston, S C	Robertson
Connally	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kerr	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Kilgore	Smathers
Eastland	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Ecton	Langer	Smith, N J.
Ellender	Lehman	Smith, N C.
Ferguson	Magnuson	Sparkman
Frear	Malone	Stennis
Fulbright	Maybank	Taft
George	McCarran	Underwood
Green	McFarland	Watkins
Hayden	McKellar	Wiley
Hendrickson	McMahon	Williams
Hennings	Millikin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair) A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S 2244) to amend certain housing legislation to grant preferences to veterans of the Korean conflict.

The message also announced that the House had rejected the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4473) to provide revenue, and for other purposes; that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill; asked a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr DINGELL, Mr MILLS, Mr. REED of New York, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S 467. An act to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota,

S 509 An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat 451, 16 U. S C 718d), as amended;

H R 971 An act for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne, and

H R 1038 An act relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Smithsonian Institution and its constituent bureaus

GRANTS FOR HOSPITAL FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2094) to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, just before the quorum call we were discussing House bill 2094, and I had raised objections to the allocations and to the manner in which they are made. I also brought out the fact that under the Hill-Burton Act the District of Columbia had a right to secure funds I also invited attention to another act which is now on the statute books, which was passed in 1946, and which is known as Public Law 648, which gave to the District of Columbia $35,000,000, of which only approximately $21,000,000 has been allocated up to the present time.

I was then interrupted in my speech by a Senator bringing to my attention some court decisions At the time the cases were pending before the Supreme Court I would have hoped, I admit, that the Court would have decided them differently I do not think that I am bigger than the Supreme Court of the United States, but I think that my position is in accordance with that of many attorneys The Court decided that pupils going to and from schools could be transported without involving a violation of the Constitution in regard to the mixing of church and state.

Every case that goes to the Supreme Court goes there on a statement of facts. This case, on a constitutional question, would have to go to the Supreme Court of the United States on a statement of facts Let us look at the question for a few moments. I am sorry to say that twenty-odd years ago I quit practicing law and have been in politics, but let me suggest what I would do if I were to try to draw up a statement of facts in this matter I would certainly include in the statement of facts the acts on the subject. I would also show that money was obtainable by the hospitals, that they could get it under the law which has been in existence since 1946 Why would I do that? In order to make a different statement of facts

I would also remind the hospitals along this line: "If you did not want the money to carry on your activities in a different way, you could have gotten it under the other law. Therefore, you want it in order to have a direct supervision over the hospital in every way."

There would be a different statement of facts raised that would certainly have to be decided by the Supreme Court. What the Supreme Court would do, we do not know. But I am saying that we should not try to do anything that mixes church and state. I do not have to invite the Senate's attention to the trouble and the headaches that other countries have when they mix church and state. That was the reason why the founding fathers wrote into the Constitution a provision that there would be no mixing of church and state.

How can we mix church and state any more than when we give money from all the people to a denominational institution, no matter what denomination is involved? As I said some two or three hours ago, in the beginning of my speech, I should be very, very thankful to the Methodist Church—that is one of the institutions involved—because it took me in when I did not have money and loaned me the money with which to go to college. Even before that the Methodist Church let me go to school by working 1 week in a cotton mill and going to school the next week. The Methodist Church did that. I love the Methodist Church, but much as I love it, when I think that something is fundamentally wrong not only from the standpoint of mixing church and state but in setting up a pattern of giving money to the District of Columbia in a different way from that in which we give it to the States of the Union, it is my duty to call attention to it. I look at the District and I say, "Surely, we have dealt fairly with you. Now we will apply to you the same principle we apply to the States."

As if we had not done enough for the District, we appropriated $35,000,000 more to set up a health center, and those funds were outside the Hill-Burton Act. We said, "You can have this in addition to what the people in the States are getting," under a form which we thought was fair and just, taking into consideration on the per capita wealth and the population in the particular State jurisdictions

Mr O'CONOR Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Maryland

Mr. O'CONOR. It is very evident that the Senator from South Carolina has given a great deal of thought and study to the legal questions involved, and I see he is about to conclude on that phase of the subject I wonder if it would be agreeable if he would yield to me for a few minutes without his losing the floor.

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina I yield for that purpose, if I do not lose the floor

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Maryland may proceed.

Mr O'CONOR. I thank the Senator for his consideration. I desire to make a brief statement in support of the amendment explained so lucidly by the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr PASTORE], and to urge favorable consideration of the pending measure in accordance with the recommendations of a majority of the Senate committee which gave consideration to this very important matter

Testimony before the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia conclusively demonstrated the urgent need for additional hospital facilities in the District of Columbia and the impossibility of obtaining such additional facilities without the incentives supplied by the proposed amendment.

The Hill-Burton Act, to which reference has been made on numerous occasions during the debate this afternoon, and which, incidentally, is an excellent piece of legislation for which the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is to be highly commended, among others, has not been able to afford adequate relief to the District of Columbia. This is so, firstly, because the per capita income in Washington is relatively high and

accordingly the benefits under the Hill-Burton Act are necessarily low; and, secondly, because the hospitals in the District find it necessary to serve outlying population almost as numerous as the population of the District, for which no credit under present legislation is available.

The District has limited boundaries and is adversely affected. Here the allocation is based on its population of 802,000 legal residents, while the actual population of the metropolitan area is estimated to be 1,464,000.

In nearby Virginia and Maryland, the States are faced with extraordinary conditions and find it extremely difficult to meet the necessary hospital requirements As a result, there are increasing demands upon the District of Columbia hospitals

For example, in a report published in 1950 by the Montgomery County Hospital Facilities Advisory Committee, it is reported that while the county has three excellent hospitals, with a total bed capacity of 455, the hospitals of the District are depended upon to some extent. We feel there is ample justification for that use, because many of the people who are treated in the hospitals in the outlying section are from the District of Columbia, spend most of their time in the District, and contribute otherwise to the District's income.

Dr. John M. Orem, superintendent of Sibley Hospital, to which reference has also been made today, Dr. Orem being a recognized hospital authority, said this before the committee:

For all practical purposes Sibley Hospital serves the public and practically operates as a public hospital This is due to the exigencies of the District of Columbia and the peculiarities of the District in relation to hospital facilities

He further said that if this bill were enacted into law, the hospital would be able to make a greater contribution to the medical-requirement needs of the people of the District. Also, he observed, that if we did not have these hospitals function in a modern way, the effect on the District would be disastrous.

This official declares that his hospital, which was founded by members of the Methodist Church, treats persons without regard to race, color, or creed. The same thing applies to all other hospitals. They do not draw any line by race, color, or creed. The same commendable principle applies to other hospitals which might be affected by the bill. Furthermore, they treat all patients whether or not they have any money. The afflicted and the suffering are not asked when they come in if they have any money.

There is another most important reason why the Hill-Burton Act is not designed to meet this need. Many of the States of the Union have supplemented the funds provided under the Hill-Burton Act by grants voted by the States, frequently supplemented by municipal appropriations for the construction of hospital facilities. In this way, the Hill-Burton grants are supplemented by other governmental appropriations in order to relieve the burden imposed on private hospitals.

Since the District of Columbia must depend upon the Congress, the problem of expanding the available grants can be met only by additional appropriations by the Congress. The percentages provided by this bill—15 percent local and 35 percent Federal additional money—corresponds roughly to the contributions made by many States and municipal governments.

In addition to these sources of money for new construction, many non-profit hospitals elsewhere are assisted by grants from local industrial enterprises. Employers, interested in the welfare of their employees, are glad to extend such assistance. In the District of Columbia, the Federal Government is the dominant employer. Its interest in its employees makes advisable the required support in order that the health of the Federal workers may be adequately protected.

I trust, therefore, Mr. President, that the Senate will adopt the proposed amendment, and I wish to express appreciation to the Senator from South Carolina for his consideration in this regard.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to read further from the testimony of Glenn L. Archer. I quoted before from him, and I quote further:

It is no mere personal or partisan or sectarian plea which I am now making to you. In all humility, what I am asking is that we hold fast to the most precious thing in American life, the great principle which has made the United States a unique example of democracy in a world of oppression In 1811, President James Madison—whom we revere as the father of the Constitution—confronted precisely the same issue which confronts you gentlemen now, when he was presented with a bill, already passed by Congress, for the purpose of incorporating the Protestant Episcopal Church in the town of Alexandria, in the District of Columbia. The President vetoed the bill, and gave the following reasons, among others

"Because the bill exceeds the rightful authority to which governments are limited by the essential distinction between civil and religious functions, and violates in particular the article of the Constitution of the United States which declares that 'Congress shall make no law respecting a religious establishment' * * * Because the bill vests in the said incorporated church an authority to provide for the support of the poor and the education of poor children of the same, an authority which, being altogether superfluous if the provision is to be the result of pious charity, would be a precedent for giving the religious societies as such a legal agency in carrying into effect a public and civil duty"

These objections, I submit, apply with exactly the same force to the hospital grants bill now before us.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of precedent, would the program apply to every one of the States, in the opinion of the Senator?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In my opinion a precedent would be established for every State in the Union to be treated likewise.

Mr. LANGER. On the question of precedent, does not the Senator feel that such a law would ruin the Hill-Burton Act as now administered?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It would do away with the fundamental principles in the Hill-Burton Act, which is aimed at helping those most in need of help, who do not have finances.

Mr LANGER. Does not the Senator believe that if this bill is enacted every State which is hard up financially will say to the Congress, "We need money. We have a great many poor people. We must take care of them quickly. We cannot meet the requirements of the Hill-Burton Act. Therefore, we want the Federal Government to turn money over to us so that we can build more hospitals."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina It is logical to believe that that would be the result.

I continue to quote from the statement of Glenn L. Archer:

President Madison's veto message also contains an answer to an argument which has been speciously advanced by the proponents of the present bill, to the effect that a religious institution * * * is, by its charter essentially a charitable rather than a religious institution In speaking of the proposed articles of incorporation for the Episcopal Church, President Madison said

"Nor can it be considered that the articles thus established are to be taken as the descriptive criteria only of the corporate identity of the society"

In other words, we must look beyond the corporate charter to the fundamental purpose, nature, and control of the institution

The hospital needs of the District of Columbia deserve to be met—

I agree with him—

but they should be met in a manner which is consistent with the spirit of our laws and the whole needs of our people If the present bill were amended to insure that Government funds would be used only by institutions which are publicly owned and publicly controlled, it would do no violence to the principle of separation of church and State. Unfortunately, in its present form, the bill does such violence H R 2094 is not even in harmony with the act of August 7, 1946, which provided for the establishment of a hospital center in the District of Columbia—with three hospitals participating on condition that they deed their property to the District of Columbia, as Representative A L MILLER put it during the very brief discussion held recently in the House When that act was passed, Congress specifically rejected one section of the bill which would have allowed outright grants to private hospitals other than the three which were to participate in the hospital center.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is not this proposal similar to the Federal-aid-to-schools bill which we had before us some 18 months ago? At that time it was proposed to grant money to schools all over the country. The Senator will recall that that proposal was defeated because of the fact that we could not agree on the terms of that particular bill. Three hundred million dollars was involved.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. LANGER. Is there any difference in principle between this bill and that bill, in the opinion of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In my opinion, they are very similar.

There is another thing which I would like to call to the attention of Senators. There is one group of people for whom I think we should care first, so far as hospitalization is concerned. Day after day and night after night I receive telephone calls from boys who served this country during World War II or World War I, and who want to get into a Government hospital. They cannot find beds Do they come first, or should we give $35,000,000 to the District of Columbia and establish a new precedent?

Reading further from the statement made before the committee by Mr. Glenn L Archer:

I am profoundly convinced that the owners and administrators of all church hospitals, as well as all the honorable Members of the House and Senate, would do well to take counsel from the pages of history, and to recognize the discord which passage of this bill—unless amended—would create. I believe that mature consideration of this question demands recognition of the danger to which Congressman MILLER drew attention during the discussion of this bill in the House on July 31—the danger that approval of the appropriations for denominational hospitals will tend to destroy the self-confidence and self-reliance of our people and their churches, particularly in the case of these strong church institutions that can go out and raise money, and they have done it, and God bless them, they have done a great job in the hospital field, and they ought to continue to do it And Congressman MILLER adds "I doubt if the Congress should permit these fine religious institutions to put then hand into the public till and say, 'We are going to get some tax money and we are not going to pay anything back,' then I think that proposition is wrong, deadly wrong" I agree wholeheartedly with Congressman MILLER that the proposition is deadly wrong, and I sincerely hope that you gentlemen will correct the wrong by making sectarian institutions ineligible for public support

Mr President, I sincerely hope that the Senate will see fit to lay this measure aside and study it for a little while We should turn it over in our minds There is no rush about it. We could think about it when Congress reassembles in January. Then I believe we could give it some study in committee. I believe some of the other members of the committee would like to do it. I see some of them nodding their heads We could look into all the fine points involved. I did not have an opportunity to hear all the testimony I have been reading. What I have suggested would be the American way to proceed. I venture to say that even during this debate, only a few Senators have had the time, with the rush of things this week and last week, to read the report and the bill. I certainly believe we should read the report and study the bill and determine what law we are amending, and what rights the hospitals have at the present time, and so forth. In that way we will be able to act more intelligently than we can act now.

Mr. President, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in relation to the pending bill a few points have been raised which I should like to clarify before a vote is taken on the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The first point raised was as to the meaning under subsection (c) on page 2 with reference to the amount of the grant therein specified.

In my opinion the language is abundantly clear. It means that in any case of an expansion of the facilities of a hospital, whether it be an expansion of present facilities or new construction, all the United States Treasury would contribute as a grant would be 50 percent, and no more In other words, in order to make it perfectly clear, if a hospital presently existing in this community is worth $3,000,000, and it expected to build a new wing costing $100,000, under the provisions of the pending bill the amount of the grant could be no more than $50,000. It means that the amount of the grant in no case can exceed 50 percent of the improvement, including new equipment.

In the case of a new establishment, of course, the amount of the grant could be only 50 percent of the entire cost of construction

I thought I would invite the attention of the Members of the Senate to that fact because the point was raised this afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

Mr President, I sincerely hope that the bill will not be recommitted to the committee.

There has been much discussion this afternoon with reference to the point that the provisions of the bill are in violation of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States Let me say to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] that if it is contended that the bill violates the provisions of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States with reference to the separation of church and state, we must of necessity reach the same conclusion with reference to the Hill-Burton Act, because the Hill-Burton Act allows the same type of institution to receive aid under that act as would be permitted to be received under the pending bill Therefore, if we determine at this juncture that this bill is in violation of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States insofar as the separation of church and state is concerned, we must of necessity reach the same conclusion consistently with reference to the Hill-Burton Act. I do not believe there is any Member on the floor of the Senate who would take that position

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that the pending bill was considered extensively and carefully by the subcommittee and by the full Committee on the District of Columbia We consider it to be good legislation. We feel that it meets a need that must be met The hospital facilities in this community are not adequate. All the witnesses representing various hospitals testified that in order to meet the pressing need they must receive some kind of incentive help from the Federal Government We must always remember that the District of Columbia is not in the same position as that occupied by all other communities and by the States of the Union. There exists on the part of the Congress of the United States a direct responsibility toward the District of Columbia. It is not the fault of the District. It is the desire, the purpose, and the design of the Congress of the United States. The District has no right to impose taxes. It has no right to administer its own affairs. If the District is in need of help, insofar as expansion of its hospital facilities is concerned, I believe it is the responsibility of the Congress of the United States to furnish that help.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANGER in the chair). The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is recognized.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the bill. I am astounded and distressed that the question of religious denomination has been brought into this debate. To me there does not appear to be the slightest reason to suppose that the provisions of the bill contravene the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States to any extent greater than or different from the question involved in the Hill-Burton Act.

I believe I know something about hospitals For many years I was a trustee of a great hospital in New York, the Mount Sinai Hospital. My wife is still a trustee My family has been connected with that great institution for more than 75 years. That institution is supported mainly by members of my religious faith. However, I have never heard any question of religious faith raised in that hospital. I can say, Mr President, that at least half of the patients who are treated daily in that hospital are members not of my religion but members of the Catholic and Protestant faiths

I know a great deal, too, about the hospitals supported by people of other faiths. I have been a patient in the great hospital supported very largely by members of the Presbyterian denomination, the Medical Center in New York.

I have been a patient in the New York Hospital, which is also largely supported by members of the Protestant faith. In the same hospital where I was a patient, there were being treated, and well treated, just as many Jews and just as many Catholics as there were Protestants.

I have had an opportunity to closely observe the work of great Catholic hospitals. When I say Catholic hospitals, I mean hospitals which are largely supported by Catholic contributions. I have observed the work of St Vincent's Hospital, in New York, and the work of St. Peter's Hospital, in Albany Over a period of 14 years while I lived in Albany I frequently visited that great institution. In those two hospitals and in similar hospitals supported by the contributions of Catholics just as many Protestant and Jewish patients were being treated as were Catholic patients.

I cannot conceive of any element of favoritism or of any desire to influence the thinking of patients which has ever arisen in the hospitals of our country, which are supported by the communicants of the three great faiths.

I know of no greater duty which we as Americans owe than that of providing good health treatment for the sick and the ailing. If the need exists, and I

believe it does, in the District of Columbia, because of the inability to raise from the residents of the District of Columbia the necessary means, then I believe the hospitals of the District of Columbia should be placed on a basis or a plane so far as benefits are concerned equal to that of the hospitals which are helped by the Hill-Burton Act.

During the debate today, one Senator made the point that the communities in the States generously support their hospitals, and that there is no reason why the District of Columbia cannot do the same. There is, however, one great difference, which I should like to point out, namely, that many of the people living in the District of Columbia reside here only temporarily. In that connection it is interesting to note that in the District of Columbia we are beginning today to initiate a drive to raise $4,000,000 for the institutions of this community Although I have no figures to prove my point, I am quite convinced that a large percentage of the people who live in the District of Columbia, but who come from other cities or communities—for instance, from Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, San Francisco, North Dakota, or other communities—will not give to the Community Chest for the District of Columbia as much as 10 percent of what most of them give to their local Community Chests. The explanation may lie in the feeling of pride in their home communities on the part of the men and women who reside temporarily in the District of Columbia while they are engaged in public service for the Federal Government or while they serve in the Armed Forces. However, the fact still remains that that great group of people, who come from other sections of the United States, and who are only temporary residents of the District of Columbia, do not and cannot, because they have obligations in their home communities, make the same generous and liberal contributions to public institutions in the District of Columbia that they would make to similar institutions in their home communities, of New York, Philadelphia, Boston, San Francisco, North Dakota, or any other part of the United States.

So, Mr President, I say to you that we would be false to our own instincts and our duty if we were to permit any question of religious denomination to enter into this discussion or into the determination which we will make regarding this bill.

I also think we cannot afford not to realize that the District of Columbia, in which a very large percentage of the population are only temporary residents, cannot possibly meet its obligations to the same extent as can a community in which practically all the residents are domiciled there permanently.

So I hope very much that the bill will not be recommitted, but will be passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] to recommit the bill to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PASTORE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr CASE If this motion does not prevail, would the bill still be open to amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT The bill would occupy the same status it had before the motion, and would be open to amendment

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

I announce further that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

Mr SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Washington [Mr CAIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], if present, would vote "yea"

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—29

Butler, Nebr.	Frear	Langer
Capehart	Fulbright	Malone
Carlson	George	Maybank
Connally	Hickenlooper	McKellar
Cordon	Hoey	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Holland	Smith, N C
Eastland	Jenner	Stennis
Ecton	Johnston, S C	Wiley
Ellender	Kerr	Williams
Ferguson	Knowland	

NAYS—34

Benton	Ives	Neely
Brewster	Kilgore	O'Conor
Butler, Md	Lehman	O'Mahoney
Case	Magnuson	Pastore
Chavez	McCarran	Saltonstall
Green	McFarland	Smathers
Hayden	McMahon	Smith, Maine
Hendrickson	Millikin	Sparkman
Hennings	Monroney	Taft
Hill	Moody	Young
Humphrey	Morse	
Hunt	Murray	

NOT VOTING—33

Aiken	Flanders	Mundt
Anderson	Gillette	Nixon
Bennett	Johnson, Colo	Robertson
Bricker	Johnson, Tex	Russell
Bridges	Kefauver	Smith, N J.
Byrd	Kem	Thye
Cain	Lodge	Tobey
Clements	Long	Underwood
Dirksen	Martin	Watkins
Douglas	McCarthy	Welker
Duff	McClellan	Wherry

So the motion of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina to recommit the bill was not agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment heretofore offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has that right.

Mr LANGER I offered the amendment under the impression that some of the States, when they got some of the loans, had to pay interest. Therefore, I wanted the District of Columbia to pay interest. I now find that the States do not pay interest, and, therefore, I withdraw the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota withdraws his amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I move to amend on page 2, line 25, after the word "amended", by inserting "by striking out 30 per centum in said section and inserting 50 per centum and", and on page 3, line 4, to strike out "30" and insert "50."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Case].

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the present law which the bill would amend authorizes 30 percent of the net amount ex-

pended by the Federal Works Administrator to be charged against the District of Columbia. The effect of my amendment would be that 50 percent would be charged against the District of Columbia. The Federal Government would pay 50 percent and the District of Columbia would pay 50 percent, instead of on a 70–30 ratio, with the 70 percent falling upon the Federal Government.

As I stated earlier in the afternoon, I have no objection to the Federal Government making a contribution to the hospital program. We do it now under the Hill-Burton Act. I have no objection to the money going to private agencies if it is done under the Hill-Burton Act. But it does seem to me that to propose that 70 percent should be borne by the Federal Government and only 30 percent by the District of Columbia goes too far, and my proposal would be to make the payments 50–50.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from South Dakota knows that under the amendment of the Hill-Burton Act the Federal Government now pays 66⅔ percent.

Mr. CASE. I know it can do so, but as a matter of practice, it seldom does. In my own State of South Dakota, the Public Health Service has followed the principle of not going above 50–50, and the 66⅔-percent payment is not mandatory. Certainly since we already provide aid for the District of Columbia, under the Hill-Burton Act, if we are to go further, it would not be unreasonable to put the payments on a 50–50 ratio, and I think the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island would agree that might be a happy solution of the matter.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that the Senator's amendment would put the District of Columbia and the Federal Government on a 50–50 basis?

Mr. CASE. My amendment would put the payments on the same basis on which they are allocated under the Hill-Burton Act.

Mr. MAYBANK. It would mean that the taxpayers in the District of Columbia would have to pay the same as that paid by the Federal Government, would it?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad the Senator has offered the amendment. I voted to recommit the bill in order that such a provision might be made. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the amendment which has just been suggested was proposed at the meeting of the Committee on the District of Columbia. I suppose any formula for payment worked out might be agreeable to some and not acceptable to others. The point is that before the figure of 30 percent was arrived at, discussions were held between the Federal Works Administration, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and they reached the figure of 30 percent.

I realize that there are some who think it should be larger, and there are some who think the percentage possibly should be smaller. The fact of the matter is that after many meetings 30 percent was the figure arrived at, and I am afraid that adoption of the suggestion being made at this late hour, especially when the point was already made in the committee and rejected, would mean that the proposed legislation would be doomed for this session. I hope the Members of the Senate will retain the percentage in the bill as now written.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as a taxpayer in Washington, I believe it is my duty to put up the same proportion I put up on my property in Washington as in South Carolina.

Mr. PASTORE Mr. President, that is not the question at all. As the bill is now drawn, 50 percent of the money will be paid by the hospital, the other 50 percent will be paid by the United States Treasury, and 30 percent is paid back by the District of Columbia to the Treasury of the United States. I do not see how the Senator can make his analogy on the basis of the Hill-Burton Act, which is not related in any way.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from South Dakota made the analogy. I asked him a question, and he told me the amendment would make the people of Washington put up some additional money, which I think they should do, and as one property owner in Washington, I am glad to support the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Hr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the pending bill provide for payments in addition to the Hill-Burton funds which have been available to the people of the District of Columbia?

Mr. PASTORE. They are in addition.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In other words, two or three of the finest hospitals in the country have already been built in the District of Columbia under the Hill-Burton Act.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The bill provides an additional amount to the District of Columbia, which is not available to any of the States. Is that correct? The point I am making is that talk about what is proposed in the pending bill, being comparable with aid under the Hill-Burton Act, has left the impression that this is the only aid that has been prepared to be given the District of Columbia. It is my understanding that this is in addition to what has been already applied to the District of Columbia.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct in that respect

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, that is generally true, but when we apply it practically, it does not work out in that way. The allocation to the District of Columbia under the Hill-Burton Act for the current year is something under $300,000—$270,000, or somewhere in that neighborhood—which, on the basis of population, is a smaller amount, because it relates to the entire metropolitan area. The hospital load in the District of Columbia is not confined to the population of the District of Columbia. A great many Federal workers who live in Virginia and Maryland are dependent on hospital facilities in the District of Columbia.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, to carry that thought through, the Hill-Burton Act is figured on a formula whereby account is taken of the population of a State plus the per capita wealth of the State or the income of the State. When we apply that formula to the District of Columbia, of course the grant is very small.

Mr. CASE. The amount is less than $300,000.

Mr. PASTORE. It is about $256,000.

Mr. CASE. I believe we have a little extra burden here, and when it is applied to the District, it is well to put it on a 50–50 basis, as it would be under my amendment.

Mr. FREAR. Mr President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. What is the termination date?

Mr. CASE. The date carried in the original act was June 30, 1952.

Mr. FREAR How many years would the money be available if the pending bill were enacted?

Mr. CASE. It is not an annual proposition. Congress originally provided $35,000,000, and it was authorized to be appropriated during the period ending June 30, 1952. A good deal of that has been used on prior propositions.

Mr. FREAR. Suppose institutions in the District of Columbia in 1953 and 1954 desire to put up 30 percent?

Mr. CASE. They would not have authority to do it, under the pending bill. The bill now pending is not an original measure, of course; it amends the 1946 act.

Mr. FREAR. I am still not clear. For how many years is the Federal Government obligated to give private agencies in the District of Columbia money for the construction of hospitals, under H R 2094?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I can answer that question.

Mr MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question.

Mr. PASTORE. The act expires in June 1952.

Mr. FREAR. Then it is only for this fiscal year.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes. It may have to be extended, in the event commitments are not made.

Mr. FREAR. It may extend to 1953 or 1954, if authorization is given in 1952.

Mr. PASTORE. The original act expires in June 1952. If commitments were not made before that time, we would have to extend the original act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that this bill is an amendment to an act which was passed in 1946, which gave to the District of Columbia $35,000,000 for a hospital cen-

ter. Approximately $21,000,000 of that sum has been spent. It is proposed now to spend the remainder under a different formula and a different system. That is what I have objected to in the bill.

So we have, first, the Hill-Burton Act; then $35,000,000 was given to the District to be used in a certain way; now it is proposed to change that program and spend the remainder of it under a different formula.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I gathered from the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] that only a very small amount was involved—only $300,000. Is that all the Senator thinks is involved in the pending bill?

Mr CASE About $300,000, or a little less than $300,000. My understanding is that the allocations under the Hill-Burton Act for the District of Columbia run about $287,000 as of today. That is on an annual basis. We are not here increasing an authorization. The 1946 act, which is now the law, authorized appropriations up to $35,000,000. That is the present law What we are proposing by this amendment is to change the percentage which the Federal Government would put up, as against the percentage which the District government would put up

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I merely wished to satisfy myself. I do not wish to treat the District of Columbia any worse than the States are treated. I was under the impression that, on a population basis, the District had been treated considerably better than other comparable population groups in the country. Is that true?

Mr. CASE. It is true in this respect, that the $35,000,000 authorization passed in 1946 created something which was not created for the rest of the country. That authorization exists as of today, and is the present law.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is in addition to the Hill-Burton funds, is it not?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr FULBRIGHT. I did not think that was clear.

Mr MAYBANK. Mr. President, as I understand, the bill would place District hospitals on a basis above any State hospitalization program under the Hill-Burton Act or other laws.

The District of Columbia collects taxes. It collects taxes from me. I am glad to pay them. I do not know what is done with the money. Garbage is collected only once a week in the District of Columbia. At home it is collected every day I hardly ever see a policeman in the District of Columbia. I hope that some of the money which the District government collects in taxes can be used to provide hospitalization for the people of the District of Columbia. The Congress should not be used as an agency to increase the expenditures for hospitalization in the District of Columbia, when every State in the Union is suffering from lack of hospital facilities.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, a great deal has been said in regard to this bill. The bill does not affect the Hill-Burton Act. Last year the District of Columbia received $276,000 under the Hill-Burton Act. Then another bill was passed for the benefit of the District, establishing a fund of $35,000,000 for the Hospital Center. Up to the present time approximately $21,000,000 of that amount has been spent. Now it is proposed to set up another system, and to spend the remainder of that money under a different formula. That is the question which is before the Senate. I disapprove of the way the money is being rationed out, so to speak. We are setting a bad precedent. If we set up a different system from the one we have had heretofore, the States will be here asking for the same consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], which are being considered en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays

The yeas and nays were ordered and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate

The Senator from Virginia [Mr BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr LONG], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

I announce further that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator for Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], if present, would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—37

Benton	Ives	Murray
Brewster	Kilgore	Neely
Butler, Md	Langer	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Lehman	O'Mahoney
Case	Magnuson	Pastore
Chavez	Maybank	Saltonstall
Green	McCarran	Smathers
Hayden	McFarland	Smith, Maine
Hendrickson	McMahon	Sparkman
Hennings	Millikin	Taft
Hill	Monroney	Young
Holland	Moody	
Humphrey	Morse	

NAYS—25

Capehart	Frear	Malone
Carlson	Fulbright	McKellar
Connally	George	Schoeppel
Cordon	Hickenlooper	Smith, N C
Dworshak	Hoey	Stennis
Eastland	Jenner	Wiley
Ecton	Johnston, S C	Williams
Ellender	Kerr	
Ferguson	Knowland	

NOT VOTING—34

Aiken	Gillette	Nixon
Anderson	Hunt	Robertson
Bennett	Johnson, Colo	Russell
Bricker	Johnson, Tex	Smith, N J.
Bridges	Kefauver	Thye
Byrd	Kem	Tobey
Cain	Lodge	Underwood
Clements	Long	Watkins
Dirksen	Martin	Welker
Douglas	McCarthy	Wherry
Duff	McClellan	
Flanders	Mundt	

So the bill (H R. 2094) was passed.

REHABILITATION OF FLOOD-STRICKEN AREAS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H J. Res. 341.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J Res. 341) making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 341), making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONSIDERATION OF MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement. The next bill to be taken up will be H. R. 5684, making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Charles Morris Irelan, of Maryland, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia, vice George Morris Fay, resigned, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

W Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Director of Mutual Security.

RETURN TO THE PRESIDENT A TREATY AND PROTOCOL

Mr CONNALLY. Mr President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably an original Executive resolution directing the Secretary of the Senate to return to the President of the United States, in accordance with his request, a consular convention, with an accompanying protocol of signature, between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed at Washington on February 16, 1949, and an exchange of notes dated October 12, 1949, relating to the nonapplication of the convention to Newfoundland and Newfoundland citizens—Executive A, Eighty-first Congress, second session.

On June 20, 1951, the President transmitted to the Senate a consular convention and an accompanying protocol of signature between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed at Washington June 6, 1951. It is the President's desire that this convention and protocol be considered in place of the consular convention and accompanying protocol of signature signed on February 16, 1949, which the President asks be withdrawn.

I ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, directed to return to the President of the United States, in accordance with his request, the following treaty:

A consular convention, with an accompanying protocol of signature, between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed at Washington on February 16, 1949, and an exchange of notes dated October 12, 1949, relating to the nonapplication of the convention to Newfoundland and Newfoundland citizens (Ex. A, 81st Cong., 2d sess.).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder whether the Senator from Texas could give us the general background of the subject to which he has referred.

Mr. CONNALLY. The statement I made was to the effect that the President had sent to the Senate a convention and protocol. Now he wants it returned, so that he can send a different one.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. All that we would be doing would be to send the convention and protocol back to the President of the United States?

Mr. CONNALLY That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is nothing for us to consider, therefore, except to follow the President's request and send back to him a certain convention and protocol.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George W. Folta to be United States district judge for division No. 1, district of Alaska

The VICE PRESIDENT Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edmund Port, to be United States attorney for the northern district of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Myles J. Lane, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Francis Xavier Chapados, of Alaska, to be United States marshal of division No. 4, district of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 17, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate, October 16 (legislative day of October 1), 1951.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Charles Morris Irelan, of Maryland, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia, vice George Morris Fay, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 16 (legislative day of October 1), 1951.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

George W Folta, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No 1, district of Alaska

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Edmund Port to be United States attorney for the northern district of New York

Myles J. Lane to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Francis Xavier Chapados, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No 4, district of Alaska

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

John P Kvidera, Carey.
Russell W Jones, Casey
Gladys E Marshall, Chestnut.
Gladys L White, Valier.

MINNESOTA

Louis Rodal, Nielsville.

MISSISSIPPI

Rusie M King, Heidelberg

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Clarence W Colbeth, North Hampton.

UTAH

Clifford H Sondrup, Ephraim
David R. Trevithick, Salt Lake City.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, inspire us now with the spirit of humility and reverence as we unite our hearts to worship Thee.

Grant that in these troubled days we may have Thy unmistakable guidance as we daily assemble to deliberate and debate in the interest of the best kind of legislation for our beloved country.

We penitently confess that our finite minds know so little. Our thoughts are often so vague and futile and we know not how to interpret and implement our problems to the life of our generation.

We pray that we may be more devoutly obedient to the leading of Thy spirit. Show us how we may decide and settle every great problem in the same way as Thy servants did in the long ago which enabled them to say, "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us."

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S 1347. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and for other purposes,

S 2244 An act to amend certain housing legislation to grant preferences to veterans of the Korean conflict, and

S Con Res 51 Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Railroad Retirement Legislation.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H R 3298 An act to amend section 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two House thereon, and appoints Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr NIXON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title.

S 945 An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 to the bill (S. 657) entitled "An act to amend and clarify the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, and for other purposes"; and

That the Senate agrees to House amendment No. 4 to the above-entitled bill with an amendment as follows Before the language "existing at the time such leave was granted" insert the following: "in accordance with the rules of the Board of Education."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 11) entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of conservations to conserve the assets of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, not amounting to unsoundness of mind, or physical incapacity".

REVENUE ACT OF 1951—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4473) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 203]

Allen, Calif.	Donovan	Murray, Wis.
Allen, La.	Dorn	Norblad
Baring	Havenner	Patman
Bates, Ky.	Hébert	Patten
Blackney	Herlong	Phillips
Boggs, La.	Hess	Powell
Bosone	Holifield	Regan
Boykin	Howell	Ribicoff
Bramblett	Irving	Roosevelt
Brown, Ohio	Jackson, Calif	Sabath
Buckley	Johnson	Scott, Hugh D, Jr
Burleson	Judd	Shelley
Busbey	Kearney	Sikes
Byrne, N Y.	Kelley, Pa	Taylor
Byrnes, Wis.	Kennedy	Teague
Celler	Keogh	Thompson, Tex
Chatham	Kersten, Wis	Thornberry
Cole, N Y	Kilburn	Velde
Combs	Kirwan	Watts
Crawford	Lantaff	Werdel
Dague	Lucas	Whitaker
Dawson	McDonough	Wilson, Tex
Deane	Mack, Ill	Wolcott
Dempsey	Madden	Wood, Ga.
D'Ewart	Miller, Calif	
Dingell	Murphy	

The SPEAKER On this roll call 352 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SIZE AND WEIGHT LIMITATIONS FOR FOURTH-CLASS MAIL

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S 1335) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class mail.

REVENUE ACT OF 1951—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER The Clerk will read the statement on the part of the managers of the House.

The Clerk read the statement

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H REPT No 1179)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H R. 4473), to provide revenue, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to, recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 3, 5, 94, 98, 119, 120, 123, 124, 125, 126, 130, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 138, 139, 140, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 152, 155, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 170, 177, 182, 183, 201, 202, and 203.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 87, 95, 103, 105, 106, 108, 109, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 153, 169, 171, 176, 180, 186, 187, 189, 190, 192, 195, 196, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 212, 218, 223, 229, 230, 232, 233, 242, 243, and 244 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

Strike out the surtax table beginning on page 1 of the Senate engrossed amendments and insert the following:

"'If the surtax net income is: The surtax shall be:

Not over $2,000	17.4% of the surtax net income.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	$348, plus 19.4% of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	$736, plus 24% of excess over $4,000
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000.	$1,216, plus 27% of excess over $6,000
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000.	$1,756, plus 31% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000.	$2,396, plus 36% of excess over $10,000
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000.	$3,116, plus 40% of excess over $12,000
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000.	$3,916, plus 45% of excess over $14,000
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000.	$4,816, plus 48% of excess over $16,000
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000.	$5,776, plus 51% of excess over $18,000
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000.	$6,796, plus 54% of excess over $20,000
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000	$7,876, plus 57% of excess over $22,000
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000.	$10,156, plus 60% of excess over $26,000
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000.	$13,756, plus 63% of excess over $32,000
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000.	$17,536, plus 66% of excess over $38,000
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000.	$21,496, plus 70% of excess over $44,000
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000.	$25,696, plus 72% of excess over $50,000
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000	$32,896, plus 75% of excess over $60,000
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000.	$40,396, plus 79% of excess over $70,000
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000.	$48,296, plus 81% of excess over $80,000
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000.	$56,396, plus 84% of excess over $90,000
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000.	$64,796, plus 86% of excess over $100,000
Over $150,000 but not over $200,000.	$107,796, plus 87% of excess over $150,000
Over $200,000	$151,296, plus 88% of excess over $200,000."

Strike out the surtax table on page 3 of the Senate engrossed amendments and insert the following.

"'If the surtax net income is: The surtax shall be:

Not over $2,000	19.3% of the surtax net income.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000.	$386, plus 21.6% of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000.	$818, plus 26% of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000.	$1,338, plus 31% of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000.	$1,958, plus 35% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000.	$2,658, plus 39% of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000.	$3,438, plus 45% of excess over $12,000.

"'If the surtax net income is:	The surtax shall be:
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000.	$4,738, plus 50% of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000.	$5,338, plus 53% of excess over $16,000
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000.	$6,398, plus 56% of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	$7,518, plus 59% of excess over $20,000
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000.	$8,698, plus 63% of excess over $22,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000.	$11,218, plus 64% of excess over $26,000

"'If the surtax net income is.	The surtax shall be:
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000.	$15,058, plus 65% of excess over $32,000
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000.	$18,958, plus 69% of excess over $38,000
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000.	$23,098, plus 72% of excess over $44,000
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000.	$27,418, plus 74% of excess over $50,000
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000.	$34,818, plus 77% of excess over $60,000
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000.	$42,518, plus 80% of excess over $70,000

"'If the surtax net income is'	The surtax shall be'
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000.	$50,513, plus 83% of excess over $80,000
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000.	$58,718, plus 85% of excess over $90,000
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000	$67,218, plus 87% of excess over $100,000
Over $150,000 but not over $200,000	$110,718, plus 88% of excess over $150,000
Over $200,000_____	$154,718, plus 89% of excess over $200,000."

Strike out the tables on pages 7 and 8 of the Senate engrossed amendments and insert the following.

"'TABLE II

"'*Taxable years beginning after October 31, 1951, and before January 1, 1954*

If adjusted gross income is—		And the number of exemptions is—				If adjusted gross income is—		And the number of exemptions is—									
								1		2			3				
At least	But less than	1	2	3	4 or more	At least	But less than	And taxpayer is single or married filing separately	And taxpayer is head of household	And taxpayer is single or married filing separately	And taxpayer is head of household	And a joint return is filed	And taxpayer is single or married filing separately	And taxpayer is head of household	And a joint return is filed	4	5	6	7	8 or more
		The tax shall be—						The tax shall be—									
$0	$675	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,325	$2,350	$335	$335	$202	$202	$202	$68	$68	$68	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
675	700	4	0	0	0	2,350	2,375	340	340	207	207	207	73	73	73	0	0	0	0	0
700	725	9	0	0	0	2,375	2,400	345	345	212	212	212	78	78	78	0	0	0	0	0
725	750	14	0	0	0	2,400	2,425	350	350	217	217	217	83	83	83	0	0	0	0	0
750	775	19	0	0	0	2,425	2,450	355	355	222	222	222	88	88	88	0	0	0	0	0
775	800	24	0	0	0	2,450	2,475	360	360	227	227	227	93	93	93	0	0	0	0	0
800	825	29	0	0	0	2,475	2,500	365	365	232	232	232	98	98	98	0	0	0	0	0
825	850	34	0	0	0	2,500	2,525	370	370	237	237	237	103	103	103	0	0	0	0	0
850	875	39	0	0	0	2,525	2,550	375	375	242	242	242	108	108	108	0	0	0	0	0
875	900	44	0	0	0	2,550	2,575	380	380	247	247	247	113	113	113	0	0	0	0	0
900	925	49	0	0	0	2,575	2,600	386	386	252	252	252	118	118	118	0	0	0	0	0
925	950	54	0	0	0	2,600	2,625	391	391	257	257	257	123	123	123	0	0	0	0	0
950	975	59	0	0	0	2,625	2,650	396	396	262	262	262	128	128	128	0	0	0	0	0
975	1,000	64	0	0	0	2,650	2,675	401	401	267	267	267	133	133	133	0	0	0	0	0
1,000	1,025	69	0	0	0	2,675	2,700	406	406	272	272	272	138	138	138	4	0	0	0	0
1,025	1,050	74	0	0	0	2,700	2,725	411	411	277	277	277	143	143	143	9	0	0	0	0
1,050	1,075	79	0	0	0	2,725	2,750	416	416	282	282	282	148	148	148	14	0	0	0	0
1,075	1,100	84	0	0	0	2,750	2,775	421	421	287	287	287	153	153	153	19	0	0	0	0
1,100	1,125	89	0	0	0	2,775	2,800	426	426	292	292	292	158	158	158	24	0	0	0	0
1,125	1,150	94	0	0	0	2,800	2,825	431	431	297	297	297	163	163	163	29	0	0	0	0
1,150	1,175	100	0	0	0	2,825	2,850	436	436	302	302	302	168	168	168	34	0	0	0	0
1,175	1,200	105	0	0	0	2,850	2,875	441	441	307	307	307	173	173	173	39	0	0	0	0
1,200	1,225	110	0	0	0	2,875	2,900	446	446	312	312	312	178	178	178	44	0	0	0	0
1,225	1,250	115	0	0	0	2,900	2,925	451	451	317	317	317	183	183	183	49	0	0	0	0
1,250	1,275	120	0	0	0	2,925	2,950	457	456	322	322	322	188	188	188	54	0	0	0	0
1,275	1,300	125	0	0	0	2,950	2,975	462	461	327	327	327	193	193	193	59	0	0	0	0
1,300	1,325	130	0	0	0	2,975	3,000	468	467	332	332	332	198	198	198	64	0	0	0	0
1,325	1,350	135	1	0	0	3,000	3,050	476	475	340	340	340	206	206	206	72	0	0	0	0
1,350	1,375	140	6	0	0	3,050	3,100	487	485	350	350	350	216	216	216	82	0	0	0	0
1,375	1,400	145	11	0	0	3,100	3,150	498	496	360	360	360	226	226	226	92	0	0	0	0
1,400	1,425	150	16	0	0	3,150	3,200	509	506	370	370	370	236	236	236	102	0	0	0	0
1,425	1,450	155	21	0	0	3,200	3,250	520	517	380	380	380	246	246	246	112	0	0	0	0
1,450	1,475	160	26	0	0	3,250	3,300	531	527	390	390	390	256	256	256	122	0	0	0	0
1,475	1,500	165	31	0	0	3,300	3,350	543	538	400	400	400	266	266	266	132	0	0	0	0
1,500	1,525	170	36	0	0	3,350	3,400	554	548	410	410	410	276	276	276	142	8	0	0	0
1,525	1,550	175	41	0	0	3,400	3,450	565	559	420	420	420	286	286	286	152	18	0	0	0
1,550	1,575	180	46	0	0	3,450	3,500	576	569	430	430	430	296	296	296	162	28	0	0	0
1,575	1,600	185	51	0	0	3,500	3,550	587	580	440	440	440	306	306	306	172	38	0	0	0
1,600	1,625	190	56	0	0	3,550	3,600	598	590	450	450	450	316	316	316	182	49	0	0	0
1,625	1,650	195	61	0	0	3,600	3,650	609	601	461	461	460	326	326	326	192	59	0	0	0
1,650	1,675	200	66	0	0	3,650	3,700	620	612	472	471	470	336	336	336	202	69	0	0	0
1,675	1,700	205	71	0	0	3,700	3,750	631	622	484	482	480	346	346	346	212	79	0	0	0
1,700	1,725	210	76	0	0	3,750	3,800	642	633	495	492	490	356	356	356	222	89	0	0	0
1,725	1,750	215	81	0	0	3,800	3,850	653	643	506	503	500	366	366	366	232	99	0	0	0
1,750	1,775	220	86	0	0	3,850	3,900	664	654	517	513	510	376	376	376	243	109	0	0	0
1,775	1,800	225	91	0	0	3,900	3,950	675	664	528	524	520	386	386	386	253	119	0	0	0
1,800	1,825	230	96	0	0	3,950	4,000	686	675	539	534	530	396	396	396	263	129	0	0	0
1,825	1,850	235	101	0	0	4,000	4,050	698	685	550	545	540	406	406	406	273	139	5	0	0
1,850	1,875	240	106	0	0	4,050	4,100	709	696	561	555	550	416	416	416	284	149	15	0	0
1,875	1,900	245	111	0	0	4,100	4,150	720	706	572	566	560	426	426	426	293	159	25	0	0
1,900	1,925	250	116	0	0	4,150	4,200	731	717	583	576	570	437	437	437	303	169	35	0	0
1,925	1,950	255	121	0	0	4,200	4,250	742	727	594	587	580	447	447	447	313	179	45	0	0
1,950	1,975	260	126	0	0	4,250	4,300	753	738	605	598	590	458	457	457	323	189	55	0	0
1,975	2,000	265	131	0	0	4,300	4,350	764	748	616	608	600	469	468	467	333	199	65	0	0
2,000	2,025	270	136	3	0	4,350	4,400	775	759	627	619	610	480	478	477	343	209	75	0	0
2,025	2,050	275	141	8	0	4,400	4,450	786	770	638	629	620	491	489	487	353	219	85	0	0
2,050	2,075	280	146	13	0	4,450	4,500	797	780	650	640	631	502	499	497	363	229	95	0	0
2,075	2,100	285	151	18	0	4,500	4,550	808	791	661	650	641	513	510	507	373	239	105	0	0
2,100	2,125	290	156	23	0	4,550	4,600	819	801	672	661	651	521	520	517	383	249	115	0	0
2,125	2,150	295	161	28	0	4,600	4,650	830	812	683	671	661	535	531	527	393	259	125	0	0
2,150	2,175	300	166	33	0	4,650	4,700	841	822	694	682	671	546	541	537	403	269	135	2	0
2,175	2,200	305	171	38	0	4,700	4,750	853	833	705	692	681	557	552	547	413	279	146	12	0
2,200	2,225	310	176	43	0	4,750	4,800	864	843	716	703	691	568	562	557	423	289	156	22	0
2,225	2,250	315	181	48	0	4,800	4,850	875	854	727	713	701	579	573	567	433	299	166	32	0
2,250	2,275	320	186	53	0	4,850	4,900	886	864	738	724	711	591	583	577	443	309	176	42	0
2,275	2,300	325	192	58	0	4,900	4,950	897	875	749	734	721	602	594	587	453	319	186	52	0
2,300	2,325	330	197	63	0	4,950	5,000	908	885	760	745	731	613	605	597	463	329	196	62	0

"'TABLE III

"'*Taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953*

If adjusted gross income is—		And the number of exemptions is—				If adjusted gross income is—		And the number of exemptions is—											
								1		2			3			4	5	6	7	8 or more
At least	But less than	1	2	3	4 or more	At least	But less than	And taxpayer is single or married filing separately	And taxpayer is head of household	And taxpayer is single or married filing separately	And taxpayer is head of household	And a joint return is filed	And taxpayer is single or married filing separately	And taxpayer is head of household	And a joint return is filed					
		The tax shall be—						The tax shall be—												
$0	$675	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,325	$2,350	$301	$301	$181	$181	$181	$61	$61	$61	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
675	700	4	0	0	0	2,350	2,375	305	305	185	185	185	65	65	65	0	0	0	0	0
700	725	8	0	0	0	2,375	2,400	310	310	190	190	190	70	70	70	0	0	0	0	0
725	750	13	0	0	0	2,400	2,425	314	314	194	194	194	74	74	74	0	0	0	0	0
750	775	17	0	0	0	2,425	2,450	319	319	199	199	199	79	79	79	0	0	0	0	0
775	800	22	0	0	0	2,450	2,475	323	323	203	203	203	83	83	83	0	0	0	0	0
800	825	26	0	0	0	2,475	2,500	328	328	208	208	208	88	88	88	0	0	0	0	0
825	850	31	0	0	0	2,500	2,525	332	332	212	212	212	92	92	92	0	0	0	0	0
850	875	35	0	0	0	2,525	2,550	337	337	217	217	217	97	97	97	0	0	0	0	0
875	900	40	0	0	0	2,550	2,575	341	341	221	221	221	101	101	101	0	0	0	0	0
900	925	44	0	0	0	2,575	2,600	346	346	226	226	226	106	106	106	0	0	0	0	0
925	950	49	0	0	0	2,600	2,625	350	350	230	230	230	110	110	110	0	0	0	0	0
950	975	53	0	0	0	2,625	2,650	355	355	235	235	235	115	115	115	0	0	0	0	0
975	1,000	58	0	0	0	2,650	2,675	359	359	239	239	239	119	119	119	0	0	0	0	0
1,000	1,025	62	0	0	0	2,675	2,700	364	364	244	244	244	124	124	124	4	0	0	0	0
1,025	1,050	67	0	0	0	2,700	2,725	368	368	248	248	248	128	128	128	8	0	0	0	0
1,050	1,075	71	0	0	0	2,725	2,750	373	373	253	254	253	133	133	133	13	0	0	0	0
1,075	1,100	76	0	0	0	2,750	2,775	377	377	257	257	257	137	137	137	17	0	0	0	0
1,100	1,125	80	0	0	0	2,775	2,800	382	382	262	262	262	142	142	142	22	0	0	0	0
1,125	1,150	85	0	0	0	2,800	2,825	386	386	266	266	266	146	146	146	26	0	0	0	0
1,150	1,175	89	0	0	0	2,825	2,850	391	391	271	271	271	151	151	151	31	0	0	0	0
1,175	1,200	94	0	0	0	2,850	2,875	395	395	275	275	275	155	155	155	35	0	0	0	0
1,200	1,225	98	0	0	0	2,875	2,900	400	400	280	280	280	160	160	160	40	0	0	0	0
1,225	1,250	103	0	0	0	2,900	2,925	405	401	284	284	284	164	164	164	44	0	0	0	0
1,250	1,275	107	0	0	0	2,925	2,950	410	410	289	289	289	169	169	169	49	0	0	0	0
1,275	1,300	112	0	0	0	2,950	2,975	415	414	293	293	293	173	173	173	53	0	0	0	0
1,300	1,325	116	0	0	0	2,975	3,000	420	419	298	298	298	178	178	178	58	0	0	0	0
1,325	1,350	121	1	0	0	3,000	3,050	427	428	305	305	305	185	185	185	65	0	0	0	0
1,350	1,375	125	5	0	0	3,050	3,100	437	435	314	314	314	194	194	194	74	0	0	0	0
1,375	1,400	130	10	0	0	3,100	3,150	447	445	323	323	323	203	203	203	83	0	0	0	0
1,400	1,425	134	14	0	0	3,150	3,200	457	454	332	332	332	212	212	212	92	0	0	0	0
1,425	1,450	139	19	0	0	3,200	3,250	467	464	341	341	341	221	221	221	101	0	0	0	0
1,450	1,475	143	23	0	0	3,250	3,300	476	473	350	350	350	230	230	230	110	0	0	0	0
1,475	1,500	148	28	0	0	3,300	3,350	486	482	359	359	359	239	239	239	119	0	0	0	0
1,500	1,525	152	32	0	0	3,350	3,400	496	492	368	368	368	248	248	248	128	8	0	0	0
1,525	1,550	157	37	0	0	3,400	3,450	505	501	377	377	377	257	257	257	137	17	0	0	0
1,550	1,575	161	41	0	0	3,450	3,500	516	511	386	386	386	266	266	266	146	26	0	0	0
1,575	1,600	166	46	0	0	3,500	3,550	526	520	395	395	395	275	275	275	155	35	0	0	0
1,600	1,625	170	50	0	0	3,550	3,600	536	530	404	404	404	284	284	284	164	44	0	0	0
1,625	1,650	175	55	0	0	3,600	3,650	546	539	414	413	413	293	293	293	173	53	0	0	0
1,650	1,675	179	59	0	0	3,650	3,700	556	549	424	423	422	302	302	302	182	62	0	0	0
1,675	1,700	184	64	0	0	3,700	3,750	566	558	434	432	431	311	311	311	191	71	0	0	0
1,700	1,725	188	68	0	0	3,750	3,800	575	567	443	441	440	320	320	320	200	80	0	0	0
1,725	1,750	193	73	0	0	3,800	3,850	585	577	453	451	449	329	329	329	209	89	0	0	0
1,750	1,775	197	77	0	0	3,850	3,900	595	586	463	460	458	338	338	338	218	98	0	0	0
1,775	1,800	202	82	0	0	3,900	3,950	605	596	473	470	467	347	347	347	227	107	0	0	0
1,800	1,825	206	86	0	0	3,950	4,000	615	605	483	479	476	356	356	356	236	116	0	0	0
1,825	1,850	211	91	0	0	4,000	4,050	625	615	493	489	485	365	365	365	245	125	5	0	0
1,850	1,875	215	95	0	0	4,050	4,100	635	624	503	498	494	374	374	374	254	134	14	0	0
1,875	1,900	220	100	0	0	4,100	4,150	645	634	513	508	503	383	383	383	263	143	23	0	0
1,900	1,925	224	104	0	0	4,150	4,200	655	643	524	517	512	392	392	392	272	152	32	0	0
1,925	1,950	229	109	0	0	4,200	4,250	665	653	533	527	521	401	401	401	281	161	41	0	0
1,950	1,975	233	113	0	0	4,250	4,300	674	662	542	536	530	410	410	410	290	170	50	0	0
1,975	2,000	238	118	0	0	4,300	4,350	684	671	552	545	539	420	419	419	299	179	59	0	0
2,000	2,025	242	122	2	0	4,350	4,400	694	681	562	555	548	430	429	428	308	188	68	0	0
2,025	2,050	247	127	7	0	4,400	4,450	704	690	572	564	557	440	438	437	317	197	77	0	0
2,050	2,075	251	131	11	0	4,450	4,500	714	700	582	574	566	450	448	446	326	206	86	0	0
2,075	2,100	256	136	16	0	4,500	4,550	724	709	592	583	575	460	457	455	335	215	95	0	0
2,100	2,125	260	140	20	0	4,550	4,600	734	719	602	593	584	470	467	464	344	224	104	0	0
2,125	2,150	265	145	25	0	4,600	4,650	744	728	612	602	593	480	476	473	353	233	113	0	0
2,150	2,175	269	149	29	0	4,650	4,700	754	738	622	612	602	490	486	482	362	242	122	2	0
2,175	2,200	274	154	34	0	4,700	4,750	764	747	632	621	611	500	495	491	371	251	131	11	0
2,200	2,225	278	158	38	0	4,750	4,800	774	756	641	630	620	509	504	500	380	260	140	20	0
2,225	2,250	283	163	43	0	4,800	4,850	783	765	651	640	629	519	514	509	389	269	149	29	0
2,250	2,275	287	167	47	0	4,850	4,900	793	775	661	649	638	529	523	518	398	278	158	38	0
2,275	2,300	292	172	52	0	4,900	4,950	803	785	671	659	647	539	533	527	407	287	167	47	0
2,300	2,325	296	176	56	0	4,950	5,000	813	794	681	668	656	549	542	536	416	296	176	56	0"'

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"'(b) Imposition of tax: There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the normal-tax net income of every corporation (except a corporation subject to a tax imposed by section 231 (a), Supplement G, or Supplement Q)—

"'(1) Calendar year 1951: In the case of a taxable year beginning on January 1, 1951, and ending on December 31, 1951, a tax of 28¾ per centum of the normal-tax net income.

"'(2) Taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954 In the case of taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954, a tax of 30 per centum of the normal-tax income.

"'(3) Taxable years beginning after March 31, 1954: In the case of taxable years beginning after March 31, 1954, a tax of 25 per centum of the normal-tax net income.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 13, line 13, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)."

On page 13, line 24, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "16½" and insert "17¼"

On page 14, line 12, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "17" and insert "18"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(c) Mutual insurance companies other than life or marine:

"(1) Section 207 (a) (1) (relating to normal tax and surtax on mutual insurance companies, other than life or marine) is hereby amended by striking out subpara-

graphs (A) and (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(A) Taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, and before April 1, 1951: In the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, and before April 1, 1951, and ending after March 31, 1951—

"'(i) Normal tax: A normal tax of 28¾ per centum of the normal-tax net income, or 57½ per centum of the amount by which the normal-tax net income exceeds $3,000, whichever is the lesser; plus

"'(ii) Surtax: A surtax of 22 per centum of the corporation surtax net income in excess of $25,000.

"'(B) Taxable years beginning after March 31,1951, and before April 1, 1954: In the case of taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954—

"'(i) Normal tax: A normal tax of 30 per centum of the normal-tax net income, or 60 per centum of the amount by which the normal-tax net income exceeds $3,000, whichever is the lesser; plus

"'(ii) Surtax: A surtax of 22 per centum of the corporation surtax net income in excess of $25,000

"'(C) Taxable years beginning after March 31, 1954: In the case of a taxable year beginning after March 31, 1954—

"'(i) Normal tax: A normal tax of 25 per centum of the normal-tax net income, or 50 per centum of the amount by which the normal-tax net income exceeds $3,000, whichever is the lesser; plus

"'(ii) Surtax: A surtax of 22 per centum of the corporation surtax net income in excess of $25,000.'

"(2) Section 207 (a) (3) (relating to a normal tax and surtax on interinsurers and reciprocal underwriters) is hereby amended by striking out subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(A) Taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, and before April 1, 1951: In the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, and before April 1, 1951, and ending after March 31, 1951—

"'(i) Normal tax. A normal tax of 28¾ per centum of the normal-tax net income, or 57½ per centum of the amount by which the normal-tax net income exceeds $50,000, whichever is the lesser, plus

"'(ii) Surtax: A surtax of 22 per centum of the corporation surtax net income in excess of $25,000, or 33 per centum of the amount by which the corporation surtax net income exceeds $50,000, whichever is the lesser

"'(B) Taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954: In the case of taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954—

"'(i) Normal tax: A normal tax of 30 per centum of the normal-tax net income, or 60 per centum of the amount by which the normal-tax net income exceeds $50,000, whichever is the lesser; plus

"'(ii) Surtax: A surtax of 22 per centum of the corporation surtax net income in excess of $25,000, or 33 per centum of the amount by which the corporation surtax net income exceeds $50,000, whichever is the lesser.

"'(C) Taxable years beginning after March 31, 1954: In the case of a taxable year beginning after March 31, 1954—

"'(i) Normal tax: A normal tax of 25 per centum of the normal-tax net income, or 50 per centum of the amount by which the normal-tax net income exceeds $50,000, whichever is the lesser; plus

"'(ii) Surtax: A surtax of 22 per centum of the corporation surtax net income in excess of $25,000, or 33 per centum of the amount by which the corporation surtax net income exceeds $50,000, whichever is the lesser.'

"(d) Regulated investment companies: Section 362 (b) (relating to tax on regulated investment companies) is hereby amended by striking out paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(3) In the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, and before April 1, 1951, and ending after March 31, 1951, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon its Supplement Q net income a tax equal to 28¾ per centum of the amount thereof. In the case of taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon its Supplement Q net income a tax equal to 30 per centum of the amount thereof In the case of taxable years beginning after March 31, 1954, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon its Supplement Q net income a tax equal to 25 per centum of the amount thereof

"'(4) In the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon its Supplement Q surtax net income a tax equal to 22 per centum of the amount thereof in excess of $25,000'

"(e) Business income of certain section 101 organizations: Section 421 (a) (1) (relating to imposition of tax on business income of certain section 101 organizations) is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following ' ; except that (A) in the case of taxable years beginning before April 1, 1951, and ending after March 31, 1951, the normal tax shall be 28¾ per centum of the Supplement U net income, and (B) in the case of taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954, the normal tax shall be 30 per centum of the Supplement U net income'

"(f) Amendment of section 15 Section 15 (relating to surtax on corporations) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC 15. Surtax on corporations.

"'(a) Corporation surtax net income: For the purposes of this chapter, the term "corporation surtax net income" means the net income minus the sum of the following credits:

"'(1) The credit for dividends received provided in section 26 (b);

"'(2) In the case of a public utility, the credit for dividends paid on its preferred stock provided in section 26 (h);

"'(3) In the case of a western hemisphere trade corporation (as defined in section 109), the credit provided in section 26 (i).

"'(b) Imposition of tax. There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the corporation surtax net income of every corporation (except a corporation subject to a tax imposed by section 231 (a), Supplement G, or Supplement Q) a surtax of 22 per centum of the amount of the corporation surtax net income in excess of $25,000.

"'(c) Disallowance of surtax exemption and minimum excess profits credit. If any corporation transfers, on or after January 1, 1951, all or part of its property (other than money) to another corporation which was created for the purpose of acquiring such property or which was not actively engaged in business at the time of such acquisition, and if such transfer the transferor corporation or its stockholders, or both, are in control of such transferee corporation during any part of the taxable year of such transferee corporation, then such transferee corporation shall not for such taxable year (except as may be otherwise determined under section 129 (b)) be allowed either the $25,000 exemption from surtax provided in subsection (b) or the $25,000 minimum excess profits credit provided in the last sentence of section 431, unless such transferee corporation shall establish by the clear preponderance of the evidence that the securing of such exemption or credit was not a major purpose of such transfer. For the purposes of this subsection, control means the ownership of stock possessing at least 80 per centum of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote or at least 80 per centum of the total value of shares of all classes of stock of the corporation. In determining the ownership of stock for the purpose of this subsection, the ownership of stock shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 503, except that constructive ownership under section 503 (a) (2) shall be determined only with respect to the individual's spouse and minor children. The provisions of section 129 (b), and the authority of the Secretary under such section, shall, to the extent not inconsistent with the provisions of this subsection, be applicable to this subsection This subsection shall not apply to any taxable year with respect to which the tax imposed by subchapter D of this chapter is not in effect'

"(g) Technical amendment: Section 14 (relating to normal tax on special classes of corporations in the case of taxable years beginning before July 1, 1950) is hereby repealed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following

"Sec 122. Credits of corporations.

"(a) Dividends received credit: Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 26 (b) (relating to credit for dividends received) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(1) In general: 85 per centum of the amount received as dividends (other than dividends described in paragraph (2) on the preferred stock of a public utility) from a domestic corporation which is subject to taxation under this chapter

"'(2) Certain preferred stock

"'(A) Calendar year 1951: In the case of a taxable year beginning on January 1, 1951, and ending on December 31, 1951, 61 per centum of the amount received as dividends on the preferred stock of a public utility which is subject to taxation under this chapter and with respect to which the credit provided in section 26 (h) for dividends paid is allowable.

"'(B) Taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954: In the case of taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954, 62 per centum of the amount received as dividends on the preferred stock of a public utility which is subject to taxation under this chapter and with respect to which the credit provided in section 26 (h) for dividends paid is allowable.

"'(C) Taxable years beginning after March 31, 1954: In the case of taxable years beginning after March 31, 1954, 59 per centum of the amount received as dividends on the preferred stock of a public utility which is subject to taxation under this chapter and with respect to which the credit provided in section 26 (h) for dividends paid is allowable'

"(b) Credit for dividends paid on certain Preferred Stock: The first sentence of section 26 (h) (1) (relating to amount of credit for dividends paid on certain preferred stock) is hereby amended to read as follows: 'In the case of a public utility, (A) for a taxable year beginning on January 1, 1951, and ending on December 31, 1951, an amount equal to 28 per centum of the lesser of (i) the amount of dividends paid during the taxable year on its preferred stock or (ii) the adjusted net income for such taxable year minus the credit for dividends received provided in subsection (b) for such year, (B)

for a taxable year beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954, an amount equal to 27 per centum of the lesser of (i) the amount of dividends paid during the taxable year on its preferred stock or (ii) the adjusted net income for such taxable year minus the credit for dividends received provided in subsection (b) for such year, and (C) for a taxable year beginning after March 31, 1954, an amount equal to 30 per-centum of the lower of (i) the amount of dividends paid during the taxable year on its preferred stock or (ii) the adjusted net income for such taxable year minus the credit for dividends received provided in subsection (b) for such year'.

"(c) Western Hemisphere trade corporations Section 26 (i) (relating to credit of a western hemisphere trade corporation) is hereby amended to read as follows·

"'(i) Western Hemisphere trade corporations In the case of a western hemisphere trade corporation (as defined in section 109)—

"'(1) Calender year 1951· In the case of a taxable year beginning on January 1, 1951, and ending on December 31, 1951, an amount equal to 28 per centum of its normal-tax net income computed without regard to the credit provided in this subsection

"'(2) Taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954 In the case of a taxable year beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954, an amount equal to 27 per centum of its normal-tax net income computed without regard to the credit provided in this subsection

"'(3) Taxable years beginning after March 31, 1954 In the case of a taxable year beginning after March 31, 1954, an amount equal to 30 per centum of its normal-tax net income computed without regard to the credit provided in this subsection'"

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 13· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with the following amendments.

On page 27 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following.

"'(3) that portion of a tentative tax consisting of—

"'(A) a tentative normal tax of 30 per centum of the normal-tax net income, plus

"'(B) a tentative surtax of 20 per centum of the surtax net income in excess of $25,000'"

On page 31 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out subsection (k) and insert in lieu thereof the following

"'(k) Taxable years of corporations beginning before April 1, 1954, and ending after March 31, 1954· In the case of a taxable year of a corporation beginning before April 1, 1954, and ending after March 31, 1954, the tax imposed by sections 13 and 15, or section 421 (a) (1), shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

"'(1) that portion of a tentative tax, computed under the provisions of sections 13 and 15, or section 421 (a) (1), applicable to years beginning on January 1, 1953, which the number of days in such taxable year prior to April 1, 1954, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year, plus

"'(2) that portion of a tentative tax, computed under the provisions of sections 13 and 15, or section 421 (a) (1), applicable to years beginning on April 1, 1954, as if such provisions were applicable to such taxable year, which the number of days in such taxable year after March 31, 1954, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year.'"

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 28· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

Strike out the surtax table beginning on page 39 of the Senate engrossed amendments and insert the following:

"'If the surtax net income is· The surtax shall be:

Not over $2,000	19 3% of the surtax net income.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	$386, plus 20 4% of excess over $2,000
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	$794, plus 24% of excess over $4,000
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	$1,274, plus 26% of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	$1,794, plus 31% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000.	$2,414, plus 32% of excess over $10,000
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000.	$3,054, plus 38% of excess over $12,000
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000.	$3,814, plus 41% of excess over $14,000
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	$4,634, plus 44% of excess over $16,000
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000.	$5,514, plus 45% of excess over $18,000
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000.	$6,414, plus 49% of excess over $20,000
Over $22,000 but not over $24,000	$7,394, plus 51% of excess over $22,000.
Over $24,000 but not over $28,000.	$8,414, plus 54% of excess over $24,000
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000	$10,574, plus 57% of excess over $28,000
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000.	$12,854, plus 60% of excess over $32,000
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000.	$16,454, plus 63% of excess over $38,000
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000	$20,234, plus 68% of excess over $44,000
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000.	$24,314, plus 69% of excess over $50,000
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000.	$31,214, plus 70% of excess over $60,000
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000.	$38,214, plus 74% of excess over $70,000
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000.	$45,614, plus 76% of excess over $80,000
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000.	$53,214, plus 78% of excess over $90,000
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000.	$61,014, plus 82% of excess over $100,000
Over $150,000 but not over $200,000.	$102,014, plus 85% of excess over $150,000
Over $200,000 but not over $300,000.	$144,514, plus 88% of excess over $200,000.
Over $300,000	$232,514, plus 89% of excess over $300,000."

Strike out the surtax table beginning on page 41 of the Senate engrossed amendments and insert the following:

"'If the surtax net income is: The surtax shall be·

Not over $2,000	17% of the surtax net income.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	$340, plus 18% of excess over $2,000
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000,	$700, plus 21% of excess over $4,000
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000.	$1,120, plus 23% of excess over $6,000
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	$1,580, plus 27% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000.	$2,120, plus 29% of excess over $10,000
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000.	$2,700, plus 33% of excess over $12,000
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000.	$3,360, plus 36% of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000.	$4,080, plus 39% of excess over $16,000
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000.	$4,860, plus 40% of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	$5,660, plus 44% of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $24,000.	$6,540, plus 46% of excess over $22,000
Over $24,000 but not over $28,000.	$7,460, plus 49% of excess over $24,000
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000.	$9,420, plus 51% of excess over $28,000
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000.	$11,460, plus 55% of excess over $32,000
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000.	$14,760, plus 59% of excess over $38,000
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000.	$18,300, plus 63% of excess over $44,000
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000	$22,080, plus 65% of excess over $50,000
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000	$28,580, plus 68% of excess over $60,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000.	$35,380, plus 71% of excess over $70,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000.	$42,480, plus 73% of excess over $80,000
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000.	$49,780, plus 77% of excess over $90,000
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000	$57,480, plus 80% of excess over $100,000.
Over $150,000 but not over $200,000.	$97,480, plus 84% of excess over $150,000.
Over $200,000 but not over $300,000.	$139,480, plus 87% of excess over $200,000
Over $300,000	$226,480, plus 88% of excess over $300,000"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC 311. Credit for dividends received.

"(a) Dividends from foreign corporation engaged in trade or business in the United States Section 26 (b) (relating to dividends received credit) is hereby amended by in-

serting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"'(3) Dividends received from certain foreign corporations: In the case of dividends received from a foreign corporation (other than a foreign personal holding company) which is subject to taxation under this chapter, if, for an uninterrupted period of not less than 36 months ending with the close of such foreign corporation's taxable year in which such dividends are paid (or, if the corporation has not been in existence for 36 months at the close of such taxable year, for the period the foreign corporation has been in existence as of the close of such taxable year) such foreign corporation has been engaged in trade or business within the United States and has derived 50 per centum or more of its gross income from sources within the United States—

"'(A) an amount equal to 85 per centum of the dividends received out of its earnings or profits specified in clause (2) of the first sentence of section 115 (a), but such amount shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to 85 per centum of such dividends received out of such earnings or profits as the gross income of such foreign corporation for the taxable year from sources within the United States bears to its gross income from all sources for such taxable year, and

"'(B) an amount equal to 85 per centum of the dividends received out of that part of its earnings or profits specified in clause (1) of the first sentence of section 115 (a) accumulated after the beginning of such uninterrupted period, but such amount shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to 85 per centum of such dividends received out of such accumulated earnings or profits as the gross income of such foreign corporation from sources within the United States for the portion of such uninterrupted period ending at the beginning of such taxable year bears to its gross income from all sources for such portion of such uninterrupted period

For determination of earnings or profits distributed in any taxable year, see section 115 (b)'

"(b) Technical amendment: Section 119 (a) (2) (B) (relating to rules as to source of income in the case of dividends) is hereby amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following 'to the extent exceeding the amount which is 100/85ths of the amount of the credit allowable under section 26 (b) in respect of such dividends'.

"(c) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950"

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 313. Mutual savings banks, building and loan associations, cooperative banks.

"(a) Mutual savings banks: Section 101 (2) (relating to exemption from tax of mutual savings banks) is hereby repealed.

"(b) Building and loan associations and cooperative banks: Section 101 (4) (relating to exemption from tax of building and loan associations and cooperative banks) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(4) Credit unions without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit; and corporations or associations without capital stock organized prior to September 1, 1951, and operated for mutual purposes and without profit for the purpose of providing reserve funds for, and insurance of, shares or deposits in—

"'(A) domestic building and loan associations,

"'(B) cooperative banks without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit, or

"'(C) mutual savings banks not having capital stock represented by shares,'

"(c) Exemptions from excess profits tax: Section 454 (corporations exempt from the excess profits tax) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(h) Any mutual savings bank not having capital stock represented by shares, any domestic building and loan association (as defined in section 3797 (a) (19)), and any cooperative bank without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit'

"(d) Federal savings and loan associations. Section 5 (h) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1464 (h)), is hereby amended by striking out 'date)' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'date, and except, in the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951, income, war-profits, and excess-profits taxes)'.

"(e) Bad debt reserves: Section 23 (k) (1) (relating to deduction from gross income of bad debts) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following. 'In the case of a mutual savings bank not having capital stock represented by shares, a domestic building and loan association, and a cooperative bank without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit, the reasonable addition to a reserve for bad debts shall be determined with due regard to the amount of the taxpayer's surplus or bad debt reserves existing at the close of December 31, 1951. In the case of a taxpayer described in the preceding sentence, the reasonable addition to a reserve for bad debts for any taxable year shall in no case be less than the amount determined by the taxpayer, as the reasonable addition for such year, except that the amount determined by the taxpayer under this sentence shall not be greater than the lesser of (A) the amount of its net income for the taxable year, computed without regard to this subsection, or (B) the amount by which 12 per centum of the total deposits or withdrawable accounts of its depositors at the close of such year exceeds the sum of its surplus, undivided profits, and reserves at the beginning of the taxable year'

"(f) Dividends paid to depositors. Section 23 (r) (relating to the deduction from gross income of certain dividends paid by banking corporations) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'Dividends paid by banking corporations:

"'(1) In the case of mutual savings banks, cooperative banks, and domestic building and loan associations, amounts paid to, or credited to the accounts of, depositors or holders of accounts as dividends on their deposits or withdrawable accounts, if such amounts paid or credited are withdrawable on demand subject only to customary notice of intention to withdraw

"'(2) For deduction of dividends paid by certain other banking corporations, see section 121'

"(g) Deduction for repayment of certain loans: Section 23 (relating to deductions from gross income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(dd) Repayment by mutual savings banks, etc., of certain loans: In the case of a mutual savings bank not having capital stock represented by shares, a domestic building and loan association, or a cooperative bank without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit, amounts paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year in repayment of loans made prior to September 1, 1951, by (1) the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof which is wholly owned by the United States, or (2) any mutual fund established under the authority of the laws of any State'

"(h) Definition of bank: Section 104 (a) (relating to definition of bank) is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: 'Such term also means a domestic building and loan association'

"(i) Definition of domestic building and loan association: Section 3797 (a) (relating to definitions for the purposes of the Internal Revenue Code) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(19) Domestic building and loan association: "The term domestic building and loan association" means a domestic building and loan association, a domestic savings and loan association, and a Federal savings and loan association, substantially all the business of which is confined to making loans to members'

'(j) Effective Date: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 67, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, insert after the period the following: "Allocations made after the close of the taxable year and on or before the fifteenth day of the ninth month following the close of such year shall be considered as made on the last day of such taxable year to the extent the allocations are attributable to income derived before the close of such year."

On page 67, line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments, insert after "patronage" the following "in the same or preceding years".

On page 69 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out line 1 and all that follows through line 9

On page 69, line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(e)" and insert "(d)".

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following

"'(i) in the case of sand, gravel, slate, stone (including pumice and scoria), brick and tile clay, shale, oyster shell, clam shell, granite, marble, sodium chloride, and, if from brine wells, calcium chloride, magnesium chloride, and bromine, 5 per centum,

"'(ii) in the case of coal, asbestos, brucite, dolomite, magnesite, perlite, wollastonite, calcium carbonates, and magnesium carbonates, 10 per centum,

"'(iii) in the case of metal mines, aplite, bauxite, fluorspar, flake graphite, vermiculite, beryl, garnet, feldspar, mica, talc (including pyrophyllite), lepidolite, spodumene, barite, ball clay, sagger clay, china clay, phosphate rock, rock asphalt, trona, bentonite, gilsonite, thenardite, borax, fuller's earth, tripoli, refractory and fire clay, quartzite, diatomaceous earth, metallurgical grade limestone, chemical grade limestone, and potash, 15 per centum, and'".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 74 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out lines 12 and 13 and insert the following: "taxes) is hereby amended by striking out '50 per centum of the value of the net estate' and inserting in lieu thereof '35 per centum of the value of the gross estate'."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 74, line 21, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "Exclusive" and insert "Exclusion"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 79 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out all after "poultry" in line 14 to and including "acquisition" in line 17; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 80, lines 7 and 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out the following: "in the cutting of such timber or"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 77 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment and insert the following:

"SEC. 328 Treatment of gain on sales of certain property between spouses and between an individual and a controlled corporation.

"(a) Disallowance of capital gain treatment: Section 117 (relating to capital gains and losses) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(o) Gain from sale of certain property between spouses or between an individual and a controlled corporation:

"'(1) Treatment of gain as ordinary income In the case of a sale or exchange, directly or indirectly, of property described in paragraph (2)—

"'(A) between a husband and wife, or

"'(B) between an individual and a corporation more than 80 per centum in value of the outstanding stock of which is owned by such individual, his spouse, and his minor children and minor grandchildren;

any gain recognized to the transferor from the sale or exchange of such property shall be considered as gain from the sale or exchange of property which is neither a capital asset nor property described in subsection (j)

"'(2) Subsection applicable only to sales or exchanges of depreciable property:

This subsection shall apply only in the case of a sale or exchange of property by a transferor which in the hands of the transferee is property of a character which is subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 23 (l).'

"(b) Effective date: The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable with respect to taxable years ending after April 30, 1951, but shall apply only with respect to sales or exchanges made after May 3, 1951."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 83, line 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "328" and insert "329".

On page 83, line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(o)" and insert "(p)".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC 330. Net operating loss carry-over.

"(a) Loss for taxable year beginning before 1948 Section 122 (b) (2) (A) (relating to the amount of carry-overs) is hereby amended by striking out '1950', wherever it appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof '1948'

"(b) Allowance of three-year loss carry-over from taxable years 1948–1949 Section 122 (b) (2) (relating to the amount of carry-over) is hereby amended by adding after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

"'(C) Loss for taxable year beginning after December 31, 1947, and before January 1, 1950 If for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1947, and before January 1, 1950, the taxpayer has a net operating loss, such net operating loss shall be a net operating loss carry-over for each of the three succeeding taxable years, except that the carry-over in the case of each such succeeding taxable year (other than the first succeeding taxable year) shall be the excess, if any, of the amount of such net operating loss over the sum of the net income for each of the intervening years computed—

"'(i) with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsection (d) (1), (2), (4), and (6), and

"'(ii) by determining the net operating loss deduction for each intervening taxable year without regard to such net operating loss or to the net operating loss for any succeeding taxable year and without regard to any reduction specified in subsection (c).

For the purpose of the preceding sentence, the net operating loss for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1947, and before January 1, 1950, shall be reduced by the sum of the net income for each of the two preceding taxable years computed—

"'(iii) with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsection (d) (1), (2), (4), and (6), and

"'(iv) by determining the net operating loss deduction without regard to such net operating loss or to the net operating loss for the succeeding taxable year, and without regard to any reduction specified in subsection (c)'

"(c) Effective date The amendments made by this section shall be applicable in computing the net operating loss deduction for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 87, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "330" and insert "331"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 88, line 7, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "331" and insert "332".

On page 88, line 21, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "a majority" and insert the following: "50 per centum or more".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 89, line 5, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "332" and insert "333"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 89, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "333" and insert "334"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 90, line 22, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "334" and insert "335".

On page 91 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out line 14 and insert the following: "coupons or in registered form, and the term 'securities of the employer' corporation includes securities of a parent or subsidiary corporation (as defined in section 130A (d) (2) and (3)) of the employer corporation,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. On page 91, line 20, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "335" and insert "336", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following "337"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 88 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows On page 97, line 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "337" and insert "338", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 89 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows On page 98, line 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "338" and insert "339", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 90 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following "340", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 91. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(c) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950 The determination as to whether a person shall be recognized as a partner for income tax purposes for any taxable year beginning before January 1, 1951, shall be made as if this section had not been enacted and without inferences drawn from the fact that this section is not expressly made applicable with respect to taxable years beginning before January 1, 1951. In applying this subsection where the taxable year of any family partner is different from the taxable year of the partnership—

"(1) if a taxable year of the partnership beginning in 1950 ends within or with, as to all of the family partners, taxable years which begin in 1951, then the amendments

made by this section shall be applicable with respect to all distributive shares of income derived by the family partners from such taxable year of the partnership beginning in 1950, and

"(2) if a taxable year of the partnership ending in 1951 ends within or with a taxable year of any family partner which began in 1950, then the amendments made by this section shall not be applicable with respect to any of the distributive shares of income derived by the family partners from such taxable year of the partnership."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 103, line 5, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "340" and insert "341."

On page 106 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out all after line 3 over to and including line 23 on page 110 and insert

"'(3) Tax adjustment measured by prior benefits: If the provisions of this paragraph are applicable to the taxable year pursuant to an election made by the taxpayer under the provisions of paragraph (5)—

"'(A) Amount of recovery. The amount of the recovery in the taxable year of any money or property in respect of property considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized in any prior taxable year shall be an amount equal to the aggregate of such money and the fair market value of such property, determined as of the date of the recovery. For the purpose of this paragraph, in the case of the recovery of the same property or interest considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized, the fair market value of such property or interest shall, at the option of the taxpayer, be considered an amount equal to the adjusted basis (for determining loss) of such property or interest in the hands of the taxpayer on the date such property or interest was considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized. The amount of the recovery determined under this subparagraph shall be reduced for the purposes of subparagraphs (B) and (C) by the amount of the obligations or liabilities with respect to the property considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized in respect of which the recovery was received, if the taxpayer for any previous taxable year chose under subsection (b) (2) to treat such obligations or liabilities as discharged or satisfied out of such property, and such obligations or liabilities were not so discharged or satisfied prior to the date of the recovery.

"'(B) Adjustment for prior tax benefits: That part of the amount of the recovery, in respect of any property considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized, which is not in excess of the allowable deductions in prior taxable years on account of such destruction or seizure of the property (the amount of such allowable deductions being first reduced by the aggregate amount of any prior recoveries in respect of the same property) shall be excluded from gross income for the taxable year of the recovery for the purpose of computing the tax under this chapter and chapter 2; but there shall be added to, and assessed and collected as a part of, the tax under this chapter for the taxable year of the recovery the total increase in the tax under this chapter and chapter 2 for all taxable years which would result by decreasing, in an amount equal to such part of the recovery so excluded, such deductions allowable in the prior taxable years with respect to the destruction or seizure of the property. Such increase in the tax for each such year so resulting shall be computed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. Such regulations shall give effect to previous recoveries of any kind (including recoveries described in section 22 (b) (12)) with respect to any prior year, and shall provide for the case where there was no tax for the prior year, but shall otherwise treat the tax previously determined for any year in accordance with the principles set forth in section 3801 (d). All credits allowable against the tax for any year and all carryovers and carry-backs affected by so decreasing the allowable deductions shall be taken into account in computing the increase in the tax, except that the computation of the excess profits credit under chapter 2 E for any taxable year shall not be affected.

"'(C) Gain upon recovery. The amount of any recovery or part thereof, in respect of property considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized, which is not excluded from gross income under the provisions of subparagraph (B) shall be considered for the taxable year of the recovery as gain on the involuntary conversion of property as a result of its destruction or seizure and shall be recognized or not recognized as provided in section 112 (f).

"'(D) Recoveries treated as gross income for certain purposes. For the purposes of sections 51, 52, and 3801 (b) the recovery in the taxable year of any money or property in respect of property considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized in any prior taxable year shall be deemed to be an item includible in gross income for the taxable year in which the recovery is made

"'(4) Restoration of value of investments referable to destroyed or seized property: For the purpose of this subsection the restoration in whole or in part of the value of any interest described in subsection (a) (3) by reason of any recovery of money or property in respect of property to which such interest related and which was considered under subsection (a) (1) or (2) as destroyed or seized shall be deemed a recovery of property in respect of property considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized In applying paragraph (3) of this subsection such restoration shall be treated as the recovery of the same interest considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized

"'(5) Election by taxpayer for application of paragraph (3): If the taxpayer elects to have the provisions of paragraph (3) applicable to any taxable year in which he recovered any money or property in respect of property considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized, the provisions of paragraph (3) shall be applicable to all taxable years of the taxpayer beginning after December 31, 1941, and such election, once made, shall be irrevocable. The election shall be made in such manner and at such time as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe, except that no election under this paragraph may be made after December 31, 1952, unless the taxpayer recovers money or property (in respect of property considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized) during a taxable year ending after the date of the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1951. If pursuant to such election the provisions of paragraph (3) are applicable to any taxable year—

"'(A) the period of limitations provided in sections 275 and 276 on the making of assessments and the beginning of distraint or a proceeding in court for collection shall not, with respect to—

"'(i) the amount to be added to the tax for such taxable year under the provisions of paragraph (3), and

"(ii) any deficiency for such taxable year or for any other taxable year, to the extent attributable to the basis of the recovered property being determined under the provisions of subsection (d) (2),

expire prior to the expiration of two years following the date of the making of such election, and such amount and such deficiency may be assessed at any time prior to the expiration of such period notwithstanding any law or rule of law which would otherwise prevent such assessment and collection, and

"'(B) in case refund or credit of any overpayment resulting from the application of the provisions of paragraph (3) to such taxable year is prevented on the date of the making of such election, or within one year from such date, by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than section 3761, relating to compromises), refund or credit of such overpayment may, nevertheless, be made or allowed if claim therefor is filed within one year from such date.

In the case of any taxable year ending before the date of the making by the taxpayer of an election under this paragraph, no interest shall be paid on any overpayment resulting from the application of the provisions of paragraph (3) to such taxable year, and no interest shall be assessed or collected with respect to any amount or any deficiency specified in clause (A), for any period prior to the expiration of six months following the date of the making of such election by the taxpayer'."

On page 112 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out line 6 and all that follows through line 17 and insert

"'(2) Property recovered in taxable year to which subsection (c) (3) is applicable: In the case of a taxpayer who has made an election under the provisions of subsection (c) (5), the basis of property recovered shall be an amount equal to the value at which such property is included in the amount of the recovery under subsection (c) (3) (A) (determined without regard to the last sentence thereof), reduced by such part of the gain under subsection (c) (3) (C) which is not recognized as provided in section 112 (f)'."

On page 113, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "1940" and insert "1941", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 113, line 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "341" and insert "342", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following

"SEC. 344. Nonbusiness casualty losses.

"(a) Removal of limitation: Section 122 (d) (5) (relating to net operating loss deduction) is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'This paragraph shall not apply with respect to deductions allowable for losses sustained after December 31, 1950, in respect of property, if the losses arise from fire, storm, shipwreck, or other casualty, or from theft'."

(b) Effective date: The amendment made by this section shall be applicable in computing the net operating loss deduction for taxable years ending after December 31, 1948.

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 345. Abatement of tax on certain trusts for members of Armed Forces dying in service

"In the case of a trust which accumulated income for a beneficiary who died on or after December 7, 1941, and before January 1, 1948, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States

or of any of the other United Nations, there shall be allowed as a deduction in computing the net income of such trust (in addition to other deductions allowable under sections 23 and 162 of the Internal Revenue Code) income of the trust for any taxable year (before diminution for income tax) which was accumulated for such beneficiary if—

"(1) the income accumulated was for a taxable year of the trust which ended with or within a taxable year (ending on or after December 7, 1941) of such beneficiary during any part of which he was a member of such military or naval forces, or, in the case of the taxable year of the trust during which such beneficiary died, the income accumulated was for the period in such taxable year prior to the death of such beneficiary; and

"(2) the amount of such accumulated income was, without regard to this section, taxable to the trust, and

"(3) the income for such taxable year accumulated for the beneficiary, if not distributed to him prior to his death, was payable by the trust at or after his death only to his estate, spouse, or lineal ancestors or descendants."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following.

"SEC. 346 Life insurance departments of mutual savings banks.

"(a) Computation of tax· Supplement A of chapter 1 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 110. Mutual savings banks conducting life insurance business.

"'(a) Alternative tax: In the case of a mutual savings bank not having capital stock represented by shares, authorized under State law to engage in the business of issuing life insurance contracts, and which conducts a life insurance business in a separate department the accounts of which are maintained separately from the other accounts of the mutual savings bank, there shall be levied, collected, and paid, in lieu of the taxes imposed by sections 13 and 15, or section 117 (c) (1), a tax consisting of the sum of the partial taxes determined under paragraphs (1) and (2):

"'(1) A partial tax computed upon the net income determined without regard to any items of gross income or deductions properly allocable to the business of the life insurance department, at the rates and in the manner as if this section has not been enacted; and

"'(2) a partial tax computed upon the net income (as defined in section 201 (c) (7)) of the life insurance department determined without regard to any items of gross income or deductions not properly allocable to such department, at the rates and in the manner provided in Supplement G with respect to life insurance companies.

"'(b) Limitations of section: The provisions of subsection (a) shall be applicable only if the life insurance department would, if it were treated as a separate corporation, qualify as a life insurance company under section 201 (b)'

"(b) Technical amendment: Section 13 (relating to normal tax on corporations) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) Mutual savings banks conducting life insurance business: For special tax, in lieu of the taxes imposed by this section and section 15, in the case of a mutual savings bank conducting a life insurance business, see section 110.'

"(c) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 120, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "348" and insert "347."

On page 120, line 23, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "the taxable year" and insert "a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1953".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 101: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following.

"SEC. 348. Deduction with respect to certain unrelated business net income.

"(a) Unrelated business net income: Section 422 (a) (relating to unrelated business net income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following. 'In the case of an organization described in section 3813 (a) (2) which is a member of a partnership all of whose members are organizations described in section 3813 (a) (2), if a trade or business regularly carried on by such partnership is an unrelated trade or business with respect to such organization, such organization shall, for taxable years beginning before January 1, 1954, be allowed a deduction in an amount equal to the portion of the gross income of such partnership from such unrelated trade or business which such organization is required (by a provision of a written contract executed by such organization prior to January 1, 1950, which provision expressly deals with the disposition of the gross income of the partnership) to pay within the taxable year in discharge of indebtedness incurred by such organization in acquiring its share of such trade or business, or to irrevocably set aside within the taxable year for the discharge of such indebtedness (to the extent that such amount has been so paid or set aside) if (i) such partnership was formed prior to January 1, 1950, for the purpose of carrying on such trade or business, and (ii) substantially all the assets used in carrying on such trade or business were acquired by it or by its members prior to such date. As used in the preceding sentence, the word "indebtedness" does not include indebtedness incurred after January 1, 1950.'

"(b) Effective date The amendment made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, and prior to January 1, 1954."

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 102. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 122, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "350" and insert "349"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 124, line 11, of the Senate engrossed "amendments", strike out "contributions—" and insert the following: "contributions;".

On page 124 of the Senate engrossed amendments, after line 11, insert the following:

"'(v) an organization organized (prior to October 1, 1951) which is exempt under section 101 (6) and which is operated for the purpose of conducting an annual chautauqua program of educational, cultural, and religious activities at a permanent location—'".

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 126 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "January" in lines 18 and 19 and insert "April"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 127 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "January" in lines 8, 16, 22, and 23 and insert "April".

On page 127, line 18, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "April" and insert "July".

On page 128 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "January" in lines 6 and 9 and insert "April".

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following·

"SEC 423 Reduction of tax on tobacco and snuff.

"(a) Reduction in rate: Section 2000 (a) (relating to tax on tobacco and snuff) is hereby amended by striking out '18 cents per pound', wherever it appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof 10 cents per pound'

"(b) Effective date· The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins more than ten days after the date of the enactment of this Act"

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 118 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 118, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment and on page 111 of the House engrossed bill, after line 16, insert: "On and after April 1, 1954, the tax imposed by this section shall be 1½ cents a gallon in lieu of 2 cents a gallon", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 130, line 18, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 131, line 1, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows· On page 131, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 131, line 11, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 129: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 131, line 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 131: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 132 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "January" in lines 1 and 8 and insert "April"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 137: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 137, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 132, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 141: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 133, line 3, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "444" and insert "454".

On page 132 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "January" in lines 11 and 18 and insert "April".

On page 133, line 20, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "February" and insert "May".

On page 134, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 142. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 142, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following. "455"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "456", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 151. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 151, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 135, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "452" in lines 8 and 13 and insert "462".

On page 135, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "December 31, 1953" and insert "March 31, 1954".

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 154: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 151, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following· "464"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 156: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "461 and 463"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 163: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 136, line 18, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "461" and insert "471".

On page 137, line 5, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "461" and insert "471".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 166: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 166, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 137, line 13, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 167: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 167, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 137, line 23, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 168: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 168, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 138, line 5, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 172· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 172, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "490"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 173· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 173, and agree to the same with the following amendments·

On page 138, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "473" and insert "483".

On page 139, line 7, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "producer or" and insert "producer of".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 174: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 174, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 139, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "474" and insert "484".

On page 140 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out lines 19, 20, and 21 and, in lieu thereof, insert the following: "15 per centum, except that on and after April 1, 1954, the rate shall be 10 per centum, fishing rods, creels, reels, and artificial lures, baits, and flies; 10 per centum.' ".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 175: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 175, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "485"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 178: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 178, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "by striking out 'Electric direct motor-driven fans and air circulators;' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Electric direct-motor-driven fans and air circulators (not of the industrial type); and the following appliances of the household type:', (2) "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 179: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 179, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(3)", and on page 139 of the House engrossed bill, in lines 3 and 4, strike out "and the following appliances of the household type:"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 181: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 181, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment and omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 184. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 184, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 139, line 11, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "485" and insert "486"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 185· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 185, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "487", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 188: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 188, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following· "15"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 191· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 191, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "488"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 193· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 193, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows· In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "489"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 194: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 194, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows· On page 144, line 11, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 197· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 197, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows· In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "489"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 198: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 198, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "a producer or importer of gasoline. The provisions of section 3443 shall be applicable to the floor stocks tax imposed by this subsection so as to entitle, subject to all the provisions of such section,

(1) any manufacturer or producer to a refund or credit of such tax under subsection (a) (1) of such section, and (2) any person paying such floor stocks tax to a refund or credit thereof where gasoline is by such person or any other person used or resold for any of the purposes specified in subparagraphs (A) (i), (ii), and (iii) of subsection (a) (3) of such section."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 199: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 199, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 145 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "January" in lines 6, 12, and 13 and insert "April"

On page 145, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "April" and insert "July".

On page 146, line 9, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April".

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 200 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 200, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "490", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 210: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 210, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 147, line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "482" and insert "492"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 211: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 211, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following. "493", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 213: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 213, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 148, line 15, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "484" and insert "494", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 214: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 214, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 149, line 15, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "485" and insert "495".

On page 149 of the Senate engrossed amendments, after the quotation marks in line 24 insert the following: "The determination as to the applicability of the tax imposed by section 3475 in the case of the transportation of any excavated material, other than transportation to which the amendment made by this subsection applies, shall be made as if this subsection had not been enacted and without inferences drawn from the fact that the amendment made by this subsection is not expressly applicable to the transportation of such other excavated material.",

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 215: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 215, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "496"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 216: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 216, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 150, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "487" and insert "497".

On page 150 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "January" in lines 15 and 22 and insert "April".

On page 151 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "January" in lines 10 and 18 and insert "April".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 217: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 217, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 151, line 22, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "488" and insert "498"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 219: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 219, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following.

"SEC 501. Maximum tax for new corporations.

"Section 430 (relating to imposition of tax) is hereby amended as follows:

"(1) By adding at the end of subsection (a) thereof, as amended by section 121 of this Act, the following:

"'(3) in the case of a corporation for which an amount is determined for the taxable year under subsection (e), the amount determined under such subsection'

"(2) By redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f), and

"(3) By inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"'(e) New corporations:

"'(1) Alternative amount: In the case of a taxpayer which commenced business after July 1, 1945, and whose fifth taxable year ends after June 30, 1950, the amount referred to in subsection (a) (3) shall be—

"'(A) If the taxable year is the first or second taxable year of the taxpayer, an amount equal to 5 per centum of the excess profits net income for the taxable year, except that if the excess profits net income exceeds $300,000, the amount shall be the sum of $15,000 plus the amount determined under subparagraph (E) of this paragraph.

"'(B) If the taxable year is the third taxable year of the taxpayer, an amount equal to 8 per centum of the excess profits net income for the taxable year, except that if the excess profits net income exceeds $300,000, the amount shall be the sum of $24,000 plus the amount determined under subparagraph (E) of this paragraph.

"'(C) If the taxable year is the fourth taxable year of the taxpayer, an amount equal to 11 per centum of the excess profits net income for the taxable year, except that if the excess profits net income exceeds $300,000, the amount shall be the sum of $33,000 plus the amount determined under subparagraph (E) of this paragraph.

"'(D) If the taxable year is the fifth taxable year of the taxpayer, an amount equal to 14 per centum of the excess profits net income for the taxable year, except that if the excess profits net income exceeds $300,000, the amount shall be the sum of $42,000 plus the amount determined under subparagraph (E) of this paragraph.

"'(E) The amount determined under this subparagraph shall be—

"'(i) if the taxable year ends before April 1, 1951, an amount equal to 15 per centum of the excess of the excess profits net income for the taxable year over $300,000.

"'(ii) if the taxable year begins on January 1, 1951, and ends on December 31, 1951, an amount equal to 17¼ per centum of the excess of the excess profits net income for the taxable year over $300,000.

"'(iii) if the taxable year (other than a taxable year described in clause (ii)) ends after March 31, 1951, an amount equal to 18 per centum of the excess of the excess profits net income for the taxable year over $300,000.

"'(2) First five taxable years: For the purpose of this subsection—

"'(A) The taxable year in which the taxpayer commenced business and the first, second, third, and fourth succeeding taxable years shall be considered its first, second, third, fourth, and fifth taxable years, respectively

"'(B) The taxpayer shall be considered to have been in existence and to have had taxable years for any period during which it or any corporation described in any clause of this subparagraph was in existence, and the taxpayer shall be considered to have commenced business on the earliest date on which it or any such corporation commenced business

"'(i) Any corporation which during or prior to the taxable year was a party with the taxpayer to a transaction described in section 445 (g) (2) (A), (B), or (C), determined as if the date "July 1, 1945" were substituted for the date "December 1, 1950" in section 445 (g) (2) (C).

"'(ii) Any corporation if a group of not more than four persons who control the taxpayer at any time during the taxable year also controlled such corporation at any time during the period beginning twelve months preceding their acquisition of control of the taxpayer and ending with the close of the taxable year, but only if at any time during such period (and while such persons controlled such corporation) such corporation was engaged in a trade or business substantially similar to the trade or business of the taxpayer during the taxable year For the purpose of this clause, the term "control" means the ownership of more than 50 per centum of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote, or more than 50 per centum of the total value of shares of all classes of stock A person shall not be considered a member of the group referred to in this clause unless during the period referred to in this clause he owns stock in such corporation at a time when the members of the group control such corporation and he owns stock in the taxpayer at a time when the members of the group control the taxpayer. For the purpose of this clause, the ownership of stock shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 503, except that constructive ownership under section 503 (a) (2) shall be determined only with respect to the individual's spouse and minor children

"'(iii) In case the taxpayer during or prior to the taxable year was a purchasing corporation (as defined in part IV), the selling corporation (as defined in such part) whose properties were acquired in the part IV transaction; but this clause shall not apply unless for the taxable year or for any preceding taxable year the conditions of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 474 (c) were satisfied with respect to such transaction.

"'(iv) Any corporation which, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, is determined by one or more additional applications of clauses (i) to (iii) to stand indirectly in the same relation to the taxpayer as though such corporation were described in any such clause.

If as of the beginning of December 1, 1950, the adjusted basis for determining gain upon sale or exchange of the aggregate assets theretofore acquired by the taxpayer in transactions described in clauses (i) and (iii) (or acquired in the ordinary course of business in replacement of such assets) and held by it at such time constituted less than 20 per centum of the adjusted basis for determining gain upon sale or exchange of its total assets held at such time, then transac-

tions described in such clauses occurring prior to such date shall be disregarded in determining the date as of which the taxpayer shall be considered to have commenced business.

"'(3) Limitation: The provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not apply to a taxpayer which derives more than 50 per centum of its gross income (determined without regard to dividends and without regard to gains from sales or exchanges of capital assets) for the taxable year from contracts and subcontracts to which the provisions of title I of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 (or the provisions of any prior renegotiation act) are applicable.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 220: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 220, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 160, line 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments insert, after "corporation", the following: "at the time it renders such services or assistance".

On page 160, line 12, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "renders" and insert "rendered".

On page 160, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "constitutes" and insert "constituted".

On page 161, line 1, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "owns" and insert the following. "at the time it rendered such services or assistance owned".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 221. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 221, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 161, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out the quotation marks and insert the following. "In computing the average base period net income for such substituted period, the excess profits net income for January, February, and March of 1950 shall be computed by use of the 'weighted excess profits net income', as defined in section 435 (e) (2) (E), for the taxable year in which such months fall.'"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 222: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 222, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 164, line 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "regulation" and insert "regulations".

On page 165, line 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out the period and quotation marks and insert the following: ", and such monthly excess profits net income shall be in lieu of the monthly excess profits net income determined under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 462 (b).'".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 224: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 224, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

SEC. 506. Adjustments for changes in inadmissible assets in case of banks.

"(a) Amendment of section 435 (g): Section 435 (g) (relating to net capital addition or reduction) is hereby amended by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (11) and by adding after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph:

"'(8) Adjustments for changes in inadmissible assets in case of banks: In the case of a bank (as defined in section 104)—

"'(A) If the increase in total assets for the taxable year exceeds the net capital addition computed without regard to the adjustment under paragraph (1) for an increase in inadmissible assets, then the net capital addition for the taxable year shall not be less than the excess of—

"'(i) the amount determined under the first sentence of paragraph (1) over

"'(ii) an amount which bears the same ratio to the increase in inadmissible assets for the taxable year, determined under paragraph (5), as the amount computed under such first sentence bears to the increase in total assets for the taxable year

"'(B) If the decrease in total assets for the taxable year exceeds the net capital reduction computed without regard to the adjustment under paragraph (2) for a decrease in inadmissible assets, then the net capital reduction for the taxable year shall not be less than the excess of—

"'(i) the amount determined under the first sentence of paragraph (2) over

"'(ii) An amount which bears the same ratio to the decrease in inadmissible assets for the taxable year, determined under paragraph (5), as the amount computed under such first sentence bears to the decrease in total assets for the taxable year.

For the purpose of this paragraph, the increase or decrease in total assets for the taxable year shall be computed in the same manner as the increase or decrease in inadmissible assets for the taxable year is computed under paragraph (5), except that such computations shall be made with respect to all assets, whether admissible or inadmissible assets as defined in section 440'

"(b) Amendment of section 438: Section 438 (relating to new capital credit changes) is hereby amended by adding after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

"'(g) Adjustments for inadmissible assets in case of banks: In the case of a bank (as defined in section 104), if the increase in total assets for the taxable year (determined in the manner provided in the last sentence of section 435 (g) (8)) exceeds the net new capital addition computed without regard to the adjustment under subsection (b) for an increase in inadmissible assets, then the net new capital addition for the taxable year shall not be less than the excess of the amount determined under the first sentence of subsection (b) over an amount which bears the same ratio to the increase in inadmissible assets for the taxable year, determined under section 435 (g) (5), as the amount computed under such first sentence bears to such increase in total assets for the taxable year.'

"(c) Amendment of section 435 (f): Section 435 (f) (relating to capital additions in base period) is hereby amended as follows:

"(1) By inserting immediately after the word 'reduced' in paragraph (1) thereof the following: '(but not below zero)'.

"(2) By adding at the end of paragraph (1) thereof the following:

"'For special rule in the case of banks, see paragraph (6)'

"(3) By renumbering paragraph (6) as paragraph (7), and by adding immediately after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"'(6) Yearly base period capital of banks: In the case of a bank (as defined in section 104), the yearly base period capital for any taxable year shall be determined as follows:

"'(A) A tentative yearly base period capital shall be computed under paragraph (1) without regard to paragraph (1) (A).

"'(B) The tentative yearly base period capital so determined shall be reduced by the amount determined under section 440 (b) (relating to inadmissible assets). For the purpose of this subparagraph, the computation under section 440 (b) shall include only the daily amounts (described in such section) for the first day of such taxable year.'"

"(d) Effective date of subsection (c) (3): The amendment made by subsection (c) (3) (adding a new paragraph (6) to section 435 (f)) shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, and, at the election of the taxpayer made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, shall be applicable to all taxable years ending after June 30, 1950."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 225: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 225, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 169 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out lines 9 to 20, inclusive, and insert the following:

"'(9) Decrease in inadmissible assets:

"'(A) Except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (B) (relating to banks), the excess of the amount computed under paragraph (2) (A) or (B), whichever is applicable to the taxpayer (whether or not any amount is determined under the first sentence of paragraph (2)), over the amount, if any, computed under the first sentence of paragraph (2) shall be considered the net capital addition for the taxable year or shall be added to the next capital addition otherwise determined under paragraph (1), as the case may be The amount of the excess so determined shall be subject to the exceptions and limitations provided in paragraph (10).

"'(B) In the case of a bank (as defined in section 104), the computation under subparagraph (A) shall be made by substituting for the amount computed under paragraph (2) (A) or (B) whichever of the following amounts is the lesser.

"'(i) An amount which bears the same ratio to the decrease in inadmissible assets as the sum of the equity capital, as defined in section 437 (c)) and the daily borrowed capital (as defined in section 439 (b)), each determined as of the first day of the first taxable year ending after June 30, 1950, bears to the total assets as of the beginning of such day;

"'(ii) If paragraph (8) (B) is applicable, the amount computed under paragraph (8) (B) (ii) "

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 226 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 226, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 172 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out line 25 and all that follows over to and including the period in line 3 on page 173 and insert the following: "'Government obligations' means obligations described in section 22 (b) (4) any part of the interest from which is excludible from gross income or allowable as a credit against net income; but such term shall include only such obligations as in the hands of the taxpayer are property described in section 117 (a) (1) (A)."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 227: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 227, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 175 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out line 11 and all that follows through line 17 on page 177 and insert the following:

"'(h) Alternative average base period net income:

"'(1) Eligibility requirements: A taxpayer which commenced business on or before the first day of its base period shall be entitled to the benefits of this subsection if—

"'(A) the aggregate excess profits net income (if any) for the 12 months selected under paragraph (2) (B) is less than 35 per centum of one-half of the aggregate excess profits net income for the 24 months remaining under such paragraph; and

"'(B) normal production, output, or operation was interrupted or diminished because of the occurrence, within 12 months preceding (1) the first day of the 12-month period

selected under paragraph (2) (B) (i), or (ii) the first day of any period of 6 or more consecutive months selected under paragraph (2) (B) (ii), of events unusual or peculiar in the experience of such taxpayer.

This subsection shall have no application unless the taxpayer has an aggregate excess profits net income for the 24 months remaining under paragraph (2) (B).

"'(2) Computation. If the taxpayer is entitled to the benefits of this subsection, its average base period net income computed under this subsection shall be computed as follows.

"'(A) By determining under subsection (b) the period subject to adjustment under this section. For the purposes of subparagraph (B) but not for the purposes of paragraph (1) (B) such period shall be considered a period of 36 consecutive months

"'(B) By selecting from such period whichever of the following 12 months results in the higher remaining aggregate excess profits net income—

"'(i) the 12 consecutive months the elimination of which produces the highest remaining aggregate excess profits net income, or

"'(ii) the 12 months which remain after retaining the 24 consecutive months which produce the highest remaining aggregate excess profits net income.

"'(C) By computing for each of the 12 months selected under subparagraph (B) a substitute excess profits net income computed under subsection (e).

"'(D) By computing the sum of—

"'(i) the aggregate of the substitute excess profits net income, as determined under subparagraph (C), for the 12 months selected under subparagraph (B), but the amount computed under this clause shall not exceed one-half of the aggregate excess profits net income for the 24 months remaining under subparagraph (B), and

"'(ii) the aggregate of the excess profits net income for each of the 24 months remaining under subparagraph (B), computed in the manner provided by the second sentence of section 435 (d) (1).

"'(E) By dividing by three the amount ascertained under subparagraph (D).

"'(3) Aggregate excess profits net income: The "aggregate excess profits net income" for any period shall be computed for the purposes of this subsection in the same manner as under subsection (b).'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 228: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 228, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 178 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out line 10 and all that follows through the word "the" in line 11 and insert "The", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 231: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 231, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 181, line 3, of the Senate engrossed amendments insert, after "Commission or", the following: "if the rates for such furnishing or sale are subject"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 234: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 234, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 183 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out line 15 and all that follows through line 21 on page 184 and insert the following:

"'(1) The adjusted basis of the taxpayer's total facilities (as defined in section 444 (d)) as of the beginning of its base period (when added to the total facilities at such time of all corporations with which the taxpayer has the privilege under section 141 of filing a consolidated return for its first taxable year under this subchapter) did not exceed $10,000,000;

"'(2) The basis (unadjusted) of the taxpayer's total facilities (as defined in section 444 (d)) at the close of its base period was 250 per centum or more of the basis (unadjusted) of its total facilities at the beginning of its base period,

"'(3) The percentage of the taxpayer's aggregate gross income which was from contracts with the United States and related subcontracts was (A) at least 70 per centum for the period comprising all taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941, and ending before January 1, 1946, (B) less than 20 per centum for the period comprising all taxable years ending after December 31, 1945, and before January 1, 1950, and (C) less than 20 per centum for the period comprising all taxable years ending after December 31, 1949, and beginning before July 1, 1950; and

"'(4) The average monthly excess profits net income of the taxpayer (computed in the manner provided in section 443 (e)) for—

"'(A) the period comprising all taxable years ending with or within the last 24 months of its base period, and

"'(B) the last taxable year ending before the first day of its base period,

are each 300 per centum or more of the average monthly excess profits net income (so computed) of the taxpayer for the period comprising all taxable years ending with or within the first 24 months of its base period'."

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 235: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 235, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following.

"SEC 517. Base period catastrophe.

"Section 459, as added by section 516 of this Act, is hereby amended by adding after subsection (a) thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) Base period catastrophe·

"'Eligibility requirements A taxpayer shall be entitled to the benefits of this subsection only if it was engaged throughout its base period primarily in manufacturing and if—

"'(A) the taxpayer suffered during the last thirty-six months of its base period a catastrophe by fire, storm, explosion, or other casualty which destroyed or rendered inoperative a production facility constituting a complete plant or plants having in the hands of the taxpayer immediately prior to the catastrophe an adjusted basis equal to 15 per centum or more of the adjusted basis of all the taxpayer's production facilities at such time,

"'(B) as a result of such catastrophe the taxpayer's normal production or operation was substantially interrupted for a period of more than twelve consecutive months, and

"'(C) the taxpayer, prior to the end of its base period, replaced such production facility with a production facility which at the end of its base period had in its hands an adjusted basis not less than the adjusted basis immediately prior to the catastrophe of the production facility destroyed or rendered inoperative.

"'(2) Computation: The taxpayer's base period net income determined under this subsection shall be the amount computed under subparagraph (A) or the amount computed under subparagraph (B), whichever results in the lesser tax under this subchapter for the taxable year for which the tax is being computed:

"'(A) The amount computed under section 435 (d) by substituting for the excess profits net income for each month in the taxable year in which the catastrophe described in paragraph (1) occurred an amount equal to the aggregate, divided by the number of months in the base period preceding such taxable year, of the excess profits net income for each month (computed under section 435 (d) (1)) in the base period preceding such taxable year. The average base period net income computed under this subparagraph shall, for the purpose of section 435 (a) (1) (B) be considered an average base period net income determined under section 435 (d).

"'(B) The amount computed under section 435 (e) (2) (G) (i) and (ii).'"

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 236: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 236, and agree to the same with the following amendments·

On page 187, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments insert after the semicolon the following· "and"

On page 188, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments insert after the semicolon the following. "and either"

On page 188, line 9, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "consolidation began; and" and insert the following: "operations were consolidated, or"

On page 188, line 21, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "consolidation began" and insert the following: "operations were consolidated".

On page 188, line 23, of the Senate engrossed amendments insert after the period the following "In determining such excess amount proper adjustment shall be made for increase in labor costs and newsprint following such consolidation Proper adjustment shall also be made for any case in which a taxable year referred to in this subsection is a period of less than twelve months"

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 237· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 237, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 519 Television broadcasting companies

"Section 459, as added by sections 516 to 518 of this Act, is hereby amended by adding after subsection (c) thereof the following new subsections·

"'(d) Television broadcasting companies:

"'(1) In general: In the case of a taxpayer engaged in the business of television broadcasting throughout a period beginning before January 1, 1951, and ending with the close of the taxable year, the taxpayer's average base period net income determined under this subsection shall be the amount computed under paragraph (2) or (3), whichever is applicable.

"'(2) If engaged in television broadcasting at close of base period. If the taxpayer was engaged in the business of television broadcasting at the close of its base period, the average base period net income computed under this paragraph shall be computed as follows:

"'(A) If the taxpayer was engaged during its base period in any business or businesses other than television broadcasting, by computing the average base period net income under section 435 (d) for such other business or businesses (determined without regard to income, deductions, losses, or other items attributable to the television broadcasting business).

"'(B) By multiplying such part of its total assets (as defined in section 442 (f)), for the last day of its base period, as was attributable to the television broadcasting business by—

"'(i) the base period rate of return determined under section 447 (c) for the in-

dustry classification which includes radio broadcasting, or

"'(ii) if the taxpayer was engaged during its base period in the business of radio broadcasting, its individual rate of return computed under paragraph (4),

whichever rate of return produces the greater average base period net income under this subsection. If the amount computed under this subparagraph is computed by the use of the rate of return specified in clause (i), the amount so computed shall be reduced by an amount equal to such portion of the total interest paid or incurred by the taxpayer, for the period of 12 months following the close of its base period, as is attributable to its television broadcasting business.

"'(C) By adding the amount computed under subparagraph (B) to the amount, if any, computed under subparagraph (A).

"'(3) Commencing television broadcasting after base period and before 1951 If the taxpayer acquires its television broadcasting business after the close of its base period and before January 1, 1951, the average base period net income computed under this paragraph shall be computed as provided in paragraph (2), except that—

"'(A) the applicable rate of return under paragraph (2) (B) shall be multiplied by such part of its total assets (as defined in section 442 (f)), for the last day of the calendar month in which it first engaged in such business, as was attributable to such business, and

"'(B) the reduction specified in the last sentence of paragraph (2) (B) shall, if applicable, be equal to such portion of the total interest paid or incurred by the taxpayer, for the period of 12 months following the month in which it first engaged in such business, as is attributable to such business.

"'(4) Individual rate of return The individual rate of return shall be computed as follows

"'(A) By determining the amount of the taxpayer's total assets (as defined in section 442 (f)) attributable to the business of radio broadcasting for the last day of each month in its base period.

"'(B) By computing the aggregate of the amounts ascertained under subparagraph (A) and dividing by 48

"'(C) By computing for each month in the base period the excess profits net income of the radio broadcasting business (determined without regard to income, deductions, losses, or other items attributable to any other business), by adding such amounts for all of the months in the base period, and by dividing by 4

"'(D) By dividing the amount computed under subparagraph (C) by the amount computed under subparagraph (B).

"'(5) Rules for application of subsection:

"'(A) For the purpose of section 435 (a) (1) (B), an average base period net income determined under this subsection shall be considered an average base period net income determined under section 435 (d), but, in computing the base period capital addition under section 435 (f), the computations under such section shall be adjusted, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, so as to exclude therefrom items attributable to the television broadcasting business.

"'(B) If any part of the total assets referred to in paragraph (2) (B) or paragraph (3) (A), whichever is applicable, were acquired, directly or indirectly, through the use of assets attributable at any time during the base period to a business of the taxpayer other than television broadcasting, the amount determined under paragraph (2) (A) shall be properly adjusted by eliminating from the excess profits net income (computed for the purpose of paragraph (2) (A)) for each month prior to such acquisition such portion thereof as is attributable to the assets used, directly or indirectly, for such acquisition For the purpose of this subparagraph, the excess profits net income for any month shall be attributed to such assets on the basis of the ratio, as of the beginning of the day of the acquisition, of such assets to total assets (as defined in section 442 (f)) determined without regard to assets attributable to the television broadcasting business.

" (C) The Secretary shall by regulations prescribe rules for the application of this subsection, including rules for the computation of the taxpayer's net capital addition or reduction

"'(6) Application of part II: The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for the application of Part II for the purpose of this subsection in the case of an acquiring corporation or a component corporation in a transaction described in section 461 (a) which occurred prior to January 1, 1951

"'(c) Basis of assets For the purposes of this section, any reference to the adjusted basis of property or to the basis (unadjusted) of property means the adjusted basis or the basis (unadjusted), as the case may be, for determining gain upon sale or exchange'"

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 238 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 238, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following

"SEC 520 Increase in capacity for production or operation

"Section 444 (f) (relating to increase in capacity for production or operation) is hereby amended to read as follows

"'(f) Rules for application of section'

"'(1) The benefits of this section shall not be allowed unless the taxpayer makes application therefor in accordance with section 447 (e)

"'(2) If, during its first taxable year ending after June 30, 1950, the taxpayer completed construction of (including the installation of the machinery or equipment for use in) a factory building or other manufacturing establishment, such factory building or other manufacturing establishment and such machinery or equipment shall, for the purpose of determining whether there is an increase in capacity under the provisions of subsection (b), be considered to have been added to its total facilities on the last day of its base period if—

"'(A) the taxpayer, prior to the end of its base period, had completed construction work representing more than 40 per centum of the total cost of construction of such factory building or other manufacturing establishment, and

"'(B) the completion of such factory building or other manufacturing establishment was in pursuance of a plan to which the taxpayer was committed prior to the end of its base period.

This paragraph shall not apply in determining the amount of the taxpayer's total assets for the purpose of subsection (c).'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 239: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 239, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC 521 Excess profits credit based on income in connection with certain taxable acquisitions

"(a) General rule: Subchapter D (relating to the excess profits tax) of chapter 1 is hereby amended by inserting immediately following section 472 the following new part:

"'Part IV—Excess Profits Credit Based on Income in Connection With Certain Taxable Acquisitions Occurring Prior to December 1, 1950.

"'SEC 474 Excess profits credit based on income—certain taxable acquisitions.

"'(a) Definitions: For the purpose of this part—

"'(1) Purchasing corporation: The term "purchasing corporation" means a corporation which, before December 1, 1950, acquired—

"'(A) In a transaction other than a transaction described in section 461 (a), substantially all of the properties (other than cash) of another corporation, of a partnership, or of a business owned by a sole proprietorship; or

"'(B) Properties of another corporation or of a partnership if (i) such properties constituted, immediately prior to the acquisition, substantially all of the properties (other than cash) of one or more separate businesses of such other corporation or such partnership, (ii) such other corporation or such partnership was engaged in one or more separate businesses other than those described in clause (i), and (iii) substantially all of the properties (other than cash) of such other corporation or such partnership were acquired, in furtherance of a single plan of complete liquidation for such other corporation or such partnership, by the purchasing corporation, and by one or more other persons, in transactions other than transactions described in section 461 (a)

"'(2) Selling corporation: The term "selling corporation" means a corporation, a partnership, or a business owned by a sole proprietorship, as the case may be, properties of which were acquired by a purchasing corporation in a transaction described in paragraph (1)

"'(3) Part IV transaction The term "part IV transaction" means a transaction described in paragraph (1)

"'(b) Average base period net income of purchasing corporation' The average base period net income of a purchasing corporation, if computed with reference to this part, shall be determined under section 435 (d) The average base period net income under section 435 (d) of a purchasing corporation shall be determined by computing its excess profits net income either with or without reference to this part, whichever produces the lesser tax under this subchapter for the taxable year for which the tax is being computed If computed with reference to this part, the excess profits net income of a purchasing corporation for any month of its base period shall be its excess profits net income (or deficits therein), computed without reference to this part, and increased or decreased, as the case may be, by the addition or reduction resulting from including—

"'(1) In the case of a transaction described in subsection (a) (1) (A), the excess profits net income (or deficit therein) for such month of the selling corporation, or

"'(2) In the case of a transaction described in subsection (a) (1) (B), the excess profits net income (or deficit therein) for such month of the selling corporation properly attributable to the business or businesses acquired by the purchasing corporation and properly allocable to such purchasing corporation.

The excess profits net income of a purchasing corporation for any month, recomputed as provided in the previous sentence, shall not be less than zero.

"'(c) Limitations: This part shall apply only if each of the following conditions is satisfied:

"'(1) The selling corporation (A) did not, after the part IV transaction (or the last transaction described in subsection (a) (1)

(B)), continue any business activities other th n those incident to its complete liquidation, and (B) within a reasonable time after ceasing business activities, completely liquidated in a transaction other than a transaction described in section 461 (a), and ceased existence.

"'(2) During so much of the base period of the purchasing corporation and of the period thereafter as preceded the part IV transaction, the properties acquired in the part IV transaction were substantially all of the properties (other than cash) which were used, or which in the ordinary course of business replaced properties used, by the selling corporation (or by a component corporation, as defined in section 461 (b), of such selling corporation) in the production of the excess profits net income (or deficit therein) which under subsection (b) increases or decreases the excess profits net income of the purchasing corporation. For the purpose of this paragraph, if a business in the hands of both the selling corporation and the purchasing corporation was operated under a substantially identical franchise or license, granted by the same person, such franchise or license shall be deemed acquired by the purchasing corporation from the selling corporation.

"'(3) The business or businesses acquired in the part IV transaction (including the properties so acquired or properties in replacement thereof) were operated by the purchasing corporation from the date of such transaction to the end of the taxable year or were transferred during the taxable year by the purchasing corporation in a part II transaction to which the provisions of section 462 (b) (4) are applicable.

"'(d) Special Rules:

"'(1) For the purpose of subsection (a) (1), the properties of a selling corporation shall be considered to have been acquired by a purchasing corporation only if acquired from—

"'(A) such selling corporation, or

"'(B) persons who received the properties upon the liquidation of such selling corporation and who forthwith transferred such properties to the purchasing corporation in a transaction other than a transaction described in section 461 (a).

"'(2) The computations required by this part in the case of a selling corporation which is a partnership or a business owned by a sole proprietorship shall be made, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, as if such pa.tnership or such business owned by a sole proprietorship had been a corporation.

"'(3) In no case shall more than 100 per centum of the excess profits net income (or deficit therein) for any month of a selling corporation be allocated to the purchasing corporation or, in the case of transactions described in subsection (a) (1) (B), to the several persons (or to any one or more of such persons) receiving the properties of such selling corporation in such transactions.

"'(e) Successive transactions:

"'(1) Part IV transaction following part IV transaction: In the case of a selling corporation which was a purchasing corporation in a previous part IV transaction, or which acquired properties of a purchasing corporation in a transaction to which section 462 (b) (4) is applicable, the computations under this part with respect to the selling corporation shall be made without regard to the previous part IV transaction.

"'(2) Part IV transaction following part II transaction: Subject to the provisions of paragraph (1), in the case of a selling corporation which was an acquiring corporation as defined in section 461 (a) in a previous transaction, its excess profits net income (or deficit therein) which increases or decreases the excess profits net income (or deficit therein) of the purchasing corporation under subsection (b) (1) or (2), and its capital changes which are taken into account under this part in determining the capital changes of the purchasing corporation, shall be determined with the application of the rules of part II to such selling corporation with respect to the part II transaction.

"'(3) Part II transaction following part IV transaction: For rules applicable in the case of a part II transaction following a part IV transaction, see sections 462 (b) (4), 463 (c), and 464 (c).

"'(f) Regulations: The Secretary shall by regulations prescribe rules for the application of this part Such regulations shall include the following rules:

"'(1) Base period capital addition: Rules (consistent with the principles of section 464) for the determination of the base period capital addition of the purchasing corporation by reference to the capital changes of the selling corporation and of the purchasing corporation

"'(2) Net capital addition or reduction: Rules (consistent with the principles of section 463) for the determination of the net capital addition or reduction of the purchasing corporation by reference to the capital changes of the selling corporation and of the purchasing corporation.

"'(3) Excess profits net income: Rules (consistent with the principles of section 462 (i) for the determination of the amount of excess profits net income (or deficit therein) of the selling corporation attributable to the business or businesses acquired by a purchasing corporation in a transaction described in subsection (a) (1) (B) and properly allocable to such purchasing corporation

"'(4) Duplication Rules for the application under this part of the principles of section 462 (j) (1) and the other provisions of part II relating to the prevention of duplication.

"'(5) Excess profits credit: In the event that the part IV transaction occurred in a taxable year of the purchasing corporation which ended after June 30, 1950, rules (consistent with the principles of section 462 (j) (2) for the determination of the excess profits credit of such corporation for the year in which the transaction occurred.

Such rules shall not include the principles of section 461 (c) (relating to the excess profits credit of the component corporation), of section 462 (b) (2) (relating to constructive excess profits net income for months during which a corporation was not in existence), of section 462 (1) (relating to minimum average base period net income in the case of certain acquiring corporations), or of such other provisions of part II as relate to sections 435 (e), 442, 443, 444, 445, or 446.'

"(b) Technical amendments:

"(1) Section 435 (a) (3) (relating to amount of excess profits credit) is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', and in the case of certain taxable acquisitions, see part IV of this subchapter'.

"(2) Section 461 (relating to definitions under part II) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(g) Component corporation which was a purchasing corporation in a previous transaction: See section 462 (b) (4) for rules applicable if the component corporation was a purchasing corporation (as defined in part IV) in a previous part IV transaction, or if (as an acquiring corporation in a previous part II transaction) it was subject to the provisions of section 462 (b) (4).

"'(h) Definition of part II transaction: For the purpose of this subchapter, the term "part II transaction" means a transaction described in section 461 (a).'

"(3) Section 462 (b) (relating to the method of recomputing the excess profits net income of an acquiring corporation under part II) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(4) If the average base period net income of the acquiring corporation is determined under section 435 (d) with reference to this subsection, and if the provisions of section 474 (b) (relating to the computation of excess profits net income in the case of certain purchasing corporations) were applicable to the component corporation immediately prior to the part II transaction (or would have been applicable if such part II transaction had occurred in a taxable year of the component corporation ending after June 30, 1950), then the excess profits net income (or deficit therein) of the component corporation shall, or the purpose of this subsection, be determined with the application of the provisions of section 474 (b). For the purpose of this paragraph, if a component corporation was an acquiring corporation in a previous part II transaction and, immediately prior to the later part II transaction, the provisions of this paragraph were applicable to such component corporation, its excess profits net income (or deficit therein) shall be determined with the application of the provisions of the preceding sentence. This paragraph shall be applicable to an acquiring corporation only if—

"'(A) the properties acquired by the acquiring corporation from the component corporation include substantially all of the properties (other than cash), or properties acquired in the ordinary course of business in the replacement of properties, which the component corporation acquired either from the selling corporation in the part IV transaction or from a previous component corporation subject (immediately prior to such acquisition) to the provisions of this paragraph.

"'(B) the business or businesses acquired by the acquiring corporation were operated by the acquiring corporation from the date of such transaction to the end of the taxable year or were transferred during the taxable year by the acquiring corporation in a part II transaction to which the provisions of this paragraph are applicable, and

"'(C) in the event that the part II transaction is one described in section 461 (a) (1) (E), the provisions of section 462 (i) (6) are satisfied.'

"(4) Section 462 (i) (6) (relating to allocation rules in the case of transactions described in section 46 (a) (1) (E)) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1), if an acquiring corporation in a transaction described in section 461 (a) (1) (E) determines its average base period net income under section 435 (d) by recomputing its excess profits net income under the provisions of section 462 (b) (4), the amount of the component corporation's excess profits net income for any month which shall be taken into account by the acquiring corporation shall be such portion of the component corporation's excess profits net income for such month as is determined on the basis of the earnings experience of the assets transferred and the assets retained by the component corporation.'

"(5) Section 463 (relating to capital changes) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) Component corporation which was a purchasing corporation in a previous transaction: The Secretary shall provide by regulations for the application of this section in cases to which section 462 (b) (4) is applicable.'

"(6) Section 464 (relating to capital changes during the base period) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) The Secretary shall provide by regulation for the application of this section in

cases to which section 462 (b) (4) is applicable.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 240: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 240, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 522. Strategic minerals.

"Section 450 (b) (1) (relating to corporations engaged in mining of strategic minerals) is hereby amended by inserting after 'chromite,' the following: 'bauxite,'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 241: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 241, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 199, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "510" and insert "506 (d)", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 245: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 245, and agree to the same with the following amendments: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "or to the benefit of a hospital, or an institution for the rehabilitation of physically handicapped persons, which maintains or is building for proper maintenance a hospital or institution staffed or to be staffed by qualified professional persons for the treatment of the sick and/or the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped."

On page 150, line 25, of the House bill strike out the quotation marks and insert the following "The determination as to whether an organization other than one described in this subsection is exempt under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code from taxation for any taxable year beginning before January 1, 1951, shall be made as if this subsection and section 301 (b) of this Act had not been enacted and without inferences drawn from the fact that this subsection and the amendment made by section 301 (b) are not expressly made applicable with respect to taxable years beginning before January 1, 1951'"

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 246: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 246, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment and insert the following.

"SEC 602 Excess profits credit based on income.

"(a) Percentage of average base period net income taken into account:

"(1) In general Paragraph (1) (A), and paragraph (2), of section 435 (a) (relating to excess profits credit based on income) are each amended by striking out '85 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '83 per centum'.

"(2) Taxable years beginning before January 1, 1952, and ending after December 31, 1951: Section 435 (a) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(4) Taxable years beginning in 1951 and ending in 1952: In the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1952, and ending after December 31, 1951, there shall be used, for the purposes of paragraph (1) (A) and paragraph (2), in lieu of 85 per centum of the average base period net income, an amount equal to the sum of—

"'(A) that portion of an amount equal to 85 per centum of the average base period net income which the number of days in such taxable year prior to January 1, 1951, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year, plus

"'(B) that portion of an amount equal to 83 per centum of the average base period net income which the number of days in such taxable year after December 31, 1952, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year.'

"(b) Effective date: The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1951"

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 247 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 247, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 200, line 13, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "602" and insert "603".

On page 201 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out lines 15 to 25, inclusive, and insert the following:

"'(A) shall not, with respect to any such tax, exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such tax actually paid to such foreign country as the value of property which is—

"'(i) situated within such foreign country,

"'(ii) subjected to such tax, and

"'(iii) included in the gross estate

bears to the value of all property subjected to such tax, and

"'(B) shall not, with respect to all such taxes, exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to the tax imposed by section 310".

On page 202, line 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "taxes" and insert "tax"

On page 205 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out all after line 23 over to and including line 12 on page 206 and insert the following:

"'(A) For the purposes of paragraph (2) (A), "such taxes paid to the foreign country" shall, with respect to any tax paid to the foreign country, be the amount computed under section 813 (c) (2) (A) "

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 248 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 248, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following "604"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 249: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 249, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows On page 208, line 21, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "604" and insert "605"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 250: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 250, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 209, line 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "605" and insert "606", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 251: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 251, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows On page 210, line 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "606" and insert "607"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 252: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 252, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 211, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "607" and insert "608"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 253: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 253, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 211, line 9, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "608" and insert "609"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 254: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 254, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec 610. Reversionary interests in case of life insurance.

"If refund or credit of any overpayment resulting from the application of section 503 of the Revenue Act of 1950 was prevented on October 25, 1950, by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than section 3760 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to closing agreements, and other than section 3761 of such code, relating to compromises), refund or credit of such overpayment may, nevertheless, be made or allowed if claim therefor was filed after October 25, 1949, and on or before October 25, 1950"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 255: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 255, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows On page 212, line 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "610" and insert "611", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 256: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 256, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 214, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "611" and insert "612", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 257: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 257, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 214, line 14, strike out "612" and insert "613", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 258: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 258, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows On page 215, line 6, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "613" and insert "614", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 259 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 259, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows On page 216, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "614" and insert "615"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 260: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 260, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following. "616"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 261: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 261, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. On page 216, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "616" and insert "617", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 262: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 262, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC 618. Prohibition upon denial of Social Security Act funds.

"No State or any agency or political subdivision thereof shall be deprived of any

grant-in-aid or other payment to which it otherwise is or has become entitled pursuant to title I, IV, X, or XIV of the Social Security Act, as amended, by reason of the enactment or enforcement by such State of any legislation prescribing any conditions under which public access may be had to records of the disbursement of any such funds or payments within such State if such legislation prohibits the use of any list or names obtained through such access to such records for commercial or political purposes."

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 263: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 263, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 619. Removal of tax exemption from expense allowances of the President, the Vice President, the Speaker, and Members of Congress.

"(a) Expense allowance of the President: Section 102 of title 3 of the United States Code is amended by striking out 'no tax liability shall accrue and for which no accounting shall be made by him' and inserting in lieu thereof 'no accounting, other than for income tax purposes, shall be made by him.'

"(b) Expense allowance of the Vice President. Section 111 of title 3 of the United States Code is amended by striking out 'for which no tax liability shall occur or accounting be made by him' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for which no accounting, other than for income tax purposes, shall be made by him'

"(c) Expense allowance of the Speaker of the House of Representatives: Subsection (e) of the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives', approved January 19, 1949 (Public Law 2, 81st Congress), is amended by striking out 'for which no tax liability shall occur or accounting be made by him' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for which no accounting, other than for income tax purposes, shall be made by him'

"(d) Expense allowances of Members of Congress: Section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by striking out 'for which no tax liability shall incur, or accounting be made' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for which no accounting, other than for income tax purposes, shall be made'

"(e) Effective dates: The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall become effective at noon on January 20, 1953, and the amendments made by subsections (c) and (d) shall become effective at noon on January 3, 1953."

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 264: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 264, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TABLE OF CONTENTS

"TITLE I—INCREASE IN INCOME TAX RATES

"Part I—Individual income taxes

"Sec. 101. Increase in surtax for 1951, 1952, and 1953.
"(a) Rates of surtax.
"(b) Limitation on tax.
"Sec. 102. Individuals with adjusted gross income of less than $5,000.
"Sec. 103. Inapplicability of certain penalties and additions to tax.
"(a) Penalties for failure to file return.
"(b) Additions to tax.
"Sec 104. Computation of tax in case of certain joint returns.
"Sec. 105. Effective date of part I.

"Part II—Corporation income taxes

"Sec 121. Increase in rate of corporation normal tax and surtax.
"(a) Amendment of section 13.
"(b) Maximum tax.
"(c) Mutual insurance companies other than life or marine.
"(d) Regulated investment companies.
"(e) Business income of certain section 101 organizations.
"(f) Amendment of section 15.
"(g) Technical amendment.
"Sec 122 Credits of corporations.
"(a) Dividends received credit.
"(b) Credit for dividends paid on certain preferred stock
"(c) Western hemisphere trade corporations.
"Sec 123 Filing of corporation returns for taxable years ending after March 13, 1951, and before October 1, 1951
"Sec 124 Effective date

"Part III—Fiscal year taxpayers

"Sec 131 Fiscal year taxpayers
"(a) Amendment of section 108
"(b) Computation of excess profits tax.
"(c) Technical amendments

"TITLE II—WITHHOLDING OF TAX AT SOURCE

"Sec 201 Percentage method of withholding
"Sec 202. Wage bracket withholding
"Sec 203 Additional withholding of tax on wages upon agreement by employer and employee.
"Sec 204 Effective date.

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS INCOME TAX AMENDMENTS

"Sec. 301 Tax treatment in case of head of household.
"(a) Surtax in case of head of household
"(b) Computation of tax by collector.
"(c) Effective date
"Sec 302 Payments to beneficiaries of deceased employees
"(a) Amendment of section 22 (b) (1).
"(b) Effective date
"Sec 303 Joint and survivor annuities.
"(a) Amendment of section 22 (b) (2).
"(b) Amendment of section 113 (a) (5).
"(c) Effective dates.
"Sec 304. Income from discharge of indebtedness.
"(a) Amendment of section 22 (b) (9).
"(b) Amendment of section 22 (b) (10)
"Sec 305 Compensation of certain members of the armed forces.
"(a) Amendment of section 22 (b) (13).
"(b) Definition of service in combat zone.
"(c) Withholding on wages.
"(d) Effective dates
"Sec. 306. Involuntary liquidation and replacement of inventory.
"(a) Amendment of section 22 (d) (6) (F) (iii).
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec 307. Medical expenses.
"(a) Amendment of section 23 (x).
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec 308 Standard deduction.
"(a) Method of election.
"(b) Change of election
"(c) Effective date
"Sec 309. Expenditures in the development of mines.
"(a) Deduction of expenditures.
"(b) Adjusted basis for determining gain or loss upon sale or exchange.
"(c) Technical amendment.
"(d) Effective date.
"Sec. 310. Gross income of dependent of taxpayer.
"(a) Increase in amount of gross income permitted.
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec 311. Credit for dividends received.
"(a) Dividends from foreign corporation engaged in trade or business in the United States.
"(b) Technical amendment.
"(c) Effective date.
"Sec 312 Joint return after filing separate return.
"(a) Change of election.
"(b) Effective date
"Sec 313 Mutual savings banks, building and loan associations, cooperative banks.
"(a) Mutual savings banks.
"(b) Building and loan associations and cooperative banks.
"(c) Exemptions from excess profits tax
"(d) Federal savings and loan associations.
"(e) Bad debt reserves.
"(f) Dividends paid to depositors
"(g) Deduction for repayment of certain loans
"(h) Definition of bank
"(i) Definition of domestic building and loan association
"(j) Effective date
"Sec. 314 Income tax treatment of exempt cooperatives
"(a) Amendment of section 101 (12).
"(b) Technical amendments
"(c) Information returns
"(d) Effective date
"Sec 315 Surtax on corporations improperly accumulating surplus
"(a) Long-term capital gains.
"(b) Effective date
"Sec 316 Election as to recognition of gain in certain corporate liquidations
"(a) Amendment of section 112 (b) (7).
"(b) Basis of property.
"(c) Effective date
"Sec 317 Certain distributions of stock on reorganization.
"(a) Distributions not in liquidation.
"(b) Basis of stock.
"(c) Effective date.
"Sec 318 Gain from sale or exchange of taxpayer's residence.
"(a) Nonrecognition of gain in certain cases.
"(b) Technical amendments.
"(c) Effective date.
"Sec. 319. Percentage depletion.
"(a) Allowance of percentage depletion.
"(b) Technical amendment
"(c) Effective date.
"Sec 320 Redemption of stock to pay death taxes
"(a) Amendment of section 115 (g) (3).
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec 321 Earned income from sources without the United States.
"(a) Exclusion from gross income
"(b) Withholding of tax on wages
"(c) Effective dates
"Sec 322. Capital gains and losses.
"(a) Treatment of long-term capital gains and losses
"(b) Alternative tax
"(c) Technical amendments.
"(d) Effective date
"Sec 323 Sale of land with unharvested crop.
"(a) Treatment of gain or loss.
"(b) Treatment of deductions.
"(c) Effective date.
"Sec. 324. Sales of livestock.
"Sec. 325 Tax treatment of coal royalties.
"(a) Definition of property used in the trade or business.
"(b) Gain or loss upon certain disposals of timber or coal.
"(c) Clerical amendment.
"(d) Technical amendment.
"(e) Conforming amendments.
"(f) Effective date.

"Sec 326 Collapsible corporations
"(a) Definitions with respect to collapsible corporations
"(b) Limitations on application of section 117 (m).
"(c) Effective date
"Sec 327 Dealers in securities—capital gains and ordinary losses.
"Sec 328 Treatment of gain on sales of certain property between spouses and between an individual and a controlled corporation
"(a) Disallowance of capital gain treatment
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec 329. Receipts of certain termination payments by employee.
"(a) Taxability to employee as capital gain
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec 330 Net operating loss carry-over.
"(a) Loss for taxable year beginning before 1948
"(b) Allowance of three-year loss carryover from taxable years 1948–1949
"(c) Effective date.
"Sec 331 Stock options.
"(a) Option subject to stockholder approval
"(b) Effective date
"Sec 332 Credit for taxes of foreign corporations
"(a) Foreign subsidiary of a domestic corporation
"(b) Foreign subsidiary of a foreign corporation
"(c) Clerical amendment.
"Sec 333 Information at source on payments of interest
"Sec 334 Abatement of income tax for certain members of armed forces upon death
"Sec 335 Employees' trusts.
"(a) Amendment of section 165 (b).
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec 336 Life insurance companies.
(a) Tax for 1951.
"(b) Adjusted normal-tax net income for 1951
"(c) Technical amendments.
"(d) Effective date.
"Sec 337 Tax treatment of certain investment companies
"(a) Inclusion of certain registered management companies in the definition of regulated investment company
"(b) Technical amendment.
"(c) Effective date.
"Sec 338 Exchanges and distributions in obedience to orders of Securities and Exchange Commission.
"(a) Definition of system group.
"(b) Effective date
"Sec 339 Taxation of business income of State colleges and universities.
"(a) Amendment of section 421 (b).
"(b) Unrelated trade or business
"(c) Effective date.
"Sec 340 Family partnerships
"(a) Definition of partner
"(b) Allocation of partnership income
"(c) Effective date
"Sec 341 War losses
"(a) Tax upon war loss recovery.
"(b) Basis of recovered property.
"(c) Credit for foreign taxes.
"(d) Effective dates.
"Sec 342 Deduction of expenditures for mine exploration
"(a) Deduction of mine exploration expenditures.
"(b) Adjusted basis for determining gain or loss upon sale or exchange
"(c) Effective date.
"Sec 343 Definition of employee
"(a) Amendment of section 3797 (a).
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec. 344 Nonbusiness casualty losses.
"(a) Removal of limitation.
"(b) Effective date
"Sec 345 Abatement of tax on certain trusts for members of armed forces dying in service
"Sec. 346 Life insurance departments of mutual savings banks
"(a) Computation of tax
"(b) Technical amendment.
"(c) Effective date
"Sec 347. Publishing business carried on by tax-exempt organization
"(a) Treatment as related trade or business
"(b) Effective date
"Sec 348 Deduction with respect to certain unrelated business net income
"(a) Unrelated business net income.
"(b) Effective date
"Sec 349 Nondistributable income of personal holding companies

"TITLE IV—EXCISE TAXES

"Part I—Tax on admissions and cabarets

"Sec 401 Removal of tax on free admissions.
"Sec 402 Exemptions from admissions tax
"(a) Reinstatement of prewar exemptions
"(b) Amendment of section 1701 (a) and (b)
"(c) Admissions to municipal swimming pools, etc
"Sec 403 Effective date of amendments relating to admissions
"Sec 404 Tax on cabarets, roof gardens, etc.
"(a) Ballrooms and dance halls
"(b) Effective date

"Part II—Tax on cigarettes

"Sec 421 Tax on cigarettes
"(a) Increase in rate
"(b) Effective date
"Sec 422 Floor stocks tax and floor stocks refund on cigarettes
"Sec 423 Reduction of tax on tobacco and snuff
"(a) Reduction in rate
"(b) Effective date

"Part III—Retailers' excise taxes

"Sec 431 Retailers' excise tax on toilet preparations
"(a) Baby oils, etc.
"(b) Sales to barber shops, etc
"Sec 432 Effective date of Part III.

"Part IV—Diesel fuel

"Sec 441 Diesel fuel used in highway vehicles
"(a) Imposition of tax.
"(b) Effective date

"Part V—Liquor

"Sec 451 Increase in tax on distilled spirits from $9 to $10 50 per gallon.
"(a) Distilled spirits generally.
"(b) Imported perfumes containing distilled spirits
"(c) Floor stocks tax.
"Sec. 452. Wines
"(a) Increase in rate of tax.
"(b) Floor stocks
"Sec. 453 Fermented malt liquor.
"(a) Increase in tax on fermented malt liquors from $8 to $9 per barrel.
"(b) Floor stocks tax
"Sec. 454 Floor stocks refunds.
"(a) Amendment of section 1656 (a).
"(b) Amendment of section 1656 (b).
"Sec. 455 Clerical amendment
"Sec. 456 Effective date of Part V.

"Part VI—Occupational taxes

"Sec. 461 Dealers in liquors.
"(a) Wholesale dealers in liquors.
"(b) Retail dealers in liquors.
"(c) Wholesale dealers in malt liquors.
"Sec. 462. Drawback in the case of distilled spirits used in the manufacture of certain nonbeverage products.
"(a) Drawback.
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec. 463. Tax on coin-operated gaming devices.
"Sec. 464 Effective date of Part VI.

"Part VII—Wagering

"Sec 471 Wagering taxes
"(a) Imposition of taxes.
"(b) Technical amendment.
"Sec 472 Effective date of Part VII.

"Part VIII—Manufacturers' excise taxes

"Sec 481 Automobiles, trucks, and parts or accessories
"(a) Increase in tax on trucks.
"(b) Increase in tax on passenger automobiles and motorcycles
"(c) Increase in tax on parts or accessories
"(d) Rebuilt parts or accessories.
"(e) Technical amendment
"(f) Parts or accessories for farm equipment
"(g) Effective date of subsection (f).
"(h) Removal of tax on tires for toys, etc
"Sec 482 Navigation receivers sold to the United States
"(a) Exemption on sales to United States of certain radio sets.
"(b) Tax-free sales of radio parts.
"(c) Refund in case of use of parts
"(d) Refund in case of resale to United States
"(e) Use by manufacturer of taxable parts
"(f) Effective dates
"Sec 483 Tax-free sales of refrigerator components to wholesalers for resale to manufacturers
"Sec 484 Sporting goods
"Sec 485 Electric, gas, and oil appliances.
"Sec 486 Adjustments of tax rates on photographic apparatus and film, repeal of tax on certain items.
"(a) Items subject to tax
"(b) Floor stocks refund on bulbs.
"Sec 487 Imposition of tax on mechanical pencils, fountain and ball point pens, and mechanical lighters for cigarettes, cigars, and pipes
"Sec 488 Repeal of tax on electrical energy.
"(a) Repeal of tax
"(b) Effective date
"Sec 489 Tax on gasoline.
"(a) Increase in rate
"(b) Floor stocks tax and refund.
"Sec 490 Effective date of Part VIII.

"Part IX—Miscellaneous excise tax amendments

"Sec 491. Reduction of tax on telegraph dispatches
"(a) Reduction of tax
"(b) Effective date
"(c) Amounts paid pursuant to bills rendered
"(d) Rate reduction date.
"Sec 492. Exemption of certain overseas telephone calls from the tax on telephone facilities
"(a) Telephone calls from members of armed forces in combat zones.
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec. 493 Exemption of fishing trips from tax on transportation.
"(a) Exemption
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec. 494. Tax on transportation of persons
"(a) Exemption of certain foreign travel.
"(b) Effective date
"Sec. 495. Transportation of material excavated in the course of construction work
"(a) Amendment of section 3475
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec. 496. Articles from foreign trade zones.
"(a) Imported articles
"(b) Previously tax-paid articles.
"Sec. 497. Refunds on articles from foreign trade zones
"(a) Imported articles.
"(b) Previously tax-paid articles.

"Sec. 498. Tax refunds on spirits lost in floods of 1951.
"(a) Authorization
"(b) Destruction of spirits.
"(c) Credit.
"(d) Regulations.

"TITLE V—EXCESS PROFITS TAX

"Sec. 501 Maximum tax for new corporations.
"Sec. 502. Payments from foreign sources for technical assistance, etc.
"(a) Amendment of section 433 (a) (1).
"(b) Amendment of section 433 (b).
"Sec. 503. Average base period net income in case of certain fiscal year taxpayers
"Sec 504 Average base period net income—alternative based on growth in case of new corporations.
"(a) General rule.
"(b) Amendment of Part II.
"Sec. 505. Average base period net income—alternative based on growth.
"Sec. 506. Adjustments for changes in inadmissible assets in case of banks.
"(a) Amendment of section 435 (g).
"(b) Amendment of section 438.
"(c) Amendment of section 435 (f).
"(d) Effective date of subsection (c) (3).
"Sec. 507. Decrease in inadmissible assets
"Sec. 508. Election with respect to certain inadmissible assets.
"(a) Amendment of section 440.
"(b) Amendment of section 433 (a) (1).
"(c) Amendment of section 433 (b).
"Sec. 509. Alternative average base period net income.
"(a) Amendment of section 442.
"(b) Technical amendments.
"Sec. 510. Definition of total assets for purposes of sections 442–446.
"Sec. 511. Average base period net income—change in products or services.
"Sec 512. Average base period net income—new corporation.
"Sec. 513. Excess profits credit — regulated public utilities.
"Sec. 514. Consolidated returns of regulated public utilities.
"Sec. 515. Nontaxable income from certain mining properties.
"Sec. 516. Transition from war production and increase in peacetime capacity.
"(a) In general.
"(b) Technical amendments.
"Sec. 517. Base period catastrophe.
"Sec. 518. Consolidation of newspapers
"Sec. 519. Television broadcasting companies.
"Sec. 520. Increase in capacity for production or operation
"Sec 521. Excess profits credit based on income in connection with certain taxable acquisitions.
"(a) General rule.
"(b) Technical amendments.
"Sec. 522 Strategic minerals.
"Sec 523 Effective date of title V.

"TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS AND AMENDMENTS

"Sec. 601. Exemption of certain organizations from income tax for prior taxable years.
"Sec 602 Excess profits credit based on income.
"(a) Percentage of average base period net income taken into account.
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec. 603. Foreign estate tax credit.
"(a) Credit against basic estate tax.
"(b) Credit against additional estate tax.
"(c) Reversionary or remainder interest.
"(d) Extension of period of limitations, etc., in case of recovery of taxes claimed as credit.
"(e) Effective date.
"Sec. 604. Estate and gift tax treatment of United States bonds held by certain nonresident aliens.
"(a) Estate tax.
"(b) Gift tax.
"Sec. 605. Estate tax exemption for works of art loaned by nonresident aliens.
"(a) Amendment of section 863 (c).
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec. 606. Exemption from additional estate tax of members of armed forces upon death.
"Sec. 607. Transfers conditioned upon survivorship.
"Sec. 608 Transfers with income reserved.
"Sec 609. Transfers taking effect at death.
"Sec 610. Reversionary interests in case of life insurance
"Sec 611 Income pursuant to award of Interstate Commerce Commission.
"Sec. 612 Credit in prior taxable years for dividends received on preferred stock of a public utility
"Sec. 613. Consolidated returns — includible corporations.
"Sec. 614. Time for performing certain acts postponed in case of China Trade Act corporations.
"Sec. 615 Treaty obligations.
"Sec. 616 Reorganization Plan Numbered 26 of 1950.
"Sec 617. Claims under the Renegotiation Act
"Sec. 618. Prohibition upon denial of Social Security Act funds.
"Sec 619. Removal of tax exemption from expense allowances of the President, the Vice President, the Speaker and Members of Congress.
"(a) Expense allowance of the President
"(b) Expense allowance of the Vice President.
"(c) Expense allowance of the Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"(d) Expense allowances of Members of Congress.
"(e) Effective dates."

And the Senate agree to the same.

R L DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D DINGELL,
W D MILLS,
THOMAS A JENKINS,
RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
TOM CONNALLY,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
E. D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT A TAFT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4473) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The House bill provided for an increase in individual income-tax rates by a percentage increase of 12½ percent of the tax liability under existing law, with an over-all effective ceiling rate of 90 percent of the net income of the taxpayer. The House bill also increased the alternative tax on capital gains by 12½ percent. The Senate amendment eliminated the increase in the alternative tax on capital gains and provided, in general, for an increase of 11 percent of the present tax liability, or 8 percent of the amount by which the surtax net income exceeds present taxes, whichever produced the lesser increase in tax The Senate amendment provided an over-all ceiling rate of 88 percent of the net income of the taxpayer.

Under the conference agreement the increase in the combined normal tax and surtax under existing law will, in general, be 11¾ percent of the present rates or 9 percent of the amount by which the surtax net income exceeds present taxes, whichever is the lesser. Special rates are provided for the calendar year 1951 so as to reflect November 1, 1951, as the effective date of the increase in tax. The ceiling rate of 88 percent contained in the Senate amendment is retained under the conference agreement, and no increase in tax is provided with respect to the alternative tax on capital gains. Under the House bill no termination date was provided for the increase in the taxes The Senate amendment provided for the termination of the increased rates on January 1, 1954, and the conference agreement retains the termination date

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3: These amendments are clerical. The Senate recedes

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5: The House bill provided for an increase in the normal tax on corporations, in general, from 25 to 30 percent of normal tax net income, applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950. The Senate provided for an increase in the corporation normal tax from 25 to 27 percent and an increase in the corporation surtax from 22 to 25 percent Under the Senate amendment, the increases in normal tax and surtax were to be effective as of April 1, 1951, and were to terminate on December 31, 1953. Special rates were provided for the calendar year 1951 to reflect the April 1 effective date. Under the conference agreement on amendments 4 and 5, the normal tax is increased from 25 to 30 percent as provided in the House bill with no increase in the surtax The increase in normal tax is to be effective as of April 1, 1951, with a normal tax rate of 28¾ percent for the calendar year 1951. The conference agreement provides that the increase in normal tax is to terminate of as March 31, 1954

Amendment No. 6 The House bill amended section 430 (a) (2) of the code (relating to maximum excess profits tax) so as to increase the percentage used under existing law for computing the maximum excess profits tax from 62 to 70 percent The Senate amendment provided a new method for computing the maximum excess profits tax which, in general, was 16½ percent of the excess profits net income for the calendar year 1951 and was 17 percent of the excess profits net income for taxable years beginning after March 15, 1951. The 17 percent figure of the Senate amendment was comparable to a 69 percent figure under the method provided in the House bill The House recedes with an amendment which adopts the Senate method of computing the maximum tax but increases the 17 percent figure to 18 percent (comparable to the House bill 70 percent figure) for taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951. Under the conference agreement the maximum excess profits tax for the calendar year 1951 is 17¼ percent of the excess profits net income for such year.

Amendments Nos. 7, 8, and 9· Senate amendments Nos. 7 and 8 amended section 207 (a) (tax on certain insurance companies), 362 (b) (tax on regulated investment companies), section 421 (a) (tax on business income of certain tax exempt organizations), and section 26 (relating to credits for corporations) of the code to make changes conforming to the action of the Senate with respect to the corporate normal and surtax rate increases. These amendments also made other technical conforming changes in the code. Senate amendment No. 9 struck out section 123 of the House bill which provided for the allowance of only one

surtax exemption and one minimum excess profits credit to certain controlled groups of corporations. The House recedes on amendments Nos. 7 and 8 with conforming amendments and an amendment adding a new section 15 (c) to the code (relating to disallowance of surtax exemptions and minimum excess profits credit) and the House recedes on amendment No. 9.

The new subsection (c) of section 15 applies to the situation where a corporation, on or after January 1, 1951, transfers property (other than money) to one or more corporations created for the purpose of acquiring such property, or to one or more corporations not actively engaged in business at the time of such acquisition, if after such transfer the transferor corporation or its stockholders, or both, are in control of the transferee during any part of a taxable year of such transferee corporation In such case the transferee corporation shall not be allowed either the $25,000 exemption from surtax or the $25,000 minimum excess profits credit unless it establishes by the clear preponderance of the evidence that the securing of the $25,000 exemption or the $25,000 minimum excess profits credit, or both, was not a major purpose of the transfer of the property to it by the transferor The term "control" is defined as the ownership of stock possessing at least 80 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote or at least 80 percent of the total value of shares of all classes of stock of the corporation Under the amendment the ownership of stock is to be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 503, except that constructive ownership under section 503 (a) (2) is to be determined only with respect to the individual's spouse and minor children The Secretary, to the extent not inconsistent with the provisions of the new subsection, is granted the same authority as under section 129 (b) to allow in whole or in part a surtax exemption or a minimum excess profits credit which might otherwise be disallowed under the subsection or to apportion such exemption or credit among the corporations involved For example Corporation A transfers on January 1, 1952, all of its property to corporations B and C in exchange for the entire stock of such corporations Immediately thereafter corporation A is dissolved, its stockholders becoming the stockholders of B and C Assuming that a major purpose for such transfers is to secure additional surtax exemptions and minimum excess profits credits, the Secretary has the authority to allow one such exemption and credit and to apportion such exemption and credit between corporations B and C. It is provided that the subsection shall not be applicable to any taxable year with respect to which the tax imposed by subchapter D of chapter 1 (relating to the excess profits tax) is not in effect It is not intended that the new subsection shall in any way delimit or abrogate any of the existing provisions of the code (including sec 129), or any principle established by judicial decision, which have the effect of preventing the avoidance of income or excess profits taxes.

Amendment No. 10: This amendment strikes out all of section 124 of the House bill relating to the computation of an alternative capital gains tax. The House recedes

Amendment No. 11: This amendment provides, in general, that corporations subject to a tax imposed by chapter 1 of the code for a taxable year ending after March 31, 1951, but prior to October 1, 1951, shall after the date of the enactment of the bill and on or before January 15, 1952, make a return for such taxable year with respect to such tax and such taxable year. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 12: This amendment, which corresponds to section 125 of the House bill, provides the effective date of part II of title I. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 13: This amendment, relating to the computation of tax by certain fiscal year taxpayers, corresponds to subsection (a) of section 131 of the House bill with such changes as are necessary to reflect the normal tax and surtax rates and the termination dates provided by the Senate amendments. The House recedes with amendments conforming to the conference action with respect to the corporate income tax rates.

Amendments Nos 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 These amendments are clerical amendments. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 22: This amendment strikes out part 1 of title II of the House bill providing for the withholding of tax at the source on dividends, interest, and royalties. The House recedes

Amendment No. 23: This amendment, which corresponds to part II of title II of the House bill (relating to increase in withholding of tax at source on wages) amends section 1622 (a) of the code by changing the percentage rate of withholding from 18 percent to 20 percent in the case of wages paid on or after November 1, 1951, and before January 1, 1954 It also amends section 1622 (c) (1), relating to wage-bracket withholding, to provide new tables which reflect the increased tax rates It also provides, as did the House bill, for additional withholding of tax on wages upon agreement by employer and employee and provides that the amendments made thereby shall be applicable only with respect to wages paid on or after November 1, 1951. The House recedes

Amendments Nos 24, 25, 26, and 27: These amendments are clerical and conforming amendments The House recedes

Amendment No 28 Section 301 of the House bill amended section 12 (c) of the code to provide for a head of a household approximately one-half of the income-splitting benefits provided for a husband and wife who file a joint return Under the Senate amendment the head of a household was afforded approximately one-fourth of such benefits The House recedes with an amendment conforming to the House action in affording approximately one-half of such benefits and making the necessary changes in the surtax tables to conform to the conference action with respect to individual income tax rates and effective date provisions.

Amendment No 29 Under the House bill, a taxpayer might qualify as a head of a household by reason of such household constituting the principal place of abode of a descendant of a stepson or stepdaughter of the taxpayer Under the Senate amendment, such descendants are eliminated from the category of persons in respect of whom the taxpayer may qualify as head of a household. The House recedes

Amendment No 30 This amendment adds subsection (b) to section 301 of the bill to provide that in the case of a head of a household who elects the benefits of section 51 (f) (1) of the code (relating to tax computed by collector in case of wage earners) the tax shall be computed by the collector under supplement T without regard to the taxpayer's status as head of a household. The House recedes.

Amendment No 31: This amendment amends section 22 (b) (1) of the code (relating to exclusion of life insurance proceeds from gross income) to provide for a limited exclusion for amounts paid by an employer to the beneficiaries of an employee by reason of the employee's death. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 32: This amendment amends sections 113 (a) (5) and (22) (b) (2) of the code to provide that the basis of a survivor's interest in a joint and survivor annuity, the value of which is required to be included in the estate of a decedent annuitant dying after December 31, 1950, shall be considered to be acquired by "bequest, devise, or inheritance" and that such basis (that is, the value of such survivor's interest at the time of the decedent's death) shall be considered, for purposes of determining the amount to be included in the income of the survivor, to be the consideration paid for the survivor's annuity. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 33. This amendment provides for the permanent enactment of section 22 (b) (9) of the code, relating to exclusion from gross income of income attributable to the discharge of certain indebtedness in the case of a corporation which consents to reduction in basis of its properties in an amount equal to the income excluded, and extends for three years the application of section 22 (b) (10), relating to the exclusion of income of a railroad corporation attributable to the discharge of its indebtednes in a receivership proceeding. The amendment is similar to H R. 2416, which was passed by the House on April 12, 1951 (H. Rept. No. 311). The House recedes

Amendment No. 34. This amendment makes certain changes in section 22 (b) (13) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the additional allowance for certain members of the Armed Forces

Section 22 (b) (13) of existing law excludes from gross income certain compensation received for active service in the Armed Forces of the United States for any month during any part of which the recipient served in a combat zone after June 24, 1950, and prior to January 1, 1952. This amendment extends this latter date from January 1, 1952, to January 1, 1954

This amendment also extends the exclusion to certain compensation received for active service in the Armed Forces of the United States for any month during any part of which the recipient was hospitalized at any place as a result of wounds, disease, or injury incurred while serving in a combat zone after June 24, 1950, and prior to January 1, 1954, provided that during all of such month there are combatant activities in some combat zone. The House recedes

Amendment No 35: This amendment revises section 22 (d) (6) (F) (iii) of the code, which provision was added to section 22 (d) (6) by Public Law 919 (81st Cong., 2d sess.), so as to vary the application of the rule with respect to replacement of involuntary liquidations of inventories in certain cases where such replacement is made during taxable years ending after June 30, 1950, and prior to January 1, 1953. The effect of the amendment would be to permit the replacement of the World War II involuntary liquidations during taxable years ending after June 30, 1950, and prior to January 1, 1953, without requiring that the involuntary liquidations occurring during such years be first replaced, thus enabling the replacement of the World War II liquidations to be made in time to permit them to qualify for the benefits of section 22 (d) (6). The House recedes

Amendment No. 36: This amendment amends section 23 (x) (relating to the deduction of medical expenses) by eliminating the 5 percent limitation with respect to the deduction of medical, dental, etc., expenses paid during the taxable year, not compensated for by insurance or otherwise, for the care of the taxpayer or his spouse if either the taxpayer or his spouse attains the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year. The limitation with respect to the maximum deduction allowable under section 23 (x) remains unchanged. The amendment is effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 37: This amendment adds paragraph (7) to section 23 (aa) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide, in general, that an election to take or not to take the standard deduction for any taxable year may be changed after the time prescribed for filing a return for such year. The House recedes

Amendment No 38: This amendment is clerical The House recedes.

Amendment No 39: Section 302 of the House bill would add a new subparagraph (D) to section 23 (a) (1) of the code providing, in general, that all expenditures paid or incurred after December 31, 1950, in the development of a mine or other natural deposit (other than an oil or gas well), to the extent paid or incurred after the existence of ores or minerals in commercially marketable quantities has been disclosed, shall be deducted ratably as the produced ores or minerals benefited by such expenditures are sold Section 302 of the House bill also amended section 113 (b) (1) by adding a new subparagraph (J) thereto to provide for adjustment to the basis of the mine or deposit for amounts allowed as a deduction under new subparagraph (D) as added to section 23 (a) (1)

The Senate bill made technical changes in the House provisions and inserted the substance of subparagraph (D) as added to section 23 (a) (1) by the House bill in a new subsection (cc) to be added to section 23 of the code The Senate bill also added a provision to the new subsection (cc) which, in general, would allow the taxpayer to elect to deduct development expenditures either in the taxable year paid or incurred or ratably during the taxable years in which the produced ores or minerals benefited by such expenditures are sold The House recedes

Amendments Nos 40 and 41 These amendments are clerical The House recedes

Amendment No 42: This amendment changes section 25 (b) (1) (D) of the code to increase the gross income test of a dependent from $500 to $600 The House recedes

Amendment No 43: This amendment adds to section 26 (b) of the code a new paragraph to provide for a dividends received credit in the case of dividends received from a foreign corporation (other than a foreign personal holding company) subject to taxation under chapter 1 of the code which for a stipulated uninterrupted period of time has been engaged in trade or business within the United States and has derived during such period 50 percent or more of its gross income from sources within the United States

The House recedes with an amendment under which the dividends received credit will be allowed with respect to dividends received from such a foreign corporation in an amount equal to—

(A) 85 percent of the dividends received out of its earnings or profits of the taxable year (computed as of the close of the taxable year without diminution by reason of any distributions made during the taxable year) without regard to the amount of the earnings or profits at the time the distribution was made, but such amount shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to 85 percent of such dividends received out of such earnings or profits as the gross income of such foreign corporation for such taxable year from sources within the United States bears to its gross income from all sources for such taxable year, and

(B) 85 percent of the dividends received out of that part of its earnings or profits specified in clause (1) of the first sentence of section 115 (a) accumulated after the beginning of such uninterrupted period, but such amount shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to 85 percent of such dividends received out of such accumulated earnings or profits as the gross income of such foreign corporation from sources within the United States for the portion of such uninterrupted period ending at the beginning of the taxable year bears to its gross income from all sources for such portion of such uninterrupted period.

The determination of earnings or profits distributed in any taxable year shall be made in accordance with section 115 (b) of the code.

The application of this amendment is illustrated by the following example: Corporation A (a foreign corporation filing its return on a calendar year basis) whose stock is 100 percent owned by Corporation B (a domestic corporation filing its return on a calendar-year basis) for the first time engaged in trade or business in the United States on January 1, 1940, and qualified under this amendment for the entire period beginning from that date and ending with December 31, 1951 Corporation A had accumulated earnings or profits of $50,000, immediately prior to January 1, 1940, and had earnings or profits of $10,000 for each taxable year during the uninterrupted period from January 1, 1940, through December 31, 1951 It derived for the period from January 1, 1940, through December 31, 1950, 90 percent of its gross income from sources within the United States, and in 1951 derived 95 percent of its gross income from sources within the United States During the calendar years, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, and 1944 corporation A distributed in each year $15,000, during the calendar years 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950 it distributed in each year $5,000, and during the year 1951, $50,000 For 1951 a dividends-received credit of $31,025 will be given corporation B with respect to the $50,000 received from corporation A, computed as follows

(1) $8,075 which is $8,500 (85 percent of the $10,000 of earnings or profits of the taxable year) multiplied by 95 percent (the portion of the gross income of A corporation derived during the taxable year from sources within the United States) plus

(2) $22,950 which is $25,500 (85 percent of $30,000 (that part of the earnings and profits accumulated after the beginning of the uninterrupted period)) multiplied by 90 percent (the portion of the gross income derived from sources within the United States during that portion of the uninterrupted period ending at the beginning of the taxable year).

If, in the foregoing example, corporation A for the taxable year 1951 had incurred a deficit of $10,000 (shown to have been incurred prior to December 31), and if it had distributed $50,000 on December 31, 1951, the dividends-received credit which corporation B would receive would be $15,300, computed by multiplying $17,000 (85 percent of $20,000 earnings or profits accumulated after the beginning of the uninterrupted period) by 90 percent (the portion of the gross income from United States sources during that part of the uninterrupted period ending at the beginning of the taxable year).

Amendment No 44: This amendment adds to section 51 of the code (relating to individual returns) a new subsection (g) providing for the filing of a joint return by a taxpayer and his spouse for a taxable year for which a joint return could have been made under section 51 (b) even though the time prescribed by law for filing the return for such taxable year has expired. This provision is effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950 The House recedes.

Amendment No 45 This amendment adds section 313 to the bill which relates to income-tax treatment of mutual savings banks, building and loan associations, and cooperative banks, effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951. The House recedes with an amendment.

Subsection (a) of section 313 as agreed to in conference repeals section 101 (2) of the code (relating to exemption from tax of mutual savings banks).

Subsection (b) amends section 101 (4) of the code to repeal the exemption from tax of building and loan associations and cooperative banks Credit unions without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit will remain tax-exempt under section 101 (4) of the code

The amendment to section 101 (4) of the code made by subsection (b) will also continue to exempt from tax corporations or associations without capital stock organized prior to September 1, 1951, and operated for mutual purposes and without profit for the purpose of providing reserve funds for, and insurance of, shares or deposits in (A) domestic building and loan associations (as defined in sec 3797 (a) (19)), (B) cooperative banks without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit, or (C) mutual savings banks not having capital stock represented by shares

Subsection (c) amends section 454 of the code to add to the list of corporations exempt from the excess profits tax any mutual savings bank not having capital stock represented by shares, any domestic building and loan association (as defined in sec 3797 (a) (19)), and any cooperative bank without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit

Subsection (d) amends section 5 (h) of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933 (48 Stat 132, 12 U S C, sec. 1464 (h)), to remove the language in such section exempting Federal savings and loan associations from Federal income tax, war-profits, and excess profits taxes, in the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951. These associations will not, of course, be subject to the excess profits tax, by reason of the amendment made by subsection (c).

Subsection (e) amends section 23 (k) (1) (relating to deduction from gross income of bad debts) to provide rules with respect to a reasonable addition to a reserve for bad debts in the case of a mutual savings bank not having capital stock represented by shares, a domestic building and loan association, and a cooperative bank without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit Where 12 percent of the total deposits or withdrawable accounts of the institution's depositors at the close of the taxable year exceeds the sum of its surplus, undivided profits and reserves at the beginning of the taxable year it may take a deduction for a reasonable addition to a reserve for bad debts for such year in any amount determined by it to be a reasonable addition for such year, except that such amount shall not be greater than the lesser of (A) the amount of its net income for such year computed without regard to this provision, or (B) the amount by which such 12 percent of its total deposits exceeds its surplus, undivided profits, and reserves at the beginning of such year Where the sum of the institution's surplus, undivided profits, and reserves at the beginning of the taxable year equals or exceeds 12 percent of its total deposits or withdrawable accounts at the close of such year, any deduction for such year for a reasonable addition to a reserve for bad debts will be determined under the general provisions of section 23 (k) (1) In determining a deduction for a reasonable addition to a reserve for bad debts, and in determining the sum of the surplus, undivided profits, and reserves, there will be taken into account surplus, undivided profits, and bad debt reserves accumulated prior to the close of December 31, 1951 (i e, during the period for which the institution was not subject to taxation).

Subsection (f) amends section 23 (r) (relating to the deduction from gross income of certain dividends paid by banking corporations) to provide that in the case of mutual

savings banks, cooperative banks, and domestic building and loan associations (for definition of domestic building and loan associations, see section 3797 (a) (19) as added by section 313 (i) of the bill), there shall be allowed as deductions in computing net income any amounts paid to, or credited to the accounts of, depositors or holders of accounts as dividends on their deposits or withdrawable accounts, if such amounts may be withdrawn on demand subject only to customary notice of intention to withdraw For example, if an institution has the right to receive 30 days' notice prior to the withdrawal of a deposit or of any amounts paid or credited to the account thereof, the amounts credited will nevertheless be considered as withdrawable on demand subject only to customary notice of intention to withdraw

Subsection (g) amends section 23 of the code (relating to deductions from gross income) to provide a deduction for repayment of certain loans by a mutual savings bank not having capital stock represented by shares, a domestic building and loan association (as defined in section 3797 (a) (19) of the code) or a cooperative bank without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit It provides that amounts paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year in repayment of loans made prior to September 1, 1951, by the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof which is wholly owned by the United States, or by a mutual fund established under the authority of the laws of any State, shall be allowed as a deduction in computing net income of the taxpayer. An example for this purpose of an agency or instrumentality wholly owned by the United States would be the Reconstruction Finance Corporation

Subsection (h) amends section 104 (a) of the code (defining the term "bank") to include, within the definition of bank, a domestic building and loan association.

Subsection (i) amends section 3797 (a) of the code (relating to definitions for the purpose of the Internal Revenue Code) to define the term "domestic building and loan association" to mean a domestic building and loan association, a domestic savings and loan association, and a Federal savings and loan association, substantially all the business of which is confined to making loans to members This amendment is of a clarifying nature and is not intended to change the existing meaning of a domestic building and loan association

Subsection (j) provides that the amendments made by the section shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951.

Amendment No 46 This amendment in general amends section 101 (12) of the code to subject tax-exempt cooperatives to normal tax and surtax on earnings not definitely allocated to the accounts of patrons

The House recedes with an amendment making a clerical change, and with the following additional amendments First, it is provided that amounts allocated to patrons with respect to income not derived from patronage, if made after the close of the taxable year and on or before the fifteenth day of the ninth following month, shall be considered as made during the taxable year to the extent such allocations are attributable to income derived before the close of the taxable year Second, it is made clear that in taking into account patronage dividends to patrons with respect to their patronage in computing the net income of the cooperative, it is immaterial whether such dividends relate to patronage of the taxable year of the cooperative or to patronage of preceding taxable years. Third, the provision of the Senate amendment relating to withholding on patronage dividends in the event withholding is required on corporate dividends is stricken from the bill.

Under the conference agreement, patronage dividends allocated by a cooperative to its patrons will not be treated as taxable income to the cooperative.

Amendment No 47: This amendment, which adds a new subparagraph (D) to section 102 (d) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, provides that the excess of the net long-term capital gain for the taxable year over the net short-term capital loss for such year, less the taxes imposed by chapter 1 of the code attributable to such excess, shall be deducted from the net income in computing section 102 net income However, the fact that such excess is not to be taken into account in the tax basis on which the penalty tax under section 102 is imposed will not prevent capital gains from being taken into consideration in determining whether earnings or profits of a corporation have been permitted to accumulate beyond the reasonable needs of the business The House recedes

Amendment No 48: This amendment amends section 112 (b) (7) of the code (relating to election as to recognition of gain in certain corporate liquidations), so as to make it applicable to cases in which the liquidation is pursuant to a plan adopted after December 31, 1950, and the transfer of all the property under the liquidation occurs within one calendar month in 1951 or 1952 The House recedes

Amendment No 49: This amendment amends sections 112 (b) and 113 (a) of the code to provide for the nonrecognition of gain in certain cases, where, pursuant to a plan of reorganization, a shareholder of a corporation which is a party to the reorganization receives stock (other than preferred stock) in another corporation which is a party to the reorganization without the surrender by such shareholder of stock This amendment is applicable with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this act, but applies only with respect to distribution of stock made after such date The House recedes

Amendment No 50 This is a clerical amendment The House recedes

Amendment No 51 Section 303 of the House bill provides in general, that any gain from a sale of property used by the taxpayer as his principal residence will not be recognized if the taxpayer within a period beginning 1 year prior to the date of such sale and ending 1 year after such date purchases property and uses it as his principal residence except to the extent that the taxpayer's selling price of the old residence exceeds his cost of purchasing the new residence. The Senate amendment provides that, where the taxpayer is constructing the new residence, such period shall include 18, rather than 12, months after such sale If the taxpayer commenced construction of the new residence more than 1 year prior to the date of the sale of the old residence, in determining the taxpayer's cost of building the new residence there will be included only so much of the cost as is attributable to the construction made during the period beginning 1 year prior to the date of the sale of the old residence and ending 18 months after such date The House recedes

Amendment No 52 This is a clerical amendment The House recedes

Amendment No 53 The House bill granted a percentage depletion allowance at the rate of 5 percent in the case of deposits of asbestos, sand, gravel, stone (including pumice, scoria, and slate), brick clay, tile clay, shale, oyster shell, clam shell, granite, and marble. The Senate amendment granted percentage depletion in the case of asbestos at the rate of 10 percent and added to the above list sodium chloride and, if produced from brine wells, calcium chloride, magnesium chloride, potassium chloride, and bromine. The Senate amendment removed slate from the parenthetical clause following stone and included it as a separate item in this 5-percent category. The House bill increased the 5-percent rate of percentage depletion now allowed for coal to 10 percent The Senate amendment followed this treatment in the case of coal and included in this new 10-percent category those minerals which the House bill would have allowed percentage depletion at a rate of 15 percent These minerals are borax, fuller's earth, tripoli, refractory and fire clay, quartzite, perlite, diatomaceous earth, metallurgical grade limestone, and chemical grade limestone The Senate amendment also added wollastonite, magnesite, dolomite, brucite, and calcium and magnesium carbonates to this 10-percent list, and added aplite and garnet to the list now allowed percentage depletion at the 15-percent rate

The bill, as passed by both the House and Senate, made technical amendments to section 114 (b) (4) (A) which do not alter its substance The House bill changed the parenthetical clause, stating that thenardite produced from brines or mixtures of brine would be allowed percentage depletion, to state that thenardite, including thenardite from brines or mixtures of brine, would be permitted such allowance The Senate amendment achieved the same effect by striking the parenthetical clause.

The amendments made by both Houses are applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950

The House recedes with an amendment which restores borax, fuller's earth, tripoli, refractory and fire clay, quartzite, diatomaceous earth, metallurgical grade limestone, and chemical grade limestone to the 15-percent category in which they appeared in the House bill and which removes potassium chloride from the list of minerals to which the Senate bill granted the percentage depletion allowance at the 5-percent rate Potassium chloride is entitled, under existing law, to percentage depletion allowance at 15 percent Under the conference agreement calcium carbonates are granted an allowance of 10 percent, while marble, which is a calcium carbonate, receives 5 percent It is intended, in any case where a mineral is specifically provided for at a stated rate of percentage allowance, that the specific provision will govern over the allowance provided (whether higher or lower) for a more general classification

It is the intention, in including stone in the 5 percent percentage depletion category, to limit such term to its commonly understood meaning This depletion would be allowed in the case of common stone which is crushed for use in building roads but would not be allowed in the case of precious stones such as diamonds

Amendment No 54 Section 115 (g) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code provides in substance that section 115 (g) (1), relating to the treatment as dividends of amounts distributed in redemption of stock, shall be inapplicable where the redemption is of stock the value of which is included in determining the value of the gross estate of a decedent provided, among other limitations, that the value of the stock in such corporation comprises more than 50 percent of the value of the net estate of the decedent Under the Senate amendment, the 50-percent limitation would be reduced to 25 percent The House recedes with an amendment under which the value of the stock of the corporation must comprise more than 35 percent of the value of the gross estate of the decedent The amendment would be applicable with respect to distributions in redemptions made after the date of enactment of the act

Amendment No 55 This amendment amends section 116 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to apply the exemption of earned income received from sources without the United States to (1) an individual citizen of the United States who has been

a bona fide resident of a foreign country or countries for an uninterrupted period which includes an entire taxable year or (2) an individual citizen of the United States who during any period of 18 consecutive months is physically present in a foreign country or countries for a total of at least 510 full days in such period Amounts paid by the United States or any agency thereof do not come within the provision of this amendment. The amendment further amends the Internal Revenue Code to adapt the provisions respecting collection of income tax at source on wages to the substantive changes made to section 116 (a) of the code, and to eliminate withholding of Federal income tax with respect to wages which are required by law of any foreign country to be withheld upon for income taxes of such foreign country. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendments Nos 56, 57, and 58: These are clerical amendments The House recedes

Amendment No. 59: This is a technical amendment conforming to the conference agreement on Senate Amendment No. 1 The House recedes

Amendments Nos 60, 61, and 62: These are clerical amendments The House recedes

Amendment No 63 This amendment provides rules for the application of section 117 (j) in cases where land bearing an unharvested crop is sold. The provision applies in cases where the land has been held for more than 6 months The period that the crop has been on the land is immaterial. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 64: The House bill contained a provision which, effective for taxable years after 1950, amended section 117 (j) (1) of the code to provide that the term "property used in the trade or business" includes livestock held by the taxpayer for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes for 12 months or more The Senate amendment restates this provision to provide that the term "property used in the trade or business" includes livestock, regardless of age, held by the taxpayer for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes, and held by him for 12 months or more from the date of acquisition. The Senate amendment also provided that the term does not include poultry except that the term does include turkeys regardless of age, held by the taxpayer for breeding purposes, and held by him for 12 months or more from the date of acquisition The Senate amendment also included rules respecting effective date. The House recedes with an amendment striking out the reference to turkeys This provision of the bill is not intended to change the present application of section 117 (j) of the code to race horses in any situation in which such race horses fall within the term "property used in the trade or business"

Amendments Nos 65 through 72. Section 307 of the House bill (which corresponds to section 325 of the Senate bill) extended capital gains treatment to certain coal royalties. The Senate amendments added certain additional rules and conforming amendments to other sections of the code The House recedes on amendments Nos. 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, and 72, and recedes on amendment No. 67 with an amendment striking out a reference to timber.

Amendment No 73: This is a clerical amendment The House recedes.

Amendment No 74: The House bill provided that the amendments relating to collapsible corporations shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950. This amendment limits the effective date to taxable years ending after August 31, 1951, and limits the application of the amendment to gains realized after such date. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 75: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 76: Section 309 of the House bill added a new subsection (n) to section 117 of the code to provide rules for the treatment of capital gains and ordinary losses by a dealer in securities in order to prevent the dealer from obtaining the most beneficial tax result by a shift in securities from one account to another or by insufficient identification of securities alleged to be w .hin a particular account. Under the amendment the provisions of section 117 (n) are made inapplicable to the extent that these provisions are inconsistent with the provisions of section 117 (i) relating to bond, etc., losses of banks. The House recedes

Amendment No 77: This amendment strikes out section 310 of the House bill. The House recedes with an amendment which adds a new subsection (o) to section 117 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide that in the case of a sale or exchange, directly or indirectly, of depreciable property (1) between husband and wife, or (2) between an individual and a corporation in which he, his spouse, and his minor children an minor grandchildren own more than 80 percent of the value of the outstanding stock, any gain recognized to the transferor shall be considered ordinary income and not capital gain The transfer of the property can be from the corporation to the stockholder or from the stockholder to the corporation. The property transferred must be property which in the hands of the transferee is property of a character which is subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 23 (l) of the code. This amendment shall be applicable only with respect to sales or exchanges made after May 3, 1951.

Amendment No. 78: This amendment adds a new subsection to section 117 of the code, to provide that certain payments received by an employee after the termination of his employment, which under existing law are taxable as ordinary income, shall be treated as gains from the sale or exchange of a capital asset held for more than 6 months. The House recedes with clerical amendments.

Amendment No. 79: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, amends section 122 (b) (2) (relating to the amount of net operating loss carry-overs) to provide for a 4-year carry-over of 1948 and 1949 net operating losses by both corporate and noncorporate taxpayers, and for a 4-year carry-over of 1946 and 1947 net operating losses by certain new corporations. The amendments to section 122 (b) (2) are made applicable in computing the net operating-loss deduction for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948 The House recedes with an amendment which eliminates the provisions of the Senate amendment for the carry-over of 1946 and 1947 net operating losses by new corporations and reduces from four to three the number of years to which 1948 and 1949 net operating losses may be carried forward by all taxpayers

Amendment No. 80: This amendment amends subsection (d) of section 130A, relating to definition of the term "restricted stock option," to provide that if the grant of an option is subject to stockholder approval, the date of the grant of the option shall be determined as if the option had not been subject to stockholder approval.

The amendment is made effective as if it had been enacted as a part of section 218 of the Revenue Act of 1950. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 81: This amendment adds to the bill a new section 331 pursuant to the provisions of which (1) a domestic corporation which owns at least 10 percent of the voting stock of a foreign corporation from which it receives dividends in a taxable year will, for purpose of computing the foreign tax credit of such domestic corporation, be deemed to have paid a proportion of certain foreign taxes paid, or deemed to be paid, by such foreign corporation, and (2) such foreign corporation will, for the purpose of the above computation, be deemed to have paid a proportion of certain foreign taxes paid by any other foreign corporation from which it receives dividends in a taxable year, if the former foreign corporation owns a majority of the voting stock of the latter foreign corporation. The House recedes with a clerical amendment and an amendment pursuant to which (2) above will be operative if the former foreign corporation owns 50 percent or more of the voting stock of the latter foreign corporation.

Amendment No 82: This amendment amends section 147 of the code to give to the Secretary the authority to require information returns reporting payments of interest, regardless of amount. Under existing law, except in the case of certain payments, information returns may not be required from persons making payment of interest unless the payment is $600 or more The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No 83: This amendment adds a new section 154 to supplement D of chapter 1 of the code, relating to returns and payment of taxes

Such section 154 provides that, where any individual dies after June 24, 1951, and prior to January 1, 1954, while in active service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, if his death occurred while serving in a combat zone, as determined under section 22 (b) (13) of the code, or at any place as a result of wounds, disease, or injury incurred while so serving, (1) the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the code will not apply with respect to the taxable year in which falls the date of his death, or with respect to any prior taxable year which ended on or after the first day he was so serving in a combat zone after June 24, 1950, and (2) the tax (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts) imposed by chapter 1 of the code and under the corresponding title of each prior revenue law for all taxable years preceding those specified in (1) above, which is unpaid at the date of his death shall not be assessed, and if assessed the assessment shall be abated, and if collected shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 84: This amendment amends section 165 (b) of the code, relating to distributions to an employee by a trust which qualifies for exemption under section 165 (a).

Under section 165 (b), amounts distributed or made available to an employee by such a trust (in excess of the employee's contributions) are taxed to the employee only in the years in which distributed or made available and, if the total distributions are paid to the employee in one taxable year on account of the employee's separation from the service, the amount of the distribution (to the extent exceeding the employee's contribution) is taxed at capital gain rates (as from sale or exchange of a capital asset held for more than 6 months).

Under the amendment, where such a total distribution occurs in 1 taxable year, and consists in whole or in part of securities of the employer corporation, that part of the excess (of the amounts distributed over the amount of the employee's contributions) as consists of net unrealized appreciation attributable to that part of the total distributions made in securities of such employer corporation shall be excluded from income in the year of distribution, and shall be subject to tax only when the securities are sold (or otherwise disposed of in a taxable transaction). The amount of the net unrealized appreciation which is excluded shall in the hands of the recipient not be included in

the basis of the stock or other securities distributed

The House recedes with an amendment providing that the proposed treatment is also to apply to securities issued by a parent or subsidiary corporation of the employer corporation.

Amendment No. 85: Under section 311 of the House bill, the special rule for 1949 and 1950, set forth in section 202 (b) (2) of the code for use in determining the reserve and other policy liability credit of life insurance companies, would have been extended to apply to taxable years beginning in 1951 Under this amendment there is substituted for this provision a system for taxing such companies, but only for taxable years beginning in 1951, which is different from that contained in present law Under this system, in lieu of allowing life insurance companies an adjustment of their normal tax net income and of their corporation surtax net income, by means of the reserve and other policy liability credit, for purposes of a tax imposed at the regular corporate rates, a low-rate tax is imposed on the normal tax net income of such companies without allowance of any such credit Under the Senate amendment there is imposed for 1951 a tax equal to 3¼ percent of the first $200,000 of the 1951 adjusted normal tax net income of such companies and 6½ percent of the amount in excess thereof The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No 86 This is a clerical amendment The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No 87: This amendment makes technical and clarifying changes in the section of the House bill providing for tax treatment under supplement Q of chapter 1 of the code of certain registered management investment companies certified by the Securities and Exchange Commission as principally engaged in furnishing capital to corporations principally engaged in development or exploitation of inventions, technological improvements, new processes, or products not previously generally available The House recedes.

Amendment No 88 This amendment for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, makes a minor change in the definition of "system group" contained in section 373 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code Under this amendment, in determining whether one or more of the corporations in a utility system owns the required 90 percent of each class of the stock of another corporation in the same system, there is disregarded not only stock which is preferred to both dividends and assets, which type of stock may be disregarded for this purpose under present law, but also stock which is limited and preferred as to dividends but which is not preferred as to assets, provided that the total value of such stock is less than 1 percent of the aggregate value of all classes of stock which are not preferred as to both dividends and assets This amendment is applicable to all taxable years affected by exchanges and distributions made after December 31, 1947 The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No 89: This amendment subjects governmental colleges and universities, and corporations wholly owned by such colleges or universities, to the supplement U tax on their unrelated business net income, effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951. The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No. 90 This is a clerical amendment The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No 91: This amendment provides for retroactive application to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1938, and before January 1, 1951, of the provisions added by the bill to the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the treatment of family partnerships for income tax purposes, which provisions are applicable generally to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950. The House recedes with an amendment revising the effective date provision to provide that the amendments made by the bill with respect to family partnerships shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, and to provide rules for cases where the taxable year of the partner differs from that of the partnership.

In applying the proposed treatment of family partnerships to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, where the taxable year of a partnership begins in 1950 and ends within or with, as to all the family partners, taxable years which begin in 1951, the proposed treatment shall apply to all distributive shares derived by the family partners from the taxable year of the partnership beginning in 1950, however, where a taxable year of the partnership ending in 1951 (whether beginning in 1950 or 1951) ends within or with a taxable year of a family partner which began in 1950, the proposed treatment is not applicable to any of the distributive shares of income derived by the family partners from such taxable year of the partnership

Amendment No 92 This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the bill as it passed the House, amends section 127 of the code to provide an alternative treatment of war loss recoveries, applicable at the election of the taxpayer Under the amendment the amount of the recovery, to the extent that it does not exceed the allowable deductions in prior taxable years on account of the destruction or seizure of property in respect of which the recovery is received, is excluded from gross income for the taxable year in which the recovery is received In lieu of including such amount in gross income for the taxable year of the recovery, there is to be added to the tax imposed by chapter 1 for such taxable year the total increase in the tax under chapter 1 and chapter 2 for all taxable years which would result by decreasing, in an amount equal to such part of the recovery so excluded, deductions allowable in prior taxable years with respect to the destruction or seizure of the property To the extent that the amount of the recovery exceeds the allowable deductions in prior taxable years on account of the destruction or seizure of the property, such amount is treated for the taxable year of the recovery as gain on the involuntary conversion of property and is recognized or nonrecognized as provided in section 112 (f) This amendment also provides a new rule for the determination of the unadjusted basis of property where the alternative treatment of the recovery is applicable pursuant to election made by the taxpayer The House recedes with amendments which revise section 127 (c) (3) (A) and (5), and make minor changes in the phrasing of section 127 (c) (3) (B) and (C) and section 127 (d) (2). The effective date of the amendment is also changed so that it will be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941.

Section 127 (c) (3) (A), relating to the definition of "amount of recovery" for the purposes of the new alternative treatment is revised under the conference agreement so that in the case of recovery of the same property or interest considered under section 127 (a) as destroyed or seized, such property or interest may be included in the amount of recovery at its fair market value, determined as of the date of recovery or at the option of the taxpayer at the adjusted basis (for determining loss) of such property or interest in the hands of the taxpayer on the date of the loss Subparagraph (A) is also revised to provide that for the purposes of section 127 (c) (3) (B) and (C) (but not section 127 (d) (2)) the amount of recovery shall be reduced by the amount of the obligations or liabilities with respect to the property recovered, if the taxpayer for any previous taxable year chose under section 127 (b) (2) to treat such obligations or liabilities as discharged or satisfied out of such property, and such obligations or liabilities were not so discharged or satisfied prior to the date of the recovery

These two new rules incorporated into section 127 (c) (3) (A) may be illustrated by the following examples:

Example (1): The taxpayer on December 11, 1941, owned Blackacre, a property located in Germany The adjusted basis of such property in the hands of the taxpayer on such date was $1,000,000 Under section 127 (a) such property was deemed destroyed or seized in the year 1941 and the taxpayer's loss of $1,000,000 was an allowable deduction for such year whether or not the taxpayer claimed such deduction A recovery with respect to such loss is required to be taken into account under section 127 (c) Assume that in 1946 the taxpayer recovered this property and that on the date of recovery it had a fair market value of $500,000. If the taxpayer elects to proceed under the provisions of section 127 (c) (3), he has an option to include in the amount of the recovery respecting this property either the fair market value on the date of the recovery ($500,000) or an amount equal to the adjusted basis of the property as of the date of the loss ($1,000,000). Assuming the taxpayer had no previous recovery with respect to this property, its unadjusted basis under section 127 (d) (2) for the period subsequent to recovery would be $500,000 or $1,000,000 depending upon whether the taxpayer chose to include the property in the amount of recovery in 1946 at its fair market value on the date of the recovery or its adjusted basis as of the date of loss If the taxpayer chooses to treat $1,000,000 (the adjusted basis of the property on the date of the loss in 1941) as the amount of the recovery, there would be added to the tax for 1946 the total increase in the tax which would result by decreasing from $1,000,000 to zero the amount of the deduction allowable in 1941 on account of the destruction or seizure of Blackacre If the taxpayer chooses to treat only $500,000 (fair market value on date of recovery) as the amount of the recovery, there would be added to the tax for 1946 the amount of the total increase in tax resulting from decreasing to $500,000 the amount of the deduction allowable in 1941 If the $1,000,000 allowable as a deduction in 1941 did not result in any tax benefit, then there would be nothing to be added to the tax for 1946, whether the taxpayer chooses the amount of the recovery as $500,000 or as $1,000,000

Example (2) The taxpayer on December 11, 1941, owned an industrial plant in Germany The adjusted basis of such property in the hands of the taxpayer on such date was $5,000,000 The property on such date was subject to a mortgage of $3,000,000 Under the provisions of section 127 (b) (2) the taxpayer chose to treat the mortgage as discharged or satisfied out of the property Assume that in 1946 the taxpayer recovered this property and that on the date of recovery it had a fair market value of $5,000,000, and is still subject to the mortgage of $3,000 000 If the taxpayer elects to have the provisions of section 127 (c) (3) apply, the amount of the recovery respecting this property for the purposes of subparagraph (B) is considered to be $2,000,000 Since this amount is equal to the allowable deduction in 1941 under section 127 (b), all of such amount is excluded from gross income in 1946, however, there is to be added to the income tax for such year the total increase in the tax under chapter 1 and chapter 2 for all taxable years which would result from eliminating the allowable deduction of $2,000,000 in 1941. For the purposes of paragraph

(C) the amount of recovery is likewise considered to be $2,000,000, so that there is no amount to be treated for 1946 as gain from the involuntary conversion of the property. However, this rule which reduces the amount of the recovery on account of liabilities and obligations is not applicable in applying the provisions of section 127 (d) (2) Under that section the amount of the recovery in respect of the property is $5,000,000, and since there was no amount considered as gain upon involuntary conversion of the property in 1946, such amount is not reduced and the basis of the property is $5,000,000.

Under the conference agreement, as under existing law and the Senate amendment, property considered as destroyed or seized under section 127 (a) of the code is considered as not being in existence from the date of the loss to the date of its recovery Thus, depreciation on the recovered property is not allowable for the period between the date of the loss and the date of the recovery.

Section 127 (c) (5), relating to the election by the taxpayer to have the provisions of section 127 (c) (3) apply to war loss recoveries, has been revised under the conference agreement to provide that if the taxpayer elects to have the provisions of paragraph (3) applicable in any taxable year in which he recovers any money or property in respect of property considered under section 127 (a) as destroyed or seized, the provisions of paragraph (3) shall be applicable to all taxable years of the taxpayer beginning after December 31, 1941 Such election once made is irrevocable The election by the taxpayer is to be made in such manner and at such time as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe However, no election may be made after December 31, 1952, by the taxpayer unless he receives war loss recoveries during a taxable year ending after the date of enactment of the Revenue Act of 1951

If under an election made by the taxpayer the provisions of section 127 (c) (3) are applicable to any taxable year, the period of limitations provided in sections 275 and 276 of the code for the assessment and collection of (1) the amount to be added to the tax for such taxable year under section 127 (c) (3), and (2) any deficiency for such taxable year or for any other taxable year to the extent attributable to the basis of the recovered property being determined under section 127 (d) (2), shall not expire prior to the expiration of 2 years following the date of the making of such election. Any amount and any deficiency specified in clauses (1) and (2) of the preceding sentence may be assessed at any time prior to the expiration of such 2-year period, notwithstanding any law or rule of law which would otherwise prevent such assessment and collection

Paragraph (5) further provides that if section 127 (c) (3) is applicable to any taxable year pursuant to the taxpayer's election, and credit or refund of any overpayment resulting from the application of section 127 (c) (3) to such taxable year is prevented on the date of the making of such election, or within 1 year from such date, by any law or rule of law (other sec. 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to compromises), credit or refund of such overpayment may nevertheless be made or allowed if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from such date.

Paragraph (5) further provides that in the case of any taxable year ending before the date of the making by the taxpayer of an election, no interest shall be paid upon any overpayment resulting from the application of the provisions of section 127 (c) (3) to such year, and no interest shall be assessed or collected with respect to any amount or any deficiency specified in clauses (1) and (2) above, for any period prior to the expiration of 6 months following the date of the making of such election by the taxpayer.

Amendment No. 93: This amendment adds a new subsection (ff) to section 23 of the code (relating to deductions from gross income), providing that expenditures paid or incurred during the taxable year for the purpose of ascertaining the existence, location, extent, or quality of any deposit of ore or other mineral, and paid or incurred prior to the beginning of the development stage of the mine or deposit, may be deducted in computing net income for the taxable year, except to the extent that such expenditures exceed $75,000 The subsection further provides that the taxpayer may elect to treat as deferred expense any portion of such deductible amount, in which event such deferred portion shall be deductible on a ratable basis as the units of produced ores or minerals discovered or explored by reason of such expenditures are sold. No deduction may be taken under this new subsection if in any four preceding years (not necessarily consecutive years) the taxpayer, or any individual or corporation (who has transferred to the taxpayer any mineral or ore property under circumstances which make the provisions of pars. (7), (8), (11), (13), (15), (17), (20), or (22) of section 113 (a) of the code applicable to such transfer), has taken a deduction, or elected to treat exploration expenditures as deferred expense, under the new subsection The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No 94 This amendment would have added a new subsection (n) to section 115 of the code to provide a special rule for the treatment of gain upon the complete liquidation of a corporation where the distribution in liquidation included stock in another corporation to which unimproved real estate had been transferred in anticipation of such liquidation. The Senate recedes

Amendment No 95 This amendment adds paragraph (20) to section 3797 of the code to provide in substance that a full-time life insurance salesman who is an employee under the definition contained in the Federal Insurance Contributions Act shall be considered to be an "employee" for the purpose of applying the provisions of chapter 1 (such as sections 22 (b) (2) (B), 23 (p) and 165) which determine the effect of contributions for the benefit of, and distribution to, "an employee" under a stock bonus, pension, profit-sharing, or annuity plan. The amendment is applicable to taxable years beginning after 1938 The House recedes.

Amendment No 96· This amendment would allow in full, for purposes of computing the net operating loss (as defined by sec. 122 (a) of the code) of a taxpayer other than a corporation, deductions allowable under section 23 (e) (2) (relating to losses incurred in a transaction entered into for profit) and section 23 (e) (3) (relating to losses of property not connected with a trade or business, if the losses arise from fire, storm, shipwreck, or other casualty or from theft). Under existing law, in computing the net operating loss in the case of such a taxpayer, section 122 (d) (5) limits the deductions otherwise allowable under section 23 of the code which are not attributable to a trade or business regularly carried on by the taxpayer to the extent of the gross income not derived from such trade or business. The House recedes with an amendment which removes from the present limitation in section 122 (d) (5) deductions for losses sustained after December 31, 1950, in respect of property, if the losses arise from fire, storm, shipwreck, or other casualty, or from theft. The amendment will enable a taxpayer who is an individual to take such losses into account in computing a net operating loss which may be carried back 1 year or carried forward 5 years. The amendment is made applicable in computing the net operating loss deduction for taxable years ending after December 31, 1948.

Amendment No. 97: This amendment relates to the abatement of tax of certain irrevocable trusts to the extent that the income is owned by any individual who dies on or after December 7, 1941, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or of any of the other United Nations and prior to January 1, 1948

The House recedes with an amendment which provides, that, in the case of a trust which accumulated income for a beneficiary who died on or after December 7, 1941, and before January 1, 1948, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or of any of the other United Nations, there shall be allowed as a deduction in computing the net income of the trust for any taxable year the income of the trust for such taxable year, before diminution for income taxes with respect thereto, which was, or would have been but for such diminution, accumulated for such beneficiary

This deduction shall be allowed, however, only if (1) the income accumulated was for a taxable year of the trust which ended with or within a taxable year (ending on or after December 7, 1941) of such beneficiary during any part of which he was a member of such military or naval forces, or, in the case of the taxable year of the trust during which such beneficiary died, the income accumulated was for the period in such taxable year prior to the death of such beneficiary, and (2) the amount of such accumulated income was, without regard to this amendment, taxable to the trust, and (3) the income for such taxable year accumulated for the beneficiary, if not distributed to him prior to his death, was payable by the trust at or after his death only to his estate, spouse, or lineal ancestors or descendants

Amendment No 98: This amendment (effective for taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this bill) would require a net worth statement to be filed with the return of any individual who during the taxable year received gross income in excess of $10,000 from one or more unlawful trades or businesses The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 99 This amendment amends the life insurance company provisions of the code to provide that the life insurance department of a mutual savings bank is to be taxed as a life insurance company. This amendment is a corollary of amendment No 45, relating to the taxation of mutual savings banks. The amendment is applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951.

The House recedes with an amendment which adds a new section 110 to the code to provide the method for computing the tax of a mutual savings bank authorized under State law to conduct a life insurance business and which conducts such a business in a separate department the accounts of which are maintained separately from the other departments of the bank. The tax is to consist of the sum of (1) a partial tax computed under sections 13 and 15 of the code upon the net income of the bank determined without regard to any items of income or deductions properly allocable to the life insurance department; and (2) a partial tax upon the net income of the life insurance department determined without regard to any items of income or deductions not properly allocable to such department at the rates and in the manner provided in supplement G with respect to life insurance companies. In determining the net income for purposes of such partial taxes no account shall be taken of any transactions between the insurance department and the bank or any other department thereof.

The amendment is applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951.

Amendment No. 100: This amendment adds at the end of section 422 (b) of the code (relating to definition of unrelated trade or business for the purpose of determining the unrelated business net income subject to the supplement U tax) a special rule with respect to publishing businesses carried on by colleges and universities This amendment is applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950 and prior to January 1, 1953. The purpose of this amendment is to afford an organization (exempt under sec 101 (6) and subject to supplement U) which owns a publishing business limited opportunity to conform or relate such publishing business to its educational or other exempt purposes within the time specified in the amendment, and thus be relieved of supplement U tax thereon for taxable years preceding the taxable year in which the activity becomes related The House recedes with a clarifying amendment

Amendment No. 101: This amendment, for taxable years beginning prior to January 1, 1954, treats as related, for the purposes of the tax imposed by supplement U, an unrelated trade or business carried on by certain educational organizations The House recedes with an amendment which adds at the end of section 442 (a) (relating to the definition of unrelated business net income for the purpose of the supplement U tax) a special rule with respect to unrelated trades or businesses carried on in partnership by certain educational organizations The amendment is applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, and prior to January 1, 1954

Amendment No 102 This amendment adds a new subsection (e) to section 504 of the code relating to the computation of undistributed subchapter A net income for purposes of the imposition of the surtax on personal holding companies Subsection (e) will provide for the deduction, for purposes of computing undistributed subchapter A net income, of an amount by which the undistributed subchapter A net income determined without regard to subsection (e) exceeds the amount which could be distributed on the last day of the taxable year as a dividend (1) without the violation of any action, regulation, rule, order, or proclamation made under the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 16, 1917, as amended, or the First War Powers Act of 1941, and (2) not subject to a lien in favor of the United States The amendment is applicable to taxable years beginning after 1939. The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No. 103: This is a technical amendment to provide that the fifth sentence of section 1700 (a) (1) of the code, added by Public Law 124, Eighty-second Congress, shall be stricken from the code as surplusage upon elimination of the second sentence as provided in the House bill. The House recedes

Amendment No 104 This amendment retains the substantive provisions of the House bill, but differs therefrom in the following respects

(a) Whereas the House bill would grant an exemption from the admissions tax in the case of shows or performances the proceeds of which inure exclusively to the benefit of certain organizations, such as religious, charitable, and educational groups, no such exemption would apply, under the Senate amendment, in the case of any motion-picture exhibition Under the Senate amendment, to come within the exemption privilege, a religious institution must be a church or a convention or association of churches; an educational institution, to be entitled to the exemption, must have a regular curriculum and student body, and a charitable institution must be supported, in whole or part, by Federal or State funds or by contributions from the general public

(b) The Senate amendment eliminates the pre-1941 exemption in the case of admissions all the proceeds of which inure exclusively to the benefit of societies for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals and the pre-1941 exemption in the case of societies or organizations conducted for the sole purpose of maintaining a cooperative or community center motion-picture theater.

(c) Whereas the House bill would exempt admissions to agricultural fairs and to any exhibit, entertainment, or other pay feature conducted by the fair association as part of the fair, the Senate amendment limits the exemption to the general admission charge to the fair only

(d) The exemption granted under the House bill in the case of benefits conducted for or on behalf of police or fire departments, their members or heirs has been further limited to provide that the proceeds from such benefits must inure exclusively to the benefit of the police or fire department or to a retirement, pension or disability fund for the members or their heirs

(e) The Senate amendment also makes it plain that an exemption from the admissions tax is to apply to operas as well as symphonies which receive their support from voluntary contributions

The House recedes with an amendment which provides an exemption from tax on admissions, the proceeds of which inure exclusively to the benefit of an organization (organized prior to October 1, 1951) which is exempt under section 101 (6) of the code and which is operated for the purpose of conducting an annual chautauqua program of educational, cultural, and religious activities at a permanent location

The bill restores the provisions of section 1701 (c) of the code without change, so that admissions to concerts conducted by a civic or community membership association (such as orchestras, choral societies, etc) will be exempt from tax

Amendment No 105 This is a clerical amendment The House recedes

Amendment No 106 This amendment grants an exemption from the admissions tax covering admissions (1) to a home or garden which is temporarily opened to the general public as part of a program carried on by a society or organization for such purpose and (2) to historic sites, houses, and shrines, and museums conducted in connection therewith, maintained and operated by a society or organization devoted to the preservation of such places The House recedes.

Amendment No. 107 This amendment provides that the increase in the rate of tax with respect to cigarettes shall be reduced to the present rate of tax effective January 1, 1954 The House recedes with an amendment fixing the rate reduction date as April 1, 1954

Amendments Nos 108 and 109 These are clerical amendments The House recedes

Amendment No 110 This amendment makes provision for a floor-stocks refund on tax-paid cigarettes which are held for sale on January 1, 1954, the rate reduction date specified in the bill as passed by the Senate. The House recedes with an amendment fixing April 1, 1954, as the inventory date to correspond with the change made in the rate reduction date and an amendment fixing July 1, 1954, as the date before which claims for refund must be filed

Amendment No. 111: This amendment provides for a reduction in the rate of tax on snuff and chewing and smoking tobacco from 18 cents per pound to 10 cents per pound The House recedes with a technical amendment.

Amendment No. 112: This amendment strikes out the provisions of section 431 of the House bill imposing a retailers' excise tax upon mechanical lighters for cigarettes, cigars, and pipes. Such articles will be taxed at the manufacturers' level at the rate of 15 percent (see amendment No 189). The House recedes.

Amendments Nos 113 and 114: These amendments are clerical. The House recedes

Amendments Nos 115 and 116 These amendments provide that the retailers' excise tax shall not apply with respect to the sale of miniature samples of cosmetics, toilet articles, lotions, powder, etc, taxable under section 2402 (a) of the code, made by a manufacturer or distributor to a house-to-house salesman for demonstration purposes only unless such samples are resold by the salesman. The House recedes

Amendment No 117 This amendment is clerical The House recedes

Amendment No 118 This amendment strikes out all of the provisions of the House bill relating to the imposition of a tax of 2 cents per gallon upon any liquid sold or used as a fuel in a Diesel-powered highway vehicle The House recedes with an amendment which restores the House provisions but provides that effective April 1, 1954, the rate of tax on such fuel will be reduced to 1½ cents per gallon

Amendments Nos 119 and 120 These amendments are clerical. The Senate recedes

Amendments Nos 121 and 122 These amendments provide that the increase in tax imposed with respect to distilled spirits generally and to imported perfumes containing distilled spirits shall be reduced to the present rate of tax effective January 1, 1954 The House recedes with an amendment fixing April 1, 1954, as the rate reduction date in lieu of January 1, 1954

Amendments Nos 123, 124, 125, and 126 These amendments are clerical. The Senate recedes

Amendments Nos 127, 128, and 129. These amendments provide that the increase in tax with respect to wines of the various classifications specified shall be reduced to the present rate of tax effective January 1, 1954 The House recedes with an amendment providing that the rate reduction date shall be April 1, 1954

Amendment No 130 This amendment is clerical The Senate recedes

Amendment No 131 This amendment provides that the increase in tax imposed with respect to certain sparkling wines, liqueurs, and cordials shall be reduced to the present rate of tax effective January 1, 1954 The House recedes with an amendment establishing the rate reduction date as April 1, 1954

Amendments Nos 132, 133, 134, 135, and 136 These are clerical amendments The Senate recedes

Amendment No 137 This amendment provides that the increase in the rate of tax imposed with respect to fermented malt liquors shall be reduced to the present rate of tax effective January 1, 1954 The House recedes with an amendment providing that the rate reduction date shall be April 1, 1954

Amendments Nos 138, 139, and 140: These amendments are clerical. The Senate recedes

Amendment No. 141: This amendment provides for floor stocks refunds with respect to tax-paid distilled spirits, wine, and beer held for sale upon the termination of the tax rate increases proposed for these products in the bill The House recedes with an amendment fixing the inventory date to be used in determining the amount of refunds as April 1, 1954, in lieu of January 1, 1954, and with a clerical amendment

Amendment No 142. This is a clerical amendment The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No 143 This is a clerical amendment The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendments Nos. 144, 145, and 146: These amendments are clerical. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos 147, 148, and 149: These amendments provide that the increase in the occupational tax for wholesale dealers in liquor, retail dealers in liquor, and wholesale dealers in malt liquor, respectively, shall be reduced to the present rate on and after January 1, 1954 Under the House bill, the increase in rates was permanent. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 150: This amendment is clerical The Senate recedes

Amendment No. 151: The House bill provided for an increase in the rate of drawback on distilled spirits used in certain nonbeverage products. The Senate amendment makes technical revisions in this provision so as to provide for reduction of the amount of draw-back after December 31, 1953, to correspond with the reduction in the rate of tax on distilled spirits on and after January 1, 1954 The House recedes with clerical amendments and with an amendment providing that the reference to drawbacks made after December 31, 1953, shall be changed to March 31, 1954, to take into account the change in the rate reduction date.

Amendment No. 152: This amendment is clerical. The Senate recedes

Amendment No 153 This amendment eliminates the increase in tax proposed under the House bill on bowling alleys and billiard and pool tables. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 154· This is a clerical amendment The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No. 155 This is a clerical amendment The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 156 This is a clerical amendment The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendments Nos 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, and 162 These amendments are clerical. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No 163· This amendment is technical and makes it clear that any person who is liable for tax under subchapter A of chapter 27A of the code, as added by the bill, or who is engaged in receiving wagers for or on behalf of any person so liable, and who commenced the activity which makes him subject to tax, or who was engaged in receiving such wagers, prior to the day on which such tax becomes effective shall be required to pay the special tax imposed by subchapter B of chapter 27A The House recedes with clerical amendments

Amendments Nos 164 and 165· These are clerical amendments. The Senate recedes

Amendment No. 166· This amendment provides that the increase in the rate of the manufacturers' excise tax with respect to trucks, busses, etc , shall revert to the present rate of tax effective January 1, 1954 The House recedes with an amendment providing that the rate reduction date shall be April 1, 1954

Amendment No 167: This amendment eliminates the present tax of 7 percent upon the sale of house trailers, including parts and accessories therefor This amendment will become effective on the first day of the first month which begins more than 10 days after the date of enactment of the bill, thus, the tax would apply with respect to the sale of house trailers made prior to such effective date and notwithstanding that such purchases may be paid for on an installment plan after such date. A house trailer would be considered as sold prior to such effective date if the right of possession thereto passed to the purchaser prior to such effective date.

The amendment also provides that the increase in the rate of the manufacturers' excise tax with respect to automobile chassis and bodies, motorcycles, trailers, and semitrailers (other than house trailers) suitable for use in connection with automobiles, shall revert to the present rate of tax with respect to sales made on and after January 1, 1954. The House recedes with an amendment providing that the rate reduction date shall be April 1, 1954.

Amendment No. 168: This amendment provides that the increase in the rate of the manufacturers' excise tax with respect to parts and accessories for automobiles shall revert to the present rate of tax with respect to sales made on and after January 1, 1954. The House recedes with an amendment providing that the rate reduction date shall be April 1, 1954.

Amendment No. 169: This is a technical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 170: This is a clerical amendment. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No 171. This is a technical amendment. The House recedes

Amendment No 172 This is a clerical amendment The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 173: This amendment provides that a manufacturer of refrigerator components may sell such components tax free to a wholesaler or dealer if such components are purchased for resale to a manufacturer of refrigerator equipment and provided the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury relating to such sales are complied with The House recedes with clerical amendments

Amendment No. 174: This amendment (a) revises the taxable list of sporting goods in the House bill to exclude baseballs and baseball equipment, (b) reinstates certain items taxable under present law but excluded under the House bill, (c) retains the present 10 percent rate of tax with respect to fishing equipment, and (d) increases the rate of tax, like the House bill, with respect to the remaining sporting equipment to 15 percent. The House recedes, with an amendment providing that snow toboggans and sleds 60 inches or less in length shall not be subject to tax and that the increase in the rate of tax shall revert to the present rate of tax effective April 1, 1954

Under the provisions of the Act of August 9, 1950 (the Dingell-Johnson Act), an amount equal to the revenue accruing from the tax on fishing rods and equipment is authorized to be appropriated for assistance to the States for fish restoration and management projects The amendments made by this bill will not affect such authorization nor the permanency of such Act

Amendment No 175. This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No 176: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 177· This is a clerical amendment The Senate recedes

Amendment No. 178 This amendment strikes out electric direct motor-driven fans and air circulators of the industrial type and electric air heaters of the blower type from the list of items subject to the manufacturers' excise tax under section 3406 (a) (3) of the code Senate amendment No. 182 exempts from the tax all appliances listed in such sections which are of the industrial type.

The House recedes with an amendment which provides that the tax imposed by section 3406 (a) (3) of the code shall not apply to electric direct motor-driven fans and air circulators of the industrial type, and shall apply in the case of all other appliances listed in section 3406 (a) (3), including those added to such list by the bill, only to such appliances of the household type.

Amendment No. 179: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a technical amendment to conform to the action of the conferees with respect to amendment No. 178.

Amendment No. 180: This amendment adds electric exhaust blowers to the list of items subject to the manufacturers' excise tax. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 181: This amendment strikes out the provision of the House bill which would have added electric shavers to the list of appliances subject to the manufacturers' excise tax under section 3406 (a) (3) of the code, and adds electric garbage-disposal units to such list The House recedes with an amendment which omits both items from the list of appliances subject to the tax.

Amendment No 182: This amendment provides that the tax imposed by section 3406 (a) (3) will not apply to appliances of the industrial type. The substance of this amendment is covered by the action of the conferees with respect to amendment No 178. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 183: This amendment makes the provisions of section 3441 (b) (relating to sale price of a taxable article) applicable to a situation where a manufacturer has a plan of negotiating the sale of an article to the ultimate user for and on behalf of the retailer of such article The Senate recedes.

Amendment No 184· The House removed certain items from the list of articles subject to the manufacturer's excise tax on photographic apparatus, imposed by section 3406 (a) (4) of the code, and subjected the items upon which the tax is retained to a uniform 20 percent rate

The Senate amendment (a) retains the present list of photographic items subject to tax and subjects such items to a uniform tax rate of 15 percent with respect thereto and (b) provides that the tax on a sale of unexposed 35-millimeter color positive-print motion-picture film shall be computed, in lieu of on the price for which so sold, on the price for which an equivalent quantity of unexposed 35-millimeter black-and-white positive-print motion-picture film is sold. The House recedes with an amendment which restores the House provision with a clerical amendment

Amendment No. 185· This is a clerical amendment The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendments Nos. 186 and 187 These are clerical amendments. The House recedes

Amendments Nos. 188 and 189: The House bill imposed a manufacturers' excise tax, at a rate of 20 percent, on mechanical pencils, fountain pens, and ball point pens Senate amendment No. 189 adds to this list mechanical lighters for cigarettes, cigars, and pipes (the House had imposed a tax on these items at the retail level; see amendment No 112), and Senate amendment No 188 provides a rate of tax of 10 percent on all these items The House recedes on amendment No 189, and recedes with an amendment on amendment No. 188 fixing the rate of tax on these items at 15 percent.

Amendment No 190· This is a technical amendment. The House recedes

Amendment No 191: This is a clerical amendment The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 192: This is a clerical amendment The House recedes

Amendment No 193. This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 194 This amendment provides that the increase in the rate of tax on gasoline shall be reduced to the present rate of tax effective January 1, 1954. The House recedes with an amendment fixing the rate reduction date as April 1, 1954.

Amendments Nos. 195, 196, and 197: These are clerical amendments. The House recedes on amendments Nos. 195 and 196 and recedes with a clerical amendment on amendment No. 197.

Amendment No. 198: This is a technical amendment. The House recedes with a further technical amendment providing that

the credit and refund provisions of section 3443 of the code shall be applicable to the floor stocks tax imposed on gasoline.

Amendment No. 199 This amendment provides for a floor stocks refund on certain gasoline held for sale on January 1, 1954, the date provided by Senate amendment No. 194 for termination of the increase in tax on gasoline The House recedes with an amendment fixing April 1, 1954, as the inventory date to correspond with the change made in the rate reduction date

Amendment No 200· This is a clerical amendment The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendments Nos 201, 202, and 203· These are clerical amendments. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No 204: The House bill reduced the rate of tax on domestic telegraph, cable, or radio dispatches from 25 percent to 20 percent The Senate amendment further reduces the rate of tax to 15 percent. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos 205, 206, 207, 208, and 209 These are clerical amendments The House recedes

Amendment No 210· This amendment provides that no tax shall be imposed under section 3465 (a) (1) (A) of the code on any payment received for any telephone or radio telephone message which originates within a combat zone, as defined in section 22 (b) (13), from a member of the Armed Forces of the United States performing service in such combat zone The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No 211: This is a clerical amendment The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No 212 This amendment strikes out the provisions of the House bill which would impose a tax on the transportation of crude petroleum and liquid products thereof by water from one point in the United States to another when such transportation is performed by the owner of the crude petroleum and liquid products thereof. The House recedes.

Amendment No 213 This amendment provides that no tax shall be imposed with respect to the transportation of persons by water on a vessel which makes one or more intermediate stops at ports within the United States, Canada, or Mexico on a voyage which begins or ends in the United States and ends or begins outside the northern portion of the Western Hemisphere if the vessel in stopping at such intermediate ports is not authorized both to discharge and to take on passengers The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No 214· This amendment provides that section 3475 of the code, relating to the tax on the transportation of property, shall not apply to the transportation of earth, rock, or other material excavated within the boundaries of, and in the course of, a construction project and transported to any place within, or adjacent to, the boundaries of such project The House recedes with an amendment providing that the determination as to the applicability of the tax imposed by section 3475 in the case of the transportation of any excavated material, other than transportation to which the amendment made by this subsection applies, shall be made as if this subsection had not been enacted and without inferences drawn from the fact that the amendment made by this subsection is not expressly applicable to the transportation of such other material

Amendment No. 215: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 216: This amendment provides for a refund of tax on cigarettes, distilled spirits, wine, and beer equal to the difference between the tax paid on such items and the amount of tax made applicable on and after January 1, 1954, brought from a foreign trade zone into customs territory of the United States on and after January 1, 1954, the rate reduction date specified with respect to the taxable articles in question The House recedes with a clerical amendment and with an amendment fixing the determinative date as April 1, 1954, in lieu of January 1, 1954.

Amendment No 217: This amendment provides that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make refund, or allow credit, in the case of a distiller or rectifier if he so elects, in the amount of the internal revenue tax and customs duties paid on spirits previously withdrawn, and lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the 1951 floods, provided certain conditions are met. The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No. 218 This amendment is clerical The House recedes

Amendment No 219 This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the bill as passed by the House provides in a new subsection (e) (1) of section 430 for the computation of an alternative amount of excess profits tax for each of the first five taxable years of corporations which commenced business after July 1, 1945 The amount computed thereunder would be the maximum excess profits tax if less than the amount computed under section 430 (a) (2). Under the Senate amendment, the maximum tax would not exceed the following percentages of the first $400,000 of the excess profits ne income 5 percent if the taxable year is the first or second taxable year (determined from the commencement of business), 8 percent for the third taxable year, 11 percent for the fourth taxable year, and 14 percent for the fifth taxable year. Under the Senate amendment, if, for any such year the excess profits net income exceeds $400,000, the excess over $400,000 is subject to the same maximum tax as in the case of other corporations

The amendment also provides rules in subsection (e) (2) for determining, for the purpose of the subsection, when a taxpayer shall be considered to have commenced business and to have had taxable years determined by reference to the date of commencement of business of certain other corporations It contemplates that the Secretary will, by regulations, provide for the determination of constructive taxable years by reference to the annual accounting period first established by the taxpayer

The Senate amendment also provides, in effect, that the benefits of the special limitation provisions under section 430 (e) (1) shall be denied to any taxpayer which derives more than 50 percent of its income for the taxable year from contracts or subcontracts to which title I of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 or to which any prior renegotiation act is applicable

The House recedes with an amendment. Paragraph (1) of subsection (e) is amended to make it clear that the provision is applicable only to taxpayers whose fifth taxable year ends after June 30, 1950 Clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (E) of subsection (e) (1) are amended to conform the percentage figures specified therein to those provided by the conference agreement on Senate amendment No 6 A change is made in each of subparagraphs (A) to (D), inclusive, of subsection (e) (1), which makes the percentages therein specified applicable to only the first $300,000 of excess profits net income instead of to the first $400,000 of such income as provided in the Senate amendment, and a conforming amendment is made to subsection (e) (1) (E). Amendments are made to paragraph (2) of subsection (e) to make clear that in determining a constructive date of commencement of business and constructive taxable years from such date thereunder, a new determination shall be made each taxable year in the light of the facts for such year. An additional amendment is made to clause (i) of subparagraph (E) to make clear that such clause applies without regard to the provisions of section 445 (g) (1). An additional amendment is made to clause (ii) of such subparagraph to make clear that, for the purpose of such clause, a person shall not be considered a member of a group of persons who control the taxpayer and another corporation unless during the period specified in such clause he owns stock in the corporation at a time when the members of the group control such corporation and he owns stock in the taxpayer at a time when the members of the group control the taxpayer. A change is made in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2) of subsection (e) to the effect that transactions described in clauses (i) and (iii) shall be disregarded in determining the date as of which the taxpayer shall be considered to have commenced business if the adjusted basis of the aggregate assets acquired by the taxpayer in such transactions before December 1, 1950 (or acquired in the ordinary course of business in replacement of such assets), constituted less than 20 percent of the adjusted basis of the taxpayer's total assets as of December 1, 1950. A change is also made in paragraph (3) of subsection (e) to provide that the gross income of the taxpayer for the taxable year from contracts and subcontracts subject to renegotiation shall, for the purpose of applying the limitation provided by such paragraph, be determined without regard to capital gains and dividends received Such gross income is the gross income after renegotiation.

Amendment No 220 This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, provides for exclusion in the computation of excess profits net income, for both excess profits tax taxable years and base period years, of payments made to a domestic corporation by its related foreign corporation as remuneration for certain technical services rendered The House recedes with clarifying amendments and an amendment which amends the definition of related foreign corporation to provide that, in order to be a related corporation, 10 percent or more of the stock of the foreign corporation must be owned by the domestic corporation at the time the specified services are rendered

Amendment No 221 This amendment adds section 503 to the bill, for which there is no corresponding section in the House bill This section permits a taxpayer with a fiscal year beginning before January 1, 1950, and ending after March 31, 1950, in computing its average base period net income under the general average method provided by section 435 (d) of the code, to use the period of 48 consecutive months ending March 31, 1950, instead of its base period, if such computation produces a lesser excess profits tax for the taxable year

The House recedes with an amendment which provides that the excess profits net income for the first 3 months of 1950 shall be subject to the percentage limitations provided in section 435 (e) (2) (E) if such months fall in a taxable year ending after June 30, 1950

Amendment No. 222 This amendment extends to a new corporation which commenced business before the end of its base period the right to qualify under section 435 (e) of the code for the alternative average base period net income based on growth for the purpose of determining its excess profits credit based on income The House recedes with technical amendments

Amendment No 223· This amendment extends the benefits of section 435 (e) (2) (G) (special alternative average base period net income for a corporation whose excess profits net income for 1949 is not more than 25 percent of its excess profits net income for

1948) to a taxpayer qualifying for growth treatment under section 435 (c) (1) (B) even though it also qualifies as a growth corporation under section 435 (e) (1) (A). The House recedes

Amendment No 224 This amendment, for which there is no corresponding section in the House bill, provides limitations in the case of a bank, as defined in section 104 of the code, on the amount of the inadmissible asset adjustment to the net capital addition or reduction for the taxable year, to the net new capital addition for the taxable year, and to the base period capital addition This amendment also amends section 435 (f) (relating to capital additions in the base period) to make clear that the yearly base period capital of any taxpayer (whether or not a bank) shall not be reduced below zero by the inadmissible asset adjustment.

The House recedes with clarifying amendments and with an amendment dealing with the effective date of the provision applicable to the base period capital addition of banks, making such provision retroactive only at the election of the taxpayer

Amendment No. 225: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, adds two new paragraphs (9) and (10) to section 435 (g) (relating to net capital addition or reduction) in order to provide, if certain conditions are met, that a decrease in inadmissible assets, to the extent in excess of the net capital reduction (if any) for the taxable year, shall be an addition to the excess profits credit computed under the income method. The principal condition to be met is that where there is a decrease in inadmissible assets there must also be a corresponding increase in operating assets before any increase in the credit is allowed

The House recedes with clarifying amendments and with an amendment providing a special rule for the treatment of a decrease in inadmissible assets in the case of a bank.

Amendment No. 226 This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the bill as passed by the House, permits a dealer in wholly tax-exempt Government securities to elect to increase its excess profits net income by the interest (with certain adjustments) on such obligations, and to treat such obligations as admissible assets The House recedes with a technical amendment and an amendment which extends the application of the section to Government obligations any part of the interest from which is allowable as a credit against net income

Amendment No 227. This amendment adds section 509 to the bill, for which there is no corresponding provision in the bill as passed by the House Section 509 adds a new subsection (h) to section 442 (relating to abnormalities during the base period) which in general permits a taxpayer in certain cases, after selecting the 36 months in the base period which result in the highest excess profits net income or lowest deficit in excess profits net income, to eliminate from such 36 months the 12 months having the lowest excess profits net income, or highest deficit, and to use a substitute excess profits net income computed under section 442 (e) for such 12 months As passed by the Senate, the provision was applicable only to a taxpayer which commenced business before the beginning of its base period and only if the aggregate of the excess profits net income for each of the 12 months for which a substitute excess profits net income is to be computed is less than 35 percent of one-half of the aggregate of the excess profits net income for each of the 24 months remaining after selecting the 12 months to be so adjusted

The House recedes with technical amendments, and also adds other amendments which further limit the application of this new subsection. The first of these additional limitations requires that in order to be entitled to the benefits of subsection (h), the taxpayer's normal production, output, or operation must be interrupted or diminished because of the occurrence (in the 12 months prior to the period for which a substitute excess profits net income is computed) of events unusual or peculiar in the experience of the taxpayer. Under this limitation there is no requirement that a causal connection be shown between the event and a decline in excess profits net income in the period for which a substitute excess profits net income is to be used.

The second limitation added by the conference agreement appears as a new sentence added to paragraph (1) and prevents a taxpayer from using new subsection (h) in cases where the aggregate excess profits net income for the 24 months, which remain after selecting the 12 months for which a substitute excess profits net income is to be computed, is an amount less than zero.

Amendment No 228 This amendment provides that in determining total assets under section 442 (f), to which factor the industry rates of return are applied in computing average base period net income under various excess profits tax relief formulas, the sum of the cash and other property included shall be reduced by the amount of the indebtedness (other than that included in the definition of borrowed capital) to a member of a controlled group which includes the taxpayer The House recedes with an amendment changing the effective date from taxable years ending after the date of enactment of the bill to taxable years ending after June 30, 1950

Amendment No 229 This amendment changes section 443, which section provides for the case of a change in products or services occurring during the last 36 months of the base period, so as to include certain base period commitments The House recedes

Amendment No 230 This amendment provides that in determining total assets under section 445 (c), which factor is used by a new corporation in computing its average base period net income for any of its first three years (if that year is an excess profits tax taxable year), the net capital addition or reduction shall be computed without regard to the 75 percent limitation as to borrowed capital and loans to members of a controlled group The House recedes

Amendment No 231: This amendment provides that a corporation engaged as a common carrier in the furnishing or sale of transportation of oil or other petroleum products (including shale oil) by pipeline shall be eligible to qualify under section 448 for the alternative excess profits credit provided for regulated public utilities if such corporation is subject to the jurisdiction of a public service or public utility commission or other similar body of the District of Columbia or of any State The House recedes with an amendment requiring that the rates for such furnishing or sale be subject to the jurisdiction of the public service or public utilities commission.

Amendment No. 232 This amendment provides that for the purpose of filing a consolidated return with its railroad lessee corporation (using the alternative credit provided by section 448 for regulated public utilities), a railroad lessor corporation meeting certain requirements shall be considered a corporation subject to section 448. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 233: This amendment adds section 515 to the bill, for which there is no corresponding section in the bill as passed by the House Section 515 allows to producers of potash, sulfur, and metallurgical grade and chemical grade limestone the alternative method for computing nontaxable income from exempt excess output provided in section 453 (b) (2) of the code where the properties were in operation during the normal period. Where these mineral properties were not in operation during the normal period, the net income from such properties is accorded the benefits of section 453 (b) (4) now available in the case of metal and coal mines, timber blocks, and natural-gas properties The House recedes.

Amendment No. 234: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, adds section 459 (a) to the code to provide a special credit for certain corporations under specified circumstances relating to a transition from wartime to peacetime production and to an increase in peacetime capacity. The House recedes with clarifying amendments

Amendment No. 235. This amendment adds section 517 to the bill There is no corresponding section in the House bill. Section 517 amends section 459, as added to the code by section 516 of the Senate amendment No 234, by adding a new subsection (b). This new subsection grants to a taxpayer which suffered a catastrophe during the last 36 months of its base period, if certain conditions are met, two alternative methods of computing its average base period net income The taxpayer may use whichever results in the lesser excess-profits tax for the taxable year The first alternative allows such a taxpayer to substitute for the excess profits net income for each month of the taxable year in which the catastrophe occurred, the average of the excess profits net income for the months in the base period preceding the taxable year in which the catastrophe occurred If the taxpayer computes its average base period net income under the first alternative, it will not be denied the benefits of its base period capital addition The second alternative allows the taxpayer to compute its average base period net income under the growth alternative of section 435 (e) (2) (G) (i) and (ii) of the code

The House recedes with technical amendments which separate new subsection (b) into two paragraphs The first paragraph sets forth eligibility requirements and the second paragraph sets forth the computation of average base period net income under this subsection.

Amendment No 236: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill adds a new subsection (c) to section 459 of the code, and is applicable in the case of a taxpayer engaged primarily in the newspaper-publishing business which, after the first half of its base period and before July 1, 1950, consolidated its mechanical, circulation, advertising, and accounting operations with such operations of another newspaper-publishing corporation in the same area In order to be eligible for the benefits of this subsection the taxpayer must meet certain specified requirements

In the case of a taxpayer eligible for the benefits of this subsection, the average base period net income under the Senate amendment shall be an amount computed under section 435 (d) plus an amount equal to the excess of the average of the amounts paid or incurred as expenses in the conduct of the mechanical, circulation, etc., operations during the two taxable years of the taxpayer next preceding the taxable year in which such consolidation began over such amounts paid or incurred during the first taxable year of the taxpayer beginning after such consolidation. The expenses referred to are those which are taken into account in computing net income. This section is inapplicable to any taxable year of the taxpayer unless the consolidation was continued throughout such taxable year.

The House recedes with amendments, one of which provides that the eligibility requirements in paragraphs (3) and (4) section 459 (c) shall be in the alternative Another amendment provides that in determin-

ing the excess amount of expenses proper adjustment shall be made for increases in the unit cost of labor and newsprint (due to wage and price increases) following such consolidation. It is contemplated that such adjustment shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary The House also adds an amendment to provide for appropriate adjustments for any case in which a taxable year referred to in this new subsection is a period of less than 12 months.

Amendment No. 237: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, provides a special credit for corporations beginning the television broadcasting business before January 1, 1951. It provides for a computation of an individual rate of return in the case of corporations engaged in the radio and television broadcasting business and for an application of such rate of return (or of the industry rate of return for the industry which includes radio broadcasting) to the assets of the taxpayer employed in the radio and television broadcasting business, or in the case of an acquisition of the television broadcasting business after the base period, to its assets employed only in the television business. In the case of a corporation engaged solely in radio and television broadcasting, this rate of return is applied to its total assets. In the case of a corporation engaged in another business or businesses, the credit includes an average base period net income computed with respect to such other business or businesses. The House recedes with an amendment providing in all cases that the industry rate of return or the individual rate of return, as the case may be, shall be applicable only to the assets of the corporation used in the television broadcasting business. The amendment also provides that the average base period net income computed in connection with the taxpayer's nontelevision business shall be only the average base period net income computed under section 435 (d) (relating to the general average of earnings during the base period), that the base period capital addition shall be allowable with regard to the taxpayer's nontelevision business, and that, in the case of corporations which first engaged in the television broadcasting business after the close of the base period and before January 1, 1951, the television assets against which the industry rate of return or the individual rate of return are to be applied shall be those held on the last day of the calendar month in which the corporation first engaged in the television broadcasting business.

The House amendment changes the provision in the Senate amendment for the elimination of duplication in the computation of a credit under this section by providing specifically the method to be used in eliminating such duplication. It is provided that if any portion of the television assets used in computing the television portion of the credit was acquired, directly or indirectly, by the use of assets attributable at any time during the base period to a business of the taxpayer other than television broadcasting, the excess profits net income with respect to such other business shall be properly adjusted by eliminating the portion thereof attributable to the assets used in the acquisition of the television properties for months prior to such acquisition. The excess profits net income attributable to such assets is determined by reference to the ratio of such assets to the total assets of the taxpayer other than properties used in television broadcasting.

Amendment No. 238: This amendment adds a base period commitment rule under section 444, which section provides for the computation of the average base period net income by applying a base period industry rate of return to the total assets of the taxpayer in case of an increase in capacity for production or operation occurring during the last 36 months of the base period. The House recedes with an amendment revising the Senate provision. As amended, the commitment rule provides that if, during the first taxable year ending after June 30, 1950, the taxpayer completed construction of a factory building or other manufacturing establishment (for example, an oil refinery), including the installation of the machinery or equipment for use in such factory building or such other establishment, such factory building or such other establishment and such machinery or equipment shall for the purpose of determining whether there is an increase in capacity under the provisions of section 444 (b), but not for the purpose of computing the average base period net income under section 444 (c), be considered to have been added to its total facilities on the last day of its base period. The provision is applicable only if (A) the taxpayer, prior to the end of its base period, had completed construction work representing more than 40 percent of the total cost of construction of such factory building or such other establishment, and (B) the completion of such factory building or such other establishment was in pursuance of a plan to which the taxpayer was committed prior to the end of its base period.

Amendment No 239 This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, provides for the addition of a new part IV to subchapter D of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with the excess profits credit based on income in connection with certain taxable acquisitions before December 1, 1950. Under this amendment a "purchasing corporation" as defined in the part, would, in certain cases, obtain the use of the income experience of a "selling corporation" for the purpose of computing its excess profits credit. The House recedes with an amendment making changes for purposes of clarification and in order further to define the scope of application of the part

The Senate amendment includes in the definition of a purchasing corporation any corporation which acquired substantially all of the assets of another corporation or of a partnership in a transaction other than a part II transaction. The amendment made by the House includes in this definition a corporation which has acquired substantially all of the properties of a business owned by a sole proprietorship The definition in the Senate amendment also includes a corporation which acquired only part of the assets of another corporation in a transaction other than a part II transaction provided the properties acquired were substantially all the properties of a separate business of the other corporation and that such acquisition was in furtherance of a plan of complete liquidation by such other corporation The purchase under the same circumstances of a separate business which constituted part of the assets of a partnership is added to the definition by the House amendment. The House amendment also deletes a provision which included in the definition of "purchasing corporation" a corporation which receives assets as paid-in surplus or as a contribution to capital from another corporation which had acquired those assets as a purchasing corporation.

This provision under the conference agreement will in general cover those cases in which assets constituting the whole of a separate business of "a selling corporation" were acquired from a corporation, sole proprietorship, or partnership It does not cover an acquisition in a tax-free transaction, for example, a case in which a corporation is liquidated to its stockholders and they in turn place all or part of the assets in a new corporation in a tax-free transaction.

The House amendment makes clear that the part provides for the use by the purchasing corporation of an average base period net income computed only under section 435 (d) (the general average of earnings method), that, under the part, the deficits as well as the excess profits net income of the selling corporation for any month shall be reflected in the computation, and that the excess profits net income to which reference is made is that of the corporation in the case of an acquisition of substantially all of the assets of a selling corporation and is the portion thereof properly allocable to the business or businesses acquired in the case of an acquisition of only part of the assets, representing one or more separate businesses of a selling corporation.

The Senate amendment provides that, for part IV to apply, the selling corporation must, immediately after the transaction, discontinue all business activities and be completely liquidated in a transaction other than a part II transaction. The House amendment changes this requirement to provide that the selling corporation must not have engaged in any business activities after the part IV transaction other than those incident to its complete liquidation and must, within a reasonable time after such cessation of business activities, have been completely liquidated (whether before or after the part IV transaction) in a transaction other than a part II transaction. Such liquidation must terminate the selling corporation's existence.

The Senate amendment further provides that the properties acquired in the part IV transaction must be substantially all of the properties which were used by the selling corporation (or by a component corporation of such selling corporation) in the operation of the business whose assets were acquired by the purchasing corporation. The House amendment provides that such properties must be those used by the selling corporation in the production of the excess profits net income or deficit therein which is used in the computation of the credit provided by this part.

The Senate amendment further provides that the business acquired in the part IV transaction must have been operated by the purchasing corporation from the date of such transaction to the end of the taxable year. The House amendment provides that such business must be operated by the purchasing corporation until the end of the taxable year unless transferred by it, during the taxable year, in a part II transaction to which the provisions of the new section 462 (b) (4) of the code are applicable

The House amendment adds three special rules The first provides that, for the purpose of the definition of a purchasing corporation, properties shall be deemed acquired from the selling corporation if they are purchased directly from the selling corporation or if they are purchased from its stockholders, provided such stockholders did not transfer them to the purchasing corporation in a part II transaction. This provision is applicable only in a case in which the selling corporation was first liquidated to its stockholders and the properties were forthwith sold by them to the purchasing corporation. The second special rule provides for the determination under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of all of the computations required by this part as if the business or businesses which were purchased from a partnership or sole proprietorship had been operated by a corporation. The third special rule is that in the case of the purchase of less than all of several businesses operated by a corporation or partnership, the amount of excess profits net income allocable to all or any number of the purchasing corporations or other persons receiving such properties upon the liquidation of the selling corporation shall not exceed 100 percent of

the excess profits net income of the selling corporation Thus, in a case in which a selling corporation has an excess profits net income for any month of $100 existing by reason of one of its businesses having an income of $300 and another having a loss of $200, the amount of the excess profits net income available to either or both of the parties receiving the two businesses shall not exceed $100 for such month.

The House amendment adds a new subsection (e) dealing with successive transactions and providing that if one part IV transaction succeeds another part IV transaction, the excess profits net income of the first selling corporation is not made available to the second purchasing corporation. The excess profits net income, however, of the first purchasing corporation is available to the second purchasing corporation but, for that purpose, it must be computed without regard to the excess profits net income of the first selling corporation It also provides that the excess profits net income of a selling corporation under this part includes the amount previously available to it under part II with respect to a previous part II transaction Thus, where corporation A had previously merged with corporation B in a transaction described in section 461 (a), the purchase by corporation C of the assets of corporation B under the circumstances outlined in this part will make available to corporation C the excess profits net income (or deficit) of both corporations A and B, as determined under part II for corporation B for the period prior to the merger, as well as the excess profits net income of corporation B for the period after the merger.

The Senate amendment provided for the promulgation of rules by the Secretary, consistent with the principles of part II, for the application of this part For the purpose of clarification, the conference agreement specifically provides for the promulgation of such rules with respect to (1) base period capital addition, (2) net capital addition or reduction, (3) excess profits net income, (4) duplication, and (5) the excess profits credit of the purchasing corporation for the taxable year in which the transaction occurs if such taxable year is a year which ended after June 30, 1950. It is also provided that the Secretary shall not apply the principles of certain specified provisions of part II

It is not intended by this specific enumeration of principles to be followed by the Secretary that the general authority to prescribe rules for the application of this part shall be restricted except as specifically provided. Such regulations may include other principles appropriate to the determination of the computations provided by this part.

The Senate amendment contains technical amendments to the code, which technical amendments are revised by the House amendments Included in these technical amendments as revised are provisions for the application of part II in cases where a corporation acquired in a part II transaction properties of a corporation which was a purchasing corporation in a previous part IV transaction In general, the amendments provide that the income experience of the original selling corporation shall be used by the acquiring corporation in determining its average base period net income under section 435 (d) with reference to part II. For these provisions to be applicable, however, substantially all of the properties acquired in the part IV transaction (or replacements thereof in the ordinary course of business) must have been transferred in the part II transaction, or, if the part II transaction involved a component corporation which acquired the properties in a previous part II transaction, substantially all of the properties of such component corporation must have been acquired by the acquiring corporation. The business operated by the selling corporation must have been continuously operated by the acquiring corporation to the end of the taxable year, unless the business is transferred by the acquiring corporation during the taxable year in a part II transaction to which the provisions of section 462 (b) (4) are applicable If the acquiring corporation obtained the properties in a part II transaction of the type described in section 461 (a) (1) (E) ("split-up"), the provisions of the following amendment to section 462 (i) (6) must be satisfied Section 462 (i) (6) is amended to provide that if the component corporation in the part II transaction was a purchasing corporation in a previous part IV transaction, and if section 462 (b) (4) is applicable, the allocation of the excess profits net income of the component corporation to the acquiring corporation must be based upon the earnings experience of the assets transferred rather than upon the fair market value rule of allocation provided in section 462 (i), this provision being applicable whether or not the other parties to the part II transaction agree to such an allocation The technical amendments, as revised, further provide that section 463 and section 464, relating to capital changes of the acquiring corporation, shall be applied under regulations promulgated by the Secretary with respect to cases in which the part II transaction follows a part IV transaction.

Amendment No 240 This amendment adds section 522 to the bill, for which there is no corresponding section in the bill as passed by the House Section 522 adds bauxite to the list of minerals deemed strategic under section 450 (b) (1) of the code for the purpose of exempting from the excess-profits tax the portion of the adjusted excess profits net income attributable to the mining of such mineral The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No 241: This amendment provides that, except as otherwise provided in section 510 of the bill, the amendments made by title V of the bill, as passed by the Senate, shall be applicable with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1950. The House recedes with amendments conforming to the conference agreement with respect to amendments Nos 224 and 228 Accordingly, the amendments made by title V are applicable with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1950, except as otherwise provided in section 506 (d) of the bill (relating to base period capital additions of banks).

Amendments Nos 242, 243, and 244 These amendments are clerical. The House recedes

Amendment No. 245: This amendment deals with possible tax liability for taxable years beginning prior to January 1, 1951, in the case of certain organizations carrying on trades or businesses the profits of which were dedicated exclusively to exempt purposes. Specifically, this amendment adds to the list of feeder organizations covered by the House bill, those organizations all of the profits of which inure to the benefit of a hospital or to an institution for the rehabilitation of physically handicapped persons which maintains or is building for proper maintenance such a hospital or institution staffed or to be staffed by qualified professional persons for the treatment of the sick and/or the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped, or to an eleemosynary corporation under State law exempt under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The House recedes with an amendment striking out the reference to "an eleemosynary corporation under State law exempt under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code," and with a clarifying amendment providing that no implication is to be drawn from the amendment as to the tax status for taxable years prior to 1951 of so-called feeder organizations not dealt with in section 302 of the Revenue Act of 1950 as amended.

Amendment No. 246: The House bill provided that the percentage of the average base period net income to be taken into account in computing the excess-profits credit based on income shall be reduced from 85 percent of the average base period net income to 75 percent thereof This reduction was effective, under the House bill, as of January 1, 1951. The Senate amendment struck this provision of the House bill. The House recedes with an amendment under which the percentage of the base period net income is reduced from 85 to 83 percent, effective January 1, 1952 Provision is made under the conference agreement for the case of a fiscal year beginning in 1951 and ending in 1952 so that a proportionate part of the decrease in the excess-profits credit will be reflected.

Amendment No. 247: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, amends sections 813 and 936 of the code to provide that, where property included for Federal estate tax purposes in the gross estate of a resident or citizen of the United States is situated in a foreign country and subjected to a death tax by such country, a credit shall be allowed against the estate tax for such foreign death tax. The amendment applies only with respect to estates of residents and citizens dying after the date of enactment of the bill

The House recedes with clarifying amendments.

Amendment No. 248 this is a clerical amendment The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No 249 This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, amends section 863 (c) of the code to extend the estate tax exemption granted by that section with respect to works of art loaned by a nonresident alien to the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D C, to works of art loaned to other public galleries or museums. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No 250: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, makes certain changes in section 939 of the code, relating to the estate tax treatment of certain members of the Armed Forces

The amendment provides that the tax imposed by section 935 (the additional estate tax) shall not apply to the transfer of the net estate of a citizen or resident of the United States dying after June 24, 1950, and before January 1, 1954, while in active service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, if such decedent (1) was killed in action while serving in a combat zone, as determined under section 22 (b) (13), or (2) died at any place as a result of wounds, disease, or injury suffered, while serving in a combat zone (as determined under section 22 (b) (13)) and while in line of duty, by reason of a hazard to which he was subjected as an incident of such service

The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No 251: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, adds a new section to the bill to provide that in the case of a decedent dying after March 18, 1937, and before February 11, 1939, the determination of whether property is included in the gross estate of the decedent as a transfer intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after his death shall be made in conformity with the provisions of article 17 of Regulations 80, as amended by Treasury Decision 4729 The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 252. This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, amends section 7 (b) of Public Law 378, Eighty-first Congress (the Technical Changes Act of 1949). Section 7 (b) now provides that the provisions of section 811 (c) (1) (B) of the code, providing for inclusion in a decedent's estate of property trans-

ferred with reservation of rights in income, shall not be applicable to transfers made before March 4, 1931 (and, in some cases, before June 6, 1932), if the decedent died before January 1, 1950. Under the amendment, inapplicability of section 811 (c) (1) (B) is extended to estates of decedents dying before January 1, 1951. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No 253: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, amends section 7 (b) of Public Law 378, Eighty-first Congress (the Technical Changes Act of 1949) to provide that the provisions of section 811 (c) (1) (C) of the code (relating to inclusion in gross estate of transfers intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death) shall not apply to transfers made before September 8, 1916. The effect of the last sentence of this section, which makes section 7 (c) of such public law inapplicable to overpayments resulting from the enactment of this section of the bill, is to limit refunds of such overpayments to those situations in which the refund is not prohibited by the statute of limitations or some other law or rule of law. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 254: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, permits the making of refund or credit of any overpayment resulting from the application of section 503 of the Revenue Act of 1950, if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from the date of enactment of the bill, even though the making of such refund or credit is otherwise prohibited by the statute of limitations or any other law or rule of law (other than sec. 3760 or 3761 of the code which relate, respectively, to closing agreements and compromises). The effect of section 503 of the Revenue Act of 1950 was to provide that proceeds of life insurance policies attributable to premiums paid on or before January 10, 1941, should not be included in the gross estate of the insured person for estate tax purposes by reason of the fact that the premiums were paid by him, unless on January 10, 1941, or thereafter he had substantial rights in the life insurance policy. The House recedes with an amendment providing that claim for credit or refund must be made after October 25, 1949, and on or before October 25, 1950.

Amendment No 255 This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, provides that in the case of the award made on December 4, 1950, by the Interstate Commerce Commission as retroactive compensation for the transportation of mail, such compensation shall be deemed to be income which accrued in the taxable year in which the services to which such compensation relates were rendered It is provided that no interest shall be assessed for deficiencies created by the inclusion of such income in prior years and that the period for assessment and collection of such deficiencies shall be extended to the date closing the period for assessment and collection for the taxable year of the taxpayer which includes December 4, 1950 The amendment also amends section 292 of the code to provide that in the case of retroactive mail payments, if such payments are required to be included in income in the year or years in which the mail was carried, no interest shall be due with respect to deficiencies resulting from such inclusion for any period prior to 30 days after the award of payment is granted. The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No 256: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, adds to the bill a new section 611 which provides with respect to certain taxable years a special rule to be followed whereby in the computation of corporation surtax net income certain amounts received as dividends on the preferred stock of a public utility will not be disregarded in computing the credit for dividends received.

Section 116 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1943 so amended section 26 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code that, in the computation of the credit for dividends paid on the preferred stock of a public utility, amounts distributed in the current taxable year with respect to dividends unpaid and accumulated in any taxable year ending prior to October 1, 1942, were to be excluded from the amount of dividends paid on its preferred stock during the taxable year The 1943 act did not contain a conforming amendment so that in the computation of corporation surtax net income the 85-percent credit for dividends received would always be allowed with respect to such amounts as were to be excluded in computing the credit for dividends paid on the preferred stock of a public utility.

Pursuant to new section 611, in the case of taxable years beginning before April 1, 1951, the 85-percent credit for dividends received will be allowed in the computation of corporation surtax net income with respect to those amounts which are to be excluded in computing the credit for dividends paid on the preferred stock of a public utility. In the case of the calendar year 1951 and taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, see the amendments made to section 26 (b) of the code by section 122 of the bill (amendment No 8). The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No 257: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, provides that if an affiliated group making a consolidated return with respect to the first taxable year of the group ending after June 30, 1950, included a corporation described in section 454 (f) of the code, pursuant to the consent provided in section 141 (e) (7) of the code, such corporation may withdraw such consent at any time within 90 days after the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1951 If such consent is withdrawn under this provision, the tax liability of the affiliated group and its several members for the taxable year shall be determined, assessed, and collected as if such corporation had never joined in the making of the consolidated return The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No 258: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, adds to the bill a new section 613 pursuant to which the due date for filing income tax returns of, or for paying the income tax by, China Trade Act corporations for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1948, and ending before October 1, 1953, shall be not later than December 31, 1953 The due date thus prescribed shall apply, however, only with respect to any such corporation and any such taxable year as the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to such regulations as he may prescribe, may determine to be reasonable in view of circumstances in China New section 613 recognizes that certain China Trade Act corporations, despite the situation existing in China, are fully able to comply with requirements of existing law as to the time for filing returns and paying the tax.

The due date of December 31, 1953, hereby prescribed is subject to the power of the Secretary to extend, as in other cases, the time for filing returns or paying the tax The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No. 259: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, adds a new section which provides that no amendment made by the bill shall apply in any case where its application would be contrary to any treaty obligation of the United States The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 260: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 261: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, extends for 4 months the date on or before which a claim for net renegotiation rebates arising under the World War II Renegotiation Act may be filed. Section 201 (c) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, approved on March 23, 1951, sets the expiration date as June 30, 1951. This amendment extends such date to October 31, 1951. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No 262: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, adds to the bill a new section relating to prohibition upon the denial of payments by the Federal Government to a State under title I, IV, X, or XIV of the Social Security Act. These titles relate to grants by the Federal Government to States for aid to needy aged individuals, needy dependent children, needy blind individuals, and needy permanently and totally disabled individuals, respectively. The Federal Government and the States share the cost of these assistance programs A State is not entitled to payments from the Federal Government unless the State plan for assistance has been approved by the Federal Security Administrator. Under existing law a State assistance plan in order to be approved must, inter alia, provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of the assistance program The Senate amendment provides that no State or any agency or political subdivision thereof shall be deprived of any grant-in-aid or other payment to which it otherwise is or has become entitled pursuant to title I, IV, X, or XIV of the Social Security Act by reason of the enactment or enforcement by such State of any legislation prescribing any conditions under which public access may be had to records of the disbursement of any such funds or payments within such State The House recedes with an amendment which imposes a condition that the State legislation providing public access to the records of disbursement must prohibit the use of any list or names obtained through such access to such records for commercial or political purposes.

Under this amendment, as agreed to by the conferees, the State of Indiana, which has a law which permits public access to the records of disbursements of public welfare funds but which contains, inter alia, a prohibition upon the use of any lists or names so obtained for commercial or political purposes of any nature, will be entitled to receive its payments under the Social Security Act in the future and will also be entitled to receive any such payments which have been withheld because of the enactment and enforcement of the Indiana law.

Amendment No 263 This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, amends the provisions of existing law which provide the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the Members of Congress an expense allowance which is tax-exempt and for which no accounting is made Under this amendment, the President would receive $150,000 a year for his services, instead of the $100,000 plus the $50,000 tax-exempt expense allowance he now receives. Under existing law, the President neither pays tax on nor accounts for this $50,000 Under this amendment, $50,000 would be added to his compensation and his $50,000 tax-exempt expense allowance would be eliminated. Likewise, the salary of the Vice President, and that of the Speaker of the House, would be increased by $10,000 and his $10,000 tax-exempt expense allowance would be eliminated And, similarly, the salary of each Member of Congress would be increased

by $2,500 and his $2,500 tax-exempt expense allowance would be eliminated. This amendment would become effective, with respect to the President, on January 20, 1953, and with respect to the Vice President, the Speaker, and Members of Congress, on January 3, 1953.

The House recedes with an amendment which eliminates the provisions of the Senate amendment increasing the compensation of the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the Members of Congress but which removes the tax-exempt status of the expense allowances of such officials The expense allowance provided the President by section 102 of title 3 of the United States Code and that provided the Vice President by section 111 of title 3 of the United States Code shall be taxable on and after January 20, 1953, the expense allowance provided the Speaker of the House by subsection (e) of the first section of Public Law 2, Eighty-first Congress, approved January 19, 1949, and that provided each Member of Congress by section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong) shall be taxable on and after January 3, 1953 The President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and each Member of Congress will be required to account for such expense allowances insofar as is necessary for the purpose of deducting such expenses for income-tax purposes

Amendment No 264· This amendment struck out the table of contents to the bill and inserted a new table of contents conforming to the amendments to the bill made by the Senate. The House recedes with an amendment to conform the table of contents to the action of the conference committee.

R L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D DINGELL,
W D. MILLS,
THOMAS A JENKINS,
RICHARD M SIMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr Speaker, I shall have time to make only a short statement on the conference report on H. R. 4473, the revenue bill of 1951.

On February 2, 1951, the President sent up a message requesting enactment of legislation to provide new revenue of $16,500,000,000 a year. This request was later modified to about $10,000,000,000 a year The Committee on Ways and Means responded promptly by starting hearings on February 5, which lasted for 2 months. After about 2½ months in executive session, we reported a bill which, as passed by the House, would have raised $7,200,000,000 in additional revenue annually.

In the other body, the Committee on Finance held hearings for almost 2 months, and spent more than a month in executive session. After 2 weeks' debate on the floor of the Senate, a bill raising $5,500,000,000 a year was finally passed.

The conference met for nearly 2 weeks and only yesterday reached final agreement on the report now before you raising taxes by about $5,750,000,000, or nearly $6,000,000,000 a year

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES

In the case of individual income taxes, the increase in the individual income-tax burden under the conference agreement is approximately midway between the Senate and House bill. It is estimated that the rate increases in the individual income tax will yield $2,538,000,000 as compared with $2,854,000,000 under the House bill and $2,394,000,000 under the Senate bill. Under the compromise there will be integrated into a rate schedule increases amounting to approximately 11¾ percent of the tax or 9 percent of the income after tax, whichever results in the smallest increase. These increases are reflected in the following table:

Comparison between the individual income tax burden in the years 1944–45, 1948–49, and under present law, with that under H R. 4473 as agreed to by the conferees for the years 1952 and 1953

A SINGLE PERSON, NO DEPENDENTS

Net income (after deductions but before exemptions)	Amount of tax			Increase in tax liability due to 1950 act		Amount of tax under H R 4473	Increase in tax liability of H R 4473 over present law		Cumulated increase in liability due to the 1950 act and H. R 4473	
	1944–45	1948–49	Present law	Amount	Percent		Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
$600	$23									
$800	69	$33	$40	$7	20 5	$45	$5	11 5	$11	34.3
$1,000	115	66	80	14	20 5	89	9	11 5	23	31.3
$1,500	230	149	180	31	20 5	201	21	11 5	51	31.3
$2,000	345	232	280	48	20 5	312	32	11 5	80	31 3
$3,000	585	409	488	79	19 2	544	56	11 6	135	31 0
$5,000	1, 105	811	944	133	16 4	1, 054	110	11.7	243	30 0
$8,000	2, 035	1, 516	1, 780	234	15 1	1, 991	211	12.0	448	29 0
$10,000	2, 755	2, 124	2, 436	312	14 7	2, 730	294	12 1	606	28 5
$15,000	4, 930	3, 894	4, 448	554	14 2	4, 970	522	11 7	1, 076	27 6
$20,000	7, 580	6, 089	6, 942	853	14 0	7, 764	822	11 8	1, 675	27 5
$25,000	10, 590	8, 600	9, 796	1, 196	13 9	10, 942	1, 146	11 7	2, 342	27 2
$50,000	27, 945	23, 201	26, 388	3, 187	13 7	28, 468	2, 080	7 9	5, 267	22 7
$100,000	69, 870	58, 762	66, 798	8, 036	13 7	69, 690	2, 892	4 3	10, 928	18 6
$500,000	441, 350	[2] 385, 000	429, 274	44, 274	11 5	436, 166	6, 892	1 6	51, 166	13 3
$1,000,000	[1] 900, 000	[2] 770, 000	[3] 870, 000	100, 000	13 0	[4] 880, 000	10, 000	1. 1	110, 000	14. 3

B MARRIED COUPLE,[5] NO DEPENDENTS

$1,000	$15									
$1,500	130	$50	$60	$10	20 5	$67	$7	11 5	$17	31 3
$2,000	245	133	160	27	20 5	178	18	11 5	56	31 3
$3,000	475	299	360	61	20 5	401	41	11 5	103	31 3
$5,000	975	631	760	129	20 5	847	87	11 5	247	31. 3
$8,000	1, 885	1, 206	1, 416	210	17 4	1, 581	165	11 6	75	31 1
$10,000	2, 585	1, 621	1, 888	267	16. 4	2, 108	220	11 7	487	30 0
$15,000	4, 695	2, 829	3, 260	431	15. 2	3, 648	388	11 9	819	29 0
$20,000	7, 415	4, 247	4, 872	625	14. 7	5, 460	588	12 1	1, 213	28 6
$25,000	10, 295	5, 877	6, 724	847	14 4	7, 512	788	11 7	1, 635	27 8
$50,000	27, 585	17, 201	19, 592	2, 391	13 9	21, 884	2, 292	11 7	4, 683	27. 2
$100,000	69, 435	46, 403	52, 776	6, 373	13. 7	56, 936	4, 160	7 9	10, 533	22. 7
$500,000	443, 895	359, 662	403, 548	43, 886	12 2	412, 432	8, 784	2 2	52, 670	11 6
$1,000,000	[1] 900, 000	[2] 770, 000	858, 548	88, 548	11 5	872, 432	13, 784	1 6	102, 432	13 3

C. MARRIED COUPLE,[6] 2 DEPENDENTS

$2,000	$15									
$3,000	275	$100	$120	$20	20. 5	$134	$14	11. 5	$34	34. 3
$5,000	755	432	520	88	20. 5	580	60	11. 5	148	34. 3
$8,000	1, 585	974	1, 152	178	18. 3	1, 286	134	11. 6	312	32 0
$10,000	2, 245	1, 361	1, 592	231	17. 0	1, 778	186	11. 7	417	30. 6
$15,000	4, 265	2, 512	2, 900	388	15 4	3, 240	340	11. 7	728	29 0
$20,000	6, 785	3, 888	4, 464	576	14 8	5, 004	540	12. 1	1, 116	28. 7
$25,000	9, 705	5, 476	6, 268	792	14. 5	7, 008	740	11. 8	1, 532	28. 0
$50,000	26, 865	16, 578	18, 884	2, 306	13. 9	21, 092	2, 208	11. 7	4, 514	27. 2
$100,000	68, 565	45, 643	51, 912	6, 269	13. 7	56, 036	4, 124	7. 9	10, 393	22. 8
$500,000	442, 985	358, 677	402, 456	43, 779	12. 2	411, 228	8, 772	2. 2	52, 551	14. 7
$1,000,000	[1] 900, 000	769, 314	857, 456	88, 142	11. 5	871, 228	13, 772	1. 6	101, 914	13. 2

[1] Maximum effective rate limitation of 90 percent.
[2] Maximum effective rate limitation of 77 percent.
[3] Maximum effective rate limitation of 87 percent.
[4] Maximum effective rate limitation of 88 percent.
[5] Income earned by 1 spouse.

The Senate conferees accepted the House provision allowing special relief in the case of heads of families.

A Senate amendment, which was accepted by the conferees, provides that an individual may be classed as a dependent if his income is less than $600. Under the present law an individual cannot be classed as a dependent where his income is $500 or more.

The House conferees accepted a Senate amendment continuing the existing 25-percent capital gains rate on individuals and corporations. This rate was increased from 16½ percent to 25 percent in World War II and has not been reduced since that time.

The increases in the individual income-tax rates under the conference agreement will become effective November 1, 1951. Under the House bill, such increases were effective September 1, 1951.

CORPORATION TAXES

The conferees adopted the House increase on corporations of 5 percentage points, and applied the entire increase to the normal tax, as was done in the House bill. This means that corporations with incomes of $25,000 or less will pay a tax at the top rate of 30 percent instead of at the rate of 25 percent imposed on such corporations under existing law. Corporations which are now subject to a total normal and surtax rate of 47 percent will be subjected to a top rate of 52 percent. Under the conference agreement, the increase in the tax on corporations was made effective on April 1, 1951, instead of January 1, 1951, as provided in the House bill. This means in effect that a corporation on the calendar-year basis will be subject to a top rate of approximately 50¾ percent for the calendar year 1951. The 1952 top rate of 52 percent will not become effective until the calendar year 1952.

Another provision of the House bill which was the subject of considerable controversy in the conference was the one lowering the earnings credit for the purpose of the excess-profits tax from 85 percent to 75 percent. Our committee felt that some additional revenue should come from this source. The conference agreement provides for an average-earnings credit of 83 percent, effective January 1, 1952. The Senate conferees agreed to the House ceiling on corporations of 70 percent. However, a simpler method for computing the ceiling was agreed upon. Under this method, the excess-profits tax cannot exceed 18 percent of the excess-profits net income. The yield from the above changes under the conference agreement from corporations will amount to $2,343,000,000, as compared with $2,060,000,000 from the Senate bill and $2,855,000,000 from the House bill. The House conferees agreed, with some modifications, to the Senate amendments providing relief from the excess-profits tax in certain hardship cases.

MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS, BUILDING AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS, AND COOPERATIVES

The Senate bill provided for subjecting mutual savings banks, building and loan associations, and cooperatives to the corporate income tax. Mutual savings banks and building and loan associations are to be taxed as ordinary corporations. In addition, there is allowed a deduction in computing income for dividends or interest paid or credited to their policyholders. A special deduction, in addition to the regular deduction allowed for bad-debt reserves, is also provided. Under this special deduction mutual savings banks and building and loan associations are permitted to accumulate a tax-free bad-debt reserve until 12 percent of the total deposits or withdrawable accounts of its depositors at the close of the year exceeds the sum of its surplus, undivided profits, and reserves at the beginning of the taxable year. These institutions were also exempted from the excess-profits tax under the conference agreement. In the case of cooperatives, the tax is applied to the net margins which are not allocated to their patrons. This is similar in principle to a provision in the North Carolina law. I believe that it is proper at this time, when all taxpayers are having their tax liabilities increased, to secure some revenue from mutual savings banks, building and loan associations, and cooperatives. It is estimated that by taxing these organizations the Government will pick up an additional $28,000,000.

EXCISE TAXES

The Senate conferees in general accepted the House provisions on excise taxes.

The tax on liquor will be increased by $1 50 a gallon, and on beer by $1 a barrel. While the tax on cigarettes would be increased by 1 cent per package. The tax on snuff, chewing, and smoking tobacco reduced from 18 cents to 10 cents per pound.

Manufacturers' excise taxes on automobiles will be raised from 7 percent to 10 percent, but the House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment removing completely the tax on house trailers.

The tax on gasoline will be raised to 2 cents a gallon and will be extended to Diesel fuel used on the highways.

SUMMARY

While the conference agreement does not raise as much revenue as the House bill, it will produce in a full year of operation close to $6,000,000,000 as follows:;

[In millions]

Individual income taxes	$2,333
Corporate income and excess profits taxes	2,195
Excise taxes	1,204
Total	5,732

The $6,000,000,000 imposed by this bill coupled with the increases already provided since the Korean war of $10,000,000,000, makes the total increase in Federal taxes during the last 12 months almost $16,000,000,000. The total annual tax bill will now be around $67,000,000,000, which is $20,000,000,000 greater than the tax bill for the highest year during World War II.

I, for one, do not believe it will be possible to impose further tax burdens upon the American people unless we get into a third world war. It is essential, therefore, that every effort be made to control Federal spending and bring it in balance with current revenue receipts. I believe that a tax bill of $67,000,000,000 is as much a burden as the economy can stand under the present conditions.

Mr. Speaker, in recommending adoption of the conference report, I should like to repeat and emphasize what I said on June 21 when I presented H. R 4473 initially for the consideration of the House:

> As I view it, there are three alternatives facing the Congress: First, we must raise taxes even higher than those provided under present law and in the pending bill, or, second, we must reexamine and reduce Federal expenditures wherever possible, including not only the ordinary operations of Government, but the military and foreign aid budgets as well; or third, we must embark upon a heavy program of additional borrowing and deficit financing. Of these three alternatives, I consider it unlikely that we shall be able to increase substantially the yield of the Federal tax system beyond what is included in the present bill. I say this in all frankness and sincerity, for I consider it essential that we face up to the fact that any higher tax rates on either individuals or corporations or excises would be exceedingly burdensome and difficult to impose On the other hand, the financing through borrowing of any substantial part of the defense program for an indefinite period in the future would certainly contribute to inflation and might permanently and seriously impair the credit of the Government. The only sound future course, in my opinion, is to reexamine the scope of Federal activities and to cut expenditures to the bone.

Mr. Speaker, with this tax situation we are confronted with a condition and not an opinion. The condition is this, that the Congress has authorized appropriations or will authorize appropriations that will amount to more than the total revenues received under this bill and under existing law How many think that taxes are already too high; maybe they are but, when the Congress assumes an obligation and creates a debt, it is our duty, regardless of what we may think about the justification for the obligation, to provide the revenues to discharge the obligations which we ourselves have created.

I do not think that anything could be more detrimental to the economy of this country than in peacetime, in time of prosperity, to embark upon a program of deficit financing.

Mr. Speaker, I hope therefore, that this conference report will be adopted. We cannot put it off on the President of the United States on the ground that he should reduce expenditures The President cannot raise a dollar of revenue himself; he cannot appropriate a dollar. All he can do is to make recommendations for expenditures. In the last analysis, the responsibility rests with the Congress. We have a serious responsibility, not to be shifted aside through political expediency. The solvency of our country must be maintained.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr Speaker, I want to say at the outset that, if time would permit, I would devote several minutes to expressing my appreciation for the fine way and the fair way in which our distinguished chairman presided over the conference.

Mr. Speaker, on September 23, 1950, the Congress increased Federal taxes by over $6,000,000,000 a year.

On January 3, 1950, Federal taxes were increased by another $4,000,000,000.

And today the question before the House is whether to increase Federal taxes by an additional $6,000,000,000, making a total of $16,000,000,000 in new taxes levied on the people within the past 13 months.

Mr. Speaker, we are not dealing today with just another revenue bill We are not debating the merits of minor tax provisions

No; and make no mistake about this; we are engaged today in a head-on clash between two basic policies—between two diametrically opposed principles—and the issues can be simply stated:

Shall we continue to spend ourselves into bankruptcy and tax the people into poverty or shall we reduce Government spending and preserve the principles of our Republic?

Shall we yield further ground to socialism or shall we hold fast to freedom and progress?

Shall we defy communism abroad but surrender our liberty at home?

These are the real issues involved in this conference report on the Revenue Act of 1951, and these issues should not become beclouded by false and pious talk of curbing inflation, of balancing the budget, or of paying-as-we-go, because this new tax-increase bill will do none of these The terrible fact is that excessive and uncontrolled Government spending is on the loose, and the bottom of the American tax barrel has already been reached

The current rate of spending by the Federal Government is accelerating month by month, and cash expenditures for fiscal 1952 will approximate $70,000,000,000 and expenditures for fiscal 1953 will rise to between $80 and $90 billion. And yet at best the increased tax yield from this legislation with all its inequities, its discriminations, and its heavy burden on all our taxpayers will yield less than $3,000 000,000 in fiscal 1952 and approximately $5,800,000 000 in a full year's operation It is clear, therefore, that unless Government spending is cut, we face a substantial deficit in fiscal 1952 and an even larger deficit in fiscal 1953 and it is just as clear that there is no feasible tax program which will raise the amount of money necessary to balance President Truman's budget in either fiscal 1952 or in fiscal 1953. We have reached our limit Federal, State, and local taxes are now taking approximately one-third of our national income. Our States are in open rebellion against the high rate of Federal taxation and are demanding that a constitutional convention be called to set a limit on the taxing powers of the Federal Government. Indeed, the collection and enforcement of our whole tax system is crumbling under the sheer weight of the high and confiscatory taxes.

It is no longer possible to place the country on a pay-as-we-go basis because this Congress has lost control of its power to determine the amount of Federal expenditures. It has lost the power to protect the savings of the people from the arbitrary demands for money by the executive departments. This Congress has surrendered one of the most basic principles of our Government and the people are now at the mercy of the predatory Truman administration which is already hard at work on an increased tax program for 1952. Higher taxes, higher spending—that is, the appalling policy of this spendthrift administration

Excessive taxation will never cure inflation. Let us clearly understand this point because it is one of the most dangerous fallacies used by the Truman spenders in support of higher and higher taxes On the contrary, money taken from the people by taxes and spent nonproductively by the Government only increases inflation. Government spending is directly inflationary because the Government does nothing to create wealth while non-Government spending is channeled back into the production of goods and services and used for expansion of both our civilian and military production. And increased production is our first line of defense against inflation The refusal by President Truman to reduce Government spending, together with the irresponsible fiscal policies of this administration has been one of the major causes of the high cost of living

Now let us stop fooling the people. Let us tell them the truth Let us tell them that this legislation to again increase their taxes is here today because the Truman administration wants it

It is here today because the socialist planners want it.

It is here today because of the waste, inefficiency, bribery, and corruption of the Truman administration

It is here today because of the disastrous foreign policy of the Truman-Acheson-Jessup clique

It is here today because we are fighting a war declared by President Truman without authority from the Congress that could have been avoided and should long ago have been ended.

It is here today because the Pendergast machine has moved to Washington

Already it has cost the honest people of this country $325,000,000,000 to support President Truman and his cronies. It will cost the people another $70,000,000,000 before next July.

Except for the Republican Eightieth Congress there has not been one word of Government economy.

There has not been one real attempt by President Truman to balance the budget and reduce the public debt. Instead the Truman administration has promoted socialism, created inflation, encouraged communism, and brought morality in public office to its lowest ebb. For $400,000,000,000 there is nothing to show but confusion, disaster, and mounting casualties, and indeed the people of the country have good cause to wonder how much of their taxes go for political patronage and party favoritism; how much go for incompetence and dishonesty, how much for waste and extravagance.

As a bare minimum, and if for no other reason, it is unthinkable to me to demand higher taxes from the people before assurance is given that there is no graft in the collection of these taxes.

There is no such assurance and, on the contrary, it now appears that even the Department of Justice has attempted to prevent indictment of one of President Truman's friends for bribery, while serving as a collector of internal revenue.

Mr. Speaker, we are now at the crossroads and unless we cry "Halt" to the excessive spending and waste of this administration, there will be no turning back If we do not stand fast, but yield instead to President Truman's demand for higher taxes, we have failed in our responsibility to the people. We have served notice that there is no limit to the amount of taxes which President Truman can demand and which the Congress will impose on the people We have laid the groundwork for another Presidential call for higher taxes next year. We have taken another major step toward socialism

Of course, Government spending can be reduced and in this period of crisis, programs unrelated to defense can be reduced. Vast savings could be made in the Military Establishment and the Government could exercise the same sacrifices and restraint in the spending of the people's money as the Government has imposed upon the people.

Although the Congress has temporarily bowed to the relentless pressure of the administration we have this last chance to show the American people that they will not be called upon to pay for waste in the spending and bribery in the collection of their earnings and savings We have this chance to serve notice on the Truman administration that a true pay-as-we-go program as advocated by the Republicans calls, first, for a reduction of Government spending and after that the imposition, insofar as necessary, of new taxes to pay for essential Government spending

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against the adoption of this conference report because expressed in its simplest terms this legislation is excessive taxation without justification It will impose higher taxes on many of our taxpayers than was ever imposed during World War II. It increases the arbitrary selectivity of our excises and raises the tax rate on our productive enterprises, whether or not engaged in war work, to exhorbitant and confiscatory rates. It will stifle the ambition and incentive to produce. It will dry the diminishing trickle of venture capital vital for expansion and increased production. It will result in increased prices, promote inflation, and impose an unfair burden on the low-income groups

The conference report should be rejected.

I am not unmindful, Mr. Speaker, that the conference report contains several provisions of merit. Among these are the excess profits relief provisions, the elimination of the proposal to withhold against dividends and corporate bond interest, and adjustment of some of the more discriminatory excise taxes, and the curbing of the arbitrary authority of Oscar Ewing to deny Federal funds to Indiana and other States which believe

in saving the taxpayers' money by efficient and honest administration of the public assistance programs. These are good provisions. They should be incorporated in a separate bill and sent forthwith to the White House.

But although improvements over the House version have been made by the other body and incorporated in the conference report, new provisions have been added which should be deleted. I have in mind, for example, the new tax on mutual savings banks, building and loan associations, and farmers cooperatives.

During the many years I have been privileged to serve as a Member of this distinguished body I have seen our tax law grow and expand and have watched the tentacles creep slowly into every American home. Many, indeed a great many of our tax laws, have been enacted not primarily for revenue but in furtherance of a social or economic policy. Our estate and gift taxes, higher progressive rates in the individual income, the excess-profits tax, many of our excise taxes—all these have a dual purpose. One of the basic policies which I have long fought to encourage is that of individual thrift as opposed to the Truman program of total reliance on the Federal Government. A tax on the mutual savings banks and building and loan associations is essentially a tax upon thrift, home ownership, and self reliance, and will be a deterrent to all three. The revenue to be derived from this tax is insignificant in comparison to the unfortunate consequences of such a tax. The imposition of more taxes has never solved any problem because two wrongs do not as yet make a right.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, because my time is running out I will call attention to only one more iniquitous feature of the conference report. That is the provision imposing for the first time a tax on small-farmer cooperatives.

Since its inception the Republican Party has always been the champion of the farmer. It always will be, but the Democratic Party has not unfurled for all to see its flag of betrayal to the farmers. I quote from the Democratic Party platform of 1948:

> We will encourage farm cooperatives and oppose any revision of Federal law designed to curtail their most effective functioning as a means of achieving economy, stability, and security for American agriculture.

This legislation repudiates the solemn pledge of the Democratic Party. I shall not repudiate my party platform.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement that this bill will cause inflation.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I would like to ask the gentleman what the Senate bill does in the way of taxing the cooperative power associations.

Mr. REED of New York. I will come to that in just a moment.

I have never repudiated it in all the years I have been serving in Congress. I firmly believe that is one of the reasons why I have been here for 33 years. The people know exactly when I say that I will stand by something that I will stand by it. No party can ever succeed over many years if they start in repudiating their platform.

I hope when the vote comes today not a person will repudiate the platform of their party, and that includes our own.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks at this point on the pending conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have five legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as is true in the case of most measures of this type, the pending conference report is a compromise between the House and Senate bills.

Your House conferees worked diligently for many days in conference in an effort to secure the best bill possible under the existing circumstances. The Senate added 264 amendments to the House bill. Of course, many of them were of a clerical or technical nature, but quite a number of them were amendments of real substance. This conference report reflects the best results that we were able to accomplish, and, although there are many provisions with which I am not in accord, yet realizing the urgent necessity for additional revenue, I feel that the conference report should be approved.

There are many provisions included in this bill and the conference report that I voted against in the Ways and Means Committee and in the conference, and there are quite a number of provisions that I supported in the committee and in the conference which are not included in the bill.

The bill as passed by the House was estimated to yield about $7,200,000,000, and the bill as passed by the Senate was estimated to yield about $5,500,000,000, and the conference report is estimated to yield about $5,800,000,000 or nearly $6,000,000,000 in additional revenue. I had hoped that we would be able to enact a revenue measure that would balance the budget and place our fiscal affairs on a pay-as-you-go basis, but I feel that the adoption of the pending conference report will not accomplish this desired result. However, because of the greatly increased costs of the national defense program, it is vitally important that we secure the additional revenue that will be provided under this conference report.

As I stated during the course of my remarks while the pending bill, H. R. 4473, was under consideration in the House, since the beginning of hostilities in Korea a little more than a year ago, your Committee on Ways and Means has been giving almost constant attention to the requirements of additional revenue and related subjects. We have reported and Congress has passed three important measures during that time. The first was the Revenue Act of 1950. The second was the Excess Profits Tax Act approved about January 3, 1951. The third was the Renegotiation of Government Contracts Act in January of 1951. And now this is the fourth important measure, the Revenue Act of 1951.

The passage of this bill, along with the other two tax acts mentioned, will add about $16,000,000,000 to the Federal revenue. The Revenue Act of 1950 produced about $6,100,000,000. The Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 is expected to produce about $3,900,000,000, and the pending bill is estimated to yield additional revenue of about $5,800,000,000.

Although some changes have since occurred, it should be borne in mind that when presented at the beginning of this year the budget for the fiscal year 1952 was $71,600,000,000. The estimated revenue for the fiscal year 1952 was $60,900,000,000, leaving a deficit of $10,700,000,000.

The President requested a revenue measure yielding about $10,000,000,000 or substantially the amount required to cover this deficit. It is apparent that the pending bill will not meet this request and will only produce a little more than half the amount of revenue that was requested.

I have always been and am now strongly in favor of all reasonable and proper economy in Government and I shall certainly continue to endeavor to accomplish desired results along this line.

It should be remembered that just four items cover about 83 percent of the Federal budget and they are as follows:

National defense, forty-one and four-tenths billion, or 58 percent.

International affairs, seven and five-tenths billion, or 10 percent.

Veterans' affairs, four and nine-tenths billion, or 7 percent.

Interest on public debt, five and nine-tenths billion or 8 percent.

Thus it will be seen that 83 cents out of every dollar of the Federal budget is covered by these four items, leaving only 17 cents out of every dollar of the Federal budget for all other expenses of the Government.

The limitation of time will not permit a detailed discussion of all of the changes made in the House and Senate bills, or many other important provisions of this conference report, but many of them will be discussed by other Members during this debate.

Your House conferees present this conference report as the best product of

its efforts that can be offered, and believe that it is worthy of your support.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr JENKINS. Mr Speaker, this conference report is an improvement over the bill passed by the House on which we voted some 2 or 3 months ago, and which I voted against. It is important in one particular respect in which we Republicans support it, and which was opposed by the Democrats. The original bill that passed the House carried a withholding tax against interest and dividends. That was not to our liking. That provision was included in the bill that went to the Senate and the Senate took it out. It came back again and the House inserted it again in the bill that is now being considered And the Senate took it out again and it is not in this conference report that we are considering The Senate took it out again and it stays out as far as this conference report is concerned. That means there will be no withholding on dividends and interest. That is out and that is due to the work of the Republicans. It was argued by the Democrats that there should be a withholding because we were withholding on wages, but that is not a tenable argument at all The conditions are not the same I shall not take your time to develop that fact.

In one other respect this bill is an improvement over the one we passed in the House in that it reduces the amount of the taxes by about $1,000,000 000 Of course, this is a very important difference and a very important reason why I can say it is a better bill.

In spite of all these nice things I have been trying to say about it I am constrained to vote against the conference report and shall vote against it This is consistent with my former votes

Mr HALLECK. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate what the gentleman has just said, particularly that part of his statement in which he has pointed out the better things that are in this conference report as against the bill we passed. He has expressed his views as to what he is going to do for whatever they may be worth. But I want to say that as far as I am concerned I expect to vote against the motion to recommit and for the conference report. I am doing that for a number of reasons. I am particularly interested in that provision of this conference report which follows the recommendation of the 46 governors adopted at Gatlinburg, Tenn., the other day to restore to the States a measure of their rights and responsibilities in respect to the handling of wealth.

Mr. JENKINS. I can say to the gentleman that the consensus of opinion of the conferees was in favor of the matter to which the gentleman has directed his attention.

Mr. Speaker, there is another reason why I want to oppose this measure. Although this conference report reduces the taxes by about a billion dollars below what our bill provided, the taxes are still too high. We do not need that $6,000,000,000 now. The Ohio State Chamber of Commerce, which is the largest State chamber in the country, recently gave special study to the matter of whether another tax bill is necessary now Their experts, which rank with the best in the country, advised that a tax bill was neither necessary nor advisable now. I understand that many men who are experts on Government financing maintain that we have now a surplus of about $3 000,000,000 that will carry us along. I received a letter today from a prominent financial adviser on government finances and he says:

> Why overtax the American people? * * * All taxes now voted are likely to lead to a pure cash surplus

I see by the newspapers that the President's right-hand man, Mike DiSalle, claims that the taxes should not be raised. I quote from a newspaper clipping which I cut out a day or two ago.

> I am not so sure that higher taxes are the thing we need at this time. Taxes tend to retard business initiative

This tax matter should have been put over until next year, at which time we could have considered the matter fully and passed upon it I can cite a very important happening that I think will justify my views in this respect About 8 months ago the President called the Ways and Means Committee down to the White House to visit with him We went down there, and he made us a very nice little speech, and at that time he asked for $10,000 000 000. He said he had to have $10,000,000,000 right immediately in the first bite, and then he wanted six billion more in the near future as the second bite We did not give him ten billion We did not give him the six billion he asked or anything like that. We Republicans would not do so, and in fairness to the Democrats on the committee, they were not in favor of doing that either. Why does the President assume the position all the time that he has to have so much money, such a tremendous lot of money, when he really does not need it? Of course, we Republicans want to maintain the boys in Korea, and we want to maintain taxes to meet Government expenses, whatever they are; but at the same time we do not have to ask for more money than we need all the time. When we visited the President I asked him what he had to suggest as to national economy. He replied that he was a great economizer.

There is another reason why I am opposed to this legislation, and that is this: On the floor of this House we Republicans made what I think was a gallant fight to maintain the building and loan associations and the little mutual savings banks in their present tax position. There was no great demand why they should be brought over the coals and taxed, but under this bill that is just exactly what happened to them, with the result that they are very much dissatisfied and are going to be dissatisfied, and it is going to throw the building and loan associations in direct competition with the banks There was an article in the New York Times last Sunday accentuating that fact, that with the passage of this bill the building and loan associations and the mutual savings banks are going to have to go out and compete with the banks and enter the other fields of action Those of us who have had a chance to know the workings of the building and loan associations of this country know that they have been doing a fine job. Ohio has one of the strongest building and loan companies in the Union Two and a half million people in Ohio are connected in some way with the building and loan companies. I understand that these organizations will acquiesce with the law as it is provided in this conference report, but they would much prefer to be let alone

Mr DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr DINGELL].

Mr DINGELL. Mr Speaker, some of the ideas I entertain about this bill and about the attitude of some of the governors as expressed at their recent conference are not included in my remarks. The fact of the matter is that they would not look well in print. The governors, in their attitude toward their aged pensioners, widows, dependent children as well as the crippled, blind and handicapped, forgot and deserted the people of their States. I refer to the Jenner amendment and make no reservation on that score, and you can come to your own deduction The governors conference is very largely dominated by one man, a gentleman named Frank Bain He is the conference, and he tells them what to do I heard that said publicly at the Chicago conference, which I attended at one time by official invitation But I am going to vote for this bill It is better than no bill at all, and the Republicans know it.

The revenue which the tax bill of 1951 will raise is not nearly as much as it should be The President in his tax message to Congress this year asked that $16,500,000,000 in additional revenues be raised so as to keep the country on a pay-as-you-go basis and fully solvent. The House bill would have increased revenues by $7,200,000,000. The Senate bill would have increased them by $5,500,000,000 The bill as agreed to in conference will raise only $5,732,000,000.

The inflationary effects of such a small tax increase are obvious. No bill would be even worse. It is estimated that on an annual basis, the total gross national product for the third quarter in 1951 will reach $328,000,000,000. On an annual basis, corporation profits for the third quarter of 1951, before taxes, are estimated to be $46,500,000,000, and after taxes, $21,300,000,000. We have been hearing the hue and cry that corporations can stand no more tax in-

creases. This is certainly not indicated by their record of profits. Even during the war period, corporate profits before taxes were running at about half of the rate which is presently indicated.

Another indication of the ability of corporations to pay far more taxes than they are called upon to pay under this bill can be seen from a look at the report of the Federal Trade Commission on rates of return for 525 identical companies in 25 selected manufacturing industries dated June 27, 1951. That report indicates a rate of return after taxes on stockholders' investments for 1950 ranging from a low of 6 2 percent in the case of cigar manufacturers, to a high of 31.7 percent for manufacturers of motor vehicles.

This means that every 3 years at this rate the motor-car manufacturers earn practically the equivalent of their capitalization.

This bill not only does not increase corporate taxes to a point they should be increased, but it also unfairly distributes the tax burden by increasing present excise taxes, and by adding new items to the list of excise taxes These are the most regressive types of taxes known. They have absolutely no relation to ability to pay and, on the contrary, they are intended to fall heaviest on persons in low-income groups.

I do not like that, and you do not, but because we desperately need the revenue we are going to have to swallow it.

Not only did I unsuccessfully fight each and every increase and addition in the excise taxes, but I was defeated in the Committee on Ways and Means on a motion to provide a 2-year termination date for the changes in the excise taxes in this bill, and also the World War II excise taxes. The one thing about the conference report in relation to excise taxes which I am glad to see in the bill is a provision which calls for the termination of the excise tax increases on April 1, 1954.

Another inequity in this bill which originated in the Senate is the means of increasing individual income taxes. The Senate approach again carried out the well-known relief-for-the-rich-man attitude which is unjustified and which we see far too often these days. Unfortunately, we were over the barrel and the Senate conferees knew it. The House conferees had to accede to this demand in order to get any tax bill. Under this approach, the poor little rich man who is single is told that when his income reaches $28,800, we will levy a special type of tax on his take-home pay of 9 percent, and that we feel that it is not fair to him to have an 11 75 percent increase in his present tax liability as is true of persons in lower-income groups.

One of the fundamental objections that I have to this conference report lies in the so-called Jenner amendment. It is vicious in concept and purpose and Congress condones the sin of Indiana in violating principle by changing the Federal law so as to conform to Indiana's unjustified wishes in this matter. I am referring to the provision in the bill to the effect that a State will not be denied Federal grant-in-aid payments under the public-assistance programs even though access and publication is permitted of the lists of names of recipients of assistance.

Remember, that Jenner proposal marks all your old-age pensioners, all your dependent widows, and their dependent children, the blind, the handicapped, and the crippled; it marks them for scorn and abuse, as suckers and as the object of scorn and abuse on the part of those who never did do anything to build up the Social Security Act and are doing everything they can to destroy it.

The House conferees were able to tone this provision down a bit by the proviso that the lists of names may not be used for commercial or political purposes, which is just a lot of chaff if the names are permitted to be published. We can all imagine the humiliation which will be brought upon needy persons who will have their misfortunes in life broadcast by every newspaper in the country

This provision in the bill will amount to a boom to newspapers who will take delight in throwing on their pages the miseries of those unfortunate people who have been reduced to the necessity of asking for public assistance This includes helpless old pensioners, widowed mothers and their dependent children, the unfortunate blind, the crippled and the handicapped. Nothing in the world can be accomplished by such publication which will lead to better administration to the public assistance programs. This is already a matter which is entirely in the hands of the States and the caliber of the persons who handle public assistance will not be improved by this provision. The State authorities can now as they always could heretofore check, recheck, and double check every recipient of the monies paid out under the social security system This is in addition to the fact that no person can be placed upon the rolls in the first instance unless and until he is thoroughly investigated. All these functions of control are not in the hands of the Federal Government, but in the hands of the State exclusively. The Federal Government accepts on faith the certified expenditures as they are presented by the State for reimbursement.

On the other hand, this provision will cause those States that do decide to make this information available to the public no end of worry and concern There will be one continuous stream of recipients clamoring at the doors of welfare offices asking these offices to justify the payment of differing amounts of money to different persons on the public assistance rolls. We all know that varying payments are bound to occur since the needs of recipients differ so widely. You can mark my words that after the States have published these rolls in their papers, it will not be long before they will see the error of their ways and again limit the use of this information to purposes connected with the administration of the social security programs.

I am not at all happy with this conference report, and I vote for it not because I think it is an adequate bill in any sense of the word, but because the need for a pay-as-you-go plan is necessary to narrow the gap between revenue and expenditures and thus to stay as far away from the dangerous and costly idea of deficit spending as possible. This only piles up the burden of an increased debt upon future generations, while at the same time doubling the cost of its reduction. I call to your attention the fact that every $1,000,000,000 added to the Nation's debt is likely to cost the taxpayers an added $1,000,000,000 in interest before it is repaid. Moreover, I am opposed to the meager amount covered in the conference report because of the grave international situation, and because the need of our country at this time for additional revenue is desperate.

Under the circumstances, it was impossible to effectively bargain with the Senate conferees or to arrive at a reasonable compromise as is expected of a conference committee for the reason that the Senate's preference frankly was "no additional revenue," therefore they would rather have no tax bill even as rewritten in the other body. The position of the Senate conferees was strongly reinforced by our own division. The House minority conferees in so many important instances strengthened the unanimous and uncompromising position of the Senate. We of the House majority, too, faced with the problems injected into the bill after it left the House, were not always united and the Senate proposals to that effect were further buttressed toward acceptance or an alternate deadlock, which meant no bill The attitude of the minority conferees of the House, as expressed by themselves in opposition to the conference report regardless of its final form, indicates how they will vote in the House. Take your cue from the publicized statement of the Republican minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, when, according to press reports, he said he would vote against a compromise tax bill, which means the conference report. I believe I am safe in saying that the Republican House conferees will unanimously follow their leader. The minority of this House would like nothing better than to see this conference report voted down and the chances for additional revenue killed, with the dangerous gap of inflation widened by deficit spending and the resultant chaos and high prices placed at our doorstep and charged as being our fault and solely as our responsibility.

That is why I am constrained in spite of my disappointment to vote for the conference report and to urge you to do so in the interests of the people.

I want all my colleagues on this side to hold to the conference report Do not be fooled by the attitude of the Republicans on that side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith an interesting table on excise taxes, present versus proposed:

Comparison with present law of excise taxes affected by conference bill

	Present law		Conference bill	
	Tax base	Rate	Change in base	Rate
Alcoholic beverages				
Distilled spirits	Per proof gallon	$9	None	$10.50.
Fermented malt liquor	Per barrel	$8	do	$9
Wines	Per gallon by alcoholic content.	15 cents, 60 cents, $2	do	17 cents, 67 cents, $2.25.
Occupational taxes:				
Distilled spirits:				
Retailers	Per year	$27.50	do	$50.
Wholesalers	do	$110	do	$200.
Fermented malt liquor Wholesalers	do	$55	do	$100.
Tobacco				
Small cigarettes	Per 1,000	$3.50	do	$4.
Chewing and smoking tobacco	Per pound	18 cents	do	10 cents.
Snuff	do	do	do	Do.
Manufacturers excise taxes.				
Passenger automobiles	Manufacturers price	7 percent	do	10 percent.
House trailers	do	do	Exempt	
Trucks, busses, tractors	do	5 percent	None	8 percent.
Parts and accessories	do	do	do [1]	Do
Tires	Per pound	5 cents	Exempt tires for toys, etc	No change.
Gasoline	Per gallon	1½ cents	None	2 cents.
Diesel fuel			Per gallon	Do.
Electrical energy	Charge	3% percent	Repeal	
Electric, gas and oil appliances	Manufacturers' price	10 percent	Certain items added to base [2]	No change.
Refrigerators, air-conditioners, etc	do	do	Exempt sales to manufacturers	Do.
Radios and equipment	do	do	Exempt equipment sold to U. S. Government	Do
Sporting goods	do	do	Exempt certain items	15 percent.
Photographic apparatus and film	do	25 percent, 15 percent	Exempt business cost items	20 percent.
Mechanical pens and pencils			Manufacturers' price	15 percent.
Cigar, cigarette and pipe mechanical lighters			do	Do.
Retailers' excise taxes Baby oils, etc, barber and beauty shop supplies	Retailers price	20 percent	Exempt	
Transportation and communication:				
Transportation of persons	Charge	15 percent	Exclude fishing trips and certain ocean travel	No change.
Transportation of property	do	3 percent	Excludes excavation material moved to adjacent area.	Do
Domestic telegraph	do	25 percent	None	15 percent
Toll telephone	do	do	Exempt calls from servicemen in combat areas.	No change.
Amusement and recreation:				
Admissions, general	Established prices	20 percent	Certain organizations exempt	Do.
Admissions, cabarets, etc	Taxable amount	do	Exclude incidental refreshments sold in ballrooms.	Do.
Gambling taxes				
Wagering			Amount wagered	10 percent.
Occupational tax on wagering			Per year	$50
Coin-operated gaming devices	Per year	$150	None	$250

[1] Exempt rebuilt parts, and those used on farm machinery
[2] Exempt commercial and industrial types, except commercial electric motor driven fans and air circulators.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, Casco Products, the largest heating pad manufacturer in the country, has a plant in Bridgeport, Conn., which is in the district I represent

This conference report removes the excise tax on electric heating pads. There is no provision whatsoever in this report for protection to thousands of dealers and distributors across the Nation covering inventories on which the excise tax has already been paid. This will cause a great hardship to Casco Products because all its customers are looking to it for refunds. Likewise, manufacturers of the heating pad, industrywise, are being besieged by the jobbers and wholesalers for refunds.

Since manufacturers have already paid the excise tax on the inventories, if they are required to reimburse their customers they stand to lose tens of thousands of dollars, because 75 percent of the entire year's business has been shipped during the last 90 days. And if manufacturers are required to issue refunds to their wholesalers and dealers, this would result in a double payment of a tax which is being repealed. Obviously, this should not be the intent of the Congress.

The inventories above referred to are those goods shipped to distributors and dealers by manufacturers since June that have not been sold to the consumer.

What action other than to amend the code can your committee take to avoid complete confusion, chaos, and hardship in the entire heating pad manufacturing industry and the unjust loss of tens of thousands of dollars. Is there administrative recourse to remove this inequity. In my opinion it might be better not to repeal this excise tax on heating pads until March 31, 1952. Action of this kind would remove hardship and chaos in the industry.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have no idea how long it is going to take the American people to realize we have reached the utmost limit of sensible and reasonable taxation in this country. Why is it, do you suppose, that the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives has worked since last February on a tax-increase bill? Why, you might reasonably ask, did we not get together and simply pass a tax-increase bill and raise at least a substantial portion of the money for which the President of the United States asked? Certainly this Congress has indicated a willingness to work along with the President in the war emergency in which we find ourselves. The Congress is willing to do it, it is anxious to do it, but we cannot do it, with respect to taxation, because we members of the committee know that we have reached the upper limits beyond which the imposition of more and more taxes is going to cause undue and unnecessary suffering upon our low-income groups. Increased taxes are going to retard production at the very time we need increased production of materials for the conduct of war. So our committee spent days, weeks, and months trying to work out some means by which taxes could be increased to the extent of at least part of the amount asked by the President. We have failed to increase taxes to the amount he asked because, as I said earlier, we know that such a thing would be disastrous to the economic life of our country. We have failed because we know that the tax burden today upon the American citizen, the greatest tax burden in history in peacetime, has reached the point where production will suffer at the very time we want to have it increased.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly thankful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding to me inasmuch as I could get no time whatever from my chairman. I want to say to the membership of the House, Mr. Speaker, that I am unalterably opposed and most sincerely opposed to this conference report, and the provisions of the bill. It is my firm conviction, Mr. Speaker, that if the membership of the House really were generally acquainted with the various provisions of this bill, the conference report would not have a ghost of a chance of passing this body. I hope the membership will recommit the conference report so that the Committee on Ways and Means, if they want to bring out a tax bill, can bring out a tax bill that can be supported.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I think if the Congress looks to the future and recognizes the true facts and realizes that we are going to have a very large deficit in our financial picture next year, they will consider the effect of heavier and heavier taxes very carefully. We have reached a crisis where very prominent Members of the other body, as well as prominent Members of this body, have said that we have reached the ceiling and that there should be no more tax bills raising individual tax rates so long as we remain out of a real war. I use the expression real war advisedly, and not to express my opinion, because I know that we are in the midst of a deadly war today. Of course, if and when a real war comes, we must keep our economy strong here at home if we are to lead other nations to strength and freedom. Higher taxes will break down the economic life of this country, from which we get the tanks and guns and ships, and from which we get our own resources.

From these resources, we have thus far been able to send help abroad.

If we in this country, through unwise taxation, seek to do more than the economy of the country will stand, we will be broke. In the final analysis there is a limit to which even the richest person, the richest Nation can extend himself.

I believe, and I think a majority of the two financial committees of the Congress are of the opinion that we have about reached that limit; that we must have economy, and if we do not have economy we are certain to have deficit financing, with the ills that will be attributable to it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, before we vote on the conference report on the tax bill, I think the Members of the House should understand how the bill we passed last June was butchered in the other body and in conference. I do not object to butchering quite so much if everybody gets a fair cut of the hog. But when a favored few get all the ham and pork chops, and the rest of the people get just plain old sow belly, at least the people are entitled to know what they are swallowing.

This is what has happened. The conference bill raises almost a billion and a half dollars a year less than the House bill. Now, just who is going to save this $1,500,000,000 that would have been paid under the House bill? Let us see how much of the tax load was lifted from people with incomes below $5,000, and how much went to those who are better able to pay.

First, take the cut in individual income taxes of $254,000,000 a year agreed to in conference. Of this amount $66,000,000, or 23 percent, went to people with net incomes of less than $5,000. This leaves $218,000,000, or 77 percent of this relief for people above $5,000 annual income.

Then consider the complete exemption from any share of the defense-tax load accorded to people with capital gains. These lucky people, provided they have net income of $18,000 a year, if single, or $36,000 a year, if married, pay no additional tax whatever on their capital gains under this bill. They receive an extra tax dividend of $54,000,000 that would have been due under the House bill. Of course, people with less income pay an additional 11¾ percent on their capital gains. You have to be in the chips to qualify.

The next bonus for the coupon clippers was the $300,000,000 lost from exempting dividends and interest from withholding. The man or woman who works for a living has his income taxes deducted from the pay check. But the coupon clippers have been forgetting to report for tax purposes nearly $3,000,000,000 of dividends and interest every year. The House bill would have made them pay just like the people who have to work for a living. The Senate bill and the conference report allows them to continue to dodge their taxes.

A final morsel for a few people over 65 is the more generous deduction for medical expenses. The only catch is that 85 percent of the people over 65 do not have enough income to get any benefit from this scheme. But the elder Morgans and the Rockefellers, and the Pews, all will be able to pay their doctor bills with a smile—knowing they get a full deduction for Federal income-tax purposes.

Then, let us take a look at the tax relief for corporations under the conference bill as compared with the bill we passed in June. Although corporations generally will still have to pay an extra $2,000,000,000 a year, the most prosperous companies are given excess-profits tax benefits of nearly $500,000,000 a year.

Think of it—when corporate profits for the first quarter of 1951, before taxes reached an all-time high rate of $52,000,000,000 a year, more than 25 percent higher than just before the Korean invasion—and while corporate profits after taxes are more than double the profits for 1944, the banner year during World War II—this bill, in effect, hands back to the corporations which have profited most from the defense effort a tax bonanza of half a billion dollars.

And then they tried to make up a part of the loss by taxing the workingman's savings banks and the building and loan associations through which he bought his home. Even the farmer's cooperatives are attacked in an effort to disguise the real tax favoritism extended to upper-bracket individuals and the corporations owing excess-profits taxes.

It is easy to hide a lot of private relief measures in a big bill like this. How many taxpayers under $5,000 do you suppose will be aided by the Senate amendment to give capital gain treatment on receipts of certain termination payments by employee, as section 329 of the bill is entitled.

Yes, the average taxpayer pays at the going rate. But the well-financed smart boys legalize their tax-dodge schemes through stock options, family partnerships, multiple corporations, and dozens of other technical sounding loopholes reopened or widened by the conference bill.

You have got to have money—a lot of money—for them to do you any good. But, boy, is it ever worth while when you get there.

As might be expected, there was no cut made in the excise tax increase made by the House bill. Excises are sales taxes—and are not based on ability to pay. So the pack-a-day smoker will pay $3.65 a year more for cigarettes—whether he makes $3,000 a year or $3,000,000.

Does this sound like a square shake or a fair deal?

Even the poor man over 65 and the needy blind receiving public assistance will have to pay this increase in tax out of their meager pensions.

And that is not the only penalty paid by the poor under this bill. When Congress passed the Social Security Act in 1935 and improved it in 1939, I thought we had removed forever in this country the degredation of poverty and want in old age.

But now this bill—through the so-called Jenner amendment—would turn back the clock just as the Eightieth Congress removed nearly a million workers and their families from the old-age and survivors' insurance rolls.

Once again the privacy of the poor would be invaded. The published poor list would give up the humiliating secret that up till now has been shared only with the postman. The misery and remorse of poverty and failure in old age would be laid bare for all to see.

Mr. Speaker, such a provision could never become law as a separate bill under the present administration. That such an abominable and irrelevant rider should be inserted in a major tax bill is an outrage.

It has helped me, however, in arriving at a decision to vote against this bill. When I couple this Jenner amendment with the 14 to 1 ratio of the tax relief granted to wealthy individuals, and great corporations, I cannot in good conscience vote to adopt the conference report.

The bill should be defeated.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against this conference report, and I hope it is defeated and that no tax bill at all is passed. We have reached the point, and far beyond, of irresponsible spending and taxation If you believe that this great and marvelous economy of ours can be destroyed by taxation, you must come to the conclusion that that point has been reached now The rates imposed by this bill on business and on individuals can only promote further socialism, further nationalization of industry, and more inflation. It is a destructive move. By better and more efficient collection of taxes we can improve the Treasury by a billion dollars. We should also rescind appropriations heretofore made by enough billions to balance the budget and save this economy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time, 8 minutes, to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it seems from what has been said today that we do not like to have to face up to realities on occasions. As the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee already stated, we are faced with a situation. It is not a theory.

We come to the closing days of this session of the Eighty-second Congress. Practically every appropriation bill for fiscal 1952 has been passed Is there a Member present on this floor now who feels that the Treasury will take in, under existing tax laws, a sufficient amount of revenue to meet those appropriations which have been passed by this House? Not one. You cannot find an individual who is conversant with fiscal matters who will advise you that we will

Now, it is fine to have your cake, but we are now at the point where we have to pay That is distasteful. There is no one in the world who dislikes to support or advocate increased taxes more than I, but we have to be honest and sincere with ourselves and with the people whom we represent in the halls of the Congress of the United States

Now, why should this conference report be accepted? First of all, I see friends of mine on the Appropriations Committee before me who will admit that, on the basis of what we have already appropriated, it is quite evident that this additional amount of some $2,700,000,000 in fiscal 1952 will be needed On the basis of what all of us anticipate the burdens will be on the Federal Government in fiscal 1953, we know that the additional $5,800,000,000 under a full year's operation will be needed then, unless there is a general disarmament program throughout the world. We know that.

It is fine to talk about reducing expenditures; we are all for reducing expenditures. I take my hat off to my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr TABER], who has made a noble fight in that direction, but the Congress of the United States has spoken; these appropriations have been made: Whatever may have been our personal desires, it is an event that has occurred.

What is the other point in opposition to the conference report? Somebody distributed some information that disturbed a lot of my colleagues on the Democratic side. It is charged that this conference report is unfair, vicious, that it discriminates against the low income groups. Let us see just what this conference report does for just a minute. The House passed a provision for increasing rates on individuals; the Senate acting within its own discretion and in its own judgment lowered that provision; the conference committee found a happy meeting ground right halfway between the 12½ percent Senate rate and the 11 percent House rate, bringing in a rate of 11 75 percent as a compromise

Oh, yes, they say it increases the taxes on those in the low brackets excessively over those in the upper brackets. Well, yes, to a degree this may be true So did the House bill. You cannot, Mr. Speaker, increase rates in certain brackets under our present law, applying the same percentage increase that you do in the lower brackets, without taking about 105 cents out of every dollar that is received in those brackets. You have to look at existing law and consider that in relation to whatever rates you propose to increase in a tax bill.

The Senate gave us practically in toto the corporation rate contained in the House bill The effective date in the House bill was January 1 next year, in the Senate bill April 1. We considered it a pretty fair trade on our part when we were in conference They gave us practically in toto what we provided in the House bill on excises and then they included some 200 more amendments to the bill, many of them without substantive effect.

Mr. TABER Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr MILLS I yield

Mr. TABER Does the gentleman realize that the cuts that the House made in the appropriations amounted to $4,900,000,000? And that if the amendments offered had been adopted it would have been in the neighborhood of $5,-800,000,000?

Mr. MILLS. Yes; that has been the reduction, and I am proud of it But the fact remains, in spite of that reduction, that we have already approved through this House appropriations that will go in excess of the $63,000,000,000 that we will take in during fiscal 1952 if we pass this conference report

I am more concerned, however, about the charges that the bill is unfair. It is not entirely in keeping with my own thinking, but when you come out of a conference on any legislation it has been my experience that you do not get it just as you want it; you have to give a little here and take a little some place else. It is just as fair as a conference report on this tax bill can be made.

Some talk about sending the bill back to conference. Mr. Speaker, there are things in here that the House Democratic conferees went along on in the hope that it would be possible to get acceptance of the conference report by all those interested in a sound fiscal position for our Government. If the bill goes back to conference, and there are no instructions on what is to be done, some of those provisions may not come back in the next conference report.

This conference report is the best we can get Cast aside this thought that it is discriminatory, that it is unfair, that it is vicious.

Mr. Speaker, the House should accept the conference report as the best job that we can do now or in the future. It should be adopted in the hope that this amount of revenue that we would bring into the Treasury in 1952 will permit us to remain on a pay-as-you-go basis

One of the greatest speeches made on the floor of the other body was made last fall by a very distinguished Member who said that we must remain on a pay-as-you-go basis. This is a step in that direction, Mr. Speaker, and each Member should think long, and should consider his own best judgment before voting to recommit this conference report.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is never pleasant to vote for a tax-increase bill, yet in the last 15 years I have voted for every major tax bill which the Congress has passed. The times and the circumstances, particularly during World War II, made it necessary that the Federal Government increase its revenue.

Tomorrow the House will consider a conference report on a bill to increase personal income taxes approximately 12 percent and altogether to raise an additional $5,700,000,000. The Congress is faced with a serious problem. There is not a Member of either the Senate or House who does not know deep in his heart that this administration is wasting billions of dollars annually in probably the most reckless spending spree in the history of all nations.

The President's attitude on spending was made unmistakably clear at the beginning of this session of Congress when he publicly dared the Congress to attempt to cut so much as a penny from his budget request. No effort has been made to bring about economy, efficiency, and elimination of waste under plans recommended by the Hoover Commission, Senator BYRD, and others. There are other ways than higher tax bills to stop inflation and balance budgets.

The redress of the American people is at the polls, but I cannot see why they should be penalized in the interim by having their taxes raised to an all-time record high A real drive for economies should have preceded this tax bill. It was essential for national solvency.

There is more at stake than the burden of taxes. If this tax bill becomes law, approximately one-third of the income of the American people will be going to Government—Federal, State, and local, The history of monarchies and the Communists and Socialist dictatorships has demonstrated conclusively that no people can be free when the citizen has less and less of his own money to spend and

the Government spends more and more of it for him.

When taxes reach the point that they are depriving the American citizen of one-third of his income, simply to meet the cost of Government, then the citizen is approaching the point of no return. Because I am convinced that the only hope of stopping the irresponsible spending of this administration lies in cutting off new tax sources, I shall vote against the tax bill when the conference report is brought up in the House tomorrow. This administration will never start to economize until forced to do so.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I voted against H. R. 4473 when it was before the House for consideration June 22. Since that time the Senate Committee on Finance, the Senate, and the committee on conference between the House and the Senate have made many changes in the proposed legislation. Most of these changes have been improvements in the bill but I am still opposed to the enactment of this bill into law.

During my service in Congress I have witnessed the enactment of appropriation bills providing for tremendous increases in Federal spending and likewise tax laws calling for tremendous increases in our taxes. Practically every new increase in taxes has been heralded as the means for stopping inflation through reducing funds available for private spending, yet total spending has gone merrily on, augmented primarily by greatly increased Federal spending. Deficit spending is undoubtedly one of the factors contributing to inflation, but higher taxation has not stopped deficit financing because Federal spending has habitually exceeded Federal revenues. I have become thoroughly convinced that the only hope of stopping the irresponsible and extravagant spending of this administration lies in our refusal further to increase our tax rates.

We have already hit the ceiling of bearable taxation, even though Truman administration backers refuse to recognize that fact. And we now are witnessing a determined effort by the Truman administration to pyramid still higher tax rates upon our already overburdened taxpayers.

I do not have time in this brief discussion to recite in detail the revenues of all the countries of the world, but I requested the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to prepare an estimate of tax revenues of the central government of each country and to translate that revenue into American dollars to enable us to compare our total Federal tax revenue with the other nations. The latest year for which such estimate can be made is 1949 and I know that Congress and the Nation will be interested to hear that in the fiscal year 1949 the total tax revenue of the 72 other countries is estimated to be $68,800,000,000. In 1949 our own total Federal tax revenue was $40,000,000,000. Looking ahead, their estimate of the total United States Federal tax revenue for fiscal 1951 is $61,000,000,000, for 1942, $64,000,000,000, and for 1953, $67,000,000,000. If we are to weigh the Federal revenues of 1953 against the revenues of 1949, I understand that inflation would require our reduction of the 1953 revenues by approximately 15 percent, so that our 1953 revenues will actually stand at approximately $57,000,000,000 on 1949 values. There is another factor involved in this comparison, however, that we cannot estimate, namely, the increases in tax rates in other countries subsequent to 1949. But we know that the total tax revenue of the 72 other countries has not been increased since 1949 as much as our own. Consequently, our ratio of the total world tax revenues has increased to the point where we will soon be carrying close to half of the total world tax load.

Our carrying of such a tremendous proportion of the total world tax load has imposed a tremendous burden upon our people. Even prior to the enactment of the bill now before us our tax experts have told us that the total confiscation of all taxable individual incomes over $4,000 would increase our total Federal revenue only $9,720,000,000. I do not have at hand the adjustment of that figure to fit the new tax rates provided in the bill now before us, but we know that the proposed increase of the personal income taxes in this bill will take away a part of that $9,000,000,000 so that such confiscation hereafter would not produce even that much additional revenue. But who wants total confiscation above $4,000? We have already cut deeply into the incentive of our people to assume the hazards of industry and business. Our Federal Government cannot go on indefinitely playing this tax game on a "heads I win, tails you lose" basis without killing incentive.

Yes, we have already hit the tax ceiling, but in the words of Burke:

> Taxing is an easy business. Any projector can contrive new impositions; any bungler can add to the old; but is it altogether wise to have no other bounds to your impositions than the patience of those who are to bear them?

THE JENNER AMENDMENT

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, coming from the State of Indiana, as I do, I have no alternative but to vote for this tax bill, which includes the Jenner amendment. But I must say that I hope that none of the other Members of this House ever find themselves in such a position as that in which the dominant faction of the Indiana Legislature has placed me.

A vote against the Jenner amendment would allow the continuance in effect of the provision of the Federal Social Security Act which requires that the welfare records of cooperating States be kept confidential. But, at the same time, because the Indiana Legislature this year passed a State law conflicting with the Federal requirement, the rejection of the Jenner amendment would result in the continued denial to Indiana of Federal-aid funds necessary to a workable State welfare-assistance program, and bring undeserved hardship and misery to the needy persons of my State.

A vote for the Jenner amendment would remove the Federal restriction, thus, of course, permitting the restoration of Federal welfare aid to Indiana and insuring again deprivation and want among the ranks of the needy That is necessary, in the immediate interests of humaneness and decency. However, there are many who maintain that the opening of welfare records ignore another consideration of humaneness and decency, and who have asked to be given a hearing on any question of changing the Federal law.

But the Indiana Legislature chose to take the State out of conformity with the Federal law, and keep it out, before Congress had an opportunity to take any kind of action. This deliberate and continued nonconformance has compelled Congress to act in haste, under the pressure of a local emergency forced upon it by a State legislature.

As a Member of Congress, I think I should be expected, and entitled, to consider this matter on its merits, hear the arguments for and against changing the confidential-records law, and then vote as my conscience dictates. But the dominant faction in the Indiana Legislature has denied me that privilege.

As it is I can only consider the fact that, if the Federal welfare law is not changed, the people of my State will be subjected to double taxation, the State's finances jeopardized, and the welfare of the aged and needy imperiled.

I was a member of the Indiana Legislature in 1941 when a bill was introduced by the then State Republican leader, to amend the State welfare law. When the bill reached the lower house, it was amended to include the confidential-records provision. We were told by the Republican leaders of the legislature at that time that the provision was necessary in order to conform with the Federal law.

If conformance with the Federal law in 1951 involved "dictatorship," as some people have loudly maintained, then the Republican leaders of the Indiana Legislature sold the State into that "dictatorship" in 1941. I voted against the 1941 welfare law, because of another provision which it contained. All the Republicans voted for it. The governor vetoed the bill, because of the same provision which I had found objectionable, but the Republicans, to a man, voted to override his veto That is how the Indiana welfare records came to be made confidential.

For 10 years, this law remained in force, but when the Indiana Legislature met this year, a great hue and cry went up to repeal the State law and open the welfare records. It was repeatedly pointed out to the State legislature that, if they did that, the State law would conflict with Federal law, and Indiana would not be entitled to participate in the distribution of Federal welfare funds

Notwithstanding this knowledge, the open-records bill was passed by a strict party vote, and enacted into law over the Governor's veto As a consequence, Federal welfare aid to Indiana was cut off. The case was taken to court, and the court decided against Indiana and upheld the Federal ruling The court admitted the predicament of Indiana's

welfare programs, but it pointed out that the fault rested entirely with the State legislature.

The Governor called a special session of the legislature to study the situation, and work out a solution. But the legislature has apparently become hopelessly deadlocked One group urged that the State law be suspended until Congress would consider the question. But the dominant faction blocked the suspension This group was willing to impair the State's conformity with the Federal law further, by adopting a so-called home rule welfare law, which would have placed Indiana irretrievably beyond recovery of Federal funds.

At this stage of affairs, the Jenner amendment was tacked onto the tax bill. I realize that this was done in the Senate, and that the House conferees were charged with the duty of effecting a compromise. But I think it unfortunate that this legislation was handled by way of an amendment which was not considered in a House or Senate committee. There are many groups who feel that a Federal confidential-records law should not be altered. They can justly protest now that they were not permitted to state their views to Congress.

This whole proceeding demonstrates the ill-considered and unwise action of the Indiana Legislature, and I am afraid that it sets a dangerous precedent for tampering with the Federal-State relationship Our existence as a Nation demands that the Federal Government be supreme over the States. Many will remember that, more than 120 years ago, Andrew Jackson cautioned that "our Federal Union, it must be preserved" Let us remember that admonition whenever the Federal authority and congressional prerogatives are challenged.

After this whole proceeding, I might liken myself to a player on a baseball team managed by the people of Indiana. I feel like a runner on second base when the runner on first attempts to steal second, and I am forced to try for third base. Maybe I will make it to third, but I assure you, if I was manager of that team, the man on first would be taken out of the game and he would never try that trick again. And I think the manager would be backed up by the citizens of the whole country sitting in the bleachers

Probably you boys on the other side for the time being have won a battle, and I congratulate you. But I think you will find in the long run that you have lost a war

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in protest against this tax-increase bill (H R. 4473) in the form as it has been reported by the House-Senate conferees, and to express my belief that the House should vote to send this measure back to committee.

Let me say at the outset that I have no quarrel with the proposition that Congress must find ways and means of raising more Federal revenues However, I do want to say for the record that it is the obligation of Congress, in approving new tax legislation, to see to it that any tax increases shall be distributed equitably among all groups of our population. The bill now under consideration is unequitable and unsound. It fails to observe the basic principles of equity of sacrifice and it is my sincere belief that Congress has done a great injustice to the American people in reporting out a bill of this nature.

I will summarize briefly what I consider to be the basic defects in the bill. First, the bill increases the individual income tax rate by 11¾ percent. This across-the-board tax increase is most unsound because it tends to break down the progressive principle of Federal taxation and because it means in effect that a greater percentage of the Federal tax burden is being shifted from the big incomes to the low-income groups. In other words, the incidents of this new tax increase falls most heavily on the low-income individuals.

Second, I also want to object to the excise tax increases imposed by this new legislation. As we all know, an excise tax is nothing more than a hidden sales tax which is borne chiefly by the low- and middle-income families. This proposal could well lead us through the back door into a national sales tax which taxes away the basic essentials of ordinary daily living.

Third, while this bill imposes new burdens upon low-income families, it is most considerate with the big corporations Corporate profits today are running at the all-time high of about $50,000,000,000 a year before taxes and $22,000,000,000 a year after taxes. It is estimated that the provisions of this bill will take about $2,000,000,000 of the $22,000,000,000 profit remaining after present taxes Therefore, even if we pass this bill, the big corporations of America will still be left with $20,000,000,000 a year in profits.

In other words, Mr Speaker, H R 4473 soaks the common people but permits the big corporations to escape their fair share of taxes It is the same old story "penalize the poor but everything to the rich and powerful."

Finally, I wish to call attention to the vicious rider attached to this bill which permits State governments to publicize the names of persons on the public assistance rolls To do this is a cruel injustice to the millions of old people, orphans, and dependent children now on public assistance because it exposes them to public ridicule and embarrassment It is bad enough to shirk its duty by refusing to adopt a decent old-age pension system to give real economic security to the aged and the disabled. Now the Congress proposes that their names be publicized in the newspapers as recipients of old-age assistance and thus add insult to injury I must protest this provision of the bill in the strongest terms at my command.

Mr Speaker, there can be no doubt that tax increases are inevitable and that the Federal Treasury needs more revenues, but I say that if there must be sacrifice in the form of necessary taxes, let there be equality of sacrifice. What we need is a tax bill which gives needed tax relief to that low-income groups in the form of increased personal and dependency exceptions and at the same time chiefly increases corporate and excess profits taxes and thus tax more heavily those most able to pay. Such a bill would have my wholehearted support, but I cannot in good faith vote for this unsound and unequitable measure which violates every principle of tax justice. I urge the Congress to vote down this bill and direct the House Ways and Means Committee to write a new tax bill which conforms to the elementary principles of tax justice

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, in a lot of ways I hate to vote for this conference report; it contains a number of inequities and it lays a heavy burden on everybody But this Congress has already appropriated, with and without my vote, more money than will come in under our present tax laws. I am opposed in principle to deficit spending; we ought to approximate pay as we go, even in a period like this. We cannot do it with this year's spending without another tax bill This bill is more than $4,000,000,000 below the President's request. That will be a deterrent to extravagance in spending. I do not think another report from these conferees will come very soon, or be much better

It is easy to vote for pet appropriations and let somebody else vote the taxes, but if a majority of us do this we will never balance the budget I am voting for this conference report.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr Speaker, I cannot and will not support this tax bill In my opinion, it is a wholly unnecessary and unconscionable raid upon the meager earnings of the rank and file of the American people who would be compelled under its provisions to pay the overwhelming portion of its huge levies.

It also would impose a most destructive and repressive load upon our great American productive machine which must at all cost be kept healthy and vigorous to enable this Nation to produce the weapons, matériel, and equipment so vital to our national security at this critical time.

The power to tax is the power to destroy. Unless we can maintain our free enterprise and the unequaled incentive of our businessmen and people at the highest possible level of efficiency and productivity we cannot possibly hope to stand up successfully against the challenge of ruthless Communist dictatorship. This bill would place handcuffs upon our great, free productive potential

In addition, it is not necessary unless and until we are directly engaged in all-out war As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, it is my studied conviction that we are providing practically all our Armed Forces with more money than they can possibly spend It is asserted by competent authority that at the end of the current fiscal year, the Armed Forces will have to their account in the neighborhood of $40,000,000,000 that they cannot possibly spend.

I am strongly of the view that one of the great and crying needs of the hour is insistence by the Congress of the meticulous elimination of waste, extravagance, and improvident spending by the military and every other branch of this

Government. We must scrupulously inspect and justify every single item of the budget to insure economy and efficiency and conserve our great national resources as against the day when we may have to mobilize and use them for the defense of the Nation.

Let me repeat, I cannot and will not in conscience vote to place this great additional and needless burden upon the backs of the American people and for that reason I must vote against this absolutely indefensible bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RABAUT. Mr Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present

Mr McCORMACK. Mr Speaker, I move a call of the House. A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following members failed to answer to their names.

[Roll No 204]

Allen, Calif	Dempsey	Murphy
Allen, La.	D'Ewart	Murray, Wis
Angell	Dorn	Norrell
Baring	Durham	Patman
Bates, Ky	Hebert	Phillips
Blackney	Herlong	Powell
Boggs, La	Hess	Redden
Bosone	Holifield	Regan
Boykin	Irving	Ribicoff
Bramblett	Jackson, Calif	Roosevelt
Brown, Ohio	Johnson	Sabath
Buckley	Kelley, Pa.	Scott,
Burleson	Kennedy	Hugh D, Jr
Busbey	Keogh	Shelley
Byrnes, Wis.	Kersten, Wis.	Taylor
Camp	Kilburn	Thompson, Tex
Celler	Lantaff	Thornberry
Chatham	Lucas	Watts
Cole, N Y.	McDonough	Werdel
Combs	Mack, Ill	Wilson, Tex
Crawford	Madden	Wood, Ga.
Dague	Miller, Calif	
Deane	Morrison	

The SPEAKER On this roll call 362 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REVENUE ACT OF 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr REED of New York. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr REED of New York moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H. R. 4473 to the committee of conference.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 157, nays 204, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No 205]

YEAS—157

Abbitt	Ford	Merrow
Abernethy	Forrester	Mills
Adair	Frazier	Morris
Albert	Fugate	Morrison
Andersen, H Carl	Gary	Morton
Andrews	Gathings	Multer
Anfuso	Gordon	Murdock
Ashmore	Gore	Murray, Tenn.
Aspinall	Granger	Norblad
Bailey	Grant	Norrell
Bakewell	Greenwood	O'Brien, Ill.
Barden	Gregory	Patten
Battle	Hale	Perkins
Beamer	Halleck	Pickett
Beckworth	Harden	Poage
Bennett, Fla.	Hardy	Preston
Bennett, Mich	Harris	Priest
Bentsen	Harrison, Va.	Prouty
Bonner	Hart	Rabaut
Bray	Harvey	Rains
Brown, Ga	Havenner	Ramsay
Brownson	Hays, Ark	Reams
Bryson	Hedrick	Richards
Burnside	Hillings	Riley
Button	Holmes	Roberts
Byrne, N Y.	Hope	Robeson
Carlyle	Hunter	Rogers, Fla
Case	Ikard	Sasscer
Celler	Jarman	Seely-Brown
Chelf	Javits	Sheppard
Cole, Kans.	Jones, Ala	Smith, Miss.
Colmer	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Va.
Cooley	Jones, Hamilton C	Spence
Cooper		Staggers
Corbett	Jones, Woodrow W	Stanley
Cotton		Steed
Cox	Judd	Stigler
Crumpacker	Kean	Stockman
Davis, Ga	Kee	Tackett
Davis, Tenn.	Kelly, N Y	Teague
Davis, Wis	Kerr	Thomas
Dawson	Kilday	Tollefson
DeGraffenried	King	Trimble
Denton	Kluczynski	Vinson
Dingell	Lanham	Vorys
Doughton	Larcade	Walter
Doyle	Lesinski	Wharton
Durham	Lind	Whitaker
Elliott	Lyle	Whitten
Engle	McCormack	Wickersham
Evins	McGrath	Willis
Fernandez	McKinnon	Zablocki
Fine	McMullen	
Fisher	Mahon	

NAYS—204

Aandahl	Church	Gross
Addonizio	Clemente	Gwinn
Allen, Ill	Clevenger	Hagen
Anderson, Calif	Coudert	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Andresen, August H.	Crosser	Hall, Leonard W.
Arends	Cunningham	Hand
Armstrong	Curtis, Mo	Harrison, Wyo.
Auchincloss	Curtis, Nebr.	Hays, Ohio
Ayres	Delaney	Heffernan
Baker	Denny	Heller
Barrett	Devereux	Herter
Bates, Mass.	Dollinger	Heselton
Beall	Dolliver	Hill
Belcher	Dondero	Hinshaw
Bender	Donohue	Hoeven
Berry	Donovan	Hoffman, Ill.
Betts	Eaton	Hoffman, Mich.
Bishop	Eberharter	Horan
Blatnik	Ellsworth	Hull
Boggs, Del.	Elston	Jackson, Wash.
Bolling	Fallon	James
Bolton	Feighan	Jenison
Bow	Fenton	Jenkins
Brehm	Flood	Jensen
Buchanan	Fogarty	Jonas
Budge	Forand	Kearns
Buffett	Fulton	Keating
Burdick	Furcolo	Kersten, Mo.
Bush	Gamble	Kirwan
Butler	Garmatz	Klein
Canfield	Gavin	Lane
Cannon	George	Latham
Carnahan	Golden	LeCompte
Chenoweth	Goodwin	Lovre
Chiperfield	Graham	McCarthy
Chudoff	Granahan	McConnell
	Green	McCulloch
		McGregor
		McGuire
		McVey
		Machrowicz
		Mack, Wash.
		Magee
		Mansfield
		Marshall
		Martin, Iowa
		Martin, Mass
		Mason
		Meader
		Miller, Md.
		Miller, Nebr.
		Miller, N Y.
		Mitchell
		Morano
		Morgan
		Moulder
		Mumma
		Nelson
		Nicholson
		O'Brien, Mich.
		O'Hara
		O'Konski
		O'Neill
		Osmers
		O'Toole
		Passman
		Patterson
		Philbin
		Polk
		Potter
		Poulson
		Price
		Quinn
		Radwan
		Rankin
		Reece, Tenn.
		Reed, Ill.
		Reed, N Y.
		Rees, Kans.
		Rhodes
		Richlman
		Rodino
		Rogers, Colo
		Rogers, Mass.
		Rogers, Tex.
		Rooney
		Sadlak
		St George
		Saylor
		Schwabe
		Scott, Hardie
		Scrivner
		Scudder
		Secrest
		Shafer
		Sheehan
		Short
		Sieminski
		Simpson, Ill.
		Simpson, Pa.
		Sittler
		Smith, Kans.
		Smith, Wis.
		Springer
		Sutton
		Taber
		Talle
		Thompson, Mich.
		Vail
		Van Pelt
		Van Zandt
		Velde
		Vursell
		Weichel
		Welch
		Wheeler
		Widnall
		Wier
		Wigglesworth
		Williams, Miss.
		Williams, N Y.
		Wilson, Ind.
		Winstead
		Withrow
		Wolcott
		Wolverton
		Wood, Idaho
		Woodruff
		Yates
		Yorty

NOT VOTING—67

Allen, Calif	Dempsey	Murphy
Allen, La	D Ewart	Murray, Wis
Angell	Dorn	Patman
Baring	Hebert	Phillips
Bates, Ky	Herlong	Powell
Blackney	Hess	Redden
Boggs, La	Holifield	Regan
Bosone	Howell	Ribicoff
Boykin	Irving	Rivers
Bramblett	Jackson, Calif	Roosevelt
Brooks	Johnson	Sabath
Brown, Ohio	Kearney	Scott, Hugh D Jr
Buckley	Kelley Pa	Shelley
Burleson	Kennedy	Sikes
Busbey	Keogh	Taylor
Byrnes, Wis	Kilburn	Thompson Tex
Camp	Lantaff	Thornberry
Chatham	Lucas	Watts
Cole, N Y	McDonough	Werdel
Combs	McMillan	Wilson, Tex.
Crawford	Mack, Ill.	Wood, Ga
Dague	Madden	
Deane	Miller, Calif	

So the conference report was not agreed to

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr Byrnes of Wisconsin for, with Mr Hess against

Mr. Lantaff for, with Mr. McDonough against

Mr Madden for, with Mr Brown of Ohio against

Mr Keogh for, with Mr Howell against

Mr. Sabath for, with Mr Kelley of Pennsylvania against

Mr Herlong for, with Mr Shelley against

Mr Bates of Kentucky for, with Mr Taylor against

Mr Hebert for, with Mr Angell against

Mr Watts for, with Mr Phillips against

Mr Camp for, with Mr. Busbey against

Mr Chatham for, with Mr Regan against

Mr Patman for, with Mr Werdel against

Mrs Bosone for, with Mr Dempsey against

Until further notice:

Mr Buckley with Mr. Allen of California

Mr Murphy with Mr Blackney

Mr Roosevelt with Mr Bramblett.

Mr Powell with Mr. Crawford

Mr Deane with Mr Cole of New York

Mr Redden with Mr Dague.

Mr Rivers with Mr Jackson of California

Mr Sikes with Mr Johnson

Mr. Baring with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Hugh D Scott, Jr.

Mr Miller of California with Mr Murray of Wisconsin

Mr Mack of Illinois with Mr Kearney

Mr. Boykin with Mr. D'Ewart.

Mr IKARD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. DOYLE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr MOULDER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr DOUGHTON. Mr Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments to the bill H R 4473, and request a further conference on the disagreeing votes to the two Houses thereon.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion

The motion was agreed to

The SPEAKER The Chair appoints the following conferees Mr DOUGHTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr DINGELL, Mr MILLS, Mr REED of New York, Mr JENKINS, Mr SIMPSON of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr EBERHARTER Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD on the tax bill conference report immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr SIMPSON]

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr REED of New York asked and was given permission to address the House on tomorrow for 30 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered

AMENDING HOUSING LEGISLATION TO GRANT PREFERENCES TO VETERANS OF THE KOREAN CONFLICT

Mr SPENCE Mr Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2244) to amend certain housing legislation to grant preferences to veterans of the Korean conflict

The Clerk read the title of the bill

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr WOLCOTT Mr Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman to briefly explain the bill?

Mr SPENCE Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to give members of the Armed Forces in Korea the same privileges with reference to housing, under housing legislation that comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, as was given to veterans of World War II It gives to those engaged in the Korean conflict the same privileges and priorities that the veterans of World War II have in regard to FHA housing, public low-rent housing, Lanham Act housing, and the Greentown housing projects when they are disposed of.

Certainly there should be no discrimination against the heroic men who are now carrying on the conflict in Korea. I think none can read of the valor that was displayed at Heartbreak Ridge and not say that those fine men are entitled to every privilege that veterans of every other war have received.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr WOLCOTT. Mr Speaker, the minority on the committee are in hearty accord with the position taken by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr SPENCE]. This bill was reported out of the committee unanimously and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr FULTON Reserving the right to object, Mr Speaker, may I ask why the present administration limits the rights of Korean veterans only to housing? Why do you not give them the same rights otherwise?

Mr SPENCE We give them everything within the jurisdiction of our committee

Mr FULTON But why does not the administration give the Korean war veterans all the same rights of education, housing, and all other rights as were given to World War II veterans?

Mr SPENCE I am heartily in favor of that, but all that this committee could give them was the rights within the jurisdiction of this committee.

Mr FULTON One further question: Why has it taken so long since the Korean war started to bring this legislation up Why has it not been done earlier?

Mr SPENCE I do not know why it has not been done earlier, but it is done now There is no use going into questions that do not arise at this time. The question is whether we are going to give them the rights provided in this bill at this time

Mr FULTON One further question, I have not seen a copy of the bill and it is not here on the floor In what words technically does the bill refer to the Korean conflict? Does it call it a war or a conflict?

Mr SPENCE. It refers to those who were in service on or after June 27, 1950 The bill has just been reported Why delay it? The sooner we pass this bill the better it will be for our servicemen. We should agree to the Senate bill

Mr. FULTON Will the gentleman accept an amendment to insert the words "Korean war" after the date "1950"?

Mr SPENCE No; I do not accept any amendment The bill has been passed by the Senate and will become law if the House passes it

Mr FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer such an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The bill is not before the House yet

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

(The bill reads as follows:)

Be it enacted, etc, That paragraph (14) of section 2 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (50 Stat 888, as amended; 42 U S C. 1402) is amended to read as follows.

"(14) The term 'veterans' shall mean a person who has served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time (i) on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, (ii) on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to November 11, 1918, or (iii) on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date thereafter as shall be determined by the President, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable The term 'serviceman' shall mean a person in the active military or naval service of the United States who has served therein at any time (i) on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, (ii) on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to November 11, 1918, or (iii) on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date thereafter as shall be determined by the President"

SEC 2 The act of October 14, 1940, as amended (54 Stat 1125, as amended, 42 U S C 1521), is hereby amended (i) by striking out in paragraph (c) of section 505 and in paragraph (c) of section 602 the phrase "of World War II" wherever such phrase occurs, and (ii) by striking out in paragraph (b) of section 601 the phrase "during World War II", and substituting therefor the words "at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, or on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date thereafter as shall be determined by the President"

SEC 3 Public Law 65, Eighty-first Congress (63 Stat 68), is hereby amended by adding, after the phrase "July 26, 1947," in section 2 thereof, the phrase "or on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date thereafter as shall be determined by the President,".

SEC 4 The National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the phrase "of World War II" wherever it occurs in paragraph (b) of section 213, and by adding the following proviso before the period at the end of said paragraph " *Provided*, That for purposes of this section the word 'veteran' shall mean a person who has served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, or on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date thereafter as shall be determined by the President"

The SPEAKER Without objection, the bill is engrossed, read a third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table

Mr. FULTON. Mr Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER The gentleman will state it

Mr. FULTON At what time was the bill open for amendment?

The SPEAKER When unanimous consent for its consideration was given The Chair waited No one rose Then the Chair put the question on engrossment, third reading, and passage of the bill.

Without objection, a motion to reconsider is laid upon the table

There was no objection

AMENDMENT TO RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AND THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] is recognized.

Mr CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H R. 3669) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H R 3669, with Mr DAVIS of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill

The CHAIRMAN General debate having been concluded, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting in the last sentence of subsection (f) thereof the phrase "one hundred twenty-six" for the phrase "fifty-four" and by adding after subsection (p) thereof a new subsection as follows

"(q) The terms 'Social Security Act' and 'Social Security Act, as amended,' shall mean the Social Security Act as amended in 1950"

SEC 2 Subsection (a) of section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting in the first sentence thereof, after "enactment date," the following 'and shall have completed 10 years of service,", by inserting in the first sentence of paragraph 5 of said subsection a period after the phrase "regular employment" and striking out all of that sentence following that phrase, and by striking out the next to the last sentence of such subsection (a)

SEC 3 Subsection (c) of section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase "60 days," the phrase "6 months"

SEC 4 Subsection (d) of section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting in the first sentence "(i)" after "individual" and by changing the period at the end of the first sentence to a comma and inserting after the comma the following "or (ii) is receiving an annuity under paragraph 1, 2, or 3 of subsection (a), or under paragraph 4 or 5 thereof after attaining age 65, is under the age of 75, and shall earn more than $50 in 'wages' or be charged with more than $50 in 'net earnings from self-employment' or (iii) is receiving an annuity under paragraph 4 or 5 of subsection (a), is under the age of 65, and shall earn more than $100 in 'wages' or be charged with more than $100 in 'net earnings from self-employment'"

SEC 5 Section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended is amended by adding after subsection (d) thereof the following new subsections

"(e) For the purpose of this section and of subsection (i) of section 5, 'wages' shall mean wages as defined in section 209 of the Social Security Act, without regard to subsection (a) thereof, and 'net earnings from self-employment' shall be determined as provided in section 211 (a) of the Social Security Act and charged to correspond to the provisions of section 203 (e) of that act

"(f) SPOUSE'S ANNUITY The spouse of an individual, if—

"(i) such individual has been awarded an annuity under subsection (a) or a pension under section 6 and has attained the age of 65, and

"(ii) such spouse has attained the age of 65 or, in the case of a wife, has in her care (individually or jointly with her husband) a child who, if her husband were then to die, would be entitled to a child's annuity under subsection (c) of section 5 of this act,

shall be entitled to a spouse's annuity equal to one-half of such individual's annuity or pension, but not more than $50 *Provided, however*, That if the annuity of the individual is awarded under paragraph 3 of subsection (a), the spouse's annuity shall be computed or recomputed as though such individual has been awarded the annuity to which he would have been entitled under paragraph 1 of said subsection. *Provided further*, That any spouse's annuity shall be reduced by the amount of any annuity and the amount of any monthly insurance benefit, other than a wife's or husband's insurance benefit, to which such spouse is entitled, or on proper application would be entitled, under subsection (a) of this section or subsection (d) of section 5 of this act or section 202 of the Social Security Act, except that if such spouse is disentitled to a wife's or husband's insurance benefit, or has had such benefit reduced, by reason of subsection (k) of section 202 of the Social Security Act, the reduction pursuant to this subsection shall be only in the amount by which such spouse's monthly insurance benefit under said act exceeds the wife's or husband's insurance benefit to which such spouse would have been entitled under that act but for said subsection (k)

"(g) For the purposes of this act, the term 'spouse' shall mean the wife or husband of a retirement annuitant or pensioner who (i) was married to such annuitant or pensioner for a period of not less than 3 years immediately preceding the day on which the application for a spouse's annuity is filed, or is the parent of such annuitant's or pensioner's son or daughter, if, as of the day on which the application for a spouse's annuity is filed such wife or husband and such annuitant or pensioner were members of the same household, or such wife or husband was receiving regular contributions from such annuitant or pensioner toward her or his support, or such annuitant or pensioner has been ordered by any court to contribute to the support of such wife or husband, and (ii) in the case of a husband, was receiving at least one-half of his support from his wife at the time his wife's retirement annuity or pension began

"(h) The spouse's annuity provided in subsection (f) shall, with respect to any month, be subject to the same provisions of subsection (d) with regard to service, 'wages' and 'net earnings from self-employment' as the individual's annuity, and, in addition, the spouse's annuity shall not be payable for any month if the individual's annuity is not payable for such month (or, in the case of a pensioner, would not be payable if the pension were an annuity) by reason of the provisions of said subsection (d) Such spouse's annuity shall cease at the end of the month preceding the month in which (i) the spouse or the individual dies, (ii) the spouse and the individual are absolutely divorced, or (iii), in the case of a wife under age 65, she no longer has in her care a child who, if her husband were then to die, would be entitled to an annuity under subsection (c) of section 5 of this act"

SEC 6 Subsection (a) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by changing "2 40" to "2 80", "1 80" to "2 00", and "1 20" to "1 40", and by striking out the phase "next $150" and substituting for said phrase the following "remainder of his 'monthly compensation'"

SEC 7 Subsection (b) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting (in each instance in the parenthetic phrase of paragraph (1)) "his 'monthly compensation'" for "$300", by striking out all of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following paragraph:

"The retirement annuity or pension of an individual, and the annuity of his spouse, if any, shall be reduced, beginning with the month in which such individual is, or on proper application would be, entitled to an old age insurance benefit under the Social Security Act, as follows (i) in the case of the individual's retirement annuity, by that portion of such annuity which is based on his years of service and compensation before 1937, or by the amount of such old age insurance benefit, whichever is less, (ii) in the case of the individual's pension, by the amount of such old age insurance benefit, and (iii) in the case of the spouse's annuity, to one-half the individual's retirement annuity or pension"

SEC 8 Subsection (c) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting in the last sentence thereof after "$300" the following "through the calendar year 1951, and in excess of $400 thereafter,"

SEC 9 Subsection (e) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out the phrase "and not less than 5 years of service", by changing the phrase "subsection 2 (a) (3)" to "sections 2 (a) 3 or 3 (b) (4)", by changing "$3 60" to "$4 10", and "$60" to "$68", and by changing the period at the end of the subsection to a colon and inserting after the colon the following "*Provided, however*, That if for any entire month in which an annuity accrues and is payable under this act the annuity to which an employee is entitled under this act (or would have been entitled except for a reduction pursuant to section 2 (a) 3 or a joint and survivor election), together with his or her spouse's annuity, if any, or the total of survivor annuities under this act deriving from the same employee is less than the amount, or the additional amount, which would have been payable to all persons for such month under the Social Security Act (deeming completely and partially insured individuals to be fully and currently insured, respectively, and disregarding any possible deductions under subsection (i) of section 203 thereof) if such employee's service as an employee after December 31, 1936, were included in the term 'employment' as defined in that act and quarters of coverage were determined in accordance with section 5 (i) (4) of this act, such annuity or annuities, shall be increased proportionately to a total of such amount or such additional amount"

SEC 10 Section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 as amended, is amended by striking out subsection (h) thereof

SEC 11 Subsection (i) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by redesignating it as subsection (h)

SEC 12 Subsection (a) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting "and Widower's" after "Widow's", by inserting "or widower" after "widow", by inserting "or his" after "her", by inserting "or he" after "she", and by substituting for the phrase "an annuity for each month equal to three-fourths of the employee's basic amount" the following: "a survivor's insurance annuity *Provided, however*, That if in the month preceding the employee's death the spouse of such employee was entitled to a spouse's annuity under subsection (f) of section 2 in an amount greater than the survivor's insurance annuity the widow's or widower's annuity shall be increased to such greater amount"

SEC 13 Subsection (b) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase "an annuity for each month equal to three-fourths of the employee's basic amount" the following "a survivor's insurance annuity: *Provided, however*, That if in the month preceding the employee's death the spouse of such employee was entitled to a spouse's annuity under subsection (f) of section 2 in an amount greater than the survivor's insurance annuity, the widow's current insurance annuity shall be increased to such greater amount"

SEC 14 Subsection (c) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase "an annuity for each month equal to one-half of the employee's basic amount" the

following: "a survivor's insurance annuity: *Provided, however,* That if the employee is survived by more than one child entitled to an annuity hereunder, each such child's annuity shall be (i) two-thirds of a survivor's insurance annuity plus (ii) one-third of a survivor's insurance annuity divided by the number of such children."

SEC. 15. Subsection (d) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting ", no widower," after "widow", and by substituting for the phrase "an annuity for each month equal to one-half of the employee's basic amount" the phrase "a survivor's insurance annuity."

SEC. 16. Subsection (e) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out all after the phrase "whose death" and substituting the following: "the same two or more children are entitled to annuities for a month under subsection (c), any application of each such child shall be deemed to be filed with respect to the death of only that one of such employees from whom may be derived a survivor's insurance annuity for each child under subsection (c) in an amount equal to or in excess of that which may be derived from any other of such employees."

SEC. 17. Subsection (f) (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting ", widower," after the word "widow" where this word first appears, by substituting in the first sentence "twelve times the survivor's insurance annuity" for "eight times the employee's basic amount", by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following: "Upon the death, on or after the first day of the month next following the month of enactment hereof, of a completely or partially insured employee who will have died leaving a widow, widower, child, or parent who would on proper application therefor be entitled to an annuity under this section for the month in which such death occurred, there shall be paid a lump sum of four times the survivor's insurance annuity to the person or persons in the order provided in this paragraph", by inserting before "would" in the fourth sentence thereof the following: "of twelve times the survivor's insurance annuity", by inserting in that sentence "widower," after the word "widow" wherever it appears, and by substituting in that sentence the phrase "eight times the survivor's insurance annuity" for the phrase "such lump sum" wherever it appears.

SEC. 18. Subsection (f) (2) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting ", widower," after the word "widow" wherever this word appears, by inserting "or her" after the words "his" and "him" wherever these words appear, by inserting after "$300" the following: "through the calendar year 1951 and $400 thereafter", by inserting immediately before ", or to other" in the first sentence the following: ", and to others deriving from him or her, during his or her life,", by changing the period at the end of said subsection to a comma and by inserting after the comma the following: "except that the deductions of the benefits paid pursuant to subsection (k) of this section, under section 202 of the Social Security Act, during the life of the employee to him or to her and to others deriving from him or her, shall be limited to such portions of such benefits as are payable solely by reason of the inclusion of service as an employee in 'employment' pursuant to said subsection (k)."

SEC. 19. Subsection (g) (2) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) If an individual is entitled to more than one annuity for a month under this section, such individual shall be entitled only to that one of such annuities for a month which is equal to or exceeds any other such annuity. If an individual is entitled to an annuity for a month under this section and is entitled, or would be so entitled on proper application therefor, for such month to an insurance benefit under section 202 of the Social Security Act, the annuity of such individual for such month under this section shall be only in the amount by which it exceeds such insurance benefit. If an individual is entitled to an annuity for a month under this section and also to a retirement annuity, the annuity of such individual for a month under this section shall be only in the amount by which it exceeds such retirement annuity."

SEC. 20. Subsection (h) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(h) Maximum and minimum annuity totals. Whenever according to the provisions of this section the total of annuities payable for a month with respect to the death of an employee, after any adjustment pursuant to subsection (g) (2) and after any deductions under subsection (i), is more than $120 and exceeds an amount equal to 2 times a survivor's insurance annuity, such total of annuities shall, subject to the provisos in subsection (e) of section 3 and in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, be reduced proportionately to such amount or to $120 whichever is greater. Whenever according to the provisions of this section the total of annuities payable for a month with respect to the death of an employee is less than $20 such total shall, prior to any adjustment pursuant to subsection (g) (2) and prior to any deductions under subsection (i), be increased proportionately to $20."

SEC. 21. (a) Subsection (i) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out subdivision (ii) of paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(ii) is under the age of 75 and will have earned more than $50 in wages or will have been charged with more than $50 in net earnings from self-employment, or"

(b) Such subsection (i) is further amended by striking out subdivision (iii) thereof and by redesignating subdivision (iv) as subdivision (iii).

SEC. 22. Subsection (j) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out all of the third sentence thereof after the phrase "the month in which" (including the proviso), and substituting the following: "eligibility therefor was otherwise acquired, but not earlier than the first day of the sixth month before the month in which the application was filed."

SEC. 23. (a) Paragraph (1) of subsection (k) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting "(i)" after the word "determining" and by inserting in said paragraph after the word "act" where it first appears the following: "to an employee who will have completed less than 10 years of service and to others deriving from him or her during his or her life and with respect to his or her death, and lump-sum death payments with respect to the death of such employee, and (ii) insurance benefits with respect to the death of an employee who will have completed 10 years of service", by striking in said paragraph after "1947," the following: "to a widow, parent or surviving child,"; by inserting before the word "occurring" the phrase "of such an employee", by inserting after the phrase "such date" the following: "and for the purposes of section 203 of that act", by substituting in said paragraph "210 (a) (10)" for "209 (b) (9)", and by inserting at the end of such paragraph (1) the following sentence: "In the application of the Social Security Act pursuant to this paragraph to service as an employee, all service as defined in section 1 (c) of this act shall be deemed to have been performed within the United States."

(b) Paragraph (2) of the said subsection (k) is amended by changing "1950" to "1956"; by inserting after the word "awards" where it first appears the following: "and in administering the proviso in section 3 (e) of this act", by substituting "Federal Security Administrator" for "Social Security Board", and by striking out from said paragraph (2) all after the phrase "such legislative changes as" and substituting the following: "would be necessary to place the Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund in the same position in which it would have been if service as an employee after December 31, 1936, had been included in the term 'employment' as defined in the Social Security Act and in the Federal Insurance Contributions Act."

"SEC. 24. (a) (1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting "'widower'," after "'widow'," where this word first appears, by substituting "216 (c), (e), and (g)" for "209 (j) and (k)", and by substituting "202 (h)" for "202 (f)."

(2) The said paragraph (1) is further amended by striking out subdivision (i) thereof and inserting in lieu of such subdivision the following:

"(i) a 'widow' or 'widower' shall have been living with the employee at the time of the employee's death, a widower shall have received at least one-half of his support from his wife employee at the time of her death or he shall have received at least one-half of his support from his wife employee at the time her retirement annuity or pension began. For the purposes of subsections (b) and (i) (1) (ii) of this section, the term 'widow' shall include a woman who has been divorced from the employee if she (A) is the mother of his son or daughter, (B) legally adopted his son or daughter while she was married to him and while such son or daughter was under the age of eighteen, or (C) was married to him at the time both of them legally adopted a child under the age of eighteen, and if she received from the employee (pursuant to agreement or court order) at least one-half of her support at the time of the employee's death and the child in her care referred to in subsection (b) is the child described in clauses (A), (B), and (C) entitled to a survivor's insurance annuity under subsection (c) with respect to the death of such employee." (3) The said paragraph (1) is further amended by inserting in subdivision (ii) after the phrase "such death" the following: "by other than a step parent, grandparent, aunt or uncle", by substituting in subdivision (iii) for the phrase "shall have been wholly dependent upon and supported at the time of his death by" the phrase "shall have received at least one-half of his support from", by changing the semicolon after the phrase "is claimed" in said subdivision (iii) to a period and striking out the portion of the sentence following that phrase.

(4) Paragraph (1) of the said subsection (i) is further amended by substituting for all the matter which follows subdivision (iii) the following: "A 'widow' or 'widower' shall be deemed to have been living with the employee if the conditions set forth in section 216 (h) (2) or (3), whichever is applicable, of the Social Security Act are fulfilled. A 'child' shall be deemed to have been dependent upon a parent if the conditions set forth in section 202 (d) (3), (4), or (5) of the Social Security Act are fulfilled (a partially insured mother being deemed currently insured). In determining for purposes of this section and subsection (g) of section 2 whether an applicant is the wife, husband, widow, widower, child or parent of an employee as claimed, the rules set forth in section 216 (h) (1) of the Social Security Act shall be applied.",

(b) Paragraph (4) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting after the table the following: "If upon computation of the compensation quarters of coverage in accordance with the above table an employee is found to lack a completely or partially-insured status which he would have if compensation paid in a calendar year were presumed to have been paid in equal proportions with respect to all months in the year in which the employee will have been in service as an employee, such presumption shall be made."

(c) Paragraph (6) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking "(a)" after "209" and by inserting after the word "act", the following: ", and, in addition (i) 'self-employment income' as defined in section 211 (b) of that act and (ii) wages deemed to have been paid under section 217 (a) of that act on account of military service which is not creditable under section 4 of this act."

(d) Paragraph (7) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting before the word "had" the phrase "completed 10 years of service and will have", and by inserting in the parenthetical phrase in subdivision (i), after the word "quarter" the following: "which is not a quarter of coverage and".

(e) Paragraph (8) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(8) An employee will have been 'partially insured' at the time of his death, whether before or after the enactment of this section, if it appears to the satisfaction of the Board that he will have completed 10 years of service and will have had (i) a current connection with the railroad industry, and (ii) six or more quarters of coverage in the period ending with the quarter in which he will have died or in which a retirement annuity will have begun to accrue to him and beginning with the third calendar year next preceding the year in which such event occurs."

(f) Paragraph (9) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by changing the language before the first proviso to read as follows:

"(9) An employee's 'average monthly remuneration' shall mean the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the sum of (i) the compensation paid to him after 1936 and before the quarter in which he will have died, eliminating any excess over $300 for any calendar month through 1951, and any excess over $400 for any calendar month after 1951 and (ii) if such compensation for any calendar year is less than $3,600 and the average monthly remuneration computed on compensation alone is less than $300 and the employee has earned in such calendar year 'wages' as defined in paragraph (6) hereof, such wages in an amount not to exceed the difference between the compensation for such year and $3,600, by (B) three times the number of quarters elapsing after 1936 and before the quarter in which he will have died"; by inserting in the second proviso after the word "quarter" the following: "which is not a quarter of coverage and", and by changing the period at the end of said proviso to a colon and adding the following: *"And provided further*, That if the exclusion from the divisor of all quarters after the first quarter in which the employee was completely insured and had attained the age of 65 and the exclusion from the dividend of all compensation and wages with respect to such quarters would result in a higher average monthly remuneration, such quarters, compensation and wages shall be so excluded."

(g) Paragraph (10) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting the phrase "'survivor's insurance annuity'" for the phrase "'basic amount'" wherever this phrase appears, by substituting in subdivisions (i) and (ii) of said paragraph "$100" for "$75", by substituting for "$250" in subdivision (i) the following: "$400 if wages are not included in the average monthly remuneration, or $300 if wages are included", and by striking out from subdivision (i) all the language after the phrase "plus (C)", up to and including the phrase "or more", and by substituting for said language the following: "$1 for each of his years of service after 1936", by substituting in said subdivision (i) "$20" for "$10" wherever the latter figures appear, by substituting in subdivision (ii) of said paragraph the phrase "the survivor's insurance annuity" for the phrases "the amount computed under this subdivision" and "such amount", by substituting "$35" for "$33 33", and for "$25" and substituting "$15" for "$13 33" and "$300" for "$250", and by striking out the phrase "four-thirds of".

SEC. 25. Section 17 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out "subsection (b) of".

AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

SEC. 26. Sections 1500, 1501 (a), 1510, and 1520 of the Railroad Retirement Tax Act are amended, effective with respect to compensation paid after December 31, 1951, by substituting for the figures "$300", wherever they appear in said sections, the figures "$400".

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 27. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided the amendments made by this act shall take effect with respect to benefits accruing under the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act after the last day of the month in which this act is enacted, irrespective of when service or employment occurred or compensation or wages were earned: *Provided, however*, That in the recomputation pursuant to this act of retirement and survivor annuities heretofore awarded, the monthly compensation and average monthly remuneration shall not be recomputed but shall be increased to the next highest multiple of $1.

(b) The amendments made by sections 3 and 22 of this act and the elimination of the language in section 3 (a) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act shall apply to benefits awarded in whole or in part after the enactment of this act.

(c) The amendments made by sections 4 and 21 with respect to "wages" and "net earnings from self-employment" shall not apply to "wages" from service, or to "net earnings from self-employment" in which an individual (other than a disability annuitant under the age of 65) in receipt of an annuity on the enactment date hereof was engaged on such date without forfeiting the annuity.

(d) The amendments made by sections 17 and 18 of this act shall take effect with respect to deaths occurring after the enactment of this act.

(e) With respect to retirement and survivor annuities currently payable and awarded under the Railroad Retirement Act prior to the enactment of this act to, and with respect to the death of, individuals who have completed less than 10 years of service, and with respect to spouses of such individuals during such individuals' lifetime, the amendments made by this act shall apply in the same manner as to, and with respect to the death of, individuals who have completed 10 years of service.

(f) All joint and survivor annuities heretofore and hereafter awarded shall, notwithstanding the provisions of law under which the election of the joint and survivor annuity was made, be increased to the amount that would have been payable had no election been made, if the spouse for whom the election was made predeceased the individual who made the election, such increased annuity shall, subject to the provisions of section 2 (c) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, begin to accrue on the first of the calendar month following the calendar month in which the spouse died but not before the calendar month next following the month of enactment hereof.

(g) All pensions due in months following the first calendar month after the enactment hereof, shall be increased by 15 percent.

(h) The increase in retirement annuities provided by this act shall apply also to annuities heretofore awarded under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935, and the term "spouse" shall include the wife or husband of an employee who has been awarded an annuity under that act. The provisions of this act shall not apply to annuities heretofore paid under the Railroad Retirement Acts in lump sums equal to their commuted values.

(i) The annuity of the spouse of an employee who has been awarded an annuity under section 3 (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 or under section 2 (a) 2 (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 prior to its amendment by Public Law 572, Seventy-ninth Congress, shall, subject to the provisions of this act, be one-half the annuity such employee would have received had the annuity been awarded at age 65.

(j) All recertifications required by reason of the provisions of this act other than section 10 shall be made without application therefor. Recomputations pursuant to sections 9 and 10 of this act shall be made only upon application therefor in such manner and form, and filed within such time as the Railroad Retirement Board may prescribe.

With the following committee amendment

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That section 1 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by adding after subsection (p) thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"'(q) The terms "Social Security Act" and 'Social Security Act, as amended' shall mean the Social Security Act as amended in 1950."

"SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by changing '2.40' to '2.76', '1.80' to '2.07', and '1.20' to '1.38'.

"SEC. 3. Subsection (e) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by changing the phrase 'subsection 2 (a) (3)' to 'section 2 (a) 3', and by changing '$3.60' to '$4.14' and '$60' to '$69'.

"SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out the phrase 'three-fourths of'.

"SEC. 5. Subsection (b) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out the phrase 'three-fourths of'.

"SEC. 6. Subsection (c) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase 'equal to one-half' the phrase 'equal to two-thirds'.

"SEC. 7. Subsection (d) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase 'equal to one-half' the phrase 'equal to two-thirds'.

"SEC. 8. Subsection (f) (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase 'eight times the employee's basic

amount' the phrase 'ten times the employee's basic amount.'

"SEC. 9 Subsection (h) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(h) Maximum and minimum annuity totals: Whenever according to the provisions of this section as to annuities, payable for a month with respect to the death of an employee, the total of annuities is more than $30 and exceeds either (a) $160, or (b) an amount equal to two and two-thirds times such employee's basic amount, whichever of such amounts is the lesser, such total of annuities shall, prior to any deductions under subsection (l), be reduced to such lesser amount or to $30, whichever is greater. Whenever such total of annuities is less than $14, such total shall, prior to any deductions under subsection (l), be increased to $14.'

"EFFECTIVE DATES

"SEC 10. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided, the amendments made by this act shall take effect with respect to benefits accruing under the Railroad Retirement Act after the last day of the month in which this act is enacted, irrespective of when the service occurred or compensation was earned.

"(b) The amendments made by sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of this act shall take effect with respect to deaths occurring after the enactment of this act.

"(c) All retirement annuities, all pensions, and all joint and survivor annuities deriving from joint and survivor annuities currently payable and awarded under the Railroad Retirement Act prior to the enactment of this act and due in months following the first calendar month after the enactment of this act, shall be increased by 15 percent.

"(d) All monthly survivor annuities currently payable and awarded under the Railroad Retirement Act prior to the enactment of this act and due in months following the first calendar month after the enactment of this act, shall be increased by 33⅓ percent.

"(e) All recertifications required by reason of the provisions of this act shall be made without application therefor."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to preface my remarks by saying that this is a most important bill. It deals with the first retirement system set up by the railroad industry. I want to call your attention to this fact, that the Railroad Retirement Act was first legislated upon in 1934. It was held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States. They then came in and passed an act in 1935 and that was also held to be partially unconstitutional, whereupon they got together by agreement in which they did write a Railroad Retirement Act which was not contested but which the railroad management and the railroad brotherhoods agreed upon, and that has been in operation since that time.

Now this is an act that was passed upon and based upon an agreement between the parties, and what the committee desires to do is to bring about an agreement among the various railroad brotherhoods and the various boards that have to administer it. Now let us see. Your committee had lengthy hearings on this bill. We did not come to an agreement because of the fact that the railroad brotherhoods themselves had no agreement. The Social Security Board was not in agreement. The Bureau of the Budget was not in agreement and the Railroad Retirement Board was not in agreement. There was a split everywhere. We recognized the fact that there was some need for an increase of benefits to annuitants and pensioners and also to survivors, and therefore your committee, by a vote of 18 out of a membership, I believe, of 30, recommended for the time being, in order that these railroad employees and pensioners and annuitants might get some relief which they need now, an across-the-board increase of 15 percent to annuitants and 33⅓ percent to the survivors, until we could have a further study, a study that was recommended, as I say to the membership of this House, by the Bureau of the Budget, one member of the Railroad Retirement Board, and also the Security Administration, which is the Social Security Board.

We are proposing here what I think will meet the situation and take care of those who need it until the people who are supposed to know something about it can come in and agree. We ought to send it back to them and say, "Get together." That is what President Roosevelt told them in 1934 when it was held unconstitutional. He said, "If you people do not get together, management and railroad brotherhoods, you are not going to get anything." I think today, if this thing was contested, it could still be held unconstitutional. We only ask this House to provide some relief until we can have a study. Now who can object to that? It will not be long. We will come back here on January 3, and if we can get the various boards together and get their cooperation with the committee, then we can study it and bring in a bill, and I will say that the railroad brotherhoods can get together and agree on it, and management can get together and agree on it. As a matter of fact, management has very little to say for the reason that this is an extra tax that is imposed upon them. The railroads will not bear it, but you will bear it by an increase in freight rates and passenger fares. That is what will happen. I understand that in the increase that was granted to the railroads a few days ago ICC took into consideration the fact that there was an increase in the tax that the railroads had to pay. So, do not base it on the fact that it is the railroads that are being hurt, but it is the common man that will have to pay in increased freight rates and passenger fares for the railroads will pass it on.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. CROSSER for the committee amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute the following: "That section 1 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting in the last sentence of subsection (f) thereof the phrase '126' for the phrase '54' and by adding after subsection (p) thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(q) The terms "Social Security Act" and "Social Security Act, as amended" shall mean the Social Security Act as amended in 1950.'

"SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting in the first sentence thereof, after 'enactment date,' the following: 'and shall have completed 10 years of service,'; by inserting in the first sentence of paragraph 5 of said subsection, a period after the phrase 'regular employment' and striking out all of that sentence following that phrase; and by striking out the next to the last sentence of such subsection (a).

"SEC. 3. Subsection (c) of section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase '60 days,' the phrase '6 months.'

"SEC. 4. Subsection (d) of section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) No annuity shall be paid with respect to any month in which an individual (i) is receiving an annuity under paragraph 1, 2, or 3 of subsection (a), or under paragraph 4 or 5 thereof after attaining age 65, is under the age of 75, and shall earn more than $50 in "compensation" or "wages" or both, or be charged with more than $50 in "net earnings from self-employment", or (ii) is receiving an annuity under paragraph 4 or 5 of subsection (a), is under the age of sixty-five, and shall earn more than $100 in "compensation" or "wages" or both, or be charged with more than $100 in "net earnings from self-employment." Individuals in receipt of annuities shall report to the Board immediately all such compensation, wages, and earnings.'

"SEC. 5 Section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by adding after subsection (d) thereof the following new subsections:

"'(e) For the purpose of this section and of subsection (i) (1) (i) of section 5, "wages" shall mean wages as defined in section 209 of the Social Security Act, without regard to subsection (a) thereof; and "net earnings from self-employment" shall be determined as provided in section 211 (a) of the Social Security Act and charged to correspond to the provisions of section 203 (e) of that act.

"'(f) Spouse's annuity: The spouse of an individual, if—

"'(i) such individual has been awarded an annuity under subsection (a) or a pension under section 6 and has attained the age of 65, and

"'(ii) such spouse has attained the age of 65 or, in the case of a wife, has in her care (individually or jointly with her husband) a child who, if her husband were then to die, would be entitled to a child's annuity under subsection (c) of section 5 of this act,

shall be entitled to a spouse's annuity equal to one-half of such individual's annuity or pension, but not more than $50: *Provided, however,* That if the annuity of the individual is awarded under paragraph 3 of subsection (a), the spouse's annuity shall be computed or recomputed as though such individual had been awarded the annuity to which he would have been entitled under paragraph 1 of said subsection: *Provided further,* That if the annuity of the individual is awarded pursuant to a joint and survivor election, the spouse's annuity shall be computed or recomputed as though such individual had not made a joint and survivor election: *And provided further,* That any spouse's annuity shall be reduced by the amount of any annuity and the amount of any monthly insurance benefit, other than a wife's or husband's insurance benefit, to which such spouse is entitled, or on proper application would be entitled, under subsection (a) of this section or subsection (d) of section 5 of this act or section 202 of the Social Security Act; except that if such spouse is disentitled to a wife's or husband's insurance benefit, or has had such benefit

reduced, by reason of subsection (k) of section 202 of the Social Security Act, the reduction pursuant to this third proviso shall be only in the amount by which such spouse's monthly insurance benefit under said act exceeds the wife's or husband's insurance benefit to which such spouse would have been entitled under that act but for said subsection (k).

"'(g) For the purposes of this act, the term "spouse" shall mean the wife or husband of a retirement annuitant or pensioner who (i) was married to such annuitant or pensioner for a period of not less than 3 years immediately preceding the day on which the application for a spouse's annuity is filed, or is the parent of such annuitant's or pensioner's son or daughter, if, as of the day on which the application for a spouse's annuity is filed, such wife or husband and such annuitant or pensioner were members of the same household, or such wife or husband was receiving regular contributions from such annuitant or pensioner toward her or his support, or such annuitant or pensioner has been ordered by any court to contribute to the support of such wife or husband, or such wife or husband and such annuitant or pensioner were not members of the same household and the separation was due to or procured by the annuitant or pensioner without the fault of such wife or husband, and (ii) in the case of a husband, was receiving at least one-half of his support from his wife at the time his wife's retirement annuity or pension began

"'(h) The spouse's annuity provided in subsection (f) shall, with respect to any month, be subject to the same provisions of subsection (d) with regard to "compensation," "wages," and "net earnings from self-employment" as the individual's annuity, and, in addition, the spouse's annuity shall not be payable for any month if the individual's annuity is not payable for such month (or, in the case of a pensioner, would not be payable if the pension were an annuity) by reason of the provisions of said subsection (d) Such spouse's annuity shall cease at the end of the month preceding the month in which (i) the spouse or the individual dies, (ii) the spouse and the individual are absolutely divorced, or (iii) in the case of a wife under age 65, she no longer has in her care a child who, if her husband were then to die, would be entitled to an annuity under subsection (c) of section 5 of this act'

"SEC 6 Subsection (a) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by changing '2 40' to '2 80', '1 80' to '2 00', and '1 20' to '1 40', and by striking out the phrase 'next $150' and substituting for said phrase the following: 'remainder of his "monthly compensation".'

"SEC 7 Subsection (b) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting (in each instance in the parenthetic phrase of paragraph (1) 'his "monthly compensation"' for '$300', by striking out all of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following paragraph:

"'The retirement annuity or pension of an individual, and the annuity of his spouse, if any, shall be reduced, beginning with the month in which such individual is, or on proper application would be, entitled to an old-age insurance benefit under the Social Security Act, as follows (i) in the case of the individual's retirement annuity, by that portion of such annuity which is based on his years of service and compensation before 1937, or by the amount of such old-age insurance benefit, whichever is less, (ii) in the case of the individual's pension, by the amount of such old-age insurance benefit, and (iii) in the case of the spouse's annuity, to one-half the individual's retirement annuity or pension (as reduced pursuant to clause (i) or clause (ii) of this paragraph): *Provided, however*, That in the case of any individual receiving or entitled to receive an annuity or pension on the day prior to the date of enactment of this paragraph, the reductions required by this paragraph shall not operate to reduce the sum of (A) the retirement annuity or pension of the individual, (B) the spouse's annuity, if any, and (C) the benefits under the Social Security Act which the individual and his family receive or are entitled to receive on the basis of his wages, to an amount less than such sum was before the enactment of this paragraph'

"SEC 8 Subsection (c) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting in the last sentence thereof after '$300' the following: 'through the calendar year 1951, and in excess of $400 thereafter'

"SEC 9 Subsection (e) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out the phrase 'and not less than five years of service', by changing the phrase 'subsection 2 (a) (3)' to 'section 2 (a) 3 or the last paragraph of section 3 (b)', by changing '$3 60' to '$4 10', and '$60' to '$68', and by changing the period at the end of the subsection to a colon and inserting after the colon the following '*Provided, however*, That if for any entire month in which an annuity accrues and is payable under this act the annuity to which an employee is entitled under this act (or would have been entitled except for a reduction pursuant to section 2 (a) 3 or a joint and survivor election), together with his or her spouse's annuity, if any, or the total of survivor annuities under this act deriving from the same employee, is less than the amount, or the additional amount, which would have been payable to all persons for such month under the Social Security Act (deeming completely and partially insured individuals to be fully and concurrently insured, respectively, and disregarding any possible deductions under subsections (f) and (g) (2) of section 203 thereof) if such employee's service as an employee after December 31, 1936, were included in the term "employment" as defined in that act and quarters of coverage were determined in accordance with section 5 (i) (4) of this act, such annuity or annuities, shall be increased proportionately to a total of such amount or such additional amount'

"SEC 10 Section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out subsection (h) thereof and by redesignating subsection (j) thereof as subsection (h).

"SEC 11 Subsection (k) of section 4 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase 'sixty days' the phrase 'six months'

"SEC 12 Subsection (a) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting 'and Widower's' after 'Widow's', by inserting 'or widower' after 'widow', by inserting 'or his' after 'her,' by inserting 'or he' after 'she', and by substituting for the phrase 'an annuity for each month equal to three-fourths of the employee's basic amount' the following: 'a survivor's insurance annuity: *Provided, however*, That if in the month preceding the employee's death the spouse of such employee was entitled to a spouse's annuity under subsection (f) of section 2 in an amount greater than the survivor's insurance annuity, the widow's or widower's annuity shall be increased to such greater amount'

"SEC 13 Subsection (b) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase 'an annuity for each month equal to three-fourths of the employee's basic amount' the following: 'a survivor's insurance annuity: *Provided, however*, That if in the month preceding the employee's death the spouse of such employee was entitled to a spouse's annuity under subsection (f) of section 2 in an amount greater than the survivor's insurance annuity, the widow's current insurance annuity shall be increased to such greater amount'

"SEC. 14 Subsection (c) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase 'an annuity for each month equal to one-half of the employee's basic amount' the following 'a survivor's insurance annuity: *Provided, however*, That if the employee is survived by more than one child entitled to an annuity hereunder, each such child's annuity shall be (i) two-thirds of a survivor's insurance annuity plus (ii) one-third of a survivor's insurance annuity divided by the number of such children'

"SEC 15 Subsection (d) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting, ', no widower,' after 'widow', and by substituting for the phrase 'an annuity for each month equal to one-half of the employee's basic amount' the phrase 'a survivor's insurance annuity'.

"SEC 16 Subsection (e) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out all after the phrase 'whose death' and substituting the following 'the same two or more children are entitled to annuities for a month under subsection (c), any application of each such child shall be deemed to be filed with respect to the death of only that one of such employees from whom may be derived a survivor's insurance annuity for each child under subsection (c) in an amount equal to or in excess of that which may be derived from any other of such employees'

"SEC 17 Subsection (f) (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting ', widower' after the word 'widow' where this word first appears, by substituting in the first sentence 'twelve times the survivor's insurance annuity' for 'eight times the employee's basic amount', by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following 'Upon the death, on or after the date of enactment hereof, of a completely or partially insured employee who will have died leaving a widow, widower, child, or parent who would on proper application therefor be entitled to an annuity under this section for the month in which such death occurred, there shall be paid a lump sum of four times the survivor's insurance annuity to the person or persons in the order provided in this paragraph', by inserting before 'would' in the fourth sentence thereof the following 'of twelve times the survivor's insurance annuity', by inserting in that sentence 'widower,' after the word 'widow,' wherever it appears, and by substituting in that sentence the phrase 'eight times the survivor's insurance annuity' for the phrase 'such lump sum' wherever it appears

"SEC 18. Subsection (f) (2) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting ', widower,' after the word 'widow' wherever this word appears, by inserting 'or her' after the words 'his' and 'him' wherever these words appear, by inserting after '$300' the following 'through the calendar year 1951 and $400 thereafter'; by inserting immediately before ', or to others' in the first sentence the following ', and to others deriving from him or her, during his or her life,', by changing the period at the end of said subsection to a comma and by inserting after the comma the following 'except that the deductions of the benefits paid pursuant to subsection (k) of this section under section 202 of the Social Security Act, during the life of the employee to him or to her and to others deriving from him or her, shall be limited to such portions of such benefits as

are payable solely by reason of the inclusion of service as an employee in "employment" pursuant to said subsection (k).'

"SEC. 19. Subsection (g) (2) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) If an individual is entitled to more than one annuity for a month under this section, such individual shall be entitled only to that one of such annuities for a month which is equal to or exceeds any other such annuity If an individual is entitled to an annuity for a month under this section and is entitled, or would be so entitled on proper application therefor, for such month to an insurance benefit under section 202 of the Social Security Act, the annuity of such individual for such month under this section shall be only in the amount by which it exceeds such insurance benefit. If an individual is entitled to an annuity for a month under this section and also to a retirement annuity, the annuity of such individual for a month under this section shall be only in the amount by which it exceeds such retirement annuity.

"'(3) In the case of any individual receiving or entitled to receive an annuity under this section on the day prior to the date of enactment of the provisions of this paragraph, the application of paragraph (2) of this subsection to such individual shall not operate to reduce the sum of (A) the annuity under this section of such individual, (B) the retirement annuity, if any, of such individual, and (C) the benefits under the Social Security Act which such individual receives or is entitled to receive, to an amount less than such sum was before the enactment of the provisions of this paragraph'

"SEC. 20 Subsection (h) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(h) Maximum and minimum annuity totals: Whenever according to the provisions of this section the total of annuities payable for a month with respect to the death of an employee, after any adjustment pursuant to subsection (g) (2) and after any deductions under subsection (i), is more than $40 and exceeds an amount equal to two and two-thirds times a survivor's insurance annuity, such total of annuities shall, subject to the provisos in subsection (e) of section 3 and in subsection (a) and (b) of this section, be reduced proportionately to such amount or to $40, whichever is greater. Whenever according to the provisions of this section the total of annuities payable for a month with respect to the death of an employee is less than $20 such total shall, prior to any adjustment pursuant to subsection (g) (2) and prior to any deduction under subsection (i), be increased proportionately to $20.'

"SEC 21 Subdivisions (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv) of paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"'(i) is under the age of 75 and will have earned more than $50 in "compensation" or "years" or both, or will have been charged with more than $50 in "net earnings from self-employment"; or

"'(ii) if a widow otherwise entitled to an annuity under subsection (b) will not have had in her care a child of the deceased employee entitled to receive an annuity under subsection (c),'

"SEC 22 Subsection (j) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out all of the third sentence thereof after the phrase 'the month in which' (including the proviso), and substituting the following: 'eligibility therefore was otherwise acquired, but not earlier than the first day of the sixth month before the month in which the application was filed.'

"SEC. 23. (a) Paragraph (1) of subsection (k) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting '(1)' after the word 'determining' and by inserting in said paragraph after the word 'Act' where it first appears the following: 'to an employee who will have completed less than 10 years of service and to others deriving from him or her during his or her life and with respect to his or her death, and lump-sum death payments with respect to the death of such employee, and (ii) insurance benefits with respect to the death of an employee who will have completed 10 years of service'; by striking in said paragraph after '1947,' the following 'to a widow, parent, or surviving child,'; by inserting before the word 'occurring' the phrase 'of such an employee'; by inserting after the phrase 'such date' the following ', and for the purposes of section 203 of that act'; by substituting in said paragraph '210 (a) (10)' for '209 (b) (9)'; and by inserting at the end of such paragraph (1) the following sentence. 'In the application of the Social Security Act pursuant to this paragraph to service as an employee, all service as defined in section 1 (c) of this act shall be deemed to have been performed within the United States.'

"(b) Subsection (k) (2) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting the following.

"'(2) (A) The Board and the Federal Security Administrator shall determine, no later than January 1, 1954, the amount which would place the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund (hereafter termed "Trust Fund") in the same position in which it would have been at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, if service as an employee after December 31, 1936, have been included in the term "employment" as defined in the Social Security Act and in the Federal Insurance Contributions Act

"'(B) On January 1, 1954, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and at the close of each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, the Board and the Federal Security Administrator shall determine, and the Board shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for transfer from the Railroad Retirement Account (hereafter termed "retirement account") to the trust fund, interest for such fiscal year at the rate specified in subparagraph (D) on the amount determined under subparagraph (A) less the sum of all offsets made under subparagraph (C)

"'(C) At the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Board and the Federal Security Administrator shall determine the amount, if any, which if added to or subtracted from the trust fund would place such trust fund in the same position in which it would have been if service as an employee after December 31, 1936, had been included in the term "employment" as defined in the Social Security Act and in the Federal Insurance Contributions Act. For the purposes of this subparagraph, the amount determined under subparagraph (A), less such offsets as have theretofore been made under this subparagraph, and the amount determined under subparagraph (B) for the fiscal year under consideration shall be deemed to be part of the trust fund. Such determination shall be made no later than June 15, following the close of the fiscal year. If such amount is to be added to the trust fund, the Board shall, within 10 days after the determination, certify such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury for transfer from the retirement account to the trust fund, if such amount is to be subtracted from the trust fund, the Administrator shall, within 10 days after the determination, certify such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury for transfer from the trust fund to the retirement account. The amount so certified shall further include interest (at the rate determined in subparagraph (D) for the fiscal year under consideration) payable from the close of such fiscal year until the date of certification. In the event the Administrator is required under the provisions of this subparagraph to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury an amount to be transferred to the retirement account from the trust fund, the Administrator, in lieu of such certification, may offset the amount determined under the first sentence of this subparagraph against the amount determined in subparagraph (A) as diminished by any prior offsets and the offset shall be made to be effective as of the first day of the fiscal year following the fiscal year under consideration.

"'(D) For the purposes of subparagraphs (B) and (C), for any fiscal year, the rate of interest to be used shall be equal to the average rate of interest, computed as of May 31 preceding the close of such fiscal year, borne by all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt, except that where such average rate is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent, the rate of interest shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent next lower than such average rate.

"'(E) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer to the trust fund from the retirement account or to the retirement account from the trust fund, as the case may be, such amounts as, from time to time, may be determined by the Board and the Federal Security Administrator pursuant to the provisions of subparagraphs (B) and (C) of this subsection, and certified by the Board or the Administrator for transfer from the retirement account or from the trust fund'

"SEC 24. (a) (1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting '"widower",' after '"widow",' where this word first appears, by substituting '216 (c), (e), and (g)' for '209 (j) and (k)', and by substituting '202 (h)' for '202 (f).'

"(2) The said paragraph (1) is further amended by striking out subdivision (i) thereof and inserting in lieu of such subdivision the following:

"'(i) a "widow" or "widower" shall have been living with the employee at the time of the employee's death, or he or she shall not have been so living with the employee and the separation shall have been due to or procured by the employee without the fault of the employee's death, or he or she shall have received at least one-half of his support from his wife employee at the time of her death or he shall have received at least one-half of his support from his wife employee at the time her retirement annuity or pension began. For the purposes of subsections (b) and (i) (1) (ii) of this section, the term "widow" shall include a woman who has been divorced from the employee if she (A) is the mother of his son or daughter, (B) legally adopted his son or daughter while she was married to him and while such son or daughter was under the age of 18, or (C) was married to him at the time both of them legally adopted a child under the age of 18; and if she received from the employee (pursuant to agreement or court order) at least one-half of her support at the time of the employee's death, and the child in her care referred to in subsection (b) is the child described in clauses (A), (B), and (C) entitled to a survivor's insurance annuity under subsection (c) with respect to the death of such employee;'.

"(3) The said paragraph (1) is further amended by inserting in subdivision (ii) after the phrase 'such death' the following: 'by other than a stepparent, grandparent, aunt, or uncle'; by substituting in subdivision (iii) for the phrase 'shall have been wholly dependent upon and supported at the time of his death by' the phrase 'shall have received at least one-half of his support from', and by changing the semicolon after

the phrase 'is claimed' in said subdivision (iii) to a period and striking out the portion of the sentence following that phrase.

"(4) Paragraph (1) of the said subsection (l) is further amended by substituting for all the matter which follows subdivision (iii) the following. 'A "widow" or "widower" shall be deemed to have been living with the employee if the conditions set forth in section 216 (h) (2) or (3), whichever is applicable, of the Social Security Act are fulfilled A "child" shall be deemed to have been dependent upon a parent if the conditions set forth in section 202 (d) (3), (4), or (5) of the Social Security Act are fulfilled (a partially insured mother being deemed currently insured). In determining for purposes of this section and subsection (g) of section 2 whether an applicant is the wife, husband, widow, widower, child, or parent of an employee as claimed, the rules set forth in section 216 (h) (1) of the Social Security Act shall be applied.'.

"(b) Paragraph (4) of subsection (l) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting after the table the following 'If upon computation of the compensation quarters of coverage in accordance with the above table an employee is found to lack a completely or partially insured status which he would have if compensation paid in a calendar year were presumed to have been paid in equal proportions with respect to all months in the year in which the employee will have been in service as an employee, such presumption shall be made'

"(c) Paragraph (6) of subsection (l) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking '(a)' after '209' and by inserting after the word 'act', the following. ', and, in addition (i) "self-employment income" as defined in section 211 (b) of that act and (ii) wages deemed to have been paid under section 217 (a) of that act on account of military service which is not creditable under section 4 of this act'.

"(d) Paragraph (7) of subsection (l) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting before the word 'had' the phrase 'completed 10 years of service and will have', and by inserting in the parenthetical phrase in subdivision (1), after the word 'quarter' the following. 'which is not a quarter of coverage and'

"(e) Paragraph (8) of subsection (l) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(8) An employee will have been "partially insured" at the time of his death, whether before or after the enactment of this section, if it appears to the satisfaction of the Board that he will have completed 10 years of service and will have had (i) a current connection with the railroad industry; and (ii) six or more quarters of coverage in the period ending with the quarter in which he will have died or in which a retirement annuity will have begun to accrue to him and beginning with the third calendar year next preceding the year in which such event occurs.'

"(f) Paragraph (9) of subsection (l) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by changing the language before the first proviso to read as follows:

"'(9) An employee's 'average monthly remuneration" shall mean the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the sum of (i) the compensation paid to him after 1936 and before the quarter in which he will have died, eliminating any excess over $300 for any calendar month through 1951, and any excess over $400 for any calendar month after 1951, and (ii) if such compensation for any calendar year is less than $3,600 and the average monthly remuneration computed on compensation alone is less than $300 and the employee has earned in such calendar year "wages" as defined in paragraph (6) hereof, such wages, in an amount not to exceed the difference between the compensation for such year and $3,600, by (B) three times the number of quarters elapsing after 1936 and before the quarter in which he will have died ', by inserting in the second proviso after the word 'quarter' the following: 'which is not a quarter of coverage and'; and by changing the period at the end of said proviso to a colon and adding the following: '*And provided further*, That if the exclusion from the divisor of all quarters beginning with the first quarter in which the employee was completely insured and had attained the age of 65 and the exclusion from the dividend of all compensation and wages with respect to such quarters would result in a higher average monthly remuneration, such quarters, compensation, and wages shall be so excluded'

"(g) Paragraph (10) of subsection (l) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting the phrase '"survivor's insurance annuity"' for the phrase '"basic amount"' wherever this phrase appears, by substituting in subdivisions (i) and (ii) of said paragraph '$100' for '$75', by substituting for '$250' in subdivision (i) the following '$400 if wages are not included in the average monthly remuneration, or $300 if wages are included', and by striking out from subdivision (i) all the language after the phrase 'plus (C)', up to and including the phrase 'or more', and by substituting for said language the following '$1 for each of his years of service after 1936', by substituting in said subdivision (i) '$20' for '$10' wherever the latter figures appear, by substituting in subdivision (ii) of said paragraph the phrase 'the survivor's insurance annuity' for the phrases 'the amount computed under this subdivision' and 'such amount', by substituting '$35' for '$33 33' and for '$25' and substituting '$15' for '$13 33' and '$300' for '$250', and by striking out the phrase 'four-thirds of'.

"Sec. 25 Section 17 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out 'subsection (b) of'.

"AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

"Sec. 26 Sections 1500, 1501 (a), 1510, and 1520 of the Railroad Retirement Tax Act are amended, effective with respect to compensation paid after December 31, 1951, for services rendered after such date, by substituting for the figures '$300', wherever they appear in said sections, the figures '$400'.

"EFFECTIVE DATES

"Sec. 27. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided the amendments made by this act shall take effect with respect to benefits accruing under the Railroad Retirement Acts and the Social Security Act after the last day of the month in which this act is enacted, irrespective of when service or employment occurred or compensation or wages were earned. *Provided, however*, That in the recomputation pursuant to this act of retirement and survivor annuities heretofore awarded, the monthly compensation and average monthly remuneration shall not be recomputed but shall be increased to the next highest multiple of one dollar.

"(b) The amendments made by sections 3, 11, and 22 of this act shall apply to benefits awarded in whole or in part on or after the date of enactment of this act

"(c) The amendments made by sections 4 and 21 with respect to 'wages' and 'net earnings from self-employment' shall not apply to 'wages' from service, or to 'net earnings from self-employment' in which an individual (other than a disability annuitant under the age of 65) in receipt of an annuity on the date of enactment hereof was engaged on such date without forfeiting the annuity

"(d) The amendments made by sections 17 and 18 of this act shall take effect with respect to deaths occurring on or after the date of enactment of this act

"(e) With respect to retirement and survivor annuities currently payable and awarded under the Railroad Retirement Act prior to the date of enactment of this act to, and with respect to the death of, individuals who have completed less than 10 years of service, and with respect to spouses of such individuals during such individuals' lifetime, the amendments made by this act shall apply in the same manner as to, and with respect to the death of, individuals who have completed 10 years of service. Where the parent of a deceased employee has, prior to the date of enactment of this act, been awarded a survivor annuity under the Railroad Retirement Acts which is currently payable, the entitlement of such parent to a survivor's insurance annuity in accordance with the amendments made by this act shall be determined without regard to whether or not such employee died leaving a widower or a child

"(f) All joint and survivor annuities heretofore and hereafter awarded shall, notwithstanding the provisions of law under which the election of the joint and survivor annuity was made, be increased to the amount that would have been payable had no election been made, if the spouse for whom the election was made predeceased the individual who made the election; such increased annuity shall, subject to the provisions of section 2 (c) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, begin to accrue on the first of the calendar month following the calendar month in which the spouse died but not before the calendar month next following the month of enactment hereof

"(g) All pensions due in months following the first calendar month after the enactment hereof, shall be increased by 15 percent.

"(h) The increase in retirement annuities provided by this act shall apply also to annuities heretofore awarded under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935, and the term 'spouse' shall include the wife or husband of an employee who has been awarded an annuity under that act The provisions of this act shall not apply to annuities heretofore paid under the Railroad Retirement Acts in lump sums equal to their commuted values

"(i) The annuity of the spouse of an employee who has been awarded an annuity under section 3 (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 or under section 2 (a) 2 (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 prior to its amendment by Public Law 572, Seventy-ninth Congress, hall, subject to the provisions of this act, be one-half the annuity such employee would have received had the annuity been awarded at age 65

"(j) All recertifications by the Railroad Retirement Board required by reason of the provisions of this act other than section 10 shall be made without application therefor. Recertifications pursuant to section 10 of this act shall be made only upon application therefor in such manner and form, and filed within such time, as the Railroad Retirement Board may prescribe."

Mr. HARRIS (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, this is obviously a copy of the original bill, H. R. 3669, which was introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, chairman of our committee. It contains 24 pages, and it is all highly technical language.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I want to correct one statement that the

gentleman makes, and that is that this bill is very much different from the other bill.

Mr. HARRIS. I accept the gentleman's explanation, if that is the case, of course. I have not had a chance to read it.

Mr. CROSSER. This contains a number of amendments, which were not in the original bill.

Mr HARRIS. In view of that situation, Mr. Chairman, and in order that we might make some progress on it since many of us are quite familiar with this, I wonder if it might not be in order to ask unanimous consent that the substitute amendment be considered as read, and printed in the RECORD at this point so that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], our chairman, may proceed to explain the changes in the provisions of the bill I would make that request if it is agreeable to our chairman.

Mr. CROSSER. I think the Clerk should read more of the amendment.

Mr HARRIS Mr. Chairman, in deference to my chairman's wishes, I will, of course, not submit the request

(The Clerk continued the reading of the amendment)

Mr. ALBERT (interrupting the reading of the substitute). Mr Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN The Chair will count [After counting] One hundred and twenty-two Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk continued the reading of the substitute

Mr. HINSHAW (interrupting the reading of the substitute) Mr Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the substitute amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. O'HARA I object, Mr Chairman.

The Clerk continued the reading of the substitute

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN The gentleman from Ohio [Mr CROSSER] is recognized in support of his amendment

Mr HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr CROSSER. I yield

Mr HALE. Mr Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be rereported because I found it extremely difficult to follow the first reading.

Mr KLEIN and Mr. PERKINS objected

Mr. CROSSER Mr Chairman, it is almost impossible and very difficult to discuss the question before the House with the sort of good patience that I like to have on all occasions. At one time or another, there have been many things that have been rather exasperating in my experience with this legislation. After all, however, according to the conceptions some have in regard to proper procedure, we must expect such experiences

Mr. Chairman, I think everyone who has given this matter his or her attention realizes that if we can do so, we should provide benefits to the greatest extent possible in order to meet the difficult situation confronting the great rank and file of railroad workers of the United States at the present time and I assure you that H R. 3669 as originally introduced represents an earned effort to provide such benefits. The measure which has just been presented to you is the result of work not only by the best special experts who were available, but also by the expert railroad labor men themselves, and by Members of Congress whose hearts were in the cause. These persons spent at least 10 months struggling earnestly to secure the very best bill that could be obtained without jeopardizing the financial stability of the retirement system, and at the same time bring reasonable relief to the rank and file of the railroad workers of the United States. I can say with every assurance, that that is what we have done. The course pursued by those frantically engaged in trying to discredit persons participating in the preparation or advocacy of the original H. R 3669, when they say: "Let us go straight across the board with a proposal to increase benefits by say, 10 percent, 12 percent, or something like 15 percent and in that way save the trouble of thinking" I say that that is all rubbish. This measure required the very best thought of the experts employed by the railway-labor people, the officials of the Railroad Retirement Board, some of the railway-labor officials themselves, as well as some of the Members of Congress. They have been a source of great help to us because of the fact that they could give us information that nobody else could give us. The Railroad Retirement Board has earnestly approved this legislation by a vote of 2 to 1 all the way through.

You understand, of course, how the members of the Railroad Retirement Board are appointed. The original law required, as does the present law, that the President appoint one member on the recommendation of the railroad industry; one member on the recommendation of the railway labor workers, and one of his own choosing from the public at large. All through this controversy—and I have checked it so that there will be no mistake about it—the Railroad Labor Board, 2 to 1, has been strongly in favor of the measure, H. R. 3669, as originally introduced by me.

I have no quarrel with the member recommended by the railroad companies. It is probably natural for him to hold the philosophy of the railroad owners and so I am not quarreling with him. The Railroad Retirement Board has recommended H. R. 3669, as originally introduced, as a well-rounded-out measure calculated to meet the very trying situation that confronts the railroad workers of the United States at the present time. A majority of the Board will tell you that the other measures are wholly insufficient to fulfill the requirements. This measure, paraded here, as the opposition bill, is substantially what the railroads themselves requested. Such being the case the Association of American Railroads very glibly and eagerly endorse their bill rather than mine. That does not surprise me. I would have been stunned if they had endorsed H. R. 3669, as originally introduced by me. The older Members of the House remember, however, that we have had this struggle for years between the railroad workers on one side and on the other side, we have been accustomed to see the railroad owners and their unions with their chatter against our bill and about those whose duty is to uphold the bill. It is just about the same line-up as has always been the case.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSSER. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Is it not true that the four operating brotherhoods are against the Crosser bill?

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, let me tell you: I have never yet come before the House when I did not have officials of at least one or more of the unions in opposition to the bill supported by me. During the long struggle for the 1946 amendments, which ended most successfully in the late summer of 1946, the official representatives of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers spoke at great length and also extended additional remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. LEONARD W HALL. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but during this time I wish the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] would explain the provisions of his present amendment which are different from the original Crosser bill, H. R. 3669.

Mr. CROSSER. In other words, you would like to have me devote my time and attention to things that you think will be the least significant and so have no time to discuss the main advantages of our measure. Come over after the House will have adjourned, when we will have lots of time, and I will tell you all about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSSER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. In the revised bill there is at least one amendment, for example, that we considered in the committee. That is the Heselton amendment. That is an amendment which would permit a wife or husband who does not wish to obtain a divorce or separation order to get the spouse's benefit if it were shown that she or he were not at fault with reference to the separation. That is one of the amendments.

Still another very major amendment is one that was passed——

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Will you permit me to make my statement first, please, and then I will yield.

I started to point out a very important amendment which I understand is found on page 16. In effect, it is a provision that was placed in the Senate bill, which is incorporated in this bill, that protects the railroad retirement fund and the social-security fund, so that the social-security fund will neither gain nor lose because of the separate existence of the railroad-retirement system. As I understand it, this provision was agreed to by the Bureau of the Budget the Federal Security Agency, and the Railway Labor Executives Association.

Mr CROSSER. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may use some of my own time, I would state that although these amendments are new, they are not half as complicated as the opponents of original H. R 3669 have tried to make them appear; they are relatively simple, in my opinion

Mr. O'HARA Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr CROSSER I yield to the gentleman briefly

Mr. O'HARA. I noticed on going through the gentleman's amendment that there were 15 pages which partially, at least, or in full, were new in the bill or in the gentleman's original bill In all fairness to the Committee, would the gentleman touch on the important ones which he feels we should understand?

Mr CROSSER. I want to do just that, Mr. Chairman; I would like to make a speech in answer to some of the prattle we have heard today, if you will excuse me, and I mean no offense to anyone

After all, this is a very plain commonsense proposition We are just simply trying to see to it that these men who largely by their own effort, back in the early thirties established this retirement system, are not compelled to witness the ruination of their retirement system

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr WOLVERTON. Mr Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for five additional minutes to explain the changes in the bill.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to state that I sat over here during all the general debate on the bill and I have listened to all this reading and to the speeches thus far, and I do not know one blamed thing about any bill that is before this House on this subject, and I do not believe anybody else does who is not on the committee. I would like to know something of what all these bills are about.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for five additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROSSER. I want to say some things in regard to the tactics that have been employed throughout this debate. It does not seem to make any difference what bill, amendment, or substitute is under consideration; it seems to be more a question of trying to discredit someone.

The railroad workers, as I say, established a statutory retirement system and in it they provided that the Government would not be required to contribute a penny toward the expense The railroad workers and the employers of the United States paid equal amounts toward the maintenance of the railroad retirement system; each pays an equal amount into the treasury of the Railroad Retirement Board. It was their own plan, their own wish that led to that decision They had nothing like what the civil service and other retirement systems had in the way of help from outside their organizations They maintained the system with the contributions of their employers and their own resources. I think that has been a commendable achievement and they have never complained about it. They desire to continue in that way

I desire to call your attention to the fact that never have we brought before the House a retirement bill or amendments thereto when we did not hear a great hue and cry "Oh, let us do some more studying, let us have an investigation," every time we brought out a bill for consideration. There is no necessity for an investigation.

We went on without any investigation and we have established what almost everybody admits is the best retirement system in the country today. But the opposition always proposes studies or investigations when they desire to prevent legislation.

In 1935 they came to me when they were hard-pressed and wanted to know what I would think of appointing a commission consisting of nine members, three to be appointed from the Senate, three from the House and three to be appointed by the President, with me as chairman. I said, "Mr. So and So," a very prominent man, "you go back and tell your boss that I desire legislation, not excuses I am opposed to such subterfuge. I have no authority to speak for the rank and file of the railroad men but I am sure that they would oppose such a move. I am unalterably opposed to it"

The same proposition was again suggested with the same result Then another Member introduced this resolution for the appointment of such a commission and the resolution for the appointment of the commission of nine members was reported favorably After our committee had reported the resolution for the appointment of an investigating commission, we succeeded in having our own bill considered in committee. Before we reached the vote, a Member asked me whether or not I would object to adding to our bill the resolution which we had reported providing for the commission. In other words if they should report the bill favorably whether or not there would be any objection to accepting the resolution providing for the appointment of this commission to investigate. I said, "I do not think it is necessary, but on condition that we do not postpone the effective date of the bill itself by any investigation, I will not object." The resolution was added to the bill The bill passed the House on August 29, 1935, and yet there was no investigation even attempted until about the 20th of December 1935. It was then proposed to extend the effective date of the act and I successfully opposed that proposal. One of the most distinguished Members said to me afterward: "Mr. CROSSER, you do not know what you accomplished in preventing that proposed investigation." He said, "You know, they had planned to trail all over Europe and spend between three and four hundred thousand dollars on an investigation to help us decide whether or not it would be well to provide for the protection of railroad workers in their old age against the menace of poverty."

So I do not take much stock in the blather about investigation. I say the investigation balderdash is for the purpose of interfering with the legislation

The CHAIRMAN The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. HARRIS Mr Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute.

Mr PRIEST. Mr Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas may be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly find myself in a position, as I advised a few days ago, as being in opposition to the very fine, distinguished gentleman from Ohio, my chairman. I have the highest regard for the outstanding service that he has rendered in this Congress, in the interest of his constituents, the railroad people, and particularly the employees, and to all the people of the United States I know that he is as sincere as anyone can be in his position

Mr. Chairman, I know you want to know what is in the bill. It is a highly technical, involved bill, and I am going to try to tell you in a very few simple sentences what is in the bill which you spent about 20 minutes or more reading a moment ago.

The Railroad Retirement Act was first adopted, as you know, in 1937. It has been amended on various occasions. The major amendment was in 1946, at which time certain important provisions, including survivorship, and so forth, were included. I supported the liberalization bill then In 1948 it was amended again. At that time 20 percent additional benefits were provided for those who received benefits under this system. I supported the adjustment. It is true that outstanding, able, actuaries, and those interested in railroad retirement, have been studying this bill with a view to amendment for over a year.

I have great sympathy for the viewpoints of people, but I have little sympathy for the viewpoint that you have

got to take one particular viewpoint and nothing else. No one man's or one individual's viewpoint can be right every time as opposed to everything else. Now as to what the bill would do.

In the first place, you would amend it to take the 10 year men, men with less than 10 years of service, and send them to social security. If a man has had 9 years and 6 months of service under the Railroad Retirement Act, where he has paid in his share—today 6 percent and beginning January 1 it will be 6¼ percent, and with the employer paying in a similar amount, making a total of 12 percent now and 12½ percent beginning January 1—he pays his part, but yet he is transferred to social security where only 3 percent is paid for benefits. That is the first major provision.

The second major provision the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] would provide, is the $50 work clause. Notwithstanding what someone might say about how the greater majority of people want it, it is my information that not only do the operating brotherhoods not want that provision, but it is my opinion and judgment that the non-operating members do not want the $50 work clause which means that if a man in any month makes more than $50 after he retires, he is not eligible to receive what he has paid for over a long period of time.

The third major provision in this substitute amendment is the spouse provision providing for a spouse's benefit of one-half of what the retired annuitant, or pensioner, would get, not to exceed $50 a month.

A fourth major provision is the increase for survivors and annuitants. It would provide 13.8 percent increase for annuitants and pensioners, about 85 percent for the survivors. Some say 60 percent to 85 percent, but it is my understanding, according to all the testimony that we have had, that it is an average of about 85 or 87 percent That is a pretty good jump in percentage increase for survivors all at one time Certainly we want to give everybody all we can, and we would like to give them as much as possible.

The fifth major provision is that he would increase the taxable base from $300 per month to $400 per month. There is a reason for the operating brotherhoods and the nonoperating brotherhoods being divided on this. It is because all of the operating brotherhoods are drawing $400 per month, and the nonoperating brotherhoods are not, consequently the operating group will have to pay it That is just a human, practical position to take

As the amendment is given to us today, there is another, a sixth major change, the one the gentleman from Texas, our good colleague [Mr. BECKWORTH] referred to a moment ago. That is section 23 of the amendment that is proposed here. It is the integration section, correlation of the railroad retirement with social security.

Let me tell you something. It is my information from talking with these men who work on the railroads that they do not want to become a part of the social-security system. It has been my information and understanding up until this moment that all employees and the brotherhoods oppose being tied in and integrated outright with social security. That statement was made by me last week on the floor of this House. Even the proponents of this bill said, "Yes; that is right, they want no part of it." But this is what you do: You integrate social security and railroad retirement with this section here which was put in the bill as passed yesterday by the Senate.

Let me tell you what it does. You go back to 1937, when the Retirement Act was first adopted. You take the payments a man would have paid had he been under social security You bring that up until this date. This bill provides that by January 1, 1954, the Railroad Retirement Board and the Social Security Administrator will determine those amounts, and it will be in one lump sum dumped over into social security. It means, believe it or not, that retirement will send to Social Security by January 1, 1954, seven to eight hundred million dollars out of their funds. That is what it means. Then each and every employee of the railroad industry will have taken each year, paid into the social-security system, 3 percent of the payroll, and that will continue until he retires.

You say that is a simple amendment? Did I understand you to say that? Now, the men retires What happens? There is a guarantee provision that he will receive as much under retirement, as a minimum, as he would receive had he been under social security. Here is how it would work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I do not want to impose upon the membership, but these amendments are not as simple as somebody says they are. They are not one of those things that when they are understood everybody is inclined to be favorable

Mr Chairman, when a man retires, he gets the guarantee of the minimum. Ultimately, that will be $80 in social security under the amendments that we provided last year. This $80 each month will be paid back from social security into the retirement fund. It will go into the account of that retired annuitant. Then, if he gets what this bill would provide, the maximum of $169, $80 would come out of social security, and the other $89 would come out of the railroad-retirement fund. That is the way it goes. If you think that is simple, and if you think the employees will say in 1 minute, "We do not want to be taken over under social security," and then we come in with this and say, "We are sending you there," it just is not consistent in my book.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. We have before us a so-called committee print dated October 12, 1951, purporting to be railroad-retirement legislation, carrying the name of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. As one member of that committee, I had never seen this print before. I wonder if the gentleman ever saw this print before. That is the bill offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARRIS. Let me say to the gentleman that the major provisions of this committee amendment, which is the substitute the gentleman has just offered, has been before our committee for the past many, many months. I do know after reading it, that several provisions were lifted from the bill that passed the other body yesterday, and included in this print, including this real integration section. Now, what he provided in the first bill was that it would not be integrated completely, but that by 1956 the Social Security Administrator and the Railroad Retirement Board would come up with a program and report how it might be done. Bless your soul, this does not put it off until 1956. This takes it under social security right now.

In view of that, Mr. Chairman, and in view of the things that have happened since we were here the week before last, and particularly in view of what happened in the other body yesterday, and in consideration of the fact that every person in this Congress is anxious that something be done before we adjourn—if and when we adjourn—now—in order that those living under the benefits of railroad retirement have an increase in their benefits to help take care of the increased cost of living, the majority of the members of the committee, reporting the committee amendment, Hall substitute, are going to ask you to vote down this highly complicated, far-reaching bill, which very few people, in my opinion, want with the exception of certain ones who have been working, hard, diligently, and honestly, of course I know that, and who are as sincere as they can be. We say, "Let us take as much as we can of what the other body has done" If we vote down this substitute, I propose to offer a substitute amendment which will be in line with what the other body did yesterday, except that it will reduce the taxable base to where it is today. They want to send it up to $350, we say leave it at $300 per month, and then also to delete this integration with social security, which would send a third of the funds in the railroad retirement fund to social security. As I say, with those exceptions, take the rest of the Senate bill.

I have tried, Mr. Chairman, as hard and as diligently as anybody has ever tried, since we debated this provision 10 days ago to get the interested parties together, I know what is in the thinking of the people who are interested. I tell you

if we turn down this and take what we propose, then I know in my own mind that it will be acceptable and entirely satisfactory to the greatest number affected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEONARD W HALL. Mr Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes

The CHAIRMAN Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr HARRIS I say this on my honor from what I know, Mr Chairman, that it will be entirely acceptable by the four operating brotherhoods In my opinion, if and when it might be acceptable to the other body, notwithstanding what has been said here, it will very likely be acceptable to the nonoperating brotherhoods. Furthermore, I believe I would be right in saying that it would be acceptable to the railroad industry I say this because I tell you I have tried diligently, in every way, even I have asked my good chairman—God bless him, I love him—to come together with us on some compromise whereby we could do something for these people. I admire him for sticking to what he says is fundamental Yes It is fundamental when you raise the taxes of people This House just now refused to do it It is fundamental when you take their money, after they have paid it in, and send it to another system? These provisions are too technical to say, "Let us pass it over by saying somebody else has done this and we will not accept it" Senator DOUGLAS in the other body offered a concurrent resolution saying that this is a stop gap He is one of the outstanding economists in that body. He offered the resolution which I believe the members of our committee are willing to take in order that these other major provisions on how additional security may be bought, may be presented to this House at a later date.

The CHAIRMAN The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired

Mr WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the situation that confronts us, I think as it is understood, will enable us to accomplish what I believe is in the heart and mind of every Member of this House. As I emphasized the other day when I spoke upon this bill, there is no difference of opinion with respect to the desire to increase the benefits for pensioners, annuitants, and survivors. The committee took action, and by a majority of the committee, recognized the need that exists for something to be done. It sought to do it in a manner that would bring immediate relief. The letters that come to us, the witnesses who appeared before us, and our correspondence all indicate that there is a real genuine need for an increase in the payments made to beneficiaries under the Railroad Retirement Act. During our discussions in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce we realized that the bill which is known as the Crosser bill (H R 3669) was extremely complicated and had within it many complex questions—provisions that would change the fundamental principles of the Railroad Retirement Act. Therefore, we sought a way to give immediate help to those who are in need, and leave the controversial questions for further consideration under a resolution that we prepared for a study to be conducted

The present situation is a bit different from that which confronted us when the legislation was before us in the committee. On yesterday the Senate passed a bill The bill which they passed, in many particulars, is identical with the bill that was reported by a majority of our committee In some particulars it was different As we studied that bill—and by "we" I mean those who constituted the majority of the committee on this legislation—as we studied the bill which was passed by the Senate we realized, of course, that there would have to be some compromise between the House and the Senate in order that there might be any legislation whatsoever. The usual procedure is for the House to pass a bill, the Senate passes a bill, conferees representing the two bodies are appointed, and then they meet and endeavor in conference to agree upon the terms of the legislation which they think will prove acceptable to the differing viewpoints in the two bodies. We believe that the bill passed by the Senate is so near what many of us are willing to accept that we should make every possible endeavor to amend the Senate bill on the floor of this House in such manner as to constitute a fair and reasonable compromise and which would have reasonable expectation of being acceptable to the Senate

The thing we are trying to do is this: We recognize the need, we recognize that if we pass the so-called Crosser bill, which changes so many fundamental principles within the present existing retirement act, that there will be no way whatsoever to bring about an amalgamation between the views of the Senate and the House without a conference, and at this late date in the session to have a conference with minds as set as some of them are in this matter, will make it impossible in my judgment, to come back to this House with any legislation before we adjourn and this would put off the enactment of all legislation until next year when the Congress reconvenes. This would mean delay in getting assistance to those so sorely in need

If you follow the suggestion that we are making to you today it will enable those who are in need to get help at an early date.

Our compromise bill to take the place of the Hall committee bill is drawn in a way that we hope the Senate can accept it without sending it to conference and thus avoid the consequent delay. Therefore we trust that you will vote down the Crosser bill in order that we may bring before you the Harris bill that is a compromise between the Hall bill and the Senate bill, believing that what we offer is such that it can be accepted in the Senate if adopted in the House It should have an appeal no matter what the individual views may be with respect to this matter

Mr HARRIS Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr WOLVERTON I yield.

Mr. HARRIS Is it not a fact that the provisions of the committee or the Hall bill as reported out by the committee are identical with the provisions in the bill which was passed by the Senate yesterday?

Mr WOLVERTON It has many provisions that are identical. We have modified some that are different and give reasons for the one or two we reject

It is now my intention to point out to you what the so-called Harris proposal as a compromise to the Hall bill will do. It will accept the Senate provisions with respect to the 15-percent increase for annuitants and pensioners; it will accept the 33⅓ percent increase for survivors; it will give credit to those who work beyond 65 for the years that they work beyond 65 and for which they now pay taxes and get no credit We correct that inequity We accept that provision in the Senate bill We accept the spouse benefit provision of the Senate bill which fixes an amount not exceeding $40, we accept the Senate provision which strikes out of the Crosser bill the so-called work limitation clause—a provision that would not deny to future retired workers the right to earn more than $50 in any one month If there is anything that has stirred me to the depths of my feelings it has been that provision in the Crosser bill that would deny to an individual who has retired and is 65 years of age or more the right to earn more than $50 in a month, or if he did so would thereby destroy this annuity for that month and every month in which he would earn $50 or more.

I know of nothing more cruel than to expect these individuals who receive retirement benefits of such a small amount to be restricted in what they can earn to supplement their meager annuities or pensions, whatever that may be Under the law as it exists at the present time they can go out and earn whatever amount is possible. The law should stay that way We accept the provision in the Senate bill that leaves the law as it is today and strikes out the unjustifiable, inequitable, unfair clause known as the work limitation clause which is presented to us, today, again in the Crosser bill.

We modify in the Senate bill that provision which relates to transferring the men with less than 10 years of service over to the social security. This is in my opinion a breaking of a contractual relationship, to me it is extremely plain that when you take money from individuals year after year up to 10 years on the basis of 6 percent each month of their salary, then tell them that we are

going to take from you your rights under the retirement act and put you under social security it is wrong. Especially in view of the fact that the workers under social security obtained the same benefits for only 1½ percent of their wages and the railroad worker had paid 6 percent. It is so inequitable that the mere statement of it should convince that it is wrong. That is as unfair and I believe as unconstitutional as anything we could do. We modified that in the Harris compromise bill.

We provided that those having less than 10 years of railroad service shall remain on the retirement fund rolls, but further provide that they shall receive in no case less than they would receive under social security. So if there is anything to this statement that under social security they would obtain more benefits than they do under railroad retirement, we say: All right, we will keep them in the railroad retirement fund, we will not pass them out, we will keep them in and we will give them not less than the benefits they would receive in social security.

We reject two provisions that are in the Senate bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, we reject that provision in the Senate bill which increases the tax base from $300 to $350. In the Crosser bill this would be increased from $300 to $400. For those in that class it would mean an increase of 33⅓ percent in the amount that they now pay. Instead of $18 a month that they pay at the present time they would pay $24 a month under the provision that is in the so-called Crosser bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In my opinion, the most unfair feature of the increase in the taxable base from $300 to $400 is the fact that the benefits to be derived from that increase do not increase proportionately, am I correct in that statement?

Mr. WOLVERTON. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The provision to increase the tax base from $300 to $400 has been offered by the proponents of the Crosser bill as an opportunity to build up the fund. If that be true, then you are building it up at somebody else's expense. The fact of the matter is they would get some additional benefits but not for many years in the future and not in the same comparative degree as their increased taxes bear to their present taxes. Nor could the remaining amount strengthen the fund to the extent that has been claimed.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. With reference to the integration features of the 10-year men with social security at least as it was offered in 3369, that was opposed by both the Social Security and the Bureau of the Budget, is that correct?

Mr. WOLVERTON. You are entirely correct. I was about to speak of that particular provision and call to the attention of the members that both the Bureau of the Budget and the Social Security opposed this provision in the Crosser bill. We reject this provision in the Senate bill because it is such a fundamental change in the Retirement Act that, in our opinion, it would be unwise to adopt such a fundamental change without careful study. There has been no study of it by the committee; absolutely none. So far as the committee is concerned, we had nobody from the Federal Social Security to testify before us. We had no actuary before us. They were not permitted to come before us, but in the reports of the Social Security Administration and the Budget Bureau they oppose it and I ask you folks who are anxious to do the right thing in this matter to read the report of the Federal Security Agency, read the report of the Bureau of the Budget, each of which in language that is plain says this provision of the Crosser bill would produce inequitable results; that it would tend to destroy the fund, and neither of them gave it their support.

Mr. Chairman, where does the support come from for this bill? It comes from no department of Government except, as some may say, the Railroad Retirement Board. Well, that was a divided report, if not a unanimous report. Furthermore the actuaries of the Railroad Retirement Board were not permitted to come before our committee and testify. They did testify in the Senate hearings and said the provisions of the Crosser bill would break the fund within 50 years and leave 16,200,000,000 of unpaid liabilities.

Mr. Chairman, I want to bring to your attention what we think is the sensible thing to do. First, give benefits that will be helpful immediately. Adopt some of these provisions that will enable the House and the Senate to get together on a basis that will give some expectation that the Senate will accept the House compromise bill without going to conference. That would mean immediate legislation and immediate help to those in need.

Now then, as to the study. The most important thing that this House can do, aside from granting these benefits, is to pass legislation that will provide for a study to be made of the possibilities of further improving the retirement and further increasing benefits. The Bureau of the Budget said:

> Any need to provide higher and more varied benefits for railroad workers toward which the bill (Crosser bill) is pointed should and can be met in a simpler and more equitable way, consistent with broad national interests and long-range objectives. Better dollar for dollar value can be given by providing coverage for all railroad workers under the old-age and survivors insurance system, with the railroad retirement program retained to supplement the old-age and survivors insurance benefits. This would carry out the recommendations of both the President and the Senate Advisory Council on Social Security.

What does that mean? I will tell you what I think it means.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I will tell you what is in the minds of some people, and I want you to think of it. The report says it can be done in a simpler way. I will tell you what this proposed study should carry out. It should make inquiry as to the feasibility of a plan that would enable the Railroad Retirement Board to remain in existence, purchase from the Social Security for railroad workers for 3 percent all of the benefits that can be obtained under social security, and leave the balance of 9 percent, now being paid by railroad workers into their retirement fund, to be used by the Railroad Retirement Board in increasing the benefits that are now paid to retired railroad workers and their survivors. That is a simple way in which this matter of increased benefits without increased taxes can be approached. I think this is what may have been meant by the Bureau of the Budget as well as of the Social Security Administration when they both suggest that a simpler way than that provided in the Crosser bill is available.

My friends, with all the sincerity that I have in my being, I ask of you in the interest of those who are in need, let us pass this Harris substitute bill that will bring us in line with the Senate bill already enacted and which gives hope that the Senate will accept it without going to conference and thus give immediate help to those who are in need.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GOLDEN].

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe all Members of Congress have been very seriously trying to find out what is the very best improvements and amendments that we could pass at the present session of Congress for the past and present railroad employees and their dependents.

Neither the committee bill nor the Crosser substitute contains everything that we Members would like to see, in the way of increased annuities and pensions, but we will have to decide which bill is better, because it is apparent that during the past week when the debates on this bill were delayed, no agreement was reached by the various brotherhoods sponsoring the different bills.

While there are many good, beneficial features of the Crosser substitute, there is one section of this bill that I do not like and I think it should be stricken from the Crosser substitute. I refer to

the limitation which cuts off and causes the railroad employee who has retired, to lose his annuity if he should earn as much as $50 per month.

My reasons for concluding that this is a hurtful provision of the Crosser substitute are as follows:

To begin with, it encourages idleness and it robs good, industrious men, who have earned in full and paid for their retirement, of earning money.

Most of these retired railroad men, through long years of work, have acquired useful skills in mechanics and electrical repair work; many of them are excellent cabinet makers and carpenters, and have business ability which would make them useful, constructive citizens who can continue to contribute to the welfare of their communities if it were not for this limitation that would prevent them from earning money when they have retired.

It is bad for the morale of a man who wants to work, knows how to work, and how to create, to be tied down so he cannot work.

You can take, for instance, most any of these men who could render useful service in the communities where they live and think about what will happen if this ball and chain is locked around their legs so they cannot be useful citizens. Take a railroad man who has retired, who is a skillful mechanic and carpenter. Many of his neighbors and friends could bring him all sorts of furniture and machinery that would be out of order and practically useless, and he could repair it and be paid for his work and knowledge, and thereby he could supplement his annuity He would be better off, his family would be better off, he would have more on which to live, he would feel like he was doing something useful and beneficial for the people among whom he lives.

In addition to this, we should consider some basic facts. Say, for instance, some housewife has a good chair that would cost $25, or maybe $50, to buy one like it and replace it, that is broken and out of repair; say this same woman takes that chair to a good skillful and retired railroad employee who can fix that chair for her for $2 and make it practically as good as new. By his work and skill he has created the equivalent of $25 or more to the wealth of this country Over a period of a month he would be able to repair many articles of furniture, improve and repair many houses, and possibly create additional wealth of from $500 to $1,000 per month, and maybe he could earn for his own family by this part-time work, $100 for himself. He would be better off, his neighbors would be better off, and his country would be better off. Yet if we adopt this work limitation clause, all of this would be lost to everybody.

Wealth is created in the United States mainly by just a few things. To start with, all wealth comes from the soil and natural resources and the products made from them by the brain and knowledge, skill, and labor of man. There is no other source from which wealth can be created.

In order to have a high standard of living, a very large amount of new wealth created each year, we must have the combined labor, brains, and effort of all the American people applied to all of our minerals, soil, and natural resources.

In order to meet the tremendous strain upon the economy of this country, to produce more wealth for our people to live on, and more wealth for our Government to tax to build up our national defenses, we should do everything possible to take the shackles off of our people, encourage individual initiative, let everybody work who is able to work, and let them make their full contribution to the welfare of society.

If we handicap 100,000 or more of our retired railroad men who possess a large degree of knowledge, experience, and skill and do not allow them to work and contribute to the creation of wealth, we will be taking a backward step

There is a provision in the social-security law like and similar to this clause in the Crosser substitute, that prevents men and women from working in covered employment and earning as much as $50 per month, that ought to be stricken from the Social Security Act, because it also cuts off a great source of creative wealth, it encourages idleness; it would in some instances place before men and women the temptation not to report their earnings in order to continue to draw their social security, and the first opportunity that we have we should amend the Social Security Act by striking out of it the work limitation contained therein

There is a direct contractual relationship between the Railroad Retirement Fund and the men who have worked on the railroad and paid in a part of their wages each month in order to become participants in the distribution of these funds for themselves and their dependents, in the way of pensions and annuities If we come along here in Congress and slap a work limitation on these retired railroad men and knock them out of drawing the annuities which they have paid for, and which belongs to them, if they work, I think we will be violating their vested contractual interest in this fund, if we take away their annuities when they work and make $50 or more per month.

In a free country, there are certain fundamental guaranties under the Constitution that every citizen should enjoy. Each man should have the right to fully enjoy the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and it is fundamental, in the land of the free and the home of the brave that a man should have a right to work and have a right to earn.

This section of the bill that prevents a man from working and earning, under penalty of losing his annuity, is against fundamental, constitutional rights, and liberties that should be enjoyed by every free man.

It has many evil consequences. Our great free country has been handicapping its citizens and taking away from them their freedom a little at a time, in first one bill and then another, passed by the Congress of the United States. We have too many laws in this country that enables the Federal Government to encroach upon the fundamental freedoms of our citizens. This section of the bill is a rank example of an invasion of the freedom of a large group of American citizens to work and earn. This section of the Crosser substitute, which, in many other particulars, is an excellent bill should be stricken out by an amendment. All people should welcome the fruits of the earnings of retired railroad men without any handicaps or limitations; they should be allowed to continue as free men in a free country, and they should not be handicapped from making their full contribution to the creation of wealth in this country, and their basic, constitutional, contractual rights should not be taken away from them by adopting a law that says, you cannot have your annuity that you have bought and paid for, if you continue to work as a free man in a free land.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that an area of disagreement does still exist, although I think it likewise is obvious that there is a tendency to agree that some provisions of the Crosser bill are good provisions.

I have been interested particularly to note that some of those who seem to object to bringing up to the social security standard in benefits all railroad retirement annuitants and pensioners now think it is a good thing, and have so stated. That was one of the original contentions of those of us who favor the Crosser amendment.

This question of doing things in a simple way is a two-pronged thing. The Senate just passed the bill yesterday. We have had no hearings on the Senate bill. We have, of course, no reason to doubt our brethren on the committee, but they have already accepted it in part, and perhaps without that great, careful study, that unusual study, that has been indicated as being so necessary.

I want to say something about the study I think the members of this committee can be assured that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to the extent of its ability and so far as time will permit, studies all matters that come before us. Whether or not a resolution is passed, whether or not there is a provision in the bill, as and when additional railroad retirement legislation is considered here, you may be sure that this committee, Republicans and Democrats, will have studied it just as much as they can. So in a great measure that is beside the point. We propose to study any future legislation we bring here just as much as possible.

I made the statement originally that the reason I am for the Crosser bill is that in my opinion it undertakes to give the greatest help to those who need help the most. I stand by that statement. If there is any reason for supporting the Crosser bill this afternoon it is because it held out that one important objective of trying to do for the poorest, the one who was receiving the least, the most. Nothing has been said or done that alters the objective of the Crosser bill, I assure you.

I repeat, the important objective of the Crosser bill has been this, to do the most for those whose need is the greatest. What objective is more laudable than that? What bill having provisions that carry that kind of object into meaning can be more meritorious?

Yes, there has been difference of opinion as we have considered this. There is still difference of opinion, and there is still, I might add, some changing of viewpoints, as has been demonstrated here this afternoon. But I repeat that those of us who have suported the Crosser bill have sought to take into consideration that there are thousands of people, thousands of spouses, thousands of children who need help, who are getting practically nothing. It does little good to come here and say that we raise a fellow or a child who is getting $20 per month 15 percent. You raise him $3. Of course, he can buy a few more hamburgers and a little bit more bread with that, but $3 falls far short of the important mark that we all should be interested in attaining. The Crosser bill in helping those people undertakes to raise them, not 33⅓ percent and not 40 percent, but around 80 percent, and that we say is justified and sustainable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I will try to answer any questions that the gentleman may have.

Mr. HESELTON. In connection with the objections that have been expressed as to the work limitation provisions of the Crosser bill, I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not it is true that this body voted those identical limitations into the Social Security Act?

Mr. BECKWORTH. On how many million people would the gentleman say?

Mr. HESELTON. About 50,000,000 people.

Mr. BECKWORTH. How many?

Mr. HESELTON. About 50,000,000 people are involved under that bill.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Whether it is right or wrong, the Congress has already taken action upon that. Of course, some people do not like it, however, this is not the first restrictive piece of legislation that we have had that causes people not to be able to do what they want to do. All Members of this body have heard me talk about the restrictions that are placed on many, many farmers throughout the country who cannot grow a row of a given crop, even though they own their own farm. This is not the first restriction, and you know that is the truth. There are thousands of people in this country today, because of the statutes that this Congress has put on the law books, who cannot do things that they want to. You know that is the truth. I have not been one who has proclaimed the virtue of the $50 work clause provision. In any bill there are undesirable features. However, I still believe the Crosser bill even though it has defects is a good bill. I know the other side does not claim perfection for their bill or bills. They are this fair and reasonable as legislators.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. One thing seems to me to have been overlooked in the debate so far. That is that in order to raise the benefits under the Railroad Retirement System, you ought to provide new sources of revenue, or you have to make savings somewhere. The Crosser bill, and this is one of the reasons I am supporting it, provides for new sources of income to meet the increases that are proposed. The committee bill does not do that. It instead proposes a study. You can study this thing from now until kingdom come, but there is one thing that you cannot lose sight of, and that is you have 12 percent of the payroll that goes into this fund. You cannot raise the retirement pensions in any substantial degree today without getting some more money. Now where are you going to get it? You either have to raise the tax base, and transfer part of this load to social security, or you have to make savings elsewhere. That is what the Crosser bill is endeavoring to do. No matter how long this thing is studied, do not forget that in order to raise these benefits and keep the funds solvent you are going to have to find new sources of income.

Mr. BECKWORTH. There has been very excellent evidence of what the gentleman has just stated in the form of a change that has taken place here this very afternoon, if those who are now supporting some of the provisions of the Senate bill actually mean what they say and I know they do. When we were here before, what did they say? They said "Do not raise the tax base from $300 to $400." Then what did the Senate do? They raised the tax base from $300 to $350. What some gentlemen have said, what the Senate has done certainly is making an impression on some of those who have spoken here this very afternoon. They now favor as has been said raising the taxation base from $300 to $350.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes, as I would like to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I will be glad to try to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. HARRIS. On the very point that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] just asked, with reference to the soundness of the fund, is it not a fact that in your report which was provided in the appendix in the minority report, that the funds as reported by the bill that the gentleman is supporting here will cost a total net of 14.13 percent of payroll?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Are you referring to page 12?

Mr. HARRIS. I am referring to the cost analysis on page 73 of your report.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I might say that I have received some figures, although I do not have them before me, that would indicate that the Hall bill, which was discussed the other day, the one not raising any taxes, as it does not, would actually cost more money—take more of the payroll percentagewise, I mean than the Crosser bill which does raise taxes. Of course, taxes would be included in the Crosser appraisal. In other words, the one that would constitute the greatest net drain on the fund would be the Hall bill. I have received some information like that.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that each of the bills proposed, according to the actuaries, will actually cost more than the amounts that are paid in by employee and employer on the taxable payroll?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. And is it not a fact that all bills proposed are unsound, from an actuarial standpoint, and it is necessary that something else be done to raise the money?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I want to try to answer the gentleman. I think the gentleman is right, that actually each bill, the Hall bill and the Crosser bill, will constitute, over and above the situation today, a net drain on the fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. But what has seemed to impress the committee is this: that in the past we have feared that as we passed legislation the fund would be depleted in a ruinous or unsound way. Even though that has been the case, we did pass legislation in the past and have found that our estimates have been unusually conservative, and therefore we have felt at liberty to go ahead and do what might be termed "taking some percentage of chance." One of the things that has contributed to that is the fact that employment in the railroad industry has been unusually high in the last few years.

Mr. BEAMER Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. Is it not true, the gentleman from Texas remembers that in the Senate the actuary for the Railroad Retirement Board testified that by the year 2000 the fund would be absolutely depleted under the provisions of the Crosser bill? That is true, not only of that actuary but of all the other actuaries that appeared before our committee.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Of course, the Railroad Retirement Board does have the benefit of some actuarial advice. I think that is something that has not been mentioned before. Having served on the committee as long as I have, we just do not find in the testimony that the actuaries present what might be termed a unanimity of sentiment. That is one thing that we are constantly baffled about, because one actuary says one thing, another says another, and we have to use our best judgment, based on the best information we can get.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if the Members of the House will take the committee report on this bill and turn to the minority report which is represented by those who are speaking in favor of the Crosser bill, on page 75 you will find a table telling where the proponents of the Crosser bill expect to get the money with which to finance this 85 percent increase and so on. The first is the so-called $50 work clause fund. They expect to get $50,000,000 into the fund by causing these people, 65 years of age, to keep right on working after they are 65, and thereby not draw their pensions, so that their pension payments would remain in the fund That $50 work clause is supposed to provide $50,000,000 which retirable people, under the Railroad Retirement Act, will not draw if they earn over $50 a month

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr HINSHAW. Briefly.

Mr HARRIS. Is it not a fact that under the testimony there is wide difference of opinion as to whether or not it will actually save $50,000,000 to the fund?

Mr HINSHAW. Sure; certainly; but that is where they propose to get $50,000,000.

Item No 2 is the so-called financial adjustment between the railroad-retirement fund and the social-security system That is supposed to yield $100,000,000. Do you know how it is done? Just sleight of hand. The railroad-retirement fund charges 6 percent to the worker and 6 percent to management on the payroll; that is 12 percent. For 3 percent they, in effect, propose to buy social security for those who work less than 10 years on a railroad, and the difference of 9 percent, half of which is paid by these men and half by the railroads, that difference of 9 percent is considered to be a clear profit to the railroad-retirement fund and hence provides $100,000,000 in benefits. They do that by saying that those who work ultimately less than 10 years for the railroads must go to social security and hence lose the 9 percent that has been paid by them and in their behalf.

Then they get another $80,000,000 from the change in the taxable and creditable monthly compensation from $300 to $400. That is a change in the tax base. They go out and tell these railroad workers that there is no change in the taxes, but actually there is a change, because they change the taxable base pay from $300 a month to $400 a month. That is supposed to bring in $80,000,000.

I think the Committee of the Whole can pretty well understand what the controversy is about in our committee. The committee is 2-to-1 against the Crosser bill. The committee wants to make a basic increase in all of these rates that are now being paid and then give this thing the study that it requires, which will take 4 or 5 months. In the meantime, however, these people will get their increase, those who are now on pension and annuity rolls will get it; they can get it beginning the 1st day of November if we adopt the substitute which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] will offer if the Crosser substitute is voted down.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to see if we can get an agreement limiting further debate on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Crosser amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. CROSSER Mr. Chairman, I will object unless I can have 10 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr Chairman, will not the gentleman modify his request to make it 30 minutes, allotting the last 10 to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I did not think that could be done, but Mr. Chairman, I so modify my request

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the Crosser amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, the last 10 to be reserved to the chairman of the committee. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. In all the years I have served in this House I have always made it a point in matters affecting the railroad workers to follow my good friend from Cleveland, BOB CROSSER. I take what he says about railway-retirement bills at face value and that his views are based on the needs of the railroad workers. I have faith in his judgment.

Originally, the Railroad Retirement Act came before the Committee on Ways and Means of which even at that time I was a member. At that time the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] was the leader and guiding light in connection with that legislation. I have never gone wrong on any proposal he has made regarding the welfare of the railroad workers. I am confident that as regards solvency and providing properly for the railway workers the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] has the issue well in hand.

I do not think he has disregarded common sense or the permanency of the retirement plan involved in this legislation. Therefore, I propose to vote in favor of the substitute he has offered. I am going to hold fast to the views and the course prescribed here by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin to the substitute offered by Mr. CROSSER. After section 12 insert the following new section:

"Section 12A, employees who, prior to death, had not less than 30 years of service as defined in section 1 (f) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 as amended, and who died in the period beginning August 29, 1935, and ending June 30, 1938, shall be deemed, solely for the purpose of a widow's age 65 annuity, to have died fully insured, within the meaning of section 5 (i) of such act *Provided, however*, That any annuity awarded under this section shall be computed in the same manner as if such annuity had been awarded under section 5 (a) of such act: *Provided further*, That this section shall apply only with respect to widows who are not receiving monthly pensions (whether under public or private plans) based on the railroad service of their deceased husbands."

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not involve the main issue which confronts the committee. I shall offer it to the committee amendment provided the Crosser substitute is not agreed to.

My amendment simply provides for consideration for a group of people, namely the widows of those employees who died between August 1935, and June 1938, who are not otherwise provided for, that they may qualify to receive a widow's age 65 pension

I inquired of the Railroad Retirement Board Research Director as to how many people this would cover and he answered it would cover less than 2,000 In other words, this would seek to provide for the widows of employees of 30 years or more of service and who died during this period, who are not otherwise provided for.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Does the gentleman know what it would cost?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Yes. It would cost less than $10,000,000, according to Mr Matscheck.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. How much less?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. The closest computation I can make is that it would affect less than 2,000 widows. In other words, in all of these measures we are seeking to care for those whose need is greatest, and here is a category of people who are not provided for.

I wish to quote, in part, from the telegram I received yesterday from Mr. Matscheck as to the effect of my amendment:

A precise determination cannot be made of widows that would be affected by your proposed amendment to H R 3669. We estimate however that the number would be less than 2,000. The total cost of the proposal on a present value basis would be less than $10,000,000. Such additional cost would not change our estimate of the tax rate necessary to finance H. R. 3669.

Employees of 30 years or more of service on the roads have invested their lives

in the railroad industry. They are the ones who have really built the great railroad system of our country. There are none more deserving of the benefits of this fund than their widows.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman from Wisconsin has just offered an amendment. Would it not be in order to vote on his amendment before further debate?

The CHAIRMAN Does anyone desire to be heard on the amendment?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment Here is an amendment coming in here for the first time I do not know whether I am for it or against it, because I do not know how it would affect the fund. We ought to really have a hearing on an amendment like this

Above all, we should always look to keeping retirement funds solvent, and this amendment might affect the solvency of the Railroad Retirement Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] to the Crosser substitute.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, there is not an awful lot that can be said in a minute and a half, but I take this time to call your attention to a remark of the gentleman from Arkansas my good friend [Mr. HARRIS]. I know that he would never willfully mislead the membership, but he made a statement about the so-called integration amendment, and I believe the gentleman left the impression that this would ultimately result in a complete integration into the social-security system of the railroad-retirement system, and I know the gentleman did not mean that

Mr HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that one-third of all funds paid in since 1937 to January 1, 1952, automatically go into the social-security fund? If that does not affect the fund, I do not know what does.

Mr. KLEIN I do not have the time to engage in any controversy with the gentleman, of whom I am very fond, but I will say that anyone who looks at the record of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], the father of the railroad-retirement system, who fathered it in 1937, who has devoted many, many years to its study, and is so recognized by all the railroad people of this country, will realize that it is farcical to state that he would possibly want to do away with the railroad-retirement system and integrate it into the social-security system.

In reply to my friend from Arkansas, let me state that over the years, more money will flow into the railroad-retirement system from social security than the other way around, and the railroad-retirement system will be strengthened thereby.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENNY]

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be yielded to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The CHAIRMAN Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, I am just as confused as anybody else, but I have heard nothing here to alter my conviction, based upon extensive hearings in our committee, that the Crosser amendment still presents the best possible solution, and I shall support it If the Crosser substitute amendment passes, I shall be happy about it, and if it does not pass I will continue in my efforts to get the best bill we can so far as my vote may assist in that direction. Certainly we must not adjourn without providing needed relief from the fund to beneficiaries suffering from the burdens of the present inflation.

Mr. HARRIS Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr HARRIS Should the Crosser bill be voted down and the proposed substitute as explained be offered, would the gentleman support it?

Mr HUGH D. SCOTT, JR I find that the prediction business is very uncertain these days. I have no idea what will happen next on this vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr WILLIAMS].

Mr WILLIAMS of Mississippi Mr Chairman, in the brief space of a minute and a half I shall address my remarks to only one aspect of this legislation. From the information I have been able to obtain as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from the hearings and from the executive sessions on this legislation, it appears to me that the Crosser bill approaches this problem with a different philosophy from that of the committee bill The Crosser bill, because of its inclusion of the $50 work clause, approaches this legislation from the standpoint of encouraging men to work beyond retirement age, or giving them the very unhappy alternative of having to live in a state of economic peonage—their income limited to the small, inadequate annuities which they may be able to receive under this bill.

In my opinion, the $50 work clause is in itself sufficient reason why the Crosser bill should be rejected. The committee bill, as it may be amended by the Harris substitute, considers these annuities to be the property of the workers, to do with as they see fit. It has no work clause and is fair in every respect to all annuitants.

I hope the Crosser amendment is rejected and the Harris substitute is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MCGUIRE].

Mr. McCUIRE. Mr. Chairman, after the fiasco of 1948 I can see why the gentleman from Philadelphia did not want to make any predictions.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman made no reference to anything except the railroad retirement bill.

Mr. McGUIRE. All right. I want to tell you that no one has worked any harder for the Crosser bill than I have. I think we are very lucky that we have a man like BOB CROSSER heading the Democrats and a man like CHARLIE WOLVERTON heading the Republicans We have a grand committee. I say we are all practical politicians and we ought to give and take.

I contacted the people back in my district. I talk to the railroad men in the New Haven station every week, sometimes three times a week. I will say frankly they do not like this $50 work clause. I would like to see it knocked out. I do not think it is good. But I would like to have said here that just as I think the Korean war situation ought to be run as if everyone of us had our only son in the front line in Korea, as far as the railroad retirement legislation is concerned, I think we should pass legislation as if our only son were a railroad worker.

We have been nice to everybody in the world I think we ought to start being nice to the American people by treating the railroad workers right now

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr HESELTON]

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I realize, too, that in a minute and a half it is impossible to cover even the basic grounds for my conviction that the Crosser bill should be accepted by the committee. I do want to try to cover two points, one of which has not been emphasized very much in the course of this debate.

In the first place, one of the principles we must follow is that this fund be kept solvent If you accept the committee bill, it has been reliably estimated that an annual deficit of over $108,000,000 will be incurred. If you support the bill that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] has suggested, the estimate is that the fund would rise gradually for between 15 to 20 years to a point of $7,600,000,000, and then level off at $7,500,000,000. To vote for the committee bill, the only alternative that is now before us is a calculated and deliberate action leading to wrecking this fund.

To vote for the Crosser bill is to vote to do as much as can be done for those who need it the most, particularly the widows and the dependent children and still maintain the solvency of this fund. And the needs of these beneficiaries would be more fully met, which is the second point.

Under the committee bill they would get a pitiful increase of anywhere from $7 to $10, but under the Crosser bill would get an increase of at least $60 and possibly up to $75.

I ask you to take these facts into consideration before you vote on these proposals.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER]

Mr. BEAMER. Mr Chairman, something is happening in this country. There are too many Members in the House who are forgetting the folks back home, the men who are in retirement, and who are about to go on retirement in a short time. Too many people are listening to the whims of certain bureaucrats. I hope you will think about the people who will be benefiting by this retirement, and who have paid their money into the fund in the past. I have written and received hundreds of letters from those people. Once they learn the contents of the Crosser bill, they are against it I am speaking in behalf of those people, and that is the reason I cannot support the Crosser bill. When they learn what is in it, they are against it. They said they do not want any increase in the rates, and you have it in the Crosser substitute. They said they do not want to be thrown into Social Security, and that is what has been done by this substitute They want the fund protected, and I know that you will find that the actuaries who appeared before the Senate and House committees testified that the fund would be depleted.

I would like to read for the RECORD a telegram from 830 Indiana retired railway employees who are now on the retirement list. It is as follows:

The Association of Retired Railway Employees of Indianapolis with a membership of 830 urgently request you to support the Hall amendment or substitute to the Crosser bill.

ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.
VERT M. VILLERS, *President.*

Those are the people who will be benefited. Why do you not listen to them?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr Chairman, when this legislation was under consideration on October 4, I stated very frankly why I could not support the Crosser bill at this time, but would support the Hall bill, which is stopgap legislation. I also said in my remarks at that time that I would favor the House resolution which provides that a study of the Railroad Retirement Act be made immediately and that by next February 15 a bill be introduced incorporating the recommended changes resulting from the study.

Since October 4, I have talked to many railroaders back in my congressional district and have heard from many others by mail. I am not being critical of any of the railway labor organizations when I say that those railroad men to whom I talked—both active and retired—confessed that to them the debate on the Crosser and Hall bills is too technical and they are bewildered and confused.

When I talked to officials of the various railway unions I found that they knew the good points of both bills but they were reluctant to discuss the controversial features. Regardless of what bill these union officials supported they joined active and retired railroaders in agreeing that the solvency of the railroad-retirement fund is the paramount issue. They were also in complete agreement on the fact that immediate relief must be given to present recipients of railroad retirement benefits

It was unanimously agreed that the Railroad Retirement Act should be examined with the thought in mind of reducing the retirement age, the years of mandatory service, and liberalizing other provisions of the existing law.

In addition to talking to active and retired railroaders several retired men canvassed members of the railroad fraternity in my congressional district and here is the report I received regarding their interviews:

We can see nothing wrong by having both Houses of Congress accept the Hall bill as an emergency plank for the bridge, thus permitting the Railroad Retirement Act to receive a general overhauling next February. Meanwhile, we old-timers will receive a much-needed increase as well as the widows and children of deceased employees.

As I said during the debate on this legislation on October 4, I am in favor of many of the provisions of the Crosser bill, if it can be shown after further study that these new benefits will not endanger the financial condition of the railroad-retirement fund.

It is freely said that these new benefits are sugar-coated pills and include the increase of benefits to annuitants and pensioners and the widows and surviving children together with the new monthly benefit to the spouse. These benefits are said to be sugar-coated because they require the acceptance of bitter pills in order to obtain them.

Taking the bitter with the sweet means that in order to obtain these new benefits certain savings to the railroad-retirement fund must be effected and in addition new sources of income must be found in order to provide $230,000,000 estimated to be the annual cost of these new benefits under the Crosser bill.

To raise the $230,000,000 it is proposed that the following changes be made in the existing law

Recipients of railroad retirement benefits would be prohibited from earning in excess of $50 monthly except if retired on disability. This prohibition means that a retired railroader cannot earn more than $50 monthly in outside employment without forfeiting his monthly railroad retirement check.

This provision in the Crosser bill is designed to force railroad employees to work beyond their retirement age of 65. It is said that such a provision will effect a saving of $50,000,000 annually.

Railroaders in my district resent Congress or anyone else restricting their earnings after they retire under the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act. They feel that with their employer they have paid for their retirement and that it is rank discrimination if not unconstitutional to apply such a restriction. In my opinion such a restriction is punitive legislation and would force retired railroaders and their families to exist on a fixed income.

The idea of forcing railroaders to work beyond the age of 65 is equally repugnant because the majority of us know that a determined effort is being made in railroad circles to reduce the age of retirement from 65 to 60 years with the option of retiring at age 60 or upon completion of 30 years service regardless of age.

I have petitions from more than 3,400 railroaders in my district urging that the age of retirement be reduced to age 60 and that the Railroad Retirement Act be amended to permit retirement upon completion of 30 years of service regardless of age.

Then too, we must not forget that in times of depression in the railroad industry it is the young man at the bottom of the roster who is furloughed and who urges the retirement of older employees. These young employees will suffer greatly if older employees are forced to work beyond the age of retirement.

Another objection to the Crosser bill is the increase in payroll taxes brought about by taxing earnings up to $400. Under existing law earnings up to $300 are taxable.

This increase which will amount to $6 25 monthly on the additional $100 is estimated to produce $80,000,000 annually after January 1, 1952. While I recognize that the increase of payroll tax will provide additional benefits to the individual upon retirement, yet the average railroadman in my district is opposed to any increase in taxes on his earnings. He knows that to increase payroll taxes will shrink further his take-home pay and he states he fails to see the necessity for an increase since he now pays 4 times the tax imposed under social security, yet, upon retirement receives less benefits.

It has been said that there is only a small percentage of railroad labor to be affected by this payroll increase under the Crosser bill. According to information furnished the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as a result of a check of the 10 largest railroads in the United States 46 percent of their 1,490,000 employees receive wages less than $300 monthly. That means that 54 percent of the employees earn in excess of $300 a month and on their shoulders will fall the burden of paying for these sugar-coated pills.

Objection is also voiced to the Crosser bill over the proposal to transfer over 5,000,000 persons with less than 10 years of service to the social security rolls, on the assumption that such action will effect a saving to the railroad retirement fund of $40,000,000.

For the Congress of the United States to arbitrarily transfer these people without any idea of their feelings on the subject and to reduce their benefits at the same time is in my opinion a violation of their rights I have hundreds of people in my district who would be adversely affected by this provision and those who are aware of it are vigorously opposed to it. Over a period of years railroad brotherhoods have indoctrinated the railroad man and his family with the idea that the social-security system is

intent on taking over the railroad retirement system. With all the sincerity at my command I can tell you that the people in my district feel that the Crosser bill is the first step in that direction and they want nothing to do with it.

According to the testimony in the Senate of Mr. Robert J. Myers, Chief Actuary, Social Security Administration, I look with suspicion upon the provision in the Crosser bill whereby the Railroad Retirement Board and the Federal Security Administrator will, by June 1, 1956, recommend legislation that they hope will make a further estimated annual saving of $60,000,000 in the railroad retirement fund.

Mr. Chairman, as I said on October 4 and I repeat it again today, there is general agreement among all who are interested in amending the Railroad Retirement Act that present recipients of benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act must be granted immediate relief through an increase in benefits. This cannot be accomplished under the Crosser bill, because the Railroad Retirement Board will have to hire and train hundreds of new employees to administer its provisions.

For example, the spouse's provision alone will require the filing of an application with supporting evidence in the form of a marriage certificate together with a birth certificate. In addition the files of more than 5,000,000 employees will have to be examined preparatory to the transfer to social security of those with less than 10 years of service.

Let us not forget the policing job that will have to be done to ferret out retired people earning in excess of $50 monthly so that their retirement check could be stopped as provided by the Crosser bill.

May I remind you that under the 1946 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act 200,000 claims had to be reexamined in order to determine if and how much increased benefits would be payable on each claim. It required over 1 year to complete the job and that meant considerable delay in paying the increased benefits.

All of us should give particular attention to the division of opinion on the Crosser bill. It starts in the Federal Security Agency, it exists with Railroad Retirement Board, is found among actuarial experts, prevails in the ranks of railway labor and among the members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, while active and retired railroad employees are equally bewildered and confused.

Nor can we ignore the opinion of experts who are opposed to the Crosser bill, including Mr. Murray W. Latimer, formerly Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, and who should know whereof he speaks, for he is a recognized authority on the Railroad Retirement Act. When testifying on Senate bill 1347, which is identical to the Crosser bill, Mr. Latimer said:

Either the Railroad Retirement System will collapse or there will be a Government subsidy.

He continued by saying that the bill "from the standpoint of financial soundness represents extreme recklessness."

In conclusion, after detailed study and serious reflection I am convinced that there is only one position that I can take to guarantee the solvency of the railroad retirement fund and to grant immediate relief to retired employees and to widows and surviving children, and that is to support the Hall bill, which if approved by both Houses of Congress this week, will mean that the check that all retired employees and survivors receive for the month of November will include an across-the-board increase of 15 percent to all annuitants and pensioners and 33⅓ percent increase to widows and surviving children, with a 25 percent increase in lump-sum death benefits.

It is my intention to support the House resolution which will be considered in conjunction with this legislation and which provides for a thorough study of the Railroad Retirement Act by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in order to determine the extent to which it may be liberalized without jeopardizing the railroad retirement fund.

The House resolution provides that the recommendations of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be submitted to Congress in the form of a legislative proposal following the completion of the study and that such legislation be introduced not later than February 15, 1952. Therefore, Congress will be given the opportunity of liberalizing the Railroad Retirement Act after careful study of the recommendations made, and will not be proceeding in a blind manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, there is just one other feature of this bill that I want to emphasize that has not been emphasized, and that is that the Crosser bill would absolutely make the retirement fund insolvent by the year 2000. That is the testimony of every expert.

Let me read you a quotation from what Mr. Latimer said. As you all know, he is the father of railroad legislation. Here is what he said:

Mr. Murphy in his prepared statement on S. 1947—

Which is identical with the Crosser bill—

said that under the bill either the railroad retirement system will collapse or there will be a Government subsidy.

None of us likes subsidies. If you want to subsidize it, all right, vote for the Crosser amendment.

He further criticized the bill from the standpoint of financial soundness as "the extreme of recklessness."

Both Mr. Mercer and Mr. Overholtzer, who is associate to the Railroad Retirement Board, each testified that if you put into operation the Crosser amendment, within the year 2000 you would have an insolvent fund and none of these people would get anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee for a minute and a half.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would not want anyone to labor under a misapprehension. I said in my remarks a moment ago that in my judgment if the Crosser bill were voted down and the substitute proposed adopted that it would be in my opinion acceptable to the nonoperating groups. I am advised by a member of the nonoperating group that it would not be acceptable to them. I wanted to make this correction known to the membership before we vote; that information shows how noncompromising some people are and the tough problem we have had.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I imagine I have perhaps half a minute left, and in that half minute I simply want to say that very shortly the House will make a choice between the Crosser substitute and the Harris substitute that will be offered if the Crosser substitute is voted down.

I can appreciate, I think, having lived rather strenuously with this subject for the last 3 months how the Members feel I hope, however, that when the decision comes in in about 10 minutes we will defeat the Crosser substitute and open the way for a substitute to be offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]. Here let me pay him a tribute and express public appreciation for the fact that during the last few weeks the gentleman from Arkansas has labored diligently night and day in an effort to bring about a compromise. I think he deserves great credit for the effort he put forth. I hope we will support his substitute when it is offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] is recognized.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I can state very briefly my reasons for supporting the Crosser bill (H. R. 3669).

This Congress has voted billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money for giveaway programs to other countries and for nonessential Federal expenditures. In so doing it has added to the fires of inflation which victimize persons living on pensions more than any other single group of our fellow citizens.

Can there be any possible question, either on the merits of the case or in the face of this record of profligacy, about voting an increase in retirement benefits for American railroad men when that action involves no increase in taxes and no added cost to the taxpayer?

Can there be any possible question, when the proposed action involves the railroad men's own pension funds, when it adequately safeguards those funds against dissipation, and when the proposed action is necessary in order to bring their pension benefits somewhere nearly in line with pension benefits provided other Americans under social security?

I think the answers to these questions are obvious.

They are, to me, compelling reasons for my support and vote in favor of the Crosser amendments contained in H. R. 3669.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] is recognized for 10 minutes to close the debate on the Crosser substitute.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, during the 2 days I have sat here, while this bill has been under consideration, I could hardly refrain from laughing at some of the manifestations of anxiety for the welfare of the fine railroad-retirement system. Some hearts almost bled in their anxiety—anxiety lest something awful should happen to the noble railroad-retirement system which some of us had already done much to establish; yet I cannot forget the indifference of some of the folks during the early stages of development of the legislation which has brought that retirement system to its present high standard.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSSER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I trust the gentleman would not imply to this Committee that at any time in the past any bill the gentleman has had before the Committee on this subject was not properly considered.

Mr. CROSSER. I was not talking about that.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to hear the wailing and dramatic references to the necessity for protecting this great railroad-retirement system. It makes me feel somethink like a kind of pride, though somewhat perplexed, because in the beginning I had the wonderful satisfaction of having the floor almost entirely to myself when the battle for the railroad-retirement legislation was in progress. But enough of that. I think the membership in general can remember something about the experiences I have had in the past.

They try to tell you that railroad men all over the country are overwhelmingly opposed to my bill. The fact of the matter is that 80 percent of the railroad workers of the United States, 80 percent are in favor of this legislation, as stated by the official heads of their organization. Railroad labor organizations favor the bill I have introduced. So let us not have any more of this balderdash about the great majority being against it.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the fact that 80 percent of all the railroad workers of the United States have committed themselves to this legislation, we have a letter from William Green, for many years president of the American Federation of Labor, in which he wholeheartedly endorses the Crosser bill and urges the Congress as earnestly as he knows how to pass this bill.

We have heard them tell us about the differences between what these bills provide. Let me show you, for instance, what would happen to widows under the three different schemes. Under the present arrangement, the widows get $30.10 a month. The Hall substitute would give them $40. The social security gives them $43. But the Crosser bill would give them $52 a month. A widow with one dependent child under present law receives $50.17. The Hall substitute would give her $66, the social security $86, and the Crosser bill $104, giving some slight indication of the amount of exaggeration with which we have had to contend because of the desperation these men have manifested in order to discredit the bill which I have been supporting.

I think everyone knows I have spent more than 20 years of my time in an effort to perfect the railroad-retirement system and I do not think that I have been far behind the newcomers in my efforts in that respect. Let me tell you that this bill is in harmony with everything I have done before. If I did a good job then, as I have been told heretofore was the case, then this bill improves the work.

Let us pass now to three or four other matters which have been misrepresented, or else those speaking in reference to the same did not know that about which they were talking. I refer to the so-called consolidation of the social-security system with the railroad retirement system. As a matter of fact, I was one of the first who opposed any effort at joining the two systems or absorbing the railroad-retirement system, as some of the self-constituted protectors of the railroad-retirement system desired to do. I not only opposed such consolidation but I advised the railroad workers also to oppose it. This bill I am glad to say does not propose any merger.

There are nearly 5,000,000 men whose names appear on the railroad-retirement records who have had less than 1 year's actual service. These men are not railroad men in the true sense. They are casual workers, do such work as washing windows, sweeping out the buildings, fellows who do a day's work now and then. They are not the rank and file of railroad men of the country for which the railroad-retirement bill was originally planned. These men are not railroad workers at all and they really belong to the lower-cost pension system, social security.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSSER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. I might add to what the gentleman has said that 83.4 percent of these people have service of 1 year or less.

Mr. CROSSER. That is right; practically all of them. The idea of saying we are wrecking the railroad-retirement system, as if I could reasonably desire to do anything of that kind. Years ago there was no one here shouting for a retirement system. The men in those days left the service of the railroads with little hope of having a sufficient income during old age. They had no assurance of protection against want and I can remember how hard we tried to arrange, for the peace and serenity during the evening of life of these old men who had spent the best part of their lives in operating a fine railroad system in this country. Now we hear the opposition talking as if I were anxious to tear down the retirement system. They are hard put for arguments, but nothing is further from the truth. We proposed in our bill in the case of old men who had reached the age of retirement, "If you have a wife, we are going to try to provide additional help, a little more than for those who have no wife to support." So in our bill we provided that wives 65 years of age should receive an additional amount, equal to half of what the man himself would get, but not to exceed $50. We thought that was the sensible way to help when we could not get a large increase for everyone alike.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

All time has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Well, if there is no objection, I would like to have a little more time.

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent, the time has been fixed.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSSER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to have the gentleman from Ohio tell the House how much consideration was given to this so-called Hall substitute in the committee.

Mr. CROSSER. Less than 15 minutes, I will say to the gentleman. That is how much time was given to it. I am glad the gentleman asked that question.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSSER. I yield.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Will the gentleman tell the Committee how much time was given to the consideration of the substitute that he has offered today, with the new provisions in it?

Mr. CROSSER. My dear fellow, the new provisions were discussed all the way through. They were not actually in the bill, but they were discussed, practically all of them.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL The gentleman has in his substitute integration with social security, which he was against in committee.

Mr. CROSSER. No; I disagree about that.

The work clause has a very good justification. The first bill we passed here had a work clause in it prepared by Murray Latimer, now the adviser of the CIO, in reference to retirement matters. He was their spokesman, a good man.

I would be very glad to give a complete discussion of all the provisions of this bill if I had time, but I do desire to say a word in closing about mankind's obligation to this fellow man. Let me give an illustration of what I think would be our ideal in conduct. Let us follow the example of the man whose life and conduct in his closing days at this earthly

scene are described in the following poem, to wit:

An old man, going a lone highway,
Came at evening, cold and gray,
To a chasm, vast and deep and wide,
Through which was flowing a sullen tide.
The old man crossed in the twilight dim—
That sullen stream had no fears for him,
But he turned, when he reached the other side,
And built a bridge to span the tide.
"Old man," said a fellow pilgrim near,
"You are wasting strength with building here.
Your journey will end with the ending day;
You never again must pass this way.
You have crossed the chasm, deep and wide,
Why build you the bridge at the eventide?"
The builder lifted his old gray head.
"Good friend, in the path I have come," he said,
"There followeth after me today
A youth whose feet must pass this way.
This chasm that has been naught to me
To that fair-head youth may a pitfall be.
He, too, must cross in the twilight dim;
Good friend, I am building the bridge for him."

Friends, let us all try to emulate the example of the old bridge builder. Let us have no more sophistry Let us pass the Crosser bill, H R. 3669, which has been carefully prepared and which we have urged for many months.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Crosser substitute for the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CROSSER) there were—ayes 99, noes 139.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BECKWORTH and Mr. WOLVERTON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 114, noes 158.

So the substitute amendment was rejected

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows.

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS as a substitute for the committee amendment "That section 1 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by adding after subsection (p) thereof a new subsection as follows

"2 The term Social Security Act and Social Security Act, as amended, shall mean Social Security Act as amended in 1950 "

Mr HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, we have had this matter before us all afternoon. The original bill was read and it has been debated rather fully. We have explained what the substitute will do already.

In view of that, I ask unanimous consent that the proposed amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, will the gentleman advise the House whether the substitute he is now offering contains all of the provisions of S. 1347, which was passed by the other body?

Mr. HARRIS. I shall be glad to explain to the gentleman, in the very brief remarks that I expect to make, just what the differences are. I would tell him there are some slight differences.

Mr. HESELTON. Are there differences in the bill?

Mr. HARRIS. There are three slight differences in the bill

Mr. HUGH D SCOTT, JR. Reserving the right to object, is the gentleman in a position to say that his amendment is substantially the same as the Senate bill?

Mr HARRIS There are two major changes in the Senate bill, and one more modified or minor change.

Mr HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Will the gentleman explain them?

Mr. HARRIS. I will be glad to, if the unanimous-consent request is granted.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CROSSER. I object; this is important enough that we should have an opportunity to read it and correct it if necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be in the RECORD.

Without objection further reading is dispensed with.

Mr. HESELTON Mr. Chairman, I shall object to dispensing with the further reading. I wonder if the chairman of the committee has in mind the question of whether this substitute will be voted on tonight before we have an opportunity to read it in the RECORD.

Mr. CROSSER That is exactly the question I want to ask We certainly have never seen this; I never have

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot dispose of that

Mr HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN The question pending before the Committee is: Is there objection to dispensing with further reading of the amendment, it to be printed in the RECORD?

Mr HAYS of Ohio. Mr Chairman, I object

Mr RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RABAUT. Is there objection to having the proposed amendment printed in the RECORD?

The CHAIRMAN. The request submitted was to dispense with further reading of this amendment and that it be printed in full in the RECORD

Mr. RABAUT. There is no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection was heard

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection I understood we were going to proceed with the discussion of this amendment, but if the Committee is going to rise and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD, the membership will have time to read it. I withdraw my objection under those circumstances

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the further reading of this amendment is dispensed with and it will be ordered printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

(The amendment referred to follows:)

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS as a substitute for the committee amendment: "That section 1 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by adding after subsection (p) thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(q) The terms "Social Security Act" and "Social Security Act, as amended" shall mean the Social Security Act as amended in 1950.'

"SEC 2 Subsection (c) of section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase '60 days', the phrase '6 months'

"SEC 3 Section 4 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase '60 days' in subsection (k) thereof the phrase '6 months.'

"SEC 4 Section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by adding after subsection (d) thereof the following new subsections:

"'(e) Spouse's annuity. The spouse of an individual, if—

"'(i) such individual has been awarded an annuity under subsection (a) or a pension under section 6 and has attained the age of 65, and

"'(ii) such spouse has attained the age of 65 or in the case of a wife, has in her care (individually or jointly with her husband) a child who, if her husband were then to die, would be entitled to a child's annuity under subsection (c) of section 5 of this act,

shall be entitled to a spouse's annuity equal to one-half of such individual's annuity or pension, but not more than $40 *Provided, however,* That if the annuity of the individual is awarded under paragraph 3 of subsection (a), the spouse's annuity shall be computed or recomputed as though such individual had been awarded the annuity to which he would have been entitled under paragraph 1 of said subsection: *Provided further,* That, if the annuity of the individual is awarded pursuant to a joint and survivor election, the spouse's annuity shall be computed or recomputed as though such individual had not made a joint and survivor election *And provided further,* That any spouse's annuity shall be reduced by the amount of any annuity and the amount of any monthly insurance benefit, other than a wife's or husband's insurance benefit, to which such spouse is entitled, or on proper application would be entitled, under subsection (a) of this section or subsection (d) of section 5 of this act or section 202 of the Social Security Act, except that if such spouse is disentitled to a wife's or husband's insurance benefit, or has had such benefit reduced, by reason of subsection (k) of section 202 of the Social Security Act, the reduction pursuant to this third proviso shall be only in the amount by which such spouse's monthly insurance benefit under said act exceeds the wife's or husband's insurance benefit to which such spouse would have been entitled under that act but for said subsection (k).

"'(f) For the purposes of this act, the term "spouse" shall mean the wife or husband of a retirement annuitant or pensioner who (i) was married to such annuitant or pensioner for a period of not less than three years immediately preceding the day on which the application for a spouse's annuity is filed, or is the parent of such annuitant's or pensioner's son or daughter, if, as of the day on which the application for a spouse's annuity is filed, such wife or husband and such annuitant or pensioner were members of the same household, or such wife or husband was receiving regular contributions from such annuitant or pensioner toward her or his support, or such annuitant or pensioner has been ordered by any court to contribute

to the support of such wife or husband, and (ii) in the case of a husband, was receiving at least one-half of his support from his wife at the time his wife's retirement annuity or pension began.

"'(g) The spouse's annuity provided in subsection (e) shall, with respect to any month, be subject to the same provisions of subsection (d) as the individual's annuity, and, in addition, the spouse's annuity shall not be payable for any month if the individual's annuity is not payable for such month (or, in the case of a pensioner, would not be payable if the pension were an annuity) by reason of the provisions of said subsection (d). Such spouse's annuity shall cease at the end of the month preceding the month in which (i) the spouse or the individual dies, (ii) the spouse and the individual are absolutely divorced, or (iii), in the case of a wife under age 65, she no longer has in her care a child who, if her husband were then to die, would be entitled to an annuity under subsection (c) of section 5 of this act.'

"SEC 5 Subsection (a) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by changing '2 40' to '2 76', '1 80' to '2 07', and '1 20' to '1 38.'

"SEC 6. Subsection (b) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out all of paragraph 4.

"SEC. 7 Subsection (e) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by changing the phrase 'subsection 2 (a) (3)' to 'section 2 (a) 3 or the last paragraph of section 3 (b)'; by changing '3 60' to '$4 14', and '$60' to '$69', and by changing the period at the end of the subsection to a colon and inserting after the colon the following: '*Provided, however,* That in case of an individual having a current connection with the railroad industry and not less than ten years of service that if for any entire month in which an annuity accrues and is payable under this act the annuity to which an employee is entitled under this act (or would have been entitled except for a reduction pursuant to section 2 (a) 3 or a joint and survivor election), together with his or her spouse's annuity, if any, or the total of survivor annuities under this act deriving from the same employee, is less than the amount, or the additional amount, which would have been payable to all persons for such month under the Social Security Act (deeming completely and partially insured individuals to be fully and currently insured, respectively, and disregarding any possible deductions under subsections (f) and (g) (2) of section 203 thereof) if such employee's service as an employee after December 31, 1936, were included in the term 'employment' as defined in that act and quarters of coverage were determined in accordance with section 5 (1) (4) of this act, such annuity or annuities, shall be increased proportionately to a total of such amount or such additional amount'

"SEC 8 Subsection (a) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out the phrase 'three-fourths of'; and by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon, and by inserting after the colon the following: '*Provided, however,* That if in the month preceding the employee's death the spouse of such employee was entitled to a spouse's annuity under subsection (e) of section 2 in an amount greater than the widow's or widower's insurance annuity, the widow's or widower's insurance annuity shall be increased to such greater amount'

"SEC. 9. Subsection (b) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out the phrase 'three-fourths of'; and by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and inserting after the colon the following: '*Provided, however,* That if in the month preceding the employee's death the spouse of such employee was entitled to a spouse's annuity under subsection (e) of section 2 in an amount greater than the widow's current insurance annuity, the widow's current insurance annuity shall be increased to such greater amount'

"SEC 10 Subsection (c) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase 'one-half' the phrase 'two-thirds'.

"SEC 11. Subsection (d) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase 'one-half' the phrase 'two-thirds'

"SEC 12 Subsection (e) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase 'one-half' the phrase 'two-thirds'.

"SEC. 13 Subsection (f) (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting in the first sentence for the word 'eight' the word 'ten'.

"SEC. 14. Subsection (h) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(h) Maximum and minimum annuity totals: Whenever according to the provisions of this section as to annuities, payable for a month with respect to the death of an employee, the total of annuities is more than $30 and exceeds either (a) $160, or (b) an amount equal to 2⅔ times such employee's basic amount, whichever of such amounts is the lesser, such total of annuities shall, prior to any deductions under subsection (i), be reduced to such lesser amount or to $30, whichever is greater Whenever such total of annuities is less than $14, such total shall, prior to any deductions under subsection (i), be increased to $14'

"SEC. 15 Subdivision (ii) of paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting '$50' for '$25'.

"SEC. 16 Subsection (j) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out all of the third sentence thereof after the phrase 'the month in which' (including the proviso), and substituting the following: 'eligibility therefor was otherwise acquired, but not earlier than the first day of the sixth month before the month in which the application was filed'

"EFFECTIVE DATES

"SEC. 17. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided, the amendments made by this act shall take effect with respect to benefits accruing under the railroad retirement acts and the Social Security Act after the last day of the month in which this act is enacted, irrespective of when service or employment occurred or compensation or wages were earned *Provided, however,* That in the recomputation pursuant to this act of survivor annuities heretofore awarded, the basic amount shall not be recomputed

"(b) The amendments made by sections 2, 3, and 16 of this act shall apply to benefits awarded in whole or in part on or after the date of enactment of this act

"(c) Where the parent of a deceased employee has, prior to the date of enactment of this act, been awarded a survivor annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act which is currently payable, the entitlement of such parent to a survivor's annuity in accordance with the amendments made by this act shall be determined without regard to whether or not such employee died leaving a 'widow', as defined in this act.

"(d) All joint and survivor annuities heretofore and hereafter awarded shall, notwithstanding the provisions of law under which the election of the joint and survivor annuity was made, be increased to the amount that would have been payable had no election been made, if the spouse for whom the election was made predeceased the individual who made the election; such increased annuity shall, subject to the provisions of section 2 (c) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, begin to accrue on the first of the calendar month following the calendar month in which the spouse died but not before the calendar month next following the month of enactment hereof.

"(e) All pensions due in months following the first calendar month after the month of enactment hereof, shall be increased by 15 per centum.

"(f) The increase in retirement annuities provided by this Act shall apply also to annuities heretofore awarded under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935, and the term 'spouse' as used in this Act shall include the wife or husband of an employee who has been awarded an annuity under the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935. The provisions of this Act shall not apply to annuities heretofore paid under the Railroad Retirement Acts in lump sums equal to their commuted values.

"(g) The annuity of the spouse of an employee who has been awarded an annuity under section 3 (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 or under section 2 (a) 2 (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 prior to its amendment by Public Law 572, Seventy-ninth Congress, shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, be one-half the annuity such employee would have received had the annuity been awarded at age sixty-five.

"(h) All recertifications by the Railroad Retirement Board required by reason of the provisions of this Act shall be made without application therefor.

"AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

"SEC 18. Section 1 (k) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of the first paragraph thereof the following. '*Provided further,* That any calendar day on which no remuneration is payable to or accrues to an employee solely because of the application to him of mileage or work restrictions agreed upon in schedule agreements between employers and employees or solely because he is standing by for or laying over between regularly assigned trips or tours of duty shall not be considered either a day of unemployment or a day of sickness'

"SEC 19 Subsection a–1 of section 4 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by striking out all of subsection (iii) and (iv) thereof.

"SEC 20 The provisions of sections 28 and 29 of this act shall become effective with respect to registration periods beginning on and after January 1, 1952."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr Chairman, it is getting late and it will require but very few minutes to explain this substitute in view of the debate we have had on this subject this afternoon following the debate which we had last Thursday, a week ago. If the membership will listen to me briefly, I will try to explain very quickly just what it will do

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce after considering this entire subject for several months, not 15 minutes, as we were told a moment ago, but after considering the entire subject for several months and holding hearings for days and days and meeting day after day in executive session, considered the original bill which was just

now voted down, considered the bill that the chairman introduced on behalf of the operating brotherhoods, and considered some 25 or 30 other bills that were introduced by individual Members of Congress We considered the entire subject over a long period of time. The committee took up the bill H R. 3669 and read it paragraph by paragraph and amended it in various ways After the completion of reading of the bill, a number of amendments were adopted, incidentally leaving the bill at that time pretty much in line with what I am offering here now. The Congress was about to recess for a few days and the members of the committee were anxious to report something before they left Consequently, we reported the Hall substitute, which would provide 15 percent across-the-board increase for pensioners and annuitants.

Mr. CROSSER Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio

Mr. CROSSER And I say without fear of contradiction that I did not see or hear that so-called substitute read until 15 minutes before we adjourned the committee

Mr HARRIS I appreciate that.

Mr. CROSSER. That is what I said before I did not say we had not considered these bills. That is not it. But we did have about 15 minutes to look at the lines that were written there

Mr HARRIS I still stand on my statement that we considered this entire subject, including this bill, in the course of many, many months

Mr. CROSSER. And on the same basis I have considered it for 20 years.

Mr HARRIS Well, I commend the gentleman for his very fine work

Mr. CROSSER. I am talking about a specific thing

Mr HARRIS So the committee voted a straight across-the-board increase of 15 percent for annuitants and pensioners. We provide 33⅓ percent for survivors and 25-percent increase for lump-sum payments We did that in order to get something out of the committee so that some tangible action would be taken by the committee before we left

I am proposing here the identical increase for the annuitants, pensioners, survivors, and lump-sum payments and the same increase that was included in the bill that was passed by the Senate yesterday. The Senate accepted the action of our committee with reference to increased benefits for beneficiaries. In addition the Senate provided a spouse provision for $40 instead of $50 We are accepting that in the substitute I am offering here

Mr HESELTON Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts

Mr. HESELTON. Does the gentleman's substitute guarantee all of the annuitants and survivors the same payments that they received before?

Mr. HARRIS. I will get to that in a moment. We have spouse benefits in this substitute providing $40. That is, one-half of the pensioner's retirement but not to exceed $40 instead of the $50. originally proposed. We do not increase the taxable base from $200 to $350 as was in Senate bill. We strike that provision out and leave the taxable base where it is.

We provide a modification for the 10-year men. The Senate transferred all 10-year men to social security, that is all employees with less than 10 years of service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection

Mr HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, we provide that the less than 10-year men will remain just as they are today We provide a guaranty for those with 10 years or more of current service in the railroad industry, a minimum guaranty that they shall receive what they would have received had they been under social security, just as the bill the gentleman originally introduced provided, the very same thing that the gentleman from Texas has been asking for to help those who need help most

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr HARRIS I yield to the gentleman from Michigan

Mr BENNETT of Michigan. Will the gentleman give us an idea of the cost?

Mr HARRIS I will come to that. We strike out the provision of social security integration, the one that I explained to you a moment ago, which the chairman accepted and offered today for the first time and which has never been considered by members of our committee. We strike that out. In other words, we modify the 10-year provision We take out the increase for the taxable base. We strike out the integration provision and we take the rest of the bill which the Senate adopted yesterday in the hope that this House will accept it, that it may go to the Senate and that the Senate will accept it and these people who are entitled to these benefits will receive them without delay

Mr BENNETT of Michigan Does the gentleman know, if his proposal is adopted, that it will cost approximately 17-plus?

Mr HARRIS No, the gentleman does not know that Neither does the gentleman from Michigan know it

Mr BENNETT of Michigan Does not the gentleman agree that the Senate bill as now passed will cost 14 06?

Mr HARRIS. No Senator DOUGLAS—and it is in the committee report—says it will cost 13 90 which is more near in line with a sound program than the one the gentleman from Michigan has been supporting.

Mr BENNETT of Michigan Does the gentleman know how much his bill will cost?

Mr. HARRIS. It will cost 13 9 plus about one-half percent, because of striking out the spouse provision. It will mean about $45,000,000.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan But you are reducing the taxable base from $350 to $300. How much are you going to lose there?

Mr. HARRIS. We do not think that that takes away from the soundness of the fund any more than your proposal. That is the reason we will have to have the resolution for further study.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. How much does that increase the cost of your proposal?

Mr. HARRIS By reducing it?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan Yes.

Mr. HARRIS I will say to the gentleman it is just as sound as any program that has been presented, and the RECORD shows it throughout, because as yet there is no bill that has been offered that has a sound program, that is keeping the fund actuarially sound.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania

Mr VAN ZANDT You have eliminated entirely the limitation on earnings after one retires?

Mr HARRIS Yes, we have eliminated the $50 work clause altogether

Mr PRIEST Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee

Mr PRIEST In line with what the gentleman just said about cost, the gentleman, I am sure, will point out to the committee, and the committee will recognize, that this also, as a majority of the committee sees it, is in effect stopgap legislation pending a study that must be made of the controversial issues

Mr HARRIS. And so stated by Senator DOUGLAS yesterday when the bill passed the Senate.

Mr. BROOKS Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr HARRIS I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana

Mr BROOKS. Does this increase the tax assessment?

Mr HARRIS It does not increase the tax assessment at all

I urge the committee to accept this substitute because I firmly believe this is undoubtedly the nearest that we can come to satisfying all groups.

Mr. HESELTON Mr Chairman, I move to strike out the last word

Mr. Chairman, at this late hour I do not intend to use 5 minutes I think the RECORD, however, should be made entirely clear that the bill that has been offered eliminates a provision that is calculated by the proponents in the other body, as well as by those of us who supported the Crosser bill, as involving $50,000,000 that you are going to throw away if you accept this amendment

Secondly, yesterday afternoon in the other body the gentleman to whom the gentleman from Arkansas referred said flat-footedly that this bill will cost 14 06 percent. That is at the bottom of the first column at page 13117 of the RECORD. You are going to take a real chance on wrecking this proposal if you act hurriedly. There should be a disposition for all of us who want to do the right thing to at least see what is in this RECORD and see what is in this bill that we are asked to vote upon at this time of night. We have no idea, except as the

gentleman has outlined it, and I agree, capably, of what it contains. I think we owe it to ourselves and to the railroad workers of this country, whatever unions they may belong to, that we take considerate and not hasty action, that we know we are acting in their best interests, and that we are individually and collectively measuring up to our responsibilities. We must recognize that in a very real sense we are acting as trustees of this fund. I hope there will be no insistence on hasty action that we may all regret very much in the days to come.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Is it not also a fact that taking the integration with social security out of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas will cost another 2 percent of the payroll?

Mr. HESELTON. It will.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. So that the total cost of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas on the railroad-retirement fund would be 1.07 percent of payroll. Where in the name of common sense is this money going to come from? The maximum fund that is raised under the present tax is 12½ percent. No one proposes that that tax rate be raised, so how are you going to provide these benefits unless you provide some savings or increase the tax rate here to make the money available?

Mr HESELTON. I cannot answer the question. But surely it should be answered.

Mr HUGH D. SCOTT, JR Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr HESELTON I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Will not the gentleman agree that the best chance of getting a workable bill here is to go along at this point with that provision in the bill from the other body which raises the base pay from $300 to $350, rather than the suggestion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. HESELTON. I would say that many of us who supported the provisions of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] would undoubtedly be willing to go along with most of the features of the Senate bill to get something done. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] suggests that we are literally providing no possibility of paying these increases. How are you going to explain this action to these people when the day comes and you have to say, "We must increase your taxes or we must reduce these benefits" That is the question that will be asked of us if we act hastily tonight without sound consideration of the fiscal side of this picture. I want these benefits increased. I am sure we all do. But I want our action now to be such that we can defend and explain it and that it will be a case of continued maintenance of the increases.

Surely those who have expressed concern about increased payments to this fund because the proposed increase in the tax base should be equally concerned as to whether there will have to be increased tax rates soon under this proposal.

I think we would all expect these beneficiaries to adjust their standards of living upward upon receiving increased benefits. Surely no one would want to have to reduce them later if this proposal made that or an increased tax rate necessary.

From the study I have been able to give to this proposal in these few minutes, I do believe it is an infinitely better suggestion than the committee bill. While I question whether an opportunity for a few short hours' study of it is likely to be granted, I feel strongly that for the RECORD, for the conference, and for the future, at least this warning of the possibilities should be given. I think it is my responsibility to do this and I appreciate the courtesy of my colleagues in permitting me to do so.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr KERSTEN of Wisconsin to the substitute offered by Mr. HARRIS: After section 16 insert the following new section:

"SEC 16 A Employees who, prior to their death, had not less than 30 years of service as defined in section 1 (f) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and who died in the period beginning August 29, 1935, and ending June 30, 1938, shall be deemed, solely for the purpose of a widow's age-65 annuity, to have died fully insured, within the meaning of section 5 (1) of such act. *Provided, however,* That any annuity awarded under this section shall be computed in the same manner as if such annuity had been awarded under section 5 (a) of such act: *Provided further,* That this section shall apply only with respect to widows who are not receiving monthly pensions (whether under public or private plans) based on the railroad service of their deceased husbands."

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the entire 5 minutes to which I am entitled, because of the lateness of the hour, but I ask the gentlemen of the Committee on both sides to consider seriously the situation of the widows of employees who died during the period from 1935 to 1938; that is not involved in the main issue that is before the House.

My amendment merely seeks to take care of less than 2,000 widows who are 65 or over, who are not otherwise provided for; widows of employees who had 30 years or more of service with the railroads. These employees have helped to build up the roads, and they are entitled to consideration.

Mr. Matscheck, the research director of the committee, estimates that the total over-all cost for all time, not just for 1 year, as I think was understood when I previously argued this point, is less than $10,000,000, for all time, to take care of fewer than 2,000 widows of railroad employees who have 30 years or more of service, in a period of time about 2 years, for which there is no provision.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the gentleman's amendment is a worthy one, and I think it is justified. I hope it will be the pleasure of the House to adopt it.

Mr. KERSTEN. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I merely want to point out that if we really want to do something for people who are in need, these are the people in greatest need.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I am sure the gentleman will recall that when the Railroad Retirement Act was amended in 1946 very careful consideration was given to the problem the gentleman presents here today. I think we all recognize that the gentleman does have a problem with which we are entirely sympathetic. May I say that a resolution was adopted by the Senate yesterday in which we hope to concur. It is a joint resolution providing for a joint study in order to further work out a program that we hope everyone will be satisfied with. Would it not be better to wait until that time and see if this problem cannot be ironed out with those other problems?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin I certainly think it should be taken care of at some time in the very near future, because the widows of these employees are more in need than any other category for which the law was enacted In response to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr HARRIS] I am happy to know that he is, as he states, entirely sympathetic with the problem of the widows of employees of 30 years or more of service, who are now without any benefits whatsoever from a system that was built up largely by the sweat and toil of their deceased husbands

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] to the Harris substitute

The amendment to the substitute was rejected

Mr CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr CHENOWETH to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Strike all of subsection D, and insert the following:

"(d) All joint and survivor annuities heretofore and hereafter awarded shall be governed by the law under which the election of the joint and survivor annuity was made, except that the individual who made the election shall have the right to revoke the same in such manner and form as the Board may prescribe.

"An election shall be deemed to have been revoked if before or after the enactment hereof the spouse for whom the election was made predeceased the individual who made the election Upon revocation of the election, or death of the spouse, as herein provided, the individual's annuity shall be increased to the amount which would have been payable had no election been made, such increased annuity shall, subject to the provisions of section 2 (c) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, begin to accrue on the first of the calendar month following the calendar month in which the election was revoked or the spouse died but not before the calendar month next following the month of enactment hereof."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr CHENOWETH] is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which was considered by the committee. There are few people involved. There is an admitted inequity. Because of the action of the committee, and the feeling at that time, and because we are familiar with what the gentleman's amendment will do, we are prepared to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement made by my distinguished colleague from Arkansas in support of this amendment I will not take the time of the House to explain the same in detail. I greatly appreciate the action of the gentleman from Arkansas in accepting my amendment to his substitute bill.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment deals with joint and survivor annuities, and removes an injustice that is now being done to those retired railroad workers who, prior to the enactment of the Crosser bill in 1946, had elected to take a smaller pension in order to be sure that their widows would receive a pension on their death. I might state that both the Crosser bill, which has been discussed here this afternoon, and the Harris substitute, contain a part of the amendment I am offering. My amendment goes a little further and includes a small group of retired railroad employees who would otherwise continue to be the subject of discrimination.

In this amendment it is provided that the election by the pensioner to take a joint and survivor annuity shall be revoked, first, if the pensioner shall so notify the Railroad Retirement Board; and second, if the spouse for whom the election was made shall die before her husband. Under the present law there can be no relief in cases where the wife dies. The retired worker continues to draw the smaller annuity, even though it will never be possible to enjoy the benefits anticipated when the election was made.

Mr. Chairman, there were three types of these joint and survivor annuities, known as A, B, and C. Under the A annuity the pensioner receives $32 per month less than he is entitled to under the present law. The class B annuity provides for a deduction of $27 per month, and under the class C annuity the pensioner takes $22 per month less than the full amount of his retirement. As stated above, before 1946 many retired workers elected to take these reduced pensions in order that their wives might have certain benefits on their death. Over the years a pensioner would have his pension reduced by several thousand dollars. This became unnecessary after the enactment of the Crosser bill in 1946.

By the adoption of this amendment it will now be possible for retired railroad workers to revoke their annuity contracts and be eligible immediately to receive the full amount of their pension. We are now seeking to repay them for the money they have already lost as a result of their election to take the annuity, and consequently the reduced pension. However, we now provide a way for these men to get their full pension for the remainder of their lives. In many of these cases the wives have already passed on. In other instances the wives are still living, and this additional money each month is needed in order to meet current expenses.

I should also explain that after the passage of the Crosser bill in 1946, which for the first time provided for benefits for widows of deceased pensioners, the period of 1 year was given in which to cancel these annuities. Several thousand retired railroad workers did elect to revoke their annuity contracts then. However, through poor advice, others retained their annuities. They now see their mistake and I am most happy that we are today giving them another opportunity to make this election. In cases where the wives have died, the restoration of the full pension is automatic. Where the wife is still living, the pensioner must elect in the manner and form as the Board may prescribe.

The CHAIRMAN The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] to the Harris substitute

The amendment to the substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Harris substitute.

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended by the Harris substitute.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr DAVIS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3669) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 428, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks with reference to the Railroad Retirement Act amendments just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS TO MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 752) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to convey by a quitclaim deed to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, a public agency created by the General Assembly of Maryland, all of the remaining portion of the former animal disease station near Bethesda, Md, consisting of approximately 32 acres, to be used exclusively for public park, parkway, or playground purposes and on the express condition that if the said Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission fails to use the lands for the purposes herein provided, or at any time discontinues the use of such lands for the purposes herein provided, or attempts to alienate such lands, title thereto shall revert to and become vested in the United States of America.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 2150) was laid on the table.

TRANSFERRING CERTAIN PROPERTY IN ST LOUIS, MO, TO THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S 466) to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Army certain property in St. Louis, Mo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. DAWSON. This bill simply transfers to the Navy certain property in St. Louis for the use of the armed services.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Who owns the property now?

Mr. DAWSON. It is owned by the GSA, General Services Administration. It is transferred from one department to another, without compensation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to transfer, without reimbursement, to the Department of the Army those buildings formerly known as the War Assets Administration Sales Buildings, located at 8900 South Broadway, St. Louis, Mo, together with the land and facilities in connection there-

with, and now under the control and jurisdiction of the General Services Administration.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEALING CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO GOVERNMENT RECORDS

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1967) to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, what does this bill do?

Mr. DAWSON. This repeals certain obsolete laws that are noncontroversial. Each of the departments was notified. This bill came up on the Consent Calendar and because it had not been on for three legislative days, it was not heard at that time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is a unanimous report from your committee?

Mr. DAWSON. It is.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That the following acts and parts of acts are hereby repealed:

(1) The sixth paragraph on page 642 of volume 31 of the Statutes at Large, in the Act of June 6, 1900 (2 U S. C 147)

(2) Section 4 of the act of July 19, 1919 (41 Stat 233; 5 U S C. 111).

(3) The second full paragraph on page 412 of volume 21 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of March 3, 1881 (5 U S. C 112).

(4) The second sentence of the first full paragraph on page 228 of volume 22 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of August 5, 1882 (5 U S. S. 112).

(5) The act of February 16, 1889 (25 Stat. 672, 5 U S. C 112).

(6) The fourth full paragraph on page 933 of volume 28 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of March 2, 1895 (5 U. S C. 112).

(7) The act of July 27, 1892, chapter 267 (27 Stat. 275; 5 U. S. C. 193).

(8) The last paragraph commencing on page 403 and ending on page 404 of volume 28 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of August 18, 1894 (5 U. S. C. 193).

(9) The act of March 2, 1913 (37 Stat. 723; 5 U S. C. 193).

(10) The act of April 28, 1904, No. 35 (33 Stat. 591; 5 U. S. C. 194).

(11) The last sentence in the paragraph commencing on page 970 and ending on page 971 of volume 25 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of March 2, 1889 (5 U S. C. 194a).

(12) The last sentence in the sixth full paragraph on page 403 of volume 33 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of April 27, 1904 (5 U. S. C. 414).

(13) The second paragraph on page 579 of volume 34 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of June 29, 1906 (5 U. S. C. 414).

(14) The fifth full paragraph on page 1281 of volume 34 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of March 4, 1907 (5 U. S C. 544).

(15) The third paragraph on page 204 of volume 31 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of May 25, 1900 (15 U. S. C. 321).

(16) The act of August 13, 1946, chapter 961 (60 Stat. 1057; 30 U. S. C. 12).

(17) Section 1 of the act of June 22, 1926, chapter 650 (44 Stat. 761; 31 U. S. C. 121).

(18) The last paragraph commencing on page 329 and ending on page 330 of volume 37 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of August 22, 1912 (34 U. S. C. 547).

(19) The proviso in the last paragraph commencing on page 929 and ending on page 930 of volume 38 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of March 3, 1915 (34 U. S. C. 548).

(20) Section 8 of the act of August 4, 1854 (10 Stat. 572; 35 U S. C 17).

(21) The act of February 13, 1925, chapter 230 (43 Stat 942; 35 U. S. C. 18).

(22) Section 6 of the act of April 11, 1930 (46 Stat. 156; 35 U. S. C. 23).

(23) The matter appearing before the proviso in the last paragraph commencing on page 415 and ending on page 416 of volume 35 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of May 27, 1908 (39 U. S. C 739).

(24) Section 58 of the act of June 8, 1872 (R S. 4060; 17 Stat. 292; 39 U. S. C. 792).

(25) The act of May 28, 1926, chapter 415 (44 Stat. 672; 43 U S C. 25, 25a, 25b).

(26) The first proviso in the second paragraph on page 112 of volume 55 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of April 5, 1941;

(27) The proviso in the fifth full paragraph on page 411 of volume 56 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of June 27, 1942 (44 U. S C 364).

(28) The first full paragraph on page 1000 of volume 56 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of October 26, 1942 (44 U S. C 365).

SEC 2 The following acts and parts of acts are amended by addition of the words "until no longer needed in conducting current business", as shown below:

(1) After "advocate" in line 8 of section 217 of the act of June 25, 1948, on page 632 of volume 62 of the Statutes at Large (10 U. S C. 1507).

(2) After "remain" in line 4 of section 42c as set forth in the act of June 22, 1938, on page 860 of volume 52 of the Statutes at Large (11 U. S. C. 70c).

(3) After "offices" in line 3 of section 71 as set forth in the act of June 2[illegible] 1938, on page 882 of volume 52 of the Statutes at Large (11 U. S. C. 111).

(4) After "institution" in line 4 of section 7 of the act of August 10, 1846, on page 105 of volume 9 of the Statutes at Large (20 U. S C 46).

SEC. 3. The following acts and parts of acts are amended, as shown below:

(1) By amending the third paragraph appearing on page 208 of volume 28 of the Statutes at Large in section 8 of the act of July 31, 1894, as amended (31 U S C. 74), to read as follows:

"The General Accounting Office shall preserve all accounts which have been finally adjusted, together with all vouchers, certificates, and related papers, until disposed of as provided by law."

(2) Section 248 of the act of June 8, 1872 (17 Stat. 313), as amended by section 2 of the act of June 13, 1898 (30 Stat. 444; 39 U. S. C. 428), is revised to read as follows:

"The Postmaster General shall have recorded, in a book to be kept for that purpose, a true and faithful abstract of all proposals made to him for carrying the mail, giving the name of the party offering, the terms of the offer, the sum to be paid, and the time the contract is to continue; and he shall put on file and preserve the originals of all such proposals until disposed of as provided by law. The reports of the arrivals and departures of the mails on mail routes made and sent by postmasters to the Second Assistant Postmaster General, on which no fines or deductions from the pay of contractors for carrying the mails have been based, and the certificates of oaths taken by carriers on mail routes may be disposed of as provided by law when no longer needed in conducting current business."

(3) By inserting "until disposed of as provided by law" after "office" in line 11 of section 1 of the act of May 18, 1858, chapter 39, as amended, on page 289 of volume 11 of the Statutes at Large (43 U. S. C. 59).

(4) By deleting "permanently" from the final sentence of section 505 (a) of the act of June 29, 1936, as amended, on page 1998 of volume 49 of the Statutes at Large (46 U. S. C. 1155), and by adding "until disposed of as provided by law" between "file" and the period at the end of said sentence

SEC 4 The following acts and parts of acts are amended, as shown below:

(1) By changing to a colon the period at the end of the twelfth paragraph on page 858 of volume 35 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of March 4, 1909, and inserting thereafter "*Provided*, That no records of the Federal Government shall be transferred, disposed of, or destroyed under the authority granted in this paragraph." (2 U S. C. 149)

(2) By changing to a colon the period at the end of section 9 of the act of April 25, 1914, on page 350 of volume 38 of the Statutes at Large, and inserting thereafter "*Provided*, That nothing in this section shall preclude the disposition of such records as provided by law when they are no longer needed in conducting the current business of the Department" (5 U. S C 196)

(3) By changing the period at the end of the first full paragraph on page 788 of volume 28 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of March 2, 1895 (5 U. S C 197), to a colon and inserting thereafter "*Provided*, That the disposition of any records required in furnishing such transcripts shall, after they are otherwise not needed in conducting current business, be made as provided by law"

(4) By deleting all after "kept" in line 7 of section 482 (e) of the act of June 17, 1930, on page 721 of volume 46 of the Statutes at Large (19 U S C 1482 (e)) and by substituting therefor "until no longer needed in conducting the current business of the consular office, at which time it may be disposed of as provided by law"

(5) By deleting all after the enacting clause of the act of March 27, 1934, chapter 93 (48 Stat. 501; 25 U. S. C 199a), and by substituting therefor "That title to records of Indian tribes heretofore placed with the Oklahoma Historical Society of the State of Oklahoma by the Secretary of the Interior shall remain vested in the United States and such records shall be held by the said society under rules and regulations prescribed by the Administrator of General Services: *Provided*, That copies of any such records, documents, books, or papers held by the said society when certified by the secretary or chief clerk thereof under its seal, or by the officer or person acting as secretary or chief clerk, shall be evidence equally with the original, and in making such certified copies the said secretary or acting secretary and the said chief clerk or acting chief clerk shall be acting as a Federal agent, and such certified copies shall have the same force and effect as if made by the Administrator of General Services as provided in section 509 (b) of the Federal Records Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 583): *Provided further*, That whenever such certified copies are desired for official use by the Federal Government they shall be furnished without cost: *Provided further*, That any such records held by the said society shall be promptly returned to the Government official designated by the Administrator of General Services upon his request therefor."

(6) By deleting "it deems advisable" in the last line of section 1120 on page 162 of volume 53 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of February 10, 1939 (26 U S. C. 1120), and substituting therefor "is provided by law."

(7) By inserting "until deposited with the National Archives of the United States" after

"kept" in the first sentence of section 6 of the act of June 25, 1948, on page 870 of volume 62 of the Statutes at Large (28 U. S C 6).

(8) By inserting a comma, followed by "subject to the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government,' approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended," after "authorized" in line 3 of the act of May 11, 1906, on page 186 of volume 34 of the Statutes at Large (39 U. S C 8).

(9) By inserting a comma, followed by "until disposed of as provided by law," after "and" in line 7 of section 71 of the act of June 8, 1872, on page 293 of volume 17 of the Statutes at Large (39 U. S. C. 41).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO REPEAL CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY LAWS

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1952) to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, does this bill repeal laws?

Mr. DAWSON. Yes, but it is noncontroversial. All departments involved were notified.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following acts and parts of acts are hereby repealed

(1) The sixth paragraph on page 865 of volume 32 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of February 25, 1903 (2 U. S. C. 148).

(2) The first full paragraph on page 1404 of volume 36 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of March 4, 1911 (3 U. S C. 47).

(3) Section 197 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (5 U. S. C. 109).

(4) Section 226 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 201).

(5) The act of June 7, 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 597; 5 U. S C. 203–207).

(6) The act of May 29, 1928, as amended (45 Stat. 985, ch 900; 5 U. S. C. 219).

(7) Section 8 of the act of July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 643, 5 U S. C. 229).

(8) The last paragraph commencing on page 817 and ending on page 818 of volume 25 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of March 2, 1889 (5 U. S C 454), and said paragraph shall be inapplicable to the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, notwithstanding the second sentence of the second full paragraph on page 245 of volume 27 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of July 19, 1892.

(9) The third full paragraph on page 270 of volume 41 of the Statutes at Large in the act of July 24, 1919 (5 U. S. C. 550).

(10) So much of the first full paragraph on page 614 of volume 47 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of July 7, 1932 (7 U. S. C. 386g), as reads: "to transfer to any Government department or establishment or to local authorities or institutions such property and/or equipment or to sell the same at public or private sale and"

(11) The sixth paragraph on page 274 of volume 37 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of August 10, 1912 (7 U. S C. 392).

(12) The matter appearing after the semicolon in the second full paragraph on page 143 of volume 59 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of May 5, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 419).

(13) The first full paragraph on page 748 of volume 55 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of October 28, 1941 (10 U. S. C. 576a).

(14) The last proviso on page 1347 of volume 40 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of March 4, 1919 (10 U. S. C. 1122).

(15) Section 3714 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1191, 34 U. S. C. 560).

(16) The last paragraph commencing on page 737 and ending on page 738 of volume 42 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of June 30, 1922 (10 U. S. C. 1225).

(17) The first paragraph of chapter IV of the act of July 11, 1919 (41 Stat. 130; 10 U. S. C. 1251).

(18) Section 8 of the act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 1015; 10 U. S. C 1257, 1311).

(19) Section 1241 of the Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 1261).

(20) The first and second paragraphs of chapter II of the act of July 11, 1919 (41 Stat 129–130; 10 U. S C. 1263–1264).

(21) The last proviso on page 105 of volume 41 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of July 11, 1919 (10 U S C 1265).

(22) The act of April 17, 1920 (41 Stat. 554; 10 U S C 1266).

(23) Section 5 of the act of July 19, 1919 (41 Stat 233, 10 U. S C 1267).

(24) The last paragraph on page 132 of volume 41 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of July 11, 1919, as amended (10 U S C., Supp 1274).

(25) The eighth paragraph on page 1028 of volume 40 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of November 4, 1918 (10 U S. C. 1286).

(26) The act of May 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 588, 10 U S C. 1349).

(27) The proviso in the act of February 20, 1931 (46 Stat. 1191, ch 235; 10 U. S. C. 1354).

(28) So much of the matter following the heading "Transportation of the Army and Its Supplies" in the act of March 2, 1905 (33 Stat. 837, 10 U S C 1372), as reads ", and hereafter no steamship in the transport service of the United States shall be sold or disposed of without the consent of Congress having been first had or obtained"

(29) The act of March 12, 1926, as amended (44 Stat 203; 10 U. S. C. 1594, 1595–1597, 1598-1605).

(30) The second and third provisos on page 585 of volume 58 of the Statutes at Large, in the Act of June 28, 1944 (10 U S C. 1594b).

(31) Section 3 of the Act of February 25, 1927 (44 Stat. 1236, 10 U. S C 1597a).

(32) Section 92 (e) of section 1 of the Act of August 4, 1949 (63 Stat. 503; 14 U. S C., Supp., 92 (e)).

(33) Section 93 (k) of section 1 of the Act of August 4, 1949 (63 Stat. 504; 14 U. S C., Supp, 93 (k)).

(34) So much of the fourth paragraph on page 1258 of volume 34 of the Statutes at Large, in the Act of March 4, 1907 (15 U. S C. 320), as reads: "and hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell any surplus maps or publications of the Weather Bureau, and the money received from such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States, section two hundred and twenty-seven of the Revised Statutes notwithstanding;".

(35) The fifth paragraph on page 1215 of volume 42 of the Statutes at Large, in the Act of January 24, 1923 (16 U. S. C. 7).

(36) Section 519 of the Revised Statutes (20 U. S. C. 5).

(37) The provisos in the fifth paragraph on page 397 of volume 20 of the Statutes at Large, in the Act of March 3, 1879 (20 U. S. C. 61).

(38) The first paragraph on page 661 of volume 38 of the Statutes at Large, in the Act of August 1, 1914 (20 U. S. C. 62)

(39) The fourth paragraph on page 930 of volume 41 of the Statutes at Large, in the Act of June 5, 1920 (20 U. S. C. 63, 33 U. S. C. 867).

(40) The second sentence of the third paragraph on page 629 of volume 22 of the Statutes at Large, in the Act of March 3, 1883 (20 U. S C 64).

(41) The Act of November 19, 1919 (41 Stat. 360, ch. 118, 20 U. S. C. 93).

(42) The Act of May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 753, ch. 760; 20 U. S. C. 94).

(43) The fifth proviso on page 452 of volume 60 of the Statutes at Large, in the Act of July 5, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1140).

(44) Section 3 of the Act of February 12, 1925 (43 Stat 890, 23 U S. C 49).

(45) The Act of March 15, 1920 (41 Stat. 530, 23 U. S. C 51–53, 39 U. S C. 502–503).

(46) The seventh full paragraph on page 373 of volume 40 of the Statutes at Large, in the Act of October 6, 1917 (24 U S C 178).

(47) The Act of June 20, 1939 (53 Stat. 843, ch 220, 24 U. S. C 298).

(48) The proviso under the heading "Transportation" on page 291 of volume 19 of the Statutes at Large, in the Act of March 3, 1877, and the fifth full paragraph on page 676 of volume 30 of the Statutes at Large, in the Act of July 17, 1898 (25 U. S C. 100).

(49) Section 2122 of the Revised Statutes (25 U S C 188).

(50) Section 2123 of the Revised Statutes (25 U S C 189).

(51) Section 6 of the Act of July 1, 1898, as amended (30 Stat 596, 25 U S C 191).

(52) Section 3796 of the Internal Revenue Code of February 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 469, 26 U S C 3796).

(53) Section 3945 of the Internal Revenue Code of February 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 482, 26 U. S. C. 3945).

(54) Section 5 of the Act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat 987, 29 U S C. 16).

(55) The matter appearing after the last semicolon in the fifth paragraph on page 807 of volume 26 of the Statutes at Large, in the Act of March 2, 1891 (31 U S C. 641).

(56) Section 7 of the Act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat 1048, 33 U. S C. 558a).

(57) The second sentence of section 3 of the Act of August 11, 1888 (25 Stat. 423, 33 U. S C 623).

(58) Section 2 of the Act of September 19, 1890 (26 Stat 452), and the first sentence of section 8 of the Act of July 25, 1912 (37 Stat. 233, 33 U. S. C 625).

(59) Section 6 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat 890; 33 U. S C. 708).

(60) The last proviso in the third paragraph on page 688 of volume 40 of the Statutes at Large, in the Act of July 1, 1918 (33 U. S C. 868).

(61) The second full paragraph on page 605 of volume 39 of the Statutes at Large, in the Act of August 29, 1916 (34 U. S C 493).

(62) Section 7 of the Act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 780; 34 U. S. C. 493a).

(63) The first full paragraph on page 818 of volume 25 of the Statutes at Large, in the Act of March 2, 1889 (34 U S. C. 525).

(64) The Act of June 6 1941 (55 Stat. 247, ch. 177; 34 U. S. C. 532a).

(65) The eleventh full paragraph on page 194 of volume 26 of the Statutes at Large, in the Act of June 30, 1890 (34 U. S C 543).

(66) The third through the sixth sentences of section 2 of the act of August 5, 1882, as amended (22 Stat. 296; 34 U. S. C. 544).

(67) The act of February 14, 1927 (44 Stat. 1096, ch. 133; 34 U. S. C. 546a).

(68) The act of July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 836; 34 U S. C. 551a).

(69) The act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 884, ch. 785; 34 U. S. C. 1123f).

(70) Section 202 (11) of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 621; 38 U. S. C. 485).

(71) The third paragraph under the heading "Office of the Second Assistant Postmas-

ter General" in the act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 1031; 39 U. S. C. 468).

(72) Section 8 of the act of July 2, 1918 (40 Stat. 753), and section 3 of the act of April 24, 1920 (41 Stat. 583; 39 U. S. C. 504).

(73) The act of July 19, 1932 (47 Stat 705, ch. 510; 40 U. S. C. 5a).

(74) The sixth paragraph in the act of July 8, 1918 (40 Stat. 831; 40 U. S. C. 7).

(75) The matter appearing after the semicolon in section 1798 of the Revised Statutes (40 U. S. C. 8).

(76) The second sentence under the heading "State, War, and Navy Department Building" in the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 553; 40 U. S C. 9).

(77) So much of the sixth paragraph on page 218 of volume 35 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of May 22, 1908, as reads. ", and the State Department Annex building"; the fourth paragraph under the heading "State, War, and Navy Department Buildings" in the act of March 28, 1918 (40 Stat. 482); and the last paragraph commencing on page 598 and ending on page 599 of volume 40 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of June 4, 1918 (40 U. S. C. 10).

(78) The third paragraph under the heading "Temporary Office Buildings" in the act of March 28, 1918 (40 Stat. 483), and the tenth paragraph on page 598 of volume 40 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of June 4, 1918 (40 U S. C. 11).

(79) The first paragraph under the heading "Custody of Interior Department Building" in the act of May 24, 1922 (42 Stat. 554; 40 U. S. C. 12, 21).

(80) The third, sixth, and last paragraphs on page 1239 and the third and fifth paragraphs on page 1240 of volume 42 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of February 13, 1923 (40 U. S C. 13, 14, 15, 17, 18).

(81) The seventh paragraph on page 66 of volume 43 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of April 4, 1924 (40 U S. C. 16).

(82) The paragraph entitled "First" in section 1812 of the Revised Statutes (40 U. S. C. 20).

(83) The final proviso commencing on page 608 and ending on page 609 of volume 50 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of August 9, 1937 (40 U S C 27a).

(84) The proviso in the third full paragraph on page 659 of volume 34 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of June 30, 1906 (40 U. S C. 44).

(85) The last paragraph commencing on page 672 and ending on page 673, and the last proviso in the second full paragraph on page 673, of volume 40 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of July 1, 1918 (40 U. S. C. 110, 116)

(86) The third full paragraph on page 148 of volume 41 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of July 11, 1919 (40 U. S C. 111)

(87) The first full paragraph on page 200 of volume 41 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of July 19, 1919 (40 U S. C 112).

(88) The fourth full paragraph, excluding the last t o provisos, on page 1211, and the last paragraph commencing on page 1211 and ending on page 1212, of volume 42 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of January 24, 1923 (40 U. S C. 114, 117).

(89) The first full paragraph on page 913 of volume 41 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of June 5, 1920 (40 U. S. C 119).

(90) The matter appearing after the semicolon in the third full paragraph on page 1091 of volume 32 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of March 3, 1903 (40 U. S C. 266).

(91) Section 21 of the act of June 6, 1902 (32 Stat 326; 40 U S C. 263).

(92) The first full paragraph on page 512 of volume 24 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of March 3, 1887 (40 U. S C. 273).

(93) The last paragraph commencing on page 592 and ending on page 593 of volume 31 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of June 6, 1900 (40 U. S. C. 287).

(94) Section 5 of the act of June 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 258; 40 U. S C. 294).

(95) Section 3749 of the Revised Statutes (40 U. S. C. 302).

(96) The tenth full paragraph on page 383 of volume 20 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of March 3, 1879 (40 U. S. C. 303a).

(97) The last proviso on page 1030 of volume 45 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of December 20, 1928 (40 U. S. C. 312).

(98) Section 1 of the act of October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1109; 41 U. S. C. 6).

(99) The third paragraph on page 281, the fourth full paragraph on page 289, the last proviso on page 292, and the last proviso in the fourth full paragraph on page 302, of volume 55 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of June 28, 1941 (41 U S C 6).

(100) The proviso in the first paragraph on page 347 of volume 56 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of June 8, 1942 (41 U. S. C. 6).

(101) The last proviso on page 483, the fourth full paragraph on page 500, and the proviso in the first full paragraph on page 505, of volume 56 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of July 2, 1942 (41 U. S. C. 6)

(102) The proviso in the eighth paragraph on page 236 and the proviso in the fourth full paragraph on page 243 of volume 57 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of June 28, 1943 (41 U. S. C. 6)

(103) The proviso in the seventh paragraph on page 351 and the proviso in the second paragraph on page 358 of volume 58 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of June 26, 1944 (41 U S C 6).

(104) The proviso in the first full paragraph on page 256 of volume 59 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of June 13, 1945 (41 U S. C 6).

(105) The first proviso on page 405 of volume 60 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of July 1, 1946 (41 U S C 6)

(106) The proviso in the fourth full paragraph on page 144 of volume 40 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of June 12, 1917 (41 U S C 6a).

(107) Section 2, paragraphs (b)-(e), (g), (l), (k)-(n), of the act of October 10, 1940 (54 Stat 1110, 41 U S C 6a).

(108) The proviso on page 344 of volume 55 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of June 28, 1941 (41 U. S. C 6a).

(109) Section 7 of the act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 947, 41 U. S. C. 27).

(110) Section 2 (b) of the act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat 649, 41 U. S C 102 (b)).

(111) Section 18 (b) of the act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat 666; 41 U. S C 118 (b))

(112) Section 6 (b) of the act of September 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 890; 41 U. S. C. 1406 (b)).

(113) Section 2 of the act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat 958; 42 U. S C. 1574).

(114) Section 1, 2, and 3 of the act of July 5, 1884 (23 Stat. 103, 43 U. S. C. 1071–1073).

(115) Section 95 of the act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat 623, 44 U. S. C 93).

(116) The proviso in the fourth full paragraph on page 259 of volume 26 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of July 11, 1890 (44 U. S. C. 283a).

(117) Section 10 of the act of July 9, 1941 (55 Stat. 582, 44 U. S. C. 300 jj).

(118) Section 12 of the act of July 7, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 382; 44 U. S C. 377).

(119) The matter appearing after the semicolon in the first full paragraph on page 1338 of volume 34 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of March 4, 1907 (48 U. S. C. 39).

(120) The proviso in the second full paragraph on page 584 of volume 42 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of May 24, 1922 (48 U. S C. 39).

(121) The proviso in the fourth full paragraph on page 1205 of volume 42 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of January 24, 1923 (48 U. S. C. 39).

(122) The proviso in the second full paragraph on page 427 of volume 43 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of June 5, 1924 (48 U. S. C. 39).

(123) The proviso in the first full paragraph on page 1181 of volume 43 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of March 3, 1925 (48 U. S. C. 39).

(124) The proviso in the second full paragraph on page 492 of volume 44 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of May 10, 1926 (48 U S. C. 39).

(125) The last proviso on page 968 of volume 44 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of January 12, 1927 (48 U. S. C. 39).

(126) Section 2 of the act of February 25, 1925 (43 Stat. 978; 48 U. S. C 174)

(127) The act of March 27, 1928 (45 Stat. 371, ch. 251, 48 U S C 472, 472a).

(128) Section 4 (f) of the act of June 22, 1936, as amended (49 Stat. 1808, 48 U. S C. 1405c (f)).

(129) The act of June 16, 1948 (62 Stat. 458 ch. 478; 50 U. S. C. App., Supp., 1622 note).

(130) Section 208 of the act of July 18, 1939 (53 Stat. 1065).

(131) Section 5 of the act of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 531; D C Code, Supp., 1–241).

(132) Section 4 of the act of December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 822; D. C. Code, Supp , 1–247).

SEC. 2. The following acts and part of acts are amended by addition of the words "subject to applicable regulations under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended", as shown below

(1) After "Columbia," in line 4 of the seventh paragraph on page 865 of volume 32 of the Statutes at Large in the act of February 25, 1903 (U S. C 110).

(2) After "That" in line 7 of the act of February 27, 1948 (62 Stat. 37; 5 U. S. C., Supp., 150p).

(3) After "That" in line 2 of the act of July 16, 1946 (60 Stat 535; 5 U S C. 207a).

(4) After "That" in line 2 of the act of April 10, 1878 (20 Stat 36; 5 U S. C. 218).

(5) After "(a)" in line 9 of the act of May 26, 1948 (62 Stat. 274; 5 U. S. C , Supp , 626 1 (a))

(6) After "That" in line 2 of the act of June 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 680; 10 U S C. 1209).

(7) After "That" in line 2 of the act of May 15, 1937 (50 Stat 167, ch 193; 10 U. S C. 1259).

(8) After "That" in line 15 on page 949 of volume 41 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of June 5, 1920 (10 U. S. C 1262).

(9) After "and" in section 92 (d) of section 1 of the act of August 4, 1949 (63 Stat. 503, 14 U. S C , Supp , 92 (d)); and there is deleted therefrom all after "them".

(10) After "vehicles, and" in section 93 (h) of section 1 of the act of August 4, 1949 (63 Stat. 504; 14 U S C , Supp , 93 (h)); and there is deleted therefrom all after "them".

(11) After "Commandant" in section 641 (a) of section 1 of the act of August 4, 1949 (63 Stat 547; 14 U. S. C , Supp , 641 (a)); and there is deleted therefrom "regularly organized flotilla or other organized" and "incorporated" is substituted therefor.

(12) After "Service" in section 302 (b) of the act of September 21, 1944 (58 Stat. 738, 16 U S. C. 590q–1).

(13) After "That" in line 15 of section 401 of the act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat 383; 16 U. S C. 715s), and there is also added after "That" in line 24 thereof "except as otherwise provided by section 204 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949".

(14) After "purpose" in the last line of section 1 of the act of June 23, 1930 (46 Stat. 798; 16 U. S C. 793).

(15) After "needed" in line 8 of the act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 906; 22 U. S. C. 277e).

(16) After "That" in line 2 of the act of April 12, 1924 (43 Stat. 93, ch 93, 25 U. S C 190); and there is deleted all after the semicolon in the last paragraph thereof.

(17) After "That" in line 1 of the fourth paragraph on page 973 of volume 39 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of March 2, 1917 (25 U S. C. 293); there is deleted "net" from line 7 of said paragraph; and there is deleted "such" from line 13 of said paragraph and "the net" is substituted therefor.

(18) After "directed" in section 2 of the act of February 25, 1919 (40 Stat. 1154, 30 U. S C 4)

(19) After "discretion" in line 9 on page 277 of volume 39 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of July 1, 1916 (31 U S C 418).

(20) After "That" in line 1 under the heading "Treasury Department" in the act of June 8, 1896 (29 Stat. 268, 31 U. S C. 489)

(21) After "discretion" in the act of March 1, 1929 (45 Stat. 1430, ch 429, 34 U. S C. 546b).

(22) After "prescribe" in the act of December 23, 1932 (47 Stat 751, 34 U S. C. 546d)

(23) After "discretion" in section 2 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 897, 34 U S C. 546g).

(24) After "That" in line 6 of the act of June 3, 1939 (53 Stat 808, 40 U S C. 311b); and there is deleted therefrom "notwithstanding the first proviso in the fourth [sic] paragraph under the heading "Division of Supply" in title I of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes", approved December 20, 1928 (45 Stat. 1030),".

(25) After "authorized" in section 7 of the act of May 28, 1948 (62 Stat 278, 48 U S C, Supp, 485f).

(26) After "authorized" in section 14 of the act of May 28, 1908 (35 Stat 443, 50 U. S C 64).

(27) After "prescribe." in line 4 of the act of February 8, 1889 (25 Stat. 657, ch. 116, 50 U S C 66)

(28) After "authorized" in section 47 of the act of March 4, 1909 (35 Stat 1075, 50 U S C 68).

SEC 3 The following acts and parts of acts are amended by deletions, as shown below

(1) All after "bee-breeding stock" in section 103 of the act of September 21, 1944 (58 Stat 735, 7 U S C. 283).

(2) The first proviso in section 1 of the act of June 28, 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 624, ch. 306, 10 U S C, Supp., 1213, 34 U S C, Supp, 555a)

(3) All after "Coast Guard shore establishments" in section 92 (c) of section 1 of the act of August 4, 1949 (63 Stat 503, 14 U S C, Supp 92 (c))

(4) Of "are surplus or" in section 1 of the act of March 4, 1921 (41 Stat 1438, ch. 166, 20 U S C 60).

(5) Of "net" in line 1 of section 88 of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 205; 32 U. S C. 45)

(6) Of ", and August 30, 1935, section 7 (49 Stat 1048)" in section 6 of the act of August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 650, 33 U S C. 701c-2)

(7) Of "to sell, lease, or exchange surplus equipment, supplies, products, or waste materials belonging to the bureau or any of its plants or institutions, and" and the last sentence in section 29 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat 615, 38 U S C 455).

(8) Of "to any purchases when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $500, nor" in section 2 (a) of the act of October 10, 1949 (54 Stat 1110; 41 U S C 6a (a)).

(9) Of "to any purchase or service when the aggregate amount does not exceed $100, or with respect to articles, materials, or supplies for use outside the United States when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $300, or" in section 2 (h) of the act of October 10, 1940 (54 Stat 1110, 41 U S C 6a (h)).

(10) All after the semicolon in section 12 of the act of January 12, 1895, as amended (28 Stat 602; 44 U. S. C. 14).

(11) The seventh paragraph on page 320 of volume 39 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of July 1, 1916 (44 U. S C 246).

(12) Of ", and any provision of law relating to the disposal of surplus Government property" in section 2 of the act of February 6, 1941 (55 Stat 6, 46 U S C. 1119b).

(13) Of "dispose by lease or sale of wells, lands, or interests therein, not valuable for helium production, to dispose of oil, gas, and byproducts of helium operations not needed for Government use, and to" in section 1 (d) of the act of March 3, 1925, as amended (43 Stat 1110, 50 U S C 161 (d))

(14) Of "and shall submit through the Secretary of the Interior, estimates thereof" in the first proviso in the last full paragraph on page 147 of volume 19 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of August 15, 1876, and of "and shall submit through the Secretary of the Interior annually estimates thereof" in the twelfth full paragraph on page 298 of volume 19 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of March 3, 1877 (401 U S C 136).

(15) Of "Extension, and the same shall be paid for by the Secretary of the Interior out of the appropriations for such extension, and from no other appropriation" in section 1816 of the Revised Statutes (40 U S C. 166)

(16) The ninth full paragraph on page 612 of volume 31 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of June 6, 1900 (40 U S C 168a).

(17) Of "with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior" in section 11 of the act of June 26, 1912, as amended (37 Stat. 184, 40 U S C 171).

(18) The fifth paragraph on page 458 of volume 38 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of July 16, 1914 (40 U S C 172).

(19) Section 1832 of the Revised Statutes (40 U S C 218)

(20) Section 1833 of the Revised Statutes (40 U S C 219)

(21) Section 220 of the Revised Statutes (40 U S C 220)

SEC 4 The following acts and parts of acts are amended, as shown below

(1) Section 93 (1) of section 1 of the act of August 4, 1949 (63 Stat 504; 14 U S C, Supp, 93 (1)) is revised to read "acquire, accept as gift, maintain, repair, and discontinue aids to navigation, appliances, equipment, and supplies,".

(2) By deleting all after "authorized" in line 1 through "authority" in line 11 of section 3 and by adding "but subject to section 207 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949" after "appropriate" in line 12 of said section, in the act of April 5, 1944 (58 Stat 191, 30 U. S C. 323).

(3) By inserting "or as provided in section 204 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, or in other law," between "authorized by law," and "shall be deposited" in section 3618 of the Revised Statutes (31 U S C. 487)

(4) By deleting all after "serviceable" in line 3 of section 5 of the act of June 13, 1902 (32 Stat 373, 33 U S C 558) and by substituting therefor "and is transferred or sold, the proceeds thereof may be credited to the appropriation for the work for which it was acquired"

(5) By deleting "It" in line 1 of section 5 of the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat 599; 34 U S C 492) and by substituting therefor "Except as otherwise provided under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, it".

(6) By deleting "section 34 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (58 Stat 765, 50 U S C 1611)" in section 1 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat 897, 34 U S C 546f), and by substituting therefor "section 602 (c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended,".

(7) By deleting "or" in line 11 under the heading "Supplies for Postal Service" in the act of June 26, 1906 (34 Stat 476, 39 U. S C. 355), and by substituting therefor "and, subject to applicable regulations under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, may similarly contract for such envelopes"

(8) The fourth full paragraph on page 1112 of volume 32 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of March 3, 1903 (40 U. S C 304), is revised to read "The General Services Administration is authorized to take custody, for disposal as excess property under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, of such lands as have been or may hereafter be acquired by the United States by devise"

(9) By adding "and shall be subject to applicable regulations under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended" after "prescribe" in the last line of section 6 (a) of the act of September 1, 1937 (50 Stat 890; 42 U. S. C. 1406 (a)).

(10) By amending the fourth full paragraph appearing on page 547 of volume 44 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of May 13, 1926 (41 U S C 6a), to read as follows:

"Hereafter the purchase of supplies and equipment and the procurement of services for all branches under the Architect of the Capitol may be made in the open market without compliance with section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, in the manner common among businessmen, when the aggregate amount of the purchase or the service does not exceed $500 in any instance"

With the following committee amendments:

On page 15, strike out all of lines 7 and 8 and renumber all of the succeeding paragraphs of section 1.

On page 22, line 19, strike the figure "136" and insert the figure "163"

One page 23, line 13 after the word "Section", strike the figure "220" and insert the figure "1834"

One page 25, strike all of lines 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19

On line 20, strike the figure "10" and insert the figure "9"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table

PROGRAM FOR OCTOBER 17, 1951

Mr MARTIN of Massachusetts Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the majority leader can tell us what the program will be tomorrow for the benefit of the membership.

Mr McCORMACK. The first order of business tomorrow will be consideration of the conference report on the civil functions appropriation bill.

The second order of business will be the study resolution reported out of the Rules Committee in connection with the Railroad Retirement Act amendment bill just passed.

The third order of business will be a continuation of the consideration of H R. 2574 the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act.

I understand that the conferees have agreed on the Federal pay increase bill, but that will not be ready until tomorrow, and that will come up some day later in the week.

NEWPORT, KY.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4928) to provide that the interest of the United States in certain real property shall be conveyed to the city of Newport, Ky.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey, without consideration, to the city of Newport, Ky., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property conditionally conveyed to that city by the act entitled "An act granting certain property to the city of Newport, Ky.," approved July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 211).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 2 The deed of conveyance from the Secretary of the Army shall provide, in such manner as he shall deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States, for waiver by the city of Newport of any claims for damages which have arisen or which may in the future arise because of river and harbor and flood-control activities of the Department of the Army."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN LAND AND OTHER PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1215) to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 4 to 19 inclusive.

Page 2, line 20, strike out "103" and insert "102."

Page 3, line 14, strike out "104" and insert "103."

Page 4, line 5, strike out "105" and insert "104."

Page 8, strike out all after line 12, over to and including line 14, on page 9.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what the Senate amendments are?

Mr. SASSCER. This bill might be termed an omnibus acquisition bill to reclaim the various pieces of land that the Government conveyed after the last war, and to acquire several other pieces of property.

The Senate amendment strikes out one section.

The committee unanimously agreed, or, rather, I checked with the ranking minority member, and with the department, and the department feels that it is more important to have the bill even with the section stricken out than it is to disagree over the action. If we concur in the Senate amendments we will be passing the bill as agreed to by the House minus certain provisions inserted by the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What are the items that the Senate changed?

Mr. SASSCER. The Senate struck out title III, recapture of an industrial plant in Milwaukee, Wis., an industrial plant in Adrian, Mich., an industrial plant in Jackson City, N. J., and a warehouse in Indianapolis, Ind. I understand the objection that came from the Senate was based upon a desire to keep these plants in private ownership so that the communities might get the tax. If the Government obtained these places they would go off the tax roll

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the civil functions appropriation bill

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. MITCHELL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 463, Rept. No. 1194), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res 285) to authorize appropriate participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDMENT TO ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2233) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish the gentleman from North Carolina would indicate to the House what the provisions of this bill are.

Mr. DURHAM Mr. Speaker, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in keeping with its responsibility to make continuing studies of problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy and to report its recommendations to the Congress, has considered two amendments to the Atomic Energy Act and submits the following report with accompanying bill with the unanimous recommendation that the bill do pass.

COMMENTS ON THE AMENDMENTS

At no time in the history of this Nation's development of atomic energy has the use of overwhelming care and precision judgment in the control of restricted data been more essential to the common defense and security of the United States. Supremacy in atomic preparedness has become the critical bulwark in our survival as a free people. Information control is a factor basic to such supremacy.

It was with solemn attention to these principles that the law was first framed, and the joint committee, from its inception, has kept the identical principles at the forefront in scrutinizing the Nation's atomic endeavors. The same overriding concern for the common defense and security has dominated consideration of the bill which is now recommended to the Congress.

The committee's judgment on this matter is unanimous.

In considering the activities of friendly nations that impact directly upon atomic endeavors within the United States, the committee has given intensive attention to an important and complex problem requiring the most responsible and informed appraisal. This problem in all its ramifications involves considerations of secrecy and cannot be detailed here. Without violating secrecy, however, it can be said that the problem includes these aspects: If, for example, certain carefully circumscribed information were made available to another nation, that nation could furnish as a direct result of the information tangible benefits to the United States which would substantially promote our own atomic preparedness. In this type of special situation, moreover, a failure to undertake an arrangement with another nation would mean that the United States will be less well equipped—in measurable degree—to use atomic energy for defense purposes.

The joint committee has exhaustively explored and weighed the issues thus

presented. It particularly took into account the unique benefits obtainable from a speedy determination of basic policy.

After conscientiously evaluating all factors from the perspective gained through half a decade of service within the classified atomic-energy field, the members of the joint committee unanimously concluded that an arrangement with another country of the kind just outlined would substantially promote and would not endanger the common defense and security of the United States. They equally concluded that such an arrangement could only be acceptable subject to severe limitations and restrictive conditions

It is the committee's thoroughly considered judgment that any determination must be confined to cases where the factors involved are plain and compelling and where, in effect, all reasonable and patriotic men with full knowledge of the facts can render a common verdict. The committee sees a clear need for acting to strengthen the atomic preparedness of the United States in the self-interest of the United States

All concerned, the members of the joint committee no less than the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, are agreed that the situation should be met by new legislation The two amendments which the joint committee unanimously recommends are, first, a new subsection (3) to be added at the end of the present section 10 (a), as follows:

Nothing contained in this section shall prohibit the Commission, when in its unanimous judgment the common defense and security would be substantially promoted and would not be endangered, subject to the limitations hereinafter set out, from entering into specific arrangements involving the communication to another nation of restricted data on refining, purification, and subsequent treatment of source materials; reactor development, production of fissionable materials, and research and development relating to the foregoing *Provided*—

(1) That no such arrangement shall involve the communication of restricted data on design and fabrication of atomic weapons,

(2) That no such arrangement shall be entered into with any nation threatening the security of the United States.

(3) That the restricted data involved shall be limited and circumscribed to the maximum degree consistent with the common defense and security objective in view, and that in the judgment of the Commission the recipient nation's security standards applicable to such data are adequate;

(4) That the President, after securing the written recommendation of the National Security Council, has determined in writing (incorporating the National Security Council recommendation) that the arrangement would substantially promote and would not endanger the common defense and security of the United States, giving specific consideration to the security sensitivity of the restricted data involved and the adequacy and sufficiency of the security safeguards undertaken to be maintained by the recipient nation; and

(5) That before the arrangement is consummated by the Commission the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has been fully informed for a period of 30 days in which the Congress was in session (in computing such 30 days, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days).

The second amendment, a companion, would alter section 5 (a) (3) to read as follows:

Prohibition: It shall be unlawful for any person to (A) possess or transfer any fissionable material, except as authorized by the Commission; or (B) export from or import into the United States any fissionable material, or (C) directly or indirectly engage in the production of any fissionable material outside of the United States, except, subject to the limitations and conditions contained in section 10 (a) (3), as authorized by the Commission upon a determination by the President that the common defense and security will not be adversely affected thereby.

Mr. ELSTON. Just one other question. I believe, of course, that the safeguards which the gentleman has just referred to, are sufficient, but I would like to inquire of the gentleman from North Carolina whether or not the Joint Chiefs of Staff have approved the bill in its present form

Mr DURHAM Yes, they have; also the Secretary of Defense and others involved.

Mr. ELSTON. And I believe there was also a unanimous report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. DURHAM There was.

Mr ELSTON. Mr Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 (a) (3) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows

"(3) Prohibition It shall be unlawful for any person to (A) possess or transfer any fissionable material, except as authorized by the Commission, or (B) export from or import into the United States any fissionable material, or (C) directly or indirectly engage in the production of any fissionable material outside of the United States, except, subject to the limitations and conditions contained in section 10 (a) (3), as authorized by the Commission upon a determination by the President that the common defense and security will not be adversely affected thereby"

Section 10 (a) is hereby amended by inserting the following subsection 10 (a) (3) after subsection 10 (a) (2)

"(3) Nothing contained in this section shall prohibit the Commission, when in its unanimous judgment the common defense and security would be substantially promoted and would not be endangered, subject to the limitations hereinafter set out, from entering into specific arrangements involving the communication to another nation of restricted data on refining, purification, and subsequent treatment of source materials, reactor development, production of fissionable materials, and research and development relating to the foregoing *Provided*,

"(1) that no such arrangement shall involve the communications of restricted data on design and fabrication of atomic weapons;

"(2) that no such arrangement shall be entered into with any nation threatening the security of the United States,

"(3) that the restricted data involved shall be limited and circumscribed to the maximum degree consistent with the common defense and security objective in view, and that in the judgment of the Commission the recipient nation's security standards applicable to such data are adequate;

"(4) that the President, after securing the written recommendation of the National Security Council, has determined in writing (incorporating the National Security Council recommendation) that the arrangement would substantially promote and would not endanger the common defense and security of the United States, giving specific consideration to the security sensitivity of the restricted data involved and the adequacy and sufficiency of the security safeguards undertaken to be maintained by the recipient nation, and

"(5) that before the arrangement is consummated by the Commission the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has been fully informed for a period of 30 days in which the Congress was in session (in computing such 30 days, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days)."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table

A similar House bill (H R. 5046) was laid on the table

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1181) to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments

The Clerk read the title of the bill

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows.

Page 3, after line 17 insert:

"'(d) This subsection shall not be deemed to authorize the payment of any claim heretofore compensated by the Congress through enactment of a private law"

Page 4, line 15, strike out "qualifications.'" and insert "qualifications"

Page 4, after line 15 insert:

"'(e) The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Treasury, for their respective Departments, shall make semi-annual reports to the Congress of all claims paid under this subsection during the period covered by each such report Each such report shall include, with respect to each such claim, a statement of the amount paid, to whom, and a brief description of the claim

"'(f) Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the payment of any amount as compensation for any benefit to which the claimant might subsequently become entitled under the laws and regulations administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs'"

The SPEAKER. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House on July 2, 1951. It was handled in the Senate by the Senate Judiciary Committee and was passed by the Senate on October 11 with three amendments. The committee this morning unanimously reported all three of these amendments. The Committee on Armed Services have agreed to them and feel that they are clarifying and of benefit to the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What are they?

Mr. DURHAM. The first amendment is merely a protective amendment in that it forbids the payment of any claim as a result of action by the Board for the Correction of Military Records if that claim has theretofore been compensated by Congress through the enactment of a private law.

The second amendment requires the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Treasury to make semiannual reports to the Congress of all claims paid pursuant to the bill.

The third amendment was added to insure that the enactment of this bill would in no sense encroach upon the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under existing law. It was not intended that this bill would deprive the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of any authority which he exercises pursuant to law.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOUNT DESERT, MAINE

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1482) for the relief of the town of Mount Desert, Maine.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the town of Mount Desert, Maine, the sum of $26,986 60 The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such town against the United States for reimbursement of expenditures made by such town in combating a forest fire in the Acadia National Park from October 24, 1947, to November 1, 1947. *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF JOHN HOWARD PAYNE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 284) authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the observance and memorialization on April 9, 1952, of the one-hundredth anniversary of the death of John Howard Payne, author of that family hymn of America, Home, Sweet Home.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object, I understand that this joint resolution refers to the author of the song, Home Sweet Home. I wonder if the author of the joint resolution would care to sing that song for us now?

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the author of the joint resolution, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me. I spoke of this matter on the floor of the House the other day. John Howard Payne was the author of Home Sweet Home. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I would be happy to sing it, but I think it is a little bit late in the evening for that.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. All the Members of Congress would be happy to sing that song.

Mrs. BOLTON. It would be very fitting.

It happens that in the University of Rochester there is the original of the opera "Clari," which was performed in London, in which the song does appear. I am about the last one on the program this afternoon, or I think we would have a full chorus happy to sing that song.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc, That there is hereby established a Commission to be known as the United States Commission for the Observance of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Death of John Howard Payne (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") and to be composed of 19 Commissioners as follows

The President of the United States; Presiding Officer of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, ex officio; eight persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, four Senators by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and four Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives The Commissioners shall serve without compensation and shall select a Chairman from among their number.

SEC 2 That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to be expended by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of this resolution

SEC. 3. That it shall be the duty of the Commissioners, after promulgating to the American people an address relative to the reason of its creation and of its purpose, to prepare a plan or plans and a program for the signalizing of the event, to commemorate which they are brought into being; and to give due and proper consideration to any plan or plans which may be submitted to them; and to take such steps as may be necessary in the coordination and correlation of plans, when, as and if such are prepared by State commissions or by bodies created under appointment by governors of the respective States, and by representative civic bodies.

SEC 4 That when the Commission shall have approved of a plan of observance, then it shall submit for their consideration and approval such plan or plans, insofar as it or they may relate to the fine arts, to the Commission of Fine Arts, in Washington, for their approval, and in accordance with statutory requirements.

SEC. 5 That the Commission, after selecting a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among their members, may employ a secretary and such other assistants as may be needed for clerical work connected with the duties of the Commission and may also engage the services of expert advisers; and may fix their respective compensations within the amount appropriated for such purposes.

SEC 6. The Commissioners shall receive no compensation for their services, but shall be paid their actual and necessary traveling, hotel, and other expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties out of the amount appropriated.

SEC 7. The Commission shall, on or before December 1, 1951, make a report to the Congress, in order that enabling legislation may be enacted.

SEC 8. That the Commission hereby created shall expire within 1 year after the expiration of the observance and prior to April 9, 1953.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the parenthetical language "(hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission') "

Page 2, lines 6 and 7, strike out "shall serve without compensation and "

Page 2, line 7, after "Chairman", insert "and a Vice Chairman "

Page 2, strike out lines 9 through 12.

Page 2, line 13, strike out "SEC 3 That it" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC 2 It "

Page 2, line 24, strike out "SEC. 4 That when" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC 3. When "

Page 2, line 25, strike out the word "of" at the beginning of the line and the word "then" following "of observance "

Page 2, line 25, after the word "submit", insert "it "

Page 2, line 25, and page 3, line 1, strike out the language "for their consideration and approval such plan or plans "

Page 3, lines 1 and 2, strike out the word "or" at the end of line 1, and "they" at the beginning of line 2

Page 3, strike out lines 5 through 18.

Page 3, line 19, strike out "SEC 8 That the" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC 4. The "

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed

The title was amended so as to read: "Authorizing the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the observance and memorialization on April 9, 1952, of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John Howard Payne, author of that family hymn of America, Home Sweet Home.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CITIZENSHIP DAY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 314) designating September 17 of each year as Citizenship Day.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution does not make that day a holiday, does it?

Mr LANE. This simply designates the 17th day of September as Citizenship Day. We have been observing I Am An American Day on the third Sunday of May. The purpose of this resolution is to change I Am An American Day from the third Sunday in May to the 17th day of September, which is Constitution Day, so that those 2 days may be observed on the same day each year

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Those who hold the celebrations of I Am An American Day are in favor of this?

Mr LANE. They are. This bill comes to us through the American Bar Association, the Department of Justice, and a number of the citizenship commissions throughout the country Everybody has agreed to it, as far as the committee knows.

Mr MARTIN of Massachusetts. The Committee on the Judiciary is in favor of this?

Mr LANE. The Committee on the Judiciary is unanimous in their report on changing I Am An American Day from the third Sunday in May to the 17th day of September each year and calling it Citizenship Day. It is felt that in May the celebration is too near Flag Day and other days in the month of May, and that by having the celebration in September, when the children are back in school, it is a better time to put on these exercises in the schools and display the flag.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts Why would not the Department of Justice and the American Bar Association be interested in such a big problem as this?

Mr. LANE. It comes to us from that source

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc, That the 17th day of September of each year is hereby designated as Citizenship Day in commemoration of the formation and signing, on September 17, 1787, of the Constitution of the United States and in recognition of all who, by coming of age or by naturalization have attained the status of citizenship, and the President of the United States is hereby authorized to issue annually a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on such day, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies.

That the civil and educational authorities of States, counties, cities, and towns be, and they are hereby, urged to make plans for the proper observance of this day and for the full instruction of future citizens in their responsibilities and opportunities as citizens of the United States and of the States and localities in which they reside.

Nothing herein shall be construed as changing, or attempting to change, the time or mode of any of the many altogether commendable observances of similar nature now being held from time to time, or periodically, but, to the contrary, such practices are hereby praised and encouraged

SEC 2 Either at the time of the rendition of the decree of naturalization or at such other time as the judge may fix, the judge or someone designated by him shall address the newly naturalized citizen upon the form and genius of our Government and the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship, it being the intent and purpose of this section to enlist the aid of the judiciary, in cooperation with civil and educational authorities, and patriotic organizations in a continuous effort to dignify and emphasize the significance of citizenship

SEC 3 The joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim I Am an American Citizen Day, for the recognition, observance, and commemoration of American citizenship," approved May 3, 1940 (54 Stat 178), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment.

Page 2, line 7, strike out "future"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S WAKE FOREST SPEECH ON PEACE WITH THE SOVIET

Mr McCORMACK Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include the text of an address which was delivered by President Truman at Wake Forest College

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection

(Following is the text of President Truman's speech at ground-breaking ceremonies for Wake Forest College)

It is a privilege to be here today.

It is a privilege to join my fellow Baptists in rejoicing at the enlargement and rebuilding of one of our great institutions

It is a privilege to join the people of North Carolina in celebrating their devotion to freedom of the mind and spirit

Freedom of the mind and spirit are very, very important to us and to the whole world today And I believe the history of Wake Forest College has some significant lessons for us in this regard

Wake Forest College has given 117 years of distinguished service to education and religion in this State Over the years this college has sent thousands of graduates out through the land to positions of leadership and trust

This college, like others in every part of our country, has remained loyal to the principle that the purpose of education is to seek the truth.

This is an article of faith that underlies our whole educational system: "Know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Students and teachers in American schools, seeking the truth without hindrance or censorship, have been largely responsible for the amazing progress of our country. We believe, in America, that the pursuit of the truth is open to all comers No group that seeks the truth is a dangerous group, or a subversive group—not in the United States of America We know that any attempt to control the mind of man defeats itself. We know that as long as our schools enjoy freedom our political liberties are safe.

ALL AMERICANS JOIN

For this reason Americans of all parties and creeds can join together in their support of education—public and private

Here in North Carolina you have built a fine public school system, crowned with a State university respected throughout the academic world At the same time you have made progress in private education, culminating in the endowment, in one generation, of two such institutions of higher learning as Duke and Wake Forest

The history of this college shows how all Americans can unite in support of education It is a Baptist college, yet the magnificent gift that stimulated its rebuilding came from donors who are not themselves Baptists, and the funds that are to go into these buildings were supplied by all kinds of Protestants—and by Catholics and Jews, as well

A college is an institution that is dedicated to the future It is based on faith and hope—faith in the basic decency of our fellow men, and hope that the increase of knowledge will promote the general welfare.

This faith and this hope are a very important part of the American way of life, so important that if they are lost, that way of life will be destroyed Faith that the average American is honest and trustworthy, hope that when he knows the truth, the truth will make him free This faith and this hope are the strong foundations on which Wake Forest College was built They are the foundations on which this Republic has stood, unshaken by all the storms that have beat upon it

Yet there are always some who do not share this faith and this hope These people go up and down the land, wailing that we must not do anything, because it might turn out wrong For faith and hope, they have substituted suspicion and fear

This is deplorable, but we should not let it alarm us to much, for after all it is nothing new It is as old as this college, and a lot older

STRANGULATION AT BIRTH

Indeed, this college was almost strangled at its birth by this sort of reactionary attitude

On December 21, 1833, the bill granting a charter to Wake Forest came up for final passage in the North Carolina State Senate Without this bill, the college could not have been founded Yet, the vote was a tie, 29 to 29, and the bill passed only by the deciding vote of the presiding officer

Think what this means If there had been one more negative vote, there might never have been a Wake Forest College—with all that it has meant to North Carolina and the Nation You might never have had such great leaders as the presidents of this college—men like W L Poteat, who did so much to defend freedom of thought, or Thurman Kitchin, who built undiscouraged through depression and war There might have been no opportunity for men like Harold Tribble to lead this institution into an era of greater service to humanity.

How was it possible for 29 men, back then in 1833, to vote against such a constructive step as the founding of Wake Forest?

We have no proof whatever that they were unpatriotic men, selfish men, or evil men. They claimed they were not Indeed, the facts seem to show that they were simply

afraid. They allowed their suspicion and fear to overcome their hope and their faith.

They argued that to incorporate Wake Forest would lead to "a proud and pompous ministry" They said that this sort of school was bound to become "a curse to the church of God, and to the nations of the earth"

Their objection, in modern terms, was that the college might turn into a subversive organization which would destroy the American way of life Of course, Wake Forest had not done anything wrong yet, because it did not even exist But those men argued that if it were given the right to exist, it might do wrong Therefore, it ought to be killed in the cradle.

QUESTION OF DOING GOOD

Friends of the college argued that it would do good, that it would develop character and intelligence among the people, which is the greatest good that can be done for a nation But no, in the minds of those 29 men, the hope that it might do good was nothing The fear that it might do harm was everything In their minds, it was most virtuous—it was safer—to try to avoid doing harm than it was to try to do good

The fear of moving ahead, the unwillingness to try anything new, almost stifled Wake Forest at birth But let us remember that the forces that nearly prevented the creation of Wake Forest were not peculiar to that time and place They are deeply embedded in human nature and are alive and powerful today There are many men of this generation who, like the 29 members of the North Carolina State Senate of 1833, allow their fears to stifle their hopes.

When the ideas of such frightened men prevail, whether in a college or in a country, no progress is made, and little is accomplished for the betterment of the world. No institution and no nation can stand before the bar of history and justify itself on the ground that it never did any harm The question that has to be answered before all mankind is, "What good did you do?"

Our country is standing before the bar of history today in a very conspicuous place. All the world is watching us, because all the world knows that the fate of civilization depends, to a very large extent, on what we do

At the present time this Nation of ours is engaged in a great series of positive actions to secure peace in the world. This effort is costing us a great deal—in taxes, in energy, in unwelcome changes in our daily living It is even costing us the lives of some of our bravest and best young people who are fighting in the front lines against aggression

EFFORT HELD WORTH MAKING

Like any positive effort, this one is being questioned and criticized There are people who ask whether it is worth doing There are people who point to the sacrifices, the inconveniences, the cost, and who say it would be better to do nothing, or as close to nothing as possible.

But it is clear, to most of us at least, that the effort is worth making, indeed that we have to make it

Our great effort for peace is a national effort It is not the decision of one group or one person It is the result of our entire national experience, over the last few decades

By the end of World War II we had learned, as a Nation, that we could not have peace by keeping out of the affairs of the world. We were determined to act, positively and vigorously, with other nations, to preserve peace. That is why we embraced the United Nations, and pledged to support it.

Everything that we have done since has been the result of this decision. All we have done, our treaties with other nations, our defense program, our aid to other countries, has been the result of our determination to uphold the principles of the United Nations.

It has been harder and more dangerous than we expected, because of the refusal of one of the great powers to carry out the spirit of the United Nations, and to live peacefully and cooperatively with its neighbors

But, if I understand this country correctly, there is no desire to backtrack on the path we have taken toward peace There is no intention of running out on the obligation we undertook to support the principles of the Charter We made our decision, it was the right decision, we are going to follow it out, and that is that.

OBJECTIVE IS PEACE

It is important to remember, as our defense program begins to turn out more and more weapons, and our alliances for defense begin to take effect, that our basic objective, our only objective, is peace

I am afraid that some people, here and abroad, believe that the creation of armed defenses must inevitably lead to war This is not the case We do not think war is inevitable

We believe that the creation of defenses will make war less likely So long as one country has the power and the forces to overwhelm others, and so long as that country has aggressive intentions, real peace is unattainable The stronger we become, the more possible it will be to work out solid and lasting arrangements that will prevent war Our strength will make for peace

We saw the folly of weakness in the days of Hitler We know now that we must have defenses when there is an aggressor broad in the world

But once we have defenses strong enough to prevent the sneaking, creeping kind of aggression that Hitler practiced—what is the next step? Must we then have a showdown, and a war until one side of the other is completely victorious?

I think not Our policy is based on the hope that it will be possible to live, without a war, in the same world as the Soviet Union—if the free nations have adequate defenses As our defenses improve, the chance of negotiating successfully with the Soviet Union will increase The growth of our defenses will help to convince the leaders of the Soviet Union that peaceful arrangements are in their own self-interest. And as our strength increases, we should be able to negotiate settlements that the Soviet Union will respect and live up to

POSSIBILITY OF DISCUSSION

For example, the Kremlin may then be willing to discuss the possibility of genuine, enforceable arrangements to reduce and control armaments Since the end of World War II, we have been trying to work out a plan for the balanced reduction and control of armaments

Long before the Soviet Union got the atomic bomb, we developed a plan to control atomic weapons Other nations endorsed this plan It was a good plan It would work It would free the world from the scourge of atomic warfare But the Soviets rejected it

Working with other nations, we also developed initial plans looking toward the balanced reduction and control of other types of weapons. The Soviet Union rejected these plans, too.

Last year, before the United Nations, I proposed further work on the problem of disarmament, and a new approach I proposed a merger of the two United Nations commissions working in this field, the one on atomic energy, and the one on other types of weapons Work on this proposal has gone forward and good progress has been made. We are ready now, as we have always been, to sit down with the Soviet Union, and all the nations concerned, in the United Nations, and work together for lifting the burden of armaments and securing the peace.

We are determined to leave no stone unturned in this search not only for relief from the horror of another world war, but also for the basis of a durable peace.

I hope that the growing strength of the free world will convince the leaders of the Soviet Union that it is to their own best interest to lay aside their aggressive plans, and their phony peace propaganda, and join with us and the other free nations to work out practical arrangements for achieving peace

This is the goal we are working toward. It is for this great goal of peace that we have a defense program, and higher taxes, and a program of aid to other nations. It is for this purpose that our men, and the soldiers of other free nations, are striving and fighting in the hills of Korea

I cannot guarantee that we will reach our goal The result does not depend entirely on our own efforts The rulers of the Kremlin can plunge the world into carnage if they desire to do so But that is something this country will never do.

This I can say Peace comes high in these troubled days, and we have shown that we are willing to pay the price for it We have shown by positive acts that we are willing to work and sacrifice for it

Twice within one generation we have spent our blood and treasures in defense of human freedom For six long years now we have contended, with all the weapons of the mind and spirit, against the adherents of the false god of tyranny When the nations of Europe, our neighbors, were left, like the man in Scripture who fell among thieves, robbed and wounded and half dead, we have offered them our oil and our wine, without stint and without price When one of the newest and smallest nations of Asia was invaded, we led the free world to its defense

These positive acts have not been easy to do They have brought upon us the hatred and threats and curses of the enemies of freedom—and may bring upon us even worse troubles Nevertheless, if this Nation is justified by history, it is these things that will justify it, and not the negative virtue of meaning no harm

God forbid that I should claim for our country the mantle of perfect righteousness. We have committed sins of omission and sins of commission, for which we stand in need of the mercy of the Lord But I dare maintain before the world that we have done much that was right

OLD TESTAMENT QUOTED

To the sowers of suspicion, and the peddlers of fear, to all those who seem bent on persuading us that our country is on the wrong track and that there is no honor or loyalty left in the land, and that woe and ruin lie ahead, I would say one thing "Take off your blinders, and look toward the future. The worst danger we face is the danger of being paralyzed by doubts and fears This danger is brought on by those who abandon faith and sneer at hope It is brought on by those who spread cynicism and distrust and try to blind us to our great chance to do good for mankind"

Yet, at heart, I do not greatly fear such men, for they have always been with us, and in the long run they have always failed. To be sure, they alarm us at times In 1833, they came within one vote of preventing Wake Forest from being born But they didn't, and that is the whole point They have never succeeded permanently in holding back the United States—and they never will

This college has suffered from such people and no doubt will again. This country is suffering from them, and no doubt will continue to do so. But college and country alike must keep on disregarding them. We have business in the world that must be attended to, and history will accept no excuses if it is neglected.

My last word to this college, therefore, is an injunction to remember the words the Lord said to Moses on the shores of the Red Sea. "Why criest thou unto me? Speak to the children of Israel, that they go forward" For when the accounts of history are rendered, it is the going forward that will constitute the record—not the hesitations and the mistakes—not how you refrained from wrong, but how you did right

Armed with the faith and hope that made this college and this country great, you may declare in the words of King David, "Through God we shall do valiantly"

ROBERT A. TAFT, CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include a statement by the next President of the United States, ROBERT A. TAFT.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, today Ohio's No. 1 citizen, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, announced his candidacy for President of the United States. Senator TAFT'S candidacy is the tonic America needs most today. It is the first breath of fresh air on the Washington scene. Americans all over the country have been waiting for BOB TAFT to say the word. We are going out to elect him, and to restore integrity and decency to public life. The Missouri crowd will fold up against TAFT'S honest statements of public principle. BOB TAFT will be elected President because he will make a fighting campaign.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, after the legislative business of the day, and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

THEY HIT THE SAWDUST TRAIL

Mr HOFFMAN of Michigan Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, over the years the wasters and the spenders, the internationalist do-gooders, have been getting Congress to authorize the expenditure of billions upon billions of dollars, and appropriate billions upon billions of dollars, not only for every conceivable domestic purpose but to remake the rest of the world to conform to their ideas.

A small minority in the House protested and voted against such authorizations and appropriations but, from the people as a whole, they received very little support, for the people did not fully realize that the cost fell upon them.

And so the spending, like Tennyson's brook, has gone on and on until finally, the Congress was forced to tax and tax again.

But the last tax bill which levied something over 11 percent more in taxes upon the income of most of us, was just a little too much for the people to take.

Today, when the conferees brought in the report on this last tax bill, many of the Members, having heard from the people back home, who, at last have discovered that, while apparently they had no personal interest in an authorization or appropriation of billions of dollars, began to see the light, that the people did have a very definite personal interest in a tax bill which picked their pockets of an additional 11 percent of tax money.

What happened? Having heard from home, and remembering an election will be with us in 1952, one by one—and sometimes two by two—realizing the hot spot we were on, they began to hit the sawdust trail. Loudly and enthusiastically they shouted "No," when the roll was called.

But when the tally was completed, it was discovered that those who had seen the light outnumbered the others by some fifty-odd and consternation struck the House. No tax bill, no adjournment, no, not even a recess. As one strolls down the corridors, he hears the not-too-well-veiled threat that if we do not reconsider and vote a tax bill we will be here the rest of the year. That is not pressure on Congress, is it? That is just asking each Member to consider his own personal interest.

The question now is, Are we so intent upon a recess or a final adjournment at this time that we are willing to give the President what he demands, then go home and meet the wrath of those who have to dig up this additional 11 percent in taxes?

The truth of the old statement that no man can serve two masters is becoming apparent We will all have to decide, and that right soon, whether we will continue to take Mr. Truman's orders on spending by the billion, or whether we will listen to our constituents—the people who pay the taxes and who really have the welfare of our country at heart.

It is a hot spot, but we are on it.

The SPEAKER Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

KEYSTONE COMEDY COPS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD FALLING ALL OVER EACH OTHER IN POLICING INSTALLMENT CREDIT CONTROLS, WHICH INDUSTRY WAS DOING ANYHOW—RESERVE BOARD ECONOMISTS FAKE FIGURES TO HOLD JOES

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve Board is faking statistics to prove the need for Federal control over installment credit, and to continue the jobs of a horde of bookkeepers, economists, statisticians, messengers, typists, and house "dicks" who should be at work in defense plants anyhow.

On June 30 of this year, the Congress again turned over to the Federal Reserve Board the power to control installment credit. This control is known as regulation W, one of the most vicious, useless, repulsive, and immoral laws ever passed in the annals of a constitutional democracy.

As you know, regulation W affects only poor people who depend on installment credit for every-day necessities. It discriminates against the poor and deprives them of their inalienable right to buy when, where, and as they see fit. There was a time in this country when poor people could sit around the table after supper and figure out a budget, but the Federal Reserve Board has decided that people cannot do this anymore. The Board wants to regiment the thinking and planning of the poor people You understand, of course, that the rich are not affected by this regulation. It is the same old story, like every war we have: a rich man's war and the poor man's fight. The present international crisis which brought on the national emergency gives the Socialists the opportunity to nationalize the poor man's credit.

The Federal Reserve Board has been flooding the country with phony figures designed to show that consumer credit and installment credit are getting out of hand and are being held in control only because of the great work of the Board and its secret police. The Federal Reserve Board has been getting away with propaganda murder for years now and it is about time somebody exposed them. The double talk of the Board's double domes is a masterpiece of deception and falsification and even the newspapers and radio stations seem to fall for it.

The Federal Reserve Board has built up such a great name for honesty that Washington correspondents and radio commentators run off with the Board's press releases without even checking them. There seems to be a general feeling in Washington that whatever the Board says is true and does not have to be checked Board officials are smart enough to know, too, that there is only a handful of Washington correspondents who would have time to analyze the Board's figures so that their chances of getting caught in the act of a brazen falsehood are pretty slim. Incidentally, I have no quarrel with Gov William McChesney Martin, of the Federal Reserve Board, for I know he is not a part of this conspiracy to fool the American public, but I am going to write him a personal note and ask him if he cannot promise the Congress a shakeup in his Research Division so that we can be guaranteed a little more honesty in the future publication of the Board's statistics on consumer credit. And while I am at it, I want to pay public tribute to J. K. Vardaman, another of the Board's Governors and the only one I know of who has had the courage to speak up against regulation W and the efforts of somebody to make a case for Federal control of installment credit through misrepresentation and downright falsification of figures. This is the same Governor Vardaman who they said would be a stooge for President Truman when the Governor's appointment was up for confirmation Well, Governor Vardaman is loyal to his President but he does not mind disagreeing with him when he sees the economic and social dangers inherent in such regulations as W. As far as I can see, Governor Vardaman has been a stooge for the American people because he has

taken a lot of thankless abuse over his position on regulation W.

At any rate the Federal Reserve Board, using its high office and prestige, now tells the country that outstanding consumer credit today amounts to $19,000,000,000 That is an impressive figure and in some respects it scares you The Board's economists want it to scare you. They want you to get the impression that every Tom, Dick, and Harry in the country is buying three televisions, four radios, and more furniture than he can possibly use. They want you to feel that this thing called consumer credit is getting out of hand and that there is only one way to stop this run-away machine and that is through Federal control, which we now have but which the Board is afraid of losing when they come up here next year for a renewal of this authority. Do you see what they are up to? They are laying the groundwork now—in October, mind you—for demands next year for continued control over the relationship between retailer and customer This is an old propaganda trick and one the American public will see through, once they have all the facts Hitler pulled this stunt and so did Mussolini and it worked for awhile, at least. The trick is to scare the people into legislative reforms. Of course, only Government can bring about any remedial legislation. Private industry cannot police itself It is too weak and selfish That is the propaganda line that the Board is feeding the American public and I am afraid they will gain their objectives unless they are exposed

Now what are the facts about the phony $19,000,000,000 which the Board says consumers owe? I will start out by saying that the truth about all consumer debt lies closer to $7,000,000,000 and not $19,000,000,000 and that of the $7,000,000,000 only $2,000,000,000 is owed by persons buying radios, televisions, furniture, and household appliances on the installment plan The Board would like the country to get the impression that the $19,000,000,000, which is strictly a phony figure to begin with, is credit outstanding for articles bought on the installment plan Obviously, they do not say that They just leave that impression hoping that newspapers will confuse the figures

Actually, the newspapers seem to believe that outstanding consumer credit and outstanding installment credit are one and the same thing The Federal Reserve Board says that the total consumer installment credit outstanding is $13,000,000,000, which is another bloated and faked figure as I will prove in a minute, but to the newspapers the $13,000,000,000 and the $19,000,000,000 figures seem interchangeable.

Now, consumer credit to me means credit that is used by an individual for personal, family, and daily needs. On the other hand, credit used by professional or businessmen is commercial credit and has nothing to do with consumer credit. Yet, nowhere in its blow-up of statistics does the Federal Reserve Board make this distinction. For example, they classify a bank loan of $100,000 as consumer credit, in an effort to exaggerate and build up the total of outstanding consumer credit.

How do they arrive at the phony $19,000,000,000 which they say consumers owe? By a simple process of manipulation and fraudulent accounting. Let me show you, step by step, just how dishonest these figures are and you can judge for yourself who is telling the truth here

The Board says that the Nation's gas, electric, and telephone bills total $1,000,000,000 and that they are a part of the $19,000,000,000 in outstanding consumer credit Now, everyone knows that these bills are either payable in advance or that a deposit is required, so how consumer credit gets into this figure is something I do not understand You will have to agree with me, however, that since there is no credit involved in these transactions, we deduct a billion dollars and the Board's padded figure of 19 billion become 18.

The next item which the Board includes as a part of consumer credit is charge accounts Here I can nail them with their own definition of installment credit with which I do not agree, but I will use it to show you how dishonest their figures are The Board says installment credit is the mortgaging of future income to satisfy current desires The middle and upper middle classes with charge accounts certainly never thought they were mortgaging future incomes when they opened charge accounts All of us know that a charge account is not a credit account but an account of convenience only. Yet, the Board adds charge accounts totaling $3,750,000,000 to outstanding consumer credit because it helps to make the total look bigger. Obviously, this $3,750,000,000 should be deducted from any total of outstanding consumer credit.

The next item the Board adds to the total outstanding consumer credit is $1,396,000,000 for bank loans, the types that are made by businessmen and individuals who use the money to buy stocks. We have the Board's own word for it that all of these loans are paid off to the banks in a lump sum. Mind you, these are not the types of loans where the little fellow agrees to pay back so much a month over a year These are the single payment loans, the kind the big fellows make. And the Federal Reserve Board has the gall to classify them as consumer loans and they add this figure to the total, to help bring the total up to $19,000,000,000.

In all fairness and honesty, the gas, electric, telephone bills, charge accounts, and single payment loans, which total more than $6,000,000,000 and which are listed as consumer credit items, should be stricken from the total of $19,000,000,000 which the Board says consumers owe. That leaves a more realistic consumer debt of only $13,000,000,000 but even this figure is bloated and purposely padded to show how this type of debt is getting out of hand and how Government controls are needed to keep it in line.

Here is a breakdown of the $13,000,000,000, as outlined by the Federal Reserve Board and classified as debt incurred by consumers either buying merchandise on the installment plan or borrowing money to be repaid in installments. $6,000,000,000 from various lending agencies; $3,000,000,000 for such articles as televisions and household appliances and $4,000,000,000 for automobiles

I have no way of telling how much of the $6,000,000,000 listed as consumer installment credit should actually be tabulated as business loans The Board does not give a breakdown of this figure All I know is that a high percentage of this $6,000,000,000 represents loans made to business and industry. Business borrows money on the installment plan, the same as individuals, but the loan certainly should not be listed as a consumer debt From information available through trade and banking channels it is clear to me that 50 percent, or only $3,000,000,000, of this $6,000,00,000 should be listed as consumer debt The $13,000,000,000 of outstanding consumer installment credit now becomes only $10,000,000,000 Even this figure is bloated to bolster the Board's case for continuance of regulation W.

The Board claims that consumers owe $3,000,000,000 on furniture, televisions and other home appliances that they are buying on the installment plan. The Board does not tell the newspapers and the public that a high percentage of this figure includes such items as furniture bought on the installment plan by rooming-house owners Such installment credit can scarcely be called consumer installment credit, yet it is so listed by the Federal Reserve Board, further evidence of dishonesty and hypocrisy and the Board's sly attempts to influence the Congress into making Regulation W a permanent law

I don't say that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board is intentionally deceiving the public. I honestly believe that the Governors have not considered the conclusions of the pencil pushers, who are pulling the wool over their eyes How do I know the intent of the Governors when they themselves don't know? This much I can say in all kindness to the Governors: it is their responsibility to see that their research division gathers facts and figures and lays off the propaganda stuff

The $3,000,000,000 listed as debts contracted by individuals buying articles on the installment plan also includes books bought by young doctors and lawyers and tools bought by carpenters, most of which are bought on the installment plan, but are not considered consumer credit, by any reasonable person, by nobody, I know, in fact, except the Federal Reserve propagandists or the pen and pencil boys down there who have a talent for making figures tell tall tales and give them jobs at the same time.

Many farmers buy necessary equipment on the installment plan and while I do not have the exact figure for that outstanding indebtedness it obviously runs into hundreds of millions of dollars annually. The Reserve Board says that this debt is part of the outstanding consumer debt, while even a child knows that it is part of a business or farm debt.

But the Federal Reserve wants that figure in the consumer debt column because it will scare a lot of Congressmen into believing that regulation W should be made permanent.

My best guess is, and do not forget that all of this work by the Reserve Board ribbon clerks is only guess work at the best, that at least one-third of the $3,000,000,000 listed as consumer installment credit debt should be sliced off, so that the real or true figure would be closer to $2,000,000,000.

The next and last item listed as consumer installment credit is $4,000,000,000 for automobiles. There are more jokers in this figure than in a rigged-up deck of cards.

To begin with, the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that one-third of all automobiles are bought and used primarily for business purposes. But the Federal Reserve Board charges the entire auto debt up to the consumer, in a further attempt to show the public and the Congress the continuing need for regulation W.

Other studies reveal that almost two-thirds of United States automobiles are used in connection with making a living. The automobile the insurance salesman buys on the installment plan can hardly be charged up to consumer credit debt, but that is what the Federal Reserve Board does. Clearly, this is a business debt and should be so listed.

My own study of this item shows that 50 percent of automobile debt is business and 50 percent out-and-out consumer. Theerfore, the $4,00,000,000 the Board has charged against consumer debt should be two billion, not four billion.

If we subtract this $2,000,000,000 sum, plus another three billion from the six billion installment loan column and another billion from the $3,000,000,000 that the Board says consumers owe on all other items we begin to get a more realistic picture of the true consumer installment debt, namely, a figure of seven billion, not thirteen billion. The $7,000,000,000 contrasts sharply with the hysterical newspaper headlines of $19,000,000,000 which the Board says is the total outstanding consumer debt.

Excluding for the moment the items of consumer installment debt and consumer automobile debt, the American consumer owes about $2,000,000,000 on all other items. It is this $2,000,000,000 sum that forms the basis for regulation W. In other words, all the ranting and raving over the consumer's wild spending spree is over this $2,000,000,000 which is much less than one percent of the total national income. I want to repeat that statement. The frenzied efforts of the Federal Reserve Board to whip the country into a fury over the consumer's spending and the inevitable demands for Federal regulation of this spending, pivot around a sum of money that is much less than one percent of the total national income.

Meanwhile, the Keystone Comedy cops of the Federal Reserve Board are enforcing regulation W, falling all over each other in their silly efforts to browbeat the little fellow. Actually, there is nothing to police because private industry, the retailers who are out on the firing line every day and the manufacturers who supply them, were doing the job themselves. In other words, Congress this year passed a law to regulate retailers and buyers when they were already doing more than the regulation required anyway. Regulation W requires a fifteen percent down payment on most articles, with the balance paid off in 18 months. It never occurred to the Federal Reserve Board when they asked for this renewal authority that most reputable retailers would not give the customer better terms than this anyhow.

Why then do we have this senseless law on the statute books? The reason is very simple. It gives power and jobs to a bunch of men in the Federal Reserve Board who could not make a living in a free and competitive society. It gives people like J. Leonard Townsend something to do. He is the Board's chief of police. He is winding up his attack on L. M. Giannini and the Bank of America and pretty soon will be idle. Townsend wants to destroy the Bank of America, the greatest retail merchandisers of money in all history. When he gets the Bank of America case out of the way, Townsend and his Rover Boys can devote full time to harassing and jailing, if possible, poor old women who violate regulation W. We must not forget that we turned over very sweeping powers to the Federal Reserve Board and that a cop like Townsend, already endowed with a jail complex, will use them to the utmost. For example, if a customer can not meet an installment payment that he signed up for, he must report to the retailer like a paroled convict and explain why he can not meet the payment. The retailer does not require this indignity. The Government forces him to do it. It seems absurd to me for Americans to worry about the loss of personal liberties of people two, three, and five thousand miles away. They better start worrying about their own personal liberties first.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the problems in housing, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the appendix of the RECORD and include therein a talk I made the other day at the National Association of Housing officials luncheon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia and to include an editorial.

Mr. REAMS and to include extraneous material.

Mr. WOLVERTON to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and include an address made today by Attorney General J. Howard McGrath in connection with the Community Chest campaign.

Mr. BURNSIDE in two instances in one to include an editorial.

Mr. WIER and to include an address by Hon. Robert Ramspeck, Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission before the Civil Service assembly.

Mr. HARRIS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole, and to include a letter and other extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include an editorial.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. VAN ZANDT) and to include an editorial from the Bridgeport Post.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH in two instances, and to include certain tables.

Mr. VAN PELT and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HINSHAW and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin, to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances.

Mr MARTIN of Iowa, in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include certain letters advocating the placing of crosses over the graves of our honored dead in the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. BOW and to include a letter.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming (at the request of Mr. BOW) in two instances.

Mr REES of Kansas and to include an address delivered by President Mallott, of Cornell University.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas and to include and editorial.

Mr. BOGGS and to include an editorial.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FURCOLO (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), from October 20 to November 10, on account of official business.

Mrs. BOSONE (at the request of Mr. DOYLE) for the balance of the week on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H R 971. An act for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne, and

H. R 1038. An act relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Smithsonian Institution and its constituent bureaus.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 467. An act to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota; and

S. 509. A act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (43 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718d), as amended.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 15, 1951, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H R 732. An act for the relief of Konstontios N. Bellos,

H R 782 An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Siegfried Oberdorfer;

H R 794 An act for the relief of Arthur E Hackett;

H R 824 An act for the relief of Luisa Monti;

H R 1087. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," to empower the courts to remit or mitigate forfeitures under the Indian liquor laws;

H R 1100 An act for the relief of Eugenio Bellini,

H R 1119. An act for the relief of Mario DiFilippo,

H R 1252 An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs Miroslav Kudrat;

H R 1413 An act for the relief of Franz Geyling,

H R 1596. An act for the relief of N H. Kelley, Bernice Kelley, Clyde D. Farquhai, and Gladys Farquhar,

H R 1696 An act for the relief of Jack Warner and family,

H R 1908 An act for the relief of Helena Jange Chinn,

H R 2210. An act for the relief of Hye Pah Kung,

H R 2322 An act to authorize the improvement of East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla.;

H R 2684 An act to provide for the sale, transfer, or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida,

H R 3221. An act for the relief of Joji Ikeda, a minor,

H R 3424 An act for the relief of Yumi Horiuchi,

H R 3430 An act for the relief of the estate of Nora B Kennedy, deceased, and Mrs. Ann R Norton,

H R 4154. An act for the relief of the estate of Jake Jones, deceased,

H R 4205. An act to provide retirement benefits for the Chief of the Dental Division of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, and for other purposes;

H R 4270 An act for the relief of the estate of Jennie Gayle, deceased;

H R 4271 An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs Richard G Adams and legal guardian of Dorothy Margaret Adams,

H R 4693. An act to amend section 77, subsection (c) (3), of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H R 4931 An act for the relief of Lewyt Corp ,

H R. 4740 An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H R. 5054 An act making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 17, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

888 A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the seventh quarterly report on the administration of the advance planning program, of non-Federal public works, pursuant to Public Law 352, Eighty-first Congress, approved October 13, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 260); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed.

889. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report for the settlement of claims for damage caused to Navy Department property, which have been settled by the Navy Department, pursuant to section 2 of the act of December 5, 1945 (34 U S C. 600a), to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr MURRAY of Tennessee Committee of conference S 1335 An act to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail (Rept No. 1187). Ordered to be printed

Mr BUCKLEY· Committee on Public Works S 97. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee, without amendment (Rept No 1188) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union

Mr KILDAY Committee on Armed Services H R 5715 A bill to amend sections 201 (a), 301 (e), 302 (1), 302 (g), 508, 527, and 528 of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, without amendment (Rept No 1190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union

Mr MURDOCK Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs H R 5097. A bill to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes, with amendment (Rept. No 1191) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union

Mr. ELSTON Committee on Armed Services H R 4928 A bill to provide that the interest of the United States in certain real property shall be conveyed to the city of Newport, Ky , with amendment (Rept No. 1192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union

Mr DEGRAFFENRIED. Committee on Armed Services H R 4979. A bill to provide for conveyance of certain land to the city of New Orleans, with amendment (Rept. No. 1193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr MITCHELL Committee on Rules. House Resolution 463 Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 285, to authorize appropriate participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy, without amendment (Rept No. 1194). Referred to the House Calendar

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 314 Joint resolution designating September 17 of each year as "Citizenship Day", with amendment (Rept No. 1195). Referred to the House Calendar.

Miss THOMPSON· Committee on the Judiciary House Joint Resolution 284 Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the observance and memorialization on April 9, 1952, of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John Howard Payne, author of that family hymn of America, Home Sweet Home; with amendment (Rept. No. 1196). Referred to the House Calendar.

By Mr CANNON· Committee of conference. H. R. 4386. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1197). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York· Committee on the Judiciary House Resolution 461. Resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H R 4290) for the relief of Keddie Resort, Inc ; without amendment (Rept No 1189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R 5731. A bill for the creation of the Commission to Study Relations Between the United States and other North Atlantic Nations, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan·

H R 5732 A bill to extend gratuitous insurance benefits provided under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to nondependent parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs

By Mr DOUGHTON:

H R 5733. A bill to suspend the duty imposed with respect to repairs made, and equipment purchased, in foreign countries for certain vessels, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H R 5734 A bill to amend section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain recreational facilities from the tax prescribed therein, to the Committee on Ways and Means

By Mr. ENGLE:

H R 5735 A bill to require all Federal officers in carrying out laws relating to water-resources development and utilization to comply with the laws of the affected States or Territories; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

By Mr BUDGE·

H R 5736 A bill to require Federal officers and employees to conform with State and Territorial laws when carrying out Federal laws relating to water resources west of the ninety-eighth meridian; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr DOLLIVER

H R 5737. A bill to confer concurrent jurisdiction on the district courts to determine income-tax deficiencies, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H R 5738 A bill to confer concurrent jurisdiction on the district courts to determine income-tax deficiencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. STOCKMAN·

H R 5739 A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

H R 5740 A bill to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Frenchtown irrigation district, the Malta irrigation district, the Glasgow irrigation district, and the irrigation districts comprising the Owyhee Federal reclamation project, to authorize their execution by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5741. A bill to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the irrigation districts comprising the Owyhee Federal reclamation project, Idaho-Oregon, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R 5742. A bill to encourage the prevention of water pollution by allowing amounts paid for industrial waste treatment works to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURDOCK (by request):

H. R. 5743. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the initial phase of the Snake River reclamation project by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOW:

H R. 5744 A bill to provide for reductions in appropriations made during the present Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H R. 5745. A bill to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr WIER:

H J Res 346 Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. Res 462 Resolution to establish a committee of the House to investigate interstate gambling and racketeering activities; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of Massachusetts Legislature memorializing Congress to revise the treaty of peace with Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H R. 5746 A bill for the relief of Joseph F. Lounsberry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R 5747. A bill for the relief of James H. Ratliff, Jr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5748. A bill for the relief of Heinz J. Schillings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 5749 A bill for the relief of Sy Youn Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr GRANAHAN:

H R 5750. A bill for the relief of Sister Julie Schuler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 5751. A bill for the relief of Esther Malka Evans (nee Kalanek) and Robert Kalanek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 5752. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Bogdanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 5753. A bill for the relief of Bernard J. Keogh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5754. A bill for the relief of Hermann Peter Winterholler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H R. 5755. A bill for the relief of Chong So Yong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 5756. A bill for the relief of certain Polish sailors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5757. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hildergarde Wycisk McKaig, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H R. 5758. A bill for the relief of Milthadis Skordos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H R 5759. A bill for the relief of Chizuko Nakagami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 5760. A bill for the relief of Baici Pompeo (also known as John Base); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 5761. A bill for the relief of Otmar Sprah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R 5762 A bill for the relief of Hugo Kern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

475. Mr. SMITH of Virginia presented a petition of mothers of Virginia and members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church, to protect our rights by passing legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through such mediums as radio, television, newspapers, and magazines, which was referred to the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, October 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, whose love for Thy children reaches to the ends of the earth, in the golden glory of a new dawn as the curtain of darkness is folded back Thou hast granted us the high privilege of faring forth to be laborers together with Thee, in the coronation of Thy great purposes for a redeemed earth. We wait now for Thy benediction, that we may face whatever the day brings in the gladness of Thy guidance, in the glory of Thy service, and in the solemn realization that we are indeed our brother's keeper.

To the leaders of our Nation in these difficult and dangerous days give, we beseech Thee, kind hearts, clear thought, and quiet faith. And among ourselves, and in our dealings with all the peoples of the earth, in nations great and small, may we be so transparently just and fair that falsehood and every evil that shuns the light may be banished by the truth which makes men free. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 16, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 16, 1951, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1277) for the relief of John R. Willoughby.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 466. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Army certain property in St Louis, Mo;

S. 752. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission;

S 1482. An act for the relief of the town of Mount Desert, Maine;

S. 1967 An act to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes; and

S 2233 An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1952) to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H R 1181. An act to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records; and

H. R. 1215. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4928. An act to provide that the interest of the United States in certain real property shall be conveyed to the city of Newport, Ky;

H. J. Res 284. Joint resolution authorizing the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the observance and memorialization on April 9, 1952, of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John Howard Payne, author of that family hymn of America, Home Sweet Home; and

H. J. Res 314. Joint resolution designating September 17 of each year as Citizenship Day.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 11. An act to provide for the appointment of conservators to conserve the assets

and provide for the personal welfare of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, not amounting to unsoundness of mind, or physical incapacity;

H R 1181. An act to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records; and

H R. 1215. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

IMPOUNDING OF MAIL IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Postmaster General to impound mail in certain cases (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

PUBLICATION ENTITLED "TYPICAL RESIDENTIAL ELECTRIC BILLS FOR CITIES OF 2,500 POPULATION AND MORE, JANUARY 1, 1951"

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the Commission's publication entitled "Typical Residential Electric Bills for Cities of 2,500 Population and More, January 1, 1951" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of John A. Gordon, of Marion, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide adequate funds to make direct Government mortgage loans to veterans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the supreme council of the Knights of Columbus, at Pittsburgh, Pa., relating to changes in the immigration laws to admit certain aliens into the United States, and so forth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

H R. 5411. A bill to amend Public Laws Nos. 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense housing areas, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1022).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 17, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S 467 An act to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota, and

S 509 An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat 451; 16 U S. C 718d), as amended.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr HOLLAND

S 2279 A bill for the relief of Mrs Francis M Sullivan; to the Committee on Finance

S 2280 A bill for the relief of T. C. Elliott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S 2281 A bill for the relief of the widow and children of the late John L LeCours, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S 2282 A bill for the relief of O/Y Concrete A/B, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr MORSE:

S 2283 A bill for the relief of William F. Friedman, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr HUMPHREY):

S 2284 A bill to require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities, to the Committee on Rules and Administration

(See the remarks of Mr MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading)

By Mr. CORDON:

S 2285 A bill to authorize the construction of a dam and dike to prevent the flow of tidal waters into North slough, Coos County, Oreg , to the Committee on Public Works

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. LODGE):

S 2286. A bill for the relief of Hugo Kern; and

S 2287. A bill for the relief of Otmar Sprah, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 2288. A bill for the relief of Maria Walters, and

S. 2289. A bill for the relief of Michiko Okuda, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT

S 2290. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to let the Federal National Mortgage Association purchase section 213 mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 2291. A bill to amend the laws of the District of Columbia to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons and for other purposes, as enacted by Congress, May 7, 1906, and as amended February 27, 1907, and as amended March 4, 1927 (D. C. Code of 1929, title 20, sec. 2-601, and the following); and

S. 2292 A bill to provide for the control, inspection, and equipment of pharmacies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. AIKEN):

S 2293 A bill to establish a code for official conduct of officers and employees in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary

(See the remarks of Mr HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr HUMPHREY:

S 2294. A bill for the relief of Carl Himura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTING OF SOURCES AND AMOUNTS OF INCOME BY CERTAIN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICAL OFFICIALS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, some days ago in a speech on the floor of the Senate in support of President Truman's proposal to require high-paid Government officials to report sources and amounts of their incomes each year, I announced that I would modify my bill, which has been pending before the Senate for some years, and which seeks the same objective, so as to carry out specifically the recommendations of the President.

I believe that the American people would feel very much more assured that there was not corruption in Government if high Government officials, including Members of Congress, were required to make public the sources and amounts of their incomes. I believe further that no man should stand for public office unless he is willing to disclose to the American people the source of his income.

Therefore, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I now introduce for appropriate reference a revised form of my bill, to require public disclosure of the sources and amounts of income of high-paid officials in Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2284) to require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. HUMPHREY), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

CODE OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a code for official conduct of officers and employees in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes. The bill is the result of hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on

Ethics, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S 2293) to establish a code for official conduct of officers and employees in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. AIKEN), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H R 4928 An act to provide that the interest of the United States in certain real property shall be conveyed to the city of Newport, Ky; to the Committee on Armed Services

H J. Res. 314. Joint resolution designating September 17 of each year as Citizenship Day, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "HEARING EXAMINER REGULATIONS PROMULGATED UNDER SECTION 11 OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT" (S DOC. NO. 82)

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Civil Service Commission has recently promulgated regulations for hearing examiners pursuant to section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act. Prior to the issuance of such regulations, some 5 years following enactment of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Civil Service Commission had found it necessary to request an opinion of the Attorney General construing its scope of authority with respect to the promotion of hearing examiners, which was forthcoming under date of February 23, 1951. Following the publication of that opinion, but again prior to the issuance of the hearing examiner regulations, there occurred an interchange of correspondence between the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, reflecting many considerations pertinent to the regulations of hearing examiners and culminating on September 21, 1951, when the Chairman of the Commission forwarded a copy of the regulations as finally promulgated with a letter of comment thereon.

Mr. President, at this time I offer the material to which I have referred, including the corespondence, the opinion of the Attorney General, and the new hearing examiner regulations, with the view in mind of having it printed as a Senate document in order that all Members of Congress may have the benefit of this information, regarding a portion of the Administrative Procedure Act which is fundamentally important to the proper effectuation of that great legislative effort.

In this connection I may say that I have letters from several members of the Committee on the Judiciary, including the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], who have reviewed this material and who have advised me they believe it should be correlated in this manner and made available to the Members of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the material which I have offered be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF RICHARD HARTSHORNE TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, October 24, 1951, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Richard Hartshorne, of New Jersey, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey, vice Hon Guy L. Fake, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]; and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON].

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

TERMINATION OF STATE OF WAR WITH GERMANY—DELETION OF PORTION OF STATEMENT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a column by Mr. Walter Winchell, discussing the amendment which has been attached to House Joint Resolution 289, the declaration of peace with Germany. I ask unanimous consent that there be deleted from the article as printed in the permanent record the second sentence of the last paragraph beginning "It is not enough" and ending "machinations." The article appears at page 13212 of the RECORD.

It was not my intention to impute any evil motives to the senior Senator from Wisconsin or to reflect on him. In regard to the amendment, itself, the facts speak for themselves. As I said yesterday, I believe the amendment is unwise and unjustifiable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Address on the subject The Tragedy of the Ukranian Nation, delivered by Hon. Edward M. O'Connor, Commissioner, Displaced Persons Commission, at the United Ukranian American Relief Committee convention in Philadelphia, Pa., October 13, 1951.

By Mr McFARLAND:

Address delivered by Commissioner Paul A Walker, Vice Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, before the 1951 annual convention of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners at Charleston, S. C, October 17, 1951.

By Mr. LANGER:

Address entitled "God and the Koch Treatment," delivered by Rev Gerald B. Winrod, D D., before the annual convention of the Christian Medical Research League, at Detroit, Mich., on September 25, 1951, together with a summary description of the speaker.

By Mr MORSE:

Address entitled "Anchors for the American Goal," delivered by Edward C Sammons at the eighty-fourth commencement of Lewis and Clark College at Portland, Oreg., on June 3, 1951.

By Mr MALONE:

Press release from office of Senator MALONE, dated October 17, 1951, dealing with security risks in Government personnel

Article by George Dixon commenting on address by Senator MALONE before 11 Western States Republican Conference at Seattle, Wash., on October 15, 1951

Editorial entitled "The Vested Interests" published in the Washington Times-Herald of October 16, 1951, dealing with past mistakes of the administration.

By Mr BENTON:

Editorial entitled "Mr BENTON Has a Chance To Correct the Record," published in the Hartford Courant of October 15, 1951, in connection with the record of Chester Bowles as Governor of Connecticut

Address by Paul G Hoffman, director of the Ford Foundation, on receiving tenth annual freedom award of Freedom House, in New York City on October 7, 1951, together with statement prepared by Senator BENTON.

Report of board of directors of American-Hungarian Federation.

By Mr WILEY:

Statement by him entitled "The Fight for Justice for American Citizens—The Case of the Amendment to House Joint Resolution 289," together with letter addressed to him by Leo T. Crowley, July 30, 1951.

Editorial from the Milwaukee Journal and a release by him with reference to getting politics out of the Office of Internal Revenue.

By Mr JOHNSON of Texas

Address on the state of our mobilization program delivered by Hon. Donald C Cook, Vice Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, before the National Conference of Business Paper Editors on October 4, 1951.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Letter from India which was sent from the Simpson's Medical Centre in Madras following the receipt of several institutional gift packages.

PROTECTION AGAINST INFILTRATION BY COMMUNIST AGENTS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Maryland may proceed.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr President, in these closing days of the session of the

Congress, I am reluctant to take the time of the Senate on any matter which is not germane to the pending legislative business on the Senate Calendar However, I do so now only because the subject which I must discuss is vital to the internal security of our Nation and, in my humble opinion, warrants the attention of the Senate and of the American people

As I shall later develop in the course of these remarks, there is strong evidence that some officials of this Government are engaged in a studied and deliberate effort to avoid compliance with certain basic provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950 which are designed to protect this country against infiltration by Communist agents.

In order to understand the significance of these provisions of the Internal Security Act, to which I shall allude, and to appraise the facts to which I will refer, it is essential that some reference be made to the background of these provisions

The evidence before the Committee on the Judiciary which prepared the Internal Security Act pointed convincingly to the fact that the Communist conspiracy in the United States is inspired, organized, and directed by foreign agents who have been sent here by the Kremlin. The evidence also established that the principal conduit for penetration by these foreign agents is through the pipeline of diplomatic immunity.

Prior to the passage of the Internal Security Act, officials of the Department of Justice testified before the Senate subcommittee that under the then existing law they were powerless to exclude from the United States any alien who presented a diplomatic passport The Chief of the Visa Division of the Department of Justice told us that in every single case in which the Visa Division had disapproved a visa application on security grounds involving an official of a foreign government or an affiliate of an international organization, the case had been approved, nevertheless, by the higher echelon of the Department of State.

He further testified that the cases involving aliens in diplomatic status, in which the Visa Division had disapproved the application on security grounds but in which the Visa Division was uniformly overruled, were running at the rate of 8 to 10 a month. Furthermore, under the then existing law, the Immigration and Naturalization Service was prohibited from instituting deportation proceedings against any alien in diplomatic status without the approval of the Secretary of State. May I add parenthetically this approval was rarely granted.

In preparing the Internal Security Act of 1950 those of us who labored for many months with the various problems of internal security were confronted with the undeniable fact that Russia had an open door through which Communist agents were being sent into this country in great numbers. We recognized, however, that so long as this country maintains diplomatic relations with Communist countries it would be necessary for us to admit into this country some aliens in diplomatic status who are Communists and under Communist discipline.

The Internal Security Act accordingly excepts from the excludable classes those aliens in diplomatic status who would be normally excludable because of membership in the Communist Party. The act provides, however, for the exclusion from the United States of any alien, irrespective of his status, whose presence in this country would endanger the public security, and for the deportation of any alien, irrespective of his status, whose presence in this country, after arrival, endangers the public security

Moreover, the Internal Security Act changes the old law by providing that in these public security cases the officials who enforce our immigration laws need not consult the Secretary of State or anybody else before executing their duties under the law.

After the passage of the Internal Security Act, the Senate, under the provisions of Senate Resolution 366 of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, established the Internal Security Subcommittee which, according to the resolution, has as one of its duties the task of maintaining a constant surveillance over the administration and enforcement of the Internal Security Act As a member of the Internal Security Subcommittee I was designated chairman of a unit to study the administration and enforcement of those provisions of the Internal Security Act relating to subversive aliens in diplomatic status.

On August 12 of this year, after extensive hearings, we released a report which was accompanied by substantial testimony bearing on the subject. It was evident from the testimony, and our report in substance stated that, notwithstanding these provisions of the Internal Security Act which provide for the exclusion and deportation of aliens whose presence in this country endangers the public security, virtually nothing was being done by the executive department to carry those provisions into effect. At that time—on August 12 of this year—the subcommittee issued a recommendation calling for an immediate and vigorous program of enforcement But the subcommittee did not stop with a mere recommendation. We have been striving with a limited staff and with heavy demands on our time, to get at the root of the problem—to find out why these particular provisions of the Internal Security Act are not being enforced.

I think, Mr. President, the facts on a typical case, which I shall now recite, will give the Senate an indication of the prevailing unsatisfactory practices.

On January 6, 1947, one Marcell Hitschmannova departed from Cairo, Egypt, aboard the U. S. S. *Marine Carp*. She arrived at the port of entry in New York on January 23, 1947, in possession of a visitor's visa and was admitted into the United States for a period of 6 months as a temporary visitor for pleasure. At the time Miss Hitschmannova was admitted here she stated that she was coming to this country to visit a friend, one Ruth Gruber, in New York City. May I say in passing that in May of 1941 the House of Representatives passed a provision of a bill which would terminate Ruth Gruber's employment in the office of the Secretary of the Interior because of alleged Communist sympathies

After her admission into the United States Miss Hitschmannova received accreditation by the United Nations as a newspaper correspondent for certain publications. Thereafter she was reaccredited for a period ending January 1, 1950, for another publication and since January 1, 1950, she has been reaccredited from time to time

On each occasion on which Miss Hitschmannova has been accredited or reaccredited by the United Nations the Division of Security of the Department of State and the Visa Division of the Department of State have registered with the Division of International Administration of the Department of State strong objection to her accreditation on the grounds that her presence in the United States is a definite security threat. But on every occasion the Secretary of State, on the recommendation of the Division of International Administration, has refused to object to this alien's accreditation of reaccreditation.

When the Immigration and Naturalization Service received notice of Miss Hitschmannova's accreditation as a press correspondent to January 1, 1951, the Service authorized an extension of her temporary stay on condition that she was in possession of a passport validated for a period at least 60 days beyond January 1, 1951. Thereafter, in February of 1951, Miss Hitschmannova, who is a native of Egypt, received a Czechoslovakian passport issued from Prague and valid until December of 1951.

It is interesting to note that a former member of the staff of the Czechoslovakian Embassy in Washington, who has been declared persona non grata by this Government, intervened to assist Miss Hitschmannova in her application for an extension of stay.

Here is the record of this alien, both before and after her admission into the United States, and may I say that this information on her record has all been known by the appropriate officials of this Government not just for months but for years

Prior to her admission into the United States Miss Hitschmannova had been acting on behalf of the Soviet Intelligence Service. While she was secretary to the Czechoslovakian Minister in Egypt in 1945 she carried instructions from the Soviet headquarters in Cairo to the Communist hierarchy in Athens. She was in contact with Communist elements in Italy, Egypt, and the Middle East, and very actively collaborated with another Russian intelligence agent In 1946 she was in close contact with an agent in the United States who was engaged in a conspiracy to purloin our Government documents.

United States intelligence agencies have reported that her background includes numerous compromising adventures and that, while living in Cairo, she

was in a very undesirable relationship with a member of the Communist headquarters cell. Her own appraisal of her personal life includes a boast that she used to catch pigeons in order to cut their throats so that she could watch the blood run in the sink and that she was a smoker of opium and a user of narcotic drugs just for the thrill of it.

I shall not detail any further the record of Miss Hitschmannova's activities prior to her entry into this country because to do so might possibly disclose sources of information. Suffice it to say that what has been said thus far is only a sample.

What have been her activities since she arrived in the United States? According to the intelligence agencies of this Government she has been in contact with a member of the Soviet intelligence net. She has been aggressive in attempting to cause accreditation by the United Nations to be made as correspondents of other persons of her ilk. Although her first visa application to come to this country was blocked by the British who reported that she was a Communist propaganda agent, she has since her arrival in this country over the course of the last 4 years written scores of articles of Communist propaganda which have been disseminated over the length and breadth of this land. She has promoted various Communist meetings and rallies.

The record in the case further discloses, Mr. President, that notwithstanding the strong representations made by our Visa Division and the Division of Security to the Division of International Administration of the Department of State that this alien should be restricted in her activities to the headquarters district of the United Nations, the Chief of the Division of International Administration took the position that Miss Hitschmannova should be allowed to give lectures outside the headquarters district.

And now let us consider the problem of the deportation of Miss Hitschmannova. On August 3, 1951, the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service addressed a letter to the Secretary of State in which he stated that the continued presence in the United States of Miss Hitschmannova may be a threat to the national security. The Immigration Commissioner requested the Secretary of State to inform him as to whether he had any objection to requiring Miss Hitschmannova to depart from the United States. That letter, may I emphasize, was addressed to the Secretary of State on August 3 of this year. To date, no reply has been made by the State Department. Since this letter was received by the Secretary of State both the Visa Division and the Division of Security have strongly recommended that the Department of State do not object to the deportation of Miss Hitschmannova. But, Mr. President, under date of September 12, 1951, the Chief of the Division of International Administration of the Department of State, dispatched to the Chief of the Office of Consular Affairs, a memorandum which opposes the deportation of Miss Hitschmannova.

We understand that a proposed letter has already being prepared giving the approval of the Department of State to Miss Hitschmannova's remaining in the United States.

Earlier in my remarks, I alluded to the testimony which was taken by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary prior to the passage of the Internal Security Act in which the Chief of the Visa Division of the Department of State testified that in every case which the Visa Division had disapproved a visa application on security grounds involving an official of a foreign government or an affiliate of an international organization, the case had been approved by the higher echelon of the Department of State; and that these cases were running at the rate of 8 to 10 a month.

In the course of the last few days we held an executive session with the officials of the Department of State on this matter including the Chief of the Division of International Administration and the administrative attorney of the Division. So far as I can comprehend their attitude it is this, that the security of the United States should be weighed in the balance against a policy of facilitating our international relations with other nations. I assert that this is not only a direct violation of the Internal Security Act, which these officials are sworn to uphold and which is designed to protect this country, but is a course leading to the practical annulment of the statutory provisions passed by the Congress to protect our internal security.

May I point out that this alien did not enter this country in diplomatic or semidiplomatic status but acquired her accreditation and a series of reaccreditations subsequent to her entry. The last available statistics show that from July 1947, to March 1951, visas totaling 3,616 in number were issued to aliens in diplomatic status to come to the United States from iron-curtain countries.

So long as certain officials of this Government refuse to heed the warnings of our intelligence agencies and deliberately ignore provisions of the Internal Security Act, we shall have an open door for the infiltration of spies and saboteurs. The security of our defense secrets shall be in jeopardy. Worse, enemy aliens in numbers will be abroad in this country to plot and to work against the interests of the United States.

PROPOSED FORMULA FOR USE IN ESTABLISHING TELEPHONE RATES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, earlier today, the Honorable Paul A. Walker, a member of the Federal Communications Commission, made an important address to the annual convention of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners at Charleston, S. C. Commissioner Walker's address was important because it laid before the State regulatory commission members a carefully prepared plan which should go far in preventing the need for further local telephone-rate increases.

The proposal which is today being considered by the various State utility commissioners is of the utmost importance to millions of telephone users in this country. Last January 30, in my capacity as chairman of the communications subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I wrote the Federal Communications Commission with respect to the disparity in rates betwen long distance interstate calls and local exchange and intrastate calls.

I should like to invite the Senate's attention to the fact that frequently when one examines the rates it is found that there is one rate, for example, between Phoenix, Ariz., and Yuma, Ariz., and a different and lower rate between Phoenix and a point in California just across the Arizona-California border. In other words it costs less to telephone a longer distance across State lines than it does to telephone a shorter distance within one's own State. That situation prevails generally throughout the United States. It was in regard to that subject that I addressed the Federal Communications Commission.

The Commission at that time was planning on moving forward with a hearing to consider a reduction in long-distance rates. The general public failed to realize that there is a direct relation between long distance and local telephone rates; that when one goes down the other goes up simply because the same plant is basically used for both services.

All over the Nation, in State after State, the local telephone companies were applying for increases in local telephone rates. And yet at the same time, a Government commission was planning on reducing long-distance rates. Those who know something about the Bell System and the rate formulas knew that in a time of rising labor and material costs, the Bell System and its associated companies simply had to have more revenue, and that if the Federal regulatory agency ordered a cut in long-distance rates, the inevitable result would be a demand for still further increase in local instrastate rates.

However, following our exchange of correspondence over a period of some 3 months, the Federal Communications Commission and the National Association of State Utility Commissions got down to work in an effort to work out a formula satisfactory to the States, to the Bell System, and to the Federal regulatory agency.

It is a matter of great satisfaction to me that the Commission and the State utility commissioners have evolved a plan which is apparently helpful to all concerned and without the Federal Government or a Federal agency interfering in any way with the duties, prerogatives, or responsibilities of the individual States. Chairman Wayne Coy, Commissioner Walker, and their colleagues, and the staff of the Commission are entitled to great credit for this accomplishment, and I commend them for it. Equally to be commended are the able representatives of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, who have worked painstakingly for months in the tedious and complicated task of arriving at a separation formula which will help resolve the dilemma that faced all of them.

Briefly and without technical detail, the new separation formula shifts from State to interstate operations some $82,000,000 in exchange plant gross investment and an additional $17,000,000 of related annual expenses Taking this sum off the rate base for local telephone plant and shifting it to the national long-distance plant means just that much less on which fair earnings have to be made by the local telephone companies.

It means that the ordinary telephone user, the housewife, the local merchant, the farmer, and the infrequent long-distance user will bear a fairer burden while a larger percentage of the cost of long-distance calls will be shifted to those who make those calls

It ought to mean that the pressure for further local telephone-rate increases will be eased.

Another result of the new formula, if it is adopted, will be to wipe out some of the disparity between intrastate and interstate toll rates Under existing circumstances, in most States the charge for a short-haul message within a State is considerably more than the charge for the same short-haul message crossing State lines Some of the existing examples are almost ridiculous, the cost dropping substantially for a telephone message a hundred yards longer simply because it crossed a State line.

Mr President, I do not know whether the new separations formula will be acceptable to all of the parties concerned, the State regulatory commissions, the local telephone companies, and the Bell System But I do know that all concerned have worked for months earnestly and faithfully in an attempt to evolve a formula which does not violate the rights of the States to fix their own rates and that the new formula is a practical step forward in an attempt to equalize the telephone-rate burden I am confident that if further changes are found necessary, they can and will be made in the spirit in which the new formula was worked out

In any event, all of those concerned are to be commended for their fine effort in the public interest. That is true whether the formula is adopted or not.

I am sorry, Mr President, that the rules do not permit the full text of Commissioner Walker's address to appear immediately following my statement I therefore ask unanimous consent that Commissioner Walker's address be printed in the Appendix so that many Senators who have taken a deep interest in this problem will have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the proposal now being considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAYDEN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

WILLIAM LIAS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr President, if there is no further routine business to be transacted, I ask for recognition.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr WILLIAMS. Mr. President, for the past several months there have been grave questions raised as to whether or not our Federal income-tax laws are being enforced in respect to gangsters and racketeers as vigorously as they are in respect to the average American citizens

The Kefauver committee in its report called this to our attention when they said:

> It is apparent that many, if not all, of the returns submitted for the gamblers and gangsters are fraudulent, and that the Government is losing huge sums in tax revenue from the illegal ventures run by them.

And in another report they said·

> The committee found evidence of corruption and connivance at all levels of government- Federal, State, and local The evidence of the corruption of Federal Government officials is primarily in connection with the enforcement of the income-tax laws

Recognizing the seriousness of this allegation, I decided to study a few specific cases to determine the accuracy of of these charges. Today I shall discuss the results of my study of how the tax laws have been enforced in one specific case against a prominent racketeer. Later I hope to be in a position to report on other examples.

The case I am discussing today is that of William Lias of Wheeling, W. Va., and Detroit, Mich., a man who has been described by the Department of Justice as the former "king pin" in the bootlegging business, the owner and operator of several of the plushiest gambling rooms between New York and Chicago, and the owner or operator of a number of bookie joints, and ofttimes he has been referred to as a "dictator" of the rackets in West Virginia and southern Ohio.

In 1948, when Mr. T. L Caudle, Chief of the Tax Division, Department of Justice, was speaking of this case, he was quoted as having said that there were many features of the case that were comparable to those of Al Capone's the Chicago gangster who went to prison for 11 years for tax evasion

Again, this same Mr Lias in 1951 was listed by the Department of Justice among such notorious characters as Frank Costello, Joe Adonis, Frank "The Bookmaker" Erickson, Mickey Cohen, and Jack "Greasy Thumb" Guzik.

The man already has a long-established criminal record:

Date	Offense	Disposition
Jan 9, 1923	Violation National Prohibition Act	6 months imprisonment and $1,000 fine
Jan 21 1924	Conspiracy to violate National Prohibition Act	Fine of $7.50
May 12, 1926	do	16 months imprisonment and $5,500 fine.
Nov 12, 1930	do	2 years imprisonment and $10,000 fine

It should be noted at this point that two of the fines referred to above, namely, the $5500 on May 12, 1926, and the $10,000 fine on November 12, 1930, were carried on the books of the Government unpaid until 1946, a period of nearly 20 years

Mr. Lias claimed that he began bootlegging about 1914 At this time he was delivering bread for a baking company to Ohio, and he would take bread over and bring a wagon load of beer and whisky back He continued bootlegging on a small scale until sometime in 1917.

He has stated that about the time the United States began drafting men for World War I he left Wheeling, and went to Detroit, Mich In 1919 he returned to Wheeling and resumed his bootlegging activities He continued bootlegging in Wheeling until he was confined in the United States Penitentiary at Atlanta, Ga.

After being paroled in November 1926, Mr Lias stated that he had his parole transferred to Pennsylvania, and then began hauling whisky out of Philadelphia. He later returned to Wheeling, continued to bootleg, and in 1928, in addition to bootlegging, he operated various gambling places, such as the White Front, Club of Allies, and the Yukon Club. In 1929 the whisky business declined, and in 1930 he began a numbers business in Wheeling and nearby Ohio and Pennsylvania towns.

He was confined in Federal Prison Camp at Petersburg, Va , and the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga , from December 17, 1931, to July 23, 1933. During this confinement the numbers business was carried on by his brother, John Lias, and two cousins, Mike and Theodore Russell. This numbers business was operated as a partnership between William Lias, Mike Russell, and George Seibert. In 1934 this partnership was terminated. A new partnership was formed between William Lias and John Lias, known as the Wheeling Book Co., and continued the operation of the numbers business until late 1937.

In 1936 Mr. Lias organized a West Virginia corporation known as the Automatic Cigarette Sales Co., to operate coin vending machines and slot machines.

In 1941 Mr. Lias organized another West Virginia corporation, known as Zellers Steak House, to operate a restaurant

Also prior to 194? Mr Lias operated, or had an interest in various gambling places, known as the Friendship Club, Bachelors Club, the Hollywood, the Tumble Inn, Paddock Club, The Silver and Green Club, and the Pirate Cafe, and operated several football pools

The record shows that Mr Lias was financially interested in numerous gambling establishments throughout the mid-West, and at this point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a descriptive list of the 18 different business establishments with which Mr. Lias was associated at the time of the investigation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr HAYDEN in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1 The Acorn Club is a partnership consisting of Lias Bros (partnership) and Andy Vusky This partnership was formed in July 1939, and operates a race-horse book and gambling house in Bridgeport, Ohio The partnership earnings are distributed on the basis of 50 percent to Lias Bros and 50 percent to Andy Vusky. The members of the

partnership and ratio of distribution of earnings remained unchanged throughout the years involved. Mr. Vusky, a resident of Bridgeport, is the dominant member of the partnership, and the partnership returns are filed in Ohio.

2. Automatic Cigarette Sales Co, a West Virginia corporation, was incorporated on December 9, 1936, and is located in Wheeling, W. Va This corporation was engaged in the business of operating coin-vending machines, music machines, and slot machines until November 1944. The corporation purchased several apartment buildings and business properties in 1943 and 1944. Shortly after discontinuing the coin-machine business the corporation disposed of that type of equipment, and during the years 1945 and 1946 derived its income from rents. Mr. Lias is president of this corporation and completely controls it. He and members of his family own all of the stock in this corporation.

3 Club Diamond is a night club and gambling house located in Wheeling, W. Va. It is owned and operated by Danny J. Phillips. Mr. Lias' association with Phillips in this venture began on November 27, 1945, and after a misunderstanding between them was terminated on January 12, 1946. Mr. Lias was to receive 40 percent of the gross gambling income from this venture. Shortly after their association was terminated the Ohio County, W Va., law-enforcement officers closed the gambling room of the Club Diamond and did not allow it to reopen.

4 The Club Paddock was a partnership consisting of Lias Bros (partnership), Spero Petrakis, and Theodore Prossos. This partnership operated a night club and gambling house in Wheeling, W. Va , during the years 1942 to 1945, inclusive. The earnings were distributed on a basis of 33⅓ percent to Lias Bros., 33⅓ percent to Spero Petrakis, and 33⅓ percent to Theodore Prossos. The members of the partnership and the ratio of distribution of earnings remained the same. Petrakis and Prossos were the active members of this partnership

5 The Globe Amusement Co was a partnership consisting of William Lias, Gregory Manos, William Manos, and August Berklas, during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1942 During the fiscal year ending September 30, 1943, the partners were William Lias, Gregory Manos, and William Manos. This partnership was engaged in the business of operating slot machines. The operations of this partnership were identical and intermingled with those of Automatic Cigarette Sales Co. This partnership was completely controlled by William Lias.

6 Greiner's, Inc , a West Virginia corporation, was incorporated August 27, 1945, but did not begin operations until February 1, 1946. This corporation is engaged in the business of retailing electrical appliances, radios, and records Mr. Lias owns 150 shares of the 250 shares of outstanding stock G C. Greiner, a former employee of Lias, owns 50 shares, and David S Goldberg, certified public accountant, owns 50 shares. Greiner is the active manager of this firm.

7. Jai Lai, Inc , a West Virginia corporation, was incorporated January 1, 1946, and began operations on February 1, 1946. This corporation took over the assets and business of the Club Paddock, and continued the operation of a night club and gambling house There was no stock issued in Mr. Lias' name, but he was to receive 30 percent of the gross gambling income

8 Laconia, Inc , a West Virginia corporation, was incorporated December 9, 1944. This corporation is engaged in the business of dealing in and holding real estate. William Lias is president and exercises complete control of this corporation He and members of his family own all of the corporate stock.

9. Lias Bros., formerly the Wheeling Book Co., is a partnership consisting of William Lias and John Lias. This partnership was in existence throughout the years investigated, and the earnings were distributed on the basis of 50 percent to each of the partners. This partnership reported its distributive share of the earnings of the various partnerships of which it was a member, and some other gambling income. Lias Bros. was a member of the following partnerships: Acorn Club, Club Paddock, Market Street Club, Point Pleasant Amusement Co., and the Pirate

10. The Main Street Bar was a saloon, horse book, and gambling house located in Weirton, W. Va. This place was operated by Henry Barber. Mr. Lias received a so-called salary from this venture in the year 1946.

11. The Market Street Club is a horse book and gambling casino operated in conjunction with Zellers Steak House It is located on second and third floors of the Zellers Steak House building, and has connecting stairways with the restaurant. It is a partnership, and the members were as follows:

Partners:	Year
Lias Bros., August Berklas, Zellers Steak House	1942
Lias Bros and Zellers Steak House	1943
Lias Bros. and Zellers Steak House	1944
Lias Bros., Gregory Manos, Zellers Steak House	1945
Lias Bros, Gregory Manos, Zellers Steak House	1946

August Berklas and Gregory Manos received a share of the profit for the years in which they were partners, but they had no proprietary interest in this business. William Lias completely dominated and controlled the business. The Market Street Club had the reputation of being the largest and most lucrative gambling casino in West Virginia. Most of the customers were drawn from Ohio and Pennsylvania cities. In addition to the horse book, the gambling facilities consisted of three crap tables, a hazard game, a roulette wheel, and a blackjack game.

12. The Pirate Cafe is a restaurant, bar, and gambling house It is located in the section of Wheeling, W. Va., known as South Wheeling, and in the red-light district It is a partnership, formed July 25, 1940, and the members were as follows:

Partners·	Year
Dominick Cerra, John Curry, Nick Miller, Lias Bros	1942
Dominick Cerra, John Curry, Nick Miller, George Seibert, Lias Bros	1943
John Curry, Nick Miller, Anthony Perotti, Lias Bros	1944
Nick Miller, George Seibert, Lias Bros	1945
Nick Miller, George Seibert, Mele Vosvick, Lias Bros	1946

None of the partners other than Lias Bros. and Nick Miller had a proprietary interest in this business. The partnership was originally formed by Lias Bros and Nick Miller in 1940.

13 The Point Pleasant Amusement Co. was a partnership that engaged in the operation of slot machines in and around Point Pleasant, W. Va., from September 1942, through January 1943. The members of this partnership were Lias Bros, G C. Greiner, and Pete Dallas. Greiner and Dallas operated this business but had no investment in it. This partnership was terminated in January 1943, when the West Virginia State Police confiscated and destroyed the slot machines belonging to the business.

14 Reuther's, Inc., a West Virginia corporation, was incorporated July 1, 1945. This corporation was engaged in the operation of a horse book and restaurant known as Reuther's Royal Bar in Wheeling, W. Va. This corporation was originally financed by the Market Street Club, and is controlled by William Lias, although William Reuther is the nominal president. The stock certificates book does not show that any stock is in William Lias' name, but shows 90 shares of stock in the name of Joseph Samuels. The dividends on these 90 shares of stock were paid to William Lias for the years 1945 and 1946 and reported by him.

15. The Silver Dollar was a gambling house located in Wheeling, W. Va. William Lias had a partnership interest in this for the year 1943. The other members of this partnership were Charles Kupchak, August Berklas, Theodore Prossos, Spere Petrakis, Pete Kalles, and Joseph Samuels.

16 and 17. Wheeling Downs, Inc., was incorporated in West Virginia in November 1945. Wheeling Downs Racing Association was incorporated in West Virginia on April 1, 1946. Wheeling Downs, Inc., owns the grounds, buildings, and equipment of the race track known as Wheeling Downs, and the Wheeling Downs Racing Association conducts the racing meets and related activities at Wheeling Downs. William Lias and members of his family own all of the stock in both of these corporations. William Lias dominates and completely controls both corporations. The racing meet held in the fall of 1946 was the only meet conducted during the years investigated.

18 Zellers Steak House, Inc , was incorporated in West Virginia on May 15, 1941, and is engaged in the business of operating a restaurant, known as Zellers Steak House, Wheeling, W. Va. This business was organized by William Lias to operate in conjunction with his gambling casino, the Market Street Club Of the 450 shares of outstanding stock, 300 shares stand in the name of William Lias, and the remaining 150 shares stand in the name of his brother, John Lias. William Lias completely dominates and controls this corporation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the record also shows that during the years 1928 to 1932, inclusive, Mr. Lias neither filed a tax return nor paid any income taxes.

According to the Treasury Department, the tax liabilities of Mr. Lias for the years 1928 to 1932 should have been:

Year:	Amount
1928	$20,195 03
1929	10,343 30
1930	1,862 50
1931	27,500 00
1932	22,102.17

On July 15, 1935, Mr Lias was tried in the United States district court at Elkins, West Virginia, for willful failure to file a tax return for the year 1931.

On March 22, 1938, Mr. Lias filed an offer in compromise, Treasury Form 656–C, in which he offered to pay $10,400 for all civil and criminal liabilities of income tax, penalties, and interest for all years prior to 1934. This offer specified that the $10,400 would be paid in installments as follows:

Three payments of $1,000 each on the first of March, April, and May, 1938; and $500 per month thereafter until the balance of the offer had been paid. The three $1,000 payments were made; and then on June 6, 1938, David Goldberg, Mr. Lias' authorized agent, wrote the Department of Justice, stating that Mr.

Lias was financially unable to make the June payment.

During the years 1939 to 1941, inclusive, Mr. Lias made statements to John D. Eller, field division chief, of the Wheeling deputy collector's office, claiming inability to pay taxes assessed for the years 1934 to 1940, inclusive.

These claims of financial inability to make the payments on delinquent taxes during this period are of particular significance in view of the fact that one of the principal arguments used by Mr. Lias in disputing the existing assessments of the Government is based upon his current claim that his large increase is net worth during the years 1942 to 1946 is as a result of his placing into his business approximately one million dollars in cash which he had carried over from the prohibition era.

During the period 1942 to 1946, the income tax returns of Mr. Lias were not audited, the excuse being given that during the war the Treasury Department was short of help. In 1947 an audit was begun; and when expenditures apparently exceeded the reported income, the returns for the years 1942 to 1946 were opened As a result the following tax assessments and penalties were proposed·

Year	Tax	50-percent penalty	6-percent penalty	Total
1942	$33, 325 45	$16, 662 73	0	$49, 988 18
1943	169, 212 63	80, 885 39	$10, 921 25	261, 019 27
1944	303, 360 57	151, 680 20	19, 201 25	474, 242 11
1945	554, 837 86	277, 418 93	33, 895 27	866, 152 06
1946	49, 020 92	24, 510 46	3, 399 75	76, 931 13
1947	166, 562 75	83, 718 88	14, 556 61	264, 838 24
Total	1, 276, 320 18	634, 876 68	81, 974 13	1, 993, 170 99

During this investigation two of Mr. Lias' establishments were also found to have forgotten some of their income. For instance:

The Automatic Cigarette Sales Co., Inc., was assessed an additional $123,-974 52 for the years 1944 and 1945.

The Zeller's Steak House, Inc., was assessed $87,106 28 for additional taxes in the years 1943 to 1946, inclusive.

Altogether this brought Mr. Lias' extra assessments, including penalties, to the grand total of $2,230,744 82.

In 1948, following these assessments, Mr. Lias was indicted on five counts charging evasion of income taxes; and on November 9, 1948, he pleaded guilty to the charge, and waived trial.

On November 24, 1948, he was sentenced by Judge William E Baker to 5 years in prison and was fined $10,000, and was given until January 24, 1949, to settle his affairs before going to the penitentiary.

On January 8, 1949—2 months after having pleaded guilty and received his sentence—Mr. Lias made the charge that he had been double-crossed and that he had only entered his plea of guilty before Judge Baker after having been promised that he would only receive a fine and not be sentenced to the penitentiary.

He claimed that the judge was his very close friend, and that he had been given to understand that a deal had been made with him, indicating that he would be placed on probation instead of having to serve time.

As a result of what he described as a double-cross, Mr. Lias, through his attorney, on January 21, 1949, filed two petitions with Judge Baker:

a One petition asked that his prison sentence be set aside and that he be placed on probation.

b. The second petition was that should the first request be refused, he be allowed to enter a plea of not guilty

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD excerpts from this second appeal.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows

EXCERPTS FROM TEXT OF LIAS' APPEAL FROM PRISON SENTENCE

1 Defendant insists that he is not guilty of any of the counts in the indictment involved in the case, and

2 Defendant, although innocent entered the aforementioned plea because he was led to believe and did believe at the time of the entry thereof and up to the time when sentence was imposed upon him that he, the said defendant, would not be committed to serve any period of time in the Federal penitentiary or elsewhere, but on the contrary that he, the said defendant, would receive a substantial fine and suspended sentence and be placed upon parole

The defendant offers the following matters in support of this motion

I Your defendant says that for a long period of time immediately preceding the entry of the aforementioned plea that he and the Honorable William E Baker, judge of the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, and presiding judge in the instant case, were friendly, that the said judge had been a guest at several of the business enterprises operated by the said defendant and was well aware of the activities involved in such enterprises, that on quite a number of occasions during the past several years when in the city of Wheeling, holding court, the Honorable William E Baker contacted this defendant and on one occasion visited this defendant at the latter's office on Sixteenth Street in the city of Wheeling, W Va, and on another was a guest at Zeller's Steak House, this steak house being the restaurant conducted by the defendant on Market Street in the city of Wheeling, that all of this, together with expressions of friendship made by the Honorable William E Baker to this defendant convinced the latter that they were indeed close friends, and that during the pendency of the instant case against the defendant the defendant caused season passes for the 1948 Wheeling Downs race meeting to be sent to said judge who on July 30, 1938, returned the passes and explained that his reason for doing so was that his regular term of court would not convene in Wheeling until after the races were over and that he had observed that tax had been paid thereon and that it would be an injustice to the defendant for the said judge to retain the passes, thereby causing the defendant to lose the tax paid.

In stating the above, no effort is being made to reflect any impropriety on the part of said Hon William E Baker, but rather is put forward to show that because of the intimate friendship existing between said Hon. William E Baker and this defendant, this defendant with what is to follow was entitled to believe that upon the entry of his plea of guilty he would be placed upon probation

II The defendant further says that as the record in the instant case will show, the United States Government seeks to recover of and from this defendant a sum in excess of $1,300,000, that in addition to Carl B. Galbraith, an attorney at the bar of this court, defendant also employed Lawrence D. Stanley and Joseph S Platt, attorneys, with offices in the city of Columbus, Ohio, and specialists in the matter of handling income-tax cases, that on or before October 20, 1948, the defendant was informed by one of his attorneys, Carl B Galbraith, that he (Galbraith) had information to the effect that the court had spoken highly of this defendant and felt that he did not believe the ends of justice would be best served by sentencing defendant to the penitentiary, but rather it would be better to place the defendant on probation

On October 19, 1948, the instant case against the defendant was set by the court for trial on November 15, 1948

This defendant further says that on October 20, 1948, the defendant met with his attorneys, Galbraith, Stanley and Platt, that it was discussed by and between the defendant and his said attorneys on this occasion the matter of what should be done with reference to trial in the instant case; that Messrs Stanley and Platt advised the defendant that it was necessary for them to know at that time and on that day what the defendant planned to do with reference to his trial set as aforesaid, that the defendant because of the friendly relationship which defendant felt existed between himself and the Honorable William E, Baker, and sincerely believing therein, and remembering what his attorney had told him with reference to probation, believed as this defendant says he had a right to believe because of said friendship and said information that he would not be required to serve any period of time in any penal institution unless he had first violated the terms of the probation, determined to enter a plea of guilty to one of the five counts set forth in the indictment in the instant case, and accepted imposition of a fine and probation, to the end that defendant might better be able to affect a full and complete settlement of Government's claimed liability against the defendant

The defendant says that in the absence of the information relative to probation given him as aforesaid, the defendant would not have determined to enter a plea of guilty as to the charges contained in the indictment of any count thereof.

III The defendant says on information and belief and therefore charges the fact to be that on October 22, 1948, his counsel, Carl B. Galbraith, met with the Honorable William E. Baker, discussing with him this case. At this conference were present, in addition, Hon C. Lee Spillers, United States district attorney, and Hon William C Howard, clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia The conference was held in the court's chambers During the course of the conference Mr. Galbraith advised the Honorable William E. Baker that this defendant would plead guilty to one of the counts in the indictment. After making such announcement

the Honorable William E Baker in substance made the following statement: "I do not believe that the ends of justice will be best served by sending Bill Lias to the penitentiary. I have known Bill Lias for a great many years I have had occasion in the past to sentence him to the penitentiary. I feel that it would be better to impose a substantial fine and place him on probation for a long period of time; that to so place him on probation would guarantee his future conduct as a useful citizen. I likewise feel that there is no necessity to have a presentence investigation made for the reasons that I know more about Bill Lias than any investigator could learn in 6 months' time."

And thereupon the Honorable William E. Baker stated that he thought it would be all right to impose whatever sentence was to be imposed upon Bill Lias immediately following the entry of his plea of guilty. The court further indicated his willingness to accept the motion of the United States district attorney to dismiss four of the five counts in this indictment against him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this request was granted, and the previous sentence was set aside. The previous indictments were returned to the court calendar.

During the succeeding months, through a legal process that I as a layman could not follow, Mr. Lias was able to win acquittal of the criminal charge. The records show that Mr. Lias spent over one-quarter million dollars in attorneys' and accountants' fees to win this acquittal.

This, however, did not relieve him of his civil liability of these taxes, totaling at that time $2,230,744.82.

For nearly 3 years this unpaid account totaling $2,230,744.82 has been allowed to gather dust in the files of the Washington bureau, with no effort being made on the part of the Treasury Department to record jeopardy assessments or liens and thereby safeguard the interests of the Government.

During this interval the taxpayer has not been idle, and the records show that since the assessment a substantial percentage of his assets have been disposed of.

As a result of the negligence on the part of the Treasury Department to take appropriate steps, it is extremely questionable today as to what percentage of the total claim can be collected.

I list the steps which the taxpayer has taken to dispose of his assets since the assessment was made.

First. By an agreement dated November 1, 1948, William Lias transferred to John Lias, his brother, capital stock in family-owned corporations, having a total par value of $231,200.

Second. By an agreement dated November 1, 1948, William Lias transferred to Gregory Koutroumanos, his brother-in-law, capital stock in family-owned corporations, having a total par value of $66,300

Third. By an agreement dated November 1, 1948, William Lias transferred to William Koutroumanos, his brother-in-law, capital stock in family-owned corporations, having a total par value of $14,400.

The total book value of the stock transferred to John Lias, Gregory, and William Koutroumanos as a result of the November 1, 1948, agreement was far in excess of the par value of said stock. A comparison of book value and par value of the stock transferred is as follows:

Stock	Shares transferred	Par value	Book value
Automatic Cigarette Sales Co	248	$24,800	$70,600
Laconia, Inc	1,866	186,600	213,724
Wheeling Downs, Inc	795	79,500	65,190
Wheeling Downs Racing Association	75	7,500	39,750
Zeller's Steak House, Inc	135	13,500	29,700
Total		311,900	418,964

The taxpayer attempted to justify this transfer on the basis that it represented repayments of funds owed to his relatives. However, prior to the date of the agreement there was nothing in the corporate records or William Lias' records to indicate that William Lias had invested sums for his relatives as claimed. The stock transferred had previously been in the name of William Lias, and he had reported and paid taxes on the dividends from the stock. A further indication that the agreement in question is fictitious is the manner in which the dividends paid by Wheeling Downs Racing Association in 1949 were handled. On October 18, 1949, Wheeling Downs Racing Association paid dividends amounting to $200 per share. These dividends were paid by three checks: check No. 2121, in the amount of $30,000, to William Lias; check No. 2122, to Alice B. Lias, in the amount of $10,000; and check No. 2123, in the amount of $10,000, to Gregory Koutroumanos. These dividends were paid on the basis of stockholdings prior to November 1, 1948, the date of the purported agreement; and the checks were deposited to the personal account of William Lias.

Another effect of the November 1, 1948, transfer of stock was the distribution of the stock holdings so that in some of the corporations a minority of the oustanding stock would remain in the names of William and Alice Lias, and in others a bare majority of the outstanding stock would remain in the names of William and Alice Lias. This had the effect of reducing the resale value of William Lias' remaining interest A schedule of the stockholdings of William Lias before and after November 1, 1948, is shown below:

Corporation	Shares outstanding	Stock in name of William Lias—			
		Before Nov 1, 1948		After Nov. 1, 1948	
		Shares	Percent	Shares	Percent
Automatic Cigarette Sales Co	829	540	65 14	292	35.22
Laconia, Inc	6,222	3,902	62.71	2,036	32 72
Wheeling Downs, Inc	3,650	2,500	68.49	1,705	46.71
Wheeling Downs Racing Association	250	150	60 00	75	30 00
Zeller's Steak House, Inc	451	300	66.52	165	36.59
Total	11,402	7,392	------	4,273	------

Fourth. Gifts to Alice B. Lias, wife of William Lias.

One of Mr. Lias' corporations was Laconia, Inc., of Wheeling, W. Va. The balance sheet of this corporation shows a net worth of around $750,000.

Laconia, Inc., has 6,222 shares of stock outstanding. Two thousand and thirty-six shares, or 32.72 percent, stand in the name of William G. Lias, and 1,450 shares, or 23.30 percent, stand in the name of Alice B. Lias, his wife. In addition, 100 shares stand in the name of each of William Lias' children, Antoinette Lias and George W. Lias. Alice B. Lias obtained her stock from gifts made to her by William G. Lias in the following manner: In 1942 William Lias purchased real property known as the Community Apartments, Wheeling, W. Va., in the name of Alice B. Lias, and in 1944 purchased the Firestone Building in Pittsburgh, Pa., in the name of Alice B. Lias. Subsequently, both buildings were transferred to Laconia, Inc., at values of $35,000 and $200,000, respectively. In exchange therefor Alice B. Lias received 350 shares of capital stock for the Community Apartments and 1,000 shares of capital stock for the Firestone Building. William Lias received the remaining 1,000 shares of capital stock due from the transfer of the Firestone Building. In 1946 100 shares of capital stock were issued outright to Alice B. Lias; 100 shares were issued her as guardian for Antoinette Lias; and 100 shares issued her as guardian for George W. Lias. The 300 shares, par value $30,000, so issued were charged to William G. Lias. On February 17, 1947, after this investigation was started, in which the $2,000,000 assessment developed, William Lias filed delinquent gift-tax returns reflecting the gift of the Community Apartments to Alice B. Lias in 1942, and the gift of one-half interest of the Firestone Building in 1944. Also, on February 17, 1947, he filed a gift-tax return reflecting the gift of 100 shares capital stock of Laconia, Inc., to each Alice B. Lias, Antoinette Lias, and George W. Lias.

As of April 30, 1950, William G. Lias' stock in Laconia, Inc., had a book value of $238,662 57, and Alice B. Lias' stock in Laconia, Inc., had a book value of $169,952.26.

Fifth. In addition to gifts to the family there is indication that through excessive payments classified either as salaries or dividends, the assets of some of Mr. Lias' corporations have been drained off.

For instance, the Wheeling Downs Racing Association of Wheeling, W. Va., is one of Mr. Lias' best money makers. This corporation operated the Wheeling Downs Race Track. The records show that for the year 1949, alone, the following salaries and dividends were paid to the Lias family. These payments were made at a time when the Government was claiming $2,000,000 tax liability against Mr. Lias, but were permissible by virtue of the fact that the Government had failed to record its jeopardy assessments. I ask unanimous consent that a breakdown of those payments, salaries, and dividends be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I

might point out that the salaries totaled $70,000, the dividends $50,000, during the year 1949, a total of $120,000 for this so-called private corporation.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Salary	Dividends
William G. Lias	$55,000	$15,000
Alice B Lias	0	10,000
John Lias	4,000	11,200
Gregory Koutroumanos	5,500	13,200
William Koutroumanos	5,500	600
Total	70,000	50,000

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not have any information as to what happened to this corporation in other years or to the other corporations in the interest in which the Government has neglected this case.

To refute the Government's claim that he owes this $2,230,744.82, Mr. Lias has claimed that his increase in net worth during the war years over and above that accounted for by his tax returns, is due to the fact that he put into his business during this period approximately $1,000,000 in cash which he had carried over from the prohibition era.

I do not know how Mr. Lias can reconcile this claim with the true facts. The income-tax history of William G. Lias indicates that he is not and has never been sincere with the Bureau of Internal Revenue. When his income-tax liability was first investigated in 1933, he denied having any taxable income. Then in his 1935 trial for income-tax evasion he admitted having taxable income in 1931 and stated that when he went into the numbers business in 1930 that all he had was a little over $5,000. Later during the settlement and payment of his civil income-tax liability for the years 1928 to 1933, inclusive, he represented to the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Department of Justice that all of his available funds were invested in the Automatic Cigarette Sales Co., and that he had no other available funds. Copies of letters written by his agent, David S. Goldberg, relative to his income tax are in the files of the Bureau. In these letters the taxpayer was trying to reduce his previous tax assessments for the years prior to 1938 through an offer in compromise and was using his lack of funds as one of the reasons for requesting reductions. Now the taxpayer claims that $1,000,000 of his earnings during the 1942–46 period can be accounted for by cash brought over from the 1920's, and in addition he claims that approximately $200,000 were assets belonging to John Lias, reportedly obtained from him in the late 1930's. There are many other inconsistencies in William Lias' representations to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. William Lias apparently changes his story to best serve his position regardless of the truth.

As a matter of information the taxpayer expended $281,663.38 in lawyers' and accountants' fees and related expenses during the years 1948 and 1949 in preparation for and in his trial for alleged income-tax evasion in June of 1949. In addition he owes $15,000 to David S Goldberg for his trial work, and in 1949 paid Barnes and Hill, attorneys, $5,000 for fees relating to his civil income tax liability. This brings the total payments to a little over $300,000 in this case during this interval. A schedule of fees and expenses paid in connection with his criminal trial is set forth below. I ask unanimous consent to have this schedule inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the schedule was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

William G. Lias—1948—Payments made in respect to accounting and legal expenses

Date		Fee	Expenses
1948			
Jan. 26	Frazer & Torbet	$1,000 00	
Feb. 9	do		$225.89
27	David S Goldberg, travel		45.00
24	Ernst & Ernst		7.31
Mar. 6	Mayflower Hotel		24.60
6	Frazer & Torbet	2,923.82	
16	David S. Goldberg, expenses		14.40
16	Burr, Porter, Stanley, Treflinger	10,000.00	
Apr. 7	W C. Brown Co		105 57
8	Burr, Porter, Stanley, Treflinger		262 55
8	Frazer & Torbet	1,870 00	
May 8	do	6,178 53	
June 10	do	7,252 91	
July 13	do	6,737 92	
21	David S Goldberg		32 00
Aug. 16	do		7.19
16	Frazer & Torbet	4,880.47	
Sept. 16	do	3,356.59	
Oct. 8	David S. Goldberg		85 64
13	Frazer & Torbet	2,938.39	
14	William Zimmerman		649 57
Nov. 15	Burr, Porter, Stanley, Treflinger		1,294 21
15	Frazer & Torbet	1,274 78	
18	Handlan, Garden, Matthews & Hess.	75.00	
Apr. 21	Frazer & Torbet	580 99	
Sept. 8	Jacob Hyer	179 14	
Jan. 13	Grace Blatchley, typing		20 00
16	do		6 00
	Total	49,248.54	2,779.93

Grand total, 1948, $52,028 47.

William G. Lias, Alice B. Lias—1949—Trial expenses—Check

Date		Professional services	Attorneys' expenses	Miscellaneous	Travel
Jan. 14	Melvin D Hildreth	$10,000 00			
20	Barnes & Hill	520 38			
Feb. 9	David S. Goldberg	100 00			
9	Carl B Galbraith	5,000 00			
9	Kepner Flying Service				$147 40
9	O'Brien & O'Brien		$416 80		
Mar. 5	do		228 01		
7	David S Goldberg	100 00			
7	Kepner Flying Service				119 70
15	T C Townsend		400 46		
15	M E Bolarsky		152 75		
Apr. 7	Carl B. Galbraith		71 92		
7	Kepner				641 70
8	The Credit Bureau			$5 40	
8	Hotel Windsor				9 79
20	The Colonial Trust Co			1 95	
20	Frazer & Torbet	1,117 52			
20	Frank Alimento	21 70			
20	do	37 80			
20	South Wheeling Bank & Trust			213.79	
23	David S. Goldberg				80 99
26	T C Townsend		196 89		
26	M. E Bolarsky		200 81		
26	David S. Goldberg			16 23	
May 4	do			4 85	
5	O'Brien & O'Brien	5,000 00			
5	David S. Goldberg			70 00	
6	do	100 00			
6	Half Dollar Trust & Savings Bank			5 97	
9	Cash			41 80	
12	David S Goldberg			177 00	
12	Carl B Galbraith			25 68	
17	Frank Alimento	246.00			
17	Frazer & Torbet	2,235 21			
18	David S Goldberg	100.00			
28	Burr, Porter, Stanley, etc.		559 54		
28	O'Brien & O'Brien		173 26		
28	W C Brown Co			25 00	
28	Frank Alimento	429 60			
31	Charles J Margiotti	25,000.00			
June 1	Henry Wessel			53 00	
2	Cash			200.00	
June 2	William Zimmerman	$146.80			
2	Henry Wessel				$100.00
2	T C Townsend		$360 69		
2	Carl B Galbraith		45.65		
2	Kepner				188 80
July 7	Fairmont Hotel				672.46
June 13	Walter Schnelle		$40.50		
21	R S Taylor	250 00			
21	David S Goldberg	100 00		21.87	
22	Frazer & Torbet	1,908.20			
22	M. E Bolarsky		346 08		
27	Morosko Photo Service			89.51	
July 8	W C Brown Co			207.73	
8	Colonial Trust Co			2.05	
8	Fairmont Photo			510 00	
8	Carl B Galbraith		98 88		
8	David S. Goldberg	100 00		5 00	
8	Wheeling Dollar Bank			50 00	
9	Cincinnati Record			3 42	
9	Frank Alimento	2,872 50			
13	Frazer & Torbet	2,304 05			
14	T C Townsend		497 24		
14	Louis Meisel	75 00			
	Chas. J. Margiotti	25,000 00			
	do	25,000 00			
20	Frank Alimento	559 50			
20	William Zimmerman	80 00			
Aug. 10	Carl B Galbraith		67.58		
11	David S Goldberg			21 88	
Sept. 8	Joseph Platt	5,000 00			
9	Carl Galbraith	5,000 00			
14	Fairmont Photo			20 40	
14	Herschel Rose	250 00			
16	Joseph Platt		667.66		
Oct. 4	Carl Galbraith	5,000 00			
12	O'Brien & O'Brien	2,500 00			
12	David S Goldberg				150 00
25	Barnes & Hill	5,000 00			
Dec. 5	O'Brien & O'Brien	2,500 00			
19	Chas. Ihlenfeld	2,000.00			
1950 Feb. 9	Irving Davidson			2,000 00	
	Total	135,755 26	4,484 22	3,813 03	2,560.84

William G. Lias—1949—Trial expenditures—Cash

	Professional services	Attorney expenses	Miscellaneous expenses
Carl B. Galbraith		$450.00	
Charles J. Margiotti	$25,000 00		
Joseph Platt	10,000 00		
Herschel Rose	3,000 00		
Fairmont Hotel			$2,500 00
Frank Alimento	2,500 00		
Joseph J. Lyman	300 00		
Joseph Saad, travel			200 00
O'Brien & O'Brien	5,000 00		
T. C. Townsend	25,000 00		
Fairmont Hotel			2,000 00
Clerk, U. S. Court			72 62
O'Brien & O'Brien		250 00	
Frank Alimento	5,000 00		
H. Wessel			900 00
Wardman Park Hotel			386 86
Washington Hotel			167 18
Witness costs			63 20
Copies of transcripts			34 40
August Berklas			200 00
Paid by cash	$75,800 00	$700.00	6,521 56
Paid by check	135,755 26	4,484.22	6,373 87
	211,555.26	5,184.22	12,898 43

Grand total, 1949, $229,637 91.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Summarizing how the Government has "enforced" the tax laws in regard to this man who has been classified by the Department of Justice as being among the top racketeers in the United States, we find:

First. Fines totaling $15,500 assessed against Mr. Lias in the years 1926 and 1930 were allowed to remain unpaid on the books of the Government for nearly 20 years.

Second. No income-tax returns were filed nor were any income taxes paid during the years 1923 to 1932, inclusive.

Third. During the period 1942 to 1946 Mr. Lias' tax returns were not audited.

Fourth. However, when the audit in 1947 was authorized, these earlier years were retroactively examined, and tax deficiencies, including penalties, of $2,230,744.82 were established.

Fifth. When tried for criminal charges, first Mr. Lias pleaded guilty as he says with the understanding that a deal had been made with the Federal judge whereby he would not receive prison sentence However, after being sentenced to 5 years, Mr. Lias then charged that he had been double-crossed and reversed his plea of guilty

Sixth For nearly 3 years the Government's books have shown Mr. Lias' tax assessments, including penalties, to total over $2,000,000; yet no warrants of restraint or liens have been entered against his property.

Seventh. During this interval in which the Government has failed to protect its interests, Mr. Lias, with the full knowledge of the Treasury Department, has been permitted to dispose of a substantial part of his assets through gifts to members of his family Still no action was taken to stop this transfer. In fact I was advised that as of last Friday no liens had yet been recorded against this notorious racketeer.

Eighth Mr. Lias has spent over $300,000—$75,300 of which was paid in cash—in the past 3 years to keep out of jail and to throw the machinery of this Government into slow motion.

This case has been presented as an example of how the Government has enforced the tax laws as affecting one of America's most notorious racketeers. Instead of my drawing any conclusions, I have attempted to merely state the facts—each taxpayer can compare this case with the treatment he himself has received.

REHABILITATION OF FLOOD-STRICKEN AREAS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 341) making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. HUNT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, the great debate was just starting when the junior Senator from Kentucky became a Member of the United States Senate on March 19, 1951. It is still going on. Men may come and men may go, but the great debate goes on forever. It has not settled anything, but it certainly serves one purpose. Those who prolong this debate have one proficiency. No one on earth can talk more and say less and they can empty the Chamber of the United States Senate quicker than a motion to adjourn.

It was an honor to be sworn in by the distinguished, beloved, and truly great Vice President of the United States. A gifted Kentuckian, he has been the keynoter of two Democratic national conventions and the permanent chairman of one Democratic national convention. He is the most popular after-dinner speaker in America. He is the only man who has ever been both the bridegroom and the grandfather of the year at the same time.

For nearly 40 years since the days of Woodrow Wilson, when he served in the House of Representatives, he has advocated world peace through international organization. By background and tradition, in private life and public service, he is as loyal and as patriotic an American as ever lived—ALBEN W. BARKLEY. But Senators know him, as do most of our citizens, because he has served in this greatest deliberative body on earth for 24 years, as a Member, as the floor leader for his party, and as the Presiding Officer.

Congress, indeed, by resolution named him a member of the National Security Council which meets every Wednesday. He has served as president of the Interparliamentary Union that has done so much for world peace, accord, and understanding.

Mr. President, Kentuckians are proud of ALBEN W. BARKLEY. He has held public office longer than has any other man in the history of our Commonwealth, even Henry Clay—and without reproach. Never has the Vice President merited admiration more than on Friday of last week when he sat with quiet dignity and listened to an attack on him that was wholly unwarranted. Surely any remark by the Vice President must be misconstrued if it appears that he has reflected upon any of his colleagues in this body because no one has gone to such extremes to preside, not only with dignity and honor, but with fairness and infinite patience and friendship for all the Members.

Silence is golden. The Vice President listened with proper disregard to a challenge to go to the floor to indulge in a mud-slinging contest. Well versed observers say that in the history of this Republic, no Member of the United States Senate has ever thus reflected upon a Vice President, or questioned what he said off the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY showed that when it is unwise and imprudent even he himself does not follow the policy of hot pursuit. Perhaps one reason for this is that in one of the most epochal incidents in the history of Kentucky, the Battle of Blue Licks, so many Kentuckians were slaughtered in an Indian massacre that their remains rested in a common grave and for many years their identity could not even be established. This was because they followed into a death trap set by the Indians, the intemperate advice of an excited officer who yelled, "Let all who are not cowards follow me." The unwise counsel of this challenge was followed to the death against the advice of Daniel Boone and the other older and more level-headed and experienced pioneers and leaders of that day.

In a speech in Hollywood, the Vice President said that there are some persons who are snooping around the alleys to dig up a platform from the garbage cans. He was not specific as to whom he referred, but, Mr. President, "Guilty conscience fleeth when no man pursueth." So we find a member of this distinguished body rising to defend itself.

Mr. President, every Kentuckian will resent this attack. It is regretted that the Senator who made it is not present today, but his office was notified that these comments would be made on the floor, though, of course, nothing will be said at which anyone could properly take offense. However, since as a conferee on a bill that originated in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee it was necessary for the junior Senator from Kentucky to be absent from the floor when the remarks on the Senate floor were made, this uncalled for sideswipe at the Vice President of the United States may be referred to now. The junior Senator from Kentucky, therefore, takes this opportunity to state that as a Kentuckian he resents it, as an American he deplores it, and as a Member of this august body he thinks it should be deeply regretted.

The real concern of those who complain so loudly is that with the adjournment of Congress near, the Vice President is able to go out and make more political speeches. Those who trembled at the news that Richard Coeur de Lion

had returned to England from the Crusades said, "Richard is himself again."

Once more BARKLEY'S voice is raised. The forgotten man remembers him. The farmer knows him well. The people have confidence in what he says. All Americans know that he works with ceaseless zeal for the defense of this country and the peace of the world.

Ah, yes, Mr. President, the lion is loose. That is what has some folks worried.

REHABILITATION OF FLOOD-STRICKEN AREAS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res 341) making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the roll call be rescinded and that the proceedings under the order be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, House Joint Resolution 341 involves appropriations for flood-stricken areas in the Middle West. In my opinion, the Committee on Appropriations has been very liberal. I do not believe there will be any objection to the joint resolution, and I trust it may be speedily passed. Every Senator knows what occurred in the afflicted areas which make it important to have these appropriations made.

The figures showing the funds available, the amounts allocated, and the unallocated balance are given in the report. Additional requests for allocations are pending in the sum of $11,550,000.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. In reading the report I note that $18,440,000 is made available for the Department of Agriculture, I believe an appropriation of an additional $30,000,000 to the disaster loan revolving fund of the Farmers Home Administration, under the Department of Agriculture, an appropriation of an additional $5,000,000 for disaster-relief activities to supplement the $25,800,000 previously appropriated, and an increase in the limitation on the RFC disaster loans from $40,000,000 to $100,000,000.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if there is any provision in the joint resolution for direct grants or direct relief to the communities.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, there is not. In the very nature of things, we have never taken that course. We are following the usual and ordinary method in granting relief, in the present circumstances.

The Senator from Kansas will recall that when the flood occurred in Kansas and Missouri the Senate made two appropriations immediately, the money to be distributed by the Chief of Engineers, and we are following the same course in the pending joint resolution.

There was no objection to reporting of the joint resolution by Senators on either side. It has the full endorsement of Republican Senators and the full endorsement of Democratic Senators on the committee. The measure seems to be necessary, proper and right, and I believe that if the Senator from Kansas had been on the committee he would have endorsed the joint resolution.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield further?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr CARLSON. I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for bringing before the Senate this joint resolution containing the provisions found in it, which deal with additional funds and authorizations and appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, the Farmers Home Administration, and make an increase in the loaning capacity of the RFC in disaster loans

I want the Senator to know that we deeply appreciate what he has done. We did suffer a most disastrous flood, one of the greatest floods ever experienced in this Nation. The loss has been estimated at $2,500,000,000. The flood affected not only Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma, but the effects were Nationwide. I had hoped there would be some provision for direct relief money in the joint resolution. But, as I have stated, I do want the Senator to know that I appreciate his bringing the joint resolution before the Senate today.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. We have provided as we usually do in such cases. I call the Senator's attention to a very short excerpt from the report:

> With respect to the indemnification provision and national system of flood-disaster insurance, as well as the creation of a Flood Disaster Administration, it is the consensus of opinion of the members of the committee that these are matters which call for substantive legislation and should be considered by the proper legislative committees.

This plan was carried out, so that the people in the affected areas could help to protect themselves, as well as receive help from the Government. I think we have been as liberal as it was possible to be under the circumstances. I believe that we did the things which should have been done.

Mr. President, if there is no objection to the joint resolution, I hope that it may pass.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that I intend to offer an amendment to the joint resolution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Any amendment will be in order.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do so with the feeling which has been expressed by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. We all revere, respect, and hold in high affection the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. At the very outset of the great disaster which overtook our section of the country he immediately called a meeting of his committee, after attending a breakfast meeting with the Governor and Representatives in Congress from our State. He was of the greatest assistance to us. He gave us all the support and encouragement he could possibly have given us Throughout the course of our efforts, insofar as was humanly possible, and insofar as has been possible legislatively up to this time, he has done everything to help mitigate the dreadful and appalling effects of this great national disaster.

In offering this amendment I am not unmindful of the fact that there is a division of respectable opinion as to what could and should be done. I wish to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for the consistent and constant cooperation which he has given to those of us who have been particularly interested in this problem because of our representation of the areas affected.

Only the other afternoon, in the press of the enormous volume of business before the chairman of the committee, he gave us an opportunity to be heard, and we presented some of the facts which I shall undertake to present today in support of the amendment which I shall offer.

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe there are no committee amendments, so the joint resolution is now before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and ask to have stated

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair) The amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK On page 3, following line 17, prior to section 102, it is proposed to insert the following:

INDEMNIFICATION

For expenses necessary to enable the President, through such agencies of the Government (including new agencies which the President is hereby authorized to create) as he may direct, and under such regulations as he may approve, to provide for and to take such measures as he may deem necessary for relief and rehabilitation in the areas declared by the President during July and August 1951 to be disaster areas because of floods, including (a) partial indemnification for physical loss of, or damage to, such tangible real or personal property as may be deemed administratively feasible, but such indemnification (1) shall not exceed $20,000 for all claims of any one person and shall in no case exceed 80 percent of an amount equal to the cost of replacing, rehabilitating, repairing, or reconstructing such property (less depreciation), (2) may be required to be contingent upon financial participation of State and/or local governments and compromise of creditors' claims (including claims of Federal agencies which are hereby

authorized to be compromised without consideration), and (3) shall be adjusted on account of any assistance, compensation, insurance, or other reimbursement received or due on account of such loss or damage; (b) loans to State and local governments, on such terms and conditions as may be deemed necessary, to enable financial participation by such governments in the indemnification program authorized herein; (c) personal services, without regard to the civil service laws; (d) hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft, (e) advance of funds under section 11 of the act of August 2, 1946 (31 U S. C. 529); (h) expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; and (i) services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U S C 55a); $221,560,000 to remain available until June 30, 1952. *Provided*, That prior to the payment of any indemnity, or the granting or guaranteeing of any loan to a State or local government under this act, the recipient thereof, or the cognizant State or local government, may be required to provide reasonable assurance of the relocation, reconstruction, replacement, rehabilitation, or repair of the damaged property so as to provide reasonable protection against the recurrence of flood loss or damage to such property, or the indiscriminate redevelopment thereof, and for these purposes there may be acquired by purchase, donation, other means of transfer, or condemnation, land which is subject to recurrent flooding, and such land may be utilized or disposed of in such a manner as to reduce the likelihood of further serious flood damage, and whenever neccessary, property acquired by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer may be occupied, used, and improved, for the purposes of this act prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U S C. 255). *Provided further*, That any indemnification made pursuant to the provisions of this appropriation shall be final and conclusive for all purposes: *Provided further*, That the authority conferred by this appropriation and the funds provided herein shall be supplementary to, and not in substitution for, nor in limitation of, any other authority conferred or funds provided under any other law. *And provided further*, That the functions and duties exercised under this act shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedures Act (60 Stat. 237), except as to the requirements of section 3 thereof.

Mr CASE. Mr. President, I desire to reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator reserves a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to do the same thing.

Let me say to the Senator from Missouri that there is great sympathy in the Senate for his amendment. While the President of the United States did not recommend this proposal as an amendment to the joint resolution, I think he either recommended it generally or in a special message to the Congress. If I correctly recall, the Senator from Missouri introduced a bill on the subject, which bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. The present amendment is subject to a point of order. I am sure the Senator understands that. I dislike to make a suggestion to the Senator from Missouri, because probably he has given this particular subject more study than I have, although I have given it a great deal of study lately. I suggest to the Senator that he let his bill take the usual course. I am sure that I would vote for the bill if it came before the Senate with the endorsement of the Committee on the Judiciary. However, as an amendment to the pending joint resolution, it would probably endanger the appropriation which the Appropriations Committee has recommended. I am afraid that the House would feel that we were undertaking to attach legislation to an appropriation bill, which we ought not to do. While I know they would be very sympathetic with the purpose, I am afraid that it would jeopardize the appropriations which we have already provided.

I would therefore suggest to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], inasmuch as Congress will reassemble in January, that he let the matter go over until January. If the Senator from Missouri desires to make a statement concerning the amendment and its purposes, that would be all right. However, I hope he will not insist on putting his amendment on this bill, because I believe it would be an unwise step for him to take, in view of the fact that Congress may adjourn in the course of a few days. At least we hope to do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. It will be such a short time before we reassemble that I believe the provisions of the bill introduced by the Senator from Missouri would have a much better chance of enactment. I hope also that the Senator from Massachusetts, the acting leader of the minority, would feel the same way about it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr SALTONSTALL. I should like to say to the Senator from Missouri that the senior Senator from Tennessee has fully expressed the feelings of the Appropriations Committee We felt that at this late hour of the present session, on the evidence which was submitted to us, we should provide what was necessary for immediate relief, and that the question of insurance and the question of indemnity could be brought forward at the next session, when they could be given careful hearings as new subject matters.

Mr. McKELLAR. By a legislative committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes. I hope the point of order will be sustained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Am I not correct in understanding that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] raised a point of order to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Tennessee merely stated that he would make such a point of order, but he has not made it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not want to cut off the Senator from Missouri. I also wish to thank him for the kind words he has said about me. So far as the amendment is concerned, I do not want to cut him off. I imagine the Senators from Kansas desire to be heard also, and I would not want to cut them off. Therefore, I shall postpone making my point of order.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, if the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will do as he has suggested, namely, withhold his point of order, I would appreciate very much having an opportunity at this time to make a statement relating to the amendment which I have offered.

I wish to express myself again to the chairman and members of the Appropriations Committe, particularly to the distinguished chairman, that I am grateful for his interest to the extent of having suggested that the bill which I introduced on August 1, 1951, S. 1935, and which is now before the Committee on the Judiciary, has received his sympathetic understanding and consideration.

Before the message of the President of August 20, which embodied the terms of the amendment I offered today, came to the Senate, I had offered a bill which was designed to provide payment for property losses resulting from the 1951 floods in Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma, and to establish a Flood Claims Commission. I take it that that is the measure to which the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee referred a moment ago

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is there any precedent for the establishment of such a commission?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; there is. If the distinguished Senator from Maryland will bear with me until I have made a short statement, I shall go into that subject.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am very much interested, because I feel that if we are going to compensate people for every act of God, we will not have any money left in the Treasury.

Mr. HENNINGS. I may say to my good friend, the Senator from Maryland, that there is a precedent. The Philippine War Damage Claims Commission was definitely a precedent for the bill, S. 1935, which I introduced.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HENNINGS. If the Senator from Maryland will permit me, I should like to proceed for a moment. There has been no flood so encompassing in its devastation and so disastrous in terms of loss of property and lives and human suffering, so far as I know, in the annals of recorded history.

We live in an age, as the Senator from Maryland fully appreciates, in which a precedent, while important in many instances, cannot be invoked in all realms

because of the times and circumstances in which we live. This is not a geographical bill, designed to help one section of the country, to the detriment of other sections. This amendment would restore the economy and the lives, and would alleviate to some extent the impoverished condition of many persons in a large area of this Nation who know not where to turn. These stricken people are part and parcel of economy of the United States, not only in terms of citizenship, but through their contribution to the national defense and the economic soundness and security of the Nation.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I can appreciate all that the Senator from Missouri has to say, and I do not wish, either, to deal in terms of sectionalism.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am sure the Senator from Maryland does not wish to do so.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I have no interest in doing so. I have every sympathy for the people who have been stricken by this horrible disaster. However, those in that area have suffered many such disasters; and in the progress of time, perhaps they will suffer many more such disasters. Can we now establish the principle of setting up a claims bureau and providing it with Federal funds with which to pay for every act of God which occurs in this country? If we do, there simply is not enough money in the world to pay the cost.

Mr. HENNINGS. Of course, the argument the distinguished Senator from Maryland has advanced is not a new one. On the other hand, never before have we been faced with the threat of total and complete domination by a totalitarian power, in a situation in which our security and our freedom are at stake; and we are going to do everything we can do to meet that threat, are we not?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I can see no similiarity between the two. In the case of the flood disaster we have an act of God, which is most unfortunate, of course.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I should like to complete my statement, and then I shall be happy to yield again to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes; excuse me, please.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am well aware that this measure establishes a precedent in respect to giving direct relief or indemnification to the victims of disaster. Let me call the attention of the Senator from Maryland and the attention of other Senators to the fact that the flood which devastated this area was the worst natural disaster in our Nation's history.

The Senator from Maryland asks whether every act of God is to be compensated by indemnification. I would say no, but I would say that a great deal depends upon the facts—upon the extent of the dislocation and the impairment of the normal functioning of our people in their individual and their collective pursuits, particularly in these desperate times when we are marshaling our people and our resources and the best that is in us to meet the threat which now hangs over Europe and the Asiatic Continent like a dark cloud.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do not feel that the extent or magnitude of a disaster has anything to do with the question of whether the Federal Government should compensate for it. If we are going to establish the principle of compensating individual citizens against disasters which are acts of God, then where are we to stop?

Mr. HENNINGS. I will say to the distinguished Senator that I do not know where we are to stop; but——

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. If we are going to do it in the case of a large disaster, why should not we do it in the case of a small one?

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not know where we are to stop; but I know where we need to start, and it is right here.

I do not know whether the Senator from Maryland received from the distinguished artist, Thomas Hart Benton, the grandnephew of a great Senator from Missouri, one of the drawings or lithographs which I now hold in my hand. I know they were sent to many Members of the Senate. Those of us, including the senior Senator from Kansas, the junior Senator from Kansas, and other Senators who serve on the Committee on Public Works or on the Appropriations Committee, and who toured the flooded area, know that this lithograph delineates most graphically, and without drawing too much upon the artist's imagination, the condition which exists there.

Let me say to the Senator from Maryland that those of us who have been there and have seen with our own eyes the devastation wrought agree with the statements which Thomas Hart Benton makes in the letter he appended to this graphic illustration of conditions in the flooded area. The lithograph indicates what happened to one small family and its home. We saw that situation multiplied time after time in that area.

I think it might be of interest to the Senator from Maryland and to the other Members of the Senate for me to read what Thomas Hart Benton, a distinguished American artist, had to say about the situation there:

DEAR SENATOR HENNINGS: "The Foxes," you will remember from your Sunday School days, "have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head."

It is now more than 90 days since the floodwaters hit the valleys out here. Ninety days of wrack, ruin, muck, and stink.

The attached lithograph shows what things are like, as of this day, for thousands of poor, hopeless "sons of man" in the Kaw River Basin. It was made for you and your fellow Members of the Eigthy-second Congress. It is not for sale.

It is given you in the hope that you will forget the academics of precedent and get out a new bill which will relieve the human side of this rotting catastrophe.

Truly yours,

THOMAS H. BENTON.

Mr. President, I do not undertake to predicate what I have to say today solely upon the human and the humanitarian considerations, although of course these are always of the utmost importance in a Christian civilization.

However, I say that in the justifications which have been filed before the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Howse, who is Mr. Charles E. Wilson's assistant, acting under direction and with the concurrence and approval of Mr. Wilson, said that he considered the rehabilitation of this area by indemnification essential to the national defense effort. I am not asking, by means of this amendment, as the Senator may have observed, for any insurance plan or for any of the features of the so-called insurance plan. However, Mr. Howse, Mr. Wilson's deputy, said that he considered the rehabilitation of this area and putting its people back on their feet and back to work and back in their homes a basic and essential requirement in our effort for national defense.

If the Senate will bear with me for just a moment, I should like to make a few remarks in relation to the amendment, which, as I have said, embodies, except for the insurance feature, the provisions of the recommendations sent to us in the President's message of August 20. I know that I speak not only for myself, but also for all those in the flood-stricken areas, and I also have assurance that I speak for my distinguished colleagues, the two Senators from Kansas, who are on the floor at this time, when I say that I express our sincere gratitude for the action the United States Senate has taken in the past in coming to the rescue of this large area in the Middle West, comprising about one-fifth of the total area of the United States, which was so severely hurt—to say nothing of the national impact of this disaster upon the country at large.

The Senate took prompt action upon the $25,000,000 disaster relief loan. The Senate took prompt and effective action upon the amendment to the Disaster Relief Act, to provide for temporary housing. The Senate took prompt and effective action upon the amendment which I offered, to liberalize the terms for Federal housing loans.

I may say in that connection, Mr. President, that I had the support of both of the distinguished Senators from Kansas, who are on the floor at this time. We have been working together. We appeared before the Appropriations Committee. I wish to thank them for allowing me to work with them and for their substantial contributions to our efforts to obtain some long-overdue action, and to make assistance available to the people who now are burdened down with hopelessness, misery, and despair as a result of these floods visited upon them by the hand of providence.

I am sure all Members of the Senate are familiar in general with the scope of the flood area and the devastation

wrought therein. Yet unless it has actually been seen at first hand and unless one has actually talked to the people, it is almost impossible to comprehend fully or to understand the impact of this disaster—the worst disaster of its kind in the Nation's history.

There are those who talk about precedents. There has been no precedent for the magnitude and the enormity of this scourge which has been visited upon us. In my humble way and with my small voice I, along with the other Senators from this area, am trying to speak for these people, to say a word for them, because they are looking to the Congress of the United States for help. They are not beggars, they are not paupers, they are American citizens—as good Americans as any in this free land of ours today. They know not where to turn. They know not where to lay their heads. They know not where to live. They know not where to work

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the appeal which the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri is making to the Senate this afternoon in behalf of the flood sufferers, who lost everything they had, including possessions which were the result of a lifetime's work, in this disastrous flood, and I want to associate myself with him in urging the Senate to give consideration, and serious consideration, to his amendment.

The devastation and loss which took place there can be fully appreciated only by those who have had an opportunity to visit the flooded area, as the distinguished Senator from Missouri, the Senators from Kansas, and many other Members of this body had an opportunity to do after the floodwaters had receded They visited the devastated areas, they drove through the streets of stricken towns and cities, they smelled the terrific stench arising in many places, and yet they saw those people returning to what had been their farms and homes. That showed the spirit animating the people of Kansas and Missouri and of that entire section. It seems to me that we ought to try to assist them in every way possible to rehabilitate themselves, not only in the interest of the local communities and of the States, but of the Nation itself.

Mr HENNINGS. I thank my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Kansas, for his contribution While pictures are inadequate to describe the full extent of the ruin and misery, I have some pictures before me, which many Senators have seen, and which those of us who have traveled over the area and who have been through it several times since, as we all have, have found to be inadequate, and understatements or underrepresentations rather than overrepresentations of the case I know that the Senators from Kansas will agree with me that much of this area is at a standstill in terms of resuming normal occupations, that thousands of people are still out of their homes, that small businesses as well as large ones have been closed and may never reopen, and that there is no means available, with the exception of certain loan provisions by which real recovery can be undertaken in that area.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas.

Mr SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri whether it is not also true that this was one of the greatest and most devastating floods ever to occur in that area, according to the known records, or according to records which have been kept by the Army engineers, and according to recorded data which have been passed down to us?

Mr HENNINGS. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, it is my understanding that the flood of 1844 was one which approached it in magnitude, though, of course, the area at that time was in a state of development totally dissimilar to the highly concentrated agricultural developments and business pursuits and industrialization of later years A great deal of it was simply wooded wild area, and the pioneers were then penetrating that region, to establish their homes and to found towns and communities.

If I am not mistaken, there was another great flood in 1851 which, so far as the records show, almost approached in magnitude the flood of 1951 But I believe that we are safe in saying certainly that in terms of damage to life and property, the flood of this year is without parallel in the history of the United States.

Mr SCHOEPPEL If the Senator will indulge me further, I should like to ask him this question Since it was the largest flood in that area, surpassing the 1903 flood and the minor floods which, of course, have been disastrous, within the past 10 or 15 years, it has established another flood plain within this area, including cities and river valleys. Is that not true?

Mr HENNINGS That is my understanding The Senator from Kansas is entirely correct

Mr SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask the Senator another question, a series of questions, indeed, because I think it well for us to have the facts in the RECORD Is it not true that within the limits of the flood of 1951 there are several thousand people who have completely lost their entire life's savings—and by that I mean their homes and their businesses and that they have been completely wiped out?

Mr. HENNINGS The Senator is entirely correct. There are hundreds and hundreds of people who have lost their homes and all their earthly possessions, who have no further borrowing capacity, and who have absolutely nowhere to turn.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask the Senator another question. Have we not been informed—and by this I do not mean to be critical—by the representatives of certain of the lending agencies of the Government, the only agencies to which hundreds and perhaps thousands of these people can turn, that within this flood area or zone they could expect no financial relief by way of guaranteed mortgages or loans upon their properties, if they expect to rebuild or request rehabilitation within the areas?

Mr. HENNINGS. I may say to the distinguished Senator that I have in my office, as I am sure he has in his office, many letters indicating that the people have made applications for loans and have made every effort they could to pull themselves up by their bootstraps, but that no agency exists which has the authority to make provision for the things which must be done, and which should be done now, if these people are to be saved.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to draw the Senator's attention to one other thing, which has made a terrific impression upon me I have taken a little time and trouble to go into that area and to get all factual information and all the data I possibly could I recognize that the measure which is before us is an emergency type of legislation, and that it cannot be fully explored in all its various angles, and I realize that, of course, we shall have the opportunity of studying it further at the beginning of the next session, but my attention has been drawn to the fact that within, let us say, five States, Missouri, Kansas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Illinois, 25,295 homes were either drastically damaged or entirely destroyed On the basis of the records which I obtained from the Flood Relief Rehabilitation Committee of that area, which is a very fine committee composed of earnest men who tried to get together as much factual information as they possibly could, and as quickly as possible, it is shown that there were 22,142 homes in the Kansas area which was affected by this flood and that the number of tenant-occupied homes so destroyed or badly damaged in the Kansas area was 9,442.

I want to mention one other thing. Naturally I have wondered what is going to happen to the people who are past the productive period of their lives Perhaps those who are around 65 and perhaps close to 70 would not like to admit it, but the fact is that the expectancy tables of the life insurance companies do not give anyone who has attained the age of 70 or 75 too much of an expectancy, too much allotted time. There are within the flood area thousands of people over 65 years of age, and as a matter of fact, over the age of 70 who have suffered complete loss of everything they possessed I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether there is going to be a possibility that those people will be able to avail themselves of, let us say, the most generous loan policies which have been offered on the basis of 10- or 20-year amortization. Does not the Senator feel that those elderly people who have lost their homes and all their savings and all their personal property should be taken care of, some-

where down the line, by some type of relief which at the present time is apparently beyond the pale so far as they are concerned?

Mr. HENNINGS. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Kansas that I most certainly do; and from his recital of the facts, there is no chance on earth for an elderly man or an elderly woman in the sunset of life ever to amortize or pay off a loan within their life expectancy. Some persons prate about precedents in this day of change, in this day of precedent shattering, but I think that if they were to have to face this problem as the people in the devastated area have had to face it, they would realize that it is in keeping with the great spirit of the United States, in keeping with the great heart of our people, and entirely consistent with our ideals and our understanding of the obligation of one citizen to another and one section of the Nation to another, to take such action as the occasion warrants and demands to give direct aid now to fellow Americans who have no place to turn except to the Congress of the United States.

The Red Cross has done much, of course; other agencies have done a remarkable and splendid job; but there is no way that I can see to handle the situation except the way in which I have suggested. I should like to have the concurrent and assembled judgment and wisdom of the Senate consider it. If we do not take action along the line suggested by my amendment, what are we going to do?

It is true that the distinguished chairman of the committee suggested that the bill which I introduced before the President's message came to the Congress would have his sympathetic consideration as well as that of other Senators. That offered one approach to the problem through the creation of a commission. It was an authorization bill, but it was thought and concluded by the office of Charles E. Wilson and by his deputies and others who gave the problem consideration that it would not provide the swift relief and immediate help which were needed. So the bill has remained in committee, and, following the President's message and the action of the House, this amendment is offered today.

If the Senator from Kansas will indulge me a moment so that I may make a brief statement, I shall be very happy to yield to him further.

The emergency disaster appropriation has been of tremendous benefit in meeting the most immediate and urgent needs arising out of the flood. It has served to relieve human suffering, provide temporary shelter, food, clothing. It was used to restore transportation and communication facilities and for public health measures to prevent disease and epidemic. This is in no sense, however, a complete answer. The problem which we are faced with is one of economic rehabilitation. Here we are confronted with a large and highly productive area of our country which is still suffering from paralysis. Business and industry and agriculture which were completely immobilized must be restored to full capacity. So long as farmers cannot produce, so long as business and industry remain crippled, so long as wage earners remain unemployed and their skills idle, there is a serious threat not only to the economy of that area but to the economy of the entire Nation. Loss of productive capacity, particularly on defense contracts, the ruin of crops, destruction of livestock, and the disruption of normal business activity are all factors which as a Nation building for defense we simply cannot afford. We must face up to the situation and we must solve it with bold and constructive measures.

On August 1, I introduced Senate bill 1935, the Flood Claims Act of 1951, to provide a measure of indemnity for losses suffered in the 1951 floods. As I pointed out at that time, while the measure represented a new concept of meeting disaster in this country, it was patterned after the method used in the Philippine Rehabilitation Act creating a War Damage Commission, as I told the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] a few moments ago, which was authorized to make compensation for physical loss or damage to certain kinds of public and private property occurring in the Philippines as the result of World War II. Direct rehabilitation of a somewhat similar nature was provided by the Federal Government in the emergency land conservation measures and direct financial aid to meet the national disaster caused by the severe drought in the thirties. Where a national disaster occurs of such proportions that the resources of the individuals and communities and States affected are inadequate to meet the need and where the impact has such a staggering effect on the national economy, I can see no alternative except for the Federal Government to provide help.

The major features of my indemnification proposals were incorporated in the message which the President sent to the Congress on August 20. In his message at that time, the President said that the indemnity proposal "will revive the region of the Nation now badly hurt—a region of such importance to the security and welfare of the whole country that its revival must be the immediate concern of all of our citizens." The measure which has been passed by the House (H. J. Res. 341) provides assistance in the form of loans but does not include either the provisions for indemnity or the insurance provisions recommended by the President. In that connection, I should like to quote briefly again from the President's message.

> Loans, even on liberal terms, are not enough to meet this situation. People who lost their homes, farms, and businesses now have little or no security to offer a lender. Very few, if any, individuals or businesses had any insurance protection against their flood losses. Generally speaking, private insurance companies have not offered such protection because of the uncertain nature of the risk. Consequently, many people were left after the flood with nothing, or with nothing but their debts. If they could borrow more, new loans added to the old ones would create a debt burden that for an indefinite time to come would be a drag on the economic vitality of the region and would impair its ability to contribute to building our national security.

For the record, let me point out the damage occurred in an area extending a thousand miles in length. The loss was estimated at $2,500,000,000. Some 5,000,000 acres of land were inundated and 30,000,000 acres suffered erosion. Almost 140 communities were inundated. Of the 385,000 people who were displaced persons at the height of the flood, about 15,000 families are still, almost 3 months later, unable to return to their homes. The loss to the Federal Government in tax revenues has been estimated at $250,000,000. In addition to the figures representing physical loss which can be cited, there was also the loss of hundreds of thousands of man-hours on a farm and factory output, which probably cannot be estimated.

I have pointed out that where the disaster is of such magnitude that it cannot be met by the resources of the area involved, the Federal Government must step in. It is of equal importance, I believe, to point out that the Federal Government has a direct responsibility because it has failed to provide the necessary protection by means of an integrated, comprehensive water program. Jurisdictional disputes and interagency differences have operated to delay realistic planning. The Missouri Basin States have not been blameless certainly in this respect and their substantial disagreement on plans and methods has further retarded constructive action. But I feel that the main responsibility lies with the Federal Government because in a program which must, of necessity, be as extensive as this and which crosses so many State lines, the initiative is properly a function of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I desire at this point to call attention to certain letters which have been written to me by people in the flood area. One writes:

> I am writing in behalf of the flood victims in Kansas City who are now homeless and destitute and for the most part out of work for the present. I do not live in the flooded area, but I cannot help but feel that our Government is letting these helpless victims down. Can't something be done to make Government grants to these victims of circumstances? These Americans are most certainly entitled to aid and I do not mean in the form of loans with interest. Surely, in the name of common decency our Government could shear off a bit here and there and make it possible to find enough money to help these people of this horrible dilemma.

Another citizen writes:

> The rehabilitation of our own people, many of whom are financially ruined, homeless, and without clothing or shelter, certainly should come first. Aren't we letting them down? These people are paying huge taxes to Uncle Sam—why can't Uncle Sam now take the matter in hand and do something for them? The situation is appalling and I do hope that our lawmakers will realize the urgent need and do something about it.

Another letter says:

> I am looking to you to be a strong voice in the cry for the help that is so urgently needed—and for people who are so very worthy. To be washed out of your home and ruined

overnight is certainly a horrible catastrophe—and these unfortunate victims must be helped Surely we don't intend to just say "too bad" and drop the matter. Let's have the dams, the reservoirs—and the Government grants for those who need rehabilitation These Americans, mostly of the great middle class, the very backbone of our country, need help and must have it.

The following was written by still another victim of the flood:

I am taking this opportunity to try to explain my grievances regarding the losses and damage to my home caused by the flooding Missouri I feel the time has come when something should be done to reimburse us for our losses are getting greater and the flood worse and more often than ever I have lived in the Missouri River bottom for 51 years, moving here with my father in 1901 when I was 8 years old, and our first flood was in 1903 I am a widow all alone, with an aged mother of 89 to care fo., and no one wants to hire someone of my age Although I do housework at a small pay, we can exist but have no money for repairs or to replace our losses

Another letter says·

There are many hundreds of small-business men, working people, and farmers who would be bankrupt if some assistance were not given to them in reestablishing their homes and businesses by an outright grant of funds Our country has given many billions of dollars to other peoples in aid We could not, in good conscience, stand by and see our own people ravaged by this terrible catastrophe, without extending to them the same helping hand we have extended to others

Another citizen has this to say:

We know that you know more about the subject than we do, but we felt that some relief should be given (grant aid) to the (1) home owner who lost his home, (2) the businessman whose business was flooded, (3) the farmer whose farm was devastated We certainly hope that enough of the lawmakers in other sections of the country will join with the lawmakers in the Middle West to work out some relief legislation especially for "little people," who have suffered the most

From another letter I quote the following·

The pictures and writeups only partially tell the story * * * no one can actually realize the suffering and privation of the thousands of individuals—as well as the great financial loss caused by the disaster—unless you actually visualize the damaged area The people are now "digging in" in an effort to reconstruct their homes, their businesses and their communities but they need help desperately Immediate action should be taken to help these people, many of whom had homes, farms, and small businesses in the lowlands of Kansas and Missouri that were completely wiped out.

Still another letter says:

We, as a nation, spend and give billions of dollars each year to people of other countries so it would seem very appropriate that the people of our own country be given protection and help, especially since the Government agencies erred in giving assurance that the flood would not happen It is all quite tragic—so please do something to (1) see that immediate relief is provided for those whose homes and businesses were wiped out or suffered severe losses, (2) see that immediate steps are taken to see that this disaster is not repeated

Mr. President, I had not desired to take as much time as has has been taken today on this matter, but to some of us the absolute and imperative need for the passage of some such measure as the amendment now before the Senate seemed so plain, and so essential, that we thought it must be readily accepted in the minds and the hearts and consciences of our colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. President, there has been some discussion of the basic governmental principle upon which indemnity can be provided, and I shall have a few words to say about that, with the indulgence of the Senate

Our friends in the House have characterized the proposal to provide indemnification for flood victims as a major departure from the usual concept of government, and they ask us to delay action until there can be a more extensive study than is now possible

In terms of what the House has failed to do, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point certain estimates offered by Mr. Howse, personal representative of Charles E Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, who appeared before the committee, the justifications concern grants to farm families unable to obtain loans, indemnity to farmers on their individual farms, indemnity to home owners and to small business, are not given the assistance they so urgently need under the resolution as it passed the House and as it has been reported to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows

Schedule of payments The program proposed here is frankly discriminatory in that it is confined to those who cannot achieve economic recovery without direct financial assistance

Grants to farm families, $1,750,000 (to farm families unable to obtain loans for livestock, repair or replacement of essential farm equipment, household furniture, etc)

Indemnity to farmers, $2x,810,000 (to provide indemnity for fences and farm buildings, fixed machinery, and other immovable equipment).

Indemnity to home owners, $60,000,000 (This is calculated on the basis of estimated damage to urban and rural residential property Reconstruction aid is likely to run to 80 percent of the total damage It would be distributed among approximately 40,000 owners, very few of whom have any financial resources with which to rebuild)

Industrial and commercial, $75,000,000. (Since the bulk of the damage in this category was inflicted upon large property owners, many of them with millions of dollars of loss each, the number of claims for reconstruction help would be relatively small as compared to the farmers and home owners. It is estimated that 5,000 businesses would need help. Payments on the formula suggested, therefore, would amount to little more than $15,000 on the average)

Mr HENNINGS. Mr. President, this is a matter which cannot wait. The people in the flooded area need help, and need it now. I respectfully suggest that there have been precedents, which I mentioned earlier in my statement. In any case, I submit that we cannot shrink from setting new precedents or taking new steps. That we recognize an obligation to take care of the flood sufferers in an adequate manner, and that we act to assist our people, seems to me to be a mark of maturity and of high civilization. We are not savages, and we are not backwoodsmen. We are the national policy-making body of the most powerful nation in the world, and I hope that the Senate will meet its responsibility realistically.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed following my remarks an editorial from the Kansas City Star of Thursday, October 4, 1951

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FLOOD BILL FALLS SHORT

The flood relief bill recommended by the House Appropriations Committee has missed the mark completely.

It provides additional lending money to farmers, businessmen and those who have the assets to build homes, which is all to the good It provides a $5,000,000 drop-in-the-bucket increase to the $25,000,000 relief fund for aiding governmental units, which is wholly inadequate to get the cities, counties, and townships on their feet

The members of the committee apparently failed to comprehend the scope of the flood disaster There was seemingly no realization that tens of thousands of people lost all their possessions. The bill has a blind spot for those who need help the most.

When Mayor Clark E Tucker of Kansas City, Kans., learned the provisions of the bill, he asked "Where do the people come in? I thought Congress was going to do something for the little man"

A tour of Armourdale today still shows heartbreaking sights nearly 3 months after the flood Abandoned homes still are filled with debris The owners have had no means to restore them The former occupants are living in basements, with relatives, or moving into the new stop-gap trailer camp. Along with thousands in other communities they cannot be restored to normal life without assistance—and this is what the committee overlooked

The Red Cross reports 25,000 applications for assistance on file today from 77 flood-damaged counties Some 8,000 are in Wyandotte County Relief to this group in the proposed bill would be negligible

When the committee reported that its bill met "fully the needs of all classes of victims in the area—the farmers, the home owner and businessman," it was talking through its hat There is great disappointment that the committee chose to throw out all recommendations for grants-in-aid and the Federal flood insurance that would have been economic protection against future disaster.

The committee has failed to appreciate that those who needed Federal assistance the most were the heads of families, workmen who now are receiving some subsistence from the Red Cross and local agencies, but who cannot resume their former home life without much more help than the bill proposes Many already are in debt, and it is impossible for them to make down payments on homes even under the liberal terms offered

Additional appropriations to the Department of Agriculture and the Farmers Home Administration will be of assistance in restoring farms to productivity. It is the cities and towns that will suffer

Unless the bill can be broadened in its course through Congress, the meaning will be that the Federal Government as the chief source of aid has failed to provide the needed

help, and that local communities must try to meet the demands through the winter to the limit of their resources.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was interested in what the Senator said about the question of integrated river developments. As the Senator from Missouri well knows, I am sure we of the Pacific Northwest have been a little more fortunate in our efforts to develop the great river systems than have those in other areas.

I recall that in the early days of the integrated river development the Senator from Missouri was a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives. I recall his zealous devotion to the idea that the Federal Government would aid all the States in the river valleys in the development of the rivers.

The Senator placed the damage caused by the recent flood at two billion and some million dollars. It is more than that, when we add up all the figures. I am sure the Senator will agree with me that had we spent in the early days one-half the amount he has mentioned for the development of the great river basins of the United States, particularly in our area of the country, we would not only have saved half the money lost, but much of the suffering and the damage would have been avoided.

The Senator from Missouri has always been in favor of the development of these areas, and I think this points up the fact that Congress should realize that, not having done what we should have done in regard to our natural resources and the natural wealth of the country, we now have to handle the matter as an emergency, because we did not act before.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Washington for his kind and generous remarks. He and I served together in the House of Representatives in the thirties as did the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. We have long been mindful of the fact that the Senator from Washington was one of the leaders in a movement to bring some integration into the plan for flood control, irrigation, reclamation, power development, and all the other phases of the great water-resources program, which, unfortunately, are still for the most part not even in the blueprint stage.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL obtained the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who is acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, whether he intends at this moment to make a point of order against the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. If he does, I understand that the Senator from Kansas has another amendment he will offer, but if the Senator from Louisiana does not intend to make the point of order, I should be glad to have the information now.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it was my purpose to make a point of order, but I understood the Senator from Kansas desired to say a few words before that was done.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I desire to speak briefly on the matter presented by the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri, whom I wish to commend for pointing out to the Senate, as he has today, certain phases and aspects of the flood-relief legislation as he has offered it for the consideration of the Senate.

Of course, I understand that a point of order will be made against the amendment, as has been stated, and from a procedural standpoint I have no quarrel with that. It is perfectly within the realm of procedural approach to do that.

I am heartened by what was said by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Missouri, to the effect that there might be other opportunities in the near future, at the beginning of the next session, when these matters might receive fuller and more complete consideration, and when an opportunity will be afforded to those of us in the Senate who are vitally interested to present our views to the appropriate committees, to submit more detailed information and data in support of some type of relief legislation insofar as it pertains to this type of disaster.

I commend the Senator from Missouri for having so zealously pursued this subject. As he has pointed out, a number of us, not only those from the States immediately affected, but also other Members of this body and of the House of Representatives, from other sections of our Nation made trips to the flooded area when the flood had recently subsided.

I wish to say most earnestly that while efforts may be made to describe the situation, it beggars description. To some of us who have gone through the area, and have observed with our own eyes the desolation and ruin which have followed the flood, conditions seem absolutely unbelievable. Probably for years to come some of the flooded areas will be blighted and desolate, so far as the people who lived there are concerned.

I am seriously concerned about the group of individuals who are on the sunset side of life. There are families who have labored for a good many years and have saved a few thousand dollars, which the invested in a home. Perhaps they were trying to provide for their own social security by buying another modest little house, fixing it up, and using it as a source of income Perhaps a family might have had a little place of business. Many of those people are between 60 and 70 years of age. For hundreds of them all is now gone. There is not much for them to look forward to in the way of long-term loans, because, as was brought out in the colloquy between myself and the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the agencies of the Government which have the responsibility or ability for lending money on such properties are staying out of the flooded areas, which are now at a higher level than they have ever been before. I mention these things because I think there is a zone of relationship into which the Congress, in its wisdom, after proper review and study, should move by way of assistance.

The problem is too big for the average city. It is much too large for the States, when we think in terms of the hundreds of millions of dollars of losses. The losses total more than $2,000,000,000 by reasonable estimates.

I should like to point out something else to my distinguished colleagues. This is the most devastating flood that has occurred in those valleys for more than 100 years. The crest of the flood has been higher than that of any flood which has struck that area in more than a hundred years. During the past several years the people were led to believe that the flood control projects which were sponsored by certain governmental agencies, some of which projects were in the course of being developed, would protect them Of course, the projects had not yet reached the stage at which funds were available to furnish the big flood control projects which might have saved this area from the present devastation. However, the people who lived in some of the areas, and who had established homes and businesses there, were led to believe that they had flood protection, and that the crest of any flood would not reach them—but it did.

I point out most earnestly that thousands of those people have lost practically all of their personal effects and personal property. I think it is only fair to point out that in those areas the people were told in many instances that the crest of the flood would never reach them and that they could depend upon the levee systems which had theretofore been established. Most of them relied upon such assurances. Obviously, when the high crest came they did not have time to move their personal property out of the area. They were lucky to get out themselves. Thank God, there was not the loss of life that there might have been had the flood struck at a more inopportune time, or had the people not had a few hours' warning with reference to the high crest

It is some of these things that support the distinguished Senator from Missouri in saying that while there may not be precedents to which we can point there is a necessity for consideration of some form of relief along the line which the distinguished Senator has pointed out

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I ask the Senator if it is not his judgment that the full-time or long-term ultimate result in loss of life, serious illness, and perhaps chronic illness, resulting from malnutrition, respiratory diseases, and other things which are likely to come upon this area as a result of the setting in of winter cannot at this time be calculated?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I think the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. In other words, we are not through with the effects of the flood.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The Senator is correct. I do not profess to be a sanitary engineer or an expert on health matters, indeed; I know very little about the subject; but when I was Governor of my State I tried to have a very high regard for the essential requirements and remedial measures which should be taken along that line. I have been told by people within that area who are skilled in the medical field that if the winter should be rigorous we would encounter exceptionally high percentage of breakdown in health and physical conditions of many of them

I think it is a very fine thing that the efforts of the Federal agencies, the officials in the cities and States were able to consolidate all efforts immediately following the flood and to hold pestilence and disease down to a very small minimum That is most commendable, in face of the large areas that had to be covered

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have been in the Senate for only a little more than 2½ years. While I have been here I have participated, by way of voting, in some pretty important legislation. In this Chamber, as well as in the Chamber on the other side of the Capitol dome, men rose and heralded to us, to the country, and to the world the necessity for a generous America, an America generous to the other nations of the world and to the peoples who, it is said, were in difficult circumstances and were facing devastation and ruin, with no opportunity for rehabilitating themselves.

What did we do? How many times did we look in the statute books, or look for precedents? We did not look for too many of them. Yes, we acted and we spent money in such amounts that I hate to state the total. When I look back and see what we have done for other nations of the world in the way of grants without any strings attached to them, I wonder if perhaps one might properly say, "I am sorry that this great area in continental United States, in the heart of the Nation that was visited by this flood, did not happen to be in Ethiopia, in Italy, in Greece, in Indochina, or somewhere else" In that event we would not have thought about precedents. Precedents would not have been mentioned, as we have heard them mentioned today. Of course, I agree that any relief along these lines should be carefully and thoroughly screened and acted on only on the basis of need; but that can be done.

Mr. President, charity ought to begin at home. I hope that I am not entirely provincial in my thinking or speaking. However, I call attention to the needs of individuals who are between 60 and 70 years of age, and who have nothing to look forward to. The ones who have lost all they had. They do not want to be continually in the position of accepting hand-outs. Let me say candidly that the Red Cross and the other agencies of the Government have done a fine job. However, as will be pointed out by my colleague from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who intends to offer an amendment which I shall support, the Red Cross is planning to withdraw from that area in a short time Winter is coming on. We are confronted with a situation in which we shall need greater flexibility of approach by way of funds, and greater flexibility of approach in the form of assistance. I do not believe that such proper consideration can be attained within the confines of the pending resolution unless a broader coverage is permitted in the case of those who find themselves in the circumstances which I have described, namely, without homes, without goods, without personal property with which to go ahead, and many of whom are beyond the limitations to which some of the agencies of government can go with the funds which they have. I honestly feel that we must make some provision for them. We can do so by adding to the pending legislation some greater amounts, and a greater degree of flexibility of operation.

Mr. President, the members of the committee have done a fine job. This has been a "hurry up" piece of legislation, and I commend them for bringing the legislation to the floor of the Senate as quickly as has been done. When we leave here there will be a period of a month or two before the next session begins. If under the operation of the pending legislation which will be passed we find that we are not covering hundreds of the cases under consideration, I think we should then offer something for the attention of the next session of Congress, something which will offer a greater degree of opportunity to meet the actual needs in a most practical way.

As I stated a while ago, this area will be blighted for years. I realize that we cannot get all the factual data together in a short period of time The full impact of this catastrophe will not be apparent for months, or perhaps for a full year. However, an atmosphere of hesitancy, uncertainty, and blight has descended upon practically all these badly flooded areas.

I do not want to leave the impression that those people are not resourceful or that they lack courage and faith to fight their way back. They are doing that. But, there is a class of people who are not blessed with ample finances and the better things of life I do not know what they are going to do during the period before we can provide the proper funds or the flexibility in the administration of this assistance which I think we should have provided for in this measure. However, those who considered the measure could not see their way clear to go as far as the Senator from Missouri would like to see them go, in accordance with the amendment which he has offered.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I hope the joint resolution can be amended along the line of the amendment I know my distinguished colleague will offer. I think it is a fair approach, an honest approach, and a necessary approach, and I am hopeful that when my colleague from Kansas presents his amendment it may receive the majority vote of Senators who see fit to vote in favor of this proposed legislation and that a point of order will not be made against it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Kansas read an article in the New York Times of last Sunday morning entitled "United States Point 4 To Aid School in Dominica." It shows the difference of treatment, as the distinguished Senator has stated, between what is being done for people outside the United States and for people within the United States. The article reads:

> A national training school for 150 boys is to be established in the Dominican Republic under the point 4 program, according to the Dominican Republic Bulletin The cost will be shared equally by the United States and the Dominican Republic.

The article goes on to say:

> The new school is to be known as Servicio Cooperativo and it will be under the direction of an educational expert from the United States It is estimated that the cost of maintaining the institution will range from $150,000 to $200,000 a year, equal parts of which will be borne by the United States and the Dominican Republic.

In other words, for the boys who will be sent to this so-called training school in the Dominican Republic our country is going to pay roughly $100,000, year after year, which would be roughly $750 for each of the 150 boys to be admitted.

My mind goes back to what the distinguished Senator said about a young couple, perhaps, in Kansas or Missouri, who have been flooded out, with all their household goods gone, and no provision made for getting anything like $750 a year, year after year.

I wish to commend my distinguished friend for the very fine argument he has made in behalf of those very unfortunate people

Mr SCHOEPPEL I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has said. Unfortunately, as I see it, we have not been as generous to the people living in a stricken area in the United States which has suffered so badly, as we have been to people in many areas outside the continental confines of our great country.

Whether right or wrong, the fact is that we are now confronted with a situation with reference to which I hope we can take the action which is imperative before too much time elapses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, under instruction from the committee I am compelled to raise the point of order to the amendment, although I dislike very much to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order on the ground that the amendment is general legislation.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,000,000, of which $3,00,000 shall be available for expenditure by the President under the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 875, 81st Cong.), and through such Federal agency as he may designate for the purpose of making grants to States to enable such States, acting through their public-welfare agencies, to furnish public assistance to families whose need for such assistance has been caused or aggravated by the floods occurring in the midwestern portion of the Nation in July 1951. *Provided,* That no such grant shall be made to any State unless the President determines that the State and the local governments within such State are making an appropriate effort, consistent with their available resources, to cope with public-assistance requirements resulting from such floods."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall be obliged to make a point of order against this amendment also, but I withhold my point of order until the Senator from Kansas has had an opportunity to speak on his amendment I understand fully the situation in which the two Senators from Kansas find themselves They are doing everything they possibly can, and no other two Senators have ever done more in behalf of their State in a time of great disaster than have the two distinguished Senators from Kansas

They have my sympathy. It is a heartfelt position with me I wish there were some way to take care of the matter now. However, we must look into it further, and it is only for that reason that I must make the point of order. I want to say again that no two men have served their constituency better than have the two distinguished Senators from Kansas

Mr SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr CARLSON Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I include in that statement also the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, those of us on this side of the aisle who sit on the Appropriations Committee feel the same way as the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee has expressed himself. The great difficulty is to work out satisfactorily the problems which confront us in connection with this legislation.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I want the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to know that I appreciate very much his withholding the point of order. I wish to state very frankly that I regret sincerely that the proposal submitted by the junior Senator from Missouri was subject to a point of order, though I fully understand that it was under the parliamentary situation. However, I had hoped that by my amendment funds could be made available under the disaster loan provisions of the bill.

There are some facts which should be given consideration by the Senate in regard to the amendment which I have offered.

I will say very frankly that the increase from $5,000,000 to $8,000,000 is not a large sum of money. I hesitated to suggest it, but I did so for a very definite reason. The American Red Cross, which has rendered outstanding service in the area which suffered so disastrously, has spent between $8,000,000 and $10,000,000 in relief work. They are now beginning to close up their operations. A large number of families in the area who have been depending on the Red Cross must have some outside aid and some outside assistance.

I had hoped that the funds which would be made available by the amendment could be used by State boards of social welfare, under the supervision of the Federal Security Administration in Washington. No one would receive any money from this fund unless need was shown. Thousands of families are going to be in the situation which the distinguished Senator from Missouri has mentioned. With winter approaching, I had hoped very much that we might be able to have the appropriation provided by the Senate this afternoon.

As I understand, the next bill we are going to consider on the floor of the Senate, will be the Mutual Security Appropriation bill If I read it correctly, that bill contains an item of more than $1,000,000,000— not a million dollars, but $1,368,281,443 for economic relief for foreign countries

What kind of economic aid? It is for the same type of aid, in many instances—in fact, in most instances—we are trying to obtain for our own citizens.

I say very sincerely that it makes it difficult for those of us who have supported bills appropriating money for the relief of citizens of foreign countries to continue to support them when we cannot obtain the same type of relief for our own citizens

I appreciate there is not much use laboring the amendment which I have presented this afternoon. I have presented the facts in connection with it. I know there are certain rules of the Senate, and that under the rule the amendment is subject to a point of order.

I appreciate the kindness on the part of the chairman of the committee in withholding his point of order, so that I may express myself and give my views on the amendment, and at least appeal to the Senate to give serious considerations to it. I would appeal to the distinguished chairman of the committee that he not make the point of order which he was good enough to withhold.

Before I yield the floor I desire to say to the distinguished chairman and the members of his committee that we appreciate their problems, too, and that we appreciate the fact that they have provided funds for the flood sufferers through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Farmers Home Loan Administration, and the Department of Agriculture. Those funds will be helpful. However, there is still a great segment of population in the flood disaster areas which will not receive any benefits from those funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. If we could get unanimous consent with respect to the two amendments, would the Senator from Tennessee withhold his point of order?

Mr McKELLAR I do not understand what the Senator means.

Mr. LANGER. If we obtain unanimous consent to have these two amendments adopted—and if there ever were two amendments that should be adopted in behalf of suffering humanity, these are such amendments—would the Senator from Tennessee be willing to withdraw his point of order? If we obtain unanimous consent, will the distinguished Senator withhold his point of order?

Mr McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota is correct in what he says about the merits of this particular matter. There is no doubt about the merits

Our committee has tried in every way under heaven to help the people who are involved in this particular situation. There are 21 members of the Appropriations Committee, and I think every one of them feels the greatest sympathy for these people. The Congress has appropriated $25,000,000 for their help, and the measure now before the Senate, when it is enacted, will afford additional help to the flood sufferers

I hope the Senator from North Dakota will understand that I cannot accede to his request, although it is the rarest thing in the world for me to disagree to such a request.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Tennessee is such a big-hearted man that I thought he would not object

Mr. McKELLAR My committee has decided what position we should take, and I must follow the committee's decision

I wish to say to the Senator from North Dakota that if he would like to speak on the joint resolution, inasmuch as his State is not far away from the area which was so severely damaged by the great flood, I shall be very happy to withhold the objection until he has spoken

Mr. LANGER. My sole interest in this matter arises because of the fact that 2 years ago the people of my State were afflicted by the same kind of flood, and I know the suffering which occurred at that time. My heart goes out to the people in the States affected by the recent floods. Does not the Senator think that if we could stretch a point and could obtain unanimous consent that the point of order not be raised, we would be providing something which the people of those States—and North Dakota is not one of them—should have? I believe that they should have it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I feel exactly as does the Senator from North Dakota; but under the rules of the Senate it is

my duty to make the objection, and I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr President, I now make the point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that there is no budget estimates for the amendment, and that the amendment does not carry out the provisions of any existing law. The amendment, therefore, is in violation of paragraph 1 of rule XVI of the Rules of the Senate Accordingly, the Chair sustains the point of order.

The joint resolution is open to amendment

If there is no other amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time..

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass? [Putting the question.]

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the suggestion of the absence of a quorum comes too late; I raise the point of order that the vote is in process of being taken

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. CASE The point of order raised by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee disposed of the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]; did it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The suggestion of the absence of a quorum has been withdrawn.

The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 341) was passed.

REVENUE ACT OF 1951—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives insisting upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4473) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, and requesting a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a further conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

In that connection, I should like to say that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who has served as a conferee, is absent from the city, and request is made that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] be appointed in the place of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]

Mr SALTONSTALL Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr GEORGE Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The purpose of the action which the Senator from Georgia suggests is that a further conference may be had on the tax bill, the conference report on which was rejected yesterday by the House Is that correct?

Mr GEORGE. The House asks for a further conference The purpose of my motion is that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a further conference, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate

The PRESIDING OFFICER The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr CONNALLY, Mr. BYRD, Mr MILLIKIN, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S 1335) to readjust the size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel-post) mail.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H R. 4386) making appropriations for the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to the bill, and concurred therein.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4386) making appropriations for the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H R 4386) making appropriations for the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 13, and 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 8, 10, 12, and 15, and agree to the same

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows Restore the matter proposed to be stricken by said amendment amended to read as follows " *Provided further*, That, during the current fiscal year, such appropriations shall not be transferred to or used to start or resume any project for which funds were not allocated for construction in the preceding fiscal year, but this proviso shall not apply to any project for which funds are provided in this act", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 4 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "for payment annually of tuition fees of not to exceed eighteen student officers of the Corps of Engineers at civil technical institutions under the provisions of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U S C. 535),", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 5 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$192,657,613", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 6 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,725,000", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 7 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$316,544,100", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$60,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 105. No part of the money appropriated by this Act which is in excess of 75 per centum of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by the Department of the Army from appropriations

for civil functions during such fiscal year in the performance of—

"(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

"(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2)."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 9.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
MILTON R YOUNG,
GUY CORDON,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I inquire if the conference report is a unanimous one on the part of the conferees?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I understand that it is unanimous, insofar as the report on the bill is concerned. Some suggestion was made about another bill, and the conferees may not have been unanimous as to that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection to the consideration of the conference report at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I should like to ask one or two questions about the conference report.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CASE. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee what the conferees agreed upon with respect to the Missouri Basin flood-control projects known as the Gavin's Point Dam, at the edge of Nebraska and South Dakota; the Oahe Dam and the Fort Randall Dam, in South Dakota; and the Garrison Dam, in North Dakota.

As the Senator from Tennessee knows, those dams are the backbone of the program to prevent future floods of the kind which recently occurred. This is a flood-prevention program, and I should like to have the RECORD show just what the conferees did in regard to those matters.

Mr. MCKELLAR. For the Gavins Point Dam, $2,000,000 is appropriated to initiate the work.

Mr. CASE. That appropriation will initiate the work on that dam, will it not?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes; it will initiate the work.

Mr. CASE. That is the regulating dam which is necessary below the high dams.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes; it is the necessary dam there.

I think the Senator will be pleased with what was done by the conferees; at any rate, I hope he will be.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate what the conferees did.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The conferees had very vigorous and active sessions—not merely one session, but probably a half a dozen or more sessions. There were quite a number of them. However, finally we reached agreement.

I will say that the main source of trouble was what was called the Tuttles Creek Dam, in northern Kansas. That particular dam is regarded by the Corps of Engineers as, shall I say, the central part of our defense against high waters in all the area which was flooded recently. However, as we had to say to the Senator from Kansas a little while ago, there was no budget estimate in that case and there was no authorization in that case. So the conferees on the part of the Senate had to yield.

I see in the Chamber at this time the very distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] who is my very fine friend. He takes a great deal of interest in all these matters, and he took a great deal of interest in this particular measure. I am sure he will endorse what I say about it.

We had more trouble in the case of that particular dam than we had in the case of any other item in the bill. Indeed, we came close to failing to arrive at a conference report because of that particular dam. However, finally the conferees got together, by leaving out at this time the provision in regard to that dam, but with the understanding that the Corps of Engineers will immediately take up this proposal and will report it to the Congress at the very earliest moment, and with the assurance that the Congress would undertake to give those who may be affected the protection they are entitled to have.

We were in constant touch with the Senators from Kansas, who were helpful in every way possible, and with other Senators who were interested, including the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who, although more interested in another dam, was interested in the whole question.

Mr. CASE. Yes. Mr. President, the dams on the upper reaches of the Missouri River are involved, because if those dams are completed and closed, then the water will be held back, so that when the water comes in from the Kaw and the other tributaries to the Missouri lower down, the channel will be able to accommodate it. So the dams on the upper Missouri will operate beneficially in two ways.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes, they will help very much.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I now have in my hand a copy of the printed conference report on the bill. In view of the very wide and great interest in the individual allocations of funds, with respect both to rivers and harbors and flood control in general, I think it would be most appropriate in considering the conference report to have those two tables appear in the RECORD. I realize that the report will be printed as a whole.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I think I shall ask unanimous consent at this point that the entire report in regard to this matter be printed in the body of the RECORD, and I think it will be better for the project and better for the country to have everyone know exactly what the conferees did. I hope I may have unanimous consent to do that

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CORDON. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I call attention to the fact that the full conference report appears on pages 13361 to 13363, inclusive, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in the House proceedings. I hope that may be sufficient.

Mr. MCKELLAR I now understand that the report will be printed again in the Senate proceedings of today. I withdraw my request, of course, and I shall merely refer to the report.

Mr. CASE. I know the report was printed in the RECORD as of yesterday, but we are here considering the report. I did not suggest that the entire report be reprinted in the RECORD at this point, but it seems to me it would answer the direct question I have raised with respect to two or three dams if only the two tables might here appear as a part of our consideration of the report. I ask unanimous consent that the two tables only appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the two tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

2 For rivers and harbors, $192,657,613, to be allocated in the following manner:

Rivers and harbors

Project	*Amount recommended*
Alabama:	
Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ala., Fla., and Ga.:	
Jim Woodruff lock and dam, Florida	$6,300,000
Buford Dam, Ga.	900,000
Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers, Ala., and Miss.: Demopolis lock and dam, Alabama	4,000,000
Alaska, Wrangell Narrows	247,000
Arkansas, Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma	4,100,000
California: San Diego River and Mission Bay	510,000
Florida:	
Jacksonville to Miami waterway	2,150,000
Jacksonville Harbor	1,787,000
Lake Worth Inlet (Palm Beach Harbor)	238,843
Georgia: Savannah Harbor	370,000

Rivers and harbors—Continued

Project	Amount recommended
Illinois.	
Illinois waterway (exclusive of Calumet-Sag Channer)	$300, 000
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers: Chain of Rocks Canal	5, 000, 000
Mississippi River between Missouri and Minneapolis:	
(A) St. Anthony Falls, Minn	1, 500,000
(B) Other work, including Clinton, Iowa	357, 770
Ohio River open-channel work	175, 000
Iowa Missouri River from Kansas City, Mo, to Sioux City, Iowa	4, 000, 000
Louisiana	
Calcasieu River and Pass	1, 025, 000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway	4, 400, 000
Pearl River, La. and Miss	987, 000
Maryland Baltimore Harbor and channels	800, 000
Massachusetts: Fall River Harbor	200, 000
Michigan: St Marys River	750, 000
Mississippi Harrison County shore protection	773, 000
Missouri Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth	2, 300, 000
Montana Missouri River at Fort Peck	944, 000
New Jersey	
Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers	732, 000
New York and New Jersey Channels	1, 414, 000
New York	
Buffalo Harbor	305, 000
Hudson River Channel	250, 000
New York Harbor, entrance channels and anchorage areas	400, 000
Ohio Cleveland Harbor	1, 000,000
Oregon	
McNary lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	42, 900, 000
The Dalles lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	4, 000, 000
Pennsylvania	
Monongahela River, Pa and W Va	
Locks 2, Pennsylvania and Morgantown lock and dam, West Virginia	4, 000, 000
Schuylkill River (culm removal)	1, 900, 000

Rivers and harbors

Tennessee:	
Cumberland River, Ky and Tenn	
Cheatham lock and dam, Tennessee	$3, 00 , 000
Old Hickory lock and dam, Tennessee	2, 000, 000
Texas	
Houston ship channel	1, 000, 000
Gulf waterway (Galveston district)	800, 000
Sabine-Neches waterway	465, 000
Virginia Quinby Creek, Accomack County	20, 000
Washington	
Chief Joseph Dam	16, 892, 000
Planning	500, 000
Current expenses	66, 965, 000
Total, rivers and harbors	192, 657, 613

3 For Flood Control, General, $316,544,100, to be allocated in the following manner:

Flood control, general

Project	Amount recommended
Arkansas:	
Blakely Mountain Reservoir	$5, 700, 000
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo	14, 960, 000
Narrows Reservoir	200, 000
Pine Bluff	265, 000

Flood control, general—Continued

Project	Amount recommended
California:	
Cherry Valley Reservoir	$3, 400, 000
Farmington Reservoir	214, 000
Folsom Reservoir	6, 870, 000
Isabella Reservoir	4, 500, 000
Los Angeles County drainage area (exclusive of Whittier Narrows Reservoir)	6, 085, 000
Merced County stream group	265, 000
Pine Flat Reservoir	8, 000 000
San Antonio Reservoir	1, 000, 000
Whittier Narrows Reservoir	4, 500, 000
Colorado Pueblo	217, 500
Connecticut Mansfield Hollow Reservoir	3, 000, 000
Florida Central and southern Florida	6, 000, 000
Georgia Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga and S C	18, 000, 000
Idaho	
Abeni Falls Reservoir	10, 000, 000
Lucky Peak Reservoir	3, 800, 000
Illinois.	
Columbia drainage and levee district	400, 000
East Cape Girardeau and Clear Creek drainage district	500, 000
East St Louis and vicinity	1, 500, 000
Farm Creek Reservoirs	1, 500, 000
Grand Tower drainage and levee district	800, 000
Prairie duRocher and vicinity	900, 000
Wood River drainage and levee district	915, 000
Indiana	
New Albany	575, 000
Vincennes	300, 000
Kansas	
Hutchinson	1, 900, 000
Kansas City, Mo and Kans	4, 500, 000
Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Nebraska, including Nebraska City	2, 312, 000
Wichita and Valley Center	500, 000
Kentucky:	
Ashland	2, 000, 000
Covington	1, 400, 000
Hawesville	108, 000
Louisville	4, 500, 000
Maysville	1, 000, 000
Wolf Creek Reservoir	3, 000, 000
Louisiana	
Mermentau River	707, 000
Natchitoches Parish	360, 000

Flood control, general

Maryland: Cumberland, Md, and Ridgeley, W Va	$1, 000, 000
Massachusetts.	
Adams	225, 000
North Adams	400, 000
Minnesota:	
Aitkin	600, 000
Red River of the North, S Dak, N Dak, and Minn	700, 000
Missouri: Perry County levee districts Nos 1, 2, and 3	1, 000, 000
Nebraska	
Gavins Point Reservoir, S Dak and Nebr	[1](2, 000, 000)
Harlan County Reservoir	1, 000, 000
New Mexico. Jemez Canyon Reservoir	900, 000
New York:	
Hoosick Falls	206, 000
Mount Morris Reservoir	5, 000, 000
Olean	392, 000
North Carolina: Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C	17, 000, 000
North Dakota: Garrison Reservoir	87, 083, 700
Ohio: Muskingum River Reservoirs	472, 000

Flood control, general—Continued

Project	Amount recommended
Oklahoma	
Denison Reservoir, Tex and Okla	$400, 000
Fort Gibson Reservoir	2, 400, 000
Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir	3, 500, 000
Oregon:	
Detroit Reservoir	16, 978, 000
Lookout Point Reservoir	16, 000, 000
Willamette River Basin (bank protection)	400, 000
Pennsylvania:	
Conemaugh River Reservoir	9, 500, 000
East Branch Clarion River Reservoir	2, 000, 000
Williamsport	775, 000
South Dakota:	
Fall River Basin	400, 000
Fort Randall Reservoir	34, 699, 000
Oahe Reservoir, S Dak and N Dak	3, 770, 000
Tennessee	
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky	500, 000
Memphis, Wolf Creek, and Nonconnah Creek	750, 000
Texas	
Belton Reservoir	4, 000, 000
Benbrook Reservoir	339, 000
Fort Worth floodway	700, 000
Garza-Little Elm Reservoir	3, 000, 000
Lavon Reservoir	1, 500, 000
San Angelo Reservoir and floodway	1, 200, 000
Texarkana Reservoir	4, 000,000
Whitney Reservoir	3, 800, 000
Virginia Philpott Reservoir	2, 940, 000
Snagging and clearing	800, 000
Emergency bank protection	500, 000
Sec 205 projects	1, 000, 000
Planning	1, 000, 000
Current expenses	7, 060, 000
Total, flood control, general	316, 544, 100

[1] To be derived by transfer from funds allocated to Fort Randall Reservoir, S Dak.

Mr CASE Mr President, I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the committee

Mr McKELLAR Mr President, I understand the Senator wanted to know something about the cost of Garrison Reservoir, in North Dakota It is $37,-083,700, and the Oahe Reservoir, $3,770,-000

Mr CORDON. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr McKELLAR I yield.

Mr CORDON I note that the complete report appears on the pages of yesterday's RECORD which I cited I also note that certain Members of the Senate conference committee were unable to be present at the time of the signing of the report, and I would hope that the RECORD would show that, as I believe, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are the only ones who were absent.

Mr McKELLAR I believe they are the only two.

Mr. CORDON. They took a very considerable part in all the negotiations, and I would like the RECORD to show that that is the case

Mr McKELLAR Both Senators were present, I think, at every meeting. I do not recall, but I am quite sure they were present at every meeting, and both helped materially in the consideration of these matters.

Mr. THYE. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I was present at all the meetings, except the last one, when the conference report was signed. I had obtained leave of the Senate to be absent on Monday and Tuesday of this week. But prior to that time I had been present at all the sessions of the conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quite sure the Senator was there, and he aided greatly in the successful culmination of the deliberations of the conferees on this bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I may say that, in my opinion, the chairman and other members of the conference committee achieved a good compromise of the differences which existed between the House bill and the Senate bill. It was difficult to arrive at a final agreement, but, as I read the report, I believe that the conference committee arrived at a reasonably good legislative agreement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad the Senator takes that view. I want to say to him, and particularly to the Senators from Kansas, whose State is affected more than any other State, that the delay will not be great. The Engineers have not yet finished their investigations as to the dam sites, but it will not take a great while to do that, and I very sincerely hope that by January we shall be able to appropriate money for additional investigations and for additional planning, so that the project may be ready to start at the earliest possible moment. I think that dam is very necessary for the protection especially of Kansas City and of numerous other towns and cities along the river.

Mr. CARLSON and Mr. CORDON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Kansas will wait a moment, since the Senator from Oregon was a member of the conference committee, I shall yield first to him

Mr. CARLSON. I gladly wait.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield to the Senator from Kansas in a moment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, it occurs to me that it might be well that there be a full understanding of the basic differences between the Senate and House with reference to the flood-control projects in Kansas. The difference was not one of dollars.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all.

Mr. CORDON. It was not a difference over the question of whether there should or should not be a new start, although that difference was present in connection with many of the other items. It was a difference of opinion as to major policy. The House conferees, as I understood them, advanced the proposition that the recent floods had raised in many minds throughout that area and in the Congress grave questions as to the adequacy of the present type of planning for flood control; that these questions could not be fully answered unless there were a complete study and review of the entire problem by some agency or group independent of the two construction agencies, the Engineers and the Interior Department, and that some sort of study and report of that character should be a condition precedent to any construction work in the flooded areas. The Senate conferees not agreeing to that view, and urging that construction funds be made available so that these major projects might be immediately gotten under way, the difference came to perhaps the sharpest division between the two groups of conferees.

The Senate conferees offered to use the same method of reapportionment as was used in connection with Gavins Point and Randall Dams in order that funds for construction might be made available without the increase of a dollar in appropriations. That was not acceptable to the House, which clearly evidenced that the difference was a difference in policy approach, a difference, Mr. President, which could not be ironed out. The final decision was one which was necessary in order that the whole civil functions program might go forward without awaiting a single determination.

The recommendation in the conference report for a study in this field contemplates legislative action to create a commission for that purpose, then the appointment of such a commission, and a study by the commission, with a report not later than the end of the current fiscal year.

Mr. President, manifestly if we wait for legislation in the coming year, then for the appointment of a commission, and then for a study, it is gravely doubtful if any such report could possibly be had before the last of the current fiscal year, and, in the mind of the senior Senator from Oregon, doubtful that it could be made even at that time. I hope that something may be done.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that it is a matter of doubt in my mind. If we have to wait until a commission has examined into all these matters and has made a report, it could not be done before next July, at the earliest. In the present situation I hope something can be done which will hasten the building of the dam known as the Tuttle Creek Dam in northern Kansas. It is a most serious matter. There is a great difference of opinion about it, and the only way in which we can win is to stand together. I say that to the Senators from Kansas, because I feel exactly as they do that the dam should be constructed as soon as is possible.

Mr. CORDON. Mr President, if the Senator will further yield——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Because of the impossibility of getting an agreement in this matter, as to which I know the consensus of opinion on our side is that it was the most important matter before the conferees——

Mr. McKELLAR. It undoubtedly was.

Mr. CORDON. I hope that one of two avenues may be followed. If we assume the adoption of the conference report, I hope that before adjournment some sort of a resolution may be adopted or a bill may be enacted by the two Houses which will permit the setting up of a commission of the character which has been suggested that can go to work immediately on this matter so that its findings may be available at the earliest possible moment in the coming year. If that cannot be done, perhaps the President will take some informal action under his general powers, and with the use of funds provided for disaster, which I think should be available, I hope some such step will be taken by the President which will result in this sort of an investigation being made so that action can be had in this field at the earliest possible time in the coming session. I believe the people of the Nation want that done. I know it should be done.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the difficulties which the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the members of the conference had in trying to arrive at an agreement in connection with the items which were in disagreement between the House and the Senate. I will say to the Senator that I am not very happy about the results of the conference, but I fully understand the situation which confronted the conference committee. I am encouraged by the statements of the chairman of the committee and the senior Senator from Oregon to the effect that they are hopeful that during the first of the coming year the subject will again receive consideration. I hope that a resolution will be adopted creating the commission which has been suggested.

As a member of the Public Works Committee of the Senate I should like to say that, in the first place, we have had, in my opinion, plenty of studies——

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CARLSON. The Army engineers are going to bring in a report within the next 15 or 30 days which will be a complete review of the entire watershed involved. I shall suggest to the chairman of the Public Works Committee that he have his staff study the subject between this time and the beginning of the session in January. I believe that under the rules he is authorized to do that on his own motion. So far as I am concerned, I shall ask him to consider it immediately in order that our committee may have a report on the situation.

To the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I say that I appreciate the problems and the difficulties which he has faced. I should like to see the conference committee report rejected and go back to conference, but I am fearful that we would have the same result.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator, and I want to say to him that I believe if the report is rejected and goes back again, much time will be lost. I think all Senators know my position. Nearly 40 years ago I introduced a bill in the House providing for the building of a dam at Muscle Shoals, in the Tennessee River in Alabama. It was laughed at. It was stated that electricity could not be produced from the river, and every kind of fun was poked at the proposal. I suffered, as anyone else would suffer, because of what happened. Even after the Tennessee Valley Authority was established, a majority of that body recommended that only three dams be built as an experiment. They argued against

the authorization for the building of any other dams on the Tennessee River because they said it was not practicable. Many other arguments were made which were quite as untenable as was that argument.

Mr. President, we have seen what the Tennessee Valley Authority has done, and I do not believe the building of dams to create electricity from waterpower has a more devoted friend in this body or any other body than I am. I regard it as one of the things with which I had something to do very early in my legislative career, and I am proud of what I had to do with it. I do not know what we would do without the electricity we are now getting from waterpower

Therefore, Mr President, I can say to my distinguished friends from Kansas that yesterday when we had to succumb on their particular proposal, which I favored very strongly, I was very sorry we had to give in But I will say to them that if we will continue to pull together, as I know we will, we will get dams built for the betterment, not only of Kansas, North and South Dakota, Missouri, Florida, and other States, but for the benefit of every man, woman, and child in America

Mr HOLLAND Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr HILL in the Chair) Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND I should like to say to the Senator from Kansas in particular that I completely echo the sentiments of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to the effect that all the Senate conferees were most reluctant to accede in any respect to the request that we recede from the Senate position with reference to the works in the State of Kansas in those areas which have been so hard hit by flood in recent months.

There were two or three fields of major disagreement between the Houses, which of course were reflected as fields of disagreement between the conferees. One field had to do with the reductions from the budgeted amounts on going operations of very great importance, and deemed to be of great importance in the defense effort I think it is sound to say that in that general field of disagreement the House conferees yielded entirely to the Senate conferees, and that the action of the Senate prevailed.

In the second field, having to do with the inauguration of new, long-time projects, some for waterpower and electricity, others for flood control, there was a give-and-take. It had to be worked out finally in order to have any conference report, and the Senate will note that two or three of the projects deemed to be most necessitous from the standpoint of furnishing additional hydroelectric power are to be started, though in a more modest way than the Senate had intended, and some of those water-power projects are not to be started at all.

It was in the field of flood control that there was the greatest divergence of opinion, and that divergence had to do not only with the beginning of the important structures planned for the valley of the Kaw, the valley of the Verdigris, and other areas which directly affect Kansas, but it also had to do with the important planning funds and funds for surveys and investigations, and on these funds the House yielded, in large measure, to the insistence of the Senate that the planning and survey work go ahead.

Senators will note that on page 8 of the printed report it appears that $400,000 is allotted for immediate planning work upon the Tuttle Creek Dam, and $100,000 on the Toronto Reservoir, likewise in Kansas, and $250,000 on the Strawn Reservoir in Kansas.

It was felt that with the short time elapsing between now and the new session in January a great deal of good would come out of the availability and the use of those planning and survey funds which are directedly allocated in the report to the three projects in Kansas I have mentioned.

The Senator from Florida is almost as unhappy as are the Senators from Kansas about the omission of the actual starting of work upon these flood control measures At the same time, he has found from long experience in legislation, as I am sure his distinguished colleagues from Kansas have found, that legislation is a matter of give-and-take, and it has been so proven in this case.

In closing, Mr. President, I should like to say that I have just been authorized by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr CHAVEZ], who was called from the Chamber, to state that the staff and engineers of the Public Works Committee will at once be requested to make a primary matter, between now and the next session, and continuing after the beginning of the next session, of a study of the Kaw Valley, the Missouri Valley, and the Verdigris Valley and the Arkansas Valley projects and related areas The Senators from Kansas will at least have the assurance that while the planning and survey work is proceeding under the Corps of Engineers, so will the work be going forward with the Public Works Committee staff, because they felt there will not be any difference of opinion at all in the committee as to the desirability of having the work go ahead just as speedily as possible, and we hope that, with the able assistance of the distinguished senior and junior Senators from Kansas and others, shortly after the beginning of the year we may be in position to do something by way of recommendation to the Senate that will be a good deal farther reaching than the planning work which will be initiated under the bill reported by the conferees.

Mr. President, I commend the distinguished chairman of the conference, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. We met in session after session after session, without rancor, but with very great differences of opinion as to the way to approach the projects in the stricken areas of Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma, and it appeared at long last that what now is incorporated in the conference report was the very best that could be worked out by mutual understanding.

The Senators have the assurance of the Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, and the Senator from Florida, as one of the members of the committee, and of the committee as a whole, that we shall make this field a field of first service, in the hope that something much more specific for the stricken areas than is being started under the conference report may result.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr CARLSON. I wish to state to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida that I certainly appreciate the statement he was authorized to make on behalf of the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, that a study will be undertaken immediately by the staff of the Public Works Committee of the Senate.

I know that the staff is not only efficient by that they will conduct a very competent and a very thorough study of the needs and the problems of our area, and I am convinced they are going to do it expeditiously, so that a report will be available at least by the beginning of the next session of the present Congress, in January To me that seems the most encouraging news we have had

Mr. HOLLAND Mr President, if the Senator from Tennessee will yield for one further remark——

Mr McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Florida

Mr HOLLAND I would not want the RECORD to have it appear that the Committee on Public Works has not recommended and has not piloted successful action in this field heretofore, because, as Senators who are now present well know, the Public Works Committee did make recommendations in the past, and they have been acted upon by the Congress, and there are authorizations now upon the statute books under which appropriations, such as were passed in the Senate but denied under the conference report, could immediately have been used But the conferees from the Senate side realize that there is very grave disagreement as to the adequacy of that planning and those authorizations, under facts which have now developed The Senator from Florida would not be surprised if the Public Works Committee were to come back with the identical recommendations which it previously made At the same time, the Senator from Florida will not close his mind, nor will any member of the Public Works Committee close his mind, I am sure, to the fact that we may be wrong. If there is a better way, a speedier way, a cheaper way, and a more economical way to deal with these grave problems than the way which is prescribed under authorizations already on the books, we shall hope to bring in recommendations which will point to that better and more efficient way.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr SCHOEPPEL I wish to say to the distinguished chairman of the Ap-

propriations Committee and to the senior Senator from Florida that I join my colleague [Mr. CARLSON] in expressing our appreciation for the manner in which the very troublesome situation which developed was handled, and the manner in which the report has been presented to the Senate.

Naturally we are disappointed. We had envisioned, following the disastrous flood, that some action would be taken to assure getting some of the projects under way. There was an honest difference of opinion. Especially do I wish to take my hat off to the Senate conferees for trying to sustain the Senate's position. I am heartened by the statement which has been made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. It has been suggested that the staff of the Public Works Committee, careful as it always is, and with its experience and background, make an investigation. This can be of great help to us in Kansas in this situation. I realize, as the senior Senator from Florida has said, that the staff of the Public Works Committee may come forward with some other practical methods which might be employed and followed to prevent disastrous floods and all the deplorable effects following them, to the end that such floods may be eliminated from the picture. That is what we in Kansas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Oklahoma, along the stems of these great streams, are interested in.

Again I say thanks for the way in which the troublesome task before the conferees was handled. We are looking forward eagerly to the beginning of the new session in January next. With the reports, suggestions, and recommendations of the staff of the committee before us, we shall do everything we can do constructively toward getting under way with types of construction which will eliminate the danger from floods such as the one we have recently experienced. We hope such a flood with its devastating effects, will never happen again.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I may say to the Senators from Kansas, especially, that so far as I can recall—and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] can correct me if I am in error—I did not hear a single solitary word in criticism of the Senators from Kansas in connection with the consideration of this subject. Senators have been told how the Senate conferees felt. They felt just as they had voted.

So far as the House Members are concerned, they took the position, not that they were opposed to the proposal, but that they merely wished to have more information, which will be revealed by a further investigation into the facts. It was felt that such investigation could be made within the time between now and the first of January.

We can easily see that that was a reasonable argument. So far as I can recall—and I am sure my distinguished friends who were present with me will vouch for what I say—not a single unkind thought was expressed. The sympathy of all was with the people of Kansas in the great disaster which overtook them, and we all realized that it was a great disaster. We also appreciate the fact that the waters which descended with such disastrous effects in Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma can, with proper engineering management, be converted into electricity, instead of being instruments of destruction, as in the last flood.

No politics was involved in the settlement of the question. Regardless of politics, whether an individual member of the conference committee happened to be a Republican or a Democrat, all wanted to help the State of Kansas in this particular trouble I ask the Senator from Minnesota whether or not my statement is correct.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee is absolutely correct. He has stated the situation as clearly as words could express it.

Let me say to both Senators from Kansas that it was not a question of being opposed to the project The House conferees felt that there was need for the engineers to have additional time to make a complete study of the entire question, because the crest of the flood had been higher than at any time in all history. Levees which it was thought would hold back any conceivable flood had not held back this flood. Those were the questions which were involved. It was not a question of whether or not projects should be approved, but it was a question of the wisdom of approving projects now under the general plan.

I believe that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has stated the situation very clearly. The entire intent of the apparent delay was to obtain more information It was felt that we could achieve just as much after Congress reconvenes following the first of the year, in the way of expediting the flood-control projects as we could by approving projects at this time and then awaiting the final engineering reports before the projects were executed

So I think the conferees did the very best that could have been done. The conferees finally agreed Earlier in the week I did not believe that an agreement could be reached. That was my frank feeling.

Mr. McKELLAR The House simply turned us down. When the House turns anything down, it does so with a vengeance. We were certainly turned down on this proposal. However, we have not yet lost the cause. We are going to help win it.

Mr. THYE Mr President, the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr CARLSON] is also a former House Member. He understands the situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. He can understand exactly what we are talking about.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The reference of the distinguished chairman of the committee may possibly have been to my association with some of the Members of the House who were members of the conference committee. As a result of close association with the conferees on this particular bill, I can say to the Members of the Senate that we were dealing with some Members who are difficult to persuade if they have a contrary point of view. The Senate conferees did a noble job in handling the conference. At the same time, I wish to express my appreciation for what the House conferees did. The men who represented the House are men of conviction.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should have said that with regard to a number of matters the House conferees acted more generously than usual. I want to give them credit for doing so.

Mr. President, at this time I yield to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] for the purpose of making a correction.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the statement on the part of the managers of the House with reference to this conference report appears on page 13362 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday. There is an error in it. In the tabulation which was used in the conference, it appears that in both the House and Senate the amount allowed for beach erosion studies, under Rivers and Harbors, was $150,000; and that the amount for stream gaging studies, for transfer to the United States Geological Survey, was $120,000.

The total sum of money listed at the conclusion of the statement by the managers on the part of the House would include that sum of money, but it is not listed in the report. The report reads:

> Of the above amount of $66,965,000 for current expenses, not to exceed $2,025,000 is included for examinations and surveys which includes $300,000 for survey of northern and northwestern lakes and $1,725,000 for fish and wildlife studies.

There should be included the two items which I have mentioned, because the total sum of $66,965,000 cannot be arrived at unless the sum of $150,000 for beach erosion and $120,000 for stream-gaging studies are included

I am sure it is a clerical error, but I wanted to invite the Senate's attention to it

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from Arizona for his kindness and his ability in presenting the matter to the Senate

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from South Dakota feels that action should not be taken without a few words being said about what the conference report does and means in the history of the Missouri Valley

By the action of the conferees $2,000,000 is set aside from the appropriation which had been indicated for Randall Dam at Fort Randall, S. Dak., for the purpose of starting construction of the Gavins Point Dam.

The initiation of construction at Gavins Point Reservoir means the start of construction of the last of the dams on the main stream of the Missouri River

The Missouri River is approximately 2,500 miles from its source in the mountains of Montana to its mouth. From its source in Montana it runs eastward in Montana, eastward in North Dakota, southerly through North Dakota, southeasterly across South Dakota, then becomes the boundary between Nebraska and Iowa and then between Missouri and Kansas, and then it turns eastward and flows into the Mississippi River. It

is four times the length of the Tennessee River. The watershed of the Missouri River is approximately one-sixth of the entire area of the United States. It is the last great river system of the country to receive treatment in respect to flood control.

In late 1942 Lt. Gen Lewis A. Pick, now Chief of the Corps of Army Engineers, was assigned to the Omaha Division of the Corps of Army Engineers, Missouri River Division. In the early part of the war, General Pick's duties—he was then Colonel Pick—were the construction of military installations. I believe he supervised more than $1,000,000,000 worth of military construction, the largest single job within the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers at that time.

When he had the job fully in hand, I recall that he was in Rapid City, S Dak., one evening, after having inspected some construction there He said to me, "I am getting ready now to take up my normal activity" I said, "What do you mean?"

He said, "I mean that we are about ready to pick up your resolution asking for a study of the Missouri River" He said, "Our construction work is well in hand now, and we must be looking ahead to the day when the war will be over"

Then he outlined what he proposed to do in making a comprehensive study of the Missouri River, with dams and a program of flood control, which would put an end to floods so far as the Missouri River below Sioux City was concerned

The flood plain of the Missouri River at Sioux City is several miles wide, and it would be impossible to construct dams on the main stream at that point He said that he must go above Sioux City, and that he would like to go across South Dakota and North Dakota to find a place where it would be suitable to construct reservoirs He referred to the levees that had been built and to the conclusion that had been reached that the levees would not solve the problem

Growing out of the studies which he initiated there resulted a comprehensive resolution, which picked up the resolutions which representatives from Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana had introduced over a period of years. Picking them all up was a resolution introduced by Representative CURTIS of Nebraska It put them all together in a comprehensive plan for the control of floods on the Missouri River below Sioux City. The report on it was made in the spring of 1944

At about the same time the Bureau of Reclamation was conducting some studies They were being conducted by W G Sloan, who was interested primarily in the responsibility of the Bureau of Reclamation for the useful use of water The Army engineers have the responsibility for flood-control projects, and the Bureau of Reclamation have the responsibility for projects which utilize water when it is stored

Mr. Sloan had been studying the possibilities of building dams on the tributaries, the construction of reclamation projects, and of the application of the power that might be created from dams on the main stream of the Missouri River and on its tributaries.

The House Committee on Flood Control received the so-called Pick report, and the report later came out as the Flood Control Act of 1944. The Pick report was embraced in the bill which was presented to the House in the spring of 1944

Two days before it was reported or acted upon by the House the Sloan report was presented The House having had its hearings on the flood-control program that year went ahead and passed the bill which embraced the Pick recommendations.

During the summer and fall of 1944 the Senate committee, headed by the late distinguished Senator from Louisiana, Mr. Overton, conducted hearings in several cities throughout the country and in the committee rooms of the Senate, with a view to working out a consolidation of the Pick and Sloan recommendations.

Finally, as a result of those hearings and the deliberations of the committee, there was embraced in a bill what became known as the Pick-Sloan plan for the comprehensive control and use of the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries The recommendations were embodied in the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944. That act authorized the program which today is being sealed by the report of the conferees, which authorizes the expenditure of money to initiate the construction of Gavins Point Dam.

Gavins Point Dam is the lowest of the dams on the Missouri River. It is the dam which will reregulate the flow of the river after it has passed through the generators at Fort Randall, the lowest of the high dams The Bureau of the Budget for 2 years has been in accord with the idea that the construction of Gavins Point Dam should be started, so as to be completed at the same time that the Randall Dam is completed The reason for that is that without a reregulating dam below the Fort Randall Dam, the water from Fort Randall Dam would fall from such a great height that in the spring the ice on the river would cause considerable havoc to the land along the river channels. So the engineers have conceived the idea of having Gavin's Point Dam serve as a regulating dam below the Fort Randall Dam. The Gavins Point Dam was one of the dams which constituted a subject of controversy when the Senate conferees met with the House conferees

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Texas in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CASE. I am glad to yield

Mr McKELLAR. I merely wish to say that the agreement in the conference committee in regard to the Gavins Point Dam was one of the pleasant surprises in connection with the conference. We had very grave doubts about that matter, judging from what we had heard about it; and when we finally reached an agreement in regard to the Gavins Point Dam, I regarded that as quite a remarkable achievement.

Mr. CASE. Yes, it was a landmark.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was an agreement which surprised me as much as it surprised the other conferees. I am delighted that we have reached that agreement, for it is necessary for that dam to be built. It should be built in the interest of our country, as a defense measure, and it should also be built as an economic measure, anyway.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Tennessee is entirely correct.

Mr HOLLAND Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr CASE I yield

Mr HOLLAND I can understand the pleasure of the distinguished Senator in regard to the beginning which is being made on construction of the Gavins Point Dam

I call his attention also to the fact that as the result of the conference report, the appropriation for continuing the construction at the Oahe Reservoir has been restored I wish to say that I, too, felt that the House conferees showed their sincerity of purpose and their complete understanding of the situation, as well as their confidence that the Missouri program seemed to be well worked out and ready to go, by their attitude toward the restoration of the appropriation for continuation of construction of the Oahe Dam and for the making of a small appropriation for the beginning of construction on the Gavins Point Dam.

Mr. McKELLAR Mr President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me at this time?

Mr CASE I yield

Mr. McKELLAR I wish to say to the Senator from Florida [Mr HOLLAND] that I hope he did not infer from anything I said that I was criticizing any Member of the House of Representatives about this matter Quite to the contrary, I believe that the conferees on the part of the House—as I told the Senator from Kansas a while ago—were perfectly honest, and certainly they were well informed about what they wanted and what they did not want. They had studied the matter most carefully, and they acted in great sincerity and honesty.

Mr HOLLAND Mr President, I may say that I did not misunderstand the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I understood that he was complimenting the conferees on the part of the House; and I wished to join him in that expression

Mr McKELLAR I thank the Senator.

Mr CASE Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate.

In conclusion, I wish to say that we began this afternoon by considering the joint resolution providing relief for the flood sufferers in Kansas and Missouri. The very fact that we were considering that joint resolution and the amendments which were submitted in connection with it, is ample proof of the fact that when floods cause great havoc, the country is confronted with demands for the appropriation of huge sums of money

for the purpose of alleviating the effects of the disaster.

The Oahe Dam and the Garrison Dam have been commenced in the past. The Fort Randall Dam was begun in 1946. As one who had the privilege of participating in the action of the House of Representatives in causing the beginning of the work on the Oahe Dam and the Fort Randall Dam, and as one who now recognizes the necessity for the construction of the Gavins Point Dam, I wish to say that I feel that today we can say to the people who live in the area from Sioux City southward that when these dams are completed they will be able to take the entire flow of the Missouri River in any one year and stop it cold, so that no longer will the floods of the Missouri River devastate one million and one-half or three million acres of farm land and devastate the cities there and devastate the farms and the communities, and isolate individual families and homes, as has occurred in the past

Of course the dams on the main stem above Sioux City will not entirely prevent floods on the Kansas River, but they will do a great deal in respect to controlling the floods, by holding back the water from above.

It should be made clear at the same time, Mr President, that as the result of construction of the dams in North Dakota and South Dakota, the benefits go to the States downstream from the Dakotas, but the Dakotas themselves do not receive the principal benefits. In South Dakota, 490,000 acres of land will be flooded for all time, in order that the floods may be kept off the farm lands and the cities below Sioux City The building of huge dams means the flooding of great stretches of land above the dams, and that is what the Dakotas are contributing to the solution of the flood problem in the areas below the Dakotas Our bottom lands along the river will be flooded for all time to come

There is a benefit to South Dakota, we hope, and to North Dakota, we hope, in respect to the possible utilization of some of the water for municipal purposes and perhaps for irrigation purposes and perhaps for power purposes We hope we shall be permitted—and I trust that at the appropriate time the Senate will make this possible for North Dakota and South Dakota—to retain within the borders of our States an appropriate amount of the electricity which will be generated at these dams, in recompense for the lands we are surrendering forever to flooding, in order to keep floods from the States downstream of us

Mr McKELLAR Mr President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me at this time?

Mr. CASE I yield

Mr McKELLAR I wish to say to the Senator from South Dakota that I think he is mistaken in the statement that South Dakota and North Dakota will not receive the benefits which will be received by the States downstream of them. Power is very easily conveyed by means of wires, as the Senator from South Dakota knows. What will be done in South Dakota, as a result of the generation of power at the dams, will result in building up the State of South Dakota immeasurably, not only in respect to providing water, but also in respect to the power which will be produced by the water

I wish to assure the Senator from South Dakota that at one time I felt rather the other way about the building of a dam in Alabama. After I introduced a bill calling for the construction of a dam at Muscle Shoals, on the Tennessee River, many persons who were opposed to that project frequently criticized me because I was favoring the construction of a dam in Alabama, although as a matter of fact Tennessee has received a wonderful return from the building of that dam.

Mr. CASE I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is correct, namely, that the power does offer an opportunity for some benefits to flow to the States in which the dams are located Certainly we hope that will be true in the case of the Dakotas We hope that not all the power will be siphoned off to the other States, but that some of the power will remain in the Dakotas, so that we shall receive some return for the lands we shall lose.

The reference the distinguished chairman of the committee has made to that fact puts the spotlight on the point that the construction of Gavins Point Dam is essential for the production of power. The Fort Randall Dam, if constructed without the Gavins Point Dam, would produce only about 100,000 or 120,000 kilowatts of power, whereas the Gavins Point Dam will produce 320,000 kilowatts of power, and the Fort Randall Dam will produce another 100,000 kilowatts of power, making a total of 420,000 kilowatts That is why it has been important to have construction of the Gavins Point Dam started, along with the regulatory features.

I express my appreciation to the chairman of the committee and to his colleagues on the committee for their understanding position in regard to this matter

Mr McKELLAR Mr President, the Senator from South Dakota is entirely correct in the statements he has just made It was that view on the part of all the conferees, both the House conferees and the Senate conferees, which resulted in keeping in this bill the provisions in regard to construction of the Gavins Point Dam

Mr CASE. Mr. President, I wish to conclude my remarks merely by emphasizing again my appreciation of the action of the committee, and I wish to state again that this action is the beginning of the end. This appropriation is not an inflationary one. Floods are inflationary, for they destroy lives, cattle, housing, and farms So that in making these appropriations we are combatting inflation, we are combatting floods, we are pointing to a day when we shall not have to consider flood relief bills.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The chairman of the committee and, I believe, other Members of the Senate will remember that when the bill passed the Senate it included an item of appropriation of $1,000,000 for power development on the Niagara River. Does that item remain in the bill as reported by the conferees?

Mr McKELLAR No. I think this is the second time that this particular item has been passed by the Senate and taken to conference, but the House would not agree to it, and that was all there was to it. I am as sorry as I can be, but it was simply an item on which we could not get the House to agree.

Mr LEHMAN I thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr President, I desire to say I am amazed and deeply unhappy over this development I have been criticized by my constituents in New York for voting so consistently in support of bills and appropriations for power development, reclamation, and irrigation in other parts of the country, without being able to show that in these developments there is any direct benefit to the State of New York or to the northeastern area My reply has always been that while I am a Senator from the State of New York and deeply interested in what affects the people of New York, I am also a Senator of the United States, and I consider it my duty to support those things which I believe to be of interest to the country as a whole I therefore voted for these tremendous appropriations for power development, for reclamation, and for irrigation in the South, the West, the Northwest, and the Southwest in the belief that what benefits one section of the country benefits all sections of the country, including my own State of New York. I still believe that But I may say, Mr. President, that it cannot be expected that the people of one part of the country will support the development of other parts of the country unless they feel that they and the broad area in which they live are to get fair recognition of their just requirements And I say to you, Mr President, that here we have a situation which I think is a most spectacular and dramatic situation, in which the State of New York and the entire northeastern area have been discriminated against

We have in the Niagara River a potentiality of power development greater, I believe, than that existing in any other part of the country, a power development which will create such cheap power that it will lead to the development of the industry of the entire area and to the greater security and happiness of the people, in their homes, in their factories, on their farms, and in their fields

There is no longer any question as to the merit of the Niagara power development, that has been established We know today that Canada is proceeding to develop the power on the Canadian side of the Niagara, and Canada has the right to do it, because under the treaty it is set forth that so long as the United States does not develop its own power resources Canada has the right to use those resources as well as their own. And Canada is doing that today, this very

minute. Before we know it Canada will be using for the benefit of her own people not only her own power resources on the Niagara River but also those belonging to the United States. May I say, Mr. President, this is no longer a moot question? There is no doubt about the merit of the Niagara power development. There is no doubt that the work must proceed, whether it be publicly owned by the Federal Government, whether it be publicly developed by the Federal Government and turned over to the State of New York, or whether it be privately controlled. It is my ardent hope that the latter course will never be accepted. The great resources of the Niagara, like those of the St. Lawrence, must be publicly developed, owned, and operated.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr LEHMAN. May I finish? Development and planning must go forward. We are losing this valuable time, losing it at the expense of a great area of our country, an area which I may say without fear of successful contradiction has supported the just claims of other parts of the country and sought their development

Mr. President, I say to you without reservation that I am deeply unhappy over this situation. I am deeply unhappy because I think there has been cut out of this appropriation bill an item regarding which New York and the Northeast had a right to expect support. I think I am not unjustified in saying that my constituents of New York will from this time forward demand that I closely weigh the claims of other parts of the country in connection with power development, reclamation, and irrigation. I do not want to do that because I continue to believe, as I have said before, that the development of one part of our country and the prosperity of one part beneficially affect every other part; but certainly this one-way street can no longer be tolerated, and it will no longer be tolerated. Mr President, I have spoken with all the earnestness at my command. I have done that because I feel so deeply

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I merely want to say a word or two in reply to what the Senator from New York has said. He has at least impliedly if not explicitly criticized the Senate committee. The Senate feels that New York is entitled to this development, and the Appropriations Committee feel that way. We have voted that way, not once but time and time again. I have voted for the development of the Niagara River ever since I have been in the Senate, and ever since the proposal was made. It was not made until long after I came to the Senate, but ever since it was made I have been for it, because I believe in building up our entire country. I do not believe in building up only a part of our country.

The Senator from New York perhaps was not present a little while ago when I said that even in 1933 there was so much opposition to the development of public power that the Tennessee Valley Corporation had its agents here—I call them agents; some call them by other names, but I shall not use the other names—it had its agents here, saying that only three dams should be built in the entire country, and those only for experimental purposes.

The Senator from New York seems to think that this situation has suddenly occurred. He is entirely incorrect. It has been going on for years. When the Senator from New York was a very young man—I doubt if he was as old as is the distinguished and handsome Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]—we were fighting day and night, at times, to get a dam built on the Tennessee River. At that time we did not have the support of the Senator from New York as we have his support at this time. The Senate has taken the exact view of the Senator from New York and has done everything within its power to get the Niagara River project bill approved. When the Senator from New York has served here long enough to have served on several conference committees he will find that no one person runs conference committees. There are honest differences of views concerning the subject matter, as there were in this case. The House conferees would not hear to it. If we rejected a civil-functions bill because one item was eliminated, we would never pass any civil-functions bill at all.

The Senator from New York has a big task before him I know he wants the Niagara River improved for water power. It may take some years. If I were in his place—and this is a mere suggestion, because the Senator, coming from a large State, knows more about it, perhaps, than I do, but what I have to say is a suggestion to the Senator—instead of criticizing his friends on the Senate floor for not having retained a provision in the bill that he wanted retained, it would be a far better legislative tactic to stand by his friends who are trying their best to help him than for him to abuse them. I am astonished at the Senator from New York undertaking to abuse his friends who have stood by him not only once, but, as I recall, two or three times.

There has never been a plan of the Senator's proposed dam submitted——

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Wait one moment. The plan was not submitted The Senator will have to take it up with the House as well as with the Senate. Strange as it may seem to the Senator from New York, there are two bodies in the Congress of the United States, and both of them have to pass on proposed legislation. In my judgment—and, as I say, I may be entirely mistaken, and I offer it merely as a statement from one friend to another—if I were trying to get a dam constructed on the Niagara River I would not abuse the Members of the Senate who are standing by me every time it is brought up. That is what we have done in the committee. Every time it has been brought up, we have stood by the Senator, and the House refused to accept it. I hope the Senator will have influence enough with the House at the next session so that the House will yield to the Senator on the matter.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I think the Senator from Tennessee, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, should know by this time the high regard in which I hold him. When I appeared before his committee on behalf of this appropriation I was shown every consideration by the committee. For that I am deeply grateful. I do not recall anything I said in my remarks a little while ago that could possibly be construed as abuse of the Members of the Senate. My statement did reflect a deep sense of disappointment on my part, a deep sense of distress, a deep sense of fear of the consequences to our country of this unfortunate elimination of an item which was merely for the initial development of the Niagara River. It was in accordance with a resolution passed, I believe, by the Public Works Committee of this body and the appropriation is absolutely necessary in order to carry on this work.

The Senator from Tennessee has referred to private power interests which were at work at the time the Tennessee Valley Administration legislation was being considered. I have no doubt that private interests were represented in the galleries of both Houses of the Congress at the time this question was discussed. Of course, we know that private interests tried before the appropriate committees of both the Senate and the House to defeat the plan which had been submitted for public development, even though the public interest was definitely recognized in a reservation made by the Senate of the United States at the time the treaty came up in this body for ratification.

Certainly there is no desire on my part to abuse anyone, but I certainly would be much less than honest and frank if I did not relate to my colleagues in the Senate what I consider the situation to be and to express concern with regard to the nondevelopment of an undertaking which is of outstanding national importance and outstanding interest both in the civil life of our country and in its defense. There is testimony from every one of the defense agencies of this country to the effect that the development of the Niagara River is essential to the interests of our security.

So it seems to me, Mr. President, that I would be less than honest, that I would be unwise, if I did not say to my colleagues that I believe a serious mistake has been made in cutting out this item. It is not large, and I know that we have had fights in conference committees before. My criticism is directed to the conference committee rather than to the Members of the Senate, and, as has been so often the case, I wish that the representatives of the Senate could have prevailed with their opposite Members of the House so as to permit the inclusion of this the Niagara item in the conference report which is about to become law.

Mr. President, I feel very deeply in this matter. I have talked earnestly, and I am glad I have.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will yield, why does he not take this matter up

with Members of the House? He well knows all of them from New York. Why does he not take it up with those who are against the project? Why does he criticize Members of the Senate, who stood by him and fought for him? That is what I object to, and I think the Senator is very unwise in doing that. He says he thinks he is wise. He is entitled to that opinion, but I say to him that we fought for the Niagara project for a number of years, and tried to get the necessary funds to have that project examined into and planned, and afterward to have it built But in spite of that the Senator is here abusing us. He says he wants to give his honest opinion I will give him mine I do not like that I am offended at it The Senator has no right to abuse his friends in any such way as that

Mr LEHMAN I feel very sorry that the distinguished chairman of the committee——

Mr McKELLAR I do not want the Senator's sorrow I do not care a particle for the Senator's sorrow, but I do not think he ought to stand on this floor and abuse those who stood for his provision in the conference between the two Houses Why does he not abuse those who fought it in the House?

Mr. LEHMAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not have the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to point out that the Senator has claimed that I have abused Members of the Senate I have abused the report, I have abused and criticized the report of the conference committee

The Senator from Tennessee has said, Why did not the Senator from New York criticize and appeal to the members of the conference committee representing the House? Today is October 17, 1951 If my information is correct, this conference report was made to the Senate on October 17, 1951, this very day, and the Senator from New York had no knowledge, not even the slightest information, from any Senator representing the Senate on the conference, that this appropriation of $1,000,000 for the development of power on the Niagara was even threatened How could he have taken it up with the House? How could he have made representations which might have had some effect with the House conferees? He did not know until this report was brought in that there was any question with regard to the inclusion of this item in the appropriation bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from New York is, of course, correct that the report was made lately, but when the Senator from New York condemns, or criticizes bitterly, the conferees on the part of the Senate—and I would call it condemnation—because they finally agreed with the House conferees, who opposed this Niagara item until the report was made, it is unfair to the Senate conferees to say that they are to be blamed now because the report was made on the 17th of October, when they have been fighting for months in order to protect what the Senator from New York had in mind.

If the conferees can agree, does not the Senator from New York realize that, after all, appropriations must be made? There is not a Senator in this body who did not lose something in which he was interested, but are we to condemn the conferees because a little item affecting my State was left out because the House would not agree, or because a little item in Kansas or a little item elsewhere was left out? It is unfair to criticize the conferees, because finally they have to agree in the conferences

Mr HOLLAND Mr President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Florida

Mr HOLLAND I confess to a great deal of sympathy with the distinguished Senator from New York in his position At the same time, I suspect that because of his having had insufficient time to analyze the situation affecting his great State, he may not realize how well he has come out in the conference.

Mr. President, there were seven items in the bill affecting the great State of New York, of which three were in conference One was the item for Buffalo Harbor of $305,000, on which the House yielded. In other words, the House acceded to the Senate appropriation of that amount, and the Senator from Florida well remembers that the Senator from New York was very anxious to have that appropriation granted

The second item affecting New York in which the Senate conferees were sustained was the item for the Mount Morris Reservoir That involved an appropriation of $5,000,000 and $500,000 had been added by the Senate to the amount appropriated by the House The Senate conferees were successful in their insistence that the Senate amount be allowed.

There was only one item affecting New York—the Niagara River item—in which the Senate conferees were not successful, and I assure my distinguished friend that the Senate conferees were zealous in standing by him, not because it was his matter, not because it was his State's important business and we were interested in it for both of those reasons, but because the Senate had so voted and the conferees were so directed; but in that matter the House conferees declined to agree with the Senate conferees

There were four other matters in the same bill, not in conference, namely, an appropriation of $250,000 for the Hudson River channel, an appropriation of $400,000 for New York Harbor, an appropriation of $206,000 for Hoosick Falls, and an appropriation of $392,900 for Olean. These are all in the bill. So the Senator sustained his position and the position of his State in six out of seven items in the bill for his State, after the Senate had concluded its work.

While the Senator from Florida had voted in the Public Works Committee with the Senator from New York in insisting upon a survey, and while the Senate Public Works Committee, headed by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, had taken that position, and while the Senator from Florida as a conferee felt bound to fight for the Niagara item, and it was his pleasure to do so, he feels we have done everything we can in this regard, and if there has been any oversight it was the simple matter of the Senator's not having been advised before the filing of the report.

In the event the distinguished Senator may feel he is the only one who may have been overlooked in some regard, I may say to him that the Senator from Florida flew here from Miami yesterday morning to participate in the final conference, and yet through some oversight his name was omitted from the conference report, though that has been taken care of now.

So, since we are in the last days of a session which has lasted many months, while the Senator from Florida has worked with the Senator from New York for the accomplishment of what he desires in respect to the item under discussion, the Senator from Florida did want to have the RECORD show that the Senator from New York and his great State have been well treated by the Congress and by the conferees

In closing, the Senator from Florida would like to remind the Senator from New York that the chairman of the Public Works Committee in the House of Representatives is one of his own colleagues, the distinguished Representative BUCKLEY, of New York. I am sure that by reason of that fact and others, that body will also be in sympathy with the position of the distinguished Senator from New York.

So the Senator from Florida hopes that the understandable vexation and disappointment of the distinguished Senator will not lead him to feel that a regional position has been taken by any member of the conference committee, because quite the contrary is the fact. I assure the distinguished Senator that this was the fact, and that the Senate conferees fought very hard to sustain the position of the Senate. We are almost as sorry as is the Senator from New York—although naturally we could not be quite so appreciative of the immensity of this loss—over the fact that we could not sustain the Senate action in this one particular, among the New York items

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida very much indeed. Of course, I appreciate his support, as I do that of other Senators. I assure the Senator from Florida and my other colleagues that I would not have brought up the question of the exact proportion which any one State gets, because, as I have frequently said on the floor of the Senate, and as I have repeated here today, I feel that we must look upon all matters of power development, reclamation, and irrigation on the basis of national interest rather than merely local interest. But since the Senator has brought up that question, and has claimed that New York was very liberally treated, I point out that of the appropriations for flood control in this bill, which total $316,000,000, $5,500,000 was appropriated for New York, or a little less than 2 percent In the case of rivers and harbors appropriations, out

of a total appropriation of $192,600,000, a little less than $1,000,000 was appropriated for New York, or approximately one-half of 1 percent. I do not bring those figures up as an argument at all because I insist that projects must be considered on their merits and in the national interest. I am simply replying to the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Now, if I may reply to my distinguished colleague from New Mexico——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to make one interpolation?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I know that the Senator from New York wants to have the figures entirely correct. The Senator has not taken into consideration the very large item in each of those appropriations for current expenses, with respect to which his State has a heavy participation, as does any other large State. In the case of rivers and harbors that item is $67,000,000, out of the total of $192,600,000. Similarly, with respect to flood control, there is a large item for current expenses.

Mr. LEHMAN. The percentage would be very slightly increased.

So far as the criticism which the Senator from New Mexico has made with regard to my procedure, I wish to make a brief statement. If I may address the Chair for the moment, I understand that under the rules of the Senate an amendment to the conference report cannot be made, but it is a question of accepting the report in toto or rejecting it in toto. Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is what I thought. If it had been possible for me to offer an amendment reinstating this particular item I would have been very glad indeed to have done so, and I would not have carried on this long colloquy. But there is no way of doing so. The only way I can bring this unfortunate situation to the attention of the Senate—and of the people of the country—is to make the statement which I have made.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will my good friend yield to me for a moment?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no objection to the Senator's bringing the matter to the attention of the Senate and the country. The Senator from New York is within his rights in making a statement as to any part of the report.

What I strenuously object to is blaming the conferees, especially the Senate conferees, after 2 months of trials and tribulations in their efforts to try to save this item and many other items. Eventually the Senate conferees had to yield. That was necessary as a matter of practice or procedure, in order that the Congress might function. The Senator from New York blames the Senate conferees for yielding. There is not a single State which did not suffer in some way, with respect to some particular project. While a given project might not be important to the rest of the country, it might be extremely important to an individual State. A given project might involve only a few thousand dollars, but to a particular area or State it might be extremely important.

There are several States which benefit to the extent of many millions of dollars from the rivers and harbors and flood control appropriations carried in this bill. The State of New York benefits to the extent of many millions of dollars. New York has a certain kind of problem. At the same time, our little 2-by-4 project in New Mexico, involving an appropriation of $900,000 for the Jemez Canyon Dam, is just as important. We cannot make a $90,000,000 project out of the Jemez Dam. The $900,000 appropriation, however, is just as important to us as a $90,000,000 appropriation might be to some other State. It all depends upon the individual conditions. I wish we had a Columbia River or a Hudson River in my State. I wish we had a Niagara Falls. But we have not. However, the few little dry creeks we have are extremely important. That is the only point I was trying to make.

Mr. LEHMAN. I did not make my plea, either before the committees or here, on the ground of selfish interest of New York.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No.

Mr. LEHMAN. If I were considering the question from that standpoint, I would have voted against many of the great projects in the west, the south, and the northwest. This is a national project.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course. When the Committee on Public Works, of which I am proud to be chairman, passed on the project, we did not approve it because it was a New York project. A national interest was involved.

Mr. LEHMAN. I appreciate that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. When we consider the Columbia River projects, it is on the basis of national interest. I am not complaining about the Senator impressing upon the Senate the necessity of doing something about the Niagara River. I simply thought he was a little too severe on his friends, who had fought so hard and consistently. They really took a beating, not only in committee, but also in conference, from the opposition on the House side.

Mr. LEHMAN. I hope that early next year we shall get an appropriation which will permit this work to continue.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, when the Senate passed the civil functions appropriation bill it contained an item of $4,000,000 with which to begin construction of the Ice Harbor lock and dam on the lower Snake River in the State of Washington. I note from the conference report that this item has been deleted.

I call attention to the fact that in the Senate committee report the Ice Harbor project was pointed out as providing for the installation of 195,000 kilowatts of power generating capacity in the lower Columbia River Basin. On several occasions the Senate has approved this project, not only because of the power it would generate, but because it would firm up the power generation in dams downstream

Recently a committee in the other body held extensive hearings on the question of authorizing the construction of eight steam generating plants in order to firm up the power in the Columbia River, where there is an acute shortage in meeting the requirements of power for the national preparedness program.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, or some of the other conferees, whether there was any discussion on the part of the House conferees as to the relative merits of steam plants in the lower Columbia and the construction of the Ice Harbor Dam on the lower Snake River.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Idaho asked whether there was any discussion of the relative merits of steam plants and the Ice Harbor project. There was not. The Senate passed the item and it went to conference. There was violent opposition in conference by the House members of the conference committee. It was as troublesome as what we were confronted with in connection with the Niagara situation. I hope we can get the project included at the earliest opportunity, because it would help build up the section of the country so ably represented by the Senator from Idaho. That is the way I feel about it, and I believe that is the way the other Senate conferees felt about it.

I look back to a very long service on the committee. I see my good friend the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] sitting in the rear of the Chamber. He served in the House before coming to the Senate. He, too, has served a long time. He, too, will tell the Senator from Idaho that we were not able to overcome the opposition of the House Members.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho appreciates the support given to the Ice Harbor project by the chairman of the committee and other Senators in the past. He merely calls attention to the deletion of this particular item. It seems illogical to fail to provide for the consideration of the highly desirable hydroelectric project in the lower Columbia River Basin while at the same time committees of Congress are considering the feasibility and desirability of building steam-generating plants to take care of the power shortage in that section of the country.

In view of the fact that the Corps of Army Engineers and the Department of the Interior and other Federal agencies interested in this particular item have pointed out the need for beginning early construction, it seems unwise to delay.

The Senator from Idaho wishes again to express his appreciation to the chairman of the committee, because he has indicated on several occasions that he does favor the construction of the Ice Harbor project.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not studied as well as I should the principal difference between firming up power by steam plants and water plants, but I am of the conviction that where the natural situation is such that it can be done with water, it is infinitely better to do so, because it will last longer, and it will be stronger and better in every way, in my judgment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. There may be some justifiable reason for the position which the House took on this item. If so, it must assume the full responsibility for not permitting the beginning of construction of the Ice Harbor Dam at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Absolutely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on a certain amendment of the Senate to House bill 4386, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U S
October 17, 1951.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No 9 to the bill (H R 4386) entitled "An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes," and concur therein

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H R 3669) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore

S 466 An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Army certain property in St Louis, Mo;

S 752 An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission,

S 945 An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947,

S 1482 An act for the relief of the town of Mount Desert, Maine,

S 2233 An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and

S 2244 An act to amend certain housing legislation to grant preferences to veterans of the Korean conflict

REVENUE ACT OF 1951

Mr GEORGE I wish to read into the RECORD a telegram which has been received, I believe, by all conferees on the tax bill, from the President of the American Farm Bureau Federation. It is dated today. The telegram, which is addressed to me, reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D C, *October 17, 1951.*
HON WALTER F GEORGE,
Senate Office Building:

We are greatly disturbed by House action on tax bill. Farmers don't like to pay taxes any better than anyone else However, in view of appropriation authorizations approved by Congress, the choice available to the American people is to pay for these expenditures through taxes or through inflation. Let us not forget the people pay the bill either way Although farmers recognize the dangers inherent in increased taxes, we fear far more the sequence of rising prices, production-strangling controls, and loss of personal freedom which are inevitable consequence of inflation resulting in failure to balance Federal budget. We believe proposed tax bill represents the best bill that can be devised this session, and therefore urge its passage.

ALLAN B KLINE,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. President, I take occasion to say that the telegram voices the sentiment expressed to me today by at least one other of the great farm organizations.

READJUSTMENT OF SIZE AND WEIGHT LIMITATIONS ON FOURTH-CLASS (PARCEL POST) MAIL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr SMATHERS Mr President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1335) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class—parcel post—mail, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration

The PRESIDING OFFICER The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S 1335) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4, and agree to the same.

MIKE MONRONEY,
GEORGE SMATHERS,
JOHN M BUTLER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate

TOM MURRAY,
M G BURNSIDE,
EDWARD H REES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr SALTONSTALL. Mr President, reserving the right to object, I would appreciate it if the Senator from Florida would tell me whether all the conferees were in agreement on the report.

Mr. SMATHERS The conferees were in agreement The report deals with the change in weight and size of parcel-post packages. The Senate conferees agreed to recede from the Senate's disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4, and to agree to them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the unanimous report of the conferees on that troublesome subject?

Mr SMATHERS I would say that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] did not vote for the change in the limitation from 30 pounds to 20 pounds, but the other two Senate conferees did so vote, and the House conferees were unanimous.

Mr. SALTONSTALL Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SMATHERS Yes

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In the opinion of the Senator from Florida is there anyone who wishes to debate that point or take up the question on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am sure that there is no Senator who desires to take the matter up on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to ask the Senator from Florida this question: Would the Senator state what changes, if any, were made in the Senate bill which we recently passed? I believe the Senate would like to know what the changes were.

Mr SMATHERS. The first change was that second-class post offices would not be included in the limitations In other words, on packages sent betweeen second-, third-, and fourth-class post offices the limitation would not prevail.

It was also determined that so far as first-class post offices were concerned on packages which were sent between first-class post offices the weight limitation would be reduced from 30 pounds to 20 pounds.

The third major change was that any package which was sent to a foreign possession or by a serviceman would not fall within the limitation of the act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

Mr. McKELLAR Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H R 5684.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R 5684) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes

Mr SALTONSTALL Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr McKELLAR Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL I have no objection to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee, but before we take up the bill I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H R 5684) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which was reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments

Mr SALTONSTALL Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bennett	Dirksen	Hayden
Benton	Duff	Hendrickson
Bricker	Dworshak	Hennings
Bridges	East'nd	Hickenlooper
Butler, Md	Ecton	Hill
Butler, Nebr.	Ellender	Hoey
Byrd	Ferguson	Holland
Carlson	Flanders	Humphrey
Case	Frear	Hunt
Chavez	Fulbright	Ives
Connally	George	Jenner
Cordon	Green	Johnson, Tex.

Johnston, S. C.	McKellar	Schoeppel
Kefauver	McMahon	Smathers
Kerr	Millikin	Smith, Maine
Kilgore	Monroney	Smith, N. J.
Knowland	Moody	Smith, N. C.
Langer	Morse	Sparkman
Lehman	Murray	Stennis
Magnuson	Neely	Taft
Malone	O'Conor	Thye
Maybank	O'Mahoney	Underwood
McCarran	Pastore	Watkins
McCarthy	Robertson	Wiley
McClellan	Russell	Williams
McFarland	Saltonstall	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the Chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be read first for committee amendments There were but two changes made. First, the committee cut all amounts by 5 percent. It is a percentages cut all along the line. That was reported by the committee, and it is virtually the only amendment made. There was one other, concerning Spain, about which we shall speak when we reach it. I doubt that there is any objection to either amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Mutual security," on page 1, line 11, after "section 101 (a) (1)", to strike out "$5,672,476,271" and insert "$4,818,852,457."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr President, this bill was marked up yesterday evening, and some of the Senators have not had an opportunity to study it. I do not know whether they are going to agree, or whether they will want to make a fight on it. The bill is different from the authorization. Some of us felt that when the authorization was cut that that should have ended the matter. I think under the circumstances, if it is agreeable to the chairman, the bill should go over until tomorrow, in order that we may have an opportunity to study it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I would have no objection whatever to pursuing that course. I think a matter of such importance as this probably should go over, in order that all Senators may have an opportunity of knowing exactly what is in the bill, and what the committee has done, and then letting it go to conference as soon as possible. Tomorrow will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, I think it should go to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think it will require a great deal of time to dispose of the few amendments which have been recommended by the committee, but I see no reason why the bill should not go over until tomorrow, if there is other business which may be taken up at this time.

Mr. McFARLAND. It may well be that those who are interested in the proposed legislation, including myself, will be perfectly agreeable to having the amendments go to conference, and to an effort being made to resolve differences in conference. But some of the Members of the House who worked on this legislation are very much disturbed by the Senate action, and I think we should give Senators an opportunity to study the bill. It was not printed in time to give us an opportunity to study it overnight. It was printed overnight and we had it this morning for the first time.

Mr. McKELLAR. That will be entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND I should like to say to the able majority leader that I think the cut made in the appropriation was a very modest one. There had been certain proposals that the cut be 10 percent, and there had been certain proposals that it be considerably greater than that. I think the 5-percent reduction is a very modest one, particularly when we consider the fact that originally the President of the United States had suggested a $10,000,000,000 tax increase. The House had passed a tax bill calling for about $7,000,000,000. The Senate passed a bill calling roughly for $5,500,000,000. The bill went to conference, and by the action yesterday of the House the conference report was rejected.

As of this moment we have no tax bill at all. It is entirely possible that if an attempt is made to restore the full amount, amendments may be offered greately increasing the reduction proposed by the Committee on Appropriations.

The administration might be very well advised to accept the very modest reduction which is in this bill under the circumstances, rather than precipitate what may be a major controversy, with perhaps deeper cuts. For instance, the able Senator from Connecticut has made suggestions on the floor of the Senate that perhaps we would be better advised to put more money into the atomic program. I happen to be a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I can say very frankly that I am not certain, when we get right down to it, but that $6,000,000,000 spent on the atomic program might not furnish more security to Europe than $7,500,000,000 under the European-aid program. I am not suggesting that at this time, but if this entire matter is opened up, there is no telling what amendments may be offered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 264) to provide for granting to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and the White House and United States Park Police forces additional compensation for working on holidays.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3298) to amend section 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

THE FIGHT FOR JUSTICE FOR AMERICAN CITIZENS—THE CASE OF THE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 289

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the statement upon which I have been working for 2 days, because of misrepresentation of fact, and a violation of Senate rules. I have prepared this statement regarding an important case involving the Office of the Alien Property Custodian. It is an interesting case which, with others, is the subject of an amendment proposed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to House Joint Resolution 289, terminating the state of war with Germany.

The specific case I have in mind, namely, that of Halbach, American citizen, of the General Dyestuff Corp., is particularly interesting because—

First. It involves the fight of a group of United States Senators, including myself, to secure what we humbly feel to be a procedure of justice for an American citizen—not, as newspapers say, a German citizen.

Second. It involves the effort of an entrenched bureaucracy in the Office of Alien Property Custodian, not only to deny such procedure of justice, but to smear, defile, and abuse all those who have the "guts" to fight for such justice.

The case is an illustration, too, of how good newspapermen can, in connection with right ideals, be innocently misinformed and deceived by an entrenched bureaucracy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my statement on this subject, and also a letter from Leo T. Crowley. I want to say that tonight's newspaper speaks of the Wiley amendment. I am sure that any Senator who attended the meeting knows that the Wiley amendment was voted down. Thereafter an amendment suggested by Democratic Members was agreed to. Somehow or other the Alien Property Custodian's gang and some members of the Department of Justice felt that the way to kill this attempt to permit American citizens and children of American citizens to have their day in

court was to smear and to misrepresent. The reason why I am not going to read the entire statement which I have prepared in my office is because I have been appointed by the Vice President to go to Europe, and I expect to leave shortly.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that after today I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the statement and letter will be printed in the Appendix, and, without objection, leave of absence is granted the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr WILEY. Mr. President, I am sure that when I return from Europe things ought to be pretty well along the road so that the American people can understand what is really at issue in connection with the Bureau of Internal Revenue Hundreds of millions of dollars are at issue The American Government bought the stock of children of American citizens by getting cash out of an American corporation The Government did not have the money, so it just had it declared Then, Mr President, what took place? It really got the stock for nothing, because it took the cash out of the corporation. But that is not the point I am inquiring who was interested in buying this stock from the Alien Property Custodian. It is a very interesting question The stock which was bought for 10 or 15 cents on the dollar when it was worth dollar for dollar, is now worth probably 20 to 1; but if the Government could sell that stock to some favorite son—and between now and the first of the year it could do so—it could show a profit But that is not the main point Big interests are involved. We are asking that the American people and the Department of Justice keep their eye on the scene to see who gets the stock and at what figure.

Mr McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr WILEY. I want to put something else in the RECORD, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr McFARLAND. Very well.

GETTING POLITICS OUT OF THE OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Mr WILEY. Mr. President, like my colleagues in the Congress I have long been aware that there is a very unfortunate degree of politics exercised in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, particularly in the field offices. This is to be expected in view of the fact that the 64 collectors of internal revenue throughout the Nation are themselves political appointees.

In the interest of nonpartisan justice and in the interest of an efficient collection of the revenues of our Government, I have urged that these collectors be placed under civil service.

The Milwaukee Journal, the daily newspaper with the largest circulation in Wisconsin, in its Monday, October 15 issue endorses this proposal, which others before me have made and which I now reemphasize.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of this Milwaukee Journal editorial be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to be followed thereafter by the text of a release which I sent out on Sunday urging a full review of the degree of political influence which has been exercised in the past in tax cases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT TO JOINT RESOLUTION TERMINATING STATE OF WAR BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND GERMANY.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I suppose the Senator from Wisconsin in his remarks referred to the publicity which has come to him as a result of the action of the committee. The senior Senator from Wisconsin and I have had vigorous differences in this body, but I am particularly pleased to say that we have not had very many differences in the Foreign Relations Committee. The Senator is an honorable man, and the attacks which have been made upon him are most regrettable.

Mr WILEY Did I correctly state the fact when I said the Wiley amendment was voted down and another amendment was placed before the committee by a Democratic member, which was called a committee amendment and which was adopted? The distinguished Senator joined me in voting for it.

Mr McMAHON I think the Senator states the record accurately. There was a difference of opinion in the Senate in connection with the cessation of the war with Germany

I invite attention to the fact that the Alien Property Custodian threw open the door with respect to alien property, and it was only natural that a citizen who felt himself aggrieved should ask to have his case tried in court even after he had signed a release. Apparently there is a great difference of opinion in this body. It is most essential that we get through Congress at this session a declaration of the cessation of hostilities with Germany But I want to say, in justice to the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr WILEY], that his interest in the matter as he represented it to the committee, and as I know is true, came out of the solicitation of an eminent citizen of his State, Mr Leo T Crowley, former Alien Property Custodian, who asked the Senator to sponsor a proposal which he viewed as one which would correct an injustice which was done in his administration. To impute to the Senator from Wisconsin or to any other Member of the committee any other motive than to try to right a wrong, is, I think, to pervert the record

It may be that it should be the subject of a private bill. There are some who hold to that opinion. But I say to the Senator again that there is no more honorable Member of this body than is the senior Senator from Wisconsin. I do not always agree with him, as is to be expected of Senators on opposite sides of the aisle, but he is as decent and honorable a man as I know.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. There is a page in the history of this matter which throws a little light on the subject Before I went to San Francisco as one of the two Republican Senators assigned to represent the Government in connection with the signing of the Japanese Treaty, my amendment was voted down, and at my instance a resolution was brought to the floor of the Senate. In the interim, two weeks, something came up in committee. I do not know just what it was, but the record shows that the committee thought it advisable not to comply with the direction which was given, but to hold the matter in abeyance until Senators came back from San Francisco. The minutes show that we discussed what took place, and that my amendment was defeated.

Then the committee thought it advisable to reconsider the whole matter. I did not make the motion. A fellow Democratic Senator, an honorable Senator, made the motion, and it was reconsidered.

Then what took place? Instead of my amendment being adopted, another amendment was offered by a fellow Senator, who is a Democrat, and it was adopted

Mr McMAHON. I am sure the Senator would be willing to say that it was not the senior Senator from Connecticut who offered the amendment, would he not?

Mr WILEY. It was not the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr President, who is familiar with what I have been recounting? The Department of Justice is. But for some reason or other they want to smear me, as they come out in the press referring to "the Wiley amendment" I have no apology. In the statement I have prepared and which has been ordered to be printed in the Appendix, I have asked certain questions of the Alien Property Custodian which I want my fellow Senators to read. I know this thing is on the skids. I know orders have gone out to get rid of it We can appropriate billions to do justice to Germans in Europe, but we cannot do justice to an American of German descent who was considered sufficiently American, after the Government had taken over these properties, to operate them. Because the stock interest he had in an American corporation was in trust for children, the squeeze was put on. Senators know how war squeezes things, and they know the wrongs that are done But when we are trying to right wrongs in Germany, and spend a billion dollars a year over there, we cannot look after our own.

It would be extremely important to find out who is interested in getting this stock. It is valuable. It was very valuable when the Government took the money out of the corporate treasury to liquidate the stock that was owned by the children. Since then it has grown more valuable, and it is estimated that this great institution, the Office of the Alien Property Custodian, which pays out salaries of $75,000 a year, $50,000, and so on, to operate certain corporations, is in control of $1,000,000,000 worth of property, including patents.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr McFARLAND. I have a very high regard for the Senator from Wisconsin, and I do not believe he would sponsor or support an amendment which he did not think was right. I wish to ask him, however, whether hearings were had on the amendment before the committee.

Mr. WILEY. To my best recollection, there was some kind of a hearing, was there not?

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator is asking me for my recollection, the Justice Department sent some representatives here, but I believe that everything that was presented for Mr. Crowley, as sponsor of the amendment, was in writing.

Mr. WILEY. The representatives of the Justice Department did appear, and they suggested, among other things, that there should be a private bill, and I would like to have that in the RECORD, because if this matter is laid aside, if there is enough iron left in the men who sponsored this new amendment, I will join with them to see that an American citizen has his day in court, especially the children of an American citizen, who own this stock

Mr. McFARLAND Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILEY Let me answer the question. There may have been hearings after I left for San Francisco. But Mr. Crowley wrote a long letter, which is a part of my statement, telling the story. There is no more honorable man than Mr. Crowley. I never knew him personally in any real sense. He is a prominent Democrat, one of the great leaders of the Democratic Party in this country, a man who was at the head of the alien property office, who came into my office and said, "I never was satisfied that we had on our side the law or the facts. I want to know, Senator, if you will introduce this amendment." I said, "Mr. Crowley, if you will write me a letter and give me the facts, I will consider it. Give me the amendment"

I then took the matter up with the committee and presented the facts, and the committee—well, they voted down my amendment Then in committee another amendment was offered and was adopted. It was not my amendment. It came from a Democrat, and the record is clear on that. I am not mentioning the name of the one who offered it, it is not important, except that it is about the first time since I have been a Member of the Senate, now almost 13 years, that I have had the experience, though other Senators have had it, that when we cross some of the big-wigs downtown, or when we cross a money interest, they start sicking their hirelings on us—yes; their hirelings.

Then what happened? People read the newspapers, and we are smeared. They get an idea about us. Yes—

> Who steals my purse steals trash; • • •
> But he that filches from me my good name
> Robs me of that which not enriches him,
> And makes me poor indeed.

I have stated the procedure.

Just one closing remark. I have no apology to make. Let Senators read Leo Crowley's letter, the letter of a man decorated by the Pope, a man so highly regarded that he is president of the Milwaukee Railroad, a man who feels that an injustice was done to American citizens, not to Germans. Get that straight, my newspaper friends, who are supposed to report the truth and the facts. When he says what the facts are, is it not my obligation, when he comes to me, to try to see that justice is done—yes; that the parties really have their day in court, without the pressures of war and the hatreds of war? We can go into foreign lands, we are voting $7,000,000,000 for mutual aid to other countries, but we cannot help Americans.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] said to me the other day, "We cannot even get enough money for Alaska, a part of our own country, to do what is necessary, but we can vote billions of dollars for use abroad."

Mr. President, all the amendment amounts to is an effort to see that Americans may have their day in court. I say the amendment has justice back of it. It is right. But reject it, and then we will see what happens I trust those who voted for it will have the guts to introduce a private bill so that the Halbach children will have their day in court Then we will encounter the opposition again, and perhaps we can smoke out those who have their slimy hands trying to take from these children this property so that they can control in a monopolistic way the output of the property, and all other products they now control.

I now yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I observe, from what the distinguished Senator has said, that the hearings on this amendment were very meager at the best. There has obviously developed serious opposition on the floor of the Senate to the amendment, and whether it has merit or not could easily be determined by full and complete hearings.

Enactment of the joint resolution terminating hostilities with Germany is considered to be important at this time, and as the distinguished Senator has said he is going to leave, I wonder if he would have any objection to the amendment being dropped from the joint resolution in order that the joint resolution might be passed promptly.

Mr. WILEY. My answer to that is that it is not my amendment. I have no right to say "Yes." I still say that the amendment is proper. But vote it down, if that is what the Senate desires to do I told the committee it could do that. It voted my amendment down. Those are the simple facts. So far as I am personally concerned I stated—and the record so shows it—that the important thing was the resolution terminating the war with Germany. But, as the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] has stated, the committee opened up the subject itself. Why should we not do justice to American citizens when we are trying to do justice to German citizens?

Mr. McFARLAND Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin a further question. He said that he was about to leave Washington for Europe. Would the Senator have any objection to the amendment being disposed of in his absence?

Mr. WILEY. I could have no objection. I am not raising objection. I am trying to place before the country the facts, because of a smear campaign. We in the Foreign Relations Committee had enough intestinal fortitude to attach to the resolution this amendment, which is just and proper. I am not one who is going to lie down and say that we were wrong, no matter if all the columnists, editorial writers, and newspapermen contend to the contrary. It is time for Senators to alert themselves to the fact that the fourth estate is a powerful instrument. It is a powerful instrument for righteousness when it is righteously conducted But sometimes some of its members become instrumentalities for evil. I must tell the Senate the experience I had Some newspapermen called me and asked, "Are these the facts?"

I said, "No; the facts are thus and so"

So the story was not published. However, others simply took what had been fed to them, as one Senator expressed it, by the Justice Department. They took its as gospel That is the way they run the show. I am giving notice that they are not going to run me.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am sure of that. My only point is this. Some of us are not members of the committee. Our only means of learning the facts about this situation is information elicited during committee hearings. Complete hearings have not been held on this subject. I am sure that if the Senator from Wisconsin or any other Senator were interested in introducing a bill, a more complete hearing could be held, the question could be gone into fully, and a determination made as to what was right However, when an amendment comes before us in this fashion, I do not think it is fair to require those of us who did not even have the benefit of the discussion in executive session to pass upon it I was hopeful that perhaps the Senate might prefer to refer the joint resolution back to the committee, so that the amendment could be eliminated

Mr CHAVEZ. Mr President, I think the question is simple. I believe there would be no objection whatsoever to passing the joint resolution as originally introduced. It had one purpose, and that was to end the war between the United States and Germany. If there are any merits in the amendment, and I do not say that there may not be, an amendment attached to a joint resolution which would end the war should come before this body only after proper hearing. The amendment has nothing whatever to do with the ending of the war between Germany and the United States. The amendment has to do only with the question of whether or not a private entity or person of German descent has a claim against the United States. What has that to do with the ending of the war? There might be a thousand claims against the United

States, but that has nothing to do with the purposes of the original joint resolution, which is brief and simple, and to which there is no objection.

I assure the Senate that if an effort is made to pass the joint resolution with the amendment attached to it, such effort will be resisted. I do not think it would be fair to the United States not to resist the amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I agree with my good friend from New Mexico that it would be most unfair to bring the joint resolution up with this amendment as a part of it. The text almost certainly would be misunderstood by the West German government and by the German people; and the vote upon the joint resolution in its present amended form would be misunderstood by the German people and might be made the subject of unfair propaganda by the East German government. The question involved in the amendment should be disposed of by means of a private bill In my honest opinion such an amendment should not have been attached to the joint resolution It has nothing whatever to do with the subject matter of the joint resolution.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the point I am trying to make. The amendment is in the interest of a private entity or private person The claim may be perfectly proper, although I have my doubts as to whether the individual in question has any rights whatsoever. However, the amendment has nothing to do with the joint resolution, which has for its purpose ending the war between Germany and the United States. I am sure that there would be no objection to the joint resolution as it passed the House and came to the Senate I think the Senator from New York and I objected most strenuously to letting the joint resolution come up for consideration on the call of the calendar the other day. I hope that in the interest of the country the committee will agree to the deletion of the amendment in question, and let the joint resolution ending the war with the German Government pass—and the sooner the better.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I think the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico was fully answered by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMahon] a few minutes ago, so I will not indulge in any reply

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. WILEY. I yield to the senior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin, in commenting upon the proposal of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez], that it would certainly be agreeable to me, as one member of the committee, to strike out all reference to the Alien Property Custodian and leave the joint resolution in the form in which it passed the House.

I am one of those who believes that it is not only necessary for public officials to be right, but to seem to be right. If there is a controversy here which needs more testimony and more hearings, that result can be accomplished through the introduction of a private bill, in order that the subject may be fully explored and debated. The Senator from Wisconsin has stated that it would be interesting to see who was maneuvering or negotiating to buy the stock of this company. I know nothing about that. However, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I see no reason under heaven why any property which the Government has seized, to which it has title, and which is of great value, should not be sold at public auction to the highest bidder.

Mr. WILEY. I agree.

Mr. McMAHON In that way there will be no opportunity for "monkey business." I think that is the way the matter ought to be handled.

Mr WILEY. Mr President, my purpose was not to precipitate any argument. I merely wished to have the Record show the facts I realize that for weeks and months people will write to me asking for an explanation I now have the record, and I challenge anyone to go to the Foreign Relations Committee and read the record and see if what I have said is not 100 percent correct and in accordance with the record.

Mr CHAVEZ Mr President, will the Senator yield to me? I made the statement just previous to the statement of the senior Senator from Connecticut, and I should like to clear up one matter.

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ I do not doubt the word of the Senator from Wisconsin. If he says that he has made the record, so far as I am concerned it is correct

Mr WILEY I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr CHAVEZ However, I doubt the propriety of attaching a personal amendment, a collection amendment, or an amendment which affects the rights of a corporation or a private citizen to a resolution which would end a war between two countries. That is all I have in mind.

Mr WILEY. I understand perfectly the position of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. He made it clear in his first statement I answered it, and I believe the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMahon] answered it very clearly when he called attention to the fact that the House had opened the door.

Furthermore, I know of no greater duty that the Senate could perform than to see to it that American citizens get justice

We are always looking after the interests of foreigners We should also see that American citizens get their day in court.

I will answer the question of the majority leader. If I were present, of course, I would vote to sustain the action of the Committee on Foreign Relations. In my opinion, the Foreign Relations Committee was amply advised It was advised by the State Department They had the letter which was attached to my statement. It gave all the facts. It showed that the man in charge felt that his own conscience was troubled about what was done by his Government in exercising its power over American citizens in wartime. Oh, it is said there was no duress and no coercion, because a settlement was made. Well, that is the issue. It seems to me that when the rights of children are involved, the only way justice can be done is by being given this opportunity.

That is all I have to say.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr McFARLAND. I should like very much to see the joint resolution passed promptly without the amendment. I do not think that it can be passed with the amendment. Would the Senator have any objection to having the joint resolution called up now and disposed of?

Mr SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Arizona does not intend at the present time to call up the joint resolution, does he? I would say most respectfully that I told several Members on this side of the aisle that there would be no further important business tonight I did so because I thought the mutual security bill would be under consideration. I would not like to be in the position of having the joint resolution taken up tonight If the majority leader would give us 12 hours' notice it would be agreeable

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know when we will be able to dispose of it if we do not dispose of it tonight. I am anxious to pass it when we have the opportunity. I thought that a separate bill could be introduced covering the subject matter of the amendment which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley] has been discussing, and meanwhile we could delete the amendment and go ahead and pass the joint resolution to which I know of no objection. Of course, I am not going to take the joint resolution up now if there is to be any objection. I hoped we could get the joint resolution passed now because its enactment is important to our relations with the people of Germany. I am afraid they will misunderstand why enactment of such a simple resolution should be so long delayed.

Mr. WILEY. I want the Record to show that I did not object. I have no objection to taking it up. I know what is on the skids. I know it definitely I felt the impact of the push all through the United States.

Mr McFARLAND. I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin understands that I have nothing but the highest regard for him. I have no feelings about the amendment and know nothing about it. I have, however, a duty with respect to the enactment of the joint resolution ending hostilities and I think it is unfortunate that it has been delayed this long.

Mr. WILEY. I am very grateful for the expression of the Senator from Arizona. If everyone were so kind life would be much sweeter.

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 3669) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H R. 3669) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act; that all after the enacting clause be stricken out and the text of the bill (S. 1347) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and for other purposes, be substituted therefor; that the House bill, as amended, be passed; that the title be amended to conform to the text; that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House thereon; and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—it is my understanding that the Senate passed its bill by a voice vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The House passed another bill, which is different from the Senate bill. Therefore, the only way in which to get the two bills to conference is by taking the action which the Senator from Minnesota suggests.

Mr. HUMPHREY That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Minnesota is not suggesting that we do anything different from what we did on Monday when we passed the Senate bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. There are two separate bills. This is the only way in which we can handle it in conference, in order to get the two bills together and iron out the differences between them.

Mr SALTONSTALL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is agreed to, and the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the Senate: Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MORSE, and Mr IVES.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1946—WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion to reconsider the vote by which was passed the bill (S. 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the motion to reconsider is withdrawn.

THE PROBLEM OF INFLATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement of my own with reference to inflation. I shall submit the statement tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ALLOCATION OF STEEL FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOLS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the other day I discussed on the floor of the Senate the matter of the allocations of steel by the National Production Authority and the effect such allocations are having upon the educational system of the United States.

Since that time I have requested additional information from various agencies of the Federal Government, and I have made particular efforts to obtain some information about the amount of steel which is going into the export trade and the purpose for which that steel is being used overseas. I think it is one thing if the steel being exported from our country is going directly into the mutual-defense program. However, I have received information that certain materials being exported from our country are going into other types of activities, including the construction of buildings, hotels, and resorts which may not fit into the defense program. Unless that situation is corrected, I do not believe that steel for such purposes should be exported from the United States at a time when our public schools are unable to take care of their needs in connection with the education of the children, the future citizens of our country.

At this time I wish to read a letter which I have received from a school district in California. The letter is typical of a large number of letters which I have received, and in no sense is the letter out of the ordinary:

ACALANES UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Lafayette, Calif., October 11, 1951

The Honorable WILLIAM KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C.

DEAR MR. KNOWLAND. We are writing you for help in connection with our school-building problem

Our district includes the Orinda, Lafayette, and Walnut Creek areas of Contra Costa County which you know are growing at a tremendous rate Ever since the end of World War II, we have been engaged in a long-range planning program intended to house our students as they enroll in ever-increasing numbers. Our average daily attendance this year will be 277 percent of what it was in 1945. Our studies show us that within 5 years it will be over 600 percent of the 1945 figures.

Last year we started construction of a second high school in our district. Because of the rapid rise in prices it was necessary to postpone part of the construction until this fiscal year, when additional funds were available. Our architect has revised the plans, taking out much steel. Now we have funds and have received a very favorable bid but cannot proceed because of NPA restrictions. On September 11, 1951, we sent an air-mail letter of application and forms to Washington. Several weeks later we received a card saying our application had been received on October 3, and giving us Government Control No. 4571, but no authorization to proceed or allotment of material. We have but 30 days in which to sign a contract with our bidder, and if construction is not started within a short time, the necessary classrooms will not be available next September.

We are fully cognizant of the defense effort, but we also know that an extremely small proportion of critical materials, especially steel, is being allocated to school construction. We do not believe that citizens are going to sit idly by and watch these materials being used for less important construction than our public schools.

As individuals and as a school board representing the people of our communities, we ask you as our Representative in Washington to take whatever steps are necessary immediately to the end that we may furnish school facilities for our children.

Sincerely yours,

Acalanes Union High School District Board of Trustees, By Neil M. Parsons, Secretary; W. B. Freeman, Lafayette; M H. Stanley, Lafayette; R C. Hall, Orinda; J F. Chaddock, Walnut Creek; Carl Newbury, Walnut Creek.

Mr President, in conclusion, I merely wish to say that the National Production Authority has announced a substantial reduction in the allocation of steel for the first quarter of the next year; and in my judgment, that will work a great hardship, not only in the State of California, which has had very rapid growth, but also in most of the other States. In that connection, statements have been made by the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from Michigan, and a number of other Senators.

I believe that the executive branch of the Government has the responsibility of resurveying the allocations for the public educational system of the Nation, and of seeing to it that the public school system is not handicapped in that connection, and that the children, who will be the citizens of tomorrow, are not deprived of fair educational facilities

Mr HUMPHREY Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from California. He has done a great service today by bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate again

As the Senator from California knows, the House Committee on Education and Labor is now holding hearings on this very matter.

Over the period of the last 2 months, I have taken considerable time to look into this question. The situation not only is becoming critical generally, but it is at a critical state insofar as the educational system of the Nation is concerned. Many areas in our country are suffering severely because of the very sharp cuts in the allocation of structural steel, in particular, which are being imposed on the educational facilities.

Likewise I can bear out the statement the Senator from California has made in regard to the vast quantities of steel, including structural steel, which are going into nonmilitary, nonsecurity, and nonessential items in other countries, after that steel is exported from the United States. I believe something should be done about that situation.

Therefore, it is my purpose, if I may do so at this time, to submit a Senate resolution expressing the sentiment of

this body, in line with the expressions of sentiment which have been made by Senator after Senator. The resolution expresses the sincere conviction of the Senate that this entire program should be reevaluated; that a careful scrutiny should be made of the allocations of steel, particularly the allocations of structural steel; and that the agencies of the Government should give careful consideration to the needs of the educational establishments of the Nation.

I should like to submit the resolution at this time, and to have the resolution considered at this time, if the Senator from California will yield for that purpose.

Mr KNOWLAND I am glad to have that done, because I think it is high time that this matter was brought to the attention of the executive branch of the Government After all, those of us who serve in the Congress are the representatives of the people of the 48 States We represent them in a far more direct way than one who holds a position of executive responsibility in the Government can possibly do. I do not say that by way of criticism However, our country is so vast in extent that no one man, no matter how wise he is, holding a position of executive responsibility, can possibly have the contact with the dire needs of the local groups throughout the 48 States that the Members of the House of Representatives and the Members of the Senate can have. So I think we have the obligation of making our views known to the executive branch of the Government

Mr HUMPHREY Mr President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr KNOWLAND I yield.

Mr HUMPHREY. I have also covered in the resolution the allocation of steel for hospitals, because the hospitals are encountering the same problem. However, for this purpose I emphasize that the major problem today is in respect to the allocation of steel for both public schools and parochial schools, which are suffering severely in that connection.

Mr President, I now submit the resolution on behalf of myself, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], and the Senator from California [Mr KNOWLAND], and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration I should like to read the resolution at this time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not think we should consider a resolution now without notice to the membership, no matter how meritorious the resolution may be.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to read the resolution before the Senator from Arizona states his objection.

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly. Of course I do not wish to object to the reading of the resolution. Furthermore, I do not wish to have to object to the present consideration of the resolution. However, I think it is only fair that notice be had by the other Members of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the health and education of the American people is vital to the strength of this nation,

Whereas the health and education of the American people has a direct relationship to our military strength and economic productivity,

Whereas there is a demonstrated need for additional schools and hospitals,

Whereas an adequate and dependable supply of steel, aluminum, and copper are critical items in the programs to alleviate existing hospital and school inadequacies,

Whereas the amounts of steel, copper, and aluminum necessary to alleviate such existing inadequacies have not been allocated in sufficient quantity or otherwise made available for the construction of hospital and educational facilities Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the National Production Authority and the Defense Production Administration should allocate steel, copper, and aluminum in such manner as to provide a sufficient quantity of such metals and products fabricated from such metals for the construction of and additions to schools and hospitals as required to protect the health and educational standards of the Nation.

That is my resolution. I believe it expresses what has been said on this floor by practically every Senator who has addressed himself to his local problems I know the resolution represents the considered judgment of Senator after Senator who has called me on the telephone during the last week or who has written to me about this matter.

So I do not believe it is improper for me to request the present consideration of the resolution, inasmuch as I believe it expresses the views which Senators have repeatedly stated on this floor during the past month

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator submits the resolution at this time, it will be received and appropriately referred Unanimous consent would be required in order to have the resolution considered at this time

Mr. HUMPHREY Mr President, I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution I am perfectly willing to discuss this matter with my colleagues; I do not wish to do anything which apparently would be contrary to the wishes of my colleagues

However, the record is filled with statement after statement by Senator after Senator in regard to this very matter.

Mr McFARLAND Mr President, I think that without question the objective of the resolution is meritorious. The only point is that as a matter of procedure at this time, when only a few Senators are on the floor, and when assurance was given that no new matter would be brought up, I do not believe we should consider the resolution.

Mr KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder whether it would be satisfactory to have the resolution lie on the table, rather than be referred to a committee. If the resolution lies on the table, perhaps in the proceedings tomorrow we can find a lull during which the resolution can be considered.

After the matter has been explained, I believe the Senate will be glad to act upon the resolution, and will not object to its consideration; and in the meantime the resolution can be printed and can lie on the table.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I shall not object to that proposal Of course, I could not object to it even if I wished to, for the Senator from Minnesota has that right.

I merely wish to say that personally I believe it is a good practice for resolutions to be considered by the appropriate committees. Proposals for the consideration of such matters without reference to committees place an undue responsibility upon the majority leader and the minority leader

Of course, I shall not object to having the resolution printed and lie on the table

Mr. HUMPHREY Mr President, I desire to say to the majority leader that I know of his deep interest in this subject. We discussed it earlier, and I realize that he is asking for what is an appropriate procedure Therefore, Mr. President, I send the resolution to the desk, and I ask that it be printed and lie on the table, so that it can be called up later, after adequate discussion, so that everyone may know of its contents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will lie on the table

Mr KNOWLAND Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry

The PRESIDING OFFICER The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND The resolution will be printed, will it not, under that order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be printed under the rule

The resolution (S. Res 225) submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MOODY, and Mr KNOWLAND) was received and ordered to lie on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND BY THE AIR FORCE TO THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

Mr ELLENDER. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon I discussed with the majority and minority leaders Senate bill 1912, calendar No 910, with a view to asking unanimous consent for its consideration this afternoon

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by its title

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK A bill (S. 1912) to provide for conveyance of certain land to the city of New Orleans.

Mr. ELLENDER Mr President, the bill is purely of local character It provides for the transfer by the Secretary of the Air Force of a certain tract of land to the city of New Orleans The city of New Orleans purchased this property through condemnation proceedings during World War II, and put up all the money As the report shows, through an oversight, the original plan to convey the property back to the city of New Orleans was not consummated. Because of certain subsequent legislation which was enacted in 1948 the enactment of this bill is necessary in order to make it possible for this land to be transferred to the city.

The bill received unanimous approval, I understand, by the Committee on

Armed Services, and I also understand that the bill was discussed with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who usually objects to transfers of this character.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a few questions?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This bill came before the Committee on Armed Services, did it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. At the request of the Senator from Louisiana, it was considered and passed around, so that each individual Member had an opportunity of reading it. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Oregon has seen it and has signed the report, has he not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is reported unanimously, is it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Am I correct in my understanding that no money is involved?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is by reason of the fact that the city of New Orleans paid for this land, is it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The land had to be taken by the Federal Government, otherwise it could not have been used during World War II. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have discussed the matter with the Program Committee on the Republican side, and I know of no objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to have the bill considered so that it can be passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So far as I am concerned, as acting minority leader, I have no objection

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1912) which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment in line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "Defense" and insert "the Air Force", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized and directed to convey to the city of New Orleans, without consideration, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all land acquired by the United States, with funds made available by the city of New Orleans, for the purposes of expansion of and removal of flight hazards at Moisant International Airport, consisting of three hundred seventy-six and three one-hundredths acres, more or less.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the bill having been passed, I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the bill, as contained in the report (No. 959), together with excerpts from a letter written by the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the explanation and excerpts from the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS FURNISHED ALL FUNDS FOR THE ACQUISITION

During World War II it was apparent that the International Airport at New Orleans would require expansion. It was difficult, however, for the city to secure the land promptly enough to meet the emergency conditions. As a consequence of this situation, and in view of the interest of the then Air Corps in the expansion of this facility, the Under Secretary of War arranged to acquire the land by condemnation, the payment to be made by funds made available for the purpose by the city of New Orleans.

This property was to be turned over to the city of New Orleans after the Government had acquired it, and in return for this conveyance the city of New Orleans was to lease the property to the United States for a nominal consideration of $1 per year.

THE ORIGINAL PLAN TO CONVEY THE PROPERTY TO THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS WAS NOT CARRIED OUT THROUGH OVERSIGHT

Although payment for the property was made by funds belonging to the city of New Orleans, with the Federal Government acting as a sort of agent, the property was not subsequently conveyed to the city of New Orleans in accordance with the original plan. It appears that this deviation from the original plan was the result of oversight incident to the heavy pressure of business during the wartime emergency, and the fact that the Federal Government actually was using the airport.

THE SUBSEQUENT ENACTMENT OF THE SURPLUS AIRPORTS ACT IN 1948 MAKES THIS LEGISLATION NECESSARY

In 1950 the property was turned over to the General Services Administration for disposition as surplus. The Department of Defense was the disposal agency. In attempting to convey the property to the city of New Orleans under the Surplus Property Act, it was found that the city of New Orleans was unwilling to accept the conveyance with the numerous restrictions which in the meantime had been imposed by the amendments to the Surplus Property Act contained in the Surplus Airports Act enacted in 1948. Furthermore, neither the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, the Secretary of the Air Force, nor the Secretary of the Navy is willing to make a finding that these restrictions should be set aside, as is authorized under the law

As a result of the above circumstances, special legislation is required to convey the property to the city of New Orleans.

SUMMARY

This real estate was bought from funds made available by the city of New Orleans. No Federal funds were expended

The acquisition was for the purpose of expansion, and removal of flight hazards, at the International Airport.

The Surplus Airports Act, with its numerous restrictions as to subsequent use of surplus airports, was enacted several years after the original agreement between the city of New Orleans and the Federal Government was made.

It therefore appears that the Federal Government has a clear moral obligation to convey this property to the city of New Orleans in accordance with the original agreement, as the bill provides.

The Department of Defense recommends the legislation, as is indicated by the following letter to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force:

* * * * *

The city of New Orleans has informed the Civil Aeronautics Administration that it will not accept a conveyance of the property with the restrictions and reservations required by Public Law 289, Eightieth Congress. Under the provisions of Public Law 289, Eightieth Congress, a conveyance of these lands to the city of New Orleans could not be made free of restrictions, conditions, or reservations, as contemplated by this proposed legislation, unless upon a determination of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Navy, that such conveyance is necessary to protect or advance the interests of the United States in civil aviation or for the national defense.

The appropriate authorities have not found the interests to warrant the making of the determination required by Public Law 289, Eightieth Congress. Therefore, in order to effect a conveyance of the unrestricted title in the described lands to the city of New Orleans, and thus fulfill a moral obligation, it is necessary that the proposed legislation be enacted.

RAILROAD RATES IN THE SOUTHERN STATES

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, during the 4 years from 1941 through 1944 I had the privilege of serving as a member of a committee of the southern governors conference which was handling the various railroad rate cases brought by the southern governors before the Interstate Commerce Commission in the effort to bring about for the South railroad rates which would be as low as the rates prevailing in the northeastern part of our Nation and would tend to bring about an equitable rail rate structure for the Nation as a whole. The committee was appointed by former Gov. Frank Dixon, of Alabama, who was then the chairman of the southern governors conference Members of the committee were Gov. Prentice Cooper, of Tennessee, as chairman, and the late Governor and Senator J. Melvile Broughton, of North Carolina, and myself. The effort had been begun during the term of my predecessor, the late Gov. Fred P. Cone, of Florida, and incidentally during the term of the present distinguished occupant of the chair, the then Governor of North Carolina, now the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. The effort was continued energetically during the terms of all the southern governors who have served since 1939 until final victory had been attained. The Florida Railroad Commission was extremely active and effective in these rate cases as were the similar public bodies from other Southern States and various unofficial business groups, such as the traffic bureaus of State chambers of commerce and various local chambers of commerce and various industrial groups.

The case of greatest importance was the class rate investigation, 1939, in which the early findings and decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission were affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States on May 12, 1947, in the case of New York against United

States, reported at Three Hundred and Thirty-first United States Code, page 284. More recent orders by the Interstate Commerce Commission accomplishing the equalization of freight rates were issued by the ICC on July 26, 1951. While the successful termination of the Class Rate case means much to all of the South and to the West, it means more to the State of Florida than to other Southern States because of the fact that much of the railroad traffic in Florida was subject not only to the high southern class rate structure, which was 37 7 percent higher than the scale in the Northern States east of the Mississippi River, but was also subject to an additional 15 percent charge which was known as the Florida arbitrary of 1928. Thus Florida has been at a greater disadvantage in the matter of freight rates than any other Southern State

Because of the great importance of this matter, not only to my State, but to all Southern and Western States, and, I believe, to the entire Nation, and because of the successful conclusion of this long effort begun in 1939, I desire to incorporate in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the most accurate summary of the whole matter which I have found, which is a newspaper article appearing in the Jacksonville Journal of August 27, based upon a formal statement issued by the Jacksonville Freight Traffic Bureau. The article is entitled "Interstate Commerce Decision Recognizes State's Importance," and I ask that it be incorporated in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE DECISION RECOGNIZES STATE'S IMPORTANCE

The recent decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the proceeding known as the Class Rate Investigation, 1939, marks an important milestone in the economic and industrial development of the South and particularly of Florida

The decision recognizes the transition of Florida from a pioneer State "to one of the important States of the Union," said a statement today by the Jacksonville Freight Traffic Bureau

The Interstate Commerce Commission prescribed a new uniform scale of freight-class rates for application on all railroads east of the Rocky Mountains, including Florida. The new uniform class rate scale and a uniform classification is required by the Commission's order to be published and effective within 4 months

In July 1939, the Interstate Commerce Commission, at the urging of governors and the railroad commissions of Southern and Western States, instituted an investigation into the freight-class rates and classification ratings for the transportation of property by railroad in the various rate territories east of the Rockies.

When that investigation was instituted the southern class rate scale was 37 7 percent higher than the scale in the Northern States On traffic to and from Florida 15 percent was added to the southern scale for the hauls within the State of Florida south of the Jacksonville-River Junction line The addition of these 15-percent arbitraries in 1928 had put the Florida class rate level on a plateau above the southern level and the southern level in turn was on a plateau of 37.7 percent above the northern level. Thus Florida had a greater degree of disadvantage in class rates than any other Southern State

"The Florida Railroad Commission, the Governor of the State of Florida, the University of Florida, and groups of shippers in the major cities of Miami, Tampa, St Petersburg, and Jacksonville took an active and vigorous part in the class-rate investigation from its inception," the Freight Bureau's statement said

"Commissioner Jerry W Carter of the Florida Railroad Commission, representing a former governor of Florida, was particularly active in the meetings of the southern and western governors and State commissions in pushing forward this major investigation into the relative levels of class rates in the North, South, and West

"Former Gov SPESSARD L HOLLAND, now senior United States Senator from Florida, took an active interest in the proceeding and testified, as Florida's foremost witness at one of the large hearings before the Interstate Commerce Commission in Indianapolis, Ind

"The evidence for the State of Florida showed that when the 15 percent arbitraries were added to the class rates for hauls to and from Florida, Florida was a pioneer State with low traffic density, that, in the intervening years, Florida had become one of the foremost States of the Union in number of tons of rail freight originated and terminated in Florida, and that the Florida Peninsula is no longer an area of light traffic density These facts are recited in the first report of the commission The commission further found that Florida's rail tonnage—originated exceeded that of New Jersey or Maryland, the States of Georgia and South Carolina combined, and the States of North Carolina and Mississippi combined. In tons of rail freight terminated, the commission's report showed that Florida exceeded the States of Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina or Mississippi

"The first report of the commission was rendered May 15, 1945 In that report the commission prescribed a uniform class scale for territory east of the Rocky Mountains. In order to give the carriers an opportunity to construct a new uniform classification the commission ordered an interim revision downward in the class rates in southern territory and an increase in the class rates in northern territory However, the railroads did not at that time remove the Florida class rate arbitraries

"The Commission's findings in the first or interim report were affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States in *New York* v *United States* (331 U S 284), on May 12, 1947 In the meantime, various efforts had been made to push forward the work of revising the uniform classification. Various general increases were made in all class rates since 1945

"These several general increases were added not only to the southern scale of class rates but also to the Florida arbitraries, so that the effect of the Florida arbitraries has been pyramided as each of the general increases was added

"The new uniform class rate scale places the South on the same level as the North; and removes the Florida arbitraries

"After the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, upholding the Commission's findings in the class rate investigation, chambers of commerce in cities and towns throughout the South and in Florida increased their active campaigns for the locations of new industries. The public had been assured by the Interstate Commerce Commission's decision in the Class Rate case that, sooner or later there would be equality in class rates between the North, South, and West.

"Even before this latest decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission, manufacturers seeking a new location were encouraged to select a point in the South, including Florida, with the assurance that such new industries would not be hampered and discriminated against in the level of freight class rates on their products.

"In the past few years there has been a tremendous increase in the number of manufacturing plants within the South and within the State of Florida While there are many economic factors which enter into the selection of a site for new industries, it is an established fact that the level of freight rates for in-bound materials and out-bound products has a very important bearing upon the location of a new plant

"Since the class-rate decision of 1945 the railroads of the South, and particularly in Florida, have been active in promoting and encouraging the location of new industries on their lines They have been successful to a marked degree This widespread growth of manufacturing plants has had an important effect upon the entire economy of the South

"Some years ago southern raw materials were shipped into the North to manufacturing plants, and the manufactured products were shipped to all parts of the country, and back into the South Most of the wealth created by the manufacturing processes stayed in the North That condition has been changed by the location of thousands of new industries in the South The wealth, created by the use of southern raw materials, and making them into goods in the South, has increased our standards of living and per capita wealth "

The victory in this class-rate investigation is of great economic importance to the South and particularly to Florida Former Governor Holland, Jerry W Carter, Richard Mack, present chairman, and Wilbur King, members of the Florida commission and its staff, and the nonprofit freight traffic bureaus of Miami, Tampa, St Petersburg, and Jacksonville, who fought this long fight with vigor and persistence, should be commended for their valued services to the public

THE ROLE WHICH ATOMIC ENERGY CAN AND SHOULD PLAY IN THE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr McMAHON Mr President, on September 18 of this year I made some remarks to the Members of the Senate on the subject of atomic weapons and the national defense, and, pursuant to making those remarks I introduced in the Senate, and Representative DURHAM introduced in the House, a concurrent resolution which would put Congress on record as favoring an all-out program for the expansion of atomic energy Because of the adjournment rush, I offered a substitute to the joint committee today which, instead of calling upon the Senate and the House to go on record, calls upon the joint committee to request the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense to transmit to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on January 3, 1952, a definite and concrete report on maximizing the role which atomic energy can and should play in the defense of the United States.

Mr President, the resolution was adopted unanimously today by the Joint Committee and will be sent to the Department of Defense and to the Atomic Energy Commission immediately. I wish to commend the committee for the action which it has taken, which I believe is in the interest of the security of the

United States. I offer for printing in the RECORD at this point the resolution to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy hereby requests the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense (after appropriate consultation with other agencies) to jointly transmit to the Joint Committee by January 3, 1952, a definite and concrete report on maximizing the role which atomic energy can and should play in the defense of the United States, including estimates of the amounts of money required, the specific extent and type of new facilities estimated to be required, the priorities in materials and manpower involved, the probable impact upon other defense projects and the national economy as a whole, and the joint views of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense as to the precise program which should be carried out in the atomic energy field.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that after we dispose of the pending business, we shall take up House Joint Resolution 289, to terminate the state of war between the United States and Germany. The resolution has been discussed today.

We hope, Mr. President, that we are nearing the end of this session. If I have been asked once, I have been asked a thousand times whether we are going to get away on next Saturday. I am unable to answer that question at this time, but I do desire to give notice that if it does appear, after developments tomorrow, that there is a possibility that we can get away this week, it may be necessary for us to hold a night session, and I want Senators to be prepared on short notice to remain.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to the Senator that I am sure there will be no one on this side of the aisle who would object to night sessions on Thursday and Friday if it will help us to bring the session to a close on Saturday night. I agree that the Senator cannot give us any indication as to whether we can or cannot get away, until the conferees on the tax bill have reported.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand the Appropriations Committee is going to mark up in the morning the supplemental appropriation bill, and that will lie over until the next day. I am hopeful that we can iron everything out better than we have anticipated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator another question. A number of new bills have come to the calendar. I heard that the Senator from Arizona planned to have a call of the calendar again on next Friday.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thought we should call it on Friday or Saturday.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the intention to start at the very beginning of the calendar?

Mr. McFARLAND. I see no reason for that. We will start where the last call ended.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I see no objection to that, provided it is not too difficult to take up some bills prior to that point.

Mr. McFARLAND. If there are such bills, I hope that we may have notice in advance, because if Senators ask unanimous consent to take up certain bills and exceptions are made, we may get into long discussions, and our time will be valuable in the last hours of the session.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know it has been done once or twice before, and I think it was done by the Senator's predecessor, who gave notice that certain bills would be called up. In other words, if the Senator gave notice the day before, on Thursday, let us say, that on Friday he would call up certain bills——

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no objection to that procedure, providing we can have assurance that the differences really have been ironed out, and not that some Senator wants to bring a bill up again hoping that by going through another calendar call the differences can be settled.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. For purposes of the RECORD, and for our information on this subject, the Senator plans, as I understand, to call up the resolution with reference to peace with Germany after consideration of the mutual-security appropriation bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; tomorrow, provided we have time to dispose of the mutual-security appropriation bill. I wanted to give notice so that we could consider the peace resolution, if possible. I do not know how long the appropriation bill will take.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is perfectly agreeable. Then the Senator hopes to bring up another appropriation bill. Has he any plans for any other special bills? How about the District of Columbia home-rule bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is still on our agenda.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Among the matters which the Senator mentioned and of which we are all aware is the appropriation bill with reference to mutual security. The Senator said we may have trouble in getting these things ironed out. I want to serve notice that that is one of the things that may offer some difficulty in the ironing process. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee who sweated the question out for weeks and weeks, I was very much disappointed in the action of the Appropriations Committee in taking its little hatchet and making a 5-percent cut. It has been intimated here today that we had better take what is offered, or we may get something worse. That will be the responsibility of those who want to tamper with the security of the United States. This question, as I understand, turns on the news that there has not been any tax bill passed. We will pass a tax bill before we go home. If we do not, when we get home, if I know the President of the United States, I think he will have us back here until we do pass one. That is what I would do if I were in his place, which I never will be. But Mr. Truman has called us back before, and certainly he has a precedent in his favor. But, above all, he has common sense.

There was a slogan in the Manufacturers' Association about a year ago to the effect that we should pay as we go. Now it seems to be, "You pay and I will go."

I wanted to offer this suggestion to the majority leader for the purpose of letting him know that there may be a few of us who will have something to say about the cut in the mutual security appropriation bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. It has always been my understanding that the ironing out process is hard work, and the ironing out in this case seems to be no exception to the rule.

Mr. McMAHON. I merely made the suggestion.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, October 18, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 17 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Joseph Charles Duggan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Abraham J. Harris, resigned.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Richard Hartshorne, of New Jersey, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey, vice Hon. Guy L. Fake, retired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Harley A. Miller, of Puerto Rico, to be United States attorney for the district of Puerto Rico, vice Philip F. Herrick, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Charles Draper William Canham, O16496, United States Army.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Frank Dorn, O15278, United States Army.

Col. Willard Koehler Liebel, O15723, United States Army.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. L. Longmire Speight, assistant pastor, St. Agnes Catholic Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, who through Jesus Christ hast revealed Thy glory to all nations preserve the work of real freedom which Thou hast brought forth in this land. Let the glory of its freedom shine before other nations as a freedom wrought by those who knew that all men are created free and equal before Thee.

Guide the deliberations of this House. Give to each of us a wisdom conceived in prayer that every work of ours may tend toward the preservation of peace.

Direct all our actions by Thy inspiration, and further them with Thy continual help, that every prayer and work of ours may always begin from Thee and through Thee be brought to an end.

Grant our petitions in Christ's name. Amen.

The journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H R 2094. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 206]

Abbitt	Deane	Mack, Ill.
Allen, Calif	Dempsey	Martin, Iowa
Allen, La	D'Ewart	Miller, Calif.
Angell	Dingell	Morrison
Baker	Donovan	Morton
Barden	Dorn	Moulder
Baring	Engle	Murphy
Barrett	Fulton	Murray, Wis
Bates, Ky.	Golden	Phillips
Beall	Gwinn	Powell
Bender	Hébert	Prouty
Blackney	Herlong	Redden
Blatnik	Hess	Regan
Boggs, La	Holifield	Ribicoff
Bosone	Howell	Richards
Bramblett	Irving	Rivers
Brooks	Jackson, Calif	Roosevelt
Brown, Ohio	Javits	Sabath
Buckley	Johnson	Shelley
Burleson	Kearney	Sikes
Busbey	Kelley, Pa.	Thompson, Tex.
Byrnes, Wis.	Kennedy	Thornberry
Celler	Keogh	Vursell
Cole, N Y.	Kilburn	Watts
Combs	King	Werdel
Coudert	Latham	Wilson, Tex
Crawford	Lucas	Wood, Ga.
Dague	McDonough	
Dawson	McKinnon	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 343 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

OCTOBER 17, 1951.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to take effect immediately.

Most respectfully,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

OCTOBER 17, 1951.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby respectfully submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Sincerely,

CHARLES P. NELSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

OCTOBER 17, 1951.

Hon SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RAYBURN. I hereby respectfully submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department

Respectfully,

WILLIAM E MILLER,
Forty-second District, New York.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H Res 464) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That CHARLES P. NELSON, of Maine, be and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Armed Services.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 465) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That FRED G AANDAHL, of North Dakota, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Appropriations.

The resolution was agreed to

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 466) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That WILLIAM E. MILLER, of New York, be and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Judiciary.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4386) making appropriations for the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1197)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4386) "making appropriations for the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 13 and 14

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 8, 10, 12 and 15, and agree to the same

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken by said amendment amended to read as follows ": *Provided further*, That, during the current fiscal year, such appropriations shall not be transferred to or used to start or resume any project for which funds were not allocated for construction in the preceding fiscal year, but this proviso shall not apply to any project for which funds are provided in this Act"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "for payment annually of tuition fees of not to exceed 18 student officers of the Corps of Engineers at civil technical institutions under the provisions of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S C 535); ", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$192,657,613"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,725,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert $316,544,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the

amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$60,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the house recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows. In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC 105 No part of the money appropriated by this act which is in excess of 75 per centum of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by the Department of the Army from appropriations for civil functions during such fiscal year in the performance of—

"(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

"(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2)"

And the Senate agree to the same

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 9.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H FERR,
LOUIS C RABAUT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
ALLEN J ELLENDER,
MILTON R YOUNG,
GUY CORDON,
WILLIAM F KNOWLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H R 4386) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Amendment No. 1—Administrative expense limitation: Authorizes a limitation of $1,525,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2—Administrative provision Provides that appropriations in this bill cannot be used to start or resume any project for which funds were not allocated for construction in fiscal year 1951. This proviso does not apply to any project for which funds are provided in this bill.

Amendment No. 3—Administrative provision: Changes the name of the project known as Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C., to John H. Kerr Dam and Reservoir, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4—Administrative provision Provides for the payment of tuition fees at civil technical institutions for not to exceed 18 student officers instead of 25 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5—Rivers and harbors: Appropriates $192,657,613 instead of $162,860,500 as proposed by the House and $213,932,613 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6—Transfer of funds: Authorizes transfer of not to exceed $1,725,000 to the Secretary of the Interior for fish and wildlife studies instead of $1,600,000 as proposed by the House and $1,740,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 7—Flood control: Appropriates $316,544,100 instead of $268,009,900 as proposed by the House and $335,011,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8—Layon Reservoir, Tex.: Provides not to exceed $300,000 for construction of water conservation and utilization facilities at the Lavon Reservoir, Tex, as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No. 9 Reported in disagreement

Amendment No 10—Flood control, general (emergency fund): Appropriates $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11—Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries: Appropriates $60,500,000 instead of $59,000,000 as proposed by the House and $61,000,000 as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No. 12—Miscellaneous civil works. Appropriates $16,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $12,000 as proposed by the House

Amendment No. 13—Niagara power development Deletes provision of the Senate providing $1,000,000 for Niagara power development.

PANAMA CANAL

Amendment No 14—Canal Zone government. Appropriates $11,595,000 as proposed by the House instead of $11,668,000 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 15. Deletes provision of the House limiting amount of funds in the bill to be used for personal services as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No 16: Revises provision of the Senate limiting amounts of funds in the bill for personnel engaged in informational activities to exclude the Panama Canal Company

With respect to Amendments Nos 5 and 7, the conferees are agreed that obligations and expenditure of funds provided therein shall be made in the following manner:

1. No funds are to be obligated or expended on the following projects:

a Ice Harbor lock and dam, Washington;

b Oologah Reservoir, Okla;

c. Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway, Alabama and Mississippi.

2 For rivers and harbors, $192,657,613, to be allocated in the following manner:

Rivers and harbors

Project	*Amount recommended*
Alabama:	
Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ala., Fla., and Ga.:	
Buford Dam, Ga	$900,000
Jim Woodruff lock and dam, Florida	6,300,000
Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers, Ala., and Miss.: Demopolis lock and dam, Alabama	4,000,000
Alaska: Wrangell Narrows	247,000
Arkansas: Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma	4,100,000
California: San Diego River and Mission Bay	510,000

Rivers and harbors—Continued

Project	*Amount recommended*
Florida:	
Jacksonville Harbor	$1,787,000
Jacksonville to Miami waterway	2,150,000
Lake Worth Inlet (Palm Beach Harbor)	238,843
Georgia: Savannah Harbor	370,000
Illinois:	
Illinois waterway (exclusive of Calumet-Sag Channel)	300,000
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers: Chain of Rocks canal	5,000,000
Mississippi River between Missouri and Minneapolis:	
(A) St. Anthony Falls, Minn	1,500,000
(B) Other work, including Clinton, Iowa	357,770
Ohio River open-channel work	175,000
Iowa: Missouri River from Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa	4,000,000
Louisiana:	
Calcasieu River and Pass	1,025,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway	4,400,000
Pearl River, La. and Miss	987,000
Maryland. Baltimore Harbor and channels	800,000
Massachusetts: Fall River Harbor	200,000
Michigan. St Marys River	750,000
Mississippi Harrison County shore protection	773,000
Missouri: Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth	2,300,000
Montana: Missouri River at Fort Peck	944,000
New Jersey:	
Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers	732,000
New York and New Jersey channels	1,414,000
New York	
Buffalo Harbor	305,000
Hudson River channel	250,000
New York Harbor, entrance channels and anchorage areas	400,000
Ohio Cleveland Harbor	1,000,000
Oregon.	
McNary lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	42,900,000
The Dalles lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	4,000,000
Pennsylvania:	
Monongahela River, Pa. and W. Va:	
Locks 2, Pennsylvania and Morgantown lock and dam, West Virginia	4,000,000
Schuylkill River (culm removal)	1,900,000
Tennessee:	*recommended*
Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.	
Cheatham lock and dam, Tennessee	3,000,000
Old Hickory lock and dam, Tennessee	2,000,000
Texas:	
Gulf waterway (Galveston district)	800,000
Houston ship channel	1,000,000
Sabine-Neches waterway	465,000
Virginia: Quinby Creek, Accomack County	20,000
Washington: Chief Joseph Dam	16,892,000
Planning	500,000
Current expenses	66,965,000
Total, Rivers and Harbors	192,657,613

Of the above amount of $66,965,000 for current expenses, not to exceed $2,025,000 is included for examinations and surveys which includes $300,000 for survey of northern and

northwestern lakes and $1,725,000 for fish and wildlife studies.

3. For Flood Control, General, $316,544,100, to be allocated in the following manner:

Flood control, general

Project	Amount recommended
Arkansas:	
Blakely Mountain Reservoir	$5,700,000
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo	14,960,000
Narrows Reservoir	200,000
Pine Bluff	265,000
California:	
Cherry Valley Reservoir	3,400,000
Farmington Reservoir	214,000
Folsom Reservoir	6,870,000
Isabella Reservoir	4,500,000
Los Angeles County drainage area (exclusive of Whittier Narrows Reservoir)	6,085,000
Merced County stream group	265,000
Pine Flat Reservoir	8,000,000
San Antonio Reservoir	1,000,000
Whittier Narrows Reservoir	4,500,000
Colorado: Pueblo	217,500
Connecticut: Mansfield Hollow Reservoir	3,000,000
Florida: Central and southern Florida	6,000,000
Georgia. Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C	18,000,000
Idaho:	
Albeni Falls Reservoir	10,000,000
Lucky Peak Reservoir	3,800,000
Illinois:	
Columbia drainage and levee district	400,000
East Cape Girardeau and Clear Creek drainage district	500,000
East St Louis and vicinity	1,500,000
Farm Creek Reservoirs	1,500,000
Grand Tower drainage and levee district	800,000
Prairie duRocher and vicinity	900,000
Wood River drainage and levee district	915,000
Indiana:	
New Albany	575,000
Vincennes	300,000
Kansas:	
Hutchinson	1,900,000
Kansas City, Mo. and Kans	4,500,000
Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Nebraska, including Nebraska City	2,312,000
Wichita and Valley Center	500,000
Kentucky:	
Ashland	2,000,000
Covington	1,400,000
Hawesville	108,000
Louisville	4,500,000
Maysville	1,000,000
Wolf Creek Reservoir	3,000,000
Louisiana:	
Mermentau River	707,000
Natchitoches Parish	360,000
Maryland: Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va	1,000,000
Massachusetts:	225,000
Adams	225,000
North Adams	400,000
Minnesota:	
Aitkin	600,000
Red River of the North, S. Dak., N. Dak., and Minn	700,000
Missouri: Perry County levee districts Nos. 1, 2, and 3	1,000,000
Nebraska:	
Gavins Point Reservoir, S. Dak. and Nebr	[1](2,000,000)
Harlan County Reservoir	1,000,000
New Mexico: Jemez Canyon Reservoir	900,000

Flood control, general—Continued

Project	Amount recommended
New York:	
Hoosick Falls	$206,000
Mount Morris Reservoir	5,000,000
Olean	392,000
North Carolina: Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C	17,000,000
North Dakota: Garrison Reservoir	87,083,700
Ohio: Muskingum River Reservoirs	472,000
Oklahoma:	
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla	400,000
Fort Gibson Reservoir	2,400,000
Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir	3,500,000
Oregon:	
Detroit Reservoir	16,978,000
Lookout Point Reservoir	16,000,000
Willamette River Basin (bank protection)	400,000
Pennsylvania:	
Conemaugh River Reservoir	9,500,000
East Branch Clarion River Reservoir	2,000,000
Williamsport	775,000
South Dakota:	
Fall River Basin	400,000
Fort Randall Reservoir	34,699,000
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N Dak	3,770,000
Tennessee	
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky	500,000
Memphis, Wolf Creek, and Nonconnah Creek	750,000
Texas.	
Belton Reservoir	4,000,000
Benbrook Reservoir	339,000
Fort Worth floodway	700,000
Garza-Little Elm Reservoir	3,000,000
Lavon Reservoir	1,500,000
San Angelo Reservoir and floodway	1,200,000
Texarkana Reservoir	4,000,000
Whitney Reservoir	3,800,000
Virginia: Philpott Reservoir	2,940,000
Snagging and clearing	800,000
Emergency bank protection	500,000
Sec 205 projects	1,000,000
Planning	1,000,000
Current expenses	7,060,000
Total, flood control, general	316,544,100

[1] To be derived by transfer from funds allocated to Fort Randall Reservoir, S. D.

Of the above amount of $7,060,000 for current expenses, not to exceed $800,000 is included for preliminary examinations, surveys and contingencies, which includes $400,000 for the comprehensive survey for New England, and $400,000 for the comprehensive survey in the White, Arkansas, and Red River basins

4. For planning: rivers and harbors, $500,000, flood control, general, $1,000,000.

The conferees are agreed that the unobligated balances presently available to the Corps of Engineers from previous appropriations shall be coupled with each of the above mentioned amounts with specific allocations to the following projects:

a. Tuttle Creek Dam, Kansas	$400,000
b. Toronto Reservoir, Kansas	100,000
c. Strawn Reservoir, Kansas	250,000

No planning shall be started on any new project, any unauthorized project, or continued on any old project (except Tuttle Creek Dam, Toronto Reservoir and Strawn Reservoir) unless certified by the President as necessary to the defense effort within the criteria set forth in the conference report on chapter IX of the general appropriation bill, 1951.

The conferees on the part of both the House and the Senate are in agreement as to the need for a comprehensive flood control program in the Missouri River basin and the urgency for prompt action thereon. They recommend, therefore, to the respective Committees on Public Works that immediate consideration be given to the establishment of a Missouri River Basin Survey Commission, members to be appointed by the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the President, which shall be authorized to make a full and complete investigation and survey of flood conditions and proposed measures for control thereof in the lower Missouri River basin area and to report to the Congress at the earliest practicable date, but not later than June 30, 1952

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report which we submit represents a complete agreement between the House and Senate managers on every item in the bill.

One amendment is reported back for a separate vote, but it is merely in technical disagreement and is only brought back in conformity with the rules of the House.

Agreement does not mean that any member of the committee of conference approves the bill as written, but it does compose our disagreements as nearly as we could compose them.

And I do not suppose the bill as reported is fully acceptable to any Member of the House or Senate. But, again, it is as nearly acceptable as we could make it in view of all the conflicting opinions with which we had to deal.

Unable to reach agreement on the many requests submitted, the committee found it impracticable to consider the bill item by item and was reduced to the necessity of considering it by categories, eliminating all unauthorized items, all unbudgeted items and excluding or including other classifications which could be handled en bloc. If items are omitted, it is because that particular request fell within the prohibited classification or in some way failed to conform to categories included in the drafting of the bill.

Of course, Members understand the desire of the committee to include provisions favored by colleagues and our regret at not being able to include all. But I am certain they also understand the impossibility of providing for all proposed expenditures even in normal years, much less a year in which so large a part of the national income must be devoted to national defense and all expenditures for rivers and harbors and flood control must be borrowed and increase to the full extent of the bill the deficit which must be added to the national debt.

To further complicate the situation there are certain "must" items in the bill to which the ordinary rules of economy cannot be applied. Among them are the appropriations for flood control in areas devastated by the record-breaking flood in the lower Missouri Valley where destruction and consequent paralysis of business have been so complete as to require exceptional measures. In response to this situation the conference report carries $400,000 for the planning of the Tuttle Creek Dam, $100,000 for the Toronto Dam, and earmarks $250,000 for

the Strawn Dam. These items provide all the money customarily appropriated, according to the regular routine, until the definite project report is complete.

After the definite project report is formulated, the project is reexamined from an economic standpoint. Then, and not until then, if the benefit cost ratio exceeds unity, funds for construction are requested. These requirements have not yet been complied with. The Army engineers testified yesterday that the DPR for the Tuttle Dam has not been completed, and will not be completed, until some time next year. In the meantime negotiations for relocation of railroads, highways, and purchase of land can be taken up without waiting for the appropriation of construction money.

The wisdom and importance of following the regular schedule is apparent on a cursory examination of similar projects. For example, it was necessary to move the location of the Gavins Point Dam 8 miles after its first location. The Wappapello Dam on the St. Francis River completed in 1940 with the assurance that it would control the floods in the St. Francis Valley, saw the most destructive flood in 1945 ever seen in that valley. It has been said that if the dams contemplated had been built on the Kaw and its tributaries this flood would have been controlled. But when the official weather map showing the rainfall area where the flood originated was superimposed on the map showing all dams—existing, authorized, or proposed—it showed that if every one of these dams had been built and had been in operation at the time of the flood, not one of them would have lain between the area of heavy rainfall and Kansas City, and all of them combined would not have saved the city and the Missouri Valley below it from the disastrous flood which swept from the Kaw and on down to the Mississippi. The Oahe Dam cost 60 percent more than the advance planning indicated. Relocation cost 180 percent more and land acquisition, 165 percent more. On one project relocation cost 4,839 percent more than the estimate.

But cost is a minor consideration in comparison with the success of the system in controlling floodwaters after it is built and after it is too late to correct mistakes. The Board of Engineers, the Congress, or the country cannot afford to take chances on short cuts when so much is at stake.

All members of the committee and of the House are in complete agreement on the necessity of taking every step to prevent recurrence of floods in the lower Missouri and its tributaries, particularly in Kansas and Missouri. And all are convinced of the necessity of providing for control at the earliest date possible. But successful control of floodwaters in this area is too vital, involves the life and property of too many people, is of too permanent a character, and requires the expenditure of too vast a sum of money, to permit any departure from the established practice. The conference report provides every dollar asked by the Board of Engineers for planning. This bill will become a law about the first of November. Congress will be back in January. When construction money is in order it will be provided.

How much time does the gentleman from Wisconsin, the ranking minority member of the committee desire?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the adoption of this conference report. At the proper time it is my intention to offer a motion to recommit this report to the committee of conference

We passed the original civil-functions appropriation bill in June of this year at a time when we led the country to believe that we were sincerely interested in the curtailment of expenditures which could not be directly traced to the national defense effort. As a result of that attitude which prevailed in June, an attitude which seems to have been dissipated on the floor of this House in the last few weeks, that bill after a unanimous subcommittee report, was approved by the House with cuts totaling approximately 20 percent. That bill was passed with a total amount of about $514,000,000

What has happened to that effort in the weeks since June? The Senate upped that bill $124,000,000. Some of this can be justified on the basis of a supplemental estimate of $21,800,000, but only a little over half of that money is actually included in this bill Those items were not before the House at the time that we took action on the original measure So that if you discount that separate appropriation, while it is included in this over-all amount, for the time being, it means that the Senate added over $100,000,000 to the bill which passed the House. They upped the appropriation just about 20 percent.

In the conference report before us this morning the total amount is $597,000,000-plus. That is an increase of about $83,000,000 over the amount which passed here. Practically every reduction in existing projects was lost before we actually conferred with the Members of the other body. They were lost by a concession the first day we went to meet with them. The conferees of the House said: "We will agree with you as to the amount that you put in on all of these existing projects," which included a number of projects that in our consideration in the House we considered to be new projects. This conference report abrogates the work of the Civil Functions Subcommittee, the work of a subcommittee which was unanimous and which was approved overwhelmingly here on the floor of the House.

This conference report includes many new projects. I cannot recall of any single major new project, many of which, practically all of which, were cut out in the House, that is left out of this conference report with the exception of Ice Harbor.

Some of the justification for the new projects is: Well, we have had this flood situation, we need more for flood control. But I think it is a fair statement that the flood situation in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri has been used only as a psychological weapon in order to increase flood-control appropriations throughout the country.

Another excuse is: Well, we have to have this power, there is a shortage of power. But I submit to you you cannot justify construction for power in this time of emergency when you cannot get 1 kilowatt of power off the line until 1956 and you will not reach the maximum until 1958. That is not meeting the power needs of the present emergency.

It is one of the strange inconsistencies in this conference report that the only real cut in a power project was in that dam which would provide the cheapest and the best single source of power in the United States.

This is not the commitment of a few additional millions here today. This is a commitment of billions of dollars in the immediate years that lie ahead.

Sure, the camel sticks that pretty little nose under the tent. It does not look too bad, and even when the head gets in, it is kind of a friendly looking thing, but pretty soon the camel is in the tent and the tent comes down on top of you.

I want to ask this question: Was the unanimous report of our subcommittee worth anything when you approved our work and passed the bill without adding a single dollar? Were the Members of the House here sincere? Did they do that with the expectation that the other body would put it all back in and you would get it anyway? Or did you really mean it when you approved the work of the subcommittee?

Did you agree at that time that nondefense spending had to be cut? If you really believed in economy then—and I believe the Members of the House were sincere in that belief and in that act—have there been any favorable changes of circumstances that would cause you to change your mind now? Is the situation any better in Korea today than it was then that would make you think we were not in a defense emergency? Do we have more money available to spend on these projects now after the tax bill was defeated yesterday? Have we appropriated less money for the Military Establishment and less money for military construction and less money for foreign assistance than you thought we were going to appropriate when this bill was on the floor of the House? Is the over-all appropriation picture any better today than it was on the 13th of June?

I know, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of economy talk, there are still a great many people in this country who approve the action of the Members of this body, who are for the appropriations and against the taxes, and in the present state of the people of this country that still seems to be the best method by which the Members of the House can be reelected. The House voted for economy on the 13th of June last, but those efforts have been lost; they were lost in the other body and they were lost in the conference committee. I

submit to you that the only real justification for some of the additions which have been made in this measure since it left the House here in June is that: "Well, we have just got to help out good old Mr. So-and-So."

Mr. Speaker, because of my belief that this House meant what it said on the 13th of June, and because I believe that the efforts which we made on this floor on that day have been substantially dissipated in the other body and in the conference committee, I intend to offer a motion to recommit this measure to the conference committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I saw that you refused even the planning funds for the Tennessee Tombigbee Inland Waterway.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I believe there was a specific statement to that effect in the conference report.

Mr. RANKIN. That would shorten the water distance between our atomic bomb plants and the Gulf of Mexico, one 800 miles and the other 300 miles, and cut the cost of transportation to the irreducible minimum. What excuse can the committee give for thus attempting to block something that has been approved by the great engineers of America and on which we have already spent $600,000 in planning?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks his committee has been fair to the Members of the House who were advised not to appear before the committee on certain projects on the ground that no money would be appropriated for the beginning of new projects or completing projects already under way, unless they were connected with defense, and then you go over and meet in conference with the representatives of the other body and concede a lot of things? Do you think that is fair to the other Congressmen who did not try to impose their projects on your committee?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Let me say, first of all, to my colleague from West Virginia, that the decision with respect to planning money and unbudgeted items was not made until after the hearings had been completed, and I know that our subcommittee did spend a great deal of time listening to Members of the Congress who did appear before the subcommittee. But I also want to point out to him that when he asked me about conceding on these matters, that he will not find the name of the gentleman from Wisconsin as one of the signers of the conference report.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I want to commend the gentleman for the position he is taking. It seems to me that we all should support the gentleman's motion to recommit this report, due to the action taken yesterday in turning down the tax bill. There will be less money to spend than some people thought they were going to have to spend, and certainly anyone who voted yesterday against the tax bill should support the gentleman's motion to recommit this report. We have to cut down these expenses. This is one place we have to do it, no matter how it hurts, and even if it hurts ourselves.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I hope a lot of the Members here on the floor will support the motion to recommit regardless of how they voted on the tax bill yesterday. I think there is a valid basis for that motion irrespective of the action yesterday.

Mr. KEATING. I did not mean to imply anything different.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That merely accentuates the fiscal problem we have.

Mr. KEATING. That is right.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. May I point out to the gentleman from New York who stated that because the tax bill failed yesterday the motion to recommit should prevail today that a large number of the Members who voted yesterday against the tax bill were not voting that way because the tax bill contained too much taxes but because not enough taxes were imposed. I think the gentleman will find that if he will scrutinize some of the votes cast yesterday.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not believe the gentleman from New York intended, in fact, I do not think he did say that that was the only basis for this motion to recommit.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. May I inquire if all the study and planning moneys in this bill are earmarked?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. No; that money is not earmarked. As to the planning money for flood control and rivers and harbors, the gentleman will notice there is $500,000 for one and $1,000,000 for the other. A part of the flood-control planning money is earmarked but the other is not. The gentleman will note in the conference report that there is a release from earmark of previously allocated funds of about $800,000 in rivers and harbors and about $3,500,000 in flood-control planning, which previously had been earmarked for other projects.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Is there much money in this bill, if any, for national defense purposes?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. You can establish some sort of tenuous connection, I suppose, between almost any appropriation these days and the national defense effort. If you sit on any subcommittee on appropriations you will certainly hear people every day trying to convince you of that.

Mr. MORANO. Is there any direct money for national defense in this measure that the gentleman knows of, something about which there would be no question in the gentleman's mind?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. As of this moment, I cannot mention any particular project.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I am interested to know the exact meaning of the words "shall be coupled with" in paragraph 4 on page 8. Does that mean that the $500,000 set aside for planning on rivers and harbors and about $1,000,000 for flood control generally means that the $750,000 for the three items in Kansas will come out of those amounts?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. My recollection is that Tuttle Creek and Toronto planning money comes from the $1,000,000 and, yes, the amount for the Strawn Reservoir of $250,000 does come out of the $1,000,000 that is mentioned there for flood control.

Mr. DONDERO. That means that those three items get three quarters of all the money for planning for flood-control works and that the Member who has a small project in his district will get nothing?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. My recollection on Tuttle Creek and Toronto is not completely clear on that. Does the gentleman from Michigan recall that?

Mr. FORD. It is my recollection of the action taken in the conference that the money for Tuttle Creek, Toronto, and Strawn did come out of the $1,000,000 for flood control. However, it should be brought out in addition that we unobligated almost $3,500,000 of flood-control planning money, which goes into the pot, so to speak, for planning for projects that can be so certified.

Mr. DONDERO. That is flood control alone?

Mr. FORD. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. How much is for rivers and harbors outside the $500,000, if any?

Mr. FORD. The unobligated balance which is being earmarked is $872,926, which is in addition to the $500,000.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I will yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to deprive my colleague from Michigan, or any other members of the subcommittee, who desire to speak, of the opportunity to do so. I think the question of the distribution of time should be cleared with them before I accept any additional time. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if the time has already been committed.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have at least 12 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, Senator HOLLAND, of Florida, who was a member of the committee of conference, and one of the managers on the part of the other

body, intended to sign this report. It was our impression that he had signed it. But through some inadvertence his name is not included in the printed report Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senator HOLLAND be authorized to sign the conference report and that his name be included as one of the Senate managers in the report as printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] makes the request that the Member of the other body be permitted to sign the conference report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri yields five additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, before I take the time, I would like to inquire whether I would be depriving other members of the subcommittee, including the gentleman from Michigan who wanted at least 12 minutes of time.

Mr CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] a member of the committee.

Mr FORD. Mr. Speaker, as one of the conferees on this appropriation bill, I would first like to say that the problem we faced as House conferees was a most difficult one. It was a very difficult one There was very little, if any, cooperation from the Senate conferees on the issue of economy

The House, as you will recall, reduced the budget estimates $126,000,000 from approximately $640,000,000 to about $514,000,000. Those are approximate figures. The Senate in its wisdom, or its lack of it, increased the overall figure substantially. The other body by increasing the House figure $124,000,000, in effect wiped out practically all of the reductions that the House had previously made. I must say, however, in the interim between the action of the House and the action of the Senate on this legislation, the budget did send over an additional request of about $21,000,000. But, the total increase by the Senate from the figures we dealt with in the House amounted to about $100,000,000. As a result, this conference report in effect, sustains the action of the other body and not the action of the House. The figure in dollars is about $83,000,000 or $84,000,000 more than the figure that the House approved.

In my estimation, this conference report is faulty in two basic respects. One, there is too much money in it, particularly so far as the House bill is concerned, and second, the money that is appropriated, or may be appropriated, is badly distributed among projects. In my judgment, the allocations among projects are particularly bad. Some projects which are very deserving have been deprived of funds, and some projects, which I think are less deserving under the circumstances, are given too much. For those two reasons, one that the bill is too much, and second, that the distribution is bad, I am wholeheartedly supporting the motion to be offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, which will seek to recommit the conference report to the conference committee. In its present form the bill will be a distorted and overgrown monstrosity.

Any person who analyzes this conference report objectively will come to this one conclusion: that the conferees have taken care of a lot of individuals in and out of the Congress, a lot of special groups, and a limited number of geographical areas. Over-all there is little or no protection for the Nation's taxpayers. I think it is our responsibility, and duty regardless of our interest in particular projects, or regardless of our interest in particular geographical areas, to perform to the taxpayers as a whole. In this bill we avoid that duty and responsibility

Mr. DONDERO Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan

Mr. DONDERO When the gentleman finishes his statement I wish he would elaborate on section 4 on page 8. There is much confusion on that planning money for rivers and harbors and flood control.

Mr. FORD. I will try to explain that subsequently.

At the time the bill came before the House, the House subcommittee set forth a very definite formula as far as any project was concerned First, we said that no new project should be considered. Second, we said that no new segment of any project should be considered We also adopted a policy of making reductions on individual projects. This House sustained the subcommittee, and I think the House as a whole did exactly the right thing If you fail to vote for a motion to recommit today, the House is in effect repudiating what the membership did on June 12 this year.

There are a number of new projects in the bill. There are a number of new segments which will be started. In fact, practically every new segment that was recommended by the budget is taken care of. In addition the conference committee authorized some unbudgeted projects They have been thrown in, for what reason I know not But I might say that in the estimation of some it was purely the old "pork barrel" with plenty of log-rolling.

At the time our subcommittee was holding long and extensive hearings, it became well known that our subcommittee was going to adopt a rather rigorous attitude concerning unbudgeted items. Some members, I think, using very good judgment, decided to not make appearance before the committee even though certain local projects were deserving. Others did appear. Our subcommittee turned down all new projects and particularly emphasized that nonbudgeted items be excluded. When the bill went to the Senate I understand there was literally a flood of witnesses from the House in an effort to try to convince the Senate that certain projects which were unbudgeted should be included in the bill. The Senate, in its wisdom or lack of it, decided to include a limited number of unbudgeted items. In my judgment, in good conscience, we cannot go along with the inclusion of unbudgeted items. I do not say that they are not deserving, but I do say they are no more deserving in any way than the unbudgeted projects that some of the Members of the Congress did not try to promote simply because they knew that they could not be justified under any circumstances on the basis of national defense. I pay tribute to those who used good judgment I think this conference report should be turned down on that basis, if no other. You cannot under any circumstances justify these unbudgeted items, for they do not contribute directly to the national defense effort. They should be excluded from the bill under any circumstances and by supporting the motion to recommit these projects will be deleted.

It also should be called to the attention of the Members of this body that the House did recede on the question of the Jensen amendment The Jensen amendment was approved on a roll call vote, but the House managers receded. I feel strongly that if this motion to recommit is approved we can make some progress in trying to effectuate proper distribution and proper reductions in the bill and in addition work out some compromise on the Jensen amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield for a question.

Mr. JENSEN. I should like to know what reason the conferees gave who opposed the Jensen amendment, what reason they gave for deleting the Jensen amendment from this bill

Mr FORD I may say to the gentleman from Iowa that the reason given for receding was that the Jensen amendment was not applicable from a practical point of view to the situations in this bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Everyone who opposes the Jensen amendment has used that same excuse. The only way we can effectively reduce the personnel in agencies is by an amendment of this nature. Of course they howl, they howl, they cry, they say they cannot live under the provisions of the Jensen amendment. Anyone who has any sense at all and knows anything about the administration of this Government knows they can live under the Jensen amendment and should live under the Jensen amendment and reduce their forces in proportion to the provisions of the amendment.

Mr FORD In further answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr DONDERO], I should like to say that under the conference report $1,000,000 was given for flood-control planning, including the planning funds for Tuttle Creek Dam and Toronto Reservoir, and $500,000 for river and harbor planning. Further we unearmarked $872,926 river and harbor planning money. I should add that $250,000 of the million total for flood-control planning was earmarked for Strawn Reservoir. On flood control we unobligated or unearned $3,475,800.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman tell the House how much unobligated funds that will leave for river and harbor work and for flood-control planning?

Mr. FORD. I understand the grand total is $5,848,726.

Mr. DONDERO. That means that there will be something over a million dollars for planning river and harbor work, and something like four and one-quarter million for planning the flood-control work.

Mr. FORD. As I understand, about $4,400,000 for flood control.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Enlarging on what the gentleman from Michigan has been able to bring out in his questions, am I to understand that the action of the conferees results in covering the funds on those unobligated projects back into the Treasury or does it just unfreeze them so that they may be available for planning of other projects?

Mr. FORD. The money was unfrozen from those projects which had heretofore been earmarked, and the funds therefrom are now in a pool. The decision as to where the planning money should be spent is left to the Army engineers under the direction of the President subject to criteria set forth in conference report.

Mr. BAILEY. The money was not covered back into the Treasury.

Mr. FORD. The money was not covered back into the Treasury.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. In the next paragraph the language states that no planning shall be started on any project, and so forth, unless certified by the President. That means that all planning will be subject to confirmation by the Executive before any work can go ahead.

Mr. FORD. All planning for flood control will have to be certified by the President as being essential to the national defense.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I am interested in the statement the gentleman made that there are unbudgeted projects in this conference report. I appeared before the committee with the most meritorious project, a project that caused great damage to citizens of the United States through no fault of their own. I withdrew because the committee assured me and told me they would not consider any project that was not budgeted.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from North Carolina had a very meritorious project. He had a number of constituents who testified and gave a very appealing presentation. I must say to him his project was as worthy as any other unbudgeted project. But he withdrew, as he indicated, and the House did not allow his or any other unbudgeted items. I do not know whether he testified before the committee in the other body or not.

Mr. BONNER. I may say to the gentleman I did not, because I thought that was a firm statement.

Mr. FORD. It was firm as far as some of us are concerned. His project is equally as worthy as any of these unbudgeted projects which are included in the bill at the present time.

Mr. BONNER. I wish the gentleman would point out the projects that are not budgeted.

Mr. FORD. The unbudgeted projects included in rivers and harbors are, for example, Clinton, Iowa; Quinby Creek, Va.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I understood the gentleman from Michigan to say there were some $4,000,000 available for planning. Will he be kind enough to give us the figures embraced in the total amounts that can be used for surveys in that $4,000,000?

Mr. FORD. The $4,000,000 does not include any survey money whatsoever.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. How much money is available for survey work?

Mr. FORD. Eight hundred thousand dollars is made available for survey work. The survey money is earmarked. It includes $400,000 for a comprehensive survey for New England and $400,000 for a comprehensive survey in the White River-Red River-Arkansas River Basins.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That means that we have $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to carry out surveys on projects authorized by the Public Works Committee to determine their economic feasibility, is that correct?

Mr. FORD. You would have nothing outside of those funds that are earmarked unless there are some unobligated balances.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. We are going to cease carrying out steady works in connection with flood control during the next fiscal year.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What is the status of surveys on flood control where the surveys are nearly completed and very little work must be done? Is there any money in there for that purpose?

Mr. FORD. The Corps of Engineers may have some unobligated balances for such survey work. I cannot give the gentleman offhand what the amount is. Perhaps there may be some. I do not recall specifically.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is everything in this bill or in this conference report earmarked as far as surveys are concerned?

Mr. FORD. The survey money to be appropriated this year is all specifically earmarked.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There will be no funds in this legislation that will take care of uncompleted surveys in the country?

Mr. FORD. That is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, whether he realizes it or not, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is rendering one of the greatest disservices to this country, and especially as to his own State of Missouri, and to every other State in the Middle West, and in the South, of any man who has served in Congress for the last 50 years, by waging his relentless fight to prevent the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway.

His attempts to usurp the functions of the Committee on Public Works by having a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations conduct its fake investigation of this project was one of the greatest blunders in the history of Congress.

This Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway is the missing link in our national defense program, as well as the missing link in our internal waterway system.

It is the greatest project of its kind that has ever been proposed, and is the only one that can be constructed anywhere in the world that would transfer the traffic from one major watershed to another with so much ease, so little expense and such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances, while saving the swift current of a major stream, such as the Mississippi, for the downstream traffic.

The nearest approach to it is the connection between the Don and the Volga Rivers in Russia, which Stalin is now speeding up with all possible haste, probably using American lend-lease machinery, if not American lend-lease money, for that purpose. While the Don-Volga project will transfer the traffic from one major watershed to another, it will cost infinitely more money than will the construction of this Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway, and will not have the advantage of saving the swift current of a major stream such as the Mississippi for its downstream traffic.

Is it not ridiculous to be spending billions and billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money to build similar projects in foreign countries, some of them in enemy countries, and at the same time deny funds to speed up the construction of this missing link in the greatest inland waterway system in the world here in our own country, as well as the missing link in our national defense program?

This Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway project has been approved by the finest and most efficient engineers this country has ever known. They made investigation after investigation, survey after survey, and found that since the construction of the Pickwick Dam across the Tennessee River just below the point where this project connects with the Tennessee River, raising the water level at that point by 50 or 55 feet, it made this project absolutely feasible; and that it will provide what will amount to a slackwater route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, as well as all points on the Ohio River up to Pittsburgh, Pa., and to all points on the Illinois, the Missouri, the upper Mississippi, and the Tennessee

Rivers, and still save the swift current of the Mississippi for the downstream traffic.

It will cut the water distance between Mobile and our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge by more than 800 miles and cut the cost of transportation between the Gulf at Mobile and the point where this project connects with the Tennessee River by more than 75 percent, of from $2.79 a ton down to $0.62 a ton. It will cut the water distance between Mobile and our atomic bomb plant at Paducah, Ky., by more than 300 miles and cut the cost of transportation from $2.47 a ton down to $0.89 a ton.

In other words, it will give us a slack-water route from the Gulf to each one of our atomic bomb plants, as well as to all points on the Great Lakes, and to the points I have mentioned on our inland rivers, and at the same time save the swift current of the Mississippi for the downstream traffic. This project is just as sure to be constructed as the night follows the day, and the sooner it is done the better it is going to be for all concerned, and especially for our boys who are now giving their lives on foreign soil.

They are simply being sacrificed by being compelled to fight with bayonets and gun butts, against a force that can lose 300 or more to our 1, probably 400 to our 1, and fight indefinitely. If that conflict continues, or if we get into war with any other power, our hope for survival is going to be in the airplane and the atomic bomb. We cannot afford to see our boys murdered, as they are being murdered in Korea today, in what they call a police action, which has already cost us more men than we lost in four wars—the Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Spanish-American War all combined. In order to provide the airplanes and the atomic bombs necessary for victory, in that police action, or for our defense in case of another world war, it is going to be absolutely necessary to speed up the construction of this great project, in order to provide the transportation to carry the materials necessary to build and maintain the strongest air force on earth, and to supply the atomic bombs necessary for their use.

This project is absolutely necessary.

In addition to its contribution to our national defense it will mean more from a transportation standpoint to the people in the States of the great Middle West, including Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Colorado, Wyoming, North and South Dakota, Montana, and all the other States in that great midwestern area, as well as to all the States in the South from Kentucky to Florida, and from Virginia to Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico, than any other project of its kind that has ever been proposed. In fact, it will greatly benefit the people of ever State in the Union.

It should be constructed with all possible haste.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, of course I could rise to a question of personal privilege on the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi that I am tied up with the railroad lobbyists, but no one gives any special credence to statements which he makes.

I will say that never in my life have I seen a railroad lobbyist to know him, and no railroad lobbyist has ever appeared before the committee or had any connection whatever with this bill.

The gentleman from Mississippi was so insistent upon this project that we made one of the most exhaustive investigations that could be made. Our staff of investigators proved, with the Army engineers before the committee, that their figures were erroneous, that the project would cost vastly more than they had estimated, and that the benefit ratio instead of being favorable to the project was below zero.

The report issued by the committee under Judge KERR's chairmanship, and now on file in the document room, shows—

First. The 1950 estimated construction cost of the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway is actually $205,400,000 instead of the $179,264,000 as computed by the Corps of Engineers.

Second. The benefit-cost ratio is 0.27 as compared with 1.13 attributed to the project by the corps.

Third. The Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission do not consider the project essential to national defense.

Fourth. Construction of the project as planned will necessitate the replacement of three existing locks below Demopolis at an estimated cost of $51,000,000, not included in the corps figures. When this cost is used in corps benefit-cost ratio, it drops below unity.

Fifth. Operating conditions across the Mississippi Sound are not safe for barges which would have to use it to reach the proposed waterway as a means of traveling north.

Sixth. The engineers' formula used to compute transportation savings has no basis in reality.

Seventh. The corps estimates delay of 1 hour in passing through the locks, but actual time would be 3½ hours, and would include double-locking and use of auxiliary power not anticipated by the corps.

Eighth. Waterway can be used only by tows up to 3,500 tons or 2,000 horsepower. Tows using the Mississippi exceed this weight and speed.

Ninth. The corps claims shipment of alumina, bauxite, sugar, and petroleum, yet—

(a) No barge has ever been designed to transport alumina.

(b) The bauxite companies do not propose to ship by water.

(c) Major petroleum producers evinced little interest in the project.

(d) Sugar and fertilizer are not moved by water in this area.

Tenth. The Venezuelan iron ore will be shipped to this country at Baltimore and Philadelphia rather than to Mobile and New Orleans because the distances to the northern cities are shorter and the rail transport from there to Pittsburgh cheaper than either the barge or rail transport from the southern locations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is too late to remedy the situation which I now bring to your attention, but I do think we should give it some consideration before we proceed on the next year's appropriation.

I learned the other day from the Army engineers that when appropriations are being considered for maintenance on the various river and harbor projects they go before the committee and justify the maintenance fund and the committee approves this maintenance money. Then when it is given to the Army engineers it is given to them in a lump sum. Now, here is a lump sum appropriation of $66,965,000 listed as "Current expenses" which I am informed is maintenance money to maintain authorized projects. The Army engineers take that money and decide for themselves where they are going to spend it. If they are not going to spend it on the projects they used to justify the appropriation it should be turned back to the Government or certainly should not be diverted, unless it was shown that the project did not need work.

The situation I complain about is that there are a large number of small projects in my district. The engineers came before the Congress and justified the maintenance money. These projects have been approved by Congress and have been opened up, have in previous years been maintained, and the maintenance money is all needed. But just recently they withdrew and transferred all of the maintenance money from that State to somewhere else which the Army engineers felt was a better place to put it.

That does two or three things that just should not be done. In the first place, it puts the Members of Congress from the various districts where these projects are located in the position of having to go to the Army engineers every year, year after year, to beg them to spend the maintenance money on the very projects they used to justify getting that money.

That occasion came up recently and the whole North Carolina delegation met with them. I was astounded to learn that fact. What happened? They then went back after much ado and conferences and correspondence and so forth, and reconsidered, and came back and said, "We have changed our minds. Some of them do need work, so we are going to bring the money back from where we had transferred it and use it where it is supposed to be used." It is not fair to the Army engineers to put them in that spot in the first place. It is not fair to the Members of Congress to put the Members of Congress in that spot. It is not fair to the people who make investments on these improvements for them to be closed up or the funds withdrawn without any further action or even knowledge by the Congress, which in its wisdom provided the money.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the law give them the authority to transfer those funds?

Mr. BARDEN. I presume so. The Army engineers are a good organization. They are certainly no worse than we have permitted them to be. What I want to do is stop this foolishness next year.

I do not know where the law is. I did not know that they indulged in these practices until this year. I used to serve on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. But this is a new and bad situation. It brings about confusion. It does not tend toward a wise administration of the funds. It certainly does not safeguard the funds so as to channel them to the projects which were used to justify the appropriation of the fund.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. KEARNS. I agree with the gentleman. I also have had the same experience that the gentleman has had.

Mr. BARDEN. I suppose there are some 75 Members of the House who have had the same experience. We cannot correct it this year, but next year we can correct it. I say the Army engineers should not have this discretionary veto power and my record has been one of friendliness to them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr COLMER].

Mr. COLMER Mr. Speaker, I have not asked for this time in an endeavor to get any new projects or to ask for any projects that are left out. I have asked for this time, in the first place, again to commend the Committee on Appropriations of the House for its efforts in trying to hold these appropriations down in these times of great expenditures; and secondly, to raise the question about the additions that have been put on in the other body. The House Committee on Appropriations did a splendid job in holding the appropriations down to a necessary minimum. Further cuts were made on the floor. But it appears that the other body has run true to form and raised the appropriations considerably.

Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the committee, I would appreciate very much some member of the Appropriations Committee giving me the exact amount that the Senate has increased this appropriation bill.

Mr RABAUT. According to the table here, in answer to the gentleman's question, I would say that the Senate has upped the amount $124,150,813.

Mr. COLMER. That is to say that the Senate has increased the amount appropriated by the House more than $124,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, on yesterday a $5,000,000,000-plus tax bill, which was some $10,000,000,000 less than the President asked for was defeated in this House by a substantial majority. No doubt the majority of those who voted against this tax bill did so on the theory that the taxpayer was already overburdened. With that thought I am in thorough accord, but I call the attention of this House again to the fact that taxes are necessary to finance appropriations. It might be popular to vote for appropriations and against taxes. But every man in this House knows that you cannot spend and spend without having taxes with which to cover the expenditures. I agree that we have just about reached the absorption point in taxes.

There is only one answer, and that is for the Government to curtail expenditures We cannot spend and spend and spend without increased taxes. There must be further retrenchment and economy in local, State, and National Government, otherwise we face national bankruptcy.

Therefore, sane, common sense demands that we keep these appropriations down to an absolute minimum There is in the House a group who have worked this entire year trying to trim these appropriations. We have succeeded to a marked degree. But it is very disheartening, after all of our labor over here, to see these bills come back from the other body, which is supposedly the more conservative and sober Chamber, invariably with sharp increases.

I am very much in hopes that this House will recommit this bill and that the House conferees will insist upon the House provisions; thereby saving approximately $125,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. For if it is appropriated we must have more taxes. We cannot eat our pie and keep it, too.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time to inquire of the chairman of the committee if the project which is partially in my district, known as the New Cumberland lock and dam, was taken out, as I asked that it should be. It was taken out originally by the House and was put back in by the Senate Did the conference committee take that out?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it is such an unusual experience to have a Member of the House ask that a project in his district be eliminated that special note was made of the gentleman's request, and in conference the Senate amendment was rejected. We are glad to cooperate with the gentleman from Ohio. It is to be regretted there are not more who take the same attitude.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I want to thank the gentleman and say that that project may be very worth while, but it certainly is not necessary at this time. In this time of inflation and high expenditures, we can certainly get along without it, because the Ohio River Channel is sufficiently deep to carry the shipping on it. If the project is brought up at some time when we need employment, it might be a good proposition. This project now would build a new dam to replace two perfectly good dams which operate satisfactorily. I thank the gentleman for not including it in this conference report.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. I want to congratulate the gentleman. I think this is the first instance of this kind that has come to my experience in the years I have served in this House.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, the committee of conference is to be congratulated for presenting to the House this report. We have made our annual appropriations in all of the bills. I think this is the last one this year. There is not another appropriation bill that has been cut anything like this one was cut by the Civil Function Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, we have not only not cut the other bills 20 percent; we have not cut them 15 percent; we have not cut them 10 percent. No, Mr. Speaker; we made very limited cuts, but what do we hear this morning? Some effort has been made to compare this with certain other bills that we have passed. Now, this bill has no connection with any other appropriation bill, not even the tax bill of yesterday or the appropriation bill for foreign aid. But if you must compare, if you want to compare this bill with others may we make a comparison with the appropriation for the aid and assistance of foreign nations. We appropriated every dime the Bureau of the Budget requested. Not one nickel was cut. I challenge any Member of the House to deny that statement, except I will say that some money was deleted for Korea, on the theory that it would be appropriated a little later. Not a dime was saved. That was for aid and relief of foreign countries. While I voted against that bill because I honestly believed that we were exceeding our financial ability as a nation. I would have supported the bill if a substantial cut had been made. However, this morning we have a bill for the aid and assistance of America. Perhaps the Committee of Conference made mistakes by including some projects here and there which should have been omitted. I do not know. I am as conservative as any Member in this House. I will put my record for conservatism up against the record of any Member of this House or the Senate, but as long as we have such large sums of money to spend in countries abroad, when it comes to spending at home I want to be guided by the Members of this House and the Senate and the folks back home. I am willing to make a few mistakes in their favor.

Mr Speaker, I am grateful to the committee of conference for the consideration they have extended to my State—Arkansas. All items pending before them have received careful consideration, and I am entirely satisfied. They have done a grand job, and we, the entire delegation from Arkansas, are well pleased and entirely satisfied. I desire especially to thank the committee of

conference for agreeing to the Senate amendment regarding Hardin drain at Pine Bluff in amount of $265,000 and the amount of $4,100,000 for the Arkansas River and tributaries. This money is to be used for bank stabilization on the Arkansas River. The money is being allowed by the Congress and will be expended by the Corps of Engineers according to the justification of estimates submitted for bank-stabilization projects on the Arkansas River in the civil functions appropriation bill on eight locations on the Arkansas River in Arkansas and Oklahoma. Of those eight locations, five touch the Sixth Congressional District of Arkansas, which I have the honor to represent in this body. The following is exact information taken from the justification of estimates affecting the five locations within our district:

Item	Total cost	Allocations	
		Fiscal year 1952	After fiscal year 1952
White Bluff to Jefferson County free bridge	$600,000	$200,000	$400,000
Plum Bayou to Rob Roy	750,000	750,000	
Medford	460,000	460,000	
Brunsons Crossing	580,000	580,000	
New Gascony	300,000	300,000	

For the sake of brevity I do not here include the description of the work contemplated at these five locations, however such descriptions are a part of the Justification of Estimates compiled by the Corps of Engineers and referred to the Senate committee by the Bureau of the Budget, and are on file in the committees of both the Senate and House.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good conference report and it ought to be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr CANNON Mr Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], a member of the committee.

Mr RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, several Members of the House have inquired concerning the total sum available for planning

On rivers and harbors the unobligated balance was $872,926. These funds were frozen projects before they were released. The appropriation which is in the bill is in the sum of $500,000. This brings the total to $1,372,926. The Budget estimate for rivers and harbors was $1,000,000, so the unobligated balance is now raised $372,926 above the amount requested.

In flood control the unobligated balance was $3,475,800. To that is added the appropriation in this bill of $1,000,000, which brings the total to $4,475,800. The Budget estimate was $2,500,000. So we have an increase there of about $2,000,000

The grand total available for planning is $5,848,726; whereas the total Budget estimate was $3,500,000. The increase is due to the unfreezing of funds in both the rivers and harbors and flood control sections.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JENSEN. I have prepared a motion to recommit which reads as follows:

I move that the conference report on the bill H R. 4386 be recommitted to the conference committee with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on House amendment No. 15, which is the Jensen amendment.

My inquiry is this: In the event a straight motion to recommit this conference report to the committee of conference is offered, will that foreclose me from offering this motion to recommit with instructions which I have just read, whether the straight motion to recommit is defeated or passed?

The SPEAKER There can be but one motion to recommit.

Mr. JENSEN. Hence I will be foreclosed from offering this motion?

The SPEAKER. If another motion to recommit is offered and adopted or rejected.

Mr. CANNON. Mr Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time to inquire of the chairman if this bill should be recommitted with no specific instructions It is not possible that no civil-functions bill would be reported and the Department would be forced to operate on a continuing resolution?

Mr. CANNON. The only alternative, of course, would be a further conference with every item in the bill subject to reduction or elimination, or a continuing resolution, assuming that a continuing resolution could be passed

The enactment of a continuing resolution would involve distressing complications The current appropriation bill which would be continued is based on last year's construction program. It has not greatly hampered the program to operate on that basis for a few months into this fiscal year but to continue it throughout the year and into the working season of 1952 would result in vastly lessened efficiency in the program and would retard vitally needed projects which are now well on the road to completion No one at all interested in any provision of the river-and-harbor sections of the bill, or the flood-control provisions, could afford to see the interests of his area subjected to the contingencies which would follow recommitment of the conference report now before the House

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the committee in charge of this bill has been very anxious to comply with the wishes of every Member of the House and to include all projects and appropriations requested. But had we done so, there has not been enough money in the United States Treasury for peacetime expenditures, beginning with the administration of George Washington and continuing down to the present time, to pay for them. I am certain the Members of the House will understand that we had no choice but to restrict to a minimum the amount we reported. A very definite line had to be drawn somewhere and, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] have explained, that we drew the line by classes and categories, as determined by authorizations, budget estimates, emergencies, relation to national defense programs, and other well-defined lines of demarcation.

And may I, at this point, express the appreciation of all majority members of the subcommittee, of the invaluable service rendered by these two distinguished minority members in the screening of evidence, the preparation of the report, and the drafting of the bill. They were in agreement with the bill as it went to the Senate, and assisted materially in efforts to protect the bill from heavy increases, some of them without authorization of law, many of them without budget estimates, and otherwise unacceptable to the managers on the part of the House. But the Senators insisted they were a part of the United States Government, and, of course, a conference is a matter of compromise, and we had no choice but to yield on many items which were not in consonance with the rules we had followed in assembling the House bill

The conference report is not acceptable to some because it is not liberal enough and does not include appropriations which have been omitted It is not agreeable to others because it is too liberal and carries appropriations which they think should have been reduced or eliminated altogether. Let me say to all Members of the House that after months of work on the bill, the committee believes it is the best bill that can be secured under the circumstances. Recommitment would unquestionably result in disadvantages which would outweigh most of the objections advanced here this afternoon I trust the conference report will be agreed to

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Mr. BOLLING Mr Speaker, this conference report includes only planning money for Tuttle Creek, one of the dams urgently required to protect the Kansas Cities and other areas so recently devastated by disastrous floods I had hoped fervently that the conference committee would provide money for the immediate construction of this and other critically necessary projects The failure to do so but increases the direct responsibility of the Congress for future, as well as past events We all pray that no further disaster will come to this tragically devastated area

The conference committee recommends to the Committees on Public Works that immediate consideration be given to the establishment of a Missouri River Basin Survey Commission to make a complete investigation of flood conditions and proposed measures for control thereof in the lower Missouri River Basin area and to report to the Congress at the earliest practicable date, but not later than June 30, 1952.

In view of the failure of this bill to appropriate money for construction of Tuttle Creek and related projects, it is imperative that this survey be made most expeditiously so that the matter may be finally resolved and the heart of America adequately protected against the re-

currence of a disaster, the results of which this Congress has already made clear it will not adequately assist in repairing.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the members of the conference committee who have seen fit to include in the conference report an appropriation for $1,000,000 for the improvement of the Cuyahoga River, in Cleveland. This appropriation will enable the engineers to remove some of the impediments which prevent long, modern freighters navigating the river to the steel and other industrial plants for the purpose of delivering ore and other raw materials so vitally needed for production for national defense.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the conference report.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-eight Members are present, a quorum

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr DAVIS of Wisconsin moves to recommit H R. 4386 to the committee of conference.

Mr. CANNON Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 81, noes 138.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FORD) there were—yeas 143, noes 77.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 8, line 5, after "project", insert ": *Provided further*, That not more than $200,000 of the funds available for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available to pay to lawful occupants of properties within the towns of Sanish and Van Hook, N. Dak., for their improvements which will be rendered useless by the construction of the project, but for which compensation may not be made under existing law because of the occupants' limited right of occupancy: *Provided further*, That payment in each case shall be limited to the fair value of the improvements, or the cost of moving such improvements to the site of the new combined town, whichever is less, as determined by the Secretary of the Army: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated shall not be expended for the payment of business losses or other losses incident to the acquisition of lands for this project."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which action was taken on the motion was laid on the table

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

READJUSTMENT OF SIZE AND WEIGHT LIMITATIONS ON PARCEL POST PACKAGES

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1335) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class—parcel post—mail, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H REPT No 1187)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S 1335) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4, and agree to the same.

TOM MURRAY,
M G BURNSIDE,
EDWARD H REES,
Managers on the Part of the House

MIKE MONRONEY,
GEORGE SMATHERS,
JOHN M BUTLER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S 1335) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendments of the House.

TOM MURRAY,
M G. BURNSIDE,
EDWARD H. REES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, since the Senate receded and agreed to the House bill, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4473) entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BYRD, Mr MILLIKIN, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H R 2574) to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H R. 2574, with Mr. BATTLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate on the bill has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 are hereby amended by inserting at the end of the above-named sections the following new subsection.

"(c) All contracts negotiated without advertising pursuant to authority contained in this act shall include a clause to the effect that the Comptroller General of the United States or any of his duly authorized representatives shall have access to and the right to examine any pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of the contractor or any of his subcontractors engaged in the performance of and involving transactions related to such contracts or subcontracts."

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. HARDY: On page 2, line 6, before the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the agency head may omit such clause from contracts with foreign contractors for supplies or services procured outside the limits of the United States, its Territories, and possessions, in any case where such omission is deemed necessary to effect a procurement"

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment before you was adopted by the committee after the report was issued. It was adopted specifically at the request of the Department of Defense and was based upon their experience and

difficulty in security goods and services overseas.

I call attention to the fact that a similar provision is included in the present renegotiation law and a similar provision was in the Renegotiation Act as far back as 1942.

The military has found that on occasion it becomes necessary to acquire goods and services overseas and that foreign contractors have refused to provide those goods and services if renegotiation was insisted upon. For this reason, it was found necessary to exempt such contracts from renegotiation. A similar position is taken with respect to permitting inspection by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY I yield.

Mr. KEATING Does it not seem to the gentleman that there is something inherently unfair to United States contractors to require that they be subjected to a review of their contract, and to the provisions of this bill, when we exempt foreign corporations from the same provisions? It just strikes me that we are not playing fair with our people when we do that sort of thing.

Mr. HARDY. We would prefer that American contractors be given every advantage that foreign contractors are given. However, we have to be mindful of practical considerations.

If it is necessary to acquire some item, or some service from a foreign contractor to service an overseas contingent of our military forces, and that contractor refuses to supply it unless he is exempted from these provisions, then it would seem to me that the dictates of wisdom would require that we exempt such contract if the acquisition of the item is of sufficient importance.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman mean to imply that there are items which can be furnished by foreign corporations, and which cannot be furnished by United States corporations, which make it necessary for us to yield to this stubborn insistence on the part of foreign corporations?

Mr. HARDY. There have been instances of that kind. There have been times when certain items were acquired by the military, which were available from foreign corporations, and which were not produced by United States corporations, at least in adequate quantity.

Mr KEATING. I do not want to inquire into any privileged matter, or other matters which should not be disclosed. But, does that situation exist today when our rearmament program has been speeded up, that there are still items which cannot be supplied in this country or by United States suppliers, which make it necessary for us to yield to this position taken by foreign contractors.

Mr. HARDY I can think at the moment of only one item on which I have personal information, which is currently being procured from United States contractors, and simultaneously being procured from overseas contractors because our production is not sufficiently great. I presume there may be many others.

Mr. KEATING. Has it been represented to the gentleman in that one case, that it is not possible for us to procure an adequate supply from our own contractors?

Mr. HARDY. That is the understanding I have. Here is another type of case, which although it is a hypothetical case, could easily arise, and I presume does frequently arise. If we have a contractor performing certain construction work overseas, and we should be temporarily short of a particular article because of shipping delays or for some other reason has not arrived, and it was then found that a local foreign supplier might be able to furnish that article, and that contractor should say they would furnish this article at a certain price. If we should say that we would have to see their books and records, he could just decline to make it available to us, and we would be stymied in the procurement of that item.

Mr. KEATING. The unwillingness of a foreign supplier to permit such an inspection raises in my mind a serious question as to whether we should let a contract to that supplier.

The CHAIRMAN The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr HARDY Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr HARDY Mr Chairman, I merely wanted to make this observation The amendment specifically prescribes that this provision in the contract may be omitted when the head of an agency finds it is necessary to effect a procurement Of course, this is a provision which should be exercised with caution and with the best judgment the responsible individual possesses.

I hope the amendment is agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] has expired

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two additional minutes in order that I may propound a question to him.

The CHAIRMAN Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. I would like to ask the gentleman: Is it not true that in the bill as drafted subcontractors are made subject to the provisions of the bill the same as the initial contractors?

Mr. HARDY. That is correct.

Mr. HARVEY. Just using an illustration. I am trying to point up some of the defects in the operation of this bill should it become law: A gentleman in my district makes a gadget which is purchased by Allison Motors in Indianapolis, a subdivision of General Motors. He makes that gadget in great quantities. Allison is the prime contractor for the Government. This man sells to a lot of other people, including Allison, this particular gadget. Does that mean that this man, who, in a sense, would be said to be a subcontractor, would be subject to having all of his books opened up for inspection by Government officials?

Mr. HARDY. It would depend on whether he was simply selling a few items or whether he was contracting to sell a number of items.

Mr. HARVEY. Is the bill sufficiently well written to set forth that distinction that the gentleman has made?

Mr. HARDY. I think it should be clearly understood that it is not contemplated that a contractor who might have to buy some casual item in connection with the performance of a contract would expect that that particular individual should open his books.

Mr. HARVEY. I am not thinking particularly of an obvious intent of fraud. I hope the gentleman understands that. But the point I am making is that a great many times we enact these laws with utmost good faith, and when they come to be interpreted by the agencies downtown on the Avenue, they take an entirely different attitude.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] has again expired.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 2 additional minutes

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan Well, Mr. Chairman, I object

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] is recognized

Mrs CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment It is true that today I have been assured by the chairman of the subcommittee, in whom I have complete confidence and whose work certainly deserves the commendation of this Congress, that there has been in the past at least one instance in which the provisions of the proposed bill would have been harmful in procuring for the United States some material which was badly needed However, to be consistent, I must report that I opposed this amendment in committee. I opposed it on principle, as well as in actuality.

It seems to me basically unfair and discriminatory to put upon American business, restrictions which we refuse to put on foreign industry. My first opposition in committee was based on this proposed discrimination against American business. Aside from the fact that the amendment proposes such discrimination, it seems to me also to offer unlimited danger. There is nothing in my experience with the way in which foreign business is conducted which would lead me to think that contracts made without this safeguard abroad would be any more trustworthy or free from chicanery or corruption than similar contracts made with American business which, after all, does have in the main a high code of business ethics.

I am speaking with some experience. The only business contracts with which I have personally ever been in close touch have been contracts made with foreign industry. With a light touch I would remind you of the old story—not completely apocryphal—that many

businesses abroad have been known to keep three kinds of books: those for themselves, those for the tax collector, and those by which they wish to sell the business. That may be going a little to extremes, nor would I seem to condemn foreign business conduct in blanket fashion. I do say, however, that contracts abroad are written on a different basis of business ethics than American contracts.

I think therefore that there is danger in giving to those with authority to make our commitments, power to make such contracts abroad without the safeguard that we have thought necesssary to impose on contracts made with our own businessmen at home.

This morning the chairman of the subcommittee did me the courtesy of calling to tell me the instance which led him to think that this amendment was necessary. I am unable, however, to bring myself to think that because of an emergency it is necessary to accept a procedure which is inherently wrong. I am going beyond that. I think that as responsible representatives of the American people we have no right because of an emergency to change the general code of conduct for our business relations. I strongly feel that if it is necessary in the interest of integrity or economy to put this safeguard and restriction on American business, it is even more necessary that the same safeguards and restrictions be put upon those foreign businesses with which we are making contracts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Having had some experience as a procurement officer in dealing with foreign concerns, I have the feeling that there is a greater necessity for this legislation with regard to contracts made with foreign corporations than there is with those in this country. I agree with the gentlewoman that in the vast majority of cases our own business people are fair and honest in all their dealings, and I make no allegations to the contrary with regard to foreign corporations; but, certainly if we are going to impose this obligation upon our own business people we should do it with regard to foreign corporations with whom our country deals.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman whose great experience as procurement officer substantiates my own fear of this amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr Chairman, permit me to say at the very beginning that I have the utmost confidence in the GAO. I knew the head of GAO when he served here in the House, and no one, so far as I have ever been able to learn, has ever questioned either his ability, his sincerity, or his integrity. But it does not follow that every employee in GAO cannot make a mistake, or has no improper motive in connection with his work.

I have noticed in connection with some of the investigations which have been instigated or carried on by GAO or some of its employees that they can be just as arbitrary, just as unfair, just as wasteful, just as deceitful, as any of the employees of some of the other agencies. In fact, I have had occasion to observe some of their work. One of their top men is what might be described as a know-it-all. He seems to resent the fact that a Congressman may have an independent thought or does not accept his conclusion without question. And from the way some of them operate it appears they are more interested in making work for the GAO than in doing a job.

The House has always been opposed to these unnecessary snooping expeditions by committee staffs or by the bureaucrats down town; and yet here we come along with a bill under the guise of doing something to protect the taxpayers which would let the GAO go into everybody's business and look it over if they just wanted to take a look at it. In one instance they spent about a week on a job that needed but a fraction of that time. Let me repeat, it is all right to have GAO look into many situations, for GAO is the arm of Congress; it is the only agency, or the most effective agency we have against fraud and extravagance and waste and all those things; it is absolutely necessary, but that is no reason, at least to my mind, why we should give them unlimited authority to go everywhere and snoop into everybody's business. GAO has many employees and it may need the same kind of an overhauling that the Internal Revenue Bureau so greatly needs. Some of these GAO boys are getting swelled heads, they seem to think they are indispensable, when in truth and in fact some are not even ornamental. Some are getting into a frame of mind where they act as though congressional committees cannot function without them, and it sure costs money to have them around. Now, after providing that they may go into the books of our own people, they come along with an amendment and in effect, say: That is all right, we must do that, but we do not want to let you look at a foreigner's books, the books of any foreigner who has a subcontract.

Where do you get to then? Let us take an illustration. Here is a contract that requires three items for its completion. Two are furnished by subcontractors here in America. One by a contractor abroad. The GAO under this bill can go into the books of our own people and ask and get from them anything and everything they want, but they cannot go into the books of the fellow abroad who furnishes the third item.

They say: Well, they, the folks abroad, will not bid on it. With all the billions and billions of dollars that we are giving to these other countries and to the people of those other countries, it is a strange situation when they will not do business with us except on their own terms. What has become of our bargaining sense? Is international trade a one-way street? What are we? Beggars?

We might better go back to the days of David Harum who always got something when he made a trade. If we are going to give them a contract over there, there is no reason why we should not protect the American taxpayers against graft from those people as well as from our own. If you say they will not deal with us, all right, they do not need to, then we will not give them any more money. I cannot see any reason why we should give billions and billions of dollars away if we do not get something in return, even if the old horse we get is wind-broken, blind, heavey and has but three legs.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has a commercial instinct down there. I do not see why he does not drive a bargain. Get something for what we give.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman is speaking beside the point on this. This is purely a practical matter. If we can provide it from our own contractors, all well and good; but if we should find it necessary to acquire material from a foreign contractor overseas, we do not want to cut our own throats.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I get the gentleman's point Sure, the fellow over there says: We will not give you this third essential item that you need if you are going to snoop into our books and find out what it costs or what will be a fair price or what profit we make.

My answer is: Why do you deal with them? Why do you give them all of these billions of dollars, not only on that particular thing, but just hand money out to them, shovel it out to them? So why should we give them something more—permit them when we want something to say they will not deal with us except on their terms.

Oh, I cannot figure it out. The gentleman grows peanuts and cotton down there, I think peanuts. The people get a price for their peanuts, but he says they must not profit too much, but when it comes to dealing with the taxpayers' money on a big contract abroad they say: "Oh, we are helpless. If the peanuts are mixed with something which only the British and the French have while we will see that the Virginia peanut grower does not profit too much, we will not let GAO ask our foreign friends to charge for what they put into the mixture."

Where did Patrick Henry come from? Did he not come from that part of the country? Was he not the fellow who told them off? But are the Virginians to go under the table now and say: No, we will give you from abroad anything you ask if you just come along with us, you need not deal fairly, you can be a war profiteer if you wish, but as for our own people we will see that they do not get more than enough to pay their taxes?

I cannot figure it out and I do not see why you want to do these unfair things to our own people while letting foreign contractors skin us alive.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, after listening to the debate it seems to me that some of us believe that by this amendment we are going to do a disservice to a foreign business. We do appreciate in the beginning

that contracts will be let to foreign governments only under certain circumstances, that is, when it is absolutely necessary to procure something that is needed.

The amendment reads as follows:

Provided, That the agency head may omit such clause from contracts with foreign contractors for supplies or services procured outside the limits of the United States, its Territories, and possessions, in any case where such omission is deemed necessary to effect a procurement

It is only under those circumstances that this provision will ever be used. The power is given to an American agency head to omit such clause from a foreign contract in any case where such omission is deemed necessary to effect procurement.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is absolutely right when he refers to the agency head. But who tells him what to do? The State Department. Who determines that policy? Acheson.

Mr. DAWSON. I have no reply against that type of argument.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. It seems to me that there is an essential fallacy in the gentleman's argument which may be because of the gentleman's possible unfamiliarity with the types of cases where procurement will be sought overseas.

During World War II, it was the policy of our Government, and very properly so, to procure everything possible under reverse lend-lease overseas from foreign contractors. It was not just emergency items. Now, I assume that today, under the Mutual Assistance Act, every effort will be made to have our foreign friends supply as much as possible to us under their participation in the mutual-assistance program. I do not think these procurements will be limited only to emergency items. I think it is very likely to be a widespread program, and, if that is true, if the policy is going to be the same as it was in World War II, then we are opening the door here to procurement abroad on entirely different terms from the method of procurement at home and on terms more favorable to foreign contractors than to our domestic contractors.

Mr. DAWSON. In the light of the experience of the gentleman as a procurement officer, I am more in favor of this amendment than ever, knowing the type of officer that he would be. As head of that agency I have every reason to believe that if you were given this power you would think in terms of the protection of your Government and not in terms of giving something away to a foreign power. So we have provided that the agency head, the procurement officer, such as the gentleman would be, may omit such clause from contracts with foreign contractors in any case where it is necessary to effect procurement. I am sure that you, as a procurement officer, would never have abused the trust that this Government placed in you when they gave you the power of a procurement officer, and you would use an amendment like this to protect your Government, and only give a contractor the benefit of this in case where it was necessary to protect your Government, and not in the interest of some foreign power.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate those very kind things the gentleman from Illinois has said; I deeply do, and I appreciate the force of the argument that he has put forth. However, it is not a question of the procurement officer in the field. He, of course, presumably, will do a conscientious job. The orders come from Washington, or did, and very properly so, in my judgment, in World War II. Everything possible must be procured from the country; indigenous products must be used to the greatest extent possible, and it is not a question of the man on the ground protecting the Government. It is the fact that there will be a large number of these procurements for which the same protection should exist as for domestic procurement.

Mr. DAWSON. The answer to that is that just as in World War II, the head of the agency gave the procurement officer in the field the ablity to make contracts. So it is in this day and time. They will no more be made here in Washington now than they were made in your time, but the head here will give to the authority in the field the right to make the contract to protect this Government wherever it is deemed necessary. Certainly that matter would not be tried here but would be handled by the procurement officer on the ground.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want, first, to commend the very able chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], for the splendid work he did in bringing this particular bill to the floor. I think it is an excellent bill, and I am very much in favor of it.

However, I am very much disturbed about this amendment the gentleman was asked to place on this bill, that limits the investigatory work of the General Accounting Office to contracts within the United States. At the time this bill was presented to our full committee for consideration, I asked what examples of foreign contracts there were that needed this sort of provision in order for us to obtain such contracts, so that it would not interfere with our defense efforts. The answer, of course, was that there were no specific examples. The chairman of the committee read a letter of very general nature saying that the Defense Department just wanted it that way. I asked whether the committee or its staff had made any further inquiry to find out just what they were talking about, because if there were no contracts that might be interfered with that would affect our defense I wanted to know about it, but in typical fashion there was nothing specific.

As a member of the committee I must report to the House that the committee itself found nothing specific in its hearing. The chairman has told me personally that since that time a couple of matters were called to his attention. I am not going to divulge their nature other than to say that in both instances they were what I would term emergency situations. This amendment is not limited to emergency situations at all. It refers to any case where such omission is necessary to make a purchase. It does not say that the purchase is absolutely vital or necessary. Even if it were an emergency, I sort of shy away from that word after having been in a period of 20 years of emergency. I doubt very much if this Administration knows what the word "emergency" really means.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. This is an amendment to the Armed Services Procurement Act.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS. Of course, our armed services procure vegetables and similar things all over Europe for our forces.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. VORYS. Would not that come under this provision?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not know why it should not

Mr. VORYS. We were told in our hearings of very substantial purchases the armed services are making particularly in Japan, where the purchases by our armed services are a great boon to their economy. My question is, would not all that procurement come under this provision?

Mr CURTIS of Missouri. Certainly it would come under this provision, just like any procurement abroad. I wish someone would tell me why we should not have the right to follow through on those contracts if we are going to spend the money. If these people abroad are our friends, as everyone indicates they are, we having spent so much money over there, if they are really our friends and it comes down to an issue of where we need an emergency purchase, and they will not give it to us because of this requirement that we insist upon with our own contractors, all I can say is that we have not procured very firm friends. It is a real question in my mind whether we do have those firm friends.

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman will yield, I think I fully understand and appreciate the sincerity on which the gentleman is basing his discussion. I, too, am concerned about granting any preferences under this type of legislation. I dislike very much to find it necessary to do so. However, I should like to refer just for a moment to the illustration made by our colleague from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] a moment ago. Suppose, for instance, a contractor should say, "We will not furnish these vegetables if you are going to inspect our books" Are we going to undertake to ship all those vegetables from here over there?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No. I suggest we handle that situation as we should handle it. I think if they are

so anxious to get the American dollar we are not going to have that particular problem.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. What would be the status of a contract made in a foreign country with a company which is in fact a subsidiary of an American company?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is exactly the way you could get around the provisions of this bill if this amendment is adopted. I think this is a real contribution to this discussion, because that is what I fear, among other things.

Mr. HARDY. I wish I had the answer to that one.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, very briefly.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I would like to ask the gentleman the same question I asked the previous speaker, namely, What would be the status of a contract made in a foreign country with a firm, which is in fact a subsidiary of an American firm?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You could not go into their books under this amendment, if it is adopted.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. That would be a great loophole then.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. To me, the absurdity of this amendment, or at least I think it is an absurdity, can be recognized if you take this illustration. We all remember in World War II, we appropriated money to buy cigarettes for the armed services abroad. It was necessary, we said, and it affected their morale adversely so we were told if they did not get their tobacco. There is a tobacco product, I understand, a plug tobacco. I do not know how they make it. Perhaps the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], my very good friend, knows. By the way, I want to compliment and express confidence in not only the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. HARDY], but in all the members of the committee, and all members of all other committees for that matter—yes, in the whole House of Representatives, and especially in my constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Michigan.

Now suppose they want to buy some tobacco, some chewing tobacco, or plug tobacco over there? You can have a contractor abroad. We buy of him. He gets the tobacco from the Virginia planters, or the jobbers, or whoever has it for sale here. He has it shipped over there and makes a contract to sell the cigarettes and the chewing tobacco to our services for the use of our men and the few who are sent by other nations in Korea or next week in Europe. You can go into the grower's, the jobber's books if he is an American to find out what he is getting out of it. But if the contractor or anyone over there adds a little molasses or "flavoring something," or whatever it is, they put into chewing tobacco, you cannot ask that foreign contractor or subcontractor whether or not they are gouging us. It gives them an unfair advantage. It lets them trim us clear down to the bone. What I think is troubling the gentleman from Virginia, and those who are supporting this bill, is they are just afraid; and they do not have confidence enough in our own people, and those who deal for us, to believe that our bargaining agents have the ability, can hold these people abroad, and make them give us a fair deal. Either that or they want to strip our own people of all opportunities to make a fair profit, but are willing to let a foreign outfit skin us. It goes back to the argument I made awhile ago.

We are on the giving end all the time, sending money and our resources and our men abroad, not for our benefit—not for our benefit, but primarily for the benefit of the other countries and these other people. Then when to help them we need something and they refuse to deal fairly—we drop down on our backs, roll our eyes, and beg them not to gouge us too deeply. Why is it that all the time in everything we do, we must extend to them a special privilege? We impose upon our people, and our manufacturers and dealers the duty of turning their books inside out, any snooper from the General Accounting Office who may want to come along, may strut his stuff, show his authority, make everyone turn his files inside out—examine the books of our people—yet, we say that the books and the fraudulent cheating operations, if any there be, of those who happen to live abroad, and with whom we happen to make a contract, cannot be examined. I think it is time we treated our own people a little more fairly. That we do not extend all of the privileges and the immunities, the right to do business, to the people who happen to live across the sea. I just cannot understand it, unless we are so fearful of what may happen to us if we do not kiss their feet or their foot or whatever way you want to put it—all the time they will frown or—most disastrous of all—refuse to accept our money. The difficulty I have, and it grows and grows on me all the time is that here are these fighting Virginians ready to fight at the drop of a hat—in years gone by—for America, but today anything that Britain or any other nation wants must be given. Figure it out—can you? Are you going to go over now and fight Egypt for control of the Suez Canal? Are you going down there and fight in Iran for the oil? Do you intend to force open the door in Iran, in Egypt, as Acheson-Marshall did in China—so that Russia may walk in? When are you going to quit, if you keep on this way? They will have us in a war all over the world. Is that necessary in order that Truman may be elected in 1952? The first thing you know, we will be fighting West Virginia. Someone here the other day introduced a bill, I think it was the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I do not know what he was going to do with West Virginia—it was for the purpose of taking them in—was it not?

Mr. HARDY. We would even welcome the State of Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And we would be glad to join you—when you get out of the habit of voting the Democratic ticket when a New Dealer heads it. This bill, Mr. Chairman, ought to be sent back to committee as was that bill yesterday. All you gentlemen who voted in the years gone by for all appropriations, then when the thing caught up with you and you learned that we had to have more taxes voted "no" were on the hot spot because the result of your votes caught up with you. Nobody objected much when you voted for appropriations, but when you reached down into the taxpayers' pocket and began to take out 11 percent more, then you heard from the folks, and so the people who have been voting for appropriations, voted "no." They reformed. They hit the sawdust trail. They became Christians and voted "no." The bad thing about it from the standpoint of those big appropriation boys was that when you counted the "no" votes they were in the majority. The church just would not hold all the Christians. Now they are over here trying to find some way to get out of that dilemma they got themselves into. One remedy is to quit voting for appropriations all the time. But the leadership need not worry. Before the week is over there will be enough backsliders so that the action can be reversed. There will be plenty of room in the church for the "no" voters after the CIO boss has herded them outside—to carry out its deal with the New Deal politicians.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARDY) there were—ayes 38, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON: On page 2, line 2, after the word "shall", insert the following "Until the expiration of 3 years after final payment."

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered is not intended to restrict the act but simply to clarify and to write into the bill the well established principle of a time limitation. By writing this into the bill there can be no misunderstanding as to the intent of Congress and this will eliminate the uncertainty of how long records must be kept. It will also tend to serve as notice on contractors that they are expected to preserve their records for this period of time. Contracts of this kind are frequently financed through banks and if

we remove uncertainties we implement credit and so aid production.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was discussed in general debate a few days ago. The effect of it would be to put a 3-year limitation of time within which the General Accounting Office would have to inspect the books and records. I have discussed the matter with several members of the committee and everyone I have discussed it with is agreeable to it. So we are willing to accept the amendment.

Mr BURTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr BURTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr HARVEY: On page 2, line 6, after the period, at the end of the sentence, insert a sentence as follows "The above authority shall not apply to a manufacturer or processor who is a supplier of material to a primary contractor and who is not a subcontractor."

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, in further pursuance of the colloquy I had with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], I want to explain the import of this amendment.

I have previously served on the very fine Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and worked very harmoniously with the gentleman from Virginia I have high regard for the intent of this bill I was a member of the subcommittee that drafted this Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and I feel that I have a little right to speak on it and know something about it.

What are you going to do if you do not restrict it by the language that I have offered in this amendment? If you do not restrict it to prime contractors and subcontractors as such, you are going to turn every manufacturer in this country almost without exception over to the GAO for inspection, for everybody in some minor capacity is a supplier of some goods that eventually find their way into defense production; so you are virtually going to subject our entire industrial economy to the scrutiny of the GAO. Some little contractor or manufacturer who may be using only 10 percent of his capacity for the production of goods for the prime contractor, but because of that—and he cannot afford to keep a separate set of books for that 10 percent—it means that every section of his books will have to come under the complete scrutiny of the GAO. He is going to be harassed no end to try to break down production costs and show the details on that 10 percent of his production that went into the general program of defense. While I credit the author of the bill with the very best of intentions, I do not think he understands or fully appreciates what the ultimate effect will be upon our economy if every person who is manufacturing anything is going to have to supply all the answers to the GAO on everything that he manufactures, and such is literally going to be the impact of the bill if this amendment is not included. I hope the Committee will adopt the amendment

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield

Mr. VORYS. I think the gentleman's amendment is sound because I happen to know suppliers in a particular field who when they are asked to supply $15 or $20 worth of some material to a Government agency and are asked to make out 16 forms in triplicate, they simply say, "No, we will not do it."

I also wonder why the committee did not decide to put in some sort of minimum to which this would not apply, simply to take care of the odd purchases that are made, and must necessarily be made, by Government agencies, small amounts where the established seller is simply not going to open his books for some such small purchase.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman; that is a very pertinent point.

Mr HARDY. Mr Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is totally unnecessary and unjustified I recognize the motive which has prompted the gentleman from Indiana in offering it, but certainly this bill does not propose that the GAO scrutinize every individual purchase transaction from a company. In the first place, it would be absolutely impossible for the General Accounting Office even to consider examining the books and records of all individual suppliers who supply some small items to the prime contractor; it is not intended to cover that type of operation at all On the other hand, to make the amendment as broad as the gentleman from Indiana has suggested would make it impossible frequently to obtain information which would be vital in a study of a contract For instance, take this automotive parts proposition as one illustration, an automobile dealer who had a prime contract with the Government. He sublet a part of it to a supply house and the supply house had an additional subcontract with a toolmaker, and so on all the way down the line until profit after profit was pyramided in that proposition. In that case, incidentally, there was involved a little matter of $100,000 that somebody got who was not entitled to it, and it is not too clear that Uncle Sam did not have to pay it

Mr HARVEY. Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr HARVEY. Without appearing to dispute the gentleman's statement, may I offer this suggestion: That after all, if that condition prevails probably the fault lies with the initial procurement and not with the method of supply?

Mr. HARDY. I think the fault lies in both.

Mr HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. If I can understand the English language, the language you have in this bill that I am now reading from, supports the gentleman from Indiana 100 percent. Listen to what it says. Here is what it says.

The GAO shall have access to and the right to examine any pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of the contractor or any of his subcontractors engaged in the performance of and involving transactions related to such contracts or subcontracts.

Mr HARDY. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he started too late in reading I am perfectly willing to stop there if the gentleman will start at the beginning. It requires there shall be a clause inserted in the contract. Obviously if it is an item or two purchased without any contract, why it could not be covered under this law.

Mr HILL Where is the gentleman reading from? I am reading from the bill the gentleman proposes to have me vote on and it says "all contractors."

Mr HARDY. It says:

All contracts negotiated without advertising shall include a clause to the effect that the Comptroller General—

And so forth. That right is given him in the contract. The right is not given him in the bill.

Mr HILL Let me ask a question to be sure. I refer to a firm in my own town that makes a certain type of equipment Most of their work is done under a subcontractor's contract. They will not come under this bill at all?

Mr HARDY I think I would have to know a little bit more about it

Mr HILL All I know is that he bids on this material and furnishes it.

Mr HARDY If he holds a contract with a prime contractor or directly with the Government, that contract, presumably, would contain this clause

Mr. HILL. Would they come out to that little town and examine all of his books because he happens to be making a few pieces of equipment for a subcontractor in New York City?

Mr HARDY. If that contract is negotiated it would have to contain this clause. If it is a bid contract with advertising it would not contain this cause.

Mr HILL. If the contract is negotiated with this firm in New York City and this firm in Colorado had a subcontract, would they come out to Fort Collins, examine the man's books, separate out the type of material he sends, furnishes, or supplies on this prime contract that he made with the prime contractor? That is the question I am asking.

Mr. HARDY. I am not sure I fully understand the question which the gentleman has raised. The bill is perfectly clear On contracts that are negotiated without advertising the General Accounting Office would have a right to inspect. Obviously, the General Accounting Office cannot inspect all these contractors nor would there be any purpose to do so.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman has me more mixed up now than before I asked

the question. I would like to know the answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, no one can question the purpose of the subcommittee or of the subcommittee chairman in connection with this bill, nor their sincerity in the matter. The whole thing arises out of the belief—and if I am incorrect I want the chairman of the committee or the chairman of the subcommittee to set me right—that the Federal employees who negotiate these contracts are no match for the people on the other end of the deal, those who negotiate for private enterprise. Is that not right? That is what gives rise to this?

Mr. HARDY. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This bill is based upon the thought that the Federal employees who negotiate these contracts are no match for the people who represented private corporations or individuals?

Mr. HARDY. I think that is one factor.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You see, the bill rests upon the proposition, which the gentleman admits, that the people in the employ of this administration are either so incompetent or so dishonest, or so ill-informed, that they cannot protect Uncle Sam's interests when they write a contract. Instead of a bill of this kind being the remedy, obviously the answer is to discharge these incompetents or dishonest employees and get competent ones, some qualified ones, even if they be Republicans, some who do not act from political motives, employees who will act for and in the interest of the country.

Recent events show the need for employees and officials who are competent, honest, loyal, and whose service in the administration will not be interrupted by indictment and conviction, or whose discharge will not be forced because of malfeasance or improper conduct. It may be well to follow that policy. Even a little integrity in the administration would, as an example, be helpful. What the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY], I think, is trying to do—and I think the amendment should be adopted—is this: If someone out in the country makes a contract for, as he said, an item which may be 10 percent of the total production, that under this bill, if it goes through, the GAO can send someone out there and go through the books, not only with reference to that one item of 10 percent which went into production for the Government, but into all of his other business where that same item was used. The gentleman wishes to prevent that practice. In the end then, will we not find ourselves in a situation where it is costing the Government far more to carry on this investigation, at least, costing the taxpayers in wasted time and money far more than the Government will ever be able to save, because this bill applies, as I understand, to transactions after the obligation to pay the money has been incurred.

I have this week, and it is typical, in the office, a case in a small town in the fourth district of Michigan. Here is a manufacturer who wants to increase wages. So he makes application to the Stabilization Board and he runs into all kinds of trouble. Down into his place of business—and there has never been any trouble there and there is not now—come the investigators for the Labor Department, the War Labor Board fellows, and then, how they go into it, I do not know, but a fellow from the internal revenue agency and one from the Food and Drug Agency, now think of it, on one item of business that went through that plant and are the Government's men impudent, arrogant, and arbitrary? Ask the owner. Now they just take the company's time, and when you multiply that by thousands or hundreds of thousands of instances—and they can be multiplied that way—you can see how necessary and vital production is slowed. We do not want, we do not need, any more snoopers going around bothering the honest, patriotic citizens who are engaged in production to carry on the war.

The amendment seems to be reasonable and sound.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia

Mr. HARDY. I tried to state this many times, that we are not anticipating that the General Accounting Office could possibly go into all of these things, but they would have the right to do it if they had any reason to suspect fraud or bad faith or illegality.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When does an agency not have someone on its staff who has, in his own mind, reason to suspect? Is there an agency which does not have some who think it their duty to suspect, to snoop, to show their authority—whose heads like that of a certain gentleman from Missouri are not swollen? They suspect all honest citizens, but people abroad, oh, they are all right; you must not do anything to offend them, and proceed on the theory, especially the Internal Revenue agents that they must keep doing something—and we begin to know what they are now—proceed on the theory that every taxpayer is a crook, and that more and more people are seeking to evade their just taxes. If people seek means of lessening their taxes, I think it is due to the fact that they are becoming convinced that this Administration has been spending too many, not millions, but billions of dollars wastefully, and they became resentful. We all want to pay our taxes if we think they are being used properly, but when they are used to pay incompetent and crooked officials, as is being demonstrated from week to week the people do not want any more of it.

I think the amendment ought to be supported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARVEY) there were—ayes 56, noes 40.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. HARVEY and Mr. HARDY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 69, noes 83.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 2, line 2, after the word "any", insert the word "directly."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr HARDY. I personally have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand the other day when I discussed it with the gentleman, that while this amendment was not all that it should be, it was the best that he could think of. Certainly, it was the best—well, I was rather forced to accept it and to agree with him.

The purpose is to limit the "snooping" that may be carried on under this bill which we do not have the votes to defeat.

Mr HARDY. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr HOFFMAN of Michigan. In that case, I will not argue.

The CHAIRMAN The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was agreed to

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BATTLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H R 5274) to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, pursuant to House Resolution 454, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARDY) there were—ayes 101, noes 20.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 921) to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1849 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 are hereby amended by inserting at the end of the above-named sections the following new subsection.

"(c) All contracts negotiated without advertising pursuant to authority contained in this act shall include a clause to the effect that the Comptroller General of the United States or any of his duly authorized representatives shall have access to and the right to examine any pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of the contractor or any of his subcontractors engaged in the performance of and involving transactions related to such contracts or subcontracts."

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr HARDY: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S 921 and insert the provisions of H R 2574 as agreed to

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER The question is on the passage of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings whereby H. R. 2574 was passed were vacated, and that bill laid on the table.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H R 2574.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF PROBLEMS OF COMMON INTEREST WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF CONSULTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (S. Con. Res. 36, Rept. No 1202), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Whereas the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe adopted on May 12, 1951, a resolution reading as follows. "The Assembly,

"Considering that the peoples of Europe and of the United States have many vital problems in common,

"considering that the solidarity between them arises not only from the common dangers they have to face, but is also the reflection of their common origin, and of their community of thought and civilization,

"taking note that the Committee of Ministers in their Message to the Assembly has declared that it would welcome any initiative of the Assembly designed to establish links with the Congress of the United States,

"believing that it would be of the greatest interest for public opinion in the democracies if these problems of common interest were to be discussed by delegations from the two Houses of Congress of the United States and from the Consultative Assembly,

"Instructs its Bureau

"To approach the Congress of the United States through the Speakers of both Houses for the purpose of arranging such a discussion to take place in public, preferably in Strasbourg, or, if for any reason circumstances make it desirable, in Washington, at a date mutually convenient, and in accordance with an agenda drawn up in advance by agreement between the officers of the Congress of the United States and the Bureau of the Consultative Assembly", and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has formally declared it to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the further unification of Europe, and

Whereas it is in the interest of the United States to encourage consultation between the Congress of the United States and the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States welcomes this invitation and expresses its appreciation of the unanimous action of the Consultative Assembly in extending it Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That not to exceed 14 Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly with the representatives appointed by the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe for public discussion of problems of common interest, as envisioned by the resolution of the Consultative Assembly of May 12, 1951 Of the Members of the Congress to be appointed for the purposes of this resolution, half shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House from Members of the House, and half shall be appointed by the President of the Senate from Members of the Senate Not more than four of the appointees from the respective Houses shall be of the same political party.

The expenses incurred by Members of the Senate, the House, and by staff members appointed for the purpose of carrying out this concurrent resolution shall not exceed $15,000 for each House, respectively, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members Payment shall be made upon the submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the respective House or Senate delegation

TO AMEND THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 3669) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, etc., be authorized to correct the title of the bill so as to read: "To amend the Railroad Retirement Act, and for other purposes"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HARRIS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understood the unanimous-consent request just made was to amend the title with reference to the amendment of the Railroad Retirement Act.

Mr. CROSSER. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. Did the gentleman include the Unemployment Insurance Act also?

Mr. CROSSER. No, sir. This is just what I showed you. That is all that is necessary.

Mr. HARRIS. I regret I did not see it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

TO AMEND SECTION 503 (B) OF THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. CROSSER Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3298) an act to amend section 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, lines 4 and 5, strike out "mail or otherwise without examination of the patient" and insert "mail"

Page 3, line 19, strike out all after "sentence" down to and including "prohibited" in lines 21 and 22

Page 4, after line 5, insert

"SEC 2 Subsection (c) of section 303 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following 'or (4) for having violated section 301 (b), (c) or (k) by failure to comply with section 502 (f) in respect to an article received in interstate commerce to which neither section 503 (a) nor section 503 (b) (1) is applicable, if the delivery or proffered delivery was made in good faith and the labeling at the time thereof contained the same directions for use and warning statements as were contained in the labeling at the time of such receipt of such article'"

Page 4, line 6, strike out "2" and insert "3."

Amend the title so as to read "An act to amend sections 303 (c) and 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPACT BETWEEN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R 5131) granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike system and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "herein" and insert "therein."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and of course I will not object, do I understand from the gentleman from Maryland that this bill provides the necessary legislation to provide a bridge for the crossing of the Delaware River, which would join the Pennsylvania Turnpike and the New Jersey Turnpike?

Mr. FALLON. That is right.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Of course I have no objection to the passage of such a bill. It will provide increased facilities for the movement of transportation between the two States and is entitled to the unanimous support of the Congress and the approval of the President.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN FOR WORKING ON HOLIDAYS

Mr McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S 264) to provide for granting to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and the White House and United States Park Police forces additional compensation for working on holidays.

The Clerk read the title of the bill

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr MILLER of Nebraska Mr Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr McMILLAN Mr. Speaker, my purpose in asking for the consideration of this bill is that on September 24, 1951, the House passed H P 4859, to provide for granting to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and the White House and United States Park Police forces additional compensation for working on holidays, which was identical to S 264

In order to facilitate action on the bill I ask that the House pass the Senate bill, which was passed by the Senate on August 27, 1951, and referred to the House District Committee on September 12, 1951.

Mr MILLER of Nebraska. Mr Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That under regulations promulgated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia each officer and member of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia when he may be required to work 6 or more hours on any holiday, shall be entitled to receive as compensation for such holiday work, in lieu of his regular pay for that day, an amount equal to twice his daily rate of basic compensation. *Provided*, That no such officer or member shall be entitled to additional compensation for such holiday work for any day for which he is entitled to receive additional compensation under the provisions of Public Law 13, Eighty-second Congress, approved March 27, 1951 So much of such compensation for such holiday work as is in excess of the regular pay for such day shall not be considered as salary for the purpose of computing retirement compensation or relief payments under section 12 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," approved September 1, 1916, as amended, nor shall such excess compensation be subject to deduction as provided in section 5 of the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia," approved July 1, 1930, as amended Appropriations for personal services for the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the White House Police force, and the United States Park Police force shall be available for payment of the additional compensation authorized by this act

SEC 2 As used in this act the word "holiday" means the following The 1st day of January, the 22d day of February, the 4th day of July, the 30th day of May, the first Monday in September, the 11th day of November, Thanksgiving Day, the 25th day of December, and such other days designated by Executive order

SEC 3 The provisions of this act shall be applicable to the White House Police force and the United States Park Police force, under regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Interior, respectively

SEC 4 The provisions of section 6 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat 763), as amended (title V, U S C, sec 84), are hereby made applicable to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCORPORATION OF THE CONFERENCE OF STATE SOCIETIES

Mr McMILLAN Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H R. 4467) to incorporate the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That the following named persons

Hon Albert Rains, Gadsden, Ala, Miss Ruth James, Gadsden, Ala, Hoyt G Irving, 512 Hoatson Street, Warren, Ariz, Miss Mary Capps, Nogales, Ariz, Claude M Hirst, Prescott, Ark, Mrs. Gertrude Scott, 1123 Stratford Avenue, South Pasadena, Calif, Howard W. Scott, Box 122, Palisade, Colo; Benjamin Sherman, Hartford, Conn; Miss Catherine Flynn, Meriden, Conn, Hon. J. Caleb Boggs, 1250 Kynlyn Drive, Wilmington, Del; Mrs. Ruth F. Henderson, Seaford, Del., Charles A Henderson, Seaford, Del; Charles G Lavin, Jacksonville, Fla; Miss Utha Gray Smith, Orange Court Hotel, Orlando, Fla; Col K N. Parkinson, Blackfoot, Idaho, Hon Addison T. Smith, Twin Falls, Idaho,

Arnold M Lederer, 5222 North Christiana Avenue, Chicago, Ill; Miss Charlotte A Marr, 6327 North Okato Avenue, Chicago, Ill, Hon. Ralph Harvey, rural route 4, Newcastle, Ind; Hon Charles A Halleck, 604 Jefferson Street, Rensselaer, Ind, Mrs Esther Costa, Indianapolis, Ind, Hon Bourke Blakemore Hickenlooper, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Hon Ben Franklin Jensen, Exira, Iowa, Hon Andrew F. Schoeppel, 115 South Rutan Avenue, Wichita, Kans; Charles H Helsper, 1199 West Street, Topeka, Kans, Robert W Salyers, 1801 South Third Street, Louisville, Ky, F M Broussard, Lafayette, La, Paul Jones, Winfield, La; Hon Homer E Capehart, Capehart Farms, Washington, Ind, Miss Pauline Pino, 2507 Boulevard, Las Vegas, N. Mex,

Hon Charles P Nelson, Waterville, Maine; Charles LeRoy Haines, 21 Pine Street, Ellsworth, Maine, Miss Dorothy Bigelow, Easton, Maine, Donald Larabee, Gorham, Maine, Mrs Winifred H Grant, Wayside, Md, William R Clay, 3 Pooks Hill Lane, Bethesda, Md; Charles F Sharkey, 31 Thurston Street, Somerville, Mass, Mrs Leona K Knight, Bloomfield Hill, Mich, Miss Hazel Ireman, 922 South State Street, Ann Arbor, Mich, Hon. Ruth Thompson, 816 Division Street, White Hall, Mich, James A. Davis, 2027 Twenty-ninth Avenue, Meridian, Miss; Mrs Donald Osborne Hays, Flora, Miss, Paul D Best, Tunica, Miss,

Eric G Jannson, 5738 Walsh Street, St Louis, Mo, Clarence McCune, 6425 McGee Boulevard, Kansas City, Mo, Lawrence Scheewe, 540 Hillsdale Avenue, Helena, Mont, Miss Molly Clasby, Missoula, Mont; Miss Jessie Stearns, Lincoln, Nebr, Walter R Johnson, Omaha, Nebr, William F. McMenamin, 1131 Ralston Street, Reno, Nev.; Miss Mildred Latham, 29 East First Street, Reno, Nev, William J. Fleming, 45 North Stenton Street, Atlantic City, N J, Ralph G Denn, Rio Grande, N J, Arthur Angel, 926 South Pacific, Las Vegas, N Mex,

Wilfred S Dowling, 330 West Seventy-sixth Street, New York, N Y, Miss Marie T Dowling, 1882 DeKalb Avenue, Ridgewood, Brooklyn, N Y, John K Sleat, 511 North Church Street, Charlotte, N C, Mrs W. Ney Evans, High Point, N C, Peter Vallar, Winston-Salem, N C, John S Bartlett, 458 Moreley Avenue, Akron, Ohio, Carl M Walker, Pierre, S Dak, Miss Iva Van Horn, Kennebec, S Dak, William L Covington, 1510 Gale Avenue, Nashville, Tenn, D C Scott Daniel, Paris, Tenn, W M Burkhalter, McKenzie, Tenn, Miss Bessie D Thrasher, 2308 Highland Avenue, Nashville, Tenn, Maurice R. Barnes, Kaysville, Utah, Don Cassidy, Tooele, Utah, Robert W Barker, 1217 Washington Boulevard, Ogden, Utah; John Y Merrell, Brigham City, Utah, Miss Dorothy Hurley, St Albans, Vt,

Capt. George P Grove, 3608 North Albemarle Street, Arlington, Va, Mrs Grace Montgomery, 301 Bellview Boulevard, Alexandria, Va; Col Heber H. Rice, 206 West Eleventh Avenue, Huntington, W Va; Willis G Kemper, 45 Maple Avenue, Morgantown, W Va, Hon Harley M Kilgore, Beckley, W. Va, Hon J R Fairington, 3180 Pacific Heights Road, Honolulu, Hawaii, Mrs Margaret C Turner, 607 Stangenwald Building, Honolulu, Hawaii, Ray E Davis, Melbourne, Ark, George A. Herman, 11 Crocker Road, Medford, Mass, Kenneth W Ingwalson, Little Falls, Minn, J F. Caprenter, Crookston, Minn; Earl Cox, 17 Alfaretta Avenue, Akron, Ohio; John M. King, 1318 Northwest Ninety-first Street, Oklahoma City, Okla,

Kenneth N. Hardy, Edmond, Okla.; Keith Hall, 808 North Holman Street, Portland, Oreg; Miss Pherne Miller, Eugene, Oreg; Hon. O. E. Teague, Bryan, Tex, L. Tex Easley,

1106 Wesleyan Avenue, Fort Worth, Tex.; Hon. William K. Van Pelt, 47 Oak Lawn Avenue, Fond du Lac, Wis; Walter Haefs, Oshkosh, Wis.; H. Mills Astin, 815 East Fifth Street, Casper, Wyo, Miss Marian Jones, Lingle, Wyo; Hon. John J. Allen, Jr., Oakland, Calif.; Milo Palmer, Concord, N. H.; Miss Victoria E. Dobroska, 78 Temple Street, Nashua, N. H.; Maj. Gen Floyd L Parks, Greeneville, S. C., Rev. J. Warren Hastings, Seattle, Wash.; and other persons who are members of the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C, their successors, and persons admitted to membership pursuant to the provisions of this act, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate by the name of the "Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C," and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers, limitations, and restrictions contained in this act.

SEC 2. The purposes of this corporation shall be to promote friendly and cooperative relations between the various State and Territorial societies in the District of Columbia, and to foster, participate in, and encourage educational, cultural, charitable, civic, and patriotic programs and activities in the District of Columbia and surrounding communities, to act as contact agent with States for carrying out State and National programs

SEC 3 The corporation shall have the following powers.

(a) To sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(b) To adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal,

(c) To choose such officers, managers, and agents as the business of the corporation may require,

(d) To ordain and establish bylaws and regulations, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States of America or of any State in which the corporation operates, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs,

(e) To contract and be contracted with;

(f) To take and hold by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest any property, real or personal, necessary for carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject to applicable provisions of law of any State (1) governing the amount or kind of real and personal property which may be held by, or (2) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of real and personal property by, a corporation operating in such State,

(g) To transfer or convey real or personal property,

(h) To borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue notes, bonds, or other evidences of indebtedness therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal or State law;

(i) To use and display such emblems and badges as it may adopt,

(j) To publish a newspaper, magazine, or other publication consistent with its corporate purposes;

(k) To do any and all acts necessary and proper to carry out the purposes of the corporation

SEC 4 (a) The headquarters and principal offices of the corporation shall be located in Washington, D C, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place, but may be conducted throughout the various States and Territories of the United States.

(b) The corporation shall maintain at all times in the District of Columbia a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation, such designation to be filed in the office of the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia Notice to, or service upon, such agent, or mailed to the address of such agent, shall be deemed sufficient notice or service upon the corporation.

SEC 5. The membership of the corporation shall be made up of the members of the various State and Territorial societies in the District of Columbia. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall, except as provided in this act, be determined according to the regulations and bylaws of the corporation.

SEC. 6. The officers of the corporation shall be a president, first vice president, second vice president, secretary, assistant secretary, treasurer, assistant treasurer, historian, and such other officers as may be designated by the governing body

SEC 7. (a) The governing body of the corporation shall be a board of representatives which shall consist of one representative from each State society and Territorial society in the District of Columbia. Such board of representatives shall exercise the powers herein granted to the corporation, and each member of such board shall have one vote upon all matters determined.

(b) The officers shall be elected by such board of representatives at an annual meeting and shall serve for a term of 1 year.

(c) The first board of representatives shall be composed of the following.

Chairman, Charles LeRoy Haines, first vice chairman, Lawrence Scheewe, second vice chairman, Mrs. Esther Costa, secretary, Miss Bessie D. Thrasher; assistant secretary, Miss Dorothy Bigelow; treasurer, Mrs Charles Henderson, regional directors, William J. Fleming, chairman, region I, Miss Catherine Flynn, region II, William Clay, region III, John Slear, region IV, James A Davis, region V, Arnold M Lederer, region VI, Miss Carlotta Reedy, region VII, Claude M. Hirst; region VIII, Maj Robert Joy, region IX, Col K. N. Parkison

Ray E Davis, Hoyt G. Irving, Mrs Gertrude J Scott, John J. Shaforth, Miss Utah Gray Smith, Ernest W Ellis, Gertrude L. Groman, Mrs Edna Rose Pearson, Mrs. Donald O. Hays, James H Pearson, William McMenamin, Wilfred S Dowling, John S Bartlett, Mrs Maurine Howard Abernathy, Carl M Walker, Don Cassidy, William Garnett Lee, Walter Haefs, Heber H Rice, Miss Marion Jones, Miss Dorothy Hurley, Charles F. Sharkey, Arthur Angel, Ralph A. Patterson, Miss Hazel Ireman.

SEC 8 The corporation may acquire any or all of the assets of the existing organization known as the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D C, upon discharging or providing for the payment and discharge of all its liabilities, and shall promptly file with the Congress full information with respect to such discharge provisions

SEC 9 No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure or be distributable to any member or officer thereof except upon dissolution and final liquidation of the corporation as provided in section 17 of this act

SEC 10 No part of the activities of the corporation shall consist of carrying on propaganda

SEC 11 The corporation, and its members and officers as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for elective public office.

SEC 12 The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

SEC 13 The corporation shall keep current and complete books and records of account and shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of its members and of the board of representatives or committees having any authority of the board of representatives. It shall keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member or his agent or attorney for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

SEC. 14. The corporation shall not have or issue any shares of stock, nor declare or pay any dividends.

SEC. 15. The corporation shall not make any loans to its officers or members of the board of representatives. Any officer or board of representatives member who votes for or assents to the making of a loan or advance to an officer or board of representatives member, and any officer or board of representatives member who participates in the making of such a loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

SEC. 16. (a) The financial transactions shall be audited annually by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositors, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress not later than July 15 of each year. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a verification by the person or persons conducting the audit of statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expense, and (5) sources and application of funds

SEC 17 Upon final dissolution or liquidation of the corporation, and after the discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets of the corporation shall be divided equally among the State and Territorial societies in the District of Columbia

SEC. 18. The corporation shall have the exclusive right to use, in carrying out its purposes, the name, "Conference of State Societies, Washington, D C," and such seals, emblems, and badges as it may adopt

SEC 19. As a condition precedent to the exercise in any State of any power or privilege granted or conferred by this act, the corporation shall serve notice upon the secretary of state, or similar officer, of any such State of the name and address of an authorized agent in such State upon whom legal process or demands against the corporation may be served.

SEC 20 The right to repeal, alter, or amend this act at any time is hereby expressly reserved

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill would incorporate the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C., and its purpose shall be to promote friendly and cooperative relations between the various State and Territorial societies in the District of Columbia and to foster, participate in, and encourage educational, cultural, charitable, civic, and patriotic programs and activities in the District of Columbia and surrounding communities, and to act as contact agent with States for carrying out State and National programs.

The Corporation would include not only those names enumerated in the bill but would also include other persons who are members of the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C, their

successors, and persons admitted to membership pursuant to the provisions of this act.

Since the corporation might acquire property located in the District of Columbia, section 20 of the bill was adopted by amendment so that it would be clear that activities in the District of Columbia would be in accordance with law enforced in the District of Columbia.

This legislation would involve no cost to the District or Federal Government and has the approval of many members of the House and Senate.

The SPEAKER The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 12, line 16 add a new section 20
"SEC 20 As used in this act the word 'State' includes the District of Columbia"
On page 12 renumber "SEC 20" as "SEC 21"

The committee amendments were agreed to

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table

PERMITTING IMPROVEMENTS TO TWO GASOLINE SERVICE STATIONS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H R. 5511) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was on objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to permit the erection, construction, alteration, conversion, maintenance, and use of such buildings and other improvements on (1) square 2695, lot numbered 800 (east side of Sixteenth Street, between Taylor and Upshur Streets NW), and (2) square 1928, lot numbered 5 (southeast corner of the intersection of Wisconsin and Massachusetts Avenues NW), both situated in the District of Columbia, as the Commissioners may deem appropriate for the purpose of conducting the businesses which are being conducted on such lands on the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. McMILLAN Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two gasoline service stations located in the vicinity of Massachusetts and Wisconsin Avenues.

Under existing law the owners have the right to continue to operate the business which they have operated for approximately 30 years. However, because of the zoning law it is impossible for them to make improvements to the building in which they do business. If this bill were enacted into law, the owners of these buildings would be able to replace the buildings which they now occupy with modern, up-to-date structures in keeping with other buildings in the neighborhood These improvements would also bring additional revenue into the District of Columbia in the form of real-estate tax.

The bill would involve no cost to the Federal or District Government

Mr Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr McMILLAN Page 1, line 8, after the word "numbered", strike out "5" and insert in lieu thereof "800."

The amendment was agreed to

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table

MARGARET K N MILLER

Mr BYRNE of New York Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H R 3376) for the relief of Margaret K N Miller, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$12,500" and insert "$10,000"

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table

FURTHER STUDY OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Mr COX Mr Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 426 and ask for its immediate consideration

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the old-age retirement and survivors benefits provided under the Railroad Retirement Act, with a view to ascertaining what changes should be made in such act The committee shall determine the scope of such study and investigation and, without limitation thereon, the following shall be given consideration

(1) The character and amount of present benefits and the estimated cost of providing such benefits

(2) The existing relationships between the system established by the Railroad Retirement Act and the old-age and survivors insurance system

(3) The changes that should be made in the character and amount of benefits to be provided workers subject to the Railroad Retirement Act and the estimated cost of providing such benefits

(4) Any changes that should be made in the existing relationships between the system established by the Railroad Retirement Act and the old-age and survivors insurance system with a view to simplifying administration, eliminating inequities and anomalies as regards benefits to workers whose earnings are included in whole or in part under either system, and strengthening the financial base for benefits to be provided under one system without impairing the financial base underlying benefits provided under the other system

SEC 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-second Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

SEC 3 The committee is authorized to designate and appoint an advisory council, as described in section 4, to study, assist, consult with, and advise the committee, or its duly authorized subcommittee, and the committee is further authorized to designate and appoint such other officers, experts, or assistants as it deems necessary for the performance of the investigation directed by this resolution.

SEC 4 The membership of the Advisory Council shall be as follows (1) Two persons appointed from recommendations made by representatives of employees subject to the Railroad Retirement Act, (2) two persons appointed from recommendations made by representatives of carrier employers subject to the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act, (3) one representative of the Railroad Retirement Board, (4) one representative of the Social Security Administration of the Federal Security Agency, (5) five persons not employees within the meaning of the Railroad Retirement Act and not employees of an employer subject to such act who possess special knowledge and experience regarding the Railroad Retirement Act, the Social Security Act, or employee-benefit plans generally

SEC 5 The compensation of persons assisting the committee in the study and investigation directed by this resolution shall be fixed by the committee at such amounts or rates as the committee deems appropriate, but such amounts or rates shall not exceed the amounts or rates payable for comparable duties prescribed by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended

SEC 6 The committee, or its duly authorized subcommittee, is authorized to request the use of the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government in the performance of its duties under this resolution

SEC 7 The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers signed by the chairman

SEC 8 The committee shall render its full report and recommendations to the Congress not later than February 15, 1952

Mr HARRIS Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate Concurrent Resolution 51 and ask for its immediate consideration

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee on railroad retirement legislation, hereinafter called the "joint committee," to be composed of three members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and to be appointed by the chairman of that committee, and three members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and to be appointed by the chairman of that committee Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection The joint committee shall select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee, and it is hereby authorized and directed, to make a full and complete fact-finding study and investigation of the Railroad Retirement Act, and of such related problems as it may deem proper, with a view toward ascertaining what changes should be made in such act. The joint committee shall determine the scope of such study and investigation, without limitation thereon, and the following shall be given consideration:

1. The character and amount of present benefits and the estimated cost of providing such benefits.

2. The existing relationships between the system established by the Railroad Retirement Act and the old-age and survivors insurance system.

3. The changes that should be made in the character and amount of benefits to be provided workers subject to the Railroad Retirement Act and the estimated cost of providing such benefits.

4 Any changes that should be made in the existing relationships between the system established by the Railroad Retirement Act and the old-age and survivors insurance system with a view to simplifying administration, eliminating inequities and anomalies as regards benefits to workers whose earnings are included in whole or in part under either system, and strengthening the financial base for benefits to be provided under one system without impairing the financial base underlying benefits provided under the other system.

SEC 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-second Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable

SEC 4 The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-second Congress, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable and, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Then we will consider the House resolution, which is a privileged matter.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I consider this resolution a very constructive approach to the problems that are involved in the matter of improving benefits to retired railroad workers and their survivors. It is the sensible way to approach this matter. It should have the approval of everyone, because it will enable a full and complete review and study of all the questions that pertain to the welfare of our retired railroad workers and their survivors. It will undoubtedly result in helpful recommendations for the improvement of the Railroad Retirement Act, by finding ways and means of increasing benefits without additional taxes and maintaining the stability of the retirement fund.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: Page 1, line 9, after "the", strike out "chairman of that committee" and insert "Speaker."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this is a companion resolution as the result of the action of the House yesterday amending the Railroad Retirement Act. You will recall that those of us who engaged in the debate said that it would be necessary to have a continuing study in order to resolve some of the differences that have been apparent and factual for a long period of time. Such resolution was adopted in the other body, Senate Concurrent Resolution 51, which has been, without objection, substituted for the House resolution reported by the Committee on Rules, providing for the study.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CROSSER. What amendment did the gentleman offer a few minutes ago?

Mr. HARRIS. I offered an amendment, Mr. Speaker, to the resolution providing for the appointment of the House members of this joint committee to be made by the Speaker. That is, as I understand, the regular established procedure and language with reference to the appointment of committees under special resolutions.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. In other words, to have done otherwise would have set an unprecedented act on the part of this House encroaching upon the prerogatives of the Speaker.

Mr. HARRIS. That is my understanding, and that was the amendment which was agreed to when the resolution was called up. There is no question about the necessity of this approach to the problem. It is recognized in this body and in the other body. It was so acknowledged by the gentlemen on the other end of the Capitol at the time the bill was considered. This resolution was passed over there immediately after they considered and passed the retirement bill, that is, matters relating to the Railroad Retirement Act. They concurred in this in order that the joint committee may take up these problems and endeavor to resolve them as we assured you we would undertake.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. When will this committee report back to the House?

Mr. HARRIS. That I could not say. This resolution does not have a specific date. The resolution which was reported by the Committee on Rules required a report be made by February 15, I believe, but every effort will be made to make the report as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I wish to highly commend the gentleman for sponsoring this resolution. I think there are certain areas of inequities that should be straightened out, and I am satisfied that the committee intends to do something about it. I highly commend the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman. I know the specific problem he has in mind and which he presented to the House yesterday. As I said then, it can and perhaps will be taken up and considered in connection with this investigation and study.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr HESELTON. As I recall, the Senate resolution does not require specifically that an investigation or changes should be made in "the character and amount of present benefits" to be provided, and particularly this language "and the estimated cost of providing such benefits." Am I correct?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is reading from the House resolution?

Mr. HESELTON. Yes, the Senate resolution eliminated the language "and the estimated cost of providing such benefits."

Mr HARRIS I think that is included in this resolution. It is in different language, of course, but this provides a broad, general investigation without limitation into the entire matter of railroad retirement; not only railroad retirement, but its relationship with social security and only to that extent with social security.

Mr. HESELTON. Having in mind the debate yesterday, I simply wanted the author of the resolution to assure not only those of us who spoke yesterday but the entire Membership of the House that there would be a definite study made of the estimated cost of the benefits included in the bill we passed yesterday.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman may have the assurance. This concurrent resolution on page 2, in the category of points to be given consideration, provides:

1. The character and amount of present benefits and the estimated cost of providing such benefits.

So it would be included.

Mr. HESELTON. That is to say that the cost of present benefits would be included, but what I am interested in is, what will be the cost of the benefits in the bill we passed yesterday? I think that subject matter should be definitely

a part of this study. I hope the gentleman feels the same way.

Mr. HARRIS. Paragraph 3 in the concurrent resolution reads:

> The changes that should be made in the character and amount of benefits to be provided workers subject to the Railroad Retirement Act and the estimated cost of providing such benefits.

So it takes care of the present benefits and those to be paid in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the concurrent resolution be adopted.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to express to the Members entire accord with the resolution that is now before the House. I believe it will prove most beneficial in promoting the welfare of retired railroad workers and their survivors.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr HARRIS. I can say to the House that it is my information that this concurrent resolution for the joint study meets with the favor of those who are interested in the railroad retirement program. They have stated very definitely that they would prefer the joint study rather than have it made by either of the bodies.

Mr. WOLVERTON. That is true. It is also in accord, I believe, with the views expressed in the reports that were submitted to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in connection with the proposed railroad retirement legislation by the Bureau of the Budget and the Social Security Administration. It is along lines that all those who are thinking in terms of the welfare of the railroad employees can support.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I imagine this committee will make every effort to get the report back to the next session of Congress so that we may take action on their recommendations.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I wish to assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who for many years has worked zealously in the interest of railroad workers and their families, that such is our desire and it is our intention and purpose to do so.

Mr COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

THE MODERN AMERICAN WAY

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, within the past few years the American people have lost, in a large degree, sight of the true values, in that they have come to think more in terms of how much money or other material things a man has than of how much individual freedom he has. There was a time in this country when a liberal was defined as a man who stood for those things that would result in the maximum of individual human liberty with a minimum of governmental control. Times have changed, however, until we now find that a man is classified as liberal in his thinking in direct proportion to his willingness to legally take from one citizen and give to another; or, as to how liberal he is in the spending of other people's money.

According to the definition of liberalism that was extant in the day of those men who were the architects of our freedom, such as Jefferson, Washington, and Jackson, I am one of the most liberal Members of this Congress. By the same token, according to the modern definition, I am one of the most conservative Members of this body.

As to political realities, I am a good Democrat so long as you will allow me to define the term. Judged by the definition prescribed by the modern ultraliberal, ADA, CIO-PAC, socialistic, dogooding, New Deal, Fair Deal, internationalist, boondoggling, befuddled theoristic intellectual coalition that calls itself the Democratic Party, I am not a good Democrat. By my own definition, however, which I think is as good as any other and is in line with Jefferson's theory of the "least governed being the best governed people," I am one of the best Democrats alive today.

There are those who will and have said that if I am not a good Democrat according to the modern definition then I must be some sort of geographically misplaced Republican. Here again I must disagree, for if all the modern Republican Party can offer is that which it is now offering in the way of either a retrogressive policy of going back to the so-called good old days which denies progress of any kind or a policy of weak-kneed, namby-pamby, gutless, fearful, jellyfish type of me-tooism—attempting always to out-deal the New and Fair Dealers—pushing and shoving for position of favor in the eyes of arrogant and selfish pressure groups, then I am not a Republican by any stretch of the imagination.

The modern Republican Party is like a rose in one respect only and that is in that it smells the same though called by another name. In its last bid for the election of a President, those who spoke for the GOP said that they agreed in all major substance with the policies of the incumbent party; with the incumbent party's domestic policy and its foreign policy or lack of policy, and with any other quack or nostrum they thought would garner a few misguided votes into its column. They said, in effect, that they agreed with the arrangement of the furniture but promised to do a little neater job of housekeeping. Feeling that they almost had to present at least one solid issue, they did say that the Taft-Hartley law should not be repealed and then proceeded to take the substance from their position by agreeing to amend the law in such a way as to suit the selfish whims of politically powerful labor leaders.

No, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of an honest alternative that will be alternative in more than name alone, I shall cling tenaciously to the political beliefs and teachings of those, like Jefferson, who founded the real Democratic Party. If renegade Johnny-come-latelies happen to currently control the machinery of the party of my fathers, and though fate should mistakenly decree that they should continue in control for uncertain season, I choose to maintain my beleaguered position in the fond hope that a brighter day may soon dawn when the leadership of my party shall return to the ancient landmarks of individual liberty and freedom under God. In the absence of this prospective return by my own party, no real alternative is offered by the current minority party.

An example of synonymous policy concurrently espoused by both the major political parties occupying the contemporary American scene is found in the fact that both invariably attempt to solve every problem that arises by the apparently simple expedient of appropriating a few billion dollars of uncollected tax money out of the pockets of the American people. They are both seemingly coldly materialistic in their evident belief that all the problems that beset mankind can be solved by spending a few more billions of magic things called dollars.

In their mad scramble to entice voters to the polls each political party had attempted to out-do the other in promising the American people more and more of less and less. In answer to this materialistic bid for their suffrage, the American people have failed to realize that these promises of more and more of the Utopian something-for-nothing mirages can result in nothing more than less and less of the things of real and lasting value. They have used the instrument of suffrage to mortgage their birthright of freedom to a bunch of political opportunists in exchange for a will-of-the-wisp mess of pottage called security.

The modern political sirens have stringed their materialistic harps with honeyed phrases; tuned them to the throbbing selfishness of little men; and, like Circe of old, enticed the Ulysses of human liberty dangerously close to the rocks of ruin. We, who as watchers in the night from off a distant shore, despair of hope to see those who would rise in fearless strength to pour the wax of truth into the ears of our great Ulysses and bind him to the mast from which the flag of freedom flies.

Expediency born of crisis after crisis is the current order of the day. Like Roman emperors of a bygone day who, when grain from public warehouses filled empty stomachs but failed to answer questions of the human heart, would seek to divert attention to the expediency of some foreign military crisis, our so-called

leaders operate in this modern day. In all our highly vaunted twentieth century wisdom we still appear sufficiently gullible as to swallow this nostrum of a bygone age and swallow it willingly so long as the witch doctors promise to keep our pockets filled with inflated dollars. God give us wisdom soon to see that dollars cannot buy for us either friends or freedom.

In our latest and current adventure into foreign military crisis we have wasted over 100,000 causualties in a Korean war that seemingly has no clearly defined objective. American boys, who to their loved ones are more than serial numbers upon a printed page, have struggled through the heat and cold; been buffeted from one uncounted heartbreak hill to another slaughterpen peak; suffered loneliness that only a soldier's heart can know; felt the warm and precious dreams of home and fireside freeze into the marrow of his bones to be buried in some unmarked grave upon a hostile shore; felt the hot tide of his own life's blood well into his throat in such way as to drown into feeble and unanswered whisper his burning question as to why he was made to give his all to no real purpose. May those who have had their part in placing those precious lives as sacrifice on the altar of their insatiable political ego pray this day that the dying breath of those who give their all may form the words first spoken by Him who died for all: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

As if the sin of sending men to die on foreign fields to no real purpose were not enough to rend the heart with endless shame, we compound our utter calumny by allowing, yes, even encouraging, men here within the safety and comfort of the homeland to strike for trivial and incidental excuse, thereby withholding from those who bear our standard in the field the very things they must require in the way of weapons and materials of war. Not only do we allow and encourage official strikes within vital defense projects but we allow and encourage men to loaf and make time so that more inflated dollars may be paid to them. Shame on those who loaf and racketeer and greater shame on those in authority who allow and encourage it. They will not be held guiltless of the blood that now drenches the gullies surrounding the heartbreak hills of Korea.

If those befuddled intellectuals who sit within the paneled halls at Lake Success could be brought preemptorily down from their stratospheric realm of fantasy and placed physically upon the field of battle in Korea, they would soon learn that battles cannot be won within the ether of intellectual dogma. If their smug and high-sounding phrases could be changed, just for 1 day, to the soundless screams of panic caused by the impending plunge of a bayonet's cold steel that paralyzes vocal cords and freezes blood within the veins, then practical means of ending this senseless slaughter would occupy their thinking. At least, they would find some way of stopping our own so-called allies from furnishing the enemy with the very bayonets that kill our men.

We, as a nation, have tried all the materialistic nostrums that could possibly be dreamed up by a bunch of befuddled intellectuals who have been directing our destiny for the past few years. All of these have been of worse than no avail for they have left us worse than they found us. In desperation, if for no other reason, it is high time that we return to constitutional government in this country so that we can live in a land governed by law instead of being governed by men. If we do not soon return to the concepts upon which this country was founded, it will not be long before our freedom will be forfeited by being hanged, like Judas of old, upon our national cross of lethargy and liberty under God will lie forever buried in a potter's field of shame.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr JUDD. Mr. Speaker, when the international conference was held recently at San Francisco for the signing of a peace treaty with Japan, the Japanese Diet, which is the equivalent of our Congress, sent to the conference a delegation of its members representing the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives of Japan and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the upper body, which is called the House of Councillors. Formerly in the days of the old empire, it was called the House of Lords and membership in it was by birth. Now the members of the upper body as well as of the lower body are elected by popular vote.

After attending the San Francisco conference, these gentlemen came on to Washington to observe and study our political processes. They were received by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, through the kindness of the chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] and attended some of our hearings.

Our guests are citizens and legislators of a country which only so recently was an enemy of the United States. It has broken with its militaristic past to a remarkable degree. These are among the men in Japan who have been waging a valiant battle down through the years, and now successful, to turn their country's course into the paths of peace and world cooperation and democratic government. They were so impressed and pleased by their reception here that they asked me if they could send a message of greetings to the Congress. I told them, Mr. Speaker, that if they would prepare a statement I would be happy indeed to present and read it to the Congress. The message signed by the four members of the Diet is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

As representatives of the Foreign Affairs Committees of the Japanese Diet now visiting the United States, we are greatly honored at having been granted the privilege of conveying a message of greetings to the Congress of the United States.

We were extremely fortunate in having been able to attend the San Francisco conference at which the Japanese Peace Treaty was signed. This event marked the beginning of an era during which Japan will be able to take her place among the free nations of the world and cooperate in establishing and maintaining a true peace.

In the name of the people of Japan we wish to express our gratitude to the United States for the good will and understanding you have shown in the reconstruction of Japan. It is our most earnest wish that the United States and Japan will continue to work together in a spirit of mutual trust and respect, in order to achieve the sort of world in which all people can enjoy the benefits and privileges of true freedom.

SEIICHI OHMURA,
Chief of Delegation.
MORIO SASAKI,
House of Representatives.
UNJURO MUTO,
House of Representatives.
INO DAN,
House of Councillors.
TOSHITO SATOW,
Chief of Staff, Foreign Affairs Committee, House of Representatives.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

(Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

THE PROPOSED ALUMINUM INDUSTRY FOR MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of the Congress a letter I have just received from the Honorable R. D. Searles, Under Secretary of the Interior, about the proposed loan to the Harvey Co. to establish an aluminum industry in the Flathead Valley of Montana.

I have received replies to my letters from the Attorney General of the United States and RFC Administrator Stuart Symington. This letter from Mr. Searles is in reply to my letter to Secretary Chapman asking for an explanation of charges made against the Harvey Co. My request to the Hardy investigating committee for an investigation of this matter has been granted and I am hopeful that it will issue its report shortly.

I have also introduced a bill in the House to establish a clearinghouse in the Department of Justice for the purpose of screening all companies seeking to do business with the Government. I have requested the gentleman from New York, Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, to hold hearings on my proposal at the earliest opportunity and he has promised to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I am turning this material over to the Hardy committee for its consideration during the course of its investigation.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, October 17, 1951.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Re Harvey Machine Co.

MY DEAR MIKE: This will supplement the information given to you over the phone in answer to your letter of September 17. Since I handled the negotiations on the proposed loan to the Harvey Machine Co.

of Montana, I am writing a detailed answer to your letter. As we mentioned to you on the phone, we desired to make a thorough investigation of the questions which you presented to us before sending an answer to you.

We have conferred with both the Department of Justice and the Department of the Navy regarding their past experience with the Harvey Machine Co. and its personnel.

We held a conference in this Department with Mr. Symington of the RFC, Mr. Jess Larson of the GSA, Mr Manly Fleischmann, Administrator of the DPA, Assistant Attorney General McInerney, and Mr E E Wilcox of Secretary of the Navy Kimball's office At this meeting all of the information which we have regarding the above company was given to those present

In addition to the conference, we have furnished Mr. Fleischmann with copies of letters regarding this company which we have received from the Department of Justice and from the Department of the Navy. All of our findings have now been given to Mr Fleischmann and we expect that a final determination on this loan will be made by him in the very near future

In the conference of July 31 to which you refer, you were given in detail the basis on which we proposed to recommend to DPA the loan to the Harvey Machine Co The final proposal as made by the Defense Minerals Administration to DPA was the same as that discussed at the above conference except for several additional restrictions favorable to the Government In turn, when DPA considered our recommendation they added several additional considerations and restrictions

As you will recall, the Harvey Machine Co. in the spring of 1950, prior to Korea, showed their first interest in building an aluminum reduction plant in Montana At that time they conferred with the Bonneville Power Administration on the purchase of power from Hungry Horse Dam for a two pot-line reduction plant In subsequent months, after the Korean fighting started, it was quite evident that a large increase in aluminum capacity would be needed and this company undertook to expand their plans to three or four pot lines at the Kalispell location

In December of 1950 they were certified by DMA for an allocation for the production of 72,000 tons of aluminum and negotiated with GSA for a procurement contract

After several months the company informed us that they were unsuccessful in obtaining the private financing with which they had anticipated building the plant On May 31 they filed with us an application for a loan of $70,274,831 for construction of a four pot-line plant at Kalispell, together with an aluminum plant to be located near Tacoma, Wash

On June 14 we informed the Harvey Co. that it would be impossible to consider the loan on the basis of the equity capital which they proposed to put into the new company but that consideration might be given for a loan to build a three pot-line plant

On June 15 the Harvey Machine Co informed us that they desired to modify their application and reduce the amount of the loan to $50,000,000 for construction of a three pot-line plant. They proposed that they would pay into a new company $6,000,000 which would be obtained in exchange for stock in a new corporation

On July 10 Dr James Boyd, then Administrator of the Defense Minerals Administration, made the following recommendation to the secretary:

"The recommendation for a Government loan to Harvey Machine Co. for three pot lines (54,000 tons) and an alumina plant, but not for their own bauxite facilities, in the amount of approximately $45,000 000 contingent on their being able to complete these facilities with this amount and the proposed $6,000,000 plus in cash equity, together with a tax amortization certificate which RFC requests that be granted with their DPA loans I believe we have delayed a decision in this case too long, changing our minds so frequently that we are duty bound to give them the chance to finish up their deal, as they are already far advanced and a new company coming in at scratch will delay the program further"

Dr. Boyd also made this recommendation in his letter of July 16 addressed to Mr E T. Gibson, then Acting Administrator of DPA.

After several further conferences, the Harvey people advised us that they were unable to obtain the $6,000,000 which they had expected would be forthcoming from New York financial interests On August 1 they made the following proposal

"A new company, Harvey Machine Co , Inc., of Montana, requests a loan of $46,000,000 required to construct an integrated aluminum project

"Harvey Machine Co , Inc (a California corporation) proposes to furnish $3,500,000 equity capital through the contribution of cash, equipment, and land to the new company An additional $3,500,000 cash is to be paid into the new company by the sale o purchasers, including such independent fabricators as desire to invest money to get an assured supply of aluminum, of company securities junior to the requested loan of a type or types satisfactory to the fiscal agent"

After further discussions, we recommended to DPA a loan of $46,000,000 to the above company for the construction of a three potline reduction plant of 54,000 tons capacity, an alumina facility of 108,000 tons annual capacity, and for the purchase of ore boats We sent DPA our recommendation on August 6, as follows:

"The company proposes a capitalization of $7,000,000 of which $3,500,000 will be paid in by contribution of cash, land, and equipment by the Harvey Machine Co , of California This contribution is to be made prior to the date of the loan

"The other $3,500,000 is to be supplied through the sale of stock to be offered to the public and especially to independent fabricators The Harvey Machine Co , of California, is to guarantee the sale of the additional stock and is given a limit of 18 months in which to pay in this additional $3,500,000. A copy of the California company's financial statement and Dun & Bradstreet's report are attached

"In case the company fails to obtain the additional contribution of $3,500,000, the Government is to have the option of selling the complete facilities to another operator, for which the Harvey Machine Co would be reimbursed for the cost of the construction of the plant, the cost to be determined by the Government

"A list of conditions and requirements of the loan is attached This list is subject to any additional requirements that the fiscal agent (the RFC) may desire There may be additional information that your office will want If so, please contact Mr Shooshan in my office, or Mr. H Heckmann, of the Defense Minerals Administration"

The staff of the DPA discussed the loan with the Harvey Co for approximately 10 days and added several conditions One added condition required Mr Leo Harvey, Sr , to put up a bond of $1,000,000 to guarantee that the $3,500,000 of additional money would be paid in within 18 months, the $1,000,000 to be forfeited if the additional cash had not been contributed. If the Harvey Co does not pay in the additional $3,500,000 within 18 months the Government, in addition to taking the $1,000,000 as a forfeiture, has the option of selling the complete facilities to another operator. The sale price would be based on the cost of the construction of the plant, the cost to be determined by the Government

The Government loan has the following further protection. Condition 6 (a) of the loan was as follows:

"Disbursements of the loan proceeds to be made from time to time in such amounts and in such manner as fiscal agent may decide, provided that prior to each disbursement fiscal agent is in receipt of satisfactory evidence that the amount then to be disbursed is necessary and the construction for which payment is to be made is in accordance with the plans, specifications, cost estimate, and construction contract filed with the fiscal agent pursuant to condition 7 (c) hereunder"

Thus, the plant was to be constructed under the supervision and control of the Government so that there was to be complete knowledge of the cost and assurance of satisfactory design and construction.

Certain other conditions which protect the Government are as follows.

"Management agreement—This will be an agreement executed by borrower, providing that until payment in full of the indebtedness evidenced by the note, the management of borrower will be satisfactory to Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the delegate agency and if within 30 days from the date of forwarding by RFC of notice to the borrower that borrower's management is not satisfactory and borrower does not make changes so that its management shall be satisfactory then the RFC with the concurrence of the delegate agency may at any time thereafter, without notice to borrower, accelerate the maturity of the indebtedness evidenced by the note

"Agreement that if the applicant company remains wholly or preponderantly owned by the parent company, there is to be made available for repayment of the loan (A) all tax savings resulting from the accelerated amortization of the subsidiary company, (B) all tax savings accruing to the parent company through consolidation of its earnings with the subsidiary, (C) all earned accelerated amortization and depreciation of the subsidiary company, less actual replacements chargeable to depreciation, (D) one-half of the net income of the subsidiary company after taxes of the parent company as if there were no consolidation (it is understood that net income for this purpose shall be computed after amortization and depreciation of the parent company).

"An agreement as an alternative to (1) above that if the subsidary company is not wholly or preponderantly owned by the parent company, and is therefore not consolidated with the parent company for tax purposes, there is to be made available for repayment of the loan (A) all tax savings resulting from the accelerated amortization of the subsidiary company, plus (B) all earned amortization and depreciation of the subsidiary company, less actual replacements chargeable to depreciation, plus (C) one-half of the net income of the subsidiary company after taxes"

Recommendation to DPA was based on the determination that the Harvey Machine Co. was in a position to construct this plant in as short or shorter time than any other company that was interested or available to build the plant. After they were allocated aluminum production in December 1950, this company placed orders for some $20,000,000 of equipment for the plant, which equipment is under construction at the present time. This added greatly to their ability to be an earlier producer

At the time the proposed loan was recommended all of the companies producing

aluminum had just been granted a second phase of expansion. The first and second phases are as follows:

Name	Location	Tonnage	Estimated cost
Alcoa	Washington	85,000	$60,000,000
Do	Texas	[1] 85,000	115,000,000
Do	do	35,000	34,000,000
Kaiser	Louisiana	[1] 100,000	70,000,000
Do	do	[1] 100,000	75,000,000
Do	Washington	[2] 20,000	12,800,000
Reynolds	Texas	[1] 75,000	79,700,000
Do	Arkansas	23,000	14,300,000
Do	Oregon	2,000	475,000
Do	Washington	[3] 20,000	10,000,000
Total		545,000	471,275,000

[1] Includes power plant
[2] Production rate Actual capacity 27,500 tons.
[3] Production rate Actual capacity 24,000 tons.

NOTE —Alumina facilities not included

Your attention is invited to the fact that 481,000 tons of the total tonnage (545,000 tons) was located in the South and Southwest, Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas.

The Reynolds Co. had been given all of the additional expansion that they desired to take at that time. In order to handle the financing of the last 20,000 tons GSA had found it necessary to agree to make them an advance payment of $9,000,000 to be paid back in aluminum after this plant expansion was in production. As you will readily see, the engineering forces of these three companies were all well-occupied, as were their administrative departments, with the vast expansion which they had on hand.

The Harvey Machine Co had developed their plans for the Kalispell plant over a period of the last 8 months, and it appeared evident that they would be able to give the earliest production of aluminum over anyone to whom we could give this allocation.

Under the conditions of the loan, the $7,000,000, of which $3,500,000 was to be advanced originally by the Harvey interests and $3,500,000 paid in from additional stock, was to be credited against the $46,000,000 and act as repayment on the loan. Provided the plant was built for the $46,000,000 estimated, the total loan made by the Government would be $39,000,000 Because of the difficulty today to determine exactly the final cost of the plant, which requires 18 months for construction, the $46,000,000 plus the $7,000,000 of equity capital, or a total of $53,000,000, was to be available for the plant. This meant that equity capital of 15 percent or more of the loan was being furnished by the borrowers.

As you know, the power to be used by the Harvey Aluminum Co at Kalispell, Mont., does not come on the line for at least another year on completion of Hungry Horse Dam and filling of the reservoir. Regardless of statements to the contrary, it had no effects whatsoever on the current shortage of power in the Pacific Northwest. It is my understanding that this power has been allocated to the State of Montana by law and even if it were available at the present time, which it is not, its use would be restricted to Montana.

The Department has assumed that an applicant who makes a request from our defense agencies here, and who is currently enjoying a contract with any of the agencies of the Department of Defense, has been cleared as to ability, integrity, and loyalty. It would be an unnecessary duplication for the defense agencies to make a check if the Department of Defense has already made such a check and has contracted with the individuals for production of needed military goods. In addition, the sources of information in many cases would not be available to us.

Considering the country's urgent need for the production of aluminum, I still feel that this is a satisfactory financial risk for the Government. The terms and conditions are certainly as tight as they could possibly be and the Government's interests are surely well-protected

I feel that the staff of DPA did an excellent job in drawing up the final conditions. The question which was later raised as to the past operating experience of the company with the Department of Defense is, of course, a matter on which DPA will make their own decision.

It should be noted that Alcoa, Reynolds, and Kaiser all have contracts requiring the Government to purchase their aluminum capacity for a period of up to 5 years. This is a very important advantage for these companies and it is not an advantage that either DMA or DPA recommended or offered to the Harvey Machine Co.

In conclusion, as I mentioned earlier in this letter, we have furnished Mr. Fleischmann with all of the available information we have concerning the past operations of this company so that he may make his determination as to whether or not the loan proposal will be completed For your information we are enclosing copies of the loan conditions and I feel sure that after studying them you will agree that they very well protect the interests of the Federal Government.

Sincerely yours,

R D SEARLES,
Under Secretary.

HARVEY MACHINE CO OF MONTANA, KALISPELL, MONT —CONDITIONS OF DMA RECOMMENDATION OF LOAN TO DPA

1 Notes will be payable in equal quarterly installments beginning 1 year after completion of the new facilities Interest at 4½ percent per annum will begin after date of the note Final maturity 20 years Fifty percent net earnings clause to be attached.

2 Collateral A first mortgage will be given to cover all realty and machinery and equipment now owned and subsequently acquired.

3 Proceeds of the loan will be used only for construction of the plant, purchase of equipment and installation of the facilities which will be identified and listed.

4 No dividends will be paid by the company until the loan is repaid

5 Salary restriction, management, tax deposit and after acquired property agreements are to be made.

6 An agreement that any additional capital must be approved by the fiscal agent

7. Plans and specifications are to be approved by a delegated agency.

8 Borrower will submit evidence of adequate working capital which has been estimated at $2,000,000

9 On request for disbursement of the loan to the borrower, evidence of compliance with all of the above must be shown.

10 Disbursement of the loan will be made only on receipt of prior approval of the fiscal agent or his representative as construction progresses.

11. Preparation of these papers and all details concerning the loan will be subject to the approval of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as fiscal agent

12. Any tax saving resulting from a certificate of necessity will be applied on the loan in inverse order of maturity.

HARVEY MACHINE CO , INC., OF MONTANA, KALISPELL, MONT —DPA CONDITIONS ON LOAN

Terms: To mature 20 years from date of note. Note will be payable in equal quarterly installments beginning 1 year after completion of new facilities. Interest at the rate of 4½ percent per annum payable monthly commencing 30 days from date of note.

Collateral: First lien on all land, buildings, building installations, machinery, equipment, furniture, and fixtures now owned or hereafter acquired by Harvey Machine Co., Inc., of Montana.

Disbursements:

Disbursements of the loan proceeds to be made from time to time in such amounts and in such manner as fiscal agency may decide provided that prior to each disbursement fiscal agent is in receipt of satisfactory evidence that the amount then to be disbursed is necessary and the construction for which payment is to be made is in accordance with the plans, specifications, cost estimate, and construction contract filed with the fiscal agent pursuant to condition 7 (G) hereunder.

The initial disbursement under this authorization may not be made later than 4 months from date of authorization unless this time limit is extended by fiscal agent provided that a time limit for the final disbursement hereunder may be stipulated upon receipt and approval of fiscal agent of the construction program and copy of construction contracts.

Other terms and conditions:

A No dividends will be paid by the company until loan is repaid.

B. RFC loan agreement.

C Agreement that no advance to or investments in associated companies be made without prior written approval by fiscal agent.

D Management agreement This will be an agreement executed by borrower, providing that until payment in full of the indebtedness evidenced by the note, the management of borrower will be satisfactory to Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the delegate agency and if within 30 days from the date of forwarding by RFC of notice to the borrower that borrower's management is not satisfactory and borrower does not make changes so that its management shall be satisfactory then the RFC with the concurrence of the delegate agency may at any time thereafter, without notice to borrower, accelerate the maturity of the indebtedness evidenced by the note.

E After acquired property clause.

F Tax deposit agreement.

G No disbursement hereunder to be made until approval by fiscal agent of plans, specifications, cost estimates, and copy of construction contracts covering the proposed construction

H Working capital to be supplied by applicant Evidence satisfactory to fiscal agent that not less than $2,000,000 will be available for working capital upon completion of the facilities.

I. The applicant agrees to provide within 18 months of the date of the loan an additional $3,500,000 by the sale of equity or junior debt securities These funds will be applied as determined by the fiscal agent to the reduction of the loan or to defray construction costs in excess of the estimated plant costs or in excess of the amount of the loan and the original capital contribution of the parent company, Harvey Machine Co., Inc , of California

J. Applicant agrees to furnish a $1,000,000 personal performance bond to be signed by Leo Harvey, Sr., to guarantee the above. The bond is to be forfeited by failure of the applicant to perform any of the conditions of the above item.

K. In addition to actual cash expenditures made by or for the account of the applicant up to the date of this certificate, as contained in Loan Application DMA 1919, as amended August 2, 1951, and properly chargeable to this project as determined by the fiscal agent, an additional amount in cash shall be deposited with the fiscal agent sufficient to provide a total cash investment by the applicant of not less than $2,500,000 prior to any disbursement of the loan. Such $2,500,000 is in addition to the working capi-

tal referred to in paragraph (H) and the $3,500,000 referred to in paragraph (I).

L Agreement that if the applicant company remains wholly or preponderantly owned by the parent company, there is to be made available for repayment of the loan (a) all tax savings resulting from the accelerated amortization of the subsidiary company, (b) all tax savings accruing to the parent company through consolidation of its earnings with the subsidiary, (c) all earned accelerated amortization and depreciation of the subsidiary company, less actual replacements chargeable to depreciation, (d) one-half of the net income of the subsidiary company after taxes, and (e) one-half of the net income after taxes of the parent company as if there were no consolidation (it is understood that net income for this purpose shall be computed after amortization and depreciation of the parent company)

M An agreement as an alternate to (L) above that if the subsidiary company is not wholly or preponderantly owned by the parent company, and is therefore not consolidated with the parent company for tax purposes, there is to be made available for repayment of the loan (a) all tax savings resulting from the accelerated amortization of the subsidiary company, plus (b) all earned amortization and depreciation of the subsidiary company, less actual replacements chargeable to depreciation, plus (c) one-half of the net income of the subsidiary company after taxes

N The minimum repayment in any one year is to be one-twentieth of the loan, provided that if any year earned depreciation and amortization plus earnings after taxes are less than this minimum payment, the excess of the cumulative total of repayments made in previous years over the cumulative total of minimum payments due may be applied to this difference

O Standby agreement in respect to any debts owed officers or stockholders

P Borrower will carry on property insurance of such type and in such amounts as may be required by fiscal agent

Q Applicant to agree to furnish fiscal agent monthly income statements as well as quarterly balance sheets not later than 30 days after the close of each quarter until repayment of loan The income and balance sheet statements shall be in form satisfactory to fiscal agent and sworn to by borrower

R The new company shall grant an option in writing enabling the mortgagee to sell the complete project to another producer upon the reimbursement by the Government of the new company for the actual cost to the company exclusive of the cost of the bond referred to in paragraph (J) and without any consideration of the proceeds received by the Government under such bond, all costs to be determined by the Government according to standard accounting procedures, the option to provide that it may be exercised by written notice to the new company 18 months after the date of the loan, if the full $3,500,000 additional capital has not been paid into the new company at the date of such notice, provided that the time within which such notice may be served may be extended and reextended by mutual consent.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the action of the House of Representatives yesterday in rejecting the conference report on the tax bill was an exercise of sound judgment, and it will have a very salutary effect in the future when the House of Representatives considers tax measures

It is my honest hope, Mr Speaker, that the conferees may be able to get together and agree on changes which will make the bill acceptable to this body. In my opinion, as a minimum, I think the conferees should, in the first place, equalize the increase in the personal income tax between the lower-income brackets and the upper-income brackets. The rates should be increased more on those having higher incomes than the present measure calls for

In the second place, Mr Speaker, I think it is very important that the so-called Jenner amendment be deleted from the measure It is a matter on which the Committee on Ways and Means had previously scheduled hearings. It is a subject on which legislation and regulations have been in existence for 12 years The conference report makes really a radical change, and there is violent objection on the part of many Members to that provision

Mr Speaker, at the present time we are withholding from every wage earner a certain percentage of his wages to help pay his tax burden This bill should provide for the same withholding on the coupon clippers, that is, on dividends and interest paid Because of the lack of a withholding provision the Treasury is losing an estimated $300,000,000 yearly in evasion of taxes I think that is a very important provision

The conference report contained many provisions of relief to those who under present law would necessarily pay an excess-profits tax In my opinion this is such an important phase of taxation that before any changes are made public hearings should be held and full committee consideration should be given by the Ways and Means Committee.

The House bill provided for the same proportionate rate of increase in the capital-gains tax as it generally provided for individual incomes This the conference report struck out so that individuals—mostly speculators in stock and commodities—able to take advantage of the capital-gains rate, would share no extra expense for the defense effort.

There are several other important changes from the House bill which could also profitably be modified

It is my sincere hope that we will yet be able to come into agreement and pass an equitable measure

Mr COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to

A motion to reconsider was laid on the the table

House Resolution 426 was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special or lers heretofore entered.

THOMAS LOGAN

Mr. STANLEY. Mr Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H Res 452) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Thomas Logan, son of James Logan, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed $350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said James Logan

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr STANLEY. Mr Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H Res 437) and ask for its immediate consideration

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows.

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 436, Eighty-second Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $75,000, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$75,000" and insert "$50,000"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATIONERY ROOM

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res 468) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House such amount as may be necessary to make up any deficit or shortage heretofore incurred in connection with the operation of the stationery room of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to make a short report on the report of Secretary General Trygve Lie, of the United Nations. The text of the report appears in the New York Times of Friday, October 12, 1951. I ask unanimous consent to extend this report at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS TRYGVE LIE SHOULD RESIGN

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr Speaker, Secretary General of the United Nations Trygve Lie should resign. The basis for that demand is his recent annual report. To read it is to reach but one conclusion, that he does not speak for the free nations of the world who are members of the United Nations; he clearly speaks for socialistic and communistic totalitarianism.

The text of this report was published in the New York Times on Friday, October 12.

Mr Speaker, I do not intend to be sensational, but I am convinced that the report is dishonest; it is biased; and finally it is an unholy report and an insult to the intelligence of every American.

The report is dishonest because it fails to recognize realities, it ignores world conditions, and by its omissions it attempts to create false impressions and conclusions.

It is biased because it is studiously written to avoid Communist criticism, and much of its language is the everyday jargon of Red propaganda.

It is unholy because the report, in its observations, recommendations, and conclusions, like the United Nations organization, fails to recognize or take into consideration the existence of a Supreme Being.

The report, like all socialistic and communistic doctrines, stresses only the materialistic things in the world, and ignores the spiritual things in life. The Secretary refuses to recognize or name the forces of evil loose in the world today, nor does he offer any plan to harness the forces of good inherent in free men.

These are serious charges I have read this document carefully, and it is only after serious thought and study that I have decided to bring this matter before the House. The Secretary's report is lengthy, and I do not intend to read it all, but I shall take a few minutes to give some of the highlights.

One significant item in the lengthy report is the single paragraph on the Korean war. In listing the achievements of what the Secretary General calls the true record of the United Nations, Korea is just "another problem dealt with by the United Nations."

What would the soldiers who are fighting in Korea say about that statement? Mr. Speaker, that is an insult to every United Nations soldier who fights in bloody Korea today and to those who have already died in that undeclared war.

American soldiers in Korea will find the last sentence of the U. N. paragraph on Korea rather hard to digest. It reads:

> When the attack occurred, collective United Nations action to resist the aggression was improvised and succeeded after a year of hard and destructive fighting in repelling the aggressor.

If, as the report states, the aggressors were repelled, why are we still in Korea?

Like President Truman, Secretary Lie refuses to recognize the Korean conflict as a war. He uses Communist jargon when referring to war. He calls it the United Nations struggle for peace. Communists are always talking about the struggle for peace.

The report carefully refrains from naming Russia, China, and even North Korea as aggressors. It merely states that "armed attack was launched from North Korea against the Republic of Korea."

In fact, the report never mentions Russia's or China's part in creating present world unrest, and makes no mention of world attempts to resist Communist aggression.

These omissions indicate to me Trygve Lie's fear of Russian criticism and are evidence of the partial and biased treatment accorded Communist aggression throughout the report.

The entire report bemoans the formation of regional pacts such as NATO, but again there is no reference to Russia's veto and actions which according to President Truman made such pacts necessary.

Further evidence of dishonest reporting is found in the Secretary's analysis of the present world crisis. He says that our present crisis is caused by "major conflicts and upheavals arising out of the conditions which existed at the close of the Second World War." Once again, the Secretary refuses to name Russia's attempt at world revolution and domination as even a contributing factor to our present world crisis.

Russia has since 1917 never tried to deny nor hide her objective of world revolution. Russia has publicly stated, time after time, her aims of world revolution. Why, then, should the Secretary General hesitate to call a spade a spade?

According to Secretary Lie, these same conflicts and upheavals, which are supposed to have arisen from conditions existing at the close of the Second World War, are to blame for the present world armament race.

Secretary Lie states that the most dangerous of these conflicts, which arose out of conditions existing at the close of the Second World War, is "between the Atlantic group and its supporters, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union, its eastern European allies, and the People's Republic of China, on the other hand."

The Secretary charges that the Atlantic group is responsible for the conflict in the world today. This is what he says:

First:

> It has prevented the completion of a peace treaty with Germany.

Second:

> It has led to a split among former allies over a peace treaty with Japan.

The report also blames this conflict between the Atlantic Pact nations and Russia for "growing tension and fear throughout the world. It has led to armed conflict in Korea, and to recurrent troubles and dangers in many parts of the world."

In his report of progress, the Secretary General states that one-fourth of the population of the world has gained political independence in the last 6 years. He fails to tell of the 630,000,000 that have become enslaved and virtual prisoners of Communist aggression. The report also fails to mention the disappearance of nation after nation behind the iron curtain.

After taking credit for repelling the aggressor in Korea, the Secretary General also lists as accomplishments the solution and settlement of the disputes and problems in Iran, Indonesia, Greece, Palestine, India, Pakistan, Kashmir, the Berlin blockade, and the Italian peace treaty. What settlements? Mr. Lie's dreamboat touches all ports and apparently carries enough oil for all troubled waters.

The charges of violation of human rights brought against the satellite states of Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania were solved, according to the report, by being made the subject of various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly. The entire problem was simply treated as a U. N. accomplishment. This out and out whitewash and pigeonholing of the serious charges of violation of human rights can be applauded by no one but the Communists.

Secretary Lie admits that the rate of progress has been slow and unless the U. N. gets greater support, the danger of the bitter conflicts and historic upheavals of our times may prove too great a strain for the U. N. in its early stages of development. He predicts disaster unless member governments make the United Nations the cornerstone of their foreign policies, thus strengthening the United Nations to, first, maintain peace; second, develop more friendly relations; and, third, to work toward a better and fairer distribution of the resources of the earth. The report states that three-fourths of the world's population living in less developed countries, though independent, are strongly demanding better opportunities to improve their meager standards of living and to achieve more rapid social and political progress.

Secretary Lie's lengthy and sometimes repetitious report—over 7,000 words—mentions some 27 nations. The Communist regime in China is called the People's Republic of China. The Secretary names it several times and lists the People's Republic of China as one of the allies of Russia. The question of seating them in the U. N. is an item that he has had to postpone. But there is no

mention whatever of the Nationalist Government of China, which happens to be a member of the U. N., in the entire report.

The Secretary has accomplished one remarkable and outstanding feat The feat lies in not once mentioning the United States which seems to be playing at least a minor role in world affairs and is at present bearing 40 percent of the entire operating cost of the United Nations.

Here we have the Secretary General of the United Nations writing a report of the United Nations' past year's accomplishments, reviewing the past 6 years' activities, posing the present and future problems, recommending procedures and policies, and last but not least, laying the ground work for next year's tremendous budget. Not once is the United States mentioned. In fact, it is not even mentioned as a geographical location. That, you must admit, is a remarkable omission. I thought at first I must have overlooked it I read the report again. I gave special attention to the part of the report dealing with proposed financial aid programs Surely it would take a lot of money to develop the other three-fourths of the world who were strongly demanding to improve their meager standards of living. When it comes to asking for money—no one—not even the United Nations has ever been shy or hesitant in mentioning the United States. But, no, not once in the entire report has the Secretary mentioned the United States At least, not by name. Lest any Member of the House feel that we will not be called on for money, let me give you a quote and show you how the Secretary puts the bite on the United States without naming us

In making his plea for using the United Nations as the main avenue through which financial aid should be channeled, Trygve Lie says:

I recognize fully the heavy costs of armaments now being borne by the same industrially developed countries which would be the source for much of this financial assistance

Reduce this statement to percentages of present armament expenditures, and it will not be hard to figure how much the United States will be expected to pay in this world-wide scheme to distribute the resources of the earth

In his closing admonition to the United Nations, Trygve Lie says "that the United Nations must never forget that its functions are not peace-keeping but peace-creating"

Once again Americans will find it difficult to follow the Secretary General We in America have not been taught to think of the world as being in a constant state of turmoil. Peace to an American is a natural and understandable condition that must prevail in our way of life. Secretary Lie, however, follows the pessimistic Old World thinking. that there is no peace, there has never been peace, and there will be no peace—unless U. N.-created

How does the Secretary propose to create this peace? Here is what he says:

The creating of conditions of peace will in a large measure be the result of providing the economic and psychological framework within which the majority of mankind finds life livable and worth while.

Reducing this to plain English, it means that the United Nations can only create peace if and when the United States dishes out the money to make life livable and worth while for the rest of mankind.

The sixth annual report of the Secretary General to the United Nations General Assembly should serve as a warning as to where we are headed and what is expected of us

The Secretary General in making this dishonest and biased report has shown his unfitness for the office.

Trygve Lie, as Secretary General, is still the creature of Russian bargaining, just as he was when first appointed for the 5-year term of office.

He has long overstayed his term.

His usefulness has long since been destroyed.

I am, therefore, bringing this to the attention of Ambassador Warren Austin, our representative to the United Nations, and to our State Department.

If Trygve Lie does not resign as Secretary General, he should be removed from office.

[From the New York Times of October 12, 1951]

TEXT OF LIE REPORT TO U N CAUTIONING MEMBERS AGAINST SOLE RELIANCE ON REGIONAL PACTS

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y, October 11—Following is the text of Secretary General Trygve Lie's introduction to his sixth annual report to the United Nations General Assembly

"During the past year, the threat of a third world war has continued to lie heavy upon the hearts of people everywhere and to burden their lives

"The governments have been preoccupied with emergency measures caused by the dangers and fears of the present time. The goal of a peaceful and better world proclaimed in the United Nations Charter has seemed more distant than ever

"Whether the world is to enter upon a period of easing of tensions or whether the great conflict that has dominated world affairs since 1945 will continue on its present acutely dangerous course, it is, I believe, both wise and necessary at this time for the governments of member states and their peoples to give careful reconsideration to the place of the United Nations in the struggle for peace

"The Charter came into force 6 years ago in a political atmosphere very different from that which exists today Is the fundamental concept of the Charter regarding the problem of world peace still valid today or has it been disproved by subsequent events? Should the main efforts in the international field made by member states to preserve peace and to protect and promote the interests of their peoples be conducted through and in support of the United Nations or by other means?"

THE UNITED NATIONS CONCEPT

"The United Nations, it is frequently said, was founded on the assumption that the five great powers which led the struggle against Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy and Imperialist Japan would continue to cooperate in the peace that followed victory Since the events of the past 6 years have led to a different result, some have come to the conclusion that the United Nations in its present form is not a workable instrument for peace and security, at least in the foreseeable future. A few would scrap the organization altogether A greater number would seek peace and security mainly by other means, while conserving the United Nations in a secondary position as a forum for world debate and a useful vehicle for international cooperation in economic and social matters

"I believe it is important to recall that the founding of the United Nations was motivated by a far more fundamental and lasting concept concerning the world than a passing wartime alliance of great powers This is that the peace and well-being of all nations and peoples have become in the present age so intimately interrelated that it is necessary for them, despite all their differences, to join in a world-wide organization looking toward security from war, freedom and independence for the peoples, and mutual economic and social progress

"We should not forget that this judgment long antedates the United Nations Its steadily increasing acceptance over the past 50 years is based upon one of the most revolutionary and far-reaching developments in the life of mankind since the beginning of civilization—the scientific and technological revolution of our time

"This revolution has made possible the industrialization of a growing number of countries and has multiplied several-fold the volume of world production It has caused the world's population to grow at an unprecedented rate At the same time, it has brought about new and rapid means of transportation and mass communication for the interchange of ideas These developments have intensified the impact of cultures one upon the other, and have greatly increased the economic interdependence of nations in all parts of the world. The world has shrunk while its population has grown; the potential benefits as well as the potential dangers that are coupled with closer interdependence have become more evident.

"The scientific and technological revolution has likewise increased the range and destructive power of weapons of war to an extent far beyond comparison with any previous age The significance of distance—of the geographical separateness of nations—has been reduced almost to the vanishing point. We live in a world where men and machines can move with such speed that an armed attack can strike home upon the victim nation anywhere in the world in 24 hours or less

"It was in the face of these inescapable realities rather than in the hope of maintaining the wartime alliance of the Five Great Powers that the governments founded the United Nations It is true the hope was there, it is reflected in the rule of great-power unanimity in the Security Council. This hope has, however, been grievously disappointed

"But the founders of our organization never conceived that its mere establishment would of itself remove or prevent conflicts and differences of national interests, aspirations, cultures, and beliefs, nor would it assure in advance the future good conduct and good faith of governments in all circumstances On the contrary, they considered that from that time forward a world organization was the one essential and primary instrument, to be available in all circumstances, through which the member nations could over a period of time develop adequate means for controlling unlawful international conduct on the part of any government and for preventing those differences which inevitably arise between nations from leading to further world wars, with the consequent denial or destruction of the political, economic, and social progress of the peoples.

"It is in the light of the record of the past 6 years that I propose to review the soundness of this fundamental judgment, as well as the concept of the United Nations as the instrument for applying it"

WORLD CONFLICT AND UPHEAVALS

"Almost immediately after the establishment of the United Nations the world was faced with major conflicts and upheavals arising out of the conditions which existed at the close of the Second World War.

"We have seen the greatest and most dangerous of these conflicts—that between the Atlantic group and its supporters, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union, its most dangerous of these conflicts, Eastern European Allies, and the People's Republic of China, on the other hand—absorbing the major attention of all members since it began. It has prevented the completion of a peace treaty with Germany, a country which is left in a state of de facto armed partition between East and West. It has led to a split among the former Allies over the peace treaty with Japan. It has resulted in increased armaments and in growing tension and fear throughout the world. It has led to armed conflict in Korea and to recurrent troubles and dangers in many parts of the world.

"In the United Nations itself we have felt the serious effects of these developments in almost every field of activity. Because of the requirement of five-power unanimity, the Security Council has not been able to establish the armed forces provided for in the Charter, nor has it been able to use its power thereunder to order such forces into action to maintain or restore peace and security. For the same reason, it has been impossible to establish a system for the control of atomic energy and the control and reduction of other armaments. The existing ideological conflict has had a negative influence not only on the political work of the United Nations but on some of its other efforts to achieve constructive results, especially as regards economic reconstruction and development, the widening of international trade, and other programs for economic and social betterment

"Although the attention of the world has been focused almost exclusively upon the main political conflict, there have been other far-reaching developments of profound global significance with which the organization has had to deal since its establishment, and to which I have previously drawn attention.

"One-fourth of the population of the world has gained political independence within the span of only 6 years. The pressure of other dependent peoples toward freedom and equality has become much stronger since the war and continues to increase. Further, three-quarters of the world's population living in the less developed countries, though independent, are strongly demanding better opportunities to improve their meager standards of living and to achieve more rapid social and political progress.

"It is against the background of these events that we must weigh the record of the United Nations in order to evaluate wisely the place it should occupy in the foreign policies of governments in both the immediate and more distant future"

THE UNITED NATIONS AS A FORCE FOR PEACE

"When we consider the role of the United Nations in relation to attempts to settle peacefully disputes between nations and to prevent or put an end to armed conflict, we find that virtually all the most serious questions of the past 6 years, with the exception of the conclusion of the actual peace treaties, have been brought in one form or another to the United Nations.

"What is the true record of the Organization in these matters? The first three cases to come before the Security Council concerned the presence of British and French troops in Lebanon and Syria and of Soviet troops in Iran, and the struggle of Indonesia for independence Following upon the Council's consideration of the first two cases, the British and French troops were withdrawn from Lebanon and Syria and the Soviet troops from Iran. Persistent efforts by the United Nations at conciliation in Indonesia were a major factor in the achievement of independence by the Republic of Indonesia through peaceful agreement with the Netherlands.

"The United Nations has been concerned over a 5-year period with threats to the independence of Greece. It is generally recognized that the unceasing watch by the United Nations over the northern borders of Greece has contributed largely to the amelioration of a dangerous situation between that country and its neighbors.

"The problem of Palestine has been in the hands of the Organization since 1947. Following decisions of the General Assembly, the State of Israel was established, and mediation by the United Nations succeeded in ending armed conflict between Israel and the Arab States. Real peace in the Middle East has yet to be achieved, but the armistices arranged through United Nations intervention have continued in effect.

"Another problem dealt with by the United Nations since 1947 is that of the unification and independence of Korea. The future of Korea was involved in the wider world conflict and the Organization was unable to bring about an agreed peaceful solution of the problem in the succeeding 2½ years. Then, in June 1950, the armed attack was launched from North Korea against the Republic of Korea When that attack occurred collective United Nations action to resist the aggression was improvised and succeeded, after a year of hard and destructive fighting, in repelling the aggressor.

"The dispute between India and Pakistan over the future of Kashmir has also been before the United Nations since the beginning of 1948. Here, too, fighting ceased after mediation by the Organization, although little progress has been made for a long time toward a settlement of the dispute. This question remains a matter of grace concern to the United Nations.

"The Berlin blockade was brought to the United Nations in 1948. This was the most dangerous conflict directly involving the great powers prior to the aggression in Korea, and was settled by peaceful negotiation in which United Nations channels were used.

"After the great powers had failed to agree, in the Italian Peace Treaty, on the future of the former Italian colonies, this question was brought to the United Nations for settlement. The General Assembly decided that Libya should be independent after January 1, 1952, that Somaliland should be independent after 10 years of trusteeship, and that Eritrea should constitute an autonomous unit federated with Ethiopia under the sovereignty of the Ethiopian crown. These decisions are now being carried out.

"Charges against Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania of violations of the human rights provisions of the peace treaties with these former enemy states have been the subject of various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly.

"It will be noted that, in all the above matters, which serve to illustrate the activities of the United Nations in the political sphere, definite decisions have been taken or recommendations made. There exist, however, a number of problems which still remain on the agenda of the relevant organs for further consideration and possible recommendations. For example, the Anglo-Egyptian dispute and the question of Trieste are retained on the agenda of the Security Council; various questions relating to China were brought to the General Assembly at its fifth session, including charges and countercharges of aggression against China, the question of the representation of China in the United Nations, the intervention of the People's Republic of China in Korea, and the future of the island of Formosa (Taiwan); and the ever-increasing problem of the armaments of the great powers has been periodically debated in various bodies throughout the life of the Organization."

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

"The first conclusion that emerges from the above enumeration is, surely, that the governments of members have found it both wise and necessary to resort to the United Nations in their effort to settle, ameliorate, or at least contain, most of the dangerous differences and disputes that have arisen among them since the end of the Second World War, including those directly involving the interests of the great powers.

"The general practice has been to bring serious disputes over of a primary regional character to the world organization for a hearing, for the judgment of world opinion as reflected in its organs, and for the deployment of its resources in negotiation, mediation and conciliation, and in the recommendation of settlements. This practice, in turn, seems to support the basic judgment embodied in the Charter: that, in a world so closely interrelated as ours today, a serious dispute between nations in one part of the world is the concern of nations in all parts of the world.

"A second conclusion to be drawn from the record on political activity is this: in spite of the lack of unanimity of the permanent members of the Security Council, United Nations action has resulted in bringing about the peaceful settlement of a substantial number of serious international issues in the first six years of its existence. In other cases not yet settled, United Nations action has prevented or halted armed conflict. In still others where little or no success has yet been achieved, governments have nevertheless found no feasible alternative, no way offering a better prospect of ultimate success, than that of continuing their efforts in and through the organization.

"A third conclusion is that armed aggression anywhere, or the threat of armed conflict anywhere, is, in fact as well as in theory, becoming more and more the concern of nations everywhere. The most striking demonstration of this has been in Korea. There, for the first time in history, armed collective security action against military aggression by a world organization has been undertaken, not under some regional pact or traditional alliance, but by and under the United Nations. Furthermore, this action has been taken in a case directly involving the great-power conflict. Nations in all parts of the world have participated, including many with none of those special national interests in the area which traditionally, have been the only cause for which nations would fight. By joining in this collective security action, these nations have recognized that, in this case at least, collective security against armed aggression anywhere is a truly vital national interest of nations everywhere

"Finally, there are the Uniting for Peace resolutions, adopted by the General Assembly at its last session, which aim at the development of an effective collective security system which could immediately be set in motion in case of an emergency.

"These resolutions, I hope, reflect the beginning of a significant evolution in the policies of the governments of most member states concerning the whole problem of security from aggression.

"Faced with the great East-West conflict and the resulting deadlock in the Security Council, governments have previously directed their efforts toward the building of mutual defense alliances, backed by rearmament. This process still continues, though with a difference. Before the attack on Korea, the tendency in many quarters was to

look upon these alliances as the only effective means of protection from aggression, because the Security Council might be unable to act. Since the attack, there has been a growing recognition that such alliances, while important and useful as supplementary measures of defense, cannot be regarded as substitutes for a United Nations collective security system. There has also been a growing recognition that such a system can be established and can be made to work under the present Charter

"It was this reappraisal which led to the adoption of the 'uniting for peace' recommendations. It remains to be determined whether member nations are now prepared fully to apply the recommendations. If they do so, the United Nations will in the future be able to act effectively in all circumstances against armed aggression, even if the Security Council should be unable to discharge its primary responsibility in this respect"

RECORD OF THE UNITED NATIONS IN OTHER FIELDS

"What has been the experience of members over the past 6 years in pursuit of other purposes set forth in the Charter—such purposes as economic and social advancement, equal right and self-determination of peoples, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, the advancement of dependent peoples toward self-government or independence, and the further development and application of international law? Has the universal approach represented by the United Nations Charter and system proved in practice to be wise and necessary, above and beyond the likewise important national and regional efforts toward these ends?

"It is true that by far the largest international programs of economic aid for recovery from the effects of the Second World War have been carried on outside the United Nations, although they have contributed greatly to the capacity of the participating nations to join in achieving the objectives of the Charter. Outside these programs, however, the United Nations system on the whole is gradually developing into the main center for international planning and action of both an emergency and a longer term character toward these goals.

"To demonstrate the scope of the Organization's activity it is only necessary to recall the work carried on under the Economic and Social Council, with its three regional economic commissions and its nine "functional" commissions dealing with world-wide economic and social problems, as well as the work of the 11 specialized agencies—the International Labor Organization with 64 members, the Food and Agriculture Organization with 66, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization with 64, the International Civil Aviation Organization with 57, the World Health Organization with 78, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund, each with 50, the Universal Postal Union with 86, the International Telecommunication Union with 84, the International Refugee Organization with 18, and the World Meteorological Organization with 66 It is hoped that the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization will be brought into operation in the near future and, in addition, the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade are now provisionally in force among 32 nations.

"Under the United Nations itself, and directly responsible to the General Assembly, are the Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, the Korean Reconstruction Agency, the International Children's Emergency Fund, and the newly established Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees.

"I come now to a nonpolitical activity that is of prime importance to the achievement of long-term stability in many parts of the world. I refer, of course, to the technical assistance program for economic development, social welfare and public administration. In many respects, this effort is unique as a United Nations activity when viewed from the aspect of Secretariat organization, because of the technical assistance program of the United Nations itself is an operational function carried on within a Secretariat which is largely concerned with research and advisory duties. Indeed, apart from urgent political questions, there is perhaps no area of the work of the United Nations that should attract more support from all members than this program, and which is more important to the future of the Organization For, the fundamental thesis of this program is to help peoples to help themselves, by introducing them to the skills and organizational techniques necessary for the most effective economic use of their own resources, personnel, and traditions.

"The main fields of technical assistance activity of the United Nations and the specialized agencies are economic development, agriculture and health programs, wide educational and vocational training schemes, social welfare in its limitless variety and, finally, the improvement of public administration, without which effective social organization and action are not possible in the modern state

"Both the regular and expanded programs of the United Nations and the specialized agencies have made substantial and heartening progress in the past year Reviewing the work of the United Nations and the agencies together, over five hundred requests have been received from 64 countries, and agreements have been signed with 45 governments to provide experts and other assistance. These are in addition to the regular work of technical assistance carried on by the United Nations and the specialized agencies in their respective fields of action. It should be said that these programs are being developed side by side with bilateral and regional programs of technical assistance outside the United Nations system

"In the field of social welfare and human rights, there has been an increasing recognition of the solemn obligations imposed by the charter The Universal Declaration of Human Rights stands as a beacon of hope and progress for peoples everywhere Its potentially vast effect upon the future of mankind has as yet only begun to make itself manifest, but the trend is already apparent. Parts of the declaration are being written into national constitutions, while civil rights in other countries are upheld by references to it Much other action toward promoting social welfare and a wider observance of human rights is also under way in the United Nations, including the drafting of a Covenant on Human Rights and measures for its implementation, the world-wide battle against the abuse of narcotic drugs, and work on such problems as rights of minorities, status of women, freedom of information, trade union rights, abolition of slavery and forced labor, prisoners of war and protection of refugees and stateless persons.

"During the past six years, the United Nations has clearly become the main international instrument for the advancement of dependent peoples towards self-government and independence. In addition to the trusteeship system, which now covers 11 Trust Territories, the principle of international accountability and concern for all dependent territories is being applied

"Virtually all important developments in the evolution of international law during the past 6 years have been closely connected with the United Nations The Charter itself has become the central instrument of international law, and one of the most important features of the development of that law is the continuing and cumulative effort to implement the Charter in all its aspects. Apart from the Charter, various international conventions designed to develop or clarify international law have been or are being prepared under United Nations auspices. The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide was adopted by the General Assembly and is now in force, although a number of important member states have not yet ratified it A convention on the status of refugees has been completed this year The establishment of a court to judge crimes under international law is being studied. The International Law Commission has produced a number of valuable drafts, including a draft code of offenses against the peace and security of mankind. There has been an increasing tendency for states to refer their legal disputes to the International Court of Justice, which has declared the existing state of the law in six judgments and seven advisory opinions"

EXPERIENCE HAS CONFIRMED THE CORRECTNESS OF THE UNITED NATIONS APPROACH

"What conclusions should be drawn from a review even so necessarily brief and incomplete as the above?

"The first is that, in these matters as in political questions, the governments of member states have once again confirmed in practice the concept reflected in the United Nations Charter that world organization is essential for the advancement of the welfare of their peoples

"A second conclusion to be drawn from the record is that already many important programs benefiting hundreds of millions of people throughout the world have been promoted through the United Nations system with good results There have been and continue to be setbacks, failures, disappointments. The great political conflicts of our time inevitably have reduced the effectiveness of some, though not all, of these programs

"At best, the rate of progress is slow in projects involving the voluntary cooperation of many nations. Viewed from year to year, the lag between proposal and debate on the one hand, and performance on the other, has often seemed disheartening. But over a period of 6 years, the perspective, I claim, is different."

NECESSITY FOR STRONG UNITED NATIONS ACTION

"As I have already said, it seems to me that the record of the past 6 years has shown the United Nations to be a practical instrument for all nations seeking peace, security, and the well-being and advancement of their peoples.

"The organization is still in its early stages of development No matter how right its principles or how practical its machinery have proved to be in many fields, the United Nations depends for its ultimate success upon the extent of the support given to these principles and the use made of this machinery by member states Unless these are realized in sufficient measure, there is danger that the bitter conflicts and historic upheavals of our times may prove too great a strain for a world structure that is still in the early stages of development.

"I believe this disaster may be avoided if the governments will act promptly, vigorously and wisely to make the United Nations—in fact and in all respects—a cornerstone of their foreign policy, and thus further strengthen the power of the United Nations to maintain peace, to develop more friendly relations, and to work toward a better and fairer distribution of the resources of the earth

"Because of the responsibilities placed upon my as Secretary General by the Charter, I feel it is my duty to submit to this end some thoughts and suggestions for consideration at the sixth session of the General Assembly and in other United Nations organs."

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF UNITED NATIONS COLLECTIVE SECURITY

"Despite the heavy loss of life, the tragedy and suffering involved, I consider that one of the most encouraging developments of the past year for the preservation of world peace has been the United Nations collective security action in Korea Equally so is the decision in principle to prepare for similar collective action in any future case of armed aggression, on the recommendation of the Security Council or the General Assembly. This decision to establish a framework for collective security action supplementary to the system intended by the Charter must be considered a milestone in the organization's history

"Progress has been made toward implementing this decision through the preparatory work of the Collective Measures Committee But I think it important that the governments of members should express more clearly and explicitly the commitment—subject of course to their respective constitutional processes and to the obligations of self-defense—of their foreign policy, their armed forces and their economic power to this developing world-wide system of collective security.

"There should be no conflict between obligations arising, on the one hand, from regional and mutual defense pacts concluded in conformity with the Charter and obligations arising, on the other hand, from the United Nations collective-security system. Any serious threat or act of armed aggression calling for action under such pacts will also call for action by the United Nations itself, since the latter must, under the Charter, always be concerned whenever and wherever peace is threatened or broken. Furthermore, it is not possible to achieve lasting security from war by regional pacts alone. At best, those pacts can of themselves only lead to a precarious balance of power.

"It is, I believe, in the vital national interest of member states desiring peace that their regional security commitments be more clearly regarded as complementary to their primary obligation to join in defending world peace under the United Nations This is essential if the United Nations is to develop a world collective-security system that will be a really effective deterrent to armed aggression and a barrier against war.

"In the present state of the world, it is of the utmost importance for the preservation of peace that the United Nations should be assured of sufficient armed power and economic resources for collective security to deter any nation from embarking upon armed aggression anywhere

"At the same time, we must never lose sight of the fact that this strong collective-security system is being organized for the purpose of preventing war, not waging it. We are not seeking to organize a system that can be used as a threat against the equal rights of any nation or any group of nations to determine their own mode of life in their own way One of the basic conditions for the success of the United Nations is the principle of peaceful coexistence for all types of political and social systems, within a universal framework of law as laid down in the Charter This principle also carries with it the obligation upon all states not to interfere in the internal affairs of other states."

FURTHER EFFORTS AT PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT

"We must continue and redouble our efforts to use all the available resources of the United Nations system to make the principle of coexistence work in fact, which it has not done so far.

"The reasons which prompted the framers of the Charter to place the primary responsibility for peace and security upon the Security Council are as sound today as they were in 1945. There can be no lasting peace in the world unless a peaceful settlement can be achieved between the two groups of great powers, and a peaceful settlement is something that, in the end, can be reached only by negotiations, mutual concession, and the development of mutual confidence.

"I believe that the development of a strong and effective United Nations collective security system, combined with renewed efforts at mediation and conciliation, can improve the chances of ameliorating and, in time, settling the great political conflicts that most endanger world peace today. The greater the ability of the United Nations to foil attempts to solve conflicts of national interest by force, the more likely will it be that those conflicts can be settled by negotiation. A realization of the political stresses of the day is essential to the achievement of lasting settlements.

"In this connection, I hope that the member nations will fully develop and use the Peace Observation Commission It is an essential part of the growing system of collective security, and the presence of the Commission's observers on any troubled border in the world could not fail to act as a deterrent to armed aggression.

"In all our efforts to implement the 'Uniting for Peace' resolutions it is necessary to keep clearly in mind the ultimate goals of making chapter VII of the Charter work as it was intended to work, and of controlling and reducing all armaments and armed forces What we are doing is seeking to build a second line of defense against war in case the first line of defense should fail

"Nevertheless, it remains that the Security Council continues and must continue to bear the primary responsibility for the preservation of peace and it should lose no opportunity to exert all its efforts to settle the conflicts threatening world peace today. There appears to be little or no hope at the present time of making progress toward establishing the forces contemplated under article 43 of the Charter and of reaching the necessary unanimity of agreement on a system of control and reduction of armaments. But the unforeseeable course of events may change the prospects for the better at some future time, near or distant, and we should do everything that is possible to encourage this result "

PERIODIC MEETINGS OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

"I wish to recall the proposal for the inauguration of periodic meetings of the Security Council included in the memorandum last year on a 20-year program for achieving peace through the United Nations. Because of the problem of the representation of China in the United Nations and the involvement in Korea of forces of the People's Republic of China, I have not since renewed this proposal because I believed that aggression in Korea should first be brought to an end

"At a later time to be determined in the light of developments and the world situation in general, the proposal for the inauguration of the periodic meetings of the Security Council should be considered. The existing practice of holding meetings of Foreign Ministers outside the United Nations needs to be supplemented by meetings within that organization which would provide full opportunity at regular intervals for a periodic testing of the possibilities of reducing world tensions, of ameliorating conflicts and of arriving at settlements of outstanding issues. I believe that it would strengthen the United Nations if special meetings of the Security Council, attended by foreign ministers or heads of governments, could be held with this purpose in view. In my opinion, the presence of the nonpermanent members of the Council at such meetings would improve the chances for constructive results. In the United Nations, the medium and smaller powers have done much, and can do much more toward moderating and conciliating opposing positions."

UNIVERSALITY OF MEMBERSHIP

"I have consistently supported the principle of universality of membership in the United Nations. The trend of events in the past year has in some ways, although not in all, seemed to make the early realization of this goal more difficult. Nevertheless, I remain convinced that it would be in the interests of world peace and an important step toward strengthening the influence of the organization if all the states now outside it could be brought into membership within a reasonable time. I believe that it would be wise and right for member states to apply the membership tests of article 4 of the Charter primarily in the light of these considerations and of the interests of the inhabitants of the countries concerned.

"The conduct of certain governments, both inside and outside the United Nations, may be condemned from time to time by the organization. But the latter's influence both for world peace and upon the conduct of governments in relation to the obligations and objectives of the Charter would undoubtedly be greater if all such governments were within the organization."

OTHER STEPS TOWARD STRENGTHENING WORK OF UNITED NATIONS FOR PEACE

"The prosecution and further development of the expanded United Nations program of technical assistance is of the highest importance. It is in the national interest of all members of our organization and the specialized agencies should be the main vehicles of technical assistance between nations I recognize that this approach sometimes poses administrative problems. Nevertheless, the overriding consideration, in my opinion, should be the application of the first principle stated in article 2 of the Charter 'The organization is based on the sovereign equality of all its members'.

"This means that in technical assistance, as in other matters, the old relationship of the powerful to the weak, of the giver to the receiver should be replaced by a cooperative program based on equal rights and obligations, in which all participate according to their capacity. In a world in which most of the formerly underdeveloped areas have risen, or are rising, to positions of independence and political strength, this is all the more necessary if we are to reach our goal of a stable and peaceful society.

"We are emerging into a new era in which the great and heavily populated states of Asia are seeking to telescope the generations of technical achievement of the West into a shorter span. Their goal, aiming as it does at improving the welfare of their peoples, should have the concrete support in deeds of the industrially advanced nations; and the deeds that will count most and will be remembered longest will be those that contribute to raising the level of economic and administrative skill, combined with capital aid for general economic development. Indeed, this applies not only to the newly emergent states of Asia, and to the peoples of Africa who are also moving toward a new life, but also to the older communities of Latin America, where great natural resources and a deep desire for improvement invite the contribution of more advanced states From now on, constructive international economic activity should, therefore, find its most creative outlet in the programs of technical assistance and economic development through capital aid made available to the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

"I hope that members will find it possible to develop and carry out, through the United Nations and its related agencies, a long-range program of financial assistance for economic development directly related to the technical-assistance program. Here again, as in the case of technical assistance, the same reasons

are valid for using the United Nations as the main avenue through which financial aid should be channeled.

"I recognize fully the heavy cost of armaments now being borne by the same industrially developed countries which would be the source for much of this financial assistance Nevertheless, I believe that such a United Nations program would contribute both to their own ultimate security from war and to their own economic well-being. By increasing the volume of production, raising living standards and alleviating population pressures the program could, within a period of a few years, reduce the basic causes of unrest and violent upheavals in many parts of the world, at the same time it could, by increasing the utilization of unused resources, so expand world economy and world trade that all countries would benefit. If wisely conceived and administered as an integral part of an over-all United Nations program for peace, it would hasten the day when nations could again reduce their armaments When we recall that the military costs of member States are now running at a rate of more than $100,000,000,000 a year, it is readily apparent that progress toward peace, leading to a reduction of these military costs, would result in net savings representing many times the cost of an effective United Nations program of financial assistance for economic development

"The Middle East is one of the areas where the connection between financial aid for economic development and the effort to settle political conflicts is most apparent. There, and in Korea, are two of the most urgent challenges to effective action by the United Nations—one for economic development, the other for economic reconstruction In both cases the political future, and the issue of peace or war, will be vitally affected by what the United Nations does, or fails to do, in the economic field

"There are other fields where further progress toward more effective work in the economic and social fields may be possible. In some cases progress is possible even if the present central political conflict continues unabated. In other cases, it will depend upon the amelioration of this conflict For example, trade between the Western World and the Soviet Union and its allies has been sharply reduced for political and military reasons, although a general expansion of world trade is in the economic interest of all concerned If the testing of possibilities for fruitful political negotiations should have positive results, the possibilities for simultaneous progress toward the removal of the present barriers to trade will be improved

'It is my deep conviction that it would be a grave mistake to permit the pressures, great as they are, of immediate political and military problems to distract the United Nations from those longer-range problems upon the settlement of which international stability and good feeling will depend, namely, those concerned with raising the living standards of peoples everywhere, particularly of those nations which have yet to attain a reasonable level of subsistence for the great masses of their populations

"The United Nations must never forget that its functions are not 'peace-keeping' but 'peace-creating,' and that the creation of conditions of peace will in a large measure be the result of providing the economic and psychological framework within which the majority of mankind finds life livable and worth while"

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I notice several times the gentleman used the expression "redistribute" or "distribute the resources of the world." My thought all the time has been that the resources they were distributing were United States resources.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is what I meant. If I said "of the world" I was incorrect. "Redistribute the resources of the United States" is what I meant.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan May I compliment the gentleman He brings to us information which some of us have not the opportunity or ability to collect, information which, in my judgment, at least is information that we must have if we are going to perform our duty here as Representatives.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman I hope the Members will take an opportunity to analyze that report, because if they do, they are in for a shock if they read all of it.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin

Mr KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I followed the gentleman's very excellent speech and analysis of this report very closely. May I ask the gentleman, who is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, whether the United Nations Charter, to which he referred several times, has not as its basic purpose to deal with aggressors? That is one of the main purposes of the United Nations Charter, is it not?

Mr SMITH of Wisconsin. It is for collective security.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Against aggression?

Mr SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin In this report is there any recognition of the fact that the real and the bloody aggressor in the world today is the Soviet regime?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. No; that is glossed over. As I said, it actually places the responsibility on those who do not agree with Russia for present conditions.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Is there any recognition of the fact that the people of China and the peoples of Eastern Europe are really enslaved by the present regimes in those countries?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Not one word.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I also want to commend the gentleman on his very excellent presentation and for his forethought in bringing this timely issue to the House. I would like to inquire of the gentleman if he does not think that the time is here when we should do some realistic thinking so far as the United Nations is concerned, and I would like to inquire if the gentleman could tell the House of anything being done in the Committee on Foreign Affairs to bring to light these conditions which he has just described in this report?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I know nothing officially that is being done in the committee. I have the feeling, personally, that there is a good deal of doubt being raised in the minds of people as to whether or not the U. N. is doing the job for which it was organized.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I would further like to ask the gentleman what attitude the Committee on Foreign Affairs is taking toward the situation in Korea. Are we going to sit complacently by for another winter and let these boys endure those indescribable hardships that they went through last year without making some effort to bring to an end that conflict?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Well, I just wonder if we can. I wonder if there is any committee in Congress that could effect that change. It is an undeclared war.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Well, is it a war, and if it is a war, between whom is it a war?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Well, if we are to believe the reports, it is a war between the United Nations and the so-called aggressors in the form of Communist China and the North Koreans; the Red government of North Korea.

Mr CHENOWETH I wish to inform the gentleman that I was amazed to learn within the last few days that United States soldiers participating in the conflict are engaged in what they call peacetime action. I was amazed that a soldier killed in that action receives benefits from the Bureau of Employees' Compensation as he would if he had suffered injuries in an accident while in a civilian status

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I think that is an important observation, if it is true

Mr. CHENOWETH. It is true.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentleman ought to bring that matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I was amazed to find it is true.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I did not know that.

Mr. CHENOWETH. It is true, and that is what is going on this very day. They consider our soldiers as engaged in peacetime action; not any war

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. But they are dying.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Is there not some way that either we in this House or the American people can bring an end to this situation?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. You can only bring it to an end at the next election, in my opinion.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The gentleman said they are dying. I am sure the gentleman is aware that in the first 16 months of the war in Korea we, in the United States, lost more men than we lost in that length of time in either the First or the Second World Wars.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes, I understand that is true.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Of course, the gentleman knows that there are many men in the Walter Reed Hospital and at the Naval Hospital and hospitals all over the country who are not receiving some of the benefits of wartime casualties. We passed that legislation here and the gentleman was evidently present when it was passed. Gradually the men are receiving benefits that they should as if it was a real war, and yet it is not called a real war. They are receiving hospitalization that the men of World War II and World War I are receiving. They are receiving for their wounds that same compensation. However, some legislation has not yet passed. Yesterday we passed a bill granting them additional benefits, but the well men have not received any of the benefits like the veterans received under the Bill of Rights in World War II. They are considered in this war—I call it a war—to receive the same benefits almost entirely that World War II veterans are receiving.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Do I correctly understand they are receiving those benefits now?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes. The men in the hospitals do not get the veterans benefits until they are discharged, but they are treated just as if they were in war.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentlewoman heard the gentleman from Colorado make the statement about their not being covered. There seems to be some conflict here. Are they covered or are they not?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is my understanding that the men that are being discharged are receiving the same rates of compensation as the World War II men are receiving.

Mr. CHENOWETH. If the gentleman will yield, I received a letter in just the last 2 days from a veteran just returned from Korea, a boy who was engaged in that action. He inquired concerning the benefits to which he is entitled on his return. He said that about all he found he was entitled to was a flag to drape his casket when he died. That was his observation. His letter complained very bitterly about the reception he received. I called to the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin just now that the action this boy was engaged in is not a wartime action but, under our conception of Korea, is a peacetime action, and I presume under our laws he would not be entitled to the benefits of a veteran. That is a rather unfortunate, a deplorable, and an unconscionable situation.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. If that is true, I think the Congress has the responsibility and should investigate that. I believe the committee of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts would be the proper committee to consider it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I think it should be done immediately.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Was he a Regular Army officer?

Mr. CHENOWETH. He was an enlisted man.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Fighting in this war?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Not a war, this is a peacetime action; it is not a war.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CAMP. I think we have already passed legislation which gives Korean veterans compensation, hospitalization, and insurance. The only thing they do not receive is this bonus and matters under the GI laws. I understand the bill we passed yesterday makes them eligible for the loans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We passed that yesterday.

Mr. CAMP. I do not think there is any doubt about it. The legislation has already been passed.

Mr. CHENOWETH. This is the distinction. I think a boy who returns who is well and who has suffered no disability receives practically no benefits, but the boy who is disabled does come in under those bills.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the bill we passed yesterday allows for loans. However, the gentleman is absolutely correct. We ought to pass before we adjourn the GI bills of rights we passed for World War II veterans. I have bills and others have bills which would make that provision law for these men. I have had letters on this subject. The men are very bitter about the situation.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Does not the gentlewoman think the time is here when we should recognize some obligation to these boys?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, but I also think it is the duty of every Member of Congress to see that that is done. I do not think it depends on one or two or three Members. I think every one of us should see that it is done, and we could if we would.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I want to compliment the gentleman on his very forceful and very informative speech. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I also wish to compliment the gentleman, particularly on that portion of his speech which points out the activities of the Secretary in connection with the United Nations. I for one believe that the present regime of Soviet Russia and the other Red regimes do not represent the people of Russia or these other iron-curtain countries. I believe these gangster regimes should be expelled from the United Nations. The United Nations will never amount to anything until they are expelled, and until a representation that really represents the Russian people and the other people takes their place.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Of course, that goes to the whole basic agreement in the Charter. If you are going to kick them out you will have to do that, but I doubt that there are means provided in the Charter itself to get rid of them. I agree with the gentleman so far as the thought is concerned.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. If they are aggressors, which I believe they are, then they should be dealt with as such. I believe on that basis they can be expelled.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

SPECIAL ORDER

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes following the conclusion of the special orders today.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. HARRIS]. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 30 minutes.

ARE YOU BETTER OFF?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, President Truman, addressing a luncheon of Democrats from 11 Western States in the gold room of the Fairmont Hotel in San Francisco on September 4, 1951, made this statement:

> We have operated the Government for the benefit of all the people since 1933, and that is the reason we are in the condition we are. We succeeded—

Said President Truman—

> in making farmers, laboring men, and industry prosperous. The test of the New Deal and the Fair Deal and all that the Democratic Party has done for the country since March 4, 1933, lies in the answer to a simple question. Are you better off today than you were in the last year of the Old Deal? I wonder if there is anybody here who can say "No" to that—I do not believe there is.

Since this speech by the President asking this question, a great propaganda machine of President Truman's spendthrift bureaucracy in Washington is now playing that tune "Are you better off?"

The President, heading a powerful secret oligarchy in a spending spree unmatched in all American history, seeks to console the people that they are better off than ever before.

This first session of the Eighty-second Congress, now drawing to a close, has authorized total spending slightly in excess of $100,000,000,000.

This is as much money as the New Deal spenders dished out under Franklin D. Roosevelt in the biggest spending year of World War II—the fiscal year 1945.

Yet we are at peace, the President tells us.

What will our budget be when war comes?

True, we have had 87,000 battlefield casualties in Korea to date. But we are not at war, says President Truman. Actually, chimes Secretary of State Dean Acheson, we are holding the line for peace.

What will our casualties be when Truman and Acheson are ready to admit that we are in a state of war?

The Truman-Acheson squanderbund declares proudly that they are the peace party. What does the record show?

During the last 50 years we have had five Republican Presidents. Not one of them had a battlefield casualty reported during his term.

But what of our three most recent Democratic Presidents in the White House?

Under Woodrow Wilson we had 334,734 battle casualties.

Under Franklin D. Roosevelt we had 994,893 battle casualties.

Under Harry S. Truman we have had 87,604 battle casualties—and Truman still has 15 months to go to the end of his administration.

But there is one difference between President Truman and his Democratic predecessors. Wilson's battle casualties were incurred in war. Franklin D. Roosevelt's battle casualties were incurred in war. But Truman's 87,604 battle casualties were incurred in peace.

Here is the box score.

Republican battle casualties, 50 years:

Theodore Roosevelt	0
William H Taft	0
Warren G Harding	0
Calvin Coolidge	0
Herbert Hoover	0

And here are the Democratic battle casualties in 35 years:

Woodrow Wilson	334,734
Franklin D Roosevelt	994,893
Harry S Truman	87,604
Total	1,417,231

Who is better off under this irresponsible spendthrift oligarchy of deceit, defeat, and retreat?

Who is better off under today's rein of communism, crime, and corruption in Washington?

Certainly those who are better off today do not include the 3,700 American boys who were caught in the Sunday morning death trap at Pearl Harbor.

Many of those boys died from wounds inflicted by bombs made from scrap steel shipped from the United States under the Roosevelt foreign-trade policies.

Are the mothers and the fathers of our 1,400,000 war casualties better off?

Are the blind, insane, legless, armless soldiers in our veterans hospitals better off?

What of those who hold $136,000,000,000 in Government bonds? Under the Roosevelt-Truman inflation policies, the purchasing power of these savings has been reduced by $68,000,000,000. Are these bondholders better off?

About 80,000,000 Americans own life insurance policies. The purchasing power of their insurance has been reduced by $30,000,000,000 by inflation. Are they better off?

There are several million elderly people in this country living on pensions and annuities in the sunset of life. The value of their pensions has been cut in half. Are they better off?

The Truman 50-cent dollar means confiscation—confiscation of one-half of every veteran's pension, one-half of every old-age pension, one-half of every school endowment, one-half of every benefaction given in the past to the support of any church or charity. Are these people and these vital institutions of civilization better off under the Truman spendthrifts?

The Treasury report now shows Government trust funds in the amount of almost $14,000,000,000. These are the payroll taxes collected during the last 15 years from millions of workers for the social security funds.

But the money was spent as fast as it was collected. All we have in the Treasury today to represent these so-called "trust funds" is a fine bunch of Treasury IOU's. When the money is needed to provide the pensions covered by those taxes the funds will have to be collected once more from the people, either in taxes or in the sale of more Government bonds to the general public. Are the millions of prudent Americans who have been paying into these trust funds better off?

Under Roosevelt and Truman we have given away more than $100,000,000,000 in overseas gifts and grants. In doing so we have depleted our forests, our mines, our precious God-given natural resources half a century ahead of the calendar.

Only 20 years ago our total Federal tax collections were less than $4,000,000,000 a year. This year total Federal taxes will run as high as $62,000,000,000. Are the taxpayers better off?

Today every man, woman, and child in this land carries a debt load of $1,700, his per capita share of the Roosevelt-Truman national debt of $257,000,000,000. This debt amounts to almost $7,000 for each and every one of our 36,000,000 families.

This administration is the author of war, debt, inflation, and shocking corruption of American life and morals.

Under this moral break-down in Washington, Communists have been permitted to invade every department and every agency of the Federal establishment.

The disciples of godless communism are at work at the very vitals of American government.

These traitors gave our priceless atomic secrets to the spies of the Kremlin.

Yet when those spies were uncovered in their evil work the President told us that it was only a red herring.

Secretary Acheson would not turn his back on Alger Hiss. But he did not hesitate to turn his back on Douglas MacArthur.

Two years after Acheson refused to turn his back on the convicted Alger Hiss, President Truman announced publicly that Acheson would be his Secretary of State as long as he remained in the White House.

Traitors, spies, and saboteurs robbed us of our greatest weapon for security and peace. There have been at least two atomic explosions within Russia during the last 2 years. Yet President Truman, by Executive order, has sealed in the White House safe the personnel records of all those suspected of Communist affiliation within the Federal Government. Truman's iron curtain protects the vital records which would enable Congress to expose every commie and every fellow-traveler on the Government payroll.

From 1933 onward, communism was sheltered, protected, coddled, and befriended in New Deal Washington.

Today that shocking national betrayal is shielded from public view by secrecy and censorship.

But there is a core of patriotism and national devotion in this mighty land which one day will wash away these dikes and secrecy and intrigue with a powerful sweep of indignation and revulsion.

The great heart of America will speak again.

Freedom will not be snuffed out by five-percenters.

Liberty will never die in a boodled deep-freeze.

Pastel mink coats may warm for a time the callous hides of the plunderers and rake-off artists; but mink coats will never smother the instincts of freedom which lives and grows in the hearts of 150,000,000 devoted Americans—men and women who are pledged to support and sustain orderly constitutional government, and freedom under law.

The little men of boodle and corruption will be swept away like so many broken sticks before the tide of a mighty river.

America has been drugged by fraud, fakery, and lies.

But the spirit of freedom did not die.

The clarion call to battle will find the hosts of freedom moving like an avalanche—to sweep away to a well-deserved oblivion the traitors, spies, and corruptionists.

Then, the sunlight of freedom will light the fair land again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE ROBERT MARSHALL FOUNDATION

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, recently the Committee on Un-American Activities conducted some investigations in New York and elsewhere concerning the Robert Marshall Foundation.

The report of the investigation shows that on September 24, 1942, the Honorable Martin Dies, of Texas, then chairman of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, arose on this floor to a point of personal privilege to answer an attack on himself by the Communist front, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

Martin Dies is a very distinguished American, and a great patriot, and I sincerely hope that the people of Texas will return him to the next session of Congress. It is becoming increasingly clear that if the Roosevelt administration had cooperated with Martin Dies and his committee in a sincere effort to ferret out and expose Communist spies and fellow-travelers then in the Government service, some of the traitorous acts since revealed could certainly have been prevented. Instead the administration attacked and smeared Martin Dies day in and day out and covered up for the spies and traitors on the Federal payroll.

During the course of Martin Dies' remarks on September 24, 1942, he had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the last will and testament of one Robert Marshall, a resident of the State of New York and late Chief of the Recreation Division of the United States Forestry Service.

Robert Marshall, who died without spouse or issue, left an estate appraised

and valued at $1,514,721.75, almost $100,000 of which had already found its way into the treasuries of subversive and Communist organizations, when Martin Dies made his speech in 1942. Some of the money went to the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, which was found by Attorney General Francis Biddle in 1942 to be subversive and communistic after an exhaustive investigation by the FBI.

THE ROBERT MARSHALL WILL

Mr Speaker, the will of Robert Marshall was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the Honorable Martin Dies in 1942, and I shall not reinsert it here. I shall, however, insert certain extracts from the will.

Robert Marshall appointed his brother, James Marshall, as executor, and his other brother, George Marshall, as alternate executor, to serve "without bond or security of any kind, in any jurisdiction, for the faithful performance of his duties."

Robert Marshall made only one bequest in his will, that being $3,000 to Herbert K Clark, of Saranac Lake, N. Y. He directed his executor to divide the remainder of his estate into four parts—the first two-fourths of which he gave to Gardner Jackson, of Chevy Chase, Md.; George Marshall, of New York; Heber Blankenhorn, of Washington; Jerry O'Connell, of Butte, Mont.; and Raphael Zon, of St. Paul, Minn., in trust, to invest and reinvest and to apply income and principal in their unlimited discretion for the following purposes:

The education of the people of the United States of America to the necessity and desirability of the development and organization of unions of persons engaged in work or of unemployed persons and the promotion and advancement of an economic system in the United States based upon the theory of production for use and not for profit.

The third quarter of his estate he devised and bequeathed to his brother, James Marshall, Roger Baldwin, and John Finnerty, of New York; Edwin S. Smith and Gardner Jackson, of Washington, D. C., and Chevy Chase; likewise in trust for the purpose of:

The safeguarding and advancement of the cause of civil liberties in the United States of America and the various States and subdivisions thereof by all lawful means and actions, with full power and authority to the trustees to print, publish, and distribute pamphlets, books, magazines, and newspapers and generally to use any and all lawful means to bring to the knowledge of the citizens of the United States of America the importance and necessity of preserving and safeguarding the cause of civil liberties.

The remaining one-fourth he devised and bequeathed to Sterling Yard, William Zimmerman, Jr., and Irving Clark, of Washington, D. C.; George Marshall, of New York; and Claus Murie, of Jackson, Wyo., for the following purposes:

The preservation of the wilderness conditions in outdoor America, including but not limited to, the preservation of areas embracing primitive conditions of transportation, vegetation, and fauna.

This will was executed on the 12th day of July 1938 as shown by a certified photostat that I hold in my hands, and was witnessed by Catherine Maltby Blaisdell and Thomas C. Blaisdell, and following the death of Robert Marshall on November 11, 1939, was admitted to probate in New York County, N. Y., on January 12, 1940.

Following the probate of the will, three trusts were established by the trustees named in the will—the Robert Marshall Foundation, the Robert Marshall Civil Liberties Trust, and the Robert Marshall Wilderness Fund.

It is to the first two named that I wish to draw attention, since the wilderness fund was apparently a worthy purpose and expended only some $100,000.

SUBVERSIVE AND COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS RECEIVE HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS

Mr Speaker, the Committee on Un-American Activities recently checked into this estate to find what had happened to the money since Martin Dies made his speech in 1942 listing disbursements to Communist and subversive organizations of almost $100,000. I have been furnished by the committee with voluminous records showing further disbursements of funds from this estate by the trustees of the Robert Marshall Foundation and the Robert Marshall Civil Liberties Trust amounting to almost $1,000,000, most of which, according to photostats of the actual checks themselves taken from the files of the New York Trust Co., was paid to subversive and Communist organizations, so designated by both the Attorney General of the United States and the Committee on Un-American Activities.

These disbursements were made over a period from October 1, 1942, to March 22, 1951, and among the subversive organizations I note that the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties received $56,000, and its successor, the Civil Rights Congress received $63,000. The National Lawyers Guild, legal arm of the Communist Party, got $15,250 The National Negro Congress got $54,530. The Southern Conference for Human Welfare got $14,000. The Southern Negro Youth Conference got $30,000. The Federated Press got $29,000. The Chicago Star, which is a Communist Midwest publication and now defunct, got $10,000, and so forth.

Mr Speaker, as part of my remarks I include herein a partial list of disbursements of the Robert Marshall Foundation:

Ades, Bernard	$2,110 00
Allied Labor News	16,150 00
American Youth Congress	2,750 00
American Youth for Democracy	5,000 00
Blankenhorn, Heber	2,500.00
California Eagle	3,000 00
California Labor School	6,500 00
Challenge	4,000 00
Chicago Star	10,000 00
Civil Rights Congress	63,500 00
Council for Pan-American Democracy	8,000.00
Farm Research	21,000 00
Farmers Educational & Cooperative Co of America	1,500.00
Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America	86,000.00
Farmers Union, Eastern Division	4,000 00
Farmers Union, Northeastern Division	19,500.00
Farmers Union of the Suffield Milk Shed	1,000.00
Federated Press	29,200 00
Highlander Folk School	5,000.00
Marshall, George	$81 93
Minnesota Leader	5,000.00
National Council of Scientific, Professional, Art, and White Collar Organizations	7,500.00
National Federation for Constitutional Liberties	56,000.00
National Lawyers Guild	15,250.00
National Wartime Conference	2,000 00
The New World	25,000.00
O'Connell, Jerry	3,366.85
Pacific Northwest Labor School	11,500.00
The People's Voice	25,000 00
Seattle Labor School	2,500.00
Southern Conference Educational Fund	3,000.00
Southern Conference for Human Welfare	14,000 00
Southern Negro Youth Congress	30,750 00
Vincent, Merle D	215 08
Washington New Dealer	1,000 00
Wolf, Henry H	1,500 00
Yergan, Max	625 00
Young Progressives of America	2,500.00
Zon Raphael	911 62

THE TRUSTEES NAMED IN THE WILL

Mr. Speaker, the trustees named in the will apparently have faithfully discharged their duties under the terms of the will. The deceased testator, Robert Marshall, to all intents and purposes, intended that they distribute his large estate to Communist and subversive enterprises because he, himself, was at heart if not in fact, a Communist, and by his will he created a huge million-dollar Communist-front bank or fund for almost the sole benefit of the Communist Party. He was associated with and active in Communist fronts himself during his lifetime. Robert Marshall knew the character of the men he named as trustees under his will. He was associated with them during his lifetime. They were his intimate and personal friends. He had confidence in them. Indeed, two of them were his own brothers, James and George Marshall. James Marshall was the executor and attorney for the estate and George Marshall was alternate executor and trustee.

George Marshall was the chairman of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, a Communist front, and became chairman of its successor, the Civil Rights Congress. This House voted him in contempt and he was subsequently indicted, tried, convicted, and sentenced to 3 months in jail and fined $500 for his refusal to answer questions and obey a subpena for production of records of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

George Marshall has a record of affiliation by membership in, or otherwise with, over 30 Communist-front organizations and movements.

The very first trustee named in the will, Gardner Jackson, of Chevy Chase, Md., who was named and served as trustee of both the Robert Marshall Foundation and the Robert Marshall Civil Liberties Trust, is an old-time Red. He was twice employed in the Department of Agriculture and removed from office each time. The first time he was removed on February 8, 1935, by Chester Davis; was later reappointed on June 30, 1941, and again fired on March 1, 1943, by Secretary of Agriculture Wickard.

Gardner Jackson has been associated with, as a sponsor, speaker, endorser, and member of 22 Communist and subversive organizations. In addition he has a local police record showing 10 years associated with and attendance at practically every Communist Party-sponsored meeting in the District of Columbia or nearby Maryland. Gardner Jackson himself is a very wealthy man.

It was Gardner Jackson who supplied the $105 paid to David Dubois Mayne for forged letters smearing Martin Dies. Frank Hook, of Michigan, placed these letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and subsequently had them deleted when Mayne entered a plea of guilty to an indictment in the District of Columbia to forgery, uttering, and obtaining money under false pretenses.

Jerry O'Connell, another trustee of this estate and a former Member of this House, has a record of affiliation, connections and even employment by Communist-front and subversive organizations which is astounding. He has been affiliated in one way or another with 20 fronts. Recently the Committee on Un-American Activities issued a pamphlet regarding his connections with the National Committee to defeat the Mundt bill, now the Internal Security Act of 1950 and the law of the land. His brazen efforts along this line are indeed amazing.

Jerry O'Connell was actually registered with the Clerk of the House as a lobbyist for this very purpose, as pointed out by the Committee on Un-American Activities in their report. Jerry O'Connell worked with the National Lawyers Guild, the legal arm of the Communist Party, in a joint endeavor to prevent the internal security bill from becoming law.

Still another trustee, Roger Baldwin, for years the executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union, is an old-time apologist for communism for over 30 years. He has been affiliated with over 40 Communist-front organizations and served time in jail for obstructing the draft in the First World War.

Edwin S. Smith, the former member of the National Labor Relations Board, also a trustee, has a record of affiliation with more than 16 Communist fronts.

FEES FOR REMINGTON'S LAWYER

Mr. Speaker, an examination of the disbursements of the Robert Marshall Civil Liberties Trust shows that a Washington, D. C., attorney, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., of 1631 K Street NW., who is chairman of the executive committee of Americans for Democratic Action, has also received several thousand dollars from the Robert Marshall Civil Liberties Trust.

Mr. Speaker, this Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., is the attorney of record for William Walter Remington, late of the Office of International Trade in the Department of Commerce. It will be recalled that Remington's conviction for perjury was recently reversed by the Circuit Court of Appeals on technical grounds, and the case remanded for a new trial.

Francis Biddle, who is now national chairman of the Americans for Democratic Action, is the same Francis Biddle who, as Attorney General of the United States in 1942, declared many of the organizations to be Communist fronts or subversive which have been, and still are, receiving thousands of dollars in grants from the Robert Marshall Foundation.

The records of the New York Trust Co., furnished to the Committee on Un-American Activities, show that on July 14, 1950, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., attorney, received $10,000 from the Robert Marshall Civil Liberties Trust; and again on November 20, 1950, the same Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., attorney, received an additional $10,000, or a total of $20,000 out of this estate.

Mr. Speaker, Martin Dies had an examination made of the income-tax returns of this estate in 1942, and the examination showed that the attorneys for the estate, Marshall, Bratter & Selgson, of 150 Broadway, New York City, claimed that there was no tax to be paid on the income of the estate because "entire principal of the estate is distributable for educational purposes pursuant to the will of the deceased."

I desire to invite the attention of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the House Committee on Ways and Means to this $20,000 disbursement from this estate. I am sure that the executors will have difficulty in convincing either the Commissioner or the committee that attorney's fees for the defense of William Walter Remington—who was charged and convicted of lying about being a Communist Party member, in addition to being a spy for the Soviet Union—constitutes a grant for educational purposes which would entitle the estate to exemptions from taxation under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, as amended.

THOMAS CHARLES BLAISDELL, JR.

Mr. Speaker, the last will and testament of Robert Marshall, a photostat of which I hold in my hand, is witnessed as previously stated by Catherine Maltby Blaisdell and Thomas C. Blaisdell, whose signatures appear thereon and who certified that the will of Robert Marshall was signed, sealed, published, and declared in their presence and hearing, and in the presence and hearing of each of them, who thereunto subscribed their names as witnesses. The signatures appear not only at the end of the will but on page 4 where the testator made a change in the name of a trustee.

Mr. Speaker, Catherine Maltby Blaisdell is shown to be the wife of Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., in the hearings conducted on the nomination of Mr. Blaisdell to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce before the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce on March 22, 1949. Thomas C. Blaisdell also signed the will of Robert Marshall as a witness, but it is not known whether this is Thomas C. Blaisdell, Sr., who died December 11, 1948, at Sanford, Seminole County, Fla., or Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., the former Assistant Secretary of Commerce, who resigned January 15, 1951, to take a position as professor at the University of California, but who later and until recently was in Paris representing the Foreign Economic Administration, according to information obtained from the State Department.

Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., when testifying before the subcommittee of the Senate investigating the Remington case in July and August of 1948, admitted that he was responsible for the employment of William W. Remington in his $10,000 position with the Department of Commerce. Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., was then Director of the Office of International Trade in the Department of Commerce.

Remington was subsequently suspended but later cleared by the Seth W. Richardson Loyalty Board and reinstated in his position at the Department of Commerce with full back pay.

In 1950 the un-American Activities Committee reopened the case with hearings beginning on April 20, 1950, and continuing through July 30, 1950, as a result of which Remington was called before a New York grand jury investigating espionage and subsequently indicted for perjury. But 1 year prior to this, Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., was nominated for the position of Assistant Secretary of Commerce and hearings were held on his nomination on February 23 and March 22, 1949. He was extensively questioned on the Remington case at the second hearing on March 22, 1949, at which time Joe Rauh also appeared as a witness and testified that Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr. had executed an affidavit of character for William W. Remington to be presented to the President's Loyalty Review Board, of which Seth W. Richardson was chairman.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that further investigation should be made:

First. Into the Robert Marshall Foundation, particularly in regard to the connections of Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., and his wife, Catherine Maltby Blaisdell, with the deceased Robert Marshall and the trustees of his estate, and the manner in which the estate has been administered.

Second. Into whether any tax-exempt privileges have been granted to this estate by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, particularly in view of the payment of $20,000 of the funds of the foundation to Joe Rauh, attorney for Remington.

Third. Into the Communist-propaganda activities of the organizations which received almost $1,000,000 out of this Communist-front estate.

Fourth. Into the connections and activities of certain persons, whose names I have not disclosed but whose names appeared in connection with this matter, and about which further information and facts should be obtained.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the House that there is pending on the calendar, House Resolution 364, introduced by my good friend and colleague from Georgia GENE COX, to investigate generally the use of moneys by these tax-exempt foundations to finance subversive propaganda and activities, and I trust that this resolution will be adopted by the House It certainly merits the support of every Member of this body.

EXHIBIT A

THE NEW YORK TRUST CO.

100 BROADWAY, NEW YORK

No. 159. JULY 10, 1950.

Pay to the order of Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., Attorney ---------- $10,000

Ten thousand ---------- Dollars

ROBERT MARSHALL CIVIL LIBERTIES TRUST,
JOHN F FINNERTY, *Trustee.*
JAMES MARSHALL, *Trustee.*

ENDORSEMENTS REVERSE SIDE

Pay to Winthrop, Stimson, Putnam & Roberts, Attorneys.

JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.,
Attorney.
JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.

Pay Bankers Trust Co. or order. Winthrop, Stimson, Putnam & Roberts, Attorneys.

EXHIBIT B

THE NEW YORK TRUST CO.

100 BROADWAY, NEW YORK

No. 165. NOVEMBER 8, 1950.

Pay to the order of Joseph L Rauh, Attorney ---------- $10,000

Ten thousand ---------- Dollars

ROBERT MARSHALL CIVIL LIBERTIES TRUST,
JOHN F FINNERTY, *Trustee.*
JAMES MARSHALL, *Trustee.*

ENDORSEMENTS REVERSE SIDF

Pay to Winthrop, Stimson, Putnam & Roberts, Attorneys.

JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.,,
Attorney.

Pay Bankers Trust Co. or order. Winthrop, Stimson, Putnam & Roberts, Attorneys.

EXHIBIT C

MEMORANDUM

William C Chanler, chief counsel for William Walter Remington, is a member of the law firm of Winthrop, Stimson, Putnam & Roberts, of 40 Wall Street and 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y (p. 2150 Martindale-Hubbell Law Directory, vol II, 1951).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE HONORABLE HALE BOGGS

Mr HAYS of Arkansas Mr Speaker, I rise today to offer a statement with reference to our colleague the gentleman from Louisiana, Hon. HALE BOGGS. I am sure all of the Members of the House who have read the press dispatches were shocked at the amazing announcement that an effort is being made by his political opposition to secure the removal of his name from the ballot as a candidate for Governor on the ground that he is of Communist sympathies, that the gentleman from Louisiana has joined Communist-front organizations, that he has maintained membership in subversive organizations and that he is promoting a radical and subversive movement in the United States.

I do not know what the laws of Louisiana provide, but I assume, of course, that if such allegations—I am speaking abstractly—could be proved, any candidate would be in danger of having his name removed from the ballot in the Democratic primary. But I am sure, too, Mr. Speaker, that no Member of this House would entertain for a moment the faintest suspicion that the gentleman has any sympathies whatever for radical organizations or would tolerate them.

As a matter of fact, his entire record, both in and out of this House, is strikingly to the contrary.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to others who have indicated a desire to endorse my statement I would like to say that it is the purpose of none of us to interfere in the elections of Louisiana.

Certainly, as a neighbor to the good people of Louisiana I would not undertake to advise them in political decisions of this kind, and I am sure they would not tolerate any such effort if I should go so far afield as to interfere. My concern is the potential damage that might be done by such ridiculous and absurd and unfounded charges to an honorable citizen and then to our election system.

My purpose today is not to promote Mr. BOGGS' candidacy, but to do what I can to help a good American keep the record straight and to assist our friend as an American and to prevent a great injustice

I remember when I first became acquainted with the gentleman from Louisiana. We were all impressed by his outstanding ability when he came to this House. He had been here for a short period before I became a Member and then went away for a while, and when he returned, after rendering a distinguished service in the Navy, when he returned to this House he impressed everyone of us who had arrived in the interim period by his outstanding ability and certainly by his loyalty and his correct Americanism So naturally, I am anxious today, as his colleague in the House, to say what I can in defense of him as an American

Mr Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this with reference to the matter that the gentleman from Arkansas has brought to the attention of the House I feel that I have had even a better opportunity to know the loyalties of this great man, the gentleman from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS, better perhaps than some others, because it was my good fortune to reside within his home for approximately 3 months during last fall During that time we frequently discussed political philosophy; we discussed international problems, and it was on one evening, I recall, that he told me that he had devised a definition of this proposition of communism and that he had defined it as three things: First, it is an economic theory based on a perverted philosophy of life; secondly, it is a political move; third, it is an international conspiracy to control the world He spoke most violently of this philosophy of communism, and certainly no Member among us feels more keenly about the danger of communism than our friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS. Surely no one residing in Louisiana, who knows the gentleman from Louisiana [HALE BOGGS], will believe any part of this absurd charge, and to those who do not know it, I would like to add my voice of assurance that the charges are utterly groundless.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I appreciate very much the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Arkansas yielding me time to say a word or two in behalf of my very dear friend and my able colleague the gentleman from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS We were sworn in as Members of the Seventy-seventh Congress on the same day, and from that day to this hour there has always been a very close bond of friendship and understanding between the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] and myself On many occasions we have worked along with a rather small group representing both political parties in this House, including the gentleman from Arkansas and others who have spoken; worked in a nonpartisan way in an effort to bring about some real approach to the question of peace and international understanding. I have been in many, many conferences with the gentleman from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS, off the floor of the House, and I know of no other person in all of my acquaintance whom I consider to be a greater American than the gentleman from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS. Like the gentleman from Arkansas, it is not my purpose or my intention to attempt to inject myself into a political primary in the State of Louisiana, but when I read the accusation of communism made against the gentleman from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS, yesterday, the thought occurred to me that if the gentleman from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS, is guilty of those charges, then where can we go to find a true American? I know him to be that type of American I appreciate the opportunity of saying a few words to let the people of Louisiana know how I feel about it, regardless of any political implications it might have in that State

Mr HAYS of Arkansas. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he does not recall the very distinguished service the gentleman from Louisiana gave us, for example, in connection with the training of the merchant-marine seamen, his determination to get sufficient funds for strengthening the armed defense of the Nation in that respect, and his service in expanding the antinarcotics program for the defense of our youth? Would these be the acts of a man who is interested in destroying our institutions?

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman from Louisiana has taken the well of this House many times to speak in behalf of the programs the gentleman has mentioned. He served in the Navy with distinction and honor during World War II. He came back to the House of Representatives fired with enthusiasm and a determination to build the defenses of this Nation, its moral defenses, its spiritual defenses, its military and its economic defenses. I know of no person who has labored more diligently and, I might say, more effectively in accomplishing those objectives.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I cannot conceive of the people of Louisiana being misled by any such dastardly charge as that which has been made against HALE BOGGS, one of the most loyal and one of the most able and capable men in this House. I do not know of a man I have known since I have been a Member of the Congress for whom I have more admiration than I do for HALE BOGGS. I feel sure that the charge will react in his favor and that it will be a boomerang against the person who started it.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP], a former State commander of the American Legion and a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, on which the gentleman from Louisiana serves.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, these most absurd charges certainly will not have any weight in the great State of Louisiana. They have not sent a more effective or a more able Representative to this Congress in the last 14 years, at least since I have been here. We on the Committee on Ways and Means consider Mr. BOGGS one of the strongest members of that committee. His work is effective. He is responsible. There is no more clear-headed thinker or sounder American than HALE BOGGS. Of course, these charges are absolutely unfounded and absurd.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. I regard HALE BOGGS not only as a friend but as an outstanding, able, conscientious, honest and fair-minded Member of the House of Representatives. HALE BOGGS is a member of the Roman Catholic Church. He is not only a Catholic but he is a good Catholic, which means that he is a good Christian. A good Christian believes in God and, by the fact that he believes in God, he believes in the Golden Rule, the Ten Commandments, and the teachings of the sermon on the mount. That is something that they do not believe in Moscow or in the Kremlin because it is a known fact that a real Communist does not even believe in God. I know because I asked several Communists that question when I was in Moscow during World War II. When they gave me their answer, I remember how sick it made me at my stomach. Yes, because the rumors that I had previously heard were the cold bare facts. Out of their own mouths they had proclaimed it.

I know that, good Catholic that HALE BOGGS is, he practices his religion daily. We Members here who are associated with and who know him best have seen and observed him in his excellent daily treatment of his fellow men, which is in a sense practicing his religion by doing unto others as he would have them do unto him. To say, my friends, that HALE BOGGS is a Communist or a pro-Communist is like saying the American flag here over the Speaker's Chair represents the hammer and sickle. It is like saying that Boston has no beans. It is like saying that Kentucky has no thoroughbreds. It is like saying Louisiana has no politics. I might say this for the RECORD, the gentleman speaking is a Protestant and a Mason. I am not interested in the politics of Louisiana. I do not care who wins the election, but by the grace of God I do want to see a decent man, treated decently. I might add that the sole purpose of this utterance is to help prevent what appears to me to be a well-planned smear campaign against a real Southern gentleman, a proud Louisianian, an able legislator, and a great American, the Honorable HALE BOGGS.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am glad to yield to Mr. BOGGS' friend and colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have heard of the charges which came from Louisiana, which have been made against our colleague, HALE BOGGS, improvidently in the course of the race for governor. I say "unfortunately" made because I think it was a serious mistake to even consider the matter of entertaining of charges of this character against HALE BOGGS.

I know of HALE'S record in the House of Representatives. I recall when he introduced a bill here called the anti-picketing bill. I discussed with him the reason and motive for introducing that bill. His reason was he felt that the Communists should not be allowed to picket our Federal courts. He presented the bill to the Congress, and it passed, and became the law of the land. HALE BOGGS wants to uphold our Federal courts against the abuses of those who are Communists and are of Red leanings. I remember his fight in support of measures which would rid our Government of those who had communistic records, and to take them out of their jobs if they were not all 100-percent Americans.

I checked his record, and I know of his record in reference to national defense. He has supported every national defense measure, which came before the Congress before and since Pearl Harbor. The fact that he was in the Navy during World War II has naturally clung to him tenaciously in his career in the Congress. He supported the Armed Forces of the United States while he had been a Member here. I can recall in the course of the debate on the extension of the selective service, which occurred this spring in the House of Representatives. The debate extended over a 2 weeks' period of time, and it was one of the most acrimonious debates we have had in the House of Representatives this year. During a high point in the course of that debate, HALE BOGGS took the floor of this House and delivered a masterful speech, urging active support of that vital measure. It was one of the greatest speeches I have heard. I think his speech had a great deal to do with resolving serious doubts in the minds of a great many of our Members regarding their support for this bill and helped to put over that measure which was vitally important this year to our national defense. I say again, I am amazed that charges of this sort are made against our colleague, HALE BOGGS. Such speeches do not come from an alien head or a disloyal mind.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, are there any other special orders?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the gentleman that there are two other special orders.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, if it is not an imposition, with the permission of those who have special orders, may I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I, too, am glad to yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I will not consume all of the time. I do thank those who have special orders, and I thank the House for hearing me and my colleagues at this inconvenient hour.

I just recalled one mark of distinction that I think might go into the RECORD while we are speaking of the unfairness of this charge, and the fact that a worthy person might be made the victim of unscrupulous political strategy; that is, that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] has often been called upon to preside over sessions of the Committee of the Whole House. I think it would be a fair appraisal to say that no one has presided with any greater dignity or ability. He is perhaps one of the most popular presiding officers in the House. But the fact that he has been called upon by the Speaker to preside is evidence of the esteem that the Speaker of the House holds for him.

Further, Mr. Speaker, this House is a testing ground. He has been a Member of the House, with one brief interruption, since 1940. I am sure that evidences the fact that the sound-thinking people of New Orleans and Louisiana recognize in him those elements of loyalty and leadership that are so essential to the survival of our democratic way of life.

Not only are individuals being tested, but systems are being tested. May I advert again to the necessity of proving the soundness of our free system of elections? The fact that amazement and disgust has been expressed over the unfairness of this attack is evidence that a strong conviction is entertained on that score, that we believe elections should be conducted in a way that does not throttle one candidate or take unfair advantage of him; that all candidates should have an opportunity to

present their points of view and their philosophies to the people.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is for this reason that I have brought up this unpleasant incident, in order that we might give expression to the faith we have in the essential loyalty and in the Americanism of a colleague who aspires to another office

I would point out, too, since a question is raised as to the propriety of his seeking another office while holding membership in the House, that we have rejoiced to see our colleagues in the past entertain and realize the same ambition. Millard Caldwell, a Member of the House, was elected to the governorship of the State of Florida Earl Clement, while a Member of the House, was made Governor of the great State of Kentucky. Frank Carlson, of Kansas, became Governor of that State while serving here John Davis Lodge, of Connecticut, and many others, have entertained the same ambitions and have been honored by their people

Mr Speaker, I make the forecast that the people of Louisiana will see the absurdity of these charges and that they will repudiate them and that our colleague will be given an opportunity to conduct his campaign without this kind of unfair dealing

There are many other Members of the House who would have spoken had they had notice that this subject would be presented. One of my colleagues from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], who has served with Mr BOGGS on the Ways and Means Committee, learned of it, but because of other duties could not be here He was extremely anxious that I quote him to the same effect

It was my privilege to serve on the Banking and Currency Committee with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] and I came to know him intimately Soon after he became a member of the Ways and Means Committee I transferred to the Foreign Affairs Committee I know something of his views on foreign affairs also I know that he is sound, that his chief interest is to protect the United States, that he is deeply concerned about our security. He and I have not seen eye to eye on all details of foreign policy matters, but I am sure of this, that every judgment he has formed has been independently formed, and he has arrived at what I believe is sound position as to basic foreign policy questions of the day.

I again apologize, Mr Speaker, for taking this much time, but I know the Members would agree that far more than one political career is involved. It is not the ambition of an individual but the principle for which we are fighting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject just discussed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the charges that our colleague, HALE BOGGS, is a Communist, or has Communist sympathies, are so irresponsible as to immediately indict the veracity of anyone who makes such a statement.

HALE BOGGS is not only a loyal American but one of the most outstanding Members of Congress. He has the mental ability to quickly grasp a problem and the judgment and experience to offer a dependable solution

I would regret the loss to the House of Representatives by the departure of HALE BOGGS, but if the people of Louisiana call him to the higher office as the governor of that great State, he carries my best wishes and the conviction that he can provide outstanding leadership—loyal, courageous, and energetic—to which this beautiful State is rightfully entitled

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr KEATING. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of those who have other special orders, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the program for tomorrow and the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Private Calendar will be called tomorrow as announced.

There are two matters out of the Rules Committee: A House joint resolution relating to the celebration in connection with the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of West Point; and Senate Concurrent Resolution 36, which relates to the appointment of 14 Members to attend and participate in the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe.

I know of no other legislation for the rest of the week that will come up under the regular rules of the House.

Mr KEATING. I assume that conference reports will be in order if they come in.

Mr McCORMACK. I was coming to that Conference reports, of course, will be in order at any time. It is hoped, and I put all Members on both sides on notice, that another conference report on the tax bill will come in on Friday. I cannot give any definite assurances, but I want to put Members on notice to expect it. I believe they ought to be here, and they can govern themselves by the notice that I give as to what might be the reasonable expectation We are notifying our Members to be here on Friday, to expect it to come up. I make this statement so that all Members of the House will be advised as to the probability of its coming up again.

Postal pay increase: I understand the conferees have agreed on the postal pay increase bill. When the report will be written and filed I am unable to state, but that is only a matter of time.

I will keep the membership advised as far in advance as I possibly can; but, as they may know, some conference reports may be called up as soon as filed with the usual understanding of the leadership on both sides.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. When will the resolution for adjournment be brought up?

Mr. McCORMACK. The resolution for what?

Mrs ROGERS of Massachusetts. For adjournment.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish I could answer that question, I can only answer it on hope

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There are certain matters I am very anxious to have transpire, and I should hate to adjourn Saturday if they had not transpired

Mr. McCORMACK. I only wish I could answer the gentlewoman's question

Mrs ROGERS of Massachusetts But the resolution is not likely to come in until just before we do adjourn

Mr McCORMACK. I am unable to answer the question, I wish I could.

Mrs ROGERS of Massachusetts I thank the gentleman for good intentions.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr JUDD Mr Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG] has a special order following mine and that of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, but because he has a tight train connection to make I ask unanimous consent on behalf of myself and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG] may proceed ahead of us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG] is recognized.

LET'S ABOLISH THE INDIAN BUREAU NOW

Mr. ARMSTRONG Mr. Speaker, some years ago I wrote a series of articles for the Reader's Digest on the status of the American Indians and the need for their full independence and citizenship. One of those articles was entitled "Set the American Indians Free."

When I took up the task of campaigning for a seat in Congress last year, I made clear my position on this question I said that I would stand for and work for complete freedom and citizenship for all American Indians.

When I say "freedom" for the American Indians, I mean just that. I mean freedom from the all-encompassing Indian Bureau which at present and for many years back has enthralled him. While a Member of this Congress, I hope to make good on my pledge to help solve this problem in the only proper way.

On March 6 of this year I introduced H. R. 3073, a bill to abolish the functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, to re-

move the guardianship over Indians and the trusteeship over Indian property and to repeal the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984) as amended—the so-called Wheeler Howard Act. An identical bill has been subsequently introduced in the Senate by the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], who has previously sponsored a similar bill in the Eighty-first Congress.

None of us can pretend to be all-wise and all-knowing on all the twists and turns of the Indian problem. The legal position of the Indian today has been made extremely complicated due to the activities of the Indian Bureau through the many years of its existence. This complication is used as an excuse to retain the services of the Bureau since it alone is presumed to be familiar with the ins and outs of the matter. There are many ancient treaties, mostly obsolete now, many special legislative enactments, innumerable executive and departmental orders and whatnot pertaining to the several hundred tribes and bands. As the years have passed more and more of these legislative enactments of a special nature have been passed so that it is hardly possible to obey one law without controvening another. But the present bill does not propose any further muddying of the waters with additional special legislation. Quite the reverse. It makes for complete elimination of all these complexities and constitutes a very real and lasting solution.

The counsel of expediency has hitherto prevailed in regard to Indian legislation. The policy has often been to patch up things here and there and to temporize while the situation has steadily deteriorated. But this is not a matter to be dealt with by half measures. In an affair involving human freedom you have got to act finally and decisively if ultimate disaster is to be prevented. As was said on another occasion of this sort, no nation can survive half slave and half free. In other words we have a mess to clean up here and we have to do the job whether we like it or not

Much, if not most, of the confusion and cross purposes which at present prevail in Indian Affairs has come about since 1934 when the so-called Wheeler-Howard Act was passed. In that year Mr. John Collier and his fellow conspirators succeeded in getting authority for reorganizing Indian tribes and thus binding them up in neat little bundles for more convenient handling by the Indian Bureau. The basic error involved in this legislation was the attempt to turn the clock back for Indians by a century and to make primitive tribesmen out of a people who were well advanced in most instances along the road to civilization and full citizenship. And so, by starting the horse off in the wrong direction, so to speak, Mr. Collier and men of his ilk have infinitely delayed the full assimilation of the Indians into citizenship. Indeed they have completely confused the picture of Indian progress by promoting reversion to primitive and uncivilized ways of living. And now we are witnessing today the fruits of this grave injustice to our Indian fellow Americans in the demoralization of domestic life amongst them and the perversion of the basic American concepts of private property and law and order by the Indian Bureau administration on reservations. This whole movement has been the work of a few men who got control of the Indian Bureau in 1933 and 1934 and worked their will without effective opposition there. I shall have occasion to revert to Mr. Collier's role in this nefarious plot a little later in this discussion.

The logic of the present situation inevitably calls for the abolition of the Indian Bureau. As it stands today, it constitutes the only real obstacle to full citizenship of the Indians It is the Indian Bureau alone which has constantly and so far effectively blocked every attempt to make Indians citizens like other Americans. It has done so, however, while rendering lip service to the principle of Indian freedom and citizenship and to the idea of complete liquidation of its own activities in the public interest When, however, the Indian Bureau really feels that its survival is at stake, it fights hard against any diminution of its powers or activities. Time and experience have proved that you cannot do business with the Indian Bureau if it feels its survival is a stake. In fact the Indian Bureau will defend its present power to regulate Indian lives and property to the last Indian. Every step of the road to liquidation is a constant fight.

It is my belief that in this issue the time has come for each and every one of us to stand up and be counted The issue can be very simply stated: "Do you favor the interest of the Indians, or the interest of the Indian Bureau?" This is a question which I would like to put to all my friends and colleagues in this august body. Our responsibility is to recognize and to differentiate between the interest of the Indians and the interest of the Indian Bureau. The interest of the Indian, on the one hand involves freedom to administer his own property and land and to participate in local civic life along with his fellow Americans; the interest of the Indian Bureau on the other hand is in perpetuating itself and its paternalistic control over Indian lives and property for all time to come.

The Indians are people just like you and me, people who want to be as free as anyone else to carry on their own private business, to administer their own properties and to live their own lives under laws which are passed by them for their own governance along with other fellow citizens. The Indian Bureau, on the other hand, is an antique form of a Government agency interested solely in conserving and increasing its power and prestige and in maintaining itself at any cost regardless of justice or decency.

From 1934 on, the Indian Bureau has conceived its interest to be in the maintenance of the Indians as a special class apart from the rest of the citizens. In this way it can continue to grow and extend itself parasitically over the lives and property of these, our fellow Americans. For, if you take away the power of the Indian Bureau over Indian property and lives the bureaucracy will wither away at once without further reason for existence. Thus it can be seen that the obvious purposes of the Indian Bureau work at complete cross purposes to the cause of Indian assimilation and citizenship.

It is evident, moreover, that the Indian will never learn to manage his own affairs and property as long as a Government bureau does these things for him. The Indian is not permitted to operate his own business, for example, because the Indian Bureau-sponsored puppet tribal councils control and regulate all business enterprise on reservations. The Indian businessman must do as he is told by his Bureau mentors.

Our foreign-born citizens from many lands learned freedom by first-hand participation in the responsibilities of making their own decisions in matters affecting their persons and properties Many have gone to night school and attended classes in citizenship to prepare themselves for American life and for full participation in the rights and duties of citizenship. By the time they were sufficiently acclimated to the ways of freedom they took out papers of citizenship and were received into the comradeship of their fellow Americans. They did not have the vast array of benefits and services of an Indian Bureau to administer their affairs for them If they had had such parasitic agency to tell them what to do they would never have become citizens in the full sense of the word any more than the Indians have. No, the foreign born learned by experience and by hard-won education just what was involved in citizenship Not having a bureaucracy to impede their progress they generally emerged during individual lifetimes from their apprenticeship into the status of full citizens of the same standing as any other American.

But can we see any possibility of an American Indian learning to become a full citizen in this way during his lifetime? Have we indeed any reason to even expect him to want to become a full citizen in this way if Indian Bureau tutelage continues on a permanent basis? Of course not. It would seem as though the Indian Bureau is the carrier of a fatal disease, a disease which has wrecked more than one people in history, the disease of totalitarianism and state paternalism, having some authority, preferably the government, tell one what to do and managing all one's affairs. With such a guardian always at his elbow how can the Indian ever learn to do anything for himself?

But then what about the so-called tribal councils which have been set up for Indians under the so-called Wheeler-Howard Act? Do they provide each tribe of Indians with a machinery of self-government in which the average Indian can learn the principles of freedom and democracy? Are Indians learning to think for themselves through these devices and to defend their own interests? The answer to each one of the foregoing questions is a most decided negative. The Indian Bureau's puppet tribal councils constitute the exact opposite to the true American principles of freedom and self-government. The Indian young people of today will tell you, if you ask them, that they do not learn the ways

of freedom and citizenship from the puppet tribal organizations of the Indian Bureau. On the contrary they learn the ways of totalitarianism and collectivism and above all the elements of chicanery and underhanded manipulation of other people's property and lives by a bureaucratic machine.

Recently, we have become aware of the importance of having honest men in our Government. We are, in fact, becoming increasingly conscious of the fact that you cannot have self-government function unless there is a minimum of decency and honesty among the administrators of that government. In a governmental agency so dominated as the Indian Bureau has been, there are no lessons of self government or freedom for the Indian youth.

We have come to regard freedom of enterprise and individual initiative as fundamental to our way of life. But under the Indian Bureau's puppet tribal governments there is no freedom of enterprise or individual initiative. Instead there are only tribal enterprises and enterprises supported by loans from puppet tribal councils. The latter are in turn dependent upon the Indian Bureau for support and loans. The Indian Bureau, through its control of the $10,000,000-revolving-loan fund and of many tribal trust funds and other sources of capital, maintains absolute and effective control over all its puppet tribal councils. So this can be used to explain why it is impossible for an Indian veteran to get a loan from non-Indian Bureau sources even though he may be entitled to it under the GI bill of rights. Freedom of enterprise and individual initiative are completely discouraged by the Indian Bureau and its puppet tribal councils.

But the Indian Bureau has not been able to contain itself within the modest bounds set up under that act. It has insisted on going beyond the bounds of the law and set up institutions which were proposed in the original version of the bill but not contained in the act as passed. I refer to the tribal courts, really kangaroo courts, which administer a special kind of law for many tribes under the so-called tribal codes of law and order. In this way the tribalized Indians are placed under a special kind of law separate from the State and county law and made more amenable to Indian Bureau control. These kangaroo courts have absolutely no validity or authority under any law of any State or under Federal law. Their operation is, in fact, quite in opposition to State laws and contrary to any law passed by Congress. Since the organization of these kangaroo courts, domestic morality among Indians has declined immensely. The regulation of marriage and divorce among Indians by these courts has been scandalous and contrary to public policy. It is a matter of record that the passage of the so-called Wheeler-Howard Act signaled the beginning of a general decline in obedience by Indians to State laws of marriage and divorce. When such is the case, what sort of education in freedom under law and in United States citizenship do you suppose the Indian youth on reservations is getting?

It is self-evident that the only way Indians can learn American ways is by participating in the same institutions of local government as other citizens, in the State and county courts, by exercise of the franchise in local and State elections, and by being elected to political office. The Indians can never learn the ways of American citizenship from tribal codes imposed through Indian Bureau tribal courts separated from other citizens. In no case has the slightest voluntary effort been made by the Indian Bureau to transfer the Indians under its control to the States for the administration of law and order. Instead, the Indians have been encouraged and abetted in the development of separate institutions of Government and for maintaining law and order which serve to keep them as a class apart from other citizens.

Now, allow me to digress from the main line of my discussion to mention the roles which certain individuals have played in the development of the recent Indian Bureau policies which are so contrary to the interests of justice and freedom.

There is first Mr. John Collier, a former Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to whom I have already referred. He is, or was at least, the chief factotum of the crowd of visionaries and socialistic conspirators who first attached their tentacles to the long suffering Indians in 1933. Mr. Collier and his cohorts pushed through the Wheeler-Howard Act, not in the original form which they would have liked to see enacted—that was too extreme even for those wild days of the New Deal—but with all the provisions for puppet tribal councils, revolving loan fund and possibilities for new reservations which have served as devices for keeping the Indians apart from other citizens. Mr. Collier's regime was marked by flat failure in solving any aspect of the Indian problem and that he was finally dismissed in 1945 after his failure to regiment some of the larger tribes such as the Navajo had caused rebellion and discontent in the ranks of his entourage.

This same Mr Collier, who almost always writes in a vein of seemingly earnest solicitation for the Indians' welfare, never quite secured the full confidence of Congress in his schemes for socialistic regimentation of the Indians. In fact those who knew him most closely were of the opinion that he was a mere adventurer who was possessed of a wild dream of becoming some sort of modern day Moses, destined to lead all of the Indians of the Western Hemisphere to some promised land. During his term of office he sent out his agents far and wide to dig up all the historically disbanded tribes they could find and to reorganize them under Bureau-constructed constitutions in complete subservience to him. And, as he gathered new tribes under his wings in this way his power waxed and his ego expanded correspondingly.

Since his dismissal from the post of Commissioner in 1945 he has attempted to maintain an influence over the subsequent policies of the Bureau in every way possible. He has organized an "Institute of Ethnic Affairs" as a pressure group for his crowd and has also kept a finger in the Congress of American Indians which was originally organized under his auspices.

Mr. Collier was just one individual in a crowd of socialistic visionaries but he, more probably than any other single person, is responsible for the present awful mess of Indian affairs. During his tenure of office, although many tribes voted to reject the application of the so-called Wheeler-Howard Act, he went right ahead and organized them any way with the usual puppet tribal council and other institutions. In doing this he was, of course, disobeying the law but carrying out the schemes of Indian enslavement which had been apparent in the original bill from which the act was derived. So his whole scheme of reviving an almost extinct tribalism worked against the basic interest of the Indian in assimilation and citizenship. Seemingly for Mr. Collier the only good Indian was a blanket Indian seated in front of his pueblo or hogan, engaged in some prehistoric arts and crafts, or performing a snake dance beneath the light of the new moon by a flickering camp fire. And, of course, this would be a rather harmless and poetic hobby if confined to the lecture hall or backyard gossip, but when applied to the administrative realities of present-day life such an out-of-date idea had most disastrous results.

The reason I mention Mr. Collier in so much detail is because of the injustice which his administration worked on the Indian, an injustice which continues to the present time

Since at least 1947 the Indian Bureau has been making public statements to the effect that it wants to start self liquidation immediately Yet, to this date never a single voluntary step has been taken by that Bureau in the direction indicated. On the contrary a consistent practice of enlargement of operations, expenditures, and personnel has been pursued Now this is certainly a serious situation. Evidently the Indian Bureau does not expect to be believed when it says one thing and does the opposite.

As time passes each day sees more and more of the private lives of our Indian fellow Americans being swallowed up by a totalitarian minded organization which, under the mask of performing public services, enthralls the Indians to a still greater degree. The Bureau tells the Indians what kind of work he may do today. Tomorrow it will tell him where to eat and sleep and when to go to church. The very multitude of current activities of the Bureau for Indians makes one shiver to think of what the situation will be like on the morrow. The history of this Bureau is the history of an octopus, a monstrous growth greedy for power and reaching out without limit. It is, let me reemphasize once more, a situation which grows steadily worse with no prospect of relief or cessation.

The long life of the Indian Bureau, extending well over 120 years by now, leads one to reflect on the causes for the survival over so long a period of a particular agency of the Government. The

explanation to this is relatively easy. The fact of the matter is that the Indian Bureau is really a well-worked out system of political patronage. Through the fact that it holds out something for nothing to every Indian, the Bureau, like the famed Tammany political machine of New York City, gains continued support and maintains its insidious hold on its victims. The so-called services which the Indian Bureau ostensibly performs such as the maintenance of hospitals, schools, irrigation, forestry, soil conservation, road building, loans, range management, and so forth, are not, in the real sense of the phrase, public services, but are rather class benefits of a special nature which enable the Bureau to obligate the Indians and render more absolute their dependence on it They constitute a front, so to speak, whereby the outsider is received by the seeming performance of important functions. These functions, needless to say, are performed by local government or other agencies for all other citizens. And, as time progresses, the extent of these activities increases and the debasement of the Indian becomes more disgraceful.

Nowadays it is becoming difficult, if not impossible, to discover an informed and intelligent public opinion among Indians in regard to their own interest divorced from that of the Indian Bureau. Most Indian tribes are, as a matter of fact, divided into factions on this very issue, the minority in most cases willing to act as pawns of the Bureau while the majority, possessed of more native intelligence, refuse to go along with bureau stooges and Bureau orders. It is upon these latter Indians that we must pin our hopes for achievement of Indian freedom and full citizenship. If a channel of public expression of the voices of the majority could be opened up, instead of the clamor which we at present get from a few Indian Bureau Indians, we would be able to mobilize a united protest capable of shaking loose the entire structure of the Indian Bureau But at present the majority contents itself with passive resistance, apparently hoping that in due time the Indian Bureau will pass as other evils have. Let the majority of Indians be heard and the present system will fall of its own weight.

We cannot compromise in the matter of human freedom. We cannot release Indian tribes one by one or State by State or jurisdiction by jurisdiction. The Indians must be released as a whole and at once if the matter is to be accomplished thoroughly and satisfactorily. There is no other way. The small crowd which has hitherto run the Bureau will not be able to manipulate things their own way if a clean sweep is made of all Indian restrictions.

In conclusion I would like to say that I did not prepare this speech simply as another sounding board for personal opinions or to set up a political smokescreen to cover lack of real accomplishment. I want to ask for a full consideration by Congress of the present bill with all angles weighed and considered and with the amount of committee or other hearings as are deemed needed. But I sincerely hope that we will not let this problem of freedom for our fellow Americans to go by default without some worth-while action being taken on it. We can do something of the greatest importance by passing this bill and seeing that its provisions are carried out. The matter is urgent and the cause is just. Let us act now while our action will mean something and before it is too late.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from my duties in the House the rest of this week due to the death yesterday of my mother.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Upon previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

NATIONAL BIBLE WEEK

Mr. JUDD Mr Speaker, when the great British historian, Mr. Toynbee, was asked to summarize the results of his lifelong study of the 21 major civilizations which have existed on this planet, it was not surprising, I think, that he had come by the study of man's experience to the same conclusion to which an increasing number of scientists is coming by the method of experimentation, and to which an increasing number of philosophers is coming by the methods of reflection and logic, and the same conclusions to which the seers and prophets of the ages came long ago by the methods of insight and inspiration, namely, that, above all else, man is a moral and spiritual being living in a moral and spiritual world under moral and spiritual laws that are just as real and dependable as are the laws of gravity, or the laws of electricity or the laws of nuclear fission. Man can violate these laws; he cannot break them. If he violates them, they break him. And so it is with a nation or a civilization.

Mr. Speaker, our forefathers established here the finest material civilization the world has ever seen, primarily, I think, because they put first the dignity and the sacredness and the decency of individual man as a spiritual being. It was because they put that first, not second, that the kind of society they developed was one which released as had never been done before in any time or place the creative capacities that are in ordinary people everywhere. Americans are no more capable than other peoples, but our society was such that it gave the individual in America who had imagination and the will to get ahead the opportunity to use his capacities to the utmost. He was not doomed, no matter what his ability, to remain frozen where he was born.

It was out of that spiritual concept that there developed a political philosophy based on the worth of the individual; and out of that political philosophy there developed an economic system where the individual had the right and the chance to get ahead, with his Government intervening only when necessary to prevent him from interfering with other people's right to get ahead also. It was the sum total of individual efforts working together not in compulsion but in voluntary cooperation that produced this finest material civilization the world has ever seen.

Why did our forefathers put first the spiritual nature of men out of which the other good things have developed? It was because, in my judgment, most of them had been trained from their mothers' knees in the spiritual values and the ethical precepts of a religious faith that had been built up first by the Jews and later by the Christians during five or six thousand years and that are recorded and set forth in the Holy Bible It is the source book of the eternal truths and principles behind the best in our culture.

It is to remind our people of these facts that for 10 years, a week in October has been set apart as National Bible Week, in which peoples of all walks of life—Jews, Catholics, and Protestants, rich and poor, city and country, labor and management, Democrats and Republicans, ministers and laymen, unite in calling everyone to study afresh the spiritual foundations of our society. Only as the rank and file of people in America go back to the wellspring from which came the ideas and the values which have made possible the good things we inherited, will we be able to preserve and transmit them to our children.

This year I have been happy to serve as chairman of National Bible Week. After months of preparation and organization, there has been an astonishing response—beyond my own faith, I confess. Almost every Governor in the United States has issued a proclamation—and some of them were truly inspired—calling upon the people of his State to read and study, each in his own way, through the religious organization of his own choice, or individually or in his home with his family, the great basic documents in the Bible—of history and law, of poetry and prophecy, of teaching and worship—which contain the ideas and ideals on which our country and the best things in our civilization were founded. Scores of mayors have issued proclamations or made statements over their local radio stations. A day or so ago I received a telegram from Philip Murray, head of the CIO, in which he urged "all the American people, regardless of creed, to give special consideration during this week to reading and studying the Holy Scriptures." Last week William Green, head of the A. F. of L., wrote that he would have an announcement made over that organization's Nation-wide hookup, calling attention to Bible Week and urging all to observe it. A great many prominent business and industrial leaders have served as a committee of one hundred to support and promote the effort on a national scale.

It is gratifying and encouraging to find, when we are in trouble, as we are in trouble today, that more and more of our people are groping their way back from pursuit of false gods and trust only in our own strength or cleverness, to a recognition that "it is righteousness that exalts a nation" and nothing else, and that "except the Lord build the house, they

labor in vain who build it." It is reassuring in a time of such confused and disturbed conditions to find people in both high and low places recognizing that we are in difficulties beyond our human power to solve, and turning to God who all through history has proved adequate, if called upon by men in humility and penitence. The very things that are necessary to restore us to health are the things that are necessary for the rest of the world if it is to move forward to peace rather than backward to war and collapse.

Sometimes people here become so accustomed to the Judeo-Christian ethics which is our heritage and the integrity, decency, and humanitarianism which are the outgrowth of its religious concepts that they assume these are usual characteristics of natural man, that they are characteristics common tc all human beings of whatever culture. It is not so. Such a notion is behind the false assumption, for instance, that since the men in the Kremlin are human beings, too, they will act as we do even though they are avowed atheists and deny the existence of moral law. But the best that we do or are is not because we are human; it is because we are trying to be Christian. Mere humans unconditioned by religious training or ethical values are predatory, like animals in the jungle. The reason we at our best are trying to liberate and build whereas Communist leaders seek to enslave and destroy is because we have been exposed for centuries to the Judeo-Christian ethics and teachings. The reason for the cold calculated cruelty of the leaders in the Kremlin is not because they are inhuman; rather it is because they are merely human and have denounced God and denied the existence of the moral principles that come from God.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress of the United States, too, need to have our attention called to Bible Week and its importance to us and our Nation. We have special weeks for everything under the sun. Surely there is nothing to which we can give study and attention with greater profit than the eternal truths upon which are based the best things that we want to strengthen and preserve in our civilization, in order to make it better here at home, and give it a better chance to spread abroad.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I will read a telegram that I sent today to General Gray:

Maj. Gen. CARL R. GRAY,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs,
Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D C.:

Deeply shocked that service men and women at Walter Reed Hospital do not receive adequate information regarding their rights. Urge that Central Office send teams of rating, vocational training, rehabilitation, loans and insurance to go through hospital, spending enough time to give complete information. Men are lying in beds seriously wounded with no idea of their rights and privileges, military and otherwise. It is cheating the veterans not to give them this information. Await immediate answer.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Veterans' Administration send enough men to tell the service men and women what they are going to receive when they get out of the hospitals so that they can plan their lives accordingly. During World War II we had to fight to get enough contact men and teams to go through the hospitals, but finally they did so. In World War II the tops, the heads of the rating schedule section, two or three doctors, and heads of other VA departments went through the hospitals in teams giving information relating to training and rehabilitation, loans and insurance, and all their benefits. The heads should go through the hospitals sometimes instead of sitting at their desks. And there should be enough VA men stationed at the hospitals all the time to advise our wounded heroes.

FAIR TRADE—SMALL BUSINESS NEEDS PROTECTION AGAINST CUTTHROAT PRICING PRACTICES

Mr. McGUIRE Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I am this day introducing a bill (H. R. 5767) to amend the Federal Trade Commission and other acts regulating trade practices. The purpose of this measure is to clarify the status of certain State laws, to affirm within specific limits the right of each State to determine its own policy with respect to the regulation of its internal affairs, and to enable each State to protect its domestic trade from unfair trade practices

THE NEED FOR AMENDING THE MILLER-TYDINGS ACT

Specifically, the bill is designed to restore the Miller-Tydings Act to the status it occupied prior to the Court decision last May in Schwegmann Bros. against Calvert Distillers Corp. This decision deprived the Miller-Tydings Act of much of its effectiveness and struck a heavy blow at State fair-trade laws.

The Miller-Tydings Act was enacted in 1937 as an amendment to the Federal Trade Commission and Sherman Acts. Its purpose was to make it possible for the several States—if they so desired—to legislate on matters theretofore considered to be wholly within the orbit of Federal authority. Under this amendment the States could enact fair-trade laws affirming the right of a manufacturer of a proprietary article to exercise a measure of control over the price at which the product can be resold. It declared that the Federal Trade Commission and Sherman Acts did not render illegal a contract between a producer of a trade-marked article and his dealers prescribing minimum prices for the resale of the commodity when such contracts are lawful under State law. The act stipulated that the article must be in free and open competition with commodities of the same general class, and also specifically forbade horizontal price-fixing agreements between manufacturers or between dealers.

A total of 42 States had enacted fair-trade legislation prior to the passage of the Miller-Tydings Act. Since then three additional States have acted. Nearly all of this legislation has been placed in jeopardy by the Schwegmann decision. If Congress intended to make it possible for States to exercise control over this matter as I believe it did and if Congress is still of the opinion that the States should have this right as I believe they should, then additional legislation is necessary.

THE SCHWEGMANN CASE

The issue confronting the courts in the Schwegmann case was whether the Miller-Tydings Act permits the States to enact laws which require dealers who are not parties to specific written contracts, the so-called nonsigners, to observe the prices stipulated by the manufacturer. In spite of the fact that every State law in existence at the time the Miller-Tydings Act was passed, as well as every law which has been enacted since, contains these nonsigner clauses, the Court said "No" The Miller-Tydings Act, according to the Court, grants only a limited immunity and does not authorize a State to permit a seller to enforce his prices on those who are not parties to specific contracts.

I am convinced that in 1937 Congress intended that the Miller-Tydings Act should exempt noncontractive price maintenance as well as contractive. Otherwise, the law made little sense. There would have been no reason to enact it. Doubtless the Court had good reasons for deciding otherwise. But that is not the point The point is that now we must indicate to the Court in unmistakable language that Congress does intend to support existing State laws on this subject. The present bill does this.

PROVISIONS OF THIS AMENDMENT

The bill declares that it is the intention of Congress to reaffirm the inherent right of each State to regulate its internal affairs and specifically to enact legislation authorizing contracts prescribing minimum prices for the resale of commodities and to extend these prices to persons not parties to the contract. Section 5 (a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act is to be amended by inserting a statement that the section does not apply to "contracts or agreements prescribing minimum prices for the resale of a commodity which bears the trade-mark, brand, or name of the producer or distributor of such commodity and which is in free and open competition with the commodities of the same general class produced or distributed by others," when such contracts "are lawful as applied to intrastate transactions." The bill further provides that all rights of action created by State laws may be exercised against nonsigners. The making of such contracts and their enforcement are not to be illegal under the Sherman Act. The bill specifically for-

bids agreements between manufacturers, or between wholesalers, or between retailers, or between "persons, firms or corporations in competition with each other."

PROTECTION AGAINST MONOPOLY

This bill is merely an enabling measure. It merely turns a specified and very limited area of trade regulation back to the States. It is not coercive. The States are not forced to do anything. All we are doing is to make it possible for States which believe in the principles of price maintenance to enact appropriate legislation. And I call your attention to the fact that the great bulk of the American people do believe in price maintenance. Otherwise we would not have these laws in 45 of our States.

If a State does not believe in price maintenance, it is not forced to tolerate the practice. In the absence of State legislation authorizing price maintenance, the Federal law remains unchanged. No State need fear any encroachment on its internal affairs by neighboring States pursuing a different policy.

The bill represents no change in our antitrust policy. It contains more than adequate protection against undesirable restraints of trade. The commodity whose price is under control must be "in free and open competition with commodities of the same general class produced or distributed by others." It will not be possible for a manufacturer to use price maintenance as an adjunct of monopoly because the law does not apply to any product which is not sold in a competitive market.

Nor need one fear that consumers will be charged higher prices under resale price maintenance. Stabilized prices do not mean high prices. The penalties for charging excessive prices are exactly the same as in any competitive economy, namely, loss of sales and reduced profits. Remember that monopoly involves horizontal control of the market Resale price maintenance is vertical control.

NEED FOR FAIR TRADE LAWS

We believe the principles underlying fair trade legislation to be entirely sound for two basic reasons. First, price cutting is the favorite device of the mass distributer to force the independent out of business and to obtain a monopolistic position. Unfair pricing practices are a potent weapon in the hands of the monopolist and would-be monopolist. The preservation of our thousands of independent retailers is a basic necessity if the competitive system is to survive. The manufacturer who stabilizes his prices is merely placing the small retailer on an equal competitive footing with the massive chain store. Price maintenance is necessary to preserve competition at the retail level.

Secondly, the right to control resale prices is inherent in the very concept of a proprietary article. We believe that a manufacturer who develops a product, attaches his name to it, and spends huge sums in convincing the consuming public of its virtues should have a continuing interest in that product. He must be able to protect his investment against the depredations of the price cutter who uses the good will of the real owner for his own personal gain.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHEEHAN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BAKEWELL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts).

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska and to include a statement.

Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. HARVEY).

Mr. SCHWABE, in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FORD and to include miscellaneous material.

Mr. PHILLIPS (at the request of Mr. POULSON) and to include a statement.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOLLINGER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KLEIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE, in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURNSIDE and to include a letter.

Mr. RAMSAY.

Mr. BOLLING to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. EBERHARTER and to include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post.

Mr. BETTS.

Mr. SCRIVNER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD, in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WERDEL (at the request of Mr. HALLECK).

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES and to include an editorial appearing in the Charlotte News of October 12 entitled "Prompt Action on Suez Problem."

Mr. ROGERS of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRESTON and to include a speech delivered by Mr. W. G. Vollmer.

Mr. BUFFETT, in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1181. An act to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records, and

H R 1215 An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 11. An act to provide for the appointment of conservators to conserve the assets and provide for the personal welfare of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, not amounting to unsoundness of mind, or physical incapacity.

S. 466. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Army certain property in St. Louis, Mo.;

S 752 An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission;

S. 945 An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947;

S. 1482. An act for the relief of the town of Mount Desert, Maine;

S 2233. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended; and

S 2244. An act to amend certain housing legislation to grant preferences to veterans of the Korean conflict.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H R 971 An act for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne,

H R 1038 An act relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Smithsonian Institution and its constituent bureaus; and

H R. 1764 An act to authorize the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force to settle, pay, adjust, and compromise certain claims for damages and for salvage and towage and to execute releases, certifications, and reports with respect thereto, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ENGLE (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

Mr. VINSON, indefinitely, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 18, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

890. A letter from the Acting Chairman Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its publication entitled "Typical Residential Electric Bills for Cities of 2,500 Population and More, January 1, 1951"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

891 A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report showing the payment of claims for damage occasioned by naval vessels, which have been settled by the Navy Department, pursuant to section 8 of the act of July 3, 1944 (58 Stat. 726; 46 U. S C. 797); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

892 A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Postmaster

General to impound mail in certain cases"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BOYKIN: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 1870. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the protection of the Bald Eagle", approved June 8, 1940; (Rept. No. 1198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 19. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, with amendment (Rept No. 1199). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. S. 1020. An act to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes of Las Vegas Wash and its tributaries, Las Vegas, Nev., and vicinity; without amendment (Rept. No. 1200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. S. 1622. An act to amend section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946; without amendment (Rept No. 1201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union

Mr COLMER: Committee on Rules Senate Concurrent Resolution 36 Concurrent resolution authorizing the appointment of 14 Members of Congress to participate in a public discussion of problems of common interest with representatives of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, without amendment (Rept. No. 1202) Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H R 4686. A bill authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station, Fort Robinson, Dawes County, Nebr., to the city of Crawford, without amendment (Rept No. 1203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H R. 4749. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to return certain lands to the Police Jury of Caddo Parish, La; with amendment (Rept. No 1204) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration House Resolution 452 Resolution to provide for the payment of certain death and burial benefits to Thomas Logan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1205). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 437. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 436, with amendment (Rept. No. 1206). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 468. Resolution relating to the making up of any deficit or shortage heretofore incurred in connection with the operation of the stationery room of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 1207). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 5763. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide that Low Middling seven-eighths inch cotton shall be the standard grade for the purposes of determining parity and price support; to the Committee on Agriculture

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 5764. A bill to promote the cause of world peace by authorizing for a limited period the admission as temporary visitors to the United States of a number of nationals of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and certain satellite countries to become acquainted with the American people and the American way of life, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

By Mr. JAVITS:

H R. 5765 A bill to promote the cause of world peace by authorizing for a limited period the admission as temporary visitors to the United States of a number of nationals of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and certain satellite countries to become acquainted with the American people and the American way of life, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr CHATHAM

H R 5766. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, so as to allow, as a deduction from gross income under section 23 (p), any contribution made by an employer to a profit-sharing employees' trust within 90 days after the close of the taxable year with respect to which such contribution is made; to the Committee on Ways and Means

By Mr McGUIRE:

H R 5767 A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum resale prices and which are extended by State law to nonsigners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr SUTTON:

H R 5768. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia

By Mr. MULTER:

H R 5769 A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 with respect to the meaning of "outside salesman"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H R 5770. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

By Mr. RANKIN:

H R 5771. A bill to postpone any reapportionment of Representatives in Congress until after another census is taken, and to authorize a special quinquennial census in the year 1955; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R 5772. A bill to provide that each member of the bar of the highest court of a State or of a Federal court shall be eligible to practice before all administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5773. A bill to provide that no suit against a State may be commenced or maintained on behalf of the United States without the consent of such State, except with prior congressional authorization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 5774. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 with respect to the meaning of "outside salesman"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H R. 5775. A bill to permit certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of Canton, S. Dak , for park, recreation, airport, or other public purposes, to be leased by it so long as the income therefrom is used for such purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr VAIL:

H. R. 5776. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 with respect to the meaning of "outside salesman"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr WICKERSHAM:

H J. Res 347. Joint resolution to provide that Federal legislation which prohibits the employment of children during certain hours shall not apply with respect to the harvesting of basic agricultural commodities, to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr BENNETT of Florida:

H Res 467. Resolution to provide for the establishment of a home for pages employed by the House of Representatives, to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs BOLTON

H R 5777 A bill for the relief of Hugo Kern, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H R. 5778. A bill for the relief of Otmar Sprah, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5779. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Maida, to the Committee on the Judiciary

H R. 5780 A bill for the relief of Haruko Katie Kaneko, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr CHATHAM

H R. 5781 A bill for the relief of the J. A. Vance Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. COUDERT:

H R 5782 A bill for the relief of Lydia Sarrka, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr GRANAHAN

H R 5783 A bill for the relief of Robert Bertram, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H R 5784 A bill for the relief of Heinrich (Henry) Schor, Sali Schor, and Gitta Aviva Schor, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr MURDOCK:

H R 5785 A bill for the relief of Carol Ann Hutchins (Sybille Schubert); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr SABATH:

H R 5786 A bill for the relief of Marigo Th Tsipoura, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr YORTY:

H R 5787. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Edith Currie, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

476. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the Preakness Reformed Church, Preakness, N. J., deploring the absence of prayer in opening the sessions of the United Nations and urging that a room be provided in the new United Nations building as a place for meditation and prayer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

477. By Mr SMITH of Virginia: Petition of mothers of Virginia and members of the

Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church, to protect our rights by passing legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through such mediums as radio, television, newspapers, and magazines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, October 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God who art the hope of all the ends of the earth, as in former times Thy spirit didst breathe over the chaos, confusions, and divisions of struggling States and weld them into one Nation, and didst lead forth our fathers unto a wealthy place; so, we beseech Thee, in these latter days having girded us to conquer tyranny without, wilt Thou heal the tensions which threaten to tear the fair robe of our democracy. Save us from violence and discord, from all pride and arrogance. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those who in Thy name are here trusted with the authority of governance, to the end that there may be peace and prosperity within our borders. Forbid that the precious oil of our unity be spilled upon the ground to ignite selfish fires. May it still feed the flame of liberty's torch as it enlightens the whole darkened earth. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 17, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 16, 1951, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1718) for the relief of Elizabeth Bozsik.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 921) to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 51) establishing a Joint Committee on Railroad Retirement Legislation, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4467. An act to incorporate the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C.; and

H. R. 5511. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 3298 An act to amend sections 303 (c) and 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended;

H. R. 3376. An act for the relief of Margaret K. N. Miller;

H. R. 4386. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5131. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike system and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAIN was granted leave from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MARTIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the week, after today.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF JOHN HOWARD PAYNE, AUTHOR OF HOME SWEET HOME

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask that House Joint Resolution 284, which has just come over from the House of Representatives be laid before the Senate and acted upon at this time. Before the joint resolution is read, I might say that it concerns the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John Howard Payne, author of the family hymn of America, Home Sweet Home.

The joint resolution calls for the appropriation of no money, but provides for a commission which is to act within a year. I have discussed the matter with the majority leader, I have conferred with the program committee of the minority, and with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and no one has any objection. The joint resolution should be passed promptly if the commission is to do any work. I have been asked to make this request, and I hope there will be no objection.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I certainly shall not object, and I hope that the Senate will be able to sing Home Sweet Home by Saturday night. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair joins the majority leader in that hope.

The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which the clerk will state by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 284) authorizing the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the observance and memorialization on April 9, 1952, of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John Howard Payne, author of that family hymn of America, Home Sweet Home.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—LETTERS, RESOLUTIONS, AND PETITIONS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have a letter from Mrs. John D. Peck, of Herndon, Va., transmitting a resolution and a petition of the mothers of Virginia and members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church, praying that their rights and those of their families might be protected by passing legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through such mediums as radio, television, newspapers, and magazines, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter, resolution, and petition, without the signatures attached, be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter, resolution, and petition, without the signatures attached, were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERNDON, VA.,
October 15, 1951.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Will you please have this petition mentioned in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? Thank you.

Yours truly,

LOUISE C. PECK
Mrs. John D. Peck.

To the Virginia Congressional Delegation:

Whereas our children are being led to believe that alcoholic beverages are harmless and their use desirable particularly through association with sports and other programs of interest to young people, on radio and television

Therefore we, the undersigned mothers of Virginia and members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church, respectfully petition you to protect our rights and those of our families by passing legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through such mediums as radio, television, newspapers, and magazines

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have two letters from Miss Elizabeth Laynor, chairwoman, Christian Social Relations and Local Church Activities of the Washington Street Methodist Church of Alexandria, Va., transmitting a resolution and a petition of the mothers of Virginia and members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church, praying that their rights and those of their families might be protected by passing legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through such mediums as radio, television, newspapers, and magazines, and I ask unanimous consent that the letters, resolution, and petition, without the signatures attached, be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters, resolution, and petition, without the signatures attached, were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

ALEXANDRIA, VA
October 15, 1951

HON A WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C

MY DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON Enclosed please find petition signed by the members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Washington Street Methodist Church, Alexandria, Va., which clearly states our wishes with respect to the advertising of alcoholic beverages

We trust that you will give it your kind consideration on our behalf and, if possible, have it read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Put yourself in our places as mothers and members

Sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH LAYNOR,
Chairwoman, Christian Social Relations and Local Church Activities

---

To the Virginia Congressional Delegation:

Whereas our children are being led to believe that alcoholic beverages are harmless and their use desirable particularly through association with sports and other programs of interest to young people, on radio and television:

Therefore we, the mothers of Virginia and members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church respectfully petition you to protect our rights and those of our families by passing legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through such mediums as radio, television, newspapers, and magazines.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr HOEY, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

H. R 5230. A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of North Carolina of the Currituck Beach Lighthouse Reservation, Corolla, N C, without amendment (Rept. No 1023).

By Mr LEHMAN, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

S 1320 A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between certain officers of the Public Health Service and comparable officers of the Army, and for other purposes, without amendment (Rept No 1024)

By Mr PASTORE from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

S 337 A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes, with amendments (Rept No 1025)

By Mr NEELY from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H R 5329 A bill to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, with an amendment (Rept No 1026)

By Mr GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance

H J Res 330 Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Trade Fair, Inc, Chicago, Ill, to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes, without amendment (Rept No 1028)

By Mr RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services

S 1650 A bill to provide for the release of the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract or parcel of land conditionally granted by it to the city of Savannah, Chatham County, Ga, without amendment (Rept No 1032)

By Mr SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services

H R 4049 A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts certain lands and improvements comprising the Castle Island Terminal Facility at South Boston in exchange for certain other lands, without amendment (Rept No 1027)

By Mr HUNT, from the Committee on Armed Services

H R 3648 A bill to provide that payments to States and Territories for care given to certain disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States shall be effective from the date such care commenced; without amendment (Rept No. 1029).

By Mr. STENNIS (for Mr CAIN), from the Committee on Armed Services

H R 3003 A bill to authorize Rear Adm. Emory D Stanley, United States Navy, retired, to accept employment with the Government of Peru, without amendment (Rept. No 1030).

By Mr JOHNSON of Texas, from the Committee on Armed Services

H R 5425. A bill to authorize construction at Air Force installations, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. No 1033).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 1628 A bill to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest fire control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept No 1034), and

H R 4027 A bill to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands, without amendment (Rept No. 1035).

WAGE STABILIZATION BOARD—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (REPT NO 1037)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit a report on the functions of the Wage Stabilization Board, together with the individual views of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed This report was unanimously accepted by the committee

The PRESIDENT pro tempore The report will be received and, without objection, printed, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota

LABOR PARTICIPATION IN DEFENSE MOBILIZATION REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (REPT NO 1038)

Mr HUMPHREY Mr President from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit a report on labor participation in defense mobilization, together with the supplemental views of the Senator from Ohio [Mr TAFT], and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed. This report was unanimously accepted by the committee

The PRESIDENT pro tempore The report will be received and, without objection, printed, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

SUPPLY AND DEMAND FOR FERTILIZERS, FARM MACHINERY AND PESTICIDES (REPT NO 1031)

Mr ELLENDER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I submit a report on the supply and demand for fertilizers, farm machinery and pesticides, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and, without objection, will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Louisiana.

AUTHORIZATION TO SENATE INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS TO SUBMIT INTERIM REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr HOEY. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or the full committee, be authorized to file interim reports during the adjourned period of the Eighty-second Congress and that they be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 18, 1951, he pre-

sented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 11. An act to provide for the appointment of conservators to conserve the assets and provide for the personal welfare of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, not amounting to unsoundness of mind, or physical incapacity;

S. 466. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Army certain property in St. Louis, Mo.;

S 752. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission;

S. 945. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947;

S. 1482. An act for the relief of the town of Mount Desert, Maine;

S. 2233. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended; and

S. 2244. An act to amend certain housing legislation to grant preferences to veterans of the Korean conflict.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER.

S 2295. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr LANGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 2296. A bill for the relief of Josephine Maria Riss Fang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S 2297. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowances among certain officers of the United States Health Service occupying positions of comparable responsibility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S 2298. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the meaning of "outside salesman"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. WATKINS, Mr BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. NIXON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr FERGUSON, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. YOUNG, Mr CASE, Mr. IVES, Mr CAPEHART, Mr JENNER, Mr. ECTON, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr THYE)

S 2299. A bill to prohibit members and employees of any national political committee from practicing before or attempting to influence the decision of any department or agency of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr SPARKMAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr GILLETTE, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 2300. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Education to encourage the further development and growth of the educational drama and music programs in the State and land-grant and other accredited nonprofit colleges and universities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 2301. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a program of grants and scholarships for education in the field of nursing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S 2302 A bill to authorize the reinstatement or issuance of national service life insurance policies covering the lives of certain persons notwithstanding the provisions of the Insurance Act of 1951; to the Committee on Finance

S 2303 A bill for the relief of Miki Takano, and

S 2304 A bill for the relief of Moshe Gips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr DIRKSEN:

S 2305 A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, regarding published articles and broadcasts by foreign agents, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr SCHOEPPEL:

S. 2306 A bill to assist in the rehabilitation of disaster-stricken areas by assuring adequate relief under the housing laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as a separate bill, which is in substance the same as an amendment to House Joint Resolution 289, ending the state of war with Germany, which was discussed on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr WILEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] yesterday.

This amendment was reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as a committee amendment with the concurrence of the majority of the committee Inasmuch as it has been indicated by Senator MCFARLAND that debate on this measure might delay the adjournment of the Congress without action on the ending of the state of war with Germany, I am, in accordance with suggestions made by Senator MCFARLAND yesterday, introducing this as a separate bill. I hope that this action will make possible without discussion and acrimony the dropping from the joint resolution ending the war with Germany all matters relating to the Alien Property Custodian and the passage of the joint resolution, so reduced to a simple joint resolution ending the state of war, by unanimous consent.

The bill (S. 2295) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT RELATING TO PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN OFFICERS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowances among certain officers of the United States Public Health Service occupying positions of comparable responsibility, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S 2297) to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowances among certain officers of the United States Public Health Service occupying positions of comparable responsibility, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

In connection with the report on S. 1320, which I have submitted today on behalf of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I would like to read a brief quotation from it The report points out:

"At the hearing on S. 1320 the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, while indicating his endorsement of the principle of according proper recognition and prestige to the dental profession, pointed out that enactment of the bill would create certain administrative problems for the Public Health Service and would disturb the parity established under existing law among top positions in the Public Health Service. Also, the National Society of Professional Engineers filed a statement at the hearing in which, while they agreed to the principle of according recognition to the dental profession, they expressed the view that similar recognition should be accorded the engineering profession through action to give equivalent rank and status to the chief sanitary engineer in the Public Health Service.

"CONCLUSION

"The committee is convinced, on the basis of information developed at the hearing, that action may have to be taken to provide for changes in grade, pay, and allowance with respect to other positions of comparable responsibility in the Public Health Service. Action should be taken now, however, with respect to the chief dental officer"

In order that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may give further consideration to this problem of assuring parity among positions of comparable responsibility in the Public Health Service, I have introduced a bill which would—

1 Provide that the six statutory assistant surgeons general shall have rank, pay, and allowance equivalent to those of a major general;

2 Provide that additional positions, as necessary, could also be classified as temporary Assistant Surgeons General with rank, pay, and allowance equivalent to those of major general or brigadier general. Only one-third of such temporary assistant surgeons general, however, could hold the rank of major general

This bill will, I hope, furnish a framework for consideration of the classification of other positions in the top administrative structure of the Public Health Service—as well as the chief dental officer—in a manner commensurate with the importance of the responsibilities of these positions

SCHOOLS IN CRITICAL DEFENSE HOUSING AREAS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MURRAY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5411) to amend Public Laws

Nos 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense housing areas, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H R 4467. An act to incorporate the Conference of State Societies, Washington, District of Columbia, and

H R 5511 An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia.

INTERNATIONAL DISARMAMENT—ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Mr FLANDERS. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has expressed a desire to be a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 42, favoring international disarmament. I ask unanimous consent that he may be listed as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FLANDERS subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago I asked to have the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] added to the list of sponsors for Senate Concurrent Resolution 42, relating to disarmament The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has just asked that his name be also added, so I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered

Mr. FLANDERS. I invite any other Senators who are so minded to notify me, as I shall be glad to add their names to the list of sponsors

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Fifty-seven postmasters

Ly Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services

Roswell L Gilpatric of New York to be Under Secretary of the Department of the Air Force, vice John A McCone, resigned; and

Lt Col Gerald Joseph Greeve, and sundry other officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Charles Morris Irelan, of Maryland, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia, vice George Morris Fay, resigned.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary·

Richard Hartshorne, of New Jersey, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey, vice Guy L. Fake, retired.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Statement prepared by him entitled "The Inflation Engine"

By Mr. WILLIAMS.

Statement prepared by him, together with a letter from John B Dunlap, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, relative to the unpaid tax account of A H Myers, Kansas City, Mo.

By Mr MARTIN

An address delivered by him before the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations at Columbus, Ohio, on October 8, 1951

By Mr BUTLER of Maryland (for Mr. HENDRICKSON)

Statement released by Mr HENDRICKSON today urging immediate consideration of the remainder of the Hoover Reorganization Commission recommendations when Congress reconvenes next January.

By Mr HOLLAND

Excerpts from address entitled "Operation Home Front," delivered by Brig Gen C. W. Christenberry, Chief of the Special Services Division of the Army, on a program conducted by the American Newspaperwomen's Club for the entertainment of servicemen and servicewomen stationed in or near the Capital

By Mr FULBRIGHT:

Editorial entitled "Inspiring Example," from the Memphis Commercial Appeal, October 9, 1951, commenting on address delivered by him at the dedication of the Crittenden Memorial Hospital, West Memphis, Ark

Article entitled "40 et 8 Establishes Scholarship Enabling French Student To Attend the University," published in the Northwest Arkansas Times of October 13, 1951

An article entitled "The Fulbright Ideal—A Great International Experiment," printed in the magazine Pacific Neighbors, published by the Australian-American Association of Australia

By Mr BRICKER·

Analysis of Senate bill 1389, the Transportation Act of 1952–53, by Hugh McCarthy, former counsel to Subcommittee on Domestic Land and Water of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

By Mr THYE

Editorial entitled "Before You Beef About Beef Prices, Know the Story," published in the Minneapolis Star of October 12, 1951.

By Mr BENTON

Statement entitled "Private Investment in Underdeveloped Countries," issued on October 16, 1951, by the steering committee of the National Planning Association.

STATEMENT BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR AND LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS RELATING TO COMMUNIST DOMINATION OF CERTAIN UNIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, 2 days ago the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations voted to have published as a Senate document nine significant reports. These are the reports of the trial committees designated by the CIO which held hearings and decided on the expulsion of nine CIO affiliated national unions because they are Communist-led.

The Senate subcommittee agreed on a statement explaining its reasons for taking this action. I feel sure I reflect the attitudes of members of the subcommittee when I say that the critical problem of security against sabotage in plants producing classified matériel for defense was a prime consideration in the members' minds. We agreed to investigate the problem and will use the CIO trial committee reports as a point of reference for the investigation and possible hearings in the months ahead.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert in the RECORD the subcommittee's statement setting forth the objectives of its action and the reasoning behind it.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

INTRODUCTION TO SENATE DOCUMENT—COMMUNIST DOMINATION OF CERTAIN UNIONS

Whatever effect the non-Communist affidavit provision of the Taft-Hartley law may have had, there can be no question that there remain labor organizations now controlled by leaders whose loyalties are not to democratic government and democratic unionism but to the policies and programs of the Communist Party The contents of this document should therefore be of consuming interest to the United States Senate and to the American people at large because it demonstrates in detail how one of our two great labor federations, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, proceeded to uproot Communist-dominated unions from its ranks

The subject matter of this Senate document is the reports of the trial committees designated by the CIO to hear and decide the charges of Communist domination against nine of its affiliates These reports, in my judgment, are of considerable historical significance for two main reasons First, they demonstrate how an alert and democratically governed organization destroyed Communist infiltration by due process Second, the reports illuminate the nature of Communist strategy as a conspiracy to subvert the unions as democratic institutions and to convert them into bases for the extension of Communist power We have here spelled out how Communist unionism functions as a system of power

The committee proposes, therefore, to investigate and to hold hearings on the extent to which Communist-controlled unions are in a position to endanger the defense effort The committee proposes further to propose appropriate legislation to meet this problem, a problem which still remains very much to be solved

REPEAL OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY LAWS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S 1952) to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes, which were, on page 15, to strike out lines 7 and 8; on page 15, line 9, to strike out "(116)" and insert "(115)"; on page 15, line 12, to strike out "(117)" and insert "(116)", on page 15, line 14, to strike out "(118)" and insert "(117)"; on page 15, line 16, to strike out "(119)" and insert "(118)"; on page 15, line 20, to strike out "(120)" and insert "(119)"; on page 15, line 23, to strike out "(121)" and insert "(120)"; on page 16, line 1, to strike out "(122)" and insert "(121)"; on page 16, line 4, to strike out "(123)" and insert "(122)"; on page 16, line 7, to strike out "(124)" and insert "(123)"; on page 16, line 10, to strike out "(125)" and insert "(124)"; on page 16, line 13, to strike out "(126)" and

insert "(125)"; on page 16, line 15, to strike out "(127)" and insert "(126)"; on page 16, line 17, to strike out "(128)" and insert "(127)"; on page 16, line 19, to strike out "(129)" and insert "(128)"; on page 16, line 21, to strike out "(130)" and insert "(129)"; on page 16, line 23, to strike out "(131)" and insert "(130)"; on page 17, line 1, to strike out "(132)" and insert "(131)"; on page 22, line 19, to strike out "136" and insert "163"; on page 23, line 13, to strike out "220" and insert "1834"; on page 25, to strike out lines 15 to 19, inclusive; and on page 25, line 20, to strike out "(10)" and insert "(9)."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES AND ARMED SERVICES PROCUREMENT ACTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 921) to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 are hereby amended by inserting at the end of the above-named sections the following new subsection

"(c) All contracts negotiated without advertising pursuant to authority contained in this act shall include a clause to the effect that the Comptroller General of the United States or any of his duly authorized representatives shall until the expiration of 3 years after final payment have access to and the right to examine any directly pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of the contractor or any of his subcontractors engaged in the performance of and involving transactions related to such contracts or subcontracts."

Mr McCLELLAN Mr President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to

INVESTIGATION OF ORGANIZED CRIME

Mr KEFAUVER Mr President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a meeting held last Monday which was of particular importance, and is one of the most encouraging events that has taken place in recent months in connection with the efforts of citizens to investigate organized and local crime, to deal with the problem, and to put a stop to crime.

In Chicago on last Monday a meeting was held of representatives of the various private crime commissions throughout the country. At that meeting a committee was appointed to examine into the possibility of forming an association or federation of citizens' crime committees the purposes of which would be to exchange information among the various private crime commissions to act as liaison with the investigative agencies of the Government and with the Congress and to keep the spotlight on crime and corruption at local levels. It is anticipated that if this national association or liaison group is formed, it will be financed by local means.

The committee which has been named to look into this matter and to report back consists of Virgil Peterson, the operating director of the Chicago Crime Commission, as chairman; James Walsh, of the Anticrime Committee of New York, Arlon Wilson, the operating director of the Crime Committee of Kansas City, and Daniel Sullivan, the operating director of the Greater Miami Crime Committee.

Mr. President, in the Third Interim Report of the former Special Committee of the Senate To Investigate Organized Crime, the third recommendation looked to the creation of a Federal Crime Commission which would have subpena power and would act as a liaison group with local commissions and local prosecuting attorneys throughout the Nation. I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD at this point this proposal in the Third Interim Report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LI APPROPRIATE LEGISLATION SHOULD BE ENACTED TO SET UP AN INDEPENDENT FEDERAL CRIME COMMISSION IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

This Commission should be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate It should be composed of three members, all of whom are prominent citizens and not otherwise members or employees of the Federal Government It should be organized promptly and be ready to function on September 1, 1951, the date set for the expiration of authority of this committee

The Commission should hear witnesses and hold hearings from time to time, but should not have the power of subpena In such cases as the Commission may find it necessary to subpena witnesses, or to hear them under oath, it should apply either to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which by virtue of Senate Resolution 120 succeeds to the functions of this committee, or in the alternative, it may apply to any other appropriate committee of the Congress which has jurisdiction over the subject matter when it deems it desirable to have hearings The hearings, in such instances, will be held by the appropriate committees

The functions of the Federal Crime Commission should be—

1 The continuing study and surveillance of operations of interstate criminal organizations throughout the country

2 Reports on such criminal activities at periodic intervals to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the United States Senate

3 To make recommendations for hearings to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the United States Senate or any other appropriate committee in cases in which the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee may not be the most appropriate, for more intensive investigation requiring the testimony of witnesses under oath.

4 The maintenance of liaison between Federal investigative and law-enforcement agencies and crime commissions at the State and local levels with the dissemination to the latter of information respecting criminal operations as may be required in the public interest.

5 Suggestion and encouragement of legislation designed to expedite, facilitate, and encourage better and more intensive law enforcement at all levels of Government.

6 The initiation and development of appropriate social study relating to crime, its punishment, and law enforcement.

7 The maintenance of files and records as a national clearing house of information respecting criminal activities in interstate commerce to be made available, to properly authorized individuals and groups, subject to suitable security measures, but not to conflict with the interests of any presently established Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency.

Recommendation III is concurred in by all members of the committee except Senator ALEXANDER WILEY who, while appreciating some of the advantages which might be achieved under a Federal Crime Commission, believes that the possible abuses of such a new agency require his opposition to the proposal.

It is Senator WILEY'S contention that the Commission could conceivably result in (a) the basis for a national-type police force which is contrary to America's tradition, and which has been vigorously opposed by all outstanding Federal law-enforcement agencies, (b) unnecessary harassment and interference with Federal investigative agencies, (c) an unnecessary and costly superstructure imposed upon the present operating agencies, (d) dissipation of the function on the part of the legislative branch

Senator WILEY believes that voluntary cooperation among Federal investigation agencies can achieve most of the objectives which the committee majority believes can only be obtained by a Federal Crime Commission

This is the only point on which Senator WILEY dissents from his agreement with this unanimous report The committee notes at this point that there has been no previous dissent by any member on any major point of policy

Mr. KEFAUVER Mr President, there was some objection to the above proposal, so in the final report of the committee a proposal for a National Crime Coordinating Council was recommended, and it is described briefly in the final report I ask permission that the proposal be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proposal was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

III RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

A RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

1. Establishment of National Crime Coordinating Council

In order to keep the searchlight of public vigilance turned upon crime and corruption in a manner that leaves at the local level the basic responsibility for law enforcement and at the same time affords centralized guidance and coordination, the committee proposes the establishment of a privately constituted National Crime Coordinating Council.

The Council would be a body composed of representatives of privately established local crime commissions. Its first chairman would be designated on an interim basis by the President of the United States to serve until appointment of his successor. As soon as the organization was established it would nominate five persons from whom the President

would select a chairman to succeed the interim chairman. The chairman so designated would serve for a term of not more than 2 years at which time the same procedure would be followed for selection of his successor.

Congress would appropriate the sum of $100,000 to be applied as a grant in aid to the Council for the purpose of permitting it to organize and begin its activities. It is not contemplated that the Congress would be called upon for any additional funds. Thereafter, the Council would be expected to obtain its funds from charitable foundations or other private sources.

Solely to provide the mechanics for establishing the Council at the initial stages, the Attorney General of the United States would have the responsibility of drafting its charter and bylaws, arranging for its organizational meetings, and otherwise sponsoring its creation. Local crime commissions now in existence would be invited to serve as its charter members and thereafter it would sponsor throughout the country other local crime commissions which would also become members or chapters of the national organization.

The functions of the Council would be as follows

(a) To foster the establishment of privately constituted local crime commissions wherever needed throughout the country.

(b) To serve as a clearinghouse for information of interest to local crime commissions.

(c) To inquire into and study such new patterns or innovations in organized crime as may develop and to make the results of its studies available to appropriate agencies and to legislative bodies so that immediate deterrents may be devised.

(d) To sponsor meetings for the purpose of exchanging ideas and information regarding local crime conditions to which would be invited representatives of local social and civic organizations, religious groups, educational bodies, women's clubs, law enforcement agencies, and all other groups having an interest in crime conditions.

The committee believes that establishment of the proposed National Crime Coordinating Council would constitute a great contribution toward the cause of law enforcement because it would provide at the local level the civic vigilance without which the evil of complacency and indifference may soon return

As previously pointed out, this plan differs substantially from the proposal for a Federal Crime Commission as described in the third interim report. The Federal Crime Commission would be an official agency in the executive branch of the Government; whereas the National Crime Coordinating Council would be a private agency serving the local, privately established crime commissions constituting its membership If the bill now pending in the Senate for establishment of the Federal Crime Commission should be enacted, the official functions of the Commission would not be in conflict with the private activities of the Council, although a demarcation of responsibilities between them might be advisable to avoid duplication of effort.

Mr KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the association or federation of citizens' crime committees which has now been recommended by the local crime commissions themselves, to be privately financed, and without any Government connection, if it can be established and sufficiently supported, would take the place of the two recommendations just printed in the RECORD, and I think it is one of the most noteworthy steps by local citizens in the battle against the cartel of crime in the country that is going on today.

THE CAPEHART AMENDMENT TO THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency spent several weeks in public hearings and considerable time in executive session in preparing for the Senate a revision of the so-called Capehart amendment to the Defense Production Act, with a view to making it more workable, but at the same time preserving the intent of the conferees last summer, that manufacturing, processing, and industrial services should be allowed a fair and reasonable profit. It is with a sense of keen disappointment that I note that apparently the House does not intend, at this sesson, to act on that bill which was passed by the Senate.

In the opinion of the junior Senator from Virginia action on that bill in the second session of the Eighty-second Congress will be too late to prevent a considerable price increase, which will be forced by the Capehart amendment. That, in turn, will be calculated to set off new demands for wage increases which, when granted, will again put pressure on price ceilings.

ALLOCATION OF STEEL FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. SALTONSTALL Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not to exceed 4 minutes on the subject of the allocation of steel for school construction purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Last night Senate Joint Resolution 225 was introduced, and it now lies on the table. That joint resolution concerns the use of steel for school construction purposes I should like to speak briefly from the Massachusetts point of view.

Mr. President, there stands on the lawn of the State House in Boston a statue of Horace Mann, perhaps the greatest figure in public education in the history of our country and without question one of the greatest fighters for freedom the world has ever known. I have thought often of Horace Mann's remarkable career and accomplishments and ideals, but never with greater seriousness than in recent weeks as the Nation has faced a growing crisis in the construction of its schools.

Figures have been quoted in some detail, Mr. President, to illustrate the meager allotment of steel and other metals that has been given school officials throughout the country for the construction of badly needed school buildings. There is no need for me to repeat those figures at length. The school construction crisis is a vivid, a real and a dangerous one, and I submit that a policy that provides millions of tons of metal per quarter for the building of automobiles, electrical appliances and commercial containers and less than 200,000 tons per quarter for the building of schools is a policy that demands immediate reexamination in the clear light of common sense and national self-interest.

During the past weeks, Mr. President, I have been receiving, in person, by mail and telegram and by telephone the almost frantic appeals of devoted and hard working school officials and public leaders throughout Massachusetts for a reconsideration of their communities' school construction and equipment needs. In Williamstown, Mass., in Pittsfield, in Worcester, in Quincy and in New Bedford the needs of a rapidly expanding school population require urgent attention. In Lunenberg and in Leominster, in Lincoln, in Stoughton and in Orleans, indeed, in almost every one of our thriving communities, no matter what their size or location, this need for attention to our schools is acute. And it is a need not only for attention but for action. I urge that action now, Mr. President, with all the sincerity and vigor I possess, both in the interests of our boys and girls themselves and in the interest of the Nation's adequate defense, now and in the years ahead.

There seem to be some persons these days who do not relate this school-construction need to the defense of our Nation. I cannot share that point of view. I do not recall just where it originated but it was certainly a wise man who said that "Education makes a people easy to lead, but difficult to drive; easy to govern but impossible to enslave" Surely those words have special significance today as the free world stands challenged as never before. If we are to defend this Nation successfully in the months and years ahead, from the attacks of aggressors from without and from subversive operations within, if our boys and girls are to be able to know the truth and to live and act in accordance with that knowledge, then we are obliged to see that their educational needs are met. We are duty bound to provide them with adequate school buildings and proper equipment We have no choice whatever, moral or otherwise, but to put America's accent on youth and upon youth's future ability to remain strong and to remain free. The defense of freedom and of this great Nation is not to be achieved overnight. It is not to be achieved by partial means. If we are to achieve that "enduring posture of strength" of which General Marshall spoke so truly we must make certain that schools as well as ships, that books as well as bazookas, that desks as well as destroyers receive the priorities they deserve. Then, in a new and true sense of the word, we will achieve a real and a lasting "defense in depth" as we fight this battle for freedom.

I urge, therefore, Mr. President, that Senate Joint Resolution 225, which is before the Senate, be approved and implemented at once and that those in administrative authority be requested immediately to revise their allocations and systems of allotments of metals to meet the needs of our schools in Massachusetts and throughout the Nation. We will never be forgiven nor will we forgive ourselves if we do not act wisely in this matter now.

Mr. FLANDERS subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to say very briefly that I heartily support the joint resolution to provide steel for the construction of school buildings, to which the senior

Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has addressed himself. Situations exist in my State which are very similar to those described as existing in the State of Massachusetts.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Benton	Hickenlooper	McMahon
Bricker	Hill	Millikin
Bridges	Hoey	Monroney
Butler, Md	Holland	Moody
Butler, Nebr	Humphrey	Murray
Byrd	Hunt	Neely
Carlson	Ives	O'Conor
Case	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Tex	Pastore
Cordon	Johnston, S C	Robertson
Dirksen	Kefauver	Russell
Duff	Kerr	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Eastland	Knowland	Smathers
Ecton	Langer	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Lehman	Smith, N J
Ferguson	Magnuson	Smith, N C
Flanders	Malone	Sparkman
Frear	Martin	Stennis
Fulbright	Maybank	Thye
George	McCarran	Underwood
Green	McCarthy	Watkins
Hayden	McClellan	Williams
Hendrickson	McFarland	Young
Hennings	McKellar	

Mr JOHNSON of Texas I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr CLEMENTS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr GILLETTE], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] are absent by leave of the Senate

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business

Mr SALTONSTALL I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr LODGE], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr MUNDT] are absent by leave of the Senate

The Senator from Maine [Mr BREWSTER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from California [Mr NIXON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr TOBEY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). A quorum is present.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5684) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, which already has been stated.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I am sure I am correct when I say that many Senators were very much disappointed that the Appropriations Committee saw fit to report the bill with an amendment calling for a 5-percent cut in the appropriations contained in the pending bill

The Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee spent many weeks considering the mutual security program for Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East A subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr GREEN], traveled through Europe and the Balkans, went to Spain, London, and Paris, talked with all our officials in the various places they visited, held hearings in the cities, conferred at great length with General Eisenhower and his staffs, and then returned home and made a report Following the report, we heard from the executive branches of the Government which were concerned with the problem, and we took hundreds of pages of testimony I think all this testimony, combined with the observations of the members of the committee, point up the fact that this program was a most carefully considered one and that it was designed not by men who were careless of the budgetary situation in this country, but by men who had the security of the United States close to their hearts The program which was designed and presented to us was not based upon what these men believed was needed in Europe, but unfortunately it had to be based upon their best estimates of what our economy could produce while still taking care of our own defense requirements

General Eisenhower impressed this upon us, as did the Secretary of State, the ECA officials, and the Secretary of Defense. Our observations in Europe convinced us of the desirability and necessity of proceeding with the business of building our defenses in combination with our allies as rapidly and as efficiently as we could

The committee then considered the authorization bill We deliberated on it, we argued about it, and reported it to the Senate In committee it was cut about $1,000,000,000 It was debated in the Senate in as vigorous a debate as the Senate has heard at this session, and I thought we had arrived at an amount to which we would adhere and upon which we would agree The authorization bill was signed, and then the appropriation bill went to the House of Representatives. The House Appropriations Committee did what I anticipated it would do—it, too, approved the amount of the authorization, and the bill was passed by the House. It then came to the Senate Appropriations Committee. There, by a vote of 10 to 9, the committee cut it by a flat 5 percent. The committee proposes to save—and I use the word "save" advisedly—approximately $200,000,000.

Mr. President, in view of the action of the Senate on the authorization bill I think there is something arrogant about the attitude of the Appropriations Committee, not only arrogant, but foolhardy, considering the situation which confronts the world today. A very great man once said, and very recently, that the world will go to those who are not tired. I fear that we in this body are a little tired. We want to go home, and understandably so The Senator from Connecticut himself wants to go home I have had practically 2 years, including a campaign of unremitting work, without respite, and I am ready for a rest But I want to say that there are those who are not resting; there are those—and every Member of this body knows it—who are designing to take over the world Mr. President, they are not resting. They are not resting in Korea They are not resting in Egypt They are not resting in Iran They are not resting in Pakistan. They are not resting in eastern Germany. Every day they are giving fresh evidences of their determination to create all of the unrest and trouble in the world they can, looking toward the dissolution of the free world and the accomplishment of their aggressive designs

Mr President, I picked off the ticker in my office today, a dispatch which has just come from the Mediterranean, quoting General Eisenhower as follows:

> There is no use shutting your eyes to crises We have a weakening of the franc and the pound They are disturbing problems You cannot have strength without economic strength. * * * I think personally

Eisenhower added—

> the greatest change we see every month is the constant rise in what I call the morale of free peoples, the free nations. They are gaining confidence, looking problems squarely in the face, setting about finding ways to do things, and gaining every day in the belief that they can solve them.

Mr President, about 6 weeks ago the leader of the Republican Party in this body stated that he was in favor of giving General Eisenhower all the arms the general stated that he needed. I regret to say that when the roll was called on the Dirksen amendment he was found voting in favor of it; and I have heard no word raised by him or anyone else in behalf of keeping the pledge which was made to General Eisenhower by the leader of the opposition and by the minority, that they would support him and get for him the aid which was promised.

Mr. President, I should like to quote from remarks which were made by the Secretary of Defense, who has many warm admirers in this body, and rightfully so Speaking to the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Robert Lovett said:

> For more than 7 months General Eisenhower has been working on plans for organizing, equipping, and training a balanced force to resist attack. For more than 18 months we have had American military advisory groups living in each of these countries, in daily contact with their respective military establishments.
>
> It is from the combined work of these groups that there have been developed the detailed lists of equipment which can be

obtained only through our provision of military assistance. As General Eisenhower has reported, any substantial reduction in this program will directly and correspondingly reduce the supply of weapons and other necessary matériel which European soldiers, sailors, and airmen will stand ready to man. "I cannot," said he, "put it more forcibly than that."

Mr. President, he put it as forcibly as he could. The Senate put it as forcibly as it could by its vote on the authorization bill. But the Appropriations Committee, in its brief consideration, saw fit by a 10-to-9 vote to cut, not any specific item, but merely to cut the authorization 5 percent; and there were those who advocated a cut of 10 percent. That is their right, that is their privilege, that is their power in the Appropriations Committee; but, Mr. President, it seems to me they have not truly evaluated what we are trying to do by means of this program. We are partners in the business of survival. Aid to one is aid to all. This money represents the best military buy, dollar for dollar, that we can possibly make.

Mr. President, I should like to quote again from General Eisenhower. He said:

Remember that this conflict, spiritually, industrially, economically, and militarily is all tied together. Let us not try to separate the parts, because they relate to one another.

A basic aim is to give assurance to Western Europe, and that assurance we have given, in an amount a little less than that which the Senator from Connecticut would give, but we did give it. Now, as events move ever closer and become ever more alarming, as in the Middle East today, we are proposing to take another tack. News of what we propose to do will certainly be received with apprehension by the man we have delegated to pull the loose ends together, to lift up the morale and to unite the free world—General Eisenhower. He certainly cannot greet the news of what we propose to do with anything but apprehension.

Mr. President, I hope the House conferees will stand by the appropriations made by the House. I hope the Senate conferees will listen to the arguments that I am assured will be made by the House conferees, and if the committee amendment is adopted I am hopeful that the conference report will show that the amount provided by the House has been restored. I assure the Members of this body that if the report comes back to the Senate in any other form the Senator from Connecticut will have some more remarks to make.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I desire to state that I agree with what the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has said. I was one of those who fought the reduction in the authorization bill. I did so because I felt we were cutting down on the defense of the United States of America. It was developed in the hearings that a dollar spent in Europe for European defense meant a great deal more than a dollar spent in this country, because it bought more. We know that our first line of defense is in Europe.

There is no need of my repeating the argument which I made at that time, and which has been made by other Senators on the floor of the Senate. I certainly hope that the amount appropriated by the House will be restored by the conferees, because I know that those who will be the conferees on the part of the House, or some of them at least, and some of the members of the Appropriations Committee, feel very strongly in regard to the cut. They feel that it is going to hamper our defense effort.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

I conclude, Mr. President, by saying that among the ominous events which have taken place since the authorization bill was passed was the announcement by our own Government of the explosion of a second atomic weapon by the Soviets. Stalin finally decided that he would confirm the report of the Russian possession of the bomb. He could not do anything else, of course.

I realize that it is becoming sort of "old hat" to talk about the atomic bomb question. A famous man made a speech yesterday in which he said that anyone who talks about any American cities being laid waste—I am paraphrasing his statement; I heard only a snatch of it over the radio—is talking nonsense. I hope that is so; but I know, Mr. President, that when we exploded an atomic bomb on Frenchman's Flat, people in Los Angeles, 400 miles away, could read a newspaper by the light of the explosion. I do not care to go into the speech that was made yesterday. I reserve that for another occasion. But, Mr. President, coming events not only cast their shadows before, but, as in the case of Frenchman's Flat, cast their light before, a horrible, terrifying light.

We are in a struggle for civilization; we are in a struggle for existence, and it is not going to be saved by the "five percenters." I do not know what a cut of 5 percent would figure out for each taxpayer in this country in connection with this bill, but I would guarantee it would be a very small amount indeed.

So far as I am concerned, I shall do everything I can to support the pledged word of the United States which we gave when we signed the North Atlantic Treaty, that we are going to do our best to defend the free world. If it means higher taxes, so be it. If it means greater sacrifices, so be it. If it means telling unpalatable truths to the people of our country, so be it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to commend strongly the distinguished Senator from Connecticut because of the able speech which he is making and because of the position which he has taken. I did not entirely agree with the distinguished Senator when the authorization measure was pending, as he will probably recall. I did feel that some reductions from the amounts recommended should be made. But I wholly agree with his position now that the authorization made only a few weeks ago should be brought to fruition and completely realized by the appropriation action which we are now taking. It seems to me he is completely correct in his position that nothing whatever has happened since the date of that authorization to make the picture less compelling.

It likewise seems to me that he is completely correct in his position that there should be stability in the commitments of this Nation, and that when we have passed, after long debate, an authorization bill in such a vital matter as this, we should stick by it, and when we fail to do so we show lack of stability which I think will shake to some degree the confidence of others in us.

The next point, if I may be permitted to make it, is that we are now embarked on a completely different kind of program from the one under ECA which we have been considering yearly, having to do purely with the giving of economic aid. There we could make a departure from a unilateral authorization made prior to the appropriation without being left in the position in which we shall be left if we make a reduction now, because we are now in a mutual program of defense and of common preparedness for war, and it seems to me that we would be in the position of having broken faith with our friend and allies who, like ourselves, are in that mutual program, if we depart from the solemn authorization made but a few weeks ago.

I strongly commend the Senator from Connecticut for the position which he has taken.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Florida very much. I particularly appreciated how pungently he expressed the thought that nothing has happened since the authorization was adopted in the Senate to change the picture of the necessities for which we authorized the appropriation. In fact, if anything, the situation has become worse, and General Eisenhower indicated that today when he talked about the weakening of the pound and the franc. The second atomic explosion in Russia indicated it.

We must be strong, we must be determined, and we must be on our guard. I feel that the action which was taken by the Committee on Appropriations was taken without proper consideration, on the spur of the moment, forgetting the underlying problems we are trying to meet, and forgetting, please God, that we are trying to defend civilization itself.

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. GREEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself wholeheartedly with the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut and those of the Senator from Florida. It seems to me that the full appropriation is the best and greatest investment we possibly could make in the defense of our own country and in the security of the free world. There has been no new development of a nature to justify at this time a reduction in the appropriation. Quite to the contrary,

as General Eisenhower has pointed out, it is a fair assumption that the situation has deteriorated. Since the Senate first made the authorization, the situation in the Middle East, in Iran and in Egypt, has become extremely critical, and there are threats in other areas of the world. To me it would seem most unfortunate and most unwise for the Senate in any way to assume the responsibility of reducing the appropriation. I very much wish we could possibly increase the appropriations, but in my opinion it would certainly be folly at this time to reduce them in the slightest degree.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I should like to add a few words supplementary to what the Senator from Connecticut has said, and perhaps bring into sharper perspective one or two points which he has raised, but which I think could be emphasized.

In the first place, the Senator from Connecticut made allusion to a committee of the Senate which was sent abroad to investigate the justification of all the appropriations which were authorized in the first instance for what is properly called foreign aid, but which should be called, and which is technically, according to the language of the bill itself, mutual security It is unfortunate to have the popular name "foreign aid" applied, because many people say, "We have done enough for these foreign nations, let us consider the people at home," whereas we are really aiding those foreign countries to aid us.

For illustration, when on our trip, we had our conferences with General Eisenhower, we went in the first instance to see him in Paris, and there we were briefed for over a day so that we might ask intelligent questions at the other places where we visited, so that we might know about the problems he had to meet in the great undertaking which he is striving so strongly to bring to a successful conclusion.

On visiting various capitals in Europe and meeting our representatives there and representatives of the governments to which they were accredited, we heard all their reports about conditions with what General Eisenhower had told us in mind. Then we went back to Paris for a couple of days to report to the General what he had found, and compare our observations with his own.

We were tremendously encouraged by what we learned both from him and from the others, the heads of states, prime ministers, foreign ministers of the different countries. We found that the morale of the countries had been greatly raised by what had happened in the past 6 months, and by what the attitude of this country had been shown to be.

One of the great elements in increasing morale in the foreign countries and giving confidence in our aid, this mutual aid which we had promised, was our action in Korea. We can hardly blame millions of people in Europe, when they thought of our promise to come to their aid under the North Atlantic Pact or otherwise, from wondering whether we really would, when the time came to do so. But they looked across the land and water to Korea, and they saw that in that country, where our interest is far less than in their countries, we had, as a matter of principle, gone to the aid of the people there, and assumed the chief responsibility for putting the aiding principle into effect. That had a marvelous effect on the peoples of Europe, and they started in to do all they could.

One of the many illustrations which I might cite, which General Eisenhower gave us, was this: There are great armies ready to be called, under training to the extent they can be trained without arms and equipment. But they lack arms and equipment. The funds which we provide under the so-called economic aid, which is really military aid, enable them to provide their armies with equipment, with uniforms and other accessories, and with the munitions of war themselves. Otherwise, we would have to provide them.

In the first place, we are not in a position to provide them, and, as the majority leader stated a few minutes ago, it would cost much less to have the European countries provide them, and they must be provided in order when the first attack may come, that those people can join in the mutual defense which includes, of course, our own defense. It is mutual defense which we have to consider as a fundamental principle.

Mr. President, the committee of nine which was sent abroad by the Senate was a very good illustration of bipartisanship in foreign policy. They went abroad with many different ideas, as individuals, as to what they would find to justify the appropriations which had been asked. It was an extraordinary illustration of bipartisanship in view of the fact that the majority party was not represented by a majority on the committee. There were nine members of the committee, five Republicans and four Democrats, and we worked together without regard to any party division, and came back and submitted a unanimous report to the Senate. That report called for the aid for which General Eisenhower had asked for.

We should remember that the authorization asked for by the President was cut $1,000,000,000 when the authorization bill itself was enacted. If the appropriation is now to be cut another 5 percent, after having discussed the authorization bill at length on the floor of the Senate and in the committee, as well as in conference, we shall be going back on General Eisenhower. We shall be going back on the countries of Europe, which are themselves doing all they can. They are doing a great deal more than we had hoped they would do. Such a reduction as is now proposed will have a bad effect on the world at large, and on the great struggle which is behind everything we do these days—the struggle between the communistic countries and the free countries of the world.

I am very glad indeed that my colleague the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] has brought up this question today.

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield for that purpose?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask how long the Senator from California expects to speak?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Not more than 10 minutes. In view of the comments which have been made on the other side of the aisle regarding the action of the Committee on Appropriations on the pending bill, I wanted to make a brief statement relative to the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course that would be entirely satisfactory. I am not complaining about that. I merely wish to state to the Senator from California that if we are to get away this week we have very little time left in which to pass upon these bills. I hope that the bills may go to conference at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that I serve with him on the committee and I am as eager as he is to get the bills out of the way. Certainly there will be no attempt on my part to delay their disposition.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from California with all my heart.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak today. However, in the interest of clarity I feel that a few words should be spoken relative to the bill as it came from the Committee on Appropriations. As a matter of fact, I believe that the reduction made by the committee represents a very modest reduction in the program.

I do not subscribe to the theory that the Appropriations Committee is bound by the terms of an authorization bill. That has never been the policy of Congress, nor do I believe it should be the policy of Congress. The fact of the matter is that there have been literally hundreds of millions of dollars authorized for public works in this country, with no appropriations being made for them. Therefore it does not follow, because an authorization bill has been passed, that the exact amount of money authorized shall be provided by the Appropriations Committee. To the contrary, I believe that the Appropriations Committee would be derelict in its duty if it gave a blank check and did not discharge its obligation to scrutinize closely every appropriation bill that came to it from the House, whether it be for foreign aid, for our own military program, or for the various branches of the Government.

I do not believe that it is correct to say that there has been no change since the authorization legislation was passed. The fact is that the fiscal program of the

Federal Government is in a worse condition today, if that be possible, than it was at that time. When in the early part of the year the President of the United States presented his budget estimates calling for approximately $71,000,000,000, he proposed that there be raised some $10,000,000,000 in new taxes. Since that time the House of Representatives has acted on a revenue bill and has provided for roughly $7,000,000,000. The Senate has acted on a revenue bill providing for roughly $5,700,000,000. The difference was later adjusted in conference. A few days ago the House of Representatives rejected the conference report. I understand that we are about to have a new conference report acted upon this afternoon. At any rate, the new revenues which will come into the Federal Treasury will be considerably less than the amount estimated by the President of the United States in his budget message in January of this year.

The American people are bearing a very heavy burden. It is interesting to note that during the fiscal year which ended on June 30 last the revenues received by the Federal Treasury totaled $50,300,000,000. It is the highest tax take from the American people in the entire history of our Nation, either in war or in peace. In fact it is $4,500,000,000 greater than the high-water mark in Federal taxes during World War II. That high point came in fiscal year 1945. Therefore, actually for the fiscal year which ended on June 30 last, the Government received from the American taxpayers $4,500,000,000 more than it received during the high point of World War II.

I believe that the American people and the Congress, which is the responsible representative of the people, must take into consideration the fact that for 152 years, from the time George Washington first took the oath of office as President of the United States down through the second administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the total cost of the Federal Government for all of its activities, in wartime and peacetime alike, amounted to just a little under $180,000,000,000, and that for the 7 years of the Truman administration, the total cost of the Federal Government has amounted to $320,000,000,000.

I believe that the Committee on Appropriations would be derelict if it did not examine very carefully every one of the appropriation bills which comes before the Senate.

The statement has been made that we would be defaulting on our agreements with foreign nations if we did not appropriate the authorized amount. Such is not the case. The people of this Nation have been very generous over the past period of wartime and in the postwar period in the aid and assistance which they have given to foreign nations. We did it not merely to help them, but because we recognized that it was in our national interest, and in the interest of the entire free world to rehabilitate war-torn Europe.

No one should rise on the floor of the Senate and suggest that we are not doing our full share. I believe the RECORD will clearly contradict any such statement or inference.

I believe we have a right to examine our contributions to the mutual defense system. If we are to have a mutual system of defense, I believe we should underscore the words "mutual" and "collective." Let us examine the facts.

The United States is contributing 68.1 percent of its total budget to national defense. Let us see what the other countries are contributing.

I may say that I do not want to list the countries by name, because the information came to us under a security classification Personally, I believe that that is a very silly policy to pursue. When money is taken out of the pockets of the American people and contributed by the Government of the United States to mutual security, the people of the United States are entitled to know country by country what the other nations are contributing. However, under the general rule, which makes it possible to stamp a security classification on information, I do not feel at liberty as a member of the Committee on Appropriations to identify the countries by name. I do take the responsibility as a Senator of the United States to list a number of countries by alphabetical designation. What are the facts?

Country A is putting up 45 percent of its total budget for its defense, as compared with 68 1 percent which is being put up by the Government and the people of the United States. Country B is putting up 32.2 percent, or just one-half of what the people of the United States are being called on to put up. Country C is putting up 27.4 percent. Country D is putting up 26.2 percent, country E is putting up 22.7 percent, country F is putting up 22.4 percent, and country G is putting up 17.1 percent. I think the American people are entitled to that information.

There are some who say that is not a fair criterion, because our country is much richer than are the others, and that therefore we should consider the total national product, and on that basis should see how much the other countries are providing for defense purposes. Mr. President, let us examine the matter on that basis: The United States of America put up for defense during the prior fiscal year approximately 14.1 percent. Actually, for the current fiscal year the amount will be considerably more than that.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In the past fiscal year the amount was in excess of $19,000,000,000. This year the total will run closer to $45,000,000,000 than any other figure which could be used. That will be $45,000,000,000 of the money of the American taxpayers that will go into the defense program of the United States, plus what we are today discussing as an appropriation to be sent to the foreign countries.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. As a matter of fact, our defense estimates for future years indicate that the amount will rise considerably above that figure.

Mr. THYE. The figures which are constantly discussed as the possible appropriations in fiscal year 1952 range between sixty billion and sixty-five billion dollars. Those are the figures which are given to us by the various defense and administrative agencies.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. That is a tremendous sum of money—far more than the Senator or I can comprehend in any sense.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the amount will be even larger than that mentioned by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, compared with the prior year, in terms of the percentage of the gross national product devoted to defense, let me say that in the prior fiscal year, as I have said, the United States put up 14.1 percent. For the current fiscal year the amount will be considerably larger, perhaps reaching 20 percent. Country A is putting up, of its gross national income or product, 8.3 percent; country B is putting up 9.3 percent; country C is putting up 8.8 percent; country D is putting up 2.3 percent; country E is putting up 6.4 percent; country F is putting up 4.7 percent; country G is putting up 4.1 percent; country H is putting up 2.7 percent; and country I is putting up 5.7 percent.

On the total dollars provided, on the basis of our total budget and the proportionate amount we are contributing to the national defense, and on the basis of our gross national income, I say that the people and the Government of the United States not only are doing their share, but are doing far more than their share. I say this as one who has supported the North Atlantic Pact, the arms implementation legislation, and the appropriations under them. Based on these figures, I become a little tired when I hear, from time to time, suggestions that we are not doing our full share or that we are running out on anyone, either under this program or under any other program.

I have suggested that this program should be looked upon as one of collective security. Certainly it does no good to close the door to aggressive communism in Europe if the door to aggressive communism is to be left open in Asia. That has been one of the fallacies of the foreign policy we have followed heretofore. It was not until aggressive communism struck in Korea that some in the administration of this Government recognized that our back door had been left wide open by the policies they had followed. However, we did meet the challenge in Korea; the United States promptly moved into the situation, both under its own obligations, having set up the Republic of Korea, and as a member of the United Nations. Yet some who hold positions of high responsibility in this country would have the American people believe that the free world sprang to arms to aid us in meeting this challenge which took place in Asia.

Mr. President, what are the facts of that matter? The facts are that today,

16 or 17 months after aggression took place in Korea, the people of the United States have approximately 350,000 of their Armed Forces meeting the aggression in Korea; and all the other members of the United Nations combined that are furnishing aid in that area have contributed somewhat less than 35,000 of their armed forces in meeting the aggression in Korea. I have said before, and I say it again, that I do not believe those nations are carrying their fair share of the load. As a matter of fact, the situation is even more difficult than that, because of the 60 members of the United Nations, aside from the United States of America, only 16 of them have contributed any troops or any air force or any navy in the collective defense of the Republic of Korea; and to the nations which have contributed approximately 35,000 troops or armed forces, or 10 percent of what we have contributed, the United States and its taxpayers are supplying the logistical support of a vast majority of even that infinitesimally small number.

So let no one say that the American people are not carrying their full share of the responsibilities in trying to build a system of international law and order, so that the peace of the world can be preserved for ourselves and our children.

I do say, as a member of this body and as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate of the United States, that we have a broader responsibility, because although I think all of us have recognized the grave danger of the threat of international communism, which might strike us in a Pearl Harbor type of attack, yet we are also conscious of the fact that we can spend this Government into bankruptcy, and we can create vast inflationary factors which will wipe out the savings of the American people and will bring hardship to those on pensions and on fixed incomes; and one of the great inflationary factors in our economy today is Government spending. We have an obligation not only to look over our own military expenditures and our own domestic expenditures but also to weigh them and the cuts we are having to make in them with the aid we are giving to the foreign countries under the circumstances I have outlined here today.

Mr. President, that is why I say—and I say it advisedly—that, in my opinion, the Appropriations Committee has been most generous, and that the cut proposed by the committee is a very minor one under all the circumstances, because those of us who sit day after day in the Appropriations Committee know that in this country there are areas which are desperately in need of additional facilities of one kind or another. We know that today there are countless school districts in the United States that cannot get steel with which to build schoolhouses for the education of the children of the Nation. We have an over-all responsibility.

I believe that those on the other side of the aisle—and, Mr. President, this is not a partisan question—will recognize the fact that the reduction recommended by the committee is a most modest one; and I believe they should accept it and should permit the bill to go to conference in the form in which it has come from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the comments just made by the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. It is rather disconcerting for a Member of this body to stand here and listen to comments made by other Members to the effect that unless we go all out and give every dollar to the President which he requests for military and foreign aid, we are in fact turning our backs on General Eisenhower and the mutual-assistance pact in Europe. Mr. President, I do not think any charge can be successfully made that the American people or the Congress are not discharging their obligations to cooperate with the countries of Western Europe in efforts to resist communism. The record is clear that, since the end of hostilities in 1945 the United States Government has spent more than $37,000,000,000 for gifts, grants, loans, the Marshall plan, UNRRA, and every other conceivable program designed to assist those countries to rehabilitate themselves and to become better fortified to resist Communist aggression. I believe it is time for the Congress to determine how far we can go in dissipating the economic and manpower resources of our country in meeting these obligations. When it is said that we are turning our backs upon General Eisenhower, I say that is a false charge, and that the record shows actually that the only charge of that kind which can be made, is that Congress has in fact turned its back upon the American people and the American taxpayers.

Of course, we have entered into a mutual-assistance pact, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I think we do owe something to the countries of Western Europe which are willing to cooperate with us in the defense of the European Continent; but I again point to the record, which shows that while the United States has funneled out these billions of dollars, while it has been sending thousands and thousands of young men in uniform to serve in Western Europe, never is there any criticism, or infrequently at least, in this body, that possibly we are rendering a disservice to the defense of free nations when we do not insist upon full participation and cooperation on the part of our allies in Western Europe. They want to do something to help. I think they would be in a stronger position, financially, economically, and from a military standpoint, today, had we not had an inept maladministration of these various aid programs during the past several years.

Mr. President, late yesterday the majority leader, referring to this appropriation bill, said:

> Some of us felt that when the authorization was cut that that should have ended the matter.

Mr. President, apparently the majority leader is not acquainted with the facts, and I should like to refresh the memory of Senators on that point. It will be recalled that when the authorization bill was before this body, approximately $250,000,000 was cut from the authorization. The bill was sent to a conference with the House. What happened there? Most of the $250,000,000 was restored, thus defying the mandate of the Senate insofar as authorization is concerned for military and economic spending. When any Senator stands in this Chamber to say that when a cut was made in the authorization bill we had done our full part and that no further reduction should be made by the Appropriations Committee, I call attention to these figures, namely, that the authorization bill as passed by the House provided $7,498,750,000; the Senate bill had authorized an appropriation of $7,286,250,000; but when the conference report came back it provided $7,483,400,000—not a cut of $250,000,000, but a reduction of only $15,000,000. So that is a very sizable cut. In fact, they probably did more than should have been done—that is, more than should have been done from the viewpoint of certain of the Members of this body who think we ought to pour out these dollars without any restraint or restriction.

Mr. President, this gigantic cut of $15,000,000 which was made in the authorization bill is a cut of precisely one-fifth of 1 percent. Why, Mr. President, that is a magnificent reduction—one-fifth of 1 percent. That is what the conference committee did in handling the foreign aid authorization bill. And so when the Appropriations Committee reports this appropriation bill and recommends a five-percent cut, I think it is entitled to the support of this body, because it is in keeping with the spirit of the authorization bill which was passed by the Congress.

Mr. President, my mind goes back momentarily to an incident which occurred in June 1948, when the Marshall plan had been approved, that is, the authorizaton for it. It authorized $5,300,000,000 for the first year. I was then a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and I recall the discussions we had at that time. Those discussions took about the same turn as the debate we have today to the effect, "You cannot cut a single dollar without breaking faith with our allies," breaking faith with our allies, who were to be the recipients of those billions of dollars.

Mr. President, at that time the Senate Appropriations Committee made a reduction of about $250,000,000 in that appropriation bill. Some of the members said, "Oh, they will be coming back for a deficiency or a supplemental appropriation." But I think the record will show that $250,000,000 was saved at that time because the Senate Appropriations Committee of that "terrible" Republican Eightieth Congress had the courage to save $250,000,000. I pay tribute to the present courageous Appropriations Committee, of which I do not happen to be a member, which reported this bill, keeping in mind that while we are committed to certain obligations and do not intend in any way to have this action construed as turning our backs upon General Eisenhower or our allies, we are yet trying so to regulate these spending programs in consonance with our revenue

collections that we shall not incur a deficit of $10,000,000,000 or $15,000,000,000 during this fiscal year.

I have just consulted the ticker tape outside, and for the first 3½ months of this fiscal year, from July 1 to October 16, we have a deficit of $4,123,000,000.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Can the Senator from Idaho inform us whether, during each of the years since the Marshall plan went into effect, there has been at the end of the year a deficit after the appropriations were made?

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator means a deficit in the amount which had been appropriated for that program, does he not?

Mr. WATKINS. I mean in the expenditures. Did the ECA ever run short, notwithstanding some of the cuts we made in the carrying out of that program?

Mr. DWORSHAK. No; I am sure the record will show that there has invariably been a sizable surplus carried over from year to year, and that even with the liberal, almost unrestrained spending policies of ECA, it has been impossible for that administration to expend all the dollars which have been appropriated annually under the Marshall plan.

Mr. WATKINS. I have not seen the figures, but I have been told, and I thought I was reliably informed, that during all that period of time there had been a rather large surplus at the end of each year, even though it was said at the time that we were cutting them short and were not giving them sufficient money.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Utah is correct.

Mr. President, almost daily the newspapers carry dispatches showing how the expenditures of American taxpayers are being used in Europe. As the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] has pointed out, there has been no deficiency in the funds which have been appropriated year after year. Congress and the American people, in fact, have done more than they should be expected to do.

In this connection, Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to a clipping from a local newspaper, dated Dublin, October 15, just a couple of days ago. I have no criticism of the Irish people in any way. I merely cite it as being typical of the situation which we will probably find in every one of the countries in Western Europe. I should like to read this dispatch at this time:

IRISH GETTING SHOCK AS UNITED STATES CUTS OFF GIFTS

DUBLIN, October 15.—The Irish Government has been living high at the expense of American taxpayers and is certain to get a severe jolt when the last of the American hand-out funds are used by the end of the year, Sean Leamass, Minister for Industry and Commerce, said here today.

The minister, who has a reputation for facing nasty facts, said that the Irish Nation has since the war been spending far more than it earned. This was only possible, Leamass said, because the former government of John Costello, ousted in the June elections, had made up the deficit by drawing on a $120,000,000 loan made to Ireland under the Marshall aid program.

Funds realized by the Irish Government through the American loan were supposed to be spent over a period of many years to develop farmland, coal fields, electrical power, and other natural wealth, Leamass said. Instead, he said, the money has been used for day-to-day living.

'The spending spree is now over and by the end of the year, when the last loan dollar will be spent, the Government will find it cannot raise enough money from taxes or public loans to make ends meet," Leamass said.

As a result, he said, the Irish must now work much harder and export far more or prepare to face a considerable drop in the standard of living. Alternatively, he said, the nation must slash its imports and learn to become more self-supporting.

Mr. President, that article is typical of some of the developments in the nations of Western Europe. I pointed out a few minutes ago that I think we have rendered a distinct disservice to our allies when we have not insisted more vigorously in the past that they should assume greater responsibility and display greater resourcefulness and industry in keeping their part of the agreement, first, to effect rehabilitation and recovery in those countries, and then, subsequently, to make a worth-while contribution to NATO in Western Europe.

Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate much longer, but I should like to refer to a few statements which were made in February of 1948 when the Marshall plan program was before this body. In the closing days of this session I do not desire to take much time, but I want to quote two or three brief statements from the report on the so-called recovery program, the Marshall plan, which was submitted to the Senate in February 1948

On page 1, under the heading "Main purpose of the bill," I read as follows from the report:

The program—

That is, the Marshall plan—

is designed to help European nations to help themselves to recovery in such a way as to become independent of outside assistance.

We are near the end of the 4 years of the Marshall plan If that plan had achieved the objectives outlined in this report and which were sold to the Senate 4 years ago, it would not be necessary to continue foreign aid nor to appropriate additional billions of dollars for military security in Western Europe. That is very evident from the situation which obtains in Europe today. If the program had been successful, there would be a greater degree of self-reliance and resourcefulness on the part of those nations.

On page 46 of the same Senate report I should like to read the following under the heading "The purpose is recovery; not relief":

This bill provides for United States assistance in a recovery program geared to the individual and collective needs of the participating countries. It is, therefore, a recovery bill and differs from the interim aid and earlier relief measures in that its primary concern is the re-creation of a strong, productive, self-supporting Western European economy. Obviously, some relief-type goods must be provided within the framework of the program, but all assistance, no matter what its form may be, will be devoted solely to European recovery.

One more quotation from that same report, Mr. President, reads as follows:

This assistance is not, and cannot be, a permanent feature of American foreign policy.

During the debate 4 years ago the distinguished Senator who now serves as the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. CONNALLY] made the following statement, which will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 2, page 2694:

I wish to say as a member of the committee, that one of the purposes of the bill is to render temporary aid, to relieve suffering, to banish fear, to relieve them of anxiety about communistic infiltration and encroachment. The other purpose is to make it possible for the nations to regain their independence, economic as well as political, to recapture their fortunes, and to stand upon their own feet.

Mr. President, during the past few days I have read much of the debate which occurred when the Marshall plan authorization was before this body 4 years ago. We were told then that if we would provide a few billion dollars, the countries in Europe which were dedicated to the preservation of peace, liberty, and freedom in this world would be able to stand upon their own feet. That is the objective we then sought. It is the objective we all want to attain at this time. But there have been many tragic errors committeed in the administration of these various programs, all of which have rolled out American dollars without achieving commensurate cooperation on the part of the nations of Western Europe.

I stress the fact that I disagree vigorously with anyone who says that unless we continue to provide every dollar for economic and military purposes that the President demands, we shall be turning our backs upon General Eisenhower or the nations in Western Europe. I think this body should support the Appropriations Committee in the very small reduction of 5 percent which has been made in the appropriation which was authorized for this particular program. The Congress will be back in session in January. It seems utterly untenable for anyone to contend that unless we appropriate without restraint $7,500,000,000 we shall foreclose the right of Congress to come back within 3 or 4 months and reexamine the entire program, and in the light of existing circumstances the American people and our Government can go on shouldering most of the responsibility in building up resistance to Communist aggression.

Mr. President, I have mentioned these facts briefly because I think we have heard far too much upon the floor of this body to the effect that the American people have not measured up to expectations and have not kept faith with our allies in Europe and elsewhere throughout the globe. The record is clear, Mr. President, and I think it is time for Congress to consider the interests of the American taxpayers, and the

interests of the young Americans who will be called upon to serve in uniform not only in Korea but elsewhere throughout the globe. Yes, Mr. President, while we are committed to the preservation of liberty and peace, likewise we have a justifiable right to insist that our allies measure up to their full responsibility in this mutual effort against Communist aggression.

NOMINATION OF DR. PHILIP C. JESSUP TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE SIXTH SESSION OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have just come from a meeting of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations at which we discussed the nominations of the American delegates to the Assembly of the United Nations. I desire to speak very briefly on the subject, and to read into the RECORD the statement I made to the subcommittee with regard to the nomination of Dr. Philip C. Jessup. I stated to the subcomittee:

This is the most difficult vote for me during my 7 years in the Senate. The nomination of Philip Jessup to be a delegate to the sixth regular session of the General Assembly of the United Nations has been confused by the charges of communism and disloyalty. I have known Philip Jessup for many years and I have absolute confidence in his integrity, ability, and loyalty to his country. I am convinced that he has not and never had any connection with the Communist Party.

However, the personal integrity of Philip Jessup is not the issue.

The real issue raised by Dr Jessup's nomination in light of past and recent events is the approval or disapproval of our over-all far-eastern policy. Dr. Jessup has been identified with those forces in and outside the administration which were responsible for the far-eastern policy which has led to the present crisis He was the editor of the China white paper. He was closely identified with the Institute of Pacific Relations, an organization some of whose employees have been suspected of Communist sympathies He participated in the unfortunate events that led to the summary dismissal of General MacArthur without a hearing He is the symbol of a group attitude toward Asia which seems to have been proven completely unsound. This is not a case of mere difference of opinion This is an issue that may well involve the future of Asia and of the world.

It is vital that the people of the United States have confidence in their representatives to the United Nations Assembly. Issues of critical importance affecting Asia will soon be before that body. Dr. Jessup has not got the confidence of our people. He is a controversial figure. His confirmation, I fear, would divide the country at a time when above all else we need unity.

This issue is not a personal one. We must meet it objectively and courageously.

I have come to the reluctant conclusion that I must oppose Dr. Jessup's confirmation.

Mr. President, I make that statement with real regret.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator from New Jersey believe that this nomination should be brought to the floor of the Senate so that the entire Senate might vote on it, and decide the issue? If it is not done in that way, it will then be possible for the President to make an interim appointment of Dr. Jessup to this very important post as a representative of the United States to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The vote in the subcommittee was three to two against Dr. Jessup, and the subcommittee referred the decision it reached to the full committee, with the urgent recommendation that the full committee meet as soon as possible and report the nomination to the Senate.

I may say, incidentally, that all the other delegates to the United Nations Assembly were approved by the subcommittee, and the whole slate of delegates will now be before the full committee. I hope it will meet immediately, and I agree with the Senator from Michigan that, in light of the present controversy, the Senate should certainly have an opportunity to express itself on this important nomination.

Again I emphasize that this is not a personal matter. There is the question of great principle involved. I emphasize again that I personally can clear Dr. Jessup of any charges of disloyalty or any charges of Communist affiliation.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator raises the question of the judgment of Dr. Jessup.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. And his identification with policies I felt he was one of the leaders in shaping our policies in the Far East.

Mr President, I must take the position I have announced; otherwise it would seem that the results of my visit to the Far East and the position I took would be negated by sending Dr. Jessup to the Assembly as our representative. That is the only reason for my decision. Dr. Jessup has ability and integrity, but I do not believe he enjoys the confidence of the American people in connection with the issues which will probably come before the Assembly next month in Paris.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that hearings have been held before the Subcommittee on Internal Security, and that they showed Dr. Jessup's connection with the thinking behind the policy which was adopted as to the Far East?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is all a part of the case, and the hearings before that subcommittee have been very helpful to me. The chairman, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], has sent excerpts from the hearings to indicate the testimony that has been developed.

I wish to make it clear that I have no lack of confidence in Dr. Jessup's integrity or ability, but I do feel that a vote to confirm his nomination would be contrary to the best interests of the people of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey also feels, does he not, that it would be unfortunate if an interim appointment were made, without a vote in the Senate, after an adverse report in the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Of course, I agree with the Senator. There is wide public interest in the case. I am receiving hundreds of telegrams on both sides of the question, from all over the United States There are many who support Dr. Jessup. But I desired to make it clear what the issue in the subcommittee was. It was not a question of his being a bad security risk, but the question was as to his attitude of mind.

Mr BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr BRICKER. I just came onto the floor of the Senate, and have not heard all the discussion, but I have been in conference with the Member of the House of Representatives from my own district, Representative VORYS, who has been appointed as a member of the American delegation, and I know the seriousness of the situation if there should be a failure to confirm the delegates.

I wish to know what assurance there is that the Senate will be allowed to vote on the nominations of Dr. Jessup and the other delegates. I cannot conceive that they are going to the General Assembly without a vote of the Senate.

Mr SMITH of New Jersey. I share the Senator's view, and I may say for his information that our subcommittee voted, by a very close vote of 3 to 2, against Dr. Jessup, and with reluctance I felt compelled to vote against him.

Mr. BRICKER And the subcommittee voted favorably on the other delegates?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We voted favorably on the others, and reported them to the full committee. I hope the full committee may vote promptly and report the nominations, so that the Senate will have a chance to vote on them.

Mr. BRICKER. In my opinion that is the only course to take that will be fair to the American people and to the Senate. I hope that the Senate may have a chance to vote on all the nominations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio and his colleague, Mr. VORYS, in the House, who is one of the delegates. Naturally he is anxious that the Senate pass on his nomination. He does not want an interim appointment.

Mr BRICKER. If the Senator will further yield, I am quite confident that he would not accept an appointment of an interim character, without the confirmation of the Senate. He would not go to the General Assembly without the full legal authority which he ought to have.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I cannot tell about that, but I believe that all the delegates would want us to act as promptly as possible, now that the subcommittee has finished its hearings and has made a report to the full committee.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to express my commendation of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and to compliment him on his analysis of the case of Dr. Jessup from his standpoint. I must say that, having

been a participant in the hearings before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, I cannot follow the reasoning of the able Senator from New Jersey. I can see how difficult it is for the Senator to come to the conclusion at which he has arrived. I compliment him highly for his patriotic and positive position. The nomination of Dr. Jessup should be brought before the Senate for a decisive vote, negative to his appointment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak on this subject at this time. However, in view of the statements made by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, and similar statements by other Senators, to the effect that they did not believe that Ambassador Jessup was qualified to be a member of our delegation, representing the United States in the Assembly of the United Nations, and in view of the further fact that I do not know whether or not we shall have an opportunity to vote on this nomination, I wish to take this opportunity to state again my opinion of this great American. I am willing to stand up and be counted. I have followed the public hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee as closely as possible and I am convinced that Ambassador Jessup is qualified by character, by experience, by training, by high morality, and by loyalty, to represent the United States in the General Assembly, which will meet in Paris within the next few weeks. If the nomination is brought before the Senate I shall certainly wholeheartedly support it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Did the Senator from New York hear my full statement?

Mr. LEHMAN. I did.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I made it clear that the issue was not as to his qualifications. The issue involved in the confirmation was the entire issue of our policy.

Mr. LEHMAN. I heard the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I made it clear that I have known Dr. Jessup for years and that I have no question of his integrity, sincerity, or loyalty to his country.

Mr. LEHMAN. I heard the Senator's statement, and I respect his point of view. However, I feel that the only charges affecting the qualifications of Ambassador Jessup to represent this country in Paris come from certain Senators and from a former Governor of the great State of Minnesota, Governor Stassen. I repeat that I have followed the hearings carefully. I believe that Ambassador Jessup disproved completely the charges made against him. I consider him fully qualified to represent the United States.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will yield for a moment, I will say in answer to him that my judgment was based upon my own experience, my own contacts in the Far East, and my own talks with Mr. Jessup. My conclusion is based on my own experience.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 57. An act for the relief of Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin;

S. 118. An act for the relief of Nouhad Ann Khoury;

S. 519. An act for the relief of Moy Chin Shee;

S. 575. An act for the relief of Robert Jose Toribio;

S 582. An act for the relief of Emma Burr;

S. 635. An act for the relief of Hans Lenk;

S. 775. An act for the relief of Dr. Anthony M. Opisso,

S. 839. An act for the relief of Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roselleen Schut;

S. 954. An act for the relief of Dr. Charles Gordon Rennick Sell;

S. 1048. An act for the relief of Myrtle Harding;

S. 1274 An act for the relief of Vera Oumancoff;

S 1436. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller;

S. 1622. An act to amend section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946;

S. 1640. An act for the relief of Cathy Dana Besser;

S. 1912. An act to provide for conveyance of certain land to the city of New Orleans;

S. 1970 An act for the relief of Louis E. Gabel;

S 2007. An act for the relief of Sharon A. Gates; and

S. 2027. An act for the relief of Leo Kieve.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1236) for the relief of Rhoda Akiko Nishiyama.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3669) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CROSSER, Mr. BECKWORTH, and Mr. WOLVERTON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S 264. An act to provide for granting to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and the White House and United States Park Police forces, additional compensation for working on holidays;

S. 1335. An act to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail; and

S. 1967. An act to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5684) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

GIFT-LOANS FINANCED BY AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the bill under consideration appropriates $7,208,401,400, to be given to foreign nations in the form of gifts, loans, or otherwise, without any specific conditions attached to such gifts.

ATLANTIC PACT DEFENDS COLONIAL POSSESSIONS

I invite attention to the statement made by the junior Senator from Nevada in March 1949, during the debate on the first extension of the Marshall plan, ECA. Under the heading "North Atlantic Pact," I stated:

I am coming back to the question in answer to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. All of the information on the real meaning of the North Atlantic Pact is that, in effect, we will be guaranteeing the protection and status quo of all the colonial possessions of the empire-minded nations of Europe. Further, we will have relinquished our right to go to war only when our peace and safety is threatened, and must go when the peace and safety of any of the European nations signatory to the pact is threatened.

On July 12, 1949, the junior Senator from Nevada said:

Mr. President, the North Atlantic Pact, simply and without question, guarantees the integrity of the colonial systems throughout Asia and Africa.

SECRETARY OF STATE DECLARES UNITED STATES IN ON EGYPT-ENGLAND CONTROVERSY

At this point I desire to call attention to a statement made by our Secretary of State on October 17, 1951. This is press release No. 944 of the Department of State. It reads as follows:

At his press conference today Secretary Acheson made the following statement:

"EGYPTIAN REJECTION OF MIDDLE EAST COMMAND PROPOSALS

"It is with genuine regret that the United States Government received notification on October 15 of the rejection by the Egyptian Government of the proposals presented to it on October 13 by the United States, France, Turkey, and the United Kingdom This Government has noted with surprise that the Egyptian Government rejected proposals of such importance without having given them the careful and considered deliberation which they merited. These proposals were formulated by the nations interested in the welfare and security of the Middle East after the most intensive and thorough consideration of the special problems of the area. The invitation to join with the other sovereign nations of the free world in a joint and cooperative effort to make the world safe from aggression was wholly consistent with the independence and sovereignty of Egypt.

"Vigilance in protecting the liberties we enjoy is the responsibility of every nation of the free world. The spirit of responsibility to others requires that no nation carelessly precipitate events which can have no constructive end but which by their nature create those elements of confusion and weakness which tempt aggression. It is the hope of the United States Government that Egypt will carefully reconsider the course of action on which it has embarked and will recognize that its own interest will be served by joining the other nations of the free world in assuring the defense of the Middle East against the common danger.

"The United States Government must reaffirm its belief that the action of the Egyptian Government with respect to the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936 and the agreements of 1899 regarding the Sudan is not

in accord with proper respect for international obligations. For its part, the United States Government considers the action of the Egyptian Government to be without validity.

"It is the sincere hope of the United States that great restraint will be shown in the present situation and that the obligation of all nations toward the preservation of world law and order will be respected."

VANDENBERG RESOLUTION—ATLANTIC PACT—ARMS—MFN

The Vandenberg resolution in 1948, which the junior Senator from Nevada debated with the then senior Senator from Michigan [Mr VANDENBERG], provided that we ask the President of the United States to make a pact with certain Atlantic European nations The junior Senator from Nevada stated then that we would be morally bound to accept the pact, and that it would be breaking a precedent of the Senate which had stood for more than 175 years; never before had we asked the President to make a treaty or pact without specifying what that treaty should contain Previous compacts, agreements, and treaties always came before the Senate and were considered in detail before they were approved or disapproved

The distinguished senior Senator from Michigan at that time stated that there was no obligation to accept the compact. Nevertheless it was a commitment; we did accept it almost immediately without any change whatever.

The junior Senator from Nevada also stated that it would mean furnishing arms to these countries almost immediately. That was denied. It was stated that there was no obligation, and that any proposition of furnishing arms would have to come before the Senate. I said at that time that it would mean that boys would be sent to Europe. That also was denied. The answer was that if the time should come for such action, it could mean only 5 or 6 divisions, perhaps 90,000 or 100,000 men.

The junior Senator from Nevada followed up by saying, on this same date, July 12, 1949:

COLONIAL SLAVERY—AN OUTMODED FEUDAL WORLD

We know that the feudal world of Europe, Asia, and Africa—made up of petty kings, strong-arm despots, and colonial landlords—can no longer survive the conditions imposed by a scientific world.

We know that the colonial landlords of England, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium can no longer keep their serfs deindustrialized in an industrial world and producing only raw materials to be shipped to the master nation in return for which they are forced to buy the necessary manufactured and processed articles to cover their backs and to secure the necessary tools and implements to eke out a bare existence

We know that some of these landlord nations have lived off the colonial areas of the Near East and the South Seas for more than 300 years.

We know all these things. Yet by our every action, through our national and international hybrid policies and programs, we seek to perpetuate these very European, Asiatic, and African feudal and nationalistic states, many of them living off the colonial countries and areas producing wool, meats, cotton, minerals, and many other products, including manufactured goods, with what amounts to slave or indentured labor in Africa, Asia, and the South Seas, which is intended to compete on even terms—through our "free trade" policies—with our own workingmen.

This type of a slave labor pool is only a step away from the Russian methods in their forced labor mining, manufacturing, and agricultural areas.

The North Atlantic Pact is simply another step down the road of guaranteeing the status quo in international affairs and holding in subjection the colonial peoples of these areas

AMERICAN SOLDIERS KEEP PEACE OF WORLD—PRESIDENT SAYS

Mr President, it will be remembered that the President of the United States recently reiterated what he has stated from time to time: we would find American soldiers wherever trouble broke out throughout the world.

Secretary Acheson has stated that Indochina is is in the same category as Korea. We take it for granted that that is the foreign policy of the administration, to hold the status quo throughout the world; wherever there was colonial slavery, then that is what it will continue to be We will join the empire-minded nations in holding the status quo

Mr. President, the Atlantic Pact followed the promotion of "free" trade and the removal of the metal base from our money. The latter was done so that the administration could print all the money it wanted to give to foreign nations. Incidentally, printing-press money has brought on the inflation about which the administration is now complaining.

FIVE-PART ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM

On July 12, 1949, on the Senate floor, I referred to what I called the "presently known five-part administration program"

The discussion on that date reads in part:

The long-range five-part program has been presented to the Congress and to the Senate by the President of the United States to correct the European problems, each as an emergency in its own right, however, taken together they include and interlock the national and international economy. The five-part program includes—

Mr. President, this was on July 12, 1949, more than 2 years ago. Continuing—

First. The North Atlantic Pact, which was not the first proposal made, but which is before us today. It would have the effect of:

A Guaranteeing the integrity of the colonial system of all Asia, Africa, and Europe, thus extending the political and economic control of France's Indochina, New Caledonia, French West Africa, and Morocco; England's Singapore and Malayan States, East Africa and the Sudan country, South Africa, North Ireland, and many other areas; the Netherlands, Indonesia, and Belgian Congo in Africa—

Mr. President, I know the Sudan country, which is included in the announcement of the Secretary of State. The junior Senator from Nevada visited the British Governor of the Sudan country in 1948 when they were planting peanuts there with our money. They were not doing very well with it, either, I may say. They lost most of it. The Sudan is a part of Egypt. Without going into the history of it—because I intend to use some material a little later in my address which will review the history of the Sudan—what the British were doing with our money was increasing the production of cotton and other agricultural products and taking the water out of the Nile.

Water is the lifeblood of Egypt. The country which controls the upper Nile and the Sudan and has the money—of course, Britain had enough money, with our appropriating money in amounts of $7,000,000,000, $8,000,000,000, and $9,000,000,000 each year for Europe—such country can endanger, I say, the very life of Egypt on the lower Nile.

I read further from the remarks I made in the Senate on July 12, 1949·

B Adding to the power and obligations of the Congress to later pass laws to discharge such obligations of the treaty, under the provisions of article I, section 8, of the Constitution which automatically become the law of the land upon the approval of such treaty by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate—and which takes no account of the absence of action of the House in incurring in such future obligations, including the implied immediate and automatic declaration of war or other suitable action

I quote the following from the Supreme Court

"The Supreme Court, in the case of *Geofroy v Riggs* (133 U. S 266), says

"'The treaty power, as expressed in the Constitution, is in terms unlimited except by those restraints which are found in that instrument against the action of the Government or its departments, and those arising from the nature of the Government itself and of that of the States It would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids or a change in the character of the Government or in that of one of the States, or a cession of any portion of the territory of the latter, without its consent * * * But with these exceptions, * * * there is no limit to the questions which can be adjusted touching any matter which is properly the subject of negotiation with a foreign country.'"

C. Abrogating the 173-year-old right of the United States Congress to alone decide when our ultimate security and safety is threatened, and provides that when the safety of any one of the signatories to the pact is threatened, we are automatically to consider our own safety in danger, regardless of the circumstances or of any independent judgment of our own.

Second Appropriations to make up the trade-balance deficits of the European nations each year in cash, currently labeled the ECA, under which our chief export is cash.

Remember, Mr. President, that this speech was delivered by me in the Senate on July 12, 1949. I continue to read from that speech:

Third The 3-year extension of the 1943 Trade Agreements Act under which the State Department has adopted a selective free-trade policy of lowering the tariffs and import fees below the differential between the cost of production in this country and that of our foreign competitors, on each particular product, on the theory that the more they divide our markets with the nations of the world, the less their annual trade-balance deficits will be

Fourth Approval by the Congress of the International Trade Organization, under

which 58 nations with 58 votes, each nation with 1 vote, we would have the same vote as Siam, would meet at least once each year, and would distribute among themselves the remaining production and markets of the world, eventually on a basis of population—we assign to this Organization all of our right to fix tariffs or import fees.

DISCREDITED SECRETARY OF STATE REMAKE INDUSTRIAL MAP OF UNITED STATES

Mr. President, at this point I pause in the reading to point out that this year, when the House and the Senate voted to extend for two more years the Reciprocal Trade Act, which would continue for two more years the right of a thoroughly discredited Secretary of State to remake the industrial map of the United States, we were told that the International Trade Organization would not again be brought before the Congress. However, those who told us that neglected to say that other acts which would be brought before the Congress would include provisions parallel with those of the International Trade Organization. Such provisions were made a part of the GATT, an international tariff and trade organization begun at Geneva, and completed at Torquay, England, this year. They have come in the back door, but the result is just the same.

The Customs Simplification Act recently passed by the House is a case in point.

I read further from the speech I made in the Senate on July 12, 1949:

Fifth. The bold new program heretofore outlined included under recommendation No 10 of the mid-year economic report of the President, just transmitted to Congress, the proposal to enact legislation to provide technical assistance to underdeveloped areas abroad and to encourage investment in such areas.

Under that program, Point 4, Mr. President, we appropriate the money and spend it in those countries, and then take more of the taxpayers' money to guarantee the integrity of the expenditure. That would be something for a Senator to try on his banker sometime if he would know just how ridiculous such an arrangement is.

SECRETARY OF STATE INTRUDES US INTO EGYPT

Mr. President, it is obvious that the Secretary of State has intruded us into the Egyptian affair without a thorough understanding of the possible consequences.

We have had a couple of these great ambassadors in Iran, but about all they have succeeded in doing is muddying the water through threats, and Iran is in a greater turmoil than ever before. About all that was ever the matter in Iran, as shown by the facts now becoming known, was that since about 1890 England has taken about all the profit from the production of oil there and left very little for Iran. Even as late as 1948, when I was in Iran and inspected the operations at Abadan, including the oil fields, the British were paying a royalty of only 17 cents a barrel, whereas across the line, in Arabia, our American companies were paying royalties of 40, 50, or 60 cents a barrel. In addition, Britain was operating under some kind of a treaty by which she was allowed to make foreign investments out of the income from the Iranian oil fields and to tax the income before anything was left for the Iranians.

About 250,000 or 300,000 of the Iranians profited somewhat in terms of their standard of living, but the other 17,000,000 Iranians were still living off of dried dates and goats' milk, just as the people of Iran have lived for 5,000 years. Apparently those who now live in Iran did not like that arrangement very much and did not like to see all that wealth leave their country.

AMERICAN SOLDIERS HOLD STATUS QUO OF THE WORLD—160,000 DEAD, MAIMED, LOST

Mr. President, we have had the amazing statement of our President and our Secretary of State to the effect that when there is any disturbance or when there are any outward evidences of dissatisfaction with the status quo at any place within the entire world, our boys will go there and will settle the matter.

In Korea we have the sad situation of several thousand of our boys being killed or wounded or lost each week, without any emphasis being placed by the administration on that loss. Actually, about 160,000 of our boys have been lost, maimed, wounded, or frozen, suffering from frozen feet or frozen arms, or otherwise incapacitated, since the war began in Korea—that police action which our boys are not allowed to win and which they dare not lose.

NO FOOT SOLDIERS OUTSIDE AMERICA

In the first place, we never should have a foot soldier outside the United States of America. We should, instead, build up our Air Corps and our submarine force to the point where we could, for our own security and welfare, blockade or make untenable any area. We should put the matter on that basis.

NO PERMANENT FRIENDSHIPS OR ENMITIES

Mr. President, the policies of England and other nations are based upon the principle expressed by one of Britain's great Prime Ministers in 1858. Lord Palmerston in 1858 said:

We have no permanent friendships or enmities; we have but permanent interests.

Mr. Churchill voiced that again in 1945, when Mr. Roosevelt said to him that he thought Britain should abandon Hong Kong and thus save trouble in that area. Churchill expressed the same thought in these words:

I did not become the King's First Minister to liquidate the British Empire.

This virtually said that if the United States does not want to support the colonial slavery system, the United States is no longer a friend of Britain's.

WHEN THEY ARE IN WAR—WE ARE IN WAR

Mr. President, we find ourselves tied up in a treaty which says that we must go to the aid of Britain or any of the other North Atlantic Pact nations; in other words, we are at war when they are at war. In 1949, during the debate on the North Atlantic Pact, I said that they will get into a war by fighting to retain their colonial possessions.

Mr. President, colonialism is outdated. With our maximum power, we could not sustain the colonial system, even if we should want to do so.

At this time I wish to call attention to a dispatch appearing in the New York Journal American on yesterday, October 17, 1951, by Karl H. Von Wiegand. The article is headlined as follows:

KARL H VON WIEGAND CABLES BRITISH UNABLE TO HOLD SUEZ WITHOUT UNITED STATES

(By Karl H. Von Wiegand, dean of American foreign correspondents)

In part, the article reads:

Britain cannot hold her position on Egyptian territory in the Suez Canal zone without the active support of America.

Mr. President, I have just read the statement by the Secretary of State. Apparently England has the active support of the United States of America. Let us see how this capable correspondent feels about what the effect is going to be. I continue:

If the United States supports Britain with the utmost diplomatic pressure and threats of military reinforcements or naval movements in the eastern Mediterranean, it will make the Arab States in the Near and Middle East and in parts of North Africa bitterly hostile to America in the event of war with Soviet Russia.

That in a few words is the situation that has swiftly followed Britain's loss of Persian oil and British evacuation of Persia.

If Britain carries Egypt's abrogation of the treaty of 1936 into the UN Security Council, the Egyptians are confident that Soviet Russia will veto any sanctions or military action that may be proposed.

It is the belief in Alexandria and Cairo that the American people have had enough of President Truman's and Secretary of State Acheson's military adventuring in Asia in the now 15-month-old Korean "police action" which has cost $5,000,000,000 and 170,000 casualties from all causes, and that they will oppose any further military interventions and dispersement of United States troops.

Mr. President, I again call attention to the fact that the number of casualties in Korea from all causes is not 87,000, as bandied about the Senate, but 160,000. I continue:

The impression also prevails that the Pentagon in Washington would not look upon any new commitments with favor.

AUDACIOUS MOVE

The action of Premier Mustapha El-Nahas Pasha, whom I have known for 25 years, and Foreign Minister Mohamed Salah El-Dine Pasha was a bold and audacious move at a time when Britain is experiencing one of her weakest periods of recent years.

It is an intense nationalist move and Nahas Pasha has all Egypt solidly behind him.

The demolition of a British barracks on the banks of the Nile in Cairo, where two Egyptian cabinet ministers with picks removed the first stones and bricks, is eloquent of public sentiment against the British and very symbolic of the situation.

The British are embittered and bellicose over Nahas Pasha's treacherous and illegal blow, as they call his surprise move.

Their dictum is, "the British will stay in the canal zone."

The Egyptians say, "the British will and must go."

The British troops in the canal zone, which is their Middle East base, cannot remain unless diplomatically and otherwise backed up by the United States.

EMPIRE-MINDED NATIONS CANNOT HOLD THEIR SLAVES

Mr. President, digressing at that point, it is obvious that none of the empire-minded nations can hold their colonial slavery nations unless backed up by the United States of America.

It is exactly as it was in Geneva when United States representatives were showing some signs of reason, saying they might withdraw on some occasion. The representatives of other nations who were present replied, "If you withdraw, there is no meeting." Of course, Mr. President, that is true.

If we withdraw there is no fight. If we withdraw from a trade agreement, there is no trade agreement. That is so because we today have the only markets in the world where it is possible to sell 10 cents' worth of merchandise and get the money. If we withdraw, there is nothing to be divided It is like having a "sucker" in a poker game When a "sucker" who has money comes in, four or five of the hangers-on get hold of him; if he should quit, there is no poker game

Continuing Mr. Von Wiegand's article:

The British troops in the canal zone, which is their Middle East base, cannot remain unless diplomatically and otherwise backed up by the United States.

Nor can the Egyptians eject the 15,000 or more British troops in the zone. They threaten to cut off all supplies.

Mr. President, there are 40,000 British troops in the Suez Canal zone. That is the latest report. Ten thousand is the limit under the treaty, but the British themselves have violated the treaty. I continue:

A suggestion that defense of the canal zone be taken over by the Americans, French, Turks, and British has received some attention but so far there is no enthusiasm for that plan

BRITISH-FOUR-NATION CONTROL

Mr President, we on the Senate floor, at least those of us who have been in Egypt and England and these other nations, must know that it was only a subterfuge to cover up the control by the British It was to continue the control, not over the Suez Canal, but over the Sudan country, the upper Sudan, which by all rightful conclusions would have to belong to Egypt. That is what that suggestion was for, and, of course, Mr President, it would be very nice if our people could ignore those things and merely say, "Let us just hold the world forever as it was in 1945" I say, Mr. President, even if it were a good idea, we cannot do it, because there are not enough of us; history will show that this has been tried before. I continue with the Wiegand article:

The British are hated and there is no warm feeling for the Turks because of their cold aloofness for years and the Turkish attitude in the past toward the Moslem region since the overthrow of the Caliphate by Ataturk.

COOL TOWARD UNITED STATES

There is far from cordiality to Americans in the canal zone because of American support of Israel.

The present crisis in Egypt and on the Suez Canal is the direct outcome of Britain's defeat in Persia, and that grew out of America's United Nations war stalemate in Korea.

All three reveal to anyone who wants to see objectively and realistically what a failure the United Nations has been and is.

Utterly incompetent diplomacy has allowed the Near and Middle East to drift into becoming a dark, messy, oily political sea in which Soviet Russia and communism can fish with an invisible fishing pole, and with lines, hooks, and bait that cannot be seen.

With the unfinished Korean war on America's hands, it would be common sense and even wisdom if the White House, State Department, and Congress would go slow and consider most carefully the possible consequences before they engage in new and costly adventures in Egypt and the Middle East just to help out Britain.

It is too late to do much for the British. They have made too many blunders.

PREDICTIONS CAME TRUE

Mr President, I have taken the floor today to put before the Senate some of the factual information which has come to light, supporting predictions made by the junior Senator from Nevada 3 years ago.

Mr. President, in that same speech of July 12, 1949, the junior Senator from Nevada said, further:

The operation of the North Atlantic Pact in relation to protecting the integrity of the colonial areas throughout Asia, Africa, and all of Europe, was correctly expressed by Sean MacBride, Prime Minister of Ireland, when he said that they would like to cooperate, but as a nation they could not They are denied the first condition of action as a nation, namely, the possession and control of the soil of their national territory, of which six counties are kept by Britain and are claimed as part of the United Kingdom—the territorial integrity of which is, in effect, guaranteed by the Atlantic Treaty.

MAKING ENEMIES OUT OF NATURAL FRIENDS

Mr President, we are making enemies of the very people who want to be our natural friends by our guaranteeing the integrity of captured territory; in other words, the colonial areas of the world.

It is obvious to anyone who will stop and study the matter for a minute that in the Middle East and throughout the territory of Northern Africa what we are doing is alienating the Moslem world. If, on the other hand, we would say that we are not supporting colonialism and try to protect a sovereign nation such as Iran, which did nothing more than nationalize its oil, we would be making friends of all those people who are the best fighters in Asia and who are more than ready and willing to be on our side in any battle.

THE FOUR-NATION PROPOSAL

Mr President, I have before me the proposal which was made by four nations to take over England's job of policing the Suez Canal, which would hold the status quo in the Sudan. I ask unanimous consent to have the conditions appear in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the proposal was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSAL PRESENTED TO EGYPT

1. Egypt belongs to the free world and in consequence her defense and the Middle East in general is equally vital to other democratic nations.

2. The defense of Egypt and of other countries in the Middle East against aggression from without can only be secured by the cooperation of all interested powers.

3 The defense of Egypt can only be assured through the effective defense of the Middle East area and coordination of this defense with that of adjacent areas.

4 It therefore seems desirable to establish an Allied Middle East command in which the countries able and willing to contribute to the defense of the area should participate: France, Turkey, United Kingdom, and United States are prepared to participate with other interested countries in establishing such a command. Invitations to participate in such a command have been addressed to Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa who have indicated their interest in the defense of the area and who have agreed in principle

5 Egypt is invited to participate as a founder member of the Middle East command on a basis of equality and partnership with other founder members

6 If Egypt is prepared to cooperate fully in the Allied command organization in accordance with the provisions of the attached annex, His Majesty's Government for their part would be willing to agree to supercession of the 1936 treaty and would also be willing to agree to withdraw from Egypt such British forces as are not allocated to the Allied Middle East command by agreement with the Egyptian Government and the governments of other countries also participating as founder members

7. As regards armed forces to be placed at the disposal of the Allied Middle East command and the provision to that command of the necessary strategic defense facilities, such as military and air bases, communications, ports, etc., Egypt will be expected to make her contribution on the same footing as other participating powers

8 In keeping with the spirit of these arrangements, Egypt would be invited to accept a position of high authority and responsibility with the Allied Middle East command and to designate Egyptian officers for integration in the Allied Middle East command headquarters staff.

9. Facilities to train and equip her forces will be given to Egypt by those participating members of the Allied command in a position to do so

10 The detailed organization of the Allied ME defense organization and its exact relationship with NATO have yet to be worked out in consultation between all the powers concerned For this purpose it is proposed that all founding members of the Allied MEC should send military representatives to a meeting to be held in the near future with the object of preparing detailed proposals to the government concerned.

TECHNICAL ANNEX

1 In common with other participating powers who are making similar contributions to the defense of the area—

(a) Egypt will agree to furnish to the proposed Allied MECO such strategic defense and other facilities on her soil as are indispensable for the organization in peacetime of the defense of the Middle East.

(b) That she will undertake to grant forces of the Allied MEC all necessary facilities and assistance in the event of war, imminent menace of war or apprehended international emergency, including the use of Egyptian ports, airfields, and means of communications

2. We should also hope that Egypt would agree to the Allied Supreme Commander headquarters being located in her territory.

3. In keeping with the spirit of these arrangements it would be understood—

(a) That the present British base in Egypt would be formally handed over to the Egyptians on the understanding that it would simultaneously become an Allied base within

the Allied MEC with full Egyptian participation in the running of this base in peace and war.

(b) That the strength of the Allied force of participating nations to be stationed in Egypt in peacetime would be determined between the participating nations including Egypt from time to time as progress is made in building up the force of the Allied MEC.

4. It would also be understood that an air defense organization, including both the Egyptian and Allied forces would be set up under the command of an officer with joint responsibility to the Egyptian Government and to the Allied MEC for the protection of Egypt and Allied bases.

EGYPTIAN PREMIER STATEMENT

Mr MALONE Mr. President, I have before me a release dated October 10, 1951, regarding the Egyptian Premier's presentation to Parliament of draft bills as follows:

1. Abrogation of the 1936 treaty and 1899 convention with Britain.

2 Modification of the Egyptian Constitution to emphasize the unity of Egypt and the Sudan.

3. Draft constitution for the Sudan.

This release reads, in part, as follows:

Submission of these bills to Parliament at this time will have a good effect on Egypt and create a favorable atmosphere for the reception of the proposed plans for the joint defense of the Near East

It should be kept in mind, however, that the recent action of the Egyptian Government did not grow out of a desire on the part of Egypt to divorce the country from its friends. On the contrary Egypt will be happy to cooperate with other nations so long as such cooperation will help to guarantee a realization of Egyptian aspirations and place the country on an equal footing with other nations Once Egypt is assured that national aspirations will be met, the full strength of the country will be put forth and Egyptians will assume their full responsibilities.

We have passed that point, Mr. President The junior Senator from Nevada stated in 1948 and in 1949 that we had reached the point of decision. In San Francisco, in 1945, when I was acting as special consultant to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs—I was not a Member of the Senate at that time, but was an observer at the conference where the United Nations was formed—the Nation was led to believe that every country in the world would be free, and if it was too small to protect its sovereignty, then the United Nations would form a protectorate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator was an observer at the San Francisco conference, and he knows that the United States and Great Britain did not vote that way. As a matter of fact, they voted against the Premier of Australia when he made a motion to carry out the Atlantic Charter. Is not that correct?

Mr. MALONE. I think that is correct. The whole atmosphere of the United Nations was to help people to become independent, self-supporting, and not to be humiliated and under the slavery of other nations.

Mr. LANGER. That was the ostensible purpose, but it was not carried out, was it?

Mr. MALONE. It never has been carried out. It was simply a question of getting some kind of a pact to show the world that the United States of America had become the leader of the world, and all we had to do was to support the world.

Mr. LANGER. It is true, is it not, that when the Original Thirteen Colonies were organized into the United States they all came in on an equal footing?

Mr. MALONE. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Yet, under the United Nations Charter, the veto power was given to five nations

Mr. MALONE. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator suppose for a moment that if we had given the veto power over South Carolina to New York, South Carolina would have come into the Union?

Mr. MALONE. It never would have come in, of course

Mr. LANGER. That is what is wrong with the United Nations, is it not?

Mr. MALONE. I think that is probably one of the weaknesses of the United Nations. However, it has many other weaknesses.

Mr. LANGER. We cannot amend the Charter. Is not that true?

Mr. MALONE I think that is substantially true. I would say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that at that time I said in a written release at San Francisco, which was published by many of the western newspapers, that there were not five major nations, there were not four major nations, there were not three major nations; there were but two major nations, and that the whole thing would degenerate into a matter of spheres of influence of those two nations, Russia and the United States. That was denied heatedly by State Department officials, but that is what has happened.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that historians and others who have made a study of the Charter, when we finally analyze what they have said, have really admitted that in all probability it might lead to perpetual war, and that is what we have?

Mr. MALONE. That is exactly what we have. The President and the Secretary of State have said that we are going to keep every area in the world status quo, but everyone who will casually examine the facts will know that is impossible because of the colonial slavery conditions which have been maintained for several hundred years.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Nevada know of any reputable military man who for a moment believes that the United States can go all over the world and maintain security?

Mr. MALONE. I know of no military man, reputable or otherwise, and I know of no reputable man of my acquaintance, who thinks we can do what Acheson and the President are trying to do.

BILLIONS TO HOLD UP THE DEAD HAND OF COLONIAL SLAVERY

What I am trying to do is to lay this matter before the Senate so that while the Senate is appropriating $7,250,000,000, it may have the facts before it. There will be another $1,000,000,000 for the Export-Import Bank to lend at random anywhere in the world, making $8,500,000,000, and when we add the Point 4 money and the World Bank money, it will be eight or nine billion dollars.

AFRICA WILL REVOLT

Before the Senate approves this appropriation, it would be well to take a look at the record and see what we are approving: appropriating money to try to browbeat smaller nations throughout the world so that the empire-minded nations can hold their possessions and continue their colonial slavery. It is deader than Julius Caesar, and even Africa, within 5 or 6 years, will run them out of Africa.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Did the Senator read the insertion I placed in the RECORD from the New York Times of Sunday, showing that just a few days ago the United States agreed to support a school for 150 boys in Santo Domingo, we to furnish half the money? It will mean an appropriation year after year, when as a matter of fact there are delinquent boys in the United States who really have not enough to live on, and certainly there are not sufficient funds available to provide good teachers in some places, as the Senator from North Dakota knows only too well, and as I believe the Senator from Nevada knows. Yet we are asked to establish a school for 150 boys in Santo Domingo. Will the Senator agree with me that if we establish that school in Santo Domingo, not under United States jurisdiction at all, we ought to establish schools all over the world?

Mr. MALONE That is exactly what the State Department has in mind. In every nation in which the junior Senator from Nevada has been, the great Point 4 program, approved by the United States Senate, is used to guarantee our own investments, he found anywhere from half a dozen to 20 or 25 of these great hot-house-raised advisers from America.

They were there, hired by the State Department or some other department, to survey the health conditions, or survey the infant mortality conditions, or survey crop tests, or something else.

BORROW EXPERTS AND PAY THEM

I said to the presidents of the Central American countries, at one time or another during a conference, "Would it not be possible, if you needed these experts, simply to borrow them, as the State of Nevada does, for example, when it wants a road expert, and put them on your payroll?" "Of course," they would invariably answer, and I would then ask, "Why don't you do it?" The answer to that was, "Nobody ever asked us to."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from Nevada is familiar, is he not, with a remark made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], indicating

that at the very time when Kansas and Missouri asked for $300,000,000 in order to avoid the floods and loss of life which have affected those regions, we sent $300,000,000 to India to build dams in India

Mr. MALONE. The Senator is correct. I remember standing here and asking Senators on the other side of the aisle why it was necessary to give the nations so much. The answer was that the nations were short of dollars. Does the Senator remember the great hoax played on Americans, that the "dollar shortage" must be made up in cash?

The junior Senator from Nevada offered a little amendment, providing that when the other nations were short of dollars, we would take their money, rupees, for instance, and put them in the Treasury and then if they produced hemp and we needed it, or monasite sand, or 30 or 40 other items, we would allow any purchaser in the United States or the Government itself to go to the Treasury and take the rupees at the prevailing exchange rate, and buy the materials from India with their own money.

I am sure the distinguished Senator will remember that the Senate steamrolled over the junior Senator from Nevada. But they were not too enthusiastic as they started to think about it. There was no argument against handling the matter that way, with England or any other nation. We could take the pounds at the current rate of exchange and put them in a special fund, instead of appropriating the seven or eight billion dollars as we are today. Then when we want to buy wool from Australia, or want to buy gold or manganese or chromite from South Africa, from any of the countries in the sterling bloc, we could simply use the pounds at the current rate of exchange.

I still do not see anything wrong about that, unless we want to give them something for nothing, dividing the wealth of the United States of America on the old Marxist socialistic theory—from every man according to his ability, to every man according to his need. Carl Marx meant that impossible theory to apply only within a nation. We go him one better. We applied it internationally, between nations. Marx would roll over in his grave if he could see what is being done with his plan by the great Senate of the United States, the great exponents of private business and capitalism as against communism.

We give the nations of the world the choice of the capitalistic system or the communistic system I think the Senator will agree that that is a fair statement. Our capitalistic system is represented in half the world by a colonial slavery system. So the Russians come along and say, "We will relieve you of this yoke of colonial slavery."

The junior Senator from Nevada has been in all the colonial slavery countries; and if there is anything a Malayan or an Indochinese or anyone in Africa could think of worse than colonial slavery, I do not know what it is. They do not know the final consequence of communism, and they cannot imagine anything worse than colonial slavery.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Does the distinguished Senator from Nevada know of any mistake our administration could have made in foreign policy in any country which it did not make?

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada knows of none.

This dispatch proceeds further to say referring to the treaty of 1936:

The British have violated the treaty in a number of ways, two of which stand out in importance First, according to the treaty, 10,400 British troops are authorized to be stationed in the Suez Canal zone but this number has been exceeded The figure now is approximately 40,000 Secondly, the British have failed to carry out their pledge to train and strengthen the Egyptian Army and to supply it with modern equipment

It is axiomatic that no country can survive, particularly in such a troubled world as now exists, without devices with which to protect its national boundaries Egypt needs arms—not for aggression, but for national defense and the defense of the free world. Egypt feels helpless in a world that is armed to the teeth

Current opinions appearing in the American press which link the present Iranian dispute with Great Britain to the action taken by the Egyptian Government are unfounded. Needless to say that the Iranian question is of recent origin, while Egypt's case dates back to 1882, when British troops bombarded Alexandria and occupied the country by force, an occupation which has continued to the present and is causing the present indignation of the Egyptian people

The second Egyptian problem concerns the Sudan Here the conflict, which has gone on for many years, touches the average Egyptian personally inasmuch as he is related to the average Sudanese by race, language, religion, and traditions. Historically and geographically the Sudan and Egypt are one country united by the river Nile

The river is the lifeline of both Egypt and the Sudan and has been so since Pharaonic times

The treaty of 1899 with Great Britain—which was signed 17 years after the British occupation of Egypt—is a much discussed document This agreement was an informal arrangement signed by the Egyptian Foreign Minister and the British Consul General in Cairo No full powers were exhibited and the text was not subject to any ratification nor was it submitted ever for any legislative approval. Moreover, this agreement recognized the sovereignty of Egypt over the Sudan and established a system of joint administration. In practice, however, Egypt has never had anything to do with this administration which was and still is British.

Consistently and continuously, British policy has been directed toward the tightening of Britain's grip on the Sudan, the stifling of Egyption interests and the elimination of all Egyptian influence. In recent years, British propaganda has pictured the unity of the Nile Valley as a concept of Egyptian imperialism, as if it were imperialistic for Egyptians and Sudanese to seek to preserve the bonds which nature and history have forged. It is ironical that this should come from the British, who maintain in the Sudan an imposing number of colonial officials, backed by British garrisons, and who are intent on holding the territory indefinitely as a British dependency

To Egypt this unity is not a matter of colonization; it is a matter of reintegration and association Egypt wants the Sudan to have a liberal constitution, one that will be voted freely by the Sudanese in elections not controlled or dictated. We are certain that if the Sudanese are permitted to express their choice freely, they would elect unity with their northern brothers.

I shall not read in detail the address delivered by the Egyptian Prime Minister, H. E. Mustafa El Nahas Pasha, on October 8, 1951, to both Houses of Parliament in Cairo. In his address, the Prime Minister gave a comprehensive review of Anglo-Egyptian relations. He called for the cancellation of the 1936 Treaty of Alliance with Great Britain and two agreements of 1899 concerning the Sudan.

Nahas Pasha introduced bills to this effect, which were unanimously approved on October 13.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the speech delivered by the Prime Minister.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD WAR DANGER—SOVEREIGNTY IMPERILED

Honorable members, when Egypt and Great Britain concluded the Treaty of Alliance on August 26, 1936, the danger of a Second World War was approaching very fast and the conflict between the Axis Powers on the one hand and Great Britain and her allies on the other was becoming graver and graver. Fascist Italy had its covetous eye on the Continent of Africa and was encircling Egypt and the Sudan both on the western frontiers of Egypt and on the southeastern frontiers of Sudan. British colonization, meantime, was battening with its full weight on Egypt. British colonists looked upon our independence and sovereignty with great misgivings They assumed for themselves the responsibility of the protection of foreigners They imposed their authority on our internal, international, and financial affairs. This hampered the progress of the country toward complete independence and held it back from proceeding to its appropriate status among the family of nations. Foreign capitulations, to give a third phase of the situation in 1936, were an instrument by which the financial, judiciary, and administrative sovereignty of Egypt were imperiled. In themselves the capitulations reduced the country to humility and blocked every way of our national activity. Fourthly, the English had exploited the assassination of the Sirdar incident in 1924 and cut every practical relation between Egypt and the Sudan. They had evicted the Egyptian Army from the Sudan and dismissed the Egyptian personnel from its administration Flithly, in 1936 the Egyptian Army felt the urgent need of liberating itself from English custody. It felt the urgent need for acquiring the necessary training and preparing for the defense of the homeland.

ARMS WERE PROMISED

In these circumstances and under the pressure of these factors, both material and moral, Egypt was compelled to sign the treaty of August 26, 1936 It was obliged to sign the treaty in order to cope with the expected dangers of the Second World War, and in order to come out in the aftermath of that war as an independent nation to redeem itself from the disgrace of foreign capitulation, and in order to establish without delay the Egyptian Army. According to the obligations of the treaty the British Government pledged to train the Egyptian Army and provide it with arms and equipment so that it might replace in the shortest period possible the limited number of British forces allowed by the treaty to be stationed in the

Suez Canal zone. Thus Egypt intended to deliver itself eventually from every vestige of the British occupation.

SHARED THE SACRIFICES

In September 1939 the imminent danger materialized, and Egypt provided Great Britain and her allies with the greatest services and the most profitable assistance. She shared with them the most dire sacrifices and her assistance had a far-reaching influence toward winning the war To this have testified several such great personalities of Britain itself, military and civil, as Lord Alexander, Mr. Churchill, Mr. Eden, and Mr. Bevin.

AXIS POWERS BEATEN

The final victory of the United Nations in that war gave an utterly new turn to the circumstances in which the 1936 treaty had been contracted. The Axis Powers, against whom the treaty had been intended, were completely beaten and their military forces were irrecoverably wiped out; and with their defeat vanished the danger that had shown itself in 1936 On the other hand, the victors considered themselves as one united block. They joined in establishing a comprehensive system through which international relations were to be organized. Thus, not only has the threat of war against Egypt become nonexistent from the side of the Axis Powers, but any threat of war from any other side has become nonexistent too.

CHARTER OF U. N. PARAMOUNT

The Charter of the United Nations contracted in San Francisco in June 1945 was created to carry out these objectives In the question of international transactions, the Charter is based on principles quite different from those on which the 1936 treaty was negotiated. The Charter of the United Nations bans war as an implement for settling international disputes; it sets up the machinery of peace through which such disputes should be decided. The Charter forbids that nations encroach on the independence of other nations or question the unity of their territories It asserts the right of nations in self-determination and provides within its texts for the equality of sovereignty among member states. Furthermore, according to the United Nations Charter, if other interstate agreements run counter to the obligations devolving from the Charter, the latter will have to be adhered to and not the former.

TRIED FOR REVISION

In view of all that, and in view of the fact that the Egyptian Nation has stood united in regard to the immediate evacuation of British troops from Egypt and the Sudan and for the unification of these two parts of our homeland the Egyptian Government negotiated with the Government of Britain with an idea of revising the treaty of 1936 and superseding it with a treaty that might be appropriate to the new international outlook. These negotiations started at the beginning of April 1946 and terminated at the end of October of the same year, and the outcome was a draft treaty initialled by Sidky and Bevin The two parties, however, differed as to the interpretation of the Sudan Protocol annexed to that draft treaty and the agreement did not materialize. The public opinion in Egypt unanimously rejected the agreement as it did not satisfy national aspirations.

EGYPT'S ACTION OF 1947

On July 8, 1947, the Egyptian Government brought the dispute between Egypt and Great Britain before the Security Council. Egypt pressed for the immediate and complete evacuation of the British forces from Egypt and the Sudan, and for the termination of the administrative system of government of the Sudan. The Security Council discussed the question in 11 sessions from August 5 to September 10, 1947, but it was unable to issue definite decisions since no motion for the settlement of the question gained the required majority. Both parties were called upon, through every one of the motions presented, to resume direct negotiations with a view to reaching a mutual agreement. The Chairman decided to retain the dispute on the agenda of the Council, and no further step was taken by the Council beyond that stage.

CORRESPONDENCE PROLONGED

After this, the Egyptian Government exchanged with the administration of the Sudan on the one hand, and with the British Government on the other, prolonged correspondence regarding the administrative and legislative reforms in the Sudan Conversations in this connection were held from May 6 to 28, 1948, between the Egyptian Minister of Foreign Affairs and the British Ambassador to Egypt. Both correspondence and conversations terminated in utter failure, and the two parties did not come to any agreement even though the scope of conversation was limited and the discussions did not include the unification of Egypt and the Sudan

In January 1950 elections were held in Egypt and the present Government was voted into power. During the elections the Egyptian Nation voiced again its unanimous demand for the realization of its national aspirations The Government, in the speech from the throne, commented that unparalleled unanimity in the following words:

VALLEY BOUND BY SHACKLES

"The Nation has been unanimous to a man regarding the deliverance of our valley—Egypt and the Sudan—from the shackles that might restrict its freedom and independence, so that it may regain its prestige and proceed to its appropriate status in international life. My Government will make the most determined efforts to accomplish the evacuation (of the British troops) from the two parts of the valley and to safeguard its unity under the Egyptian Crown against any misusage or encroachment."

The Government then proceeded to carry out its pledges Its first step was to try to reach an agreement with the English. We engaged in a long series of conversations which lagged for months; we tried in every possible way to convince the English of the rights of this country; we based our suggestions on realistic solutions but all our efforts were in vain. On November 16, 1950, the Egyptian Government felt that in the honorable carrying out of its pledges it could do nothing else than to announce its intention of canceling the 1936 treaty together with the two agreements of January 19 and July 10, 1899, regarding the joint administration of the Sudan.

THREE MONTHS LATE

The conversations between the two parties, however, went on. Our Minister of Foreign Affairs proceeded to London for direct talks with the British Secretary of the Foreign Office. These talks terminated on December 15, 1950, in a decision taken by the British Secretary to the effect that he would submit to the British Cabinet, a plan embodying new practical measures to be taken in order to solve the question of defense. He said he hoped to be able to report the reaction of his Government by mid-January 1951, or shortly after. The promised suggestions were received by the Egyptian Government as late as April 11, 1951—3 months after their fixed time, and then they were very far from satisfying our national demands.

On April 24, 1951, the Egyptian Government refused these suggestions, both as a whole and in detail. We sent back counter-suggestions regarding evacuation and the unity of Egypt and the Sudan.

The British Government made a reply to our countersuggestions only on June 8, 1951.

While these conversations were lagging, the British Foreign Secretary delivered his address in the House of Commons on July 30, 1951. In his address he announced that the British Government was still clinging to occupation and the idea of the joint defense in peace under the pretext of international necessity. He also asserted that the British Government objected to the unification of Egypt and the Sudan under the Egyptian crown, giving as an excuse that the will of the Sudanese had to be first consulted.

POLICY STILL COLONIZATION

This announcement was an indication that there is an unbridgeable gap between the two parties. The British Government still bases its policy on the antiquated principles of colonization and empire that were so unsuccessful in America, in India, and Iran. It still assumes responsibilities that are not its own and resists national rights with various excuses and pretexts

EGYPT READY TO CONSIDER

In answer to the British Secretary's address, the Egyptian Minister of Foreign Affairs made an announcement on August 6, 1951, before the two Houses of Parliament to the effect that the British Foreign Secretary had with his address, closed the door of conversations. But the British Foreign Secretary sent me, on August 17, 1951, a personal message denying that he had ever closed the door and that on the contrary he was investigating a new plan on the matter of defense. In my answer to him I enumerated the reasons why we considered that he had brought the conversations to a close, and I added that the evacuation of British forces from Egypt is only one part of the Egyptian question, the other part being the unity of Egypt and the Sudan under the Egyptian crown. These two parts of the question, I said, are one and indivisible. I also stated that what he had said about the Sudan would be sufficient reason why the conversations should cease I regretted that his personal message to me did not alter the situation, yet I told him that nothing would please me more than these suggestions if they were received in time, and if the Egyptian Government found therein practical evidence that Egypt's national rights would be respected. In that case the Egyptian Government would be ready to reconsider its attitude.

BRITAIN FAILS TO FIX DATE

My answer was sent on August 26, 1951, and I received another personal message from the British Foreign Secretary on September 21, 1951, to the effect that he was unable to fix a date on which he could send his suggestion concerning the matter of defense and the Sudan. Upon receiving the message I asked H. E., the British Ambassador in Cairo, to transmit to the British Foreign Secretary that the Egyptian Government was bound to announce its plans to Parliament before the end of the current recess at the beginning of October.

LAGGED FOR 16 MONTHS

Honorable deputies, this is the history of the political conversations between the two countries. Needless to say England loses nothing by delaying and deferring these issues The British occupation is existent in the Suez Canal zone and the British rule under the guise of the Condominion is carrying out its disintegrating effects in the Sudan. As to Egypt, it has become impossible for her to longer continue an impossible situation. These conversations have lagged for 16 months. They have been only one feature of a long series of endeavors carried out by Egypt since the end of World War II to convince Great Britain that she should respect Egypt's national rights and cease

encroaching on them with her efforts of colonizing supremacy.

Therefore, I find it incumbent on myself, now that the current parliamentary session has extended to 11 months and has almost overlapped the next one, to announce before your honorable House that the Egyptian Government considered that the time limit we promised Mr. Morrison in our personal message has expired, and that the conversations between the two countries have ceased in view of their futility.

As our incessant endeavors to realize our national demands through agreement have failed, it is time that your Government fulfilled the promises given in the last speech from the throne and to take immediately the necessary measures to cancel the treaty of August 26, 1936, and the two agreements of January 19 and July 10, 1899, regarding the administration of the Sudan.

I place the royal decrees prepared for these steps in the Office of this House.

GREEN BOOK IS DUE

The Government intends to issue very shortly a green book embodying the records of the conversations and the documents related to them. It will be shown clearly through these documents that we made indefatigable endeavors to come to an agreement. We never gave up patience; but we supported our demands with irrefutable evidence; but it was the British who persisted on the antiquated principles of a colonial empire, which in themselves form the real threat to international security and hamper the efforts for carrying out for universal peace.

Honorable members, after stating the foregoing I need not make any comments on the bills of law I am introducing; nor need I justify their enactment The circumstances and reasons I have just stated are grounds enough for such justification And, yet, I should like to enlighten you more regarding this grave historical event

The English have argued that Egypt cannot cancel the 1936 treaty or the 1899 covenants, but there are numerous precedents for the unilateral revocation of international treaties and agreements. The following are some examples:

UNITED STATES BROKE 1850 PACT

1. In 1884 the United States of America canceled the Anglo-American Treaty, concluded on April 19, 1850, regarding the construction of a maritime canal in Central America

2. On December 9, 1905, France canceled the agreements of the concordat contracted by herself and the Pope on July 15, 1801.

3. On October 3, 1908, Austria and Hungary canceled the Treaty of Berlin 1878, by annexing to her territories Bosnia and Herzegovina.

4. On October 5, 1908, Bulgaria canceled the Treaty of Berlin by proclaiming her own independence.

5. On September 9, 1914, Turkey canceled the system of foreign capitulations that had been organized through international obligations.

6 In 1919 China canceled the 1913 and 1915 treaties with Russia and Mongolia.

7. Between 1926 and 1928 China canceled all the treaties to which she had been an unequal party.

8. In 1932 France denounced the payment of her debts for the United States of America, which were contracted through agreement on April 29, 1926.

IRISH CANCEL TREATY

9. In November 1933 the Irish Free State canceled the 'Anglo-Irish Treaty concluded on December 5, 1921.

10. On September 13, 1934, Poland canceled her international obligation regarding the protection of minorities.

11. In December 1938 the Japanese Government canceled the Nine Power Pact signed on February 6, 1922, regarding the principles which had guided these powers in their dealings with China and had determined their relations to that country.

These are various examples of the precedents of the unilateral cancellation of interr tional treaties and agreements. They differ as to cause and circumstances and the other party always argued that the cancellation was not legal, but they were canceled in practice and the cancellation had its legal effects in all events It may be said that most of the countries that resorted to that measure were relying on material force; and that is true. This does not apply to us in this case as we have, in revoking the 1936 treaty, only the moral support of our own clear rights, universal justice, and the sublime principles embodied in the United Nations Charter. Our case, however, is far more justifiable than any of the precedents cited in the foregoing. Not one of them comes near to our own case as regards the soundness of evidence, the urgency of necessity, and the force of the grounds on which we base our cancellation These grounds can be summed up in the following:

EGYPT HAD NO FREE CHOICE

First, this treaty was concluded under the influence of British occupation and the Egyptian party did not enjoy at that time necessary right of complete free choice. This is not an excuse with which we try to justify our attitude toward the treaty, but it was a view taken by the late Mr. Bevin, the former British Foreign Secretary. Mr. Bevin announced this view in the most unequivocal terms when the dispute between Russia and Iran was brought before the Security Council. He said that the British Government regretted that an agreement had been imposed on Iran by force while the Government of Soviet Russia occupied part of Iran.

On the same occasion Mr Bevin said in effect, "We are powerful; we are sometimes called the Big Three, and we are undoubtedly identified with power. Power has its weight in negotiations."

Our view of this matter was adopted by the Security Council as its decision implied that the existence of foreign troops in another country's territory deprives her of her freedom of choice in negotiations.

WHOLE NATION INVOLVED

This is then the resolution given by the Security Council and the viewpoint of the British Foreign Secretary regarding agreements concluded under the domination of foreign occupation, and it is the true judgment that should be passed on the 1936 treaty which was concluded under the British occupation of the whole country of Egypt and not only of some of its parts, as was the case with Iran.

I find it necessary here to explain what we mean by the pressure of foreign occupation. This does not mean that anybody exercised any material coercion on us when we signed the treaty, but we mean that there was a state of moral coercion prevailing in the country Egypt was at the time stifled under the occupation which dominated every phase of our life and tampered with each of our interests. Foreign capitulations had, on the other hand, their suffocating weight and we sought for an outlet. The treaty was only the first step in this direction and it should be followed by larger steps.

Secondly, the circumstances in which the treaty was concluded have undergone a complete change. This we have sufficiently explained in the foregoing.

TWO TREATIES IN CONFLICT

Thirdly, the treaty contradicts the Suez Canal Convention on the one hand and the U. N. Charter on the other. Both of these have the priority of execution and respect. The Suez Canal Convention had been concluded a long time before the treaty by several nations with a view of creating an important international status as to the neutrality of the canal and the complete freedom of passage to all countries. According to this convention the signatory parties are forbidden to seek any particular privileges whether regional, commercial, or otherwise, through international agreements. According to the same convention Egypt alone, as the proprietor of the region, has been placed in charge of the defense of the neutrality of the canal and the safety of passage through it. This has not been complied with by the treaty. The treaty itself is nothing but a collection of privileges gained by Britain against the independence of Egypt and its sovereignty; and Britain should not have seized this opportunity of her occupation and gained for herself all these privileges, thus running counter to the text of the 1888 convention

As to the United Nations Charter, I have explained in the foregoing the points where the 1936 treaty contradicted the Charter. I need not repeat the fact that the Charter is most important and that it should have the priority of our adherence if any treaties were repugnant to it

BRITISH ARE VIOLATORS

Finally, the United Kingdom herself has again and again violated the treaty. In fact, the English never adhere to the treaty unless they seek some pretext to support their occupation or to disunite Egypt and the Sudan. The bonds and obligations they undertook according to the treaty weigh nothing in their view They exceed the number of forces allowed to be stationed in the Suez Canal zone; they overstep the bounds limited for these forces; they refuse to comply with the health and customs measures required by the Egyptian laws, they stand against the training of the Egyptian Army and preparing it according to the obligations undertaken by them in the treaty. In the Palestinian question they took, and they are still taking, only a hostile course. This has exposed Egypt to the gravest of dangers, though, according to the treaty, the British are bound in their foreign policy not to take an action hostile to our alliance with them. Furthermore they have pursued the policy of separating the Sudan and Egypt, and Southern Sudan from Northern Sudan. They have been only aiming at attaining their objectives of colonial empire by not complying with the 1936 treaty and the 1899 agreement at one and the same time

ACTING UPON LEGAL RIGHTS

Honorable Deputies, you will realize from the foregoing that Egypt, in canceling the 1936 treaty, is only acting within her legal rights. The grounds we have discussed are the same for which we are also canceling the two agreements of 1899. These two agreements are still less binding than the treaty itself. They were concluded at the time when Egypt did not possess the right of entering into political treaties. Egypt was dictated to and coerced in the matter with the conventions signed by the Egyptian Secretary for the Foreign Affairs Administration on the one hand and the British Proconsul on the other. They are related to the administration of the Sudan; and the text does not include any time limit for the status imposed upon Egypt. The two agreements have only created a temporary state of affairs dictated by British authority in that period; and they should be terminated by the disappearance of that authority.

It would have sufficed if our Minister of Foreign Affairs had issued a decree canceling these agreements. But, in view of the relation between this act and the main national

case, we have included it in the bill for the cancellation of the treaty so that it may have your sanction.

KING OF EGYPT AND SUDAN

By the cancellation of the treaty and the two agreements the status of the Sudan before the British occupation is regained; and the King of Egypt will be the King of Egypt and the Sudan.

A system of government has to be organized in order to replace the existent administrative authority in the Sudan A bill for this system of government is submitted to you Through this bill the Sudanese, both in the north and in the south, will enjoy complete self-rule and a true democratic constitution. You will find that an outline of the principles has been drawn and the details are left to the Sudanese themselves to set up a constituent assembly truly representing the Sudanese.

The constitutional basis on which the Government of the Sudan will be organized will be in perfect harmony with the natural union of Egypt and the Sudan; this ancient union was recognized by Winston Churchill himself when he stated that the two parts of the Nile Valley form a palm tree that has its roots in the Sudan and its branches in the delta.

NO TIME FOR TALK

The time of talking has passed; and we have now to work without sound or fury. The situation demands united efforts on the part of all parties and we are determined to endure grim sacrifices to attain our just demands.

It is a divine omen that these measures will be taken under the guidance of His Majesty, King Farouk I, whose birth coincided with the birth of our revolution in 1919

Honorable deputies, for Egypt I concluded the treaty in 1936 and for Egypt I am asking you now to cancel it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, a dispatch in the New York Times of October 18, 1951, brings up to date the actions by the British in Egypt and in the Sudan. I ask unanimous consent to have this dispatch printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EGYPT SAYS BRITAIN ILLEGALLY SEIZES CANAL ZONE AREAS—INTERIOR MINISTER CHARGES PLACES UNDER CAIRO RULE HAVE BEEN OCCUPIED—BRITISH SEND IN MORE MEN—PARATROOPERS ARE FLOWN FROM CYPRUS—PREMIER URGES THE EGYPTIANS TO REMAIN CALM

(By Albion Ross)

CAIRO, EGYPT, October 17.—Fuad Serag el-Din Pasha, Egyptian Minister of the Interior, accused the British tonight of occupying Egyptian installations in many parts of the Suez Canal zone.

His statement, made in the Senate, came shortly after Premier Mustafa Nashas Pasha had made a ringing appeal to the Nation to remain calm in what he called the greatest crisis in Egyptian history

Earlier in the day the British began ferrying by Air Transport 3,000 paratroopers from the Island of Cyprus to reinforce their garrison at Adaba, 15 miles south of Suez.

Other British forces occupied various lines of communication, including a bridge at Kantara, the only bridge crossing the Suez Canal, and bridges on the Port Tewfik-Suez Road.

CHARGES MADE AGAINST BRITISH

Speaking of the day's events the Interior Minister said:

"British forces have occupied the customs passport offices and the quarantine offices in Suez after having made a forced entry. In the two cities of Ismailia and Port Said, British troops have occupied the railway offices and the office of medical inspection, breaking down the doors and arresting certain of the employees, and taking their arms. They struck a soldier when he refused to give up his arms and left him unconscious.

"British troops have occupied the Ferdan Bridge. [This is the sole bridge across the Suez Canal and used by the railway to Palestine.] British troops have occupied the public utilities in Ismailia, such as the waterworks and some bridges.

"British troops have seized the railway from Nafisha to Ismailia and halted communications and are inspecting trains. British troops also have seized ferries and all means of traversing the canal from the eastern bank.

SAYS VESSEL WAS SEIZED

"British troops have seized a vessel standing on the canal bank on the Sinai side and they have surrounded an Egyptian patrol on the eastern bank of the canal and have prevented it from being supplied with water and food"

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota

Mr. LANGER. I noticed in the newspapers a few days ago that during the past 24 months 13 premiers have been assassinated in the areas concerning which the distinguished Senator is speaking. I should like to have the opinion of the distinguished Senator as to why those assassinations took place.

Mr. MALONE. In answer to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, the junior Senator from Nevada will say that the colonial slave nations of the world are on the move Make no mistake about it. It is the humble opinion of the Senator from Nevada that with all our power we cannot stop the movement. We really have no decision to make in the matter. If we could stop it, if it were possible to maintain the status quo of colonial slavery in the world, starting in the Malayan States in the Far East, in Indochina, and going over to Egypt, the Sudan country, and Africa, the question would be whether we should stop the movement. The junior Senator from Nevada was in every nation in Africa. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that the slavery which we had in the United States was a very pale thing in comparison to what is going on in Africa now, all the way from Liberia and Morocco to South Africa, and in nations of the Middle East which have been almost entirely controlled by empire-minded nations for a long time.

For perhaps 100 years the British were able to maintain order in the Far East and in other countries mainly by virtue of the fact that they had the best fleet in the world, which dominated the controlled areas. Then the airplane came along, and the fleet faded out of the picture. Now we have other means of warfare. We have the submarine and the atom bomb. Atomic power is going to do more to end quickly the colonial system throughout the world than perhaps any other single factor.

I say again to the Senate, stop, look, and listen. If we could hold the status quo in all the colonial slavery nations of the world, and all the dominated nations, it would then be a question of whether we should do it. I say without fear of contradiction—and the next 2 or 3 years will demonstrate it beyond question—that we cannot hold the status quo.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from North Dakota is very much interested in ascertaining the attitude of the Senator from Nevada with reference to the colonial empires about which he is speaking. When the premier of a country is assassinated, as happened in Pakistan the other day, is it the Senator's opinion that the so-called mob, as the newspapers term it, consists of Communists, or is it his opinion that they are patriots fighting for their own country?

Mr. MALONE. If the word had been in existence at the time of the Civil War, I suppose that either the North or the South would have been called Communist by the British because they would have wanted to split us. It would have made no difference whether they had sided with one or the other, so long as they could have split the United States and made it easier to again take over

I do not say that there are no Communists in the nations to which I have referred. However, I do say that there are many people in the colonies who are loyal to their own people and to their own country As examples, I cite my friends, Soekarno and Dr. Hatta, in Indonesia.

Whenever there is an insurrection somewhere and a dominant nation comes in and kills a few people and quiets it, the uprising is called a Communist uprising. Investigation may show that it was only the people trying to get back their own country.

The distinguished Senator from North Dakota can remember, as can the junior Senator from Nevada, the events of the past 30 or 40 years. Forty years ago, when we picked up the newspaper, we saw that there had been an uprising in the Malayan States. A British gunboat would be on the way in the morning. It would throw a little grapeshot over into the jungle and that would be the end of the uprising. The name "Communist" had not yet been invented. The uprising was the rebellion by some stout souls in the jungle who did not want to continue to work for no return.

However, since the radio was developed and became practical and the airplane came into general use, many of the people from Liberia, Morocco, and various other nations in Africa, including Egypt, and many people from Iran, the Malayan States, and Indochina, have gone to school outside their own respective countries.

COLONIAL PEOPLE ARE NOT INFERIOR

When we meet the leaders of those countries face to face we find that they are not inferior. In the United States we are led to believe—and unfortunately most of our people still believe—that we are dealing with savages. They are not

savages. Of course, there is not a large percentage of them who are educated, but there are enough educated people in those countries so that all the people know what is going on. There is no chance of reestablishing the colonial slavery system. We might prolong it for a little while, but only for a very little while. I predict that within 5 or 6 years the Negroes of Africa will run the empire-minded nations out of Africa.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Should not the proper designation, in the judgment of the Senator from Nevada, be "Nationalist" rather than "Communist"? Are not those people fighting to control their own country?

Mr. MALONE. In answer to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, let me cite Indochina. The junior Senator from Nevada was in Indochina when trouble was brewing. Having been in several conflagrations, one of which was called World War I, the Senator from Nevada was not particularly perturbed about being over there where the fighting was going on. He wanted to go to Jogjakarta from Batavia to see Dr. Hatta and Soekarno, but my application for a permit to fly from Batavia to Jogjakarta was denied. The junior Senator from Nevada woke up the pilot that night at midnight and the pilot said, "It is too bad they are not going to let you go to Jogjakarta."

The junior Senator from Nevada said, "Of course, I am going over there. It is all a question of how I am going to get there. Would it embarrass you greatly if I just showed up at the airport and stepped aboard the plane?"

The pilot said, "Of course not. I am for you. I would like to take you. However, what are you going to do if somebody stops you from getting on the plane without a permit?"

I said, "Who is going to stop me?"

Mr. President, nobody tried to stop the junior Senator from flying to Jogjakarta. I flew over the battle lines. I wanted to see the gunboats in the harbor that were preventing the shipping of vast amounts of rubber, tin, and copper.

I met with the Cabinet. They showed me how the tin, copper, and rubber were being stockpiled. All that material was lying there in huge piles. Nevertheless we were giving the Netherlands $475,000,000 a year, helping to finance her army in the jungle.

I would say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that President Soekarno and Dr. Hatta were fighting the Communists and the Dutchmen at one and the same time. They were nationalists. They wanted independence, and they got it. The other countries are going to get independence, with or without our help.

Why are we now proposing to appropriate $7,500,000,000? We are doing it, in fact, to permit the continuance of colonial slavery throughout the world.

One hears a great deal of talk about supporting Eisenhower in Europe. Mr. President, the greatest thing in the world that we could do would be to bring him home, and bring our foot soldiers home.

We ought never to put any foot soldiers anywhere outside of this country. We should use our submarines and airpower. We should build both of them up strong enough so that we can draw a line anywhere and say, "This is our Monroe Doctrine"—or whatever we want to call it—"and if you cross that line, we will make the whole area untenable for you."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Would it embarrass the distinguished Senator from Nevada if, very humbly, the Senator from North Dakota were to ask him about the so-called bipartisan policy, particularly with reference to the Republicans who support it?

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada has made himself clear several times with reference to the so-called bipartisan policy. Whenever two branches of the Government get together—the Congress of the United States with the State Department—and agree that whatever is brought here will pass without question, it is collusion, and every man connected with it ought to be impeached.

That is what some Republicans and the Democrats here set up; that is part of the so-called bipartisan foreign policy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield for a question.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I must catch a plane for Newark, N. J. Would the Senator permit me to make two insertions in the RECORD?

Mr. MALONE. The Senator from Nevada does not yield for anything but a question.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask whether or not in fairness to the American people the main issue in the next President election ought not to be the foreign policy of the United States of America. Does not that issue override everything else?

Mr. MALONE. I would say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that we have a foreign policy tied to a domestic policy. We have a free-trade policy. We laughingly call it reciprocal trade. The act transfers the authority of the United States Congress to regulate foreign trade to a discredited Secretary of State, who can thus remake the industrial map of the United States of America at will.

It means that we remove the floor under the wages of workingmen and the money of investors in this country and divide our markets with foreign countries, so as to readjust their so-called trade-balance deficits, while at the same time using Marshall plan money to make up the difference.

There is a pattern to this whole thing, Mr. President. Each part is part of a mosaic. It started in 1924. We recognized Communist Russia. That is when it all started. We put no safeguards whatever into the agreement. We removed the metal base from our money, so that the Administration could print all the money it wanted without having to tie our money to anything. Then came the reciprocal-trade policy. Then, the policy of dividing the wealth of our to tie our money to anything. Then taxes designed to end our economy. Under the income-tax amendment to the Constitution, Congress has a perfect right to go not only to 88 percent, which the current tax bill does, but to 100 percent. I will say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that Congress can make it 125 percent any time it wants to do so and take over everything for the Government.

We are playing with fire. We get a seven-, eight-, or ten-billion-dollar tax bill from the President's office, and the Senate jumps through a hoop to pass it. Senators do not look around. They do not seem to know that all these things are tied together, part of a pattern.

The mistake that the Senators and the Representatives in Congress are making is in believing these things are coincidental, are separate. They fit into a pattern, I say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. It leads up to one economic world.

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has introduced a bill which would have us join a federation of nations. We would join 11 other nations. That would lead, of course, to other nations coming in. Why? To bring about a federation of 12 nations, each with one vote, with perhaps two senators, and perhaps representatives appointed on the basis of population, governed by a majority vote. It would mean that by a majority vote taxes could be levied on the people of America to support these countries in a style to which they would like to become accustomed.

Without the embarrassment of having to come to Congress, they could appropriate, say, $7,500,000,000 for the federation of nations. I say to the Senator from North Dakota that is the ultimate objective of the whole program.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Assuming that the Democrats nominate an internationalist like President Truman, and the Republicans also nominate an internationalist, how are the American people who are opposed to the present foreign policy of the administration going to be able to register their protests?

Mr. MALONE. If the Republican Party should succumb to the extent of nominating a man who would carry on the Truman internationalist program, I would say that the senior Senator from North Dakota might as well start catching up on his catfishing, because the Nation's economy would then be gone.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that there has been no real choice in the last three elections?

Mr. MALONE. Yes; there has been no real choice.

I noticed with interest a great speech which was made before the American Legion National Convention. I was invited to the convention, but I could not miss the proceedings here in the Senate. This will be the first time in many years that I have not attended the American Legion Convention.

After reading General MacArthur's speech, I do not feel quite so badly about missing the convention. I stood here in 1949, at a time when representatives of Britain and Canada were in Washington for an international conference, and said that as soon as the representatives returned home, Britain would revalue her currency Mr. Cripps denied that seven times However, as soon as they got home, Britain devalued her currency

Everyone should have known that would happen, because no one had been paying more than $2 60 for a British pound for a number of years. Although the British said that their pound was worth $4 03, all that anyone had to do was to go to Hong Kong and, at the exchange window of a bank, exchange an American dollar for $16 50 Hong Kong currency, and then take that to another exchange window and learn that the British pound was worth about $2.60 of United States funds in the free market.

Mr. President, at the present time the British pound is worth about $2.26 Who would pay more for it? The British pound can be obtained for that amount of American funds in the international exchanges of the world. However, the British still keep up the subterfuge and hocus-pocus that their pound is worth $2 80, although no one except the American Government is silly enough to pay that much.

Not one cent of our funds should ever go into any of these nations except on the condition of the establishment of a United States of Europe. Only thus can those countries strengthen themselves. They should be forced to stop this hocus-pocus of kings, dictators and presidents for each little nation there, half of which could be lost in Nevada without being found for a number of years unless a prospector happened to go into that area. Each one of them keeps up a full-dress parade, and we support it. They will not trade with each other. They have all the quota systems and all the barriers to trade between themselves.

They will trade with us, though. At the moment we are sending coal to England.

Mr President, I think most of us remember that when we were studying in the third grade or fourth grade in school, one of the common ways of saying that a thing was ridiculous, was to say that it was as silly as sending coal to Newcastle. Well, Mr. President, we have reached that point now; we are actually sending coal to Newcastle, and we are appropriating $5,225,000,000 to do so.

PRIVATE INVESTMENTS ABROAD IN JEOPARDY

Mr. President, another condition we should place on further aid is the requirement that the recipient nation guarantee the integrity of private investments. We are now sending money abroad in order to support nations in such a way that any private investor who invests his money there will not be able to take the money out.

THROUGH MARSHALL PLAN WE ARM RUSSIA

Mr. President, we appropriate billions and billions of dollars under the Marshall plan for the European nations which use that money for materials and goods which they sell to other European nations, some of which, in turn, sell the goods or materials to Russia and her satellite countries Those materials go to Russia and the iron-curtain countries by means of the 96 trade treaties to which I have previously referred, and which probably have increased in number to 125 now We are making it possible for Russia and the iron-curtain countries to obtain everything they need for world war III and to consolidate their gains.

I would say to the Senator from North Dakota that this program has been planned from the beginning We are following England's lead, and England is helping Russia.

Unfortunately, the Senate is jumping through the hoop without stopping to think.

Personally, Mr President, I am not in such a hurry to go home that I cannot stay here and vote against the tax bill and the appropriation bills for the next 14 months, which will bring us to the first of 1953. Of course during that time I shall be running for office. However, I am not in such a hurry to get home that I would not be willing to remain here and work against these bills.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada knows how I feel I am perfectly willing to stay here with him. Does not he know that I am willing to do so?

Mr. MALONE. Yes; I am sure of it.

Mr. President, the latest Egyptian budget for the fiscal year 1951–52 is balanced as follows: Income, 212,415,000 Egyptian pounds, which equal approximately $630,000,000; expenditures 230,000,000 Egyptian pounds, which equals approximately $690,000,000—the deficit being drawn from the reserve funds.

EGYPT AND ENGLAND

The Egyptian pound rate of exchange is $2 87. The present rate of exchange for the pound sterling is $2 80.

Mr. President, by law Britain is still indebted to Egypt for the sum of 230,000,000 Egyptian pounds, which is equivalent to approximately $690,000,000.

I wish to say that that is one of the things wrong with those countries; because of lack of confidence, private investments in those nations have stopped. Yet, we still support that system.

Mr. President, in closing I wish to say that I have little hope that we can stop this appropriation bill. I think the administration will go right off the deep end and will finance all these nations in their crooked schemes; and we shall find out, when the knot is finally tightened, that we have no help on the Continent. An attempt is made to argue that this appropriation bill should be passed by the Congress on the theory that to refuse to pass it would amount to a failure to support General Eisenhower. Mr. President, today General Eisenhower is the greatest failure in Europe. General Eisenhower is getting American troops and American money; he is not getting anything from Europe.

I should be glad to debate that point if anyone would like to debate it with me.

Mr President, I hope that when we return in January, after we have visited our constituents, we will bring back a little common horse sense, which is about the most uncommon thing in the Congress at this time.

Mr LANGER Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for another question?

Mr MALONE. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from Nevada knows that in the United States there are 13 States which have an assessed valuation of less than $1,000,000,000. In short, by means of this appropriation bill, if we vote for it, we shall be voting to give to Europe, the Near East, Africa, Asia, the Pacific area, and the American Republics seven times everything—every horse, every cow, every acre of land, all the money on deposit, everything there—in seven of the States of the United States of America; and that will be done when only a few Senators are present, and when apparently they are acting in a hurry. It will be done at a time when they are in a hurry to go home, whereas as the distinguished Senator from Nevada has said, some of us are perfectly willing to remain here until New Year's, if we can prevent this great calamity from falling on the people of the United States.

Mr MALONE Mr President, I have said that I am ready to remain here I agree with the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota. Of course, there are 38 States out of the 48 States which, if they were called on to pay their per capita share of the national debt, they could not do so even if they could realize the total assessed valuation of every bit of property within their borders. That is what we have done in the past 18 years

Mr. President, the $41,000,000,000 which has been committed and sent to foreign countries since World War II is $5,000,000,000 more than the assessed valuation of all the property in the 11 Western States, including California, Oregon, and Washington, and the 14 Southern States, including Texas. Two more bites, and they will have it all.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Benton	Fulbright	Kerr
Bricker	George	Kilgore
Bridges	Green	Knowland
Butler, Md	Hayden	Langer
Butler, Nebr.	Hendrickson	Lehman
Carlson	Hennings	Magnuson
Case	Hickenlooper	Malone
Connally	Hill	Martin
Cordon	Hoey	Maybank
Dirksen	Holland	McCarran
Dworshak	Humphrey	McCarthy
Eastland	Hunt	McClellan
Ecton	Ives	McFarland
Ellender	Jenner	McKellar
Ferguson	Johnson, Tex	McMahon
Flanders	Johnston, S. C.	Millikin
Frear	Kefauver	Monroney

Murray	Saltonstall	Thye
Neely	Schoeppel	Underwood
O'Conor	Smathers	Watkins
O'Mahoney	Smith, Maine	Williams
Pastore	Smith, N. C.	Young
Robertson	Sparkman	
Russell	Stennis	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. GEORGE obtained the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, we have been debating this appropriation bill all day, and I am wondering whether we cannot by unanimous consent pass the bill at the present time. It is ready for passage. I do not think any Senator will ask for the yeas and nays, and it will only take a moment or two.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I hope we may have a voice vote on sustaining the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee reducing by 5 percent the appropriations contained in the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I have no objection to a voice vote. I see no reason why we cannot vote at this time and dispose of the bill. I could not agree to a unanimous-consent request, because I am not in favor of the bill as reported.

Mr. McKELLAR. I can understand that, but I ask unanimous consent for a vote. I hope the Senator from North Dakota, who has just risen, will not object.

Mr. LANGER. There is no objection to a voice vote on the amendments, but I want a yea and nay vote on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. That means several roll calls before it is over, and I shall be obliged to call up the conference report on the tax bill, a matter which has been under consideration for a long time.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is within his rights.

Mr. GEORGE. If there were merely one vote, I should be very glad to consent to having it.

Mr. LANGER. I am only asking for one record vote, and that is on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GEORGE. Are the amendments to be voted on en bloc? Has there been an agreement of that kind?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that there has been no such agreement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I did not hear the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I made inquiry as to whether there had been an agreement to vote on all the amendments en bloc.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understood there was such an agreement, but, if not, I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Tennessee that there has been no such request.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on all the committee amendments en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments

The amendments were agreed to.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading "Mutual security," on page 1, line 11, after "section 101 (a) (1)", to strike out "$5,072,476,271" and insert "$4,818,852,457."

On page 2 line 13 after "section 101 (a) (2)", to strike out "$1,012,000,000" and insert "$961,400,000"; in line 14, after the word "addition", to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$9,500,000"; in line 17, after the word "the", to strike out "Administrator" and insert "Director", and in line 25, after the word "appropriation", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That after December 1, 1951, no funds herein appropriated shall be made available to any nation of which a dependent area fails in the opinion of the President to comply with any treaty to which the United States and such dependent area are parties"

On page 3, after line 4, to insert:

"Assistance to Spain: For economic, technical, and military assistance, in the discretion of the President under the general objectives set forth in the declaration of policy contained in the titles of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 and the Mutual Security Act of 1951, for Spain, $100,000,000."

On page 3, line 12, after "section 201", to strike out "$396,250,000" and insert "$376,437,500"

On page 3, line 21, after "section 203", to strike out "$160,000,000" and insert "$152,000,000."

On page 3, line 24, after "section 301", to strike out "$535,250,000" and insert "$508,487,500"

On page 4, line 6, after "section 302", to strike out "$237,155,866" and insert "$225,298,073."

On page 4, line 22, after "section 401", to strike out "$38,150,000" and insert "$36,242,500."

On page 4, line 24, after "section 402", to strike out "$21,245,653" and insert "$20,183,370."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time. The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a sufficient second. The yeas and nays are ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] are absent on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] would vote "yea."

Mr SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 13, as follows:

YEAS—57

Benton	Hoey	McMahon
Bridges	Holland	Millikin
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Monroney
Carlson	Hunt	Murray
Connally	Ives	Neely
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Eastland	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Kerr	Pastore
Ferguson	Kilgore	Robertson
Flanders	Knowland	Russell
Frear	Lehman	Saltonstall
Fulbright	Magnuson	Smathers
George	Martin	Smith, Maine
Green	Maybank	Smith, N. C.
Hayden	McCarran	Sparkman
Hendrickson	McCarthy	Stennis
Hennings	McClellan	Thye
Hickenlooper	McFarland	Underwood
Hill	McKellar	Watkins

NAYS—13

Bricker	Ecton	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Williams
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Young
Dirksen	Langer	
Dworshak	Malone	

NOT VOTING—26

Aiken	Douglas	Mundt
Anderson	Duff	Nixon
Bennett	Gillette	Smith, N J.
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Byrd	Kem	Tobey
Cain	Lodge	Welker
Capehart	Long	Wherry
Chavez	Moody	Wiley
Clements	Morse	

So the bill (H R 5684) was passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr O'MAHONEY, Mr BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr McKELLAR. Mr President, I am grateful to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] for his generosity in allowing the appropriation bill to be passed before proceeding with the conference report on the tax bill. I thank him with all my heart.

REVENUE ACT OF 1951—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr GEORGE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R 4473) to provide revenue, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report see proceedings of the House of Representatives.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report

Mr. GEORGE Mr. President, the tax bill has been discussed at great length in the Senate, and Senators are entirely familiar with practically all the amendments made. I am quite sure that Senators are also familiar with such changes as have been made in the conference. I should like to file a statement relating to each of the amendments made, and then I hope I shall be able to answer any question any Senator may wish to ask. I request that the statement be printed in the RECORD

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There were 264 Senate amendments. Of this number the House receded on 96, the Senate, 44. The balance were receded to with amendments.

I will discuss the rates of the individual income tax. Under the Senate amendment, individuals were subject to an 11 percent increase in the tax or an 8 percent increase in take-home pay, whichever was the lesser. The House imposed a 12½ percent increase in the individual income tax on individuals. There was a difference of over $400,000,000 in revenue between the two bills. The conferees first agreed to a proposal which would levy in effect an 11¾-percent increase in the individual income tax or a 9 percent increase in the take-home pay, whichever was the lesser The Senate ceiling of 88 percent was retained. This added approximately $115,000,000 to the Senate bill As a result of our second conference today, it was agreed that the increase in the first bracket of individuals should be 11 percent instead of 12½ percent

The House conferees originally agreed to the Senate amendments which eliminated the House provision increasing the 25 percent tax on capital gains of individuals and corporations However, today an agreement was reached increasing this rate to 26 percent

The House conference agreed to the Senate amendment striking out the provisions of the House bill applying a withholding system to dividends, interest, and royalties

The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment providing that the increases in the corporate normal and surtax should be effective as of April 1, 1951, instead of as of January 1, 1951, as provided under the House bill However, we were forced to yield to the House conferees in applying the corporate income tax increase to the normal tax instead of spreading it between the normal tax and the surtax as provided in the Senate bill

The Senate bill struck out the provision of the House bill reducing the average earnings credit from 85 percent to 75 percent An agreement was reached among the conferees reducing the credit to 83 percent, effective January 1, 1952 The conferees modified this today so that the decrease in the earnings credit from 85 percent to 83 percent will be effective July 1, 1951, instead of January 1, 1951, as originally agreed to. This means in effect that a corporation on the calendar-year basis will have an average earnings credit of 84 percent for the calendar year 1951 and an 83 percent credit for the calendar years 1952 and 1953

Under the Senate bill, the ceiling on total corporate income and excess profits taxes was made 69 percent by providing a limit on the excess profits tax of 17 percent of the excess profits net income Under the compromise agreement the 17 percent figure was increased to 18 percent, making a ceiling of 70 percent.

The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment striking out the provision of the House bill allowing one surtax exemption of $25,000 and one minimum excess profits credit of $25,000 for certain controlled groups of corporations However, in lieu of this, the conferees agreed to an amendment which denied such multiple credits to a controlled group in case of transfers by one of a controlled group to another of the controlled group on or after January 1, 1951, of property other than money unless the transferee corporation establishes by a clear preponderance of the evidence that the securing of such credits was not a major purpose of the transfer of property to it by the transferor This provision does not apply to controlled corporations created prior to January 1, 1951

Our conferees accepted the provisions of the House bill giving to a head of a household one-half of the benefits of income splitting accorded to married persons The Senate bill only allowed 25 percent of such benefit to the head of a family. The House agreed to the Senate amendment eliminating descendants of a stepson or stepdaughter of the taxpayer from the category of persons who may qualify as head of a household.

I was very much disappointed that we were unable to get the House conferees to agree to the provisions of the Senate bill making the provisions of the House bill dealing with family partnerships retroactive to the date of the Internal Revenue Code. It seems to me that it would be much better to apply the rule in the House bill to all open cases, so that these controversies could be settled. However, the House conferees were adamant on this amendment and we were forced to yield in order to get a bill.

The House conferees agreed to the provisions of the Senate bill taxing mutual savings banks, building and loan associations, and cooperatives, with a few changes However, as was originally intended, the requirement as to information returns in the case of patronage refunds was expressly stated in the conference agreement finally reached today not to apply to REA payments or payments by mutual insurance companies and other organizations covered by section 101 (10) of the Internal Revenue Code

In the case of mutual savings banks and building and loan associations the deductible bad debt reserve limit was changed from 10 percent of deposits to 12 percent of deposits, and these organizations were exempted from the excess-profits tax

The House conferees agreed to the provision of the Senate bill extending depletion allowances However, under the conference agreement borax, fuller's earth, tripoli, refractory and fire clay, quarzite, diatomaceous earth, metallurgical limestone, chemical grade limestone, and garnet are placed in the 15-percent category as they appeared in the House bill Potassium chloride is removed from the minerals which the Senate granted a 5-percent rate, in order to avoid duplication The conferees also agreed to the Senate amendments placing asbestos, wollastonite, brucite, dolomite, magnesite, perlite, calcium carbonates, and magnesium carbonates in the 10-percent category, aplite in the 15-percent category, and if from brine 5 percent for calcium chloride, magnesium chloride, and bromine

The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment dealing with livestock, except that it excluded turkeys from the definition of livestock

I was also very much disappointed that we were unable to get the House conferees to agree to the provisions of the Senate bill providing a 4-year carry-over of net losses in the case of corporations organized in the base period This provision would have afforded substantial relief to new corporations formed in the base period However, the conferees at a meeting today agreed to allow new corporations organized in the base period a 3-year carry-over of net losses for 1947

The other part of the Senate amendment related to net losses for taxable years beginning in 1948 and 1949 Under the Senate amendment these losses could be carried forward for a period of 4 years Under the conference agreement losses for 1948 and 1949 are permitted to be carried forward 3 years instead of 4 years

The conferees accepted the Senate amendments with respect to coal royalties with two exceptions First, all references to timber were eliminated from the section, since capital gain treatment for timber is provided for under existing law Second, the section was clarified so that coal royalties will still be considered as royalties and not as capital gains for the purpose of computing the penalty tax under section 102, or the personal holding company tax

The conferees have agreed to accept all of the excess profits tax provisions which were in the Senate bill In addition to a number of technical amendments, the conferees made some modifications affecting the substance of the excess-profits tax provisions The conference agreement makes the special ceiling rates for new corporations applicable only to the first $300,000 of a new corporation's income instead of the first $400,000 as in the Senate bill The provision permitting certain fiscal year corporations to include the first 3 months of 1950 in computing

their general average earnings credit was modified by the conferees to require that the income for these 3 months be reduced where they are part of a fiscal year which extended beyond June 30, 1950. The conferees modified the provision dealing with the computation of base period capital additions in the case of banks to make the provision elective instead of compulsory in the case of taxable years beginning before the date of enactment of this bill. The conferees also modified the provision with respect to inadmissable assets which are the stock in trade of municipal bond dealers in order to make it applicable to partially tax-exempt as well as wholly tax-exempt bonds.

The conferees modified the provision which permits substitution of the industry rate of return for actual earnings in the case of an extremely low-base-period year Under the conference agreement the substitution may be made only if an abnormality occurred in the year before the low-income year. The conferees modified the provision which permits regulated intrastate pipelines to qualify as regulated public utilities. Under the modification these pipelines may qualify only if their rates are subject to the jurisdiction of a State public utility commission The conferees made two modifications in the section which provides relief for newspapers which have consolidiated their operations. The first modification puts two of the eligibility requirements in this section in the alternative rather than requiring that both requirements be met The second modification permits an adjustment to be made for increases in wages and increases in the price of newsprint.

The conferees amended the relief provision for television broadcasters so that the radio broadcasting industry rate of return or the radio broadcasting rate of return of the individual taxpayer (whichever is higher) will be applied only to the taxpayer's television assets at the end of the base period, rather than to the taxpayer's total radio and television assets.

The provision in the Senate bill relating to a corporation which increased its capacity after the close of the base period was modified by the conference agreement so that it is applicable only where the new construction was substantially under way during the base period and was completed during the taxpayer's first excess-profits tax year. The provision in the Senate bill which in certain cases permitted a corporation to base its excess-profits credit on the earnings experience of a business which it purchased was modified by the conferees in several respects. The modifications make it clear that the provision covers a case where the assets of an old corporation were purchased from its stockholders immediately after its liquidation, that the provision covers the sale of a separate business owned by a sole proprietor, and that the provision covers the split-up and sale of separate businesses operated by a partnership.

The effective date of the provision requiring a corporation to reduce its total assets by the amount of certain loans it has received from its parent corporation before applying the industry rate of return to its total assets was modified so as to make the provision applicable for all excess-profits tax years.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], extending the time for filing a claim under the Renegotiation Act was accepted by the House conferees

An amendment offered by Senator CONNALLY dealing with the taxation of unrelated business activities carried on by two colleges was modified by the House conferees to permit the earnings from such business to be applied during 1951 to 1953 against any debt incurred by such schools in acquiring the business before the income of such business is subject to Federal income tax.

The Senator from South Carolina, Mr. MAYBANK, offered an amendment which added to the list of feeder corporations exempt for years prior to 1950 those organizations all of the profits of which inure to the benefit of an eleemosynary institution exempt under section 101 (6) of the Interral Revenue Code. The House receded with an amendment striking out this provision but providing a clarifying amendment to the effect that no inference was to be drawn from this section of the bill as to the tax status of feeder organizations not covered by this section. The House conferees agreed to that part of the amendment exempting the earnings of a feeder corporation for years prior to 1951 which inured to the benefit of a hospital or to certain types of institutions for the rehabilitation of physically hardicapped persons. I believe this last amendment was offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. BRIDGES

In genera , the House conferees agreed to the excise-tax changes in the Senate bill. However, the conferees eliminated electric shavers from the taxable list, but retained the Senate provision applying the 10-percent manufacturers' tax on electrical appliances to garbage-disposal units

The House conferees also agreed to the Senate amendmert eliminating house trailers from the tax.

Snow toboggans and sleds 60 inches or less in length were exempted from the sporting-goods tax The Senate provisions relating to the tax on sporting goods were accepted by the House conferees, except that under the conference agreement skates are exempted from the sporting-goods tax

The Senate agreed to the House provision with respect to the photographic items This provision eliminated certain business cost items and imposed a tax on the articles retained at the rate of 20 percent.

The conferees also retained the tax imposed by the House on Diesel oil used on the highways.

The conferees agreed to impose a manufacturers' tax on mechanical pencils, fountain pens, and ball-point pens and mechanical lighters for cigarettes, cigars, and pipes at the rate of 15 percent.

The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment reducing the tax on domestic telegrams to 15 percent

The House conferees also agreed to the Senate amendment exempting from the telephone tax any telephone or radio-telephone message which originates within a combat zone from a member of the Armed Forces regardless of who pays for the message

Other Senate amendments agreed to by the conferees included one permitting contractors to transport excavated material within the boundaries of and adjacent to a construction project without being subject to the freight tax, and one excluding from the transportation tax on persons a tax on transportation by water on a vessel which makes intermediate stops at ports within the United States, Canada, or Mexico, if the vessel making such intermediate stops is not authorized both to discharge and take on passengers.

The conferees agreed to the Senate amendment regarding exemptions from the admissions tax with a slight change.

The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment eliminating the House provision providing for a 3-percent tax on the transportation of oil by water when transported by the owner of the oil

Among other amendments introduced on the floor, which were accepted by the House conferees, were the following:

An amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr CARLSON], applying the net loss carry-back and carry-forward provisions to casualty losses.

An amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], placing bauxite in the list of strategic minerals exempt from the excess-profits tax

An amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], providing tax refunds to manufacturers for spirits lost in floods.

An amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr KEFAUVER], providing for a refund in the case of a tax paid by a trust, the beneficiary of which was killed in action in World War II This amendment was rewritten in conference to carry out the purpose intended. However, another amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr HUNT], requiring net worth statements from certain law violators was rejected on advice of the Treasury that the authority to require such statements is already contained in existing law

An amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], in regard to a publishing business carried on by a university was accepted with modified language to carry out the intent.

An amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], reducing the tax on smoking tobacco to 10 cents a pound to conform to the action of the Finance Committee in reducing the tax on plug and twist chewing tobacco and snuff to 10 cents a pound

The House conferees also agreed to another amendment offered by Mr ROBERTSON exempting from the tax on toilet preparations miniature samples bought and exhibited by house-to-house salesmen

An amendment offered by the Senator from Deleware [Mr FREAR], permitting a lessor railroad to file a consolidated return with its lessee railroad for the purpose of securing the utility credit for excess-profits tax purposes.

An amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], adding garnet to the list of minerals accorded a 15-percent depletion allowance

An amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr HILL], exempting admissions to games between two high-school teams which inured to the benefit of a children's hospital.

An amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN exempting electric, gas, and oil appliances of the industrial type was modified by the conferees As agreed to in conference, the tax on electrical appliances will not apply to electric direct motor-driven fans and circulators of the industrial type In the case of all other electrical appliances, the tax will apply only to those of the household type.

An amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] amending the Social Security Act with a proviso that the State must enact legislation prohibiting the use of information obtained from the relief rolls for political or commercial purposes

In regard to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the House receded with an amendment which eliminated the provisions of the Senate amendment increasing the compensation of the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the Members of Congress, but removed the tax-exempt status of the expense allowance of such officials This tax exemption in the case of the President and Vice President is removed as of January 20, 1953, and in the case of Members of Congress as of January 3, 1953 The President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and each Member of Congress will be required to account for such expense allowance insofar as is necessary for the purpose of deducting such expenses for income-tax purposes.

At this point, I wish to insert a table which shows the estimated revenue to be derived under the conference agreement in a full year of operation and the effect on receipts in the fiscal year 1952

I believe that the additional revenue under this bill may well exceed $6,000,000,000 instead of the $5,700,000,000 estimate of the staff. In any event, the total annual tax bill of the American people will be, when this bill becomes law, around $67,000,000,000. I wish to point out that our corporate rates are now higher than those imposed in other countries. And in many cases our income tax on individuals is higher than the income tax imposed by other countries. Our economy can be destroyed through confiscatory and oppressive taxation. Therefore, I believe that we should hesitate about placing any further additional tax burdens upon the American people. I, for one, am opposed to any further increases in taxes except in case of another world war. We must make every effort to keep our expenditures in line with our receipts. Every waste in Government and nonessential spending must be curtailed. The American taxpayer must receive full value in the expenditure of his tax dollar

I hope that the additional taxes imposed by this bill will be removed within the time limit provided for in the bill, that is, at the end of 1953 in the case of individuals and before April 1, 1954, in the case of corporations and excises In my opinion, the economy will not be able to stand such a heavy burden over an extended period of time.

I wish to insert a table which shows the tax burden imposed on individuals in the past year

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have been somewhat confused about the situation, as I think most other Members of the Senate have, and would appreciate having the distinguished chairman of the committee state the legislative status of the tax bill, in view of the House action.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the conferees agreed some days ago on the 264 amendments made to the bill in the Senate. The Senate had asked for the conference, and the House therefore acted first upon the conference report.

I am sure the Senate is familiar with the outcome of the procedure in the House on the conference report. A motion to recommit was made, which was rejected by the House, but on a motion to agree, the House rejected the conference report itself by a vote of 204 to 157.

There was an important issue raised on the individual income rates. Originally the House bill called for a straight percentage increase in individual rates of the 12½ percent in all brackets. The Senate bill provided for an increase of 11 percent or 8 percent on the take-home pay, whichever was the lesser.

In the first conference report, which was rejected by the House, the conferees had agreed upon 11¾ percent, or 9 percent of the take-home pay, whichever was the lesser tax. On the first bracket group, the increase was 11½ percent. The conference report which has been agreed to by the conferees today has adopted the Senate provision of 11 percent so far as the first tax bracket is concerned. In other words, that is as low as the conferees could go with respect to taxpayers in the first bracket. The rate for the brackets above the first bracket was agreed to as in the original conference, that is, 11¾ percent, or 9 percent of the take-home pay, whichever was the lesser. This agreement, as originally made, increased the revenue by an estimated $186,000,000. The amendment to which the conferees agreed today reduces that increase by approximately $68,000,000. So the total increase in individual taxes is above the original tax bill passed by the Senate. It is, of course, below the original bill as passed by the House.

I now offer for the RECORD at this point a statement of the burdens of these rates, showing the tax burden for previous years and the burden on unmarried taxpayers and married taxpayers with two dependents. I believe that the table indicating the burden upon married taxpayers without dependents has been deleted from this particular statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison between the individual income tax burden in the years 1944–45, 1948–49 and under present law, with that under H. R 4473 as agreed to by the conferees for the years 1952 and 1953

A SINGLE PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income (after deductions but before exemptions)	Amount of tax			Increase in tax liability due to 1950 act		Amount of tax under H R. 4473	Increase in tax liability of H R 4473 over present law		Cumulated increase in liability due to the 1950 act and H. R 4473	
	1944-45	1948-49	Present law	Amount	Percent		Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
$600	$23									
$800	69	$33	$40	$7	20 5	$44	$4	11 0	$11	33 7
$1,000	115	66	80	14	20 5	89	9	11 0	22	33 7
$1,500	240	149	180	31	20 5	200	20	11 0	50	33 7
$2,000	345	232	280	48	20 5	311	31	11 0	78	33 7
$3,000	585	409	488	79	19 2	542	54	11 1	133	32 5
$5,000	1, 105	811	944	133	16 4	1, 052	108	11 4	241	29 7
$8,000	2, 035	1, 546	1, 780	234	15 1	1, 992	212	11 9	446	28 8
$10,000	2, 755	2, 124	2, 436	312	14 7	2, 728	292	12 0	604	28 4
$15,000	4, 930	3, 894	4, 448	554	14 2	4, 908	520	11 7	1, 074	27 6
$20,000	7, 580	6, 089	6, 942	853	14 0	7, 762	820	11 8	1, 673	27 5
$25,000	10, 590	8, 600	9, 796	1, 196	13 9	10, 940	1, 144	11 7	2, 340	27 2
$50,000	27, 945	23, 201	26, 388	3, 187	13 7	28, 466	2, 078	7 9	5, 265	22 7
$100,000	69, 870	58, 762	66, 798	8, 036	13 7	69, 688	2, 890	4 3	10, 926	18 6
$500,000	444, 350	[1]385, 000	429, 274	41, 274	11 5	436, 161	6, 890	1 6	51, 164	13 3
$1,000,000	[2]900, 000	[3]770, 000	[3]870, 000	100, 000	13 0	[4]880, 000	10, 000	1 1	110, 000	11 3

B. MARRIED COUPLE [5]—2 DEPENDENTS

$2,000	$45									
$3,000	275	$100	$120	$20	20 5	$133	$13	11.0	$34	34 7
$5,000	755	432	520	88	20 5	577	57	11.0	146	34 7
$8,000	1, 585	974	1, 152	178	18. 3	1, 282	130	11 3	308	31 6
$10,000	2, 245	1, 361	1, 592	231	17. 0	1, 774	182	11 4	413	30 3
$15,000	4, 265	2, 512	2, 900	388	15 4	3, 236	336	11 6	724	28 8
$20,000	6, 785	3, 888	4, 464	576	14 8	5, 000	536	12 0	1, 112	28 6
$25,000	9, 705	5, 476	6, 268	792	14 5	7, 004	736	11 7	1, 528	28 0
$50,000	26, 865	16, 578	18, 884	2, 306	13 9	21, 088	2, 204	11 7	4, 510	27 2
$100,000	68, 505	45, 643	51, 912	6, 269	13 7	56, 042	4, 120	7 9	10, 389	22 8
$500,000	442, 985	358, 677	402, 456	43, 779	12 2	411, 224	8, 768	2 2	52, 547	14 7
$1,000,000	[2]900, 000	769, 314	857, 456	88, 142	11. 5	871, 224	13, 768	1. 6	101, 910	13. 2

[1] Maximum effective rate limitation of 77 percent.
[2] Maximum effective rate limitation of 90 percent.
[3] Maximum effective rate limitation of 87 percent.
[4] Maximum effective rate limitation of 88 percent.
[5] Income earned by 1 spouse

Mr. GEORGE. I should also like to offer for the RECORD at this time a statement with respect to certain changes made by the conferees in their meeting today. Some of these changes are referred to in a general statement which I shall wish to place in the RECORD, but I think it proper to insert at this time a statement of the changes agreed to by the conference committee today.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RATES

The increase in tax in the first bracket is reduced from 11½ percent to 11 percent. This change will reduce the yield of the bill by $68,000,000 in a full year of operation, of which $43,000,000 or 63 percent would go to taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes of less than $5,000.

2. MAXIMUM RATE ON CAPITAL GAINS

The maximum rate on long-term capital gains for individuals and corporations is to be increased from the present 25 percent to 26 percent. This will increase revenue by approximately $28,000,000.

3. EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE 83 PERCENT EXCESS PROFITS TAX CUT-BACK

The effective date of the cut-back of the average earnings credit under the excess profits tax from 85 percent to 83 percent will be changed from January 1, 1952 to July 1, 1951. This will increase liabilities on 1951 profits by $60,000,000.

4. EXCISE TAXES

Electric garbage disposal units are added to the list of electrical appliances subject to the 10-percent manufacturers' tax. Skates are removed from the list of articles subject to the 15-percent sporting goods tax There is a $2,000,000 loss on skates and a $2,000,000 gain on the taxing of garbage disposal units.

5. INFORMATION RETURNS

Rural electrification cooperatives and certain companies exempt under section 101 (10) or (11), and mutual insurance companies taxable under Supplement G are exempted from the requirement of filing information returns with respect to patronage dividends or refunds made to their patrons.

6. HOLDING PERIOD FOR TIMBER

The present method for computing the holding period in the case of timber subject

to the provisions of section 117 (k) (2) is retained. Under the present law the holding period runs only to the date of the contract for disposal of the timber, instead of the date of the cutting of the timber as under the bill.

7. COAL ROYALTIES

The provision giving capital-gain treatment to coal royalties is made inapplicable in computing the income subject to the surtax on improper accumulations under section 102 and the surtax on personal holding companies under section 500.

8. TERMINATION PAYMENTS TO EMPLOYEES

The provision in the bill giving capital-gain treatment to lump-sum payments received at retirement upon the release of rights to future profits of the employer is restricted to cases where the employee was entitled to such profits either for the duration of his life or for at least 5 years after retirement.

9. CARRY-OVER OF NET OPERATING LOSSES

The provision in the bill allowing 3-year carry-over of net operating losses for years 1948 and 1949 be liberalized to include 1947, in the case of new companies. This will lose approximately ten million.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, has the distinguished Senator any objection to reading the changes?

Mr. GEORGE. The changes which were made today?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to do so.

The first change was in the individual-income-tax rate, as I have already stated. The increase in tax in the first bracket is reduced from 11½ to 11 percent. This change will reduce the yield of the bill by $68,000,000 in a full year of operation, of which $43,000,000, or 63 percent, would go to taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes of less than $5,000.

The second change agreed to today was with respect to the maximum rate on capital gains. The maximum rate on long-term capital gains for individuals and corporation is to be increased from the present 25 percent to 26 percent. This will increase revenue by approximately $28,000,000.

The third change made today was in the effective date of the cut-back on the average earning credit allowed corporations in computing their excess-profits taxes. The effective date of the cut-back of the average-earnings credit under the excess-profits tax from 85 to 83 percent will be changed from January 1, 1952, as originally agreed to by the conferees, to July 1, 1951. This will increase the liabilities on 1951 profits by approximately $60,000,000. That change is equivalent to applying an 84-percent rate to the average-earnings credit of the corporation for the calendar year 1951 and to 83 percent for the calendar years 1952 and 1953.

The fourth change related to excise taxes. The change is minor. Electric garbage disposal units are added to the list of electrical appliances subject to the 10-percent manufacturers' tax. Skates are removed from the list of articles subject to the 15-percent sporting-goods tax. There is a $2,000,000 loss on skates and a $2,000,000 gain on the taxing of garbage-disposal units, according to the staff estimate. One approximately offsets the other.

The subject of informational returns led to some confusion. There is no tax placed in this bill on rural electric cooperatives and certain companies exempt under section 101 (10) or (11), and mutual-insurance companies taxable under supplement G. The conference agreement made today exempted such corporations from the requirement that they file information returns with respect to patronage dividends or refunds made to their patrons.

The sixth change made today relates to the holding period for timber. The present method for computing the holding period in the case of timber subject to the provisions of section 117 (k) (2) is retained. Under the present law the holding period runs only to the date of the contract for disposal of the timber, instead of the date of the cutting of the timber, as under the Senate bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That means, in effect, that there is no change at all.

Mr GEORGE. There is no change at all from the present law so far as timber is concerned.

The seventh change relates to coal royalties. The provision agreed to today, giving capital gains treatment to coal royalties, is made inapplicable in computing the income subject to the surtax on improper accumulations under section 102 and the surtax on personal holding companies under section 500.

The eighth provision agreed on today relates to the termination payments to employees. It will be recalled that a provision in the bill gave capital gains treatment to lump-sum payments received at retirement upon the release of rights to future profits of the employer, where an employee had been employed for over a 20-year period. By the agreement made today by the conference committee, the provision is restricted to cases in which the employee was entitled to such profits either for the duration of his life or for at least 5 years after retirement, so as to bring the provision more directly in line with the general provision relating to pensions.

The ninth provision agreed to by the conferees today relates to the carry-over of net operating losses. The Senate version of the bill contained a provision for a 4-year carry-over of net operating losses for new companies, that is, companies organized in the base period. By the conference agreement made finally today a 3-year carry-over of net operating losses for the year 1947 is allowed such new companies. This will result in an additional loss of $10,000,000. Both old and new companies can carry forward for 3 years net losses for the years 1948 and 1949.

On the whole, the bill as now reported will produce approximately $5,691,000,000, according to the staff estimates. In my opinion the bill will bring in at least $6,000,000,000 in a full year of spending.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator for making this statement. May I inquire what happened to the family partnership provision?

Mr. GEORGE. The family-partnership provision as it passed the Senate was made retroactive to the date of the enactment of the Internal Revenue Code in 1939. The House conferees objected to this retroactive provision. The House conferees were adamant, and we finally yielded to the House conferees on that point. The bill contains the family-partnership provision as it was originally written in the House bill itself, but it is not made retroactive beyond January 1, 1951.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. What was done relative to wiping out the distinction between individual taxes and taxes on corporations.

Mr. GEORGE. There is no actual distinction.

Mr. LANGER. The rate was lower for corporations in the bill we sent to conference.

Mr. GEORGE. We did make a change in the corporate rate. The House insisted upon the application of the corporate rate increases to the normal tax rather than to the surtax. The Senate had split it. We in the Senate thought that in the interest of the smaller corporations—at least smaller earning corporations—it would be more equitable to apply 2 percent of the increase to the normal tax and 3 percent to the surtax, thus aggregating a 5-percent increase.

We yielded to the House on that point. The net effect of it will produce $150,000,000 more annually. The increase is borne by all corporations. However, the smaller corporations will bear a heavier increase than under the Senate bill, because of the $25,000 surtax exemption.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. Gladly.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to commend the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the other Senate conferees on doing a good job.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia on behalf of the conferees and myself. I hope that the job is a fairly good one.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I gladly yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The junior Senator from South Dakota is attempting to run down the plus and minus figures on the changes, according to the estimates which the distinguished chairman of the committee has given. If I have followed him correctly, it would leave us with a net increase of $10,000,000 over the bill that first went to conference; is that correct? There was a loss of $68,000,000 on the first change, the individual income taxes. There was a gain on the change in the average carrying base of $60,000,000. That would leave a net loss of $8,000,000. There was an increase of

$28,000,000 on the capital gains change, which would leave a net increase——

Mr. GEORGE. Approximately $10,000,000, I would say to the Senator, taking into consideration the nonrecurring items, which on the effective date of the excess profits credit and the allowance of net losses for 1947.

These items will only effect revenue for 1 year, and amount to a net gain of $50,000,000. The changes in the individual income tax and the capital gains tax result in a loss of $41,000,000, which is a permanent let loss The net is, therefore, around $10,000,000.

Mr. CASE. In other words, it is a net gain of about $10,000,000.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes

Mr CASE. I thank the Senator from Georgia

Mr GEORGE. I neglected to insert in the RECORD another table, although the material is already covered by an insertion which I have already made I believe the table should go into the RECORD also as a separate statement. It represents the estimated effect of the conference bill on tax liabilities in a full year of operation and on collections in the fiscal year 1952. The individual income tax for a full year will be increased by $2,280,000,000, and for the fiscal year 1952 by $1,190,000,000.

The corporate income and excess profits taxes are increased for a full year by $2,207,000,000, while for fiscal year 1952 the effect will amount to $787,000,000.

The excise taxes have been increased by $1,204,000,000. The fiscal year 1952 effect is $787,000,000 The total increase in the bill, as I have stated, under the staff-Treasury estimate, is $5,691,000,000, of which $2,764,000,000 will be realized in the current fiscal year.

I ask that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated effect of the conference bill on tax liabilities in a full year of operation and on collections in the fiscal year 1952

[In millions of dollars]

	Full year effect	Fiscal year 1952 effect
Individual income tax	2,280	1,190
Corporate income and excess profits taxes	[1] 2,207	[1] 787
Excise taxes	1,204	[2] 787
Total	5,691	2,764

[1] Net increase after allowing for reduction in individual income taxes due to lower dividends

[2] Assumes excise tax changes are effective November 1, 1951

Mr. GEORGE. I believe there is one other table which I should insert. It shows the revenue effects of the conference agreement. The money amounts are shown in millions of dollars For the adjusted gross income class under $5,000 the liability under the present law is $8,684,000,000. The increase over the present law from the conference agreement for the taxpayer under $5,000 gross income is $951,000,000. By percentage points it is 39.2 percent.

For the adjusted gross income class over $5,000 the liability under the present law is $14,771,000,000. The increase over the present law from the conference agreement is $1,478,000,000. Percentagewise it is 60.8 percent.

The total tax liability under the present law on all individual income taxpayers is $23,455,000,000. The increase over present law, as a result of this agreement, amounts to $2,429,000,000.

Mr. President, I should like to have this table printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Revenue effects of conference agreement on individuals

[Money amounts in millions of dollars]

Adjusted gross income class	Liability under present law [1]	Increase over present law from conference agreement	
		Amount	Percent
Under $5,000	$8,684	$951	39 2
Over $5,000	14 771	1, 478	60 8
Total	23, 455	2, 429	100 0

[1] Normal tax, surtax and alternative tax on net long-term capital gains

NOTE.—Estimates include rate changes and Head of Household provisions

Mr GEORGE Mr. President, I earnestly hope the conference report will be approved

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr HUNT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the report

Mr HUMPHREY. Mr President, I shall not delay the Senate in reaching its decision on this tax bill

On behalf of the Senator from New York (Mr LEHMAN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr DOUGLAS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr MORSE), and myself, I submit, for printing in the RECORD, a joint statement on the tax bill and the second conference report which we are now considering

There being no objection, the joint statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT ON THE TAX BILL BY SENATORS HUMPHREY, LEHMAN, DOUGLAS, AND MORSE

The decision of the House of Representatives to send the tax bill back to conference gave the Senate and House conferees an opportunity to improve some of the deficiencies in the bill We regret that the conference has not acted to correct these deficiencies The tax bill still represents a violation of the principle of fair treatment. It is grossly inadequate and inequitable

We urged the conference committee to arrive at a truer "middle ground" between the Senate and House versions The new tax bill should raise much more revenue The new tax bill should distribute its burden close some loopholes To do otherwise is to bear that burden The new tax bill should close some loopholes. To do otherwise is to invite new pressures for price rises, and subsequent inflation.

The bill as it now stands will bring in only $2,500,000,000 during the current fiscal year in the face of a prospective deficit which may exceed $10,000,000,000 and which will undoubtedly grow. It will only raise a total of $5,700,000,000 in a full year.

The conference committee should have improved the tax bill by making corporation taxes retroactive to January 1; establishing a withholding plan for the payment of taxes on dividends and corporate bond interest; lowering the excess-profits tax "earning base" to 75 percent; increasing the capital-gains rate to 28 percent; and eliminating many of the new minerals which have been added to the privileged "percentage depletion" tax reduction class. These will yield a total of $1,400,000,000

A study of the conference report shows that in arriving at a so-called compromise between the Senate and House versions the conference report favored those who earned incomes of more than $5,000 at the expense of the lower income groups In deciding to decrease the amount raised by individual income taxes from the House version by $432,000,000, only 30 percent of that amount, or $129,000,000, benefited families with less than $5,000 income—yet those families comprise 80 percent of the individual taxpayers of this country We fail to see equity in a proposal where 80 percent of the taxpayers get only 30 percent of the relief while 20 percent of the taxpayers get 70 percent of the relief.

We have, of course, other criticisms of the conference report. There is one which we cannot fail to mention now We are shocked by the action of the conference in accepting the so-called Jenner amendment, which has nothing to do with taxes but has everything to do with the dignity and welfare of unfortunate people who happen to need public assistance This amendment is a rider which will permit the States to make public the names of those who receive relief or other public aid It will allow newspapers to publish the names of the children, the aged, the needy mothers, and the needy blind on the public-assistance rolls Now school children will be told which of their parents are receiving public aid This is cruel This is inconsistent with every principle of humaneness associated with our public assistance program This rider must be rejected.

An effective tax bill is vital to defeat inflation The American taxpayer would prefer to pay for the defense mobilization program through taxes which he can see and understand rather than through the hidden tax of inflation and high prices

Mr President, the second conference has resulted in very few changes The changes are insignificant and do not meet the requirements of a fair and equiptable tax bill The tax measure still fails to meet the needs of our fiscal situation It raises inadequate revenue It will add to inflation; it opens new tax loopholes It violates the principle of the ability to pay and equitable treatment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on my own behalf—and I commend this matter to the reading of every one of my colleagues—I present, for printing in the RECORD, an analysis of corporate profits for the years 1940 up to the third quarter of 1951, based on a study of the Federal Trade Commission's reports up to the third quarter of 1951. This report has been carefully checked by the economic consultants of the Federal Trade Commission; and it represents what I consider to be a factual analysis of corporate profits, which are unprecedented in the history of the United States.

Let me refer to just one item, Mr. President. In 1929, corporate profits were running at the rate of 6.7 percent on the total amount of stock equity; in 1951, they were running at the rate of 13.6 percent on stock ownership. I think this fortifies the point which was made during the debate on the tax bill, namely, that the tax structure on corporate income can well stand a considerable boost, so as at least to give some equity to the tax program of the Government.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have this statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ANALYSIS OF CORPORATE PROFITS BASED ON STUDY OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION REPORTS

The profits of corporations have grown during the past decade by utterly fantastic proportions. The corporations are now taking profits—after taxes—at a rate which was undreamed of even during World War II, and undreamed of even in the heyday of 1929

The Department of Commerce has recently released a compendium of statistics showing the growth of corporate profits over the last 10 years—1940 to 1950, inclusive. I should like to read these figures. They are profits for all corporations—including manufacturing corporations, mining corporations, corporations in the wholesale and retail trade fields, in the banking, service, transportation and all other fields. They reflect, in short, profits of all business corporations in the United States. And I might emphasize that these figures reflect net profits after all taxes. The figures are as follows.

	Billion dollars
1940	6.4
1941	9 4
1942	9 4
1943	10. 6
1944	10 8
1945	8. 5
1946	13. 9
1947	18. 5
1948	20. 7
1949	17. 3
1950	22 8

Here it may be noted that corporation profits last year reached their highest peak in all history. They were almost three times what they were in 1945, the last full year of World War II This was after taxes.

Now, how are the corporations faring under the present wartime tax law? The Federal Trade Commission has just this week released its financial statement for the second quarter of the year. This statement shows the profits before and after taxes for corporations in the manufacturing business. Manufacturing corporations account for about half—or usually somewhat more than half—of the profits of all business corporations. The Commission does not compile up-to-date figures on corporations other than manufacturing corporations and no up-to-date figures on the other lines of business are available. But let's look at the manufacturing corporations.

In the second quarter of this year—that is, April, May, and June of 1951—manufacturing profits before Federal taxes were even greater than in the same quarter of last year. In the second quarter of last year, net income before Federal income taxes totaled $5,100,000,000. In the second quarter of this year they totaled $6,900,000,000. But, of course, we have had a new excess-profits tax law since last year, and this has taken a small bite—sort of a flea bite—out of corporate profits. Profits of manufacturing corporation after set-asides for Federal income taxes totaled $3,200,000,000 in the second quarter of last year—$3,100,000,000 in the second quarter of this year. In other words, on the face of it, it would appear that the present tax law has reduced profits of manufacturing corporations by about $100,000,000 per quarter. Actually, however, this appearance somewhat overstates the matter. There have been certain offsets—certain increases in real profits which are not reflected in the figures. In short, the increased deductions allowed because of the accelerated amortization program are taken out of the profits figures for this year.

But even so, how do the profits figures compare with past times? We must, of course, take account of the increased investment in corporate assets. Much of the increase in corporate assets is in the form of idle money—that is, a large proportion of the assets represent undeclared dividends from past profits, and this is money which is not needed for production facilities or for operating capital. A large proportion of it is in Government bonds and has nothing to do with the corporations' physical plant for turning out goods. Nevertheless, we will take account of the increased investment—whether the assets be enlarged plants or increased corporate savings. We will assume that all the money the corporations have is needed to run their businesses.

In 1929, net income of manufacturing corporations, after taxes, amounted to a return of 6.7 percent on the stockholders' total equity In 1945, the last full war year of World War II, these same profits, after taxes, amounted to an annual rate of return of 7 1 percent on stockholders' equity. Taxes during World War II could, therefore, hardly be said to be cruel to manufacturing corporations. The rate of return was substantially higher in 1945 than in 1929 But what about now—1951? Compared to a rate of return of 6 7 percent in 1929, and 7 1 percent in 1945, second quarter 1951 profits were at an annual rate of 13.6 percent—more than twice the 1929 rate and almost twice the 1945 rate

What could this mean in tax dollars? Would 1945 be a fair basis of comparison? If corporate taxes were increased so that manufacturing corporations were still allowed to keep profits at the same rate they were allowed in 1945, this would mean that these corporations would not be retaining about $6,400,000,000 a year instead of the $12,900,000,000 which they will retain this year, if they do as well for themselves during the second half of the year as they did in the first half of 1951. This would also mean an additional $6,500,000,000 coming into the Federal Treasury from manufacturing corporations alone. Considering all the other business corporations, taxes which allowed retention of profits at the 1945 rate would probably bring in about $13,000,000,000 more than is now coming in Let me emphasize again, this would not mean allowing corporations to retain the same absolute amount of profits they retained in 1945. On the contrary, the additional $13,000,000,000 which they ought to be paying in taxes makes allowances for increased business investment. It would allow corporations to retain profits at the same rate of return which prevailed in 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that on this question I will vote "no." In view of the fact that the yeas and nays have not been ordered by the Senate, I wish the RECORD to show distinctly that I will vote "no."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if we have reached the point in the proceedings where we are about to vote on the question of agreeing to the conference report, I wish to be registered as voting "no" on this question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. [Putting the question.]

The report was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the absence of a yea-and-nay vote, I should like to have the RECORD show that on that vote I voted "no."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

PURCHASE OF AUTOMOBILES OR OTHER CONVEYANCES BY CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 83)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, ordered to lie on the table and to be printed:

To the Senate of the United States:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, S. 1864, Eighty-second Congress, "An act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes."

The purpose of the enactment is to authorize payment of not to exceed $1,600 on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance for any veteran of World War II, or of service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to a date to be determined by the President or the Congress, who is entitled to compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for the loss, or loss of use, of one or both hands or feet, or for defective vision to a prescribed degree.

Previous laws accorded a similar benefit to each World War II veteran entitled to compensation for loss, or loss of use, of one or both legs, at or above the ankle, with the requirement that the veteran be qualified to operate the vehicle. Although the authority for that program expired on June 30, 1951, nearly all of the eligible World War II veterans with leg disabilities have already qualified for and received a conveyance. The principal effect of the present proposal on World War II veterans would be to grant assistance in obtaining a vehicle to those with service-connected disabilities of the upper extremities and to those with seriously impaired vision. It would also qualify veterans of the emergency period beginning June 27, 1950, for this benefit for the first time.

This proposal is very similar in essential respects to S. 2115, Eighty-first Congress, which was passed by the Congress in the fall of 1949, and on which I withheld my approval for reasons set forth at length in a memorandum of disapproval of October 31, 1949.

It is significant that the considerations set forth in that memorandum of disapproval were accepted as sound by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare when it reported favorably on the original version of S. 1864, Eighty-second Congress, on July 25, 1951. At that time the bill would have simply extended the previous World War II program of assistance in obtaining

automobiles for veterans with compensable leg disabilities to include those suffering the same types of disabilities in the active service since June 27, 1950. Apparently recognizing the necessity for restricting this benefit to those having a definite need, in addition to compensation and other existing benefits, for assistance to overcome the handicap of decreased mobility, the committee stated that it had "confined this bill to the same sound standards of rehabilitation which have governed this program since its inception for the benefit of World War II veterans." The Senate accepted and passed the original bill embodying this principle.

However, the bill as finally adopted by both Houses of the Congress is subject to most of the basic objections raised against S. 2115, Eighty-first Congress. While, unlike the previous bill, this one does not include World War I veterans, it does depart materially from the principle upon which the original World War II program was founded, by extending the program to include veterans with disabilities of the upper extremities and blind veterans. As indicated with reference to S. 2115, the factor of materially diminished mobility, which was an underlying basis of the original program of automobiles for disabled World War II veterans with injury or loss of lower limbs, would be largely disregarded in the cases of the relatively large group of veterans with disabilities of the upper extremities who would be brought in by this bill. In addition, this proposal would dispense with the requirement of the original program that the veteran must be able to drive the vehicle, at least in those instances where someone else is available to drive for him. S. 1864 would, with respect to a considerable proportion of the beneficiaries, abandon the principle upon which the original program was based.

The question of policy arising from this legislation should certainly be determined on a more solid basis than the theory that the proposed benefit is a desirable convenience. The proper test is whether it would be a necessary, sound, and substantial part of the program of rehabilitation and readjustment which the Government is obligated to provide for veterans seriously disabled in the service.

The broad program which has already been placed into effect is based upon the concept that the best help which can be given the disabled veteran is that which directly assists him to the maximum extent possible in overcoming his service disability. Sound measures to this end include medical and hospital care, prosthetic appliances, vocational rehabilitation training, and liberal rates of monthly compensation, including additional amounts for dependents in severe cases. Blind veterans may be provided with guide dogs and electrical or mechanical equipment to aid them in overcoming their physical handicap. Special increased rates of compensation are granted to those with specific disabilities such as the loss of one or both hands or feet, or blindness. Veterans who would benefit by S. 1864 receive monthly compensation payments ranging from $102 to $360, with extra amounts in most cases for those with dependents. To these benefits the bill would add a payment on one automobile, which would necessarily afford but a temporary type of assistance.

It is difficult to perceive how this bill would fit into the existing benefit structure, for the reason that in a great many instances the benefit provided would not be geared to a peculiar and urgent need for rehabilitative assistance of this nature and would not be in keeping with the underlying objective of assisting these disabled veterans to be as nearly as possible self-reliant and self-sustaining members of society.

As I pointed out in the statement on the Eighty-first Congress bill any proposal to make gifts of specific nonmonetary benefits to a selected group of disabled veterans easily leads to serious inequalities. The previous World War II automobile program sought to avoid these inequalities by restricting the benefit to those with leg injuries constituting a material handicap to their mobility. The present bill would include more than 9,400 World War II veterans and an unknown but substantial number of veterans of the present emergency, with disability of the upper extremities. About 9,200 of these World War II veterans would have loss, or loss of use, of only one hand or arm. Many of these would have a disability rating of only 60 or 70 percent, with only slight impairment of mobility, if any, while at the same time a much greater number of veterans dated as 100 percent disabled, but without the specific disability covered by this proposal, will not receive automobiles. It would be easy to find wholesale discriminations as the result of enactment of this legislation. For example, of the estimated 11,700 World War II veterans who would become eligible for assistance in obtaining automobiles under this legislation, approximately 41 percent, or 4,800, would be cases rated for compensation purposes as disabled 70 percent or less, while only some 3,000 would be rated as 100 percent disabled. At the same time, at least 70,000 World War II veterans receiving compensation for 100-percent disability from the Veterans' Administration will have been unable to qualify for automobiles under either this or the prior law.

What was stated by way of conclusion in the memorandum of disapproval on S. 2115, Eighty-first Congress, is just as applicable in testing the merits of this legislation:

> When we move beyond the provision of individually fitted prosthetic appliances for disabled veterans into the field of compensation, the sound and equitable method of meeting the needs of disabled veterans is through the provision of a carefully considered scale of compensation rates paid in cash on a monthly basis. This is our long-tested practice from which I believe we should not depart.

Although I am impelled for the foregoing reasons to withhold my approval from S. 1864, I would be glad to approve legislation which would limit eligibility to veterans of World War II and to each person who, after June 27, 1950, and until termination of the present emergency, has served in the military forces of the United States, and who is entitled to compensation for the loss, or loss of use of, one or both legs at or above the ankle.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 18, 1951.*

TERMINATION OF STATE OF WAR BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND GERMANY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 289, to terminate the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany, was debated somewhat yesterday. I should like to have the joint resolution passed while Senators are present on the floor. Following action on the joint resolution we can take up routine matters.

I think it was generally the consensus of everyone that the amendment attached to the joint resolution by the committee should be rejected and the subject matter should be dealt with in separate legislation. I should like to have the Senate act quickly on the resolution and pass it, rejecting the amendment, the subject matter of which to be considered by a committee separately. This resolution has been pending for some time, and I fear that the German people may not understand the reason for the delay. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 289.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 289) to terminate the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment on page 2, after line 9, to insert:

> Any citizen (or his successors in interest) whose property was acquired by vesting or otherwise by the Alien Property Custodian and who thereafter instituted suit to recover such property in the manner provided in section 9 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, and subsequent to the institution of such suit, and during the existence of the state of war with Germany hereby terminated, entered into an agreement with officers or agents of the United States, purporting to compromise or release his claim without a full hearing on the merits by a court of competent jurisdiction to determine whether such property was validly vested under the Trading With the Enemy Act, may, within 1 year of the effective date of this resolution, institute suit to recover such property in the manner provided in section 9 (a) of such act; and no agreement, compromise, or release executed by such citizen during the state of war and purporting to convey such property to the Alien Property Custodian or to release any claim by the citizen to such property and no judgment entered on any such agreement, compromise, or release shall be pleaded in bar of such suit, it being the intent of this section to afford every such citizen whose property was so acquired by the Alien Property Custodian an opportunity for full hearing on the merits of his claim to such property. A claimant hereunder shall not be required, as a condition precedent of instituting such suit, to tender back

any benefit or consideration received by him in connection with any release, compromise, or agreement executed by him, but the court shall, in its final judgment, make such order with respect to any such benefit or consideration as it shall deem equitable in the circumstances.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I understand there is a motion to strike out the amendment and proceed to vote on the joint resolution.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is unnecessary to strike it out. It is a matter of voting to reject the amendment, after which we can pass the resolution. Thereafter the amendment can be considered in the form of separate legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I do not intend to take up the time of the Senate. I have already spoken twice on this subject, and I think my position is well known. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared in connection with the amendment to House Joint Resolution 289.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object, I have not read the statement. I should like to ask the Senator simply to tell me whether there is in the statement any reference to the Senator from Wisconsin, or any other personal reference.

Mr. LEHMAN. No; but it will only take me about 3 or 4 minutes to read it. In order that no question may be raised, I should like to read it, if I may. It will not take long.

Mr. President, I trust and hope that the Senate will disagree with the committee amendment. I cannot conceive that this body will agree to this rider, for the benefit of one man, to a bill deciding a question of war and peace for our country.

Although this amendment is couched in general terms, its effect is frankly intended to be specific—to permit a Mr. Ernest Halbach to reopen a claim which has been disposed of as thousands of other claims have been and are being disposed of every day by the Government.

I think the claim itself, on the basis of the facts known to me, is unjustified and unwarranted. But there are legal avenues open to Mr. Halbach to seek the reopening of his claim, to set aside the settlement made with him more than 6 years ago. He can go to the courts. He has gone to the courts. His case is even now pending before the Federal court in New Jersey.

If he desires to press his claim before the Congress, he can do so, if he can get one Member of Congress to introduce such a bill. The Judiciary Committees of both House and Senate handle hundreds of private bills.

The Judiciary Committee would, I am sure, go into this matter with great thoroughness, and get at the facts, all the facts, in this strange case of Mr. Halbach.

Mr. President, I have looked at a great deal of data on this case. I have read the RECORD of the proceedings and affidavits and depositions in the original case, which was settled 6 years ago by the payment to Mr. Halbach of $537,000, and in the current case, which is still pending before the Federal court in New Jersey. I do not think it necessary for me to discuss these facts at this time, although I am prepared to do so.

I want only to say that as far as I can see the Government was more than fair in its treatment of Mr. Halbach. I think the Government leaned over backward in its efforts to be fair. The Government paid Mr. Halbach a half million dollars in settlement of whatever claim he had, and paid him more than a half million dollars in salary in the years since title to the property in question was vested.

This was, in my judgment, enemy property. This was enemy property in the judgment of the Alien Property Custodian who vested that property. It was property used to advance the interests of Nazi Germany. The record, before the Kilgore committee in 1945, is very clear on this point, and on the point of Mr. Halbach's activities in support of those interests up to the very moment we got into war with Germany.

But all this is aside from the question facing us today. That question is: Are we going to attach the Halbach case to this resolution declaring war with German at an end?

I can think of nothing more incredible. Even if the case was on its surface, absolutely clear, this rider should not be attached to this high declaration of national purpose and policy. The Judiciary Committee, and not the Foreign Relations Committee should consider such a proposal. It is a private bill, and not a matter of foreign policy, or of our relations with Germany.

If it is a question of relations with Germany, if it is a question of returning this property to Germany, rather than to Mr. Halbach, the Senate should be told about it.

I do not think it is. I think it is an attempt to gain control of General Aniline & Film Co. There is ample evidence in the record, including a statement by my good friend, Mr. Leo Crowley, that control of General Aniline & Film Co. cannot be separated from control of General Dyestuffs Corp. Is this resolution of peace with Germany to be tied up with that question?

That would be a sorry spectacle for the Nation and the world to regard. What would our children think and our children's children, in reading this declaration of peace, to see, in their history books, this strange language, specifically written to cover Mr. Halbach, and his alleged claim for the return of property that was seized as enemy property, that was used to advance the purposes and interests of an enemy nation?

What a come-down is this. What a descent from the heights of foreign policy to the pedestrian level of the financial claims of one man, of an effort to secure a lever on the control of one corporation through the control of another.

The language of the amendment does not speak of Mr. Halbach. His name is not mentioned or spelled out. It is general language. The Justice Department tells me that, inevitably, this language will cover a score of claims, that have been settled in the same way as that of Mr. Halbach. Is that the way to conduct Government business?

The Government settles thousands of tax claims every month, by stipulation, duly approved by courts of record. Perhaps some of those settlements are questionable in their justice. Would the Finance Committee presume to attach an amendment to a tax bill opening up these settlements to further court review years after the claims have been settled? Of course not. That would result in chaos and anarchy.

If Mr. Halbach has a proper claim, let him continue to pursue it in the courts. What are we doing here but presuming to prejudge a pending court case?

If he does not get satisfaction in the courts, he can get somebody to introduce a private bill, which can be passed on by the Judiciary Committee. I urge the rejection of the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in order to get away from the difficulty concerning the amendment, at the opening of the session today I introduced a private bill which can be taken up on its merits in the Judiciary Committee. The amendment on which we are about to vote is long overdue, but I think it is too bad that the joint resolution should become mixed up with a private matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 2. In furtherance of the purposes of section 1 hereof, the President of the United States hereby is requested to proceed with the negotiation of a treaty of peace between the United States and the Government of Germany and to submit the same for the consideration of the Senate at the earliest practicable date; and the President is advised that it is the sense of the Congress that said treaty of peace should be negotiated jointly with the allies of the United States in the war against Germany except that if such joint negotiations prove impossible or impracticable, the treaty should be negotiated as was the treaty with Japan.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from South Dakota is proceeding under no illusions with respect to the situation with which we are confronted today. Congress has one eye on the clock and the other eye on the calendar. Senators are anxious to dispose of the resolution which is now pending and to get down to other business. But the memory of World War II is still very clear in our minds. We ought not continually to be "behind the eight ball" insofar as taking the initiative in Europe is concerned. The initiative today rests

with Russia; it rests with Eastern Germany. Evidence of that is the number of news dispatches which have been coming out of that country within the past few weeks, added to the announcement of the East German Government that German unity discussions have started with Western Germany. That proposal of the East German Government for unity discussions with Western Germany has stalled the movement of General Eisenhower in connection with bringing West Germany into Western Europe for the defense of the West against the inroads of communism.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a special dispatch to the New York Times dated Berlin, October 13, only 5 days ago, the first sentence of which is as follows:

President Wilhelm Pieck said today that his East German Government wanted to start German unity discussions immediately without imposing any conditions. He said skeptical Bonn officials were mistaken if they interpreted the appeal made Wednesday by the East German People's Chamber as excluding such talks unless Bonn's negotiations on rearmament with the Allied High Commission were dropped

Herr Pieck insisted that East German Government was not demanding that West Germany make a choice between the east and the west.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire dispatch be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PIECK DENIES HIS REGIME WANTS BONN TO END DEFENSE TALK AS CONDITION FOR UNITY

BERLIN, October 13 — President Wilhelm Pieck said today that his East German Government wanted to start German unity discussions immediately without imposing any conditions He said skeptical Bonn officials were mistaken if they interpreted the appeal made Wednesday by the East German People's Chamber as excluding such talks unless Bonn's negotiations on rearmament with the Allied High Commission were dropped

Herr Pieck insisted that East German Government was not demanding that West Germany make a choice between the east and the west

He said the East German offer was intended as a mark of his Government's readiness to reach an understanding on the basis of a compromise. He cited the East German willingness to discuss the neutral supervision of any all-German elections as evidence of his Government's readiness to reach a compromise solution.

Herr Pieck did not say whether Otto Grotewohl, East German Premier, had dropped another condition he voiced in the People's Chamber Wednesday—the exclusion of his opposite number, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, from these proposed talks of Germans at one table.

An article by Walter Ulbricht, secretary general of the Socialist Unity (Communist) Party in appearing today in the East German press supported the unity appeal in terms that underlined the objective—to prevent or delay West German participation in the Atlantic Alliance, in any way, shape or manner.

Herr Ulbricht, who is believed to be closer to the Kremlin than any other East German official made it clear that the main weight would be brought to bear against the use of the Ruhr industries, rather than against German divisions yet to be born even on paper.

As a formula for top-level diplomacy Herr Ulbricht stressed support for the Soviet proposal of a peace accord among the powers, including Communist China.

It is generally believed that if and when the Russians, decide to play a real all-German settlement card they will have to offer it on a 4-power basis.

Herr Ulbricht hailed the Soviet Union as the land with the highest development of human society from which Germany must learn.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have several articles with reference to this question. While I do not intend to take too much time, I am trying to fulfill a responsibility which I feel in laying them before the Senate tonight.

On the 12th of October Stewart Alsop published an article in the Washington Post in which he reviewed the situation and said, starting out with a quotation from General Eisenhower:

"We can do the job without the Germans, if that becomes absolutely necessary"

This recent remark is reliably attributed to Gen Dwight Eisenhower.

Then Mr. Alsop points out that although General Eisenhower said it could be done, we should not rest with that, and goes on to say.

Yet the stick is not enough—there must also be a carrot, and a large one.

Quoting further:

The best men here are becoming increasingly convinced that we must be prepared to accept the risks of offering the West Germans the only carrot which will really tempt them—genuine complete internal sovereignty, within a Western European framework And surely as the choice between the carrot and the stick is made very clear, there cannot be much doubt in the end about how the Germans will choose

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by Mr. Alsop be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

THE STICK AND THE CARROT

BONN —"We can do the job without the Germans, if that becomes absolutely necessary" This recent remark is reliably attributed to Gen Dwight D Eisenhower. Presumably, Eisenhower thinks that, given great air power and atomic superiority, the defense of Western Europe without a German manpower contribution is militarily feasible. And in the peculiar atmosphere of this artificial political capital, the remark takes on great significance

For the demonstrable fact is that something has gone very wrong with allied plans for a West German defense force Consider the facts. It is more than a year now since Secretary of State Dean G Acheson, pushed and chivvied by the Pentagon, and against the advice of able United States High Commissioner John McCloy, demanded immediate German rearmament. At that time, the Pentagon planners, suffering from the delusion that the militant German nation would spring to arms at the word of command, were talking of an important German military contribution in a matter of months.

Yet now, a year later, the first German soldier in the western alliance is unlikely to put on his uniform for at least 10 months—and only then if all goes more smoothly than there seems much reason to expect. And the best private guess here is that, under present conditions, Western Germany will not contribute more than about eight rather thin divisions by the end of 1953—hardly a decisive contribution

In short, in the time of great danger immediately ahead, the job will simply have to be done without the Germans Meanwhile, in the view of some very able men here, it is time to have a good hard look at what has gone wrong.

Many things have gone wrong. For one thing, the effectiveness of the Soviet-Communist unity line has been vastly underestimated in the west, a matter which will be examined in a later report But what seems to have gone principally wrong is that the Pentagon planners, fascinated like a rabbit by a snake by the thought of future German divisions, have fixed a rigid but entirely unrealistic time table for German rearmament Thus the western administrators here, including the extremely able United States High Commissioner John J McCloy, have been robbed of the flexibility required in negotiation.

Any negotiation is a matter, in the end, of the carrot and the stick And because the German politicians are convinced that the west must have a German defense contribution at any cost, the allied negotiators had no stick

Logically, the Germans should be begging the Allies for the means to defend their own soil Instead, the Pentagon-planned program has placed the Allies in the position of doing the begging This immensely stimulates the sort of irrationality displayed by such a man as the powerful, fanatically nationalist, Dr Kurt Schumacher, leader of the Social-Democratic Party.

Schumacher haughtily dismisses the Schuman plan and the European army, now the twin pillars of American policy in Europe, as French trickery. He would permit German rearmament only on the impossible condition that there were sufficient Anglo-American ground strength to halt a Soviet attack at the Elbe and once this condition was fulfilled, he strongly implies, Germany would rearm only in order to march to the Vistula

With this sort of internal political pressure to deal with, it is not surprising that negotiations between the high commissioners and the brilliant aging Chancellor Konrad Adenauer move sluggishly from deadlock to deadlock The fact is that until both a large stick and a juicy carrot can be made clearly visible to the Germans, the German rearmament project will continually bog down, as it has for more than a year now

The nature of the stick was summed up by one wise official here about as follows "We should be in a position to tell the Germans flatly that if they really want it that way, we shall concentrate everything on the defense of the Rhine Western Germany will then become a temporary useful outpost and maneuver area in case of war"

This is tough talk, but particularly in this country, tough talk sometimes clears the air Yet the stick is not enough—there must also be a carrot, and a large one. Because the risks of rearming Germany are so frightening, there has been a great tendency in all three allied capitals to try to keep Germany in rather clumsily concealed leading strings during the rearmament period This just will not work A nation simply cannot be rearmed and kept in leading strings at one and the same time.

The best men here are becoming increasingly convinced that we must be prepared to accept the risks of offering the west Germans the only carrot which will really tempt them—genuine complete internal sovereignty, within a western European framework. And surely as the choice between the carrot

and the stick is made very clear, there cannot be much doubt in the end about how the Germans will choose.

Mr. CASE. I do not know, Mr President, whether, with my brief references, the point is clear, so I desire to state it very simply and definitely. My amendment proposes to add a section to the pending resolution which would advise the President that we believe he should immediately seek to negotiate a treaty of peace with Germany The pending resolution would merely be a one-sided declaration that the state of war with Germany is at an end, but it does not give West Germany the status of a country which has a treaty of peace. The fighting in Europe stopped many months before the fighting stopped in the Pacific, yet we have already negotiated a treaty of peace with Japan. Japan can look with confidence toward standing on her own feet. Germany cannot.

This one-sided, unilateral resolution is, again, a flagrant example of lack of initiative of the State Department. It is negative action. It leaves the initiative with East Germany, which is now proposing unity talks, and it is that proposal which has stalled General Eisenhower's attempt to bring the West Germans into European harmony. That is not merely my conviction or that of Mr. Alsop, it is also the conviction of Mr. Enno Hobbing, who, in Time magazine, has an article of some length, entitled "Germany, Up From the Ashes"

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. This resolution has already passed the House, and if we tie to it the Senator's amendment, it would have to go to conference and would probably be killed. Why cannot the Senator let the joint resolution be passed, and offer his proposal as a separate measure? We will take care of it.

Mr CASE. I may say to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that that is exactly what I am going to suggest at the end of my remarks The amendment which I have offered has been before the Committee on Foreign Relations since it was submitted on the 12th of August 1951. However, I feel that I would be derelict in my duty at this time, when we are passing this half measure, if I failed to bring to the attention of the Senate and the country the situation which exists in Germany, and to point out why we do not have the initiative.

Mr. President, I shall not read this entire article. I shall read a paragraph from it, if I may, and then I shall ask permission to place the entire article in the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Senator to say that at the conclusion of his remarks——

Mr. CASE. I intend to follow the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I shall not ask him any more questions.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Time correspondent, Mr. Hobbing, has a four-column article in Time magazine for August 6, 1951, the key paragraph of which reads as follows:

What is needed is a whopping gesture, something on the order of the Japanese treaty, saying in effect "O K, boys. The war is over and we are ready to be friends again, pledged to defend each other."

That is the recommendation of the Time correspondent in Germany, and those Members of the Senate who have followed the editorial policies of Time magazine through the years will know that when Time publishes this four-column story under the heading "Germany; Up From the Ashes," and discusses the problems which General Eisenhower confronts in Germany today in attempting to bring them into the organization with the other western European countries, Time is not making its recommendation that "What is needed is a whopping gesture, something on the order of the Japanese treaty," without there being a real need for it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article from Time magazine may be incorporated in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMANY; UP FROM THE ASHES

(By Enno Hobbing)

The people of Western Germany have turned a big corner S.x months ago, stagnation was still everywhere; today, from the Elbe to the Rhine, everything is in motion. Ponderous blocks of new building bulk cleanly amid the jagged skylines In Hamburg, Frankfurt and Essen, brick red factory construction and flashy white housing projects chase the gloom of rubble gray The ruins no longer depress, but act as a stimulant to German energy A Hamburg shipping magnate curtly told me why: "If I don't get something done, I'll go crazy. That's sure. A war may take it all away again—maybe. But we'll take that chance."

PROSPERITY

German trade unions have virtually dropped the class-warfare creed In the coal and steel industries the unions are jealous of their newly won right to share in management's decisions Labor leaders are striding into statesmanship; they support the Schuman plan, German rearmament By choosing Christian Fette as chairman to succeed the late venerated Hans Bockler, the unions have affirmed their political independence. Stern, stubby Chairman Fette, 56, will not dance when the doctrinaire Socialist Party pipes; his business is practical gains for German workers.

Under able Finance Minister Fritz Schaffer, employment is up, luxury taxes are stiffer. As economic inequality tends to diminish, a feeling of opportunity grows On the streets, fewer Germans glare enviously at expensive automobiles; cheap Volkswagens, Opels and Fords are nearer the public's reach. Already, more Germans own cars than in 1936. In Bad Godesberg, a German mason carped at the new apartment houses for United States officials· "I wish we were that well off." Promptly two of his colleagues chipped in: "Don't worry. We will be."

BONN DOING WELL

All is not strawberries and cream, however. Western Germany's prosperity still rests on a bedrock of $400,000,000 annual United States aid. The housing shortage is still acute, and so is the economic plight of the war victims. In a camp, just beyond Bonn itself, 50 bombed-out families live like animals Across the land, there are well over a million people unemployed. Conspicuous consumption by the wealthy (encouraged by a tax system that allows huge exemptions for business expenses) makes for glaring contrasts with poverty

But these defects are no longer dominant in German thinking. "We've stopped remembering how poor we were only 5 years ago," said a Frankfurt clerk. "Now we look ahead"

Up and down Western Germany, I found a new note in politics. To any number of political questions, people replied "That's up to Bonn" The Bonn Federal Government has gained grudging acceptance, even respect Local elections center on Federal issues Western Germany's body is beginning to respond to its brain

Bonn, for the provisional capital it was originally intended to be, looks remarkably permanent. It quietly attracts hard-working, talented men from all over Western Germany. The work of parliamentary committees and cabinet ministeries has become impressively competent

Chancelor Konrad Adenauer has moved his office out from under the stuffed animals of the König Museum into the newly redecorated, million-mark Schaumburg palace "If we want to be a power again," says Adenauer, "we have to look like one"

GUILT

Physical recovery is still far ahead of psychological recovery Ripped loose from tradition in 1933, tossed by tyranny and war, submerged under occupation, the Germans are mentally still very much at sea

On the tense uncertain faces, personal tragedies have graven bitter lines Often, helpless hysteria bursts through the curtain of self-control, at other times, Germans seek emotional relief by unburdening their life stories to any listener. Whining and self-pitying creep into ordinary conversations The Germans are not yet a happy people How could they be?

On the surface, the postwar Germans appear to be still busy denying Nazi sins, justifying themselves and criticizing the occupation powers But why should the Germans be so terribly eager to minimize nazism, unless they felt that nazism was a black blot on their record? Why should they take so much time and effort justifying themselves, unless they knew that their reputations were ruined? German criticism of other countries is mainly defensive When a German angrily declares that "die Amerikaner sind auch nicht besser" (the Americans are not better, either), he makes himself feel that he is not the only one who bears a burden of guilt.

FANATICISM FINISHED

Most Germans these days live by and for themselves. They are, in the main, unkind to each other. They lack confidence in any community and are skeptical of new sacrifices for the common interest Thus there is little prospect that German resentments will take the form of organized violence.

The atomization of society has its good side· social mobility. Many a professional soldier has lost his Prussianized kinks after working in the Ruhr mines, many a previous failure has proved himself in the tough scramble of postwar life. Healthy distrust of outworn German codes is surging Fanaticism for the state is finished On this point, the Germans are explicit. "Wir sind nicht noch einmal die Dumen" (We're not going to be played for suckers again).

At bottom, the Germans seem to seek a chance to work off the weight of guilt. The Germans naturally want to feel again that they belong, somewhere. But they will not blindly buy another new order.

This state of mind produces no easily definable political pattern. It is rather meaningless to talk of democracy in Western Germany: The Germans at this point are neither particularly prodemocratic nor antidemocratic.

Nationalism is an equally irrelevant term. Since their destruction and partition in 1945, the Reich and the nation have simply not been realities to the Germans. The very meager successes of the noisy nationalist parties signify more protest against existing economic inadequacies than passion for a political ideal.

THE LEADERS

Durable, level-headed Konrad Adenauer is undoubtedly the best available Chancelor for the Germans. To a people weary of bombast, Adenauer makes calm speeches; to a people fearful of the state, he gives unobtrusive administration. His chief stock in trade is still his shrewd knack for compromise. Rather than have the workers grow restive, Adenauer, the conservative Christian-Democrat, has given trade-unions more responsibility than they ever had in Germany. In order to keep former soldiers from deserting to the radical right, Adenauer the antimilitarist courteously receives influential former generals.

In dealing with the Allies, Adenauer and company have adopted tactics that seem unusual for Germans: politeness and waiting. When confronted with an allied order they dislike, they often ask courteously for time to think it over.

Socialist Leader Kurt Schumacher, Adenauer's implacable political foe, has a more dramatic vision than the Chancelor. Schumacher better understands Communist aims and tactics. His utopian goal is a big Europe, a continent free from the Atlantic to the Soviet border; he considers the little Europe envisaged by projects like the Schuman plan a trap on the road to his larger objective. This all-or-nothing attitude makes the Socialist boss a hard man for the west's statesmen to deal with. It also cuts down Schumacher's popularity in Western Germany.

REARMAMENT

On foreign policy, the Adenauer-Schumacher feud cleaves the Bundestag. Many German and Allied officials hope, probably in vain, for a great coalition of conservatives and Socialists so that German rearmament can be launched by bipartisan decision. German opposition to rearmament has decreased greatly in the last 6 months. There has been what the Germans call zeit zum umdenken—time to think it over. General Eisenhower's declaration that the German soldier never lost his honor soothed much injured pride. Oddly enough, neo-Nazi Ernst Remer (Time, May 21) has also been helpful. A German veteran explained how: "When that scum, Remer, started lambasting rearmament, we soldiers figured rearmament must be the right thing." Two other factors: Rising prosperity gives the Germans a feeling they have something to defend; and Allied successes in Korea suggest that joining the west is not joining the hopeless side.

Adenauer has wisely entrusted his embryonic defense ministry to a sober, militarism-proof trade-unionist, Theodor Blank. Blank's top experts, Gens. Adolf Heusinger and Hans Speidel, have anti-Nazi records, though they also had brilliant military careers.

NEW GERMAN DANGER?

The increased readiness to rearm will go for nothing unless the Germans get gleichberechtigung (equality of rights), i. e., removal of the last discriminatory restrictions on Western Germany. Specifically, this would mean the abolition of the Allied nursemaid, the High Commission. Many Americans here feel sure that the United States could just as well exercise economic controls through the ECA, political controls through an ambassador, military controls through Ike Eisenhower.

What is needed is a whopping gesture, something on the order of the proposed Japanese treaty, saying in effect: "O. K., boys. The war is over and we are ready to be friends again, pledged to defend each other."

German leaders are not going to rearm a second-class people, and Germans are not going to fight as second-class soldiers. The French give the impression that they still want to avoid both a German Army and German equality. Britain, while rigorously rearming at home, has gone slow on Germany, apparently in deference to its anti-United States left-wing Socialist sentiment. United States officials have been waiting for everybody else to make up their minds.

In recent weeks, there have been signs of progress United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy came back from Washington with speed-up orders. Britain officially ended the state of war with Germany, and the United States and other countries are following suit. All the arguments for delay fall flat before the fact that, on the basis of NATO plans, Western Europe cannot be made defensible without the Germans.

The "German danger" today is not that the Germans will dominate or desert the West. The danger is rather that the Germans will not be put into position to do their proper share for the West.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I call attention to a United Press dispatch from Bonn today which I copied from the ticker, which quotes High Commissioner John J. McCloy as saying that he opposes any German unity program which would prevent full German membership in the Western European community. I ask unanimous consent that this dispatch may appear in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BONN.—United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy said today that he opposes any German unity program which would prevent full German membership in the Western European community.

Communist and western leaders alike have been exploiting the deep-rooted German desire for unification in a recent barrage of plans and counter plans, but there has been no indication so far that any effective action is likely.

McCloy said the United States would welcome a Communist agreement to accept western proposals for free, all-German elections to choose a single government for the divided country.

He added, however, that "certainly no steps may be taken or agreements made which would preclude the possibility of German integration (into Western Europe)."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in this matter, as a Member of the Senate, I do not have any more responsibility than any other Senator, but it does happen that 4 years ago I spent 6 weeks in Germany and wrote the report for the so-called Herter committee which dealt with Germany. I wish to read one paragraph from that report in order that the RECORD may show that my interest has been based on some background and upon a continuity of conviction on the subject.

In a paragraph which appeared on page 4 of our interim report, our committee said:

We recommend that the states of Germany which are free to do so be encouraged to form a constitutional government at the earliest possible date: a government with powers prescribed by and derived from the member states, a government which other German states could join when free to do so, and free itself to join any federation of free states looking toward the economic stability of Europe and world peace.

Mr. President, too long a delay elapsed before the states of Germany were encouraged to form that constitutional government, but today they have it, and its headquarters are at Bonn. It is now late in the day, but we should proceed to see that the Bonn Government is free to join the Federation of Free States looking toward the economic stability of Europe and world peace, and the only way they can experience that freedom is to have a treaty of peace so that they will feel that they are an independent nation. The consciousness, the realization that they are free to develop, that they are free to be accepted as partners in a western European federation for peace, is what is necessary to get away from the holding back which up to this time has made the task of General Eisenhower so difficult. It is the lack of such a consciousness which has stalled West German rearmament, which has delayed the West German build-up and which has killed initiative on the whole German question.

I recognize the situation which has been mentioned by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I realize that the Congress is approaching adjournment. I realize that if this amendment were agreed to tonight it would require a conference with the House, and concurrence by the House, or at least further consideration. I do not wish to delay the taking of the half step that is proposed in the resolution now pending, so I am not going to press for action on the amendment now. I shall, however, ask permission that the amendment may be offered as an independent resolution and appropriately referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations for further consideration. But in taking that step, Mr. President, I am doing so because I do not wish to delay action on the joint resolution. However, I desire to say, with all the earnestness at my command, that just as Germany is the key to peace in Europe, just as peace in Europe is the key to whether or not there will be a third world war, or whether or not this Congress and other Congresses will wrestle with problems of raising troops or sending troops abroad, of raising taxes, and of condemning yet unborn generations to pay the bills for the difficulties of today, just so surely the step now proposed should be taken, we should have a treaty of peace with Germany, we should put Germany on such a basis that she can join with the other nations of Western Europe against the encroachments of communism.

Having said this, and presented the situation, I bow to the situation we now confront. I want this half step to be taken, I do not want any delay. Therefore, I withdraw my amendment, and I ask that it be submitted as a separate resolution and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from South Dakota is granted.

The resolution (S. Res. 226), submitted by Mr. Case, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to proceed with the negotiation of a treaty of peace between the United States and the Government of Germany and to submit the same for the consideration of the Senate at the earliest practicable date; and the President is advised that it is the sense of the Senate that said treaty of peace should be negotiated jointly with the allies of the United States in the war against Germany except that if such joint negotiations prove impossible or impracticable, the treaty should be negotiated as was the treaty with Japan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 289) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KEFAUVER subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with the joint resolution in regard to the treaty with Germany, and the amendment reported by the Foreign Relations Committee to that joint resolution, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement by myself printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER

This resolution providing for the termination of a state of war with Germany is a resolution relating to a high policy matter in the field of our international relations.

As such, it should not be marred with an amendment, such as that added by the Foreign Relations Committee, which has absolutely no place in a solemn resolution of the Congress of the United States ending the state of war with Germany.

Stated as briefly as possible, the amendment would permit the reopening of many cases of vesting of enemy property, which cases have already long since been settled by compromise agreements by the claimants and the Government. To my mind this amendment is objectionable for a number of different reasons, which I shall outline briefly.

In the first place, as I have indicated already, the principal resolution is a very serious matter of high policy in the field of foreign affairs, whereas this amendment relates to a domestic matter and has no place in the consideration of the principal resolution.

In the second place, the amendment, while it is general in nature and would open the doors to many other cases, actually seeks to benefit one particular claimant, one Ernest K. Halbach, who claimed ownership of a number of shares of General Dyestuff Corp. of New York. Those shares, along with others, were vested during the war by the Alien Property Custodian in connection with the I. G. Farben industries group. Mr. Halbach sued for return of this property, but while the suit was pending he agreed to a settlement by which he received over twice the amount of money which he had originally invested in the stock. He claims that this settlement was unjust, and this amendment has for its real purpose the reopening of that one particular case. Therefore, it is a matter which, if proper for the Congress to consider at all, should be dealt with through private legislation and not through a general bill. And I might add that I doubt if it is proper for Congress to consider this at all.

In the third place, although the amendment is designed to reopen that one case, it would at the same time reopen many cases where property has been vested and settlements finally concluded with the claimants. This would mean that years of effort on the part of the Office of Alien Property to liquidate the assets under its jurisdiction would be rendered completely futile.

In the fourth place, this, in turn, would mean a delay in the transfer of moneys to the War Claims Fund. I should like to point out that the War Claims Fund, which was established under the Trading With the Enemy Act, is the source of moneys from which the claims recognized by the War Claims Act of 1948 are paid. Further, it was evidently the intention of Congress that this fund should be a potential source for the payment of such meritorious war claims of American citizens as the Congress might later wish to recognize and compensate, including prisoner-of-war claims.

Principally for these reasons, but also for others, this amendment which has been added to House Joint Resolution 289 by the Foreign Relations Committee, is objectionable and should not be allowed to stand.

AUTHORITY TO REPORT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL — LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to report during the recess of the Senate following today's session the second supplemental appropriation bill, H. R. 5650.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, of course, I do not object to that, but I should like to take this opportunity to ask the Senator from Arizona what his plans for tomorrow are.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to make the appropriation bill the unfinished business, if there is no objection. If we are to adjourn on Saturday——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope the Senator will make the request he has just indicated.

Mr. McFARLAND. I so request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona a question for the RECORD about Order No. 745, Senate bill 2104. I reported that bill, and I should like to request the majority leader to put the bill on the agenda. It is an extremely important measure in connection with our international relations.

Mr. McFARLAND. What bill is it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a bill reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. I reported the bill, and I have some responsibility in seeing that it is considered, if the majority leader will agree to have that done.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there is some objection to the bill. If we can get time before the session adjourns, I have no objection to having it considered, but we need to have a call of the calendar. If we are to conclude the session by Saturday night, the first matter of importance is the passage of the appropriation bills. We have to have conferences after the appropriation bills are passed. The next matter on the agenda is the call of the calendar.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think I have the floor for the moment, Mr. President. I merely wish to say that the American Farm Bureau is extremely concerned about the action taken in the passage of the last Defense Production Act, in the inclusion of the section which Senate bill 2104 would repeal. I have received letters from them. The Department of Agriculture is also very much concerned about it. I am informed that if the Senate does not act there will be retaliation immediately by the foreign countries concerned and very great hardships will be caused to aspects of agriculture other than the part concerned in the bill. A small segment of the cheese industry is about the only group concerned about the bill, the blue cheese manufacturers.

I merely desired to make this statement for the RECORD, so that the Senate would know the importance of the bill, and that it would not be overlooked. If we do not take any action, I am reliably informed that some six or eight countries will be forced to take action which will be detrimental to agriculture in this country as a whole. That is the view of the American Farm Bureau Federation. The letter is in the RECORD. I have received a subsequent communication from them on this subject. They are greatly concerned about our not taking any action. They point out very clearly that there are two alternative ways, perfectly legitimate, recognized ways, for the cheese industry to protect itself under existing law. I wish only to emphasize the importance of the situation. I feel that I would be derelict in my duty if I did not call it to the attention of the Senate and the majority leader. I think the bill ought to be considered and passed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I stated several days ago that so far as I was concerned I would be perfectly willing to have this bill considered. We are trying to meet a goal. We are trying to get away from here by Saturday night. If there were any possibility of action on the part of the House I would not mind taking up the bill and remaining in session for another week, if that is what the Senate wants to do. But if the House is not going to act on the bill—and it has not given any indication that it intends to act on these bills—I see no reason for the Senate remaining in session for another week in order to debate the bill. If we have time during the crowded hours of tomorrow and the next day to dispose of this bill and of other measures, it is agreeable to me to dispose of them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that I am told that

if the Senate alone takes action on the bill, that will indicate to the parties concerned that we intend to do something about the situation, and that that would serve the purpose, even though the House did not take action.

This matter involves a long-term program in our foreign trade. We have just passed a bill providing appropriations of more than $7,000,000,000 for mutual security. We are paying out our own money in an effort to build up the same countries which we are tearing down by means of this provision in the law. So it seems utterly inconsistent to me for us to adopt two divergent policies.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. This is the first time I have heard that anyone would consider action by one body of the Congress as evidence that a bill would be passed. It does constitute a step, of course. However, reporting the bill constitutes a step. The House has refused to act. I know that the debate on this bill would require considerable time. We would not be able to pass it promptly. I am willing to talk with Members of the House to see if we can get some indication that the House will take action on the bill. I am willing to have the Senate remain in session for another day if it wishes to take up the bill. Otherwise, I do not want to assume the responsibility for taking it up and passing it merely as a gesture, when it will not be enacted during this session.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to make it clear to the Senator that it is not merely my opinion that the passage of the bill by the Senate would be advantageous. I am told by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State that it would have that effect. The reason it would have that effect is that this is not something which represents merely the imposition or lifting of an embargo. It involves what is considered by other countries as a breach of faith, in this sense: For the past 5 years our own representatives, particularly in ECA and the Department of Agriculture, have encouraged other countries to develop the very types of cheese which they have started importing into this country. We helped to finance the building of some of the factories, on the theory that they were largely noncompetitive, and that thereby those countries would be enabled to earn dollars, rather than being the recipients of grants. They undertook to do that, particularly in Denmark, the Netherlands, and Italy. Just when they have built that industry up to a point where it becomes significant, we take the rug out from under them and, by an embargo, limit our imports to what they were 3 or 4 years ago, which is really a less over-all amount than those countries exported to this country back in 1939.

So the matter of good faith is involved. It is not merely a question of the immediate impact for a few months. The question is whether or not we intend to follow a policy which will enable other countries to earn money, or whether we intend immediately to put up our tariffs in such a way that they will be unable to do any trading with us. That is why an expression by the Senate is significant. I do not see anything illogical or unusual about it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Arkansas have the floor?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I had the floor on a reservation of objection to the unanimous-consent request. Does the Senator wish me to yield to him for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think the RECORD should show that the situation is not quite so simple as the Senator from Arkansas makes out. In the first place, there are some American plants going out of business. Secondly, we had some very substantial testimony in support of keeping section 104 in the Defense Production Act.

Thirdly, it should be pointed out that while there was no cheese purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation from April to September, it is now taking surplus cheese off the market. If I correctly remember the figures, it took off half a million pounds in September. To me it seems like a rare inconsistency, indeed. I think that is one reason why a number of members of the committee opposed the repeal of section 104. We feel constrained to oppose it on the basis of the testimony, and because of the inconsistency which develops in the agricultural program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not say that the report was unanimous. I am quite willing to admit that the Senator from Illinois objected to the bill in the committee, and is opposed to it. The only really serious objection to the bill was from a constituent, I believe, of the Senator from Illinois, representing a cheese company which is in the blue-cheese business. As I previously stated, there are some 20 blue-cheese factories in this country, the operators of which feel that this bill would be injurious to them. There is no question about that. I know of no way in which free or even relatively free, international trade can be carried on without some conflict somewhere.

I do not pretend that there is no one who does not feel that this bill would be an interference with his business. I am saying only that the American Farm Bureau Federation supports the bill. I do not think the Senator from Illinois disputes that. The Farm Bureau Federation speaks as a great agricultural organization. It has made it very clear that, in view of the fact that our exports are far greater than our imports, and that it is to the interest of this country's agriculture, certainly—and I believe the interest of the entire economy—to have some degree of foreign trade, the bill would be beneficial to agriculture as a whole, not merely to one cheese manufacturer.

I recognize that the Senator from Illinois has a perfect right to oppose free trade. That is traditional in his party. His party likes fully to protect every single industry in being, and possibly potential industries. There is a legitimate, honest difference of opinion as to the importance of international trade. I do not wish to sit here and not invite the attention of the Senate to the importance of this bill. I think it has great importance to agriculture as a whole, as distinguished from the cheese manufacturers who are represented by one or two men.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to make one further observation. The cheese and dairy industry is a very considerable industry in itself. The Cheese Institute of America appeared and gave what I thought was some very substantial testimony. There was additional testimony before the committee. As I appraise the whole situation, it is not so simple as it might appear.

For that reason, and in view of the fact that there is a definite inconsistency when the Commodity Credit Corporation, with the cash of the American taxpayer, takes cheese off the market, and at the same time there is an importation of certain types, notably blue cheese, which has already put a number of cheese plants out of business and reduced others to 50 percent production, I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Inasmuch as the bill is not before us for consideration there is no use in going into its merits. I do not accept as a fair presentation what the Senator has said about so many plants going out of business. Most of the concern about this bill is over the possibility that in the future it might cause some harm.

I am quite willing to recognize the importance of the dairy industry, but I do not believe the dairy industry is in any way threatened by the proposed legislation. A few manufacturers of blue cheese might be slightly injured. They have a perfectly proper defense to their interests through the escape clause in the reciprocal agreement and in section 101.

I wish only to emphasize that I believe it is important to recognize that in a year or two, or perhaps 3 years, we will have to recognize that we have made a great mistake in returning to the traditional policy of high tariffs and cutting off our own nose to spite our face, because even in the dairy industry, even in products that are derived from the dairy industry, we export more than we import. If we cut off importations, I believe it will be to the detriment of that industry itself.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—it is my understanding that the majority leader intends to take up tomorrow the second supplemental appropriation bill, if it is ready, and then to have a call of the calendar starting from where we left off the last time. Am I correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is the intention. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to report during the recess of the Senate the second supplemental appropriation bill, H. R. 5650.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL THE UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow the second supplemental appropriation bill, H. R. 5650, be the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON FRIDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of H. R. 5650, the second supplemental appropriation bill tomorrow, there be a call of the calendar beginning at the point where we stopped on the last call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON RAILROAD RETIREMENT LEGISLATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 51) establishing a Joint Committee on Railroad Retirement Legislation, which was, on page 1, line 9, strike out "chairman of that committee" and insert "Speaker."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. This is not the resolution which, I think, the Senator from Massachusetts has in mind.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is this the measure amending the Railroad Retirement Act?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The concurrent resolution creates the joint committee, which is the study committee. The concurrent resolution passed by the Senate has been accepted by the House, with the exception that instead of the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce appointing the three members of the group, the Speaker of the House shall appoint them. I understand that is in accordance with the House rules.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

ALLOCATION OF STEEL FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOLS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 225, to allocate steel for the construction of schools.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this is the resolution which was considered last night and was held up by the majority leader. I know of no objection on this side of the aisle. Personally I believe it is very appropriate. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Minnesota, however, to page 2 of the resolution. I believe it is a little stiffer than it is wise to have it. I have shown the Senator a suggested change in the language, which I hope he will accept. I believe it would accomplish his objective, and at the same time give a little more leeway to the Defense Production Administration, which I believe they should have.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have studied the amendments suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts. I believe they are not only worthy amendments, but would improve the resolution. I am glad to accept them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 3, after the word "should", to strike out "allocate" and insert "reconsider its allotments of"; in line 4, after the word "a", to strike out "sufficient" and insert "greater"; in line 6, after the word "as", to insert "may be"; and in line 7, after the word "required" to insert "better."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the National Production Authority and the Defense Production Administration should reconsider its allotments of steel, copper, and aluminum in such manner as to provide a greater quantity of such metals and products fabricated from such metals for the construction of and additions to schools and hospitals as may be required better to protect the health and educational standards of the Nation.

The preamble was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the health and education of the American people is vital to the strength of this Nation;

Whereas the health and education of the American people has a direct relationship to our military strength and economic productivity;

Whereas there is a demonstrated need for additional schools and hospitals;

Whereas an adequate and dependable supply of steel, aluminum, and copper are critical items in the programs to alleviate existing hospital and school inadequacies;

Whereas the amounts of steel, copper, and aluminum necessary to alleviate such existing inadequacies have not been allocated in sufficient quantity or otherwise made available for the construction of hospital and educational facilities.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution favoring increased allocations of steel, copper, and aluminum for construction of schools and hospitals."

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following the adoption of Senate resolution 225, an editorial entitled "School Construction," appearing in the Washington Post of today, October 18, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The Defense Production Administration's decision that it can allot only 96,000 tons of steel for school construction during the first quarter of 1952 raises serious problems for the country's public-school system. For nearly two decades—first because of the depression, then because of the war, and now because of the threat of war—urgently needed school building has been deferred. When this lag is considered in conjunction with a rapidly growing school-age population, the concern expressed Tuesday by Commissioner of Education Earl McGrath in testimony before a House Education and Labor subcommittee is easy to understand. The American schools face the worst crisis in their history.

In many communities, as Mr. McGrath pointed out, "classrooms are so overcrowded as to make effective teaching almost impossible. * * * In many instances school authorities are having to resort to half-day sessions and less to carry the load. Deferral of construction in the first quarter of 1952 will mean deferral for at least five quarters of the educational opportunity of the school children concerned." In critical defense housing areas, for the relief of which the House Tuesday approved the Barden bill to provide liberalized Federal aid, the situation is particularly acute.

DPA Administrator Fleischmann said that he tried to give the educational system enough structural steel to provide elementary schools for these critical defense areas, to replace condemned buildings, and to complete—"perhaps with some delay"—other projects now under way. Even with the most economical use of the steel available, even with a shift wherever possible from structural steel to reinforced concrete, 96,000 tons won't meet even the most elementary needs. Granting the primary importance of elementary school construction high-school and college building cannot be wholly neglected without serious consequences. Students cannot be kept in cold storage until buildings are ready. The Office of Education figures that an absolute minimum of 150,000 tons is needed for the first quarter of the year ahead.

This is not so much, really, when it is considered in relation to the tremendous steel output of the Nation—and in relation to the pressing need. One hundred and fifty thousand tons amounts to no more than about three quarters of 1 percent of the steel that will be produced in the United States during the first quarter of 1952. A country girding for defense ought to be able to spare that much for the use of what it is defending. The enrollment in American schools this fall was greater by about 800,000 than in the fall of the previous year. Next fall, enrollment will be increased by an additional 1,700,000. We cannot deny these children the chance at education which has always been an American birthright.

CONDITIONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST—AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate. I merely desire to say that, in my judgment, this country and the world are today in one of the most ominous and dangerous situations they have been in

since the close of World War II. The headlines today point out that there is a battle for the Suez Canal, and that the British and the Egyptians are engaged in a shooting war, in effect, although it may be only a minor war, and although only a few persons may be killed.

I wish to point out that the United States, so far as the State Department's policy is concerned, is again taking a step toward destruction, in my opinion, when they tie our destiny to the tail of the diving British colonial kite The announcement of the Secretary of State of the apparent utter and complete support of the British colonial policy, which we have opposed in our own country since the Revolutionary War, may be a step toward that ominous beginning of a third world war.

The Moslem world, in my opinion, is aroused The New York Times today, in a rather cavalier editorial--at least it is somewhat cavalier—states that the Secretary of State made a courageous statement and that there were evidences of phony nationalism in the Middle East, which should be interpreted properly in the light of what they mean

Mr. President, in my opinion the nationalism which is showing itself in the Middle East is not phony, but is deadly serious. Those countries today do not have the military might to defeat England or the United States, but so far as the masses of humanity in the Middle East are concerned, we must reckon with them, if we are to live in a peaceful world in the future and the near future at that.

I believe that our policy in the Middle East has failed I believe we are taking step after step over there which are leading us, first, closer to a complete alienation of three of four hundred million people and, secondly, are perhaps driving those people day by day into the orbit of Soviet Russia.

I expect to discuss the subject a little bit later, but events are moving rapidly in this world. We recall that it was the stupidity of Yalta that gave communism domination over a third of the population of the earth. It was the mistaken policy in Korea prior to the invasion of South Korea by the North Korean Reds that led to a war which has cost us 100,000 battle causalties and 100,000 nonbattle casualties.

Again, Mr. President, it is the policy on the part of the State Department to support completely British colonialism, which is not only on the way out but which is known and recognized as being on the way out by every country in the world.

I am not anti-British. I believe that the English-speaking people of the world have basic principles in common, such as community of language, community of laws, and community of principles between individuals. I have supported a great many measures which have sustained the British Government. However, there is a difference between sustaining the principles of Anglo-Saxon justice and supporting the principles of colonialism over the world, which violate every principle the American Government has ever stood for We are treading dangerous ground today, Mr President

I do not wish to detain Senators any longer this evening I am merely stating this matter for the record, and I am pointing out that the path we are taking as a result of the announcement by the Secretary of State, on behalf of the Government of the United States, is a dangerous one indeed; and it is entirely possible that in the years to come we shall rue this decision with a bitterness which we would rather not have to face.

Mr. DIRKSEN Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER I yield Of course, I assured the majority leader that I would not take up much time

Mr. DIRKSEN I merely wish to observe that a person would have to be blind, indeed, if he was familiar with the situation in Egypt, if he did not see that when a country like Britain has her soldiers scattered all over Egypt and, in the second place, can tell Egypt year after year how much dollar exchange she can have from the United States, and can deny cotton-producing machinery to Egypt, thereby perpetuating her impoverished condition, that situation is bound to break out in ferment at some time Someone has simply missed the boat in regard to this matter

Mr. President, this is not a "phony" matter; it is a ferment.

I had an opportunity to find out about it by sitting on a balcony in Cairo, Egypt, in 1945, with a member of the Egyptian Cabinet, and hearing the story. The Egyptians do have some devotion to freedom; and when we ask them what their principal problem is, they will simply shout it to you, and then will point to all the foreign soldiers in their land.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I point out that although there may be a difference between the attitude of the people of this land and the people of the Middle East in respect to the world of today and the world of tomorrow, nevertheless those people are proud and individualistic. We, as Americans, have enjoyed their respect in times past However, I say that we are dangerously close to losing the respect on their part which has been built up over a period of 150 years. The policies we are following now cannot benefit us; they can only harm us.

I have no intention at the moment of going into a discussion of the merits or demerits of the dispute. I am merely saying that the United States may be putting its finger into a jam jar into which it has no business putting it, and we may be supporting policies which will rise up to condemn us. I shall discuss this matter at greater length in the very near future.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARDS TO MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, this afternoon, the Department of State made a number of distinguished service awards to members of the Foreign Service and others who have ably served this country, in a civilian capacity, in the fields of diplomacy and foreign relations

I am proud that four of those awards went to residents of New York. One of those four fine public servants is a resident of Glens Falls, another, of Scarsdale; and two, of New York City.

One of the four, who until recently was American Minister to Hungary, and who arranged the release of William Vogeler, is well known to me personally. His name is Nathaniel P. Davis. He has been in many a troubled and dangerous situation, and has always conducted himself in the highest traditions of the Foreign Service.

These men, who ordinarily receive little public acclaim and whose chief reward is the satisfaction of a job well done, deserve the gratitude of their countrymen

I ask unanimous consent that the citations of the four citizens of New York, Mr. Davis, Mr. James C Dunn, Mr. Howard Fyfe, and George Q Herrick, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the citations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATHANIEL P. DAVIS

Having entered the Foreign Service more than 32 years ago as a clerk, Mr Davis recently ended his long tour of duty with the highest rank a career officer can achieve. In addition to his loyal service in the Department in Berlin, Pernambuco, and London, his experiences during World War II and the execution of his last two assignments as Ambassador to Costa Rica and then as Minister to Hungary have earned him this highest award of departmental recognition During World War II, Mr Davis was a prisoner of the Japanese from January 1942 to September 1943 in Manila. Refusing to withdraw under military protection to a safe area, he assumed full responsibility for the welfare and comfort of those Americans who became interned with him After the war he served again in Manila as counselor of the Embassy with the personal rank of Minister In 1948, as American Ambassador to Costa Rica, Mr Davis found himself in the midst of a 6-week revolution which broke out in the spring of 1948 between the government in power and Communist-inspired rebels At the request of the Costa Rican Government, the diplomatic corps appointed a committee to seek a basis for a general suspension of hostilities. Mr Davis was on of the most active member of this committee, and at extraordinary personal risk, crossed no-man's land between the Government and rebel forces 20 times On one trip he was fired upon five times and on another the car in which he traveled, although carrying the United States flag and the flag of the Apostolic Nuncio, was fired upon and damaged. In his last post, as American Minister to Hungary, Mr. Davis added another outstanding achievement to his record, and, upon accepting his resignation, President Truman praised the skill and determination with which he carried to a successful conclusion the long and difficult negotiations for the release of Robert A. Vogeler, an American citizen unjustly imprisoned by the Communist-run Hungarian Government.

Mr. Davis was born in Princeton, N. J., and now lives in Silver Bay, N. Y.

JAMES CLEMENT DUNN

Having assumed his present position as American Ambassador to Italy in 1946, Mr.

Dunn was in one of the most crucial areas of high postwar tension Italy, suffering materially and spiritually from the ravages of war, could either become another Soviet satellite or could take her place in the community of free, democratic nations. Ambassador Dunn, with energy and zeal, has demonstrated throughout this period the highest diplomatic skill and judgment in representing the United States in Italy. He is now known throughout Italy as the symbol of a friendly United States and Soviet imperialism has lost another potential slave state Since joining the Foreign Service in 1919, Mr Dunn has served in Habana, Madrid, Port-au-Prince, Brussels, Haiti, and London, as well as in the Department and on the United States delegation for numerous international conferences During World War II, his skill and experience were utilized in the successful planning and execution of a number of the highly important political problems which arose in the Allied conduct of the war He served as Assistant Secretary of State in charge of political affairs from 1944 to 1946, and as the Secretary of State's deputy in the negotiations in the Council of Foreign Ministers of the Treaties of Peace With Italy, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary, Mr Dunn's immeasurable contribution to the success of American policies in Italy and in every assignment he has held, has contributed to an extraordinary degree to the cause of the free world

Mr Dunn was born in Newark, N J , and considers New York City his home

HOWARD FYFE

As United States dispatch agent in New York City, Mr Ffye heads the largest individual freight-forwarding enterprise in the world—responsible for the shipments abroad of the State Department and other Government agencies Beginning his career in 1911 at the age of 15, Mr Fyfe literally grew into his present job, which he has held since 1930 Although it would require 50 trips of the Queen Mary to carry the yearly shipments handled by the dispatch agency, Mr. Fyfe has never failed to live up to his creed to the effect that no shipment will miss a boat due to mistake on the part of himself of his staff This is an outstanding record as the packing cases full of equipment forwarded by Mr Fyfe and his staff each month, if stacked one on top of another, would make a pile 60 times the height of the Empire State Building His efficiency and initiative have made him a legendary figure with all Foreign Service personnel In fact, he has become such an institution among members of the Foreign Service and other Government personnel traveling abroad that he once had a difficult time convincing a Foreign Service officer's wife whom he met at the pier that "Howard Fyfe" was not just a fictitious name used for the office of the United States dispatch agency in New York. An honorary member of the American Foreign Service Association, Mr. Fyfe was born in Brooklyn and has lived in New York all his life

GEORGE Q HERRICK

As Chief of the Facilities Branch of the Division of International Broadcasting in New York City, George Q Herrick was faced with the problem of Soviet jamming of Voice of America broadcasts to the U. S S R Showing a high degree of technical skill, he developed a device and applied it to Voice transmitters Combining very unorthodox methods with a good deal of ingenuity, Mr. Herrick has substantially increased the level of intelligibility and therefore the level of effectiveness of the radio arm of the campaign of truth. Engineers in this country and abroad originally scoffed at his device. However, experience has proven that Mr. Herrick's ideas were correct.

Mr Herrick was born in Newburg, N. Y., and his present address is 109 Nelson Road, Scarsdale, N. Y.

SUPPRESSION OF INFORMATION BY GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr SCHOEPPEL. Mr President, recently we have heard a great deal about the lack of open and complete disclosures, not only to the Congress and to congressional committees, but also to the American people, about much which goes on in the departments and agencies of the Government On the contrary, we have seen made an effort to black out the information concerning the activities of certain executive departments and agencies of the Government

I think this practice of secrecy is wrong I wonder what there is to hide, or why it should be hidden

In this month of October 1951 there appeared in the Farm Journal an editorial entitled "The Honest Do Not Hide " I believe that this timely editorial should be read and heeded by all departments of the Government Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows

THE HONEST DO NOT HIDE

An ever-present fear constantly terrorizes every person who lives under the Communist tyrannies behind the iron curtain. The same fear pervaded Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy

At any hour of night or day uniformed officers may appear at any door The member of the family who is summoned—father, brother, mother, or daughter—has to go instantly with the officers Where? Usually no one ever learns Why? That is secret, too Whether any word will ever be heard, or whether the victim will ever return, no one can learn

That sort of thing is today common in all Communist countries The overwhelming power of secret government leaves the individual completely helpless

Beyond what is essential to military security, the least tinge of secrecy in government is dangerous to the people

If no other reasons argued against secret actions by public servants, it would be enough that government by the people depends upon free and complete access to information How can the people decide unless they have all the facts?

Other highly important reasons make secrecy abhorrent Secrecy offers a convenient cover for corruption It hides mistakes And it permits Government's officers to exert power to which they have no right.

In this issue Farm Journal reports the extraordinary facts of the potato marketing agreement referendum which was conducted last year The Iowa farming firm of McKinley & Sons has challenged the procedure, and unreasonably annoys, embarrasses, and oppresses the United States Government, according to the Federal attorney who is trying to prevent all the facts from coming to light

The key point in this matter is secrecy. Department of Agriculture officials, making their own rules, kept the counting of ballots secret, and refused to allow growers as observers.

This is a far cry from the trembling Russian who is seized from his home by night. But both situations arise from the same evil—the evil of secrecy in government.

President Truman last week signed an order which directs all agencies of Government to classify as secret certain kinds of information. So far as this protects military secrets, it is customary, and necessary. But this order went far beyond military matters. If permitted to stand it will help to cloak mistakes, hide corruption, and to hold out information vital to fair judgment by the people Only recently the New York Times published an impressive list of secrecy acts, by the State, Treasury, and Defense Departments, for which obviously no justification could be found, and which concealed facts to which the public was entitled.

The secret diplomacy of the State Department, from Yalta on, has misled Americans, and has built up toward the tragedy of Korea and the costly tensions of today's world

Secrecy is indispensable to dictatorship and destructive to freedom Let's not tolerate it in the United States of America.

TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, COMMERCE, AND NAVIGATION WITH ISRAEL—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr HUNT in the chair). As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate, Executive R, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and Israel, together with a protocol and an exchange of notes, relating thereto, signed at Washington on August 23, 1951 Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the treaty, and the treaty, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD The Chair hears no objection

The message from the President is as follows.

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and Israel, together with a protocol and an exchange of notes, relating thereto, signed at Washington on August 23, 1951.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the treaty.

HARRY S TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 18, 1951.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State, (2) treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation, with protocol and exchange of notes, signed at Washington on August 23, 1951.)

RECESS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, October 19, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 18 (legislative day of October 1), 1951.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR MUTUAL SECURITY

Richard M Bissell, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Ernest A. Tolin, of California, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California, vice Paul J McCormick, retired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Edward C. Boyle, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania, vice Owen McIntosh Burns, elevated.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Sidney J. Thompson, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 1, district of Alaska, vice William T. Mahoney, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art the joy of those who know Thee and the strength of all who hope and aspire and struggle for better todays and better tomorrows, grant that daily we may surrender ourselves faithfully to the sovereignty of Thy wise and holy will.

Inspire us with courage to make a more sincere and daring trial of the Master's spirit and way of life; His faith and love; His humility and obedience; His limitless mercy and forgiveness; His consideration and compassion; His friendship and kindness.

We beseech Thee that in these confused and critical days we may be guided and directed by His spirit to new insights, new ventures of faith, new vistas of outlook, new attitudes, a new sense of social obligation and responsibility, and a new obedience to the God of the Universe.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1912. An act to provide for conveyance of certain land to the city of New Orleans.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R 3669, an act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. IVES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1335) entitled "An act to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4386) entitled "An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 52–9.

FLOOD REHABILITATION LEGISLATION

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, on July 13 the crest of the most disastrous flood in American history, having devastated much of the State of Kansas, smashed into Kansas City on its way to wreak havoc across the State of Missouri. Yesterday the Senate cleared for the President grossly inadequate flood rehabilitation legislation which fell far short of the measure urged by the President on August 20, and contained in my bill, H. R. 5259.

On last Monday every Member of the House and the Senate received from one of America's most distinguished artists, Thomas Hart Benton, a signed lithograph vividly depicting the incredible human suffering that followed the flood. In the past few days I have salvaged from the trash heap of the House of Representatives more than a dozen of these lithographs. A number of Members have kindly given me their copies. I now appeal to all Members who can or will to forward their Benton lithographs to my office so that these as well as those which I already have may be sold to the highest bidder in an auction at Kansas City—the total proceeds to go to relieve the suffering of flood victims.

The Congress as a whole has not seen fit to pass a measure adequate to the needs of the flood disaster. Through this auction of the Benton lithographs perhaps at least an infinitesimal fraction of the needs of thousands of suffering people can be met.

Just this morning I received the following telegram from Mr. Benton:

DEAR DICK: Well, I failed. But remind your conferees of the Eighty-second Congress that when they adjourn and go home to their clean houses and lay down in their clean beds where no rotting stinks tighten their nostrils that a lot of poor flood-wrecked Americans out here are not blessing their luck. Billions to spend but not a cent for a humane precedent should be the motto of the Eighty-second.

THOMAS H. BENTON.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, through the press it appears that the United Textile Workers Union of America, an affiliate of the CIO, has filed a protest with the National Production Authority against the erection of new textile plants in the South. It is contended that there is widespread unemployment in the textile industry. Attached hereto is a clipping from a recent issue of my home town paper denying such a charge.

While it is true that there has been an unprecedented growth in the textile industry in our section of the country, we are continuing to welcome industries calculated to give more and better employment to our people.

The expansion of this industry in South Carolina and our neighboring States is based on a sound foundation—nearness to raw materials, lower construction and other costs, and, not least, available willing workers released from agriculture and where there had been underemployment in the past.

It seems strange that the spokesman for the Textile Workers Union of America should be presumptuous enough to speak for our greatest industry. Strange, indeed, and regrettable is the fact that a legitimate industry, furnishing gainful employment to so large a number of American citizens as does the textile industry, should have to consult any labor union as to when and where it would invest its money and construct its plants.

To be sure, if scarce essential materials are required for the construction of defense plants anywhere in the country, scrupulous consideration should be given thereto to the end that our defense program is given first claim on such materials.

As in the past, we of the South shall continue to welcome new and additional industries.

SOUTH CAROLINA LEADS IN TEXTILE GAIN

South Carolina today is leading 8 southeastern States in textile employment gains so far this year with a 3,700 worker increase, Brunswick A. Bragdon of Atlanta, regional director of labor statistics, said today.

However, employment in the textile industry in the southeast declined approximately 1,100 in August as compared to July of this year.

Mr. Bragdon said principal reasons for the continued declining employment are lack of orders resulting in the temporary closing of some mills and heavy inventories. North Carolina and Virginia reported the largest declines—1,100 each.

Over-all factory employment in this State during August was 215,800—a 1,900 increase over July. Average number of hours worked per week was 38.5 at an average of $1.18 per hour. Average weekly wages during the

period was $45.39 as compared to $46.18 during July.

Workers put in 39 hours per week in July at a $1.10 per hour.

FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORTS ON S. 1046, S. 355, AND S. 622

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file conference reports on the bills S. 1046, to readjust postal rates; S. 355, to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; and S. 622, to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

MOISANT AIRPORT, NEW ORLEANS

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4979) to provide for the conveyance of certain land to the city of New Orleans and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Speaker, in 1944 and 1945, it was necessary for the Government to obtain some land adjacent to the International Moisant Airport at New Orleans The Government needed to acquire this land and to develop it because of certain flight hazards, which existed at the airport. The Government made an agreement with the city of New Orleans that if they would furnish $300,000 for the purchase price of this land, the Government would convey title to the city of New Orleans, and the city of New Orleans would lease the property back to the Government. The city of New Orleans has paid the money. The deed from the Government has never been executed to the city of New Orleans. This bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to execute a deed to the City of New Orleans, in conformity with the agreement and moral obligation which the Government owes the city of New Orleans.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why would special legislation be necessary?

Mr DEGRAFFENRIED. According to the report, if a deed were made by the Secretary of the Air Force to the city of New Orleans without authorization from the Congress, under existing law it would have to be made with certain restrictions, which was not a part of the agreement with the city of New Orleans. The city of New Orleans is entitled to a fee simple deed, under the agreement made with the Government at the time this land was acquired.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. They put in all the money?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. They put in all the money.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusets. And this bill has a unanimous report from the gentleman's committee?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. It has a unanimous report from the Armed Services Committee of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr BROOKS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill completes an agreement that has already been set up. It does require authorization by the Congress. An identical bill was passed yesterday by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That the Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to convey to the city of New Orleans, without consideration, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all land acquired by the United States, with funds made available by the city of New Orleans, for the purposes of expansion of and removal of flight hazards at Moisant International Airport, consisting of $376\frac{3}{100}$ acres more or less.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "Secretary of Defense" and insert "Secretary of the Air Force"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1912) to provide for conveyance of certain land to the city of New Orleans, which is exactly similar to the bill just passed, H. R 4979, and that it be substituted therefor.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized and directed to convey to the city of New Orleans, without consideration, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all land acquired by the United States, with funds made available by the city of New Orleans, for the purpose of expansion of and removal of flight hazards at Moisant International Airport, consisting of three hundred and seventy-six and three one-hundredths acres, more or less:

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings by which the bill H. R. 4979 was passed were vacated and that bill laid on the table.

WEAR A HAT

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of National Hat Week, being observed from October 13 to October 20, I would like to say a few words in support of a grand old custom, the wearing of hats. I represent the district of Fairfield County, Conn., including the towns of Norwalk and Danbury—the hat centers of the world, where the bareheaded male traversing the streets commands the disdain reserved in other towns for the absent-minded gentleman who boards the streetcar minus his trousers. To support this great and ancient industry, I particularly urge my fellow Members of Congress to wear a hat.

The hat has become an important item in America today. Band Leader Ted Lewis, whose trade-mark is an old topper, has this battered chapeau insured for $50,000. The other night Mr. Lewis, whose slogan is "Is everybody happy?" was considerably saddened when his old topper disappeared and he was forced to perform without it for the first time in 17 years. I am happy that subsequently Mr. Lewis recovered his hat atop a night-club chandelier, where, possibly it became lodged while floating on air over the distinction of the Nation's week-long dedication. However, I do believe that Mr. Lewis, in keeping his old topper for some 17 years, is setting a bad example and is indirectly the cause of much consternation in American homes, and threatens the future of the hatting industry.

Imagine the annual autumn scene in homes throughout the country. That inevitable day when the summer breeze gives way to the brisk gusts of autumn and the head of the house takes out his old fedora. There is a shrill scream from the kitchen, and while the breakfast eggs go up in smoke the flabbergasted wife utters her annual, "Darling, you can't wear that old mangy hat another day. Go down to the store today and get yourself a nice, new gray fedora."

In previous years the husband, following the tradition set as far back as the Garden of Eden, acquiesced. Everybody—including the wife, the storekeeper, and the Danbury hatters—was happy. The economy of the Nation received a shot in the arm. The husband received a surge of confidence from his new dashing appearance. The wife had grounds for purchasing a new fall hat of her own. The result, to paraphrase Mr. Lewis' slogan, everybody was happy.

Now when exhortations are made to trade in the battered but comfortable fedora for the new fall chapeau, friend husband can point to Ted Lewis and say, "Look at him. A famous band leader making all kinds of money, and he's been wearing the same old battered top hat for the past 17 years."

I am sure the Danbury and Norwalk hatters will be pleased to provide Mr. Lewis with a brand new hat. Even a top hat.

UNETHICAL PRACTICES

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, a Senate committee took steps yesterday toward stopping the practice of Government employees from engaging in unethical activities to get headlines and for personal gain. Such action is timely, for only last Monday night Downey Rice, a senatorial staff member, spoke in Reading, Pa., under conditions which give rise to suspicion and distrust of his work during the crime probe in that city.

The political rally at which Rice spoke was sponsored by a so-called citizens' committee which is financed by special interests which are far more concerned about destroying liberal legislation than they are about wiping out organized crime.

Organized crime is a serious threat and an evil that should be destroyed, but probes that are nothing more than smokescreens to cover unethical and immoral activities of selfish interests cannot be effective in fighting crime syndicates.

Mr. Rice is the second member of the Reading crime probe staff to come under suspicion. Mr. R. P. S. McDonnell, who headed the Reading investigation, also committed acts which have thrown suspicion on the probers. McDonnell was recently arrested in Washington on a charge of threatening a woman telephone operator and he now awaits a mental test. According to a Washington newspaper report, McDonnell was released as a mental patient in 1950 even before he was selected to head the Reading probe. Evidently he was out long enough to head a crime probe in my city.

There are many reasons to believe that McDonnell was influenced by local elements in a manner which was not only unethical and immoral but which gives encouragement to the crime syndicates to continue their corrupt practices.

Mr. Speaker, I am making a report on the probe in the Appendix of the RECORD which I hope all Members of the House will take time to read.

It appears to me that we are reaching the point of immorality where it becomes necessary to start probing the probers.

STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS OF REFUGEES AND EXPELLEES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 469) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Committee on the Judiciary under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 has been given jurisdiction as a standing committee over legislation pertaining to immigration and naturalization; and

Whereas in the course of activities conducted in pursuance of section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, it has been ascertained by the committee that the continuing influx of new refugees tends to aggravate the problem of Europe's surplus population; and

Whereas the presence of over 10,000,000 refugees and "expellees" in the western zones of occupation in Germany and Austria, in addition to the problem of the surplus of population in Italy and in Greece, is resulting in continuous pressure upon the very foundations of the United States immigration system; and

Whereas the International Refugee Organization is to terminate its operations on December 31, 1951; and

Whereas the above-outlined problems, in addition to considerable expense for the American taxpayer, involve a heavy burden for the devastated countries of Europe which the United States is assisting to rehabilitate, and a deterrent to a peaceful solution to Europe's economic and social difficulties; and

Whereas there is, therefore, an obvious need for a broad plan of international cooperation which would provide for a satisfactory solution of this emergency and for relieving the American economy of the expenditures involved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, acting by duly authorized subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of the said Committee on the Judiciary, is authorized and directed to conduct such studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the purview of the preamble of this resolution as will be deemed appropriate by the committee.

SEC. 2. That upon the completion of such studies and investigations as provided for in section 1 of this resolution, but not later than on April 1, 1952, it shall be the duty of the committee to submit to the House of Representatives a report for appropriate legislative action with such recommendations as may be deemed desirable by the committee.

SEC. 3. That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee or subcommittees thereof as designated by its chairman, may sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or without the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to conduct such investigations as it deems necessary.

SEC. 4. That in making such studies and investigations and in holding such hearings as provided for in section 3 of this resolution, the committee is authorized to include the services and travel of the requisite staff to accompany the committee or its subdivisions on such study missions, investigations, and hearings within the United States or abroad; and to procure the advice and assistance of such officials of the Federal Government as deemed necessary by its chairman.

Mr. WALTER (interrupting the reading of the resolution). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, for the benefit of the House I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania should make an explanation of just what this resolution is.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the continuation of authority given by the House during the last Congress to investigate the problem of the resettlement of Europe's surplus populations, particularly of the 8,000,000 expellees and refugees that are now in the British and American zones of Germany.

On about the 10th of November an international conference will be held in France, attended by the immigrant-receiving countries and the countries affected by this problem for the purpose of trying to find places throughout the world for the resettlement of these people. The United States, of course, cannot and will not receive any appreciable number of them, and our immigration quotas will not be increased. But, for the purpose of reporting to the Congress the need for legislation enabling an international solution of the surplus population problem, the Committee on the Judiciary feels that its members should attend this conference.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will this conference take in the Arabs who were driven out of their homeland?

Mr. WALTER. No. This new special and temporary organization will consist of 21 countries, countries, for example, like Australia, which had indicated a willingness to accept 400,000 European people within the next 2 years, and Canada, which will take a very large number of them, as well as several Latin-American countries willing to receive additional manpower and new settlers. Our participation in this movement will consist chiefly in the furnishing of surplus shipping. The immigrant-receiving and emigrating-sending countries are the ones that are going to meet for the purpose of trying to find a place for at least 5,000,000 of these people, and work out operational arrangements.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then it will not take in the refugees that have come into Turkey from Bulgaria or the Arab refugees, of which there are a million?

Mr. WALTER. I do not know whether the agenda will include those people or not. According to my information, it will not.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN or Massachusetts. I understand this committee will be a subcommittee of a regular committee of the House that handles these problems?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How many is it proposed to send to this conference?

Mr. WALTER. There will be five members of the subcommitee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GROSS. What is the need for the United States attending this conference and spending money to send a delegation over to Paris to attend this conference? Cannot these countries tell the United States how many people they can take without the United States expending more thousands of dollars to send people all over the world?

Mr. WALTER. As a matter of fact, the United States Congress has already appropriated $10,000,000 for the purpose of continuing the displaced-persons program, the program with respect to the expellees and for the purpose of participating in the new resettlement venture

for 1 year. At the expiration of 1 year the taxpayers of the United States will be relieved of at least a part of the burden imposed on them now in the British and American zones of Germany where we are feeding these helpless victims of Communist persecution.

Mr. GROSS. But I renew my question: Why cannot these countries tell us how many they can take and go ahead and take them?

Mr. WALTER. Of course, it is necessary for those 21 nations to sit down together and work out the entire program. It is not as simple as that. We had hoped that the conference would be held in Washington, but it is going to be held in France, because it will be at the same time that the United Nations Assembly will meet in Paris, and commitments can be made for that reason by high-ranking representatives of the governments that concern themselves with an attempt to work out a solution of this problem.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman why the State Department cannot handle this with our constituted authorities already in France?

Mr. WALTER. Well, the State Department, of course, will be represented. I think Mr. George Warren has already been designated as one of the representatives of our Government, and it is the hope of the State Department that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization will participate, because we have done much work on the displaced-persons program and many phases of that program, as you know, have not expired, and it will actually fit into this other program.

Mr GROSS. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that it seems to me it is about time, if we are interested in saving the taxpayers of this country any money, that we stop sending people all over the world, on all kinds of trips, and for all purposes. I do not know how we are ever going to save the taxpayers of this country any money if we are going to continue to spend thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars on various trips, some of them purely junkets. It is about time it is stopped.

Mr. WALTER. It seems to me that this will result in an eventual saving, because the few thousand dollars required for this trip will be well expended if we can point the way toward getting rid of those thousands and millions of people who have been expelled from behind the iron curtain.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. As a matter of fact, in the last analysis, this means that those countries, like Australia and others who are willing to take a large number, will relieve us, and therefore our quotas will not be encroached upon to that extent. Secondly, it means that we will be able to protect those people who have been driven out, and the little expense which is attendant upon the four or five men who will attend that conference will be almost infinitesimal as contrasted with the tremendous sum we will save.

Mr. WALTER. There is no question about that. I think the gentleman has in mind the case of the Mennonites from my State who have resettled 500 Mennonite families in Uruguay at no cost to the United States, except shipping expenses. Until they were sent to Uruguay, those 500 people were on the relief rolls in Germany, supported by the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, why cannot the State Department handle that sort of thing?

Mr. WALTER. Of course they want our participation since we will have to legislate.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I was afraid of.

Mr. WALTER. And it may well be that the program ought to be continued and expanded if it is without much expense to the United States and without bringing any appreciable number of immigrants to the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RHODA AKIKO NISHIYAMA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1236) for the relief of Rhoda Akiko Nishiyama, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 6, strike out all after "States," down to and including "laws" in line 7, and insert "may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this one that comes in under the regular quota?

Mr WALTER. The Senate amended the House bill by changing the status of a 3-year old immigrant from a quota immigrant to that of a nonquota immigrant.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What are the extenuating circumstances?

Mr. WALTER. The child is the daughter of an American mother and an alien father, who is in the United States under student status. We passed the bill authorizing the admission of the child as a quota immigrant and the Senate amended it by changing its status from quota to nonquota immigrant.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1946

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4450) to amend section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. This bill is identical with Senate bill 1622, which has for its purpose the plugging of the gap in the levees that are already built on the White River.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subparagraph (q) under the subtitle Lower Mississippi River in section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (Public Law 526, 79th Cong.) is hereby amended by inserting after the words "St. Francis River Basin" a comma and the words "the White River backwater area."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1622) to amend section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946, which is identical with the bill just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subparagraph (q) under the subtitle "Lower Mississippi River" in section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (Public Law 526, 79th Cong.), is hereby amended by inserting after the words "Saint Francis River Basin" a comma and the words "the White River Backwater Area."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings by which the bill H. R. 4450 was passed were vacated, and the bill was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

ROBERT E. VIGUS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3219) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Robert E. Vigus.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Robert E. Vigus, of Wichita Falls, Tex., for alleged personal injuries sustained as a result of an injection of 25 percent silver nitrate instead of a one-fourth of 1 percent in the Tokyo Army Hospital, Tokyo, Japan, on June 2, 1950.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the

lapse of time or any statute of limitation. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 1346 of title 28 of the United States Code

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "Tokyo Army" and insert "One Hundred and Seventy-second Station."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "Tokyo" and insert "Sendai."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAUDE S BURMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2962) for the relief of the widow of Frank Winfield Burman, lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That Lt Frank Winfield Burman, United States Naval Reserve, shall, prior to his death on July 14, 1942, be deemed to have applied for and been granted national service life insurance in the sum of $10,000, payable upon death to his widow, Maude S. Burman, in the manner provided for in title I, section 601, subsection (h), of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1008), as amended (38 U. S. C., sec. 802h): *Provided*, That no part of an amount appropriated for the purpose of this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Maude S. Burman."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERTOGROUL OSMAN AND MEHMED FAHREDDIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 57) for the relief of Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quotas for the first year that such quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOUHAD ANN KHOURY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 118) for the relief of Nouhad Ann Khoury.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws Nouhad Ann Khoury shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JESUS JUAN LLANDERAL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 210) authorizing the naturalization of Jesus Juan Llanderal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Jesus Juan Llanderal shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Jesus Juan Llanderal."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOY CHIN SHEE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 519) for the relief of Moy Chin Shee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Moy Chin Shee, a former resident of the United States and the mother of seven United States citizen children, shall be deemed to be a returning resident under the provisions of section 4 (b) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, if otherwise admissible to the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT JOSE TORIBIO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 575) for the relief of Robert Jose Toribio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Robert Jose Toribio, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Zacarias Toribio, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMMA BURR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 582) for the relief of Emma Burr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category, section 3, of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Emma Burr may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HANS LENK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 635) for the relief of Hans Lenk.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Hans Lenk shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Hans Lenk becoming a public charge.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR ANTHONY M. OPISSO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 775) for the relief of Dr. Anthony M. Opisso

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Anthony M. Opisso shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. CHARLES GORDON RENNICK SELL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 954) for the relief of Dr. Charles Gordon Rennick Sell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Charles Gordon Rennick Sell, who was born in India of British parents, shall be deemed to have been born in Great Britain.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MYRTLE HARDING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1048) for the relief of Myrtle Harding.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Myrtle Harding may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VERA OUMANCOFF

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1274) for the relief of Vera Oumancoff.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Vera Oumancoff shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS MARIE Y. MUELLER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1436) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc , That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Mrs. Marie Y Mueller, of Spokane, Wash The said Mrs. Marie Y Mueller, who has resided in the United States since 1933, shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or such warrants and order have issued

SEC 2 Notwithstanding any provision of the immigration laws, the said Mrs Marie Y. Mueller shall be considered as having been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon the payment by her of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CATHY DANA BESSER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1640) for the relief of Cathy Dana Besser.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions of law excluding persons of races ineligible to citizenship from admission to the United States, the minor child, Cathy Dana Besser, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Staff Sgt. and Mrs. Gerald D. Besser, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHARON A GATES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2007) for the relief of Sharon A. Gates.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Sharon A. Gates, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Maj. and Mrs William M. Gates, citizens of the United States

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEO KIEVE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2027) for the relief of Leo Kieve.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc , That Leo Kieve, a United States citizen veteran of World War II, shall not be held to have lost United States citizenship under any of the provisions of the Nationality Act of 1940 providing for loss of citizenship through continuous residence in a foreign state *Provided,* That the said Leo Kieve returns to the United States for permanent residence within a period of 1 year following the effective date of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CINDY EBERHARDT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 800) for the relief of Cindy Eberhardt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc , That, solely for the purpose of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Cindy Eberhardt, a minor Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born daughter of Marjorie M Eberhardt.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. MANUEL J CASAS AND MRS. JULIA NAKPIL CASAS

The Clerk called the bill (H R. 827) for the relief of Dr. Manuel J. Casas and Mrs. Julia Nakpil Casas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr Manuel J. Casas and Mrs Julia Nakpil Casas, who entered the United States for a temporary period, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of their last entry. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quoa control officer to make appropriate deduction of two numbers from the proper immigration quota or quotas.

With the following committee amendment:

Page, 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Manuel J. Casas and Mrs. Julia Nakpil Casas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA SZENTGYORGI MAYER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1828) for the relief of Maria Szentgyorgi Mayer

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc , That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Maria Szentgyorgyi Mayer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES YAO

The Clerk called the bill (H R. 1857) for the relief of James Yao.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc , That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, James Yao shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat 1011; 64 Stat. 219, 50 U. S. C App. 1953).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS E. GABEL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1970) for the relief of Louis E. Gabel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not

otherwise appropriated, to Louis E. Gabel, an individual trading as Gabel Construction Co., of Orlando, Fla., the sum of $24,916.71 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for uncompensated losses sustained by him under contract No. NOY-9336, for the construction of a water-softening plant at Florida City, Fla., for the Navy yard at Key West, Fla., as a result of a delay in receiving materials and equipment provided for in said contract: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KENNETH McRIGHT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1161) for the relief of Kenneth McRight.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Kenneth McRight, Henryetta, Okla., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Kenneth McRight against the United States arising out of the permanent injuries sustained by him in Dallas, Tex., on April 13, 1950, when he was shot by an insane member of the United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STAMEY CONSTRUCTION CO. AND/OR THE OKLAHOMA PAVING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1267) to reimburse the Stamey Construction Co. and/or the Oklahoma Paving Co., as their interests appear.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the Western District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render findings of fact as to the amount of loss, if any, sustained by Stamey Construction Co., Hutchinson, Kans., and/or Oklahoma Paving Co., Oklahoma City, Okla., as their interests appear, Reclamation Bureau contract under Schedule of Specifications No. 1374, Altus project, Oklahoma, arising out of or attributable to the alleged failure of the Government to supply materials as provided for in said contract, and to render judgment upon the merits of such claim: *Provided*, That the passage of this act shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the Government of the United States. Such judgment shall be subject to appeal by either party pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 1291, and action thereon by the court of appeals may be reviewed pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

SEC. 2. If the court shall enter a final judgment in favor of the claimant, the court shall cause such findings and judgment to be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, the amount set forth in said findings and judgment to the Stamey Construction Co. and the Oklahoma Paving Co., as their interests may appear.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "findings of fact as to the amount of loss" and insert in lieu thereof "judgment according to law with respect to the loss"

Page 1, line 9, after the word "appear" insert "under."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "under."

Page 2, line 2, strike out the words "and to render judgment upon the merits of such claim"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. THELMA A. NOLEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2662) for the relief of Mrs. Thelma A. Nolen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Thelma A. Nolen the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Thelma A. Nolen against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by her when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a Government vehicle in Fuerth, Bavaria, May 29, 1950: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ORINDA JOSEPHINE QUIGLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3375) for the relief of Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley, Dayton, Ohio, the sum of $5,000. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley against the United States for payment of United States Government life insurance benefits. The late husband of the said Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley, Lt. Robert Harry Quigley, applied for such insurance on April 4, 1940, and paid premiums therefor, but no benefits have been paid on such insurance: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ALBERTA S. ROZANSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4558) for the relief of Mrs. Alberta S. Rozanski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the national service life insurance (FV 121 71 65, V 124 19 85) granted in the amount of $10,000 to the late Dr. Frank S. Rozanski, effective January 26, 1951, shall be held and considered to have been in full force and effect at the time of his death on March 5, 1951, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to pay such insurance to Mrs. Alberta S. Rozanski, widow of the said Dr. Frank S. Rozanski and designated beneficiary of such insurance.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY GEMMA KAWAMURA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1974) for the relief of Mary Gemma Kawamura.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mary Gemma Kawamura, of Minneapolis, Minn., if found otherwise admissible to citizenship, may be naturalized under this act upon compliance with all the requirements of the naturalization laws, except that—

(a) The provisions of section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 703), relating to racial limitations, shall not apply to the said Mary Gemma Kawamura; and

(b) The petition for citizenship shall be filed with any court having naturalization jurisdiction prior to the expiration of 4 months immediately following the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, in the administration of the naturalization laws, section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (8 U. S. C., sec. 703), shall not apply to Mary Gemma Kawamura, who was born in Japan on January 7, 1918, and brought to the United States on July 20, 1920."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the

third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALICE IBRAHIM HANNAN IBRAHIM ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2593) for the relief of Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Yacoub Mayouf Muhammad Elliyan, Afifeh Michail Juries Issa Matar, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill (S. 839) for the relief of Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut, be substitued for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required number from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available *Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut becoming public charges.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNELIESE BARBARA VOLLRATH AND MRS MARGARETE ELISE VOLLRATH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2775) for the relief of Anneliese Barbara Vollrath and Mrs. Margarete Elise Vollrath.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Anneliese Barbara Vollrath and Mrs Margarete Elise Vollrath shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U S C. 1953).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUDOLF BING AND NINA BING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2833) for the relief of Rudolf Bing and Nina Bing.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Rudolf Bing and his wife, Nina Bing, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS CAMPBELL BOYD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3569) for the relief of Louis Campbell Boyd.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That, for the purpose of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Louis Campbell Boyd, shall be held and considered to be the natural born alien child of Mr and Mrs Cecil H. Boyd, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ALEXANDER SYMEONIDIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3600) for the relief of Dr. Alexander Symeonidis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the laws relating to immigration and naturalization the alien, Dr. Alexander Symeonidis, a lawful resident of the United States, shall be held and considered to have resided in the United States for 5 years prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID YEH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3668) for the relief of David Yeh.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall be held to be applicable to the alien David Yeh, the minor, unmarried child of Jun Sun and Chang Shang Wen Yeh, permanent residents of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the Act of December 17, 1923, as amended (8 U. S. C. 212 (a)), David Yeh, the minor, unmarried child of Jun Sun and Chang Shang Wen Yeh may be admitted to the United States as a preferential quota immigrant in accordance with section 6 (a) (2) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, if he is otherwise admissible to the United States"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERLINDA MARIA BOWERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3877) for the relief of Erlinda Maria Bowers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Erlinda Maria Bowers, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Corporal Roy G. Bowers, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTHER PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3971) for the relief of Esther Park.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and nationality laws, section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940 shall not be held applicable to Esther Park, who was born in Korea on October 18, 1902, and brought to the United States in 1904.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAI SOON LEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3985) for the relief of Hai Soon Lee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That, in the administration of the naturalization laws, section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (8 U. S. C., sec 703), shall not apply to Hai Soon Lee, wife of Han Ken Lee, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAROLINE WU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4130) for the relief of Caroline Wu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall be held to be applicable to the alien, Caroline Wu, the minor, unmarried child of Mrs. Lonn Gay Wu, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCESCO FRATALIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4876) for the relief of Francesco Fratalia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Francesco Fratalia may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGHERITA CAROLI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4877) for the relief of Mrs. Margherita Caroli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Margherita Caroli, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the said act From and after naturalization under this act, the said Mrs Margherita Caroli shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That in the administration of the immigration laws, Mrs. Margherita Caroli may be admitted to the United States as a nonquota immigrant in accordance with section 4 (b) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, if otherwise admissible to the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS DORA TROOST

The Clerk called the bill (H, R. 5397) for the relief of Mrs. Dora Troost.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs Dora Troost, a former naturalized citizen of the United States, who lost her United States citizenship under section 404 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized as a citizen of the United States by taking, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, before any court referred to in section 301 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of such act From and after naturalization under this act, the said Mrs. Dora Troost shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That Mrs. Dora Troost, shall not be held to have lost United States citizenship under any of the provisions of the Nationality Act of 1940 providing for loss of citizenship through continuous residence in a foreign state: *Provided*, That the said Mrs. Dora Troost returns to the United States for permanent residence within a period of 1 year following the effective date of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KEDDIE RESORT, INC.

The Clerk called House Resolution 461, providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 4290) for the relief of Keddie Resort, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 4290) entitled "A bill for the relief of Keddie Resort, Inc.," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The House resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVENUE ACT OF 1951

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 4473, the Revenue Act of 1951.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I shall not, can the gentleman tell us when it is expected to bring the report up?

The SPEAKER. Tomorrow.

Mr. COOPER. My understanding is that it will be brought up tomorrow. The purpose of getting this consent request is so that it may be in order tomorrow.

Mr MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has the report been agreed upon?

Mr. COOPER The conference report has been completed and the report has been signed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wonder if the gentleman would care to tell us if there were any changes made in the bill?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; there were several changes made, and we will try to cover that by the time the conference report is filed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman care to say what they were at this time?

Mr. COOPER. I would not be prepared to list all of them at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I did not know but what the gentleman might give us some of the high lights.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING OCTOBER 19 AND PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will that enable us to get through Saturday night by 12 o'clock?

Mr. McCORMACK. The hope that I expressed day before yesterday with the assurance that I would do everything I could to have it carried into effect has increased materially. I cannot make a definite statement except that it is strengthened; and if the tax conference report is agreed to tomorrow, it looks very, very good.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I understand, then, that the tax conference report will be before the House tomorrow; is that right?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, tomorrow we will consider the conference report on the tax bill.

Then there are three other conference reports, the postal rate readjustment bill, the postal employees, postmasters, and supervisors' salary bill; and the salary bill for the Federal classified employees.

There is also a possibility of the supplemental bill that is in conference being agreed to. There may be others besides those, but I can definitely say there will be four conference reports.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. But the gentleman is not programing anything beyond the conference reports at this time?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is nothing else.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY SESQUICENTENNIAL

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 463, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H J. Res. 285) to authorize appropriate participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House

with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MITCHFLL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution 285 which would authorize appropriate participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy. The Committee on Rules considered this resolution and reported the rule to the House for its consideration.

Mr Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I think that the Members of the House ought to know a little bit about this particular resolution We are now considering a resolution making in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution 285. House Joint Resolution 285 authorizes an appropriation of $95,000 for the purpose of putting on a sesquicentennial celebration at West Point Military Academy, N Y. The original bill was on the Consent Calendar I objected to the consideration of the legislation on the Consent Calendar. Subsequently, it was stricken from the calendar by three objections. It is now before us, or will shortly be before us, in the form of House Joint Resolution 285.

Mr. Speaker, my only question in reference to this particular authorization is whether or not it is desirable to spend even $95,000 at this time for some fanfare up at the Military Academy. I think it might be well to have the membership look at what House Joint Resolution 285 proposes. There was no warning that this particular proposal was coming before the House, so, frankly, I have not had a chance to go over it in detail, and I do not know any more about it than what I can recall at the time it was on the Consent Calendar. But I can remember this, they want $95,000 to put on a show up at the Military Academy, a show that has no direct reference to our military effort. They want $95,000 to dress up West Point and have some people up there, dignitaries of one sort or another, or alleged dignitaries, and spend some time and effort and the taxpayers' money to just create some fancy show.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, who does the gentleman mean by the word "they"? Who is taking on the responsibility for spending this $95,000? Is it a commission to be appointed, or a body or group of men, to take on this responsibility, or who will have the authority to expend this money and put on this celebration?

Mr. FORD. According to House Joint Resolution 285, on pages 2, 4, and 5 they set out who are to be members of the commission. They are all distinguished leaders.

Mr. JONAS. It is already provided who the commission shall be?

Mr. FORD. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. That commission will be clothed with the power to expend this $95,000 and determine the nature and character of the celebration to be put on?

Mr. FORD. There is some very fancy language in here as to what is needed and why, but it does not make much sense to me.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. I might say to the gentleman from Michigan that the subcommittee of which I am a member held hearings on this resolution. We had testimony on it, and explored into the very thing the gentleman has raised by way of question here this morning. The committee unanimously was satisfied that this was for a good and worth-while purpose, that would be of some benefit not only to the educational system but to our military program.

Mr. FORD. Just how will it help the educational system.

Mr. HILLINGS. One of the things this resolution is going to result in is the Conference on Education to be held at West Point for 3 days. It will be attended by approximately 125 representatives of educational institutions, the military, Government, and industry throughout the country.

Mr. FORD. What will they do?

Mr. HILLINGS. This body not so long ago passed a bill appropriating $56,900,000,000 for military defense purposes At this very time we are concerned about military defense and about the education of the young men in this country as it affects the military, and vice versa We ought to give a little bit of attention to the operation of our great military academy on its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary. On that one hundred and fiftieth anniversary we should not only commemorate it, but we should take time to discuss and study our entire system of education at West Point and other military institutions.

Mr. FORD. I think that is a nice explanation, but I should like to know just what they are going to do specifically to solve the educational problems of West Point.

Mr. HILLINGS. I do not believe it is the intention of the resolution to solve the problems of the military educational program in 3 days. Certainly we are not anticipating that the $56,900,000,000 we spend is going to solve all the military and diplomatic problems of the world. But I do think this is going to help us in not only commemorating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of this institution but by giving our educators at West Point and other institutions of similar kind throughout the country a chance to sit down and study the operation of that educational institution. Perhaps as a result of such a study it can be improved. Certainly the recent scandal at West Point has raised in the minds of many people in this country some questions as to the operation of that educational institution. Perhaps this might help toward meeting some of those problems.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I offered this bill at the behest of the Department of Defense. It has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and by practically all the executive departments of the Government. Every university that has been in existence for 150 years has had conferences and celebrations of the type that is envisaged by this bill. Certainly it is not going to be a mere show or a jubilee or anything of that sort. There are three or four series of important conferences that will be held, to which will be invited educators, college presidents, and professors from all over the country, so as to spread the good gospel of military training kept within proper channels. Goodness knows we need to spread that good gospel of military training if we are to be the preeminent military nation of the world. I do not believe the gentleman should have any fear that it is going to dwindle into a mere circus or show. The gentleman has only to look at the Members who have been appointed on the commission to be assured that that will not happen.

Mr. FORD. I should like to say that maybe that convinced me it will be a show with fanfare rather than a constructive educational conference.

Mr. CELLER. You have the Chief Justice of the United States and six members to be appointed by him. You have the Speaker of the House and six Members of the House of Representatives You also have the Governor of New York State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chief of Staff, United States Army, and so forth. I am sure the gentleman can have confidence in the integrity of purpose of those men. They are not going to let this be a mere circus.

Mr. FORD. I might say to the very distinguished chairman of this committee that I have faith generally in the people he mentions, but they will not be actually managing the show. But that does not tie in with what the gentleman from California said. Certainly, this list of people that you read off are not going up there for 3 days to help develop the educational system of West Point.

Mr. CELLAR. They will determine the agenda and the program. It is contemplated that you will have a conference on military education and training. It is contemplated to have a conference on general education to be attended by 125 representatives of educational institutions, government, industry, the military, the press, and the professional foundations, and other groups. There is to be an athletic meeting, which would indicate or help to indicate the prowess of our athletes in this country. I think something like that is quite essential. The cost is practically inconsequential.

Mr. FORD. I would like to say to the gentleman from New York that the cost is not inconsequential. Ninety-five thousand dollars, as I recall, will buy quite a bit of military equipment.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I want to say at the outset, I admire the gentleman from Michigan for the vigilant stand that he takes from the standpoint of economy. It is most commendable. I was inclined to go along with the gentleman in this picture. But is this not true, now? Here is an institution which is traditional with the American people. We are celebrating its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary. Having in mind what transpired there recently, and I merely mention it with reference to the cadets there, I have no proof as to who is right or who is wrong—I think this would be the most propitious time to celebrate this one hundred and fiftieth anniversary in the tradition of America to alert the people as to the high ideals and traditions that go with that institution. This is the way it can be done. There is no other way except through the channels we have here, do you not see?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I want to associate myself with the remarks and sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]. We, of the Committee on Appropriations, cannot cut down on appropriations if the legislative committees of the Congress continue to authorize more and more expenditures. The celebration may be all right, but I see no reason why it cannot be postponed until after this emergency. Furthermore, all these generals who will go up there to celebrate, have something else more important to do right now.

Mr. FORD. I think the gentleman from New Mexico has made a very excellent point. In fact, the gentleman has made two excellent points. This celebration could well be postponed. We are at war. It seems to me that our generals and military personnel could be better used in the field or in the Pentagon, or at other military stations in order to expedite and promote the successful prosecution of the war.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. HILLINGS. I certainly differ with the opinions expressed by the gentleman from New Mexico. I think we are getting to the point in our Congress, and certainly in this session of the Eighty-second Congress where we have appropriated billions and billions of dollars to help the military organizations of foreign countries. Here we are celebrating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of our own great military institution, the United States Military Academy at West Point, and we are so concerned about whether or not it is a good thing to reaffirm our faith in that fine institution which has done so much to give us military leadership so vitally necessary throughout the world, including men like Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, and General MacArthur. We apparently are not too interested in celebrating this occasion, and doing something for our own academy, but we spend billions of dollars to help supply and honor foreign military organizations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman for the stand he is taking. I think by appropriating this $95,000, we will be establishing a precedent of underwriting educational meetings and athletic events all over the country.

We well remember 2 years ago that we appropriated—I say we qualifiedly because I voted against it—but there was appropriated by the House of Representatives and by the Congress $3,000,000 for the sesquicentennial celebration in Washington, which money, of course, came out of the pocketbooks of the taxpayers of this country. I am wondering just how much the people of the State of Michigan and the State of Iowa got out of that $3,000,000 which was expended here in the sesquicentennial celebration. It is high time we put the brake on this kind of spending.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Michigan will recall that the other day I joined with him in objecting to this particular bill. I did so for a variety of reasons. First of all, I am of the opinion that until the cloud that today is above West Point is dissipated, it would be far better if we did not have such an observance as this, and especially when we take into consideration the fact that we are at war and that we need all the money we have available to buy munitions of war. Everything taken into consideration I think the viewpoint of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] should be upheld and this resolution should be defeated.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. May I say to the gentleman, in reply to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] who stated he was a member of the Committee on Appropriations and that it was about time we should stop spending money for such purposes, that on September 14 of this year we had before the House H. R. 5054, a bill making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Resources Board for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952. May I call attention to page 29 of that bill, in which we, here in the House, appropriated the $95,000 that is now being talked about in this debate, for this sesquicentennial to be held at the Military Academy. The House passed that appropriation, and there was no opposition to that item of $95,000. It went to the other body and it was passed there, and it has now become legislation. In other words, may I say to my colleague that this bill is simply an authorization bill. The money has been appropriated. It was approved by the Bureau of the Budget. Previously the amount asked for was $140,000. It was reduced by the Bureau of the Budget to $95,000. Your Committee on Appropriations went over this item, and there was no opposition to it and it has now become the law. We simply seek to have this authorization passed today, because the money has already been appropriated.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has again expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. FORD. I would like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] that the point he makes is one that all of us should remember. We approved a $56,000,000,000 appropriation bill. We could not see the trees because of the woods. I think that points out a weakness in the procedure of having a $56,000,000,000 appropriation bill under consideration when you do not have the time or the facilities for knowing all that is in it. If we had had that opportunity, I, for one, would have objected to this item. This is the most direct way in which I can object to the inclusion of that item.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If we did appropriate it we certainly made a mistake and it is high time we corrected it by not authorizing the expenditure.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. Is not the gentleman from Michigan a member of the Committee on Appropriations? Did the gentleman raise objection to this item in the appropriation bill?

Mr. FORD. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, but at the time the military appropriation bill was approved, I had objected previously on the Consent Calendar to the consideration of the sesquicentennial bill which preceded this resolution. Consequently I did voice my objection in the proper way. In the second place, the Committee on Appropriations should not include unauthorized projects. I was objecting to the authorization legislation then and I am objecting to it now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wonder if the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS] expects you to look after the business of the whole House and all the Members? There are some folks who do all the spending and never object. I know the gentleman from Michigan has done a remarkably fine job on that committee.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

In conclusion, I want to say that this proposed fanfare which includes educators meeting for 3 days, and a track meet on one of the days, with the West Point boys against some other institutions of higher learning, is not, in my judgment, the way to spend $95,000 during the present emergency. Certainly, it is a small item, a mighty small item; but, just the same, I would prefer to see the expenditure of $95,000 for whatever military equipment can be purchased with that amount of money.

The Romans in the old days, you know, used to put on fantastic celebrations; they had their gladiators running up, down, and around the arenas. We may be doing the same thing in a small way by approving $95,000 for this celebration. In my estimation this rule ought to be disapproved.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I would like to ask where the Romans are now.

Mr. FORD. I assume everybody knows where they are; certainly that nation fell by the wayside.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH.]

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, although I find myself a bit unhappy to be in opposition to the gentleman from Michigan and some of the other Members of the House. As has been indicated before, this is an authorization bill. The great Committee on Appropriations of the House has already appropriated the funds which would be necessary under this bill. The rule makes in order for consideration the basic legislation to authorize it.

To have this celebration is in accordance with custom and tradition that has been long in effect in America. I am sure that when the University of Michigan reached its one hundredth anniversary there was a great celebration there; I am sure that when the University of Iowa reaches its one hundredth anniversary there will likewise be a celebration there; and the same is true of the great university in New Mexico, and I am hopeful that that will be the case when the Ohio State University reaches its one hundredth anniversary. Harvard, Yale, all those great institutions of higher learning which have furnished us with leaders all through our years have established this fine custom and tradition. At this celebration will be the educational leaders from all over America.

It seems to me that in view of the thousands, millions, and billions of dollars being expended for other purposes, that the $95,000 which has already been appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations will, by comparison, be well spent, indeed. I hope every Member of the House will support the rule and finally the resolution.

I want to make just one more comment: For a century and a half the Military Academy not only has furnished the military leaders of the Nation but has also furnished many of the business and professional leaders of the Nation. I think this celebration, a review of the Academy's history and a projection of that which is to come, is justified.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Why did the gentleman say that when the University of Iowa reaches 100 years? It is more than a hundred years old.

Mr. McCULLOCH. When it reaches 150 years. I am sorry for the error.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. There are already precedents for the gentleman's argument. As I recall, when the West Point Academy was 100 years old there was something done from a national standpoint to impress that very significant event upon the people of the United States by congressional act.

Mr McCULLOCH. I have a recollection that that was the testimony before the committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 44, noes 8.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 149, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

YEAS—179

Albert	Corbett	Hale
Anderson, Calif.	Cox	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Arends	Crosser	Hall, Leonard W.
Aspinall	Davis, Tenn.	Harris
Ayres	Dawson	Harrison, Va
Bailey	DeGraffenried	Havenner
Barden	Denton	Heller
Beckworth	Dollinger	Hillings
Bender	Dolliver	Hoffman, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Donohue	Holifield
Bentsen	Doughton	Holmes
Blatnik	Doyle	Horan
Bolton	Durham	Howell
Bonner	Eaton	Hunter
Boykin	Eberharter	Ikard
Brehm	Ellsworth	Jackson, Wash.
Brown, Ga.	Elston	James
Bryson	Evins	Jarman
Buchanan	Feighan	Jenkins
Burleson	Fenton	Jonas
Burnside	Fine	Jones, Hamilton C.
Burton	Flood	Jones, Woodrow W.
Byrne, N. Y.	Forand	Karsten, Mo.
Cannon	Forrester	Kee
Carlyle	Frazier	Kelly, N. Y.
Carnahan	Fugate	Kerr
Celler	Furcolo	Kilday
Chatham	Gamble	Kirwan
Chelf	Gary	Klein
Chenoweth	Gathings	Kluczynski
Clemente	Gordon	Lane
Colmer	Graham	Lanham
Cooley	Greenwood	Larcade
Cooper	Gregory	Lesinski
	Hagen	Lind
		McCarthy
		McCormack
		McCulloch
		McGregor
		Machrowicz
		Madden
		Mahon
		Mansfield
		Martin, Mass.
		Merrow
		Miller, N. Y.
		Mills
		Mitchell
		Morano
		Morgan
		Morris
		Morrison
		Morton
		Multer
		Murdock
		Nicholson
		Norrell
		O'Brien, Ill.
		O'Brien, Mich.
		O'Neill
		O'Toole
		Patman
		Patten
		Philbin
		Pickett
		Poage
		Preston
		Price
		Priest
		Rabaut
		Radwan
		Rains
		Ramsay
		Reed, Ill
		Rhodes
		Richards
		Riley
		Rivers
		Roberts
		Robeson
		Rodino
		Rogers, Colo.
		Rogers, Mass
		Rogers, Tex.
		Sadlak
		St George
		Sasscer
		Secrest
		Sheppard
		Sieminski
		Smith, Va.
		Springer
		Staggers
		Steed
		Stigler
		Tackett
		Teague
		Tollefson
		Trimble
		Van Zandt
		Vorys
		Walter
		Weichel
		Wickersham
		Wier
		Willis
		Withrow
		Wolverton
		Yates
		Zablocki

NAYS—149

Abernethy	Goodwin	O'Konski
Adair	Gore	Ostertag
Addonizio	Granahan	Patterson
Allen, Ill	Grant	Polk
Andersen, H Carl	Green	Potter
Andresen, August H.	Gross	Poulson
Andrews	Halleck	Rankin
Anfuso	Hand	Reams
Auchincloss	Harden	Reece, Tenn.
Baker	Harvey	Reed, N. Y.
Bakewell	Hays, Ohio	Rees, Kans.
Bates, Mass	Hedrick	Riehlman
Battle	Herter	Saylor
Beamer	Heselton	Schwabe
Belcher	Hill	Scrivner
Bennett, Fla	Hinshaw	Scudder
Berry	Hoeven	Seely-Brown
Betts	Hoffman, Mich	Shafer
Bishop	Hope	Sheehan
Boggs, Del.	Hull	Simpson, Ill.
Bow	Jenison	Simpson, Pa.
Brownson	Jensen	Sittler
Budge	Jones, Ala	Smith, Kans.
Buffett	Jones, Mo	Smith, Miss.
Burdick	Kean	Smith, Wis.
Bush	Kearns	Stanley
Butler	Keating	Sutton
Camp	Kersten, Wis.	Taber
Canfield	Kilburn	Talle
Chiperfield	Lantaff	Taylor
Church	LeCompte	Thomas
Clevenger	Lovre	Thompson, Mich.
Cole, Kans.	McConnell	Vail
Cotton	McGuire	Van Pelt
Crumpacker	McKinnon	Velde
Cunningham	McMillan	Vursell
Curtis, Mo.	McMullen	Welch
Curtis, Nebr.	McVey	Wharton
Davis, Ga	Mack, Wash	Wheeler
Davis, Wis.	Magee	Whitten
Devereux	Marshall	Widnall
Dondero	Mason	Wigglesworth
Elliott	Meader	Williams, Miss.
Fallon	Miller, Md.	Williams, N. Y.
Fernandez	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson, Ind.
Fisher	Moulder	Wolcott
Ford	Mumma	Wood, Idaho
Fulton	Murray, Tenn.	Woodruff
George	Nelson	Yorty
	Norblad	
	O'Hara	

NOT VOTING—100

Aandahl	Cole, N. Y.	Hays, Ark.
Abbitt	Combs	Hebert
Allen, Calif.	Coudert	Heffernan
Allen, La	Crawford	Herlong
Angell	Dague	Hess
Armstrong	Deane	Irving
Baring	Delaney	Jackson, Calif.
Barrett	Dempsey	Javits
Bates, Ky	Denny	Johnson
Beall	D'Ewart	Judd
Blackney	Dingell	Kearney
Boggs, La.	Donovan	Kelley, Pa.
Bolling	Dorn	Kennedy
Bosone	Engle	Keogh
Bramblett	Fogarty	King
Bray	Garmatz	Latham
Brooks	Gavin	Lucas
Brown, Ohio	Golden	Lyle
Buckley	Granger	McDonough
Busbey	Gwinn	McGrath
Byrnes, Wis	Hardy	Mack, Ill
Case	Harrison, Wyo.	Martin, Iowa
Chudoff	Hart	Miller, Calif.

Murphy	Rogers, Fla.	Stockman
Murray, Wis.	Rooney	Thompson, Tex.
Passman	Roosevelt	Thornberry
Perkins	Sabath	Vinson
Phillips	Scott, Hardie	Watts
Powell	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Werdel
Prouty	Shelley	Whitaker
Quinn	Short	Wilson, Tex
Redden	Sikes	Winstead
Regan	Spence	Wood, Ga.
Ribicoff		

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr Herlong against.

Mr Hébert for, with Mr. Rogers of Florida against

Mr McGrath for, with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin against

Until further notice:

Mr Quinn with Mr Cole of New York.
Mr Delaney with Mr Case
Mr. Regan with Mr Coudert
Mr Redden with Mr Crawford
Mr Keogh with Mr Johnson
Mr Heffernan with Mr Kearney.
Mr Whitaker with Mr. Short
Mr Bates of Kentucky with Mr Stockman.
Mr Watts with Mr. Bramblett.
Mr Buckley with Mr Bray
Mr Hart with Mr Brown of Ohio
Mr Hays of Arkansas with Mr Busbey
Mr Deane with Mr Gavin
Mr Baring with Mr Dague
Mr Dempsey with Mr Denny.
Mr Murphy with Mr D'Ewart.
Mr Engle with Mr Golden
Mr Miller of California with Mr Hugh D. Scott, Jr
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Judd
Mr Passman with Mr Latham.
Mr Perkins with Mr Hardie Scott.
Mr Garmatz with Mr Phillips.
Mr. Granger with Mr McDonough.
Mr Dorn with Mr Prouty.
Mrs Bosone with Mr Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr Boggs of Louisiana with Mr Gwinn.
Mr Sikes with Mr Harrison of Wyoming.
Mr. Shelley with Mr Jackson of California.
Mr Rooney with Mr Martin of Iowa.
Mr Roosevelt with Mr. Javits
Mr Madden with Mr Angell.
Mr Mack of Illinois with Mr Beall
Mr King with Mr Blackney
Mr Hardy with Mr Armstrong
Mr Abbitt with Mr Allen of California.
Mr. Barrett with Mr Aandahl.

Mr. BENDER, Mr. AYRES, and Mr. RODINO changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BUFFETT and Mr McKINNON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr LANE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 285, to authorize appropriate participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 285, with Mr. YATES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr LANE Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the resolution that is before us is one which seeks authorization from the Congress to hold appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy. It is nothing different from that which was offered to the Congress at the one hundredth anniversary of the Military Academy at West Point. On the one hundredth anniversary the Congress passed legislation to properly observe that anniversary. This was also true in the case of the Naval Academy. On the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of the Naval Academy the Congress passed similar legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this bill comes before us at the recommendation of the Assistant Secretary of Defense. She was heard by a Subcommittee on the Judiciary and the bill was reported unanimously by that committee. This is merely an authorization bill.

Mr Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that on September 14 of the present year we passed here in the House an act making appropriations for the National Security Council, National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense. On page 29 of that bill, a military appropriation bill considered by the House, there was an item of $95,000 to carry out the commemoration which the bill before the House today would authorize.

That bill, with the $95,000 referred to in it, was not objected to at that time and, as I understand it, was not objected to when before the Appropriations Committee I understand that the Secretary of Defense originally sought $140,000, but the Bureau of the Budget cut this amount to $95,000, which amount was submitted to the Committee on Appropriations and without objection was passed That appropriation bill, which included that item, was passed by the House and by the other body and has now become law We simply seek an authorization here today in accordance with that appropriation

Mr Chairman, this matter was gone into thoroughly by the subcommittee and the subcommittee very carefully scrutinized the amount of money to be appropriated. All of the members of the subcommittee have in the past, both on the floor of the House and by their votes in committee, shown that they are interested in economy. The members of the subcommittee who voted in favor of this resolution consist of the following: The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr WOODROW W. JONES], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH], the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS]. Each one of those Members, the House well knows, has voted on several occasions here to cut appropriations and economize in every way, shape, and manner, and I am satisfied that they would not have voted out this bill unless they felt that it would inure to the benefit of the United States at large.

Let me see, Mr. Chairman, exactly what this proposal does:

This would authorize the Government, the people of the United States, to join with the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y., in a fitting and appropriate observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of its founding. The proposed plan for the sesquicentennial celebration in 1952 is to follow the general ideas and customs employed by other leading educational institutions for similar occasions.

Mr. Chairman, this plan includes the following: First, in the matter of education; a conference on education to be held at West Point, N. Y., for 3 days during January 1952, to be attended by approximately 125 representatives of the educational institutions, government, industry, military, press, and professional foundations and groups.

For that item, I notice, Mr. Chairman, and much has been said under the rule about it, on education, the only amount to be spent is $6,000 Secondly, it calls for a conference on military education and training to be held at West Point, N. Y., on April 21 to 25 to be attended by 140 people, mostly representatives of the various military departments Thirdly, there is to be a jubilee held at West Point for 1 day only, to include, of course, a luncheon and a dinner and a convocation in the mess hall. Fourth, there is a conference to be held there on March 16 between representatives of the New York Historical Association and the United States Military Academy on the history of West Point and the Hudson Highlands. Then there will be an athletic event and conference to be held at West Point in the spring of next year. Then there is to be a history conference dealing with the history of the United States Military Academy to be prepared under the guidance of Dr. Forman, Sesquicentennial Historical Librarian of the United States Military Academy.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to authorize appropriate participation by the United States in the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy. In order to facilitate such a commemoration, it is proposed to establish the United States Military Academy Sesquicentennial Commission, to be composed of the following-named persons:

The President of the United States of America and 16 members to be appointed by him.

The Vice President of the United States of America, and six Senators to be appointed by him.

The Chief Justice of the United States of America, and six members to be appointed by him.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives, and six Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by him.

The governor of New York State.
The Secretary of Defense.
The Secretary of the Army.
The Secretary of the Navy.
The Secretary of the Air Force.
The Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Chief of Staff, United States Army.

The Chief of Naval Operations, United States Air Force.

The Commandant of the United States Marine Corps.

The Commandant of the United States Coast Guard.

The Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army.

The Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

The Superintendent, United States Military Academy.

The Superintendent, United States Naval Academy.

The Superintendent, United States Coast Guard Academy.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the opposition to this bill today is based not so much on the fact that West Point is going to hold a celebration of its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary but the fact that this joint resolution calls for the appropriation of $95,000.

In order that the House may have some information in reference to the $95,000, may I read a statement submitted to the subcommittee that may be of some help in breaking down this amount. This is a support statement for the conduct of the United States Military Academy sesquicentennial activities.

The following major events will take place during the period from January 1 to January 30, 1952:

Sesquicentennial Exhibition and Static Display. That is $30,000.

Conference on History of West Point and the Hudson Highlands, $2,000. That has already been mentioned by me as one of the items to be considered at that time.

The Conference on Education, that so much was said about when we were discussing the rule. That is merely $6,000. To that conference, as I stated previously, all the educational institutions of the country will be invited.

The Conference on Military Education will cost only $5,000.

Then there is the visit of the Boy Scouts of America, to give them the opportunity to see how we carry on our activities and our education and our learning at West Point. In order to allow those Boy Scouts to come from all over the United States, only $4,000 is appropriated.

Conference on Athletics, only $2,000. The Jubilee Convocation, $10,000. That is the item I mentioned previously, to take place in the mess hall. It will take a period of time because I expect they are going to have various dignitaries from all over not only the United States but the entire world there.

The administrative expenses are $19,900.

In conclusion, I know that this was gone into rather thoroughly under the rule, but I repeat it is something of a historical nature. It is something that has been done in the past. It was done on the one hundredth anniversary of the Military Academy. The military seek to carry out the same procedure at this time by observing the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Military Academy at West Point. In view of the fact that the Committee on Appropriations went over this matter I assume rather thoroughly, and felt that it was worthy of the approval and the sanction of that committee in appropriating $95,000, we simply at this time ask for this authorization of the House in order that this matter may take its course.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, we will have to start some time to hold down appropriations if we are to save any money. That tax bill rejection the other day indicated that the folks at home, while they make little if any protest when appropriation bills are up, certainly come awake when they discover that we are trying to take a little money out of their pockets to meet an increase in taxation.

I was advised a while ago that the tax bill will come back with a slight reduction on the income-tax rate, and that the War Stabilization Board and the administration under the contracts which have been made with industry on wages would be agreeable to including as a cost of living any increase in tax that was put on men who are in the unions or working in some of these industries. Being interpreted, that means that the workers, the union men, anyway, and others perhaps who are in the factory who are not unionized will not pay any tax because they are to have an increase in their wages on the basis of the cost-of-living formula equal to the amount of the tax. That is a nice situation, and perhaps it will get enough votes to put the bill over. But, here is this bill. It is not much, it provides but $95,000. For what purpose? To celebrate something. We had a celebration at West Point not so long ago—the one hundredth anniversary. Now here are 50 more years, and someone wants another celebration. I have been wondering perhaps if this celebration is not for the purpose of calling attention to what happened there so recently to some of the students; maybe not. I do not blame the students so much; of course, they should not have cheated. We all know that. But how can you take boys of school age, of high-school age, or just out of high school—how can you take young men and send them down there and hold before them the honor—and it is an honor—to be on the football team, and then compel them, if they are to be on that team, to go out and practice and do a man's work in that part of the job, and at the same time carry on their studies which is another man's work. That is to say that while we have a wage-and-hour law for people in industry, on the other hand for the boys down at West Point and at Annapolis, what happens? They have to do 2 days' work in 1 if they are to be on the football team. I do not think it is fair. Then the boys are fired but the coach remains—he holds his job. Is he not as guilty as the cadets? I should think in the interest of economy and because of the principle involved it would be better to let this thing die down; it might be just as well if we did not celebrate anything at West Point until the second 100 years have rolled around. Certainly it is not necessary to take the President, the Cabinet members down to show them what West Point is or means. If the money was to send the boys home for Christmas I would consider it, but to spend $95,000 to send a lot of brass and big shots to West Point, call the students out to parade for them, that does not seem desirable.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HALE. They might want to celebrate the fact that they received the $95,000. If we give them the $95,000 then they could have another celebration to celebrate the fact that they got the money.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think there is some merit in that argument. For this reason—it is so seldom that any institution here in America gets any money, or any group of people here in America get any money, maybe we should celebrate every time an American organization and every time an American citizen gets an opportunity to draw back part of the taxes that they pay. Usually the money goes abroad. I think that the gentleman from Maine has something there. The other people across the seas get our funds automatically—or not quite automatically, sometimes they have a representative come here when the House meets and shake hands with the Representatives, and sometimes we have a joint session. I do not know whether they bring a basket, a freight car or a truck to take what they get back with them, but we always give them something. What the gentleman says may be a good reason for expending $95,000. It is the only argument that I can think of which would tend to justify this appropriation—but even that does not convince me I should vote for it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, this bill has the unanimous consent of the Committee on the Judiciary. I am sure the Members would not in a light and transient way consider a bill of this character. The committee felt it was most appropriate to celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of this very famous, and very important institution—highly important to the military as well as to the industry of the Nation, and the culture of the Nation. We have had celebrations before. There is nothing new in a celebration of this character. Harvard, Yale, my own alma mater, Columbia, have all celebrated the one hundred and fiftieth and two hundredth year of their founding. You have celebrations in the State of Michigan, and in every State. You have fairs. They are celebrations and they are devised to sell products. A celebration of this character is devised to sell ideas, the idea of the efficacy and of the worthiness of West Point. I am sure that you can place faith and confidence in the names that have been read

to you of those who will constitute this Commission. There will be Members of this Chamber and of the other body, the Speaker of the House, the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, the President, and the Vice President, and the various members of the Cabinet. You know that the motto of West Point is "Duty, honor, and country." I think it would be well for us to rededicate the whole Nation to the idea of "duty, honor, and country." One of the very purposes of this celebration would be for the general rededication of those great principles.

It is well to remind the Nation of the great names that came from West Point, names of graduates like Grant, Lee, Pershing, MacArthur, Arnold, Eisenhower, and hosts of other illustrious personages who have done so much for our Nation.

In the bill itself we find such names as Bonneville, Marcy, Comstock, Bache, and Wheeler, men who carried out systematic and extensive surveys in mapping the topography and resources of the Nation and its coasts. Graduates like Whistler, McNeil, Parke, and Warren, who, at the suggestion and behest of this very House, pioneered the work in covering the Nation with a network of rail lines and canals; planned for flood control; did all and sundry to conserve our water resources, to improve our harbors and inland waterways; who helped in the construction of the Panama Canal, particularly Goethals—all graduates of West Point. Every Member of this House has a definite stake in West Point. You make your appointment to West Point You give to West Point men who will eventually become as illustrious and great as those names that I have just mentioned.

This celebration is going to be a historic one. It will involve a conclave of many of the most important educators of the country. They will go into the question of education in general. More specifically they will go into the question of military education. We have to infuse into the hearts and minds of the people in the far-flung regions of this Nation the needs for some sane ideas of the military. There is an insufficient amount of knowledge concerning the military. This convocation will high light and dramatize our military needs, procurements, logistics, and our status as a Nation in this changed and changing world. We are no longer in our swaddling clothes when it comes to being a member of the family of nations. We are preeminent in the family of nations. We have got to assume and will have to assume the role that was England's during the last two centuries, namely, to hold the balance of power so that thereby we can maintain peace. It is well to know that England for over a hundred years was able to keep the peace in Europe and the world, from the time of the Napoleonic wars up to the First World War, because of her naval and military strength. We, because of our naval and military strength, beyond peradventure of doubt, will be able to hold that balance of power and to maintain peace.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Is not this resolution under consideration almost identical with that which was drafted by the Congress about 50 years ago?

Mr. CELLER Of course, I was not in the House at that time. I take it for granted the gentleman is correct. I presume that is the case. If I get to be 150 years old, and the gentleman also, we would like to have a celebration.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Were we at war 50 years ago? I do not think we were. That is the whole point.

Mr. CELLER. We may be at war 50 years from now, unless we are able to hold the balance of power by virtue of our naval and military strength West Point helps us in that direction. I think we will have peace and we will not have an outbreak of hostilities anywhere. We will be able to stem it before it starts if we know whither we are going from a military standpoint.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman says we are preeminent in the family of nations; are we not likewise preeminent in the national debt of the world?

Mr. CELLER I presume you have to incur some obligations to become preeminent in anything. I am concerned about the national debt, but when I consider men like the gentleman from Iowa and 150,000,000 other splendid people in these United States; when I consider such very valuable assets, valuable human assets, and then consider our debt, large as it is, I am not so much concerned. Those assets, plus our vast resources, more than offset the debt.

Mr LANE Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER I yield.

Mr. LANE. May I say to the gentleman from New York in reply to the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] that during the hearings on this bill I asked the witness who was testifying, Brig. Gen. Chauncey L. Fenton, the following question.

Mr LANE I assume, General Fenton, you perhaps had a like celebration at the one hundredth anniversary?

General FENTON Yes, a like celebration was held. The President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt, and the Secretary of War, Mr Elihu Root, were in attendance at that time

The Naval Academy also had its centennial celebration in 1945.

Mr. LANE. And this celebration is planned along the same line as the one hundredth anniversary you had back some years ago at West Point?

General FENTON. Yes; and I might indicate that a similar celebration is held by universities, such as Princeton University had its bicentennial, and a commission was authorized by Congress at that time. It was held 2 or 3 years ago.

Colonel MCKENNEY. A similar joint resolution was passed by the Congress for the Princeton bicentennial.

Mr. CELLER. Here is one last point, this conclave to be held will arrange for a definitive history of the United States Military Academy. There is no real history that has been developed and compiled with reference to the Academy. Not so long ago I wanted to get certain information concerning the Academy, and I could not adequately procure it. That alone would be valuable. Such a history will emanate from that convocation and be a very important historical document concerning the United States Military Academy

Finally, I am sure there will be a definite guarantee of freedom from abuse and freedom from any waste of funds because of the appointment of men of the highest integrity to become members of this Commission.

Mr. BENDER Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I always yield to my good friend from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I appreciate the comments of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I wonder if he would object to an amendment that I propose to suggest that on page 4, after line 24, we insert language to include on this Commission all living generals of the Army?

Mr. CELLER I have no objection to that; why not? How many are there?

Mr. BENDER. I have one in mind particularly, General MacArthur

Mr CELLER. I certainly would have no objection to the inclusion of General MacArthur

Mr. BENDER. He was Superintendent of the Academy and he had the highest grade of anybody who ever graduated from the Academy

Mr. CELLER. I personally would have no objection whatsoever; as a matter of fact, MacArthur is named in the resolution You will see on page 2 there is set forth names of men of great military distinction; the name of MacArthur is bracketed with Grant, Lee, Pershing, MacArthur, in that order.

Mr. BENDER. I know that. Under the circumstances I am sure there could be no objection.

Mr. CELLER. I can see no objection whatsoever to that; as a matter of fact, on second thought, I think it would be very praiseworthy

Mr. MCCULLOCH Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr Chairman, certainly none of us want to take away from West Point in any way the great glory that belongs to this institution in the years gone by. But, as was said here on the floor the other day, the timing of this bill is wrong None of us but approve of the one hundredth anniversary celebration which occurred 50 years ago. But, let us remember at the same time, that was a celebration during an era of peace. We were not at that time faced with the tremendous financial obligations that we as a Nation are faced with today. All of the lieutenants who have recently graduated from West Point, and who have given their lives in Korea, have dedicated themselves to their country and they have proven the glory of West Point far

more than we are able to do so by this resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] has referred several times to the appropriation made for the one hundredth anniversary celebration. We did not at that time have a debt of $260,000,000,000, did we?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. No. We had little, if any, debt.

Mr. GROSS. And the highest spending program and the highest tax burden confronting the people of the country.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not think we appropriated on that occasion a fraction of $95,000.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] has informed me that back in 1944 Bowdoin College celebrated its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary, but the cost did not amount to more than $2,500 and that came out of the institution and interested participants, not out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the United States. Why should we spend $95,000 here during wartime when this money is desperately needed now and may be desperately needed in the future for such essentials as backing up the boys in Korea? I see smiles on the faces of such gentlemen as Mr. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, to whom perhaps a saving of this $95,000 does not represent very much.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In a moment. This $95,000 represents a comparatively small amount, but if we save enough of those particular small items I feel we will be showing a far greater consideration for these boys who died in Korea and in World War II, including the graduates of West Point, in respect to their memory than we would by spending $95,000.

I want to reiterate, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take away from that great school the least bit of credit that is due it. But let us remember that we do have a debt of $257,000,000,000. Let us try to save a little money if we can.

Reverting to the remarks of the chairman of the subcommittee with reference to the appropriation already made, may I say that this comparatively small amount was part and parcel of many hundreds of items in a large military appropriation bill. Had it been known on the floor of the House that it was there, I think a point of order would have been lodged against it and this item would have been stricken. But we members on the Appropriations Committee who do not serve on that particular subcommittee cannot know all of such items contained in the bill unless brought to our attention. However, unless we do O. K. today the expenditure of this $95,000, that money will not be permitted to be expended. Let us save this amount.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman, who may not have been smiling at the remark I made about trying to save $95,000. I may have been in error as to the reason for his smiling.

Mr. WALTER. Yes; I actually was smiling because the gentleman stated that the $95,000 meant so much to the boys in Korea. Being a member of the Appropriations Committee, as the distinguished gentleman is, I am sure he will realize better than anyone that $95,000 does not mean very much to the boys in Korea.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Ninety-five thousand dollars certainly in itself, may I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, means comparatively little, but if you will put together enough of these $95,000 items, perhaps the new tax bill would not have been necessary.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 285, especially if it serves to enlighten our future military leaders, the cadets and faculty of West Point, on world affairs.

Earlier a gentleman referred to the bicentennial of Princeton University, endorsed by this House. I attended the ceremonies which rededicated Princeton's ideals of service in the Nation's interest. General Marshall was present. I am sure that those who heard the distinguished general appreciated an expression of his views.

Reference has been made to the fact that America was at peace and its financial obligations not as great when West Point celebrated its centennial 50 years ago. The world is troubled today. Commitments are heavy. It would appear that now is the time that the students and faculty of West Point would most appreciate an orientation on world affairs such as the passage of House Joint Resolution 285 could make possible.

I recall with mixed feelings that dark moment in North Korea last December when the Supreme Commander of U. N. forces in the Far East stated in effect that the conflict had reached such proportions as to require disposition of the chancellories of the world. It was to be resolved by higher authorities. Yet when negotiations on a diplomatic level were proceeding, as urged by this commander, exception was taken.

I think it would be a wonderful thing for the faculty and cadets at West Point to benefit by the passage of House Joint Resolution 285 at this time.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I question the advisability of a West Point celebration.

According to statements that have been made on the floor of the House, it is to be a great military celebration. I have just as high respect as anyone on the floor of the House for West Point and its achievements, but I think a celebration at this particular time is not quite in order.

I am thinking of the many West Point graduates, together with the other boys, who are fighting in Korea, giving their lives, in what is described as a police action, but which, after all, is war at its worst.

I just cannot think the military department of our Government would want to carry on a celebration now. To do so does not favorably impress me at this time.

I have recently received a message from the Department of the Army that a young man I nominated to West Point, and who was graduated last spring, has made the supreme sacrifice in Korea. I hardly think the family of this young man, or the families of other young men fighting and dying in Korea, would feel that a celebration is in order at the present hour.

If this Congress wants to approve a celebration and spend approximately $100,000 in doing so, the least you should do is to wait until the war in Korea has been brought to a conclusion. In other words, if you deem such celebration worth while, and if you think you ought to spend $95,000 of the taxpayers' money in carrying on such celebration, the least you can do is to put it off until a more propitious time. This is not the time to celebrate. It should be a time of commemoration, not celebration.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will be glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Ohio, whom I respect greatly.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Unquestionably the gentleman from Kansas knows that this authorization, with the appropriation which would implement it, provides for far more than a celebration; that it actually provides for a convocation and a conference, which will review the magnificent history of the Military Academy and will project for the future the course of study and the course of action which will affect the young men that we are sending, and those who will come after us, will send there. It is more than an empty celebration.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not charge it is an empty celebration, but from the description that I have heard on the floor of the House thus far, excepting a few words from the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I know, as the gentleman has so well stated, the Military Academy has a great record. That record speaks for itself. I know that convocations with educators from other institutions of learning will be most helpful in the improvement of the educational program at the institution. We have some of that now. We should have more. In fact, I think the Academy would do well to seek more advice and consultation from other great institutions of learning in this country. I agree with the gentleman that the courses taught in West Point and its management can be improved, and they should be, but that is hardly cause for celebration or the expenditure of these funds.

I really believe this is not the time to put on the program described by the chairman of this great committee. As I

said a few moments ago, the celebration should be postponed until the war situation, in which our country is now involved, is brighter than it is today.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS].

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the joint resolution. I think its purposes are worth while. This resolution can help make a definite contribution to our country and our national defense effort at a very serious time in American history

There are probably three basic reasons why the resolution is worthy of support. First, it is to commemorate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the United States Military Academy. The Academy has given our country its finest leaders on the battlefield, including some of the greatest men in public life today. It commemorates the anniversary of an Academy in which the Congress is particularly interested, because the vast majority of the cadets of that Academy are appointed by Members of Congress We have consistently sought to seek out the very finest young men in the Nation so that they can be appointed to the West Point Academy and later serve as leaders in our Armed Forces.

I think it is particularly important that we remember that at this time we are at war. We are at war in Korea. We may be in other actions, the world situation being what it is

The second reason why the joint resolution should be supported is that it is important that we instill in the minds of all the people in our country a great respect and understanding of this institution, particularly so in view of the fact that we have always maintained civilian control of the military in this country. At this particular time when we are drafting millions of young men, when we have young men fighting at this very moment in Korea, when more and more young men are going into the Armed Forces in the next few months, it is important that we do have more respect and understanding of the educational institution which supplies those young men with their leadership. It is important that we keep that in mind.

For many years various organizations in this country, the Communist Party and others, have endeavored to destroy faith in the Military Academy. It might be well if we turned our thoughts toward this fine institution and learn more of its great contribution to a strong America.

The third reason is that this resolution will help to set up an educational conference, where leaders from around the country can exchange ideas not only on the conduct of the United States Military Academy but as to the conduct of other institutions of higher education, particularly military institutions.

Those are the three purposes which I think make this joint resolution worth while.

Many Members have spoken of economy, of the need to reduce expenditures. I have voted time after time with many of my colleagues who have voted against large appropriations that could have been reduced. Personally, I feel that the $56,900,000,000 which we turned over in many ways with a blank check to the military authorities could have been reduced and still not have impaired the national defense efforts. I think there were all kinds of places where we could have reduced the military appropriations and other national defense appropriations Unfortunately, we did not think too much about that But now, when we have an appropriation for $95,000, which has already been appropriated and for which this is the authorization, we are giving a great deal of attention and concern to it, even though this money would honor our great Military Academy. I think the reason for this situation is that so many of us can understand what $95,000 looks like but we have no comprehension of what a billion dollars looks like. We in this Congress seem in many cases to vote the billions of dollars with less question than we are raising on the legislation before us today

Mr Chairman, I think it is important and worth while that this joint resolution be approved.

Mr HOFFMAN of Michigan Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr HILLINGS I yield

Mr HOFFMAN of Michigan There is merit to the proposition that the gentleman makes that the people should know more about West Point We can all agree with that. But who is going on this commission? The President of the United States, the members of the Supreme Court, Members of Congress, and the Secretaries of Navy and War. They ought to know all about it now If you would send somebody down there to learn something, that would be all right.

Mr HILLINGS By way of answer to the gentleman from Michigan and to supplement the names he mentions, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr BENDER] has already given indication that he will offer an amendment at the appropriate time which will allow certain others to attend that celebration and participate in it. Through the attention given to their participation many people around the country will come to understand it more. I am referring to the amendment which would allow the generals of the Army to attend Of course that would include General MacArthur.

Mr HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why send all of them there? They have been there, at least most of them have. Why not send the parents of some of these boys who have just gone from West Point and been killed in Korea, and let them find out all about it.

Mr. HILLINGS. I think the persons that the gentleman from Michigan mentions will participate, and as result of their participation, will help to inform many of the people for whom the gentleman has expressed concern.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I just wonder if the Department of Defense for which we are appropriating such huge funds could not find $95,000 to finance this project?

Mr HILLINGS. I think that might have been a good way to handle it, but unfortunately I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations so I do not know what the attitude of the Department of Defense would be on that.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require to answer the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Chairman, I think those in the armed services of our country, who have suggested this authorization, should be complimented for their forthright honesty rather than resorting to the use of funds appropriated to them by some subterfuge. This has been brought out into the open, and we hope the full story is being told

Mr KEATING. Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr HILLINGS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING Was there any evidence, either before the subcommittee or the Committee on Appropriations with reference to the need for $95,000 for the purpose of having this celebration?

Mr. HILLINGS. As I recall, General, one of the witnesses broke down the various proposed expenditures I think, perhaps, the gentleman from Massachusetts has that breakdown

Mr KEATING I would appreciate hearing it. It seems to me that it is quite possible that this celebration might be held with a considerably less sum than $95,000, and if it can be, while it is not a large figure as Washington figures go, it seems to me we ought to consider that possibility. I would be happy to hear any evidence on either side with regard to the need for this precise sum of money—or will $9,500 or some lesser sum do just as well as $95 000?

Mr HILLINGS. I repeat, as I recall, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] has the breakdown on that budget, or at least a part of the budget, making up the entire $95,000.

Mr KEATING Would the gentleman from Massachusetts enlighten us on that?

Mr LANE Mr Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to answer the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. May I say to the gentleman from New York that this amount has already been mentioned during debate. It calls for the sesquicentennial exhibition in static display, and that item will require $30,000 of the $95,000. The conference on the history of West Point and the Hudson Highlands, $2,000. The conference on education, $6,000. The conference on military education, $5,000. The visit of the Boy Scouts of America from the various districts and areas throughout the country, $4,000. Conference on athletics, $2,000. Jubilee convocation, $10,000. Administrative expenses, publication, commemorative items, and minor events, $19,900. Pay of six civilian employees, $16,035.

Mr. Chairman, West Point never surrenders to dishonor.

In a confused and troubled world where individuals and nations lose heart and trade their character for the tempting tinsel of money, power, or athletic glory, it is time to speak up for the real and enduring values.

The United States Military Academy, on the heights above the Hudson, will observe, beginning January 1, 1952, 150 years of distinguished service above and beyond the call of duty.

Its high standard of integrity is uncompromising.

It does not hide or condone moral weakness under the thin excuse of expediency.

The West Point tradition, based on experience, has never lost sight of this fundamental fact, that acquired skills are a shallow accomplishment unless they are rooted in truth, honesty, and courage.

The training of youth to become a man is first and all-important.

He must learn to obey before he can lead.

His ideals must never be tarnished by deals.

This dedication to honorable service merits a salute from all Americans for its own sake, and in the hope that it will serve as a stimulating example for young men and women on the threshold of careers in business, in the professions, in the labor movement, and particularly in government.

In 1802, Thomas Jefferson, following the advice of George Washington, John Adams, Alexander Hamilton, and others, recommended the establishment of a National Military Academy on the Hudson River at West Point. It was authorized by an act of Congress, dated March 16, 1802. The picturesque setting is rich in memory and inspiration. It was here that the tattered Revolutionaries defeated the enemy's attempt to isolate New England from the rest of the Thirteen Colonies.

Only the cream of American youth can qualify for the Point.

Its scholastic standards are unexcelled. Its discipline transforms good youngsters into better men.

As the Nation grew, so did the Military Academy, training the cadets to meet a more complex and ever-widening area of responsibility. The sound preparation and experience of its graduates proved decisive in handling the problems of organization, mobilization, supply, and leadership. The names of Grant, Lee, Pershing, MacArthur, Arnold, Eisenhower, and a host of others, bear testimony to the high caliber of its educational system.

The 19th of January is the birthday of that great and gallant soldier, Gen. Robert E. Lee. At West Point, today, you can see a portrait of this famous alumnus, dressed in blue. The full tribute due him will become complete when, on the 1952 anniversary of his birth, a new portrait of him will be dedicated, this time in the gray uniform of the Confederacy that he loved and served so well.

I single out this one event, in a series of jubilee observances, because it symbolizes the unique quality of West Point. To be ready for any eventuality, to fight hard if need be, to be generous in victory and noble in defeat, but above all, to do one's level best.

West Point trains its graduates not only for military careers, but for other public service as well; for its graduates have served with distinction as Federal judges, as Members of the United States Congress, as ambassadors, as cabinet officers, and as President of the United States.

It was one of the first technical institutions to be established in the United States, and during the first half century of its existence advanced engineering education, providing teachers and textbooks to many newly founded scientific schools of the period.

Graduates like Bonneville, Marcy, Comstock, Bache, and Wheeler, carried out systematic surveys, mapping the topography and resources of the entire Nation and its coasts, and helping to further the extraordinary expansion of our Republic.

Whistler, McNeil, Parke, and Warren, at the behest of Congress, led the work of covering the Nation with a network of rail lines and canals; planned and supervised flood control, the conservation of water, the improvement of harbors and inland waterways, and numerous other engineering projects, including the construction of the Panama Canal under the direction of George Goethals.

The Academy educates men to be faithful to the trust that is reposed in them. No letdown in the code is tolerated by the cadet body itself.

The 1951 Academy catalog says:

> Honor, as it is understood by the corps of cadets, is a fundamental attribute of character. The honor system is merely straightforward honesty of thought and of action.

Some educational institutions concentrate on the training of the mind alone.

West Point develops the mind and the character.

Judged by the brilliant record of its graduates, who put service to the Nation before personal ambition, and who have built such efficient staffs for the United States Army and the United States Air Force that our military security is in the most competent hands, it appears that the West Point system, reinforcing skill with integrity, builds men who are physically, mentally, and morally strong.

The theme chosen for the celebration of the Academy's one hundred and fiftieth birthday is: "Furthering our national security."

It will be developed through study and conference, amplifying the relationship between civilian and military education in the winning of peace through security. Participants will be distinguished scholars and representatives of higher education from the United States and abroad, personnel of government, representatives of business and industry and of the Armed Forces, cadets, and midshipmen of West Point and Annapolis, student representatives of ROTC units, and of officer candidate schools.

There will be other major events during the period from January 1, 1952, until June 1, 1952. These will include an exhibition and State display, a conference on the history of West Point and the Hudson Highlands, a visit by the Boy Scouts of America, a conference on athletics, and the jubilee convocation.

An invitation to participate in the observance will be extended to representatives of the signatories of the North Atlantic Treaty, the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance and other friendly foreign nations. Such action will promote good will, enhance common ties, demonstrate our training methods, and foster an understanding of cultural differences between the United States and these nations. The result of such a joint participation will therefore serve to cement more fully the amicable relationships with these important foreign powers.

West Point is mindful and proud of its share in our Nation's long struggle through peace and war to hold to the ideal of Government by the people. And we believe that from the studies and conferences of this program will come a strengthened devotion to that ideal.

I speak for Joint Resolution 285, to authorize appropriate participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy.

In order to facilitate such a commemoration, a commission to be known as the United States Military Academy Sesquicentennial Commission, composed of members designated in the joint resolution, and to serve without compensation, is recommended. The Commission is authorized to make such expenditures for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution not to exceed $95,000 as it may deem advisable.

This is a small sum to ask for such a well-merited tribute.

This cost is subject to the availability of funds included for this purpose in the appropriation for the operation of the United States Military Academy.

The Committee on the Judiciary recommend that the joint resolution do pass.

As the flags of the States are presented to the Academy we will be reminded, individually and collectively, of the superior ethics and performance demanded of all Americans to promote the moral tone and vitality of our Nation.

We are mobilizing our material strength.

That is not enough.

To further our national security, we must activate our faith, our character, and our will.

The impressive ceremonies attending the on hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of West Point will call upon American citizens, without exception, to rededicate themselves to the high purpose of "duty, honor, country" which is the sublime motto of the United States Military Academy.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio.

There was no objection.

TO BRING MONEY INTO THE PUBLIC TREASURY IS A NOVELTY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in addressing the House at this time is not to discuss these distressing situations that confront us such as Korea and the high cost of living and dishonesty in Government. You are very familiar with all of these. I want to bring to the House some good tidings. You will remember the Biblical story of the old patriarch who sent his trusted servant into a far country on an important mission. He waited long and anxiously for his return and one day as he was keeping his vigil and sitting against the wall of his house by the front door, he saw his servant running down the distant mountain returning from the long trip. Confident that the mission was successful, he said:

Beautiful upon the mountain are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings.

Now if you please, let me bring you some tidings. I shall tell you a story of legislation that Congress passed 2 years ago this week, October 19, 1949. That legislation, contrary to the rule these days, has brought large amounts of money into the treasuries of many of the States without calling upon the people to pay any taxes of any kind. I think this is an accomplishment of national importance. I refer to the cigarette law, commonly known in the trade as the Jenkins Act.

At the time of the passage of this act all but about six of the States had laws taxing cigarettes. The tax in most of the States was 2 or 3 cents a pack. In some cases the tax was as high as 7 cents. This would be in addition to the Federal tax which is now 7 cents. This State tax is vital to the revenues of these States. Sharp traders in States which did not levy a State tax soon saw a chance to get rich by bootlegging cigarettes to customers in those States which levied a tax. These bootleggers soon built up a great business by which they cheated the State taxing authorities out of an estimated thirty or forty millions of dollars a year. Great quantities of cigarettes without a tax stamp on them were shipped and mailed into these States. The postmasters in some of the large cities of these States handled more cigarettes than the largest legitimate cigarette dealer in that city.

To prevent this Nation-wide thievery, I introduced a bill in Congress that provided:

That any person selling or disposing of cigarettes in interstate commerce, whereby the cigarettes are shipped to other than a distributor licensed by or located in a State taxing the sale or use of cigarettes, shall each month forward to the tobacco tax administrator of the State into which such shipment is made certain information, including the name and address of the person to whom the shipment was made and the brand and the quality of the cigarettes shipped. Violation of the act is a misdemeanor punishable by fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment of not more than 6 months.

Some bootleggers fought the enactment of this law with high-priced lawyers. They attended the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee but the committee recommended the passage of the bill which in due time was passed by the House. These same high-powered groups appeared before the Finance Committee of the Senate. The bill passed both Houses of Congress and was signed by the President.

At the hearings some of the bootleggers stated that if the bill became a law they would go out of business. I think some of them kept their word but some of the most daring tried to continue but the United States enforcing officers soon took them to trial before the United States courts. I think there are some criminal cases still pending. I hope that the State taxing authorities will not relax their vigilance but will keep after these law violators.

There was a civil suit filed in the United States Court for the District of Columbia on November 30, 1950. The style of this case is as follows.

United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil Action No. 1560–50.

Consumer Mail Order Association of America et al., plaintiffs, v J. Howard McGrath, individually and as Attorney General of the United States, defendant.

In this case the district court sustained the constitutionality of the Jenkins Act. This case went to the Supreme Court of the United States and the Supreme Court approved the decision of the district court without a written opinion on February 26, 1951 And the Jenkins Act then became a valid effective law of the land.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me discuss the financial advantages that have come to the State treasuries by reason of the enactment of the Jenkins Act It is practically impossible to ascertain just exactly how much money the State treasuries have received by reason of this law. This law did not bring in any direct tax. It prevented money escaping from State treasuries which rightfully belonged there In other words, it permitted money to get into the State treasuries that otherwise would have been kept out.

I have contacted the official finance officers in many of the States in an effort to find out what would be a fair estimate as to how much their respective State treasuries have benefited by reason of the enactment of this law. Many have responded and I have gotten some estimates from other sources. I shall not attempt to quote directly any of my informants but I shall give figures that will, I think, be fair in each case that I cite. The States with the heaviest cigarette tax and the greatest volume of cigarette sales will profit the most, such as Louisiana and Oklahoma, each of which has a heavy tax.

Here are some of my estimates as to how much these States will benefit annually:

Ohio	$600,000
Texas	1,000,000
Michigan	1,500,000
Oregon	500,000
West Virginia	300,000
South Carolina	500,000
Georgia	300,000
Oklahoma	1,100,000
Arkansas	225,000
Wisconsin	300,000
New Jersey	500,000
Washington	500,000

I have attempted to cite States from different parts of the country. States with large populations such as New York, Pennsylvania, and California have profited immensely. I do not have complete estimates from all of the States but I feel sure that the total savings will be between twenty-five and thirty million dollars per year.

Letters to me from many of the State taxing authorities have indicated that they appreciate the benefits that have come to their respective States from the enactment of the Jenkins Act. Here is a paragraph from one letter that is a fair sample:

Virtually every State and hundreds of thousands of retailers owe you a debt of gratitude, and you have every right to be proud of your achievement.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas

Mr BECKWORTH. Does the gentleman have the figures with reference to Missouri?

Mr. JENKINS. No I am sorry to say that Missouri even up to this time is a bootlegging State. That is one State that violates the law. Strange as it may seem, there were about six of them, and with the passage of this law it has given them religion, apparently, and I think they are all in but Missouri and one other State

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman mentioned Texas. I remember specifically some conversations we had with reference to Texas I am glad it has come out as the gentleman has indicated, and I want to commend the gentleman on the very fine job he has done and the insistent interest he has taken in this matter.

Mr. JENKINS Mr. Chairman, diagnosing the benefits that might come to the people of my State of Ohio by reason of this $600,000 that will be added annually to the budget of that State without any cost to the State, let me say that $600,000 would, if applied to that purpose, add greatly to the relief of many widows and dependent children now receiving insufficient aid in that great State. It would go a long way toward paying a little more money for the aged and blind if it were applied that way. Or it would repair many miles of bad roads resulting from the wear and tear of last winter, which was terrifically bad in Ohio.

And it will give encouragement to the thousands of law-abiding cigarette dealers who felt the competition that they were suffering from the illegal sales of cigarettes by these competitors, who did not pay any State cigarette tax.

And, Mr. Chairman, it will give encouragement to the various State taxing authorities who have a difficult job administering their State tax laws even without hunting up bootleggers who did this bootlegging through the mails and through interstate commerce.

I congratulate the Congress of the United States for having passed the Jenkins Act that brings great amounts of money into the State treasuries annually and without the levying of taxes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York, General KEATING.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of West Point is a commendable objective. This is a great event in the history of our country. It is entirely proper that we should celebrate this significant occasion in an appropriate, dignified manner.

It is the provision for an appropriation, however, that bothers me, and it is that feature which makes it difficult for me to support this bill in its present form. It has been suggested that the appropriation should be stricken out, that there are funds available to have a proper and appropriate and dignified celebration without this appropriation. Certainly whether the appropriation paragraph is eliminated or not, at the very least the figure should in my judgment be substantially reduced. It now appears that there is ample justification for that action arising out of the figures given by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts. I am not convinced by the itemization which he gave us that $95,000 is necessary. This Commission, like all others—it is the same old story—they want to have six civilian employees. That is what we encounter all the time, this effort to pad the Federal payroll. That takes up some $15,000 or $20,000, as I remember the figures. There are a lot of items in this $95,000 that it does not seem to me should be there. Unless in the amendment stage this figure is substantially reduced, and I mean substantially, I shall not be able to support the measure. It might be pleasant if we could spend money recklessly on any project suggested to us, but the financial condition of our Federal Treasury simply demands that we conduct ourselves responsibly and not authorize expenditures of large or even small sums on such meager evidence as has been presented here today.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, while I have not been a Member of this distinguished body as long as some other Members who are here today, it seems to me that this is a significant day in the recent history of America. I think there has been more concern today over the way we spend our money than at any time in all my days here, and I am hopeful that the people of this country will be able to call it blessed. I really hope, that in the days that are ahead, those members of the Appropriations Committee and the rest of us who are not on that committee will be as careful about the money that we spend in those bills that carry appropriations of millions and billions of dollars as we are about this $95,000.

The facts have been covered by others, but before concluding I want to say again that this is more than a celebration; it is a convocation; it is a conference. There is not a man or woman here today who attended a university which has attained maturity which has not held such a conference or celebration. The past of this great institution will be reviewed, and I am sure that those educators from every institution in America who will be in attendance will bring with them suggestions and recommendations that will be of lasting benefit to that great Academy and to all the people in America. I hope that those of you who voted against the rule will consider this matter in a proper light, not with a knife out for $95,000, but in view of what has been done at the Academy and the great good that will be accomplished in this conference and in this celebration. I hope you will support the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired; all time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas there are to be held at West Point, N. Y., during the period beginning January 1, 1952, and ending June 3, 1952, suitable conferences, convocations, and a jubilee ceremony in celebrating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the United States Military Academy, and

Whereas such conferences, convocations, and jubilee ceremony will be devoted to applying, in discussion with prominent educators and military leaders throughout the world, our common knowledge and experience to the consideration of the theme which has been chosen for the celebration of the Military Academy's sesquicentiennial—"Furthering our national security"; and

Whereas the United States Military Academy, upon the recommendations of Washington, Adams, Hamilton, and Knox, was founded by an act of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the Military Academy was established at West Point, N. Y., a site already identified in the hearts of the American people as the citadel which during the American Revolutionary War was instrumental in preventing the enemy attempt to isolate New England from the rest of the Thirteen Colonies; and

Whereas in succeeding wars, the graduates of the Military Academy have won ever increasing acclaim, their military training and experience having proved decisive in handling the problems of organization, mobilization, supply, and leadership, and the whole world today acknowledges with respect and esteem the names of Grant and Lee, Pershing, MacArthur, Arnold, Eisenhower, and a host of others; and

Whereas West Point has become a keystone in the structure of our national defense; and

Whereas West Point has trained its graduates not only for military service to the Nation, but for other public service as well, for West Point graduates have served with distinction as Federal judges, as members of the United States Congress, as ambassadors, as cabinet officers, and as President of the United States, namely Ulysses S Grant; and

Whereas the United States Military Academy was one of the first technical institutions to be established in the United States, and during the first half century of its existence significantly advanced engineering education in America and provided teachers and textbooks to many newly founded scientific schools of the period; and

Whereas West Point graduates such as Bonneville, Marcy, Comstock, Bache, and Wheeler, who carried out systematic and extensive surveys and mapping of the topography and resources of the entire Nation and its coasts, have made outstanding contributions to the extraordinary expansion of our Republic; and

Whereas graduates of the United States Military Academy such as Whistler, McNeil, Parke, and Warren, at the behest of Congress, pioneered the work of covering the Nation with a network of rail lines and canals; and planned and supervised flood control; conservation of water, the improvement of harbors and inland waterways, and numerous other national engineering projects, including the construction of the Panama Canal under the direction of George Goethals; and

Whereas, since its founding West Point has dedicated itself to the ideals of its motto, "Duty, Honor, Country"; and

Whereas, at its approaching sesquicentennial, the United States Military Academy, through its Superintendent, its faculty, its graduates, and the Corps of Cadets, drawn from every State and Territory of the Union, will rededicate itself to these ideals: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Government and the people of the United States join with the United States Military Academy in a fitting and appropriate observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of its founding, and, in order to facilitate such a commemoration, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States Military Academy Sesquicentennial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), to be composed of the following-named persons:

The President of the United States of America and 16 members to be appointed by him,

The Vice President of the United States of America, and six Senators to be appointed by him,

The Chief Justice of the United States of America and six members to be appointed by him;

The Speaker of the House of Representatives, and six Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by him;

The Governor of New York State;

The Secretary of Defense,

The Secretary of the Army;

The Secretary of the Navy;

The Secretary of the Air Force;

The Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff;

The Chief of Staff, United States Army;

The Chief of Naval Operations, United States Navy,

The Chief of Staff, United States Air Force;

The Commandant of the United States Marine Corps,

The Commandant of the United States Coast Guard,

The Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army;

The Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force,

The Superintendent, United States Military Academy;

The Superintendent, United States Naval Academy,

The Superintendent, United States Coast Guard Academy.

The President of the United States of America shall be Honorary Chairman of the Commission. The Secretary of Defense shall be Chairman of the Commission. The Superintendent, United States Military Academy shall appoint, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the Commission, a Secretary for the Commission; any vacancies shall be filled in the manner provided for in the original appointment. The authority of the Commission under this joint resolution shall cease and terminate on June 30, 1953.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Commission to formulate plans for the appropriate participation by the United States in the sesquicentennial celebration at West Point. The Commission is authorized in performing its functions under this section to utilize the services and facilities of various agencies and instrumentalities of the United States, with the consent of such agencies and instrumentalities.

SEC. 3. The Commission is authorized to make such expenditures for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution not to exceed $95,000 as it may deem advisable. Expenditures of the Commission

shall be paid upon the presentation of vouchers approved by the Secretary of the Commission subject to the availability of funds included for this purpose in the appropriation for the operation of the United States Military Academy.

SEC. 4. The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for actual expenses incurred in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

Mr. LANE (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD and that it be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr FORD: On page 5, line 24, after the word "exceed", strike out "$95,000" and insert "$5,000."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be approved, but first, I would like to make several general comments. A number of speakers have tried to justify this expenditure of $95,000 on the basis that the Military Academy should be honored at its sesquicentennial. In justification they have stated a number of State institutions of higher learning, have had sesquicentennial and centennial celebrations, therefore the Military Academy should do likewise.

There are several reasons why that argument is not valid. In the first place, you will find that most State institutions when they have had these various celebrations, either centennial or sesquicentennial, the respective State treasuries have been solvent. There has been no comparable deficit like Uncle Sam is operating under at the present time. Those States had no deficit or debt such as the Federal Government has at the present time.

Someone has mentioned that we had a centennial celebration for the Military Academy, which is true, but in 1901 and 1902 we were not at war. The Federal budget at that time, I think, was in balance and we certainly did not have a debt of $257,000,000,000.

Let us take the figures and be specific as to why this particular amendment should be approved. The justification says that the sesquicentennial exhibition and static display will cost $30,000. Just where can they spend $30,000 on a static display at West Point? They have already all kinds of military equipment up there. How much more equipment do they have to lug in at a cost of $30,000?

They want a conference on the history of West Point at Hudson Highlands, N. Y. And I can see where they might want to have a conference on the history of West Point, but why do they have to bring in $2,000 for Hudson Highlands?

They have an item of $6,000 for a conference on education; then they want $5,000 for a conference on military education; they want $4,000 for a visit of the Boy Scouts. Then they want, and this is the most unjustifiable item of all, $2,000 for a conference on athletics and I notice here they have an athletic event and conference to be held at West Point, N. Y., in the spring of 1952. It is anticipated that the heptagonal track meet at West Point, N. Y., will be designated as the athletic event. I suspect that track meet has been scheduled for a number of years, at least for 12 months. I am sure they will have that track meet regardless and that the cost will be paid by the West Point Athletic Association whether or not this appropriation and authorization are made. That is the most ridiculous justification I ever heard of. How stupid do they think Members of Congress are? They are insulting the intelligence of Members of Congress when they say they are not going to have that track meet up there unless we authorize $2,000 of the $95,000 for it

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman did not include in his figures the amount which they propose to use to hire six civilian employees.

Mr FORD. I am coming to that.

Mr KEATING. Before the gentleman comes to that, there is one figure in there I think I am in hearty accord with. That is a provision for bringing the Boy Scouts of America to West Point. I think that is a commendable purpose and it will do a lot of good; it is a great organization. But your amendment would still permit them to do that and have a little left over.

Mr. FORD. It should be brought out, and the gentleman from New York has done so, that they want to hire six civilian employees, I presume for half a year, because it certainly will not take any more than that, at a cost of $16,035. That is not bad pay for the kind of work that is visualized.

I want to make this point: I happen to know how much it costs to put on a track meet, and I know the Military Academy officials will have this heptagonal athletic event whether this authorization goes through or not. The funds for that track meet can and should come from the athletic association. Those funds will be there and the track meet will go on whether we do anything or not. The proceeds from the various football games will take care of that.

I say to you that if the other items of this $95,000 proposal are no more justifiable than the $2,000 for the track meet, it is not worth the paper it is written on.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I wonder if there is an item in that list that you have seen which would provide a memorial service to honor the memory of those boys who gave their lives in that undeclared war in Korea.

Mr. FORD. In response to the gentleman from Wisconsin, as I look over the letter from Mr. Daniel K. Edwards to the Speaker, they do say they are going to have a convocation, and so forth and so on. I certainly hope that appropriate services will be held at the Academy for those who have lost their lives in this war.

I repeat again in conclusion, I certainly believe that this amendment, which cuts it from $95,000 down to $5,000, if approved, will permit the Academy officials to do certain things which will be worth while and desirable. I am sure this $95,000 is just another example of the Pentagon coming in here asking for about 10 times what they actually need and what they can spend judiciously.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GAMBLE. From my experience I happen to know that each college pays its own expenses. They had a heptagonal athletic meet at West Point 3 years ago, and there was not any Federal appropriation at that time. Each college pays its own expenses, and whatever expense there is for the university the meet is paid out of the association funds

Mr FORD. It is my recollection that the gentleman from New York is a former member of the Olympic team, and he knows something about track meets He is absolutely right. The track meet will go on as it did 3 years ago and the schools that participate this year will pay their own expenses. I cannot, under any circumstances, visualize what they will spend $2,000 for. It just does not make sense.

Mr. GAMBLE. A meet was held at Annapolis 2 years ago and there was no appropriation. The respective universities paid their own expenses. I know, because I was there.

Mr. FORD. And the gentleman probably donated his time as an official.

Mr. GAMBLE I did not get my expenses, I know that.

Mr. KEATING Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. It should be noted at this point in the RECORD that the gentleman from New York who just spoke was one of the greatest figures that ever hit the cinder paths of this country.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment prevails it would destroy utterly the efficiency of the resolution. It is an attempt to sabotage this resolution under the guise of so-called economy.

In a matter of this sort, particularly because of its importance, I do not think we must be pinch-penny or parsimonious. There is a proper time to be pinch-penny, but I do not think that in the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of this great institution which has done so much for America, we should attempt to strike down the appropriations from $95,000 to $5,000. It is ridiculous to do that. We have already cut down the original appropriation from $140,000 to $95,000 at the behest of the Bureau of the Budget.

Something has been mentioned about Hudson Highlands. I should like to take the gentleman from Michigan to Hudson Highlands and show him the scenes of

bloody conflict during the Revolutionary War along the Hudson Highlands. I do not think he knows anything about the Hudson Highlands. One of the very purposes of this celebration, of this convocation of educators, is to make known to the people something of what happened around and about West Point. I should like to take the gentleman up there and show him exactly what happened at Hudson Highlands. He speaks from a lack of knowledge of what happened up there. I do not want to leave the Nation in the same ignorance in which the gentleman from Michigan finds himself on this subject. I want the Nation to be enlightened on these facts.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I appreciate the comments made by the distinguished chairman of the committee, but I should like to sit down some time with him and total up the number of hours he has spent at West Point and the total number of hours I have spent there. I would say to the gentleman from New York that I have been at West Point more times individually and spent more hours there than he has.

Mr. CELLER. I question that. I would like the gentleman to have some knowledge of what happened around and about West Point. That is one of the purposes of this celebration, to make known to the people of this Nation something of what happened during the Revolutionary War which emphasized what the war of the Revolution stood for, and also, as I said before, to rededicate the Nation within the purview of those great principles expressed in the motto prominently displayed at West Point "Duty, honor, country." That is another reason for this celebration.

To cut down the appropriation to $5,000 would utterly destroy the resolution. Anybody who supports the amendment is voting to destroy the very purpose of the resolution.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, it certainly had not been my intention to speak on this resolution but I have become very much interested in the course of the debate. It seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, so far from sabotaging the purpose of the resolution, will assure the Military Academy at West Point a more dignified and more appropriate kind of sesquicentennial observance than is contemplated by the $95,000 appropriation.

I may say that if the motto of the United States Military Academy is, as I understand it is, "Duty, honor, country," an appropriate method of displaying its loyalty to that motto would be not to raid the Treasury of the United States.

I happen to have graduated from a college in my State, Bowdoin College, which is not as big as the United States Military Academy at West Point but still I think it is a very good college. In 1944 we had a sesquicentennial celebration that was a very dignified and fine sesquicentennial celebration. I remember Lord Halifax came down from Washington. There were people from all over the world who attended that celebration. I just called the president of the college on the telephone and he tells me that the college appropriated for that celebration two or three thousand dollars, he was not sure of the exact figure. I wonder whether the gentleman from New York can inform me whether the committee, in approving this resolution, got any figures for the tercentenary celebration, for example, of Harvard or the two hundred and fiftieth celebration of Yale or Princeton, or whatever those celebrations were.

Mr. CELLER. I was not on the subcommittee that made the investigation, but I can assure you it would be utterly and woefully impossible for Harvard or any of these institutions adequately to conduct a worthwhile celebration with only $5,000.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. GAMBLE. I introduced a resolution for the two hundredth celebration at Princeton University. We did not ask for any money. Similar resolutions have been passed for Yale, Harvard, and the University of Pennsylvania here in Congress. Resolutions have been passed for several other colleges. This is the first time any Federal funds have ever been requested to my knowledge.

Mr. CELLER. Princeton, Yale, and Harvard are not national institutions supported by the Government. This happens to be a Federal institution.

Mr. HALE. I quite appreciate that, but what I am talking about is the scale on which those famous institutions spend money to celebrate important anniversaries in their own history. I am sure it is on a much more modest scale.

For example, look at the statement in this report:

> A conference on education to be held at West Point for 3 days during January 1952, to be attended by approximately 125 representatives of educational institutions.

That should not cost a great deal of money. The representatives of these educational insitutions will come to West Point on appropriations made by the institutions which they represent. Then there is to be a conference on military education and training to be held at West Point. The professional military men who attend this conference will already be on the Government payroll. You can hold conferences pretty cheaply. You do not have to spend very large sums of money on a conference. The track meet has been pretty well covered by other gentlemen who have spoken. Then there is the jubilee to be held at West Point during one day in May, including a luncheon, an academic procession, convocation and a dinner. Well, you can have a luncheon and a dinner, and, of course, it will cost some money to be sure. But, you can do it with much less money than the amount that has been suggested.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] suggested that $95,000 would not mean very much to the boys in Korea. I readily admit that it would not build an aircraft carrier but it would carry quite a few letters to the boys in Korea. It might be well to apply that money to the purchase of some K rations, which I am sure the boys would enjoy. The money could be used to buy quite a few pints of ice cream. I do not see any occasion for an extravagant celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of West Point. I think the celebration would be a great deal more dignified if it were a great deal less extravagant.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Tennessee that the amendment is not proper for the purpose for which it is offered. The pending matter is a perfecting amendment and the gentlemen's amendment seeks to strike the paragraph.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will it be in order after the pending amendment is disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. SUTTON. I will not offer the amendment at this time then.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Does the gentleman from Tennessee withdraw his amendment?

Mr. SUTTON. That is for the time being.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Ford amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I might say for the information of the gentleman from New York that my amendment, which is not in order at this time, provides for the striking out of section 3 and section 4. It does away with the entire $95,000. Personally, I believe in commemorating the sesquicentennial of West Point, Princeton, the University of Tennessee, Vanderbilt, the University of Texas, SMU, and other schools throughout the country when they have their anniversaries. But why come in here and ask for $95,000 to do it?

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] says that $95,000 would not amount to much to the boys in Korea. I can say to him as a combat veteran, and my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], will join me in saying that $95,000 would mean a lot to them. K rations? Yes. They mean a lot to the boys over there. It will buy a lot of K rations. It is true it would buy but half a tank, but sometimes that half a tank will save the lives of a lot of boys. That gun still may be in action.

Let us look through this $95,000, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] did, and see what it is for.

Thirty thousand dollars for exhibition and display. Have you ever been to West Point or Annapolis? You see there every type of gun, every type of missile that is used in the Army or the Navy on display there. Why they want to spend $30,000 to put more weapons there I cannot understand.

A definitive history of West Point, $2,000. In the office of every Member of Congress you will find pamphlets on the history of West Point, which we send out to cadets. Why do they need $2,000?

Conference on education. Why gather these professors to talk about West Point to them? I presume they know as much as my commandant at West Point, who was my commanding officer in the war.

Conference on military education. Are we going militaristic in this country? Try to teach them all military history? We need to teach them peace, love, and religion instead of militarism.

Visiting Boy Scouts of America. Yes. I would like to see the Boy Scouts go anywhere, but heaven forbid that they be trained about militarism. Let us send them to some of these church schools. I would vote for $4,000 for that.

Conference on athletics. We have just had a conference throughout all the newspapers recently on athletics.

A jubilee convention, $10,000. I do not know what kind of a convocation it would take to spend $10,000.

Administrative expenses, publications. What do they want? Another political book to send out for the campaign next year at the taxpayer's expense?

Pay of six civilian employees, $16,035. That is pretty good pay for six of them.

This is asinine, in my opinion.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. LANE. I am wondering if the gentleman from Tennessee, since he is objecting to any money at all for this celebration participation by the United States at West Point, would object to appropriating any money for this particular observance that is going to be held on the 19th of January 1952, when General Lee's portrait in southern gray uniform will be dedicated at West Point—the 19th of January is General Lee's birthday.

Mr. SUTTON. Yes. I will tell the gentleman I am a great admirer of General Lee, but I still do not think we should appropriate Federal money for it. To me, there is no such thing as sectionalism. I am one southerner who is an American first. I do not think we should appropriate this $95,000, and after the Ford amendment, whether it is passed or defeated, I shall offer my amendment to strike out the entire $95,000.

Above all, I would like to say this: That I would like to go to West Point for their celebration, and if I am here I plan to go. But I will pay my own expenses to go there. I hope that West Point will pay its own expenses instead of asking for $95,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LANE) there were—ayes 98, noes 47.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTTON: On page 5, line 22, strike out section 3 and section 4.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take up the time of the Committee. All I would like to say is that this is not an economy drive. Certainly, I would like to save $95,000, but this is just another one of those things in which there is no justice. If we are going to appropriate $95,000 for West Point let us do the same for all the universities throughout the United States, or whether it be $5,000 or even $1,000.

I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of rising during the course of this debate, but I think we are overlooking one very important thing. It is all right to talk about private universities and their raising and spending money on their commemorative functions, but bear in mind that they have the right to spend their own money and, in addition, they all solicit funds; they have the right to solicit funds; their alumni as well as others participate in the fund raising.

West Point is an American institution; it is part of our Government. Under the law it has no right to solicit funds for anything, and if you do not appropriate the money for these events, West Point cannot spend $1. We Members can spend our own money to go there as visitors or participants if we want to, but West Point has no money except Government money. It cannot spend a dollar of that money unless this Congress authorizes the appropriation and appropriates the money.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. West Point has an alumni; they have an alumni association.

Mr. MULTER. But they cannot use their money for this purpose and they cannot go out and solicit funds for any West Point event.

Mr. SUTTON But they do.

Mr. MULTER. They have no right to do it under the law, and surely you do not want them to violate the law.

Mr. SUTTON. They do do it.

Mr. MULTER. This is an opportunity to aid in demonstrating to the world how we build our armed services, not for war but for peace. If ever there was a time when West Point needed a vote of confidence, it is now. Let us give that vote of confidence by rejecting this amendment and by adopting the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 58, noes 35.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: On page 4, after line 24, insert "All living generals of the Armies."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, we will accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. YATES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 285 to authorize appropriate participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy, pursuant to House Resolution 463, he reported the House joint resolution back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the House joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the House joint resolution

The House joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CONSULTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 36 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe adopted on May 12, 1951, a resolution reading as follows.

"The Assembly,

"Considering that the free peoples of Europe and of the United States have many vital problems in common,

"considering that the solidarity between them arises not only from the common dangers they have to face, but is also the reflection of their common origin, and of their community of thought and civilization,

"taking note that the Committee of Ministers in their message to the Assembly has declared that it would welcome any initiative of the Assembly designed to establish links with the Congress of the United States,

"believing that it would be of the greatest interest for public opinion in the democracies if these problems of common interest were to be discussed by delegations from the two Houses of Congress of the United States and from the Consultative Assembly,

"Instructs its Bureau

"To approach the Congress of the United States through the Speakers of both Houses

for the purpose of arranging such a discussion to take place in public, preferably in Strasbourg, or, if for any reason circumstances make it desirable, in Washington, at a date mutually convenient, and in accordance with an agenda drawn up in advance by agreement between the officers of the Congress of the United States and the Bureau of the Consultative Assembly"; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has formally declared it "to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the further unification of Europe"; and

Whereas it is in the interest of the United States to encourage consultation between the Congress of the United States and the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States welcomes this invitation and expresses its appreciation of the unanimous action of the Consultative Assembly in extending it: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That not to exceed 14 Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly with the representatives appointed by the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe for public discussion of problems of common interest, as envisioned by the resolution of the Consultative Assembly of May 12, 1951. Of the Members of the Congress to be appointed for the purposes of this resolution, half shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House from Members of the House, and half shall be appointed by the President of the Senate from Members of the Senate. Not more than four of the appointees from the respective Houses shall be of the same political party.

The expenses incurred by Members of the Senate, the House, and by staff members appointed for the purpose of carrying out this concurrent resolution shall not exceed $15,000 for each House, respectively, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members. Payment shall be made upon the submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the respective House or Senate delegation.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, and I now yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this is a concurrent resolution which has already been passed by the Senate, authorizing the appointment of a commission of seven Members of the House and seven Members of the Senate, to accept the invitation of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe to appear at its next meeting, which takes place in November.

This measure was considered, I believe, by members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It came to the Committee on Rules because it sets up a special committee, and for that reason that committee had jurisdiction.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Would this committee have any power to make commitments binding the Congress?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. None whatever. The resolution so specifically says.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What do they discuss, world problems, to make us sort of one worlders and live in peace and harmony? What is the agenda?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know whether that would make a lot of difference as long as they have no authority to do anything about it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Just sort of conversation?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; I think it is really a matter to just show our sympathy and interest in the very worthy while effort of the European nations to try and work out their mutual problems.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is more or less unification of Europe or one world, is that the idea?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, they have this commission that is discussing their mutual problems.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I guess they ought to talk about that.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It would not be a bad idea.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia the meaning of the second paragraph on page 2. Does that mean we are still further trying to tell the nations of Europe as to what they shall do or not do? Just what does that particular paragraph have to do with the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That paragraph is not the language of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or the Senate or the House. It is the language of the resolution adopted by this consultative assembly, which merely precedes the invitation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Might I suggest that that is one of the whereases on page 2. It seemingly commits this body to state that it is the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the further unification of Europe. Why should we go into that subject in this particular measure?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota that perhaps that language should not be in there. In any event, I will, at the proper time, offer an amendment to strike the whereases out of the resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, the day before yesterday this House voted against a tax bill because they believed that the American people were paying too much in taxes at the present time. With the passage of this bill, I admit it is only $15,000 per house—but with the passage of this bill it merely means this: Do you want your Government to go into the red another $30,000 during this fiscal year? That is the whole proposition. We all admit that even though they are taking confiscatory taxes away from the people now, we are going in the red as it is, and the sole question here is: Do you want them to go into the red another $30,000?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question or two of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], or the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], anyone who has the information. This provides, on page 2 that not to exceed 14 Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly with certain representatives of an European organization, the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, half to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, the others by the President of the Senate.

My question is: Are there any Members of the House who are not committed to some investigation in some foreign country at the present time? Has anyone ascertained whether there are seven Members of the House who are available for this service? I ask someone from the Committee on Foreign Affairs for that information. Can you tell me whether any inquiry was made to ascertain whether Members would be available for the proposed discussion?

Mr. RICHARDS. The Committee on Foreign Affairs as such does not know whether or not Members would be available.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You do not know?

Mr. RICHARDS. This resolution did not come from the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Where did it come from?

Mr. RICHARDS. The resolution came from the Committee on Rules. It was never considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then I will ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], who is handling the resolution here, Has any effort been made to ascertain whether there were seven Members of the House who would be available for this particular trip or discussion?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. As far as I know, there has been no special select committee set up to make an investigation of the very serious question the gentleman from Michigan raises. I might say, however, that the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Expenditures and it might be a subject for investigation by that committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. While I value his knowledge and his opinion, I call his attention to the fact that the Committee on Expenditurees in the Executive Departments has authority to investigate expenditures in the executive departments, not expenditures in the legislative department. That committee has no control over the expenditures of Members of Congress or its committees. It is concerned only with the executive branch of the Government. I ask this question in all seriousness because the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has had some difficulty in finding four Republicans who want to go on this trip around the world that is just starting off Saturday at 10 o'clock and which will be back on the 5th of December. The one thing that to my mind makes it—I will not say worth while—I will say that one thing that might be said to make the trip worth while is that some of the women of Congress are being recognized as qualified to go on that trip abroad. They are going, and no longer can the women claim there is discrimination in at least this committee. But I do not like to vote for a resolution which will authorize the Speaker to appoint Members of Congress

when there might not be any Members available. We might have to have supplemental resolutions coming in here drafting Members of the House, and some of us may have duties elsewhere either on other investigating committees or here on the floor, or explaining to our constituents, even, why it is that the tax rate is so high and why it is, after we have appropriated so much money—and they paid little attention to that at that time—it becomes necessary to levy a tax or to borrow more money.

There are other things here, too, I would like to know about. On the first page it says:

Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe.

Probably had I been doing my homework I would know what that organization is. There are some 80 agencies which deal with foreign problems. Can the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] tell me about that? Just what is this Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe? What are its duties—who pays the bills for its operations? Or the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee [Mr. RICHARDS] may answer, if he prefers. What is it? Who is on it? What are its duties—its authority? There are 80 or more of those organizations, I am advised.

Mr. RICHARDS. If the gentleman will just wait I will tell him the nations in this organization. They are nations which have parliamentary bodies similar to ours. There were 10 nations to start with. There were 3 Scandinavian countries, and Great Britain, France, Italy, Luxemburg, Belgium, and Holland. I may not have named 10, but there were 10. Then, there were two additional nations, Greece and Turkey. The whole idea was to bring about an interchange of opinion on how to improve parliamentary government. They have asked the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives by a formal invitation to send a delegation of Congress over there because we, too, are supposed to be a democratic country. They seem to think, and I believe it, that some good would come out of it for both the European nations and this Nation itself.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They will have the meat of real effective parliamentary procedure which gives a people peace, prosperity, liberty, and happiness if we send them copies of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights—and if they follow the principles of those documents. Cannot our representatives on the United Nations discuss that matter with them?

Mr. RICHARDS. No, they have no authority in that capacity at all. This has nothing to do with the United Nations at all. This is the Council of Europe.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was sent to the floor of the House by the Committee on Rules, and the time is in charge of the Committee on Rules. Under the rules, any amendments to this resolution can only be offered if the chairman of the committee yields for that purpose, at which time such person, if anyone is recognized for that purpose, may have 1 hour. I make that explanation for this reason. After careful reading of this resolution, I am strongly of the opinion that it needs some amendment. First of all, let me say that I am very much in favor of the over-all idea expressed, and which is to be implemented by the resolution. I think the more conversations our people can have with the peoples of other governments, the more likely we are to have peace in this world in our time. So I am wholeheartedly in accord with what this resolution tries to do, but I would like to call the attention of the House to some of the problems involved in passing this resolution. In the first place, the resolution is for the purpose of accepting an invitation sent to us by unanimous vote of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe. It certainly is sent in good faith, and for a good purpose. The invitation says conversations are to take place in public, and the invitation suggests that the conversations be in accordance with an agenda drawn up in advance by agreement between the officers of the Congress of the United States and the Bureau of the Assembly. That is all rather clear and reasonable. But the pending resolution does not confer any power whatever on these 14 Members of the Congress to organize themselves, to delegate the chairman among themselves or to set up an agenda. It does not provide for the keeping of a record, but it does say something about staff members. How many staff members are there to be, and what are they supposed to do? Just what is the function of such a staff, and what will be the result of their going? The meeting is a public meeting. If we pass this resolution, we will be sending 14 Members of the Congress, 7 from the House and 7 from the other body. Are they speaking for themselves or are they speaking for the Congress of the United States? Are they speaking officially or are they speaking unofficially? Will their status be understood by the public who will be in attendance at these meetings since they are to be public meetings? What will be the over-all effect of a meeting of this kind under these circumstances with no more proscription regarding the voice of these people who go there than is specified in this resolution? I submit, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this resolution is exceedingly serious in these times. I recommend to the acting chairman of the Rules Committee, and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that steps be taken to amend this resolution so as in some way to give it a little bit clearer meaning, and place on the people we are sending a little more limitation than this resolution provides. I offer these comments in sincerity, and with my own approval of the idea of the resolution, but unfortunately with disapproval of the wording of it as it now stands.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know how long this conference is supposed to last?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. No. There is nothing said in the resolution as to how long the conference is expected to last.

Mr. GROSS. So we can expend $2,140 per head at a conference that may last for a week Is that right?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That is possible. My criticism is not with the idea of the resolution itself, which does not say anything at all except that we are to send 14 Members to Europe. I do think it is an error to give such a blank check to any 14 individuals officially representing the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. This does not state whether they are observers or whether they have any official capacity.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. It does not clarify their status as representatives of the United States. It simply says they are from the Congress, but I, as a Member of this body, hesitate to vote to send even my good friends and colleagues in this body to Europe to talk over matters of policy with other nations unless I know what they are going to talk about.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN What can be done by this assembly that could not be done by the Interparliamentary Union, to which we send a delegation each year?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. In answer to the gentleman's question on that point, I think we could reasonably send people in response to this invitation, since the invitation has been made. I feel as I said in the beginning that all the consultation we can have with officials of other countries is a good thing, because it is only by full and free discussion of our mutual problems that we will have peace. So I am heartily in favor of the idea, but I took this time simply to explain some of the things that I feel are defective in this resolution. Perhaps the ensuing debate will be sufficient to clarify the responsibilities of the delegation we send. I hope so.

The SPEAKER The time of the gentleman from Oregon has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I might add to what I said a while ago, that this resolution has already passed the Senate. The Senate, in addition to that, has passed a Senate resolution, so that whatever this body may do, nevertheless this country is going to be represented at this occasion, either solely by Members of the Senate or by Members of both the House and the Senate. They have already passed two resolutions, so that they can catch it one way or the other. I am sure there will be a better understanding after we have heard from the chairman of the Committee on For-

eign Affairs, and I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] 10 minutes.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee to explain that my committee did not consider this resolution. It was very properly referred to and considered by the Committee on Rules. Nevertheless the Foreign Affairs Committee has a strong indirect interest in this resolution. As a matter of fact, identical resolutions were introduced in both the House and Senate. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has just said this resolution has unanimously passed the Senate. A similar simple resolution was also adopted by the Senate, which makes it possible for Members of the Senate to go regardless of whether any Members of the House are appointed to go.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] said something about our not knowing what the duties of this delegation would be. As a matter of fact, the invitation from the Council, signed by the president of the Council and also by the vice president, states that they have issued a formal invitation to the House and to the Senate for this delegation to come over there and consult with them before their regular session begins. Something was said about not knowing how long the committee would be there. I do not know of anybody on the Foreign Affairs Committee who is scheduled to go. But the plan is that the Members who will be designated should go there for 5 or 6 days. They would be there not longer than a week to consult on democratic processes of government with the 125 members of the Consultative Assembly.

Fifteen thousand dollars is involved in this. There is no question about that, but when you think of the great sum that we have spent in military aid in Europe I feel that it would be well spent. This $15,000 might be well spent if this delegation does not do anything but impress upon the Council of Europe what the United States has tried to do in its fight against Communist influence throughout the world.

We have plenty of military men over there to give them military advice, and we have diplomats galore, but so far we have not had an official committee from the Congress of the United States to tell these people what we are up against and what they are up against. Frankly, I think this sum of $15,000 would be spent to our best advantage. Those people over there have given us a courteous invitation; they want advice from our side of the picture. The question is whether it will be worth while to the United States to accept. Frankly, I think it would be.

There will be 7 Members of the House, not from the Foreign Affairs Committee or any particular committee, plus 7 from the Senate, not from the Foreign Relations Committee or any particular committee of that body, but 14 in all who would meet and advise with these people, learn from them. At the same time they would learn from us some of the problems each is up against, and particularly the problems we are up against in this country from particularly the economic and financial standpoint.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. What are we to tell them from our side? That the Treasury of the United States is busted, but that we will continue to shovel out money by the scoop shovelful and further burden our people?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not know what is going to be told to them. I do not know what the gentleman would say if he should go. Even granting that the gentleman is against all of the things that we have done to help the democracies of Europe in this common front against communism; granting all that, I cannot see why the gentleman does not agree that this meeting might not be helpful.

Mr. GROSS. I know how I would spend my $15,000.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not a fact that in the laws passed by Congress we have insisted on, first, the encouragement of unification, the next year further unification, and this year by a law passed by this House upon economic unification and political federation of Europe as a condition of aid that we have already voted? The formal expressions of the Congress to which I have referred shows that that is our belief, that they have got to get together or there is no hope for them? And, therefore, based upon those statements we have already written into law it might be extremely helpful for Members of Congress to call that to their attention as they make their points.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman has hit the heart and core of this thing.

I referred a while ago to the language on page 2 to which the gentleman referred, which is included in the second paragraph:

> Whereas the Congress of the United States has formally declared it to be the policy of the United States to encourage the further unification of Europe—

That wording and the wording to which the gentleman referred are to be found in both the Economic Cooperation Act and also the Mutual Security Act. We laid down the pattern; we admonished them that they should do these things, and now they ask us to go over there and further advise them.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That particular paragraph is distasteful to some of us who feel we ought not to continue to stick our nose into Europe's business at every opportunity.

Mr. RICHARDS. I have not any particular pride in that phraseology, but it is a fact; those words have been used by the Congress in two great pieces of legislation which have been passed here. I do not want to argue with the gentleman about the matter.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have already stated that at the proper time I shall move to strike out all of the preamble of the resolution.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes; I understood the gentleman to say that, but I am fearful that the parliamentary situation might prevent the gentleman's doing that.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman has control of the time.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. Representatives of these organizations came to see me, and I am sure they came to see other Members of the House. As is stated in the report on this resolution, it commits the United States of America to nothing. These people already have this organization and they simply want Representatives of the Congress of the United States to come and sit in with them on this one meeting without any commitment, or any obligation or anything of the kind. I think it is a gesture of friendship that the Congress of the United States should certainly be willing to accord to these people who are trying to go in the same direction that I trust we are going in an endeavor to strengthen the democracies of the world against totalitarian states.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Can there be any question of the friendship of the United States to the nations of the world?

Mr. RICHARDS. I would not think so. Some people might think so.

Mr. GROSS. Why, the gesture?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is not the only question involved here.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This Congress is pretty free in appropriating money for other people to go over and represent this country. Here is an opportunity to appropriate or to authorize an appropriation for a little amount for some of our Members, most of them outside of the Foreign Affairs Committee, to see at first hand what the problems are and what we can do. As a matter of fact, I think that this committee will come back with recommendations to the effect that will in the long run save us millions and millions of dollars.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman. Remember, whether you like this resolution or not, let me emphasize what has just been said, there will be a delegation from the Congress going over there. Seven Members of the Senate will go. If the Congress is to be represented in consultation with this organization I want this body to be represented, too.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, I love every member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. RICHARDS. Please remember that this resolution did not come from the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There are only three or four of its members who represent my views. The gentleman cannot represent my views on foreign affairs, and I refer to the gentleman speaking, although I think a lot of him, his integrity and character, and do not impugn his motives at all. But we in the Midwest have a different philosophy in thinking about what our Government should do in sticking its nose into the business of every country in the world. I hope we will have men on there who will think my way.

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not expect the gentleman to adopt my views and I hope I will never adopt his as he has expressed them.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I might explain to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee that one purpose I had in objecting to the resolution was so there would be these things discussed on the floor today to make a record on the House side for this resolution since there is no report, which is generally considered as part of the legislative history of a bill. I am glad that the gentleman is making the statement he is making. I want to ask a question for the purpose of the record. The activities and the discussions of these Members that we send over there is unofficial. It does not bind the Congress of the United States, it does not bind any Member; it is merely for the purpose of a full and free discussion of the problems; in other words, a round-table get-together and talking of things over. Is that the general idea?

Mr. RICHARDS. That is the general idea. It binds nobody to anything.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 208]

Abbitt	Bramblett	Dague
Allen, Calif.	Brown, Ohio	Dawson
Allen, La.	Brownson	Deane
Anderson, Calif.	Buckley	Delaney
Angell	Busbey	Dempsey
Armstrong	Byrnes, Wis.	Denny
Auchincloss	Case	D'Ewart
Baring	Celler	Dingell
Barrett	Chudoff	Engle
Bates, Ky.	Cole, N. Y	Fallon
Beall	Combs	Fulton
Blackney	Coudert	Garmatz
Boggs, La.	Crawford	Gavin
Bosone	Crosser	Golden
Granger	McCarthy	Rooney
Green	McConnell	Roosevelt
Gwinn	McDonough	Sabath
Harrison, Va.	McGrath	St George
Hart	McKinnon	Scott, Hardie
Hays, Ark.	Mack, Ill.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Hébert	Martin, Iowa	Shelley
Heilong	Miller, Calif.	Sikes
Hess	Morrison	Sittler
Holifield	Murphy	Stockman
Irving	Murray, Wis.	Teague
Jackson, Calif.	Passman	Thompson, Tex.
Javits	Perkins	Thornberry
Johnson	Phillips	Vinson
Judd	Powell	Watts
Kearney	Prouty	Werdel
Kelley, Pa.	Quinn	Whitaker
Kennedy	Rabaut	Whitten
Keogh	Ramsay	Winstead
Larcade	Redden	Wood, Ga.
Latham	Regan	
Lucas	Ribicoff	
Lyle	Rogers, Fla.	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONSULTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this matter I bring before the House I bring with sorrow. It does not have to do with our foreign policy; it is a veto message from the President of the United States of the so-called automobile bill for amputees, the hand and leg amputees, paraplegics, and the blind.

I did not dream that the President would veto this bill, but he has; and why, I do not know. These boys were sent into war in Korea; our other boys were sent into war, into World War II. Many of these boys were wounded in World War II Many of these fine men were sent to Korea ill-equipped; they did not have the proper clothing; they did not have the proper arms or ammunition; they were fighting under green officers, and many of them were wounded by the material that we had given or sold to other countries England has sold or given to the Chinese and Russians many guns and much munitions of war. The United States also did so. Many of these boys now lying out at Walter Reed Hospital, the Naval Center at Bethesda, and hospitals all over the country were wounded by our own gunfire, injured by missiles made in the United States. Many of the amputees lost their arms and legs because of inadequate clothing for cold weather.

Mr. Speaker, three times the House has passed this bill and the Senate has passed the provisions of this bill. It was vetoed 2 years ago but some of the things to which the President objected were taken out of the bill and the Congress passed the bill again and it was sent to the White House.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, no one will want to go home until the veto has been overridden. How can any one of you go back to your district and tell your amputees and your blind, your paraplegics, that you did not stay to override a veto? Billions for foreign aid and billions for military defense—recommended by the President and passed by the Congress, and a mere pittance for the maimed. I know you will do it when the veto message comes over tomorrow. Override. It has to be acted upon by the Senate first to override—they will override then we will override.

Under the foreign-aid bill for $8,000,000,000 automobiles will go over there to foreign countries, to foreigners. Many automobiles are being sent to Latin American countries. Think of hundreds of persons in our Government, at home and abroad, rolling around in automobiles, able-bodied men.

The membership of the Senate and House will override, I am sure. The Congress will not adjourn until this bill is passed.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly happy to have a few moments in which to discuss this Senate Concurrent Resolution 36 which the House is presently considering. My distinguished chairman the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr RICHARDS] has made it clear that the Foreign Affairs Committee had nothing to do with the introduction of the resolution, but that it has come to us through the Rules Committee. However, the Foreign Affairs Committee is deeply interested as it would seem to be an excellent way to build better understanding on the parliamentary level. I have taken great interest in this valiant effort by the nations of free Europe to reverse history and would like to refer you to a report that I made to this body on my return from Europe in 1949.

The first meeting of the Council of Europe was held at Strasbourg in 1949 following the signing of the statute in London on May 5, 1949, was a meeting of delegates from 12 countries who had an expressed aim "to achieve a greater unity between its members" As I studied it and talked with the people who were there, as I followed in detail everything that had been done, it was to be one of the most exciting things that the world has seen since our own constitutional convention Granted, the delegates had no power, but they faced the realities of the complex problem of attempting to unite nations which for centuries had fought, which for centuries had hated each other, which for centuries had been suspicious of each other.

What they have been trying to do in these all too few years has been to turn the wheels of history right around. In the first meeting they set up committees, one of which was a committee to examine the various constitutions to see what would have to be changed in each separate constitution in order to make it possible for them to join in a federation of states of Europe and become united in order to fight the menace from the East.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. On the desirability of unifying Western Europe for the common good, we made that decision long ago.

Mrs. BOLTON. I have only 1 minute left.

Mr. COX. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BOLTON. The second committee was created to discover what were the common denominators of possible agreement.

Now, they have come to us—not we to them, they to us—saying to us: We feel it would be exceedingly helpful and constructive if there might be informal discussions between us and a group of your Congress on our parliamentary level, of the problems that we are facing in our effort to unite the free countries of Europe.

It seems to me that nothing could be more gracious on their part and nothing more constructive on ours. Members of the Senate are going. The seven Members mentioned for House participation are not mandatory. However, the Speaker will appoint them from the membership, and he will make good appointments. I have confidence in his judgment

Then we will have the opportunity of having reported back to us the point of view of the people over there. Mr. Spaak, President of the Council; Lord Layton, the Vice President; and Mr. Paris, the Secretary General, serving both Council and Assembly, were over here several months ago There was a meeting with a few Members of the Senate and a few Members of the House. An agenda was drawn up, torn apart, and put together again. From what I have seen of it, Mr Speaker, I think there need not be any fear about the agenda for this meeting. It will be wholesome, it will be constructive, and it will be a very good thing for this country to be able to talk with people of these other countries on such a basis.

I hope that in the wisdom of this House there will be no question with reference to the passage of this resolution

Mr McCORMACK Mr Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield gladly to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is a simple resolution The Senate has passed it, so if we do not pass it there will be representatives from the Senate present and none from the House. We all have pride in the House, and in the stability of the House, and in the ability of the House Futhermore, there has been an invitation extended to the Members of the Congress to attend and participate, and it would be most unfortunate if the invitation were rejected.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I remind our majority leader, the very distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, and modestly suggest that the House did have the first record of this Strasbourg meeting; that some of us have followed its courageous work with a considerable amount of care, and that it would indeed be most unfortunate, as the gentleman states, if some of the House membership were not present at this Strasbourg meeting.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, one of the clearest things that has ever happened in my life and perhaps left the greatest impression is when I stood in front of the Speaker's desk here and took the oath of office; when I swore to maintain and support the Constitution of the United States against all enemies from without and from within. I meant every word I said.

Mr. Speaker, there has grown up within this country in the past 4 or 5 years one of the greatest subversive plots of all history, to take our constitutional Republic and merge it within a one-world body, which has been formed without the slightest authorization, within the body of the United Nations. Each of these aggressions came in with a simple resolution committing us to nothing. We were merely there to talk, but from the first one developed the United Nations and from its self-propagating womb have sprung up hundreds of organizations which are costing us millions of dollars yearly, and perhaps one world war. Then after that came the Atlantic Pact, which started as a simple resolution, which committed us to nothing except discussion, which plainly stated that it could take no funds from us. It could call no men over into Europe or any other place unless there was an actual act of aggression. It has and is taking funds from us It now has somewhere in the neighborhood of 1,500,000 or 2,000,000 men illegally over in Europe, but there has been no aggression and no war declared, and no order of any Atlantic Pact or any other group except our military government here in the United States has sent those men abroad. Will this Congress not wake up to the fact that a treasonable plot is well-nigh completed to seize this Government and turn it over into a hybrid, mongrel world state, 51 percent of which is even now Communist, and if Communist China is admitted, it will be 69 percent Communist?

Mr Speaker, I have nothing against Europe; I have nothing against talks, I have nothing against leagues or organizations in which we can meet for the discussion of helpful ideas and the development of mutual help, but when that breeds and develops into an organization which seeks to steal from us our Government and to merge it into a world state, I am very much against it, and I hope the time will never come, as long as God gives me breath, when I shall stand on the floor of this House and not speak against it. I earnestly hope and desire that all Members of this Congress will please read over your oaths tonight again, and make very sure that in these simple resolutions you are not carrying things one step farther toward our becoming the smallest member, so far as votes are concerned, in this world group.

We are supposed to meet with the democracies. What common ground have we with democracies? The democracies crucified Christ. Democracy is mob law. It has always been wrong. We are not a democracy, we are a constitutional republic.

The gentlewoman from Ohio just spoke about overhauling the constitutions of those European nations. I submit to her there are none. Even Great Britain, which at one time took precedence over the other governments of Europe, and who was largely the cradle of our liberties, never had a constitution which was ever submitted to writing. These peoples have little in common with our constitutional republic except to seek and complete the mulcting of our savings of 200 years in a vain and foolish attempt, on our part, to send freedom abroad in a paper bag as a merchantable commodity. Freedom cannot be bought or sent to anyone It must be implanted within the hearts of men by Almighty God. And if so implanted, it can never be destroyed except by the glory of the Lord God being desecrated by our own acts within the Shekinah of our liberty.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, when Benjamin Franklin came out of Constitution Hall where they were having a struggle to write the Constitution of the United States, and there was a long and hard struggle with a lot of difference of opinion, someone said to him, "Ben, what kind of government did you give us?"

Old Ben without hesitation at all said, "I have given you a republic, if you can keep it." I am wondering if we have a republic in this country that we are going to continue to keep very long. It seems uncertain.

Regarding this resolution, I have no objection to the folks sitting down to a sort of sewing bee and discussing the problems of the day, but I am wondering just how much they may commit the United States to do. Under the Democratic leadership on this side you have put us into the Marshall plan. From a little, obscure speech by a man by the name of Marshall up in one of the colleges we got the Marshall plan, that has drained from this country billions of dollars. Yes, it has done some good, but I submit to you that we do not have a single country on the face of the earth that is our friend today. Listen to the political speeches in England. When Aneurin Bevan is making a speech about this country, what does he say? He points the finger of scorn at the United States and says, "Sure, you people of the United States have brought us down to the position we are in today." And he means it, and the people believe him.

It was said on the floor of the House here that we have demanded of Europe unification, we have demanded that they do something about their tax laws, about their political problems. We have put our nose into every country's business, until we are the hated nation of the world.

Go over to Egypt today. The mobs there chant their hate of this country. Its amazing how we are hated. Your life would not be worth much if you went over there in Egypt today, yet we have poured billions of dollars all over the world, including Egypt, in an effort to buy friends. Have we bought friends? Not at all.

Somebody says, "Well, the other body is going to go over, we ought to go." They have unlimited debate in the other body, and they like to talk. I do not have any objection to their going. I am not going to object to this country's going, but I do not like them to go there and commit this country. It has been done every time at these conferences. In the Atlantic Pact, a little grain of mustard was planted and what has it amounted to? Billions of American dollars and the lives of many American boys eventually will be wasted in Europe because of a little Atlantic Pact that did not have any authority except to talk. The United Nations is the same way. They have some 50 different organizations within the United Nations. I supported the measure, but I am getting sick at heart and want to vomit when I think about some of the things they are doing in this organization and what they do to our country. They do not represent the views of this country—the U. N. is filled with known Communists. They are permitted to roam this country and show their venom for all to see and hear. That occurs under this new deal group who dictates our foreign policy. As I said to the gentleman from the Carolinas he was not very kind to me about never wanting to represent my views. I do not care whether you do or not. But your administration, young fellow, has brought this Nation to its knees. You are bleeding us white all over the world, and putting cemeteries and graves in every town in the United States because of the damnable foreign policy that your party has imposed upon this Congress and the people of the United States. I am sick and tired of that kind of leadership. If you want to have phoney inflation and phoney prosperity with the blood of American boys, you can have it. But I do not want it. I say to you, it is none of our business to stick our nose into the business of every country in the world. If this committee wants to have a little sewing bee and sit around and do some talking all right, but do not go over there and committ the United States of America to some wild new plans. I say to the Speaker in all earnestness that to interfere in other countries as we are doing brings contempt upon us. I hope those he appoints will not be all the worlders who want to get us into every situation all over the world. These new dealers are spending us into destruction—Its about time for this Congress to represent America.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, that the attitude of some of the European countries toward the United States is not as friendly as might be desirable, I readily admit, and that the United Nations does not function to my complete satisfaction is likewise true, but on the question of the desirability of unifying Western Europe for the common good—we made that decision long ago. Now to hesitate to go forward with the program that has been made, would, in my judgment, be a mistake. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the failure to adopt this resolution would, in my opinion, be a discourtesy to the Senate. It would constitute an affront to the countries that have asked us to come and sit with them and counsel with them on the state of the free world. I hope that the House will view this whole question in a generous spirt, and will do what I think is the proper thing, that is, to accept the resolution; let the representation of the House go abroad with the representation of the Senate, and make such favorable presentation of the case of the United States and of the free world as it is possible for them to make.

Mr. Speaker, I remind you, sir, I have never too greatly favored the setting up of special committees to do too much traveling abroad, but this is not a committee which is being set up. This is a group of representatives of the House, whom the resolution authorizes the Speaker to appoint to visit abroad with a like representation from the other body in response to an invitation that has been extended. I hope the affront to these friendly people whose cooperation is so important for world peace will not be made by voting down this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this resolution because its objective is the unification of Europe. The lack of such unification was the cause of World Wars I and II.

The ultimate objective and ideal for Europe is a United States of Europe. Who can quarrel with that? The economic and political unification of Europe would be a major step toward permanent peace. Certainly the economic and political unification of the United States of America is the strongest guarantee against internecine conflict on our continent.

In this Europe is seeking to emulate the United States. Why should we not encourage them?

In his Farewell Address George Washington said:

> It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and at no distant period, a great nation to give mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence.

Why should not the principle of unity among our people be held up as an example to disunited peoples elsewhere? Those who are not concerned with areas of potential major conflict in Europe should take steps first to do away with all modern communications, transportation, and weapons.

Certainly in discussing and encouraging the unification of Europe we are following Washington's advice when he said:

> Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it?

We cannot cultivate peace and harmony with all by crawling into a shell.

I believe that we should avoid dangerous foreign entanglements. I also know that the world Socialists who dominate the present administration would squander our substance all over the world. But, as the greatest nation in the world today, we cannot play the ostrich.

If we can bring about conditions of permanent peace in Europe we can avoid the attractions which led us into entanglements that brought on the late world wars wherein we took sides in a divided Europe.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr Speaker, I move to strike from the resolution the recital beginning with the first "Whereas" on page 1 and ending at the beginning of line 1 on page 2.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr SMITH of Virginia: Strike out the language beginning on page 1 beginning with the first "Whereas" down to and including the last "Whereas" appearing on page 2.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree that it should be stricken out, but I am also informed that when we adopted the ECA policy we adopted the same words that are quoted here, "to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the further unification of Europe." That was in the ECA bill. Whether that makes any difference or not, I do not know.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 133, noes 31.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 238, nays 75, answered "present" 1, not voting 114, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

YEAS—238

Aandahl	Betts	Byrne, N. Y.
Addonizio	Boggs, Del.	Camp
Albert	Bolling	Canfield
Andrews	Bolton	Carlyle
Anfuso	Bonner	Carnahan
Aspinall	Bow	Chatham
Ayres	Boykin	Chelf
Bakewell	Bray	Chenoweth
Barden	Brown, Ga.	Chiperfield
Bates, Mass.	Brownson	Church
Battle	Bryson	Colmer
Beamer	Buchanan	Cooley
Beckworth	Burleson	Cooper
Bender	Burnside	Corbett
Bennett, Fla.	Burton	Cotton

Cox	Hunter	Philbin
Crumpacker	Ikard	Poage
Cunningham	Jackson, Wash.	Polk
Curtis, Mo.	James	Potter
Davis, Tenn.	Jarman	Preston
DeGraffenried	Jenkins	Price
Denton	Jones, Ala.	Priest
Dollinger	Jones, Mo.	Rabaut
Dolliver	Jones, Hamilton C.	Radwan
Donohue		Rains
Donovan	Jones, Woodrow W.	Ramsay
Dorn		Reams
Doughton	Karsten, Mo.	Reece, Tenn.
Doyle	Kearns	Reed, Ill.
Durham	Keating	Rhodes
Eaton	Kee	Richards
Eberharter	Kelly, N Y.	Richlman
Elliott	Kerr	Riley
Ellsworth	Kersten, Wis.	Rivers
Elston	Kilburn	Roberts
Evins	Kilday	Robeson
Feighan	Klein	Rodino
Fenton	Kluczynski	Rogers, Colo.
Fernandez	Lane	Rogers, Mass.
Fine	Lanham	Rogers, Tex.
Fisher	Lantaff	Sadlak
Flood	LeCompte	Sasscer
Fogarty	Lesinski	Secrest
Forand	Lind	Seely-Brown
Ford	Lovre	Sieminski
Forrester	McCarthy	Smith, Miss.
Frazier	McCormack	Smith, Va
Fugate	McCulloch	Smith, Wis.
Furcolo	McGregor	Spence
Gamble	McGuire	Springer
Gary	McMillan	Staggers
Gathings	McMullen	Stanley
Goodwin	Madden	Steed
Gordon	Magee	Stigler
Gore	Mahon	Tackett
Graham	Mansfield	Talle
Granahan	Marshall	Taylor
Grant	Martin, Mass	Teague
Greenwood	Meader	Thomas
Gregory	Merrow	Thompson, Mich.
Hagen	Miller Md	
Hale	Miller, N Y.	Trimble
Halleck	Mills	Van Pelt
Hand	Mitchell	Van Zandt
Harden	Morano	Vorys
Hardy	Morgan	Walter
Harvey	Morris	Weichel
Havenner	Morton	Welch
Hays, Ohio	Multer	Whitten
Heffernan	Murdock	Wickersham
Heller	Murray, Tenn	Widnall
Herter	Nelson	Wier
Heselton	Nicholson	Wigglesworth
Hill	O'Brien, Ill	Willis
Hillings	O' Brien, Mich.	Wolcott
Hinshaw	O'Neill	Wolverton
Holifield	Ostertag	Yates
Holmes	O'Toole	Yorty
Hope	Passman	Zablocki
Horan	Patman	
Howell	Patterson	

NAYS—75

Abernethy	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Rankin
Adair		Reed, N Y.
Allen, Ill.	Hall, Leonard W.	Rees, Kans.
Andersen, H Carl		St George
	Harris	Saylor
Andresen, August H.	Harrison, Wyo.	Schwabe
	Hedrick	Scrivner
Arends	Hoeven	Scudder
Belcher	Hoffman, Ill.	Shafer
Bennett, Mich.	Hoffman, Mich.	Sheehan
Berry	Hull	Simpson, Ill.
Bishop	Jenison	Smith, Kans.
Brehm	Jensen	Taber
Budge	Jonas	Tollefson
Buffett	Kean	Vail
Burdick	McVey	Velde
Bush	Mack, Wash.	Vursell
Clevenger	Mason	Wharton
Cole, Kans.	Miller, Nebr.	Wheeler
Crosser	Mumma	Williams, Miss.
Curtis, Nebr.	Norblad	Williams, N. Y.
Davis, Ga.	Norrell	Wilson, Ind.
Davis, Wis.	O'Hara	Winstead
Devereux	O'Konski	Withrow
Dondero	Patten	Wood, Idaho
George	Pickett	
Gross	Poulson	

ANSWERED PRESENT—1

Butler

NOT VOTING—114

Abbitt	Angell	Baker
Allen, Calif.	Armstrong	Baring
Allen, La.	Auchincloss	Barrett
Anderson, Calif.	Bailey	Bates, Ky.
Beall	Granger	Murray, Wis.
Bentsen	Green	Perkins
Blackney	Gwinn	Phillips
Blatnik	Harrison, Va.	Powell
Boggs, La.	Hart	Prouty
Bosone	Hays, Ark.	Quinn
Bramblett	Hébert	Redden
Brooks	Herlong	Regan
Brown, Ohio	Hess	Ribicoff
Buckley	Irving	Rogers, Fla.
Busbey	Jackson, Calif.	Rooney
Byrnes, Wis.	Javits	Roosevelt
Cannon	Johnson	Sabath
Case	Judd	Scott, Hardie
Celler	Kearney	Scott, Hugh D, Jr.
Chudoff	Kelley, Pa.	
Clemente	Kennedy	Shelley
Cole, N Y.	Keogh	Sheppard
Combs	King	Short
Coudert	Kirwan	Sikes
Crawford	Larcade	Simpson, Pa.
Dague	Latham	Sittler
Dawson	Lucas	Stockman
Deane	Lyle	Sutton
Delaney	McConnell	Thompson, Tex.
Dempsey	McDonald	Thornberry
Denny	McGrath	Vinson
D'Ewart	McKinnon	Watts
Dingell	Machrowicz	Werdel
Engle	Mack, Ill	Whitaker
Fallon	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Tex.
Fulton	Miller, Calif.	Wood, Ga.
Garmatz	Morrison	Woodruff
Gavin	Moulder	
Golden	Murphy	

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr Javits for, with Mr Byrnes of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Busbey against.

Until further notice:

Mr Hébert with Mr. Beall.
Mr Morrison with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr Bates of Kentucky with Mr Kearney.
Mr Watts with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr Abbitt with Mr. Prouty.
Mr Hart with Mr Hess.
Mr Redden with Mr. Short.
Mr Regan with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania
Mr. Keogh with Mr Armstrong
Mr Buckley with Mr Cole of New York.
Mr Celler with Mr Dague.
Mr Rooney with Mr Fulton.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Gavin.
Mr Rogers of Florida with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Baker
Mr Baring with Mr. Anderson of California
Mr. Clemente with Mr Allen of California.
Mr Quinn with Mr. Golden.
Mr Delaney with Mr. Case.
Mr Chudoff with Mr. Coudert.
Mr Barrett with Mr. Crawford.
Mr McGrath with Mr Denny.
Mr Mack of Illinois with Mr Angell.
Mr Perkins with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr Murphy with Mr. Johnson
Mr Whitaker with Mr Woodruff.
Mr Green with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr Granger with Mr Werdel
Mr. Garmatz with Mr Stockman.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. McDonough
Mr Engle of California with Mr. McConnell.
Mr Dempsey with Mr Brown of Ohio.
Mr Deane with Mr. Bramblett.
Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. King with Mr. D'Ewart.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Sittler.
Mr. Sutton with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

THE HEADWATERS ON THE WARRIOR RIVER SYSTEM ABOVE LOCK AND DAM 17, IN ALABAMA, SHOULD BE IMMEDIATELY DEVELOPED FOR FLOOD CONTROL, NAVIGATION, HYDROELECTRIC POWER, AND WATER-CONSEPVATION PURPOSES

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to authorize an examination and survey of that part of the Warrior River and its tributaries above lock and dam 17 in Alabama, for the purposes of flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, water-conservation and allied purposes. The bill provides for the survey to be made under the direction of the Chief of the Corps of United States engineers, and further authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make a preliminary examination and survey for retarding the water flow and preventing soil erosion in the drainage area of the Warrior River and its tributaries above lock and dam 17.

I hope this bill will receive early and favorable consideration by the House Committee on Public Works and by the House itself.

I am confident that the Corps of Engineers will find that this headwaters section of the Warrior and its tributaries, which drain an area of some 2,000 square miles of land, has great potentialities from the standpoint of national defense, and great possibilities relating to the future economic and industrial development of the entire area.

The examination and survey envisioned by this bill will cover the Mulberry Fork of the Warrior River, which rises in northeast Cullman County and forms the boundary line between Cullman and Blount Counties in the Seventh Congressional District; the Sipsey Fork of the Mulberry River, which rises in northern Winston and pursues a southeasterly course across Walker County to join the Mulberry River near Empire, Ala.; also, the Locust Fork of the Warrior River, which begins in Marshall County, and, which with its tributaries crosses the whole of Blount County to enter Jefferson County near Trafford, Ala., from which point it pursues a southwesterly direction across Jefferson County via Birmingport to join the Mulberry Fork on the boundary betweeen Walker and Jefferson Counties, just a few miles above lock and dam 17.

I predict, Mr. Speaker, that the examination and survey which this bill calls for will result in the finding that it is practical, economical and in the interest of national defense to develop the hydroelectric power inherent in the racing headwaters of these streams, constantly fed by an average rainfall of more than 50 inches per year, over a drainage area of more than 2,000 square miles.

The navigability of the streams embraced within the area covered by this

resolution should be improved, industrial water should be conserved to meet the ever-expanding economy of the great coal, steel, timber and clay region through which these streams flow.

And last, but not least, the implementation of this bill by the construction of justified dams and other public works will have the effect of stopping the ruinous floods which, at periodical intervals, descend upon the towns along the banks of the lower reaches of the Warrior River.

The improvements which must be made on the headwaters section of the Warrior River, should be made in such a manner as to conserve every resource of the area. These resources are many and varied. Full account should be taken of the agricultural and timber resources. I doubt very much whether any stream development can reach its maximum efficiency without adequately evaluating these factors.

YELLOWSTONE RIVER

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 1311, an act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Yellowstone River.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so for the purpose of asking the gentleman to explain the bill, if he will.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the bill has been cleared by the leadership on both sides of the aisle. It has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House. A House bill by Congressman D'EWART is identical with the Senate bill. This is the usual form of compact between the States concerning an interstate stream. I am positive there is no objection that has been called to my attention.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of the Congress is hereby given to an interstate compact relating to the waters of the Yellowstone River which was signed (after negotiations in which a representative of the United States duly appointed by the President participated) by the Commissioners for the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming on December 8, 1950, at Billings, Mont., and which was thereafter ratified by the legislatures of each of the States aforesaid as provided by Public Law 83, Eighty-first Congress, approved June 2, 1949, which compact reads as follows:

YELLOWSTONE RIVER COMPACT

The State of Montana, the State of North Dakota, and the State of Wyoming, being moved by consideration of interstate comity, and desiring to remove all causes of present and future controversy between said States and between persons in one and persons in another with respect to the waters of the Yellowstone River and its tributaries, other than waters within or waters which contribute to the flow of streams within the Yellowstone National Park, and desiring to provide for an equitable division and apportionment of such waters, and to encourage the beneficial development and use thereof, acknowledging that in future projects or programs for the regulation, control and use of water in the Yellowstone River Basin the great importance of water for irrigation in the signatory States shall be recognized, have resolved to conclude a Compact as authorized under the Act of Congress of the United States of America, approved June 2, 1949 (Public Law 83, 81st Congress, First Session), for the attainment of these purposes, and to that end, through their respective governments, have named as their respective Commissioners:

For the State of Montana:
Fred E. Buck
A. W. Bradshaw
H W. Bunston
John Hersog
John M. Jarussi
Ashton Jones
Chris Josephson
A. Wallace Kingsbury
P. F. Leonard
Walter M. McLaughlin
Dave M. Manning
Joseph Muggli
Chester E Onstad
Ed F. Parriott
R. R. Renne
Keith W. Trout

For the State of North Dakota:
I A. Acker
Einar H. Dahl
J. J. Walsh

For the State of Wyoming:
L. C. Bishop
Earl T. Bower
J Harold Cash
Ben F Cochrane
Ernest J. Goppert
Richard L. Greene
E C. Gwillim
E. J. Johnson
Lee E. Keith
N V. Kurtz
Harry L. Littlefield
R. E. McNally
Will G. Metz
Mark N. Partridge
Alonzo R. Shreve
Charles M. Smith
Leonard F. Thornton
M B. Walker

who, after negotiations participated in by R J. Newell, appointed as the representative of the United States of America, have agreed upon the following articles, to-wit:

ARTICLE I

A. Where the name of a State is used in this Compact, as a party thereto, it shall be construed to include the individuals, corporations, partnerships, associations, districts, administrative departments, bureaus, political subdivisions, agencies, persons, permittees, appropriators, and all others using, claiming, or in any manner asserting any right to the use of the waters of the Yellowstone River System under the authority of said State.

B. Any individual, corporation, partnership, association, district, administrative department, bureau, political subdivision, agency, person, permittee, or appropriator authorized by or under the laws of a signatory State, and all others using, claiming, or in any manner asserting any right to the use of the waters of the Yellowstone River System under the authority of said State, shall be subject to the terms of this Compact. Where the singular is used in this article, it shall be construed to include the plural.

ARTICLE II

A. The State of Montana, the State of North Dakota, and the State of Wyoming are hereinafter designated as "Montana," "North Dakota," and "Wyoming," respectively.

B. The terms "Commission" and "Yellowstone River Compact Commission" means the agency created as provided herein for the administration of this compact.

C. The term "Yellowstone River Basin" means areas in Wyoming, Montana, and North Dakota drained by the Yellowstone River and its tributaries, and includes the area in Montana known as Lake Basin, but excludes those lands lying within Yellowstone National Park.

D. The term "Yellowstone River System" means the Yellowstone River and all of its tributaries, including springs and swamps, from their sources to the mouth of the Yellowstone River near Buford, North Dakota, except those portions thereof which are within or contribute to the flow of streams within the Yellowstone National Park.

E. The term "Tributary" means any stream which in a natural state contributes to the flow of the Yellowstone River, including interstate tributaries and tributaries thereof, but excluding those which are within or contribute to the flow of streams within the Yellowstone National Park.

F. The term "Interstate Tributaries" means the Clarks Fork, Yellowstone River; the Bighorn (except Little Bighorn River); the Tongue River; and the Powder River, whose confluences with the Yellowstone River are respectively at or near the city (or town) of Laurel, Big Horn, Miles City, and Terry, all in the State of Montana

G. The terms "Divert" and "Diversion" mean the taking or removing of water from the Yellowstone River or any tributary thereof when the water so taken or removed is not returned directly into the channel of the Yellowstone River or of the tributary from which it is taken.

H. The term "Beneficial Use" is herein defined to be that use by which the water supply of a drainage basin is depleted when usefully employed by the activities of man.

I. The term "Domestic Use" shall mean the use of water by an individual, or by a family unit or household for drinking, cooking, laundering, sanitation and other personal comforts and necessities; and for the irrigation of a family garden or orchard not exceeding one-half acre in area.

J. The term "Stock Water Use" shall mean the use of water for livestock and poultry.

ARTICLE III

A. It is considered that no Commission or administrative body is necessary to administer this compact or divide the waters of the Yellowstone River Basin as between the States of Montana and North Dakota. The provisions of this Compact, as between the States of Wyoming and Montana, shall be administered by a Commission composed of one representative from the State of Wyoming and one representative from the State of Montana, to be selected by the Governors of said States as such States may choose, and one representative selected by the Director of the United States Geological Survey or whatever Federal agency may succeed to the functions and duties of that agency, to be appointed by him at the request of the States to sit with the Commission and who shall, when present, act as Chairman of the Commission without vote, except as herein provided.

B. The salaries and necessary expenses of each State representative shall be paid by the respective State; all other expenses incident to the administration of this Compact not borne by the United States shall be allocated to and borne one-half by the State of Wyoming and one-half by the State of Montana.

C. In addition to other powers and duties herein conferred upon the Commission and

the members thereof, the jurisdiction of the Commission shall include the collection, correlation, and presentation of factual data, the maintenance of records having a bearing upon the administration of this Compact, and recommendations to such States upon matters connected with the administration of this Compact, and the Commission may employ such services and make such expenditures as reasonable and necessary within the limit of funds provided for that purpose by the respective States, and shall compile a report for each year ending September 30 and transmit it to the Governors of the signatory States on or before December 31 of each year.

D The Secretary of the Army; the Secretary of the Interior; the Secretary of Agriculture; the Chairman, Federal Power Commission; the Secretary of Commerce, or comparable officers of whatever Federal agencies may succeed to the functions and duties of these agencies, and such other Federal officers and officers of appropriate agencies of the signatory States having services or data useful or necessary to the Compact Commission, shall cooperate, ex-officio, with the Commission in the execution of its duty in the collection, correlation, and publication of records and data necessary for the proper administration of the Compact; and these officers may perform such other services related to the Compact as may be mutually agreed upon with the Commission.

E. The Commission shall have power to formulate rules and regulations and to perform any act which they may find necessary to carry out the provisions of this Compact, and to amend such rules and regulations. All such rules and regulations shall be filed in the office of the State Engineer of each of the signatory States for public inspection.

F. In case of the failure of the representatives of Wyoming and Montana to unanimously agree on any matter necessary to the proper administration of this Compact, then the member selected by the Director of the United States Geological Survey shall have the right to vote upon the matters in disagreement and such points of disagreement shall then be decided by a majority vote of the representatives of the States of Wyoming and Montana and said member selected by the Director of the United States Geological Survey, each being entitled to one vote.

G The Commission herein authorized shall have power to sue and be sued in its official capacity in any Federal Court of the signatory States, and may adopt and use an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

ARTICLE IV

The Commission shall itself, or in conjunction with other responsible agencies, cause to be established, maintained, and operated such suitable water gaging and evaporation stations as it finds necessary in connection with its duties.

ARTICLE V

A Appropriative rights to the beneficial uses of the water of the Yellowstone River System existing in each signatory State as of January 1, 1950, shall continue to be enjoyed in accordance with the laws governing the acquisition and use of water under the doctrine of appropriation.

B Of the unused and unappropriated waters of the Interstate tributaries of the Yellowstone River as of January 1, 1950, there is allocated to each signatory State such quantity of that water as shall be necessary to provide supplemental water supplies for the rights described in paragraph A of this Article V, such supplemental rights to be acquired and enjoyed in accordance with the laws governing the acquisition and use of water under the doctrine of appropriation, and the remainder of the unused and unappropriated water is allocated to each State for storage or direct diversions for beneficial use on new lands or for other purposes as follows:

1. Clarks Fork, Yellowstone River
   a. To Wyoming---------- 60%
      To Montana---------- 40%
   b. The point of measurement shall be below the last diversion from Clarks Fork above Rock Creek.
2. Bighorn River (Exclusive of Little Bighorn River)
   a. To Wyoming---------- 80%
      To Montana---------- 20%
   b. The point of measurement shall be below the last diversion from the Bighorn River above its junction with the Yellowstone River, and the inflow of the Little Bighorn River shall be excluded from the quantity of water subject to allocation.
3. Tongue River
   a. To Wyoming---------- 40%
      To Montana---------- 60%
   b The point of measurement shall be below the last diversion from the Tongue River above its junction with the Yellowstone River
4. Powder River (including the Little Powder River)
   a To Wyoming---------- 42%
      To Montana---------- 58%
   b. The point of measurement shall be below the last diversion from the Powder River above its junction with the Yellowstone River

C. The quantity of water subject to the percentage allocations, in Paragraph B 1, 2, 3 and 4 of this Article V, shall be determined on an annual water year basis measured from October 1st of any year through September 30th of the succeeding year The quantity to which the percentage factors shall be applied through a given date in any water year shall be, in acre-feet, equal to the algebraic sum of·

1. The total diversions, in acre-feet, above the point of measurement, for irrigation, municipal, and industrial uses in Wyoming and Montana developed after January 1, 1950, during the period from October 1st to that given date;

2 The net change in storage, in acre-feet, in all reservoirs in Wyoming and Montana above the point of measurement completed subsequent to January 1, 1950, during the period from October 1st to that given date;

3 The net change in storage, in acre-feet, in existing reservoirs in Wyoming and Montana above the point of measurement, which is used for irrigation, municipal, and industrial purposes developed after January 1, 1950, during the period October 1st to that given date;

4 The quantity of water, in acre-feet, that passed the point of measurement in the stream during the period from October 1 to that given date.

D. All existing rights to the beneficial use of waters of the Yellowstone River in the States of Montana and North Dakota, below Intake, Montana, valid under the laws of these States as of January 1, 1950, are hereby recognized and shall be and remain unimpaired by this compact During the period May 1 to September 30, inclusive, of each year lands within Montana and North Dakota shall be entitled to the beneficial use of the flow of waters of the Yellowstone River below Intake, Mont., on a proportionate basis of acreage irrigated. Waters of tributary streams, having their origin in either Montana or North Dakota, situated entirely in said respective States and flowing into the Yellowstone River below Intake, Mont., are allotted to the respective States in which situated.

E. There are hereby excluded from the provisions of this compact:

1. Existing and future domestic and stock water uses of water: *Provided*, That the capacity of any reservoir for stock water so excluded shall not exceed 20 acre-feet;

2. Devices and facilities for the control and regulation of surface waters.

F. From time to time the Commission shall reexamine the allocations herein made and upon unanimous agreement may recommend modifications therein as are fair, just, and equitable, giving consideration among other factors to:

Priorities of water rights;
Acreage irrigated,
Acreage irrigable under existing works; and
Potentially irrigable lands.

ARTICLE VI

Nothing contained in this compact shall be so construed or interpreted as to affect adversely any rights to the use of the waters of Yellowstone River and its tributaries owned by or for Indians, Indian tribes, and their reservations.·

ARTICLE VII

A. A lower signatory State shall have the right, by compliance with the laws of an upper signatory State, except as to legislative consent, to file application for and receive permits to appropriate and use any waters in the Yellowstone River system not specifically apportioned to or appropriated by such upper State as provided in article V, and to construct or participate in the construction and use of any dam, storage reservoir, or diversion works in such upper State for the purpose of conserving and regulating water that may be apportioned to or appropriated by the lower State· *Provided*, That such right is subject to the rights of the upper State to control, regulate, and use the water apportioned to and appropriated by it: *And provided further*, That should an upper State elect, it may share in the use of any such facilities constructed by a lower State to the extent of its reasonable needs upon assuming or guaranteeing payment of its proportionate share of the cost of the construction, operation, and maintenance. This provision shall apply with equal force and effect to an upper State in the circumstance of the necessity of the acquisition of rights by an upper State in a lower State.

B. Each claim hereafter initiated for an appropriation of water in one signatory State for use in another signatory State shall be filed in the office of the State engineer of the signatory State in which the water is to be diverted, and a duplicate copy of the application or notice shall be filed in the office of the State engineer of the signatory State in which the water is to be used

C. Appropriations may hereafter be adjudicated in the State in which the water is diverted, and where a portion or all of the lands irrigated are in another signatory State, such adjudications shall be confirmed in that State by the proper authority. Each adjudication is to conform with the laws of the State where the water is diverted and shall be recorded in the county and State where the water is used.

D The use of water allocated under article V of this compact for projects constructed after the date of this compact by the United States of America or any of its agencies or instrumentalities, shall be charged as a use by the State in which the use is made: *Provided*, That such use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in another shall be charged to such latter State.

ARTICLE VIII

A lower signatory State shall have the right to acquire in an upper State by purchase, or through exercise of the power of eminent domain, such lands, easements, and rights-of-way for the construction, operation, and maintenance of pumping plants, storage reservoirs, canals, conduits, and appurtenant works as may be required for the enjoyment of the privileges granted herein to such lower State. This provision shall apply with equal

force and effect to an upper State in the circumstance of the necessity of the acquisition of rights by an upper State in a lower State.

ARTICLE IX

Should any facilities be constructed by a lower signatory State in an upper signatory State under the provisions of article VII, the construction, operation, repairs, and replacements of such facilities shall be subject to the laws of the upper State. This provision shall apply with equal force and effect to an upper State in the circumstance of the necessity of the acquisition of rights by an upper State in a lower State.

ARTICLE X

No water shall be diverted from the Yellowstone River Basin without the unanimous consent of all the signatory States. In the event water from another river basin shall be imported into the Yellowstone River Basin or transferred from one tributary basin to another by the United States of America, Montana, North Dakota, or Wyoming, or any of them jointly, the State having the right to the use of such water shall be given proper credit therefor in determining its share of the water apportioned in accordance with article V herein.

ARTICLE XI

The provisions of this compact shall remain in full force and effect until amended in the same manner as it is required to be ratified to become operative as provided in article XV.

ARTICLE XII

This compact may be terminated at any time by unanimous consent of the signatory States, and upon such termination all rights then established hereunder shall continue unimpaired.

ARTICLE XIII

Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or prevent any State from instituting or maintaining any action or proceeding, legal or equitable, in any Federal Court or the United States Supreme Court, for the protection of any right under this compact or the enforcement of any of its provisions.

ARTICLE XIV

The physical and other conditions characteristic of the Yellowstone River and peculiar to the territory drained and served thereby and to the development thereof, have actuated the signatory States in the consummation of this compact, and none of them, nor the United States of America by its consent and approval, concedes thereby the establishment of any general principle or precedent with respect to other interstate streams.

ARTICLE XV

This compact shall become operative when approved by the legislature of each of the signatory States and consented to and approved by the Congress of the United States.

ARTICLE XVI

Nothing in this compact shall be deemed:

(a) To impair or affect the sovereignty or jurisdiction of the United States of America in or over the area of waters affected by such compact, any rights or powers of the United States of America, its agencies, or instrumentalities, in and to the use of the waters of the Yellowstone River Basin nor its capacity to acquire rights in and to the use of said waters;

(b) To subject any property of the United States of America, its agencies, or instrumentalities to taxation by any State or subdivision thereof, nor to create an obligation on the part of the United States of America, its agencies, or instrumentalities, by reason of the acquisition, construction, or operation of any property or works of whatsoever kind, to make any payments to any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, municipality, or entity whatsoever in reimbursement for the loss of taxes;

(c) To subject any property of the United States of America, its agencies, or instrumentalities, to the laws of any State to an extent other than the extent to which these laws would apply without regard to the Compact.

ARTICLE XVII

Should a Court of competent jurisdiction hold any part of this Compact to be contrary to the constitution of any signatory State or of the United States of America, all other severable provisions of this Compact shall continue in full force and effect.

ARTICLE XVIII

No sentence, phrase, or clause in this Compact or in any provision thereof, shall be construed or interpreted to divest any signatory State or any of the agencies or officers of such States of the jurisdiction of the water of each State as apportioned in this Compact

In Witness Whereof the Commissioners have signed this Compact in quadruplicate original, one of which shall be filed in the archives of the Department of State of the United States of America and shall be deemed the authoritative original, and of which a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each signatory State.

Done at the City of Billings in the State of Montana, this 8th day of December, in the year of our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty.

Commissioners for the State of Montana:

Fred E Buck	/s/ Fred E Buck
A. W Bradshaw	/s/ A W Bradshaw
H W Bunston	/s/ H W Bunston
John Herzog	/s/ John Herzog
John M Jarussi	/s/ John M Jarussi
Ashton Jones	/s/ Ashton Jones
Christ Josephson	/s/ Chris Josephson
A. Wallace Kingsbury	/s/ A. Wallace Kingsbury
P F Leonard	/s/ P F Leonard
Walter M. McLaughlin	/s/ Walter M. McLaughlin
Dave M Manning	/s/ Dave M Manning
Joseph Muggli	/s/ Joseph Muggli
Chester E Onstad	/s/ Chester E Onstad
Ed F Parriott	/s/ Ed F Parriott
R. R Renne	/s/ R R. Renne
Keith W. Trout	/s/ Keith W. Trout

Commissioners for the State of North Dakota:

I. A. Acker	/s/ I A Acker
Einar H. Dahl	/s/ Einar H Dahl
J. J Walsh	/s/ J J. Walsh

Commissioners for the State of Wyoming:

L. C. Bishop	/s/ L. C. Bishop
Earl T. Bower	/s/ Earl T. Bower
J Harold Cash	/s/ J. Harold Cash
Ben F. Cochrane	/s/ Ben F. Cochrane
Ernest J. Goppert	/s/ Ernest J. Goppert
Richard L. Greene	/s/ Richard L. Greene
E. C. Gwillim	/s/ E C. Gwillim
E. J. Johnson	/s/ E. J. Johnson
Lee E. Keith	/s/ Lee E. Keith
N. V. Kurtz	/s/ N. V. Kurtz
Harry L. Littlefield	/s/ Harry L. Littlefield
R. E. McNally	/s/ R. E. McNally
Will G. Metz	/s/ Will G. Metz
Mark N. Partridge	/s/ Mark N. Partridge
Alonzo R. Shreve	/s/ Alonzo R. Shreve
Charles M. Smith	/s/ Charles M. Smith
Leonard F. Thornton	/s/ Leonard F. Thornton
M. B. Walker	/s/ M. B. Walker

"I have participated in the negotiation of this Compact and intend to report favorably thereon to the Congress of the United States.

/s/ R. J. Newell
R. J. Newell,
Representative of the United States of America."

SEC 2. The right to alter, amend or repeal section 1 of this Act is expressly reserved. This reservation shall not be construed to prevent the vesting of rights to the use of water pursuant to applicable law and no alteration, amendment, or repeal of section 1 of this Act shall be held to affect rights so vested.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3544) was laid on the table.

REPAYMENT CONTRACTS UNDER FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAW

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5097) to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr Speaker, will the gentleman explain this bill briefly?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, this bill extends existing law permitting the Bureau of Reclamation or the Department of the Interior to negotiate amendatory contracts for those reclamation projects which need rehabilitation. The present law expires on the 31st of December. Several of these contracts have been in progress of renegotiation but not yet completed. This bill would extend the time for a period of 3 years.

Mr MARTIN of Massachusetts. They have been in progress and have not yet been completed. Is that it?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I hardly understand this bill which the gentleman is asking us to pass in the closing days of the session. It is very important and far-reaching legislation. I am wondering why this was not brought up before and why it was not brought before the committee and hearings held. Were there any hearings held on this bill?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. Hearings were held. It was unanimously reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs after a Subcommittee on Reclamation and Irrigation had previously passed upon it. So it has the unanimous report of both committees.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] that I think the bill is all right. It merely gives an opportunity for some of these irrigation projects which need to be rehabilitated for some additional time, up until 1953 or 1954, I believe.

Mr. MURDOCK. Nineteen hundred and fifty-four.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The law under which they are now operating will shortly expire. So they do need some additional time to rehabilitate these projects. It is nothing new in legislation.

Mr. JENSEN. Does your bill give the Bureau of Reclamation additional authority to go into these reclamation projects and do things they have not heretofore been legally entitled to do?

Mr. MURDOCK. No. I am sure I may say that it does not. They have already used this law to rehabilitate a number of projects. The bill has been wholesome and useful during its life. It should be extended because there are still other projects on which amended contracts are being negotiated.

Mr JENSEN. Of course the gentleman knows there are some 20 projects of this nature which have been carried on year after year after year, and we have appropriated money. In 1946 the Bureau of Reclamation told us if we would furnish a certain amount of money they would clean up 15 projects. To this day none of them is cleaned up To the contrary, they have asked for and have received twice as much money for those jobs as they said it would take to clean them up, and still they are not cleaned up Now, how long is this going on?

Mr MURDOCK This law provides for rehabilitating projects needing same but not turning them over. The extension of the law would apply to projects that have not yet been rehabilitated. Of course, the gentleman is acquainted with uncompleted projects but this is another matter and I do know that quite a number of old projects that need rehabilitation have been rehabilitated. I think in that sense they have been cleaned up, but there are still some other projects that need some time.

Mr. JENSEN. No, no projects have been cleaned up, not one in the past 10 years; not one has been cleaned up and taken off the books and given back to the people, not one.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. I think my colleague from Iowa is right about the fact that they have not been paid out. What this does, however, is to continue the policy, which is a sound policy, of allowing and authorizing rearrangement of the repayment provisions and to set it up on a basis where they can pay out. The mistake was made in the past of authorizing too many projects both through the Appropriations Committee indirectly and directly through the legislative Committees on Public Land and Interior and Insular Affairs; we have authorized too many projects which were not feasible or which were not sound. The fact is the Bureau of Reclamation has given you a story or figures which would not stand up, and then when they get to the point where they cannot pay out on the repayment schedule as made, it is necessary to rearrange that.

This bill helps us rescue some of the projects which should never have been authorized.

The thing for Congress to do is not to authorize infeasible projects as we have in the past.

I think the bill is a very sound bill.

Mr. JENSEN. I am glad to have that explanation. I am sure the gentleman from Arizona knows I have leaned over backward both in committee and on the floor of the House to be liberal to irrigation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. I do know that, and I want to express my appreciation thus publicly for the gentleman's efforts. Replying to the gentleman from California, I must say some of the very best projects have needed rehabilitation and some have been rehabilitated.

Mr. JENSEN. But there has been too much dilly-dallying along and keeping these projects on the books and in operation, and too much administrative expense charged to the people living on the projects, and not enough actual work done to clean them up.

Mr MARTIN of Massachusetts Mr: Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That the authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior by sections 3, 4, and 7 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat 1187, 1188) and by section 3 of the act of April 24, 1945 (59 Stat. 75, 76), is hereby extended through December 31, 1956.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "1956" and insert in lieu thereof "1954"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 28, RONAN, MONT.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3847) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue to School District No. 28, Ronan, Mont., a patent in fee to certain Indian land.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and I shall not, because I think this is simply the State giving some land for school purposes, is it not?

Mr. MORRIS. The purpose of the bill, I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Masachusetts, is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer about 5 acres of land to this school district in Ronan, Mont., School District No. 28.

This land originally was set aside for administrative purposes by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. There is no longer any need of it for administrative purposes, but there is need of it for school purposes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I suppose there are no oil or mineral rights connected with the land at all?

Mr. MORRIS. I have never heard of any. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] might answer that question; it is his bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed with the consent of the Tribal Council of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, to issue to School District No. 28, Ronan, Montana, a patent in fee to certain land situated in Ronan, Montana, and more particularly described as follows. South half northwest quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter, section 36, township 21 north, range 20 west, containing five acres, more or less, of Tribal Agency Reserve Land.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

IMPORTANT BUSINESS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED BEFORE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I hope there will be no adjournment until some of the extremely important unfinished business is completed. I do not want to take the time of the Members to give many illustrations because we all know of the important matters that need attention. However, as only one example, let me just mention in passing that this session of the Congress has done practically nothing even on those recommendations of the Hoover Commission that are not controversial—and there are some in that category.

I hope there will be no adjournment until some of the legislation that should be enacted is considered by the Congress.

WORLD REBELLION VERSUS TYRANNY

Mr PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the last few days have given us striking evidence of the rebellious spirit of dissatisfaction and resentment that exists in many parts of the world.

We have witnessed the United Nations protest of the Iranian premier against an imperialistic policy, which, from his standpoint, has adversely affected the great natural oil resources of his nation.

We have learned of the heinous and tragic assassination of the outstanding Pakistan leader, Liaquat Ali Khan, who, not long ago, addressed this Congress and gave us a distinct impression of his great ability, understanding and stability as a great statesman of this newly founded nation. No one will doubt that he was, as Premier Nehru termed him, "a steadying influence" in the affairs of the Far East.

We have also observed the rebellion in Egypt against imperialistic domination over the territory and independence of that nation.

While these instances are all separate, they are, unquestionably, part of a pattern—an international pattern fabricated, in part, out of Communist conspiracy and, in part, from the natural indignation and animosity, which generate from real or fancied interferences by the strong with the affairs of the weak. These instances materially serve the Communist cause by producing bloodshed, disorder, social unrest, and insurrection against the existing order.

These incidents are not transitory. They do not spring from ordinary casual events. They are rooted deeply into the fabric of many small governments. They stem from long-contained feelings of hatred and resentment which have been gradually developing against imperialism, colonialism and dictatorship over the affairs of small nations. It is obvious to me that our Nation alone cannot effectively deal with these disturbing and revolutionary manifestations. In fact, it has been our traditional policy to avoid interfering with the internal affairs of other nations, even as we have encouraged those in bondage to seek and secure their freedom. The establishment of the United Nations marked an official step by this Nation in the direction of maintaining order and peace through principles of collective security and collective judicial settlement of episodes likely to affect the peace of the world.

But if we are to find the causes of these violent protests against existing orders, we must probe much more deeply into the psychology, into the national aspirations and into the spiritual values of the peoples presently torn by these revolutionary movements. To my mind, there is, undoubtedly, an admixture of hatred of imperialism, and colonialism and resentment of interference with basic national and individual human rights because it is apparent to me that many small peoples throughout the world, heretofore manacled by imperialism and force, are fairly seething with hatred and violently moving to break away from every form of bondage and exploitation which presently binds them.

There is another factor in these situations, which is manifest to me, and must surely be manifest to those who have studied pending international developments and are familiar with the background and heritage of the peoples involved, and that is the emergence, not only of understandable nationalistic feelings based on aspirations for free government, but also strong compulsive racial feelings, which emanate from the real or fancied program of the white Anglo-Saxon peoples to dominate the world organization for peace and, consequently, as these other peoples believe, thwart and obstruct their hopes for liberation from various forms of tyranny, which have heretofore beset them.

In my opinion, these nationalistic and racial feelings are sweeping through a great many nations, not only in the Near and Far East, but also in Europe. It should be evident to us that we cannot build a world organization, designed to maintain order and peace, without considering the feelings, the aims, the hopes and the aspirations of those races and nations, who now feel that they are excluded from any, save a nominal part, of the policy making and other operations of the United Nations. Such a situation greatly promotes world communism.

Americans detest war. We detest violence as a means of settling international disputes. We seek, in accordance with our traditions, the settlement of these disputes by argument, discussion, judicial methods and moral suasion, and the force of public opinion moving toward collective action.

We should recognize that no satisfactory or constructive United States foreign policy can be based on the exclusion of millions, yes, more than a billion, of struggling, aspiring peoples throughout the world, who have become aroused in one way or another, frequently, by Communist propaganda and subterfuge, but just as often by the age-old urge of men and women for the blessings of human liberty.

There is great danger at the moment that what we do by way of safeguarding our own democratic institutions may have too much of the appearance of supporting western imperialism and colonialism and too little of an all-embracing universal policy recognizing and protecting the rights of the small nations, the small inarticulate peoples of the world, to establish themselves on a firm basis of free, unfettered government, which like our own accords to the individual his free choice in determining the kind of political system under which he shall live. There has been too much emphasis on a make-shift expediency and too little upon great fundamental principles of freedom.

In this campaign for broader participation, we could well begin in our own country by promoting even greater tolerance and unity among the American people. That is certainly indicated as a most commendable domestic policy. But we can also move with as much speed as practicable and sound to bring wholeheartedly into our great work for defense, peace, and order the peoples of our own Western Hemisphere—the great, free peoples of Canada and Central and South America, who have the same stake we have in the part of the world in which we live.

We should also seek every means of strengthening the ties between the great English-speaking peoples of Europe from whom America has drawn so much of her strength—her language, her law, her democratic institutions, her culture and we should not hesitate to include also the other great peoples of Europe, who are naturally on our side and from whom our Nation has drawn so much of its inspiration and strength, not only of institutions but of loyal citizenship.

If we do these things and, in addition, in equity and justice recognize the claims of the other racial groups in the Near and Far East, who, I believe, desire to be friends of ours, provided that we exhibit a friendly attitude toward them and encourage their aspirations, we shall find many firm friends and willing allies in the fearful, but critical, struggle between totalitarian slavery and freedom of democracy.

I must also state that in these efforts to gain a broader front against world communism this Nation should place its case on principle rather than expediency, on impartiality rather than favoritism, on universality rather than provincial racism, on real justice rather than international bribery. A friend gained by purchase or blackmail will not prove a true friend in this or any other crucial struggle.

ARMY EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. If there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from a constituent of mine in San Rafael, and I desire to quote a portion of the same:

> Winter has arrived at Yanggu, and it is as cold as ever—and no winter clothing for our boys The last three letters we have received from our young son requesting us to send him boot sox, knit cap, and gloves, has made us plenty mad Where is all the money going that we read has been handed over to the Army "planners," those clever "twirps" who let our poor boys freeze last winter? It looks like they never learn, not even from painful experience.

The letter goes on in such tone. Could it be possible that the moneys we have appropriated in an effort to give our boys good equipment and proper supplies is not being properly spent?

I trust the Armed Services Committee will give recognition to this type of complaint.

CONGRESS HAS FAILED MISERABLY TO DISCHARGE ITS OBLIGATION TO THE AGED OF THIS NATION

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 284. Joint resolution authorizing the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the observance and memorialization on April 9, 1952, of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John Howard Payne, author of that family hymn of America Home Sweet Home.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4473) entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes."

The message also anounced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H R 5684 An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H R. 5448.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AND THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3669, an act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CROSSER, BECKWORTH, and WOLVERTON.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have here photostatic copy of a deportation proceeding hearing which was held in Los Angeles, Calif., on November 29, 1950. I would like to read from page 126 of this stenographic record the following testimony by John L. Leech, testifying as a Government witness on behalf of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice before a hearing officer of that Service.

Question by the attorney for the defendant in this proceeding, whose name, I believe, was Alice Orins; I do not recall ever hearing of her before:

Now, so that we don't have any question about a matter we went into this morning, you did testify, did you not, on July 16, 1940, at Beaumont, Tex., under oath as follows in response to the following questions:

"Do you know the present Member of Congress from San Francisco, Mr. FRANCK HAVENNER?

"Answer. Yes, sir.

"Question. Has he any connection with the Communist Party?

"Answer. Yes."

Did you so testify?

Answer. I so testified.

Question. Do you now testify under oath that the testimony which you gave then was true as of that period?

Answer. Yes

Question. That he was at that period a member of the Communist Party?

Answer. Yes.

Question Do you now reassert that?

Answer I now reassert that as of that period I have no knowledge of his present activities and affiliations.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the gentleman states a question of personal privilege, having been accused of being a Communist, as the lowest designation that could possibly be made of a man

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the necessity of rising on a question of personal privilege during these busy closing hours of the congressional session, but I think when the Members of the House have heard my statement, they will agree that under the circumstances no other course would be open to any self-respecting Member.

Nearly 7 years ago, on January 11, 1945, I read to the House of Representatives a political advertisement which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle of October 30, 1944, under the following heading:

Would you trust your postwar future in these hands? Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities in the United States (hearing), Tuesday, July 16, 1940, House of Representatives Subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Beaumont, Tex.—Excerpts from sworn testimony of John L Leech, former member, State committee, Communist Party of California, and candidate for Congress on the Communist Party ticket in 1936 from the Seventeenth California Congressional District.

I now quote from the advertisement:

Question. Do you know the present Member of Congress from San Francisco, Mr. FRANCK HAVENNER?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Question Does he have any connection with the Communist Party?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Did you ever meet him in a meeting where no one else was present except Communists?

Answer. Yes.

Question. You stated you had met with Mr. HAVENNER in a fraction meeting of the Communist Party?

Answer. That is correct.

Question. Was that fraction meeting held in San Francisco?

Answer. Now excuse me; I would like to make a correction for the record. I did not mean to say, if I did, that I had met him in a fraction meeting. I had met him in a State executive committee meeting.

Question. Is Mr. HAVENNER a member of the State executive committee of the Communist Party?

Answer. No

Question What was he doing at this State executive committee meeting?

Answer. To the best of my recollection this was a discussion—and it is not necessary that a person be a member of the State executive committee or the State committee, to be called in for assistance, or directions of the State executive committee.

Question Could he have attended this meeting if he had not been a member of the Communist Party?

Answer No, I have never known of a case, and I don't believe such a connection has ever taken place where a nonmember could meet with a leading body of the party.

Question Now, in addition to this meeting you have already discussed, you stated you met with him on other occasions?

Answer Yes; informally, in left-wing affairs In other words, he participated in affairs organized by the Communist Party or left-wing organization under the domination of the Communist Party.

Question And at this time he was a Member of Congress?

Answer. That is correct.

Mr Speaker, when I read this political advertisement in San Francisco in 1944, I knew nothing about this meeting of the subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities which the advertisement alleged was held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940. Naturally, I immediately inquired whether such a meeting had actually been held.

I am informed that representatives of the press who went to the office of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities were furnished with a printed volume entitled "Investigation of Un-American Propaganda in the United States," which contained a report of a meeting of a subcommittee held in Beaumont, Tex., on the date mentioned. It was marked "Executive session" and showed as present Hon. Martin Dies, chairman; Robert E. Stripling, secretary of the committee; and James H. Stedman, investigator.

In this printed volume appeared all of the questions and answers which were contained in the political advertisement which I have just read, together with other questions and answers relating to me, as follows:

Question. When did you first meet Mr. HAVENNER, Mr Leech?

Answer I have been several times with him, Mr. Stedman. However, some of the times were simply at left-wing gatherings, and I am afraid, to be completely accurate, I could not even place the dates.

Question. But you have met him on a number of occasions?

Answer. Yes, sir; I have met him on a number of occasions.

Question. Did Mr. HAVENNER ever join the Communist Party?

Answer. I have never seen an application card or any documentary proof as to that. It is my understanding, on the basis of his participation in party activity, that he has been and is at the present time a member of the Communist Party. But, again I say, I have at no time ever seen documentary proof of this.

Question. You have met him in strictly Communist Party meetings?

Answer. On one occasion that I remember.

Question. Would you please state what that occasion was, Mr. Leech?

Answer. That is a very serious question. I am afraid of my accuracy not on the basic facts—but I am afraid of my accuracy on it.

Question. Could you give us the approximate year when this meeting occurred?

Answer. Well, this meeting occurred some time during the course of 1936. Again I think it was in preparation for the State criminal syndicalism congress.

Question. Did Mr. HAVENNER take an active part in that conference?

Answer. In the discussion—he was not, to the best of my recollection, at the conference but he took an active part in the discussion and preparation and the outlining of this conference.

Question. Do you know what he was doing at that time?

Answer. I think he was connected in some way with the first California writers' project. I do know he worked and associated with Harry Carlyle, who was a member of the Communist Party, and he was the organizer of the first California State writers' project. But all of my party work was in the Los Angeles area and Mr. HAVENNER lived in San Francisco, and I will have to say that my recollection of details is vague here.

Question. But you do know Mr. HAVENNER cooperated with the party?

Answer. I do know that to be a fact; yes, sir.

Mr. Speaker, at the time of this meeting of the Subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities at Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, I was a Member of the House of Representatives and had been for 3½ years next preceding that date. I had never received any notice of this hearing prior to the time it was held and have never received any notice of the hearing from the Special Committee on Un-American Activities or from any other person up to the present time. The first knowledge I had that such a subcommittee meeting was held was more than 4 years later when I read in this political advertisement printed in several San Francisco daily newspapers during the months of October and November 1944, excerpts from the testimony given by witness Leech which I have just read to the Members of the House. I have never been given an opportunity to face my accuser or to reply to his testimony.

I may interpolate here, Mr. Speaker, that for years I attempted to locate this individual Leech and was unable to do so. He had apparently dropped from sight for a long time. That opens up one of the most amazing aspects of the statement I am now going to make to the House.

If the former chairman of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, who presided at this secret meeting, believed that this sworn testimony was true, it was his duty to report it to the House of Representatives and recommend that I be brought before the bar of the House and expelled. If there was any doubt in his mind as to the truth of this testimony, it certainly was his duty to notify me and call me before his committee to disprove the testimony, if I could.

But Mr. Speaker, the former chairman of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Dies, did neither of those things. He did not even notify the other members of his special committee that this damaging testimony had been given against a Member of Congress. Instead, the record of this secret meeting held down in Beaumont, Tex., was pigeonholed for more than 4 years, when, suddenly and mysteriously, it was made available for use against me in a political campaign.

I might interpolate again, Mr. Speaker, at the time I made this statement in 1945, certain members of the Texas delegation came to me and said:

We think we can tell you why this matter was held secret for 4 years. It was held secret for 4 years in order to allow the statute of limitations against perjury and libel to expire.

Mr. Speaker, the sworn testimony of Witness Leech in this printed report is false in its entirety and constitutes perjury of the most vicious and malicious type. I am not and never have been a member of the Communist Party, nor have I ever had any connections or associations with that party or its activities in any manner whatever. I do not subscribe and never have subscribed to the platform or the program of the Communist Party. I am now and always have been a devout believer in and supporter of the fundamental principles and institutions upon which the American Government is founded. The idea of the employment of force and violence to overthrow the Government which I love is as hateful to me as it possibly could be to any other true American citizen.

Indeed the only time when I could possibly advocate the use of violent force with relation to our Government would be in defense of its fundamental principles and institutions. For more than 25 years I have been a public official in America, sworn to uphold and protect our Constitution and our form of government, and no man in all those years, except in the instance to which I am now addressing myself, has ever accused me of being false to that high trust.

Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to take the time of the House now to recite all of the history of this case. For the present it will suffice to say that after a most painstaking inquiry the House Un-American Activities Committee of the Eightieth Congress, by unanimous vote, expunged all of the testimony of this Witness Leech concerning me from the records of the committee. I am very proud of that vindication by the Committee on Un-American Activities, particularly because it was done at a time when the Republican Party was in the majority in the House of Representatives and was in control of the committee.

When I was able to examine the record of the secret hearing of the Dies subcommittee at which the witness Leech gave this perjured testimony against me I found that he had given similar testimony against a large number of other persons, including my present colleague from California, Representative SHELLEY, who is now in California because of very serious illness in his family. Mr. SHELLEY called me by long distance yesterday and asked me to say that if he were present he would also rise to a question of personal privilege, as I am doing now.

Mr. Speaker, witnesses like Leech do not appear by mere accident at a secret meeting of a subcommittee of the House of Representatives in a place remote from the Capitol of the United States to attack the reputation of a Member of Congress who is at his post of duty at the Capitol. Someone brought this witness, Leech, to that secret meeting in Beaumont, Tex., by prearrangement, and whoever brought him there was undoubtedly thoroughly familiar with the testimony he was prepared to give. And if his testimony concerning me was, as I now solemnly assure the House, perjured in its entirety, then someone was guilty of subornation of perjury.

Mr. Speaker, my reason for addressing the House on this subject again at this time is that I have just been advised that this witness, John L. Leech, after the lapse of more than 10 years, has within the past year repeated under oath the perjured testimony he gave at the secret meeting of the subcommittee on Un-American Activities concerning me and the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY]. This testimony was given in deportation proceedings in the case of Alice Orans before a hearing officer of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the United States Department of Justice. The hearings were held in Los Angeles, Calif., on November 29, 1950 and December 11, 1950. I do not know the defendant in this case, Alice Orans, nor did I know that any such hearings had ever been held until I received a letter from the defendant's attorney a few days ago.

I am now in possession of photostatic copies of the transcript of these hearings which show that John L. Leech, under detailed examination on the witness stand, repeatedly swore that the testimony he had given concerning me and concerning the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY], at the secret subcommittee hearing in Beaumont, Tex., in 1940, was true. I was amazed to find that John L. Leech had appeared at these hearings as a Government witness for the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, when I first addressed the House on the subject of this perjured testimony on January 11, 1945, the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] expressed the opinion that there was a conspiracy among certain individuals in California to smear me. During the next 4 or 5 years I was repeatedly made the target of Communist smear attacks. Finally, during the congressional campaign of 1948 I filed suit for libel against the San Francisco Examiner, a Hearst newspaper.

On Sunday, February 27, 1949, the following letter, signed by the publisher of the San Francisco Examiner, was printed on the first page of all editions of that newspaper:

SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER,
February 24, 1949.

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAVENNER: As part of the amicable settlement of the libel suit

brought by you against us, we are pleased to address this letter to you publicly.

Your suit was instituted as a result of editorials and articles appearing in the San Francisco Examiner.

We are convinced that you are not a Communist nor in sympathy with communism.

We are convinced that you are a true American in the American tradition. We are sorry that we attempted to cast a doubt on your Americanism during your various campaigns for public office.

It is not necessary to reserve the right to differ with you in the future on specific issues, but we do not wish this apology to carry the implication that any promise has been made to support you. As a real American, we know you wish us to assert an independent judgment on all issues.

Very truly yours,

CLARENCE R LINDNER.

Mr. Speaker, the astonishing renewal of this perjured testimony against two Members of Congress by a witness appearing on behalf of the Government of the United States strengthens my belief that the majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK, was right when he said that there was a conspiracy to smear me, and that this conspiracy should be investigated by Congress. I now urgently request that the Committee on the Judiciary, under the authority granted it by House Resolution 95, conduct a complete investigation of all of the charges made by John L. Leech against the gentleman from California [Mr SHELLEY] and myself.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK I remember well the experience which the gentleman from California went through. I remember the discussion on the floor of the House several years ago and the remarks that I made on that occasion. Of course, nobody believes this infamous liar. I hesitate personally to criticize, because I like to exercise restraint, but where the evidence is so overwhelming about a man of hate, and I have nothing but contempt for persons of that kind, in this case to term him as "an infamous liar" is tolerance on my part.

The gentleman from California has been subjected to the attacks of this man, and behind him is someone who started him and who spearheaded him. There is no question about that, in my mind. But the best evidence that it has not fallen on fruitful ground is the fact that the people of the gentleman's district have continuously reelected him. But that is not the answer. The pain and the suffering the gentleman from California has undergone, and that his loved ones have undergone, cannot be softened. When we in public life are unjustifiably attacked, it is not ourselves who suffer most, but our loved ones. I can understand thoroughly the position of the gentleman from California, his justifiable wrath at these unjust, these false attacks and the continuation of them.

We remember well how several years ago the gentleman himself demanded that a committee of this Congress investigate the conspiracy against him, and now another colleague of ours is attacked. This is convincing proof to anyone that the gentleman from California who is addressing the House as well as the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] fear nothing, but they want to expose this vicious conspiracy which for some reason or other is trying to destroy the character and reputation of two honorable men. This is not a matter that addresses itself to the House concerning one who is a member of the Democratic party. It could just as well apply to any colleague of mine on the other side. This is an attack against a Member of the House.

I hope the Committee on the Judiciary will take cognizance of the gentleman's request and if any authorization by the House is necessary I hope the House will grant it and investigate the charges of this Leech. His name is certainly consistent with his character I hope they will investigate the conspiracy that exists to undermine the character and reputation of the gentleman from California—and now another one I never heard the slightest intimation of an attack against the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] before, but it has come—and it might be any one of us, attacked by some man of hate. It might be someone in our own community, full of hatred and resentment. Tomorrow it might be another section of the country. Today it is California, but it might be Massachusetts or somewhere else. Minds that hate, no matter where they exist, are contemptible, destructive

My purpose is mainly to commend the gentleman for his fine service in this House. We do not always agree, but I never impugn the motives of any one of my colleagues, nor their intent. It is a good thing to have in this body Members who disagree, for then we get the cross current of the country; but no one ever heard me attack the motives of any one of our Members I might disagree as to what results might flow from his actions, but that is different.

The gentleman from California who is addressing the House has been here for years and rendered honorable and outstanding service, as has the gentleman from California [Mr SHELLEY]. So it is not a question of defending either one of them; it is a question of looking behind the scenes, finding out who are the vicious forces and what purpose they have in mind in conceiving and carrying on this conspiracy to destroy the standing and reputation and to poison the minds of Americans against the patriotism of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] and now the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

I sincerely hope, I repeat, that if not in the remaining days of this session, at least in the early days of the next session, appropriate action will be taken by one of our committees; and if they lack authority, that the House will grant the authority to investigate this contemptible conspiracy.

Mr. HAVENNER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I discussed this matter with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and I think he believes his committee now has the necessary authority to make an exhaustive and thorough investigation of this matter. I gathered from his conversation with me today that he is willing to do so.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr BURDICK. I just want to remark that what this man said against the gentleman 1,800 or 2,000 miles from where he was he could have said of any Member of Congress and if it could be secluded for 4 years any Member of Congress would be handicapped the same way. So, as an old-time prosecutor for the Government, I am convinced that there was and is a conspiracy. There is some reason why that was done. There is some purpose behind that more than to injure the gentleman personally. Why not pick out somebody else? They could have picked me out. Nobody would believe that story if they did say it. I am in a sparsely settled country where they do not have many newspapers But they picked out the wrong fellow when they picked the gentleman out because everyone knows that he was secretary to the great Senator from California, Hiram Johnson, for years here in the Capitol. He has been in public life and in front of people for a quarter of a century. Here in this Congress he is respected by every Member and has been for years. The people of California elect him term after term. It seems to me they picked out the wrong man to foster on a witch-hunt charge of communism. I will do whatever I can as a Member of Congress to see that the gentleman gets that investigation, because I am interested in finding out why Congressman HAVENNER was singled out for attack.

Mr. HAVENNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr EBERHARTER. I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I agree wholeheartedly with the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Massachusetts, our majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK]. We who have served with the gentleman from California for many years in this House have not the slightest doubt but what a conspiracy exists, as he stated this afternoon. I strongly believe that every Member of this House on both sides of the aisle will join in insisting that an investigation be made of this conspiracy, because these methods of attacking without any justification whatsoever people in public life must be stopped if we are to carry forward the principles of our country. I am certain that we will do the country good and stop some of this stuff if a real investigation is made of this conspiracy

Mr. HAVENNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr EBERHARTER. I may also add that I am confirmed in that conviction by what has just been said by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I have known the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] for many, many years. I knew him by reputation long before I had the pleasure of meeting him. He is one of the most highly respected and beloved public servants that California has ever sent to this Congress. For that reason it is very profitable to some people and profitable to the Communists to get a gentleman of his standing and character named as a Communist by some person who, as the majority leader referred to correctly, is a liar. Because that sort of propaganda confuses the people and leads them to believe that all charges of communism are just as false as the one they know to be false leveled against a gentleman like the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER]. So I have no doubt that if the committee will thoroughly go into this conspiracy back of it they will find the Communists themselves trying to spread these false rumors, as they have in other cases.

I am very much surprised that the Government would use a witness like this man Leech in a case as important as this case, thereby discrediting their whole case against her by using a witness whose testimony is not reliable.

Alice Orans was assistant director of relief in Los Angeles County in 1939 when my own State Committee on Un-American Activities investigated communism in relief organizations. I heard her testimony and I became convinced, as did the whole committee, without question that she was a Communist and a leader in the Communist movement to take over the relief organizations in the State of California.

She led 500 pickets out in front of my house and trampled the grass in front of it and the grass in front of my neighbor's house carrying placards up and down the street. We found out later that she was not an American citizen. She is a citizen of Russia. I myself conferred with the FBI and turned over my files about Alice Orans to them.

In my judgment she ought to be deported. To think that the Government would use a witness like Leech in an important case like this, and by leveling false and ridiculous charges against a fine gentleman like the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] is just beyond belief.

REVENUE ACT OF 1951

Mr. COOPER (on behalf of Mr. DOUGHTON) submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4473) to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

READJUSTMENT OF POSTAL RATES

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1046) to readjust postal rates and for other purposes.

INCREASING RATES OF COMPENSATION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government and for other purposes.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], I ask unanimous consent that he may have permission to file a conference report on the Railroad Retirement Act, H. R. 3669, before midnight tonight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has labored over and found solutions for many of the most vital and domestic problems ever brought before a legislative assembly. For these achievements, touching all aspects of human endeavor, the commendations of all mankind are justly merited. However, the failure of this Congress to provide for another of the most pressing needs of our own people, Federal aid to education, jeopardizes the effectiveness of much that we have attempted to do.

Our country, our people have accepted the responsibility of the leadership of the nations of the free world. To be equal to this leadership, we must provide for the more effective training of all our people in the issues involved in world leadership. The demands made upon our people of this and future generations are, and will continue to be, of increasing complexity. Our citizens are now confronted with the necessity of being as well-informed on the problems of other peoples of the free world as they are upon their own domestic problems. They are now aiding in making decisions that affect the lives of peoples throughout the entire world. They are supplying much of the labor and the wealth to implement those decisions. That we have so ably succeeded, thus far, in fulfilling the responsibilities thrust upon us, is a glorious tribute to public education in America. If we are to continue to hold our present position, and to be prepared to meet the challenges of the years to come, it will be only because we have a program of education that will effectively train our people to do so.

Up to this time the responsibility for financial support of the public schools has been a State responsibility. For the great part the States have sincerely endeavored to meet their educational needs to the limit of their abilities. As the citizens have been informed of the increased needs for funds for buildings, equipment, and salaries they have repeatedly demonstrated their desire to support education by increasing existing taxes and adding new ones. It is the belief of the people of many States that they have given proof of making a supreme effort to provide for schools. They also feel that their educational needs contrasted with their ability to pay conclusively prove that they are unable to adequately educate their people without Federal aid.

If this be true, then all that we have done toward world security can be threatened by our failure to find a workable solution for this problem which has long been before us.

This year my State, West Virginia, added more than $18,000,000 to its budget for State aid to schools, bringing the total for public education for the biennium to approximately ninety-five millions. This made possible a salary increase of $540 a year for degree teachers and proportionate increases for those with lesser certificates. However, this increase is not sufficient to meet the advance in the cost of living as shown by the Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In spite of the effort of the people of our State, many teachers have moved to other States where salaries are much higher, or have taken jobs in industry. The State has been forced to issue great numbers of emergency certificates. Some counties have schools closed because teachers cannot be obtained.

Increased enrollments for many years to come demand classrooms, equipment, and teachers not now available.

The conditions which exist in West Virginia are duplicated in many States throughout the country.

Can this country survive without a citizenry prepared through public education to meet the tasks which will confront them? If survival is dependent upon our schools, dare we continue to delay to provide Federal funds for education where they are needed?

The children of today will be the America of tomorrow. Will it be a weak America, or a strong and happy America? The answer to that question lies within the ability, or the inability, of all of us who determine here and now whether our leaders of tomorrow will be equipped with ignorance and stupidity, or knowledge and wisdom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to notify the Members that there is no chance of the President's veto of the amputee car bill being brought before the House this evening. Many Members have asked that question as they want to be here to override the veto. It was a Senate bill and they must act upon it first. My belief is that the Senate will override the veto just as will the House. We took the Senate bill and struck out all after the enacting clause when it came over here and inserted the provisions of the Elliott bill with certain amendments. The very fine gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] is himself a battle-wounded veteran, with very splendid war service. The House knows that the bill as amended passed overwhelmingly, and it passed the Senate overwhelmingly. The President's veto, I think, was a surprise to very many persons.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What was the basis for the veto? What reason was put forth?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. A somewhat similar bill was vetoed by the President 2 years ago. Some of the President's objections were taken out, the cash payment and the objection so far as mobility is concerned, but to tell the truth I am not quite sure why he vetoed it.

I have talked with many Army doctors and Navy doctors and Public Health doctors and they all feel that it was a very fine rehabilitation measure for the men that had already received cars and also for these new groups. Many of these men were wounded, not intentionally, but during World War II and the Korean war many of our men were wounded by our own guns and our own bullets, guns and bullets that were sent to Russia. They were sent to Korea and sent to China and to Russia and used by the Communists. They were missiles of war that were sent or given by the English to Russia and the Chinese and our own United States. The boys have seen on some of the missiles the mark of the United States

All of these heroes are service-connected cases. The House and the Senate both overruled an increase in pension for the permanently disabled some time ago They were not service-connected These boys in this bill are few and are service-connected The amount of money is a mere pittance Compare it with the billions upon billions given to foreign countries and billions given in military preparedness and billions for everything under the sun There was a misunderstanding about that bill because of the increase in pension, and they were permanently and totally disabled. The House would be interested in a number of letters I have received stating that because of the increase in the pension the men were taken out of the hospital and were living at home, saving the Goverment money. The President does his own thinking and the Congress does its own thinking.

I am very sure the Congress will override the President's veto. We must not adjourn until it does

FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr STAGGERS Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection

Mr STAGGERS Mr Speaker, it is my desire to bring to your attention the needs, as I see them, of the agricultural section of our country. The farmer is in a peculiar position in relation to labor, industry, and Government, for he has no control over the price he pays for needed supplies and very little control over the selling price of farm products He is at the mercy of the urban consumers on the price question, since he is overshadowed by this greater populace.

What affects the farmer, as we all know, affects the entire Nation. Since the founding of our country one of the basic factors contributing to the high standard of living we enjoy has been cheap and abundant food of wide variety. Even today it takes the pay of less hours of labor to adequately feed an American family than in any other country on earth.

Up until the present time there has been sufficient farm land to produce more than we need, and although the acreage under cultivation is not increasing to any appreciable amount, the modernization of our farms has allowed the food supplies to keep up with the increase in population and the rising standard of living.

There is very little new land that can be brought into production. The possibilities of maintaining an adequate food supply will depend to no small extent upon the intelligent understanding of both the farmer and the city dweller, and upon how we handle our farm land to preserve it from the ravages of mishandling and erosion

Today we understand the importance of wise land use, and realize that it is not alone the farmers' problem The results of proper or improper land use affects us all and we acknowledge it is every one's problem. Because of the awareness of the situation every State of the Union has passed laws enabling farmers to vote soil-conservation districts into being.

It is recognized that the problem of conservation and wise use of our soil are Nation-wide in scope, and constitute a job too big for the individual. The production of food is a problem to be dealt with on a national basis. It is, therefore, essential that the necessary machinery and supplies be made available to the farmer in order to satisfy our ever-increasing needs Farm-equipment manufacturers must receive the needed allocations of metals, and other farm supplies must be kept available. With farm labor becoming more scarce, it is necessary that we increase the mechanization and efficiency of farming

The farmer has always responded to emergencies, and has made almost superhuman effort to keep our food supplies adequate. He will respond again and again when called upon. But his efforts alone, without understanding and help on our part, may not be enough the next time. An appraisal of his needs and problems is a national duty. We cannot short change the soldiers who are protecting us from the aggressor in Asia and Europe by curtailing their food supplies, nor the supplies of those in industry who keep them furnished with the weapons of war.

Food is essential. The farmer supplies it. Let us understand and help him to the best of our ability.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to

Mr. HART and to include an address by the President of the United States

Mr. HEFFERNAN in three instances, to include extraneous matter

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'NEIL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS in two instances, in one to include a speech by Senator FULBRIGHT, and in another a speech by Dr. John W. Cronin, of the Public Health Service.

Mr. MADDEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois and to include a report of the projects committee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Mr. BELCHER.

Mr VAN PELT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEALL (at the request of Mr. DEVEREUX) and to include some excerpts from a speech by Governor McKeldin.

Mr WOOD of Idaho and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr BENDER in two separate instances.

Mr EDWIN ARTHUR HALL in three instances and to include letters.

Mr. RHODES

Mr. MANSFIELD and to include an article from the Reclamation News.

Mr. ROBERTS Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address I delivered October 17, 1951, over the following stations: WSPC and WHMA, Anniston, Ala; WHTB, Talladega, Ala.; WGWC and WHBB, Selma, Ala , and WFEB and WMLS, Sylacauga, Ala

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection

Mr. MCMULLEN and to include a statement dealing with the port of Tampa, Fa

Mr. RIVERS and to include a radio address by State Senator Charles Fenwick of Arlington County, Va., over radio station WARL, September 30, about the Hill-Burton funds expended in that county.

Mr MILLS and include a telegram.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. CHELF).

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. DOYLE) and to include extraneous material.

Mr. DOYLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include five resolutions from the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation.

Mr. WERDEL (at the request of Mr MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts).

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts)

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. MORTON and to include a letter from a constituent to Mr. Eric Johnston.

Mr. MACK of Washington.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R 3298 An act to amend sections 303 (c) and 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended,

H R 3376. An act for the relief of Margaret K. N. Miller,

H. R. 4386. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

H R 5131. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike System and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes; and

H J Res 341 Joint resolution making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S 264. An act to provide for granting to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and the White House and United States Park Police forces, additional compensation for working on holidays;

S 1335. An act to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail; and

S. 1967. An act to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H R 1181. An act to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records;

H. R. 1215. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes;

H. R 3298 An act to amend sections 303 (c) and 503 (b) of the Federal, Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended;

H R 3376. An act for the relief of Margaret K N Miller;

H R. 4386. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

H R. 5131. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike system and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SIEMINSKI, for Friday and Saturday of this week, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 19, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

893 A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950"; to the Committee on Armed Services

894. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States and others, who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of the outbreak of hostilities in Korea"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FALLON. Committee on Public Works. H R. 4900. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee of conference S. 1046. An act to readjust postal rates (Rept No. 1210). Ordered to be printed.

Mr MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee of conference S. 355 An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department (Rept. No. 1211). Ordered to be printed.

Mr MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee of conference S. 622. An act to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1212). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee of conference. H. R. 4473. A bill to provide revenue, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1213). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H R. 5448. A bill to provide for the temporary free importation of zinc; with amendment (Rept. No. 1214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr CROSSER: Committee of conference. H. R. 3669. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1215). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5730. A bill for the relief of William Lund Main; without amendment (Rept. No. 1209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 5788. A bill to extend certain 10-year oil and gas leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HART (by request):

H. R 5789. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

By Mr. LIND:

H R. 5790. A bill to amend chapter 33 of title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new section to be known as section 711, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H R 5791. A bill to finance the exploration, development, production, and production expansion of critical and strategic minerals and metals within the United States, its Territories, and insular possessions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H R 5792. A bill to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency

By Mr WHITTEN:

H R. 5793. A bill to channel into Government hands excess production of basic commodities needed for defense purposes and to prevent the price-depressive effects of such production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DORN:

H R 5794 A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H R 5795. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H R 5796. A bill to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor

By Mr ELLIOTT:

H R 5797. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, water conservation, and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED:

H R. 5798. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, water conservation and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 5799. A bill to assist in the rehabilitation of disaster-stricken areas by assuring adequate relief under the housing laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. R. 5800. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide additional authority to insure mortgages on existing single-family residences; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 5801. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, regarding published articles and broadcasts by foreign agents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5802. A bill for the relief of nationals of the United States against whom acts of sabotage were committed before the entry of the United States into World War I, and in whose favor the Mixed Claims Commis-

sion, United States and Germany, made awards of damages which have not been satisfied; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R 5803. A bill to prevent the shipment in interstate commerce of illegal undersized fish, to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WALTER:

H Res. 470. Resolution authorizing expenses of conducting studies and investigations of certain matters pertaining to immigration; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, relative to transmitting a copy of the mutual aid compact entered into between the States of Alabama and Florida, dated October 15, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr ANDERSON of California:

H R 5804 A bill for the relief of Mitsuko Sato, to the Committee on the Judiciary

H R 5805 A bill for the relief of Patricia Lauretta Pray, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr BRAMBLETT.

H R 5806 A bill for the relief of Toshiko Yamane, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr DINGELL

H R 5807. A bill for the relief of Shukri Elias Ajlouni (Ajluni), to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr FEIGHAN:

H R 5808 A bill for the relief of Antonia Majer; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. MULTER:

H R 5809 A bill for the relief of Francesco Cavero, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE (by request):

H R 5810 A bill for the relief of Jose Medalha, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H R 5811 A bill for the relief of Jose Simao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H R 5812 A bill for the relief of Joaquim Madeira, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr REAMS:

H R 5813 A bill for the relief of Theodore Karam, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON.

H R 5814 A bill for the relief of John J. Hopkins, to the Committee on the Judiciary

H R 5815 A bill to provide additional time for presenting certain tort claims against the United States, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H R 5816. A bill for the relief of William Elden Joslin, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

478 By the SPEAKER: Petition of Statewide Tidelands Committee of Texas, Austin, Tex., relative to a resolution of the board of directors of the Missouri State Chamber of Commerce, held October 8, 1951, dealing with the tidelands matter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

479 Also, petition of Joseph F Lamb, supreme secretary, Knights of Columbus, New Haven, Conn., relative to changes in immigration laws as would permit at least 100,000 expellees and 100,000 Italians to enter the United States as immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, October 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, under the all-embracing canopy of Thy goodness and mercy which have followed us all the days of our lives, we come as children in our Father's house. Beneath all diversities of gifts and of thought we seek the common unity which binds us together with the cords of Thy brooding love, which will not let us go, and which seeketh us, even in perplexities and pain. Away from all the divisive forces of the world about us, which tear and separate and push apart, we would kneel in penitence at the altar of the one God whose love shed abroad in our hearts alone can send us out on our differing and often difficult paths, hoping all things and enduring all things

From the valley of futility and despair we lift our eyes to the hills of eternal verities which stab the horizon like great and glorious steeples pointing to the skies, for we know that our help and our hope are in Thee, who hath made heaven and earth. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 18, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1311) granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Yellowstone River.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 210) authorizing the naturalization of Jesus Juan Llanderal, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House numbered 4 to the bill (S 657) to amend and clarify the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) authorizing the appointment of 14 Members of Congress to participate in a public discussion of problems of common interest with representatives of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2094) to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H R 800. An act for the relief of Cindy Eberhardt;

H R 827 An act for the relief of Dr. Manuel J Casas and Mrs. Julia Nakpil Casas;

H R 1161. An act for the relief of Kenneth McRight;

H R. 1267 An act to reimburse the Stamey Construction Co. and/or the Oklahoma Paving Co., as their interests appear;

H R 1828 An act for the relief of Maria Szertpyorgyi Mayer;

H R 1857 An act for the relief of James Yao,

H R 1974 An act for the relief of Mary Gemma Kawamura,

H R 2662 An act for the relief of Mrs. Thelma A Nolen,

H R 2775 An act for the relief of Anneliese Barbara Vollrath and Mrs Margarete Elise Vollrath,

H R 2833 An act for the relief of Rudolf Bing and Nina Bing;

H R 2962. An act for the relief of Maude S Burman;

H R 3219 An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Robert E Vigus,

H R 3375 An act for the relief of Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley,

H R 3569 An act for the relief of Louis Campbell Boyd;

H R 3600 An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander Symeonidis,

H R 3668 An act for the relief of David Yeh,

H R 3847 An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue to school district No 28, Ronan, Mont., a patent in fee to certain Indian land;

H R 3877 An act for the relief of Erlinda Maria Bowers;

H R 3971 An act for the relief of Esther Park,

H R 3985 An act for the relief of Hai Soon Lee,

H R 4130 An act for the relief of Caroline Wu,

H R 4558 An act for the relief of Mrs. Alberta S Rozanski;

H R 4876 An act for the relief of Francesco Fratalia;

H R 4877 An act for the relief of Mrs. Margherita Caroli,

H R 5097 An act to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes,

H R 5397 An act for the relief of Mrs. Dora Troost;

H R 5730 An act for the relief of William Lund Main; and

H J. Res. 285 Joint resolution to authorize appropriate participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R 800. An act for the relief of Cindy Eberhardt;

H. R 827 An act for the relief of Dr. Manuel J Casas and Mrs. Julia Nakpil Casas;

H. R. 1161 An act for the relief of Kenneth McRight;

H. R 1267. An act to reimburse the Stamey Construction Co. and/or the Oklahoma Paving Co., as their interests appear;

H R. 1828. An act for the relief of Maria Szentgyorgyi Mayer;

H R. 1857. An act for the relief of James Yao;

H R. 1974. An act for the relief of Mary Gemma Kawamura;

H R 2662 An act for the relief of Mrs. Thelma A Nolen,

H. R 2775. An act for the relief of Anneliese Barbara Vollrath and Mrs. Margarete Elise Vollrath;

H R 2833 An act for the relief of Rudolf Bing and Nina Bing;

H. R. 2962. An act for the relief of Maude S. Burman;

H. R 3219. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Robert E. Vigus;

H R 3375. An act for the relief of Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley,

H R 3569 An act for the relief of Louis Campbell Boyd;

H. R. 3600. An act for the relief of Dr Alexander Symeonidis;

H R 3668. An act for the relief of David Yeh;

H. R 3971. An act for the relief of Esther Park,

H. R. 3985. An act for the relief of Hai Soon Lee;

H R. 4130. An act for the relief of Caroline Wu;

H R 4558. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alberta S. Rozanski;

H. R 4876. An act for the relief of Francesco Fratalia;

H R 4877. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margherita Caroli;

H R 5397. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dora Troost; and

H J Res 285. Joint resolution to authorize appropriate participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H R. 3847. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue to school district No. 28, Ronan, Mont., a patent in fee to certain Indian land; and

H R 5097 An act to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, October 19, 1951, he signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 264. An act to provide for granting to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and the White House and United States Park Police forces additional compensation for working on holidays;

S. 1335. An act to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail; and

S. 1967. An act to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL and by unanimous consent, Mr. BENNETT was granted leave to be absent from the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HOLLAND was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and submit routine matters for the record, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATIONS FOR FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY S. Doc. No. 86)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, for the Federal Security Agency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE WHO SUFFERED LOSSES OF PERSONAL PROPERTY BY REASON OF HOSTILITIES IN KOREA

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States and others, who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of the outbreak of hostilities in Korea (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPAYMENT CONTRACT NEGOTIATED WITH IRRIGATION DISTRICTS COMPRISING THE OWYHEE FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, IDAHO-OREGON

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the irrigation districts comprising the Owyhee Federal reclamation project, Idaho-Oregon, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPAYMENT CONTRACT NEGOTIATED WITH FRENCHTOWN IRRIGATION DISTRICT, MONTANA

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Frenchtown Irrigation District, Montana, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPAYMENT CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED WITH MALTA AND GLASGOW IRRIGATION DISTRICTS

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Malta Irrigation District and the Glasgow Irrigation District, to authorize their execution by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MUTUAL AID COMPACT BETWEEN STATES OF ALABAMA AND FLORIDA

A letter from the Director, Civil Defense Department, State of Alabama, transmitting a copy of the Mutual Aid Compact recently entered into between the States of Alabama and Florida (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION (S. REPT. NO. 1040)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the chairman and vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first annual report of that committee, together with a report from each agency performing functions under law, which was ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

H. R. 3937. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), to provide for the operation, management, maintenance, and demolition of federally acquired properties following the acquisition of such properties and before the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No 1042).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S 2169 A bill authorizing the acquisition by the Secretary of the Interior of the Gila Pueblo, in Globe County, Ariz., for archaeological laboratory and storage purposes, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1043).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H R. 4288. A bill granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Sabine River by the States of Texas and Louisiana; without amendment (Rept. No 1044).

By Mr. ECTON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H R. 3838. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Joseph Pickett; without amendment (Rept. No. 1045);

H R. 3840. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Laura A. Craig; without amendment (Rept. No. 1046);

H. R 4219 A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Milliken; without amendment (Rept. No. 1047);

H R 4351. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Ursula Rutherford Ollinger; without amendment (Rept. No. 1048); and

H. R. 4352. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary Rutherford Spearson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1049).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 1005. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for bailing hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material; without amendment (Rept. No. 1050);

H. R. 2490. A bill to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotic laws, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1051);

H. R. 3590. A bill relating to the income-tax treatment of gain realized on an involuntary conversion of property; with amendments (Rept. No. 1052); and

H. R. 4948. A bill to suspend certain import duties on lead; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1053).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Public Works:

H. R. 4055. A bill to authorize for an additional 1-year period the use of rivers and harbors appropriations for maintenance of the canal from Cape May Harbor to Delaware Bay and the railroad and highway bridges over such canal; without amendment (Rept. No. 1054).

DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1041)

Mr. McMAHON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, submitted, pursuant to Public Law 585, Seventy-ninth Congress, a report on the development and control of atomic energy, which was ordered to be printed.

PROGRESS REPORT ON PROBLEMS OF DOMESTIC LAND AND WATER TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRICKER (S. REPT. NO. 1039)

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a short statement at this time in regard to the submission to the Senate of a progress report on the domestic land and water transportation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Ohio may proceed.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I have been authorized by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to submit to the Senate a progress report of the Domestic Land and Water Transportation Subcommittee of that group, pursuant to the extensive hearings held during the Eighty-first Congress under the authority of Senate Resolution 50.

I know that public comment on this report, particularly from the transportation industry, will reflect the controversies which now exist in the industry. There are few subjects in this report which could reasonably be called noncontroversial. On the other hand, in my judgment, there is no more important work being performed by your Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee than its consideration of these problems in the transportation industry.

I want to emphasize that the report I am offering is only a progress report. Many areas of our study need further consideration; in many areas there is new evidence to be adduced. By and large, however, Mr. President, the conclusions to which the subcommittee has already come, on the basis of our extended hearings, have not been shaken by the evidence of the past several months. I can assure the Members of the Senate that those of us who participated in this study will make every effort to insure that this study is a continuing one, and that changing circumstances and changing facts will be given due consideration as we progress further.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of this study to the transportation industry. I have received notice from trade organization, including shippers' organizations, that policy formulation in and among those groups is awaiting the development of congressional action. Particularly at a time of national crisis, it is of primary importance that we give early consideration to the strengthening of our national transportation structure.

There are very few Members of this body who will recall, of personal experience, the last such comprehensive survey of the transportation industry made by a committee of the Congress. It would not be far from the truth to say, Mr. President, that no earlier investigation has been as thorough, as far reaching, or as productive of fact as has the investigation conducted under Senate Resolution 50. I want to take this opportunity to extend my appreciation and the appreciation of the subcommittee to those witnesses who assisted us, by their candid testimony during the course of the hearings, in providing such a splendid record. I would be remiss if I did not also express my appreciation, and the appreciation of the subcommittee, to the members of the staff of the subcommittee whose long hours of work are responsible for this progress report.

I shall not delay the Senate with any lengthy review of the contents of the progress report. I am hopeful that every Member of the Senate will find an opportunity, during the approaching adjournment, to read the report critically. I feel confident the Members of the Senate will find it worth while.

I do, however, Mr. President, want to point out that we have confined ourselves to the study of domestic surface transportation. Within that field, we have attempted to delineate the relationships between and among the Federal Government, State regulatory agencies, and rail, motor, and water carriers. We have sought to bring out, in one document, the complex regulatory history of the transportation industry, and the processes by which it has evolved into the patchwork Interstate Commerce Act. We have sought, too, to trace the birth and development of the keen competition existing in the industry Most important, in my judgment, this report seeks to develop the extent of the inconsistency and inequality occasioned in the industry by this conflict of archaic regulation and modern competition.

We have tried, too, to point out, in general, what steps the Congress and the Interstate Commerce Commission can and should take to establish or restore a true equality of Federal regulation, under the wise principles of the Federal transportation policy. We believe that the measures we have recommended will help to lend new vitality and vision to the transportation industry. In some cases, the remedies recommended may seem drastic, but we are convinced that strong measures are necessary if the industry is to survive as a free element in a free economy.

Finally, let me point out that it is not for the industry's sake alone that we are concerned. The lifeblood of the Nation flows through the veins and arteries which are our national transportation system. Impeding that flow are ancient and unrealistic regulatory strictures and superstitions. The measures we prescribe in this report are intended to relieve these artificial pressures, to the benefit of our national economy and security.

It has been urged that, in a time when national defense is and should be our paramount interest, the correction of the ills of the transportation industry could well afford to be postponed. I do not share that view. In my judgment, our national security may depend in large measure upon the efficiency and the vigor of the transportation industry. It is not too early to correct the inequalities which pervade Federal regulation of transportation. Let us only hope it is not too late.

Mr. President, I am quite confident that at the coming session of the Congress several bills will be introduced to carry out the recommendations of the subcommittee, in the light of the facts which have been adduced. I hope that as a result of filing this report and having it printed at this time, Members of the Senate may be enabled to read the record and report of the committee, and give adequate consideration to these very important matters when they come before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

Mr. O'CONOR subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr BRICKER] submitted a report relating to the problems of the domestic land and water transportation industry. I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared on that subject matter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR O'CONOR

I feel that the report on domestic land and water transportation which the junior Senator from Ohio, Mr BRICKER, has submitted to the Senate merits much more than passing attention from our colleagues. The amount of time and effort which has gone into the assembling and evaluation of the material from which this report has resulted represents a most significant addition to the many efforts already put forth toward the solution of the problems faced by our national transportation system

More than that I believe that in the selection of pertinent data and in the judicious and balanced approach to the subject, this report provides a valuable basis for some much-needed legislation in the field of transportation. I am pleased to assure our colleagues that the time they spend reading this report will be spent profitably, and I commend it to them

The report springs directly from Senate Resolution 50, which was adopted on April 11, 1949. It directed the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make a full and complete study and investigation of the national transportation system. It also contained a mandate to determine: "(a) whether existing conditions conform to the national transportation policy as declared in the Interstate Commerce Act, and (b) the effect of large expenditures of public moneys and private capital upon transportation charges and to what extent such expenditures are reflected in costs of production and prices to consumers."

One of the results of Senate Resolution 50 was the creation of the Subcommittee on Domestic Land and Water Transportation. Since April 1949 the subcommittee has been engaged in a broad, general study of this field of transportation to ascertain the extent to which the following objectives of

national transportation policy have been achieved

(a) Fair and impartial regulations;

(b) Sound economic conditions in transportation and among the several carriers;

(c) The establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services; and

(d) The development of a national transportation system adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the Nation, of the postal service, and of the national defense.

Two and one-half years have gone into the study of domestic land and water transportation in the light of these objectives This report, by discussing the high lights, the changes, the weak points and trouble spots in our national transportation system, becomes the most up-to-date study of the subject available. It has added significance, too, in that it appears at a time when the national economy—so deeply dependent on its transportation facilities—settles more firmly into this unique economic era, the period of long-range, partial mobilization. Because it is unique, new and different strains are being placed on all segments of our economy, thus necessitating an even greater knowledge and understanding of the workings of this vast and complex economic system This report, I believe, provides a great deal of this much-needed knowledge, and the key to a greater understanding, of our Nation's economic blood stream: its transportation system.

Without undertaking to endorse various proposals referred to in the report and with an entirely open mind on the subject matter, I nevertheless urge our colleagues to give thought and attention to the important questions involved in the report which can well serve as a basis of discussion henceforth

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S 2307 A bill for the relief of Holger Kubischke; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr MURRAY:

S 2308 A bill for the relief of Socorro Gerona de Castro; and

S 2309 A bill for the relief of Musa Eid M. Abdes Salam, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr THYE·

S 2310 A bill to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

S 2311 A bill for the relief of Marie-Antoinette Kerssenbrock, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr BRICKER (for himself and Mr TAFT)

S 2312 A bill for the relief of Col Justin W Harding, USAR, to the Committee on Armed Services

By Mr O'CONOR.

S 2313 A bill for the relief of Hsieh Ta-Chuan or Der Ott-Kuan; and

S 2314 A bill for the relief of Lui Ming Choi, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr GREEN·

S 2315 A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 with respect to assisting or certifying the construction of plants or other facilities not located in areas of substantial labor surplus; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr GREEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER (for Mr. TAFT):

S. 2316. A bill for the relief of Elisabeta Drugoci; and

S. 2317. A bill for the relief of Mrs Lula J. Brooks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2318. A bill to establish a Columbia Basin Account and for other purposes;

S. 2319 A bill to establish a Columbia Basin Account and for other purposes; and

S. 2320. A bill to provide the basis for authorization of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam; to provide for financial assistance thereto from power revenues, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr MAGNUSON (by request) (for himself and Mr HUMPHREY)

S 2321 A bill for the relief of Winston Bros. Co and The Utah Construction Co.; Roy L Bair & Co and James Crick & Sons; J A Terteling & Sons, Inc; and T E Connolly, Inc; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. MARTIN)

S 2322 A bill prohibiting the manufacture or use of the character "Smokey Bear" by unauthorized persons, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr KNOWLAND:

S 2323 A bill for the relief of Prospero Honore Latour and his wife, Maria Luisa Lee Latour, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 2324 A bill to amend the law relating to the disposition of wages and effects of deceased seamen in order to require that such wages and effects must be delivered to a legal personal representative of the deceased only when they exceed one thousand dollars in value; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

By Mr HUMPHREY:

S 2325 A bill to create in the Department of Labor a Bureau of Accident Prevention for the purpose of promoting and maintaining safe and healthful conditions of employment in industries affecting commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading)

By Mr SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr HILL)

S 2326 A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, water conservation, and allied purposes, to the Committee on Public Works

By Mr HENDRICKSON (for himself and Mr SMITH of New Jersey).

S 2327 A bill providing for the reconveyance to the Town of Morristown of certain land included within the Morristown National Historical Park, in the State of New Jersey, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

By Mr LEHMAN·

S 2328 A bill for the relief of Jawad Hedayaty, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr RUSSELL by request)·

S 2329 A bill to amend section 62 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat 198), as amended (32 U S C, 1946 ed, sec 4c), to include the Virgin Islands, to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr MURRAY:

S J Res 110 Joint resolution to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, into methods for its prevention and control and for recovery of critical materials from atmospheric contaminants, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

(See the remarks of Mr MURRAY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION OF PLANTS NOT LOCATED IN AREAS OF LABOR SURPLUS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 with respect to assisting or certifying the construction of plants or other facilities not located in areas of substantial labor surplus. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

The bill (S. 2315) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 with respect to assisting or certifying the construction of plants or other facilities not located in areas of substantial labor surplus, introduced by Mr. Green, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr GREEN. Mr President, a serious unemployment situation exists in certain areas of the country which possess highly developed productive facilities. Insofar as practicable, the responsible executive agencies should administer the vast economic powers which Congress has given them so as to mitigate rather than accentuate the human and material dislocations existing in a depressed economic area Before the Government encourages by way of loans or tax treatment further economic expansion in any area it shall give careful consideration to the employment situation both in that area and also in other areas

This bill provides that no loans shall be made by the Government for the construction or expansion of plant capacity, and no certification for purposes of section 124A of the Internal Revenue Code shall be made in respect to any such construction or expansion, unless the Secretary of Labor shall determine that such construction or expansion is consistent with a sound policy of fully utilizing the available labor supply of the Nation, and reducing the incidence of unemployment in areas where there exists a substantial labor surplus. The Secretary of Labor in making this determination is directed to consider, among other things, whether the plant to be constructed or expanded will produce goods which could be produced in ample supply by fully utilizing productive facilities in areas of substantial labor surplus.

It is to be hoped that during the recess the committee to which this bill is referred will take whatever steps are possible to facilitate its early consideration in the next session

BUREAU OF ACCIDENT PREVENTION IN LABOR DEPARTMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to create in the Department of Labor a Bureau of Accident Prevention for the purpose of promoting and maintaining safe and healthful conditions of employment in industries affecting commerce, and for other purposes I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanatory statement by me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2325) to create in the Department of Labor a Bureau of Accident Prevention for the purpose of promoting and maintaining safe and healthful conditions of employment in industries

affecting commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The explanatory statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Around the clock one American worker is killed or crippled on the job every 4 minutes; one is injured every 16 seconds. This totals nearly 2,000,000 occupational injuries every year

Instead of improving the record we lost ground last year; 15,500 were killed in 1950—500 more than in 1949. The 1950 total of 1,950,000 injuries was an increase of 100,000 over the 1949 total.

The increase in industrial fatalities and lost-time injuries outran the increase in employment, industrial fatalities increased from 26 per 100,000 workers in 1949 to 27 per 100,000 workers in 1950; injuries increased from 3,250 per 100,000 workers in 1949 to 3,360 per 100,000 workers in 1950.

Figures for 1951 forecast another 4 percent increase in work injuries over 1950.

We are slipping backward in the race for industrial health and safety.

Most of this bloodshed, tragedy for individuals and families, and loss of earning and productive power is unnecessary. It can be stopped. Experience shows that 90 percent of all occupational injuries and illnesses can be prevented.

Industrial health and safety work got underway shortly after 1916, when the establishment of workmen's compensation laws supplied cash reasons for guarding machinery and guarding workers against hazards from machinery, materials, dusts, fumes, gases, and other unhealthy and dangerous working conditions

We have had voluntary health and safety work. We have had compulsory health and safety work, enforced by State labor departments, industrial commissions, and similar agencies They have done much good, more in some States than in others, but have been held back everywhere by the argument that employers could not afford to invest too much in safety because they were in competition with other employers not required by conscience or statute to make similar investments. So we have allowed interstate competition in workers' health and lives to continue year after year.

Today, as I will show later in my remarks, industrial accidents and disease cause the loss of six times as many man-days a year as do industrial disputes.

We have recognized that industrial disputes affect and obstruct interstate commerce. We have enacted laws to improve labor-management relations so as to reduce the number and duration of strikes and lockouts by providing for the extension of the principles of democracy to industry, in the freedom of workers to organize and to bargain collectively through unions of their own choosing. Every year millions of words and miles of newsprint are used in publicizing the losses of man-days because of industrial disputes.

Yet, except among the workers, their families, some managements, safety workers, and social-service workers, who know the true cost of lost earning power resulting from industrial accidents and disease, this appalling and largely preventable toll upon our productive strength and individual happiness is too much taken for granted and allowed to pass unnoticed. How many Americans, how many reporters and editors, how many Members of Congress know that industrial accidents and disease, 90 percent preventable, cause six times as much lost time in production as do industrial disputes?

Mr. President, 2 years ago I introduced a bill intended to take the lives and health of workers out of interstate competition by creating machinery for the establishment and enforcement of uniform Federal industrial health and safety standards.

In my opinion, such action is justified and overdue. Workers and their organizations are justified in being impatient with the slow and uneven progress in the improvement of State health and safety laws and enforcement, held back as they are by the plea that no single State can afford to be too humane, too careful of workers' health and lives, lest the lower costs of operation in other less safety-conscious States induce employers to migrate to those States.

I have today reintroduced this bill, amended to cover all workers engaged in production for or affecting interstate commerce. My bill would establish in the Department of Labor a Bureau of Accident Prevention for the purpose of promoting and maintaining safe and healthful conditions in industry.

I intend further to propose to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare a special investigation and study of the interrelated subject of workmen's compensation.

I want to discuss briefly the need for this bill. A major contributing factor to industrial hazards and occupational diseases is the crazy quilt of laws on industrial health and safety, varying from State to State. This lack of Nation-wide standards encourages disastrous competition between the various jurisdictions, with the life and health of workers as the pawns. The very same employers who insist on leaving the problem with the respective States argue to the State legislatures that they cannot agree to improved health and safety standards because their competitors in States having lower standards would then enjoy lower costs of production. A piecemeal, State-by-State approach will continue to condemn thousands of workers to death, disablement, and serious injury that could be prevented by the adoption and enforcement of Federal health and safety standards.

The individual person is the most important asset our country has We can no longer be patient under the steady toll levied annually on the American workers by killing or crippling accidents or occupational diseases.

Why are 15,500 of our people killed each year while at work? Why must 85,000 suffer permanent disablements? Others total disablement for life? How long are we going to leave this trail of broken lives, family and community suffering, and hardship?

In these trying days, our country can ill afford to lose 45,000,000 man-days of production while striving to keep freedom alive in the world. These direct annual production losses are equal to a work force of 150,000 men idle for an entire year. This is the same as closing down one-third of our automobile plants for a year—or one-fourth of our steel mills. The picture is really much worse than this. The National Safety Council says that if we count the indirect losses, it would be the equivalent of a work force of 760,000 men idle for an entire year. We can't afford this loss of production at any time, much less at a time when we are facing the peril of world-wide communism. The bear behind the iron curtain must be licking his chops as he peers over the curtain and watches his ace ally—industrial injuries—go about the industrial plants in our country doing his bloody job.

Industry loses $3,500,000,000 per year because of these unnecessary injury costs. It seems to me that industry should be anxious to do everything necessary to wipe out this unwarranted loss.

What about labor? Workers are the chief losers from job-connected injuries and sicknesses Even after workmen's compensation is paid, American workers lose more than $1,500,000,000 in wages per year. This also means a loss of skills and a waste of manpower and production. Both capital and labor suffer a monetary loss. But nothing can ever make up for the suffering and misery that must be borne by the worker and his family.

Employers, industries, and States who really want to do more to promote and maintain workers' health and safety and to provide more nearly adequate compensation payments for deaths and disabilities resulting from accidents and disease incurred on the job are slowed down because—

First. We do not have uniform standards of health and safety;

Second We do not have uniform enforcement of such standards as now exist; and

Third. We do not have uniform workmen's compensation payments and workmen's compensation insurance charges.

As was stated by my cosponsor in the House on the occasion of introducing the original bill 2 years ago, it is high time that we act to take workers' lives, workers' health, and workers' disability payments out of competition as between plant and plant, industry and industry, State and State. Fair competition requires this action.

This bill is proposed to make a beginning by bringing industry under uniform health and safety codes and under uniform enforcement.

It would not cover agriculture, where most of the shockingly large numbers of fatal accidents and disabling accidents are suffered by farmers themselves and members of their families

The bill would avoid duplication of State labor departments' work in the field by authorizing the Secretary of Labor to make agreements with State and local agencies for the enforcement of the health and safety codes to be set up under the act. But the standards in those codes shall be uniform and their enforcement would be uniform

Freed from the blood- and tear-stained unfair competition that now prevails, we can quickly set new highs in safety and new lows in industrial deaths and disabilities. We can take much of the blood and tears and some of the sweat out of hazardous industries. Thereby we can add greatly to our productive strength, our national welfare and the happiness of the millions of families who today are subjected to the shock of injury or death of the principal wage earner.

There is a need for Federal standards of health and safety. When a citizen of Ohio and a citizen of Georgia, or Texas, or California, or Tennessee, or Oregon, or New York are given passports for travel abroad, they are given the identical assurances of the protection of the Government of the United States. The same parity which they enjoy abroad should be assured to them at home and on the job, certainly in the matter of protection against industrial accidents and disease and in the matter of compensation for death or disability accidents.

Those who are aware of the facts are impatient with the uneven progress of improving State laws and with the unfair competition argument that meets every attempt to improve standards State by State. This does not mean that labor, conscientious employers and other citizens of good will are going to, or that they should, relax their efforts to get improvement in State laws, standards, and enforcement. The fight for industrial health and safety should be continued on both the State and Federal fronts.

In proposing this bill for the creation of uniform Federal health and safety standards in industry and for their uniform enforcement, I am not opposing grants-in-aid to State labor departments to assist them in promoting industrial health and safety. That is needed. But, in my judgment, it does not go far enough. It would help. But it would not meet adequately and in time the problem of unfair competition that is now a drag upon all our efforts to reduce

the shocking toll of industrial fatalities and disabling accidents.

Before giving a short description of this bill I have introduced, let me state some reasons why such action is justified and, in my opinion, is long overdue.

Increased employment and intensified activities from 1949 to 1950 in construction and manufacturing do not wholly account for an increase of approximately 12 percent in the volume of work injuries in each of these industries

The public utilities industry was the only one to show a major decrease in the number of injuries. There was a slight decrease of injuries in the telephone employment and a substantial drop in other communications industries Most of the decrease in injuries, however, can be attributed to an improvement in the injury record for most divisions of the utilities industry.

The other industry groups showed little change or only minor increases in the number of injuries. Within the transportation group of industries, however, railroads showed a modest decrease in work injuries

The total volume of disabling work injuries in 1950 was estimated at about 1,952,000, an increase of 82,000 over 1949.

Approximately 15,500 persons died as a result of work injuries encountered during 1950. An additional 84,900 suffered some permanent impairment, such as the amputation of some body member or the impairment of which the disability was serious enough to completely incapacitate the persons for any gainful employment for the remainder of their lives. The main bulk of the injuries (95 percent), however, resulted in temporary disability which incapacitated the workers for one full day or more but from which the injured persons recovered without any permanent ill effects

Approximately 40,000,000 man-days were lost during the year as a result of injuries which occurred in 1950. This is equivalent to a year's full-time employment for approximately 134,000 workers If additional allowance is made for the future effects of the deaths and permanent physical impairments, the total economic time loss would amount to about 230,000,000 man-days—or a year's full-time employment for about 760,000 workers. This is about six times as much time as was lost during the year because of strikes. Only 38,842,000 man days of production were lost in 1950 in work stoppage—0.42 percent of the work time available, while 2 5 percent of the work time available was lost because of work injuries

It is of tragic significance that while this and other Congresses have spent many hundreds of man-years in the consideration of so-called labor legislation relating to strikes and industrial disputes, it has spent almost no time on the problem of reducing the shocking total of industrial deaths and injuries which, each year, bring tragedy and hardship into millions of American homes, and, speaking in cold-blooded economic terms, reduce our industrial production far more than it is reduced by strikes. I suggest that we strike a healthy balance between attention to strikes and attention to the problem of industrial health and safety.

I insert at this point in my remarks a summary table giving the estimated number of disabling injuries during 1950, by industry groups, taken from the BLS study, Work Injuries in the United States During 1950·

TABLE I.—*Estimated number of disabling work injuries during 1950, by industry group (preliminary)*

Industry group	All disabilities		Fatalities		Permanent disabilities		Temporary total disabilities	
	Total [1]	To employees	Total [1]	To employees	Total [1]	To employees	Total [1]	To employees
All groups [2]	1,952,000	1,483,000	15,500	[3] 11,100	84,100	65,100	1,851,600	1,406,000
Agriculture [4]	340,000	60,000	4,300	1,100	15,600	3,700	320,100	55,200
Mining and quarrying [5]	72,000	67,000	1,000	900	3,200	3,000	67,800	63,100
Construction [6]	205,000	159,000	2,300	1,800	8,500	6,600	194,200	150,600
Manufacturing [7]	420,000	419,000	2,600	2,500	21,700	21,400	401,700	395,100
Public utilities	24,000	24,000	300	300	600	600	23,100	23,100
Trade [8]	335,000	268,000	1,500	1,200	8,100	6,700	325,400	260,300
Transportation [9]	177,000	155,000	1,300	1,200	9,800	8,700	165,900	145,100
Finance, service, Government, and miscellaneous industries [2 6]	373,000	331,000	2,200	2,100	17,400	15,400	353, 00	313,500

[1] Differences between total number of injuries and injuries to employees represent injuries to self-employed and unpaid family workers

[2] Does not include domestic servants

[3] Includes approximately 1,600 permanent total disabilities

[4] The total number of injuries in agriculture is based on cross-section surveys made by U. S Department of Agriculture in 1947–48. These are considered to be minimum figures, injuries experienced in performing chores are excluded, also, there are some indications of underreporting. The breakdown of agricultural injuries by extent of disability is based on other sources

[5] Based largely on U S Bureau of Mines data.

[6] Based on small sample studies

[7] Based on comprehensive survey.

[8] Data for railroads are based on Interstate Commerce Commission reports, data for other transportation are based on small sample surveys.

The highest frequency rate among the manufacturing industries was 92.1 for logging. Sawmills had a rate of 67.8, and combination saw and planing mills, a rate of 40 8. Other industries with excessively high rates included iron foundries, 30 7; structural clay products, 31.8; planing mills, 41.5; and wooden containers, 36.2.

I now include at this point in my remarks a short description of the bill:

SECTION I. THE ENACTING CLAUSE

Describes the bill as the Accident Prevention Act of 1951.

SECTION II. FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

The Congress finds and declares that unsafe and unhealthful conditions of employment in industry engaged in the production of goods for commerce or in any other activity affecting interstate and foreign commerce, burdens and obstructs such commerce and the free flow thereof, first, through unfair competition between products produced under unsafe and unhealthful conditions with products produced under safe and healthful conditions of employment; second, through use of commerce and its channels and instrumentalities to promote such unfair competition, thereby spreading unsafe and unhealthful conditions among the workers in industries in the several States and "due to the facility with which hazardous operations may be moved from one State to another with the result that regulation and control under State laws describing safe and healthful conditions of employment are not reasonably effective means of eliminating such conditions; and, third, through leading to strikes, labor disputes, and other forms of industrial unrest" Unsafe and unhealthful conditions of employment in industries burden the Nation as a whole, thereby impairing the general welfare.

The policy of this act is "to establish means for ascertaining the existence of harmful and deleterious conditions and develop remedial devices, processes and safeguards, for promoting the utilization thereof and developing and promulgating for industries safety and health codes having the force of law.'

SECTION IV BUREAU OF ACCIDENT PREVENTION

The Bureau of Accident Prevention is to be under the direction of a Director of Accident Prevention, appointed by the Secretary of Labor. The Director shall be a person equipped by technical education or practical experience in the field of industrial health and safety engineering and in practical administration.

The duty of the Bureau and its Director is, first, technical investigation into conditions of employment in industries for the purpose of improving the health, safety, and general well-being of the employees therein; second, to develop reasonable standards of safe and healthy operations, and for the prevention and correction of industrial hazards; and to promote the acceptance by employers and workers of standards developed by the Bureau.

SECTION V. ACCIDENT PREVENTION BOARDS

An accident prevention board shall be established for each industry. It shall consist of nine members to be appointed by the Secretary of Labor, four to represent employers in each industry, four to represent workers in each such industry, and one member representing the public who shall be designated chairman. The Director and Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, are to be ex officio members, without vote. Board members are to receive no salary but are to receive a reasonable per diem and necessary expenses.

SECTION VI RULE-MAKING POWER

The boards shall make and modify rules and regulations "for the elimination of unsafe and unhealthful conditions, including the prevention of accidents and occupational diseases in industries and for the construction, repair, inspection, and maintenance of establishments in such industries and for the instruction of employees thereof, in accordance with reasonable standards in health and safety therein"

The boards shall set such standards upon "the basis of substantial evidence presented at a public hearing."

In making such findings the boards shall consider, first, causes of accidents and industrial and occupational diseases, second, the testing of new materials, machinery, devices, and methods for health and safety prior to use in production; third, the effectiveness of particular equipment, devices, processes, plant lay-outs, lighting systems, heating and ventilation, and inspection and instruction in prevention of accidents and diseases; and fourth, standards and operations in industries which do maintain reasonably safe and healthful conditions of employment.

No rule or amendment is to be effective unless approved by the Secretary of Labor and published in the Federal Register and elsewhere as required by law.

The Secretary of Labor, the Director, and upon petition, any group of 50 or more persons shall have the right to propose to the boards such rules and amendments as they may deem necessary to carry out the act.

SECTION VII

Provides for hearings and court review of rules and regulations.

SECTION VIII. INVESTIGATIONS, WITNESSES

The Secretary of Labor and the Board are to be given authority to require the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents for the purpose of any hearing or investigation provided for in the act.

SECTION IX. RIGHT OF ENTRY, UTILIZATION OF STATE AGENCIES

The Secretary of Labor, the director or any designated officers or agent of the Department of Labor is authorized to enter and inspect "such places and such records, question such employees, and investigate such facts, conditions, practices, or matters as they may deem necessary or appropriate to determine whether any person has violated any provision of this act, or which may aid in the enforcement of the provision of this act."

The Secretary of Labor may utilize the services of State and local agencies, with the consent and cooperation of State agencies, reimbursing such agencies and their employees for services rendered under the act.

SECTION X. PROHIBITED ACTS

It shall be unlawful for any person to fail to comply with the act or any rule or regulation issued pursuant to section 6 or to interfere with, impede, or obstruct the Secretary of Labor, the director, the boards or any of their designated representatives in the performance of official duties under the act. Any person who willfully violates this section shall, upon conviction, be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or both. Imprisonment is limited to second and subsequent offenses.

SECTION XI. INJUNCTION PROCEEDINGS

The Secretary of Labor shall have the power to appeal to the United States courts for injunctions to restrain violations of this act.

SECTION XII. RELATION TO OTHER LAWS

This act or any rule or regulation thereof shall not excuse noncompliance with any State law or municipal ordinance that is "not inconsistent with the provisions of this act or any rule or regulation issued thereunder."

SECTION XIII. SEPARABILITY

The usual saving provision for the remainder, should any provision of the act or its application thereof be held invalid.

PREVENTION AND CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION AND RECOVERY OF CRITICAL MATERIALS FROM ATMOSPHERIC CONTAMINANTS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, into methods for its prevention and control, and for the recovery of critical materials from atmospheric contaminants, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the joint resolution by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 110) to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, into methods for its prevention and control, and for recovery of critical materials from atmospheric contaminants, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The explanatory statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

I have introduced a joint resolution to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, into methods for its prevention and control, and for the recovery of critical materials from atmospheric contaminants.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to remedy a situation of ever increasing consequence to the health—even the lives—of American people, a condition which also is wasteful of the Nation's assets of wealth and natural resources.

Serious attention to this important national problem is long overdue. It is time we took a more positive attitude toward solution of the problem. Certainly there are means by which air pollution can be brought under control. But before we can formulate regulations for proper precautions and for adequate safeguards, we must be more clearly informed about the many factors involved.

There is need—there is immediate need—for a thorough investigation of this grave national hazard. In the United States Public Health Service and in the Bureau of Mines we have scientists amply qualified to undertake the necessary research. This legislation is planned to implement that research.

I have vivid recollections of my early years in Butte, when smelter smokestacks spewed forth eternal dark clouds laden with poisonous fumes that hid the sun and drifted down to spread injurious chemicals over the earth. I recall our policemen, who patrolled the streets at night with sponges held in place under their nostrils by twine tied in bow knots behind their heads, to protect them from throat and lung irritation. A primitive device, indeed, but have we advanced much further in our fight against injurious elements thrown out into the air in many sections of the country? I am happy to report that in my State, through aid from the Bureau of Mines and cooperation of the mining industry, we are controlling those smelter smoke conditions. There still exist serious evils from other sources. I look to this legislation for completion of the essential task.

But I cannot fail to recall that smoke in Montana. It enveloped everything. It filtered into our homes and school rooms and clung to our furnishings and clothes; it desecrated the countryside, smearing all vegetation and extending even into the nearby farm lands and forests. In those days—and even now, in some localities—the dense smoke from the chimneys of industry constituted an honored badge of a bustling community. A nuisance, yes, but one easily condoned as a recognized symbol of prosperity.

In time we learned better. Damage suits taught us what the nuisance was costing us in damaged property and personal belongings, in defilement of our cities and farms, and destruction of our forests. This damage was estimated in millions of dollars, and smoke regulations just had to be initiated.

But our eyes have been opened all across the country to the real menace of air pollution. In the autumn of 1948 the Donora tragedy shocked the Nation. During the last few days of October, that year, death and disaster struck from the skies at Donora, a little Pennsylvania community nestled in the Monongahela Valley. A dense smog pressed down—a thick, smoke-laden fog that blotted out all visibility. From Wednesday till Sunday, not the slightest breeze stirred to dispel the strangling horror. Thousands fell ill. The local physicians worked unceasingly. The hospitals, fire department, and the Red Cross chapter assisted. The number of deaths rose to 20. Out of a population of less than 14,000, almost 6,000 were seriously affected.

Frantic calls for help were phoned to the United States Public Health Service from the Donora Borough Council, the Pennsylvania State Health Department, and the CIO Steelworkers' Union. In response, the Public Health Service immediately dispatched to the scene a field team of investigators from its Division of Industrial Hygiene, now known as the Division of Occupational Health.

This group of scientists conducted a study to ascertain the cause of the occurrence and to obtain information to prevent its happening again. That study was the most exhaustive ever undertaken of an air pollution problem, for it encompassed not only the cause of the deaths in that tragedy but also consideration of the serious effects on health.

Donora presented a case of overwhelming concentration of smog. But what about the effects of lesser concentrations of polluted air—the sort breathed in for years on end, day and night, hour after hour? How is that condition affecting the health of our people in highly industrialized areas? We must take steps to find out. For one of the most depressing circumstances of the Donora episode is the fact that the people there attached no significance whatever to the preliminary symptoms of their illness. To them, smarting eyes, running noses, sore throats, dry coughs—all such discomforts—were accepted as ordinary conditions of their daily lives—as merely the customary annoyances from dirty smoke. It was not until breathing became too difficult to bear, until they dropped in their tracks—at work, at home, in the streets—that there was real alarm. They were ill long before they knew it.

In submitting his report on Donora, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service observed:

"The Donora report has completely confirmed two beliefs we held at the outset of our investigation. It has shown with great clarity how little fundamental knowledge exists regarding the possible effects of atmospheric pollution on health. Secondly, Donora has emphasized how long-range and complex is this job of overcoming the problem of air pollution. * * *

"Our first step now, of course, is immediate basic research. We need to investigate, for instance, what long-range effect continued low concentrations of polluted air has on the health of individuals—not only healthy individuals, but those with chronic diseases, and the aged and children. We know nothing about the indirect effect of air pollution on persons with diseases other than those of the respiratory tract. We also need immediate research into another indisputable effect of air pollution; its ability to shut out some of the healthful rays of the sun.

"When we find the answers to all of these unknowns, we can proceed to the problem of eliminating the causes."

It is 3 years ago this month since the catastrophe which occasiond that report. How much longer will the Surgeon General's recommendations remain unheeded?

Recommendations from other sources point to a further reason for early attention to the problem. We must curb the practice of permitting escape, through industrial smokestacks, of materials which are vitally needed in our present national preparedness program We just cannot afford the waste of these critical substances.

It may seem, at first thought, that only minute quantities go up the flue—that there can be no substantial leakage. But the opposite is true; the total loss is enormous. For example, thousands of tons of sulfur are being discharged into the atmosphere. Sulfur is one of the most important elements used in industry, and there is definitely a potential shortage of sulfur in the United States.

In recent years, engineers have developed means for removing and collecting the sulfur from stack gases, so that it is economically feasible for some industries to make a profit through conversion of sulfur dioxide gas into sulfuric acid or elemental sulfur. This is routine in certain plants, such as those of the petroleum industry in California. Further research should reveal means for rcapturing much more of it from other industrial processes.

It is well known that valuable metals, such as beryllium, titanium, magnesium, manganese, and others are found in the general atmosphere over most large industrial areas. It is also known that these metals are discharged—with other minerals—from industrial operations. Certainly further research is indicated here, so that these elements can be recovered before they literally go up in smoke

But the primary urgency of this legislation is the security of the people's health. Until quite recently, illness and deaths attributable to atmospheric conditions have been written off as caused by an act of God—as inevitable. Such incidents were classed with occurrences which could not be foreseen or guarded against—like tidal waves and tempests. But God has granted us reasoning powers and tne gift of developing them As our knowledge grows, so our responsibilities increase. We know now that air pollution can be prevented. It is no longer pardonable for us to hold God alone answerable for the suffering and the damage and the deaths from contamination of the air we breathe. We know now that we are accountable.

This legislation acknowledges that fact and undertakes to remedy such dangerous conditions.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO COORDINATE REFUGEE RELIEF

Mr. KNOWLAND (for Mr. NIXON, himself, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. IVES, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. BENNETT) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 227), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas a large number of refugees from Russia and other countries behind the iron curtain have escaped to Western Europe, anxious to free themselves from Soviet tyranny and constituting a potentiality of valuable citizenry in the free world, and

Whereas escapees from Czechoslovakia presently have been placed at Nuremberg, under the western Germany economy which is not adequately equipped to care for these escapees indefinitely; and

Whereas the Czechoslovak escapees from the so-called freedom train, are illustrative of the trust imposed in us and other free peoples by millions still under totalitarian rule; and

Whereas several slave laborers recently escaped from Czech uranium mines, after rebelling against Soviet atom production, and after learning of opportunities in free Europe; and

Whereas a genuine interest in the lives and future welfare of these unfortunate fellow members of the human race has been manifested by the great majority of the citizens of this Republic; and

Whereas free peoples should encourage and promote the preservation and enjoyment of the God-given rights of man to live in freedom from tyranny of the body and spirit, as opposed to those forces which would enslave and suppress those rights; and

Whereas many underpopulated areas of the world which either are benefiting or may benefit in the future from the point 4 program, would benefit from immigration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That (a) there is hereby established a special committee to be known as the Special Committee to Coordinate Refugee Relief (hereinafter referred to as the "committee"), to be composed of 13 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, one of whom he shall designate as chairman Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made. The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a thorough and complete study, survey, and investigation of ways and means to assist worthy refugees from European Communist countries, to make recommendations for the coordination (1) of the activities of the various agencies of the Government having responsibilities with respect to the care, rehabilitation, and immigration of such refugees, (2) of the activities of those agencies of the Government having responsibilities with respect to the enlisting and integrating of such refugees in or with the forces of the democratic nations in the cold war, and (3) of the activities of all agencies of the Government exercising any responsibilities with respect to such refugees, within their respective spheres and with each other; and to obtain and report all facts in relation to the foregoing which would assist the Congress in enacting remedial legislation as required, and be of public interest

(b) The committee shall report to the Senate from time to time the results of its study, survey, and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable

(c) For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate during the Eighty-second Congress, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to request such information from any departments and agencies of the Government; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $——, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

(d) All authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate on——.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930 RELATING TO FREE IMPORTATION OF TWINE FOR USE IN CERTAIN CASES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BENTON (for himself and Mr. MCMAHON) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 1005) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

WILLIAM E. GILLESPIE, JR.—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3898) for the relief of William E. Gillespie, Jr., and that it be referred to the Committee on Finance. The Committee on Finance has before it a companion Senate bill, S. 756.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INTERNATIONAL DISARMAMENT—ADDITIONAL SPONSORS OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 42

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I have been asked by the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] that his name be included among those of the sponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 42, having to do with disarmament, and I ask unanimous consent that his name be included.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there is a rule, designed to save money, providing that after a bill or resolution is once printed with the names of the sponsors it cannot be reprinted to add the names of other sponsors. To reprint a measure because the name of another sponsor is added involves additional expense. Does the Senator from Vermont understand that?

Mr. FLANDERS. I would suggest, then, that it is my thought that the name be added only when the concurrent resolution is reprinted for committee purposes, but I wish to have the additional names which I have given from time to time go into the RECORD.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is entirely satisfactory, so long as an actual reprinting of the concurrent resolution is not required

Mr. FLANDERS. I did not contemplate that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONTROL OF INSTALLMENT CREDIT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

Mr CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] relating to control of installment credit.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

Recently the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board said that the volunteer program to curb inflationary loans was so effective as to confound the critics.

In line with that observation, let me comment briefly on a study made recently among low-income families to prove the point that the common sense and the sense of values of the average American family is our greatest bastion of hope in this field.

A conference group on low-income families, which is made up of a number of organizations, made a study of the use of installment credit by 100 families with in-

comes less than $2,000 per year, and found but a single case where credit was misused or mismanaged.

What a record that really is. What a testimony to the good judgment and prudence of the average American family.

It is also a testimony to the American retailer. A decade ago the retailers established the Retail Credit Institute to educate customers against the abuse or unwise use of credit. Recently that organization merged with the National Foundation for Consumer Credit It embraces not only retailers but manufacturers, distributors, bankers, and lending agencies as well Its efforts are directed to the wise use of installment credit. It knows the importance of credit to the well-being of the national economy.

This is the mass-production age The success of mass production depends on mass sales and mass sales require installment credit. What would happen to the production of washers and ironers, motor cars and TV sets, radios and vacuum sweepers, refrigerators and lamps, unless consumers could supply their needs through available credit? The answer is simple. Production would stagnate.

Installment credit enables the humblest of American families to participate in material progress.

It is easy enough for those to whom the comforts of civilization are easily available to criticize a poor family for improvidence because it has acquired some modern gadget to drive away the dreariness of poverty. Let's be careful about casting stones. A TV set in a seemingly impoverished home or a piano in a home where it may seem out of place is a grand adventure. It's more than that. It's a lifter, a morale builder. It can be an answer to spiritual erosion.

Here in Washington, a certain social busybody was scolding because a cab driver's wife bought a piano on the installment plan A check-up by an interested credit man revealed that the driver's wife was a conservatory graduate and that the lilting music of a piano was as important as food. It's the old story of selling bread to buy hyacinths.

And so I conclude that installment credit wisely used is the instrument by which the grand adventure of civilization becomes available to young and old, rich and poor alike. But most important of all is the finding of the conference group that only 1 family in 100 misused or abused it. What an incontrovertible answer this is to the emotional bleeding hearts who would like to lace the country into the strait-jacket of controls.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HENNINGS:

Jackson-Jefferson Day dinner address delivered by the Vice President in St. Louis, Mo., October 6, 1951.

Address on the obligations of citizenship, delivered by Col. John J. Griffin, vice president of the Bank of St. Louis, at Desoto, Mo., on September 25, 1951, under the auspices of the Rotary Club.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Statement prepared by him and excerpt from the pamphlet National Health Service, distributed by the Ministry of Health, Whitehall, England, regarding the dental treatment of school children in England under the British nationalized health services.

Statement prepared by him with regard to the establishment of a National Arts Commission.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Statement by Senator DIRKSEN and letter to Senator DIRKSEN from L. E. Leverone, discussing the Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. IVES):

Address on the subject, The Responsibility of Congress to the Banking System, delivered by William A. Lyon, superintendent of banks of New York and president of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, at the golden anniversary convention of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, St. Louis, Mo., September 27, 1951

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

A summary of the work of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, published in Newsweek magazine, October 22.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Address entitled "The Rochambeau Road," delivered over the radio by Charles Parmer, of the Senate Radio Gallery, on October 19, 1951

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

Article entitled "Dead Ashes of Bright Promises," written by Thomas L. Stokes, and published in the Washington Evening Star of October 19, 1951.

Article entitled "State Department in a Dilemma," written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Evening Star of October 16, 1951.

By Mr JENNER:

Statement of policy by board of directors of Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce relative to withholding of Federal social-security funds from the State of Indiana by the Federal Security Administrator.

By Mr CARLSON:

Editorial entitled "Is There No End to Crookedness?" published in the Haviland (Kans.) Journal of October 12, 1951.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Statement prepared by him on the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Yale University.

By Mr BREWSTER.

An article written by former Senator Albert Wahl Hawkes.

Statement prepared by him entitled "How the New York Times Lost Its Nerve," together with certain correspondence and information relative thereto.

Article entitled "Sound Democrats and Republicans Should Combine for Country's Sake," by James M. Thompson, Gaylord, Clark County, Va.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article describing the success of the city of Hollandale, Minn., in integrating migrant farm-worker families into the community life, published in the August 1951 issue of the Labor Information Bulletin, United States Department of Labor.

Article entitled "The Government in Medicine," written by Dr Max Seham, and recently published in the Reporter.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

A letter received by him under date of September 9, 1951, from Mrs John K. Bangs, of Plainfield, N. J., in regard to the inflation situation.

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF FIRST SESSION OF EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS—DIGEST OF MAJOR LEGISLATION BY SENATOR McFARLAND (S. DOC. NO. 84)

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the legislative record of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, made by me together with a digest of all major legislation passed by the Senate be printed as a Senate document, and also that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD after the final adjournment of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WHERRY AND LEGISLATIVE REVIEW (S. DOC. NO. 85)

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority leader, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, after the final adjournment, a statement by the junior Senator from Nebraska and an accompanying legislative review of the legislative record of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress.

I also ask unanimous consent that the statement by the Senator from Nebraska and the legislative review be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR AND LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS TO SUBMIT REPORTS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the adjournment of the Senate a number of reports of the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations on different phases of collective bargaining, Communist control of certain unions, injunctions, the administrative practices of the National Labor Relations Board, labor relations, manpower, and migratory labor may be filed, accepted, and printed as Senate documents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PUBLICATION OF STATE WELFARE ROLLS—LETTER FROM HENNEPIN COUNTY (MINN.) WELFARE BOARD

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Hennepin County (Minn.) Welfare Board, dated October 9, 1951, expressing concern over the possible effect of the Jenner amendment to the appropriation bill for the Federal Security Agency, be entered in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed, as follows:

HENNEPIN COUNTY WELFARE BOARD,
Minneapolis, Minn., October 9, 1951.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: We wrote to you on June 29, 1951, expressing our concern over the possible effect of the so-called Jenner amendment to the Federal Security Agency's appropriation bill then under consideration which would have permitted Federal financial contributions to States that would choose to publish the names of people unfortunate enough to have to apply for and receive public assistance. That amendment was subsequently dropped from the bill.

Now we are informed that a similar rider has been attached to H. R 2416 by Senators JENNER and DIRKSEN and has been referred to the House Ways and Means Committee.

We should now like to reiterate our opposition to the adoption of this rider which

we feel would cause children and old people to be held up to public ridicule to no good purpose.

Your cooperation in avoiding this backward step would be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

HENNEPIN COUNTY WELFARE BOARD,
RICHARD O HANSON, *Chairman.*
S EARL AINSWORTH.
JENS CHRISTENSEN
GEORGE W MATTHEWS.
I G. SCOTT

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1952.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Chapter I—Legislative branch," on page 1, after line 8, to insert:

Effective January 1, 1952, Public Law 479, Seventy-ninth Congress, under the heading "Contingent expenses of the Senate", paragraph 8, page 7, is amended by striking out the word "fifty" and inserting in lieu thereof "sixty", and by striking out the words "two hundred and fifty" and inserting in lieu thereof "three hundred"

Mr SALTONSTALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Benton	Hill	Millikin
Brewster	Hoey	Monroney
Bricker	Holland	Moody
Bridges	Humphrey	Murray
Butler, Md	Hunt	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	O'Conor
Carlson	Johnson, Tex	O'Mahoney
Case	Johnston, S C.	Pastore
Chavez	Kefauver	Robertson
Connally	Kerr	Russell
Cordon	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Knowland	Schoeppel
Ecton	Langer	Smathers
Ellender	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	Long	Smith, N J.
Flanders	Magnuson	Smith, N C
Frear	Malone	Sparkman
Fulbright	Maybank	Stennis
George	McCarran	Thye
Green	McCarthy	Watkins
Hayden	McClellan	Welker
Hendrickson	McFarland	Williams
Hennings	McKellar	Young
Hickenlooper	McMahon	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr GILLETTE], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr WHERRY] are absent because of illness

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

ALLOCATION OF STEEL FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOLS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, a letter and attached tables which I have received from the Department of Commerce, Office of International Trade, transmitting certain information relative to United States imports and exports of iron and steel products. I feel that the letter and tables will be of interest to those who have been concerned with the lack of adequate steel for school construction

I hope this matter will be reviewed. It shows that steel exports for the calendar year 1950 exceeded 3,200,000 short tons, and that for the first 6 months of this year they were a little more than half of that amount. In the general consideration of the need for additional steel for school construction, I believe that when we compare the allocations of steel during the first quarter of 1952 for all school construction in the United States, which amounted to less than 100,000 tons, the exports in the amounts above stated should be carefully analyzed.

There being no objection, the letter and attached tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE,
Washington, D. C., October 18, 1951.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate, Washington, D C

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: In accordance with the telephone request from your office for information on United States exports and imports of steel in 1950 and January-June 1951, I am enclosing two typewritten tables which show quantity and value of iron and steel-mill products exported and imported. A third table shows exports of steel scrap separately which is included in the data for iron and steel-mill products.

If there is any way in which we can be of further assistance, we shall be glad to know.

Sincerely yours,

LORING K. MACY,
Acting Director.

United States imports of iron- and steel-mill products

Country	Value (1,000 dollars)		1,000 tons of 2,000 pounds	
	1950	January to June 1951	1950	January to June 1951
Total	131,458	191,300	[1] 2,650	[1] 2,247
Canada	24,666	8,567	454	122
Europe, total	101,016	163,296	(2)	(2)
Sweden	5,063	5,497	41	54
United Kingdom	7,614	11,253	80	95
Netherlands	11,887	6,003	351	121
Belgium-Luxemburg	29,255	43,279	457	411
France	17,937	47,947	357	515
Germany	26,268	44,052	585	525
Asia	4,087	13,551	(2)	(2)
Japan	3,315	11,755	131	105
Other areas	1,689	5,886		

[1] Exclusive of iron and steel scrap, imports amounted to 1,912,000 short tons in 1950 and 2,025,000 short tons in January-June 1951

[2] Not compiled, see general note

NOTE Imports from countries other than those shown amounted to 494,000 short tons in 1950 and 418,000 January-June 1951

Prepared in the Department of Commerce, by International Economic Analysis Division, Office of International Trade, from basic data of the Bureau of the Census, October 1951

United States exports [1] and imports [2] of iron and steel scrap

Country	1,000 short tons	
	1950	January to June 1951
Exports, total	217	107
Canada	81	41
Mexico	125	51
Other countries	11	12
Imports, total	738	223
France	155	28
Germany	186	57
Japan	113	30
Canada	64	21
Other countries	220	87

[1] Including reexports.

[2] Imports for consumption.

Prepared in the Department of Commerce by International Economic Analysis Division, Office of International Trade, from basic data of the Bureau of the Census, October 1951.

United States exports of iron- and steel-mill products, 1950 and January-June 1951

Area and country	Value (1,000 dollars)		1,000 tons of 2,000 pounds	
	1950	January to June 1951	1950	January to June 1951
Total	172,463	289,606	[1] 3,291	[1] 1,767
Canada	124,109	89,147	979	598
Southern North America	65,793	40,356	(2)	(2)
Mexico	37,273	21,382	370	186
Cuba	13,917	10,321	82	58
South America	80,335	65,988	(2)	(2)
Colombia	12,413	6,044	70	28
Venezuela	18,605	21,309	94	125
Chile	8,633	5,534	56	29
Brazil	16,022	13,925	90	62
Argentina	14,621	12,562	78	59
ERP countries	95,948	39,607	(2)	(2)
United Kingdom	9,877	2,672	69	19
Belgium and Luxemburg	4,764	2,704	25	12
Netherlands	13,599	6,051	78	31
France	9,467	6,370	76	54
Norway	6,911	1,833	42	10
Italy	15,961	8,177	88	35
Turkey	11,665	1,913	68	12

See footnotes at end of table.

United States exports of iron- and steel-mill products, 1950 and January-June 1951—Continued

Area and country	Value (1,000 dollars)		1,000 tons of 2,000 pounds	
	1950	January to June 1951	1950	January to June 1951
Other Europe	4,768	1,417	(2)	(2)
Western Asia [3]	37,524	20,655	(2)	(2)
Lebanon	7,461	1,616	59	12
Iraq	3,080	11,046	22	81
Palestine	13,129	5,007	95	33
Saudi Arabia	9,223	2,213	71	13
Other Asia and Oceania	46,223	23,514	(2)	(2)
India	5,237	3,250	34	14
Philippines, Rep. of	10,807	4,560	70	25
Australia	14,811	8,821	95	48
Africa	17,699	8,922	(2)	(2)
Union of South Africa	9,544	6,687	58	41

[1] Exclusive of iron and steel scrap, exports amounted to 3,074,000 short tons in 1950 and 1,661,000 short tons in January-June 1951.

[2] Not compiled; see general note.

[3] Excludes Turkey, which is included with ERP.

NOTE Exports to countries other than those shown amounted to 522,000 short tons in 1950 and 182,000 short tons in January-June 1951.

Prepared in the Department of Commerce, by International Economic Analysis Division, Office of International Trade, from basic data of the Bureau of the Census, October 1951.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As the Senator from California knows, I have given considerable thought to the same problem, and I have spoken several times in regard to it. We must bear in mind that while the construction of schools is delayed because of a lack of steel allocations for the purpose of school construction, the children of school age are growing older and gradually are passing beyond their school years. I believe that the Department of Commerce should make sure that at the same time when steel is being shipped abroad, sufficient allocations of steel are made for use for school-construction purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have a very strong feeling that not all the tonnage of steel going into the export trade is being used directly in the mutual defense effort.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If not all the steel being exported from our country is being used in the mutual defense effort, I certainly think the schools of the United States should have a priority over nondefense usage of steel in other nations.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree entirely with the Senator from California.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to go on record as concurring fully in the remarks of the able and distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] on the question of the allocation of steel for school-construction purposes.

At a recent meeting attended by Mr. Charles E. Wilson and Mr. Manly Fleischmann, before a joint congressional committee, I raised the question of whether sufficient steel is being allocated in connection with our urgent school needs. As a further comment on this subject, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my brief remarks, an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Thursday, October 18.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PRICE WE SHOULD NOT PAY

If the defense program means that we are arming ourselves and the rest of the anti-Communist world at the expense of failing to provide necessary school facilities for millions of American children, we need some new evaluation of the net losses involved in saving democracy.

There were about 28,230,000 children enrolled in schools throughout the Nation (through the twelfth grade) in 1940. By next year that total will have increased by 2,400,000. By 1960 the total will have grown to 37,138,000 There were many shortages of school buildings in 1940. But with the unavailability of building material during World War II, which postponed so much construction, and with the new shortages threatened now by the defense program and the great increase of school population, we are not providing either for current needs or for those that lie ahead.

For the first quarter of 1952, communities throughout the Nation have made requests for 255,400 tons of steel for school building construction. The National Production Authority has allotted, in the face of that demand, only 81,000 tons The demand, and the allocations, cover all types of construction in the field of education. But the greatest need for school construction is in the primary grades. Unless this need is more adequately met, there are going to be millions of young children who will be forced to use makeshift schoolrooms, on part-time schedules, throughout all of their school days. Some way should be found to increase the allocation of steel in this field particularly. The communities affected are paying for the construction. What they need is the steel. The allocations must be increased, regardless of where they come from. We can get along without many things But adequate school construction is not one of them.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS

DIRECTOR OF MUTUAL SECURITY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Director for Mutual Security, be confirmed at this time, as in executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that when this matter came up last night, the senior Senator from North Dakota objected because of one complaint which had been lodged against Mr. Harriman. I made a full and complete investigation of that charge, and I find that it is entirely unsubstantiated.

Therefore, I not only withdraw my objection, but I express the hope that the nomination will be confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? Without objection, as in executive session, the nomination of W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Director for Mutual Security, is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there are a few other nominations on the Executive Calendar, to which I understand there is no objection. Therefore, I now ask unanimous consent that the remaining nominations on the Executive Calendar be approved at this time, as in executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? Without objection, the nominations will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Department of the Air Force.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE—RICHARD HARTSHORNE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Richard Hartshorne, of New Jersey, to be district judge for the district of New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON subsequently said: Mr. President, it was the intention of the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to speak on the nomination of Richard Hartshorne to be a United States district judge for the district of New Jersey when the nomination was considered. Unfortunately, the senior Senator from New Jersey was not on the floor when the Executive Calendar was called.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the remarks which the senior Senator from New Jersey would have made had he been present be inserted in the RECORD immediately preceding my remarks.

Without objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. President, I would like to comment very briefly upon the nomination of the Honorable Richard Hartshorne for appointment as judge of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. I want to say that I commend the President and the Attorney General for having nominated a Republican and a man of the highest possible qualifications to fill this important position My colleague, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and I recommended Judge Hartshorne for this vacancy last January after we had assured ourselves that he was the outstanding available man for the job, and we are extremely gratified that the Attorney General and the President have concurred in our recommendation.

I may recall to the Senate that on April 9, 1951, I spoke at some length on the Senate floor on the question of appointments to the Federal Judiciary At that time my colleague and I introduced a resolution calling for an investigation by the Judiciary Committee of certain practices related to such appointments. One of the points which particularly concerned us, and which I discussed in detail in that speech, was the question of unbalance between the two major political parties in appointments to the Federal bench. I said that the tradition of partisan appointments to Federal judgeships was one that undermined the independence and integrity of our great judicial system. I suggested that the best approach to a solution would be through voluntary action by the Executive.

On several occasions I discussed this problem personally with the Honorable J. Howard McGrath, the Attorney General, who was most sympathetic with my point of view. Mr. McGrath pointed out to me the difficulty

of changing such a long standing tradition, but I felt that he would make a sincere effort in the direction of a better balanced Federal Judiciary, and I think the nomination of Judge Hartshorne indicates that he is doing so

I want to emphasize to the Members of the Senate that the nomination of a distinguished Republican to this vacancy is one deserving of real commendation

I have, upon occasion, severely criticized the President and various members of his administration when I thought such criticism was justified, and I shall continue to do so But I think it is only fair to offer praise when praise is deserved I feel sure that the strength of our Federal judiciary system will be greatly increased by the addition of Judge Hartshorne to the ranks of Federal judges and I hope that the Senate will take prompt action to confirm his nomination

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, it is gratifying to me and my colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], that the name of Judge Richard Hartshorne has been sent by the President of the United States to the Senate for confirmation as judge for the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. I highly commend the President for his splendid selection.

Judge Hartshorne has had a distinguished career as a member of the bar and bench of the State of New Jersey

Judge Hartshorne served with distinction as judge of the Essex Court of Common Pleas from 1931 until the adoption of the new State constitution in my State in 1947. Thereafter, Judge Hartshorne continued as a jurist in the newly named Essex County Court. Judge Richard Hartshorne was formerly a professor of constitutional law at the New Jersey Law School, now Rutgers University, he is a former chairman of the Section of Judicial Administration of the American Bar Association; and formerly he was president of the Interstate Commission on Crime, which now has been merged into the Council of State Governments

He was a delegate from the United States Government to the Eighth International Conference for the Unification of Penal Law, held at Copenhagen, Denmark, in 1935

Judge Hartshorne served as an enlisted man and officer in the United States Naval Forces during World War I; and in World War II he was the Inspector General of the New Jersey State Guard. For many years he has been active in the affairs of the American Legion

It is with a great deal of personal satisfaction that I bring to the attention of the United States Senate even so brief a statement of the record of the accomplishments of this outstanding citizen of my State.

Mr. President, I have every confidence that as a member of the Federal judiciary Judge Hartshorne will establish a record which will reflect great credit upon our system of Federal jurisprudence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Richard Hartshorne, of New Jersey, to be district judge for the district of New Jersey.

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles Morris Irelan, of Maryland, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc

Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations of nominations.

REPEAL OF EMBARGO ON IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES

Mr FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to give further notice in regard to Senate bill 2104, Calendar No 745, to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, about which we had a discussion yesterday. At that time, in discussing the matter with the Senator from Illinois [Mr DIRKSEN], I said that after the call of the calendar was had, I would endeavor to have this bill considered and acted upon

Mr SALTONSTALL Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr SALTONSTALL I say most respectfully to the Senator from Arkansas that until last night, I think it was the feeling that the bill would not be pushed, certainly if the Congress decided to adjourn or take a recess this week. A number of Senators on this side of the aisle who are away are very much interested in the bill, but they cannot be back this afternoon

I realize that the absence of Senators is not always a reason for not pushing a matter, but this is one on which there is a very considerable degree of contention. So I respectfully say to the Senator from Arkansas that I hope he will not urge his proposal

Mr. FULBRIGHT Of course, Mr. President, under normal circumstances we would not be disposed to do so However, I have never admitted that the bill should not be brought up, and I have spoken to the majority leader on at least three or four occasions in regard to the bill, because it involves national policy, not merely a small, local matter.

The trouble about making any deferment at this time is that we are faced with the prospect of an adjournment. If the Senate wishes to vote it down, that is its privilege, but I feel obligated to do everything I can to bring up the bill and have the Senate pass upon it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I may say, Mr. President, that this is one of the bills which I gave notice some time ago was on the agenda. Personally, I have not felt that it was so important to bring up this bill, unless the House were going to act; but the Senator from Arkansas was rather persuasive as to what effect it might have, and I did not want to take the responsibility of saying it would not be brought up. I hope the question may be debated following the call of the calendar, and that we may now quickly proceed to the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill. If we are to conclude this session, it is very important that we act promptly on that bill.

Mr FULBRIGHT. Mr President, I wish to cooperate with the Senator, but the fact that a Senator who is interested in this bill chose to go home, it seems to me is a matter for his responsibility, not mine.

Mr McFARLAND. If the Senator will yield further, evidently I did not make myself clear. What I said was that I thought we could debate this question of bringing up the bill when the motion is made, instead of now.

Mr FULBRIGHT Oh, certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is not before the Senate, and it cannot be brought up now

Mr. MAYBANK Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee

Mr MAYBANK I only want to say that I hope the debate, following the call of the calendar, when the bill may be called up, will not be too lengthy As the Senator from Arkansas has said, it affects the national policy, and there was quite a bit of confusion caused at the Geneva Conference in connection with the matter The Department of Agriculture now has authority otherwise under the law to impose limits and to do certain other things in connection with the importation of cheese I feel that I have discharged my responsibility in the matter, as has also the Senator from Arkansas, who supported the proposition all the way through and who held hearings on the measure, and who also spoke to the majority leader. It is a highly important bill.

COMMITTEE TO DISCUSS PROBLEMS WITH CONSULTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF COUNCIL OF EUROPE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con Res 36) authorizing the appointment of 14 Members of Congress to participate in a public discussion of problems of common interest with representatives of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, which was to strike out the preamble.

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In that connection, the Chair wishes to announce three other appointments to the Senate committee for this purpose, namely, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON]. The Chair reappoints, under the concurrent resolution, all Senators previously appointed by the Chair; so that their appointments will become effective along with the delegation the House may choose.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 355) to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S 1046) to readjust postal rates.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H R. 1236. An act for the relief of Rhoda Akiko Nishiyama;

H J Res 284. Joint resolution authorizing the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the observance and memorialization on April 9, 1952, of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John Howard Payne, author of that family hymn of America, Home Sweet Home; and

H. J. Res. 289. Joint resolution to terminate the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR subsequently said: Mr. President, a while ago when we were considering the appropriation bill I wished to place at the very beginning of the debate on the bill the report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. It is brief, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at the beginning of the consideration of the appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the report (No. 1036) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5650), making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made.

Amount of bill as passed House	$4,428,357,970
Amount of decrease by Senate	−411,659,704
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	4,016,698,266
Total estimates considered by the Senate (contained in H. Docs. Nos. 185, 236, 238, 240, 241, 242, 243, 246, 247, and 248, and S Docs. Nos. 77, 78, 79, and 80)	5,089,517,074

Summary by chapter of Senate committee recommendations

Chapter	Agency	Budget estimates	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—	
					Estimates	House bill
I	Legislative	$650,500	$550,500	$550,500	−$100,000	
II	Federal Security Agency	25,500,000	1,200,000	10,300,000	−15,200,000	+$9,100,000
III	Agriculture	1,475,000	186,800	186,800	−1,288,200	
IV	Interior	5,385,000	385,000	4,335,000	−1,050,000	+3,950,000
V	Independent Offices	564,080,000	239,103,000	251,503,000	−312,577,000	+12,400,000
VI	Department of Defense—Military public works	4,488,541,158	4,186,321,758	3,747,637,550	−740,903,608	−438,684,208
VII	Emergency agencies			300,000	+300,000	+300,000
VIII	Claims	1,885,416	610,912	1,885,416		+1,274,504
	Total	5,087,517,074	4,428,357,970	4,016,698,266	−1,070,818,808	−411,659,704

MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS

In the review of the supplemental appropriations bill covering the military public-works funds for the Department of Defense, your committee does not believe that certain items of construction, such as laundries and individual room-type barracks, should be provided, and that the standards generally applied by the services are above those which can prudently be accepted for execution at this time. Your committee has modified the language of the appropriation act to preclude the abusive use of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts. The committee further believes that the language of the appropriation act should make clear the intent of Congress that this program is to be executed in an orderly, businesslike fashion without the application of expediting funds or the assumption of unreasonable completion dates for any item included in the program. It is the feeling of this committee that every item included for funding can be obtained without additional appropriations and the committee does not intend to entertain requests from the services for additional funds in support of items for which funds are herein provided.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Military construction

The budget estimate for military construction, Department of the Army, is $1,237,069,698 The committee made an over-all reduction from this estimate of approximately 25 percent, rounded to $300,000,000, leaving a total recommended appropriation of $937,069,698. The cuts are to be applied by the Secretary of Defense, with the elimination of the less-urgent projects, and with the full amount of those of the highest priority which can come within the specific amount of money.

In making this reduction the committee sustained the House reductions of $75,000,000 based on estimated unit prices for construction activities and the House reduction of $805,450 for the antiaircraft firing range at Bethany Beach, Del.

Also included in the committee reduction are three items at Fort Belvoir, Va. These are reductions of $10,800,000 for enlisted men's barracks; $624,000 for WAC's barracks; and $582,000 for acquisition of land adjacent to the engineer proving ground.

In addition to this, no funds have been provided herein for the Departments of the Army, Navy, or Air Force for hospital construction not already commenced. The committee is of the opinion that a more careful review should be made of existing hospital facilities, and that this review can be completed and a full report thereon made to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House in the next session of the Congress

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Public works

The budget estimate for public works, Department of the Navy, is $950,271,460. The committee made an over-all reduction from this estimate of approximately 25 percent, rounded to $230,000,000, leaving a recommended appropriation of $720,271,460. Included in this is $35,247,000 for certain classified projects not considered by the House.

In making its reductions the committee sustained the House in providing no funds for the construction of a dam on the Santa Margarita River at Camp Joseph H. Pendleton, Oceanside, Calif.

The committee has also disapproved the request for $3,000,000 for the construction of a railroad spur from Camp Lejeune to Cherry Point, N. C., which was approved by the House. However, the committee wants assurance from the Navy at the hearings on the first supplemental bill submitted at the second session of the Eighty-second Congress that the railroad has given evidence in writing that it will provide, at an early date, service to Camp Lejeune comparable to that to be provided under the House provision.

The committee has disapproved the request for all Navy hospital construction not already commenced.

Refund to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission

The committee has recommended the appropriation of $1,096,392 as a refund to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission. This would retire the amount owed to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and enable the Navy to operate independently the water-transportation system from Homestead, Fla., to Key West

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Acquisition and construction of real property

The budget estimate for acquisition and construction of real property, Department of the Air Force, is $2,301,200,000. The committee has made an over-all reduction from this estimate of approximately 10 percent, rounded to $230,000,000, leaving a total recommended appropriation of $2,071,200,000.

In making these reductions the committee sustained the House action in disallowing $7,779,000 for the Olmsted Air Force Base near Lancaster, Pa., and the reduction of $3,495,450 for laundry and dry-cleaning plants

The committee recommends in the over-all reduction that no funds be provided for the laundry and dry-cleaning plant at Lake Charles, La., and has further provided that no part of the funds made available by this act or any other act of the present Congress shall be used for the construction, replacement, or reactivation of any laundry or dry-cleaning facilities in the United States, its Territories, or possessions as to which the Secretary of Defense does not certify, in writing after consultation with representatives of the laundry and dry-cleaning industry affected, that the services to be furnished by such facilities are not obtainable from commercial sources at reasonable rates.

In regard to the House reduction of $150,000,000 the committee recommends the restoration of $25,000,000 of that amount.

Included in the over-all reduction of funds for the Air Force is all hospital construction not already commenced

Increases and limitations

CHAPTER I LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Senate The committee recommends that the following language relative to official long-distance telephone calls made by Senators to and from Washington, D. C., be added to the bill

"SENATE

"Effective January 1, 1952, Public Law 479, Seventy-ninth Congress, under the heading "Contingent expenses of the Senate,' paragraph 8, page 7, is amended by striking out the word 'fifty' and inserting in lieu thereof 'sixty', and by striking out the words 'two hundred and fifty' and inserting in lieu thereof 'three hundred'."

CHAPTER II. FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Defense community facilities and services. The committee recommends an appropriation of $10,000,000, an increase of $9,000,000 over the House allowance, but $15,000,000 under the budget estimate, for loans or grants to public and nonprofit agencies for the purposes authorized in sec 304 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951. The funds recommended are to be used exclusively for construction of water purification facilities, interceptors, and sewage treatment facilities, and refuse collection and disposal facilities. No funds have been allowed—either assistance or administrative—for construction, operation, development, or administration of day-care or recreation facilities nor for hospitals and health centers and hospital and related services.	$9,000,000
Salaries and expenses, defense community facilities and services	100,000
Total increases, chapter II	9,100,000

Increases and limitations—Continued

CHAPTER IV. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation: Construction and rehabilitation. The additional amount recommended by the committee is for the construction of Kirwin Dam in the Kansas River Basin of the Missouri River Basin project.	$3,200,000
The committee recommends that the following be added to the bill	
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION	
Construction and rehabilitation: For an additional amount for "Construction and rehabilitation", $3,200,000, to remain available until expended	
Construction and rehabilitation. The additional amount recommended by the committee is for the commencement of construction of the Jamestown, N. Dak., unit of the Missouri-Souris project	750,000
The committee recommends that the following be added to the bill	
Construction and rehabilitation: For an additional amount for "Construction and rehabilitation", $750,000, to remain available until expended	
Total increases, chapter IV	3,950,000

CHAPTER V. INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Civil Service Commission. The increase recommended by the committee is to provide the full estimate of $1,700,000 for an additional amount for investigations, in order to enable the Commission to process increased workloads in connection with the Federal loyalty program.	$700,000
Federal Trade Commission. The committee considered a supplemental estimate of $300,000 in S. Doc 80 and approved $200,000 as an additional amount for salaries and expenses in connection with legal case work of the antimonopoly program in order to allow the Commission more adequately to undertake the enforcement of Public Law 899 of the 81st Cong. which amended sec. 7 of the Clayton Act to prohibit business mergers which would have the effect of creating monopoly or substantially lessening competition	200,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency: Defense housing. The committee recommends that the following language be stricken from the bill (for accounting purposes only) The committee feels that the Administrator should be permitted to effect the economies intended by the proviso allowing consolidation of operating funds in connection with projects built under the present housing program with similar funds for projects built under previous war and emergency housing programs, without the handicap injected by the language recommended to be stricken	
Defense community facilities and services. The increase recommended by the committee is to provide the full estimate of $15,000,000. The committee believes that the amount is necessary in order that the most urgent needs for such facilities may be met with a minimum of delay.	7,500,000
Revolving fund for development of isolated defense sites. The increase recommended by the committee is to provide a total revolving fund of $7,500,000, which is $2,500,000 below the estimate of $10,000,000. The committee also recommends that the following be added to the bill: "including necessary administrative expenses in connection with said title,"	2,500,000
Federal National Mortgage Association: The committee recommends that the administrative expense limitation for the associations be increased by an additional amount of $62,500, to provide a total limitation of $3,460,000, which is $50,000 below the estimate.	

Increases and limitations—Continued

CHAPTER V. INDEPENDENT OFFICES—CONTINUED

Housing and Home Finance Agency—Continued. Office of the Administrator, prefabricated housing, etc. The committee recommends that the administrative expense limitation relating to prefabricated housing and large-scale modernized site construction be increased by an additional amount of $25,000, to provide a total limitation of $237,250, which is $30,000 below the estimate.	
Federal Housing Administration. The committee recommends that the administrative expense limitation for the Administration be increased by an additional amount of $6,750, to provide a total limitation of $45,000, which is $6,000 below the estimate	
Renegotiation Board. The committee approved the full amount of the budget estimate contained in S. Doc. 77 to cover the expenses of the Renegotiation Board created by the Renegotiation Act of 1951 (Public Law 9)	$1,500,000
The committee has approved the purchase of 3 automobiles, instead of 8 as estimated, and in allowing the hire of passenger motor vehicles the committee intends to provide for the use of public transportation and does not approve funds for the hire of privately owned automobiles	
The committee recommends that the following be added to the bill	
"RENEGOTIATION BOARD	
"SALARIES AND EXPENSES	
"For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, purchase (not to exceed three) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals, and rents in the District of Columbia, $1,500,000 *Provided*, That the Board is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, to place not more than five positions in grades 16, 17, or 18 of the general schedule established by said Act, and such positions shall be in addition to the number authorized by said section"	
Corporations: Inland Waterways Corporation: The committee recommends that the following be added to the bill.	
"CORPORATIONS	
"INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION	
"The provisions of section 605 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952 (Public Law 137, Eighty-second Congress) shall not apply to the operating personnel of the Inland Waterways Corporation."	
Total increases, chapter V	12,400,000

CHAPTER VI. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS

Department of the Navy: Refund to Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission. The committee recommends that the following section be added to the bill	$1,096,392
"Refund to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission: For refund to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission in accordance with the provisions of the Act of October 25, 1949 (Public Law 379, Eighty-first Congress), $1,096,392"	
General provisions, Department of Defense: The committee recommends that the following sections be added to the bill.	
"SEC 602. None of the funds appropriated in this chapter shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work to be performed within the continental United States without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor."	

Increases and limitations—Continued

CHAPTER VI. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS—Continued

General provisions, Department of Defense—Continued

SEC. 603. None of the funds appropriated in this chapter shall be expended for additional costs involved in expediting construction: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense, or his designee for the purpose, shall establish a reasonable completion date for each project, taking into consideration the type and location of the project, the climatic and seasonal conditions affecting the construction and the application of economical construction practices.

"SEC. 604. No part of the funds made available by this act or any other act of the present Congress shall be used for the construction, replacement, or reactivation of any laundry or dry-cleaning facilities in the United States, its Territories, or possessions, as to which the Secretary of Defense does not certify, in writing, after consultation with representatives of the laundry and dry-cleaning industry affected, that the services to be furnished by such facilities are not obtainable from commercial sources at reasonable rates."

Total increase, Department of Defense	$1,096,392

CHAPTER VII. EMERGENCY AGENCIES

Office of Defense Mobilization.

The committee recommends that the following section be added to the bill.

"OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"No provision in any act appropriating funds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, shall be deemed to limit the funds available for compensation of persons in the Office of Defense Mobilization who are engaged in informing the public of the progress and purposes of the defense mobilization program, or persons in the agencies assigned functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, who are engaged in informing consumers, agriculture, business, and labor about rules, regulations, and orders issued by such agencies under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended."

Increases and limitations—Continued

CHAPTER VII. EMERGENCY AGENCIES—Continued

Department of the Interior: Office of the Secretary, Defense Production Activities	$300,000

The committee recommends an additional amount of $300,000, in order to provide a total of $2,700,000 for the 1952 activities of the Petroleum Administration for Defense.

The committee recommends that the following section be added to the bill:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses, Defense Production Activities,' $300,000."

CHAPTER VIII.

Claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments	1,274,504

CHAPTER IX. GENERAL PROVISIONS

The committee recommends that the following section be added to the bill

"SEC. 903. No part of the money appropriated to any department, or made available for expenditure by any corporation, in the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1952, which is in excess of 75 percent of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the aggregate budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by such department or corporation during such fiscal year in the performance of—

"(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

Increases and limitations—Continued

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Con.

CHAPTER IX. GENERAL PROVISIONS—Continued

"(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2). No person whose only performance of the functions described in (1) or (2) of the preceding sentence is in activities necessary for the enforcement of law, promotion of safety of human life, dissemination of weather information, or scientific experimentation, or whose compensation is paid from funds appropriated specifically for 'International information and educational activities' shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to be engaged in the performance of the functions so described."

TOTAL INCREASES

Chapter II, Federal Security Agency	$9,100,000
Chapter IV, Department of the Interior	3,950,000
Chapter V, Independent Offices	12,400,000
Chapter VI Department of Defense	1,096,392
Chapter VII Emergency Agencies	300,000
Chapter VIII, Claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments	1,274,504
Total increases	28,120,896

CHAPTER VI. DECREASES

Department of Defense.	
Department of the Army: Military construction, Army	$221,451,050
Department of the Navy Public works	177,357,000
Department of the Air Force Acquisition and construction of real property	40,972,550
Total decrease, Department of Defense	439,780,600
Total decrease	439,780,600
Total increase	28,120,896
Net decrease	411,659,704
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	4,016,698,266

Comparative statement of the amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by this bill

	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with— Estimates	House bill
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE					
H. Doc 247	Miscellaneous items	$650,000	$550,000	$550,000	−$100,000	
H. Doc. 247	Stationery (revolving fund)	500	500	500		
	Total, legislative branch (ch. I)	650,500	550,500	550,500	−100,000	
	FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY					
H. Doc 242	Defense community facilities and services	25,000,000	1,000,000	10,000,000	−15,000,000	+$9,000,000
H. Doc. 242	Salaries and expenses, defense community facilities and services	500,000	200,000	300,000	−200,000	+100,000
	Total, Federal Security Agency (ch II)	25,500,000	1,200,000	10,300,000	−15,200,000	+9,100,000
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
H. Doc 243	Flood control (ch. III)	1,475,000	186,800	186,800	−1,288,200	
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS					
H. Doc. 246	Commutation of treaties, Choctaw Nation of Indians in Oklahoma	385,900	385,000	385,000		
	BUREAU OF RECLAMATION					
S. Doc 67	Construction and rehabilitation	5,000,000		3,200,000	−1,800,000	+3,200,000
				750,000	+750,000	+750,000
	Total, Bureau of Reclamation	5,000,000		3,950,000	−1,050,000	+3,950,000
	Total, Department of Interior (ch. IV)	5,385,000	385,000	4,335,000	−1,050,000	+3,950,000

Comparative statement of the amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by this bill—Con.

	Department or agency	Estimates	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—	
					Estimates	House bill
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES					
H Doc 248	Atomic Energy Commission	$484,240,000	$200,000,000	$200,000,000	−$284,240,000	
H. Doc 241	Civil Service Commission	1,700,000	1,000,000	1,700,000		+$700,000
S. Doc 80	Federal Trade Commission	300,000		200,000	−100,000	+200,000
	Housing and Home Finance Agency					
H Doc. 242	Office of the Administrator.					
	Defense Housing	[1] 50,000,000	[2] 25,000,000	[2] 25,000,000	−25,000,000	
	Defense Community Facilities and Services	15,000,000	7,500,000	15,000,000		+7,500,000
	Revolving Fund for Development of Isolated Defense Sites	10,000,000	5,000,000	7,500,000	−2,500,000	+2,500,000
	Salaries and expenses, Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services	1,440,000	603,000	603,000	−737,000	
	Federal National Mortgage Association	(3)	(4)	(3)		
	Prefabricated Housing	(5)	(7)	(8)		
	Federal Housing Administration	(9)	(10)	(11)		
S. Doc 77	Renegotiation Board	1,500,000		1,500,000		+1,500,000
	Total, Independent Offices (ch V)	564,080,000	239,103,000	251,503,000	−312,577,000	+12,400,000
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE					
H Doc 185	Department of the Army Military construction, Army	1,237,069,698	1,158,520,748	937,069,698	−300,000,000	−221,451,050
H Doc. 185	Department of the Navy					
	Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission			1,096,392	+1,096,392	+1,096,392
H. Doc 236	Public works	950,271,460	897,628,460	720,271,460	−230,000,000	−177,357,000
	San Diego, Calif		18,000,000	18,000,000	+18,000,000	
	Total, Department of the Navy	950,271,460	915,628,460	739,367,852	−210,903,608	−176,260,608
H Doc 185	Department of the Air Force Acquisition and construction of real property	2,301,200,000	2,112,172,550	2,071,200,000	−230,000,000	−40,972,550
	Total, Department of Defense (ch VI)	4,188,541,158	4,186,321,758	3,747,637,550	−740,903,608	−438,684,208
	EMERGENCY AGENCIES (CH VII)					
	Department of the Interior					
	Office of the Secretary			300,000	+300,000	+300,000
H. Doc 248	Judgments and authorized claims	1,885,416	610,912	1,885,416		+1,274,504
	Grand total	5,087,517,074	4,428,357,970	4,016,698,266	−1,070,818,808	−411,659,704

[1] Administrative expenses for Public Housing Administration increased from "$12,780,000" to "$13,280,000."
[2] Administrative expenses for Public Housing Administration increased from "$12,780,000" to "$13,155,000."
[3] Administrative expenses increased from "$3,060,000" to "$3,510,000."
[4] Administrative expenses increased from "$3,060,000" to "$3,397,500."
[5] Administrative expenses increased from "$3,000,000" to "$3,460,000."
[6] Administrative expenses increased from "$157,250" to "$267,250."
[7] Administrative expenses increased from "$157,250" to "$212,250."
[8] Administrative expenses increased from "$157,250" to "$227,250."
[9] Administrative expenses increased by "$51,000," and limitation on nonadministrative expenses increased from "$23,300,000" to "$25,800,000."
[10] Administrative expenses increased by "$88,250," and limitation on nonadministrative expenses increased from "$23,300,000" to "$25,175,000."
[11] Administrative expenses increased by "$45,000," and limitation on nonadministrative expenses increased from "$23,300,000" to "$25,175,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I received earlier today a letter from the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, on the bill (H. R. 5684) making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952. It came too late to go into the hearings, of course, but I think, by all means, it should go into the RECORD. It gives the views of the Department in frank and no uncertain terms. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 19, 1951.

The Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate

MY DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR. I wish to express to you and Representative CANNON my grave concern over the 5 percent cut the Senate has made in the appropriations under the Mutual Security Act of 1951.

The original request for $8,500,000,000 was determined upon only after careful screening by the Bureau of the Budget. It was considered, and I think rightly so, the smallest amount which was needed to obtain the security goals we seek during the current fiscal year. The cut of over $1,000,000,000 made by the authorizing legislation leaves us in a most difficult situation

We have been reprograming to reflect this cut and are reviewing the form in which our program will be administered in an effort to minimize the effect of the cut or, to state it in reverse, an an effort to maximize the effect of the reduced amount of dolllars. To make a further cut now of 5 percent is to endanger our objectives to such an extent that I feel obliged to urge you and your committee to refuse to take the responsibility of doing so I ask you earnestly to restore the 5 percent cut which the Senate has made

I can add little except emphasis to the points which have been made before your committees I do, however, wish to restate two of the more important considerations.

1 The Mutual Security Act has been loosely called the foreign aid bill This is a misnomer It is truly a United States security measure The areas to which arms will go are vital to the security of the United States; Europe, Greece, Turkey, Formosa, the Philippines and Indochina are of the highest importance to our defense. If we lose the manpower, technical skill, manufacturing facilities and raw materials of Europe and her colonies to Soviet domination, we face a grim future in which successful defense of our own borders will be immeasurably more difficult and the cost immeasurably greater than if Europe is able to defend itself. Furthermore, the base for bearing the increased cost will be much narrower because we will lose much of the trade and raw materials on which our prosperity depends Under those conditions our standard of living would bear no resemblance to that of today The loss of Greece and Turkey would leave General Eisenhower's southern flank unguarded, would unbar the land bridge to Africa and would open to the Soviets the rich oil fields of the Middle East and the main road to the Far East with its wealth of raw materials I need not dwell on the seriousness of enemy domination of Formosa, the Philippines, and Indochina The economic aid under the Mutual Security Act which is not in support of military effort is almost wholly devoted to discouraging Communist aggression by imparting to the peoples in underdeveloped areas the know-how to use their own natural resources to rid themselves of hunger and disease—sources of the discontent on which communism feeds Such aid is by far the most effective weapon we can use against communism in these areas

2 The Mutual Security Act is truly an economy measure There is no question but that we obtain more defense effort per $1 of military aid or supporting economic aid than for a corresponding dollar spent on our own Armed Forces. Europe is the largest recipient of this type of aid. For each unit of military forces in Europe we pay only the cost of a part of its armament Troop pay, housing,

personal equipment, most of the lighter arms and their ammunition, and some of the heavier arms are provided by our partners. The economic aid we furnish in support of military effort is estimated by ECA to produce on the average at least $3 of military results for each $1 of aid. In no other way can we obtain in Europe or elsewhere anything like the amount of military defense effort which we obtain through the Mutual Security Act.

I can add that the cut already made by the authorizing legislation will put us behind in meeting our schedule for arming General Eisenhower's troops. Moreover, since the program for Europe was presented to the Congress, two of our principal partners in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are experiencing unforeseen financial problems—problems which endanger their ability to provide the forces they have agreed to place under General Eisenhower's command. An important factor in this grave situation is that our ability to aid them has been crippled by the cut already made by the authorizing legislation. A further cut would very much increase the already great danger.

I, therefore, urge upon you and your committee that the only wise action from the point of view of the security of the United States is to restore the 5 percent cut which the Senate has made.

Sincerely yours.

The VICE PRESIDENT. For the information of the Senate, the clerk will restate the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Chapter I—Legislative branch," on page 1, after line 8, to insert:

Effective January 1, 1952, Public Law 479, Seventy-ninth Congress, under the heading "Contingent expenses of the Senate," paragraph 8, page 7, is amended by striking out the word "fifty" and inserting in lieu thereof "sixty", and by striking out the words "two hundred and fifty" and inserting in lieu thereof "three hundred."

The amendment was agreed to

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter II—Federal Security Agency—Defense community facilities and services," on page 2, line 23, after the word "facilities," to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses, defense community facilities and services," on page 3, line 8, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)," to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter IV—Department of the Interior", on page 4, after line 4, to insert:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Construction and rehabilitation: For an additional amount for "Construction and rehabilitation", $3,200,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 8, to insert:

Construction and rehabilitation: For an additional amount for "Construction and rehabilitation", $750,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter V—Independent offices—Civil Service Commission—Salaries and expenses", on page 4, line 21, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 5, to insert:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1952, for "Salaries and expenses," $200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Housing and Home Finance Agency—Office of the Administrator—Defense housing," on page 5, line 15, after the word "merged", to strike out "(for accounting purposes only)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Defense community facilities and services," on page 6, line 5, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$7,500,000" and insert "$15,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Revolving fund for development of isolated defense sites," on page 6, line 21, after the numerals "1951", to insert "including necessary administrative expenses in connection with said title," and in line 22, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$7,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal National Mortgage Association," on page 7, line 15, after the word "to", to strike out "$3,397,500" and insert "$3,460,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Administrator," on page 7, line 22, after the word "to", to strike out "$212,250" and insert "$237,250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Housing Administration," on page 8, line 10, after the word "by", to strike out "$38,250" and insert "$45,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 17, to insert:

RENEGOTIATING BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; purchase (not to exceed three) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; and rents in the District of Columbia; $1,500,000: *Provided*, That the Board is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, to place not more than five positions in grades 16, 17, or 18 of the general schedule established by said act, and such positions shall be in addition to the number authorized by said section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 7, to insert:

CORPORATIONS

INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

The provisions of section 605 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952 (Public Law 137, 82d Cong.), shall not apply to the operating personnel of the Inland Waterways Corporation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment, was under the heading "Chapter VI—Department of Defense—Military public works—Department of the Army—Corps of Engineers," on page 10, line 6, after the word "expended", to strike out "$1,158,520,748" and insert "$937,069,698."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of the Navy," on page 11, line 2, after the word "expended", to strike out "$897,628,460" and insert "$720,271,460."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 11, after line 6, to insert:

Refund to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission: For refund to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission in accordance with the provisions of the Act of October 25, 1949 (Public Law 379, 81st Cong.), $1,096,392.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think I should be very remiss did I not at this time express, for myself and my colleague, our appreciation of the expeditious handling of this important Navy item by the Senate Committee on Appropriations and by the Senate and House Committees on the Armed Services, whose approval of the new contractual set-up was required under the authorizing legislation, before this emergency Navy appropriation could be made.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this particular item merely involves, does it not, payment to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission of the Navy's share of the cost of transmission pipelines for the Key West Naval Base?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is for the State commission's share, and the purpose of haste was that the Navy wishes to put some additional pumping facilities there in order to step up the supply of water, but did not want to do it until the question of title was straightened up.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I want to inquire of the chairman of the committee regarding the section of the bill we are now considering. The items are not stated in this bill, but the report says:

The committee has also disapproved the request for $3,000,000 for the construction of a railroad spur from Camp Lejeune to Cherry Point, N. C., which was approved by the House.

Is that involved in the paragraph we are now discussing in the appropriation for the Navy Department, on pages 10 and 11?

Mr. McKELLAR. I may say to the Senator that in the committee there was quite a division and a great deal of discussion on the item relating to the construction of a railroad spur at Camp Lejeune. When it came to a final vote, those of us who thought it ought to be in the bill were defeated, and it was not placed in the bill.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to include this item of $3,000,000, as it appears in the House bill, for the construction of a railroad spur from Camp Lejeune to Cherry Point, N. C.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless it is proposed as an amendment to the committee amendment, it would not be in order at this time.

Mr. HOEY. The committee omitted it, and I thought I would have to offer it at this time

The VICE PRESIDENT. If it is an amendment to the text of the bill, the Senator would have to wait until we get through with the committee amendments

Mr RUSSELL. Mr. President, in my judgment, the amendment is in order at this time. It affects the committee amendment.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, the bill omits the item which had been included in the House bill, which I want to have restored

Mr RUSSELL. If the committee amendment be agreed to, the Senator from North Carolina would then be estopped from amending the amendment

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understood it was an amendment to the text, not to the amendment.

Mr RUSSELL Oh, no

The VICE PRESIDENT. If it is an amendment to the committee amendment, it is in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is a matter of form.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, this item has been before the Senate two or three times previously. The Navy Department has recommended the building of this railroad spur as a defense measure, $3,000,000 was provided heretofore As a result of the controversy which arose, it was not agreed to The House adopted this amendment

I call attention to the fact that Cherry Point and at Camp Lejeune there are 70,000 soldiers. They have no railroad facilities, no railroad connections These soldiers there as they come in and go out, and all the people who come to visit them, find it necessary to travel by bus. It is necessary for them to travel from 26 to 40 miles by bus in order to reach the camp.

This railroad spur would pay for itself. The Navy Department estimates that in less than 15 years it would repay its cost entirely. In fact, a spur was built on the other side only a few years ago, and it paid for itself within 4 years.

No expense should be involved except the $3,000,000, which would be saved in both freight and passenger traffic. I think it is an economy measure. I consider it to be a national defense measure, and I believe it ought to be included for the protection of troops who are moving in and out, and who are transported to the port of embarkation at both Moorehead City and Norfolk. I feel that this amendment ought to be included in the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOEY. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I suggest that the amendment to which the Senator from North Carolina wishes to offer his amendment has already been agreed upon under the heading of the Department of the Navy. He may ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which that amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOEY. I thought I had called attention to that before action was taken, but I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted, in order that the Senate may pass upon this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Does the Senator from North Carolina offer his amendment?

Mr HOEY. I offer the amendment to restore this item of $3,000,000, which is to be used for the purpose of rebuilding the railroad spur from Camp Lejeune to Cherry Point, N C , as included in the House bill—the same language as that which is in the House bill

Mr SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr HOEY. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one member of the committee, I read the brief of the Atlantic Coast Line lawyer, and I heard some of his testimony. I remember a little of the background of the situation. I was in the vicinity referred to 9 or 10 years ago.

I speak as one member of the committee who voted in favor of the committee action. I felt that the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, to use colloquial language, should put up or shut up in the next couple of months There will be another supplemental appropriation bill for the armed services in January or February. The report shows, on page 4, that the Navy is to bring before the committee at that time, in writing, what assurance, if any, it has from the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad that that railroad will provide the service which the Navy wants for the Marine camp If that service should not be satisfactory, it was the feeling, I think, of the majority of the committee that we should immediately proceed, but to take action in view of the protestations of the railroad company, in view of their brief, and in view of the fact that they say they can furnish this service, that we should give them this one chance of approximately 3 to 4 months to make up their minds. If we cannot receive proper assurances from the railroad company that passenger service as well as freight service will be furnished, then we shall proceed. But only 3 or 4 months would be missed, and we would not be building a duplicate line at Government expense when a private railroad company could allegedly furnish the service.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I am always in favor of private enterprise. This subject has been in controversy for two years, and the railroad company has not come forward with any adequate service for the camp. Seventy thousand men are stationed there, and their families are coming and going on visits to them. No facilities are provided, and there is no immediate prospect of getting any. I do not think the project should be delayed.

Mr SALTONSTALL. I may say to the Senator that my own son was at the camp, and that is how I happened to go there. I know the position of the Senator on all these matters, and I respect it very much. Speaking as one member of the committee, I thought it was a place where we could give the railroad company one more chance of about three months within which either to put up or shut up.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr HOEY I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think the Senator from North Carolina is completely justified in offering his amendment at this time and pressing it to a vote If there is any one item in the bill that has been carefully considered for over a period of years, it is this proposal which is designed to alleviate a deplorable condition affecting some 70,000 marines and their families who are stationed at Camp Lejeune. People are being killed on the highways almost like flies. The highways are inadequate The camp is situated in a rather remote and inaccessible part of the great State of North Carolina, and there is nothing in the record that indicates that the railroad company, which is protesting this measure, will ever take any steps to alleviate the condition. On last evening I looked over the record and found that the railroad company claims that it has given all the service to which Camp Lejeune is entitled.

I suggest, with the indulgence of the Senator from North Carolina, that this item is justified for the welfare and benefit of men, many of whom are in service on being recalled to the colors after fighting in one war, and who are isolated from the outside world They cannot get to their families and their families cannot get to them

Mr McKELLAR Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield

Mr McKELLAR. This item was discussed as much as was any one item in the bill, probably more than was any one other item It was very vigorously and actively discussed. I had the same view about the matter that the Senator from North Carolina has, namely, that some action should be taken to alleviate the condition. Yet, when it came to a vote, the vote was 9 to 3 against it, if I remember correctly, and there was nothing for the chairman of the committee to do but to follow the direction of the committee

Has the Senator offered his amendment?

Mr. HOEY Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR I imagine that the only thing the Senator will have to do will be to offer an amendment to increase the item on page 11 of the bill, from $720,271,460, to $723,271,460.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I think I am justified in saying that every Member of the Appropriations Committee recognizes the need of the 70,000 marines to get railroad transportation.

The only difference in the committee was that some members thought we

should give the railroad company a little more time. But, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has pointed out, the Marines have been trying to get this railroad connection ever since the camp was established some 10 years ago. I think it is a fair statement, as made by the junior Senator from Georgia, that to postpone it until next year and then have an independent bill and hearings, would mean much more delay, because we will wind up by appropriating for the spur line.

Therefore, Mr President, I hope the Senate will support and concur in the amendment offered by the senior Senator from North Carolina. I recognize the fact that the distinguished chairman of the committee cannot accept the amendment, because the majority of the committee voted against it. But the matter is fundamental and is just and fair to the boys stationed at Camp Lejeune, and it is a relatively small item in our total construction program. Certainly no Member of the Senate can stand and not take off his hat to the Marines because of what they have been doing in Korea

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "$720,271,460" and insert "$723,271,460."

Mr KNOWLAND Mr. President, I think in fairness to the committee this statement should be made in regard to the item As the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] pointed out, I do not believe there is a member of the committee who does not understand the problem which the able Senator from North Carolina is trying to solve, and we are sympathetic There is a conflict in the testimony regarding the desirability of building the additional facility.

In the first place, I think it should be noted that the amount of $3,000,000 is only a start in constructing a facility which would be of use to the Marines at this particular camp, which is one of the most important camps in the United States and is one of the great training centers for the Marine Corps. The additional appropriation will, in effect, provide only some of the steel rail facilities.

Furthermore, if passenger service is to be furnished, it will be necessary that an estimated additional $6,000,000 be made available for rolling stock, so that the amount may be from $9,000,000 to $12,000,000 The estimated $12,000,000 may be an unduly large figure, but it is doubtful whether it would be less than $9,000,000

So, Mr. President, it is not merely a $3,000,000 item with which we are dealing. I think all the members of the committee, however, even in view of the fact that it may entail an expenditure of $12,000,000 will be prepared in the next session, in one of the early appropriation bills——

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In just a moment. I should like to finish my statement

I think the committee will be prepared to support and adopt an appropriation for what otherwise might be called a duplicating feature if it is not possible to work it out in some other way. We do not believe there should be unnecessary delay in finding the answer to the problem

The committee was of the opinion that, unless by the 31st day of March the Marine Corps could receive assurances from the existng transportation system that it would furnish passenger service fully equal to that proposed in this alternative proposal, the committee would then be prepared to go ahead with the program

It should be borne in mind that the committee has kept before it at all times in this entire military construction program what the effect may be of the shortage of steel and other critical items Of course, in building what might be a duplicating rail facility, there will be a great deal of steel used in the trackage, and in the rolling stock It was for that reason that the committee wrote into its report, as will be found on page 4 of the committee report, the following language:

> The committee has also disapproved the request for $3,000,000 for the construction of a railroad spur from Camp Lejeune to Cherry Point, N C., which was approved by the House However, the committee wants assuance from the Navy at the hearings on the first supplemental bill submitted at the second session of the Eighty-second Congress that the railroad has given evidence in writing that it will provide, at an early date, service to Camp Lejeune comparable to that to be provided under the House provision.

Mr President, I merely call this to the attention of the Senate and of the Senators from North Carolina. I think there is no doubt that if that assurance is not forthcoming, they will have the unanimous support of the committee in arriving at an equitable solution of the problem

I now yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to say to my colleague on the Committee on Appropriations that I discussed this question at some length with Representative BARDEN, of North Carolina, the Representative who sponsored this proposal in the House. I asked him about the rolling stock, and he said he had a definite assurance from the State-owned railroad, which would be the connecting link, that it would furnish the rolling stock, and that it would establish the passenger lines to give adequate passenger service

I asked about the willingness of the other railroad. He said that, in the first place, they needed a 14-mile connection just to get out the freight, and they begged for the building of that connecting link. The Government built it, and in 3 or 4 years, as the Senator from North Carolina knows, the freight received, with the Government furnishing the rolling stock and the switching charges to get the freight in, amounted to the entire investment in the tracks.

Representative BARDEN said that two vice presidents of the railroads appeared in opposition to the proposal now made, and that both of them said very positively two things, first, that they would not give the State railroad any connection with their main line; second, that they would not build this connecting line themselves They took the position that it was not necessary to build it.

I believe that all members of the Committee on Appropriations think it is necessary to build the line, and the only difference remaining is as to whether the Government will have to provide the rolling stock—and I hope it will not—and, second, whether the railroad will eventually build the line, as we stated in the report, and I do not believe they will, on the basis of what they have said all along

Mr KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield further?

Mr HOEY. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND Knowing the able Senator from North Carolina, and the position he has taken on the floor of the Senate over the years since I have been a Member of the Senate, I am sure he would be interested in the work contemplated being done by private facilities, providing they would do it, and it would be only with great reluctance that he would favor taking the alternative course.

I might submit a proposal to the Senator I have no authority to speak for the committee, but during the course of the discussions in the Committee on Appropriations yesterday, the so-called Hayden formula was suggested, which is perhaps a medium ground between the desire of the Senator from North Carolina in offering his amendment and the position taken by the committee The suggestion was that the amount of $3,000,000 be appropriated, but that in the report, or, in this case, in the discussion on the Senate floor, the Marine Corps and the Navy Department would be instructed not to use the funds if within a period of 90 days satisfactory arrangements have been made by the existing rail facilities to furnish transportation equal at least to that which would be furnished if this proposal were adopted.

It seems to me that that type of arrangement would meet the desires of the able Senator from North Carolina, for the funds would be included in the pending bill, and at the same time those of us who do have some reasonable doubts in the situation could at least feel assured that the matter would be fully explored

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from California, and I have no objection in the world to giving a reasonable time for this work to be done. But I feel that unless this appropriation goes into the bill, nothing will be done, and I believe the appropriation ought to be made.

I am advised this morning that there are 16,000 applications for homes for people who live around Cherry Point and Camp Lejeune. Camp Lejeune is the largest Marine establishment in the

United States, and it is increasing in size all the time. As the distinguished Senator from Georgia has said, it is located in a rather segregated area in the county, isolated, not easily accessible, and people are now being crowded out on the highways and killed because there is no means for their transportation. I do not believe the matter should be delayed further.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am confident that the distingushed Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, would be very glad if the amendment were agreed to. But the Department of the Navy should be advised that these funds should not be expended for 90 days, or until the railroad has had every opportunity to make available the services which I regard as being essential to Camp Lejeune. As chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, I should be happy to advise the Department of the Navy that I think that course should be followed. But unless the amendment is agreed to, nothing will be done. This is not a new matter. It was before us in World War II, and still this question was not resolved. I would yield only to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina in my determination to utilize private enterprise when private enterprise makes itself capable of utilization. But in this case the railroad representative came before the committee, and the distinguished chairman of the committee questioned the representative of the road. I shall read only a few lines of the testimony. The chairman was examining the representative of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, and that representative, Mr. Fields, made this statement:

> The Government has asked to build this railroad. That is what I am opposing
>
> Chairman MCKELLAR. And you are willing to build it yourself?
>
> Mr. FIELDS. No, sir. We have this railroad which we contend adequately serves the Marine Corps at Camp Lejeune.

There has been a constant request that passenger service be established, and that the railroad has told the officials they would not make it available. It has not been made available, and, in justice to the men at Camp Lejeune, many of whom served their Nation through World War II, and have been called back into service, most of them family men, there ought to be some way for those men to get out to see their families and for their families to get in to see them.

I should be glad to follow the course suggested by the Senator from North Carolina, and I hope that it may produce the desired effect.

Mr. MCKELLAR and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] has the floor. Does he yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOEY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, the only trouble about the suggestion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is that there would have to be inserted in the bill certain language which, of course, would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that, with the statement made by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, and with this legislative history with regard to the situation, if the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, knowing what the general intent of the Appropriations Committee was, were to write a letter to the Department of the Navy, I am personally convinced that the funds would not be expended until the Navy Department had complied with the legislative intent.

I will say to the Senator from North Carolina, if he will yield, that one other factor, which I mentioned before, is the question of steel. The amount of steel which would be used has been stated to be some 4,800 tons. If it is necessary to do this construction work, of course, it must be done. However, by the alternative procedure which has been suggested, it seems to me that we would reach the problem the Senator intended to reach.

As one member of the committee, I will say that I was very strongly influenced by the fact that both distinguished Senators from North Carolina, who live in the area, felt very strongly that something should be done. Personally, I am willing to accept the suggestion which has been made, on the basis of the alternative proposal.

Mr HOEY. I think that is all right. The Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Georgia could write a joint letter.

Mr SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator from Tennessee writes the letter, of course, that will leave a difference between the House and the Senate. The House placed the item in the bill flatly. It is proposed that the Senate place it in the bill with a certain proviso. I wonder if it would not be well, at least in conference, for the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee, to call this matter to the attention of the House committee chairman, in order that he may be apprised. I think it might be well also to have him join in the letter. If the letter were to come from both branches, it would be stronger.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, there is just one thing further in connection with the critical need for this facility. According to a report which was issued just a few days ago dealing with this situation, since January 1 of this year there have been 441 accidents in which 14 marines, 1 dependent, and 3 civilian workers have been killed on the highway. This shows the congestion and shows the inability of the people to travel safely on the highways because of the accumulation of traffic.

This camp was formerly very much smaller, but it has been tremendously expanded, without provision being made for sufficient facilities. Unless this facility is provided without delay there will be continuing accidents of this character. I believe that 160 marines have been injured on the highways since January 1.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the evidence, there is a connection with the main line of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, which now connects with the town.

Mr. HOEY. That is effective only in one direction.

Mr ELLENDER. It is on Government property.

Mr HOEY A spur was built 2 years ago by the Government, from Jacksonville down to the camp. That line paid for itself right away, just as this proposed line would do. All freight carried from the camp must go by Wilmington, a long distance around. Troops and equipment moving to Morehead City, the port of embarkation, or to Norfolk, must be hauled on trucks over 26 miles to reach the railroad. The proposed construction would eliminate all that.

Mr ELLENDER. Could not the line already built on Government property be used to carry passengers?

Mr. HOEY. Not for this purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why not?

Mr. HOEY. It does not make connections in the right direction. It is necessary to circle around.

Mr. ELLENDER. What distance would be added by the construction of the line?

Mr. HOEY. The line proposed to be built would be about 30 miles in length. It would enable anyone to reach the various points without circling around.

Mr. ROBERTSON Mr. President, I can answer the question, if the Senator will yield to me.

Mr. HOEY. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The additional distance is from 125 to 150 miles to reach the cities to which most of the passengers wish to go.

Mr. HOEY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The proposed line, however, would not connect with the main line of the Atlantic Coast Line; would it?

Mr. HOEY. It would provide an opening in every direction.

Mr. ELLENDER. But it would not connect with the main line. Would the Senator answer the question? Would it connect with the main line of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, the railroad which is now carrying freight into Camp Lejeune?

Mr. HOEY. This line would provide a connection with it. It would not merely tap the line, but would give a connection with it directly.

Mr. ELLENDER. It would give a connection through a line owned by the State of North Carolina.

Mr. HOEY. Yes. It would provide a connection with the Norfolk and Southern, the Southern Railway, the Atlantic Coast Line, and the Eastern Carolina Railroad, which is owned by the State. In other words, it would open the area, for communication and transportation, to all the railroads. At present, trans-

portation is virtually restricted to the Atlantic Coast Line.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr ELLENDER. Does the Senator from North Carolina take the position that it is absolutely necessary to build this line?

Mr. HOEY. Yes.

Mr ELLENDER. Either by the Government, as is proposed, or by some railroad.

Mr. HOEY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much mileage would be saved?

Mr. HOEY There would be a saving in distance traveled, as the Senator from Virginia has said, of approximately from 125 to 140 miles, by traveling 30 miles over the proposed line.

Mr ELLENDER Is the Senator willing to permit this appropriation to be made on condition that, let us say, four months should be allowed——

Mr HOEY I do not believe that we ought to wait 4 months, because the need is too great I should be glad to allow any reasonable time, but I do not believe that the project ought to be delayed for 4 months

Mr ELLENDER. What limit of time would the Senator suggest, to give opportunity to private enterprise to build the line, instead of having the Government build it?

Mr HOEY Ninety days has been suggested I think that would be ample. I do not see any reason for making it 4 months.

Mr ELLENDER If the Senate were to agree to the Senator's amendment providing an appropriation of $3,000,000, would the Senator be willing to agree that, say, 90 days be given to some railroad to build the line, in lieu of the Government building it?

Mr. HOEY Yes In other words, I would be perfectly willing to agree to the suggestion made by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr RUSSELL], that the committee chairman write letters. I do not believe we ought to place any such provision in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER I wish to state to the Senator that the language which the committee decided to adopt, appearing on page 4, as read by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] would have the same effect, in my opinion.

Mr. HOEY. I do not think so. That is no appropriation at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; it is no appropriation at all.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr HOEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I voted against the proposal in the committee. As I told the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, no one knows better than I do the necessity for this railroad line. I did not vote against it because the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad was involved. The reason I voted against it, and against some other items in the bill, was that they would require strategic materials. This project would obviously require steel and other scarce materials. That is the reason why I hoped the 90-day trial period might be allowed, so that anyone who had the strategic materials and the air-conditioning equipment could be given an opportunity to build the line. The railroad line should be built. It is absolutely essential that it be built; but the purpose of my vote in the committee was as I have stated.

I listened to a part of the testimony, as the Senator from North Carolina knows The only thing I was fearful about was the strategic material situation I am in thorough accord with what the Senator from California [Mr KNOWLAND] and other Senators have suggested that the item be included in the bill, and that a letter be written by the committee chairmen. I do not believe that the Navy Department or any other department would act contrary to the expressed wishes of the chairmen of the committees.

Mr. GEORGE Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr GEORGE. I suggest that we should place an appropriate statement in the conference report, which would take care of the situation

Mr HOEY. That would be entirely agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr HOEY] to the committee amendment on page 11, line 2

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to

The amendment as amended was agreed to

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, if I may do so and if it is in order at this time

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma may proceed.

Mr KERR. Mr. President, I am looking at the report of the committee at page 3 The report reads:

> The cuts are to be applied by the Secretary of Defense, with the elimination of the less urgent projects

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma will suspend. The Senate will be in order The Senate has a very heavy calendar today. Following consideration of the pending bill there will be a call of the calendar and consideration of conference reports. Of course, there is no limitation on debate, but all Senators can assist materially by keeping quite while a Senator is speaking.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I hope so I hope we will have an early disposal of the pending bill

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a few days ago we passed an authorization bill for military public works It carried in detail the projects which were being authorized. I believe it was the understanding of the Senate and of Congress that an appropriation bill to carry out the authorization would soon be before us.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee which one of the authorized projects would be eliminated by the reduction in this bill of $438,000,000 plus, which the committee has recommended for military public works.

Mr MCKELLAR. The law provides that the Secretary of Defense shall pass upon that question. Our report so states.

Mr. KERR Mr. President, then I take it, from what the distinguished chairman has stated, that although we passed an authorization bill for certain projects, and although we did so believing that we would later appropriate money for them, under the provisions of the pending bill and in accordance with the action taken by the committee, it will be up to the Secretary of Defense to eliminate such authorized projects as he may deem expedient?

Mr. MCKELLAR That matter was not discussed before the committee, as I recall

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr HILL Is it not rather a matter of priority, instead of one of elimination? In other words, it was the thought of the committee that more immediate necessities would be met first, having in mind that Congress would be in session in January, we would have another appropriation bill before us As I understand, the priority would be determined by the Secretary of Defense. I see the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who is a member of the Committee on Armed Services, is in the Chamber, and I believe that he will agree that even if the bill carried the full amount, it would not provide funds for all the military housing which has been authorized

Mr KERR I appreciate what the distinguished chairman of the committee has stated, and what the distinguished Senator from Alabama has stated. However, it seems, if we approve this action of the committee, that we would be scrambling the program of military public works, and that we would be defeating the purpose we had in mind when we approved the action of the Committee on Armed Services. Furthermore, it seems to me that we would be transferring authority to the Secretary of Defense.

I may say, Mr President, that if it is merely a postponement of some of the projects, I see no advantage to be gained in postponing 25 percent of the appropriation until next January. I should think that the Senate would want more detailed information as to the effect of the reduction in the appropriation and how it would affect the various States represented in the bill. I believe we are entitled to more detailed information

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish merely to say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that, as I told the distinguished

junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] the funds for planning and surveying the needs and the financial ability of the communities to provide community facilities were cut in half by the House, from approximately $1,300,000 to approximately $600,000. We made an attempt in committee, as the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and others realize, to have the full amount restored, so that at least the key appropriation item to the proper and efficient administration of the act, and the funds for determining in the first place which areas are critical defense areas; in the second place, the exact need for the community facilities; and thirdly, the financial ability of the local communities to provide the needed facilities. I want to point out that until an area is declared to be a critical defense area, regulation X cannot be relaxed, advance commitments by FNMA cannot be made, the provisions of the more liberal FHA title IX cannot be made available, grants and loans for sewers, water, and so forth, cannot be made. Temporary housing cannot be provided, and so forth. The 50-percent reduction from the budget request can only slow up the whole process at the very time it ought to move ahead more rapidly.

Yet, in spite of the recommendation of the Johnson subcommittee and the recommendation of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the House committee reduced the funds from approximately $1,000,000 to $600,000. I do hope we will make more adequate provision for this work next year.

I voted in committee to reduce the amount of money by 25 percent as affecting the Army and Navy, and by 10 percent as affecting the Air Force, because we did not have the necessary information.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from South Carolina. However, as I read the report of the committee, it says:

> The cuts are to be applied by the Secretary of Defense, with the elimination of the less urgent projects.

The report does not say that the projects would be held up until adequate planning had been done. The report does not say that the other justified expenditures at this air base or that air base would be delayed or postponed. As I read the report of the committee, it would call upon the Secretary of Defense to eliminate some of the projects for which we had provided in the authorization bill, but would not put any burden on the Secretary of Defense to economize on the projects with which the Secretary of Defense might in his judgment decide to go forward. I do not believe such was the intention of our distinguished committee.

Mr. MCKELLAR and Mr. CORDON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KERR. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator from Oklahoma quotes the words of the report. The law is what all people must follow, including the Secretary of Defense, and everyone else. Such authority has been frequently granted to the Secretary of Defense. I am quite sure it was done during the last war. I am quite sure that during the last war the Secretary of Defense had the right to establish priorities in certain cases. That is all that the report provides.

Mr. KERR. Was it the intention of the committee to permit the Secretary of Defense to eliminate, from the program of military public works, the reactivation of certain bases in their entirety?

Mr. MCKELLAR. No, sir; not at all.

Mr. KERR. Not at all?

Mr. MCKELLAR. No; certainly not.

Mr. KERR. Then I take it that the interpretation of the language is that in the reactivation of the air bases, they shall eliminate the less urgent items of the air base.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. And it is not intended that under this language they would eliminate the less urgent air bases?

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to state for the RECORD that what the Senator from Oklahoma has said and what the distinguished chairman of the committee the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has said is, of course, absolutely correct. Again let me emphasize that in view of the cutting in half of the planning money and the money to be used to make investigations and surveys in critical defense areas, and so forth, while I appreciate the fact that we cannot legislate in this record, yet I am hopeful that the agencies charged with doing this work will do the very best they can with the limited funds; and if it is necessary for them to have a deficiency appropriation in order to have the work done properly next year—although I am not one to advocate deficiency appropriations—the Congress will see fit to act generously and expeditiously with respect to it.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I wish to thank the Senator from South Carolina for his concurrence and for his other remarks and to say that the Senators from Tennessee and South Carolina have answered the question I had in mind, in conjunction with the comments made by other Members of the Senate, namely, that it was definitely not the purpose of the committee to direct the Secretary of Defense to fail to reactivate any of the bases or projects which were provided for in the authorization bill, but that this provision was for the purpose of saying to him that in the development of all the projects, the less urgent buildings, or items with reference to the individual base be deleted or eliminated.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, the distinguished chairman of the committee can speak with more authority on that matter than I can, but I wanted to make the statement regarding the surveys of critical defense areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of the Air Force," on page 12, line 5, after the word "expended", to strike out "$2,112,172,550" and insert "$2,071,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 10, to insert a new section, as follows:

> SEC. 602. None of the funds appropriated in this chapter shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work to be performed within the continenal United States without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 15, to insert a new section, as follows:

> SEC. 603. None of the funds appropriated in this chapter shall be expended for additional costs involved in expediting construction: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense, or his designee for the purpose, shall establish a reasonable completion date for each project, taking into consideration the type and location of the project, the climatic and seasonal conditions affecting the construction and the application of economical construction practices.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 23, to insert a new section, as follows:

> SEC. 604. No part of the funds made available by this act or any other act of the present Congress shall be used for the construction, replacement, or reactivation of any laundry or dry-cleaning facilities in the United States, its Territories, or posessions, as to which the Secretary of Defense does not certify, in writing, after consultation with representatives of the laundry and dry-cleaning industry affected, that the services to be furnished by such facilities are not obtainable from commercial sources at reasonable rates.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 9, to change the section number from "602" to "605."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 10, to insert:

> CHAPTER VII—EMERGENCY AGENCIES
>
> OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION
>
> *Salaries and expenses*
>
> No provision in any act appropriating funds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, shall be deemed to limit the funds available for compensation of persons in the Office of Defense Mobilization who are engaged in informing the public of the progress and purposes of the defense mobilization program, or persons in the agencies assigned functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, who are engaged in informing consumers, agriculture, business, and labor about rules, regulations, and orders issued by such agencies under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 15, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Salaries and expenses, defense production activities

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Defense Production Activities," $300,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, to this committee amendment I offer, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 15, after line 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Resources Management," for the development of additional water supplies on the Navajo Reservation, $500,000, to remain available until expended; and the limitation under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1952.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks regarding this amendment to the committee amendment.

On October 12, I received two resolutions from the chairman of the Navajo Tribal Council, Samuel Ahkeah, dealing with the drought conditions on the Navajo Reservation.

Mr. President, some 2 years ago Congress passed a rehabilitation bill for the Navajo and Hopi Indians. Contained in that bill was an item of $10,000,000 for soil and water conservation and range improvement work. To date there has been appropriated, for the year 1951, $300,000, and for the year 1952, $288,300 additional.

Mr. President, the conditions on this range of the Navajo and Hopi Indians are very desperate. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to read the resolutions in detail. I call attention to the fact that the Indians are doing their very best to take care of the situation, but in their resolutions they ask the Congress of the United States to appropriate $2,000,000 to aid them in this very important project.

There was not time to have this matter submitted to the Bureau of the Budget and to obtain its approval. However, Congress has authorized this expenditure for these poor people. Their stock is dying, as will appear from the resolutions. They are appropriating $250,000 of their own funds for tribal drought relief.

I call attention to one item which appears in their resolution:

Tribal drought relief grant fund (principally water hauling to stricken areas), $45,000.

Think of it, Mr. President. These good citizens of the United States have to haul water for miles for their stock.

I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to read these resolutions in detail, but I ask unanimous consent to have the resolutions in full, together with the letter from the chairman of the tribal council, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NAVAJO TRIBAL COUNCIL,
Window Rock, Ariz., October 12, 1951.

Hon. E W. McFARLAND,
Senate Office Building,
United States Senate,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR: Attached are copies of two resolutions passed by the Navajo Tribal Council on October 12, 1951, concerning the present drought emergency.

One resolution appropriates tribal funds to help relieve drought hardships on Navajo families and livestock.

The second resolution points out the seriousness of the situation, lists tribal efforts to combat the continuing drought and finally requests assistance from Congress in the amount of $2,000,000.

We know that yours and your colleagues' interest in the Navajo people and their present desperate plight will result in favorable action on our request if it is within your power to do so in this session of Congress.

We wish to take this opportunity to express our deep appreciation to you for this and all past consideration.

Sincerely yours,

SAM AHKEAH, *Chairman,*
Navajo Tribal Council.

RESOLUTION OF THE NAVAJO TRIBAL COUNCIL—DROUGHT RELIEF

Whereas—

(1) Drought conditions remain critical in many parts of the Navajo country,

(2) Available range feed is inadequate to carry Navajo sheep and cattle through the winter months in certain areas;

(3) Stock owners in drought areas have requested assistance from the tribe: Be it therefore

Resolved, That—

(1) The following steps designed to extend needed assistance and to prevent further range deterioration, be taken by the Navajo Tribal Council.

(a) Continue the funds authorized in the Tribal Council Resolution CS–38–50 including $150,000 unadvanced and $73,856 44 available cash.

(b) An additional fund in the amount of $250,000 of tribal moneys is hereby authorized, to be used for the purchase and stockpiling of concentrate feed, for expenses incident to transportation of stock owners to inspect off-reservation areas of winter feed, and for expenses incident to the removal of sheep and cattle to those areas.

(c) Not to exceed $150,000 of the funds specified in (a) or (b) above may be used for the purchase of feed concentrates, to be stockpiled within the Navajo country. Feed of this type shall be available to stock owners through cash purchase at cost, or through purchase on a short-term loan basis. The chairman of the tribal council is authorized and hereby directed to approve a plan of operation to be drawn up by the resources committee of the tribal council.

(d) To prevent further damage to the range, and to escape the hazard of wintering livestock in areas where range forage is very scarce, stockmen are urged to sell stock which they own in excess of the available feed supply; or to ship sound, young breeding animals away from the reservation for the winter, retaining only goats and cull sheep needed for home consumption.

The Navajo people have never tried the system of shipping livestock to other areas of the country for winter, although this is a common practice among non-Navajos. If any one Navajo community wishes to pool their breeding animals and ship them to an off-reservation feeding area as a pilot project the Navajo Tribe will pay one-half of the total expense involved on a gratuity basis, for not to exceed 2,000 sheep units of sheep and cattle, and will loan the individual stockmen the remainder of the expense. Subsequent decisions to ship livestock on the part of other communities can be financed on a loan basis with tribal funds. Cost of insurance for livestock shipped to feed under this plan will be borne by the Navajo Tribe from the amount authorized under (b) above.

(e) To further encourage Navajo stock owners from any one community to establish a pilot project involving shipment of livestock for wintering in an off-reservation area, the Navajo Tribe will provide expenses in the amount of not to exceed $9 per person per day for a group of not more than eight persons from that community to make a trip of inspection in the area to which they propose to ship their stock. Funds for this purpose shall be made available from the amount authorized under (b) above.

In order that the Navajo people may be more widely informed about the shipping of livestock to off-reservation feed areas, the Navajo Tribal Council hefeby agrees to defray the costs of transportation and other expenses at the rate of $9 per day per person for not to exceed 36 tribal councilmen, stockmen, or other leaders from the various districts to permit them to inspect livestock feeding operations in the Wheat Belt. Funds for this purpose shall be made available from the amount authorized under (b) above.

CERTIFICATION

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly considered by the Navajo tribal council at a duly called meeting at Window Rock, Ariz., at which a quorum was present and was approved by a vote of 55 in favor and 0 opposed on this 12th day of October 1951.

Approved:

WALTER O. OLSON,
Acting Area Director.
SAM AHKEAH,
Chairman, Navajo Tribal Council.

RESOLUTION OF THE NAVAJO TRIBAL COUNCIL

Whereas—

(1) A disastrous drought has prevailed in Navajoland for the past 2 years, resulting in voluntary reductions in livestock, in death losses of livestock, and in serious damage to the range.

(2) The Navajo people have shouldered these extensive losses and curtailments through their own efforts, and through assistance from the tribe out of tribal funds, as follows:

(a) Tribal drought-relief loan fund, 1950	$250,000
(b) Tribal permanent water development program	250,000
(c) Tribal drought-relief grant fund (principally water hauling to stricken areas)	45,000
(d) Employment of artificial precipitation expert	6,500
(e) Expenses for transportation of feed and for miscellaneous purposes	5,000
(f) Tribal drought-relief program, 1951	250,000
Total	806,500

(3) The drought has been particularly difficult to meet on account of the lack of adequate permanent water development throughout Navajoland;

(4) The Navajo Tribe has on this date enacted a further drought-relief program based on the use of tribal funds, thus reaching the limit of the tribe's ability to successfully withstand the severities of the coming winter months;

(5) The self-help efforts of the tribe will probably be insufficient to carry their livestock over the rigorous winter months ahead, although the emergency will depend on the length and severity of winter conditions; and

(6) There is desperate need for additional financial assistance on the part of the tribe over and above the assistance derived from the use of tribal funds and personal efforts: Therefore be it

Resolved—

(1) The Navajo Tribal Council declares that the tribe is unable any longer to carry the burden of financing the livestock drought-relief program for the Navajo people

(2) The Navajo Tribal Council appeals to the Congress of the United States to extend emergency aid to the members of the Navajo Tribe in the amount of $2,000,000 to be expended for the following purposes in accordance with a detailed program to be prepared jointly by the tribal committee on resources and the area director:

(a) Expenses of shipping livestock to feed lots and leasing of pastures;

(b) Purchase of feed and concentrates;

(c) Replacement of breeding livestock depleted on account of the drought, when range conditions permit;

(d) Development of permanent water supplies;

(e) Employment of Navajo Indians to assist in supervision of drought-relief program and expenses of travel therefor;

(f) Direct relief.

CERTIFICATION

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly considered by the Navajo Tribal Council at a duly called meeting at Window Rock, Ariz., at which a quorum was present and was approved by a vote of 55 in favor and none opposed on this 12th day of October 1951.

Approved:

WALTER O. OLSON,
Acting Area Director.
SAM AHKEAH,
Chairman, Navajo Tribal Council.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to read the justification I received from the Department, after I took up this matter with them.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Appropriations Committee was in session yesterday. Why did not the Senator from Arizona appear before the committee, so that the committee could look into this matter, even though it was not presented to the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. McFARLAND. I received the final draft of these papers only this morning. If I had received them yesterday, I would have appeared before the Appropriations Committee on this matter, which is most urgent.

I hope the committee will be willing to take this item to conference, because $500,000 is a small sum, as compared with the billions of dollars we are appropriating for the relief of the people of other countries.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for another question?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, as soon as I read the justification.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the justification reads as follows:

JUSTIFICATION

The estimate provides for a supplemental appropriation of $500,000 for water development on the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations.

The severe drought during 1950 and 1951 has clearly demonstrated the urgent need for more permanent sources of range water and the necessity for better distribution. The welfare of the Navajo and Hopi Indians has been endangered, both physically and economically, due to the lack of sufficient range water for their use. Indians from every district have petitioned water developments that are urgently needed. Approximately 15,000,000 acres of Navajo-Hopi range land is used by 11,500 horses, 29,000 cattle, and 288,000 sheep and goats. Range resources cannot be properly utilized and maintained nor livestock properly supported without further water development.

It was possible with all funds available to drill 9 wells during the fiscal year 1951. In addition, 147 surface water developments were constructed, 30 of which were 26 feet deep or deeper. The latter are considered permanent water. The 1952 funds do not provide for any more water developments than in 1951. The present water developments are so far apart it is not possible to utilize some of the areas of range land on which there are supplies of forage.

The necessity of long trailing of livestock results in undue trampling and destruction of forage and loss of weight in the animals. The heavy concentration of livestock around limited water facilities destroys vegetative cover with a consequent loss of much needed feed and exposes the surface to accelerated wind and water erosion which further depletes range resources.

The act of April 19, 1950, the Navajo-Hopi Rehabilitation Act, authorized appropriation of $10,000,000 for soil and moisture conservation and range improvement work. The sum of $300,000 was appropriated under this authorization in 1951 and $288,300 additional was appropriated in 1952.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, to begin with, let me ask whether this condition has developed on land owned by the Federal Government?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; this is on Navajo and Hopi land; and the request is made in accordance with the rehabilitation program, which already has been authorized by the Congress.

Mr. BRIDGES. The present request is for the drilling of additional wells, is it not?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, in part, and also, of course, to make water holes or ponds where they can be built.

Mr. BRIDGES. Even though this item has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, it is authorized by law, in connection with the rehabilitation of the Indians in that region; is it not?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. The work would be done on tribal land, would it not?

Mr. McFARLAND. It would.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is it for driven wells? Is the water table steadily dropping in that area?

Mr. McFARLAND. There has not been sufficient drilling in the area really to determine the status of the water table, but I should say that it is not dropping materially, because there has not been a great amount of drilling. If it has dropped, it is only because of the drought conditions which prevail in that area.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. How many wells are to be drilled?

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know the exact number which can be drilled with the amount proposed by the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. They are to be drilled over what area?

Mr. McFARLAND. Over an area embracing more than 15,000,000 acres.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if I may answer that question, the reservation itself contains about 15,000,000 acres in Arizona and New Mexico.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan has been on the reservation, but I wondered what area it covered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is difficult to tell about the water, because in an area of 15,000,000 or 16,000,000 acres it is impossible to make a survey in a hurry. This is in the nature of an innovation because of drought and other conditions. That is why the Congress passed the act for the relief of the Navajos and Hopi Indians of Arizona.

Mr FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr FERGUSON. Have wells been tried in this district, or is this something new?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Wells have been tried, but their number is insignificant compared to the need and the area involved. The reservation is very large.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize that, and I realize that a shortage of water would put these people in a terrible position, because they are really wards of the United States and could not move if they wanted to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not only that, but I may say to the Senator from Michigan that the reservation was created under a treaty with the Navajo Indians.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Navajo Indians at that time were considered as a completely foreign nation. Under the treaty Uncle Sam was obligated to do certain things for the poor Navajos. Of course, if the Senator has been on the reservation he will know of the desolation in that tremendous area. The Navajos, being a nomadic tribe, are widely scattered. The $500,000 proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Arizona will be a godsend, but only a pittance compared to what I consider to be the obligation of the United States toward the reservations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator know how much of this money will be needed for wells?

Mr. McFARLAND. The estimated requirement is $10,000,000. As I said a few moments ago, there has been appropriated in two separate bills only $288,000 and $300,000 thus far, and it is estimated that $10,000,000 will be re-

quired in order to develop fully the water resources of the reservation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me add, refering to the resolutions adopted by the Navajo Tribal Council, that the Indians are urging their people to sell their livestock in an effort to save themselves from this desperate situation. The Indians are doing everything they can do, and as the Senator from New Mexico says, while the $500,000 provided by my amendment is a mere pittance, nevertheless it would be helpful

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ Let me say a word or two, both to the Senator from New Hampshire and to the Senator from Michigan, in regard to the Navajo Indians and the Navajo Reservation. When we do something like this we are actually helping the Indians As Senators know, I am neither a lover of nor very partisan toward the Indian Bureau. We would accomplish more for the Indians by digging wells than by adding 300 or 400 employees to the Indian service, for service in connection with the reservations. We are proceeding in the proper way The proposal is for something practical. If we dig a well for an Indian, he will be able to exist and to take care of his livestock. The story of their efforts is a beautiful one and is illustrative of Americanism. The average sheep unit of the Navajo is 80 head, from which they get a sufficient clip of wool to enable the Indian women to make blankets. They will lose a certain number of sheep during the year, but with nature taking its course, the Indian will always have his 80 head of sheep

We are merely trying to take this action in the interest of the poor Navajos. With the billions of dollars which we are pouring out for the benefit of complete strangers, the amount to be appropriated for the benefit of the Indian is, comparatively speaking, a mere pittance. It is $500,000 to begin with. I do not want one penny of the $500,000 to be spent on the upkeep of the Indian Bureau I want it to be spent, so far as may be necessary, in the digging of wells

Mr McFARLAND Let me state to my good friend from New Mexico that when the amendment was prepared a footnote was appended to it, reading, "The amount available for personal services is increased by $100,000." I crossed that out before I offered the amendment, because I wanted this money to be used for the development of the water supply for the Indians, not for the payment of personnel

Mr. CHAVEZ But it will be for the purpose of the well drilling, and for very few employees of the Bureau.

Mr FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Department really is not tied down to the $500,000 for the drilling of wells. There is $100,000 for personnel. I mean that is what it would amount to.

Mr. McFARLAND. I eliminated the $100,000, because, to be frank, I thought the Senator from Michigan might object to it.

Mr. FERGUSON. He would have objected.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would have objected to it, had the Senator from Michigan not done so.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire

Mr. BRIDGES. As I understand when this item came up it was in the amount of $500,000, $100,000 of which was for personnel. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; the item was for $500,000 with no restriction. I have marked out the reference to personnel It read, "The amount available for personal services is increased by $100,000 " I merely marked that out, so that the amendment is limited to a straight $500,000.

Mr. HAYDEN Mr President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to my colleague.

Mr HAYDEN I suggest the Senator ought to mark it out, beginning a little further back and including the words:

And the limitation under the heading of the Interior Department Appropriation Act of 1952, in the amount of "

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I modify my amendment accordingly.

Mr. FERGUSON. That should be taken out, because there is a limitation on personal services contained in the bill

The PRESIDING OFFICER The Senator from Arizona modifies his amendment

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER Mr. President, I have a recollection that when the regular appropriation bill for the Interior Department was considered 2 weeks ago, there was an amount set aside for resources management Has the Senator investigated the provision of the bill which appropriates $10,921,360 for that purpose, and the question of how much of that could be used for drilling the wells to which he has made reference?

Mr. McFARLAND None of that money has been allotted for the wells on the Navajo Reservation

Mr. ELLENDER. Why can that not be done?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend for a moment. The Chair is certain that Senators cannot hear the speakers The Chair cannot hear them, due to the confusion and restlessness in the Senate Those who feel it necessary to have conferences will please retire from the Senate Chamber. The Senator will speak a little louder, please.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I assume that the money referred to by the Senator from Louisiana can be spent only for the purpose stated in the authorization bill, namely:

(4) Development of industrial and business enterprises, $1,000,000.

(5) Development of opportunities for off-reservation employment and resettlement and assistance in adjustments related thereto, $3,500,000.

(6) Relocation and resettlement of Navajo and Hopi Indians (Colorado River Indian Reservation), $5,750,000.

(7) Roads and trails, $20,000,000.

(8) Telephone and radio communication systems, $250,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. McFARLAND. From the authorization bill.

Mr. ELLENDER I was talking about the general appropriation bill which was enacted just a few weeks ago in which Congress provided $10,921,360 for the development of natural resources

Mr. McFARLAND That was not just for the Navajos and Hopis.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that, but it strikes me that some of the money could be used for the purposes which the Senator is now indicating.

Mr McFARLAND Of course, it might be possible to take some money from the Indians in Oregon or in Oklahoma and put it into Arizona, but I do not think it will be done

Mr. CHAVEZ Not only that, Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will yield to me—

Mr McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr CHAVEZ. The Senator from Arizona bases his amendment on the authorization for the Navajos and for the Hopis; is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct

Mr ELLENDER Are we to understand that they are not entitled to any of the $10,000,000?

Mr. CHAVEZ. They are entitled to some of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course they are.

Mr. CHAVEZ Of course they are; but, inasmuch as that is a general fund for all the Indians throughout the United States, the amount each would be entitled to would be insignificant

Mr ELLENDER. Can the Senator tell us whether any of the approximately $10,000,000 has been allocated for the purpose of drilling wells?

Mr. HAYDEN Mr President, will the junior Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield

Mr HAYDEN I understand that it has not The budget was made up over a year ago In the meantime there has been a terrific drought which has paralyzed the whole area The water level in the wells has gone down, and the situation is desperate Because of new and changed circumstances the Indians need this additional money.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the senior Senator from Arizona inform us as to whether the Interior Department would have a right to allocate money?

Mr HAYDEN It would, but when a budget is made up more than a year ahead and plans are prepared for the entire Indian service throughout the United States, and allocations are made on that basis, when a terrific drought occurs and a complete change in the situation is wrought the Department would simply have to rob someone else in order to provide for the particular emergency.

Mr. ELLENDER. If any of the money were to be used as the Senator has just indicated, it would be taken from other

worthy causes which might be as important as is the one at issue?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is entirely true.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. My inquiry goes to the amount involved. The first question, in order to clarify the subject, in my own mind is this: Was the amount which is included in the amendment determined by the Indian Bureau?

Mr. McFARLAND It was. The tribal council asked for $2,000,000. They are very anxious to get these wells completed as quickly as possible. However, the Indian service, in making its estimates, gave me an estimate of $500,000 for this additional appropriation.

Mr. CORDON. The next question, then, is this: Inasmuch as the Indian Bureau, in determining the amount, suggested at the same time that there should be an additional $100,000 for administration expenses, and inasmuch as the Senator has now eliminated from his amendment that particular provision, would it not be proper to reduce the total in the amendment by $100,000 and still have the amount that was estimated to be used for this purpose?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator will permit me, what the Bureau sought to do was to increase the limitation which he and I placed in the bill so as to increase the total sum of money available for personnel.

Mr. CORDON. I understand that.

Mr. HAYDEN. It was sought to increase the appropriation by $100,000, so that a part of the money for this purpose could be used for personnel. But having eliminated that, they must do the work with their present funds.

Mr. FERGUSON. Are the additional funds needed?

Mr. HAYDEN. They are. The tribal council appropriated out of its own funds $375,000, which was all it could dig up for the purpose. It then asked Congress to appropriate $2,000,000. Certainly the amount should not be cut. They could spend $500,000 in digging wells.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that the $500,000 is for the purpose of digging wells and developing a water supply for these desperate Indians. I hope the Senate will be willing to adopt the amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, the Senator from Oregon suggested a reduction of $100,000.

Mr. CORDON. He did not suggest it. He asked why it was not made.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was going to make this suggestion to the Senator, if he will permit. It is close to the time for our committee meeting, as the Senator knows, and I am very anxious to have the bill passed before we hold that meeting. I make this suggestion to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who will be on the conference committee: Why can we not take to conference the figure of $400,000 and do the best we can with it after we get there?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I appreciate the suggestion made by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and I understand fully the reasons for it. I have no desire to continue the debate or to extend it at all. I feel, however, that although it is a minor amount of money which is involved, it also involves the principle of orderly consideration of the business of this country. The Appropriations Committee has had no opportunity to go into this request. The best evidence of that fact is that active members of the committee have been on their feet inquiring of the majority leader with respect to facts that should have been disclosed so that the committee could have gone into the matter further and so that information might be available to the Members of the Senate in an orderly manner.

I have no objection, if the chairman of the Appropriations Committee desires that this particular item go to conference, but if I am a member of that conference committee, Mr. President, I must be relieved from any necessity to support the item under the circumstances. I feel that if we are going to conduct this business in a sound, orderly, and systematic way, we must adopt certain principles and adhere to them.

I recognize the right of any Member of the Senate to make the offer of any amendment he desires, but by the same token, every other Member has the right to present his views and his objection. In this case my objections do not go to the use of the money at all. It may well be that three times $500,000 ought to be used for this purpose; I do not know about that; but, because I do not know, because, as a member of the committee, I have had no opportunity to know, I cannot blindly accept this amount as an amendment, and be expected to go into conference and defend it.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the Senator offering the amendment has indicated that he does not know how far it will be necessary to go down to get water in these wells. Seemingly there has been no exploratory work. The sound approach, I submit, would be to come to the committee, then to the Senate floor, and get sufficient funds to do the exploratory work, before we commit half a million dollars of Government money and two or three hundred thousand dollars of the Navajos' money, which might all be wasted.

I oppose the amendment, but I will accept it on the basis I have mentioned.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am still for the Navajos, not for the Indian Bureau, and I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona if he would have any objection to adding a little to his amendment. The amendment as it now reads states:

For an additional amount for "Resources Management," for the development of additional water supplies on the Navajo Reservation, $500,000, to remain available until expended.

That is the end of the amendment. I should like to know if he would modify his amendment by inserting the following proviso:

Provided, That development shall be made after consultation with and approval by the Navajo Tribal Council.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no objection to that amendment, Mr. President. I accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator modify his amendment?

Mr. McFARLAND. I so modify the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona modifies his amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona, as modified. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment, as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

On page 4, after line 4, to insert:

"RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

"For an additional amount for 'Resources Management,' for the development of additional water suplies on the Navajo Reservation, $500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That development shall be made after consultation and approval by the Navajo Tribal Council."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not wish to take any more time of the Senate, but I desire to thank the Senate for the action it has taken. I do not know whether the Senator from Oregon was present in the Chamber when I made my statement in the beginning, but I would have submitted this matter to the committee if I had had the information in time, and I shall submit more information for the conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 7, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "VII" and insert "VIII."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Claims for Damages, Audited Claims, and Judgments", on page 15, line 15, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 79, and", and in line 17, after the word "Congress" to strike out "$610,912" and insert "$1,885,416."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 6, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "VIII" and insert "IX."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions," on page 16, line 8, to change the section number from "801" to "901."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 16, to change the section number from "802" to "902."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 19, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 903. No part of the money appropriated to any department, or made available for expenditure by any corporation, in the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1952, which is in excess of 75 percent of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the aggregate budget estimates for personal service heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by such department or corporation during such fiscal year in the performance of—

(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2) No person whose only performance of the functions described in (1) or (2) of the preceding sentence is in activities necessary for the enforcement of law, promotion of safety of human life, dissemination of weather information, or scientific experimentation, or whose compensation is paid from funds appropriated specifically for International Information and Educational Activities shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to be engaged in the performance of the functions so described.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 4, to change the section number from "803" to "904."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. Are there any amendments to be offered from the floor?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it will be recalled that when the Senate passed the Defense Housing Act for critical areas it carried a provision known as the "community facilities provision," which authorized an appropriation of funds for waterways, sewerage, streets, schools, and other community facilities.

When the bill went to the House of Representatives the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], and other members of his committee, insisted that schools be stricken from the community facilities provision, stating that the House Committee on Education and Labor would bring in a separate bill amending the legislation which the Congress had passed during the last session, which would take care of the schools in the critical areas of defense housing. It was only Monday of this week that the separate legislation taking care of these schools was passed by the House of Representatives, the schools having been stricken in conference from the Defense Housing Act.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has reported the House bill taking care of the school situation in the critical areas, and the bill is now on the calendar of the Senate, and we hope to reach it when the calendar is called this afternoon. If for any reason it is not reached on the calendar, I shall ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the bill.

Now we are confronted with this situation: The pending appropriation bill is the last appropriation bill we expect to be passed in the Senate, or, for that matter, to be passed in either House of Congress, before the adjournment or the recess of the Congress. So if any funds are to be made available for schools in the critical areas, the funds must be provided for in the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN If the legislation of authorization, as the Senator refers to it, should not be enacted at this session, would this appropriation be available?

Mr. HILL. It would not be available, and I shall offer an amendment in a moment. I am merely making an explanatory statement.

I took the matter up with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and he advised me that the question had come up overnight, so to speak, and he felt that funds should be made available for schools in the critical areas, but he had not had time to check and determine accurately what amount should be made available. So he made the suggestion that, instead of including the funds in the pending bill and increasing the appropriation in the bill, funds which have been made available for school construction and school operation and maintenance in impacted areas, funds which were authorized in legislation passed at the last Congress, be made available to take care of the urgent situation in the critical areas.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has forwarded to me a copy of a letter which he has sent to the White House today suggesting that the White House send to the Congress an amendment, which I shall suggest in a moment. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget in addressing the President at the White House said:

This proposed provision is necessary in order to carry out the provisions of H. R. 5411—

That is the bill which has passed the House of Representatives and has been reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—

which has passed the House and is now pending in the Senate. The legislation would amend Public Law 815, approved September 23, 1950, and Public Law 874, approved September 30, 1950.

That is the legislation to which I have adverted.

This will enable the agency to carry out the provisions of the pending legislation which would authorize payments to local educational agencies for the the operation of schools, and for providing school facilities and payments to local educational agencies for construction in critical defense housing areas.

I recommend that the foregoing draft of a proposed provision be transmitted to the Congress.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. The purport of the amendment, then, is that both the operating expenses and the construction funds would be made available out of the present appropriation to take care of the entire needs in the critical defense areas.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to advise the Senator that in the conference practically every one of the Senate conferees was in favor of including the school facilities in the construction bill, and possibly school facilities will also include school-operating expenses.

The House Members, under the instructions of the Committee on Education and Labor, sent their chairman to the conference meeting, an unusual proceeding, and he advised us at that time that they would move in this matter immediately and make available the proper authorizations for appropriations to take care of the needs. I think every Member among the Senate conferees was in favor of the provision in the bill. We deleted it out only when we were advised that it could not be gotten through the House because of some particular objections.

I am hopeful of the passage of the bill referred to. We do not want to build new facilities in the critical defense areas, with all the money the Government is putting into them, unless there are available for the youngsters the educational opportunities they had in their own home communities before they moved. It will be necessary to have some funds immediately available to catch up with the expanding program of building and housing.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio for his statement. He was a member of the conference. He is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. He told the Senate the story of exactly how the school facilities were taken out of the bill, which, as the distinguished Senator from Ohio has so well said, was very much over the opposition of the Senate conferees.

Mr. BRICKER. So strong was the feeling of members of the Senate conferees that two of them, I believe—one, at least, I know—definitely threatened to leave the conference and vote against the conference report if this item were not included. Finally, upon the persuasion of the chairman of the House committee, we concurred in the final bill which was reported.

Heretofore we have appropriated money for these communities. We have

made appropriations both for operating expenses and for construction, even where there has been only a moderate expansion of the needs for school facilities. There is now a much greater need than we have ever had heretofore in these communities So I, for one, am glad to join the Senator in this program. I think it ought to be included in the pending bill.

Mr. HILL I thank the Senator very much for the very fine contribution he has made.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that I think his amendment will be helpful in meeting the problem he indicates. However, I wish to reemphasize the fact that the mere allocation of dollars alone will not solve the problem, because even today there are literally hundreds of school districts throughout the country which are in critical areas, and which are prepared to do their own financing for school construction. They have voted bonds, they have prepared plans, and contracts have been let; but they cannot construct buildings because they cannot obtain an allocation of steel. So the mere allocation of dollars will not solve the problem, unless there is a coordinated effort on the part of the National Defense Production Authority, and a recognition that the school problem is a critical one.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator for his contribution. I share his concern with respect to the allocation of steel for schools. I think the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is more familiar with this subject even than I am. I think he will confirm the fact that perhaps a great many of the schools contemplated in this program will not require very much steel. In the critical areas some of the school construction would be more of a temporary nature.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to have the Senator from Alabama, from that side of the aisle, give those of us on this side of the aisle who have been voicing concern over the lack of steel for building schools some help in the problems of obtaining allocations.

Mr. HILL. I will say to my distinguished friend from Michigan that I have been endeavoring to do all I could to render such help. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I had scheduled hearings on this subject so as to bring out the facts. I have been using all the power and influence of the Senate committee to try to obtain steel.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that.

Mr. HILL. I found that the House Committee on Education and Labor had also scheduled hearings. I saw no reason why there should be two hearings running concurrently. I will say to my good friend from Michigan that I am wholeheartedly with him in the cause, and I am doing everything I can.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I should like to say to the Senator from Alabama that the allocation of steel for the construction of public schools is a very critical matter at this time, as he well knows. Communities all over the country, both in the expanded defense areas as well as in areas where there is only the normal expansion of various municipalities in relation to the needs for school construction, are being held up in their programs. I have been intensely interested in finding out where the steel is at the present time. In our committee we have tried to find out. It is being hoarded somewhere. The totals for usage do not add up. We find that the allocation authority has already allocated more steel than is available for the various uses, according to the War Production Administrator.

In the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I may say that yesterday our staff was directed to look into the question of steel tonnage. By the end of this year or the beginning of next year there will be a total tonnage of 117,000,000 tons. The industry is now operating at about 104 percent of normal capacity. The shortage of scrap is also involved. That problem is being considered in connection with the war-production program.

Our committee has a great many statistics available. It is now working to bring them up to date, so as to find out where the steel is—whether hoarding is going on, whether it is in the black market, or whether the Government has more laid aside at the present time than it can utilize. So it may be possible to discover an additional available supply of steel. If the Senator were to confer with the chairman and the staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I think he might get some aid from them.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator for the information he has given us. I shall certainly make it my business to confer with the chairman of the committee so that we may join hands and pool our efforts to try to get some steel for school construction.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. It seems incredible to me, with the immense production of steel going on at the present time, that this year there is available for allocation only half as much steel as is represented by the allocations already made and the certificates which have been granted. I think there is a lag somewhere in the program, and that we are not getting full utilization, even of the steel which is being produced at the present time.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HILL. I yield first to the Senator from California. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There is one thing that I should like to try to clear up, so far as the legislative history is concerned. I wonder if the Senator from Alabama could state for the RECORD whether it is the intent to divert all the funds which are presently available for this new type of construction in the defense areas.

Mr. HILL. Oh, no.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The reason I raised that question is that there are numerous cases in which really critical areas are involved, areas which have not yet been so declared under the terms of the law, but where school facilities are urgently needed. There is fear that the funds which otherwise would go to those districts might all be taken and used under this proposal. I think the Senator should clear up that matter.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to make it very definite and clear that it is not the idea, the intent, or the language of the amendment that all these funds shall go exclusively for schools in critical areas. As the Senator well knows, the entire appropriation is about $90,000,000 for school purposes, under the legislation which we enacted last year—Public Law 874 and Public Law 815. We shall be back in session in January, and no doubt other appropriation bills will be before us. It is certainly not the idea that all the funds should go to the critical areas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The authorities who are doing the allocating would certainly have to prescribe some standards of judgment, because actually there might be a more critical situation in a nondefense area than in a defense area.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from California is exactly correct. As he knows, there is a shadowy borderline between what is declared to be a critical area and an area which is called a federally impacted area. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I promised to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to the Senator from Alabama that, as of yesterday—and I am sure he is aware of this, although he was tied up in conference at the time—the Senate took action upon Senate Resolution 225, which expresses the deep concern of the Senate over the problem of the shortage of critical supplies of steel, copper, and aluminum for schools and hospitals. When this bill is passed I hope we shall make the legislative history sufficiently strong to point up to the National Production Authority and the Defense Production Administration that it is absolutely mandatory that they reexamine the entire system of allocations, particularly for structural steel. It is incredible that we could fail to take care of the educational needs of the country at a time when our national security is threatened. The schools are as fundamental to the productive and economic health of our country as any industrial plant can possibly be.

I merely wanted to make that brief comment at this time as part of the con-

sideration of the bill, because the resolution which we adopted should not be regarded as a token expression, but should be taken for what it is, namely, the sense of the Senate that there should be a reconsideration of allocations and that a sufficient supply should be made available, and in such manner as to guarantee the construction of and additions to school facilities. We should make it indubitably clear that that is our purpose.

Mr. HILL. The statement of the Senator from Minnesota is very timely, and I thank him for it I wish to commend him for offering the resolution and for his leadership in having it adopted by the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What I am about to say may be of secondary consideration to the bill and to the whole question of the allocation of steel. I do not know exactly why we are criticizing the allocation of steel Of course, I am not against what the Senator from Minnesota is discussing, but a very serious situation is developing, and I should like, with the permission of the Senator from Alabama, to read into the RECORD a telegram which I received today. It deals with a very serious problem in connection with the allocation of steel

We are trying to build approximately 20 modern ships. Our merchant marine is the fourth arm of defense of this country. We have been unable to get a priority for an allocation of steel for the ships. I may say that these ships are just as important as tanks, airplanes, guns, or the situation in which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has discussed. I hope it will be the sense of the Senate that the proper authorities look at the problem and determine where the steel is most sorely needed If the Senator from Alabama will allow me to do so, it will take me only a short time to read the telegram into the RECORD

Mr HILL With the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER Unanimous consent is requested that the Senator from Alabama may yield to the Senator from Washington for the purpose of reading a telegram without his losing the floor. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Washington may proceed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The telegram is addressed to me. It reads.

The delegates of all the Nation-wide ports of the Propeller Club of the United States—

This is not a hasty resolution; it refers to a problem with which we have been working for many weeks—

in convention today expressed their grave concern over the proposed drastic curtailment of steel allocations by NPA for the first quarter of 1952 for shipbuilding and ship repair. These delegates voted unanimously to protest such curtailment and to urge in strongest terms revision of the proposed allocations to the end that sufficient steel be allocated in that quarter and subsequent quarters to permit the construction under normal production schedules of all vessels now on order and subsequently to be ordered, and the expeditious repair and maintenance of all existing vessels now in operation or to be placed in operation so that the Merchant Marine can function effectively as the indispensable fourth arm of the national defense without which all other defense production cannot be utilized overseas to provide vital support for the military services. Failure to make such revision inevitably will jeopardize the entire defense program and immediate corrective action thus is necessary

HUGH GALLAGHER, *President,*
The Propeller Club of the United States.

Mr. BRICKER Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield

Mr. BRICKER. There is a further problem, in addition to that which has been emphasized by the Senator from Alabama There is a shortage of steel. Apparently when such a shortage develops it becomes very real and pressing immediately, and everyone begins to clamor for steel. It is well known that some of the steel companies which are expanding their plants have been unable to continue with the expansion because they cannot get a proper allocation of steel with which to complete what is necessary to bring about an expanded steel production That emphasizes the need even more strongly.

However, when we approve these funds, there will be not much more needed before Congress returns and considers another appropriation bill, except for making plans and specifications, and perhaps the purchase of some land. The amount which has already been appropriated would be sufficient to take care of those needs But we do not want to emphasize to the material allocation administration that these are the only communities in need of steel. Some communities are paying out their own money, issuing their own bonds, and levying taxes to expand their present school systems, and they should receive just as much consideration in the allocation of steel as the Government-expanded programs.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the Senator from Ohio. I hope we may get a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the amendment be stated. There is no amendment at the desk.

Mr. HILL. I thought I had sent the amendment to the desk. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 8, it is proposed to insert:

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Appropriations granted in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1952, under the headings "Payments to school districts" and "School construction," shall be respectively available for payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools in critical defense housing areas pursuant to section 10 of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874), as amended, and for providing school facilities and making grants pursuant to title III of the act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815) as amended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 5411, Eighty-second Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, there was included in the pending bill and amendment which does not have to do primarily with the departments considered in the bill. It relates to a reduction of the expenditures for keeping channels of information open between the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and the American people. I should like to move to reconsider the action by which the Senate adopted the amendment The other day the Senate decided the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER To what section of the bill does the Senator from Michigan refer?

Mr MOODY. Section 903.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Michigan that the Senate reconsider the vote by which section 903, beginning on page 17, line 20, was adopted.

Mr. MOODY. The question was thoroughly debated the other day in the Senate It was debated when there were more Senators on the floor than there are today. I believe it is a mistake to put the amendment in the bill, and I hope the Senate will reconsider its vote.

Mr KERR Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr MOODY. Yes

Mr. KERR. I do not believe that I understood what the Senator from Michigan stated with reference to the previous action by the Senate

Mr. MOODY The question was before the Senate a few days ago, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr KERR. That is what I understood I thought the Senator from Michigan said that it was adopted by the Senate.

Mr MOODY. The amendment was rejected by the Senate when we adopted the conference report on the State, Justice, and Commerce bill

Mr KERR. That is the way I remember the situation. Therefore, I must have misunderstood the Senator from Michigan I thought he said the amendment was agreed to. The amendment was rejected by the Senate the other day.

Mr. MOODY. That is correct

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MOODY. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr BRIDGES. If I may do so, I wish to say that I think the Senator from Michigan is a little in error in what he stated to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The Senate adopted this amendment, and it was incorporated in the bill which went to conference. At the conference, because of the refusal of the House conferees to agree to the amendment, the Senate conferees yielded on that point.

However, the amendment was adopted by the Senate and was included in the bill as passed by the Senate, and the bill as thus amended went to conference; and in the conference the conferees on the part of the Senate yielded to the conferees on the part of the House in regard

to this matter. I think that is the correct picture of it.

Mr. MOODY. That is a fact; but I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire will also agree that it is likewise a fact that when the conference report was before the Senate, this issue was again argued, and the Senate decided to accept the conference report and not to change it.

So I think it is unwise to bring up this question now in the pending bill, although of course it is proper to do so.

I hope the Senate will stand by its former action.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope very much the Senate will agree to retain this item in the bill. It should go to conference by all means. If there is any trouble about this matter, it can be ironed out in the conference. By all means this item should be considered in the conference.

Therefore, I hope the Senate will retain this provision.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in regard to this matter, I merely wish to say that this provision is a very simple one, and it is included in every other appropriation bill which has been passed by the Congress this year except the one appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Commerce, Justice, and the Judiciary.

In colloquy with the Senator from Michigan, we have stated the procedure which was followed and we have stated the status of this matter at the present time.

In order to be consistent, I think this provision should be included in every appropriation bill. So far as I remember, the Senate committee voted unanimously in favor of this amendment, at its meeting yesterday. This provision does not work an injustice upon any particular department; it does not result in eliminating the information service. This amendment merely cuts down the personnel 25 percent, but still allows this agency to have 75 percent of the total number of persons now so engaged.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. MOODY. I do not contend that this amendment inflicts an injustice upon any department; but I do contend that the amendment inflicts an injustice on the American people, there is nothing in more controversy today than the foreign policy of the United States. It has been placed in controversy largely by means of attacks on that policy, some of those attacks being justified and some of them being unjustified, many made on the floor of the Senate.

The purpose of this appropriation is to make it possible for the State Department to make available to organizations, such as those to which I referred the other day in a colloquy with my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], competent persons to answer inquiries. While maintaining a prompt information service to newspaper reporters and others representing the public. In that connection I refer now to the American Legion, which is not entirely in agreement with the foreign policy of the Government, as we found out yesterday; the Chamber of Commerce of the United States; labor organizations; veterans' organizations; and many other groups, which continually are seeking information of that sort.

This group in the Department is headed by a particularly able man, whose ability has not been questioned. I believe it would be a serious mistake, at a time when the Senator has agreed that the recent security order should be changed, not to keep the channels of information open, without of course divulging military secrets.

In my judgment eliminating these competent information specialists would militate against such contacts, particularly between such organizations as those referred to by me and those who are setting the foreign policy. If we say we want to keep the channels of information open, let us keep them open.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that the latter part of the amendment which he will find set forth on page 18, specifically excludes "activities necessary for the enforcement of law, promotion of safety of human life, dissemination of weather information, or scientific experimentation, or whose compensation is paid from funds appropriated specifically for international information and educational activities shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to be engaged in the performance of the functions so described."

In other words, this provision covers the very essential activities and permits them to be carried on.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Does the Senator from New Hampshire think it is more important for the American people to know about the weather than it is for them to know about their foreign policy?

Mr. BRIDGES. Probably sometimes in the past, information about the weather has done the American people as much good as has the information they have received about the foreign policy. However, I hope that situation has changed.

Mr. MOODY. Why should information about the weather be exempted, but information about the foreign policy not be exempted?

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that information about the weather has a definite effect on the safety of human life, for instance, in the case of aircraft operations. Such information is vital in connection with transportation and the growing of crops in the great agricultural regions, and so forth. That information is very important.

Mr. MOODY. Of course, it is important.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has not yielded. The Chair feels constrained to enforce the rule very strictly.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President——

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield for a question to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Of course, the weather reports are important; but I wish to point out to the Senator from New Hampshire that it also is important that the American people have all possible information about the Nation's foreign policy.

I am told by men in this agency in whom I have confidence, including the gentleman the Senator from Michigan with whom I discussed it the other day, that this amendment will be a crippling one. So I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will agree to have the amendment eliminated from the bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to ask whether my recollection is correct in one particular. At the time when the appropriation bill for the State Department was before the Senate, a proposal was made to make a considerable reduction in the amount of the appropriation for the purpose of the Information Bureau, or whatever the exact name is. I recall that I participated in the debate and the colloquy which occurred at that time. I know that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] made a speech on that occasion; and I recall that there was a yea and nay vote, as a result of which it was decided that that appropriation should not be cut.

My recollection is that the reason for our decision at the time was twofold, first, because this agency was able to give to the public, in reply to questions or otherwise, authoritative answers in regard to the work being carried on within the State Department; and, furthermore—and I think it important to stress this point—that such information is of tremendous importance to the Members of Congress, who are not able, without further information from the State Department or without briefing, to reply to their constituents in an intelligent or authoritative manner.

Is my recollection of that matter correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from New York, let me say that I think most Senators and most Members of the House of Representatives whom I know answer their own mail. Although they may obtain some information indirectly from the Department, yet I believe that the basis of their answers, so I would guess from my knowledge of the matter is rather largely their own information, and I believe that generally speaking their answers are made on their own responsibility.

As the Senator from New York is aware this amendment specifically exempts from its provisions the so-called Voice of America. Is not the Senator from New York aware of that?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; but of course I am also aware that many other questions or subjects are of interest to the American people, and inquiries are made about those matters of their representatives in the Senate and in the House of Representatives.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will recall that this matter has come before us almost every year. My recollection is that in one of the appropriation bills which has passed, namely, the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, in which the exceptions which have been mentioned were specifically included, the wording was not the same, but the facts were the same as in the present instance, and the reduction was made.

The result of disagreeing to this amendment at this time will be to undo a very large part of what the Congress has already done, and, I think, properly and rightfully and honestly done, for the American people.

The Senator says the American people are involved in this matter. They are involved, but they are involved on a side quite different from that on which my distinguished colleague the Senator from Michigan feels they are involved, in my judgment.

So I believe the amendment is a proper one in every way, and I hope the Senate will sustain it at this time.

Mr. BRIDGES Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me point out to the Senator from New York, in final answer to his question, that an examination of page 18 of the bill, paragraph (2), in line 11, will disclose that that portion of the bill defines the duties of the persons who assist in performing the functions described in paragraph (1), as follows:

> Drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material.

That has nothing to do with any private letters which may be written. The various items are specifically designated at that point in the amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was not referring to private letters, of course; I was referring to inquiries relating to very important issues and activities carried on by our Government.

My recollection is that this proposal came before us, as I have already said, in connection with the State Department appropriation. I have no recollection of anything which related to the Justice Department or to the Commerce Department. When that proposal was made it was debated on the floor of the Senate before a very full attendance. It was debated for a long time. After that, on a record vote, the proposal to reduce this appropriation, which many of us considered of high importance, was rejected by a very substantial vote. Therefore, it would seem to me that it would be eminently proper if we voted to reconsider this amendment, which has already been adopted.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senator from New York that what he says concerning a certain item of appropriation is correct, but by the same token, the same Senate, and I assume on the same day, adopted this proposal, and the bill was passed and went to conference with the House.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from California

Mr KNOWLAND. I should like to propound two questions to the able Senator from New Hampshire. Is this substantially the amendment which was offered by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr BYRD], along with the Senator from Michigan, I think, to other appropriation bills?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Secondly, does not the able Senator from New Hampshire think it a little odd that the administration should want no restraint upon its expenditure of funds in the field of propaganda, while at the very same time the President of the United States, by Executive directive, is trying to close the channels of information to newspapers and correspondents, whereby they might get their own news?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think it is, and to be consistent, I think the President of the United States instead of issuing that directive and instead of opposing this cut of 25 percent, should have favored about a 50 percent cut in information service personnel.

Mr KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the able Senator from New Hampshire think that the American people can be more adequately informed if the channels of information are opened up to the press and to the wire services, so that they may be facilitated in getting the news of the Government, and be able to question propaganda handouts rather than to emphasize propaganda which in many instances only gives one side of the picture?

I have read a great many of the documents issued by the State Department. I may be mistaken, but almost without exception they contain only the point of view of the administration. I do not recall having seen the speech of General MacArthur, when he raised some questions as to the policies being followed by the Government. I do not recall having seen the speeches of the Senator from New Hampshire, when he questioned certain policies of the Federal Government in regard to our far-eastern policy. But almost consistently and overwhelmingly the propaganda material issued supports the point of view of the administration, and of the administration alone. One of the great problems we have today, I believe, Mr President—and I should like to ask whether the Senator agrees with me regarding it—is that too often there are some people who mistake the administration for the Government of the United States. As Lincoln clearly pointed out, the administration is not the Government. The Government consists of the three great branches of our Government, all of which contribute to the general over-all functioning of the Federal system.

Mr. MOODY rose.

Mr BRIDGES. I agree with the distinguished Senator from California that we should have clearly in mind that the Government of the United States is a perpetual organization, a perpetual entity, while an administration is but the temporary occupant of offices provided by the Constitution for the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of moving that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table?

Mr. BRIDGES I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I so move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate is not in order. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] to reconsider the vote by which section 903 was agreed to. [Putting the question.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for a division.

Mr. BENTON and Mr. MOODY requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Benton	Hill	Monroney
Brewster	Hoey	Moody
Bricker	Holland	Murray
Bridges	Hunt	Neely
Butler, Md.	Jenner	O'Conor
Capehart	Johnson, Tex	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Case	Kefauver	Robertson
Connally	Kerr	Russell
Cordon	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Knowland	Schoeppel
Ecton	Langer	Smathers
Ellender	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	Long	Smith, N. C.
Flanders	Magnuson	Sparkman
Frear	Malone	Stennis
Fulbright	Maybank	Thye
George	McCarran	Watkins
Green	McCarthy	Welker
Hayden	McClellan	Williams
Hendrickson	McFarland	Young
Hennings	McKellar	
Hickenlooper	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

For the information of Senators the Chair will state the parliamentary situation. Section 903 of the bill which is before the Senate was adopted today.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] has moved that the Senate reconsider the vote by which section 903 was adopted. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table. The yeas and nays on this question have been ordered. Debate is not in order.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry, in connection with which I hope I may have the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr BENTON. Mr President, I am not sure that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee realized that there are several Senators who expected to make comments on this issue. We had not sought recognition, inasmuch as we were waiting for the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to finish his remarks. If the Senator from Tennessee did not so realize, I should like to bring it to his attention, because, in view of this problem, and in view of my long background, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes on the subject.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, this subject has been argued in connection with every single appropriation bill. Thirteen of them have been signed by the President, and these words, or the substance of them, are in each one of the bills. Why should we now undertake to delete the provision from the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to rule that debate is not in order. If the Senator from Connecticut wants to make a unanimous-consent request he may state it.

Mr. BENTON. I have asked unanimous consent to address the Senate for 5 minutes, so that I may answer such questions as that which the Senator from Tennessee has asked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I object, and call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. If the senior Senator from Connecticut were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is unavoidably detained on official business at the White House.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr BENNETT], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 21, as follows:

YEAS—44

Brewster	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bricker	Hoey	O'Conor
Bridges	Holland	Robertson
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Connally	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Long	Stennis
Ecton	Magnuson	Thye
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Maybank	Welker
Frear	McCarran	Williams
George	McCarthy	Young
Hendrickson	McKellar	

NAYS—21

Benton	Hunt	Monroney
Ellender	Kefauver	Moody
Fulbright	Kerr	Murray
Green	Kilgore	Neely
Hayden	Lehman	O'Mahoney
Hennings	McClellan	Pastore
Hill	McFarland	Sparkman

NOT VOTING—31

Aiken	Duff	Mundt
Anderson	Eastland	Nixon
Bennett	Gillette	Russell
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Ives	Taft
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Tobey
Capehart	Kem	Underwood
Chavez	Lodge	Wherry
Clements	Martin	Wiley
Dirksen	McMahon	
Douglas	Morse	

So Mr. MCKELLAR's motion to lay on the table Mr. MOODY's motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to be offered?

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, line 22, after the word "information" and before the word "or" it is proposed to insert "specialists assigned to the responsibility of disseminating factual information regarding the foreign policy of the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair heard the amendment stated, it is an amendment to a committee amendment which has already been agreed to. In the opinion of the Chair, it would not be in order, and the Chair holds the amendment is not in order.

Are there any other amendments to be offered from the floor? If not, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 5650) was passed.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

INCREASED PAY IN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 355) to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see pp. 13565–13572, House proceedings, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 19, 1951.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, is my understanding correct that this is a conference report, unanimously agreed upon, on the bill raising the salaries of postal officials and employees?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator intend to follow this conference report with another, dealing with all Federal employees?

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is the plan.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection to the consideration of the conference report

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senate in the beginning that the conference-report bill, so far as the money it will require is concerned, will not vary more than $5,000,000 from the bill as passed by the Senate. It will cost about $252,000,000 to pay the increases in salary to all the postal workers, and also to reclassify the salaries of postmasters and supervisors. We have two bills in one, as Senators will remember. This bill would also pay a flat increase of $400 to all postal employees, and an increase of 20 cents an hour for hourly employees, in addition to the elimination of the two lowest automatic grades.

Mr BRIDGES Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield

Mr. BRIDGES. Are the provisions of the conference report printed? Is it available for distribution?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The provisions are as they were in the bill which the Senate passed, practically without change. The conference report is practically the Senate bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then the conference report, generally speaking, with minor exceptions, is the Senate bill which we passed.

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is the Senate bill with one exception. We agreed to the House provision for a flat increase of $400, instead of going to 8.8 percent for the employees other than postmasters and supervisors. This affected only about 150 employees. The difference between the conference committee bill and the Senate bill is perhaps $5,000 or $10,000.

Mr RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. What is the estimated annual cost?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The estimated annual cost of the increased pay for postal employees, and also the adjustment of salaries of postmasters and supervisors, is $252,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Have the conferees agreed on the bill raising postal rates?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They have agreed. The conference report is now on the desk. The House has already approved it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Can the Senator indicate how much money is to be raised through increased postal rates, under the conference report?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Taking into consideration the Interstate Commerce Commission ruling, it will be somewhere in the neighborhood of $235,000,000 or $236,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. The net result is that the postal rate increase bill does not raise quite enough money to take care of the salary increases, and we have made no progress whatever toward eliminating the postal deficit.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true. That is because of the treatment of certain provisions of the postal rate bill, especially those with respect to first-class mail. The House refused to go along with any increase. That reduced the amount under the Senate bill by approximately $217,000,000. I was not pleased with that, but it was the best we could get out of the conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know that the distinguished Senator and other representatives of the Senate vigorously represented the views of the Senate in the conference. But as one who voted for increased rates, I express my disappointment that our efforts have resulted only in taking care of the pay increases for postal employees. We have been unable to apply any substantial sum to the half billion dollar annual postal deficit. That must come out of the taxpayers of the United States generally.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am sure that I speak for all the Senate conferees when I say that they felt the same way. We labored and tried to do everything we could, with the two bills which were before us, to bring about an increase in revenue, but we could not do it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Senator and his committee will consider the matter afresh next year, to see if some steps cannot be taken toward eliminating some of the deficit.

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina I am glad the Senator from Georgia brought out that point. We are not discussing the other bill at this time, except to the extent of letting the Senator know what happened. In the conference we adopted what was known as the Carlson resolution or proposal, to look into the matter thoroughly and see where we could raise more revenue, and thus do justice to the taxpayers. The joint committee of the House and Senate will work on the problem The great trouble has been that the House would go off into one field and the Senate into another, and they would not meet when bills came before the conferees.

Mr. RUSSELL I am delighted that that much progress has been made in the adoption of the Carlson proposal. I hope it will lead to measures which will enable us to make the Post Office Department self-sustaining. To me, that is something that is pressing upon us in this day of deficits. When we have a monopoly in the transportation of mail, we ought to be able to make it pay its own way.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. May I ask the distinguished Senator what the arguments were with respect to the so-called Long amendment regarding magazines carrying advertising?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That bill is not now under consideration.

Mr. McFARLAND. The reason I ask the question is that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] asked about that bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We made another minor amendment which we thought would save a little money. In the Senate bill, we increased the equipment allowance for rural carriers from 8 to 9 cents a mile or a minimum of $3 per day, regardless of how much that mileage might be. That was amended so as to provide an increase in the equipment allowance for rural carriers from 8 to 9 cents a mile, with authority to the Postmaster General to make the equipment allowance to rural carriers on heavy-duty routes, not to exceed $3 a day in lieu of the 9 cents, which is in effect practically the same thing as the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], except that it leaves to the discretion of the Postmaster General as to what is a heavy-duty route and the exact amount to be allowed in lieu of 9 cents, but with a ceiling of $3. If, however, the mileage is such that 9 cents a mile is more than $3, then the 9 cents a mile is mandatory.

Mr HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is this the amendment which I offered with respect to rural delivery?

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is

Mr HUMPHREY. I was out of the Chamber when the Senator was explaining it. Will he please tell me again what was done?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The equipment allowance for rural carriers was increased from 8 to 9 cents a mile, with authority to the Postmaster General to make an allowance for use of equipment to carriers on heavy-duty routes, not to exceed $3 a day, in lieu of the 9 cents, which is in effect practically the same thing as the Senator's amendment

Mr. HUMPHREY. It provides more flexibility for the heavy-duty routes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr LANGER. The Senator from Minnesota will remember that the figure in his amendment was $3 50.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. That was reduced to $3 on the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. This provision would still give the Postmaster General the right to leave the allowance at $3, if he so desires.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr President, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution, for which I ask immediate consideration. The purpose of the concurrent resolution is to correct a typographical error which crept into the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be stated.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 52) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S 355) to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, to make the following correction, namely: In the language contained in the conference report on page 2, table of grades and salaries of employees in the automatic grades, under "Examiners of Equipment and Supplies," strike out "4,470" and insert in lieu thereof "5,470."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it is necessary to correct the typographical error. It affects the classifications.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4473) to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5684) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GARY, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. CANNON, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. COUDERT, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3669) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S 57. An act for the relief of Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin;

S 118. An act for the relief of Nouhad Ann Khoury;

S. 519. An act for the relief of Moy Chin Shee;

S. 575. An act for the relief of Robert Jose Toribio;

S. 582. An act for the relief of Emma Burr;

S 635. An act for the relief of Hans Lenk;

S. 775. An act for the relief of Dr. Anthony M. Opisso;

S. 839 An act for the relief of Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roselleen Schut;

S 921. An act to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947;

S 954. An act for the relief of Dr. Charles Gordon Rennick Sell;

S 1048. An act for the relief of Myrtle Harding;

S. 1274. An act for the relief of Vera Oumancoff,

S. 1436. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller,

S 1622. An act to amend section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946;

S 1640 An act for the relief of Cathy Dana Besser,

S 1912. An act to provide for conveyance of certain land to the city of New Orleans;

S. 1952. An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes;

S 1970. An act for the relief of Louis E. Gabel;

S. 2007. An act for the relief of Sharon A. Gates;

S 2027. An act for the relief of Leo Kieve; and

H. R. 4473 An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Roger M. Foley, of East Milton, Mass., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Massachusetts, to fill an existing vacancy, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joseph Charles Duggan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Abraham J. Harris, resigned.

INCREASE OF COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see pp. 13576–13578 of House proceedings, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 19, 1951.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I would appreciate it if the Senator from Rhode Island would give the Senate a brief explanation of the report. I should also like to ask him this question: Was the report of the conferees unanimous?

Mr. PASTORE. The senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] did not sign the report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask one further question. Is the senior Senator from North Dakota interested in being present when the report is considered?

Mr. PASTORE. The senior Senator from North Dakota was in the Chamber not more than 2 minutes ago.

Mr. President, the House bill provided for a flat $400 increase for employees under the classified service of the Federal Government. The Senate bill provided a 10-percent increase for these same employees, with a maximum ceiling of $800. The conference agreement provides a $300 floor and an $800 ceiling, with a 10-percent increase.

The compromise agreement will cost $37,000,000 more than the Senate version and $25,000,000 less than the House version. Employees covered under the provisions of the conference agreement number approximately 1,150,000. Such employees include employees under the Classification Act of 1949, employees in the judicial branch under the Classification Act, secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, employees of the legislative branch, Foreign Service officers of the State Department, and officers and employees of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration.

The conference agreement is retroactive to July 1, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement. I was a member of the conference committee, and I am the only member who did not sign the report. The reason I did not sign the report was not because I was not in favor of a $300 raise, but because to my mind it seemed that the amount of $300 was far too low to give to these Federal employees, some of whom have worked for the Government for 25 years or more. Now we come along with a little, miserable $300 increase.

I remember very well, Mr. President, when the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], spoke at the annual convention in Los Angeles. I remember the newspaper headline. I do not know whether he saw it. Across the

top of the newspaper, in very large type, it told about the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] coming home to fight for a real salary increase, mentioning $500 and $600. It was stated that at last the Federal employees had a chairman who was going to see that the people who had worked and slaved for the Government would get a real increase. It was a remarkable speech. In fact, I complimented the Senator from South Carolina on the magnificent political speech he had made in favor of an increase to these employees.

Now he comes back and he settles for a miserable $300. The postal workers got $400. The postal employees are organized. They have men like Bill Doherty and Jerome Keating, who work for them. They are real organizers. They have gotten practically 100 percent cooperation. The other Federal workers wander around aimlessly and get lost in the shuffle. The result is that they do not get $400, but only $300.

It is stated that the raise was made $300 in order to save a little money. I believe about $30,000,000 a year would be saved. On the same day that the salary-increase bill was passed the Senate passed a bill which gave $7,157,000,000 to foreign countries

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. Is the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota aware of the fact that one of the recipients of the $7,157,000,000 was Belgium, which retired their King Leopold to the back pasture on $125,000 a year?

Mr. LANGER. No; I did not know that. I do not believe that a king could get along on $125,000 of American money. I suppose he could make a stab at it. Some of the Federal workers who have been given a $300 raise are driving taxicabs at night, their wives are out scrubbing floors, and their daughters, when they get to be 12 or 13 years of age, get jobs as baby sitters. The families of the workers cannot educate their children properly.

When an investigation was made about 2 years ago it was found that at the end of 20 years service for the Government a man could not even send one of his children to college. When the husband or wife falls sick and must go to the hospital, the family is in debt for years and years.

I like all my colleagues on the conference committee, but I wish to call attention to the fact that the House conferees voted 4 to 1 for a raise clear across the board. It may be that the House conferees are closer to the rank and file of our people, and know the kind of struggle they are having in meeting the highest cost of living in all the history of the United States of America.

So I wish to say that while I am not going to oppose adoption of the conference report, and I hope it will be adopted, yet I would be ashamed of myself, and I could not look at myself in the looking glass, if I were to vote for a miserable $300 increase in pay. That is why I refused to sign the conference report.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to one of the features of the conference report which I think is most important and requires the serious consideration of the Senate.

After action is taken on this conference report, I expect to call up and request immediate consideration for House bill 5329. I make that statement for the reason that by means of the Kilgore amendment, which was made on the floor of the Senate, we included in the benefits of Senate bill 622 the Metropolitan police, firemen, and school teachers of the District of Columbia. The conference committee did not agree to the retention of that amendment in the conference report. For that reason, the conferees on the part of the Senate receded from their position, and accepted the House version of the bill, which means that now the Metropolitan police, firemen, and school teachers of the District of Columbia are not included in the benefits provided by Senate bill 622.

However, it was generally felt by the members of the committee of conference that the House bill 5329 should be amended by including in it a provision for benefits similar to those which are being given to Federal Government employees under Senate bill 622.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now give notice that immediately after action is taken on the conference report, I shall ask unanimous consent for the consideration of House bill 5329, which already has been reported favorably by the committee, with an amendment. That bill is for the purpose of extending the same benefits to the Metropolitan police, firemen, and school teachers of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I now move the adoption of the conference report on Senate bill 622.

The report was agreed to.

INCREASE IN SALARIES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE, MEMBERS OF THE FIRE DEPARTMENT, AND EMPLOYEES OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 5329.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5329), Calendar No. 977, to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I wish to assure the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that I am not going to object, let me say that, as a matter of fact, I wish to commend the Senator from Rhode Island for bringing up this bill at this time. It had been my hope, too, that these employees might be included in the pay legislation which was considered by our committee. In all fairness to the policemen, firemen, teachers, and other employees of the District of Columbia, I sincerely trust that they will be taken care of pursuant to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Rhode Island, if he will yield to me for a question.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the pay increase the policemen and school teachers will receive also be in the amount of a minimum of $300?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island believe that is enough?

Mr. PASTORE. I only say that at least it is consistent.

Mr. LANGER. Consistent with what, Mr. President?

Mr. PASTORE. Consistent with the bill we passed a moment ago.

Mr. LANGER. It is not consistent with the $400 pay increase received by the postal employees, is it?

Mr. PASTORE. The situation is somewhat different. We have gone over that matter time and time again; all of it has been explained.

The fact is that if we consider the proportionate increase for those in the lowest pay scale in the classified service and for those in the lowest pay scale in the postal service, we find that the $300, as compared with the $400, is a very reasonable compromise.

My heart bleeds just as much as does that of the Senator from North Dakota for these workers.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me ask if it is true that the cost of living affects a poor man just as much as it does a man who receives a salary of $12,000. A poor man has a grocery bill which is just as high; his bills for rent and the price he must pay for potatoes and beefsteak are just as large as those of the higher salaried employees, even though the former receives a salary of only $3,000 or $3,500, or in some instances only $2,500. Is not that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, let me ask how much beefsteak can be purchased by a man who receives a salary of $3,500.

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly the point. Similarly, how much rent can be paid by a man who has a salary of $3,200 or $3,300 or $3,500 a year?

At this time a proposal is made to increase their pay by $300, at a minimum, on the basis of a pay increase of 10 percent, with a maximum increase of $800 for those in the higher salary brackets.

I submit that the poor man is not getting a square deal by means of this measure. I submit that this bill should call for an increase of $400 straight across the board, if the purpose of the bill is to provide for meeting the increase in the cost of living.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5329) to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That (a) the annual compensation (including basic salary and additional compensation in lieu of overtime pay and night pay differential) of each officer and member of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, as increased by the act entitled "An act to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia," approved July 14, 1945, as amended and by the act entitled "An act to increase the compensation of certain employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1949, shall be further increased by 10 percent, (plus 8 percent of such 10 percent as additional compensation in lieu of overtime pay and night pay differential) except that in no case shall such compensation be increased by less than $300 per annum or by more than $800 per annum. The proviso contained in the first sentence of the first section of said Act of June 30, 1949, is hereby repealed; but no officer or members covered by this section shall, by reason of the enactment of this section, be paid with respect to any pay period, basic salary, or basic salary plus additional compensation at a rate in excess of $11,130 per annum

(b) (1) Each employee of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose salary is fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, except the Superintendent of Schools, shall receive, in addition to the compensation already provided by such act and by the Act of June 30, 1949, compensation at the rate of 10 percent of the aggregate compensation provided by such acts, except that in no case shall the additional compensation provided for in this paragraph be increased by less than $300 per annum or by more than $800 per annum.

(2) The basic and maximum salaries for all salary classes in Title I of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, except class 29, are hereby increased by 10 percent, except that in no case shall any such basic or maximum salary be increased by less than $300 per annum or by more than $800 per annum.

(c) In the exercise of the authority granted by section 81 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as amended, the Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized and directed to grant additional compensation to policemen, firemen, and school teachers employed by the Canal Zone Government, whenever additional compensation is granted to employees of the District of Columbia employed in similar or comparable positions. The additional compensation for such Canal Zone employees shall be effective as of the date any additional compensation is granted to similar or comparable employees of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. Authority is hereby granted to the Commissioners and to other wage-fixing authorities of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Interior and the President of the United States, in their discretion, to grant additional compensation at rates not to exceed those prevailing without regard to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), additional compensation at rates not to exceed those prevailing in the District of Columbia for similar or comparable employment to each employee in or under the municipal government of the District of Columbia, National Capital Parks and the Executive Mansion Grounds, whose compensation is fixed and adjusted from time to time by a wage board, or whose compensation is fixed without reference to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or whose compensation is limited or fixed specifically by the provisions of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1952.

SEC 3. This act, except section 2 hereof, shall become effective as of the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to; and, without objection, the amendment will be engrossed, and the bill will be read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, before that action is taken, I wish to offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair begs the pardon of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment; and to that amendment the Senator from Rhode Island submits an amendment, which will be stated

The Chief Clerk. In the committee amendment, on page 7, in line 1, after the word "Act", it is proposed to strike out "except section 2 hereof".

On page 7, line 1, after the numeral "(3)", it is proposed to insert the letter "(a)".

On page 7, it is proposed to insert a new subsection (b) to section 3, as follows:

(b) No retroactive compensation or salary shall be payable by reason of the enactment of this act in the case of any individual not in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid a retired officer or employee for services rendered during the period beginning with the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951, and ending with the date of his retirement.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island explain the amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. PASTORE. This amendment to the committee amendment is to take care of those who have left the service after July 1, 1951. The purpose is to give them retroactive pay only for the length of time they were actually employed after that date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, to the committee amendment as amended, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator's amendment offered to the committee amendment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk. In the committee amendment on page 7, before line 1, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. (a) Public Law 159, Eighty-second Congress, is hereby amended by striking out section 3 thereof.

(b) This section shall be effective October 8, 1951.

On page 7, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "SEC. 3." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 4."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment to the committee amendment is to correct the mistake which we permitted to go in, in connection with another bill which gave employees a retroactive feature in regard to their retirement. That is something we have never done before, and the purpose of this amendment to the committee amendment is to correct that error, which went through

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further amendments to be proposed to the committee amendment?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time

The bill was read the third time and passed.

READJUSTMENT OF POSTAL RATES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1046) to readjust postal rates. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see pp. 13581–13587, House proceedings of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 19, 1951.)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as agreed upon by the

conferees and as passed in the House today by a voice vote, S. 1046 does the following:

First-class mail: Increases postage on postals and post cards from 1 to 2 cents with a surcharge of 10 percent if bought in quantities of 50 or more. Increases rate on drop letters from 1 to 2 cents. Drop letters are regular sealed letters mailed in office, without free delivery, for delivery in that office.

Second-class mail: Increases rate on second-class mail 10 percent annually for 3 years, said increase based on present rates, and exempts from such increase certain nonprofit organizations and also publications designed for classroom or religious instruction. Increases rate of transient second-class mail to 2 cents. Transient second-class mail are publications having second-class entry mailed by others than publishers, sample copies mailed by publishers in excess of 10 percent allowance, and copies mailed by publishers to persons not included in required legitimate list of subscribers.

Third-class mail: The minimum rate of third-class bulk mailings is increased from 1 to 1½ cents effective July 1, 1952. No increase in bulk mailing rates on mailings of certain nonprofit organizations.

Fourth-class mail: Makes no change in rates put into effect October 1, 1951, pursuant to order of ICC as to parcel post and catalogs but retains present rates on books.

Special services: Follows recommendation of Postmaster General as to all fees for special services except minimum special delivery fee which was raised from 15 to 20 cents instead of 23 cents as in original bill. Follows original bill as to leaving to Postmaster General adjustment in future of fees for special services which was recommended by the Hoover Commission, but both as to rates in fourth-class mail and special services attention is called to the investigation contemplated of all postal rates by the joint committee, which is set up under section 13 of the bill

Effective date. Second-class mail, April 1, 1952; third class bulk mail, July 1, 1952; remainder of bill February 1, 1952.

Estimated increase in revenue: Based on 1950 cost ascertainment estimate of volume, without taking into consideration possible increase or decrease in volume, it is estimated that the bill will increase present postal revenue approximately $117,00,000 first year; $121,000,000 second year; $125,000,000 third year, to which should be added, each year, the increase in revenue by reason of the increase in fourth-class mail, $100,000,000.

Title 2 of the bill sets up a graduated annual and sick leave law as a substitute for the Douglas rider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

THE BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF A SOLDIER IN KOREA

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a story came to my attention today which I considered to be very heartwarming and inspiring. I should like to share it with the other Members of the Senate. A young boy by the name of Charles Marston, who used to be a messenger in the Press Gallery and who is now in the thickest of the fighting in Korea, has just written a letter to his uncle, who is employed in the Capital of the Nation. Charles Marston's birthday will be next month, in November, and among the many things he said to his uncle was, that the one thing he desired the most for his birthday was an American flag. I am happy to report that his friends in the Senate will see to it that he gets his wish for his birthday.

But, Mr. President, I consider this story to be a noble example of the quality of our American youth. It is indeed an inspiration. It shows a sense and quality of devotion which gives us a hope for future peace and liberty on this, God's earth.

I wish to extend my congratulations and felicitations to Charles Marston, and to say to him that I think I bespeak the sentiments of the entire Senate in wishing him a very happy birthday in the month of November. We devoutly hope for him and for all our men, sons of very fine fathers and mothers, who are fighting in Korea, that their present will be a speedy termination of the hostilities in Korea and a quick, safe, and sound return to their homes in America.

AUTOMOBILES FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS—VETO MESSAGE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed immediately to reconsider the bill (S. 1864) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that by unanimous consent it has been agreed that following the disposition of the conference reports, the Senate would proceed to call the calendar of unobjected-to bills; but inasmuch as this is a privileged matter, the Chair presumes it is in order. So the Chair lays before the Senate the veto message; and the question is on the motion of the Senator from New York who moves that the Senate proceed to the reconsideration of Senate bill 1864, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not insist upon his motion. Unanimous consent has been been obtained to take up other matters. I omitted to state that the veto message would take precedence over a call of the calendar. But when unanimous consent is obtained the object of it is to advise Senators of the business to be considered. There are many Senators interested in bills which are on the calendar, who are required to take trains, and I hope that we may dispose of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels that a veto message of the President is a privileged matter, and that, in the absence of any agreement that the call of the calendar should take precedence over everything else, a Senator has a right to move to reconsider the bill, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LEHMAN The Senator from New York, who was chairman of the conference committee which approved this bill, or submitted this bill to the Senate, has given his assurance to a number of people that the message of the President vetoing Senate bill 1864 would be brought before the Senate. Obviously, the Senator from New York could give no assurance whatever in regard to the action of the Senate, but in view of the probability of an early adjournment or recess of the Congress, it would seem to me to be important to bring the matter to the attention of the Senate for such action as it may desire to take. I have always understood that a veto message of the President of the United States was a privileged matter. I do not want to press this, but I do wish to have some assurance that before we adjourn tonight this matter will be considered by the Senate

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will put the question again. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New York to reconsider the bill (S. 1864), the objection of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 1864) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The veto message of the President has heretofore been read. Therefore, the question now before the Senate is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. CARLSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Benton	Hoey	Monroney
Brewster	Holland	Moody
Bricker	Humphrey	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Neely
Carlson	Johnson, Tex	O'Conor
Case	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kefauver	Pastore
Connally	Kerr	Robertson
Cordon	Kilgore	Russell
Dworshak	Knowland	Saltonstall
Ecton	Langer	Schoeppel
Ellender	Lehman	Smathers
Ferguson	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Flanders	Malone	Smith, N. C.
Fulbright	Maybank	Sparkman
George	McCarran	Stennis
Green	McCarthy	Thye
Hayden	McClellan	Watkins
Hendrickson	McFarland	Welker
Hennings	McKellar	Williams
Hickenlooper	McMahon	Young
Hill	Millikin	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish briefly to explain the bill. It authorizes payments by the Veterans' Administration for automobiles for certain disabled veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict. The House approved the conference report on this bill on October 5. The Senate approved the report on October 11.

Senate bill 1864, as it passed the Senate unanimously on August 9, provided for the extension for three more years of the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay for the purchase of automobiles for World War II veterans who have suffered the loss of, or loss of use of a leg. This measure also extended the same benefits to veterans of service in the Armed Forces who have seen active duty on or after June 27, 1950.

The House of Representatives amended the bill by inserting the language of House bill 4233 which it had passed on June 13. The House bill would have granted automobiles to veterans of World War I, World War II, and of the Korean conflict, who suffered either the loss of, or the loss of use of an arm or a leg, or those who are blind.

Senate bill 1864, as the House amended it, also permitted the payment of $1,600 cash in lieu of the automobile.

The conference report, as it comes before the two Houses, has wider coverage than had the original Senate bill, but it is considerably less than the House amended version.

While the Senate conferees agreed to include under this legislation veterans who suffered the loss of, or loss of use of an arm or leg, or who are blind, the House conferees receded from their insistence on including World War veterans, and also agreed to eliminate the cash payment provision.

This measure would permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to authorize payments on the purchase of automobiles for World War II veterans and veterans of the Korean conflict who have suffered the loss of, or loss of use of an arm or leg, or who are blind. It also changes the provision which requires the veteran to be able to operate the vehicle by permitting him, if he is physically unable to drive, to purchase one so that it may be operated for him by another person.

Mr. President, I believe the bill as passed represents a fair compromise of the differences between the House and Senate versions of this desirable legislation.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I rise to associate myself with the explanation made of the bill by the distinguished Senator from New York. I agree completely with him—that this is a fair compromise. The bill as we originally presented to and passed by the Senate extended to the Korean veterans the same benefits enjoyed by those of World War II. The bill was amended when it reached the House so that it became all-inclusive. In my humble opinion, it is a very realistic and practical compromise, and I think it makes a great deal of sense, because I could never understand why we should give an automobile to a leg amputee and at the same time deny one to a veteran who was completely blind. After all, a blind person may have a brother or a sister who can drive him in a car.

I consider it to be a fair compromise, and I shall vote to override the veto.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I listened to the explanation made by the Senator from New York, and I, of course, am familiar with the particular bill under consideration. It was reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The bill was before us in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, in the second session, and it is now before us in this session. The chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. LEHMAN] did an admirable job in preparing the bill, and I cannot understand why it should be vetoed in view of the compromises which have been made in a determined effort to eliminate the difficulties which arose from provisions in the prior measures. So I, for one, think the bill ought to be passed and made public law, and therefore I join with my colleagues from New York and Rhode Island.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wanted to point out to the Senator from Minnesota that some years ago, immediately following World War II, we did attach to an appropriation bill at the last moment, in the closing days of the session, an appropriation to provide automobiles for so-called amputees. It was clearly understood at that time that we were merely trying to take care of one segment of the wounded. We did not have an opportunity to hold hearings.

I see in the Senate Chamber at this time the distinguished Congresswoman from Massachusetts, Mrs. ROGERS, who sponsored the provision in the House. I had the honor to sponsor the amendment in the Senate, and it was understood at that time that we would give this whole matter further study and extend the benefit to those who were worthy. In my opinion, the conferees have acted excellently in that regard. They have not resolved all the problems, but at the time when we specifically added an amendment to an appropriation bill to take care of one class of amputees we intended to go further and do what is now proposed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] worked vigorously on this matter, both in this session of Congress and at prior sessions.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I should like to point out to the Senate very briefly what seems to me a great difference between the bill which has just been vetoed and the vote taken in the last Congress on another veto by the President of a bill dealing with veterans' interests. Last year the President vetoed a bill to provide free medical service to Spanish-American War veterans regardless of the cause of their injuries. In other words, if a Spanish-American War veteran went into a bar and was hit over the head and wanted to go to a veterans' hospital and spend the rest of his life at Government expense, under the bill then passed he was privileged to do so. Only three Members of the Senate voted to sustain the President's veto of that bill, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and myself.

The bill now before the Senate seems to me to be a wholly different type and character of measure. As I voted to sustain the President's veto last year, so I shall vote to override his vete this year, because in my judgment we cannot be too generous with the boys who have been maimed as young men, right at the start of their life's career.

I congratulate the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] for his leadership, and I congratulate Congresswoman ROGERS for the way she has worked, has had the boys brought to the Capital, and has kept everlastingly at it until we have reached the point where we are today.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, before final action is taken on the veto message, I desire to express appreciation for the very excellent service rendered by the Congresswoman from Massachusetts, Mrs. ROGERS, on the type of bill which has been vetoed. It was my privilege to serve for several terms in the House of Representatives, and during that time Mrs. ROGERS initiated this type of legislation. She has persisted in pressing for such legislation and is to be congratulated by the maimed veterans of the United States for the excellent work she has done in their behalf. While a Member of the House of Representatives I supported legislation of this type and today I am going to vote to override the President. We spend billions of dollars all over the world—certainly we should be generous to those who were maimed in service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding? Under the Constitution, a yea-and-nay vote is required, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], would each vote "yea."

The roll call resulted—yeas 55, nays 10, as follows:

YEAS—55

Benton	Johnson, Tex.	Moody
Brewster	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Bricker	Kefauver	Neely
Butler, Md.	Kerr	O'Conor
Carlson	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Case	Knowland	Pastore
Chavez	Langer	Saltonstall
Connally	Lehman	Schoeppel
Cordon	Magnuson	Smathers
Dworshak	Malone	Smith, Maine
Ecton	Maybank	Sparkman
Ferguson	McCarran	Stennis
Flanders	McCarthy	Thye
Hayden	McClellan	Watkins
Hendrickson	McFarland	Welker
Hickenlooper	McKellar	Williams
Hill	McMahon	Young
Humphrey	Millikin	
Hunt	Monroney	

NAYS 10

Ellender	Hennings	Russell
Fulbright	Hoey	Smith, N. C.
George	Holland	
Green	Robertson	

NOT VOTING—31

Aiken	Duff	Morse
Anderson	Eastland	Mundt
Bennett	Frear	Nixon
Bridges	Gillette	Smith, N. J.
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Taft
Byrd	Jenner	Tobey
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Underwood
Capehart	Kem	Wherry
Clements	Lodge	Wiley
Dirksen	Long	
Douglas	Martin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas are 55; the nays are 10. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the bill is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

JESUS JUAN LLANDERAL

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 210) authorizing the naturalization of Jesus Juan Llanderal, which was to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Jesus Juan Llanderal."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in this matter the House merely corrected the title of the bill. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, is the Senate about to proceed with the call of the calendar at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the regular order of business, under the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday. The call of the calendar begins with Calendar No. 888, House bill 5062.

TERMINATION OF STATE OF WAR WITH GERMANY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds with the call of the calendar, I should like to make a brief statement.

Yesterday the Senate passed House Joint Resolution 289, after defeating a proposed committee amendment.

As passed, the bill included a proviso which raised what is in my opinion a very serious constitutional question. This proviso is subject to the construction that it attempts to convey authority to the alien property custodian to continue to seize the property of German nationals in spite of the fact that the major purpose of the resolution is, purportedly, to bring to an end the state or war between the United States and the Government of Germany.

Section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act now prohibits the return of vested property to nationals of Germany. If vesting may still take place after the state of war between the United States and Germany has been terminated, such vesting will amount to confiscation, since the law prohibits the return of any property so vested. At least as far as friendly German aliens in this country are concerned, I seriously doubt whether this provision would be constitutional.

I called this matter to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. CONNALLY] by letter, under date of September 21. I have had no word to indicate that the committee considered this constitutional question, and the committee's report, Senate Report 892, does not indicate that this constitutional question was considered. In view of this situation, I believe the action of the Senate in passing this resolution should be reconsidered and that the constitutional question should be thoroughly examined, preferably by the Committee on the Judiciary, which has jurisdiction over the Trading With the Enemy Act. I have no hesitancy in entering a motion for reconsideration, since I know that if the President wants to terminate the technical state of war with Germany, he may do so at any time by proclamation.

Accordingly, I now enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate passed House Joint Resolution 289.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Nevada that that motion must be accompanied by a motion to request the House to return the papers.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then I move that the House be requested to return the papers to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The other motion will be entered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER subsequently said: The Chair would advise the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] that the joint resolution with reference to which the Senator from Nevada moved that the Senate reconsider its vote and recall the joint resolution from the House, has been signed by the Speaker of the House and by the President of the Senate, and has been transmitted to the President of the United States for his signature. Therefore, it would require joint action by both Houses to return the joint resolution to the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well. The matter was drawn to the attention of the committee many weeks ago. I regret that it was passed with a provision in it which I believe will raise some trouble later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would advise the Senator from Nevada that the committee amendment was rejected by the Senate on yesterday.

Mr McCARRAN. Yes, the amendment was rejected, but that did not touch the point that I was drawing to the attention of the Senate. Let it be understood that my motion to reconsider the vote of the Senate still stands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would take action by both Houses to make it possible to reconsider the joint resolution, because it would have to be recalled from the President of the United States.

Mr. McCARRAN. In all probability a joint resolution to that effect will have to be prepared.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider can be entered, but it will not accomplish the purpose of recalling the joint resolution.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall have to ask that such a joint resolution be passed by both Houses.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The call of the calendar is the regular order of business at this time. The clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO EMPLOY RETIRED OFFICERS

The bill (H. R. 5062) to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status was announced as first in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

FARMER McKINLEY "OPPRESSES" THE U. S. A.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I did not realize that we had started the calling of the calendar. I merely wish to make an insertion in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for that purpose.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in the November issue of the Farm Journal, beginning at page 31, there appears an article by one of the ablest agricultural writers in the United States, Mr. Ray Anderson. I have known Mr. Anderson for a long time. He has been investigating a very celebrated case in my State, which began when Mr. H. L. McKinley thought that bureaucracy was overrunning his right as an American citizen in connection with the potato program. It created a great deal of attention. Mr. Anderson, in an article in the Farm Journal, under the title "Farmer McKinley 'Oppresses' the U. S. A.," describes the very heroic struggle of Mr. McKinley to retain his basic rights as an American citizen to do business without oppression by bureaucracy in the Government.

It is a very short article, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, so that I shall not have to take the time to read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMER McKINLEY "OPPRESSES" THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—HE WANTS THE WORLD TO SEE WHAT CAN HAPPEN WHEN BUREAUCRATS GET TO RUNNING AGRICULTURE

(By Ray Anderson)

There's a case in Federal court in Iowa that matters to you.

At first you might think it's just the private trouble of an Iowa potato grower who got in a jam with the Government over a marketing agreement.

But it isn't. It's a determined fight on the part of one American family to show, with all the attention they can focus on it, what can happen when bureaucrats get to running agriculture. It's a picture worth looking at.

The whole affair started with an injunction suit by the Government against H. L. McKinley & Sons, farmers near St. Ansgar, Iowa. It stopped the McKinleys from selling potatoes, and seemed to put them in a bad light.

The Government is now feeling very smug and sitting back with folded hands. But not the McKinleys. They have applied to USDA for the prescribed administrative ruling—which USDA has so far been loath to give—so they can appeal such ruling in court. They want this thing thrashed out in public, for your benefit as well as theirs.

As the McKinleys see it, the question is one of simple honesty and integrity in Government. It is whether the Secretary of Agriculture and officials in the Fruit and Vegetable Section of the PMA practiced deception and fraud, in putting over a potato referendum last fall affecting North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, 12 counties in Iowa, and 20 counties in Indiana. And whether the same thing could happen with any marketing-agreement vote.

The McKinleys are not fighting the constitutionality of marketing agreements. They want to show how Government planners can operate when they get their hearts set on a plan that they consider "good for you."

McKinley & Sons freely admit violating the Government's potato-marketing order based on the disputed referendum. In fact, they helped the USDA get evidence against them. They claim that Iowa and Indiana farmers never wanted this order, but had it shoved down their throats, that the referendum wasn't honest, hence illegal.

They propose to prove this with records taken from Government files by a legal instrument known as subpena duces tecum, which means, in effect, "Come and bring the records with you." All of which has caused a Federal attorney to complain, for the record, that the McKinleys are defending themselves in a way that "unreasonably annoys, embarrasses, and oppresses" the United States of America.

Here's what happened: Back in 1942 a potato-marketing order was voted for North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan. It lay dormant until 1947, when the Secretary of Agriculture activated it.

(A marketing order is simply a USDA directive, requested by written ballot by two-thirds of the producers who vote. It allows the Secretary of Agriculture to limit the amount of produce any grower or handler may sell, and it prescribes other marketing regulations. Note that a minority—those who vote—can saddle an order on everybody.)

In the spring of 1950 a push was launched, largely by PMA officials and by certain growers in Minnesota and Michigan who had a stake in the matter, to bring 12 Iowa counties and 20 Indiana counties under the order. Significantly, Illinois was ignored—a hot political fight was brewing there at the time.

Meetings of farmers were held to discuss whether to have a referendum at all. In one early meeting in Iowa—and attended by 10 PMA men—16 out of 25 growers voted in favor of going under the order, but reversed themselves, 24 to 1, the next week, when they found out what is was all about.

At the same time Indiana growers turned down the proposition, 198 to 2.

Two general hearings were called officially by the USDA—one at Minneapolis and one at Lansing, Mich. The big majority of growers at these meetings favored dropping the marketing order they were already under.

At the Lansing meeting a grower insisted on taking a vote, then and there, over the protest of the PMA chairman. It went overwhelmingly against the order. This was in an area, remember, that had had experience with the order—not in one of the new States to be brought in. Nowhere did the majority of those farmers who came to meetings seem to favor the order.

Nevertheless, USDA went blithely ahead with a referendum, anyway. Shortly afterward it announced that the referendum had "carried." That continued the marketing order for the area already covered, and herded 12 Iowa and 20 Indiana counties into the fold.

When it became apparent that the referendum was to be held, willy-nilly, a group of farmers in Iowa, Wisconsin, and Indiana organized to petition the Secretary of Agriculture for representation when the ballots were counted in Chicago. The request was denied.

USDA explains that "the law" prohibits anyone being present at the count who is not a full-time USDA employee, and says that this provision is necessary because the ballots are confidential.

The law itself doesn't contain a single syllable about that. But like so many laws we have nowadays, it allows a bureau—in this case USDA—to make regulations which then have the force of law. In other words, the bureaucrats make the laws.

Actually the votes were counted in Chicago every day, as they came in, and PMA knew at all times exactly how the referendum was going. (This has been admitted under oath.) It could have been a simple matter, then, for PMA to get out and hustle in more of the right kind of votes, as needed.

The new territory came under the order after the potatoes had been produced. Farmers had had no warning that they would be allowed to sell only part of their crop. Now here they were with the potatoes.

The McKinleys had 25,000 bushels of potatoes on hand, and started selling them, as they had for 25 years. The USDA sent a detective to St. Ansgar. He stayed 23 days. The McKinleys voluntarily phoned him at his hotel every time they sold potatoes, and laid out the invoices for him to copy. I was there one of those days, and took the photograph on page 155.

USDA officials couldn't stand that. They got a temporary injunction restraining McKinley & Sons from selling or even giving away potatoes "illegally." (The day I was there they were giving a truckload to an old peoples' home.)

They quit marketing, managed to feed a few hundred bushels, let several thousand bushels rot and hauled them out for manure. Meanwhile the case attracted attention all over the upper Midwest.

The Iowa Legislature passed a resolution condemning USDA. Many of the most respected newspapers of the area joined the chorus. And groups of farmers in several States offered money to help in the fight. Soon afterward, the Secretary of Agriculture called another referendum, and this time found that it didn't pass.

Just for the record, the McKinleys have taken no price-support money on potatoes since 1946, and have kept their acreage even lower than the official allotment, by 10 percent to 25 percent.

The Government now wants to hear no more about the McKinley case—declares it is moot, inconsequential, now that there's no marketing order.

But the McKinleys don't think it's inconsequential. They fully intend to appeal the case just as soon as they can wring a ruling out of USDA. If the case goes on and they lose, they will be out $25,000 in fees and expenses, plus a possible $12,000 in fines. But they want to take that risk in order to expose how bureaucracy can work.

For instance:

When served with subpena duces tecum the Government said that Walworth County, Wis., had voted 100 percent in favor of the marketing order. Affidavits taken since then from a majority of Walworth growers show that they had voted no.

The Government now claims that this was a clerical error. If so, one wonders how many more errors there were. The record is not on public view.

The McKinleys say, then, that here was a referendum farmers didn't want, that the vote could have been manipulated, and that farmers have nothing but officials' word as to the outcome.

Interesting, in a democracy, isn't it?

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO EMPLOY RETIRED OFFICERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 5062?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5062) to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRIBUTE TO MEMBERS AND STAFF OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ORGANIZED CRIME IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a statement I have prepared with reference to the work of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR O'CONOR

It is very much in order, I believe, before this first session of the Eighty-second Congress draws to a close, to pay deserved tribute to my associates in the Senate investigations of crime in interstate commerce. It was an arduous, and in many ways, a thankless task, although the satisfaction of having awakened the entire country to the dangers posed by the operation of interstate-crime syndicates will always remain as a worth-while compensation for the duties performed.

Certainly it would be difficult, I believe, to find a congressional activity in which there was more wholehearted cooperation, both among the members of the committee and the staff, and a more intense desire to utilize every possible opportunity and every avenue of information in order to perform successfully the task at hand. I desire to pay special tribute to the former chairman of the committee, Senator KEFAUVER, as well as to Senators HUNT, TOBEY, and WILEY who rendered outstanding service in this all-important undertaking.

In a special way also recognition should be accorded to the outstanding work done by the chief counsel of the committee, Mr. Richard G Moser, of New York A thoroughly competent, intelligent, and experienced attorney, his organizational and administrative ability, as well as his direction of all phases of the various investigations, were uniformly of the highest order.

Worthy of special mention, also, not only because of his valuable contribution to the investigation, but also because of his unselfish voluntary devotion of practically all his time during the 4 months of my chairmanship, was Mr. James M. Hepbron. A Baltimorean of long experience in the field of criminal investigation, he very generously accepted the invitation to give us the benefit of his advice and experience, and did so without any financial remuneration.

The deputy chief counsel of the committee, Mr. Downey Rice, was responsible in large degree, also, for the successful conduct of the investigations and hearings. Mr. Rufus G. King, Jr., who prepared and followed up the legislation; Mr. Wallace Reid, who assisted in the administration of the committee's affairs; and Mr. George Martin, who aided constantly in our work; and all the other members of the staff without exception gave their best unstintingly and with very satisfactory results.

NOMINATION OF CHARLES M. IRELAN

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks, a statement which I prepared on the nomination of Charles M. Irelan to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

The Senate has had before it the nomination of Charles M. Irelan, of Maryland, for appointment as United States Attorney for the District of Columbia. In Mr. Irelan the President of the United States has selected a man of sterling worth, of high character and of wide experience.

Mr. Irelan combines all of the qualifications necessary to make a successful United States attorney and judging by his past record he will perform these important duties creditably.

The Senate has also had opportunity to consider the nomination of Judge Richard Hartshorne, of New Jersey, as Federal judge. Over a period of years I have known Judge Hartshorne and unqualifiedly endorse him as a jurist of high caliber and of unquestioned integrity.

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr HILL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference or the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3669) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report see pp. 13634–13638 of House proceedings, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 19, 1951.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there is general agreement on the conference report. The House unanimously agreed to the report. As will be recalled, there was no disagreement as to the need for the legislation. In view of the terrible increase in the cost of living, the benefits under the Retirement Act should be increased. In the past there has been disagreement as to how the benefits should be increased. I am happy to be able to advise the Senate that the conference report is concurred in by those groups who have been most active in behalf of legislation to increase the benefits, but which were in disagreement as to how they should be increased.

In other words, to be more specific, the Railroad Labor Executives Association, representing 80 percent of all railroad employees, and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, which represents 9 percent of such employees, which organizations were sharply in disagreement, are in agreement with the provisions of the conference report. I am happy to advise also that the Association of American Railroads, representing railroad management, is also in accord with the terms of the conference report.

I am further happy to say that the conference report, with the exception of one amendment, is substantially in accord with the Senate bill. Unless there is some question with reference to it, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

PAYMENT OF REENLISTMENT ALLOWANCES

The bill (H. R. 5405) to amend section 207 (a) of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I wonder whether the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia would give us an explanation of the bill, with particular emphasis on the costs involved.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be very happy to do so. The purpose of the bill is to correct an administrative situation which has arisen as a result of a defect in the armed services pay bill of 1949.

It has been the policy for a great many years for the services to pay a bonus to enlisted personnel when they renew their voluntary enlistments The Career Act of 1949 carried on this policy, which had been in existence for a number of years. The payments are $40 for a 2-year reenlistment, $90 for a 3-year reenlistment, $160 for a 4-year reenlistment, $250 for a 5-year reenlistment, and $360 for a 6-year reenlistment.

The Air Force and the Army have what is called a career reenlistment for noncommissioned officers of the first three pay grades. That means that for a man who reenlists under such a career reenlistment, it is an indefinite reenlistment. It means that he has adopted the Army as a permanent career, and his enlistment can be terminated only by discharge for the convenience of the service or by his retirement. On a career enlistment, there is authorized a reenlistment bonus to be paid on an annual basis of $60 a year.

It was the declared intent of Congress to continue the career enlistments in the Compensation Act of 1949. However, due to some quirk in the wording of the act, the Comptroller General has ruled that career enlistments in effect prior to the date of the enactment of the new law cannot receive payment of reenlistment allowances.

Obviously, Congress could not tolerate such a situation, in which a man who prior to 1949 had made an indefinite enlistment could not draw the reenlistment bounty, whereas a man who reenlisted subsequent to that date could draw it.

The intent of the bill is to correct that situation.

I have tried to ascertain the cost of the bill. It is difficult to assess its cost. However, it was never the intent of Congress to deprive the men who reenlisted

to these bonus payments. Not only have they been deprived of them, but some of them who have been paid them inadvertently have had demands made upon them to return the money.

The best estimate I can get is that the initial cost of the bill will be $2,500,000, and that the recurring costs for these enlisted men will be $1,200,000.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Georgia. During the consideration of the Defense Establishment appropriation bill, the attention of the Appropriations Committee was drawn to the fact that at Fort Myer a notice was published on the bulletin board of the headquarters office, inviting the reenlistment of enlisted men at that post, and promising them, if they would reenlist, certain leave payments. In good faith, I have no doubt, this notice was given, and in good faith it was accepted by numerous soldiers, and they received their payments for leave; but later the Comptroller General held that to be in violation of law, and called upon the enlisted men to refund those payments.

A corrective amendment was submitted by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and was unanimously approved by the committee, but in conference, because it was discovered that there were other cases of a similar character throughout the United States, the conferees decided to substitute for the Senate amendment a general amendment prohibiting the collection of these payments during the fiscal year 1952, so that an opportunity might be provided to the Congress to correct an obvious inequity.

Accordingly, I introduced, on behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and myself, a measure which would have that effect. I called it to the attention of the Senator from Georgia. It is Senate bill 2262. At that time he suggested that it might be possible to attach that bill as an amendment to this bill.

He now tells me that he fears it might prevent the enactment of the measure which is on the calendar.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am apprehensive that it might. I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that I am not at all certain that this bill does not take care of the situation he has in mind. On page 2, line 8, of the bill now under discussion, we find a provision which would take care of all these series of enlistments prior to October 1, 1949.

I say to the Senator from Wyoming that if this bill does not enable the correction of that situation, at the earliest possible date in January, I will bring this matter to the attention of the Armed Services Committee, and I am sure the bill will be reported.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Armed Services Committee will act upon it early in the next session, prior to the expiration of the next fiscal year, the correction could be made.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Congress never intended to have such a condition arise. If the pending bill does not correct that situation, I can assure the Senator from Wyoming that the Armed Services Committee will give the matter its attention at the very first meeting the committee has in the second session of this Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, under those circumstances, I shall not offer the bill as an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5405) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FACILITATION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT WORK BY DEPARTMENTS OF ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1180) to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the distinguished Senator from Mississippi explain the bill?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is largely to clarify certain administrative authority which is required in order to carry on the research and development programs authorized for the military services.

This bill is not intended to provide additional basic authority to the Armed Forces with respect to research and development programs. Actually, the Armed Forces already have very broad authority for the conduct of research and development programs. It will be noted from the existing law quoted on pages 6 and 7 of the committee report that the Army, Navy, and Air Force already are authorized, under existing law, to conduct research and development programs and to procure or contract for the use of the necessary facilities, equipment, services, and supplies to effectuate such programs.

The bill addresses itself, therefore, not to the proposition of expanding existing authority, but simply to the proposition of clarifying it. A similar bill passed the Senate in 1948, but no action was taken on that bill in the House of Representatives.

This bill makes no policy changes in that version of the proposed legislation.

In 1948 the bill was handled on the floor of the Senate by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. He is a member of the subcommittee which handled the bill in 1951. The bill is on the calendar with the unanimous recommendation of the Armed Service Committee.

Mr. President, I emphasize that this bill is largely a clarification of existing law. These research projects are now being carried on by the various groups of the armed services; and the purpose of this bill is largely to coordinate the law and clarify it and bring it down to a modern package.

I hope there is no opposition to the passage of the bill. It does not relate to an extreme emergency, but passage of the bill would greatly facilitate carrying forward these programs.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I appreciate the explanation which has been given by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. However, I am compelled to object to the passage of the bill; and, by request, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

CONVERSION OF NATIONAL BANKS INTO AND THEIR MERGER WITH STATE BANKS

The bill (S. 2252) to clarify the act of August 17, 1950, providing for the conversion of national banks into and their merger and consolidation with State banks was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1950 (12 U. S. C. 214c), is amended by striking out the words "as provided by Federal law" at the end of the section and substituting the words "under limitations or conditions no more restrictive than those contained in section 2 hereof with respect to the conversion of a national bank into, or merger or consolidation of a national bank with, a State bank under State charter."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, following the passage of Senate bill 2252, Calendar No. 892, for the benefit of many bankers and other persons throughout the United States, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the committee be made a part of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report of the Banking and Currency Committee (No. 940) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, having considered a bill to clarify the act of August 17, 1950, providing for the conversion of national banks into and their merger and consolidation with State banks, report favorably a committee bill (S. 2252) and recommend that the bill do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Public Law 706, an act to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger and consolidation with State banks, was passed by the Senate last session on the recommendation of your committee. It was intended to enable national banks to convert into or consolidate with State banks under State charter; that is, to afford a right similar but converse to that enjoyed by State banks converting into and consolidating with national banks—a two-way street, so to speak.

Section 2 of that act sets forth the procedure under which a national bank can transfer into the State system. This procedure prescribes, among other things, that a national bank can convert into or merge or consolidate with a State bank upon a vote of the holders of not less than two-thirds of the stock, and that dissenting shareholders shall be entitled to the value of their stock in cash. In addition to these requirements in section 2, however, section 4 of the act contains the following limitation: "and no such conversion, merger, or consolidation shall take place under this act unless under the law of the State in which such national

banking association is located State banks may without approval by any State authority convert into and merge or consolidate with national banking associations *as provided by Federal law.*" [Italics added.]

With respect to consolidations, the Federal law to which this reference is made in section 4 contains provisions relating to the vote required for approval and the payment of dissenting shareholders similar to those in section 2 for a consolidation in the other direction (12 U. S. C. 34a).

With respect to conversions, the Federal law to which the reference is made in section 4 provides that a State bank may convert into a national bank upon a vote of the holders of only 51 percent of the stock, and it contains no provision for the payment of cash to dissenting shareholders for the value of their stock (12 U. S. C. 35). This provision, your committee wishes to point out, does not impose conditions on a nationalwise conversion as onerous as section 2 of Public Law 706 imposes on a Statewide conversion. The limitation in section 4 therefore becomes significant because it cuts off the National-to-State street if a State's law governing nationalwise conversions imposes conditions parallel to those prescribed in section 2 of Public Law 706 for the National-to-State street.

Since the enactment of Public Law 706, several instances have occurred in which State legislatures have in fact enacted laws imposing conditions on State-to-National conversions patterned after those contained in section 2 of Public Law 706 for National-to-State conversions. But, this has cut off the National-to-State street because the requirement of section 4 has not been met.

Your committee believes the illustration of the action of Minnesota with reference to this law might be illuminating The Minnesota Legislature, doubtless noting the conditions precedent in section 2 of Public Law 706 with respect to vote of approval and payment of dissenting shareholders, enacted a law which imposes identical conditions upon State banks transferring out of the State system into the National system. Unfortunately, however, this Minnesota law prevents Minnesota from being a State under whose laws a State bank may convert into a national banking association as provided by Federal law, because as indicated above the applicable Federal law provides for conversion of a State bank into a National bank upon a vote of the holders of only 51 percent of the stock with no provision for cash payment for dissenting stockholders, as compared with the provision under the Minnesota law requiring a vote of two-thirds of the stockholders and cash payment for dissenting stockholders. Accordingly, section 4 of Public Law 706, as it is now phrased, makes transfers out of the National system and into the State system impossible in Minnesota.

Since it was the purpose of Public Law 706 to provide an equitable two-way street provision in the Federal statutes, the Treasury Department and the Comptroller of the Currency propose that the law be amended so that the limitation in section 4 beyond which State law cannot go (without depriving national banks in that State of the benefits of Public Law 706) will be measured by the standard set out in section 2 for National-to-State conversions and consolidations, rather than by the minimum requirements prescribed by other Federal statutes, for transfers in the same direction as those the State laws will govern.

In order to carry out our intent in Public Law 706 to place National banks and State banks on an equal footing with respect to conditions under which they might change from one system to the other, your committee recommends that this bill do pass.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

"Public Law 706, Eighty-first Congress

"An act to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes

* * * * *

"CONTRAVENTION WITH STATE LAW

"SEC. 4. No conversion of a national banking association into a State bank or its merger or consolidation with a State bank shall take place under this act in contravention of the law of the State in which the national banking association is located; and no such conversion, merger, or consolidation shall take place under this act unless under the law of the State in which such national banking association is located State banks may without approval by any State authority convert into and merge or consolidate with national banking associations [as provided by Federal law] *under limitations or conditions no more restrictive than those contained in section 2 hereof with respect to the conversion of a national bank into, or merger or consolidation of a national bank with, a State bank under State charter.*"

* * * * *

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

The bill (S. 2251) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the decentralization of certain Government personnel, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 210 (e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) (1) In the performance of his functions with respect to the management, assignment, and reassignment of space in buildings for use by executive agencies, the Administrator is authorized, in accordance with policies and directives prescribed by the President under section 205 (a), after consultation with heads of the executive agencies affected, and upon a determination by the Administrator that assignment or reassignment is advantageous to the Government in terms of economy, efficiency, or national security, to assign and reassign space of all executive agencies in Government-owned or leased buildings in and outside the District of Columbia without regard to any other provision of law relating to the physical location either (a) of any executive agency or (b) of performance of its functions.

"(2) The Administrator is directed to provide on a permanent basis for a net reduction of not less than fifty thousand in the number of positions in the executive agencies existing and located on the effective date of this act in the District of Columbia or in any place within 20 air miles from the White House. Such reduction shall be accomplished by the permanent transfer of positions in such number to places not less than 150 air miles from the White House, except that the Administrator is authorized to transfer to places more than 20 but less than 150 air miles from the White House—

"(A) not more than 50 positions of any executive agency; and

"(B) such additional numbers of positions in any one executive agency as may be approved prior to the transfer by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the Senate and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives. Not less than one-quarter of such reduction shall be accomplished within 1 year, not less than one-half within 2 years, and the entire reduction within 3 years after the effective date of this paragraph. During said period of 3 years the Administrator shall not provide space within the area enclosed by a circle having its center at the White House and a radius of 20 air miles for more than 15,000 new positions (other than positions within the postal field service) created in the executive branch after the effective date of this act. All executive agencies shall cooperate fully with the Administrator in carrying out the purposes of this section. The Administrator is further authorized and directed to demolish temporary buildings constructed by the Federal Government immediately prior to and during World War II at any place within 20 air miles from the White House at such time as they can be vacated by reason of the decentralization of Government positions as hereinabove provided. The Administrator is authorized to expend in accomplishing the purposes of this subsection any funds available for the performance of his functions or any portion thereof, with respect to the procurement and management of space in, and the operation, maintenance, and protection of, Government owned and leased buildings."

SEC. 2 Whenever an agency, in whole or in part, is required under paragraph (2) of section 210 (e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to move to another location, only such furniture and furnishings as the Administrator of General Services shall determine cannot more economically and efficiently be made available by General Services Administration at the new location shall be moved. Remaining furniture and furnishings shall promptly be reported as excess property.

ISSUANCE OF HAWAII REVENUE BONDS

The bill (H. R. 4203) to ratify and confirm act 7 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, revised laws of Hawaii, 1945, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTABLISHMENT OF POST OFFICES AT DEFENSE INSTALLATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2078) to authorize the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices at military, naval, and Coast Guard camps, posts, or stations and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to submit an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before an amendment can be submitted from the floor, the question is whether there is objection to the present consideration of the bill. Furthermore, certain committee amendments have been reported to the bill, and they should first be considered, before amendments coming from the floor.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Very well; I shall withhold my amendment until the committee amendments are considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas object to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2078), which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "serving", to strike out "military, naval, and Coast Guard"; in line 5, after the word "stations", to insert "of the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard)"; on page 2, line 10, after the word "the", to strike out "military, naval, and Coast Guard"; in line 11, after the word "stations", to insert "of the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard))"; in line 14, after the word "such", to strike out "military, naval, or Coast Guard", and in line 15, after the words "stations", to insert "of the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, whenever the Postmaster General deems it necessary in serving camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard), and defense or other strategic installations during periods of national emergencies as proclaimed by the President or in time of war, he may establish postal stations or branch post offices at such camps, posts, stations, or installations notwithstanding the limitations imposed by the third proviso in the act of June 9, 1896 (39 U S. C. 160).

SEC. 2. Section (a) of the act entitled "An Act to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1950 (Public Law 552, ch. 252, Eighty-first Congress, second session), is amended to read as follows

"(a) Whenever the Postmaster General deems it necessary in serving the camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard), and defense or other strategic installations, he is authorized to (1) detail postal employees from main post offices to postal units at such camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard), and defense or other strategic installations, without changing the official station of any such postal employee, and (2), without regard to the Travel Expense Act of 1949, pay each such postal employee an allowance, in lieu of actual expenses, of not more than $4 for each day while so detailed"

SEC 3 This act shall apply to Guam and the other Territories and possessions of the United States.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the committee amendments.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 6, it is proposed to strike out the following: "during periods of national emergencies as proclaimed by the President or in time of war."

On page 2, line 2, after the period at the end thereof, it is proposed to insert the following:

The authority granted by this section shall terminate 5 years after the date of enactment of this act, or any prior date which the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I find that I have sent to the desk two amendments which are on one page. I wish to have only the first one considered at this time. In order to clarify the matter, I ask that the first amendment only be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning in line 6, on page 1, it is proposed to strike out the following: "during periods of national emergencies as proclaimed by the President or in time of war."

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I understand that this amendment has been submitted——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, we have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will read the next amendment offered the Senator from Kansas.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 2, after "(39 U. S. C. 160)" it is proposed to insert "The authority granted by this section shall terminate 5 years after the date of enactment of this act, or any prior date which the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate."

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I understand that this amendment has been submitted to the chairman of the committee, and that it is acceptable to him.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

POSTAL RATE INCREASES AND THE POSTAL DEFICIT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to express my appreciation of the splendid work of the distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. We this afternoon adopted two conference reports dealing with the Post Office Department, one, Senate bill 355, the postal pay bill, and the other, Senate bill 1046, the postal rate bill. I had expected to take a few moments' time when those conference reports were being considered, but we were getting along so well that I did not want to interfere with speedy action on the part of the Senate.

I think it appropriate at this time to state that the distinguished chairman and the committee, of which I happen to be one of the minority members, brought to the Senate a bill which, had we been able to secure its approval in the conference between the House and Senate, would have raised $400,000,000 in revenue. I think it is time that the Senate and the country made a study of our fiscal situation as it affects the Post Office Department. Instead of getting $400,000,000 in new revenue, we secured in first-class mail an additional revenue of approximately $52,000,000. I shall use round figures, for convenience. In second-class mail, we secured $5,000,000; in third-class mail, $34,000,000; and in fourth-class mail, which is now having its rates fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, $100,000,000. We secured additional revenue in connection with the special services, of $26,000,000, making a total of approximately $217,000,000 additional revenue.

Let us look at the deficit side of the Post Office Department. The Postmaster General advised us early this year that, without additional revenue, the over-all deficit on June 30, 1952, would be $520,000,000. We passed a postal-pay bill this afternoon which will cost $252,000,000. We have an annual-leave provision in the postal-rate bill which will cost $30,000,000. We have a possible increase in railway transportation costs to the Post Office Department of $75,000,000. This brings the total to approximately $875,000,000. When we subtract that from the amount of revenue which we secured today, instead of having a deficit next year as of June 30, 1952, of $520,000,000, we shall have a deficit of $660,000,000. I think that is of concern to the Senate.

But I want to say—and I regret very much to say it—that we did not have the support of the Post Office Department in securing additional revenue with which to take care of this additional cost In fact, the Postmaster General sent letters to the members of the committee urging that first-class postage rates be not increased, the contention being, of course, that first-class mail pays its way. It may pay its way, according to the cost-ascertainment program of the Post Office Department, but, in my opinion, we must begin to put the Post Office Department more nearly on a pay-as-you-go basis than it is at present. I do not believe that we, as Members of Congress, or that we, as a country, should anticipate carrying a deficit of $660,000,000.

I am not one of those who believe that the Post Office Department should pay its way 100 percent. We have $160,000,000 of air-mail subsidy, penalty mail, free mail, and mail of other kinds, such as mail carried for the blind, the cost of which is $160,000,000. The Post Office is a service organization, but certainly not a $500,000,000 service organization.

I think I should also state that the President personally took a hand in this matter and objected to the increased postal rates, which, in my opinion, would have provided additional revenue sufficient to carry the additional cost that we would have placed on it through the bills which were passed this afternoon.

There is one encouraging thought. The Senate and the House have approved a resolution which will provide for a study of the entire Department. I think it is essential to get that study under way and to get our Postal Department operating under a program which will at least come nearer to balancing income with outgo than it does at present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be

offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2078) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard), and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes."

STUDY OF EFFECTS OF MALNUTRITION SUFFERED BY PRISONERS OF WAR AND CIVILIAN INTERNEES IN WORLD WAR II—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 513) to provide for a study of the mental and physical consequences of malnutrition and starvation suffered by prisoners and civilian internees during World War II, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, would the Senator withhold his objection momentarily so that I may make an explanation of the bill?

Mr SCHOEPPEL. I shall be glad to withhold the objection.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, this bill provides for a study of the mental and physical consequences of malnutrition and starvation suffered by prisoners of war and civilian internees during World War II. We held a hearing, at which were represented the Public Health Service, and many of the medical societies, who have unanimously recommended such a survey. The survey is to be undertaken by the War Claims Commission, in cooperation with, and with the assistance of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Federal Security Administrator. The Commission is to report the findings of its study to the President for transmittal to Congress. The purpose of the study is to determine the following four things:

First. The procedures and standards to be applied in the diagnosis of the mental and physical condition of former prisoners of war;

Second. The life expectancy of former prisoners of war;

Third. Whether there is evidence to sustain a conclusive presumption of service connection in favor of former prisoners of war for purposes of hospitalization in Veterans' Administration facilities; and

Fourth. Standards to be applied, for the evaluation of claims of American civilian and military personnel based upon the physical and mental consequences of the conditions of their imprisonment, in the event such claims are later made compensable.

In addition to the Public Health Service and the various medical agencies, appearances were made at the hearing by various Veterans' associations and agencies. They all strongly advocate the passage of this bill.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from New York that if he will amend this bill to provide that the Veterans' Administration shall conduct the hearings and make the investigations, there will be no objection to it. Unless that is done, I am bound to object.

Mr. LEHMAN. I appreciate the Senator's position, but I do not feel authorized to do as he suggests, because the bill was introduced by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I may say that originally the War Claims Commission was charged with the responsibility of rendering this service, with the assistance and cooperation of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Federal Security Administrator. That was changed by amendment to read "in cooperation with and with the assistance of the Administrator of Veterans Affairs." In other words, the Federal Security Administration will be equally responsible, but the final responsibility will rest with the War Claims Commission.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I appreciate the explanation, but in view of the fact that the amendment would not be acceptable, I object to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

SMALL CLAIMS AND CONCILIATION BRANCH OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MUNICIPAL COURT.

The bill (S. 1368) to amend the Act relating to the small claims and conciliation branch of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The purpose of this bill is to increase the exemption of earnings from $100 to $200 a month for the person who provides the principal support of a family. During the hearing on the bill, it was pointed out that the so-called "easy credit" merchants rely to some extent upon the process of garnishment as the key to extension of credit. We feel that if the exemption were raised to $200 a month for each of the two preceding months prior to the date of the garnishment, the ability to secure easy garnishments of substantial portions of income would be greatly reduced. This would tend automatically to correct many of the existing credit abuses.

It should also be pointed out that the $100 exemption was enacted in 1901. If $100 in 1901 was right, $200 is certainly not too much at the present time.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It seems to me that section 2 of the bill makes mandatory the seeking of judgment in garnishment proceedings within 4 weeks after a claim is filed; otherwise the garnishment or attachment will be voided.

Such rigidity may result in unnecessary litigation and, more important, may be unduly oppressive to a debtor. Some attention might appropriately be given to a provision which would permit the creditor and debtor to waive this section by stipulation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the Senator thinks the time is too short and he wants it changed, we would not object.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. If the Senator would agree to strike section 2, I would have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We would not object to the striking of section 2.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1368) to amend the act relating to the small claims and conciliation branch of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subsection (a) of section 1107 of the District of Columbia Code of 1901, as amended by section 2 of the act of December 20, 1944 (D. C Code, sec. 15–403 (a)), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The earnings, salary, insurance, annuities, or pension or retirement payments, not otherwise exempted, not to exceed $200 each month, of any person residing in the District of Columbia, or of any person who earns the major portions of his or her livelihood in the District of Columbia, regardless of place of residence, who provides the principal support of a family, for 2 months next preceding the issuing of any writ or process against him, from any court or officer of and in said District shall be exempt from attachment, levy, seizure, or sale upon such process, and the same shall not be seized, levied on, taken, reached, or sold by attachment, execution, or any other process or proceedings of any court, judge, or other officer of and in said District: *Provided, however*, That where husband and wife are living together, the aggregate of the earnings, salaries, insurance, annuities, and pension or retirement payments of the husband and wife shall be the amount which shall be determinative of the exemption of either in cases arising ex contractu. *Provided further*, That food, shelter, or clothing received as part of earnings, salary, insurance, annuities, or pension or retirement payments, shall not be included in computing income for the purposes of this section."

SEC. 2. Section 467 of the District of Columbia Code of 1901 (D. C. Code, sec. 16–323) is amended by adding at the end thereof: "Applications for judgment of condemnation under this section must be filed within 4 weeks after garnishment has been filed or, in default of garnishment answer, within 4 weeks after the service of the interrogatories upon the garnishee. If no judgment of condemnation has been applied for or entered under this section, the attachment shall lapse."

The amendment was agreed to

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina to strike section 2 of the bill is agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend subsection (a) of section 107 of the District of Columbia Code of 1901, as amended by section 2 of the act of December 20, 1944 (D. C. Code, sec. 15–403 (a)), and to amend section 467 of the District of Columbia Code of 1901 (D. C. Code, sec. 16–323)."

INCOME TAX CASE OF MR. WILLIAM G. LIAS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, 2 days ago I outlined in the United States Senate the income-tax case of William G. Lias. Last night I received a telegram from Mr. Lias which I should like to read into the RECORD. It is as follows:

I would like to have the opportunity to tell my side of the story publicly before a Senate committee.

That is signed "William G. Lias."

I contacted both the House committee and the Hoey committee, and I was advised that either committee would be glad to have Mr. Lias come before them.

Upon receiving this assurance I telegraphed Mr. Lias today as follows:

OCTOBER 19, 1951.

MR. WILLIAM G. LIAS,
Wheeling, W. Va.:

Upon your request I have contacted both the counsel of King subcommittee and chairman of Senate investigating committee and have received assurance that they are only too glad to open your case for thorough investigation during which you will be given ample opportunity to explain your side. You will be advised by one of the committees when to appear.

JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senator

I am very glad that Mr. Lias is coming before a congressional committee. The Senate has always had a difficult job to find among this type of characters one who was willing to talk, but now we have one who wants to lay everything openly before the public. When he arrives here I hope he will be able to tell whether or not it is true he kept $1,000,000 in cash from the prohibition era and only released it during the war years 1942–46. Also if that is true why did he not pay income taxes on this cash during the twenties.

I hope he will be able to tell the Senate and the country why he did not file any income-tax returns from 1928 to 1932, inclusive. I hope he will be able to explain that satisfactorily.

I hope that when he comes he will tell us not only whether there is any truth to his statement that he had a million dollars in cash but also tell why it was he did not pay $15,500 in fines assessed against him in 1926 and 1930. With that much cash in a lock box it apparently was not on the basis that he was a pauper. I hope he will be able to answer all these questions. I also hope he will be able to tell us if there is any truth to the story that is quoted in the New York Herald Tribune of October 18, 1951, the last two paragraphs of which I should like to read into the record. The writer was referring to payments recorded in my speech of October 17, 1951:

Among the trial expenses listed by the Senator was $10,000 paid for professional services to Melvin D. Hildreth, attorney, who is Democratic National Committeeman from the District of Columbia and who was chairman of the committee for President Truman's inauguration in 1948–49.

"He called on me some years ago," Mr. Hildreth explained today. "I didn't even know he was in my office at first. He said he was in bad health and wanted to know if I couldn't advise him what to do. I advised him to go to Johns Hopkins. I never presented him any bill. He gave me $10,000 as a retainer. I never did any more for him. It was a voluntary payment as a retainer."

I hope Mr. Lias will tell us why he thought it was necessary to pay $10,000 to a Democratic national committeeman merely to find out which hospital to go to.

I hope he will be able to explain what services were rendered when he paid a former attorney general of Pennsylvania, Mr. Margiotti, $100,000 during this same period.

I congratulate Mr. Lias upon his willingness to explain all these things to the Senate and the American people.

Another point I want Mr. Lias to be ready to explain is why he attempted to have his tax payments deferred during the 1930's if there is any truth to his claim that he had $1,000,000 in cash hid during that same period. A man cannot be broke with that much reserved cash.

I also hope he will be able to tell us how he spent $300,000 for protection during 3 years and why it was that $75,800 of this amount was paid in cash. I am sure he will have a good explanation for all these things. I also hope that he will be able to tell us why it was he transferred so much of his property, since these tax assessments, to members of his family. Perhaps he can show a good excuse for transferring these assets which total well over half a million dollars. I feel that Mr. Lias is going to be a great help in showing the American people whether there is any truth to the story that racketeers have had preferential tax treatment. I hope all angles of this case will be explored by either the Senate committee or the House committee, and I appreciate very much the enthusiasm of both those committees in welcoming Mr. Lias before them. He will be notified in due time as to when he can expect to be called

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I suspect the gentleman will be looking again for a hospital after he has appeared before the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There seems to be a great deal of ill health in the city of Washington.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1023) for the relief of Fumiko Theresa Shibata.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. MAHON, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. TABER, and Mr. SCRIVNER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 19, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 57. An act for the relief of Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin;

S. 118. An act for the relief of Nouhad Ann Khoury;

S. 264. An act to provide for granting to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and the White House and United States Park Police forces additional compensation for working on holidays;

S. 519. An act for the relief of Moy Chin Shee;

S. 575. An act for the relief of Robert Jose Toribio;

S. 582. An act for the relief of Emma Burr;

S. 635. An act for the relief of Hans Lenk;

S. 775. An act for the relief of Dr. Anthony M. Opisso;

S. 839. An act for the relief of Alice Ibrahim, Hannan Ibrahim, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roseileen Schut;

S. 921. An act to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947;

S. 954 An act for the relief of Dr. Charles Gordon Rennick Sell;

S. 1048. An act for the relief of Myrtle Harding;

S. 1274. An act for the relief of Vera Oumancoff;

S 1335. An act to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail:

S 1436 An act for the relief of Mrs Marie Y Mueller;

S 1622. An act to amend section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946;

S. 1640. An act for the relief of Cathy Dana Besser;

S 1912. An act to provide for conveyance of certain land to the city of New Orleans;

S. 1952 An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes;

S. 1967. An act to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes;

S. 1970. An act for the relief of Louis E. Gabel;

S. 2007. An act for the relief of Sharon A. Gates; and

S 2027 An act for the relief of Leo Kieve

EMERGENCY 5-YEAR GRANTS AND SCHOLARSHIPS FOR EDUCATION IN MEDICINE, ETC

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt what is going forward now, but I have to leave the Chamber, and I desire to have unanimous consent, if I can get it, to call up Senate bill 337, order of business 976. I shall object to it, but I have to get it up before I can object. I ask unanimous consent that that bill be called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health and nursing professions, and for other purposes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

SABINE LAKE BRIDGE AND CAUSEWAY AUTHORITY

The bill (H. R. 5593) authorizing the Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority, hereby created, and its succes-

sors, to construct, maintain, and operate bridges over Sabine Lake, at or near Port Arthur, Tex.; to construct, maintain, and operate all causeways, approaches, and appurtenances pertaining thereto; and to finance said objects by the issuance of bonds secured by the said properties and income and revenues; and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I see the able junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is present, and I shall be glad to yield to him if he would like to explain the bill. It is a bill creating a bridge authority, for the construction of an approach, a causeway, and a bridge across Lake Sabine from the State of Texas to the State of Louisiana.

The bill would authorize creation of a bridge authority to construct and operate an interstate toll bridge or bridges across Lake Sabine between Louisiana and Texas. They would be financed by bonds issued by the authority and payable in 30 years from time of completion of the bridges. The authority can then transfer the bridges to the respective States to be maintained and operated thereafter free of tolls. If the States do not take over the bridges after their cost is amortized, the authority must reduce tolls to the amount necessary to pay only maintenance and operation costs.

Certain amendments were requested by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, a member of the committee. They have been reported with the report of the committee. So far as the Senator from Florida knows, that makes the report of the Committee on Public Works unanimous, and he believes that to be the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments, on page 6, line 16, after the word "affairs," to strike out the semicolon and "and (j) without limitation of the foregoing, to borrow money from the United States Government or any corporation or agency created, designated, or established by the United States and to enter into contracts with the United States or such corporation or agency, or any other person, firm, or corporate entity," and on page 8, line 25, after the word "same", to strike out "including the United States Government, or any corporation or agency designated or created by it."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

INVESTIGATIONS BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION IN LIEU OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

The bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to transfer from the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the Civil Service Commission the responsibility for conducting personnel investigations now required of the Federal Bureau of Investigation pursuant to various congressional enactments. Under the provisions of the proposed legislation the Civil Service Commission would have the full responsibility for conducting such applicant-type investigations.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation would continue to check against its files the names and fingerprints of applicants for Federal appointment, and furnish any pertinent information thus discovered. The Bureau would also receive for its files the fingerprints of all persons applying for positions in the executive branch of the Government. Under this plan the Federal-employee loyalty program would be uniformly applied to all agencies, and the Bureau would continue to perform all of the functions, including the making of full field investigations required of it by that program.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation would continue to make the required investigations of applicants for positions under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 and the Mutual Security Act of 1951, where such positions are certified to be of a high degree of importance and sensitivity.

Mr. President, let me state what we are facing at the present time. The Federal Bureau of Investigation have approximately 200,000 files which they must investigate. If they continue to investigate every one of them then we will find that they will be delayed 3 or 4 or 5 months, and for that reason the Department of Justice have asked that this bill be passed, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation have also asked that it be passed.

We took into consideration also what the Senator from Connecticut had to say in reference to the Atomic Energy Commission. They thought it was urgent legislation. I see the Senator from Connecticut is on the floor. He will vouch for the fact that we have taken this matter up with him.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, after hearing the testimony of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, I am convinced that we should give this agency some relief. They have accumulated two to three hundred thousand files and so far as investigation is concerned they are behind in their work, and are making investigations of many people whom I do not believe it is necessary to investigate.

This character of work has grown so that everybody in a highly sensitive place or position has to be investigated. But why should we investigate a gardener, for instance, who does not come within 3 or 5 miles of the particular agency or department concerned be investigated? It seems to me this bill is a measure which will save much money to the taxpayers, and it should be approved.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, when we were setting up the OPS, as the Senator from Florida no doubt will recall, there would be a delay of 3 or 4 months before they could get employees to carry on their work, and that is what we are trying to avoid by this bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, is it the purpose of the bill to have the Civil Service Commission perform the functions now performed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation with reference to investigations?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, in fields not absolutely concerned with the security of the United States.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is it not true that that will entail an enlargement of the personnel of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It will, but the personnel of the Civil Service Commission which will do this work can do it much cheaper than can those in the Department of Justice under the Federal Bureau of Investigation, because the latter are much higher paid employees. It will probably cost twice as much in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as they have to do the work so much more thoroughly, because they must maintain their reputation. Senators will understand that; they have a good reputation to sustain.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I believe it might be well to point out that when other agencies call in the FBI to make an investigation, they actually pay for the cost of the investigation, and it is their intention to do the same insofar as the Civil Service Commission is concerned, and it was so testified. It is not proposed by the pending bill that the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be relieved from making all investigations. The language is that whenever the Commissioners of the Atomic Energy Commission certify that a position is of importance and sensitivity, the FBI thereafter shall make investigation. The same is true as to the Department of State. The same is true as to other agencies, where the top men in the agency certify that it is of a sensitive character. Then the FBI will make the investigation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, that is exactly what I have in mind. Some top men in some department will make the declaration. The FBI is now receiving an enormous appropriation to carry on such work. If we transfer it to another agency, it will have to be carried on by increased personnel.

This matter has been before the Committee on Appropriations in connection with the Department of Justice, on a number of occasions. I have never favored such a move, and I shall object to the consideration of this bill at this time, because I cannot see that it would inure to the security of the United States, and it might take away a great deal from its security.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. If I have the floor, I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to make one correction with regard to the FBI appropriation. Each agency now pays

the FBI to make investigations for it. So there would be no change in that regard. The cost would be paid to the FBI by the agency requesting the investigation. We believe that it could be done much cheaper under the Civil Service Commission than it could be done under the FBI. The Department of Justice thinks so.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on two or three occasions the Department of Justice has stated before the Appropriations Committee that it wanted to get rid of this investigative work. It suggested the idea embodied in this proposal, but it has never suggested that its appropriation be reduced. It has always asked for an increase in the appropriation. If we now transfer this work to the Civil Service Commission, we shall have to transfer an increased appropriation to the Civil Service Commission, and we shall not get the class of investigation provided by the FBI.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to be recognized for a very brief comment on the remarks made by the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course we are all interested in seeing to it that there are no bad eggs in the Federal service. We want as complete an investigation as can be obtained. However, we must bear in mind that the main objective of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is the investigation of crimes against the United States, and violations of Federal law, as well as the investigation of espionage and sabotage. I for one would like to take from the FBI the burden of investigating applicants for Federal positions, particularly nonsensitive positions, so that that agency may devote more of its time and attention to the real threats to our security. The idea of having a stenographer in the State Department or the Atomic Energy Commission investigated through three or four States where he or she may have worked at various times, and consuming many hours of the time of a man who has been trained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to look out for Communists, saboteurs, and espionage agents, seems to me to be missing the main danger. I am afraid that we are using the energies of the trained personnel of the FBI wastefully and inefficiently.

I cannot comment on the statement made by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] concerning the appropriated funds, although I take it that the explanation made by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is correct. I urge upon the Senator from Nevada the consideration that we want the agents of the FBI to go after the Red apparatus in this country, and not to be devoting their time to a job which less skilled investigators could do.

This proposal has been urged upon us by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, through the Department of Justice, on the ground that they, with the tremendous burden of these personnel investigations, are not able, in their opinion, to devote the man-hours necessary to the work of pursuing the real danger to our security.

I know that the committee has heard a great deal of evidence on the question. I regret that the Senator from Nevada feels that he must object, and that nothing can be done on a call of the calendar.

The fact remains that Susie Q. Klutz, from Sioux City, Iowa, who is 22 years old and has a civil-service job, is not very likely to pose any threat to our security. The birds in the Communist Party need plenty of surveillance, shadowing, and checking up. I want the agents in the Federal Bureau of Investigation to go after them, instead of after $3,000 stenographers.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that the investigation of Susie Klutz would delay the investigation of a very important person whose services might be badly needed, to determine whether or not he is a security risk? The personnel of the FBI are employed in the investigation of Susie, while the investigation of John Doe hangs in abeyance.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from West Virginia has something there. We hear complaints from the departments downtown, and in particular from the Atomic Energy Commission, that the time consumed by the terrific burden of investigation which has been placed upon the Federal Bureau of Investigation has resulted in delay after delay in getting people on the job.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The reason I ask the question is that I know of one particular case in the State Department, in which a man whose services were very much needed was delayed so long, because the investigation could not be started, that he finally went into business for himself, and now he cannot afford to go with the Department.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. It is reported to us indirectly that there is a place in Washington where a roomful of people sit around playing canasta, gin rummy, or other games, waiting until the time when they can be investigated. They were employed before the investigation was conducted, because the particular agency involved feared that some other agency would take them away.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Civil Service Commission now have the personnel to do this work?

Mr. SMATHERS. They have some personnel now, but they report to us that they do not have nearly enough.

Mr. McCARRAN. That means that we must enlarge the personnel of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. SMATHERS. Yes; but as I understand, the money has already been appropriated for the State Department and the other departments to pay for this type of investigation, and there would be no additional expense. I think that is the understanding of the chairman. We were told that it was necessary to investigate a man who drove a Coca-Cola truck. Also a man who shoveled dirt at the atomic energy plant had to be investigated. We are employing high-priced help on such investigations, and in the process the functions of government are being slowed up.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the enemies of this country are no respecters of positions. Judith Coplon was a $3,000 or $3,600 employee. Communists are just as likely to be in the lower echelon of employment as in the key positions.

Mr. SMATHERS. The FBI did not discover her in advance. The Civil Service Commission might have done better.

It seems to me, as the Senator from Connecticut has pointed out, that there is a tremendous delay in the operations of the Government. As the Attorney General says, there are more than 200,000 cases waiting to be investigated. He does not have sufficient personel to make the investigation. Many of the investigations could well be made by civil service personnel.

Mr. McMAHON. In effect, we have our best detectives out putting parking tickets on automobiles.

Mr. SMATHERS. I certainly agree to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada objects to the present consideration of calendar 901, Senate bill 2077. The bill will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1117) for the creation of a Commission on Congressional Salaries and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I did not rise to object to this bill. Since objection has been made, I will wait until the next bill is called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] object to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. I did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The clerk will call the next bill.

INTERSTATE COMPACT RELATING TO MUTUAL MILITARY AID

The bill (S. 968) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to mutual military aid in an emergency, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection, to the present consideration of the bill?

REVENUE ACT OF 1951—STATEMENT ON TERMINATION PAYMENTS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not rise to object to the consideration of Senate bill 968. I merely wish to place in the RECORD a brief statement

with reference to one of the changes made in the tax bill in the conference of yesterday afternoon. The statement is explanatory of the intention and purpose.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GEORGE ON TERMINATION PAYMENTS

I should like to make a further short statement with regard to one of the eight changes in the revenue bill made by the conferees at their meeting yesterday and which I discussed yesterday.

The change in question was the one relating to the provision giving capital-gain treatment to lump-sum payments received at retirement or the termination of his employment upon the release of rights to a share in the future profits of the employer. This change provided that the application of the provision would be limited to cases where the employee's rights were to continue "for a period of not less than 5 years (or for a period ending with his death)."

I desire to make it clear that this change was not intended to require that the employee's contract expressly set out a minimum term of five or more years in so many words The thought was merely to insure that the rights being sold were not rights likely to be less than 5 years in duration. For instance, if the rights were to a share of the earnings under a certain patent with a further life of 8 years, or to a share of the profits from a certain timber tract which would probably take more than 5 years to cut, or to a share of the royalties on a book or a play or a script which might well extend beyond 5 years, these rights (whether or not ending with the employee's death) would be covered by the amendment.

SUGGESTION FOR CONSIDERATION OF BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to advise the Senate that four bills have been reported from the Commitee on Finance today, none of which, I believe, is controversial. The majority leader advises me that since we must be in session tomorrow, those bills may go to the calendar and be called tomorrow as a part of the present calendar call

Mr McFARLAND. Mr. President, there are a few small bills such as the ones to which the Senator from Georgia refers, which are being reported, and which could possibly be passed without objection. We might have a brief call of the calendar tomorrow, for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection.

If there is any objection to them, they would not be called. However, if they are cleared with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], or any other Senator who is interested in them, they should be called up.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is a satisfactory arrangement.

INTERSTATE COMPACT RELATING TO MUTUAL MILITARY AID

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 968?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 968) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to mutual military aid in an emergency was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to an interstate compact, relating to mutual military aid in an emergency, negotiated and entered into by the States of New York and New Jersey, which compact reads as follows:

"AN INTERSTATE COMPACT FOR MUTUAL MILITARY AID IN AN EMERGENCY

"ARTICLE I

"1. The purposes of this compact are

"a. to provide for mutual military aid and assistance in an emergency by the military forces of a signatory State to the military forces of the other signatory States or of the United States, including among other military missions, the protection of interstate bridges, tunnels, ferries, pipelines, communications facilities and other vital installation, plants, and facilities; and the military support of civil defense agencies;

"b. to provide for the fresh pursuit in case of an emergency, by the military forces or any part or member thereof of a signatory States into another State, of insurrectionists, saboteurs, enemies or enemy forces, or persons seeking or appearing to seek to overthrow the Government of the United States or of a signatory State;

"c. to make provision for the powers, duties, rights, privileges, and immunities of the members of the military forces of a signatory State while so engaged outside of their own State

"2 a 'Emergency' as used in this compact shall mean and include invasion or other hostile action, disaster, insurrection or imminent danger thereof.

"b. 'State' as used in this compact shall include any signatory State.

"c 'Military forces' as used in this compact shall include the organized militia, or any force thereof, of a signatory State

"ARTICLE II

"This compact shall become effective as to the signatory States when the legislatures thereof have approved it and when the Congress has given its consent either before or after the date hereof. Any State not a party to this compact at the date hereof may become a party hereto.

"ARTICLE III

"The Governor of each signatory State or his designated military representative shall constitute the Committee for Mutual Military Aid for the signatory States. It shall be the duty of the Committee for Mutual Military Aid to make joint plans for the employment of the military forces of the signatory States for mutual military aid and assistance in case of emergency.

"ARTICLE IV

"1 It shall be the duty of each signatory State to integrate its plan for the employment of its military forces in case of emergency with the joint plans recommended by the Committee for Mutual Military Aid and with the emergency plans of the Armed Forces of the United States.

"2 In case of emergency, upon the request of the Governor of a signatory State, the Governor of each signatory State, to the extent consistent with the needs of his own State, shall order its military forces or such part thereof as he, in his discretion, may find necessary, to assist the military forces of the requesting State in order to carry out the purposes set forth in this compact. In such case, it shall be the duty of the Governor of each signatory State receiving such a request to issue the necessary orders for such use of the military forces of his State without the borders of his State and to direct the commander of such forces to place them under the operational control of the commander of the forces of the requesting State or of the United States which may be engaged in meeting the emergency.

"3. The Governor of any signatory State, in his discretion, may recall the military forces of his state serving without its borders or any part or any member of such forces.

"ARTICLE V

"In case of an emergency, any unit or member of the military forces of a signatory State which has been ordered into active service by the Governor may upon order of the officer in immediate command thereof continue beyond the borders of his own State into another signatory State in fresh pursuit of insurrectionists, saboteurs, enemies or enemy forces or persons seeking or appearing to seek to overthrow the Government of the United States or of any one of the signatory States, until they are apprehended by such unit or member. Any such person who shall be apprehended or captured in a signatory State by a unit or member of the military forces of another signatory State shall without unnecessary delay be surrendered to the military or police forces of the State in which he is taken or to the forces of the United States. Such surrender shall not constitute a waiver by the State of the military forces making the capture, of its right to extradite or prosecute such persons for any crime committed in that State.

"ARTICLE VI

"1. Whenever the military forces or any part thereof of any signatory State are engaged outside of their own State in carrying out the purposes of this compact, the individual members of such military forces so engaged shall not be liable, civilly or criminally, for any act or acts done by them in the performance of their duty.

"2 The individual members of such forces shall have the same powers, duties, rights, privileges and immunities as the members of the military forces of the State in which they are engaged, but in any event.

"3. Each signatory State shall save harmless any member of its military forces wherever serving and any member of the military forces of any other signatory State serving within its borders for any act or acts done by them in the performance of their duty while engaged in carrying out the purposes of this compact.

"ARTICLE VII

"1 Each signatory State shall provide, in the same amounts and manner as if they were on duty within their own State, for the pay and allowances of the personnel of its military forces, and for the medical and hospital expenses, disability and death benefits, pensions and funeral expenses of wounded, injured or sick personnel and of dependents or representatives of deceased personnel of its military forces, in case such personnel shall suffer wounds, injuries, disease, disability or death while engaged without the State pursuant to this compact and while going to and returning from such other signatory State Each signatory State shall provide in the same amounts and manner as if they were on duty within their own State for the logistical support and for other costs and expenses of its military forces while engaged without the State pursuant to this compact and while going to and returning from such other signatory State.

"2. Any signatory State rendering outside aid in case of insurrection or disaster not the result of invasion or hostile action, shall, if it so elects be reimbursed by the signatory State receiving such aid for the pay and allowances of its personnel, logistical support and all other costs and expenses referred to in Section 1 of this Article and incurred in connection with the request for aid. Such election shall be exercised by the Governor of the aiding State presenting a statement and

request for reimbursement of such costs and expenses to the Governor of the requesting State.

"ARTICLE VIII

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or restrict the power of any signatory State in case of an emergency affecting that State only, to provide for the internal defense of any part of the territory of said State or for the protection and control of any bridge, tunnel, ferry, installation, plant or facility or any part thereof within the borders of such State or to prohibit the enforcement of any laws, rules and regulations or the execution of any plan with regard thereto.

"ARTICLE IX

"This compact shall continue in force and remain binding on each signatory State until the legislature or the Governor of such State gives notice of withdrawal therefrom. Such notice of withdrawal shall not be effective until 6 months after said notice has been given to the Governor of each of the other signatory States.

"In witness whereof, the States whose Governors have signed below have become parties to this compact.

"12 December 1950.

"Approved December 11, 1950.

"NATHANIEL L. GOLDSTEIN,
"Attorney General of the State of New York.

"By KENDALL P. BROWN,
"Solicitor General.

"THOMAS E. DEWEY,
"Governor of New York.

"Attest:

"THOMAS J. CURRAN,
"Secretary of State of the State of New York.

"ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,
"Governor of New Jersey.

"Approved December 11, 1950.

"W. J. DOUGHTERY
"(For the State Comptroller).

"Approved December 12, 1950.

"THEODORE D. PARSONS,
"Attorney General of the State of New Jersey.

"By LEON S MILMED,
"Deputy Attorney General and Counsel to the Governor.

"Approved December 12, 1950.

"J. LINDSAY DE VALLIERE,
"Director, Division of Budget and Accounting and State Comptroller of the State of New Jersey.

"By the Governor:

"LLOYD B. WARD,
"Secretary of State of the State of New Jersey."

SEC. 2. Without further submission of the compact, the consent of Congress is given to any State to become a party to it in accordance with its terms.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

WILLY GIROUD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1839) for the relief of Willy Giroud which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), insofar as concerns any act or acts of Willy Giroud, of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has notice at the time of the enactment of this act, Willy Giroud may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is not otherwise inadmissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BANK OF AMERICA NATIONAL TRUST AND SAVINGS ASSOCIATION

The bill (H. R. 1672) for the relief of Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NUMA A. WINSTEAD

The bill (H. R. 2207) for the relief of Numa A. Winstead was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PENALTY FOR GATHERING OR DELIVERING CERTAIN DEFENSE INFORMATION TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

The bill (S. 1292) to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the criminal penalty provided for persons convicted of gathering or delivering certain defense information to aid a foreign government in time of peace was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the measure.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the bill seeks to amend the penal code by making it possible for the Federal courts to impose more drastic penalties with respect to cases of espionage in times of peace.

As the situation now stands, a flagrant case, in which secrets of the United States Government are obtained and delivered to a potential enemy on the eve of war, could be punished only by a sentence of not to exceed 20 years imprisonment. A case recently occurred in which the Federal judge in imposing sentence commented on that situation, and suggested an amendment of the law. The Department of Justice recommends it, and it has been unanimously favored by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill would amend section 794, title 18, United States Code, so as to increase the criminal penalty provided therein for persons convicted of gathering or delivering defense information, in aid of a foreign government, in time of peace or in time of war.

The Department of Justice considered the bill in its original form and recommended certain amendments, which have been incorporated in the bill as it is reported to the Senate. Otherwise the Department of Justice makes no objection to enactment of S. 1292.

With the enactment of this bill the Federal courts will be empowered to impose life imprisonment or a death sentence as the maximum punishment for persons convicted of gathering or delivering defense information in aid of a foreign government, whether the act occurs in time of peace or war, and thereby raise a substantial deterrent to the commission of such acts.

The committee recommends favorable consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1292) to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the criminal penalty provided for persons convicted of gathering or delivering certain defense information to aid a foreign government in time of peace on page 2, line 8, after the word "imprisonment", to strike out "for not more than 30 years" and insert "for any term of years or for life"; and after line 11, to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(c) Subsection (b) of such section, as redesignated by this act, is amended by striking out "for not more than 30 years", and inserting in lieu thereof "for any term of years or for life".

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subsections (a) and (b) of section 794 of title 18 of the United States Code are amended to read as follows:

(a) Whoever, with intent or reason to believe that it is to be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of a foreign nation, communicates, delivers, or transmits, or attempts to communicate, deliver, or transmit, to any foreign government, or to any faction or party or military or naval force within a foreign country, whether recognized or unrecognized by the United States, or to any representative, officer, agent, employee, subject, or citizen thereof, either directly or indirectly, any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, note, instrument, appliance, or information relating to the national defense, shall be punished by death or by imprisonment for any term of years or for life"

(b) Subsections (c) and (d) of such section are redesignated as subsections (b) and (c), respectively.

(c) Subsection (b) of such section, as redesignated by this act, is amended by striking out "for not more than 30 years", and inserting in lieu thereof "for any term of years or for life".

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECRUITMENT PROCEDURE FOR COMPETITIVE CIVIL SERVICE

The bill (S. 1135) to provide a recruitment procedure for the competitive civil service in order to insure selection of personnel on the basis of open competition and merit, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The principal purpose of the bill, as amended by the committee, is to provide for a more effective recruitment, examination, and certifying procedure for selecting persons for positions in the competitive civil service and at the same time to insure that the selection of such persons is made on the basis of open competition and merit. In addition, it

would clearly authorize the Commission to establish standards for the personnel operations of the departments, and would provide for a systematic transfer plan for Federal employees.

Many legislative steps have already been taken as a result of the Hoover Commission recommendations on personnel management: Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1949, which designated the Chairman of Civil Service Commission as its chief administrative official; the classification act of 1949, which completely overhauled the Federal classification system; the Executive Pay Act of 1949; and the Performance Rating Act of 1950. In addition, the civil service commission recommendations by administrative effected several of the Hoover Commission recommendations by administrative action: better promotion plans; aggressive steps to recruit promising junior personnel; and the beginnings of an executive development system.

S. 1135 as amended would put into effect in modified form several of the remaining Hoover Commission personnel recommendations; those related to examining and selection, transfer, and personnel records.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] handled the bill. He may wish to give a further explanation of the bill at this time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I should like to add to the statement made by the distinguished chairman of our committee only a brief observation, which I believe will be of interest in the consideration of the bill by the Senate.

For the most part, the procedure outlined is now being carried out under executive directive. The bill is actually a legislative codification of a system which is now in being. It is an attempt to bring about a more expeditious handling of the civil-service procedures.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe the bill was reported unanimously by the committee. Is that correct?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr President, if Senators will turn to the bill, they will see that it is sponsored by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1135) to provide a recruitment procedure for the competitive civil service in order to insure selection of personnel on the basis of open competition and merit, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments on page 2, line 10, after the word "departments", to insert "under regulations of the Commission"; on page 3, line 13, after the word "discharge", to strike out "its duty and responsibility under this act" and insert "the duty and responsibility assigned to it by law"; on page 4, line 23, after the word "thereof", to strike out "after duly held hearings" and insert "after consultation with the department"; on page 5, line 1, after the word "Commission", to strike out the comma and "pursuant to subsection (b) of this section,"; in line 5, after "(1)" to strike out "to recruit, examine, and certify persons for selection and appointment to competitive civil-service positions in such department which are subject to such plan," and insert "to conduct or to supervise the conduct of recruiting, examining, and certifying of persons for selection and appointment to competitive civil-service positions in such department which are subject to such plan"; in line 16, after the word "shall", to strike out "taken" and insert "take"; after line 17, to insert:

(d) Whenever the Commission performs additional recruiting, examining, or certification work in order to render services to a department as a result of action taken under paragraphs (b) or (c) of this section, funds shall be made available to the Commission for its expenses in connection with the performance of such services from funds appropriated or otherwise available to the department for which the Commission performs such services, by advances or reimbursements, in such manner and in such amounts as may be approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The Commission shall keep records of its expenses in connection with the performance of such additional services and shall certify such expenses to the Bureau of the Budget.

On page 6, line 15, after "SEC. 8.", to insert "(a)"; in line 18, after "(2)", to strike out "by placing them in categories of outstanding, well-qualified, qualified, and unqualified. Except under unusual circumstances, category ratings shall be used in the case of competitors for professional, administration, and scientific positions of a high level" and insert "in the case of such scientific and professional positions as the commission may designate, by placing them in categories of outstanding, well-qualified, qualified, and unqualified"; on page 7, after line 3, to insert:

(b) The term "service-connected disability" as used in section 2 (1) of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, shall be construed as a service-connected disability which is compensable under public laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force.

In line 17, after "(3)", to strike out "(5), and (6)" and insert "(5)"; on page 8, after line 19, to strike out:

"(b) For professional and scientific positions for which the entrance salary is over $3,000 per annum and for which eligibles are rated by categories, the names of preference eligibles shall be entered on the appropriate civil service registers of eligibles in accordance with their respective category ratings and ahead of all others in the same category. For all other positions for which eligibles are rated by categories, the names of preference eligibles shall be entered on the appropriate civil service registers of eligibles in accordance with their respective category ratings and ahead of all others in the same category, except that the names of special preference eligibles shall be entered at the top of the highest category.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

For all positions for which eligibles are rated by categories, the names of preference eligibles shall be entered on the appropriate civil service registers of eligibles in accordance with their respective category ratings and ahead of all others in the same category, except that the names of special preference eligibles shall be entered ahead of other preference eligibles in the same category.

On page 10, line 10, after the word "appointment", to strike out "and" and insert "on"; on page 11, after line 13, to strike out:

APPOINTMENTS, AND SO FORTH, SOLELY ON MERIT

SEC. 11. Section 10 of the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, as amended (5 U. S. C. 142), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. No person in the public service is for that reason under any obligations to contribute to any political fund, or to render any political service, and no such person is liable to be removed or otherwise prejudiced for refusing to do so. No person in the public service has any right to use his official authority or influence to coerce the political action of any person or body. No political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, and no basis other than merit shall be used, in the selection, promotion, demotion, assignment, transfer, furlough, layoff, dismissal, discipline, compensation, or reinstatement of employees in positions under the civil-service laws, rules, and regulations. Any officer in the executive branch of the Government (who was appointed by the President either with or without the advice and consent of the Senate) who is found by the President to have violated this section shall be removed from office by the President, and any officer or employee of an executive agency (who was appointed by the head of such agency) who is found by the head of such agency to have violated this section shall be removed from office by the head of such agency. This section shall not be construed to prohibit any holder of political office in the United States from furnishing recommendations relative to the character, ability, and general fitness of an applicant for Federal employment."

On page 12, line 18, to change the section number from "12" to "11"; on page 13, line 3, after the word "establish", to strike out "uniform"; in line 4, after the word "for", to strike out the comma and "or otherwise regulate,"; after line 17, to strike out:

SEC. 14. Under such arrangements as the President may prescribe, there shall be established throughout the United States facilities for the counseling, testing, and placement of veterans in suitable Federal employment. Such facilities shall be known as "Veterans' Civil Service Counseling and Placement Facilities." Each veteran who applies therefor at any such facility shall have his aptitudes and qualifications tested and evaluated, shall be advised as to any Federal employment or employments for which he appears to be qualified, and shall be provided active assistance in locating and being placed in any suitable Federal vacancy.

On page 14, line 4, to change the section number from "15" to "13"; in line

15, to change the section number from "16" to "14"; in line 18, to change the section number from "17" to "15"; in line 22, to change the section number from "18" to "16"; at the top of page 15, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 17. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

In line 3, to change the section number from "19" to "18", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Federal Personnel Recruitment Act of 1952."

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "department" includes all departments, independent establishments, agencies, and corporations in the executive, legislative, or judicial branches of the Federal Government or in the municipal government of the District of Columbia in which there are competitive positions subject to the Civil Service Act of 1883, as amended and supplemented.

(2) The term "Commission" means the Civil Service Commission.

(3) The term "employment plan" means a plan provided for in section 3 (c).

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the duty and responsibility of the Commission and of the departments under regulations of the Commission to maintain and protect a system of recruitment, examination, certification, and selection of persons for competitive civil-service positions in the departments which will result in open competition and selection on merit

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Commission is authorized, at the direction of the President and during a national emergency declared by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress, to modify or set aside the principle of open competition to the extent and for such time as it deems necessary in order to expedite and facilitate the recruitment of the best qualified and available personnel.

(c) Each department shall submit to the Commission an employment plan or plans for the recruitment, examination, certification, and selection of persons for specified categories of competitive civil-service positions in such department. Two or more departments may jointly submit and operate under an employment plan. If the Commission approves an employment plan submitted by a department, such department, or such department and the Commission, in accordance with such plan, shall recruit, examine, and certify, and such department shall select, persons for such of its competitive civil-service positions as are included in such plan. All operations of a department under any employment plan shall be subject to such supervision and direction by the Commission as may be necessary for the Commission to discharge the duty and responsibility assigned to it by law.

SEC 4 (a) The Commission shall, after consultation with the departments principally concerned—

(1) determine, from time to time, with due regard to the effectiveness of the operations of the departments and to the best interests of the Government, those competitive civil-service positions which shall be subject to recruitment, examination, and certification by the Commission, and those positions which shall be subject to employment plans;

(2) prepare standards to be followed in the establishment and operation of employment plans;

(3) from time to time revise, supplement, or abolish existing standards, or prepare new standards for employment plans.

(b) Standards prepared by the Commission under subsection (a) shall be published in such form as it may determine.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall undertake directly, or make appropriate alternative arrangements for, the recruitment, examination, and certification of persons for selection and appointment to competitive civil-service positions not covered by currently approved employment plans.

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall from time to time, but at least annually, review the operations of the departments under approved employment plans in order to determine whether such operations are in compliance with such plans and with the civil-service rules and regulations. The Commission shall make findings with respect to the operations of the departments under their employment plans and shall report such findings to the heads of the departments concerned.

(b) The Commission shall withhold, withdraw, or suspend its approval of any employment plan or part thereof, after consultation with the department, whenever it finds that such plan does not meet the standards prepared by the Commission.

(c) Whenever the Commission finds that the operations of a department under an approved employment plan are not in compliance with such plan or with the civil-service rules and regulations, the Commission shall have authority (1) to conduct or to supervise the conduct of recruiting, examining and certifying of persons for selection and appointment to competitive civil-service positions in such department which are subject to such plan, and (2) to modify or change any action taken or procedure followed by such department under such plan The Commission shall certify to such department any such action taken by the Commission under this subsection The department shall take action in accordance with such certificate and such certificate shall be binding on the department.

(d) Whenever the Commission performs additional recruiting, examining, or certification work in order to render services to a department as a result of action taken under paragraphs (b) or (c) of this section, funds shall be made available to the Commission for its expenses in connection with the performance of such services from funds appropriated or otherwise available to the department for which the Commission performs such services, by advances or reimbursements, in such manner and in such amounts as may be approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The Commission shall keep records of its expenses in connection with the performance of such additional services and shall certify such expenses to the Bureau of the Budget.

SEC. 7. The Commission, in the case of those examinations for which it expects competition to be greatly in excess of the needs of the service, may, with due regard to the principle of open competition, take such action, or direct that such action be taken by a department, as the Commission deems necessary to limit the number of persons permitted to compete for positions to such number as is reasonably required to meet economically and effectively the needs of the service for qualified and capable employees.

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission, or a department as authorized by an approved employment plan, shall rate competitors for selection to competitive civil-service positions either (1) numerically on a scale of 100, or (2) in the case of such scientific and professional positions as the Commission may designate, by placing them in categories of outstanding, well qualified, qualified, and unqualified. Category ratings shall not be used in the case of competitors for positions in the field service of the Post Office Department.

(b) The term "service-connected disability" as used in section 2 (1) of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, shall be construed as a service-connected disability which is compensable under public laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force.

SEC. 9. (a) So much of section 3 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended (5 U. S. C. 852), as precedes *"Provided,* That" is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3 In those examinations to determine the qualifications of applicants for entrance into the service in which applicants are rated numerically, 10 points shall be added to the earned ratings of those persons included under section 2 (1), (2), (3), and (5) (such persons being hereinafter sometimes called 'special preference eligibles'), and five points shall be added to the earned ratings of those persons included under section 2 (4) of this act, and in those examinations in which applicants are rated by categories such persons shall receive the preference provided by section 7 (b) of this act: *Provided,* That any such preference eligible must receive a passing grade in order to qualify for such additional 10 points or such additional 5 points or for such preference provided by section 7 (b) "

(b) Section 7 of such act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 856), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. (a) For professional and scientific positions for which the entrance salary is over $3,000 per annum and for which eligibles are rated numerically, the names of preference eligibles shall be entered on the appropriate civil-service registers of eligibles in accordance with their respective augmented ratings and ahead of all eligibles having the same rating who are not entitled to preference. For all other positions for which eligibles are rated numerically, the names of eligibles entitled to 10 points preference shall be entered at the top of the appropriate civil-service registers in accordance with their respective augmented ratings, and the names of eligibles entitled to 5 points preference shall be entered on such registers of eligibles in accordance with their respective augmented ratings and ahead of all eligibles having the same rating who are not entitled to preference.

"(b) For all positions for which eligibles are rated by categories, the names of preference eligibles shall be entered on the appropriate civil-service registers of eligibles in accordance with their respective category ratings and ahead of all others in the same category, except that the names of special preference eligibles shall be entered ahead of other preference eligibles in the same category."

(c) So much of section 8 of such act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 857), as precedes *"Provided,* That" is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. (a) When in accordance with civil-service laws and rules, a nominating or appointing officer requests certification of eligibles for appointment purposes, there shall be certified, from the top of the appropriate civil-service register of eligibles, such number of names as may be necessary to permit such officer to make a selection for each vacancy in the manner provided by this section.

"(b) When eligibles have been rated numerically, the nominating or appointing officer shall be entitled to consider at least three eligibles for each vacancy and shall make selection from not more than the highest three eligibles available for appointment on certification: *Provided,* That the Civil Service Commission may by regulation provide that with respect to certain positions, not including positions in the field service of the Post Office Department, the nominating or appointing officer shall be entitled to consider at least five eligibles for each vacancy and shall make selection from not more than the highest five eligibles available for appointment on certification.

"(c) When eligibles have been rated by categories, the nominating or appointing of-

ficer shall be entitled to consider at least five eligibles for each vacancy and shall make selection from the highest category. The Commission shall prepare standards for determining when the number of eligibles in any category to be considered is insufficient or excessive. If, under such standards, there is an insufficient number of eligibles in the highest category, eligibles in the next highest category or categories shall also be considered for selection. If, under such standards, there is an excessive number of eligibles in the category or categories to be considered, the officer shall make selection from such lesser number of eligibles in such category or categories as may be determined to be sufficient under such standards. Selection of a nonpreference eligible shall not be made in any case if there are available for selection the names of at least five preference eligibles in the same or a higher category.

"(d) A nominating or appointing officer shall not be required to consider an eligible for selection if objection to such eligible shall be made and sustained for any proper and adequate reason under regulations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission:".

SEC. 10. Any competitor for selection to a competitive civil-service position shall, upon written request to the Commission, be entitled as a matter of right to a review by the Commission of the rating given him under section 8 of this act. After such review the Commission shall take such action as it may find to be proper.

SEC 11. Subject to the Federal Reports Act of 1942 (5 U S C. 139), the Commission—

(1) shall provide for the maintenance and preservation of personnel records, including the records of examinations, either by the Commission, or by the departments, or by both, as the Commission may determine; and

(2) shall, after consultation with the departments (when the Commission deems it practicable), establish standards, practices, procedures, and forms for the personnel operations of the departments, to the extent that the Commission deems such action to be in the interests of the service

SEC. 12. As an aid to more effective governmental administration, the Commission is authorized and directed to facilitate the transfer of officers and employees with special qualifications to positions requiring such qualifications by referring the names of such officers and employees to any departments making requests therefor. The Commission shall obtain from other departments, in connection with the filling of such positions, the names of and information with respect to officers and employees with special qualifications, and shall maintain such records as are necessary for the economical and efficient administration of this section.

SEC. 13. (a) The President is authorized to issue such civil-service rules, and the Commission is authorized to issue such regulations, as may be necessary for the administration of this act.

(b) The Commission shall from time to time make such investigations with respect to the operation of this act as it may deem necessary. The departments shall furnish the Commission such information in connection with such investigations as the Commission may request. The Commission shall take such corrective action as it may deem necessary in the light of such investigations.

SEC. 14. The selection of persons under this act and the promotion of officers and employees to higher positions shall be made on the basis of merit and efficiency.

SEC. 15. The provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1949 (5 U. S. C. 133z–15 notes) shall apply with respect to the performance of functions of the Commission under this act.

SEC. 16. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 17. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

SEC. 18. This act shall take effect on the ninetieth day after the date of its enactment.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EASEMENT FOR PUBLIC ROAD THROUGH PEA ISLAND NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, NORTH CAROLINA

The bill (H. R. 4808) to provide for the granting of an easement for a public road through the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge in Dare County, North Carolina, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to read to the Senate a letter which I received today from the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]:

OCTOBER 17, 1951.

Hon ROBERT C HENDRICKSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENDRICKSON: Since I probably will not be able to be on the floor of the Senate when the calendar is called on Friday, October 19, I am calling your attention to H. R. 4808, Calendar 909.

This bill, authorizing the conveyance of a permanent easement in the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge to the State of North Carolina, makes no provision for compensation to the United States, except to the extent that there is legal validity in the claim that the State has prescriptive rights over the refuge. It is my information that the area crossed in traveling from one end of Pea Island to the other varies greatly from time to time due to the nature of the land, which is of a sandy or marshy composition. Further, the land was purchased by the Federal Government from private owners, not the State of North Carolina. Thus, there would appear to be serious question as to whether the State has a legally enforceable claim to any well-defined prescriptive right over the Island

As nearly as I can determine, there has been no attempt to make a thorough determination of the legal rights involved. Since the rights of the State, if any, are not clearly established, it would seem that adequate compensation for the land to be transferred is not called for by H. R. 4808.

I therefore suggest an amendment which would require payment by the State of North Carolina of 50 percent of the appraised value of the land included in the transfer. In addition, however, this amendment would still allow the value of any rights which the State of North Carolina might actually have to be applied against the purchase price. In effect, therefore, the amendment differs from H. R 4808 as reported only in that it requires a finding of value as to the various rights which may be involved, and guarantees, on that basis, that the Federal Government will not be giving the land away.

I would appreciate it if you would offer the attached amendment in my behalf.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I now send to the desk the amendment suggested in the letter of the distinguished Senator from Oregon; and after the bill is considered, I shall ask that the amendment be stated at the appropriate time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Oregon, I now submit the amendment set forth in his letter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey, on behalf of the Senator from Oregon, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning with the words ", and to", in line 9, on page 1, it is proposed to strike out all to and including line 3, on page 2, and to insert in lieu thereof a period and the following:

The conveyance authorized by this act shall be made only upon payment to the United States of a sum equal to 50 percent of the appraised value of the lands included therein, and any sum or sums so received shall be credited to the migratory bird conservation fund and shall be available for expenditure in accordance with authorizations relating thereto: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may accept the conveyance to the United States of any rights of way, easements, or other rights in land owned by the State of North Carolina within the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge, and shall apply the appraised value of any rights so accepted to the satisfaction of any payment due to the United States under this act.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, I feel quite confident that if the junior Senator from Oregon understood the situation in the case of the land referred to in this case, his amendment would not have been submitted.

The situation is that a sand bar runs north and south along the coast of North Carolina, with the Atlantic Ocean on one side and with Pamlico Sound, a body of water 20 or 30 miles wide, on the other side. From time immemorial there have been settlements on these sand bars, mainly settlements of fishermen. Within recent years there have been great developments along the sand bars, in various villages and small towns.

Some years ago the State of North Carolina, which owned this land, attempted to begin the development of a series of paved highways. It was with some difficulty that the State finally began paving the roads in the coastal section of the State. There is a paved road along all this portion, except for a stretch of 13 miles, a portion of that area being included in the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge, which the State of North Carolina was interested in having the Federal Government take over for that purpose.

For many years there has been a road through this stretch of sand. The State of North Carolina wishes to pave this highway; but before doing so, the State wishes to make certain what the proper location is; and in straightening the

road, there may be portions of land on one side or the other which will have to be used a little differently from the present use.

Although the State of North Carolina considers that it has full title to this road, the State feels that it might be wiser to have a conveyance of the road made to it by the Secretary of the Interior.

Consequently, we have introduced this bill, which has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior and also by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Having been along that area, I doubt very much whether the area of the sand involved in this measure, which is included within the wildlife refuge, would be worth the cost of appraising it. However, be that as it may, the State of North Carolina has title to that portion, we believe. It is estimated that there has been a road through that area for 200 years or more.

The purpose of this measure is to make it possible for those who live around what is known as Hatteras Inlet to have the same benefit which is had by those who live to the north and to the south of that area; and this measure, if enacted, also will benefit the United States Government, by providing for ingress and egress with respect to this section of the State of North Carolina.

So I hope the amendment will be rejected, and I hope the bill will be passed, so that the State of North Carolina can pave the road, which is used by those who live there on the banks, as we ordinarily call that area.

I can assure the Senate that there is no particular consequence or importance of any sort to the strip of sand affected by this measure.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to supplement what the Senator from North Carolina has said, by saying that although we did not hold hearings on the bill, yet we were familiar with the situation involved.

Although I might agree with the amendment of my friend, the Senator from Oregon, I believe that if the amendment were agreed to, it might cost 10 times more to ascertain what 50 percent of the appraised value of the land would be, than the cost involved in the passage of the bill.

I do not think any particular benefit would accrue to anyone as a result of conveying that amount of sand to the State of North Carolina. I think the Federal Government will benefit by having the road constructed. I am afraid that if someone were sent there to try to ascertain the value of 50 percent of the sand involved in the measure, including the title of the States of North Carolina to that sand, the cost of the investigation would be much greater than the cost of the entire roadway.

So I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to say that in view of the explanation, I shall vote against the amendment. However, I feel constrained to offer the amendment at the request of the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey, on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 4808) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAXIMILIAN OTTO RICKER-HUETTER AND MRS. EUGENIA RICKER-HUETTER

The bill (H. R. 853) for the relief of Maximilian Otto Ricker-Huetter and Mrs. Eugenia Ricker-Huetter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VIRGINE ZARTARIAN, ALSO KNOWN AS VERGIN ZARTARIAN

The bill (S. 1359) for the relief of Virgine Zartarian (also known as Vérgin Zartarian) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Virgine Zartarian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

EDWARD CHI-KAN LAM

The bill (S. 750) for the relief of Edward Chi-Kan Lam was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of section 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall be held to be applicable to the alien Edward Chi-Kan Lam, the husband of Frances Lew, a citizen of the United States.

CAMILLA PINTOS

The bill (S. 1560) for the relief of Camilla Pintos was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Camilla Pintos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CAROL ANN HUTCHINS (SYBILLE SCHUBERT)

The bill (S. 2271) for the relief of Carol Ann Hutchins (Sybille Schubert) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Carol Ann Hutchins (Sybille Schubert), shal be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Capt. and Mrs. Lavern C. Hutchins, citizens of the United States.

ADELHEID WICHMAN, NOW ADELHEID WAITSCHIES

The bill (S. 1980) for the relief of Adelheid Wichman (now Adelheid Waitschies) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child Adelheid Wichman (now Adelheid Waitschies) shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alen minor child of Mr. and Mrs. Otto Waitschies, citizens of the United States.

WILLIAM ELDEN JOSLIN

The bill (S. 2228) for the relief of William Elden Joslin was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, William Elden Joslin, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Technical Sergeant and Mrs. Ivan E. Joslin, citizens of the United States.

THEFT OR RECEIPT OF STOLEN MAIL MATTER

The bill (S. 2198) to amend section 1708 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the theft or receipt of stolen mail matter generally was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth paragraph of section 1708, title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by striking out the semicolon and the clause reading "but if the value or face value of any such article or thing does not exceed $100, he shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

MIEKO TAKAMINE

The bill (S. 2172) for the relief of Mieko Takamine was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purposes of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Mieko Takamine, a minor Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Corp. Joseph A. Gruber, a citizen of the United States.

JOYCE JACQUALYN JOHNSON

The bill (S. 1931) for the relief of Joyce Jacqualyn Johnson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States

persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Joyce Jacqualyn Johnson, a minor half-Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Sgt. and Mrs. Prather Johnson, citizens of the United States.

THEODORE ALEXANDER VLANDY

The bill (S. 1636) for the relief of Theodore Alexander Vlandy was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Theodore Alexander Vlandy shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CARLOS TANNOYA

The bill (S. 1685) for the relief of Carlos Tannoya was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Carlos Tannoya shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

TORY LEE EAKIN

The bill (S. 1620) for the relief of Tory Lee Eakin was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Tory Lee Eakin, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Lt. and Mrs John B. Eakin, citizens of the United States.

SISTER EDELTRUDIS SAILER

The bill (S. 589) for the relief of Sister Edeltrudis Sailer was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Edeltrudis Sailer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DR. LOUIS S. K. YUAN

The bill (S. 560) for the relief of Dr. Louis S. K. Yuan was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Louis S. K. Yuan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the propert quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JOSEPH ROSSABI AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 544) for the relief of Joseph Rossabi and others was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Joseph Rossabi, Corrine Rossabi, Mayer Rossabi, and Morris Rossabi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct appropriate numbers from the first available appropriate quota or quotas.

GREGORY JOSEPH COLES

The bill (S. 1925) for the relief of Gregory Joseph Coles was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of that act, the minor child Gregory Joseph Coles, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Clinton J. Coles, a citizen of the United States.

ADMISSION OF STATE PRISONERS TO FEDERAL PENAL AND CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

The bill (S. 2160) to authorize the Attorney General to admit persons committed by State courts to Federal penal and correctional institutions when facilities are available was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is Calendar 930, Senate bill 2160. At the present time the Attorney General is authorized by law to make contracts with State officials for the purpose of temporary confinement of Federal prisoners. This bill would authorize a more or less reciprocal arrangement whereby, under certain conditions in a limited category of cases, at no expense to the Federal Government, the Attorney General may contract with State officials for the custody of persons convicted and sentenced under State laws.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 401 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof, immediately after section 5002, a new section as follows:

"§ 5003. Custody of State offenders.

"(a) The Attorney General, when the director shall certify that proper and adequate treatment facilities and personnel are available, is hereby authorized to contract with the proper officials of a State or Territory for the custody, care, subsistence, education, treatment, and training of persons convicted of criminal offenses in the courts of such State or Territory: *Provided*, That any such contract shall provide for reimbursing the United States in full for all costs or other expenses involved.

"(b) Funds received under such contract may be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation or appropriations from which the payments for such service were originally made.

"(c) Unless otherwise specifically provided in the contract, a person committed to the Attorney General hereunder shall be subject to all the provisions of law and regulations applicable to persons committed for violations of laws of the United States not inconsistent with the sentence imposed."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 401 of said title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end of such analysis a new item, "5003. Custody of State offenders."

OSWALD A. DRICA-MINIERIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 465) for the relief of Oswald A. Drica-Minieris, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "date", to strike out "he last entered the United States" and insert "of the enactment of this act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General of the United States is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence in the United States of Oswald A. Drica-Minieris as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year the said quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT WENDELL TADLOCK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 993) for the relief of Robert Wendell Tadlock, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, solely for the purposes of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, and notwithstanding any provision excluding from admission to the United States persons predominantly of races ineligible to United States citizenship, Robert Wendell Tadlock, a minor child, born in Japan, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Lt. Col. and Mrs. Marion C. Tadlock, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEOPOLD KAHN, JR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1255) for the relief of Leopold Kahn, Jr., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Leopold Kahn, Jr., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FACILITIES FOR DETENTION OF ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1932) to authorize the establishment of facilities necessary for the detention of aliens in the administration and enforcement of the immigration laws, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (39 Stat 890; 57 Stat. 511; 8 U. S. C. 156), as amended by section 23 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following language: "Where no Federal buildings are available or buildings adapted or suitably located for the purpose are available for rental, the Attorney General is hereby authorized, notwithstanding section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S C 5), or section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a), to expend, from the appropriation provided for the administration and enforcement of the immigration laws, such amounts as may be necessary for the acquisition of land and the erection, acquisition, maintenance, operation, remodeling, or repair of buildings, sheds, and office quarters (including living quarters for officers where none are otherwise available), and adjunct facilities, necessary for the detention of aliens.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MEIKO SHINDO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2041) for the relief of Meiko Shindo which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of that act, the minor child, Meiko Shindo, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Captain and Mrs. Elmer F. Reavis, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TOMIZO NAITO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2054) for the relief of Tomizo Naito which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provision of law excluding aliens inadmissible to the United States because of race, the minor child, Tomizo Naito, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born child of Master Sergeant and Mrs. Charles R. Senteney, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAUDIA TANAKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2119) for the relief of Claudia Tanaka which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "Mr. and Mrs. William T. Bain, citizens of the United States" and insert "William T. Bain, a citizen of the United States", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended and notwithstanding any provision of law excluding aliens inadmissible to the United States because of race, the minor child, Claudia Tanaka, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of William T. Bain, a citizen of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

UNAUTHORIZED ACCEPTANCE OR WEARING OF FOREIGN DECORATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2165) to prevent unauthorized acceptance or wearing of foreign decorations by officers of the United States was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is calendar 938, Senate bill 2165. At the outset let me say that there is an error in the committee report on this bill in that it is stated that a similar bill of the Eighty-first Congress died on the Senate Calendar. As a matter of fact, the bill referred to was passed by the Senate on July 26, 1950, and thereafter no action upon it was taken by the House Judiciary Committee.

The Constitution of the United States provides that no person holding an office of profit or trust under the United States shall accept any present, emolument, office, or title of any kind whatever, from any foreign country, without the consent of Congress.

The Department of the Army, in a recently issued regulation, has attempted to circumvent this clear prohibition of the Constitution by creating a false distinction between the "receipt" of a decoration from a foreign government and "acceptance" of such a decoration.

This bill makes it a criminal offense for any officer or employee of the United States to violate the clear provisions of the Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I merely wanted to ask the distinguished chairman a question about a point which I think should be made clear for the RECORD. This bill does not prohibit any civilian from accepting a decoration, does it?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not unless he is an officer of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2165), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 8, after the word "Congress", to strike out the period, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) chapter 33 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding a new section thereto as follows:

"§ 711 Unauthorized acceptance or wearing of foreign decorations by officers of the United States

"Whoever, being an officer of the United States, accepts or receives any present, decoration, or other thing conferred or presented to him by any foreign government unless such present, decoration, or other thing shall have been (a) tendered through the Department of State and not to such officer in person, and (b) delivered to him by the Department of State pursuant to an act of Congress authorizing such delivery, or

"Whoever, being an officer of the United States, publicly shows or exposes upon his person any decoration heretofore or hereafter accepted by him from any foreign government unless the acceptance or receipt of such decoration is specifically authorized by an act of Congress

"Shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both, and be disqualified from holding any office of honor, profit, or trust under the United States."

(b) The Secretary of the appropriate Department is authorized and directed to provide by regulation that no member of the military services of the United States while on active duty shall accept, receive, or wear any such present, decoration, or other thing except in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(c) The index at the beginning of chapter 33 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"711. Unauthorized acceptance or wearing of foreign decorations by officers of the United States."

SEC. 2. Sections 2 and 3 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the persons therein named to accept of certain decorations and presents therein named, from foreign governments, and for other purposes," approved January 31, 1881 (21 Stat. 603), are hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROHIBITION OF DISPLAY OF UNITED NATIONS FLAG ABOVE UNITED STATES FLAG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2039) to prohibit the display of the flag of the United Nations or any other national or international flag in place of or in a position equal or superior to that of the flag of the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 2, line 8, after the word "thereof", to strike out "except"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That nothing in this section shall make unlawful the continuance of the practice heretofore followed of displaying the flag of the United Nations in a position of superior prominence of honor, and other national flags in positions of equal prominence or honor, with that of the flag of the United States"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the analysis to chapter 1 of title 4, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"4. Display of other flags equal, above, or in place of the flag of the United States."

(b) Such chapter is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 4. Display of other flags equal, above, or in place of the flag of the United States.

"(a) No person shall display the flag of the United Nations or any other national or international flag equal, above, or in a position of superior prominence or honor to, or in place of, the flag of the United States at any place within the United States or any Territory or possession thereof: *Provided,* That nothing in this section shall make unlawful the continuance of the practice heretofore followed of displaying the flag of the United Nations in a position of superior prominence or honor, and other national flags in position of equal prominence or honor, with that of the flag of the United States at the headquarters of the United Nations or at any place at which any official meeting or proceeding of the United Nations is in progress.

"(b) Whoever knowingly violates the provisions of this section shall be fined not more than $250 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to prohibit the display of flags of international organizations or other nations in equal or superior prominence or honor to the flag of the United States except under specified circumstances, and for other purposes."

Mr. BENTON subsequently said: Mr. President, I was absent from the floor when Calendar No. 939, Senate bill 2039, was passed; I regret I was absent, for I have a memorandum prepared by the Department of State relating to that bill. In the absence of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations who may be interested in this subject, I make a motion that the action of the Senate in passing the bill be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That motion will not be in order until the present order of business is completed. The Senator can enter it.

Mr. BENTON. Does the Chair advise me to make the motion at the end of the call of the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can enter the motion now and call it up later in the day.

Mr. BENTON. I enter the motion, Mr. President, and I shall call it up at the end of the consideration of the calendar.

STEPHEN FOSTER MEMORIAL DAY

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) authorizing the President to proclaim January 13 of each year as Stephen Foster Memorial Day was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. STANISLAUS GARSTKA AND DR. MARTHEWAN GARSTKA

The bill (H. R. 610) for the relief of Dr. Stanislaus Garstka and Dr. Marthewan Garstka was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am called to a conference on the foreign-aid bill, and there is no Senator present perhaps, who has personal knowledge of a number of bills which appear from this point on the calender excepting myself——

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will it be agreeable to the Senator if we go ahead and call the calendar? There are many of the bills bearing the Senator's name which will not require explanation. If there are any that do require explanation, they can be placed at the foot of the calendar and called in the morning.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any bills which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has reported, if an explanation is required, may go to the calendar for tomorrow and at the beginning of the session tomorrow we shall call the calendar of unobjected-to bills left over from today.

I ask unanimous consent that House bill 4692 to authorize the appointment of Joseph F. Carroll as a permanent colonel in the Regular Air Force may go to the foot of the calendar to be called tomorrow.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Reserving the right to object, that is a bill, as I understand, reported from the Judciary Committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. No.

TERMINATION OF WAR WITH GERMANY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may I say that the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], are in a position to explain most of the bills.

Before I leave, Mr. President, I send forward a proposed Senate concurrent resolution which I ask to have read, and to have immediately considered. It has to do with a question which I raised a little while ago, involving in my judgment, a serious unconstitutional provision which has crept into the joint resolution with regard to ending the war between this country and Germany.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the concurrent resolution for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 53) as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 289) to terminate the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany; that if and when returned the action of the Presiding Officers in signing the joint resolution be rescinded, and that the House be requested to return the engrossed joint resolution to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. McFARLAND. Reserving the right to object, House Joint Resolution 289 was discussed on the floor for several days, and it was discussed thoroughly yesterday. I think it would be very much misunderstood by the German people if, after the resolution has been passed, we ask that it be returned. I regret very much that I shall have to object to the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The concurrent resolution will go over under the rule.

PROPOSED CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, before the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] leaves the floor, may I ask if it is his understanding, as it is that of the Senator from New Jersey, that under the majority leader's proposal of a calendar call tomorrow, any bills reported and printed on the calendar tomorrow will be called?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct. If Senators have not had sufficient time to study them, naturally they will have to go over.

JOHANNA A. STOOTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next bill on the calendar will be stated.

The bill (H. R. 884) for the relief of Johanna A. Stoots was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM LUND MAIN

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time a rather unusual matter may be considered. An American citizen went to Europe and adopted a 13-month-old baby. The lady is there now and wants to bring the baby home. The baby has been adopted, and unless this bill is

passed at this session, she will be compelled to remain in Europe and not return home. I want to say that it has not been submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, but it has passed the House. It is an unusual request and is certainly subject to objection at any time, but because of the unusual situation, I should like to have the bill considered at this time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 5730) for the relief of William Lund Main, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5730) for the relief of William Lund Main was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the report on the bill.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5730) for the relief of William Lund Main having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide for admission into the United States of a minor adopted child of citizens of the United States. The child would be considered to be a nonquota immigrant, which is the status normally enjoyed by the alien minor children of citizens of the United States.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill was born in Norway on August 6, 1950, and has been adopted by Mr. and Mrs. William H. Main, who are citizens of the United States residing in Toledo, Ohio. Mrs. Main is presently in Norway with the child.

Congressman REAMS appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and made the following statement in support of the bill:

"The purpose of this bill is to provide for the admission into the United States of a minor Norwegian child who has been adopted in Arendel, Norway, by Mr. and Mrs. William H Main, citizens of the United States.

"The subject of this bill is a little boy who was born in Norway on August 6, 1950. Mr. and Mrs. William H. Main who are citizens and residents of the city of Toledo, Ohio, have been endeavoring for the past few years to find a suitable child to adopt. Mrs. Main's mother and father were both born in Norway although they are citizens and residents in this country and live in Florida. The foster parents of this little boy asked Mrs. G. E. Lund, mother of Mrs. Main, to look for a Norwegian baby boy for them to adopt while she was visting in Norway. She reported to them she had found the very baby that they would want early in the summer of 1951. Thereupon, the foster parents sent the proper credentials to the Norwegian court and received the adoption papers for the child. Before adopting the child, Mr. and Mrs. Main, through Mrs. Lund, had the baby examined by four doctors and carefully investigated the child's parentage and have been assured that it is a fine, healthy child with a strong healthy lineage both mentally and physically.

"Mrs. Main has been in Oslo for the last 2 months giving a mother's care to this child. When she went to Norway she had no other belief but she would be able to bring the child back with her as citizens and foster parents of an alien minor child. Attached are passport pictures of Mrs. Main and the child. She was greatly shocked to find that an adopted child does not come under this provision of the law. Mrs. Main is returning from Norway, October 20 and unless this relief is granted will find it necessary to leave the child in care of strangers. To the natural love of these foster parents of the child is added the fact that he is commencing to talk and they are very desirous to have him with them so that he may learn to speak their language naturally. These foster parents have been advised by the American consul in Oslo that it will be approximately 10 months before the child can come to the United States under the immigration quota. At that time he will be almost 2 years old.

"Mr and Mrs. Main are very fine, high class people of our city. He is employed as personnel and safety director of the Shortway Bus Lines. His income is in excess of $6,000 a year. They own a comfortable home which has a minimum value of $17,000. They are people of high integrity and fine standing in our community. It would be an ideal home for children.

"I sincerely trust that your committee will approve this bill and make it possible for Mr. and Mrs Main to bring this child to their home now rather than wait for the operation of the quota provision of the law which will require at least another 10 months."

Congressman REAMS also submitted the following correspondence in connection with the bill:

THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
AMERICAN EMBASSY,
Oslo, Norway, August 28, 1951.

Hon FRAZIER REAMS,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. REAMS: We have received your letter of August 20 concerning the application of Mr and Mrs. William H Main on behalf of the immigration of their adopted child, William Lund Main.

This problem was first brought to our attention in a letter from Mr. Main to the Ambassador, and following the receipt of this letter Ambassador Bay requested me to give every possible attention to the matter. Mrs. Main is presently in Norway and has discussed the problem at length with me and with the visa officer concerned.

Unfortunately, the Mains did not register their adopted child for immigration until July 30, 1951. At the present time the Embassy is authorized to consider only those applications under the Norwegian quota filed prior to April 1, 1951. An adopted child receives no preference under the immigration laws of the United States. Since the demand from qualified applicants is presently heavy, it would appear to be several months before the Embassy can take further action on the application of William Lund Main.

The Embassy also investigated the possibility of the Mains' child being qualified under section 2 (f) of the Displaced Persons Act. This section applied, however, only to children resident in certain countries of Europe, including Norway, prior to June 30, 1950. The Mains' child was not born until August 5, 1950.

Please be assured that the Embassy has made every effort to investigate all possibilities in this case and to explain it in full to Mrs. Main. We regret, however, that under the immigration laws of our country there is nothing further that can be done until the child's turn is reached on the immigration-quota waiting list. You may feel certain that when the child's application is ready for processing it will be handled in the most expeditious manner possible.

Very truly yours,

CARROLL C PARRY,
American Consul
(For the Ambassador).

THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
AMERICAN EMBASSY,
Oslo, Norway, August 29, 1951.

Mr. WILLIAM H. MAIN,
Toledo, Ohio.

DEAR MR. MAIN: Promptly upon receipt of your letter of August 18, I personally went into the matter with the chief officer of our consular section to make sure that at least all of the facts would be investigated After his report to me, I requested him to write you officially concerning the status of your application, and I note that he has done so, explaining matters in detail and mentioning the alternative possibility of taking up interim residence in Canada.

I must tell you I am completely sympathetic with your position, because as a matter of fact I have adopted three children here myself. You will also be interested to know that I was obliged under the law to place their names on the waiting list, although in my case there was no hardship since we naturally had them at home with us here in Norway. It did mean, however, delay in taking them to the United States for naturalization

Incidentally, presuming the law is still the same, you will be interested in knowing—although perhaps you have already looked this up—that you will be obliged to make formal adoption in the United States before the adopted child can be naturalized. I would suggest that you look up the immigration and naturalization regulations in advance.

I was very much interested to note that you have had some yachting eperience, but something tells me that you have probably not had any regattas in your sailing area like some that we have had here at Hanko.

I have received a letter from Rod Stephens expressing his own appreciation of any help that could be given in the case of your baby, and also referring to yachting. As I have remarked in my reply to him, the contests over here seem to be getting to the stage where the contest is between designers and builders rather than sailors. It is a case of whose yacht will hold up and whose will fall apart. Anyway, we enjoy it.

If you think I can be of any further assistance at any time, please do not hesitate to write me.

Cordially yours,

C. ULRICK BAY,
American Ambassador.

The files of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives contain the following cable from Mr C Ulrick Bay, American Ambassador to Norway, in connection with the bill:

FRANCIS WALTER,
Member of Congress, Washington:

Norwegian Ministry of Justice September 11, 1951, granted Ruth Lund and William H. Main permission adopt William Lund Main. Born, Oslo, August 6, 1950. Mains assume responsibility, but under normal practice of Americans adopting in Norway, adoption actually completed in United States.

BAY.

The committee, after consideration of all the facts in the case, is of the opinion that the bill (H. R. 5730) should be enacted.

KIKUE UCHIDA

The bill (H. R. 980) for the relief of Kikue Uchida was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANTRANIK AYANIAN

The bill (H. R. 1457) for the relief of Antranik Ayanian was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARK PING JEE NONG (NGON)

The bill (H. R. 1851) for the relief of Ark Ping Jee Nong (Ngon) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FORT PIERCE PORT DISTRICT

The bill (H. R. 2176) for the relief of Fort Pierce Port District was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill for the RECORD.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall endeavor to explain the bill briefly. It involves a seaport at Fort Pierce, Fla., constructed by the expenditure of local funds of a very small county in the area immediately around the town of Fort Pierce. Bonds were sold in the 1920's to a total amount of $1,850,000, and the port was completed in 1930 after which time quite a substantial commercial maritime business was developed at the port.

During World War II the United States decided that the location was a perfect one for the stationing of navy operations on the Atlantic side of the Nation in the field of amphibious training, and quite a large Navy installation was placed there. The police regulations were such that the port became unusable for commercial navigation. That situation obtained for 3 years and 2 months.

Ever since World War II, Mr. President, this matter has been coming to committees of Congress, and without exception they have always agreed that here was a worthy cause, but the question has been as to what is the proper measure of damages. The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and other Senators have scratched their heads over that question for the past 2 or 3 years. One distinguished Senator was so concerned about it that he made a special trip to view the situation for himself.

At any rate, Mr. President, instead of allowing the claim put in by the port which would have covered all payments made by way of interest and amortization during the period of Navy use, the committee adopted another method which substantially cut in two that amount. In other words, the amount of $235,000 which is allowed is a little less than half the amount paid out by the port district during the time the Government was in charge of the port and during the time that commercial maritime movements through the port were prevented by the occupancy of the port by the Government.

The way this payment was reached was not by arbitrarily cutting the amount in two, because it was not a cut of half, but a little less than half. Instead of that the committee took the entire payments over the period of 23 years since the bond issue was floated, reduced it to an average annual figure, multiplied that by 3 years and one-sixth, covering 3 years and 2 months, and reported it back to the Senate unanimously as being in their judgment the best approximate way to pay the damages.

Mr. President, there is one other port, which need not be mentioned, which was in somewhat the same situation, and into that matter the committee went very carefully. That other port, in another State, was subjected to condemnation at the beginning of the war, or early thereafter, and the Federal Government, in the Federal court, was required to pay the whole bond issue and all the interest to retire the bonds.

It would seem to the Senators from Florida that certainly no one could object to the very modest payment here proposed.

We appreciate the long and careful study with which the Senator from Washington and other members of the subcommittee, and ultimately all the members of the full Committee on the Judiciary, have considered this matter. We shall be content with the passage of the bill.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I am pleased to have the explanation, because the Senator from Kansas was somewhat disturbed about how the basis of this claim was really arrived at, but in view of the explanation, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2176) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RALPH AMBROSE THRALL AND MINNIE HAZELL THRALL

The bill (H. R. 2290) for the relief of Ralph Ambrose Thrall and Minnie Hazell Thrall was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MASUNARI SAITO AND ISAO SAITO

The bill (H. R. 2506) for the relief of Masunari Saito and Isao Saito was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

YOSHIKO ITO

The bill (H. R. 2547) for the relief of Yoshiko Ito was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR AND MRS. RICHARD E. DEANE

The bill (H. R. 2791) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Richard E. Deane was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PERMANENT RESIDENCE OF SISTER ADALGISA BELLAGAMBA AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 2632) providing for the permanent residence of Sisters Adalgisa Bellagamba, Maria Rina Montecchio, Anna Tericco, Maria Caterina Crevani, Elizabeth Baggio, Rosa Portale, Lorenzina D'Amico, Assunta Bonfiglio, Maria D'Amico, Lorenzina Scellato, Luigia Andreina Fratelli, Elena Montecchio, and Maria Bellesso, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FANNY TSIHRINTGE PAPAN

The bill (H. R. 3281) for the relief of Fanny Tsihrintge Papan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DONALD I. HAMROCK AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 4035) for the relief of Donald I. Hamrock, Robert N. Lensch, Russell E. Ryan, and Helen P. Stewart was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEROY PEEBLES

The bill (H. R. 4181) for the relief of Leroy Peebles was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROY SAKAI

The bill (H. R. 4567) for the relief of Roy Sakai was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUZIE BALLARD

The bill (H. R. 4940) for the relief of Suzie Ballard was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

USE OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR REFUND OF FORFEITED BAII AND MONEYS ERRONEOUSLY RECEIVED

The bill (H. R. 4945) to authorize the use of appropriations for refunding moneys erroneously received and covered for the refund of forfeited bail was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WITHHOLDING OF PATENTS DETRIMENTAL TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY

The bill (H. R. 4687) to provide for the withholding of certain patents that might be detrimental to the national security, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if it is in order, in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Nevada is not present, I should like to send an amendment to the desk for consideration, and ask that the bill be considered tomorrow in the category that was mentioned by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary before he left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received and lie on the table, and the bill will go to the foot of the calendar for consideration tomorrow.

PATRICIA ANN EDDINGS

The bill (H. R. 4922) for the relief of Patricia Ann Eddings was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MICHAEL BERNARD (CERVERA)

The bill (H. R. 4929) for the relief of Michael Bernard (Cervera) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSA YUKIKO THOMASON

The bill (H. R. 4969) for the relief of Susa Yukiko Thomason was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. INGE L. CURTIS

The bill (H. R. 5104) for the relief of Mrs. Inge L. Curtis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS OF THE ARMY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1709) for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the words "letters of," to insert "June 15, 1951" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That relief is hereby granted the various disbursing officers of the United States or claimants hereinafter mentioned in amounts shown herein, said amounts representing amounts of erroneous payments made by said disbursing officers of public funds for which said officers are accountable or amounts due said claimants as listed in and under the circumstances described in identical letters of June 15, 1951, of the Secretary of the Army to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

SEC. 2 That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of the following officers and employees of the Army of the United States the amounts set opposite their names: Col. Henry M. Denning, Finance Corps (now retired), $133 77; Col. C. K. McAlister, Finance Corps, $39.79; Col. Frank Richards, Finance Corps (now retired), $34 69; Col. H. R. Cole, Corps of Engineers, $18.72, the said amounts representing erroneous payments of public funds for which these persons are accountable, resulting from minor errors in determining amounts of pay and allowances due former members of the Civilian Conservation Corps, former officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Army or contractors from whom collection of the overpayments cannot be effected, and which amounts have been disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Maj. Paul M. Birkeland, Artillery, $500; First Lt. Maurice A. Berg, Air Force, $108; Second Lt. Charles Nuckols, Jr., class A agent officer for Lt. Col. Julius S. Eberstein, Finance Corps, $48.75; First Lt. Austin E. Pritchard, Air Force, $121; First Lt. Irwin D. Bingham, Air Force, $330; First Lt. Charles F. Schwep, Signal Corps, $276; First Lt. Henry Fontenot, Ordnance Corps, $100; Capt. B. D. Grossman, Finance Corps, $50; First Lt. Harold B. Cockrell, Infantry, class A agent officer for Maj. W. F. Menegus, Finance Corps, $436; Warrant Officer (junior grade) Gregory W. Corken, class B agent officer for Maj. E. A. Ganschow, Finance Corps, $30.26; Capt. Francis S. Chasm, Infantry, $181.36; in full satisfaction of the claim of each such claimant against the United States for a like amount.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the PG Publishing Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., $218.40; Cleveland Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio, $206.38; the Indianapolis Star, Indianapolis, Ind., $260.04; the Dispatch Printing Co., Columbus, Ohio, $188.16; the Cincinnati Enquirer, Cincinnati, Ohio, $321.30; Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., $60.90; the Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times Co., Louisville, Ky., $78.75; the Madison Courier, Madison, Ind., $4.50; the Marion Star, Marion, Ohio, $11.76; the Toledo Blade Co., Toledo, Ohio, $50 40, the Columbus Dispatch, Columbus, Ohio, $47.88; the Tribune Co., Chicago, Ill., $138.60; Tribune-Star Publishing Co., Inc., Terre Haute, Ind , $15.12; the New York Sun, Inc., New York, $99.63; the LaPorte Printing Co , LaPorte, Ind., $24.32; the Chicago Daily News, Inc., Chicago, Ill., $69 30; the News-Journal Co., Wilmington, Del., $16.80, the Philadelphia Record Co., Philadelphia, Pa., $63; Indianapolis News Publishing Co , Indianapolis, Ind , $52 48, the New York Times Co., New York, $138.60; Richwood Publishing Co., Richwood, W. Va., $8; Elkins Inter-Mountain Co., Inc., Elkins, W. Va., $8.82; West Virginia Newspaper Publishing Co., Morgantown W. Va , $16.80, the Athenaeum, Morgantown, W. Va., $6 60; Clarksburgh Publishing Co., Clarksburgh, W Va., $12 50; Grant County Press, Petersburg, W. Va., $9 98; Mineral Daily News-Tribune, Keyser, W. Va , $12.60; Advocate Messenger Co., Danville, Ky., $2.40; the Newspaper Advertising Service, Madison, Wis., $25.20; the Journal Co., Milwaukee, Wis., $46 20; the Shopper's Guide, J. Schilling and J. Holton, publishers, Baraboo, Wis , $4 95; the Sauk County News, Prairie du Sac, Wis., $5; and the Albert Hand Co., Cape May, N J , $16 30, which amounts are due the several publishing companies mentioned above for advertising ordered and published for and in the interest of the United States without the prior approval of the Secretary of War as required by Revised Statutes 3828 (44 U S C. 324) *Provided*, That no person shall be held pecuniarily liable for any amount on account of the above-mentioned payments

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the township of Montgomery, Harlingen, N. J., $199.31, and the township of Hillsborough, Neshanic, N J., $136.44; which amounts are due to the townships mentioned above for cost and legal fees incurred in the enactment of local ordinances which were enacted at the behest of the military authorities at the Belle Mead Army Service Forces Depot, Somerville, N. J., for reasons of military security: *Provided*, That no person shall be held pecuniarily liable for any amount on account of the above-mentioned payments.

SEC. 6. That any amounts refunded by any disbursing officer or his heirs in connection with any item of indebtedness in accounts cleared herein and/or any amount otherwise due any disbursing officer or his heirs which was set off against any item of indebtedness in the accounts which are cleared herein, shall be refunded to said disbursing officer or his heirs: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts authorized herein to be credited in the accounts of the disbursing officer shall be charged against any individual other than the various payees.

SEC. 7. That in all cases where disbursing officers' accounts are cleared or relieved under the authority of this or any other act, such clearance or relief shall be considered and construed as precluding the recovery of any interest charged from said disbursing officer arising from any items so cleared or relieved, whether such interest charges are in connection with judicial proceedings or otherwise.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF SUSIE LEE SPENCER

The bill (S. 1045) for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in view of the fact that this bill was vetoed once by the President, and in view of the fact that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is not present, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over until tomorrow in the same category with the others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go to the foot of the calendar, without prejudice.

ESTATE OF CARLOS M. COCHRAN

The bill (S. 1097) for the relief of the estate of Carlos M. Cochran, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that this bill go over until tomorrow, for the reasons stated by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] as to the former bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

ALASKA JUNEAU GOLD MINING COMPANY

The bill (H. R. 596) for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask that this bill go to the foot of the calendar, under the same conditions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary in his colloquy with the majority leader suggested that this bill and the Fort Pierce bill could be explained without his presence.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I withhold any objection at the present time, but I am committed to raise an objection to the bill and ask that it go over. I will withhold the objection for an explanation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If there is to be objection, we might as well let it go over until tomorrow, and then have the explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will go to the foot of the calendar, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

HAROLD W. BRITTON

The bill (H. R. 658) for the relief of Harold W. Britton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

O. E. HAMBLETON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1538) for the relief of O. E. Hambleton, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to O. E. Hambleton, and his wife, Mrs. Harriet Elizabeth Hambleton, of Seattle, Wash., the sum of $5,552.52, in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of the mistreatment of the said Mrs. Harriet Elizabeth Ham-

bleton during her interrogation by a member of the Criminal Investigation Division of the Army on January 20, 1948, and in compensation for the resulting injuries sustained by the said O. E. Hambleton and Mrs. Harriet Elizabeth Hambleton, the claimants having no remedy under the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of O. E. Hambleton and Mrs. Harriet Elizabeth Hambleton."

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN TITLES OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3899) to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 11, after section 17a, to insert

SEC. 17b Section 2 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2. Principals

"(a) Whoever commits an offense against the United States or aids, abets, counsels, commands, induces or procures its commission, is punishable as a principal.

"(b) Whoever willfully causes an act to be done which if directly performed by him or another would be an offense against the United States, is punishable as a principal."

On page 14, after the sixth line, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec 21a Section 708 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"This section shall not make unlawful the use of any such design or insignia which was lawful on August 31 1948."

On page 15, in the fourth line of the paragraph beginning "The term 'foreign government'", after the word "country", to insert "or for or on behalf of any government or any person or persons purporting to act as a government within a foreign country."

On page 17, to strike out section 28, as follows:

SEC. 28 Section 1114 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "the field service of the Division of Grazing of the Department of the Interior", appearing in such section, and in lieu thereof inserting "the field service of the Department of the Interior with respect to grazing on public lands", so that such section will read as follows:

"§ 1114. Protection of officers and employees of the United States.

"Whoever kills any judge of the United States, any United States Attorney, any Assistant United States Attorney, or any United States marshal or deputy marshal or person employed to assist such marshal or deputy marshal, any officer or employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, any post office inspector, any officer or employee of the secret service or of the Bureau of Narcotics, any officer or enlisted man of the Coast Guard, any officer or employee of any United States penal or correctional institution, any officer, employee or agent of the customs or of the internal revenue or any person assisting him in the execution of his duties, any immigrant inspector or any immigration patrol inspector, any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture or of the Department of the Interior designated by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior to enforce any act of Congress for the protection, preservation, or restoration of game and other wild birds and animals, any officer or employee of the National Park Service, any officer or employee of, or assigned to duty in, the field service of the Department of the Interior with respect to grazing on public lands, any employee of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture, or any officer or employee of the Indian field service of the United States, while engaged in the performance of his official duties, or on account of the performance of his official duties, shall be punished as provided under sections 1111 and 1112 of this title.".

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC 28 Section 1114 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words, "the field service of the Division of Grazing of the Department of the Interior", appearing in such section, and in lieu thereof inserting "the field service of the Bureau of Land Management", so that such section will read as follows:

"§ 1114 Protection of officers and employees of the United States.

"Whoever kills any judge of the United States, any United States attorney, any assistant United States attorney, or any United States marshal or deputy marshal or person employed to assist such marshal or deputy marshal, any officer or employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, any post-office inspector, any officer or employee of the secret service or of the Bureau of Narcotics, any officer or enlisted man of the Coast Guard, any officer or employee of any United States penal or correctional institution, any officer, employee or agent of the customs or of the internal revenue or any person assisting him in the execution of his duties, any immigrant inspector or any immigration patrol inspector, any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture or of the Department of the Interior designated by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior to enforce any act of Congress for the protection, preservation, or restoration of game and other wild birds and animals, any officer or employee of the National Park Service, any officer or employee of, or assigned to duty in, the field service of the Bureau of Land Management, any employee of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture, or any officer or employee of the Indian field service of the United States, while engaged in the performance of his official duties, or on account of the performance of his official duties, shall be punished as provided under sections 1111 and 1112 of this title."

On page 21, to strike out section 36a, as follows:

SEC. 36a. Subsection (b) (2) of section 90 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the word "Washington", so that the subsection will read as follows:

"(2) The Macon Division comprises the counties of Baldwin, Bibb, Bleckley, Butts, Crawford, Hancock, Houston, Jasper, Jones, Lamar, Monroe, Peach, Pulaski, Putnam, Twiggs, Upson, and Wilkinson."

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 36a. Subsection (c) (6) of section 90 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the word "Washington", so that the subsection will read as follows:

"(6) The Swainsboro Division comprises the counties of Bullock, Candler, Emanuel, Jefferson, Jenkins, and Toombs.

"Court for the Swainsboro Division shall be held at Swainsboro."

On page 25, to strike out section 48, as follows:

SEC. 48. Section 1291 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of such section the following new paragraph:

"Except where a direct review may be had in the Supreme Court, the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit shall have jurisdiction of appeals from all final decisions of the District Court of Guam in all cases involving the Constitution, laws or treaties of the United States or any authority exercised thereunder, in all habeas corpus proceedings, and in all other civil cases where the value in controversy exceeds $5,000, exclusive of interest and costs.".

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC 48. Section 1291 of Title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "Canal Zone" in such section, the words ", the District Court of Guam", so that such section will read as follows.

"The courts of appeals shall have jurisdiction of appeals from all final decisions of the district courts of the United States, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of Guam, and the District Court of the Virgin Islands, except where a direct review may be had in the Supreme Court."

On page 28, to insert a new section 53a, as follows:

SEC 53a. (a) Upon the filing of a complaint in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia wherein remedy is sought under section 4915 or section 4918 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (35 U S C, secs. 63 and 66), without seeking other remedy, if it shall appear that there is an adverse party residing in a foreign country, or adverse parties residing in a plurality of districts not embraced within the same State, the court shall have jurisdiction thereof and process shall, unless the adverse party or parties voluntarily make appearance, be issued against all of the adverse parties and served anywhere within the United States, except that process issued against parties residing in foreign countries pursuant to this section may be served by publication or otherwise as the court may direct.

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall be deemed to be in effect as of September 1, 1948.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 430) for the relief of Mark G. Rushmann was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I ask that this bill go over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

REFERENCE TO UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS OF BILL FOR RELIEF OF ANN ARBOR CONSTRUCTION CO.

The resolution (S. Res. 224) to refer to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 122) for the relief of the Ann Arbor Construction Co. was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 122) for the relief of the Ann Arbor Construction Co., now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

CHARLES H. CRAFT

The bill (H. R. 4930) for the relief of Charles H. Craft was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SCHOOLS IN CRITICAL DEFENSE HOUSING AREAS—AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAWS NOS. 815 AND 874, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

The bill (H. R. 5411) to amend Public Laws Nos. 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense-housing areas, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think we should have an explanation of this bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this is the bill to which I alluded earlier today, to provide funds for schools and defense housing in critical areas. As I stated earlier in the day, when the Senate passed the Defense Housing Act, it included what was termed the community facilities provision. It provided for schools, waterworks, sewerage, streets, and other community facilities. After the bill passed the Senate and went to the House, on the insistence of the House Committee on Labor and Education the provision with reference to schools was stricken from the bill. All other community facilities were provided for in the bill except schools. That provision was stricken, with the understanding that the House Committee on Labor and Education would bring in a separate bill amending the legislation which we passed at the last session of Congress to take care of the schools. This is the bill which the House Committee on Labor and Education said it would bring in.

This bill passed the House last Monday, and it was unanimously reported to the Senate by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It is simply to take care of the need for schools in critical defense housing areas. If the Senator had been present earlier in the day at the time the discussion took place, he would recall that the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] made a fine statement in behalf of the passage of the bill to meet the needs in the critical areas for schools.

Does the Senator desire to ask any questions?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have no objection to the bill. I thank the Senator for the explanation.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment on page 6, line 13, after the word "State", to insert "and education provided under this section shall be available to the children for whom it is being provided on the same terms, in accordance with the laws of the State in which the Federal property is situated, as free public education is available to other children in such State."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONVEYANCE TO STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA OF CURRITUCK BEACH LIGHTHOUSE RESERVATION

The bill (H. R. 5230) providing for the conveyance to the State of North Carolina of the Currituck Beach Lighthouse Reservation, Corolla, N. C., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EQUALIZATION OF GRADE, PAY, ET CETERA, OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE OFFICERS

The bill (S. 1320) to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between certain officers of the Public Health Service and comparable officers of the Army, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, under the present organization of the Public Health Service there are a certain number of Public Health officers who have the rank and pay of major general, and a certain number who have the rank of brigadier general. Those with the rank of major general include the Surgeon General, the Deputy Surgeon General, the Chief of Medical Services, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, and the head of the Bureau of State Relations.

There are three who have the lower rank, including the Chief Dental Officer. The Chief Dental Officer of the Army has the rank of major general. I believe that the Chief Dental Officer of the Navy has the rank of rear admiral in the higher half of the personnel.

In view of the great importance of the work of the Chief Dental Officer, it was felt that he should be on a par, so far as rank and pay are concerned, with the Chief of Medical Services, because, after all, in this work the question of dental care and treatment looms pretty large.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. Gladly.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to inquire whether the Bureau of the Budget has approved the bill. Has the Senator any information on that question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am advised by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], who attended the hearings, that the Bureau of the Budget interposed no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 206 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 207; 58 Stat. 684), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Surgeon General, during the period of his appointment as such, shall be of the same grade, with the same pay and allowances, as the Surgeon General of the Army; the Deputy Surgeon General while assigned as such, shall have the grade corresponding with the grade of major general, with the pay and allowances thereof; and the Chief Dental Officer, while assigned as such, shall have the grade with the same pay and allowances, as is prescribed by law for the officer of the Dental Corps selected and appointed as Assistant Surgeon General of the Army."

EXCHANGE OF CASTLE ISLAND TERMINAL FACILITY AT SOUTH BOSTON, MASS., FOR CERTAIN OTHER LANDS

The bill (H. R. 4049) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts certain lands and improvements comprising the Castle Island Terminal Facility at South Boston in exchange for certain other lands, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IMPORTATION OF ARTICLES FOR EXHIBITION AT CHICAGO INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 330) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the thrd time, and passed.

PAYMENTS TO STATES AND TERRITORIES FOR CARE OF CERTAIN DISABLED SOLDIERS AND SAILORS

The bill (H. R. 3548) to provide that payments to States and Territories for care given to certain disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States shall be effective from the date such care commenced was considered, ordered to a

third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMPLOYMENT OF REAR ADM. EMORY D. STANLEY, UNITED STATES NAVY, RETIRED, BY GOVERNMENT OF PERU

The bill (H. R. 3003) to authorize Rear Adm. Emory D. Stanley, United States Navy, retired, to accept employment with the Government of Peru was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement on the bill just passed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STENNIS

I am presenting this bill on behalf of the junior Senator from Washington, Senator CAIN, who is unavoidably absent.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize a retired rear admiral of the Navy, who, incidentally, is a recognized expert in large-scale terminal operations, to accept employment with the Government of Peru.

The circumstances of this case are set forth in detail in the committee report.

I would point out one thing with particular emphasis. In common with other Senators, I have been concerned about the number of highly placed military officers who retire voluntarily from the services to accept lucrative positions in civil life. Likewise, I am not favorably impressed with the principle of permitting American military officers to accept positions and emoluments from foreign governments.

However, I would point out that this case does not conflict with either of these two concepts. In the first place, Admiral Stanley became eligible for retirement for age in 1943. He will attain age 70 in November 1951. As a member of previous naval missions in Peru, he has served as a consultant in the layout and operations of that country's major port.

The committee feels that this legislation has merit and should be passed. Not the least of our considerations is the importance of the main port of Peru to our own national interests.

RELEASE OF UNITED STATES TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS IN CHATHAM COUNTY, GA.

The bill (S. 1650) to provide for the release of the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract or parcel of land conditionally granted by it to the city of Savannah, Chatham County, Ga., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey, relinquish, and release to the city of Savannah, Chatham County, State of Georgia, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain tract or parcel of land conditionally granted to such city under the act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of real property no longer required for military purposes," approved March 4, 1923. Such land is situated in such city and is more particularly described as follows:

All of the land known as Fort Jackson (formerly Fort Oglethorpe), Ga., being the property conveyed to Thomas Jefferson, President of the United States, and his successors in office, by deed dated May 16, 1808, from Nichol Turnbull, recorded in the clerk's office of Chatham County, in book BB, folio 162, May 17, 1808, said property being described therein as follows: "All that wharf lot known by the number 12 situate in New Deptford, formerly known by the name of Five Fathom Hole on the Savannah River, east of the city of Savannah, containing two hundred feet front on said river, three hundred and forty-five feet running nearly a southeast course from the front to the back line adjoining a lane of twenty-five feet which divides the aforesaid lot from lot 11, two hundred feet on the said back line and on the northeast side of said lot adjoining lot number 13 and two hundred and ninety-two feet from the aforesaid back line to low water mark; bounded southeasterwardly by land of the said Nichol Turnbull, northeastwardly by lot number 13 and southwestwardly by the aforesaid lane of twenty-five feet dividing the aforesaid lot number 12 from lot number 11 and northwestwardly by Savannah River, which said lot number 12 is designated on a general plan of the same by the remains of Mall-fort, as will more fully appear reference being had to the said general plan on record in the surveyor general's office of the State of Georgia, taken and laid off by the county surveyor the 9th day of May 1798, as will further appear by reference to a plat of record in the office of the clerk of superior court, Chatham County, Ga., bearing the legend, 'Fort Jackson Military Reservation, photostatic copy of map on file with the National Archives and Records Service, Washington, District of Columbia RG 77. Records of the Office of the Chief of Engineers Fortifications Map File, map. Dr. 189, Ga 5-5 '."

CONSTRUCTION AT AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS

The bill (H. R. 5425) to authorize construction at Air Force installations, and for other purposes, was anounced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have a statement of the estimate of the cost involved in this proposed legislation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that this matter has largely been taken care of by the appropriation bill passed earlier in the day. The purpose of this bill is to delete some authorizations which we previously passed. The net result is a saving of $617,000.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank and commend the Senator

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That Public Law 155, Eighty-second Congress, is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Strike so much thereof under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Operational support facilities" in section 301 as reads as follows:

"Friendship International Airport, Baltimore, Md.: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop facilities, family housing, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, and shops, $43,478,000."

and so much as reads as follows:

"McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, N. J.: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, hazard removal, operational facilities, troop facilities, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, and shops, $23,773,000."

and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, N. J.: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, hazard removal, communications facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop facilities, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities (or medical facilities at Fort Dix, Wrightstown, N. J.), storage facilities, and shops, $74,745,000."

(b) Strike so much thereof under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Operational support facilities" in section 301 as reads as follows:

"Hammer Field, Fresno, Calif.: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop facilities, family housing, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, and shops, $22,303,000"

and so much as reads as follows:

"Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif.: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop facilities, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, storage facilities, and shops, $17,561,000"

and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif.: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communication and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop facilities, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, and shops, $36,362,000."

(c) Strike so much thereof under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Operational support facilities" in section 301 as reads as follows:

"Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop facilities, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, and storage facilities, $19,063,000."

and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.: Airfield pavements, communications and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, troop facilities, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, and storage facilities, $12,708,000

"Sioux City Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids facilities, operational facilities, family housing, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, and medical facilities, $1,746,000."

(d) In clause (3) of section 502 thereof delete the amounts "$1,993,603,800" and "$3,480,661,800" and insert in lieu thereof the amounts "$1,992,986,800" and "$3,480,044,800," respectively.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The bill (H. R. 4027) to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr ELLENDER] could give us some idea as to what the position of the agencies involved in this proposed legislation may be.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to inform the Senator that the Senate passed a similar bill during the last Congress. The bill passed during the last Congress was Senate bill 2809 of the Eighty-first Congress, passed by the Senate on July 26, 1950.

The primary purpose of this bill is to transfer the agricultural activities in the Virgin Islands from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain an agricultural research and extension service program in the Virgin Islands. Agricultural experiment facilities now operated by the Department of the Interior would be transferred to the Department of Agriculture for use in the new program. The proposed program would cost an additional $109,000 per year, as estimated by the United States Department of Agriculture. However, by making agriculture more efficient and scientific, the economy of the islands would be improved and thereby reduce other appropriations.

Hearings were held on a similar bill during the last session of Congress, and it was the considered judgment of the committee that by the passage of such a bill agriculture could be developed for the Virgin Islands to such an extent that we could save quite a bit of money, which we are now spending toward the maintenance of the people of the islands.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Then I take it that all the agencies involved favor the legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; both the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture favor the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H R 4027) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FOREST-FIRE CONTROL FACILITIES NEAR MISSOULA, MONT.

The bill (H. R. 1628) to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest-fire control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for two unanimous-consent requests?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for that purpose, provided I do not lose the floor. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] for that purpose without my losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONVEYANCE OF INTEREST IN CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO CITY OF NEWPORT, KY.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 4928) to provide that the interest of the United States in certain real property shall be conveyed to the city of Newport, Ky., and I submit a report (No. 1055) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ERLINDA MARIA BOWERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 3877) for the relief of Erlinda Maria Bowers, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas will state it.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. What is the calendar number of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Kansas that this bill has just been sent over from the House. It has not been placed on the calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will yield, I should like to say that this is an adoption case. I understand a corporal is returning to the country with an adopted baby. The baby cannot be admitted into this country unless the bill is passed. I believe it is a meritorious bill and should be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I certainly shall not object—it is a very meritorious case, and I hope the bill will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Arkansas yielded to me for the purpose of making two unanimous-consent requests. I thank the Senator.

APPOINTMENT OF JOSEPH F. CARROLL AS PERMANENT COLONEL IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] yield for a unanimous-consent request, provided he does not lose the floor?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield with that understanding.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on the last call of the calendar, Calendar 705, H. R. 4692, for the appointment of Joseph F. Carroll as a permanent colonel in the Regular Air Force, was objected to by the Senator from Iowa. The objection has now been removed. The Senator from Iowa states that he will not object further. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4692) to authorize the appointment of Joseph F. Carroll as a permanent colonel in the Regular Air Force was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPEAL OF EMBARGO ON IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 745, Senate bill 2104, to repeal the embargo on importation of certain commodities.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand that the Senator from Alabama wishes to make a unanimous-consent request. If the Senator from Minnesota will withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum I believe we can dispose of the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request, provided I do not lose the floor. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Arkansas for that purpose without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SIXTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as in executive session, I make a unanimous-consent request on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. CONNALLY].

On yesterday the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee on the confirmation of appointments to repre-

sent the United States in the Sixth General Assembly of the United Nations, completed its work and made a report to the full committee.

Of the 10 names that have been submitted, 8 were reported favorably without hearings. Dr. Channing H. Tobias was reported favorably after being heard briefly on charges relating to his affiliation with certain organizations.

The subcommittee held extensive hearings on the nomination of Dr. Philip C. Jessup, and then recommended against his confirmation by a vote of 3 to 2.

These hearings, it is estimated, will run to nearly a thousand pages. Members of the full committee have not had an opportunity to see these hearings. We have been advised by the Public Printer that they cannot be available before the middle of next week.

The matter has been discussed by members of the Foreign Relations Committee and others on both sides of the aisle. It is agreed by all of us who have discussed this matter that the nine against whom no vote was cast by any member of the subcommittee, should be confirmed, but that the full committee should be given ample opportunity to study the record before acting upon the nomination of Philip C. Jessup.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I now propound the following unanimous-consent request:

First. That the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of the nominations of Warren R. Austin, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Michael J. Mansfield, John M. Vorys, John Sherman Cooper, Ernest A. Gross, Benjamin V. Cohen, Anna Lord Strauss, and Channing H. Tobias.

Second. That there may be immediate consideration of these nine nominees en bloc, and

Third. That the name of Dr. Philip C. Jessup be left without prejudice before the Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], as in executive session?

Mr SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—do I understand that the procedure has been agreed to by the members of the Foreign Relations Committee acting as individuals?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would say that all four members of the subcommittee who are present in the Chamber have agreed upon it. The chairman of the full committee was consulted, and I believe it was agreeable to him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am glad to identify myself with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] on the unanimous-consent request as presented by him.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Alabama, on behalf of the chairman of the committee in presenting the matter. I want to point out that this is an act of justice to those nominees as to whom no question has been raised. With reference to Mr. Tobias, some question was raised as to his nomination, but the three members of the subcommittee decided to approve his nomination. Since then other charges have been brought against him, but it did not seem that they should be pressed at this time, because of the lateness of the hour. There is some authority with reference to recess appointments, but we must leave that in the hands of the Executive finally to determine. That was the only reason that motivated us in feeling that action should be taken on the nine nominees whose names are now presented.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection, as in executive session, to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Warren R. Austin, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Michael J. Mansfield, John M. Vorys, John Sherman Cooper, Ernest A. Gross, Benjamin V. Cohen, Anna Lord Strauss, and Channing H. Tobias, to be representatives of the United States of America to the sixth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. McFARLAND rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona wish to be recognized?

Mr. McFARLAND. No, Mr. President, I have no objection to these nominations. I wish to have them acted on at this time

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to these nominations, which are to be considered en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmations.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in connection with the nominations, I ask unanimous consent that I may have permission to file a report. I do not know whether the chairman of the committee has made such request in the case of the nomination of Dr. Jessup, namely, to file subsequently, a report dealing with his nomination.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I had not asked such permission. I assumed that would not be in order, because the nomination is now before the full committee, not before the subcommittee.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to ask for that permission, because the Senate will not be in session later on, and it seemed to me that it would expedite the matter for each Member who desired to do so to have permission to file a report within 30 days of the taking of the recess or the adjournment, so that the report would be available when we returned.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator from Maine mean that each member of the subcommittee would file a report with the full committee?

Mr. BREWSTER. Whatever way the Senator wishes to specify it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as I see it, the situation is that the nomination is now before the full committee, and the members of the full committee—other than those of us who were on the subcommittee—have not yet had an opportunity to know what is contained in the hearings, which will not be available until the middle of next week, at the earliest.

I do not see how individual members of the committee could very well file individual reports. It seems to me that the orderly thing to do is to wait until there can be a committee hearing, and then the committee can vote on the nomination, and then the question of the committee report will come up.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not true that several members of the committee have filed their individual views?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not so far as I know; I have not heard of it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me ask the majority leader whether the usual permission to file material subsequent to the adjournment will be taken care of, as usual.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know that the request may be made. However, in regard to filing a report on a nomination which has not been acted on by a committee, I would say that the filing of such a report would not be in order. I do not think it would be appropriate for that to be done.

If a Senator wishes to make an insertion in the RECORD, we might consider that tomorrow and might then see what the insertion would be. But I would not wish to see the Senator establish a precedent in regard to the filing of a report on a nomination before the committee files its report on the nomination. I do not think such a procedure would be in order.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think it has been customary at the conclusion of any session to give the Members a certain number of days—usually 15 or 20—within which simply to file any material they desire to file. I am addressing myself to that matter.

Mr. McFARLAND. The minority leader already has obtained permission for the filing of a report on the part of the minority, and I have obtained permission to file a report in behalf of the majority. So the customary arrangement already has been made.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is not what I refer to. Perhaps I am in error, but I thought we were allowed a certain number of days—and I notice that the Senator from Texas agrees—within which to make insertions in the RECORD. I think that is customary.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Senator from Maine will take up that matter with me tomorrow, I shall take it up with the Parliamentarian, and certainly we shall do the customary thing.

REPEAL OF EMBARGO ON IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, before a quorum call is suggested, let me say that various conference committees are now meeting and considering what their reports will be. It would take some time to obtain a quorum at this time of the evening.

I wonder whether it will be agreeable to the Senator from Arkansas and to the other Senators who are interested in Senate bill 2104 to have the Senate take a recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, or perhaps until 10:30 tomorrow morning, for I understand the House already has taken a recess until tomorrow. That arrangement would give us a little more time, and we could then finish the calendar and could begin our work on other matters. I am sure we would make more progress in that way than we would by taking up Senate bill 2104 at this time of the evening.

I believe the procedure I now suggest would be the more orderly one, and would allow us equally as much time; and then all Senators would have had notice of the motion of the Senator from Arkansas, and could be present.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. As chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, I wish to state that I have a very important engagement at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. I understood the discussion of this matter was delayed when it was begun earlier today, because at that time not very many Senators were present.

I think the proper time to handle this matter is now. I believe that Senators who now are in conference committees could well afford to leave those committees and return to the floor of the Senate, either to vote for or to vote against this bill.

On the other hand, if the bill is brought up at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, although I will be here at that time if necessary, yet I know that nothing will be done at that time on the bill, and it will not be possible to have a conference on the bill, because the House of Representatives is going to adjourn tomorrow night.

I would much prefer to have the bill go over until January, in that event, rather than have the bill taken up tomorrow morning, because everyone knows that the bill will not be finally acted upon tomorrow if it is not taken up by the Senate until tomorrow morning.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have proposed a quorum call because a number of Senators have indicated to me their interest in Senate bill 2104, Calendar No. 745. Therefore, I shall have to insist that Senators come to the floor of the Senate and remain in attendance here.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me, if he has the floor?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not sure who has the floor——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor, and he has yielded only to certain Senators, when unanimous consent has been requested.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me, to permit me to make a brief statement and an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, before that is done, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me, to permit me to make an announcement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am going to follow my usual custom, namely, when a bill comes up, I shall try to abide by the wishes of the chairman of the committee.

I do not wish to be put in the position of having to ask for a postponement which will have the result of preventing the desired result in the case of this bill; but I wish to state that I think it is a mistake to have a quorum call at this time of the evening.

However, if the bill is taken up now, I know there will have to be a quorum call, although many Senators have left the floor for the evening, and will have to be brought back to the Senate Chamber.

So I think we would not make nearly as much progress by proceeding with the bill at this time as we would if we were to take a recess at this time until tomorrow morning.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, would it be agreeable to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to have the bill considered at 1 o'clock tomorrow afternoon?

Mr McFARLAND. I had assumed that we would meet tomorrow beginning at 10 o'clock, and then would proceed to conclude the calendar, which we have not yet concluded.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me? I wish to ask a question.

Mr. THYE Mr. President——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Minnesota will not mind my asking a question or making a brief statement at this time.

I realize that tomorrow morning conference reports will be ready for consideration, and at that time a conference report will have priority over other matters.

I merely wish to ask the distinguished majority leader to set some time, by means of unanimous consent, at which we may proceed with Senate bill 2104—for instance, at 1 o'clock, 2 o'clock, or 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Of course, I wish to point out that at any time a conference report can be called up, despite any agreement as to other use of the time.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, before I consented to a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, I would have to notify the Senators who are vitally interested in Senate bill 2014.

So I must insist upon the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, and I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, at the moment I do not yield for any further comments of that kind before I make a very short statement.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not yield for that purpose. I wish to say a few words about Senate bill 2104.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor, and he declines to yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I make the point of order that a constitutional question is involved on a quorum call——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not yield for any purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has that right. That is all I wanted to say.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wanted to say one or two words about this bill. I do not think it has been properly understood at all by the Senate. It has been bandied about here at though it were of merely local interest. This bill has a Nation-wide significance. It involves agriculture as a whole. I know that a great many people do not understand that such organizations as the Farm Bureau and the Grange have specifically and very definitely and positively endorsed this particular piece of legislation. It deals with the repeal of an amendment which was added in the Senate and the House only a few months ago to the National Production Act, although the amendment had no hearings by any committee. It was adopted, though I certainly did not realize the significance of it at the time, and I do not think other Senators did. Afterward it was realized how far-reaching it was, and that it would force, and has forced, the Secretary of Agriculture to impose an embargo on cheese, for example, which is threatening to cause retaliation against all our agricultural exports, such as tobacco, wheat,

cotton, apples, and so forth. It is a very serious matter, so I think everyone interested in agriculture certainly ought to give some attention to the significance of this bill.

The only persons who made any objection at all were the inedible-fat producers, who made some sort of weak objection, but who frankly admitted that there were no imports at all, though they were afraid some might develop. The Milk Producers Association, which was very vague in its presentation, had nothing positive to offer to the committee. The only objection with any substance came from the blue-cheese manufacturers, an industry consisting of a total of about 20 relatively small manufacturers.

This is a very serious matter involving the good faith of this country under the reciprocal trade agreements. I think it is a great mistake to let the interests of one or two States which produce practically all the blue cheese determine our foreign policy, our foreign trade, if you please, in agricultural products, by obstructing the consideration of this bill at the last moment.

I realize that the Senator from Minnesota must do his best in behalf of the cheese industry of his State, but I do not think he is warranted or that the Senate is warranted in merely pushing this bill aside and not having it considered.

If we can get a definite agreement that the bill will be considered tomorrow, I shall have no objection to its going over, for I have no great desire to remain here this evening. But it is a much more important bill than appears on its face, as must be realized by anyone who has heard an explanation of it or has had an opportunity to read the report.

The objections to this bill, I would say, are very definitely localized in two or three States, whereas the interest in passing the bill is practically Nationwide. Practically all of the States will be affected. Our exports of agricultural products are 2½ times our imports. Agriculture has a much greater interest in maintaining a relatively free international trade in agricultural products than in closing it up. If we are to cut it all off, we would merely be cutting off our nose to spite our face.

I do not know what the attitude of the Senator from Minnesota is relative to reaching an agreement about considering the bill tomorrow. I should be very glad to yield to him, if he would care to discuss that question.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in reply to the question which the Senator propounded to me, I may say that, inasmuch as several Senators have asked me whether I would remain here to make certain that this bill was not taken up, I shall have to inform him that in order that those Senators who are now absent from the floor may be notified, it will be necessary for me to insist upon a quorum call, before I will agree to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have some little interest in this bill to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, because I proposed it. But I would say to the Senator from Arkansas that I would object to any unanimous-consent request to set a time for voting on the bill, though I expect to speak at some length upon the motion to consider it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in view of the attitude of the Senators from Washington and Minnesota, I think I must insist on the motion to proceed to the consideration of this bill. It is obvious that if we let it go over it will never receive any attention at all. I think the Senate should show its good faith, and, as a member of both the Banking and Currency Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, I cannot sit back and let go by the board a program on the development of which we have spent a great deal of time and money, both under reciprocal trade agreements and under ECA. I cannot merely let it go without any effort at all. The full Senate must take the responsibility, if we are going to destroy our international trade in agriculture. I am not going to take it. If the Senators from Washington and Minnesota wish to take that responsibility, it will be theirs. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Washington had said that there would be quite a good deal of discussion of the bill: but to postpone the consideration of the bill until tomorrow, unless some procedure is agreed upon, would mean that we would have no bill, because every conference report will receive priority unless we have a unanimous-consent agreement concerning this bill. If we are not to have a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at some particular time tomorrow, the thing to do is to bring the bill up tonight.

Hearings were held and witnesses heard. I held the first hearings and the distinguished Senator from Arkansas later conducted other hearings when we divided the committee into three parts.

This is a bill which, according to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture, vitally affects the exports of American agricultural products. I hope it will be considered and passed.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish the Senator would withhold his suggestion temporarily.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion has been made that the Senate proceed to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to make a short statement on the motion, after which I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Idaho for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas has well stated the problem involved in the bill which he seeks to bring before the Senate. He says there has been much misunderstanding about this bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. I agree with him, there have been misundertandings of all kinds. With due respect to the Senator's own understanding of the purposes of this bill, I think he still misunderstands it. The amendment which was sponsored by myself and the Senator from Oregon is not at all sectional in nature. It involves neither apples nor any other particular commodity. It involves something which has been on the statute books for almost 10 years as part of the Second War Powers Act. That indicates the object of the amendment. That act expired July 1. The amendment, which I shall be glad to try to explain to the Senate, changes slightly, but not in any great detail a provision of the Second War Powers Act which has been on the books for 10 years. It has not ruined our international trade. It has now been the law of the land, for some time, yet it has not ruined our international trade. What the amendment provides is now the law. All it provides is that if and when importations of certain definite agricultural products named in the act—if and when, I repeat—would be detrimental to a Government-sponsored program for agriculture or detrimental to our defense, or detrimental in three other instances which are specified in the Act, then the Secretary of Agriculture may impose quotas or may determine exports.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall be through in a moment. There is no use in the Senator from Arkansas and myself getting into a discussion of technical details at this time, because I wish to speak at some length on the bill. I merely wanted to answer the Senator by saying that, in my opinion and in the opinion of many others, it has not had the effect described by him. Hearings were held on the repeal of this section. It was passed by a substantial vote of the Senate. This amendment was brought up approximately at the time the Defense Production Act was being considered. Now it is desired to repeal it.

I think the State Department is unduly alarmed. If they are so alarmed about an amendment of this kind, I do not know where they have been for the past 10 years, because the authority has been in the Second War Powers Act for that length of time. Representatives of the State Department testified, in effect, that the main objection was that they thought it was mandatory. I have said on many occasions to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], that if the language was such that it is considered mandatory, it was never the intention of the sponsors to have it so interpreted, and we would be glad to amend it to make it permissive.

We must have some protection for our own people in situations of this kind. We do not say there should not be tariffs or reciprocal trade agreements. We simply say that if the Secretary of Agriculture finds certain things are happening, he may submit to the President a proposal which might stop importations which are injurious.

I have heard rumors downtown saying that it is wrecking our negotiations in Geneva. If that be true, I do not know what has happened in the years when the same proposal was in the Second War Powers Act. It has not wrecked their negotiations. The same nations which are members of the Geneva Pact decided in the preamble of the Geneva agreement that some of these things might be part of certain agreements. That is all we are trying to accomplish.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think the Senator should mislead the Senate. The Senators know that the language has not been in the law for 10 years. It is not the same. That is the whole point. I do not know why the Senator insists that it is the same. I have the law before me.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Will the Senator from Arkansas read the law?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will read it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I did not yield for that purpose. I intend to put the Second War Powers amendment into the RECORD, and those who can read and understand the English language can determine for themselves. There is no intention to mislead the Senate. In my opinion, the objectives and the purposes of the language are the same.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the Senator's interpretation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I stated that in my opinion we did not change the purposes of the two amendments.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The purposes may be all right, but——

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator from Arkansas was listening, he heard what I said.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I heard it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I refuse to yield any further.

Mr. President, this is a matter which will provoke a great deal of debate. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and the other cosponsors want to be heard at some length. We are near the closing days of the session. I cannot speak for the House, but I believe the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House said in a statement that he did not believe the House would take up the bill at this late date. Some of us want to speak at length. I hope the Senator from Arkansas will clear up what seems to be a misunderstanding in the interpretation of the language, which is technical.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator left the impression that there were hearings on the amendment. The Senator knows he offered the amendment on the floor during the consideration of the War Production Act, and there has been no consideration of it by committees of either House.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not make any such statement. I said there were hearings held on the bill before us.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But not on this amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator certainly left the impression that he was referring to this amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I said there were hearings held on the bill to repeal it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. There were plenty of hearings on the bill which is before us, and it came out of committee with the recommendation that it pass. Did the Senator appear at the hearing?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Arkansas knows I was not present. We sent in the best statement we knew of in opposition to the repeal of the amendment. It was a long statement and it is in the record. The language is very technical.

I am not trying to mislead anyone. There were no hearings held on the original amendment. There were hearings held on the bill to repeal the amendment. I stated that, in my opinion, with some slight changes in the amendment, there is not a great deal of difference in the authority granted in the Second War Powers Act and in this extension. The Senator from Arkansas may disagree with me. I want to put it all into the RECORD so that Senators can read it for themselves.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Washington knows that the Department of Agriculture disagrees with him very definitely.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course I do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They have stated that it would constitute an embargo which would require them to put into effect a limitation on the importation of the materials involved.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator reads the language incorrectly. It is now the law of the land. It provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may, if he deems it necessary, do certain things. He does not have to do anything if he does not want to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It cannot be interpreted to mean nothing.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not want to delay the Senate tonight. I want to place in the RECORD the present law and the other law to which reference has been made. The words, of course, are somewhat different, but the authority conferred in both of them, in my opinion, can be and would be used in the same identical way.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator's interpretation is correct, that it is just permissive, why is not the Senator satisfied with the operation of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act which provides orderly procedure which has been applied time and time again? In fact, the Senator from Washington is the one who did most of the work in protecting the situation. It seems quite logical to me that the reason the Senator wants this provision is that it is mandatory. Why is not section 22 all the protection which is needed?

Mr. MAGNUSON. We did have a good deal to do with trying to perfect the machinery in section 22, and we have had very sad experiences with that machinery, which is cumbersome and it takes so long that the damage is usually done by the time any action is taken. We have never been able to convince the Department of Agriculture that in reasonable cases the Secretary should invoke his authority under the Second War Powers Act. We have found cumbersome procedure under section 22, and we have tried to establish a very simple procedure, so that if the Secretary finds a certain situation to exist he may report it to the President.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is simple because it is an embargo, and is mandatory.

I have here a letter from Secretary Brannan who says:

> The provisions of section 104 are mandatory and in determining whether import controls must be imposed, no consideration can be given to the broad effects of import restrictions of the type required by the act upon international trade and upon our relations with friendly nations. The position of the Department with respect to the proposed repeal of section 104 has already been presented to the committee by Under Secretary McCormick in his testimony on August 31, 1951.

That letter appears at page 3103 of the hearings. They make that very distinction. If it is permissive, and there is no room for discretion, they naturally would follow some procedure similar to that of section 22.

The only virtue of it is that it is simple in the sense that it is mandatory.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not interpret the language of the amendment to mean that at all. The procedure under section 22 is cumbersome. It has never been practical. We tried, when we previously amended section 22, to change the procedure and simplify it, but we were unable to have the second section of the amendment adopted.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely desire to refer to what the committee said in approving this amendment. It said that the President should exercise the authorities and powers conferred if the Secretary of Agriculture so determined.

I think the Department of Agriculture in opposing this amendment, and saying they thought it was mandatory in its approach, did not want to have that responsibility thrown upon them, and I do not blame them for it. Again I say, if it is interpreted that way, I shall be glad to work out any language so that there would be no question that it would be permissive.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, is it a fair statement to say that section 22 has been invoked in meeting the situation, when in June 1951 there were imports of 16,669,000 pounds of cheese and about 57½ million pounds of casein, as

well as millions of pounds of dried milk and other dried products? If the dairy interests of the country had proper safeguards under existing legislation prior to the adoption of the amendment to the Agricultural Production Act, then certainly those powers were not invoked by the Department of Agriculture. Is not that true?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct, and I had personal knowledge in a few cases, although there was procedure available which was very cumbersome and impracticable, that by the time they got around to making the decision, in 16 or 18 months, all the damage was done. It was our hope in amending section 22 at one time to make the procedure a little less cumbersome. Failing to do that, we went ahead with what is now proposed.

I do not see anything wrong with it. If the Senator from Arkansas will suggest some changes to bring about the interpretation intended, I shall be glad to accept them. I think the Senator from Arkansas may determine that, when we say the President shall exercise the authority set forth in the amendment, perhaps it might make it mandatory upon the President to do something if and when the Secretary found it was advisable. The word "shall" could be changed to "may." I do not think that would hurt the provision in the act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this illustrates one of the reasons why amendments of this sort should have been considered in committee, as this one was not. It seemed clear to the Banking and Currency Committee that the section ought to be repealed, in view of the fact that there are three alternatives to take care of the problem, that is, section 22, the escape clause, section 7 of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and section 101, as to import controls, all of which can reach the question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am quite familiar with section 101 and what it does, but in that particular instance it seems to me that there must be almost an extreme case to justify acting under the sole theory of contributing to the national defense.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is section 7 of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think that under section 101 we would ever get any action on some of the things we fear, and that is the reason why some of us sponsored the amendment. Section 101 provides for procedure, but I think it would apply only to war materials.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The language which offends most is the language which says "product below present production levels."

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator will read further, he will see that it continues, "or below such higher levels as the Secretary may deem necessary." He can raise it as high as he desires.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am merely trying to present the attitude the Secretary has taken. I do not think the Senator means to leave the impression that the present Secretary or any other Secretary in recent years has not been sympathetic with agriculture.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Or that he wants to destroy domestic agriculture.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On the contrary.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think he has been trying to be reasonable. Those interested in agriculture, I know, think he has been sympathetic with agriculture, and I do not see why he should have taken this attitude, unless he and his counsel believed he must do it. We cannot take an arbitrary attitude and say the provision is not mandatory and then flay the Senate committees for having misinterpreted the law. That is the way the Secretary has interpreted it.

Another point. I have a letter from the Department of State which I can read now. They merely asked that this measure be passed by the Senate in order to give time for them to negotiate and for us to consider this subject at the next session. We do not really expect the bill to be passed by the House. I cannot guarantee that it will not, but it would be very unusual. But I have a letter which explains that point, if the Senator will permit me to read it to him.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should be glad to have the Senator read it. I do not think it will change my mind, because I have known for many months the State Department's attitude regarding this amendment, that they were opposed to it, and that they opposed anything which might have a bad effect on trade negotiations. I merely pose the question again, if that is correct, Public Law 590, which I consider confers a similar type of power upon the Secretary of Agriculture, has not had such an effect at all.

I shall be glad to yield to the Senator to read the letter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was going to make the point of the significance of the bill's being passed by the Senate and not by the House.

This letter is from Assistant Secretary Jack K. McFall, and reads:

> I understand the question has arisen whether any purpose would be served by having the Senate consider S 2104, a bill to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act, even though it were clear that the House could not act on the bill during the current session.
>
> After carefully considering the question, the Department is strongly of the view that the early passage of the bill by the Senate would be extremely useful in dealing with the complaints of foreign governments. These governments are disposed, by and large, to postpone or mitigate any retaliatory measures so long as there is evidence of our good intentions to press for the repeal of the bill. If we fail to progress beyond the present stage, however, it is reasonably clear that restrictive measures on American agricultural exports will shortly be applied in some quarters.
>
> The desirability of an early passage of the bill by the Senate is all the greater because the problem is now on the agenda of the sixth session of the contracting parties of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which is currently meeting in Geneva. There has already been one discussion on the subject by the contracting parties, and another discussion will take place before the session ends, that is, within the next 2 or 3 weeks. The tenor of that discussion will be substantially altered if the Senate has enacted the bill in the meantime.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> JACK K MCFALL,
> *Assistant Secretary.*

I might add, to complete the presentation, that I have an article here from the New York Times which goes into some detail, under the dateline of Geneva, September 17, reporting that 10 countries have taken up the matter and are extremely concerned about it. They feel that it will not only have the effect already indicated, under the existing ruling of the Secretary of Agriculture, but that this is just the beginning to a return to a high tariff policy such as we had in the thirties, and that there is no use trying to promote any international trade in agriculture.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the Senator from Arkansas has gone pretty far when he says that this is a return to high tariffs. This is only a permissive measure, to take care of certain conditions at certain times. If other nations feel that way about it, they should have felt the same way about the Second War Powers Act.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. If they feel that way about it, they are repudiating their own agreement in the basic Geneva agreement. In the preamble it was agreed that when a government had a government program, that government would have the right, within certain framework, to protect its agricultural program. I am somewhat amused about the talk with respect to retaliatory action. I doubt whether any nation will take retalitory action. This provision may be on the books for 25 years and never be used.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It has already been used, as the Senator knows.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know of any case in which it has been used to any great extent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It has been used in connection with cheese. The Senator knows that the embargo placed by the Department of Agriculture has reduced imports of cheese substantially below the average of the imports between 1935 and 1940.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It may have been used in connection with cheese.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the case in which it has been used. The amount involved in dollars is not very large.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know of any other item. Perhaps it should have been used in connection with cheese. Perhaps the case was such that it should have been used.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If it was used in connection with one item, it may be used in connection with others. It is regarded by them as a direct violation of our obligations under the general tariff and trade agreements.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Whom does the Senator mean by "them"?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Netherlands, Switzerland, Denmark, Italy, France, Canada, and other countries. I think there are 10 countries. The information is all contained in this article. The other countries have all registered their protest. They have all charged that a direct quota embargo which does not permit procedures as under section 22 is a violation of the general agreement on tariffs and trade. That is exactly the difference. If it were the language of the old War Powers Act, it would be a very different situation. I do not think there would be the same objection to a reenactment of the provision in the Second War Powers Act; but apparently no one else agrees with the Senator as to the similarity and effect of those two statutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The authority and the power are the same, in my opinion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The standards are not the same.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Just a moment. The standards are only the yardstick for the Secretary to use if he wishes to act. He can set up the same yardstick, and use the same blueprint which we suggest in the amendment, under the general authority in the Second War Powers Act. The only difference is that under the Second War Powers Act there is a proviso to the effect that controls should be removed as soon as conditions giving rise to them have ceased. I suspect that the Department of Agriculture would do that anyway. When conditions giving rise to controls have ceased, they would automatically remove them. We merely set up a different blueprint with which to guide the Secretary of Agriculture if he wishes to act. He could act himself administratively under the broad authority of the Second War Powers Act. He could have used those criteria as a justification for his action.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let us assume, for the purpose of argument, that the Secretary misinterpreted the law. Would the Senator be agreeable to passing the bill in the Senate in order to stabilize the situation, which is described so well in the dispatch from Geneva, while we try to adjust the situation with the Secretary? If he has been arbitrary when he should not have been, I can only say that I am surprised at Mr. Brannan. I was informed—and I have considerable documentation to that effect—that he sincerely believed that he had to take such action, that he had no alternative, and that he regretted having to take it. I confess that I did not make the interpretation, but I have the letter from the Secretary, the last paragraph of which I read to the Senator. That would seem to me to be a compromise. It would not repeal the act, but it would at least give other nations some belief that we were considering the question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not say that the Secretary of Agriculture is arbitrary. I merely think that he is putting a wrong interpretation upon the wording. Perhaps I am wrong. I think the purposes are right. I think someone is becoming unduly alarmed about dealing with other countries. We hear talk about retalitory measures by other countries. What retaliatory measures could they take, when we have reciprocal trade agreements with them all?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They firmly assert that this action is a violation of our undertaking under the general trade agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Arkansas and I went into that subject one day in the Old Supreme Court Chamber. We consumed the entire day. I read the preamble to the general agreement, and the Senator from Arkansas read some letters which he had received from the State Department. We were in disagreement on that question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That involves a different law. That was not this law.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The only difference was that we had a little different procedure.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That was in connection with section 22.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That was in connection with section 22.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Section 22 is not under discussion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But the same principle was involved. We were discussing whether or not it might be a violation of the basic Geneva agreement. I do not think it is. I do not think the present provision is.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Both the articles to which I have referred are by reputable writers. The one I have before me at the moment is a special dispatch to the New York Times. It is plainly stated that the representatives of Norway, the Netherlands, Canada, and other countries contend that this action is a violation because it is a flat embargo. If the Senator would like to have me do so, I should be glad to read some of these statements

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think we need to go into that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I read one or two paragraphs from the article:

> Summarizing the debate, Johann Melander of Norway, chairman of the contracting parties, said it had been agreed that section 104 of the Defense Production Act involved the impairment of United States obligations. He added that "if these effects were not removed" action to relieve other countries of their obligations under the agreement toward the United States would have to be taken.
>
> In the absence of challenge, such a statement by the chairman has the effect of a decision of the contracting parties, under procedure that has become traditional in these meetings.

That is a summary of the discussion at Geneva. The dispatch is dated September 24, at Geneva. All the contracting parties were represented at Geneva. The Secretary of State having made his interpretation that this provision constitutes an embargo, the representatives of other countries have to make their own interpretation, in the light of the action of our Secretary of State.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that is exactly what happened. The Secretary of State has long opposed this type of amendment. The advisers of the State Department have long opposed such an amendment. They interpret the provision to be what they call an embargo. I do not think the language says that at all. I think they are becoming unduly alarmed. They oppose the amendment. They even opposed our attempting to clarify section 22 at one time. They oppose any amendment which might have any type of reflection—and perhaps rightly so—upon their ability to trade and make reciprocal trade agreements.

I think I spoke for about an hour and a half on the question of reciprocal trade agreements. One Senator made the statement at that time that this provision violates the reciprocal trade agreements. It never touches the basic reciprocal trade authority at all. The Senator from Washington voted to extend that authority on many occasions, and believes in it.

This provision merely gives some protection in certain cases which are unusual, just as was done in connection with the Second War Powers Act.

Under present conditions I do not know just when we might use this authority. If we did use it in connection with cheese, perhaps we were justified in using it in connection with cheese.

Let me give the Senator an example of why we need something like this, and why section 22 would not operate under present procedure.

I hope the Senator will listen to what I am about to say. I will tell him why I think this provision is needed, and why I think the State Department is wrong in opposing this sort of language, without trying to work out something more satisfactory. Prior to the war, for example, although the Japanese sold approximately 60 percent of all the canned tuna in the world, on which we have a 45-percent tariff, they did not know too much about refrigeration. Since the war they have learned a great deal about refrigeration. The same is true of Peru, Costa Rica, and Mexico.

We never brought the matter up. It is an unusual situation. There is no tariff on fresh or frozen tuna. Taking advantage of the situation, some Americans have flooded the country with frozen tuna. The result is that the whole tuna fleet on the Pacific coast has been in the harbor for 9 months. That is a situation in regard to which, because it is unusual, we should have some such authority. I understand the provision does not apply to fish, but perhaps some similar authority could be applied pending the negotiation of a reciprocal trade agreement.

If we followed section 22 in this particular case, or if we had an opportunity to do what the State Department suggests, it would be 18 months before we could get any action, and the fishing boats by that time would have rotted. Perhaps the same situation obtains in the case of cheese. I do not know whether it does. I have no interest in cheese. Perhaps the Senator from Arkansas was facetious in his reference earlier that it applied to apples. It does not apply to apples

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I said that the people whom this would injure buy apples.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I have no sectional feeling about the matter. I thought that this was an item which ought to have an escape clause, in order to protect ourselves from these situations. That is why I offered the amendment. Section 22 has been very cumbersome. It was never intended to be so cumbersome.

I might agree with the Senator from Arkansas that perhaps in our zeal in this situation we might feel that the State Department went too far in its interpretation. That may be true. I do not interpret the provision in that way. I do not believe there is a great deal of difference between this authority and the authority granted in the Second War Powers Act, because under that authority they could do exactly what they could do under the amendment. I agree with the Senators, as I stated in the beginning, that the wording is different, but I did not believe that it changed the effect. I said to the Senator informally that I did not think it could change the situation. That is not trying to mislead anyone.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator will admit, regardless of his fine interpretation, that what has caused the trouble is the interpretation of the Secretary of Agriculture. The fact is that he has interpreted it in this way, and it has been applied as an embargo. The governments represented at the meeting to which I have referred also so interpreted it.

I wish to read another paragraph. It is an official release by the conferees on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, of the sixth general session of the contracting parties. The last paragraph reads:

> At the suggestion of the Netherlands and Danish delegates it was agreed to retain the item on the agenda. The chairman said it was agreed that section 104 of the Defense Production Act was an infringement of the general agreement.

It does not matter what the Senator from Washington or I think about it. The interpretation has been made and they have agreed that this is an infringement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe it makes a great deal of difference what the Senator from Arkansas and I think about it. We represent the American people. If a foreign nation is putting what we think is the wrong interpretation on permissive practices, we had better know about it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe the Senator knows what the Secretary of Agriculture has done.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What has he done?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He has put an embargo on it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On what?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On cheese.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not believe he has put an embargo on cheese. It is a question of the interpretation of what an embargo is.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Washington has not read the hearings.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask some questions of the Senator from Washington. The Senator from Washington presented the amendment on the floor of the Senate, and I accepted the amendment, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; we had a vote on it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; we also had a vote on the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. We had a yea-and-nay roll-call vote on it.

Mr. MAYBANK. The amendment was taken to conference. The Senator from Washington says it is permissive. His idea was that it was permissive and not mandatory.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is the one worry we had and that I have had since then. If it is permissive and not mandatory, I do not know that I have any great quarrel with the Senator from Washington. I want the RECORD to show, for the benefit of the Secretary of Agriculture, for the benefit of the Secretary of State, and for the benefit of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that the Senator from Washington considers it to be permissive. I hope the Senator from Washington agrees with me that it is permissive.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If it is not, and language can be drafted whereby it can be made permissive, I will be very happy to undertake to draft it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not the opinion of the Senator from Washington that his intention was that it be permissive?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That was my intention.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is the question that I wanted to ask of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It happened that I was out on the Pacific coast, in San Francisco at the time.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand. I tried to contact the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I went to the committee and gave a long statement in which I stressed the fact that the interpretation by the witnesses who testified on the bill was not my interpretation, and that if they thought it was mandatory, it was my intention to have it made permissive.

Mr. MAYBANK. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Minnesota, I understand that many Senators want to speak on this issue. A long debate would ensue. I do not know what the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has in mind. I know his ideas are the same as mine, namely, that the section in question ought to be repealed. Here we are in the closing hours of what we hope will be the last days of the session. We hope the Congress will be able to adjourn tomorrow. I understand that the Senator from Minnesota stated he would be forced to ask for a quorum call. I was going to propound a unanimous-consent request, if the Senator from Arkansas would agree with me, that, since it is only 2 months until we meet again in January, this measure be made the unfinished business when Congress reconvenes.

Mr. THYE. I must say to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, and I regret that I must say it, that there are several Senators who have asked me not to agree to any unanimous-consent agreement without first having a quorum call. I am sure the Senator from South Carolina does not want me to break my word.

Mr. MAYBANK. I would never ask the Senator to do that. If the Senator from Minnesota has made such an agreement he knows I would not ask him to break his word. On the contrary, I withdraw any such request.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield to me, I should like to make a suggestion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield, with the understand that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the bill could go over until tomorrow, perhaps the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] could work out an agreement with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. The fact is, that when Congress reconvenes in January there will be no trouble about taking up this bill. I do not believe any Senator would lose much by postponing it until that time. Although I would not object to that being done, I am put in an awkward position, for I had hoped that we would have as the unfinished business the home rule bill.

I had intended to bring up that bill at the earliest possible moment. I had hoped that we could dispose of it before we adjourned. However, when we get down toward the end of a session, if there is a bill that a Senator does not like very much he can always talk it to death. I do not believe that either the home rule bill or this bill would be talked to death in January, but if any Senator wanted to do so, he could talk either one of them to death now. I believe Senators are reasonable men. If the bill could go over until tomorrow I am sure something could be worked out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the majority leader could give us any assurance at all that the Senate would take up this bill early in January, remembering the wisdom displayed by the Senate with regard to oleomargarine legislation, I would be inclined to make such an agreement, because if Senators are given an opportunity to vote on it I know how they will vote. They are bound to repeal it.

So if this bill follows the home-rule bill, I think perhaps that would be an agreeable solution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Arkansas that if he has no doubt about what the Senate will do about this bill, then at least a considerable number of Senators

will have to change the votes they cast several months ago when the Senate by a very substantial majority adopted the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe that was done by a yea-and-nay vote, and also I do not believe that Senators understood what they were doing when they voted for the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, there was a yea-and-nay vote, following a quorum call.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask another question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator from Arizona intend to request that the home-rule bill be made the unfinished business, by unanimous consent?

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know that the Senate would agree, by unanimous consent, to make that bill the unfinished business. I do not believe I could obtain such unanimous consent, any more than I could obtain such unanimous consent in the case of the bill the consideration of which the Senator from Arkansas has been seeking.

Mr. President, I am a little embarrassed by the request that I agree to have the bill to which the Senator from Arkansas has been referring brought up the first thing at the next session, as I am by the suggestion that similar action be taken in regard to the home-rule bill for the District of Columbia.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a suggestion?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I am always open to suggestions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me say that the amendment has been in operation since July.

Mr. FREAR. And it has been operating fairly well, has it not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; I think it has, except for the fact that the Senator from Arkansas says it has not been operating well in regard to cheese.

It is highly improbable that the House will act on this measure at this session. Apparently the State Department wants to have some action taken on this matter, so that the Department may be able to say to other countries that the Congress has gone halfway in connection with the matter. If that is the case, I think it would be more harmful to the State Department if the bill were brought up at this time and were then defeated.

However, if the yea-and-nay vote which was taken on the amendment, following very extensive debate, is any criterion, I think there is no possibility of the passage of this bill.

I shall be glad to sit down with Mr. McFall or Mr. Thorp, the economic adviser, who testified, or with the Secretary, and I am sure all of us would be willing to work out a provision satisfactory to all concerned, so as to provide the necessary protection and still not permit of the interpretation in the way that the Senator from Arkansas says the provision has been interpreted.

Again I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Arkansas in handing me the letter which I wrote to the committee on July 26, in which I suggested to the chairman of the conferees that I understood there was then some question whether the language would be permissive, and I suggested that in the conference they change the language so that that would not be the case.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But did the conferees change it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. They did not change it; but I suggested to them that if there was any possibility of the making of such an interpretation, they change the language.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator made that suggestion to the chairman of the committee, but the language could not be changed in the conference because the House and the Senate had agreed to identical provisions, just as in the case of slaughtering quotas the provisions adopted by the two Houses were identical.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I suggest that the amendment will not be repealed before we return, in any event.

I say to the Senator from Arkansas that if other countries do feel the way he has indicated—and I suppose the newspaper articles are correct—then, if the bill were brought up now and were defeated, the situation might be worse.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have no fear that the bill would be defeated.

Why does the Senator from Washington object to having the bill considered now? We could dispose of it in a few minutes. I have much more confidence in the Senate than to fear that the Senate would defeat this bill. All I am asking for is that a vote be taken on the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Senators did not understand what they were doing on the previous occasion when they voted in favor of adoption of the amendment, and when it was adopted, if the Senator from Arkansas has no fear that the bill will be defeated at this time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is exactly correct; Senators were completely misled when they voted for the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not yield for that purpose.

I think Senators understood the amendment very well. It was debated at considerable length; and then, following a quorum call, it was adopted on a yea-and-nay vote.

If we let this matter go over until tomorrow, inasmuch as the Senator's motion is merely that the bill be considered, although the bill has not yet been considered, I shall be glad to confer with the Senator in the meantime, to see whether we can prepare a bill to repeal the present law and to have such bill drawn in language which perhaps will be completely satisfactory—although, of course, that will be difficult—or at least satisfactory in regard to clearing up the difference of opinion as to whether the provision is mandatory or permissive.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas a question. Does he think the Senate exercised its best judgment and wisdom when it voted to pass the oleomargarine bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. FREAR. Does the Senator say that in the light of the experience since that time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no doubt about that. I have not received a single complaint, not even from Delaware.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the reason why I am so exceedingly careful about the questions involved in the request of the Senator from Arkansas is that I know that the repeal of the tax on colored oleomargarine has absolutely driven a great many dairy farmers out of business and has caused a reduction by more than 3,000,000 head in the dairy cow population. For that reason I am exceedingly careful when the Senator from Arkansas makes a proposal, because I am not certain that he is thinking about the welfare of the American farmer.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield, to permit me to answer an inquiry which was made of me a few minutes ago?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. In regard to the order of business when we convene in January, I would state that the bill to which the Senator from Arkansas has been referring is on the agenda which has been approved by the Majority Policy Committee.

Of course, I do not like to state now what the order of business will be two months from now.

As I said before, I do feel a little obligated to try to have the home-rule bill taken up as soon as that can be done because I had stated I would try to have it considered before adjournment.

I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that so far as my endeavors are concerned, I am willing to try to see that the bill which he has been discussing receives early consideration after we convene in January, if that will be satisfactory.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows of no bill which would take precedence over this bill, other than the home-rule bill, does he?

Mr. McFARLAND. Only the statehood bills, about which the Senator from Washington has been asking. However, those bills will take some little time.

I really think that in the ordinary course of business the bill to which the Senator from Arkansas has been referring would be disposed of one way or the other in not more than 2 days. I hardly think more than 2 days would be required for consideration of the bill. I do not believe Senators would want to take more than that amount of time on it.

However, if we are going to adjourn tomorrow, Senators who are opposed to proposed legislation know that in that event they can cause any action on controverted measures to be postponed simply by talking a little longer; and in such cases it has been my experience that that is done.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Washington has referred to the vote on the amendment. I merely wish to correct the RECORD by saying that a yea-and-nay vote was not taken on the amendment, and the Senator from Washington was in error when he said that a yea-and-nay vote was taken.

I took the amendment to conference after the distinguished Senator from Washington had debated the amendment and after the distinguished Senator from Minnesota had debated it. I wish the RECORD to show that. Of course, when I got to the conference, I had no other alternative than to support the amendment.

I hope this matter will be brought up at some time in January.

As I have just stated, a year-and-nay vote was not taken on the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I was just checking on that matter, myself. I was under the impression that a yea-and-nay vote was taken on the amendment. However, I now find that the yea-and-nay vote which was taken was taken on the previous amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The previous amendment was submitted to section 22, and a yea-and-nay vote was taken on that amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

In the case of the particular amendment to which the Senator from Washington referred, and which he said was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote, let me say that the Senator from Washington did not request a yea-and-nay vote on that amendment although a yea-and-nay vote would have been taken on the amendment if the Senator from Washington had wished to have that done and had so requested.

In any event, I took the amendment to conference. The Senator wrote to me the letter to which reference has been made. Unfortunately, the permissive words referred to in the letter could not be included in the conference report, because the House had already agreed to the same language which had been agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have but one further observation to make to the Senator from Arizona. The desire of the committee is merely to give some assurance to the leaders of American agriculture that we simply have not run out on them without making any effort. The Farm Bureau and the Grange are very much interested in this bill. Mr. Kline wrote the strongest letter of any, much stronger than the letter of the department, with respect to the effect of this embargo on agriculture in general, particularly on wheat, cotton, and tobacco, which are the major export commodities. I think California has a great interest in this matter, since she is now taking over the cotton production of the country. I think they would have some assurance if they believed the bill was certain to receive consideration. The only thing which leaves it entirely unsettled is that they do not know whether action will be taken or not. I think they feel quite confident that the Senate will remedy this situation, either by repeal or amendment of the act. I am not wedded to the language of the bill. I am certainly open to suggestion, but we obviously do not have time in which to work this question out at the last minute. It is important that those interested in agriculture feel that something will be done, by way either of amendment or repeal.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the position on the part of some of the farm people is that they wanted to be included. They wanted more to be added to the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, no; the Senator misinterprets their attitude. I have a letter here from Mr. Kline on this very subject, if the Senator would care to read it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Kline is one; but the Grange is very anxious about it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; the Grange has not manifested anxiety about it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They are against the amendment of the Senator from Washington, and are for this bill. There is no question about their position.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have letters, too, which they wanted to present at one time, but they reconsidered it. That, however, is beside the point. I think we can work it out. I think we are all trying to achieve the same result, even though there may be some extreme objections; and if the bill could go over, I should be glad to sit down with the Senator from Arkansas to try to work it out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator from Arizona, the majority leader, would give some real assurance that the bill would be brought up, I think the agricultural interests would then be at least fairly well satisfied under the circumstances.

Mr. McFARLAND. I was trying to give as much assurance as I could.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator could give a little more assurance than he gave.

Mr. McFARLAND. I stated on the floor of the Senate some time ago that if it appeared likely that the House would pass this bill, we would then proceed to act on it, and one reason why I have consented to the Senator's bringing it up is that I had information to the effect a rule might be given on it in the House; but it now appears that a rule will not be given. I can assure the Senator that so far as my efforts are concerned, I shall try to see that the bill receives early consideration. Merely because the honor of majority leader has been conferred upon me, I do not like to be put in the position of making definite statements that things will be done, because, after all, I am still but one of ninety-six Senators.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I would not agree to that. The Senator is a very unique one of the ninety-six. He can do things.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator from Arkansas that I am glad to accept what the majority leader has suggested, and I am sure he will do his best to carry it out. He cannot guarantee it, but when he suggests that he may be able to do something, it usually happens.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I know he will if he gives that assurance. I am willing to rely on his assurance, as one of ninety-six Senators, that we will get early consideration of the bill in January.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope I may have the assurance of the Senator from Arkansas that we shall make a serious attempt to iron out some of these misunderstandings, and I hope the Senator from Arkansas will allow me to place in the RECORD the letter which I addressed to the conferees, so that there may be no question about my desire to have the provision made permissive.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator mean the letter he wrote to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; so that the situation may be clarified.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator wish to have the letter go in the RECORD?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks. It is a letter sent to the conferees while the bill was in conference, and in it I strongly expressed the hope, since there was some doubt, or there had been some colloquy in the House regarding part of the language, that if the language was not what we intended it to be conferees would change it along permissive lines. I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter dated July 24, 1951, addressed to me by Ernest Falk, manager of the Northwest Horticultural Council.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE
AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
July 26, 1951.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: You will recall the Senate adopted an amendment, offered by me, Senator THYE, and others, to title 1, Defense Production Act of 1950, which added a new section 104. The new section deals with import controls on fats, oils, dairy products, rice, etc., during the existing emergency. The House adopted an identical amendment, sponsored by Congressman ANDRESEN of Minnesota.

I have just received the attached letter from the Northwest Horticultural Council suggesting there may be "latent ambiguity" in this amendment I think the letter speaks for itself on this point.

You will remember, I am sure, the colloquy on the Senate floor when my amendment was under consideration. I refer to the colloquy on page 7372 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which sets forth my understanding of what the amendment is designed to accomplish.

Senator ANDERSON had raised the question as to who would exercise authority under the amendment. In response to his comment, I said: "I wanted to leave it discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture. I think the language so provides."

Just before the vote was taken, I made the following statement: "This amendment would apply only when the Secretary of Agriculture deemed that certain imports would impair the defense effort."

On the House side a colloquy occurred which lends itself to a contrary interpretation of the intent of the amendment. I think it would be desirable, therefore, if the conferees would insert a paragraph in their report clarifying the legislative history of this particular amendment.

I appreciate your consideration of this problem

Sincerely,

WARREN G MAGNUSON,
United States Senator.

NORTHWEST HORTICULTURAL COUNCIL,
Yakima, Wash., July 24, 1951.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: The tree fruit industry of the States of Washington and Oregon is concerned with a rumored interpretation of the Magnuson-Andresen amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1951. While we believe that the language is clear and gives to the Secretary of Agriculture the discretionary power to prohibit importation of any of the listed commodities (or of any segment thereof) if he finds the importation would have any one of the prohibited effects, some people think the legislation requires the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately embargo each of the commodities, in toto.

We have noted the colloquy, appearing at page 7372 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 28, 1951, wherein you stated that the exercise of the power is discretionary with the Secretary However some statements were made on the House floor which support a conflicting interpretation.

An interpretation that the Secretary must embargo the products listed would seriously and unnecessarily hamper our efforts toward reestablishing exports of fruits without a corresponding benefit of the defense production effort or to American agriculture.

We sincerely trust that any latent ambiguity may be clarified so that all concerned will understand the intent of Congress was to give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to impose the controls when, and only if, he finds the existence of the requisite grounds for implementation of the legislation as to a specific commodity or type thereof.

Sincerely,

ERNEST FALK, *Manager.*

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho desires to serve notice that when the Senator from Arkansas says that only a score of bluecheese factories are interested in this matter, he is entirely erroneous, because so far as the dairy interest of my State is concerned, and the dairy interests in other States, they do not propose to be made the scapegoat for the reciprocal trade agreements or any other program which will not only make it possible, but which will force the American people to choose between oleomargarine and butter imported from foreign countries.

HENRY A. WALLACE TREATED FAIRLY BY SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, some days ago the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] read on the floor of the Senate certain newspaper articles written by the distinguished American journalist, Mr. Joseph Alsop. These articles seemed to be a very severe castigation of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, and perhaps of the Senate itself. At least that was what some people who read them construed them to be. Suggestions were made that a distinguished American, a former President of this body and former Vice President of the United States, had not been accorded the opportunity of speaking and testifying before the Internal Security Subcommittee as he had wished to do.

I wish to report to the Senate today, Mr. President, that yesterday and the day before, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee conducted hearings. On the day before yesterday, Mr. Henry A. Wallace testified, and at the conclusion of his testimony the junior Senator from North Carolina, who was then acting as chairman of the hearing, asked him a series of questions, in reply to which, as the junior Senator from North Carolina understands, Mr. Wallace completely exonerated the Internal Security Subcommittee and the United States Senate of any suggestions or implications of impropriety on the part of either the committee or the Senate. I wish to read very briefly the questions propounded by me to Mr. Wallace, and the answers given by him:

Senator SMITH Right in that connection there are 2 or 3 questions that I would like to ask you. I think you can answer very quickly.

In connection with Mr. Budenz's testimony, I assume you are in sympathy with the over-all objective of this committee's activities in tracking down Communists in the Government if there are any?

Mr. WALLACE Of course. I agree completely that the world situation as it is, it is a very important function indeed.

Senator SMITH Do you think that is a field within which the committee ought to operate to secure such evidence as it can?

Mr. WALLACE Of course.

Senator SMITH. Do you feel now from published reports and information you have there are any Communists or Communist sympathizers in America? Is there any doubt in your mind about that?

Mr. WALLACE. They seem to have gotten into various places. They even got into the Manhattan project, if you may remember. They have a capacity to get around that is altogether astounding and which has been well demonstrated, it seems to me, by documented evidence.

Senator SMITH. I am asking these questions manifestly for the purpose of establishing the good faith in your mind and what you feel in regard to this committee's activities.

You feel these Communists as such as you have just mentioned should be tracked down, if possible?

Mr. WALLACE. Certainly. If there is real trouble going to break out, there is no question as to where their allegiance will lie.

Senator SMITH There is no question that this committee, if it can be of assistance, should attempt to keep that sort of people out of government?

Mr. WALLACE Yes. I agree.

Senator SMITH. When we call people as witnesses either by subpena or voluntarily on their part, you feel we should hear whatever a witness is testifying to under oath?

Mr. WALLACE. I hope so.

Senator SMITH. In that connection, if a witness should come here and testify under oath and it later turned out he did not tell the truth, you do not think that should be any reflection upon this committee or its members?

Mr. WALLACE. No, I don't. I just feel that the committee has perhaps been imposed on.

Senator SMITH. That goes back to the efforts that the committee has made to take testimony in executive session to test witnesses before the open session and to protect a person who might be innocent. You agree on that?

Mr. WALLACE. I do, sir.

Senator SMITH. You, of course, realize always that the committee cannot hear but one person at a time and it takes a good deal of time on each person?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Senator SMITH You have any personal complaining against the committee either for its subpenaing you or for its failue to hear you?

Mr WALLACE As a matter of fact, I wrote Senator FERGUSON sometime in early September I had quite a little correspondence with him in which I indicated if there was any way in which I could be of service to him personally or through the committee, I would be glad to do so. I was a little bit surprised to reccive a subpena on my farm directing me to be at Foley Square on 18 hours' notice. That is the only point at which I felt that I was a litle bit up against the gun, because I had a personal situation that was very difficult to meet.

At that time I may say I was assured that it would only take a half or three-quarters of an hour to take my testimony.

Senator SMITH. You were talking to an optimist.

Mr WALLACE. Then a little later I talked to Mr. Sourwine and he was utterly cordial. This was about midnight. At that time there were only 8 hours separating me from the necessity of catching a train and those were hours of sleep.

Mr. Sourwine was so cordial and so completely agreeable that I should have the necessary time to get counsel that I have no complaint against the committee at all, although I had some uneasy moments the evening of October 3 when I was trying to arrange my affairs to see whether or not I could get down to New York City the following morning at 11 o'clock.

Senator SMITH. I did, too, as I was scheduled to hold that hearing and could not go

Mr WALLACE So I frankly have no complaint against the committee, except this one, and that was a passing minor irritation.

Senator O'CONOR It does seem to me Mr. Wallace has several times emphasized that there should be given opportunity to him to put a statement in. I think that should be granted.

Senator SMITH. We have told him that this morning.

Mr. President, the answers of Mr. Wallace appeared to me to be quite forthright and he seemed to be interested in the objective of the Senate committee. I was very much gratified that he gave the testimony which he gave.

On the following day Mr. Joseph Alsop, a distinguished journalist, appeared before the committee and answered some questions. He told us a great deal about the articles he had written, and then, near the conclusion of his testimony,

which lasted almost all day, I asked him a few questions to which he gave answers. He appeared willing to testify and stated that there was no intention to reflect upon the committee or upon the Senate. He seemed so amiable that I thought his testimony should at this time be read into the RECORD. The questions and answers to which I have referred are as follows:

Senator SMITH. Now do you approve of the system which we have attempted to use here, of conducting executive sessions where we think that an individual's name may be mentioned for the first time in connection with some possible Communist activities in order that his name may be protected unless there is real evidence?

Mr. ALSOP. Senator, in that connection I wish to make two confessions, not just one.

First, I thought that the system was wrong until I experienced it.

In the second place, and this relates to something that Senator MCCARRAN said this morning, I also thought when I wrote my first columns that the committee itself had had some part in encouraging Mr. Budenz to give what seemed to me demonstrably false testimony. I would like now to say for the record that after seeing Mr. Budenz in his second appearance on the stand, I think it was Mr. Budenz that misled the committee and not the committee that encouraged Mr. Budenz I consider that Mr. Budenz is the only man who has been in any way at fault in this matter.

Senator SMITH. Now you realize in that connection this committee or any investigating committee cannot hear but one witness at a time?

Mr ALSOP. I agree with that

Senator SMITH You were present during part of Mr. Budenz's public testimony?

Mr ALSOP That is correct.

Senator SMITH. Now, as I recall, you were given the privilege of testifying immediately following Mr Budenz, were you not, if that suited your convenience?

Mr ALSOP. Yes, and I told Senator FERGUSON that it would be impossible, or I indicated to Senator FERGUSON that I wasn't ready, and you can see the mass of documentation; I couldn't testify in any serious way at that time.

Senator SMITH. So you have no fault to find with the committee hearing you today instead of some preceding day?

Mr ALSOP None at all

Senator SMITH. That was for your convenience as well as the committee's?

Mr ALSOP Yes, sir.

Senator SMITH Now, I believe you did refer in one of your articles, which was read on the Senate floor by Senator LEHMAN, to the fact that the committee was guilty of accepting demonstrably false testimony. Now you explained that a moment ago, as I understood

Mr. ALSOP Yes I would say this also, Senator, that it seems to me that it makes the point that I made earlier against this kind of procedure, that these facts as to the real outcome of Mr Wallace's mission were easily ascertainable by a properly expert procedure, and this testimony, I feel quite confident, would then have not been given, and it demonstrates, I think, the need for a larger expert apparatus to do this work less in the glare of publicity and with more attention to the background facts which suggest the value or absence of value of the testimony of a man who comes now very close to being a professional informer.

Senator SMITH. You realize, do you not, that the courts in accepting testimony first have witnesses sworn?

Mr. ALSOP. Yes, sir.

Senator SMITH. Therefore the court has to rely upon the witness being sworn and thereupon telling the truth?

Mr. ALSOP. I agree with that.

Senator SMITH That does not guarantee the accuracy or the truthfulness of the witness?

Mr. ALSOP Yes, that is true.

Senator SMITH. You realize that is what this committee is attempting to do in swearing the witness?

Mr ALSOP. I withdraw any criticism of the committee.

Senator SMITH. You would not say that the committee was chargeable because a witness swore falsely here?

Mr. ALSOP I think the procedure is at fault and not the committee

Senator SMITH You would not blame the committee if a witness has testified erroneously or untruthfully here?

Mr ALSOP. Let me put it this way, Senator Your excellent system of holding executive hearings is intended to avoid false accusations against innocent persons. In the present case, in my opinion a wholly false accusation has been brought against an innocent person, Mr Vincent I do believe with a different kind of procedure and with a larger range of prior investigation and a lesser tendency to accept, without inquiry, the allegations of a man who is by now almost a professional informer, the background of the Wallace mission to China would have been looked into, and if Mr. Budenz had testified as he did, he would have been subjected to more careful questioning, greater knowledge being in the hands of the committee, and a different impression would in the end have been made

It is all a matter of procedure.

Senator SMITH You realize, do you not, that even in conducting hearings in executive session the committee has to be careful lest they be accused of attempting to suppress information on someone? That is true, is it not?

Mr ALSOP I agree with that.

Senator SMITH You agree generally that where possible, where there is reasonable basis, we may say, a hearing involving public interest to such extent as this should be conducted in the open where everybody interested could hear it?

Mr ALSOP I agree.

Senator SMITH Now I believe that Senator LEHMAN on the floor of the Senate made some statements to the effect that some very grave charges had been made against this committee and in effect said it was a slander upon the Senate. Now those were not your words, were they?

Mr ALSOP No, I think they are a fair representation of what I had written at that time, which I have now withdrawn because having seen Mr Budenz in performance the second time I am convinced the fault was his and not the committee's.

Senator SMITH You do not subscribe to the statement made by Senator LEHMAN on the floor of the Senate?

Mr ALSOP. Let me say, sir, I would have to qualify my reply to that because Senator LEHMAN gave a perfectly accurate summary of the articles which I then wrote, and Senator LEHMAN, if I am correct, and I have read the record, did not in any sense take responsibility for the accuracy of my statements.

Senator SMITH I understood that.

Mr. ALSOP He asked instead for an investigation of their truth or falsehood. I have withdrawn the statement, withdrawn any implication that the committee purposely encouraged this false evidence. I say now that the man who is at fault was Mr. Budenz So I couldn't say that Senator LEHMAN didn't accurately reproduce what I wrote, because I think I was in error.

Senator SMITH. Now I have one other question, and then I am through. Do you feel now, Mr. Alsop, that there is anything else you wish to say to this committee or any other evidence you wish to introduce?

Mr. ALSOP. No, sir.

Senator SMITH. Up to now?

Mr. ALSOP. I think we have covered the story very completely.

Senator SMITH. I think you understood today from what the chairman said that if something else did develop which in your mind ought to be presented that if you would let us know we would be glad to let you present it? You understand that?

Mr ALSOP I don't mean there isn't a lot of evidence, but it does seem to me the story is complete and there is no use burdening the time of this committee with repetition.

Senator SMITH. Then you understand we will receive any other evidence?

Mr ALSOP Yes

Senator SMITH Now do you have any complaint against the conduct of this hearing so far as you are concerned?

Mr. ALSOP On the contrary, I think it has been most fair

Mr. President, I have read those questions and answers because it seemed to me that Mr. Alsop in a very gracious manner attempted as best he could to correct any false implications that might have been drawn from his articles, and attempted to set himself straight with the committee after he understood the procedure of the committee.

I am taking the time to present this matter because I know that many of the people of America are interested in the work of the Senate and of the committee, and I did not want anyone to get the idea that the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee was not willing to hear anyone who had any evidence to offer, was not willing to hear him fully, and give him a chance to testify either in executive session or in public session.

It seems to me that the information which I have given the Senate by way of questions and answers should at least spike any suggestion that the Internal Security Subcommittee is doing anything other than what it should do under the circumstances, and to accomplish the purposes for which it was created.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN BILLS ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I had intended to ask unanimous consent this afternoon that when the Senate convenes tomorrow it proceed with the call of bills which went to the foot of the calendar, and those which were placed on the calendar today to which there is no objection. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, October 20, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate October 19 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Roger M. Foley, of East Milton, Mass., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Massachusetts, to fill an existing vacancy.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 19 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the sixth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

Warren R. Austin, of Vermont.
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York.
MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD, a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of Montana.
JOHN M. VORYS, a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of Ohio.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the sixth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky.
Ernest A. Gross, of New York.
Benjamin V. Cohen, of New York.
Anna Lord Strauss, of New York.
Channing H. Tobias, of New York.

DIRECTOR OF MUTUAL SECURITY

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Director for Mutual Security.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Roswell L. Gilpatric, of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Department of the Air Force.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Richard Hartshorne, of New Jersey, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Charles Morris Irelan, of Maryland, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, without specification of branch, arm, or service:

Lt. Col Gerald Joseph Greeve, O29576, United States Army.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States:

Maj. William May Myers, O32160, United States Army.
Maj. John William Gorn, O22200, United States Army.
Maj. James Franklin Bishop, O22231, United States Army

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

James Anderson Ralph, Joiner.

COLORADO

Roy P Barrowman, Berthoud.
Leslie Wilkinson, Cripple Creek.
Frank G Harbour, Woodland Park.

GEORGIA

Walter A Johnson, Mount Berry.

ILLINOIS

Richard K Weller, Chatsworth
Leonard J Ries, Henry.
Sorrell A Hukill, Homewood.

KANSAS

Dallas G Worrell, Gridley.
William Harold Young, Salina.

KENTUCKY

Homer D Allen, Oneida.

MASSACHUSETTS

Manuel R. Tavares, East Falmouth.
Donald P. Greeley, Hamilton.

MINNESOTA

Robert C. Hillyer, Backus.
Paul A. Stevenson, Motley.
Rodney C. Shogren, Shafer.

NEBRASKA

Donald E. Hickman, Bushnell.
Howard F. Nutting, Ericson.
Milton H. Maurer, York.

NEW JERSEY

Elmore D. Freshwater, Campgaw.
Bernard M. Degnan, Orange.

NEW YORK

Mary I. Ward, Moravia.

NORTH CAROLINA

Neil B. McDonald, Cameron.
Lawson A. Foil, Mount Pleasant.

NORTH DAKOTA

Frederick G. Knauss, Hannaford.
James O. Solberg, Lakota.

OHIO

Richard D. Walter, Archbold.
Victor L. Will, Canal Winchester.
Waldon E Reed, Galena.
Cora A. Williams, Green Camp.
Robert S Prater, Kenton.
Garnett G. Schlechty, London.
Louis L. Chevraux, Louisville.
Richard J. Kelch, Versailles.

OKLAHOMA

Herbert Wayne Hendren, Fargo.
Robert L. Cummings, Kinta.
Lucile L. McAllister, Luther.
Sedric D. Cowell, Mounds.

PENNSYLVANIA

Gladys K. David, Bryn Athyn.
Louis S Heins, Huntingdon Valley
Bertha N Martin, Intercourse.
Paul M. Kuhns, Leacock.
James E. Clark, Leechburg.
Carl F. Hynek, Jr., Meadowbrook.
Joseph V. McGrory, Norristown.
David B. Beach, Woodbury.

PUERTO RICO

Eladio Burgos, Jr., Villalba.

TENNESSEE

Richard T Zimmerman, Fordtown.

TEXAS

Alba A. Hall, Roby.

UTAH

Robert M. Birdzell, Wendover.

VIRGINIA

Robert E Denny, Bluemont.
Coleman A. Doss, Hurt.

WASHINGTON

Richard B Dahlager, Algona.
Asa Wayman Perkins, Garfield.
Howard W Sievers, Lynnwood
Owen M Lade, Sumas.

WEST VIRGINIA

Rena P. Lane, Elbert.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of righteousness and holiness may this Chamber now be for us a sanctuary and a place of answers to prayer. Inspire us in this moment of quietness and communion with a greater faith in Thee and in the power of those eternal ideals and principles which Thou hast ordained.

We pray that Thy Spirit may mediate a larger measure of moral health and strength to our Republic during these days when the peace and security of our national life seem to be seriously menaced by forces of aggression from without and by many within our own borders who are making a mad scramble for wealth and power and pleasure.

Grant that our citizens and all who guide the ship of state may embody and express that noble kind of patriotism which seeks in personal character and public service to safeguard and perpetuate the good name of our country.

May it be our supreme ambition to glorify Thee and to help humanity find the more abundant life of peace and happiness. Make us worthy of receiving the benediction which Thou dost bestow upon the faithful. May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with us all.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H J. Res. 289. Joint resolution to terminate the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 921. An act to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947,

S. 1952. An act to amend or repeal certain Government-property laws, and for other purposes, and

S. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Railroad Retirement Legislation.

GRANTS FOR HOSPITAL FACILITIES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2094) to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 25, after "amended", insert "by striking out 30 percent wherever it appears in said section and inserting 50 percent and"

Page 3, line 4, strike out "30" and insert "50."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS LEAVE ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 657, an act to amend and clarify the District of Columbia Teachers Leave Act of 1949, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment to House amendment No. 4, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Before the language "existing at the time such leave was granted", insert the following: "In accordance with the rules of the Board of Education."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the amendment?

Mr. McMILLAN. It seems the enrolling clerk left out a couple of words in rewriting the bill, leaving the teachers leave pay up to the Board of Education. Those two words were left out.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment to House amendment No. 4 was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 210]

Aandahl	Combs	Hoffman, Mich.
Allen, Calif.	Crawford	Irving
Allen, La.	Dague	Jackson, Calif.
Anderson, Calif.	Davis, Wis.	Johnson
	Dawson	Judd
Angell	Delaney	Kearney
Armstrong	Dempsey	Kelley, Pa.
Bailey	Denny	Kennedy
Baring	D'Ewart	Keogh
Bates, Ky.	Dondero	Latham
Beall	Dorn	Lucas
Blackney	Engle	Lyle
Boggs, La.	Fine	McDonough
Bosone	Gathings	McGrath
Bramblett	Golden	Mack, Ill.
Brooks	Granger	Martin, Iowa
Brown, Ohio	Hagen	Miller, Calif.
Busbey	Hays, Ark.	Morrison
Celler	Hébert	Morton
Cole, N. Y.	Hess	Murphy
Murray, Wis.	Regan	Taber
O'Neill	Ribicoff	Thornberry
Passman	Rogers, Fla.	Vinson
Perkins	Roosevelt	Watts
Phillips	Sabath	Werdel
Powell	Shelley	Wilson, Tex.
Prouty	Short	Wood, Ga.
Quinn	Sieminski	Zablocki
Ramsay	Sikes	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 343 members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONFERENCE REPORTS—APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight to file conference reports on general appropriation bills, and that it be in order to consider such conference reports at any time during the remainder of the session

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I assume the latter part of the request means after they have been filed?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. TABER. That should be in the request. The request should be modified so that that is done.

Mr. CANNON. Of course They would have to be filed before they could be considered.

Mr. TABER. I would not want a conference report taken up without it being filed.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri include that in his request?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly, Mr. Speaker; such conference reports when filed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

WILLIAM LUND MAIN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R 5730) for the relief of William Lund Main.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is the bill about which the gentleman spoke to me?

Mr. WALTER. Yes. The purpose of this bill is to permit an American citizen to bring to the United States an infant adopted in Norway, which is about a year old.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And only one?

Mr. WALTER. That is right.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, William Lund Main, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs William H Main, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJUSTMENT OF COMPENSATION AND GRADES OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 355) to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the mangers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H REPT. No 1211)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 355) to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following.

"That the Act entitled 'An Act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service, to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes', approved July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress), is amended by inserting after section 11 thereof a new section as follows:

"'GRADES AND SALARIES OF EMPLOYEES IN THE AUTOMATIC GRADES

"'SEC 11A. Employees shall be divided into grades and shall receive basic annual salaries or hourly rates of pay as shown in the following compensation schedules:

"'GRADES AND SALARIES OF EMPLOYEES IN THE AUTOMATIC GRADES

	Grades								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
REGULAR EMPLOYEES									
Clerks in post offices of the third class; carriers in village delivery service	$2,770	$2,870	$2,970	$3,070					
Laborers; cleaners; matrons, head charmen, and head charwomen, junior mechanics	2,870	2,970	3,070	3,170	$3,270				
Firemen laborers, elevator operators	2,970	3,070	3,170	3,270	3,370				

"'GRADES AND SALARIES OF EMPLOYEES IN THE AUTOMATIC GRADES—continued

	Grades								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
REGULAR EMPLOYEES—continued									
Mail handlers, messengers, watchmen; operators of the pneumatic tube service, garagemen drivers; skilled laborers, sewers	$3,170	3,270	$3,370	$3,470					
Telephone operators; firemen, guards, window cleaners, skilled helpers	3,170	3,270	3,370	3,470	$3,570				
Special-delivery messengers in post offices of the first class	3,170	3,270	3,370	3,470	3,570	$3,670	$3,770		
Elevator starters	3,270	3,370	3,470	3,570	3,670				
Clerks; carriers in the city delivery service, dispatchers of the pneumatic tube service, driver mechanics and general mechanics in motor vehicle service, nurses, painters	3,270	3,370	3,470	3,570	3,670	3,770	3,870	$3,970	$4,070
Assistant enginemen, general mechanics (custodial), elevator mechanic helpers, pressmen, lock makers, mail bag repairers, mail bag examiners, postmarking stamp makers, and mechanics in mail equipment shops, requisition fillers and packers in Division of Equipment and Supplies	3,470	3,570	3,670	3,770	3,870				
Postal transportation clerks on class A runs, in terminals, air-mail fields and offices of division superintendents and district superintendents, operators of highway post-office vehicles	3,470	3,570	3,670	3,770	3,870	3,970	4,070		
Postal transportation clerks on class B runs; transfer clerks in transfer offices and in air-mail fields, clerks in inspection service	3,470	3,570	3,670	3,770	3,870	3,970	4,070	4,170	4,270
Mechanics	3,670	3,770	3,870	3,970	4,070	4,170			
Elevator mechanics	3,870	3,970	4,070	4,170	4,270	4,370			
Special mechanics	4,070	4,170	4,270	4,370					
Principal review clerks	4,270	4,370	4,470	4,570					
Traveling mechanicians	4,570	4,670	4,770	4,870	4,970	5,070	5,170		
Cost accounting clerks, purchasing clerks, and draftsmen in mail equipment shops	4,470	4,570	4,670	4,770	4,870				
Examiners of equipment and supplies	5,070	5,170	5,270	5,370	4,470	5,570	5,670	5,870	
Carriers in rural delivery service									
Fixed compensation per annum	1,418	1,442	1,466	1,490	1,514	1,538	1,562	1,586	1,610
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	58	60	62	64	66	68	70	72	74
For each mile of route over 30 miles	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
SUBSTITUTE, TEMPORARY, AUXILIARY, AND CHAR EMPLOYEES									
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes to which no regular carrier is assigned									
Fixed compensation per annum	$1,418								
Compensation per mile per annum									
For each mile up to 30 miles of route	58								
For each mile of route over 30 miles	20								
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes having regular carrier absent without pay	(1)								
Substitute carriers in rural delivery service on routes having regular carriers absent with pay									
	Hourly rates								
Clerks in post offices of the third class, carriers in village delivery service	$1.365	$1.415	$1.465	$1.515					
Charmen and charwomen	1.425	1.475							
Mail handlers, messengers, watchmen; operators of the pneumatic tube service, garagemen-drivers	1.565	1.615	1.665	1.715					
Special delivery messengers in post offices of the first class	1.565	1.615	1.665	1.715	$1.765	$1.815	$1.865		
Clerks, carriers in city delivery service, driver mechanics, general mechanics, dispatchers of the pneumatic tube service	1.615	1.665	1.715	1.765	1.815	1.865	1.915	$1.965	$2.015
Postal transportation clerks	1.715	1.765	1.815	1.865	1.915	1.965	2.015		
Special mechanics	1.925								

[1] Rate authorized for the regular carrier.'

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following one year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the top automatic grade.

"SEC 2. (a) Section 11 (b) of such Act of July 6, 1945, is amended by striking out 'grade 9' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'grade 7'.

"(b) Section 12 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Marine carriers assigned to the Detroit River Marine Service shall be paid an annual salary of $300 in excess of the highest salary provided for carriers in the automatic grades in the City Delivery Service: *Provided*, That the annual salary of such marine carriers shall not be in excess of $4,370.'

"(c) Section 12 (e) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(e) Clerks in post offices of the third class shall not be appointed or promoted to a salary grade in excess of $100 less than the salary of the postmaster at the office to which assigned. Substitute, temporary, or auxiliary clerks in post offices of the third class shall not be paid in excess of $1.465 per hour where the salary of the postmaster is $3,128 per annum; in excess of $1.415 per hour where the salary of the postmaster is $3,019 per annum; and in excess of $1.365 per hour where the salary of the postmaster is $2,883 per annum.'

"(d) Section 15 (f) of such Act is amended by striking out '$3,270' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$3,670'.

"(e) Section 16 (c) of such Act is amended by striking out the second, third, and fourth sentences, including the proviso.

"(f) Section 16 (g) of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'grade 9' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'grade 7';

"(2) by striking out 'grade 11' and inserting in lieu thereof 'grade 9'; and

"(3) by striking out so much of the second sentence as precedes the first proviso.

"(g) Section 16 (h) of such Act is amended to read as follows.

"'(h) Examiners to be eligible to receive the salary provided in this Act shall first progress through the automatic grades to and including grade 7.'

"(h) Section 16 (j) of such Act is amended by striking out 'grade 9' and inserting in lieu thereof 'grade 7'.

"(i) Section 16 (k) of such Act is amended by striking out all after 'regular employees assigned to road duty' and inserting in lieu thereof 'on an hourly basis at the rates prescribed in section 11A.'

"(j) Section 16 (o) of such Act is amended by striking out all preceding the proviso therein.

"(k) Section 17 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Carriers in the Rural Delivery Service shall be divided into grades, with salaries based in part on specified rates per mile per annum and in part on fixed compensation per annum, as provided in section 11A.'

"(l) Section 17 (d) is amended by striking out '$3,970' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$4,370'.

"(m) The following portions of such Act are repealed: Section 12 (b), section 12 (c), section 12 (d), section 13 (b), section 13 (c), section 13 (d), section 14 (b), section 14 (c), section 14 (d), section 14 (e), section 14 (f), section 14 (g), section 14 (h), section 14 (i), section 14 (j), section 14 (k), section 15 (d), section 15 (e), section 16 (b), section 16 (d), section 16 (e), section 16 (n), section 16 (s), section 18 (b), section 18 (c), section 18 (d), section 18 (e), section 19 (a), section 19 (c), section 19 (d), section 22 (a), and section 22 (b).

"SEC 3. The Act entitled 'An Act to provide additional compensation and other benefits for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service', approved October 28, 1949, is repealed.

"SEC 4. (a) Each employee on the rolls of the field service of the Post Office Department on the effective date of this Act for whom automatic grades and salaries are pro-

vided by section 11A of such Act of July 6, 1945, as added by this Act, who—

"(1) entered the field service after June 30, 1945, and

"(2) (A) has not been advanced at least two automatic grades through the operation of the provisions of the first section and section 2 of the Act of March 6, 1946, as amended (Public Law 317, 79th Congress), the Act of July 31, 1946, as amended (Public Law 577, 79th Congress), and section 2 (a), (b), (c), and (d) of the Act of October 28, 1949 (Public Law 428, 81st Congress), or (B) is not advanced at least two automatic grades through the operation of such provisions and the operation of the provisions of section 14 (b) (1) of this Act—

shall be advanced two automatic grades or, if such employee has been advanced one automatic grade through the operation of such provisions, shall be advanced one automatic grade. For the purposes of this section, the assignment of any employee in grade 1 or 2 on the effective date of this Act to grade 1 as provided in section 14 (b) (1) shall be considered as an advancement of two or one automatic grades, respectively.

"(b) Any advancement under subsection (a) of this section shall be effective as of the effective date of this Act and shall not be considered as a promotion for purposes of determining the date on which any employee is eligible for a promotion to the next higher grade.

"SEC. 5. (a) Section 8 (a) of such Act of July 6, 1945, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The salaries of postmasters and assistant postmasters at all classes of post offices and of officers and supervisory employees at post offices of the first class shall be annual salaries, to be fixed by the Postmaster General based upon gross postal receipts as shown in the quarterly returns of the respective post offices for the calendar year immediately preceding, at the following rates: *Provided*, That subsection (c) of section 1001, of the Revenue Act of 1932 (47 Stat. 285), as amended, is hereby repealed retroactive to January 1, 1944, and thereafter the gross postal receipts shall be counted for the purpose of determining the class of the post office or the compensation or allowances of postmasters or other employees, whose compensation or allowances are based on the annual receipts of such offices: *Provided further*, That in fixing the salaries of the postmaster and supervisory employees in the post office at Washington, District of Columbia, the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, add not to exceed 75 per centum to the gross receipts of that office:

"'POST OFFICES OF THE FIRST CLASS

Gross receipts	Per annum rates					
	Postmaster	Assistant postmaster	General superintendent of mails, general superintendent of finance	Assistant general superintendent of mails	Assistant general superintendent of finance	Superintendents
$80,000,000 and up	$13,770	$8,470	$7,470	$6,870	$6,870	$6,470
$40,000,000 to $79,999,999.99	13,770	8,470	7,470	6,870	6,870	6,470
$20,000,000 to $39,999,999.99	12,770	7,970	7,270	6,870	6,870	6,470
$10,000,000 to $19,999,999.99	11,770	7,070	6,870	6,670	6,670	6,270
$7,000,000 to $9,999,999.99	10,770	6,870	6,570	6,470	6,470	6,170

Gross receipts	Per annum rates								
	Senior assistant superintendents	Chief station examiner	Assistant superintendents	Auditor	Assistant auditor	Station examiners	General foremen	Foremen	Clerks in charge
$80,000,000 and up	$6,270	$5,470	$5,670	$6,170	$5,470	$5,170	$5,370	$4,896	$4,570
$40,000,000 to $79,999,999.99	6,270	5,470	5,670	6,170	5,470	5,170	5,331	4,896	4,570
$20,000,000 to $39,999,999.99	6,202	5,470	5,670	5,984	5,470	5,170	5,331	4,896	4,570
$10,000,000 to $19,999,999.99	5,870	5,370	5,658	4,970	4,870	4,970	5,114	4,896	4,570
$7,000,000 to $9,999,999.99	5,706	5,370	5,270	4,870	4,770	4,970	5,005	4,896	4,570

Gross receipts	Per annum rates						
	Postmaster	Assistant postmaster	Superintendent of mails	Superintendent of finance	Superintendent of money orders	Senior assistant superintendent of mails	Assistant superintendents of mails
$3,000,000 to $6,999,999.99	$9,770	$6,270	$6,070	$5,770	$5,470	$5,670	$5,270
$1,500,000 to $2,999,999.99	8,770	6,070	5,870	5,470	5,170	5,470	5,270
$1,000,000 to $1,499,999.99	7,770	6,070	5,870	5,470	5,170		5,270
$800,000 to $999,999.99	7,370	5,970	5,670	5,270	5,070		5,070
$500,000 to $799,999.99	7,070	5,870	5,470	5,170	4,970		5,070
$400,000 to $499,999.99	6,570	5,770	5,370				5,005
$300,000 to $399,999.99	6,370	5,670	5,370				5,005
$250,000 to $299,999.99	6,170	5,570	5,270				5,005
$200,000 to $249,999.99	6,070	5,470	5,170				
$150,000 to $199,999.99	5,970	5,370	5,170				
$120,000 to $149,999.99	5,870	5,270	5,070				
$90,000 to $119,999.99	5,770	5,170	5,005				
$75,000 to $89,999.99	5,670	5,070	4,896				
$60,000 to $74,999.99	5,570	4,970	4,787				
$50,000 to $59,999.99	5,470	4,970	4,678				
$40,000 to $49,999.99	5,370	4,896	4,570				

Gross receipts	Per annum rates						
	Assistant superintendents of finance	Assistant superintendents of money orders	Auditor	Station examiners	General foremen	Foremen	Clerks in charge
$3,000,000 to $6,999,999.99	$5,270	$4,970	$4,870	$4,970	$5,005	$4,787	$4,570
$1,500,000 to $2,999,999.99	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,896	4,787	4,570
$1,000,000 to $1,499,999.99	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,870	4,896	4,787	4,570
$800,000 to $999,999.99						4,787	4,570
$500,000 to $799,999.99						4,787	4,570
$400,000 to $499,999.99						4,787	4,570
$300,000 to $399,999.99						4,787	4,570
$250,000 to $299,999.99						4,787	4,570
$200,000 to $249,999.99						4,787	4,570
$150,000 to $199,999.99						4,787	4,570
$120,000 to $149,999.99						4,787	4,570
$90,000 to $119,999.99						4,787	4,570

"'POST OFFICES OF THE SECOND CLASS

Gross receipts	Per annum rates	
	Postmaster	Assistant postmaster
$27,000 to $39,999.99	$5,070	$4,670
$18,000 to $26,999.99	4,870	4,570
$12,000 to $17,999.99	4,770	4,461
$8,000 to $11,999.99	4,770	4,352

"'*Provided*, That where the gross postal receipts of a post office of the second class for each of two consecutive calendar years are less than $8,000, or where in any calendar year the gross postal receipts are less than $7,000, it shall be relegated to the third class.

"'POST OFFICES OF THE THIRD CLASS

Gross receipts	Per annum rates, postmasters
$7,000 to $7,999.99	$4,298
$6,000 to $6,999.99	4,162
$5,000 to $5,999.99	4,058
$4,200 to $4,999.99	3,917
$3,500 to $4,199.99	3,781
$3,000 to $3,499.99	3,645
$2,700 to $2,999.99	3,509
$2,400 to $2,699.99	3,400
$2,100 to $2,399.99	3,264
$1,900 to $2,099.99	3,128
$1,700 to $1,899.99	3,019
$1,500 to $1,699.99	2,883

"'*Provided*, That where the gross postal receipts of a post office of the third class for each of two consecutive calendar years are less than $1,500, or where in any calendar year the gross postal receipts are less than $1,400, it shall be relegated to the fourth class.

"'POST OFFICES OF THE FOURTH CLASS

Gross receipts	Per annum rates, postmasters
$1,300 to $1,499.99	$2,611 20
$1,100 to $1,299.99	2,494 80
$1,000 to $1,099.99	2,336 04
$900 to $999.99	2,177 28
$800 to $899.99	2,045 44
$700 to $799.99	1,914 88
$600 to $699.99	1,762 56

"'POST OFFICES OF THE FOURTH CLASS—CON.

Gross receipts	Per annum rates, postmasters
$500 to $599.99	$1,588.48
$450 to $499.99	1,441.60
$400 to $449.99	1,327.36
$350 to $399.99	1,218.56
$300 to $349.99	1,111.32
$250 to $299.99	979.20
$200 to $249.99	848.64
$150 to $299.99	685.44
$100 to $149.99	522.24
Less than $100	326.40'

"(b) Section 8 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(c) At central accounting offices where the gross postal receipts are less than $7,000,000 the superintendent of finance, or the employee in charge of central accounting records and adjustments of the accounts, shall be allowed $200 per annum in addition to the salary specified in subsection (a). At central accounting offices with receipts of less than $1,000,000, the employee performing the duties of an auditor shall be allowed a salary equal to that of a foreman'

"SEC 6. Section 9 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SUPERVISORS IN THE UNITED STATES STAMPED ENVELOPE AGENCY, SUPERINTENDENTS AND ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS OF CLASSIFIED STATIONS AND BRANCHES

"'SEC. 9. (a) The annual salaries of supervisors in the United States Stamped Envelope Agency shall be as follows:

"'Agent, $5,770; assistant agent, $5,270.

"'(b) The salary of superintendents and assistant superintendents of classified stations shall be based on the number of employees assigned thereto and the annual postal receipts. No allowance shall be made for sales of stamps to patrons residing outside of the territory of the stations. At classified stations each $25,000 of postal receipts shall be considered equal to one additional employee: *Provided*, That in determining the number of employees at a classified station, credit shall be allowed for service performed by regular employees, substitute employees other than those serving in lieu of regular employees absent from duty for any cause, and temporary employees assigned to the station, and for each two thousand and twenty-four hours of service performed by such employees credit shall be allowed for one employee.

"'(c) At classified stations, the annual salaries of superintendents and assistant superintendents shall be as follows:

"'Number of employees	Superintendent	Assistant superintendents
2,001 and up	$6,470	$5,970
1,001 to 2,000	6,470	5,970
501 to 1,000	6,370	5,870
401 to 500	6,170	5,670
301 to 400	6,070	5,570
201 to 300	5,970	5,470
151 to 200	5,770	5,270
101 to 150	5,670	5,170
76 to 100	5,549	5,005
51 to 75	5,331	4,787
26 to 50	5,114	
16 to 25	5,005	
6 to 15	4,787	
1 to 5	4,678	

"SEC 7. (a) Section 10 of such Act is repealed.

"(b) Section 11 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows.

"'(a) The Postmaster General shall determine the supervisory needs in each organizational unit in the field service of the Post Office Department and shall fix the number of supervisors to be employed in accordance with the salary schedules provided in sections 8 (a), 9, 13 (a), 14 (a), 15 (a), 15 (b), 16 (a), 18 (a), and 19 (b) of this Act· *Provided*, That not more than one assistant postmaster may be employed at any post office.'

"SEC. 8 Section 13 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows.

"'(a) The salaries of supervisory employees in the Motor Vehicle Service shall be annual salaries based upon the number of employees supervised as follows: *Provided*, That, in determining the number of employees supervised, credit shall be allowed for service performed by regular employees, substitute employees other than those serving in lieu of regular employees absent from duty for any cause, and temporary employees, and for each two thousand and twenty-four hours of service performed by such employees credit shall be allowed for one employee:

"'Number of employees	Superintendent	Senior assistant superintendent	Assistant superintendent	Assistant superintendent of auxiliary garages	Chief of records	Chief mechanic, chief of supplies	Chief dispatcher, route supervisors	Mechanics in charge	Dispatchers
701 and up	$6,470	$5,970	$5,170		$5,170	$5,170	$4,970	$4,870	$4,470
401 to 700	6,470		5,170		5,170	5,170	4,970	4,870	4,470
251 to 400	6,170		5,170		4,870	4,870	4,870	4,770	4,470
101 to 250	5,970		5,170		4,870	4,870	4,870	4,770	4,470
51 to 100	5,770		5,070	$5,070	4,670	4,670	4,670	4,570	4,470
31 to 50	5,570		4,970	4,970	4,570	4,570	4,570	4,470	4,470
16 to 30	5,170		4,970	4,970	4,470	4,470	4,470	4,470	4,470
11 to 15	5,070				4,470			4,470	4,470
6 to 10	4,870				4,470			4,470	4,470
1 to 5					4,470			4,470	4,470'

"SEC 9 Section 14 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The salaries of supervisory employees in the Custodial Service shall be annual salaries as follows:

"'Cubic content of buildings	General superintendent	Assistant general superintendent	Superintending engineer	Superintendent of building	Assistant superintendent of building	Chief engineer	Assistant chief engineer	Assistant superintending engineer	Engineers	Inspection engineers	Mechanical engineers
2 or more buildings with—											
50,000,000 cubic feet and up	$6,970	$5,970								$5,970	$5,970
15,000,000 to 49,999,999 cubic feet	6,970									5,970	5,970
1 or more buildings with—											
40,000,000 cubic feet and up				$6,770	$5,770	$6,770	$5,670		$4,970		
20,000,000 to 39,999,999 cubic feet				6,770	5,766	6,746	5,666		4,970		
15,000,000 to 19,999,999 cubic feet				6,270	5,270	6,270	5,170		4,970		
10,000,000 to 14,999,999 cubic feet			$6,270	5,970	4,970	5,970	4,970	$5,270	4,787		
6,000,000 to 9,999,999 cubic feet			6,170	5,670		5,670		4,970	4,787		
3,000,000 to 5,999,999 cubic feet			5,970	5,370		5,370			4,787		
1,000,000 to 2,999,999 cubic feet			5,370	5,070		5,070			4,787		
600,000 to 999,999 cubic feet			4,370								
Less than 600,000 cubic feet			4,170								

Number of employees supervised	Superintendent of shops	Assistant superintendent of shops	General foremen of mechanics	Foremen of mechanics	General foremen of laborers	Foremen of laborers	Foremen of elevator operators	Captain of guard	Lieutenant of guard	Chief telephone operator	Assistant chief telephone operator
151 and up	$6,770	$5,970			$4,770		$4,470	$4,570			
101 to 150	6,770	5,970			4,570		4,470	4,570			
61 to 100	6,570	5,878			4,352	$4,134	4,352	4,570			
41 to 60	6,370	5,658	$5,222		4,134	4,134	4,352	4,570			
31 to 40			5,222	$4,787	4,134	4,134	4,352	4,352	$4,134	$4,270	$3,917
21 to 30			5,222	4,787		3,917		4,352	4,134	4,270	3,917
11 to 20			5,222	4,787		3,917		4,134	4,134	4,270	3,917
1 to 10			5,222	4,787		3,699		3,917	3,917	4,270	3,917

Number of employees supervised	Foremen	Clerks in charge
151 and up		
101 to 150		
61 to 100	$4,787	$4,570
41 to 60	4,787	4,570
31 to 40	4,787	4,570
21 to 30	4,787	4,570
11 to 20	4,787	4,570
1 to 10	4,787	4,570'

"SEC. 10. (a) Section 15 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The annual salaries of inspectors in charge, assistant inspectors in charge, and supervisory employees at division headquarters of the Inspection Service shall be as follows:

"'Title	Per annum rates
Post office inspector in charge	$8,470
Assistant post office inspector in charge	7,770
Superintendent	5,770
Assistant superintenent	$5,270
Chiefs of section	5,170'

"(b) That portion of section 15 (b) of such Act which precedes the first proviso is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Post office inspectors shall be divided into ten grades with annual salaries as follows:

Grade 1	$4,970
Grade 2	5,170
Grade 3	5,370
Grade 4	5,570
Grade 5	5,770
Grade 6	5,970
Grade 7	$6,370
Grade 8	6,770
Grade 9	7,270
Grade 10	7,770

and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following one year's satisfactory service in each grade until they reach grade 8.'.

"SEC. 11. Section 16 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The annual salaries of officers and supervisory employees in the Postal Transportation Service shall be as follows:

"'Organizations	General superintendent	Assistant general superintendent	Assistant general superintendents at large	Superintendents at large	Administrative assistants	District superintendent	Assistant district superintendents
Divisions	$8,470	$7,470	$7,270	$6,770	$5,970		
Districts						$6,770	$5,970
	Examiner	Assistant examiner	General foremen	General foremen	General foremen	Foremen	Clerks in charge
Division offices	$4,896	$4,787	$5,270	$5,114	$4,896	$4,787	$4,570
District offices	4,896	4,787	5,270	5,114	4,896	4,787	4,570
Railway post offices and highway post offices.							
Class B:							
Runs in which more than 60 feet of distributing space is authorized over entire length of the run in either direction not less than 5 days per week			5,270	5,114		4,787	
Runs with 60 feet or less of distributing space					4,896	4,787	
Class A							4,570
	Number of employees in organization						
Transfer offices	61 and up		5,270	5,114	4,896	4,787	4,570
	31 to 60			5,114	4,896	4,787	4,570
	11 to 30				4,896	4,787	4,570
	1 to 10					4,787	4,570
Air-mail fields	101 and up		5,270	5,114	4,896	4,787	4,570
	31 to 100			5,114	4,896	4,787	4,570
	1 to 30				4,896	4,787	4,570
Terminals	251 and up		5,270	5,114	4,896	4,787	4,570
	101 to 250			5,114	4,896	4,787	4,570
	31 to 100				4,896	4,787	4,570
	1 to 30					4,787	4,570'

"SEC. 12. Section 18 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The annual salaries of supervisory employees in the Mail Equipment Shops shall be as follows:

"'Title	Per annum rates
Superintendent	$7,470
Senior assistant superintendent	6,470
Assistant superintendent	5,970
General foremen	5,370
Engineers in charge	4,870
Foremen of mechanics	4,570
Foremen of repair	4,370
Assistant foremen	4,170'

"SEC 13. Section 19 (b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Storekeepers shall be paid annual salaries of $4,896 and foremen shall be paid annual salaries of $4,352'

"SEC 14 In the adjustment of assignments to grades, salaries, and positions to conform with the provisions of such Act of July 6, 1945, as amended by this Act—

"(a) Postmasters and employees for whom salaries are provided in such Act of July 6, 1945, as amended by this Act, shall be placed under the position title which covers their regularly assigned duties and which is in accord with the applicable organizational unit structure and shall be placed under the annual salary or hourly rate prescribed by such Act of July 6, 1945, as amended by this Act, for the position to which assigned

"(b) Employees (other than special mechanics, cost accounting clerks, purchasing clerks, and draftsmen) for whom automatic grades and salaries are provided in section 11A of such Act of July 6, 1945, as added by this Act and who—

"(1) on the effective date of this Act, are in grades 1, 2, and 3 shall be placed in grade 1; and

"(2) on the effective date of this Act are in grades 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 shall be placed in grades 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 respectively—

and shall receive the annual salary or hourly rate of pay of the grade in which placed

"(c) Special mechanics who, on the effective date of this Act, are receiving basic annual salaries of $3,670, $3,770, $3,870, or $3,970, shall be placed in grades 1, 2, 3, or 4, respectively

"(d) Cost accounting clerks, purchasing clerks, and draftsmen who, on the effective date of this Act, are receiving basic annual salaries of $4,070 shall be placed in grade 1, those receiving basic annual salaries of $4,270 shall be placed in grade 3, and those receiving basic annual salaries of $4,470 shall be placed in grade 5

"(e) Post office inspectors shall be placed in the same numbered grade as they are in on the date of enactment of this Act

"SEC 15 (a) Employees who, under such Act of July 6, 1945, as in effect prior to the effective date of this Act, are entitled to automatic grade promotions on the effective date of this Act, shall be given credit for their earned automatic grade promotion before applying the provisions of sections 4 and 14 of this Act. Employees who, under such Act of July 6, 1945, as in effect prior to the effective date of this Act, would have been entitled to automatic grade promotions within one year from the effective date of this Act, shall be given credit for the time served since their last promotion prior to the effective date of this Act in determining eligibility for automatic grade promotions under the provisions of such Act of July 6, 1945, as amended by this Act. This subsection shall not apply to any employee who, under section 14 (b) (1), is advanced from grade 1 or grade 2 under such Act of July 6, 1945, as in effect prior to the effective date of this Act, to grade 1 under such Act of July 6, 1945, as amended by this Act.

"(b) Any increase in rate of basic compensation by reason of the enactment of this Act shall not be considered as an 'equivalent increase' in compensation within the meaning of section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, in case of postal service employees who transfer or are transferred to a position coming within the purview of the Classification Act of 1949.

"SEC. 16. In the readjustment of salaries to conform with the provisions of this Act, (1) no postmaster (except postmasters in offices of the fourth class), assistant postmaster, supervisor, or employee shall, by reason of the enactment of this Act, receive an increase in basic annual salary of less than $400 per annum or in excess of $800, (2) no postmaster in an office of the fourth class shall receive an increase of more than 20 per centum of his present salary, except as otherwise provided in this Act, and (3) employees paid on an hourly basis shall receive an increase of 20 cents per hour over their present compensation

"SEC. 17. The Act entitled 'An Act to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service', approved May 21, 1946 (Public Law 386, Seventy-ninth Congress), and section 101 of title I of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for permanent postal rates and to provide pay increases for Government employees', approved July 3, 1948 (Public Law 900, Eightieth Congress), are repealed

"SEC 18 The third sentence of subsection (a) of the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide uniform longevity promotional grades for the postal field service', approved May 3, 1950 (Public Law 500, Eighty-first Congress), is amended by inserting after '5 per centum per annum' the following 'or $100 per annum, whichever is the lesser,'.

"SEC 19 The first proviso in the paragraph headed 'Third class' in section 1 of the Act of February 28, 1925 (43 Stat 1054), is repealed

"SEC 20. The first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion', approved June 19, 1948 (Public Law 674, Eightieth Congress), is amended by striking out ', not exceeding one year of such service,'.

"SEC 21 Subsection (e) of section 17 of the Act entitled 'An Act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service, to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes', approved July 6, 1945, as amended (Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress), is amended to read as follows

"'(e) In addition to the salaries provided in this section, each carrier in the rural delivery service shall be paid for equipment maintenance a sum equal to 9 cents per mile per day for each mile or major fraction of a mile scheduled The Postmaster General may, in his discretion, allow and pay such additional equipment maintenance allowance (not in excess of $3 per day when combined with the equipment maintenance allowance provided by the preceding sentence) as he may determine to be fair and reasonable in the case of rural carriers entitled to additional compensation under subsection (d) of this section for serving heavily patronized routes. Payments for equipment and maintenance as provided herein shall be at the same periods and in the same manner as payments for regular compensation to rural carriers'

"Sec 22. In the exercise of the authority granted by section 81 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as amended, the Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized to grant, as of the effective date of this Act, additional compensation to postal employees of the Canal Zone Government, based on the additional compensation granted by this Act to similar employees in the field service of the Post Office Department of the United States.

"Sec. 23. (a) This Act shall become effective as of July 1, 1951.

"(b) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid under this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid a retired postmaster, officer, or employee for services rendered during the period beginning July 1, 1951, and ending with the date of his retirement.

"(c) In the case of any employee who entered the field service of the Post Office Department after July 1, 1951, and prior to, or on, the date of enactment of this Act, the term 'effective date', as used in this Act, means the day of entry of such employee into the field service."

And the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title of the bill

TOM MURRAY,
J. H. MORRISON,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
EDWARD H. REES,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

OLIN D JOHNSTON,
JOHN O PASTORE,
THOMAS R UNDERWOOD,
WILLIAM LANGER,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 355) to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report

The House amendment to the text of the bill struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the House amendment with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment Except for technical and minor drafting changes, the differences between the Senate bill, the House amendment, and the conference substitute are explained below.

SENATE BILL

The first section of the Senate bill added a new section (section 11A) to Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress Subsection (a) of this new section consists of a schedule which prescribes the grades and compensation of all employees in the postal field service who are now in the automatic grades, plus four groups of employees, namely, special mechanics, cost-accounting clerks, purchasing clerks, and draftsmen, for whom automatic grades have not heretofore been provided This new schedule eliminated the first two grades with respect to each group of employees and provided an 8 8 percent increase in compensation Subsection (b) provided annual promotions for employees for whom annual salaries are provided by the schedule, and for charmen and charwomen, substitute railway postal clerks, and substitute mail handlers in the Railway Mail Service

Section 2 of the Senate bill amended and repealed portions of Public Law 134 in order that the law may conform to the consolidation in the new section 11A of the salary schedules for employees in the automatic grades and to the adjustments in the supervisory positions made by sections 5 to 13, inclusive, of the Senate bill

Section 3 of the Senate bill repealed subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 2 of Public Law 428, Eighty-first Congress. These subsections, which had the effect of partially eliminating the first two automatic grades, are rendered obsolete by the amendments to Public Law 134 made by the Senate bill.

Section 4 (a) of the Senate bill provided for a two-grade advancement in the automatic grades in the case of employees who

entered the postal field service after June 30, 1945, and have not been advanced at least two automatic grades through the operation of certain specified provisions of law, including the provisions of the Senate bill. An advancement of one grade was also provided for those employees who entered the postal field service after such date and have been advanced only one automatic grade through the operation of such provisions of law.

Section 4 (b) of the Senate bill provided for an advancement of one automatic grade for each special-delivery messenger in the postal field service who, on July 1, 1945, had been in the service as a special-delivery messenger for more than 1 year but less than 2 years.

Section 4 (c) provided that any advancement under section 4 (a) or (b) of the Senate bill shall be effective as of the effective date of the bill and shall not be considered as a promotion for purposes of determining the date on which any employee is eligible for a promotion to the next higher grade.

Sections 5 to 13, inclusive, of the Senate bill provided adjustments in position classifications and salaries for postmasters, assistant postmasters, and supervisors in the postal field service The purposes of such adjustment are (1) to correct certain existing inequities in the salaries of postmasters, assistant postmasters, and supervisors by providing salaries commensurate with the duties and responsibilities of their positions without regard to any "cost-of-living increase", and (2) to provide a "cost-of-living" salary increase of 8 8 percent, with a ceiling of $800

Section 5 (a) amended section 8 (a) of Public Law 134, and contained a consolidated compensation schedule which prescribes the position classifications and salaries of postmasters, assistant postmasters, and supervisors in first-class post offices, of postmasters and assistant postmasters in second-class post offices, and of postmasters in third- and fourth-class post offices.

Section 5 (b) of the Senate bill added a new subsection (c) to section 8 of Public Law 134 which relates to the salaries of certain supervisory employees in central accounting offices and provides adjustments in such salaries based upon the gross postal receipts of such offices

Section 6 of the Senate bill amended section 9 o Public Law 134 This section, as so amended, while omitting many of the provisions of the present section 9 which are no longer necessary by reason of the consolidation of salary schedules for supervisors in first-class post offices, prescribes the salaries of supervisors in the United States Stamped Envelope Agency and the position classification and salaries of superintendents and assistant superintendents of classified stations

Section 7 (a) of the Senate bill repealed section 10 of Public Law 134. Section 10 prescribes the salaries of assistant postmasters in second-class post offices and is rendered obsolete by the inclusion of such assistant postmasters in the new consolidated compensation schedule.

Section 7 (b) of the Senate bill contained technical amendments to section 11 (a) of Public Law 134. Section 11 (a) confers authority upon the Postmaster General to fix the number of supervisory employees. These technical amendments are made necessary by the reclassification of supervisory positions provided in the Senate bill.

Sections 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 of the Senate bill amended sections 13 (a), 14 (a), 15, 16 (a), 18 (a) and 19 (b) of Public Law 134, respectively, and prescribed the respective position classifications and salaries of (1) supervisors in the Motor Vehicle Service, (2) supervisors in the Custodial Service, (3) inspectors in charge, assistant inspectors in charge, and supervisors at division headquarters in the Inspection Service, (4) post-office inspectors, (5) officers and supervisors in the Postal Transportation Service, (6) supervisors in the Mail Equipment Shops, and (7) storekeepers and foremen of the Division of Equipment and Supplies While section 15 (b) of Public Law 134, as amended by section 10 (b) of the Senate bill, retained the automatic grades for post-office inspectors, such positions are not included in the new compensation schedule in section 11A of Public Law 134, as added by the first section of the Senate bill, for employees in the automatic grades, because post-office inspectors are supervisory employees.

Section 14 of the Senate bill prescribed the manner of assigning postmasters, assistant postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees who are on the rolls of the field service on the effective date of the Senate bill to the positions, grades, and annual salaries contained in Public Law 134, as amended by the Senate bill. Postmasters, assistant postmasters, officers, and supervisors will be placed in the position, the title of which covers their regularly assigned duties and which is in accord with the applicable organizational unit structure Employees in automatic grades 1, 2, and 3 will be placed in grade 1. Employees in automatic grades 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 will be placed in grades 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. This adjustment reflects the elimination of the two lowest automatic grades provided by the Senate bill Provision was also made for the integration into the automatic grades of special mechanics, cost-accounting clerks, purchasing clerks, and draftsmen, which positions are not at present in the automatic grades

Section 15 (a) of the Senate bill provided that each employee who under Public Law 134, as in effect prior to the effective date of the Senate bill, is entitled to an automatic grade promotion on such date shall receive credit for such earned promotion prior to any advancement in grade or assignment to a grade under section 4 or section 14.

Section 15 (a) also provided that postal field employees will retain credit for the time they have served since their last promotion prior to the effective date of the Senate bill in determining eligibility for automatic grade promotions under Public Law 134, as amended by the Senate bill

Section "5 (b) of the Senate bill provided that any increase in rate of basic compensation by reason of the enactment of the bill shall not be considered as an "equivalent increase" in compensation under section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949 in the case of any employee in the postal field service who transfers or is transferred to a position covered by the Classification Act of 1949. Section 701 of such Act provides for within grade step increases in compensation for employees at the expiration of certain stipulated periods on condition that "no equivalent increase in compensation from any cause was received during such period". Section 15 (b) safeguards the right of any employee who so transfers or is so transferred to receive step increases under such section 701 without regard to any increase in rate of basic compensation which he may have received by reason of the enactment of the Senate bill.

Section 16 of the Senate bill provided a floor of $400 and a ceiling of $800 for all postmasters, assistant postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service on the effective date of the bill; with a further provision that no postmaster in an office of the fourth class shall receive an increase of more than 20 percent of his present salary and that no employee paid on an hourly basis shall receive an increase of more than twenty cents per hour over his present compensation. The section also provided that (1) no provision of the bill shall be construed to reduce the annual salary of any postmaster, assistant postmaster, supervisor, or employee, and (2) in the adjustment of the salaries of postmesters, assistant postmasters, and supervisors in the postal field service, beginning on July 1, 1952, only 85 per centum of the gross postal receipts in any post office shall be counted in determining the class of the post office or the compensation or allowances of postmasters or postal employees of post offices.

Section 17 of the Senate bill repealed Public Law 386, Seventy-ninth Congress, section 101 of title I of Public Law 900, Eightieth Congress, and section 3 of Public Law 428, Eighty-first Congress. These laws provided increases in the compensation of employees in the field service, all of which are reflected in the new salary schedules contained in the Senate bill.

Section 18 of the Senate bill amended subsection (a) of the first section of Public Law 500, Eighty-first Congress, which established the longevity grade increases for fourth-class postmasters at 5 percent of their basic compensation and for other postmasters and employees at $100. Therefore, fourth-class postmasters having a basic salary of $2,000 or more receive longevity grade increases of more than $100 This discrimination was removed by section 18 of the Senate bill which provided that longevity grade increases for fourth-class postmasters would be $100 per annum or 5 percent of their basic compensation, whichever amount was the lesser.

Section 19 of the Senate bill repealed a provision in section 1 of the act of February 28, 1925 (43 Stat 1054), which is included in section 8 (a) of Public Law 134, as amended by section 5 of the Senate bill

Section 20 of the Senate bill amended the first section of Public Law 674, Eightieth Congress, by striking out the provision which restricts to one year the credit toward promotion which an employee, who is transferred from a position not in the automatic grades to a position in the automatic grades, may receive for service in his former position.

Section 21 of the Senate bill increased the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers by 1 cent per mile and in addition provided that the equipment maintenance allowance for all rural carriers shall not be less than $3 per day

Section 22 of the Senate bill provided that the effective date of the bill shall be July 1, 1951.

HOUSE AMENDMENT

Subsection (a) of the first section of the House amendment amends the Act of July 6, 1945, as amended (Public Law 134, 79th Cong), by eliminating the first three grades in those pay schedules providing for a series of automatic annual increases in salary for employees in the postal field service. It also provides that the remaining grades in each such pay schedule be appropriately renumbered.

Subsection (b) of the first section of the House amendment places in the new grade 1 provided by the House amendment all employees who were in grades 1, 2, and 3 prior to the effective date of the House amendment.

Subsection (c) of the first section of the House amendment provides that all employees who had entered the postal service after June 30, 1945, and who had not been advanced any automatic pay grade by operation of law shall be advanced two grades, and that those employees who had received an advancement of one annual automatic pay grade by operation of law and who entered the postal service after June 30, 1945, shall be advanced one additional annual automatic pay grade. Employees advanced in grade under this subsection would retain their time in grade toward their next promotion.

Section 2 of the House amendment gives to all employees paid on an annual basis, except fourth-class postmasters, a $400 a year increase in salary, to fourth-class postmasters a 20 percent increase in salary, and to those employees paid at an hourly rate an increase of 20 cents an hour.

Section 3 of the House amendment provides that the increases under the bill will not be counted as equivalent increases for purposes of within-grade salary promotions under section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949. This section preserves the rights to within-grade promotions for postal employees in the custodial service who might be transferred to positions under the Classification Act of 1949.

Section 4 of the House amendment establishes the effective date of the bill as July 1, 1951. However, retroactive salary payments could be made only to employees who were still employees of the Federal Government, including the District of Columbia government, or in the Armed Forces on the date of enactment of the bill. Employees retiring between July 1, 1951, and the date of enactment of the bill would be paid the increased salary and also be permitted to count the increase for retirement purposes.

The House amendment amends the title of the bill to read "A bill to reduce the number of grades for positions in the postal field service and to provide salary increases for personnel in such service."

CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE

The conference substitute follows in general the provisions of the Senate bill except for the differences noted below. It should be noted that most of the provisions of the Senate bill, and of the conference substitute, not specifically contained in the House amendment have already been approved by the House in H. R. 4255 (a bill to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, assistant postmasters, and superviory officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes) as passed by the House on September 20, 1951.

The compensation schedule for employees in the automatic grades contained in the first section of the conference substitute provides a $400 per annum increase for all employees in the automatic grades paid on an annual basis and a 20-cents-per-hour increase for all such employees paid on an hourly basis, as required in both the Senate bill and the House amendment. Under this compensation schedule, all employees in the automatic grades will receive the same amount of increase as under the Senate bill and House amendment, except (1) traveling mechanicians in the three highest grades, and examiners of equipment and supplies, who would have received slightly higher increases under the provisions of the Senate bill, which in effect, gave an increase of $400 or 8.8 percent of present salary, whichever would be the higher; and (2) painters in the mail equipment shops who are placed in the category of clerks and carriers in post offices of the first class, rather than in the category of mechanics as provided in the Senate bill. The conference substitute establishes four grades for special mechanics and five grades for cost accounting clerks, purchasing clerks, and draftsmen, rather than two grades for each group as provided in the Senate bill.

The conference substitute clarifies the provisions of the Senate bill relating to automatic annual promotion, by making such provisions applicable to all employees whose annual salaries or hourly rates of pay are prescribed in the new section 11A of Public Law 134.

The conference substitute omits the provisions of section 2 (f) of the Senate bill relating to clerks in terminal railway post offices and air mail field railway post offices having twenty or more employees who perform the duties of substitute general foremen, foremen, and clerks in charge. The conference substitute also omits the provisions of section 2 (g) of the Senate bill relating to clerks in transfer offices having twenty or more employees, who perform the duties of substitute general foremen, foremen, and clerks in charge. Present clerks in these positions will be transferred to the supervisory schedules.

The conference substitute omits section 4 (b) of the Senate bill relating to one automatic grade advancement of certain special delivery messengers.

The conference substitute omits the last sentence of section 5 (b) of the Senate bill relating to special salaries for auditors at central accounting offices with receipts of $3,000,000 and up.

Section 15 (a) of the Senate bill provided that employees on the rolls of the field service on the effective date of the bill should retain credit for the time accumulated toward his next automatic promotion in the new grade to which assigned under the bill. The conference substitute makes this section inapplicable to those employees who are advanced one or two grades by reason of the elimination of the two lowest grades as provided in the conference substitute

The conference substitute omits the sentence in section 16 of the Senate bill which permitted only 85 percent of the gross postal receipts to be counted for the purpose of determining the class of the post office or the compensation or allowances of postmasters or of postal employees.

Section 21 of the conference substitute retains the provision of the Senate bill which increases the equipment maintenance allowance of rural delivery carriers from 8 cents to 9 cents per mile, but, in lieu of providing a minimum allowance of $3 per day, gives authority to the Postmaster General to allow and pay to rural carriers serving heavily patronized routes such additional equipment allowance as he deems necessary in an amount which when added to the regular equipment allowance does not exceed $3 per day.

Section 22 of the conference substitute adds a new section to the bill which authorizes the Governor of the Canal Zone to increase the compensation of postal employees of the Canal Zone Government in conformity with the provisions of the bill as agreed to by the conference committee.

Section 23 of the conference substitute retains the provision of the House amendment relating to retroactive payment of compensation, but clarifies such provision to make certain that payment of retroactive compensation shall be made only to a person who is (1) an employee of the United States (including a member of the armed forces) (2) an employee of the Municipal Government of the District of Columbia, or (3) a retired postmaster, officer, or employee of the field service of the Post Office Department who has retired since July 1, 1951. This section also provides that, in the case of an employee who entered the postal field service after July 1, 1951, and prior to, or on, the date of enactment of the bill, the term "effective date", as used in the bill, shall mean the date of entry of such employee into the field service.

TOM MURRAY,
J. H. MORRISON,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
EDWARD H. REES,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee (interrupting the reading of the statement.) Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is the purpose of this legislation to make an adjustment in postal employees' salaries to meet the increased cost of living and to remove certain inequities which have developed in the salaries of postmasters and supervisors resulting from a series of flat increases which have been given to postal employees since July 1, 1945, the date of the last reclassification for these employees.

The conference substitute, which is recommended by the conferees, provides employees in the automatic grades with: A flat $400 salary increase for all employees paid on an annual basis, and 20 cents an hour for all employees paid on an hourly basis.

It raises the entrance salary by eliminating the first two automatic grades and provides some adjustment in the number of grades.

The conference agreement also provides one or two grade advancements for employees who entered the postal service after July 1, 1945, and who have not received at least one or two grade advancements by operation of various laws which have been passed giving advancements to certain groups of postal employees entering the service since that date. Virtually all employees who had entered the postal service prior to July 1, 1945, received four such administrative advancements on reconversion of their positions to the salary schedules provided by Public Law 134.

Employees will retain credit for time served in their present grade for promotion purposes after they have been assigned to the new grades, except in the case of employees who are placed in new grade 1 by reason of the elimination of the present first 2 grades.

The conference agreement contains a reclassification of postmasters and supervisors in accordance with schedules approved in the Senate bill. In the case of some fourth-class postmasters where the 20 percent provision approved by the House represented a higher increase than they would have received under the classification schedules appearing in the Senate bill, they were given this higher rate. There is a maximum of $800 which any employee may receive under the provisions of the bill.

The salary increases and reclassification will be effective retroactively to July 1, 1951.

Rural carriers receive a 1-cent-per-mile additional equipment maintenance allowance, except that the Postmaster General may grant an equipment allowance not to exceed $3 a day—when combined with their regular equipment allowance—for heavy-duty routes.

This conference agreement is in substantial accord with action already approved by the House in two separate bills, the House amendment to S. 355, which gave all postal employees a flat across-the-board increase of $400 per annum and H. R. 4255, containing the reclassification of postmasters and supervisors.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I realize this legislation comes at a time when Members of the House have a good many other problems to consider. This legislation affects a half million employees in the postal service. This legislation comes to the Congress because of increases in the cost of living.

I regret that such important legislation comes so late in the session when Members do not have opportunity to give it all of the consideration to which it is entitled.

The chairman has just told you this legislation will cost $255,000,000 above the present cost of salaries of postal employees.

Mr. Speaker, the main provisions of this bill do not differ in many respects from the legislation approved by the House a few days ago. It is different from the legislation that was introduced in the House and upon which hearings were held by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The original so-called Miller bill, and other identical bills introduced in the House, provided, among other things, for the elimination of three grades and a 17-percent increase of those employed in the postal service. The committee in executive session immediately considered and approved a proposal to eliminate three grades and pay $400 "across the board" to all postal employees.

In order to keep the record straight, Members should be reminded that the Bureau of the Budget, representing the Administration, recommended not more than 7½ percent across the board for postal employees. In fact, it made similar recommendations for all Government employees.

Increases in pay for postal supervisors and postmasters was considered in separate legislation, so the committee struck out all of the provisions of the original H. R. 244 and included, as I have just stated, legislation to increase all postal employees' salaries $400, including fourth-class postmasters, and to increase salaries for those employees on an hourly basis by 20 percent. The conference committee accepted the provisions of the House bill, except the Senate provisions for striking out two grades instead of one which are contained in the House report.

I should also state that the provisions in this report with respect to supervisors and postmasters are almost identical with the provisions of a bill approved by our committee that passed the House 2 weeks ago. The increases in this bill for rural carriers were in the Senate legislation, but not in the House bill.

All employees—and for the RECORD and so we will know—all employees in the automatic grades receive a flat increase of $400 annually. Hourly employees receive an increase of 20 cents an hour.

This is the main part of the bill.

The first two grades are eliminated so that combined with the $400 salary increase the entrance salary for most clerks and carriers is $3,270 per annum.

Employees who have not received administrative advancements in the automatic grades and who entered the postal service after July 1, 1945, will receive either a one- or two-grade advancement.

Employees will retain credit for time served in their present grade for promotion purposes after they have been assigned to the new grades, except in the case of employees who are placed in new grade 1 by reason of the elimination of the present first 2 grades.

All postmasters and supervisors are reclassified in accordance with the provisions contained in S. 355, as approved by the Senate, except fourth-class postmasters who will receive a greater increase by reason of a 20 percent increase on their present salaries. The basis for determining the salaries of postmasters and supervisors will be total gross receipts.

Rural carriers receive a 1-cent-per-mile additional equipment maintenance allowance, except that the Postmaster General may grant an equipment allowance not to exceed $3 a day—when combined with their regular equipment allowance—for heavy duty routes.

The effective date of the increases provided in the bill is July 1, 1951.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Both the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Tennessee said this would cost $251,000,000. The gentleman does not mean to tell the House it would cost $251,000,000 more than the bill that was originally passed by the House?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman evidently misunderstood my statement. This bill when enacted into law will cost the Government $255,000,000 more than it costs now with respect to salaries of postal employees and other costs included in this legislation.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am glad the gentleman has explained that.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman explain how this measure affects the postmasters of first- and second-class offices?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall yield to the chairman of our committee on that subject matter because he has the exact material before him and has given this provision of the legislation particular attention.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I did not hear the question.

Mr. REES of Kansas The question is how this legislation affects postmasters serving in first- and second-class post offices.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. All of the postmasters of first-class offices will receive an increase of $800. Those postmasters of second-class offices will receive an increase of $600 to $700. The increase is based upon the receipts of the offices in these particular classes.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas, who has shown a lot of interest in this legislation, especially with respect to veterans' rights.

Mr. TEAGUE. Will an employee who was ordered into the armed services since July 1 be entitled to retroactive pay?

Mr. REES of Kansas. If he served on July 1 and after and has been called into the armed services, he will receive retroactive compensation.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. What was done in the conference with regard to the Senate's version in reference to 85 percent of the receipts as against the 100 percent for small post offices that the House provided for?

Mr REES of Kansas. The Senate's version of 85 percent was stricken out.

Mr. CHELF. And the House 100 percent was maintained?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the able gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BRYSON. I understand the chairman to state that the over-all additional cost of this bill would be $251,000,000 and that the gentleman who is now speaking said it would cost $255,000,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I gave the approximate figure. It is between $250,000,000 and $255,000,000, in my opinion, nearer $255,000,000. I am now informed by the Post Office Department it is $255,000,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point in the RECORD a chronological history of laws affecting salaries and benefits provided for postmasters, supervisors, and principal groups of employees in the field postal service since 1907.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. The chronological history of laws is as follows:

Chronological history of laws affecting salaries and benefits provided for postmasters, supervisors, and principal groups of employees in the field postal service since 1907

Effective date	Congress	Public Law	
July 1, 1907	59th (President Theodore Roosevelt)	172	Classification Act providing six grades of clerks and carriers, minimum $600 and maximum $1,200 per annum 30-cent hourly rate for substitutes
July 1, 1911	61st (President William H. Taft)	481	Authorized salaries for clerks and carriers at a higher rate than $1,200 per annum due to unusual conditions. Also authorized compensatory time for Sunday service to supervisors, clerks in first and second-class offices, and city carriers.
Oct. 1, 1912	62d (President William H. Taft)	336	Provided 10 grades of pay for railway postal clerks, minimum $900, maximum $1,800 per annum
Mar. 4, 1913	do	336	Authorized payment of overtime for work in excess of 8 hours and provided that the regular tour of 8 hours daily should be completed within 10 hours.
July 1, 1913	do	428	Classification Act of 1907 amended to provide minimum salaries of clerks and carriers at $800 per annum.
July 1, 1914	63d (President Woodrow Wilson)	65	Granted increase to substitutes from 30 cents to 35 cents per hour.
July 28, 1916	64th (President Woodrow Wilson)	169	Authorized compensatory time for holiday service.
July 1, 1917	do	380	Authorized compensatory time for Sundays and holidays to certain supervisors and provided increased compensation of 15 percent to employees with salary rates of $480 per annum or less, and 10 percent to employees earning more than $480 and less than $1,000 per annum.
July 1, 1918	65th (President Woodrow Wilson)	185	Provided increased compensation to field employees, except postmasters, of $200 per annum and provided a minimum of $1,000 per annum and maximum of $1,500 per annum for clerks and carriers. Increased the pay of substitutes from 35 cents to 40 cents per hour, extended the compensatory time privileges to railway postal clerks for Sunday and holiday service.
July 1, 1919	66th (President Woodrow Wilson)	Pub. Res 19	War bonus of $150 per annum provided for clerks and carriers.
Nov 7, 1919	do	Pub. Res. 33	Increased hourly rate of substitutes, first and second class offices, from 40 cents to 60 cents per hour
July 1, 1920	do	265	Reclassified salaries, eliminated temporary war bonuses and fixed a maximum salary of $1,800 per annum for clerks and carriers.
Aug. 21, 1920	do	215	Provided for the retirement on annuity of employees in the classified civil service
July 1, 1921	67th (President Warren G Harding)	41	Amended the Reclassification Act of 1920 to adjust certain inequities in the salaries of supervisors and assistant postmasters
June 17, 1922	do	243	Amended Retirement Act of 1920 to include charwomen, laborers and other employees whether classified or unclassified but who were employed on a regular annual basis and whose basic salary was at a rate of $600 per annum
Sept. 22, 1922	do	363	Provided for deferred annuity for employees 55 years of age or over with more than 15 years' service who were involuntarily separated.
Jan. 1, 1925	68th (President Calvin Coolidge)	506	Provided for the reclassification of salaries of postmasters and employees in the field postal service. This act increased the maximum salary for clerks and carriers from $1,800 to $2,100 a year with corresponding increases for others.
June 4, 1926	69th (President Calvin Coolidge)	337	Amended the Classification Act of 1925 to adjust the compensation of fourth-class postmasters
July 1, 1926	do	522	Amended the Retirement Act of 1920, providing increased benefits and an increase in the retirement deductions made from employees' salaries from 2½ to 3½ percent.
July 1, 1928	70th (President Calvin Coolidge)	495	Granted 15-percent allowance of earned compensation for rent, fuel, light, and equipment to postmasters at offices of the fourth class
Do	do	496	Authorized payment of 10-percent night differential to postal employees, except postmasters, who worked between the hours of 6 p m., and 6 a m.
June 11, 1930	71st (President Herbert Hoover)	336	Amended Classification Act of 1925 to provide increased salaries to postmasters at first-class offices with receipts of $1,500,000 and upward
July 1, 1930	do	279	Increased retirement benefits.
July 1, 1931	72d (President Herbert Hoover)	672	Provided a shorter workweek for postal employees reducing hours of service from 48 to 44 hours a week.
July 1, 1932	do	212	Provided for a furlough of Government employees with 8⅓ reduction in compensation to a majority of all employees, suspended all automatic promotions, provided for compulsory retirement for age; reduced travel allowances and the amount of night work differential
Apr 1, 1933	73d (President F. D Roosevelt)	2	The reduction in compensation of postal employees was increased from 8⅓ to 15 percent.
Feb. 1, 1934	do	141	Eliminated part of the reduction in compensation fixing the amount at 10 percent instead of 15 percent.
July 1, 1934	do	141	Restored additional 5 percent to compensation making the amount of the reduction 5 percent instead of 10 percent
Do	do	463	Amended Classification Act of 1925 to adjust the compensation of rural carriers and increased allowance for equipment maintenance from 4 cents to 5 cents per mile
Apr. 1, 1935	do	Pub. Res. 3	Eliminated all compensation deductions provided for in all previous economy measures.
Aug. 7, 1935	74th (President F. D. Roosevelt)	249	Authorized and directed the Postmaster General to adjust the compensation of post office inspectors to correspond as far as may be practicable to the rates established by the Classification Act of 1923
Oct. 1, 1935	do	275	Reduced the work week from 44 to 40 hours and provided limitations on the number of substitutes that may be employed.
May 26, 1936	do	619	Provided for the adjustment of compensation to officials of the railway mail service to correspond, as far as practicable to the rates established by the Classification Act of 1923.
June 25, 1938	75th (President F. D. Roosevelt)	720	Provided for extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes
July 1, 1938	do	749	Amended the Classification Act of 1925 to adjust the salaries of rural carriers on heavily patronized routes.
July 18, 1939	76th (President F. D. Roosevelt)	194	Granted classified substitute employees in the Postal Service the benefits of annual and sick leave in proportion to the time actually employed on the same basis as regular employees.
Jan. 24, 1942	77th (President F D. Roosevelt)	411	Amended the Civil Service Retirement Act which provided in part for optional retirement, increased annuities, and increased the retirement deductions from 3½ percent to 5 percent.
Mar 27, 1942	do	509	Authorized the payment of overtime in lieu of compensatory time for Saturday service to certain postal employees for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter.
May 1, 1943	78th (President F. D. Roosevelt)	25	Provided that employees subject to the Classification Act of 1925 would receive additional compensation at the rate of $300 per annum. Substitutes, fourth class postmasters, and certain other employees paid on an hourly fee for part-time basis received an increase of 15 percent of their base pay. This act provided for its termination on June 30, 1945.
Oct. 18, 1943	do	161	Extended the provisions of the Classification Act of 1925 to include custodial employees in the Postal Service
Dec. 17, 1943	do	205	Provided an increase of 1 cent a mile from 5 to 6 cents for equipment maintenance to rural carriers until June 30, 1945.
Mar. 20, 1944	do	259	Changed the name of laborer in the postal service to that of mail handler.
June 12, 1944	do	334	Extended the authority for payment for overtime for Saturday service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, post office inspectors, employees of the Air Mail Service and certain other employees.
July 1, 1944	do	271	Placed fourth-class postmasters on an annual salary basis based on gross postal receipts for the preceding calendar year. The compensation of these postmasters had formerly been based on the total of the cancellations of postage on mail matter originating at their offices.
Do	do	406	Extended to custodial employees in the field postal service benefits applicable to other postal employees, such as annual automatic promotions, payment of overtime for work in excess of 8 hours compensatory time for Sunday and holiday service and night differential pay.
Dec. 21, 1944	do	525	Provided for lump-sum payments to employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from the Government service. "Separation" included resignation, retirement, death, and transfer to another position under a different leave system.
July 1, 1945	79th (President Harry S. Truman)	134	Reclassified and increased the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service. Increased the rate of night differential and overtime and established uniform procedures for computing compensation This act established 11 automatic grades for clerks and carriers in first and second class post offices with a minimum of $1,700 and a maximum of $2,700 per annum It also provided 3 longevity grades, $2,800, $2,900, and $3,000 per annum to which employees were to be promoted after 3 years, 5 years, and 7 years of service respectively in each of the grades above the $2,700 automatic grades.
Jan. 1, 1946	do	386	Provided for additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service at the rate of $400 per annum; that employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis receive additional compensation at the rate of 20 cents per hour and that the basic compensation of fourth-class postmasters be increased 20 percent.

Chronological history of laws affecting salaries and benefits provided for postmasters, supervisors, and principal groups of employees in the field postal service since 1907—Continued

Effective date	Congress	Public Law	
Feb 1, 1947	80th (President Harry S. Truman)	44	Placed rural carriers on a 5-day week for leave purposes.
Apr. 15, 1947	do	35	Provided for the automatic promotion of substitutes after each year of satisfactory service without regard to number of hours actually worked.
July 30, 1947	do	265	Amended Public Law 134 of 1945 to provide compensatory time and in some instances overtime for service performed by supervisors on Saturdays, Sundays, and Christmas Day during the month of December.
Apr. 1, 1948	do	426	Amended the Civil Service Retirement Act to allow retirement at 60 years after 30 years' service; increased the employees' contribution from 5 to 6 percent of basic salary or pay.
Do	do	467	Provided increase from 6 cents to 7 cents per mile to be paid rural carriers for the maintenance of equipment.
May 18, 1948	do	530	Provided promotions and preferential assignments for rural carriers be based on seniority and ability.
June 19, 1948	do	687	Increased travel allowance of railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks from $4 per day to $6 per day
July 1, 1948	do	900	Provided increases of $450 per annum for all postmasters and employees in the field postal service; additional compensation of 25 cents per hour for hourly or part-time employees and additional compensation of 25 percent for fourth class postmasters. This act also provided for an increase from 7 to 8 cents per mile for vehicle maintenance of rural carriers
Nov. 1, 1949	81st (President Harry S. Truman)	428	Provided increased compensation for postmasters and employees in the field postal service at the rate of $120 per annum, an increase of 2½ cents per hour for employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis and 5 percent increased compensation for fourth-class postmasters. This act also liberalized and speeded up promotion to the longevity grades and extended the benefits of the 3 additional longevity grades to all officials and employees in the field postal service.

NOTE.—All amendments to the Reclassification Act, Public Law 134 of 1945, provided increases in the hourly rate of pay for substitutes commensurate with the increases provided for regular employees.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there are no more worthy Federal employees than those in the postal service. The postal system of the United States is the communications system of American business and of the American economy. Without it we could not function as a nation. The postal employee is one worthy of his hire. The strange paradox of the Fair Deal administration is that it has slighted the legitimate functions of government such as our postal system and has mushroomed the questionable areas of government activity.

Mr REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD..

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, the post-office and civil-service conference committee has reported out one bill for classified employees and another for postal employees.

I think this is regrettable. Certainly the House conference committee has failed to adhere to the views explicitly expressed by the House of Representatives. The House passed two bills covering classified and postal employees. Under the provisions of these bills their salaries would be increased $400 a year.

It is only fair to treat all Federal employees alike as far as salaries are concerned. Salaries for all should be comparable. There should be no double standard for pay purposes.

I favor the bills passed by the House. I reiterate that it is most regrettable the conference committee did not comply with the views of the House.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the present inequities of compensation schedules as effecting our postal employees. This injustice should not be permitted to continue. We owe to these faithful Government employees not only fine words of appreciation for the splendid service they have rendered through the years, but monetary recognition that will enable them to meet the present high cost of living.

The increases they were given in the past do not begin to enable them to meet the inflationary conditions that now exist. Although insufficient compensation and other unsatisfactory working conditions have been sorely felt, yet they have continued working with no diminution of their endeavor to give satisfactory service to the public. The time has come when we are in duty bound to give the relief they are entitled to have. Recent increases in postal rates should enable this action to be taken without creating any deficit in the Post Office Department.

I shall support the conference report that increases their compensation and trust the other Members of the House will do likewise

Mr. REES of Kansas The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON] inquired with respect to the additional cost of this bill. I have been informed just now by the Post Office Department that the figure is approximately $255,000,000.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, since the conference report represents substantially the legislation already approved by the House, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 339, nays 7, not voting 82, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

YEAS—339

Abbitt	Anfuso	Bates, Mass.
Abernethy	Arends	Battle
Adair	Aspinall	Beall
Addonizio	Auchincloss	Beamer
Albert	Ayres	Beckworth
Allen, Ill.	Bailey	Belcher
Andersen, H Carl	Baker	Bender
	Bakewell	Bennett, Fla.
Andresen, August H.	Barden	Bennett, Mich.
	Barrett	Bentsen
Berry	Elliott	Jenkins
Betts	Ellsworth	Jensen
Bishop	Elston	Jonas
Blatnik	Evins	Jones, Ala.
Boggs, Del.	Fallon	Jones, Mo.
Bolling	Feighan	Jones, Hamilton C.
Bolton	Fenton	
Bonner	Fernandez	Jones, Woodrow W.
Bow	Fisher	
Boykin	Flood	Karsten, Mo.
Bray	Fogarty	Kean
Brehm	Forand	Kearns
Brown, Ga.	Ford	Keating
Brownson	Forrester	Kee
Bryson	Frazier	Kelly, N. Y.
Buchanan	Fugate	Kerr
Buckley	Fulton	Kersten, Wis.
Budge	Furcolo	Kilday
Buffett	Gamble	King
Burdick	Garmatz	Kirwan
Burleson	Gary	Klein
Burnside	Gavin	Kluczynski
Burton	George	Lane
Bush	Goodwin	Lanham
Butler	Gordon	Lantaff
Byrne, N. Y.	Gore	Larcade
Byrnes, Wis.	Graham	LeCompte
Camp	Granahan	Lesinski
Canfield	Grant	Lind
Cannon	Green	Lovre
Carlyle	Greenwood	McCarthy
Carnahan	Gregory	McConnell
Case	Gross	McCormack
Celler	Gwinn	McCulloch
Chatham	Hale	McGregor
Chelf	Hall, Leonard W.	McGuire
Chenoweth	Halleck	McKinnon
Chiperfield	Hand	McMillan
Chudoff	Harden	McMullen
Church	Hardy	McVey
Clemente	Harris	Machrowicz
Clevenger	Harrison, Va.	Mack, Wash.
Cole, Kans.	Harrison, Wyo.	Madden
Colmer	Hart	Magee
Cooley	Harvey	Mahon
Cooper	Havenner	Mansfield
Corbett	Hays, Ohio	Marshall
Cotton	Hébert	Martin, Mass.
Coudert	Hedrick	Mason
Cox	Heffernan	Meader
Crosser	Heller	Merrow
Crumpacker	Herter	Miller, Md.
Cunningham	Heselton	Miller, Nebr.
Curtis, Mo.	Hill	Miller, N. Y.
Curtis, Nebr.	Hillings	Mills
Davis, Ga.	Hinshaw	Mitchell
Davis, Tenn.	Hoeven	Morano
Deane	Hoffman, Ill.	Morgan
DeGraffenried	Holifield	Morris
Denny	Holmes	Morton
Denton	Hope	Multer
Devereux	Horan	Mumma
Dingell	Howell	Murdock
Dollinger	Hull	Murray, Tenn
Dolliver	Hunter	Nelson
Donohue	Ikard	Nicholson
Donovan	Jackson, Wash.	Norblad
Doughton	James	Norrell
Doyle	Jarman	O'Brien, Ill.
Durham	Javits	O'Brien, Mich.
Eaton	Jenison	O'Hara
Eberharter		O'Konski

O'Neill	Sadlak	Thompson, Mich.
Ostertag	St. George	Thompson, Tex.
O'Toole	Sasscer	Tollefson
Patman	Saylor	Trimble
Patten	Schwabe	Vail
Patterson	Scott, Hardie	Van Pelt
Philbin	Scott Hugh D., Jr.	Van Zandt
Pickett	Scrivner	Velde
Poage	Scudder	Vorys
Polk	Secrest	Vursell
Potter	Seely-Brown	Walter
Preston	Shafer	Welchel
Price	Sheehan	Welch
Priest	Sheppard	Wharton
Rabaut	Simpson, Ill.	Wheeler
Radwan	Simpson, Pa.	Whitaker
Rains	Sittler	Wickersham
Ramsay	Smith, Va.	Widnall
Rankin	Smith, Wis.	Wier
Reece, Tenn.	Spence	Wigglesworth
Reed, Ill.	Springer	Williams Miss.
Reed, N. Y.	Staggers	Williams, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.	Stanley	Willis
Rhodes	Steed	Wilson, Ind.
Riehlman	Stigler	Winstead
Riley	Stockman	Withrow
Rivers	Sutton	Wolcott
Roberts	Tackett	Wolverton
Robeson	Talle	Wood, Idaho
Rodino	Taylor	Woodruff
Rogers, Colo.	Teague	Yates
Rogers, Mass.	Thomas	Yorty
Rogers, Tex.		
Rooney		

NAYS—7

Andrews	Smith, Kans.	Whitten
Gathings	Smith, Miss.	
Hoffman, Mich	Taber	

NOT VOTING—82

Aandahl	Golden	Murray, Wis.
Allen, Calif.	Granger	Passman
Allen, La.	Hagen	Perkins
Anderson, Calif	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Phillips
Angell	Hays, Ark.	Poulson
Armstrong	Herlong	Powell
Baring	Hess	Prouty
Bates, Ky.	Irving	Quinn
Blackney	Jackson, Calif.	Reams
Boggs, La.	Johnson	Redden
Bosone	Judd	Regan
Bramblett	Kearney	Ribicoff
Brooks	Kelley, Pa.	Richards
Brown, Ohio	Kennedy	Rogers, Fla.
Busbey	Keogh	Roosevelt
Cole, N. Y.	Kilburn	Sabath
Combs	Latham	Shelley
Crawford	Lucas	Short
Dague	Lyle	Sieminski
Davis, Wis.	McDonough	Sikes
Dawson	McGrath	Thornberry
Delaney	Mack, Ill.	Vinson
Dempsey	Martin, Iowa	Watts
D'Ewart	Miller, Calif.	Werdel
Dondero	Morrison	Wilson, Tex.
Dorn	Moulder	Wood, Ga.
Engle	Murphy	Zablocki
Fine		

So the conference report was agreed to

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Short.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Engle with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Fine with Mr Hagen.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Quinn with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Armstrong.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Johnson.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Angell.
Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Murphy with Mr Cole of New York.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr Busbey.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Perkins with Mr. D'Ewart.
Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Bramblett.
Mr. Sieminski with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Poulson.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Redden with Mr. Golden.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Reams.

Mr. WHEELER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' PAY INCREASE

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1212)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That (a) section 603 (b) and section 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"'Grade	Per annum rates						
GS-1	$2,500	$2,580	$2,660	$2,740	$2,820	$2,900	$2,980
GS-2	2,750	2,830	2,910	2,990	3,070	3,150	3,230
GS-3	2,950	3,030	3,110	3,190	3,270	3,350	3,430
GS-4	3,175	3,255	3,335	3,415	3,495	3,575	3,655
GS-5	3,410	3,585	3,660	3,785	3,910	4,035	4,160
GS-6	3,795	3,920	4,045	4,170	4,295	4,420	4,545
GS-7	4,205	4,330	4,455	4,580	4,705	4,830	4,955
GS-8	4,620	4,745	4,870	4,995	5,120	5,245	5,370
GS-9	5,060	5,185	5,310	5,435	5,560	5,685	5,810
GS-10	5,500	5,625	5,750	5,875	6,000	6,125	6,250
GS-11	5,940	6,140	6,340	6,540	6,740	6,940	
GS-12	7,040	7,240	7,440	7,640	7,840	8,040	
GS-13	8,360	8,560	8,760	8,960	9,160	9,360	
GS-14	9,600	9,800	10,000	10,200	10,400	10,600	
GS-15	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800		
GS-16	12,000	12,200	12,400	12,600	12,800		
GS-17	13,000	13,200	13,400	13,600	13,800		
GS-18	14,800						

"'(c) (1) The compensation schedule for the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule shall be as follows

"'Grade	Per annum rates						
CPC-1	$1,810	$1,870	$1,930	$1,990	$2,050	$2,110	$2,170
CPC-2	2,420	2,490	2,560	2,630	2,700	2,770	2,840
CPC-3	2,552	2,632	2,712	2,792	2,872	2,952	3,032
CPC-4	2,750	2,830	2,910	2,990	3,070	3,150	3,230
CPC-5	2,974	3,054	3,134	3,214	3,294	3,374	3,454
CPC-6	3,200	3,280	3,360	3,440	3,520	3,600	3,680
CPC-7	3,435	3,535	3,635	3,735	3,835	3,935	4,035
CPC-8	3,740	3,865	3,990	4,115	4,240	4,365	4,490
CPC-9	4,150	4,275	4,400	4,525	4,650	4,775	4,900
CPC-10	4,565	4,690	4,815	4,940	5,065	5,190	5,315

"'(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of $2,700 per annum, and head charwomen working part time at the rate of $2,840 per annum.'

"(b) In adjusting initially the rates of pay of employees affected by the provisions of this section—

"(1) an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this Act at one of the scheduled or longevity rates provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this Act at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate as increased by this Act; and

"(2) an employee receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this Act at a rate other than a scheduled or longevity rate provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this Act as follows:

"(A) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this Act was less than the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at the scheduled or longevity rate which he would receive under paragraph (1) had he been receiving basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date at the scheduled or longevity rate next higher than his rate of basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date.

"(B) If his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this Act was in excess of the maximum longevity rate of the grade, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this Act in such maximum longevity rate.

"(C) If he is a part-time char employee and his rate immediately prior to the effective date of this Act was in excess of the rate provided for his position under section 603 (c) (2) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this Act in the rate for like positions under such section.

"(c) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed pursuant to section 62 (2) of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. 102 (a) (2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the second and third

sentences of section 603, section 604 (5), or sections 673 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code, or who are appointed pursuant to section 792 (b) of title 28 of the United States Code, are hereby increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by subsections (a) and (b) in corresponding rates of compensation paid to officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949.

"(d) The limitations of $9,600 and $13,050 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, contained in the sixteenth paragraph under the head 'Miscellaneous salaries' in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress), or in any subsequent appropriation Act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this Act.

"(e) Section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting '(a)' after 'Sec. 701' and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) Any increase in compensation granted by law after June 30, 1951, shall not be construed to be an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of subsection (a).'

"SEC. 2. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government (other than an employee in the office of a Senator) whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 10 per centum of the aggregate rate of his basic compensation and the rate of the additional compensation received by him under sections 501 and 502 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 301 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the provisions under the heading 'Increased pay for legislative employees' in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, except that (1) no such officer or employee shall be paid additional compensation at a rate less than $300 per annum or in excess of $800 per annum, and (2) employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 20 cents per hour.

"(b) The provisions of section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 7 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, as amended, section 303 (c) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and the provisions of paragraph (b) under the heading 'Increased pay for legislative employees' in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, shall not apply to officers or employees subject to the provisions of subsection (a) or to employees in the offices of Senators, but no such officer or employee, or any other officer or employee of the Senate or House of Representatives, shall be paid with respect to any pay period basic compensation or basic compensation plus additional compensation at a rate in excess of $11,646 per annum unless expressly authorized by law.

"(c) (1) The aggregate amount of the basic compensation authorized to be paid for administrative and clerical assistance and messenger service in the offices of Senators is hereby increased by—

"(A) $4,140 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is less than three million,

"(B) $4,860 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is three million or more but less than five million;

"(C) $5,220 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is five million or more but less than ten million; and

"(D) $5,760 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is ten million or more.

"(2) The second proviso in the paragraph relating to the authority of Senators to rearrange the basic salaries of employees in their respective offices, which appears in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, as amended (2 U. S. C. 60f), is amended by striking out '$5,280' and inserting in lieu thereof '$5,880'; and by striking out '$6,720' and inserting in lieu thereof '$7,320'.

"(3) Notwithstanding the third proviso in such paragraph any increase in the compensation of an employee in a Senator's office shall take effect on the effective date of this Act or on the date such employee became employed, whichever is later, if (A) the certification filed by such Senator under such proviso so provides, (B) such certification is filed in the disbursing office of the Senate not later than November 30, 1951, and (C) the amount of such increase does not exceed the amount of the increase which would be payable in the case of such employee if he were subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

"(d) The provisions of subsection (a), and the provisions of law referred to in such subsection, shall not apply to employees whose compensation is paid from the appropriation contained in the paragraph designated 'Folding documents' under the heading 'Contingent expenses of the Senate' in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act.

"(e) The rates of basic compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the presiding officers of the two Houses), the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, the legislative counsel of the Senate, the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, and the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives are hereby increased by 10 per centum, except that in no case shall any such rate be increased by less than $300 per annum or by more than $800 per annum.

"SEC. 3. Section 66 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 269) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 66. No director, officer, or employee of the Central Bank for Cooperatives, or of any production credit corporation, production credit association, or bank for cooperatives shall be paid compensation at a rate in excess of $13,800 per annum.'

"SEC. 4. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration whose rates of basic compensation are provided by Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved January 3, 1946, as amended, are hereby increased by 10 per centum, except that in no case shall any such rate be increased by less than $300 per annum or by more than $800 per annum.

"(b) Section 8 (d) of Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out '$12,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$12,800'.

"SEC 5 (a) The rates of basic compensation provided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, are hereby increased by 10 per centum, except that in no case shall any such rate be increased by less than $300 per annum, or by more than $800 per annum.

"(b) The Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission are authorized and directed to transmit to the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives on or before April 1, 1952, a report on pay and personnel practices being followed in overseas areas by all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including the Foreign Service of the State Department.

"SEC. 6. (a) This Act shall become effective as of the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951.

"(b) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid under this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid a retired officer or employee for services rendered during the period beginning with the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951, and ending with the date of his retirement."

And the House agree to the same.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
JOHN WHITAKER,
EDWARD H. REES,
KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
Members on the Part of the House.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
MIKE MONRONEY,
JOHN M. BUTLER,
Members on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 622) to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

Except for the differences noted in the following statement, the conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

Subsection (a) of the first section of the House amendment amends the compensation schedules in section 603 (b) and section 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (including the annual full-time rates for part-time charwomen), by increasing each per annum rate in such schedules by $400. Subsection (a) of the first section of the conference substitute amends such schedules by increasing the minimum rate of each grade by 10 percent and the resulting increase is applied uniformly to every other rate in the grade. However, no rate is increased less than $300 or more than $800. The annual full-time rate for part-time charwomen is increased by $300.

Subsection (c) of the first section of the conference substitute provides that the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the judicial branch of the Government shall be increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by the conference substitute at corresponding rates of compensation paid to officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. This subsection was not contained in the House amendment, since the compensation of most of the officers and employees covered by the subsection may be fixed by administrative action. The subsection does not specifically cover United States court reporters, but the committee of conference feels strongly that the Judicial Conference should adjust the salaries of these court reporters to conform to the increases provided by the conference substitute. This subsection was contained in the Senate bill.

Section 2 (a) of the House amendment provides that each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional

compensation of $400 per annum or 10 percent, whichever is higher, with the limitation that no increase for any individual shall exceed $800 per annum. Additional compensation for hourly or part-time employees is fixed at the rate of 20 cents per hour. Section 2 (a) of the conference substitute provides that such legislative officers and employees (except employees in the office of Senators) shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 10 percent of their gross compensation, except that no such officer or employee shall receive an increase in rate of compensation of less than $300 per annum or more than $800 per annum. Additional compensation for hourly or part-time employees remains at the rate fixed by the House amendment, namely 20 cents per hour

Section 2 (b) of the House amendment places a ceiling of $11,246 per annum on the aggregate rate of compensation payable to officers and employees in or under the legislative branch who are subject to section 2 (a). Section 2 (b) of the conference substitute provides for a ceiling of $11,646 per annum on the aggregate rate of compensation of (1) such officers and employees, (2) employees in the offices of Senators, and (3) any other officers or employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, unless a higher rate of compensation is expressly authorized by law

Section 2 (c) of the conference substitute is included in order that Senators may, if they wish, grant to employees in their own offices (who are excluded from the provisions of section 2 (a)) increases corresponding to those provided for other legislative employees under section 2 (a). Paragraph (1) of section 2 (c) increases the clerk hire allotments of Senators by an amount sufficient to pay such increases; paragraph (2) of such section raises the existing ceilings on base pay of employees in Senators offices by an amount sufficient to permit the making of such increases, and paragraph (3) of such section authorizes Senators to make such increases retroactive to July 1

Section 2 (d) of the conference agreement provides that the increases in the rates of compensation granted by section 2 (a) shall not apply to certain piece-work employees of the Senate engaged in the folding of documents This provision is included because these employees received an increase in compensation under the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1952, indentical in amount to the increase proposed to be granted such employees under the Senate bill.

Section 2 (e) of the House amendment increases by $400 per annum the rates of basic compensation of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the presiding officers of the two Houses), the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, the legislative counsel of the Senate, the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, and the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives Section 2 (e) of the conference substitute adds to such list of officers the Parliamentarian of the Senate, and provides that the rates of basic compensation of all such officers shall be increased by 10 percent, except that in no case shall any such rate be increased by less than $300 per annum or by more than $800 per annum. It is the intent of the conferees, in adding the Parliamentarian of the Senate to the list of officers specified in section 2 (e), that the increase under such section shall be added to any increase provided for the Senate Parliamentarian in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952

Section 3 of the conference substitute amends section 66 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 by increasing the maximum rate of compensation which may be paid to a director, officer, or employee of the Central Bank for Cooperatives, or of any production credit corporation, production credit association, or bank for cooperatives from $13,000 per annum to $13,800 per annum. There is no corresponding provision in the House amendment.

Section 3 of the House amendment increases by $400 the rates of annual basic compensation of (1) physicians, dentists, nurses, and other employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration whose rates of compensation are provided by Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved January 3, 1946, as amended, and (2) officers and employees whose rates of basic compensation are provided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended

Section 4 (a) of the conference substitute provides that the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration described in the preceding paragraph shall be increased by 10 percent, except that in no case shall any such rate be increased by less than $300 per annum or by more than $800 per annum.

Section 4 (b) of the conference substitute amends section 8 (d) of such Public Law 293 by increasing the maximum amount of pay, plus allowance, which any person rated as a medical or surgical specialist under section 8 of such Public Law 293 may receive, from $12,000 to $12,800

Section 5 (a) of the conference substitute provides that rates of basic compensation prescribed by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, shall be increased by 10 percent, except that in no case shall any such rate be increased by less than $300 per annum or by more than $800 per annum

Section 5 (b) of the conference substitute authorizes and directs the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission to transmit to the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives on or before April 1, 1952, a report with respect to pay and personnel practices followed in overseas areas by all departments and agencies of the Government, including the Foreign Service of the Department of State

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
JOHN WHITAKER,
EDWARD H REES,
KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Mr MURRAY of Tennessee (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this is a conference report involving increases in salaries for the classified employees of the Government and employees of the legislative and judicial branches. There are about 1,100,000 employees covered by this legislation.

The House passed a bill which gave a $400 flat increase to all these employees from top to bottom. The Senate passed a bill which gave a percentage increase of 10 percent to all employees, with a maximum increase of $800 and with no minimum increase or floor. So the major point in disagreement between the conferees of the House and Senate was whether or not the House version, a $400 flat increase to all employees, be agreed to or the 10-percent increase with a maximum of $800 as provided in the Senate bill be agreed to.

After much deliberation and discussion the conferees reached a compromise agreement to the effect that a minimum increase of $300 would be given to every employee; that any employee who made less than $3,000 a year would get a $300 increase, that employees making from $3,000 to $8,000 would get a 10-percent increase on the amount of their present salaries and that the increase on all salaries above $8,000 would be $800. So you have by this compromise proposal a minimum of $300, a maximum of $800, and a 10-percent increase to apply on all salaries between $3,000 and $8,000. This is a unanimous conference report.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will cost $418,000,000. I may say that the two conference reports for all Federal employees, the one for the postal employees and the one for classified employees, will cost the Government approximately $700,000,000 Of course, this is a staggering amount. As I have stated on this floor previously, I am disturbed at the gigantic cost of our Federal payroll, which today is about $10,000,000,000. With these two bills totaling $700,000,000. you will either have to provide for additional revenue by new taxes or else go on with more deficit financing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas Mr. Speaker, this again is an extremely important piece of legislation. It affects 1,100,000 employees of the Federal Government and increases the cost of Government, as our chairman has just told you, approximately $418,000,000.

I think I should state briefly that the bill that passed the House provided for an increase of $400 across the board for all of those employed in the Federal classified service. The other body provided for a 10-percent increase with a ceiling of $800. The conference report, in substance, says that there shall be a 10-percent increase, except that there should be a floor of $300. However, none shall receive less than $300 annually or more than $800 per annum.

I believe it is fair to state by way of further explanation and review that all of the bills submitted to the House committee dealing with additional compensation for classified employees provided for an increase in salaries of not less than 17 percent. The Civil Service Commission recommended an increase of between 7 and 8 percent.

The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, as in the case of the postal pay bills, provided for a flat increase of $400 annually across the board to all classified employees, and for 20-percent increase to those employed on an hourly basis. In other words, all Federal employees would be treated substantially alike with respect to increases in compensation.

Here is a brief summary and explanation of the legislation now under consideration:

A 10-percent increase in compensation, with a $300 per annum minimum and an $800 maximum, is granted the following Federal employees:

First, employees under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

Second, officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government:

Third, officers and employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government—including the elected officers of Senate and House of Representatives, except the presiding officers of the two Houses;

Fourth, officers and employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration whose compensation is fixed under Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress; and

Fifth, officers and employees whose compensation is provided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946

The salary increases provided under the conference agreement will affect approximately 1,100,000 Federal employees and is retroactive to the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951.

The total cost of this legislation is $418,346,430.

All salary increases provided are automatic, except in the case of employees in the offices of Senators. Senators may allocate the increased funds available in any manner they desire.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri who has shown much interest in this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Is this a 10-percent increase on the base salary or a 10-percent increase in the total compensation which they are now receiving?

Mr REES of Kansas. It is a 10-percent increase on the amount they are presently receiving.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That includes any extras that have been given along the way.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell us how much the 10-percent increase above $3,000 will amount to; that is, the bill that was passed by the House.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would say in substance to the gentleman that the bill we have before us, as compared with the bill which passed the House is less expensive. I think to the extent of about $30,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. Less than the across-the-board $400 increase?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does this increase apply to the hundreds of thousands of temporary employees that have been put on the payroll?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It does.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I want to get it clear in my own mind as to where the limitations are on the $300 and the 10 percent. Now it is my understanding that as to those who might be in our employ, for instance, as secretaries, the $300 applies to those who are getting $3,000 or under.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. And those that are getting 10 percent or a maximum of $800 are in the $3,000 class and above.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does that affect the base pay or the over-all?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That total amount that the employee receives. If the employee receives $4,000, he will receive $400 more than he presently receives annually.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am wondering did your committee consider how much of this increase is going to come back to the Government in taxes?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It gave some consideration to it, but I cannot, of course, give you any estimate of how much that will amount to. Of course, some of it will be returned in taxes, especially from those who are in the higher brackets.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Does this legislation deal with the subject of annual leave?

Mr. REES of Kansas. This legislation does not provide for annual leave. That is treated in another bill.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is that coming up?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. I should add that the provision included in the Senate bill that created considerable discussion with respect to foreign service employees, by putting them under Civil Service as such, was stricken from the Senate bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that there are certain employees in the Veterans' Bureau and elsewhere that are not covered by this bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No, I did not say that. They are included.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It covers all of them?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include a statement and table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

GENERAL PAY STATUTES INCREASING OR REDUCING BASE PAY RATES OF SALARIED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES OUTSIDE THE POSTAL SERVICE, 1908 TO JUNE 30, 1951

During the period from 1908 to July 1, 1924, when the Classification Act of 1923 became effective, there was no comparable Federal pay statute of general application. Consequently, there was no legislation providing for revision of existing salary schedules during this period comparable to subsequent revisions in Classification Act salary schedules The only pay legislation during these years that was at all comparable to such revisions provided additional compensation, commonly referred to as "bonuses"

General pay legislation since 1908 providing salary increases or decreases for salaried employees outside the postal service (including statutes providing such so-called bonuses) and the administration in power at the time are shown by the following tabulation:

Statute and effective date of pertinent provisions	Increase or reduction provided	President on date of enactment
Act of Mar 3, 1917, amended June 12, 1917, effective during fiscal year 1918	10-percent increase for employees at salaries below $1,200, and 5-percent increase for employees at salaries not less than $1,200 and not more than $1,800	President Woodrow Wilson
Act of July 3, 1918, effective during fiscal year 1919	In place of percentages added during fiscal year 1918, $120 increase for employees at salaries of $2,500 or less, and all salaries between $2,500 and $2,620 increased to $2,620	Do.
Acts of Mar 1, 1919, May 29, 1920, Mar 3, 1921, June 29, 1922, and Mar 4, 1923. Effective during fiscal years 1920–24, inclusive	In place of amounts granted during fiscal year 1919, $240 increase for employees at salaries of $2,500 or less, and all salaries between $2,500 and $2,740 increased to $2,740.	Do.
Classification Act of Mar. 4, 1923, effective July 1, 1924	Increase in salaries was an incidental result of this act. Average increase per employee, $67 or 4 percent, in the departmental service, field service data not available.	President Warren G. Harding.
Welch Act of May 28, 1928, effective July 1, 1928	Increased Classification Act salary rates. Average increase per employee, $151 or 8 2 percent.	Do.
Brookhart Act of July 3, 1930, effective that date	Increased Classification Act maximum rates of some grades. Data on average increase not available	President Calvin Coolidge
Act of June 30, 1932, effective during fiscal year 1933	Employees with salaries in excess of $1,000 a year furloughed without pay for 1 calendar month. Resulted in reduction of 8⅓ percent in annual pay	President Herbert C. Hoover.
Act of Mar 20, 1933, effective Apr. 1, 1933	Salaries reduced by the percentage of decrease in the cost of living as compared with the 6 months ending June 30, 1928, but not to exceed 15 percent. Resulted in reduction of 15 percent in annual salary rates.	Do.
Act of Mar. 28, 1934, effective Feb. 1, 1934	Limit on cost-of-living reduction changed from 15 to 10 percent during the portion of fiscal year 1934 beginning Feb. 1, 1934, and to 5 percent during fiscal year 1935. In place of prior 15-percent reduction, resulted in reduction of 10 percent in annual salary rates from Feb 1, 1934, to July 1, 1934, and 5-percent reduction thereafter.	President Franklin D. Roosevelt.
Joint resolution of Feb 13, 1935, effective Apr 1, 1935	Eliminated cost-of-living reduction entirely	Do.

Statute and effective date of pertinent provisions	Increase or reduction provided	President on date of enactment
Custodial Pay Act of Aug. 1, 1942, effective that date	Increased Classification Act rates for first 8 grades of crafts, protective, and custodial schedule and first 2 grades of subprofessional schedule. Among entire Classification Act group, average increase per employee, 1.1 percent.	President Franklin D. Roosevelt.
Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945, effective July 1, 1945	Increased Classification Act and certain other statutory salary rates by 20 percent on the first $1,200, 10 percent on next $3,400, and 5 percent on remainder. Minimum rate of lowest grade increased 20 percent. Maximum rate of highest grade increased 8 9 percent. Average increase per employee, 15 9 percent.	President Harry S. Truman.
Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946, effective July 1, 1946	Increased Classification Act and certain other statutory salary rates by 14 percent or $250 a year, whichever was greater, but not more than 25 percent. Minimum rate of lowest grade increased 25 percent Maximum rate of highest grade increased 2 percent. Average increase per employee, 14 2 percent.	Do.
Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees' Salary Act of 1948, effective first pay period beginning after June 30, 1948.	Increased Classification Act and certain other statutory salary rates by $330 a year Minimum rate of lowest grade increased 30.6 percent Maximum rate of highest grade increased 3.3 percent. Average increase per employee, 11 percent.	Do.
Classification Act of 1949, effective first pay period beginning after Oct. 28, 1949.	Increase in Classification Act salary rates was an incidental result of this act. Minimum rate of lowest grade increased 7 1 percent Maximum rate of grade 15 increased 6 5 percent [1] Average increase per employee, 4 1 percent.	Do.

[1] Grade GS-15 of the schedules of the Classification Act of 1949 is equivalent to the highest grade in which agencies or the Commission could classify positions prior to this act. The 1949 act established, in addition, grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, but limited the number of positions which might be placed in these new grades

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report now before the House provides an increase of compensation to Federal employees of not less than $300 for those having salaries of $3,000 or less, and 10 percent to those above that amount with a maximum not to exceed $800.

For a long time it has been realized that some action should be taken by Congress to increase the pay of Federal employees so as to bring them in line with the ever-increasing cost of living due to the inflationary conditions that now exist. Furthermore, we must realize that if the administration succeeds in its present plan to increase income taxes it will mean a serious condition to be faced by Federal employees on the basis of present salaries.

It is right and just that Congress should give recognition to the need that exists in this matter. The delay in meeting this obligation is no longer justified. I will give my support to the conference report that provides this necessary increase.

I trust the conference report will have the approval of the House.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 318, nays 26, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]

YEAS—318

Abbitt	Aspinall	Beckworth
Abernethy	Auchincloss	Belcher
Adair	Ayres	Bender
Addonizio	Bailey	Bennett, Fla.
Albert	Baker	Bennett, Mich.
Allen, Ill.	Bakewell	Bentsen
Andersen, H Carl	Barden	Berry
	Barrett	Betts
Andresen, August H.	Bates, Mass.	Bishop
	Battle	Blatnik
Anfuso	Beall	Boggs, Del.
Arends	Beamer	Bolling
Bolton	Fulton	Lesinski
Bonner	Furcolo	Lind
Bow	Gamble	Lovre
Boykin	Garmatz	McCarthy
Bray	Gary	McConnell
Brehm	Gavin	McCormack
Brown, Ga	Goodwin	McCulloch
Brownson	Gordon	McGregor
Bryson	Gore	McGuire
Buchanan	Graham	McKinnon
Buckley	Granahan	McMullen
Budge	Grant	Machrowicz
Burdick	Green	Mack, Wash
Burleson	Greenwood	Madden
Burnside	Gregory	Magee
Burton	Gwinn	Mahon
Bush	Hale	Mansfield
Butler	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Marshall
Byrne, N. Y.		Martin, Mass.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hall, Leonard W	Meader
Camp		Merrow
Canfield	Hand	Miller, Md
Cannon	Harden	Miller, N. Y.
Carlyle	Hardy	Mills
Carnahan	Harris	Mitchell
Case	Harrison, Wyo	Morano
Celler	Hart	Morgan
Chatham	Harvey	Morris
Chelf	Havenner	Morton
Chenoweth	Hays, Ohio	Moulder
Chiperfield	Hedrick	Multer
Chudoff	Heffernan	Mumma
Church	Heller	Murdock
Clemente	Herter	Murray, Tenn.
Cole, Kans.	Heselton	Nicholson
Colmer	Hill	Norblad
Cooley	Hillings	Norrell
Cooper	Hinshaw	O'Brien, Ill.
Corbett	Hoeven	O'Brien, Mich.
Cotton	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Hara
Coudert	Holifield	O'Konski
Cox	Holmes	O'Neill
Crosser	Hope	Ostertag
Crumpacker	Horan	O'Toole
Cunningham	Howell	Patman
Curtis, Mo.	Hull	Patten
Davis, Ga	Ikard	Patterson
Davis, Tenn.	Jackson, Wash.	Philbin
Deane	James	Pickett
DeGraffenried	Jarman	Poage
Denny	Javits	Polk
Denton	Jenison	Potter
Devereux	Jenkins	Preston
Dingell	Jonas	Price
Dollinger	Jones, Ala	Priest
Dolliver	Jones, Mo.	Rabaut
Donohue	Jones, Hamilton C.	Radwan
Donovan		Rains
Dorn	Jones, Woodrow W.	Ramsay
Doughton		Reams
Doyle	Judd	Reece, Tenn.
Durham	Karsten, Mo.	Reed, Ill.
Eberharter	Kean	Rees, Kans.
Elliott	Kearns	Rhodes
Ellsworth	Keating	Riehlman
Elston	Kee	Riley
Evins	Kelly, N. Y.	Rivers
Fallon	Kerr	Roberts
Feighan	Kersten, Wis.	Robeson
Fenton	Kilday	Rodino
Fernandez	King	Rogers, Colo.
Fisher	Kirwan	Rogers, Mass.
Flood	Klein	Rogers, Tex.
Fogarty	Kluczynski	Rooney
Forand	Lane	Sadlak
Ford	Lanham	St. George
Forrester	Lantaff	Sasscer
Frazier	Larcade	Saylor
Fugate	LeCompte	Schwabe
Scott, Hardie	Stigler	Welch
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Sutton	Wharton
	Tackett	Whitaker
Scrivner	Talle	Widnall
Scudder	Taylor	Wier
Secrest	Teague	Wigglesworth
Seely-Brown	Thomas	Williams, Miss.
Sheehan	Thompson, Mich.	Williams, N. Y.
Simpson, Ill.		Willis
Simpson, Pa.	Thompson, Tex.	Wilson, Ind.
Sittler	Tollefson	Winstead
Smith, Va.	Trimble	Withrow
Smith, W'a	Vail	Wolcott
Spence	Van Pelt	Wolverton
Springer	Van Zandt	Wood, Idaho
Staggers	Vorys	Yates
Stanley	Walter	Yorty
Steed	Welchel	

NAYS—26

Andrews	Jensen	Smith, Kans
Buffett	Kilburn	Smith, Miss
Clevenger	McVey	Stockman
Curtis, Nebr.	Mason	Taber
Gathings	Miller, Nebr	Veldo
George	Nelson	Vursell
Gross	Rankin	Wheeler
Halleck	Reed, N. Y.	Whitten
Hoffman, Mich	Shafer	

NOT VOTING—84

Aandahl	Golden	Passman
Allen, Calif.	Granger	Perkins
Allen, La.	Hagen	Phillips
Anderson, Calif	Harrison, Va	Poulson
Angell	Hays, Ark.	Powell
Armstrong	Hébert	Prouty
Baring	Herlong	Quinn
Bates, Ky	Hess	Redden
Blackney	Hunter	Regan
Boggs, La.	Irving	Ribicoff
Bosone	Jackson, Calif.	Richards
Bramblett	Johnson	Rogers, Fla.
Brooks	Kearney	Roosevelt
Brown, Ohio	Kelley, Pa	Sabath
Busbey	Kennedy	Shelley
Cole, N. Y.	Keogh	Sheppard
Combs	Latham	Short
Crawford	Lucas	Sieminski
Dague	Lyle	Sikes
Davis, Wis.	McDonough	Thornberry
Dawson	McGrath	Vinson
Delaney	McMillan	Watts
Dempsey	Mack, Ill.	Werdel
D'Ewart	Martin, Iowa	Wickersham
Dondero	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Tex.
Eaton	Morrison	Wood, Ga.
Engle	Murphy	Woodruff
Fine	Murray, Wis.	Zablocki

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Allen of California.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. Engle with Mr. Dondero.

Mr. Fine with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Quinn with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Short.

Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Johnson.
Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Golden.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Busbey.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Poulson.
Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Bramblett.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Hunter.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. D'Ewart.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Redden with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Reams.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Angell.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

READJUSTMENT OF POSTAL RATES

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1046) to readjust postal rates, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TRIMBLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1210)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1046) to readjust postal rates, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I

"FIRST-CLASS MAIL

"SECTION 1. (a) The rate of postage on each single postal card issued and sold under the provisions of section 3916 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 39, sec. 356), and on each portion of double postal cards issued and sold under the provisions of the Act of March 3, 1879 (U. S. C, title 39, sec. 358), shall be 2 cents: *Provided*, That on all single and double postal cards sold in quantities of fifty or more there shall be an additional charge of 10 per centum. The rate of postage on each private mailing or post card conforming to the conditions prescribed by the Act of May 19, 1898 (U. S. C., title 39, sec. 281), shall be 2 cents.

"(b) Except as provided in paragraph (a) of this section, the rate of postage on mail matter of the first class when mailed for local delivery at post offices where free delivery by carrier is not established and when the matter is not collected or delivered by rural or star route carriers, shall be 2 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof.

"SECOND-CLASS MAIL

"SEC. 2. (a) In the case of publications entered as second-class matter (including sample copies to the extent of 10 per centum of the weight of copies mailed to subscribers during the calendar year) when mailed by the publisher thereof from the post office of publication and entry or other post office where such entry is authorized, or when mailed by news agents (registered as such under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General) to actual subscribers thereto or to other news agents for the purpose of sale, the total postage computed at the pound rates in effect under existing law and based on the bulk weight of each mailing shall be increased (1) by 10 per centum, beginning on April 1, 1952, (2) by an additional 10 per centum, based on the rates now in force, beginning on April 1, 1953, and (3) by an additional 10 per centum, based on the rates now in force, beginning on April 1, 1954: *Provided*, That publications having over 75 per centum advertising in more than one-half of their issues during any twelve months' period shall not be accepted for mailing as second-class matter and their entry shall be revoked, except that for the purpose of this proviso only, a charge made solely for the publication of transportation schedules, fares, and related information shall not be construed as constituting a charge for advertising: *Provided further*, That the rate of postage on newspapers or periodicals maintained by and in the interests of religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans' or fraternal organizations or associations, not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, shall be 1½ cents per pound or fraction thereof, and the increases provided by this section shall not apply to such rate: *And provided further*, That existing rates shall continue in effect with respect to any religious, educational, or scientific publication designed specifically for use in school classrooms or in religious instruction classes. The publisher of any such newspaper, periodical, or publication before being entitled to such rate shall furnish proof of qualification to the Postmaster General at such times and under such conditions as the Postmaster General may prescribe.

"(b) The free-in-county mailing privilege and the rates of postage on copies of publications of the second class when addressed for delivery within the county in which they are published and entered as such shall be the same as authorized by existing law: *Provided further*, That copies of a publication mailed at a post office where it is entered, for delivery by letter carriers at a different post office within the delivery limits of which the headquarters or general business office of the publisher is located, shall be chargeable with postage at the rate that would be applicable if the copies were mailed at the latter office, unless postage chargeable at the pound rates from the office of mailing is higher, in which case such higher rates shall apply.

"(c) In no case, except where the free-in-county mailing privilege is applicable, shall the postage on each individually addressed copy be less than one-eighth of 1 cent.

"(d) The rate of postage on copies of publications having second-class entry mailed by others than the publishers or authorized news agents, sample copies mailed by the publishers in excess of the 10 per centum allowance entitled to be sent at the pound rates, and copies mailed by the publishers to persons who may not be included in the required legitimate list of subscribers, shall be 2 cents for the first two ounces and 1 cent for each additional two ounces or fraction thereof, except when the postage at the rates prescribed for fourth-class matter is lower, in which case the latter rates shall apply, computed on each individually addressed copy or package of unaddressed copies, and not on the bulk weight of the copies and packages.

"THIRD-CLASS MAIL

"SEC. 3 The rate of postage on third-class matter shall be 2 cents for the first two ounces or fraction thereof, and 1 cent for each additional ounce or fraction thereof up to and including eight ounces in weight, except that the rate of postage on books and catalogs, of twenty-four pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants not exceeding eight ounces in weight shall be 2 cents for the first two ounces or fraction thereof and 1½ cents for each additional two ounces or fraction thereof: *Provided*, That upon payment of a fee of $10 for each calendar year or portion thereof and under such regulations as the Postmaster General may establish for the collection of the lawful revenue and for facilitating the handling of such matter in the mails, it shall be lawful to accept for transmission in the mails, separately addressed identical pieces of third-class matter in quantities of not less than twenty pounds, or of not less than two hundred pieces, subject to pound rates of postage applicable to the entire bulk mailed at one time: *Provided further*, That the rate of postage on third-class matter mailed in bulk under the foregoing provisions shall be 14 cents for each pound or fraction thereof with a minimum charge per piece of 1 cent, except that in the case of books and catalogs of twenty-four pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants the rate shall be 10 cents for each pound or fraction thereof with a minimum charge per piece of 1 cent: *Provided further*, That the minimum charge per piece of one cent specified in the foregoing proviso shall be increased to 1½ cents on July 1, 1952: *Provided further*, That pieces or packages of such size or form as to prevent ready facing and tying in bundles and requiring individual distributing throughout shall be subject to a minimum charge of 3 cents each: *And provided further*, That the rates prescribed by this section shall not apply with respect to matter mailed by religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans', or fraternal organizations or associations, not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, and the existing rates shall continue to apply with respect to such matter.

"BOOKS

"SEC. 4. The rates of postage prescribed by subsections (d) and (e) of section 204 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 shall remain in effect until otherwise provided by Congress.

"SPECIAL DELIVERY

"SEC 5. Mail of any class shall be given the most expeditious handling and transportation practicable and immediate delivery at the office of address when, in addition to the regular postage, a special-delivery fee is prepaid thereon by means of special-delivery stamps or ordinary postage stamps, or in such other manner as the Postmaster General may prescribe, in accordance with the following schedule: Matter weighing not more than two pounds, if of the first class, 20 cents; if of any other class, 35 cents. Matter weighing more than two but not more than ten pounds, if of the first class, 35 cents; if of any other class, 45 cents. Matter weighing more than ten pounds, if of the first class, 50 cents, if of any other class, 60 cents.

"REGISTERED MAIL

"SEC. 6. (a) Mail matter shall be registered on the application of the party posting the same. The registry fees, which shall be in addition to the regular postage, and the limits of indemnity therefor within the maximum indemnity provided by this subsection, shall be as follows:

"For articles having no intrinsic value and for which no indemnity is payable, 30 cents;

"For registry indemnity not exceeding $5, 40 cents;

"For registry indemnity exceeding $5 but not exceeding $25, 55 cents;

"For registry indemnity exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50, 65 cents;

"For registry indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $75, 75 cents;

"For registry indemnity exceeding $75 but not exceeding $100, 85 cents;

"For registry indemnity exceeding $100 but not exceeding $200, 95 cents;

"For registry indemnity exceeding $200 but not exceeding $300, $1.05;

"For registry indemnity exceeding $300 but not exceeding $400, $1.15;

"For registry indemnity exceeding $400 but not exceeding $500, $1 25;

"For registry indemnity exceeding $500 but not exceeding $600, $1.35;

"For registry indemnity exceeding $600 but not exceeding $700, $1 45;

"For registry indemnity exceeding $700 but not exceeding $800, $1.55;

"For registry indemnity exceeding $800 but not exceeding $900, $1.65;

"For registry indemnity exceeding $900 but not exceeding $1,000, $1.75: *Provided*, That for registered mail having a declared value in excess of $25 a registry fee of not less than 55 cents shall be paid.

"(b) For registered mail or insured mail treated as registered mail having a declared value in excess of the maximum indemnity covered by the registry or insurance fee paid there shall be charged additional fees (known as 'surcharges') as follows: When the declared value exceeds the maximum indemnity covered by the registry or insurance fee paid by not more than $50, 2 cents; by more than $50 but not more than $100, 3 cents; by more than $100 but not more than $200, 4 cents; by more than $200 but not more than $400, 6 cents; by more than $400 but not more than $600, 7 cents; by more than $600 but not more than $800, 8 cents; by more than $800 but less than $1,000, 10 cents; and if the excess of the declared value over the maximum indemnity covered by the registry or insurance fee paid is $1,000 or more, the additional fees for each $1,000 or part of $1,000 on articles destined to points within the several zones applicable to fourth-class matter shall be as follows:

"For local delivery or for delivery within the first zone, 12 cents;

"For delivery within the second zone, 14 cents;

"For delivery within the third zone, 16 cents;

"For delivery within the fourth zone, 17 cents;

"For delivery within the fifth or sixth zones, 18 cents;

"For delivery within the seventh or eighth zones, 19 cents: *Provided*, That for registered mail or insured mail treated as registered mail of such kind or character that it may be carried at less than the maximum risk of loss in the mails, the Postmaster General may prescribe rules for determining upon what part of the declared value in excess of the maximum indemnity covered by the registry or insurance fee paid the additional fees shall be based.

"RETURN RECEIPTS FOR REGISTERED MAIL

"SEC. 7. Whenever the sender of any registered mail shall so request, and upon payment of a fee of 7 cents at the time of mailing or of 15 cents subsequent to the time of mailing, a receipt shall be obtained for such registered mail, showing to whom and when the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided*, That upon payment of the additional sum of 24 cents at the time of mailing of any such registered mail, a receipt shall be obtained for such registered mail, showing to whom, when, and the address where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided further*, That no refund shall be made of fees paid for return receipts for registered mail where the failure to furnish the sender a return receipt or the equivalent is not due to the fault of the postal service.

"FEES FOR INSURED MAIL

"SEC. 8 The fees for insurance, which shall be in addition to the regular postage, and the limits of indemnity therefor within the maximum indemnity provided by this section, shall be as follows: 5 cents for indemnification not exceeding $5; 10 cents for indemnification exceeding $5 but not exceeding $10; 15 cents for indemnification exceeding $10 but not exceeding $25; 20 cents for indemnification exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50; 30 cents for indemnification exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; 35 cents for indemnification exceeding $100 but not exceeding $200.

"RETURNED RECEIPTS FOR INSURED MAIL

"SEC. 9. Whenever the sender of an insured article of mail on which other than the minimum fee was paid shall so request, and upon payment of a fee of 7 cents at the time of mailing or of 15 cents subsequent to the time of mailing, a receipt shall be obtained for such insured mail, showing to whom and when the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided*, That upon payment of the additional sum of 24 cents at the time of mailing of any insured article of mail on which other than the minimum fee was paid, a receipt shall be obtained for such insured mail, showing to whom, when, and the address where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided further*, That no refund shall be made of fees paid for return receipts for insured mail where the failure to furnish the sender a return receipt or the equivalent is not due to the fault of the postal service.

"FEES FOR COLLECT-ON-DELIVERY MAIL

"SEC. 10. The fees for collect-on-delivery service for sealed domestic mail matter of any class bearing postage at the first-class rate and for domestic third- and fourth-class mail matter shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be as follows: 30 cents for collections and indemnity not exceeding $5; 40 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $5 but not exceeding $10; 60 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $10 but not exceeding $25; 70 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50; 80 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; 90 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $100 but not exceeding $150; $1 for collections and indemnity exceeding $150 but not exceeding $200.

"REGISTERED COLLECT-ON-DELIVERY MAIL

"SEC. 11. (a) The fee for collect-on-delivery service for registered sealed domestic mail of any class bearing postage at the first-class rate shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be 80 cents for collections and indemnity not exceeding $10; $1.10 for collections and indemnity exceeding $10 but not exceeding $50; $1.20 for collections and indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; $1 40 for collections and indemnity exceeding $100 but not exceeding $200. The maximum amount of charges collectible on any registered sealed domestic collect-on-delivery article shall be $200.

"(b) When indemnity in excess of $200 is desired, the fee for such registered sealed domestic collect-on-delivery mail shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be $150 for indemnity exceeding $200 but not exceeding $300; $1 60 for indemnity exceeding $300 but not exceeding $400, $1 70 for indemnity exceeding $400 but not exceeding $500; $1 80 for indemnity exceeding $500 but not exceeding $600; $1 90 for indemnity exceeding $600 but not exceeding $700; $2 for indemnity exceeding $700 but not exceeding $800; $2.10 for indemnity exceeding $800 but not exceeding $1,000.

"FEES FOR SPECIAL SERVICES

"SEC. 12. (a) The Postmaster General is authorized to prescribe by regulation from time to time the fees which shall be charged by the postal service—

"(1) for the registry of mail matter;

"(2) for the insurance of mail matter, or other indemnification of senders thereof for articles damaged or lost;

"(3) for securing a signed receipt upon the delivery of registered or insured mail matter and returning such receipt to sender;

"(4) for collect-on-delivery service;

"(5) for special-delivery service;

"(6) for special-handling service;

"(7) for the insurance of money orders;

"(8) for notice to publishers of undeliverable second-class mail, for notice of change of address, and for notice to addressee or sender of undeliverable third- or fourth-class matter, or of undeliverable second-class matter mailed at the transient rate.

"(b) Regulations issued by the Postmaster General under subsection (a) shall, to the extent prescribed therein, supersede existing laws, regulations, and orders governing the fees for the services covered thereby.

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON POSTAL SERVICE

"SEC. 13. (a) (1) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Postal Service (hereinafter referred to as the 'joint committee'), to be composed of three members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"(2) The chairman of the joint committee shall be the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the Senate, and the vice-chairman shall be the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. A majority of the members of the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the joint committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

"(b) The joint committee, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, shall conduct a thorough study and investigation in respect of the following matters:

"(1) Postal rates and charges in relation to the reasonable cost of handling the several classes of mail matter and special services, with due allowances in each class for the care required, the degree of preferment, priority in handling, and economic value of the services rendered and the public interest served thereby.

"(2) The extent to which expenditures now charged to the Post Office Department for the following items should be excluded in considering costs for the several classes of mail matter and special services:

"(A) Expenditures for free postal services;

"(B) Expenditures in excess of revenues for international postal services;

"(C) Expenditures for subsidies for postal services pursuant to law or legislative policy of Congress,

"(D) Expenditures in excess of revenues, pursuant to the Act of June 5, 1930 (39 U. S. C. 793), not enumerated in the preceding subparagraphs (A), (B), or (C);

"(E) Expenditures for services of any character not otherwise enumerated herein which may be performed for other departments and agencies of the Government; and

"(F) Expenditures which may be justified only on a national welfare basis and not primarily as a business function.

"(3) Expenditures for the Post Office Department by other Government agencies which should be considered in connection with the cost for the handling of the several classes of mail matter and special services, such as employees' retirement, use of Government buildings, and maintenance services

"(4) The extent, if any, to which Post Office Department expenditures in excess of revenue for its various services and for the handling of various classes of mail, are justified as being in the public interest.

"(c) (1) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized (A) to hold such hearings, (B) to sit and act at such places and times; (C) to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; (D) to administer such oaths; (E) to take such testimony, (F) to procure such printing and binding, and (G) to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not exceed 25 cents per hundred words The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

"(2) The joint committee is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions. Such compensation shall not be fixed at a rate in excess of the maximum rate payable under section 202 (e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in the case of employees of standing committees, except that the joint committee may employ part-time consultants, experts, and technicians at a per diem rate not in excess of $50. The joint committee may also contract for the service of accounting and management engineering firms to assist it in the performance of its functions. Insofar as practicable, the joint committee shall employ persons familiar with the operation of the postal service, accounting practices, or problems of public transportation and distribution with special reference to rate making in those fields. The chairman and vice chairman of the joint committee are authorized to assign from time to time the members of the staff of their respective committees to duties and responsibilities in connection with the operation of such joint committee.

"(d) The joint committee shall report from time to time to the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives from which the membership of the joint committee was appointed, and shall submit its final report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than January 15, 1953, of the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem advisable. Upon the submission of such final report the joint committee shall cease to exist.

"(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of $100,000 to carry out the purposes of this section, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman and vice chairman of the joint committee.

"REPEAL OF EXISTING PROVISIONS

"SEC 14. All existing laws or portions thereof, inconsistent or in conflict with this title, are hereby amended or repealed.

"APPLICATION TO GUAM

"SEC 15. This Act shall have the same force and effect within Guam as within other possessions of the United States.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC 16 This title shall take effect on the first day of the third calendar month following the calendar month in which it is enacted, except the rates herein provided for second-class mail shall take effect on the first day of the second quarter beginning after the approval of this Act.

"TITLE II

"SEC 201 This title may be cited as the 'Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951'.

"COVERAGE AND EXEMPTIONS

"SEC. 202. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), this title shall apply to all civilian officers and employees of the United States and of the government of the District of Columbia, including officers and employees of corporations wholly owned or controlled by the United States.

"(b) (1) This title shall not apply to—

"(A) teachers and librarians of the public schools of the District of Columbia;

"(B) part-time officers and employees (except hourly employees in the field service of the Post Office Department) for whom there has not been established a regular tour of duty during each administrative workweek;

"(C) temporary employees engaged on construction work at hourly rates;

"(D) employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company when employed on the Isthmus of Panama;

"(E) commissioned officers of the Public Health Service;

"(F) commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

"(G) doctors, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration;

"(H) officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives; and

"(I) officers and employees of any corporation under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration of which corporation any member of the board of directors is elected or appointed by private interests.

"(2) This title, except section 203 (g), shall not apply to alien employees who occupy positions outside the several States and the District of Columbia

"(3) Section 204 of this title shall not apply to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia.

"ANNUAL LEAVE

"SEC. 203. (a) Officers and employees to whom this title applies shall be entitled to annual leave with pay which shall accrue as follows—

"(1) one-half day for each full biweekly pay period in the case of officers and employees with less than three years of service,

"(2) three-fourths day for each full biweekly pay period (except that the accrual for the last full biweekly pay period in the year shall be one and one-fourth days) in the case of officers and employees with three but less than fifteen years of service, and

"(3) one day for each full biweekly pay period in the case of officers and employees with fifteen years or more of services."

In determining years of service for the purposes of this subsection, there shall be included all service creditable under the provisions of section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, for the purposes of an annuity under such Act and the determination of the period of service rendered may be made upon the basis of an affidavit of the employee. In the case of an officer or employee who is not paid on the basis of biweekly pay periods, the leave provided by this title shall accrue on the same basis as it would accrue if such officer or employee were paid on the basis of biweekly pay periods

"(b) Any change in the rate of accrual of annual leave by an officer or employee under the provisions of this section shall take effect as of the beginning of the pay period following the pay period, or corresponding period in the case of an officer or employee who is not paid on the basis of biweekly pay periods, in which such officer or employee completes the prescribed period of service.

"(c) The annual leave provided for in this section, which is not used by an officer or employee, shall accumulate for use in succeeding years until it totals not to exceed sixty days at the end of the last complete biweekly pay period, or corresponding period in the case of an officer or employee who is not paid on the basis of biweekly pay periods, occurring in any year.

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (c), a maximum accumulation not to exceed ninety days at the end of the last complete biweekly pay period, or corresponding period in the case of an officer or employee who is not paid on the basis of biweekly pay periods, in any year is authorized to the following categories of employees of the Federal Government, other than officers and employees in the Foreign Service of the United States under the Department of State, stationed outside the several States and the District of Columbia:

"(1) Persons directly recruited or transferred from the United States by the Federal Government.

"(2) Persons employed locally but (A) who were originally recruited from the United States and have been in substantially continuous employment by other Federal agencies, United States firms, interests, or organizations, international organizations in which the United States Government participates, or foreign governments, and whose conditions of employment provide for their return transportation to the United States, or (B) who were at the time of employment temporarily absent from the United States for purposes of travel or formal study and maintained residence in the United States during such temporary absence

"(3) Persons who are not normally residents of the area concerned and who are discharged from the military service of the United States to accept employment with an agency of the Federal Government.

"(e) Where an officer or employee to whom the provisions of subsection (d) are applicable, or who is in the Foreign Service of the United States under the Department of State, and whose post of duty is outside the several States and the District of Columbia returns to any such State or the District of Columbia on leave, the leave granted pursuant to this Act shall be exclusive of the time actually and necessarily occupied in going to and from his post of duty and such time as may be necessarily occupied in

awaiting sailing or flight. The provisions of this subsection shall not apply with respect to more than one period of leave in any twenty-four month period.

"(f) Officers and employees in the Foreign Service of the United States under the Department of State may be granted leave of absence, without regard to any other leave provided by this title, for use in the United States, its Territories or possessions, at a rate equivalent to one week for each four months of service outside the several States and the District of Columbia. Such leave may be accumulated for future use without regard to the limitation in subsection (c) but no such leave which is not used shall be made the basis for any terminal leave or lump-sum payment.

"(g) Alien employees who occupy positions outside the several States and the District of Columbia may, in the the discretion of the head of the department or agency concerned, be granted leave of absence with pay not in excess of the amount of annual and sick leave allowable under this title in the case of citizen employees.

"(h) The annual leave provided for in this section, including such leave as will accrue to any officer or employee during the year, may be granted at any time during such year as the head of the various departments and independent establishments may prescribe.

"(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), an officer or employee shall be entitled to annual leave under this title only after having been employed currently for a continuous period of 90 days under one or more appointments without break in service. In any case in which an officer or employee completes a period of continuous employment of 90 days there shall be credited to him an amount of annual leave equal to the amount which, but for this subsection, would have accrued to him under subsection (a) during such period.

"SICK LEAVE

"SEC. 204 (a) Officers and employees to whom this title applies shall be entitled to sick leave with pay which shall accrue on the basis of one-half day for each full biweekly pay period.

"(b) The sick leave provided for in this section, which is not used by an officer or employee during the year in which it accrues, shall accumulate and be available for use in succeeding years.

"(c) Not to exceed 30 days sick leave may be advanced in cases of serious disability or ailments and when required by the exigencies of the situation.

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 205. (a) The days of leave provided for in this title shall mean days upon which an employee would otherwise work and receive pay, and shall be exclusive of holidays, and all nonworkdays established by Federal statute or by Executive or administrative order

"(b) An employee shall be considered for the purposes of this title to have been employed for a full biweekly pay period if he shall have been employed during the days within such period, exclusive of holidays and all nonworkdays established by Federal statute or by Executive or administrative order, which fall within his basic administrative workweek.

"(c) Part time officers and employees, unless otherwise excepted, shall be entitled on a pro rata basis to the benefits provided by sections 203 and 204 of this title.

"(d) The authorized absence of a rural carrier on Saturdays which occur within or at the beginning or end of a period of sick or annual leave of five or more days' duration (or four days' duration if a holiday falls within or at the beginning or end of the period of sick or annual leave) shall be without charge to such leave or loss of compensation. Saturdays occurring in a period of annual or sick leave taken in a smaller number of days may at the option of the carrier be charged to his accrued leave and when so charged he shall be paid for such absence.

"REGULATIONS

"SEC. 206. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to provide for the administration of this title.

"REPEALS

"SEC. 207. (a) The following Acts or parts of Acts are hereby repealed:

"(1) The Act entitled 'An Act to provide for vacations to Government employees, and for other purposes', approved March 14, 1936 (49 Stat. 1161).

"(2) The Act entitled 'An Act to standardize sick leave and extend it to all civilian employees,' approved March 14, 1936 (49 Stat. 1162).

"(3) Section 6 of the Act entitled 'An Act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedure for computing compensation; and for other purposes', approved July 6, 1945, as amended (59 Stat. 435).

"(4) The paragraph under the heading 'Public Printing and Binding' in the Act entitled 'An Act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety-seven, and for other purposes', approved June 11, 1896 (44 U. S. C. 45), relating to leaves of absence of employees of the Government Printing Office.

"(5) The third proviso in the Act of August 29, 1916 (34 U. S. C. 513).

"(6) Sections 931 and 932 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

"(7) Section 601 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952.

"(b) Section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes', approved April 15, 1947 (61 Stat. 40), is amended by striking out the words 'and leave'.

"SAVING PROVISION

"SEC. 208. (a) In any case in which—

"(1) the amount of accumulated annual leave carried over into the calendar year 1952 by an officer or employee under provisions of law applicable to such officer or employee on December 31, 1951, is in excess of the amount allowable under the applicable provisions of section 203, or

"(2) the amount of accumulated annual leave to the credit of an officer or employee who is subject to the provisions of section 203 (d) and who becomes subject to the provisions of section 203 (c) is in excess of the amount allowable under section 203 (c),

such excess shall remain to the credit of such officer or employee until used, but the use during any year of an amount of leave in excess of the aggregate amount which shall have accrued during such year shall automatically reduce the maximum allowable accumulation at the end of the last complete biweekly pay period in any year until the accumulation of such officer or employee no longer exceeds the amount prescribed in the applicable provisions of section 203.

"(b) An officer or employee heretofore subject to a system of leave administered on a calendar-day basis shall be deemed to have to his credit on the effective date of this title five-sevenths day of leave chargeable as provided in section 205 (a) for each calendar day's leave to his credit on such date.

"(c) No officer or employee shall be considered, by reason of the enactment of this title, to have been transferred to an agency under a different leave system within the meaning of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave upon their separation from Government service', approved December 21, 1944 (5 U. S. C. 61d).

"(d) Any person who served during the period from December 1, 1950, to January 6, 1952, as an employee in the postal service, other than a substitute rural carrier, under a temporary or indefinite appointment for not less than ninety days and who shall not have been separated from the postal service prior to January 6, 1952, shall be deemed to have earned annual leave at the rate of fifteen days per year and sick leave at the rate of 10 days per year, and for such purposes shall receive credit for one-twelfth of a year for each whole calendar month he was carried on the roll as a temporary or indefinite employee during such period.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 209. This title shall take effect on January 6, 1952, except that paragraph (7) of section 207 (a) shall take effect as of the date of enactment of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952."

And the House agree to the same.

TOM MURRAY,
GEORGE M. RHODES,
M. G. BURNSIDE,
EDWARD H. REES,
HAROLD C. HAGEN,
Members on the Part of the House.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
JOHN O PASTORE,
THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD,
WILLIAM LANGER,
FRANK CARLSON,
Members on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1046) to readjust postal rates, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the House amendment with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. Except for technical and minor drafting changes, the differences between title I of the Senate bill, the House amendment, and title I of the conference substitute are explained below.

The Senate bill consisted of two titles: title I relating to the readjustment of postal rates and the establishment of a temporary Joint Committee on the Postal Service, and title II provided for a new annual and sick leave law for Government officers and employees. The House amendment related only to the readjustment of postal rates.

POSTAL RATES

Section 1 (a) of title I of the Senate bill increased the rate of postage on the first ounce, or fraction thereof, of letters and sealed parcels in first-class mail from 3 cents to 4 cents. The House amendment provided no such increase. The conference substitute does not provide for such increase in first-class mail rates.

Section 1 (c) of the Senate bill and section 1 (a) of the House amendment both increased the rate of postage on Government postal cards and private mailing or post cards, and on each portion of double Government postal cards, from 1 cent to 2 cents. The House amendment also imposed an additional charge of 10 percent on all single and double Government postal cards sold in

quantities of one hundred or more. The conference substitute retains this additional charge of 10 percent on single and double Government postal cards, but provides that such charge shall apply with respect to all such cards which are sold in quantities of 50 or more.

Section 1 (d) of the Senate bill increased the rates of postage on the first ounce, or fraction thereof, of domestic air-mail letters and packages from 6 cents to 8 cents, and on air-mail Government postal cards and private mailing or post cards from 4 cents to 5 cents. The House amendment provided no such increase in air-mail rates. The conference substitute does not provide for such increases in air-mail rates.

Section 2 (a) of the Senate bill provided three permanent increases of 20 percent each in the total postage computed at the pound rates in effect under existing law on that portion of second-class mail sent outside the county of publication, the first 20 percent increase to take effect on the first day of the second quarter following the approval of the bill and the second and third such increases to take effect 1 and 2 years, thereafter, respectively, except that in the case of newspapers such increases shall be at the rate of 10 percent instead of 20 percent. In section 2 (a) of the House amendment, such permanent increases were limited to 10 percent in the case of all such second-class mail, including newspapers. The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the House amendment.

Section 2 (a) of the Senate bill further provided that publications having over 75 percent advertising in more than one-half of their issues during any 12 months' period shall be ineligible for second-class mailing privileges, except that a charge made solely for the publication of transportation schedules, fares, and related information shall not be construed to be a charge for advertising for the purpose of this provision. The House amendment contained the provision of the Senate bill which bars from second-class mailing privileges publications having over 75 percent advertising in more than one-half of their issues during any 12 months' period, but omitted the provision which excepts charges made solely for the publication of transportation schedules, fares, and related information from being construed as advertising charges. The conference substitute retains the provisions of the Senate bill.

Section 2 (a) of the Senate bill also contained a provision which continues in effect the existing second-class mail rates on publications maintained by and in the interests of nonprofit religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, or fraternal organizations or associations, and which extends such rates to veterans' organizations or associations not now entitled thereto, to temperance organizations or associations, and to service clubs. A further provision continued in effect the existing rates with respect to any religious, educational, or scientific publications designed specifically for use in school classrooms or religious instruction classes, whether or not the publisher is a nonprofit organization, and includes temperance publications within such categories of publications. The House amendment contained provisions to the same effect as those of the Senate bill, except that (1) temperance organizations or associations, service clubs, and temperance publications, are excluded from the House provisions, and (2) it is required that the publisher of any such publication, before being entitled to the existing rate, shall furnish to the Postmaster General proof of qualification at such times and in such manner as the Postmaster General may prescribe. The conference substitute retains the provisions of the House amendment. Since the word "temperance" does not appear in the language of the House amendment, the conference committee emphasizes that it is not necessary specifically to include in the second proviso of section 2 (a) of the conference substitute nonprofit temperance organizations or associations among the categories of nonprofit organizations and associations with respect to which the existing rates are to remain unchanged, for the reason that these nonprofit temperance organizations and associations may qualify as educational organizations and associations within the meaning of the language of the second proviso of section 2 (a) of the conference substitute.

Section 3 of the Senate bill provided for an increase in the minimum charge per piece in third-class matter mailed in bulk from 1 cent to 1¼ cents, to take effect on the first day of the third calendar month following the calendar month of enactment of the bill, and a second increase in such minimum charge per piece to 1½ cents, to take effect 1 year after the effective date of the first increase. Section 3 of the House amendment provided for one increase in the minimum charge per piece on third-class bulk mailings to 1½ cents, effective on the same date as the date of the first of the two increases provided for by the Senate bill. The conference substitute retains the present minimum charge of 1 cent per piece until July 1, 1952, at which time this rate will be increased to 1½ cents per piece.

Section 3 of the Senate bill made no change in the existing minimum charge of 3 cents each for pieces of such size or form as to prevent ready facing and tying in bundles and requiring individual distributing. The House amendment increased the minimum charge for such pieces from 3 cents to 5 cents. The conference substitute retains the present rate of 3 cents for such odd size pieces in accordance with the Senate bill.

Section 3 of the Senate bill also provided that the existing rates on third-class matter, and not the increased rates prescribed by such section, shall continue to apply with respect to matter mailed by nonprofit religious, educational, scientific, temperance, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans' or fraternal organizations or associations, or service clubs. The House amendment contained no such provision. The conference substitute retains the provisions of the Senate bill except that the words "temperance" and "service clubs" are omitted.

Section 4 of the Senate bill provided rates of postage on fourth-class mail (except books) which are in excess of the rates which were in effect on September 30, 1951, under section 204 (b) and (c) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, but less than the rates which became effective on October 1, 1951, by virtue of the Postmaster General's Order No. 46380. This order was the result of a provision in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 843, 81st Cong), which, in effect, directed the Postmaster General to request the "consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission to the establishment of such rate increases * * * as may be necessary to insure the receipt of revenue from fourth-class mail service sufficient to pay the cost of such service." Authority to fix fourth-class postage rates in this manner was granted by section 207 of the act of February 28, 1925, as amended (39 U. S. C., sec. 247).

In addition to superseding the rates on postage on fourth-class mail which became effective on October 1, 1951, by virtue of the order of the Postmaster General, the Senate bill prevented any future change in such fourth-class rates except by action of the Congress.

Except in the case of books, the House amendment contained no such provisions with respect to fourth-class mail, thus permitting the rates (other than on books) fixed by the order of the Postmaster General to continue in effect.

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment retained the rates of postage in effect on September 30, 1951, with respect to books, and provided that such rates shall remain in effect until otherwise provided by Congress.

The conference substitute, like the House amendment, does not provide for any change in existing fourth-class mail rates. The conference committee points out, however, that the question of the advisability of continuing the method of fixing fourth-class postal rates by recommendation of the Postmaster General with the concurrence of the Interstate Commerce Commission will be explored by the Joint Committee on the Postal Service in its study of postal rates authorized by section 13 of the conference substitute.

Section 5 of the Senate bill and section 5 of the House amendment provided identical general increases in the fees charged in addition to the regular postage for special-delivery mail, except in the case of matter of the first class weighing not more than 2 pounds. In that case the Senate bill increased the fee from 15 cents to 20 cents while the House amendment increased the fee to 23 cents. The conference substitute contains the rates of the Senate bill for such special-delivery items.

Section 12 of the House amendment authorizes the Postmaster General to prescribe by regulation from time to time the fees to be charged for the following special services: (1) registry of mail matter, (2) insurance of mail matter, or other indemnification of senders thereof for lost or damaged articles, (3) securing a signed receipt upon delivery of registered or insured mail matter and returning such receipt to sender, (4) collect-on-delivery service, (5) special-delivery service, (6) special-handling service, (7) issuance of money orders, and (8) notice to publishers of undeliverable second-class mail, notice of change of address, and notice to addressee or sender of undeliverable third- or fourth-class matter, or of undeliverable second-class matter mailed at the transient rate. The House amendment further provided that regulations issued by the Postmaster General with respect to prescribing such fees shall supersede, to the extent prescribed therein, existing laws, regulations, and orders governing the fees for the services covered thereby. The Senate bill did not contain such provisions. The conference substitute retains the provisions of the House amendment.

However, the conference committee points out that the method of fixing fees for the special services will be one of the subjects of the study to be conducted by the Joint Committee on the Postal Service.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE POSTAL SERVICE

Section 12 of title I of the Senate bill established a joint committee of the Congress, known as the Joint Committee on the Postal Service, to be composed of three members of the Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service of the Senate, appointed by the President of the Senate, and three members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House

The joint committee was charged with the duty of conducting a thorough study and investigation of the following matters relating to the postal service: (1) Methods and means for the economical and efficient development and improvement of the postal system; (2) the justification for expenditures in excess of revenue with respect to various postal services in the light of both the business and public service aspects of the postal service; (3) costs of handling, transporting, and distributing mail matter

and procedures for reduction of such costs; (4) postal rates and charges; (5) the extent to which certain items of expenditures (including free postal services, international postal services, subsidies, and services performed for other Government departments and agencies or justified only on a national welfare basis) should be excluded in the consideration of the costs of certain postal services; (6) cost ascertainment; (7) cost analysis; and (8) such other matters relating to the efficient and economical development and improvement of the postal service as might be deemed pertinent to the objects and purposes of the study and investigation.

This section also provided for the appointment, by the Joint Committee on the Postal Service, of an advisory council of not more than 20 members to assist the joint committee in its study and investigation of the postal service. The membership of the advisory council included representatives of the general public, representative users of the mails, members of accounting and management engineering firms, postal experts, representatives of postal employee organizations, and representatives of public transportation and distribution organizations (appointed with special reference to ratemaking in their fields). It was required that appointments as members of the advisory council be offered to officials of the Post Office Department and that the council should select its chairman from those members representing the general public. A member of the council in the executive branch of the Government was to receive the salary which he would normally receive for his services in the executive branch if he were not a member of the council plus such additional amount as may be necessary to make his total aggregate salary $12,500 per annum. A member of the council from private life was to receive $50 per diem when engaged in duties of the council. All members of the council were to be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in connection with their duties.

Section 12 also contained provisions granting the joint committee the subpena power and the authority to procure necessary printing and binding, to appoint and fix the salaries of necessary personnel, to contract for the services of accounting and management engineering firms, and to employ certain part-time consultants and other experts at a rate not to exceed $50 per diem. It was required that, insofar as practicable, the joint committee employ persons familiar with postal service operation, accounting practices, or public transportation and distribution problems, particularly rate making.

Section 12 also authorized the Joint Committee on the Postal Service to obtain directly from the Post Office Department, or any postal field office, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics in conducting its study and investigation of the postal system; and such department or postal field office was authorized to furnish such assistance to the joint committee upon request of the chairman or vice chairman.

The joint committee was required to report, from time to time, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives and to submit its final report to the Senate and House of Representatives, not later than January 15, 1953, of the results of its study and investigation, together with necessary recommendations for legislation. The Joint Committee on the Postal Service was to cease to exist upon the submission to the Congress of its final report.

Section 12 also authorized the appropriation of such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of the section, such sums to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers approved by the chairman or vice chairman of the joint committee.

The House amendment contained no provision for a Joint Committee on the Postal Service.

The conference substitute retains the provisions and objectives of section 12 of the Senate bill with regard to the Joint Committee on the Postal Service with the following modifications and exceptions:

(1) The chairman of the joint committee is to be the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the vice chairman is to be the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives;

(2) The provisions of the Senate bill covering the scope of the matters to be studied by the joint committee are revised so as to establish clearly that the studies of revenues, expenditures, methods, procedures, cost ascertainment, postal policies, etc., by the joint committee will relate to the problem of postal rates;

(3) The provisions of the Senate bill relating to the advisory council are eliminated;

(4) The compensation of personnel employed by the joint committee shall not exceed the maximum compensation payable under section 202 (e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in the case of employees of standing committees;

(5) The chairman and vice chairman of the joint committee may assign staff members of their respective committees to duties in connection with the operation of the joint committee;

(6) The sums authorized to be appropriated for the use of the joint committee are limited to $100,000; and

(7) Appropriations for the use of the joint committee are to be disbursed on vouchers signed by both the chairman and the vice chairman of the joint committee.

APPLICATION TO GUAM

Pursuant to section 25 (b) of the act of August 1, 1950 (Public Law 630, 81st Cong.), providing that "* * * no law of the United States * * * shall have any force or effect within Guam unless specifically made applicable by Act of the Congress * * *", section 14 of the conference substitute makes the provisions of the conference substitute applicable to Guam.

The following is a discussion of title II of the Senate bill, relating to annual and sick leave, as changed by the conference substitute.

ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE ACT OF 1951

Title II of the Senate bill constitutes a new annual and sick leave law for substantially all civilian officers and employees of the United States and of the government of the District of Columbia.

Section 201 provides that the title may be cited as the "Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951".

Section 202 extends the coverage of the law to all civilian officers and employees of the United States and of the government of the District of Columbia with the exception of certain specified categories of officers and employees who are exempted by reason of the special circumstances of their employment. These exempted officers and employees are (1) teachers and librarians of the public schools of the District of Columbia, (2) part-time officers and employees without a regular tour of duty in each administrative workweek, (3) temporary employees engaged on construction work at hourly rates, (4) employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company when employed on the Isthmus of Panama, (5) commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, (6) commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, (7) doctors, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, (8) officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and (9) officers and employees of any corporation under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration of which corporation any member of the board of directors is elected or appointed by private interests. Since there is no intention to make the bill applicable to judges who have not heretofore been subject to the leave laws or who have their own separate leave system, the provision of the Senate bill repealing provisions of the act of April 1, 1942, which relate to the leave of judges of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, were deleted. Officers and members of the Metropolitan Police and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia are subject to the annual-leave provisions of the law but are exempt from the sick-leave provisions.

Section 203 provides annual leave as follows: one-half day for each full biweekly pay period for officers and employees with less than 3 years of service, three-fourths day per biweekly pay period (except that the accrual for the last full biweekly pay period in any year shall be 1¼ days) for officers and employees with three but less than 15 years of service, and 1 day per biweekly pay period for officers and employees with 15 years or more of service. There is no credit of annual leave for fractional parts of biweekly pay periods either at the beginning or end of an employee's period of service. In the case of officers and employees who are not paid on the basis of biweekly pay periods, leave accrues on the same basis as it would accrue if such officers and employees were paid on a biweekly basis. Any change in the rate of accrual of leave by an officer or employee shall take effect at the beginning of the next succeeding pay period following the one in which he completes the prescribed period of service.

All service which could be creditable under section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, for the purposes of an annuity under such act shall be used in determining years of service for the purposes of section 203.

Annual leave which is not used by an officer or employee may accumulate for use in succeeding years in an amount not to exceed 60 days at the end of the last complete biweekly pay period in any year. A maximum accumulation of not in excess of 90 days at the end of the last complete biweekly pay period in any year is authorized with respect to certain categories of Federal employees stationed outside the several States and the District of Columbia. This means either fiscal or calendar year depending on whether the agency administers leave on a fiscal or calendar year basis.

Special leave provisions are provided for officers and employees in the Foreign Service of the United States under the Department of State. Such officers and employees may be granted leave of absence for use in the United States, its Territories or possessions, at a rate equivalent to 1 week for each 4 months of service outside the several States and the District of Columbia. Such leave may be accumulated without limitation, but any such leave which is not used during one or between two consecutive assignments outside the several States and the District of Columbia shall not be made the basis for any terminal leave or lump-sum payment.

In the case of officers and employees whose post of duty is outside the several States and the District of Columbia and who return to any such State or the District of Columbia travel time in going to and from their posts of duty shall not be charged against the leave of such officers and employees. However, this provision does not apply with respect to more than one period of leave in any 24 month period.

Section 203 also provides that no leave shall be credited to an officer or employee until he has been currently employed for a continuous period of 90 days under one or more appointments. The purpose of this provision is to prevent the granting of leave to employees who serve for periods of less than 90 days. When an officer or employee has completed 90 days of service he will be credited retroactively with leave for the entire period .

Annual leave with pay not in excess of the amount allowed employees who are citizens of the United States may, in the discretion of the head of the department or agency concerned, be granted alien employees occupying positions outside the several States and the District of Columbia.

Annual leave provided for in section 203, including such leave as will accrue to any officer or employee during the year, may be granted at any time during the year as may be prescribed by the heads of the various departments and independen. establishments.

Section 204 provides sick leave for officers and employees on the basis of one-half day for each biweekly pay period. Sick leave shall accumulate without limit for use by the officer or employee. Section 204 also permits the advancement of not to exceed 30 days' sick leave in case of serious disability or ailments and when required by the urgency of the situation.

Section 205 contains several technical provisions necessary for the proper administration of the new annual and sick leave law. Also, it provides that part-time officers and employees, unless otherwise excepted, shall be entitled to annual and sick leav· on a pro rata basis.

Section 206 authorizes the Civil Service Commission to prescribe necessary rules and regulations for the administration of the new annual and sick leave law

Section 207 repeals certain acts and parts of acts which are inconsistent with the new annual and sick leave law.

Section 208 provides that the amount of annual leave previously accumulated by an officer or employee, which is carried over into the period covered by the new annual and sick leave law and which is in excess of the maximum amount of accumulated annual leave allowable to such officer or employee under the new law, shall, notwithstanding such maximum allowable amount, remain to the credit of such officer or employee until such excess annual leave is used. The amount of any such excess annual leave of an officer or employee is reduced by that amount of annual leave used by him during any year which is in excess of the annual leave which accrued to him during that year.

Section 208 also makes provision for converting to a workday basis the calendar days of leave to the credit of officers and employees previously subject to a leave system administered on a calendar-day basis by allowing credit, on the effective date of the new law, of five-sevenths days of leave on a workday basis for each calendar day of leave to his credit on such date.

Section 208 further provides in subsection (d) that substitute employees in the postal field service (except substitute rural carriers), serving during the period from December 1, 1950, to January 6, 1952, under a temporary or indefinite appointment for not less than 90 days, shall be considered to have earned annual and sick leave during that period at the same rate as regular and substitute classified employees in the postal field service and shall receive appropriate credit for such annual and sick leave under the new annual and sick leave law. No provision is made under existing law for granting annual and sick leave to temporary employees in the postal field service. At the present time all appointments are made on a temporary or indefinite basis with the result that such employees may remain on the rolls for extended periods without opportunity to earn annual or sick leave.

The House recently considered this problem when it passed H. R. 3605, on June 4, 1951, which granted to substitute temporary and indefinite employees in the postal field service serving under appointments of not less than 90 days the same annual and sick leave benefits as enjoyed by regular and substitute classified employees in the postal field service H. R. 3605 was not enacted into law. Since employees in the postal field service serving under a temporary or indefinite appointment of not less than 90 days are entitled to annual and sick leave benefits under the new annual and sick leave provisions of title II of the Senate bill, section 208 (d) merely carries out the purposes of H. R. 3605, as passed by the House, with appropriate changes in language to conform to the provisions of the new annual and sick leave law.

Section 209 provides that the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, except paragraph (8) of section 207 (a), shall take effect on January 6, 1952. Such paragraph (8) is to take effect on the date of the enactment of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952. This paragraph repeals section 601 of such act which provides (1) that no funds appropriated under such act or any other act shall be available to pay for annual leave accumulated by any civilian officer or employee during the calendar year 1951 and unused at the close of business on June 30, 1952, and (2) that no civilian officer or employee shall be entitled to earn annual leave at a rate in excess of 20 days per annum.

TOM MURRAY,
GEORGE M RHODES,
M G. BURNSIDE,
EDWA·D H REES,
HAROLD C. HAGEN,
Managers on the Part of the House,

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, it is the purpose of this legislation to provide an adjustment in postal rates in order to increase revenue to the Post Office Department. Under the conference agreement there is no increase provided for first-class letter mail nor air mail. Government postal cards and private mailing cards will be increased to 2 cents with an additional 10 percent surcharge on the Government postal cards when they are purchased in quantities of 50 or more. Drop letters will be increased to 2 cents from the present rate of 1 cent.

The rates on second-class mail will remain the same within the county of publication. Outside the county of publication the present rates on second-class mail will receive a permanent increase of 30 percent applied in three annual increases of 10 percent each beginning April 1, 1952.

There will be no increase in the rates on publications maintained by and in the interest of nonprofit religious, education, scientific, philanthropic, veterans', labor, or fraternal organizations. Transient second-class mail is increased by 1 cent per piece.

The major increase in third-class bulk mail is an increase from the present rate of 1 cent to 1½ cents per piece. This increase will be effective July 1, 1952. There will also be an increase of one-half cent per piece on individual pieces of books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, and so forth, not mailed under the bulk mailing privilege. Other rates and fees in third-class mail remain unchanged. These other rates were increased January 1, 1949.

The conference agreement does not contain any changes in the rates on fourth-class mail since these rates were changed by the Postmaster General with the concurrence of the ICC, effective October 1, 1951. The conference agreement also leaves in effect the authority of the Postmaster General to set the rates on parcel post and catalogs with the concurrence of the ICC.

Books which are also parcel post will remain at their present rates which were not increased on October 1, 1951.

The fees for most of the special services are increased under the conference agreement in accordance with the increases recommended by the Postmaster General except in the case of special-delivery mail, the increase for first-class special-delivery items weighing less than 2 pounds is increased to 20 cents rather than 23 cents as recommended by the Postmaster General.

The conference agreement also provides that the Postmaster General may in the future establish the rates so they will pay their own way on these special services.

The conference agreement includes a provision establishing a joint committee on the postal service to study and investigate matters relating to the problem of postal rates. One hundred thousand dollars is authorized for this activity and a report is to be submitted to the Congress not later than January 15, 1953.

The conference agreement contains an amendment providing for a graduated leave system for employees in the executive branch of the Government as follows: 13 days' leave for employees with less than 3 years' service, 20 days' leave for employees with 3 but less than 15 years' service and 26 days' leave for employees with 15 years or more service. Thirteen days' sick leave per year is granted all employees, regardless of length of service.

With regard to postal rates, the provisions of the agreement are substantially the same as contained in the bill as it passed the House. It includes, as I have indicated, two additional provisions, one for a joint committee on the postal service and the other is a graduated leave system for all Federal employees.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Are the leaves cumulative or must they be used within the year?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. They are cumulative. There is no provision that they must be used within the year. Under this report there is no maximum amount of accumulation for sick leave, but there is a maximum accumulation of 60 days on the annual leave.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement on this bill has been explained by the chairman of this committee. The House committee has spent a great deal of time, effort,

and energy in trying to work out satisfactory legislation in dealing with this problem of increased postal rates. It is quite similar in some respects to the work of the Committee on Ways and Means, because when efforts are made to increase the postal rates and fees there is some resistance. I want to say again to the members of our committee that I appreciate the efforts which were put forth in dealing with this problem.

The bill which has been approved by the committee of the conference contains almost the same provisions as were contained in the House bill.

The rate on post cards is increased to 2 cents. First-class letter mail, which has been discussed so much, pays its way. However, even under the increased rate, post cards will not pay their way under cost ascertainment. The other body increased letter mail to 4 cents. To me, such action is out of line and unfair, especially in view of rates accorded other classes of mail. Second-class mail deals, of course, with newspapers and magazines. There is, according to cost ascertainment, a deficit of approximately $200,000,000 in this item. Under this bill we will raise enough to reduce the second-class deficit approximately $12,000,000 anually at the end of 3 years. The chairman explained that we still exempt from increase publications of nonprofit, religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans, and fraternal organizations. There was a considerable amount of discussion with respect to publications of temperance organizations. It was agreed by the conference committee, and generally understood, that those publications will be granted preferential rates because they come under what is known as education publications. The conference report confirms my statement. It reads in part as follows:

Since the word "temperance" does not appear in the language of the House amendment, the conference committee emphasizes that it is not necessary specifically to include in the second proviso of section 2 (a) of the conference substitute nonprofit temperance organizations or associations among the categories of nonprofit organizations and associations with respect to which the existing rates are to remain unchanged, for the reason that these nonprofit temperance organizations and associations may qualify as educational organizations and associations within the meaning of the language of the second proviso of section 2 (a) of the conference substitute

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, who has always shown special interest in this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am wondering about these classifications. For instance, some of our large fraternal organizations, and veteran organizations have national magazines from which a considerable amount of income is derived through advertising. Are they considered in the educational group or not?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Although some of us thought there might be abuses, the House approved by a substantial majority, this legislation which provides that such publications of nonprofit organizations may be included among those which receive no increases.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I know as a matter of fact that some of them have very huge profits at the end of the year.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The House agreed to an amendment submitted by the gentleman from Minnesota, which provided no increases for nonprofit religious, educational, and fraternal organizations.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. In those instances, that I have in mind, I think there has been an abuse of this privilege.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I know the gentleman has given these matters a great deal of study and care, and I also know that his views with respect to this matter ought to have a great deal of consideration.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. It is my understanding that the religious publications are given consideration here. That is true, is it not?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct, as they have in the past.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Yes; as they have been in the past. There is not any more of a burden upon them; is that correct?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Is that also true so far as those publications that are designed for use in schools, even though there is a profit involved?

Mr. REES of Kansas Those publications for use in classrooms?

Mr KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Yes; for use in classrooms.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. They are also protected to the same extent?

Mr. REES of Kansas. They are given preferred consideration by this legislation.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I am happy to know that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. They are given a preferred position as approved by the House 2 weeks ago.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I am glad to hear that because I think they deserve that consideration.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's views.

With respect to third-class mail there is a deficit of $135,000,000, according to the best estimate obtainable. This legislation will raise revenue of $17,500,000 next year and approximately $35,000,000 in the years thereafter, if we have similar mailings and similar profits. Of course, if we have additional costs in handling this business, then the deficit will not be decreased as much as I have indicated.

The chairman of our committee has indicated what has occurred with reference to fourth-class mail. This House did not give consideration to increasing fourth-class mail, because both the House and the other body agreed and directed the Postmaster General to request the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix rates in accordance with the present law. The other body saw fit to fix some of those rates after all. That provision of the Senate bill was stricken out. There was a difference there of $40,000,000.

There is a provision in the conference substitute that was not in the House bill, and that is with respect to the appointment of a joint commission on postal service, composed of members of the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees, to study and investigate matters relating to the problem of postal rates. That is included in this present legislation. This legislation provides an authorization for $100,000 to be spent for that purpose. My own opinion was that $50,000 would be sufficient to start with, but I was overruled in that regard.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD Was any estimate made of the annual savings that would accrue from the imposition of the graduated leave program?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I believe the answer is that there is not very much saving as compared with the annual leave program in effect at the present time. That is to say, there is a saving in the classified service, but it is offset, to a considerable degree, by reason of increasing leave for those in the postal service.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman in his discussion with the conferees from the other body obtain any information as to how much saving was made with respect to the curtailment that was put into effect last year on deliveries and collections of mail?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That question was not considered by the conference committee at all. It was not included in this legislation. So, for that reason, there was no occasion to discuss it in this conference committee. I will say to the gentleman that the conference committee did spend a great deal of time in attempting to deal with this entire problem of how much money could be raised to partly offset the deficit in the postal service.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Was there anything done affecting the accumulated leave of persons who have, for instance, 60 or 90 days accumulated leave from past years of service?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No, because the amount of annual leave accumulated by the employees will still remain to their credit after the passage of this bill. The limit on accumulation of annual leave is 60 days, the same as it is under present law.

However, with respect to sick leave there is no limit on the amount of accumulation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Are we to understand that the accumulated leave on 60 days is accumulated for the future after this bill becomes law, or a part of the old accumulated leave?

Mr. REES of Kansas. If an employee has already accumulated 60 days annual leave, he will not accumulate more under this bill.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut, a member of our committee.

Mr. SADLAK. With the adoption of this conference report dealing with annual and sick leave, employees in all branches of the Government are treated equally, and the postal employees will have the same amount of leave as others; in other words, we have uniformity throughout the entire service.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As usual, the gentleman is eminently correct. We have had a great deal of discussion on the floor of the House and a lot more of it in the committee with respect to the fact that those in the postal service do not have as much leave as those in the classified service. We are certain this legislation will eliminate that criticism.

This legislation as it stands is expected to raise $120,000,000 annually.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS ON THE TAX BILL

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the conference report on the tax bill, H. R. 4473, just prior to the ordering of the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

REVENUE ACT OF 1951

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4473) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 213]

Aandahl	Dondero	Murray, Wis.
Allen, Calif.	Engle	O'Neill
Allen, La.	Fine	O'Toole
Anderson, Calif.	Golden	Passman
Anfuso	Granger	Perkins
Angell	Hagen	Phillips
Armstrong	Hays, Ark	Powell
Baring	Hébert	Prouty
Bates, Ky.	Herlong	Quinn
Blackney	Hess	Reams
Boggs, La.	Irving	Redden
Bosone	Jackson, Calif.	Reed, Ill.
Brambiett	Johnson	Regan
Brooks	Kearney	Ribicoff
Brown, Ohio	Kelley, Pa.	Rogers, Fla.
Busbey	Kennedy	Roosevelt
Celler	Keogh	Sabath
Cole, N. Y.	Kilburn	Shelley
Combs	King	Sheppard
Crawford	Latham	Short
Crosser	Lucas	Sieminski
Curtis, Mo.	Lyle	Sikes
Dague	McDonough	Thornberry
Davis, Wis.	Mack, Ill.	Vinson
Dawson	Martin, Iowa	Yursell
Deane	Mason	Watts
Delaney	Miller, Calif.	Werdel
Dempsey	Morrison	Wilson, Tex.
D'Ewart	Murphy	Zablocki

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 341 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REVENUE ACT OF 1951

The SPEAKER The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr DOUGHTON] asks unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT No 1213)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4473), to provide revenue, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 3, 5, 94, 98, 119, 120, 123, 124, 125, 126, 130, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 138, 139, 140, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 152, 155, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 170, 177, 182, 183, 201, 202, and 203.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 87, 95, 103, 105, 106, 108, 109, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 153, 169, 171, 176, 180, 181, 186, 187, 189, 190, 192, 195, 196, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 212, 218, 223, 229, 230, 232, 233, 242, 243, and 244 and agree to the same

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

Strike out the surtax table beginning on page 1 of the Senate engrossed amendments and insert the following:

"'If the surtax net income is:

Not over $2,000	17.4% of the surtax net income.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000.	$348, plus 19.4% of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000.	$736, plus 24% of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000.	$1,216, plus 27% of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000.	$1,756, plus 32% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000.	$2,396, plus 36% of excess over $10,000
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000.	$3,116, plus 40% of excess over $12,000
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000.	$3,916, plus 45% of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000.	$4,816, plus 48% of excess over $16,000
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000.	$5,776, plus 51% of excess over $18,000
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000.	$6,796, plus 54% of excess over $20,000
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000.	$7,876, plus 57% of excess over $22,000
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000.	$10,156, plus 60% of excess over $26,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000.	$13,756, plus 63% of excess over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000.	$17,536, plus 66% of excess over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000.	$21,496, plus 70% of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000.	$25,696, plus 72% of excess over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000.	$32,896, plus 75% of excess over $60,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000.	$40,396, plus 79% of excess over $70,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000.	$48,296, plus 81% of excess over $80,000.
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000.	$56,396, plus 84% of excess over $90,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000.	$64,796, plus 86% of excess over $100,000.
Over $150,000 but not over $200,000.	$107,796, plus 87% of excess over $150,000.
Over $200,000	$151,296, plus 88% of excess over $200,000."

Strike out the surtax table on page 3 of the Senate engrossed amendments and insert the following

"'If the surtax net income is:

Not over $2,000	19.2% of the surtax net income.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000.	$384, plus 21.6% of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000.	$816, plus 26% of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000.	$1,336, plus 31% of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000.	$1,956, plus 35% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000.	$2,656, plus 39% of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000.	$3,436, plus 45% of excess over $12,000.

"'If the surtax net income is:	The surtax shall be:
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000.	$4,336, plus 50% of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000.	$5,336, plus 53% of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000.	$6,396, plus 56% of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000.	$7,516, plus 59% of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000.	$8,696, plus 63% of excess over $22,000
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000.	$11,216, plus 64% of excess over $26,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000.	$15,056, plus 65% of excess over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000.	$18,956, plus 69% of excess over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000.	$23,096, plus 72% of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000.	$27,416, plus 74% of excess over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000.	$34,816, plus 77% of excess over $60,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000.	$42,516, plus 80% of excess over $70,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000.	$50,516, plus 82% of excess over $80,000.
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000.	$58,716, plus 85% of excess over $90,000
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000	$67,216, plus 87% of excess over $100,000
Over $150,000 but not over $200,000.	$110,716, plus 88% of excess over $150,000.
Over $200,000 ------	$154,716, plus 89% of excess over $200,000 "

Strike out the tables on pages 7 and 8 of the Senate engrossed amendments and insert the following:

"'TABLE II

"'*Taxable years beginning after Oct. 31, 1951, and before January 1, 1954*

If adjusted gross income is—		And the number of exemptions is—				If adjusted gross income is—		And the number of exemptions is—										
								1		2			3					
At least	But less than	1	2	3	4 or more	At least	But less than	And taxpayer is single or married filing separately	And tax payer is head of household	And taxpayer is single or married filing separately	And tax payer is head of household	And a joint return is filed	And tax payer is single or married filing separately	And tax payer is head of household	And a joint return is filed	4	5	6	7	8 or more
		The tax shall be—						The tax shall be—										
$0	$675	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,325	$2,350	$334	$334	$201	$201	$201	$67	$67	$67	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
675	700	4	0	0	0	2,350	2,375	339	339	206	206	206	72	72	72	0	0	0	0	0
700	725	9	0	0	0	2,375	2,400	344	344	211	211	211	77	77	77	0	0	0	0	0
725	750	14	0	0	0	2,400	2,425	349	349	216	216	216	82	82	82	0	0	0	0	0
750	775	19	0	0	2	2,425	2,450	354	354	221	221	221	87	87	87	0	0	0	0	0
775	800	24	0	0	0	2,450	2,475	359	359	226	226	226	92	92	92	0	0	0	0	0
800	825	29	0	0	0	2,475	2,500	364	364	231	231	231	97	97	97	0	0	0	0	0
825	850	34	0	0	0	2,500	2,525	369	369	236	236	236	102	102	102	0	0	0	0	0
850	875	39	0	0	0	2,525	2,550	374	374	241	241	241	107	107	107	0	0	0	0	0
875	900	44	0	0	0	2,550	2,575	379	379	246	246	246	112	112	112	0	0	0	0	0
900	925	49	0	0	0	2,575	2,600	384	384	251	251	251	117	117	117	0	0	0	0	0
925	950	54	0	0	0	2,600	2,625	389	389	256	256	256	122	122	122	0	0	0	0	0
950	975	59	0	0	0	2,625	2,650	394	394	261	261	261	127	127	127	0	0	0	0	0
975	1,000	64	0	0	0	2,650	2,675	399	399	266	266	266	132	132	132	0	0	0	0	0
1,000	1,025	69	0	0	0	2,675	2,700	404	404	271	271	271	137	137	137	4	0	0	0	0
1,025	1,050	74	0	0	0	2,700	2,725	409	409	276	276	276	142	142	142	9	0	0	0	0
1,050	1,075	79	0	0	0	2,725	2,750	414	414	281	281	281	147	147	147	14	0	0	0	0
1,075	1,100	84	0	0	0	2,750	2,775	419	419	286	286	286	152	152	152	19	0	0	0	0
1,100	1,125	89	0	0	0	2,775	2,800	424	424	291	291	291	157	157	157	24	0	0	0	0
1,125	1,150	94	0	0	0	2,800	2,825	429	429	296	296	296	162	162	162	29	0	0	0	0
1,150	1,175	99	0	0	0	2,825	2,850	434	434	301	301	301	167	167	167	34	0	0	0	0
1,175	1,200	104	0	0	0	2,850	2,875	439	439	306	306	306	172	172	172	39	0	0	0	0
1,200	1,225	109	0	0	0	2,875	2,900	444	444	311	311	311	177	177	177	44	0	0	0	0
1,225	1,250	114	0	0	0	2,900	2,925	449	449	316	316	316	182	182	182	49	0	0	0	0
1,250	1,275	119	0	0	0	2,925	2,950	455	454	321	321	321	187	187	187	54	0	0	0	0
1,275	1,300	124	0	0	0	2,950	2,975	460	459	326	326	326	192	192	192	59	0	0	0	0
1,300	1,325	129	0	0	0	2,975	3,000	466	465	331	331	331	197	197	197	64	0	0	0	0
1,325	1,350	134	1	0	0	3,000	3,050	474	473	338	338	338	205	205	205	72	0	0	0	0
1,350	1,375	139	6	0	0	3,050	3,100	485	483	348	348	348	215	215	215	82	0	0	0	0
1,375	1,400	144	11	0	0	3,100	3,150	496	494	358	358	358	225	225	225	92	0	0	0	0
1,400	1,425	149	16	0	0	3,150	3,200	507	504	368	368	368	235	235	235	102	0	0	0	0
1,425	1,450	154	21	0	0	3,200	3,250	518	515	378	378	378	245	245	245	112	0	0	0	0
1,450	1,475	159	26	0	0	3,250	3,300	529	525	388	388	388	255	255	255	122	0	0	0	0
1,475	1,500	164	31	0	0	3,300	3,350	541	536	398	398	398	265	265	265	132	0	0	0	0
1,500	1,525	169	36	0	0	3,350	3,400	552	546	408	408	408	275	275	275	142	8	0	0	0
1,525	1,550	174	41	0	0	3,400	3,450	563	557	418	418	418	285	285	285	152	18	0	0	0
1,550	1,575	179	46	0	0	3,450	3,500	574	567	428	428	428	295	295	295	162	28	0	0	0
1,575	1,600	184	51	0	0	3,500	3,550	585	578	438	438	438	305	305	305	171	38	0	0	0
1,600	1,625	189	56	0	0	3,550	3,600	596	588	448	448	448	315	315	315	181	48	0	0	0
1,625	1,650	194	61	0	0	3,600	3,650	607	599	459	459	458	325	325	325	191	58	0	0	0
1,650	1,675	199	66	0	0	3,650	3,700	618	610	470	469	468	335	335	335	201	68	0	0	0
1,675	1,700	204	71	0	0	3,700	3,750	629	620	482	480	478	345	345	345	211	78	0	0	0
1,700	1,725	209	76	0	0	3,750	3,800	640	631	493	490	488	355	355	355	221	88	0	0	0
1,725	1,750	214	81	0	0	3,800	3,850	651	641	504	501	498	365	365	365	231	98	0	0	0
1,750	1,775	219	86	0	0	3,850	3,900	662	652	515	511	508	375	375	375	241	108	0	0	0
1,775	1,800	224	91	0	0	3,900	3,950	673	662	526	522	518	385	385	385	251	118	0	0	0
1,800	1,825	229	96	0	0	3,950	4,000	684	673	537	532	528	395	395	395	261	128	0	0	0
1,825	1,850	234	101	0	0	4,000	4,050	696	683	548	543	538	405	405	405	271	138	5	0	0
1,850	1,875	239	106	0	0	4,050	4,100	707	694	559	553	548	415	415	415	281	148	15	0	0
1,875	1,900	244	111	0	0	4,100	4,150	718	704	570	564	558	425	425	425	291	158	25	0	0
1,900	1,925	249	116	0	0	4,150	4,200	729	715	581	574	568	435	435	435	301	168	35	0	0
1,925	1,950	254	121	0	0	4,200	4,250	740	725	592	585	578	445	445	445	311	178	45	0	0
1,950	1,975	259	126	0	0	4,250	4,300	751	736	603	596	588	456	455	455	321	188	55	0	0
1,975	2,000	264	131	0	0	4,300	4,350	762	746	614	606	598	467	466	465	331	198	65	0	0
2,000	2,025	269	136	2	0	4,350	4,400	773	757	625	617	608	478	476	475	341	208	75	0	0
2,025	2,050	274	141	7	0	4,400	4,450	784	768	636	627	618	489	487	485	351	218	85	0	0
2,050	2,075	279	146	12	0	4,450	4,500	795	778	648	638	628	500	497	495	361	228	95	0	0
2,075	2,100	284	151	17	0	4,500	4,550	806	789	659	648	638	511	508	504	371	238	105	0	0
2,100	2,125	289	156	22	0	4,550	4,600	817	799	670	659	648	522	518	514	381	248	115	0	0
2,125	2,150	294	161	27	0	4,600	4,650	828	810	681	669	658	533	529	524	391	258	125	0	0
2,150	2,175	299	166	32	0	4,650	4,700	839	820	692	680	668	544	539	534	401	268	135	2	0
2,175	2,200	304	171	37	0	4,700	4,750	851	831	703	690	678	555	550	544	411	278	145	12	0
2,200	2,225	309	176	42	0	4,750	4,800	862	841	714	701	688	566	560	554	421	288	155	22	0
2,225	2,250	314	181	47	0	4,800	4,850	873	852	725	711	698	577	571	564	431	298	165	32	0
2,250	2,275	319	186	52	0	4,850	4,900	884	862	736	722	708	589	581	574	441	308	175	42	0
2,275	2,300	324	191	57	0	4,900	4,950	895	873	747	732	718	600	592	584	451	318	185	52	0
2,300	2,325	329	196	62	0	4,950	5,000	906	883	758	743	728	611	603	594	461	328	195	62	0

"'TABLE III

"'*Taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953*

If adjusted gross income is—		And the number of exemptions is—				If adjusted gross income is—		And the number of exemptions is—											
								1		2			3						
At least	But less than	1	2	3	4 or more	At least	But less than	And taxpayer is single or married filing separately	And taxpayer is head of household	And taxpayer is single or married filing separately	And taxpayer is head of household	And a joint return is filed	And taxpayer is single or married filing separately	And taxpayer is head of household	And a joint return is filed	4	5	6	7	8 or more
		The tax shall be—						The tax shall be—											
$0	$675	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,325	$2,350	$301	$301	$181	$181	$181	$61	$61	$61	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
675	700	4	0	0	0	2,350	2,375	305	305	185	185	185	65	65	65	0	0	0	0	0
700	725	8	0	0	0	2,375	2,400	310	310	190	190	190	70	70	70	0	0	0	0	0
725	750	13	0	0	0	2,400	2,425	314	314	194	194	194	74	74	74	0	0	0	0	0
750	775	17	0	0	0	2,425	2,450	319	319	199	199	199	79	79	79	0	0	0	0	0
775	800	22	0	0	0	2,450	2,475	323	323	203	203	203	83	83	83	0	0	0	0	0
800	825	26	0	0	0	2,475	2,500	328	328	208	208	208	88	88	88	0	0	0	0	0
825	850	31	0	0	0	2,500	2,525	332	332	212	212	212	92	92	92	0	0	0	0	0
850	875	35	0	0	0	2,525	2,550	337	337	217	217	217	97	97	97	0	0	0	0	0
875	900	40	0	0	0	2,550	2,575	341	341	221	221	221	101	101	101	0	0	0	0	0
900	925	44	0	0	0	2,575	2,600	346	346	226	226	226	106	106	106	0	0	0	0	0
925	950	49	0	0	0	2,600	2,625	350	350	230	230	230	110	110	110	0	0	0	0	0
950	975	53	0	0	0	2,625	2,650	355	355	235	235	235	115	115	115	0	0	0	0	0
975	1,000	58	0	0	0	2,650	2,675	359	359	239	239	239	119	119	119	0	0	0	0	0
1,000	1,025	62	0	0	0	2,675	2,700	364	364	244	244	244	124	121	124	4	0	0	0	0
1,025	1,050	67	0	0	0	2,700	2,725	368	368	248	248	248	128	128	128	8	0	0	0	0
1,050	1,075	71	0	0	0	2,725	2,750	373	373	253	253	253	133	133	133	13	0	0	0	0
1,075	1,100	76	0	0	0	2,750	2,775	377	377	257	257	257	137	137	137	17	0	0	0	0
1,100	1,125	80	0	0	0	2,775	2,800	382	382	262	262	262	142	142	142	22	0	0	0	0
1,125	1,150	85	0	0	0	2,800	2,825	386	386	266	266	266	146	146	146	26	0	0	0	0
1,150	1,175	89	0	0	0	2,825	2,850	391	391	271	271	271	151	151	151	31	0	0	0	0
1,175	1,200	94	0	0	0	2,850	2,875	395	395	275	275	275	155	155	155	35	0	0	0	0
1,200	1,225	98	0	0	0	2,875	2,900	400	400	280	280	280	160	160	160	40	0	0	0	0
1,225	1,250	103	0	0	0	2,900	2,925	405	404	284	284	284	164	164	164	44	0	0	0	0
1,250	1,275	107	0	0	0	2,925	2,950	410	409	289	289	289	169	169	169	49	0	0	0	0
1,275	1,300	112	0	0	0	2,950	2,975	415	414	293	293	293	173	173	173	53	0	0	0	0
1,300	1,325	116	0	0	0	2,975	3,000	420	419	298	298	298	178	178	178	58	0	0	0	0
1,325	1,350	121	1	0	0	3,000	3,050	427	426	305	305	305	185	185	185	65	0	0	0	0
1,350	1,375	125	5	0	0	3,050	3,100	437	435	314	314	314	194	194	194	74	0	0	0	0
1,375	1,400	130	10	0	0	3,100	3,150	447	445	323	323	323	203	203	203	83	0	0	0	0
1,400	1,425	134	14	0	0	3,150	3,200	457	454	332	332	332	212	212	212	92	0	0	0	0
1,425	1,450	139	19	0	0	3,200	3,250	467	464	341	341	341	221	221	221	101	0	0	0	0
1,450	1,475	143	23	0	0	3,250	3,300	476	473	350	350	350	230	230	230	110	0	0	0	0
1,475	1,500	148	28	0	0	3,300	3,350	486	482	359	359	359	239	239	239	119	0	0	0	0
1,500	1,525	152	32	0	0	3,350	3,400	496	492	368	368	368	248	248	248	128	8	0	0	0
1,525	1,550	157	37	0	0	3,400	3,450	506	501	377	377	377	257	257	257	137	17	0	0	0
1,550	1,575	161	41	0	0	3,450	3,500	516	511	386	386	386	266	266	266	146	26	0	0	0
1,575	1,600	166	46	0	0	3,500	3,550	526	520	395	395	395	275	275	275	155	35	0	0	0
1,600	1,625	170	50	0	0	3,550	3,600	536	530	404	404	404	284	284	284	164	44	0	0	0
1,625	1,650	175	55	0	0	3,600	3,650	546	539	414	413	413	293	293	293	173	53	0	0	0
1,650	1,675	179	59	0	0	3,650	3,700	556	549	424	423	422	302	302	302	182	62	0	0	0
1,675	1,700	184	64	0	0	3,700	3,750	566	558	434	432	431	311	311	311	191	71	0	0	0
1,700	1,725	188	68	0	0	3,750	3,800	575	567	443	441	440	320	320	320	200	80	0	0	0
1,725	1,750	193	73	0	0	3,800	3,850	585	577	453	451	449	329	329	329	209	89	0	0	0
1,750	1,775	197	77	0	0	3,850	3,900	595	586	463	460	458	338	338	338	218	98	0	0	0
1,775	1,800	202	82	0	0	3,900	3,950	605	596	473	470	467	347	347	347	227	107	0	0	0
1,800	1,825	206	86	0	0	3,950	4,000	615	605	483	479	476	356	356	356	236	116	0	0	0
1,825	1,850	211	91	0	0	4,000	4,050	625	615	493	489	485	365	365	365	245	125	5	0	0
1,850	1,875	215	95	0	0	4,050	4,100	635	624	503	498	494	374	374	374	254	134	14	0	0
1,875	1,900	220	100	0	0	4,100	4,150	645	634	513	508	503	383	383	383	263	143	23	0	0
1,900	1,925	224	104	0	0	4,150	4,200	655	643	523	517	512	392	392	392	272	152	32	0	0
1,925	1,950	229	109	0	0	4,200	4,250	665	653	533	527	521	401	401	401	281	161	41	0	0
1,950	1,975	233	113	0	0	4,250	4,300	674	662	542	536	530	410	410	410	290	170	50	0	0
1,975	2,000	238	118	0	0	4,300	4,350	684	671	552	545	539	420	419	419	299	179	59	0	0
2,000	2,025	242	122	2	0	4,350	4,400	694	681	562	555	548	430	429	428	308	188	68	0	0
2,025	2,050	247	127	7	0	4,400	4,450	704	690	572	564	557	440	438	437	317	197	77	0	0
2,050	2,075	251	131	11	0	4,450	4,500	714	700	582	574	566	450	448	446	326	206	86	0	0
2,075	2,100	256	136	16	0	4,500	4,550	724	709	592	583	575	460	457	455	335	215	95	0	0
2,100	2,125	260	140	20	0	4,550	4,600	734	719	602	593	584	470	467	464	344	224	104	0	0
2,125	2,150	265	145	25	0	4,600	4,650	744	728	612	602	593	480	476	473	353	233	113	0	0
2,150	2,175	269	149	29	0	4,650	4,700	754	738	622	612	602	490	486	482	362	242	122	2	0
2,175	2,200	274	154	34	0	4,700	4,750	764	747	632	621	611	500	495	491	371	251	131	11	0
2,200	2,225	278	158	38	0	4,750	4,800	773	756	641	630	620	509	501	500	380	260	140	20	0
2,225	2,250	283	163	43	0	4,800	4,850	783	766	651	640	629	519	514	509	389	269	149	29	0
2,250	2,275	287	167	47	0	4,850	4,900	793	775	661	649	638	529	523	518	398	278	158	38	0
2,275	2,300	292	172	52	0	4,900	4,950	803	785	671	659	647	539	533	527	407	287	167	47	0
2,300	2,325	296	176	56	0	4,950	5,000	813	794	681	668	656	549	542	536	416	296	176	56	0'

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"'(b) Imposition of tax. There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the normal-tax net income of every corporation (except a corporation subject to a tax imposed by section 231 (a), Supplement G, or Supplement Q)—

"'(1) Calendar year 1951: In the case of a taxable year beginning on January 1, 1951, and ending on December 31, 1951, a tax of 28¾ per centum of the normal-tax net income.

"'(2) Taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951 and before April 1, 1954: In the case of taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954, a tax of 30 per centum of the normal-tax income.

"'(3) Taxable years beginning after March 31, 1954: In the case of taxable years beginning after March 31, 1954, a tax of 25 per centum of the normal-tax net income.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 13, line 13, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)."

On page 13, line 24, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "16½" and insert "17¼."

On page 14, line 12, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "17" and insert "18."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(c) Mutual insurance companies, other than life or marine:

"(1) Section 207 (a) (1) (relating to normal tax and surtax on mutual insurance companies, other than life or marine) is

hereby amended by striking out subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(A) Taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, and before April 1, 1951: In the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, and before April 1, 1951, and ending after March 31, 1951—

"'(i) Normal tax: A normal tax of 28¾ per centum of the normal-tax net income, or 57½ per centum of the amount by which the normal-tax net income exceeds $3,000, whichever is the lesser; plus

"'(ii) Surtax: A surtax of 22 per centum of the corporation surtax net income in excess of $25,000.

"'(B) Taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954: In the case of taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954—

"'(i) Normal tax A normal tax of 30 per centum of the normal-tax net income, or 60 per centum of the amount by which the normal-tax net income exceeds $3,000, whichever is the lesser, plus

"'(ii) Surtax: A surtax of 22 per centum of the corporation surtax net income in excess of $25,000.

"'(C) Taxable years beginning after March 31, 1954 In the case of a taxable year beginning after March 31, 1954—

"'(i) Normal tax. A normal tax of 25 per centum of the normal-tax net income, or 50 per centum of the amount by which the normal-tax net income exceeds $3,000, whichever is the lesser, plus

"'(ii) Surtax. A surtax of 22 per centum of the corporation surtax net income in excess of $25,000.'

"(2) Section 207 (a) (3) (relating to a normal tax and surtax on interinsurers and reciprocal underwriters) is hereby amended by striking out subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(A) Taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, and before April 1, 1951. In the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, and before April 1, 1951, and ending after March 31, 1951—

"'(i) Normal tax: A normal tax of 28¾ per centum of the normal-tax net income, or 57½ per centum of the amount by which the normal-tax net income exceeds $50,000, whichever is the lesser; plus

"'(ii) Surtax. A surtax of 22 per centum of the corporation surtax net income in excess of $25,000, or 33 per centum of the amount by which the corporation surtax net income exceeds $50,000, whichever is the lesser

"'(B) Taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954: In the case of taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954—

"'(i) Normal tax: A normal tax of 30 per centum of the normal-tax net income, or 60 per centum of the amount by which the normal-tax net income exceeds $50,000, whichever is the lesser; plus

"'(ii) Surtax: A surtax of 22 per centum of the corporation surtax net income in excess of $25,000, or 33 per centum of the amount by which the corporation surtax net income exceeds $50,000, whichever is the lesser

"'(C) Taxable years beginning after March 31, 1954. In the case of a taxable year beginning after March 31, 1954—

"'(i) Normal tax: A normal tax of 25 per centum of the normal-tax net income, or 50 per centum of the amount by which the normal-tax net income exceeds $50,000, whichever is the lesser; plus

"'(ii) Surtax: A surtax of 22 per centum of the corporation surtax net income in excess of $25,000, or 33 per centum of the amount by which the corporation surtax net income exceeds $50,000, whichever is the lesser.'

"(d) Regulated investment companies: Section 362 (b) (relating to tax on regulated investment companies) is hereby amended by striking out paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(3) In the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, and before April 1, 1951, and ending after March 31, 1951, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon its Supplement Q net income a tax equal to 28¾ per centum of the amount thereof. In the case of taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon its Supplement Q net income a tax equal to 30 per centum of the amount thereof. In the case of taxable years beginning after March 31, 1954, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon its Supplement Q net income a tax equal to 25 per centum of the amount thereof

"'(4) In the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon its Supplement Q surtax net income a tax equal to 22 per centum of the amount thereof in excess of $25,000.'

"(e) Business income of certain section 101 organizations Section 421 (a) (1) (relating to imposition of tax on business income of certain section 101 organizations) is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following. '; except that (A) in the case of taxable years beginning before April 1, 1951, and ending after March 31, 1951, the normal tax shall be 28¾ per centum of the Supplement U net income, and (B) in the case of taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954, the normal tax shall be 30 per centum of the Supplement U net income'

"(f) Amendment of section 15. Section 15 (relating to surtax on corporations) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC 15 Surtax on corporations.

"'(a) Corporation surtax net income. For the purposes of this chapter, the term "corporation surtax net income" means the net income minus the sum of the following credits

"'(1) The credit for dividends received provided in section 26 (b);

"'(2) In the case of a public utility, the credit for dividends paid on its preferred stock provided in section 26 (h);

"'(3) In the case of a western hemisphere trade corporation (as defined in section 109), the credit provided in section 26 (i).

"'(b) Imposition of tax There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the corporation surtax net income of every corporation (except a corporation subject to a tax imposed by section 231 (a), Supplement G, or Supplement Q) a surtax of 22 per centum of the amount of the corporation surtax net income in excess of $25,000

"'(c) Disallowance of surtax exemption and minimum excess profits credit If any corporation transfers, on or after January 1, 1951, all or part of its property (other than money) to another corporation which was created for the purpose of acquiring such property or which was not actively engaged in business at the time of such acquisition, and if such transfer the transferor corporation or its stockholders, or both, are in control of such transferee corporation during any part of the taxable year of such transferee corporation, then such transferee corporation shall not for such taxable year (except as may be otherwise determined under section 129 (b)) be allowed either the $25,000 exemption from surtax provided in subsection (b) or the $25,000 minimum excess profits credit provided in the last sentence of section 431, unless such transferee corporation shall establish by the clear preponderance of the evidence that the securing of such exemption or credit was not a major purpose of such transfer. For the purposes of this subsection, control means the ownership of stock possessing at least 80 per centum of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote or at least 80 per centum of the total value or shares of all classes of stock of the corporation In determining the ownership of stock for the purpose of this subsection, the ownership of stock shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 503, except that constructive ownership under section 503 (a) (2) shall be determined only with respect to the individual's spouse and minor children. The provisions of section 129 (b), and the authority of the Secretary under such section, shall, to the extent not inconsistent with the provisions of this subsection, be applicable to this subsection. This subsection shall not apply to any taxable year with respect to which the tax imposed by subchapter D of this chapter is not in effect'

"(g) Technical amendment. Section 14 (relating to normal tax on special classes of corporations in the case of taxable years beginning before July 1, 1950) is hereby repealed"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 122. Credits of corporations.

"(a) Dividends received credit. Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 26 (b) (relating to credit for dividends received) are hereby amended to read as follows.

"'(1) In general. 85 per centum of the amount received as dividends (other than dividends described in paragraph (2) on the preferred stock of a public utility) from a domestic corporation which is subject to taxation under this chapter.

"'(2) Certain preferred stock:

"'(A) Calendar year 1951. In the case of a taxable year beginning on January 1, 1951, and ending on December 31, 1951, 61 per centum of the amount received as dividends on the preferred stock of a public utility which is subject to taxation under this chapter and with respect to which the credit provided in section 26 (h) for dividends paid is allowable

"'(B) Taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954 In the case of taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954, 62 per centum of the amount received as dividends on the preferred stock of a public utility which is subject to taxation under this chapter and with respect to which the credit provided in section 26 (h) for dividends paid is allowable.

"'(C) Taxable years beginning after March 31, 1954 In the case of taxable years beginning after March 31, 1954, 59 per centum of the amount received as dividends on the preferred stock of a public utility which is subject to taxation under this chapter and with respect to which the credit provided in section 26 (h) for dividends paid is allowable'

"(b) Credit for dividends paid on certain Preferred Stock: The first sentence of section 26 (h) (1) (relating to amount of credit for dividends paid on certain preferred stock) is hereby amended to read as follows: 'In the case of a public utility, (A) for a taxable year beginning on January 1, 1951, and ending on December 31, 1951, an amount equal to 28 per centum of the lesser of (i) the amount of dividends paid during the taxable year on its preferred stock or (ii) the adjusted net income for such taxable year minus the credit for dividends received provided in subsection (b) for such year, (B) for a taxable year beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954, an amount

equal to 27 per centum of the lesser of (i) the amount of dividends paid during the taxable year on its preferred stock or (ii) the adjusted net income for such taxable year minus the credit for dividends received provided in subsection (b) for such year, and (C) for a taxable year beginning after March 31, 1954, an amount equal to 30 per centum of the lower of (i) the amount of dividends paid during the taxable year on its preferred stock or (ii) the adjusted net income for such taxable year minus the credit for dividends received provided in subsection (b) for such year'.

"(c) Western Hemisphere trade corporations: Section 26 (i) (relating to credit of a western hemisphere trade corporation) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(i) Western Hemisphere trade corporations: In the case of a western hemisphere trade corporation (as defined in section 109)—

"'(1) Calender year 1951: In the case of a taxable year beginning on January 1, 1951, and ending on December 31, 1951, an amount equal to 28 per centum of its normal-tax net income computed without regard to the credit provided in this subsection.

"'(2) Taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954: In the case of a taxable year beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954, an amount equal to 27 per centum of its normal-tax net income computed without regard to the credit provided in this subsection

"'(3) Taxable years beginning after March 31, 1945: In the case of a taxable year beginning after March 31, 1954, an amount equal to 30 per centum of its normal-tax net income computed without regard to the credit provided in this subsection'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment and insert the following:

"SEC. 123. Computation of alternative capital gains tax.

"Section 117 (c) (1) (relating to alternative tax on corporations) is hereby amended by striking out the second paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(A) A partial tax shall first be computed upon the net income reduced by the amount of such excess, at the rates and in the manner as if this subsection had not been enacted

"'(B) There shall then be ascertained an amount equal to 25 per centum of such excess, except that in the case of any taxable year beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954, there shall be ascertained an amount equal to 26 per centum of such excess.

"'(C) The total tax shall be the partial tax computed under subparagraph (A) plus the amount computed under subparagraph (B).'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 24, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "123" and insert "124"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 25, line 21, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "124" and insert "125"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 27 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"'(3) that portion of a tentative tax consisting of—

"'(A) a tentative normal tax of 30 per centum of the normal-tax net income, plus

"'(B) a tentative surtax of 20 per centum of the surtax net income in excess of $25,000'."

On page 31 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out subsection (k) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"'(k) Taxable years of corporations beginning before April 1, 1954, and ending after March 31, 1954: In the case of a taxable year of a corporation beginning before April 1, 1954, and ending after March 31, 1954, the tax imposed by sections 13 and 15, or section 421 (a) (1), shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

"'(1) that portion of a tentative tax, computed under the provisions of sections 13 and 15, or section 421 (a) (1), applicable to years beginning on January 1, 1953, which the number of days in such taxable year prior to April 1, 1954, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year, plus

"'(2) that portion of a tentative tax, computed under the provisions of sections 13 and 15, or section 421 (a) (1), applicable to years beginning on April 1, 1954, as if such provisions were applicable to such taxable year, which the number of days in such taxable year after March 31, 1954, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year.'"

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

Strike out the surtax table beginning on page 39 of the Senate engrossed amendments and insert the following:

"'If the surtax net income is: The surtax shall be:

Not over $2,000	19 2% of the surtax net income.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000.	$384, plus 20 4% of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000.	$792, plus 24% of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000.	$1,272, plus 26% of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000.	$1,792, plus 31% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000.	$2,412, plus 32% of excess over $10,000
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000.	$3,052, plus 38% of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000.	$3,812, plus 41% of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000.	$4,632, plus 44% of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000.	$5,512, plus 45% of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000.	$6,412, plus 49% of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $24,000.	$7,392, plus 51% of excess over $22,000.
Over $24,000 but not over $28,000.	$8,412, plus 54% of excess over $24,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000.	$10,572, plus 57% of excess over $28,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000.	$12,852, plus 60% of excess over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000.	$16,452, plus 63% of excess over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000.	$20,234, plus 68% of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000.	$24,312, plus 69% of excess over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000.	$31,212, plus 70% of excess over $60,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000.	$38,212, plus 74% of excess over $70,000
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000.	$45,612, plus 76% of excess over $80,000.
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000.	$53,212, plus 78% of excess over $90,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000.	$61,012, plus 82% of excess over $100,000
Over $150,000 but not over $200,000.	$102,012, plus 85% of excess over $150,000.
Over $200,000 but not over $300,000.	$144,512, plus 88% of excess over $200,000.
Over $300,000	$232,512, plus 89% of excess over $300,000 '

Strike out the surtax table beginning on page 41 of the Senate engrossed amendments and insert the following:

"'If the surtax net income is: The surtax shall be:

Not over $2,000	17% of the surtax net income.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000.	$340, plus 18% of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000.	$700, plus 21% of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000.	$1,120, plus 23% of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000.	$1,580, plus 27% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000.	$2,120, plus 29% of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000.	$2,700, plus 33% of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000.	$3,360, plus 36% of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000.	$4,080, plus 39% of excess over $16,000
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000.	$4,860, plus 40% of excess over $18,000
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000.	$5,660, plus 44% of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $24,000.	$6,540, plus 46% of excess over $22,000.
Over $24,000 but not over $28,000.	$7,460, plus 49% of excess over $24,000
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000.	$9,420, plus 51% of excess over $28,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000.	$11,460, plus 55% of excess over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000.	$14,760, plus 59% of excess over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000.	$18,300, plus 63% of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000.	$22,080, plus 65% of excess over $50,000.

" 'If the surtax net income is: The surtax shall be:

Over $60,000 but not over $70,000.	$28,580, plus of excess over $60,000.	68%
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000.	$35,380, plus of excess over $70,000.	71%
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000.	$42,480, plus of excess over $80,000.	73%
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000.	$49,780, plus of excess over $90,000.	77%
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000.	$57,480, plus of excess over $100,000.	80%
Over $150,000 but not over $200,000.	$97,480, plus of excess over $150,000.	84%
Over $200,000 but not over $300,000.	$139,480, plus of excess over $200,000.	87%
Over $300,000 ------	$226,480, plus of excess over $300,000."	88%

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 311. Credit for dividends received.

"(a) Dividends from foreign corporation engaged in trade or business in the United States: Section 26 (b) (relating to dividends received credit) is hereby amended by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

" '(3) Dividends received from certain foreign corporations: In the case of dividends received from a foreign corporation (other than a foreign personal holding company) which is subject to taxation under this chapter, if, for an uninterrupted period of not less than 36 months ending with the close of such foreign corporation's taxable year in which such dividends are paid (or, if the corporation has not been in existence for 36 months at the close of such taxable year, for the period the foreign corporation has been in existence as of the close of such taxable year) such foreign corporation has been engaged in trade or business within the United States and has derived 50 per centum or more of its gross income from sources within the United States—

" '(A) an amount equal to 85 per centum of the dividends received out of its earnings or profits specified in clause (2) of the first sentence of section 115 (a), but such amount shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to 85 per centum of such dividends received out of such earnings or profits as the gross income of such foreign corporation for the taxable year from sources within the United States bears to its gross income from all sources for such taxable year, and

" '(B) an amount equal to 85 per centum of the dividends received out of that part of its earnings or profits specified in clause (1) of the first sentence of section 115 (a) accumulated after the beginning of such uninterrupted period, but such amount shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to 85 per centum of such dividends received out of such accumulated earnings or profits as the gross income of such foreign corporation from sources within the United States for the portion of such uninterrupted period ending at the beginning of such taxable year bears to its gross income from all sources for such portion of such uninterrupted period.

For determination of earnings or profits distributed in any taxable year, see section 115 (b).'

"(b) Technical amendment: Section 119 (a) (2) (B) (relating to rules as to source of income in the case of dividends) is hereby amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: 'to the extent exceeding the amount which is 100/85ths of the amount of the credit allowable under section 26 (b) in respect of such dividends'.

"(c) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following

"SEC. 313. Mutual savings banks, building and loan associations, cooperative banks.

"(a) Mutual savings banks: Section 101 (2) (relating to exemption from tax of mutual savings banks) is hereby repealed.

"(b) Building and loan associations and cooperative banks: Section 101 (4) (relating to exemption from tax of building and loan associations and cooperative banks) is hereby amended to read as follows.

" '(4) Credit unions without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit; and corporations or associations without capital stock organized prior to September 1, 1951, and operated for mutual purposes and without profit for the purpose of providing reserve funds for, and insurance of, shares or deposits in—

" '(A) domestic building and loan associations,

" '(B) cooperative banks without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit, or

" '(C) mutual savings banks not having capital stock represented by shares;'.

"(c) Exemptions from excess profits tax: Section 454 (corporations exempt from the excess profits tax) is heerby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" '(h) Any mutual savings bank not having capital stock represented by shares, any domestic building and loan association (as defined in section 3797 (a) (19)), and any cooperative bank without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit'

"(d) Federal savings and loan associations: Section 5 (h) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1464 (h)), is hereby amended by striking out 'date)' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'date, and except, in the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951, income, war-profits, and excess-profits taxes)'.

"(e) Bad debt reserves: Section 23 (k) (1) (relating to deduction from gross income of bad debts) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'In the case of a mutual savings bank not having capital stock represented by shares, a domestic building and loan association, and a cooperative bank without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit, the reasonable addition to a reserve for bad debts shall be determined with due regard to the amount of the taxpayer's surplus or bad debt reserves existing at the close of December 31, 1951. In the case of a taxpayer described in the preceding sentence, the reasonable addition to a reserve for bad debts for any taxable year shall in no case be less than the amount determined by the taxpayer, as the reasonable addition for such year; except that the amount determined by the taxpayer under this sentence shall not be greater than the lesser of (A) the amount of its net income for the taxable year, computed without regard to this subsection, or (B) the amount by which 12 per centum of the total deposits or withdrawable accounts of its depositors at the close of such year exceeds the sum of its surplus, undivided profits, and reserves at the beginning of the taxable year.'

"(f) Dividends paid to depositors: Section 23 (r) (relating to the deduction from gross income of certain dividends paid by banking corporations) is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'Dividends paid by banking corporations:

" '(1) In the case of mutual savings banks, cooperative banks, and domestic building and loan associations, amounts paid to, or credited to the accounts of, depositors or holders of accounts as dividends on their deposits or withdrawable accounts, if such amounts paid or credited are withdrawable on demand subject only to customary notice of intention to withdraw.

" '(2) For deduction of dividends paid by certain other banking corporations, see section 121'

"(g) Deduction for repayment of certain loans: Section 23 (relating to deductions from gross income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" '(dd) Repayment by mutual savings banks, etc., of certain loans: In the case of a mutual savings bank not having capital stock represented by shares, a domestic building and loan association, or a cooperative bank without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit, amounts paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year in repayment of loans made prior to September 1, 1951, by (1) the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof which is wholly owned by the United States, or (2) any mutual fund established under the authority of the laws of any State'

"(h) Definition of bank: Section 104 (a) (relating to definition of bank) is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following 'Such term also means a domestic building and loan association.'

"(i) Definition of domestic building and loan association: Section 3797 (a) (relating to definitions for the purposes of the Internal Revenue Code) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" '(19) Domestic building and loan association: "The term domestic building and loan association" means a domestic building and loan association, a domestic savings and loan assocation, and a Federal savings and loan association, substantially all the business of which is confined to making loans to members'

"(j) Effective Date: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with the following amendments.

On page 67, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, insert after the period the following. "Allocations made after the close of the taxable year and on or before the fifteenth day of the ninth month following the close of such year shall be considered as made on the last day of such taxable year to the extent the allocations are attributable to income derived before the close of such year."

On page 67, line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments, insert after "patronage" the following: "in the same or preceding years",

On page 68, line 25, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out the quotation marks and insert the following: "This subsection shall not apply in the cases of any corporation (including any cooperative or nonprofit corporation engaged in rural electrification) exempt from taxation under section 101 (10) or (11) or in the case of any corporation subject to a tax imposed by supplement G."

On page 69 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out line 1 and all that follows through line 9.

On page 69, line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(e)" and insert "(d)".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"'(i) in the case of sand, gravel, slate, stone (including pumice and scoria), brick and tile clay, shale, oyster shell, clam shell, granite, marble, sodium chloride, and, if from brine wells, calcium chloride, magnesium chloride, and bromine, 5 per centum.

"'(ii) in the case of coal, asbestos, brucite, dolomite, magnesite, perlite, wollastonite, calcium carbonates, and magnesium carbonates, 10 percentum.

"'(iii) in the case of metal mines, aplite, bauxite, fluorspar, flake graphite, vermiculite, beryl, garnet, feldspar, mica, talc (including pyrophyllite), lepidolite, spodumene, barite, ball clay, sagger clay, china clay, phosphate rock, rock asphalt, trona, bentonite, gilsonite, thenardite, borax, fuller's earth, tripoli, refractory and fire clay, quartzite, diatomaceous earth, metallurgical grade limestone, chemical grade limestone, and potash, 15 per centum, and'".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 74 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out lines 12 and 13 and insert the following: "taxes) is hereby amended by striking out '50 per centum of the value of the net estate' and inserting in lieu thereof '35 per centum of the value of the gross estate'.", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 74, line 21, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "Exclusive" and insert "Exclusion"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment and insert the following: "In the case of any taxable year beginning after October 31, 1951, and before November 1, 1953, there shall be ascertained, in lieu of the amount computed under the preceding sentence, an amount equal to 26 per centum of the excess of the net long-term capital gain over the net short-term capital loss." And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 79 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out all after "poultry" in line 14 to and including "acquisition" in line 17; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "This paragraph shall not apply to income realized by the owner as a co-adventurer, partner, or principal in the mining of such coal. The date of disposal of such coal shall be deemed to be the date such coal is mined. In determining the gross income, the adjusted gross income, or the net income of the lessee, the deductions allowable with respect to rents and royalties shall be determined without regard to the provisions of this paragraph. This paragraph shall have no application, in the case of coal, for the purposes of applying section 102 or subchapter A of chapter 2 (including the computation under section 117 (c) (1) of a tax in lieu of the tax imposed by section 500)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment and insert the following:

"SEC. 328. Treatment of gain on sales of certain property between spouses and between an individual and a controlled corporation.

"(a) Disallowance of capital gain treatment Section 117 (relating to capital gains and losses) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(o) Gain from sale of certain property between spouses or between an individual and a controlled corporation.

"'(1) Treatment of gain as ordinary income. In the case of a sale or exchange, directly or indirectly, of property described in paragraph (2)—

"'(A) between a husband and wife; or

"'(B) between an individual and a corporation more than 80 per centum in value of the outstanding stock of which is owned by such individual, his spouse, and his minor children and minor grandchildren;

any gain recognized to the transferor from the sale or exchange of such property shall be considered as gain from the sale or exchange of property which is neither a capital asset nor property described in subsection (j).

"'(2) Subsection applicable only to sales or exchanges of depreciable property:

"'This subsection shall apply only in the case of a sale or exchange of property by a transferor which in the hands of the transferee is property of a character which is subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 23 (l).'

"(b) Effective date: The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable with respect to taxable years ending after April 30, 1951, but shall apply only with respect to sales or exchanges made after May 3, 1951."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 83, line 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "328" and insert "329".

On page 83, line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(o)" and insert "(p)".

On page 83, line 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments insert after "employment" and before the comma the following: "and for a period of not less than 5 years (or for a period ending with his death)".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 330. Net operating loss carry-over.

"(a) Loss for taxable year beginning before 1948. So much of subparagraph (A) of section 122 (b) (2) (relating to the amount of carry-overs) as precedes 'the taxpayer' is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(A) Loss for taxable year beginning before 1948: Except as provided in subparagraph (D), if for any taxable year beginning before January 1, 1948,'.

"(b) Allowance of three-year loss carry-over from taxable years 1948-1949: Section 122 (b) (2) (relating to the amount of carry-over) is hereby amended by adding after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraphs:

"'(C) Loss for taxable year beginning after December 31, 1947, and before January 1, 1950: If for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1947, and before January 1, 1950, the taxpayer has a net operating loss, such net operating loss shall be a net operating loss carry-over for each of the three succeeding taxable years, except that the carry-over in the case of each such succeeding taxable year (other than the first succeeding taxable year) shall be the excess, if any, of the amount of such net operating loss over the sum of the net income for each of the intervening years computed—

"'(i) with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsection (d) (1), (2), (4), and (6), and

"'(ii) by determining the net operating loss deduction for each intervening taxable year without regard to such net operating loss or to the net operating loss for any succeeding taxable year and without regard to any reduction specified in subsection (c).

For the purpose of the preceding sentence, the net operating loss for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1947, and before January 1, 1950, shall be reduced by the sum of the net income for each of the two preceding taxable years computed—

"'(iii) with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsection (d) (1), (2), (4), and (6), and

"'(iv) by determining the net operating loss deduction without regard to such net operating loss or to the net operating loss for the succeeding taxable year, and without regard to any reduction specified in subsection (c).

"'(D) Loss for Taxable Year Beginning After December 31, 1946, and Before January 1, 1948, in the Case of a Corporation Which Commenced Business After December 31, 1945.—If for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1946, and before January 1, 1948, a corporation which commenced business after December 31, 1945, has a net operating loss, such net operating loss shall be a net operating loss carry-over for each of the three succeeding taxable years, except that the carry-over in the case of each such succeeding taxable year (other than the first succeeding taxable year) shall be the excess, if any, of the amount of such net operating loss over the sum of the net income for each of the intervening years computed—

"'(i) with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsection (d) (1), (2), (4), and (6), and

"'(ii) by determining the net operating loss deduction for each intervening taxable year without regard to such net operating loss or to the net operating loss for any succeeding taxable year and without regard to any reduction specified in subsection (c). For the purpose of the preceding sentence, the net operating loss for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1946, shall be

reduced by the sum of the net income for each of the two preceding taxable years computed—

"'(iii) with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsection (d) (1), (2), (4), and (6), and

"'(iv) by determining the net operating loss deduction without regard to such net operating loss or to the net operating loss for the succeeding taxable year, and without regard to any reduction specified in subsection (c) '

"(c) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable in computing the net operating loss deduction for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948 "

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 87, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "330" and insert "331", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 88, line 7, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "331" and insert "332"

On page 88, line 21, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "a majority" and insert the following: "50 per centum or more".

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows· On page 89, line 5, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "332" and insert "333", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. On page 89, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "333" and insert "334"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 90, line 22, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "334" and insert "335".

On page 91 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out line 14 and insert the following: "coupons or in registered form, and the term 'securities of the employer' corporation includes securities of a parent or subsidiary corporation (as defined in section 130A (d) (2) and (3)) of the employer corporation,"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 91, line 20, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "335" and insert "336"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "337"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 97, line 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "337" and insert "338"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 98, line 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "338" and insert "339"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following·

"(c) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950. The determination as to whether a person shall be recognized as a partner for income tax purposes for any taxable year beginning before January 1, 1951, shall be made as if this section had not been enacted and without inferences drawn from the fact that this section is not expressly made applicable with respect to taxable years beginning before January 1, 1951. In applying this subsection where the taxable year of any family partner is different from the taxable year of the partnership—

"(1) if a taxable year of the partnership beginning in 1950 ends within or with, as to all of the family partners, taxable years which begin in 1951, then the amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to all distributive shares of income derived by the family partners from such taxable year of the partnership beginning in 1950, and

"(2) if a taxable year of the partnership ending in 1951 ends within or with a taxable year of any family partner which began in 1950, then the amendments made by this section shall not be applicable with respect to any of the distributive shares of income derived by the family partners from such taxable year of the partnership "

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 103, line 5, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "340" and insert "341 "

On page 106 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out all after line 3 over to and including line 23 on page 110 and insert·

"'(3) Tax adjustment measured by prior benefits: If the provisions of this paragraph are applicable to the taxable year pursuant to an election made by the taxpayer under the provisions of paragraph (5)—

"'(A) Amount of recovery: The amount of the recovery in the taxable year of any money or property in respect of property considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized in any prior taxable year shall be an amount equal to the aggregate of such money and the fair market value of such property, determined as of the date of the recovery. For the purpose of this paragraph, in the case of the recovery of the same property or interest considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized, the fair market value of such property or interest shall, at the option of the taxpayer, be considered an amount equal to the adjusted basis (for determining loss) of such property or interest in the hands of the taxpayer on the date such property or interest was considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized. The amount of the recovery determined under this subparagraph shall be reduced for the purposes of subparagraphs (B) and (C) by the amount of the obligations or liabilities with respect to the property considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized in respect of which the recovery was received, if the taxpayer for any previous taxable year chose under subsection (b) (2) to treat such obligations or liabilities as discharged or satisfied out of such property, and such obligations or liabilities were not so discharged or satisfied prior to the date of the recovery.

"'(B) Adjustment for prior tax benefits: That part of the amount of the recovery, in respect of any property considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized, which is not in excess of the allowable deductions in prior taxable years on account of such destruction or seizure of the property (the amount of such allowable deductions being first reduced by the aggregate amount of any prior recoveries in respect of the same property) shall be excluded from gross income for the taxable year of the recovery for the purpose of computing the tax under this chapter and chapter 2; but there shall be added to, and assessed and collected as a part of, the tax under this chapter for the taxable year of the recovery the total increase in the tax under this chapter and chapter 2 for all taxable years which would result by decreasing, in an amount equal to such part of the recovery so excluded, such deductions allowable in the prior taxable years with respect to the destruction or seizure of the property. Such increase in the tax for each such year so resulting shall be computed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. Such regulations shall give effect to previous recoveries of any kind (including recoveries described in section 22 (b) (12)) with respect to any prior year, and shall provide for the case where there was no tax for the prior year, but shall otherwise treat the tax previously determined for any year in accordance with the principles set forth in section 3801 (d). All credits allowable against the tax for any year and all carryovers and carry-backs affected by so decreasing the allowable deductions shall be taken into account in computing the increase in the tax, except that the computation of the excess profits credit under chapter 2 E for any taxable year shall not be affected.

"'(C) Gain upon recovery: The amount of any recovery or part thereof, in respect of property considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized, which is not excluded from gross income under the provisions of subparagraph (B) shall be considered for the taxable year of the recovery as gain on the involuntary conversion of property as a result of its destruction or seizure and shall be recognized or not recognized as provided in section 112 (f).

"'(D) Recoveries treated as gross income for certain purposes: For the purposes of sections 51, 52, and 3801 (b) the recovery in the taxable year of any money or property in respect of property considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized in any prior taxable year shall be deemed to be an item includible in gross income for the taxable year in which the recovery is made.

"'(4) Restoration of value of investments referable to destroyed or seized property: For the purpose of this subsection the restoration in whole or in part of the value of any interest described in subsection (a) (3) by reason of any recovery or money on property in respect of property to which such interest related and which was considered under subsection (a) (1) or (2) as destroyed or seized shall be deemed a recovery of property in respect of property considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized In applying paragraph (3) of this subsection

such restoration shall be treated as the recovery of the same interest considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized.

"'(5) Election by taxpayer for application of paragraph (3): If the taxpayer elects to have the provisions of paragraph (3) applicable to any taxable year in which he recovered any money or property in respect of property considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized, the provisions of paragraph (3) shall be applicable to all taxable years of the taxpayer beginning after December 31, 1941, and such election, once made, shall be irrevocable. The election shall be made in such manner and at such time as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe, except that no election under this paragraph may be made after December 31, 1952, unless the taxpayer recovers money or property (in respect of property considered under subsection (a) as destroyed or seized) during a taxable year ending after the date of the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1951. If pursuant to such election the provisions of paragraph (3) are applicable to any taxable year—

"'(A) the period of limitations provided in sections 275 and 276 on the making of assessments and the beginning of distraint or a proceeding in court for collection shall not, with respect to—

"'(i) the amount to be added to the tax for such taxable year under the provisions of paragraph (3), and

"'(ii) any deficiency for such taxable year or for any other taxable year, to the extent attributable to the basis of the recovered property being determined under the provisions of subsection (d) (2),

expire prior to the expiration of two years following the date of the making of such election, and such amount and such deficiency may be assessed at any time prior to the expiration of such period notwithstanding any law or rule of law which would otherwise prevent such assessment and collection, and

"'(B) in case refund or credit of any overpayment resulting from the application of the provisions of paragraph (3) to such taxable year is prevented on the date of the making of such election, or within one year from such date, by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than section 3761, relating to compromises), refund or credit of such overpayment may, nevertheless, be made or allowed if claim therefor is filed within one year from such date.

In the case of any taxable year ending before the date of the making by the taxpayer of an election under this paragraph, no interest shall be paid on any overpayment resulting from the application of the provisions of paragraph (3) to such taxable year, and no interest shall be assessed or collected with respect to any amount or any deficiency specified in clause (A), for any period prior to the expiration of six months following the date of the making of such election by the taxpayer.'"

On page 112 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out line 6 and all that follows through line 17 and insert:

"'(2) Property recovered in taxable year to which subsection (c) (3) is applicable: In the case of a taxpayer who has made an election under the provisions of subsection (c) (5), the basis of property recovered shall be an amount equal to the value at which such property is included in the amount of the recovery under subsection (c) (3) (A) (determined without regard to the last sentence thereof), reduced by such part of the gain under subsection (c) (3) (C) which is not recognized as provided in section 112 (f).'"

On page 113, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "1940" and insert "1941", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 113, line 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "341" and insert "342"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC 344. Nonbusiness casualty losses.

"(a) Removal of limitation: Section 122 (d) (5) (relating to net operating loss deduction) is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'This paragraph shall not apply with respect to deductions allowable for losses sustained after December 31, 1950, in respect of property, if the losses arise from fire, storm, shipwreck, or other casualty, or from theft.'"

(b) Effective date. The amendment made by this section shall be applicable in computing the net operating loss deduction for taxable years ending after December 31, 1948.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 345 Abatement of tax on certain trusts for members of Armed Forces dying in service.

"In the case of a trust which accumulated income for a beneficiary who died on or after December 7, 1941, and before January 1, 1948, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or of any of the other United Nations, there shall be allowed as a deduction in computing the net income of such trust (in addition to other deductions allowable under sections 23 and 162 of the Internal Revenue Code) income of the trust for any taxable year (before diminution for income tax) which was accumulated for such beneficiary if—

"(1) the income accumulated was for a taxable year of the trust which ended with or within a taxable year (ending on or after December 7, 1941) of such beneficiary during any part of which he was a member of such military or naval forces, or, in the case of the taxable year of the trust during which such beneficiary died, the income accumulated was for the period in such taxable year prior to the death of such beneficiary; and

"(2) the amount of such accumulated income was, without regard to this section, taxable to the trust, and

"(3) the income for such taxable year accumulated for the beneficiary, if not distributed to him prior to his death, was payable by the trust at or after his death only to his estate, spouse, or lineal ancestors or descendants."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 346. Life insurance departments of mutual savings banks.

"(a) Computation of tax. Supplement A of chapter 1 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 110. Mutual savings banks conducting life insurance business.

"'(a) Alternative tax: In the case of a mutual savings bank not having capital stock represented by shares, authorized under State law to engage in the business of issuing life insurance contracts, and which conducts a life insurance business in a separate department the accounts of which are maintained separately from the other accounts of the mutual savings bank, there shall be levied, collected, and paid, in lieu of the taxes imposed by sections 13 and 15, or section 117 (c) (1), a tax consisting of the sum of the partial taxes determined under paragraphs (1) and (2):

"'(1) A partial tax computed upon the net income determined without regard to any items of gross income or deductions properly allocable to the business of the life insurance department, at the rates and in the manner as if this section has not been enacted; and

"'(2) a partial tax computed upon the net income (as defined in section 201 (c) (7)) of the life insurance department determined without regard to any items of gross income or deductions not properly allocable to such department, at the rates and in the manner provided in Supplement G with respect to life insurance companies.

"'(b) Limitations of section: The provisions of subsection (a) shall be applicable only if the life insurance department would, if it were treated as a separate corporation, qualify as a life insurance company under section 201 (b).'

"(b) Technical amendment: Section 13 (relating to normal tax on corporations) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) Mutual savings banks conducting life insurance business For special tax, in lieu of the taxes imposed by this section and section 15, in the case of a mutual savings bank conducting a life insurance business, see section 110.'

"(c) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 120, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "348" and insert "347"

On page 120, line 23, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "the taxable year" and insert "a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1953".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 101: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following.

"SEC. 348. Deduction with respect to certain unrelated business net income.

"(a) Unrelated business net income: Section 422 (a) (relating to unrelated business net income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'In the case of an organization described in section 3813 (a) (2) which is a member of a partnership all of whose members are organizations described in section 3813 (a) (2), if a trade or business regularly carried on by such partnership is an unrelated trade or business with respect to such organization, such organization shall, for taxable years beginning before January 1, 1954, be allowed a deduction in an amount equal to the portion of the gross income of such partnership from such unrelated trade or business which such organization is required (by a provision of a written contract executed by such organization prior to January 1, 1950, which provision expressly deals with the distribution of the gross income of the partnership) to pay

within the taxable year in discharge of indebtedness incurred by such organization in acquiring its share of such trade or business, or to irrevocably set aside within the taxable year for the discharge of such indebtedness (to the extent that such amount has been so paid or set aside) if (1) such partnership was formed prior to January 1, 1950, for the purpose of carrying on such trade or business, and (11) substantially all the assets used in carrying on such trade or business were acquired by it or by its members prior to such date. As used in the preceding sentence, the word "indebtedness" does not include indebtedness incurred after January 1, 1950.'

"(b) Effective date: The amendment made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, and prior to January 1, 1954."

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 122, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "350" and insert "349"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with the following amendments·

On page 124, line 11, of the Senate engrossed "amendments", strike out "contributions—" and insert the following: "contributions,".

On page 124 of the Senate engrossed amendments, after line 11, insert the following:

"'(v) an organization (organized prior to October 1, 1951) which is exempt under section 101 (6) and which is operated for the purpose of conducting an annual chautauqua program of educational, cultural, and religious activities at a permanent location—' ".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows On page 126 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "January" in lines 18 and 19 and insert "April", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 127 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "January" in lines 8, 16, 22, and 23 and insert "April"

On page 127, line 18, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "April" and insert "July".

On page 128 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "January" in lines 6 and 9 and insert "April".

And the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC 423. Reduction of tax on tobacco and snuff.

"(a) Reduction in rate: Section 2000 (a) (relating to tax on tobacco and snuff) is hereby amended by striking out '18 cents per pound', wherever it appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof '10 cents per pound'.

"(b) Effective date: The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins more than ten days after the date of the enactment of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 118: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 118, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment and on page 111 of the House engrossed bill, after line 16, insert: "On and after April 1, 1954, the tax imposed by this section shall be 1½ cents a gallon in lieu of 2 cents a gallon"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows· On page 130, line 18, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows· On page 131, line 1, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows· On page 131, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows· On page 131, line 11, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 129· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. On page 131, line 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 131: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. On page 132 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "January" in lines 1 and 8 and insert "April"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 137: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 137, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 132, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 141: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 133, line 3, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "444" and insert "454".

On page 132 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "January" in lines 11 and 18 and insert "April".

On page 133, line 20, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "February" and insert "May".

On page 134, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 142: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 142, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "455"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows· In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "456"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 151: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 151, and agree to the same with the following amendments·

On page 135, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "452" in lines 8 and 13 and insert "462".

On page 135, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "December 31, 1953" and insert "March 31, 1954".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 154: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following "464"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 156: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following "461 and 463", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 163: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same with the following amendments

On page 136, line 18, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "461" and insert "471".

On page 137, line 5, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "461" and insert "471".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 166. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 166, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 137, line 13, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 167. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 167, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows On page 137, line 23, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 168· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 168, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows· On page 138, line 5, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 172: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 172, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "490", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 173: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 173, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 138, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "473" and insert "483".

On page 139, line 7, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "producer or" and insert "producer of".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 174: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 174, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 139, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "474" and insert "484".

On page 140, line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "skates;"

On page 140 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out lines 19, 20, and 21 and, in lieu thereof, insert the following: "15 per centum, except that on and after April 1, 1954, the rate shall be 10 per centum; fishing rods, creels, reels, and artificial lures, baits, and flies; 10 per centum.' ".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 175: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 175, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "485"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 178: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 178, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following, "by striking out 'Electric direct motor-driven fans and air circulators;' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Electric direct-motor-driven fans and air circulators (not of the industrial type); and the following appliances of the household type:', (2)"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 179: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 179, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(3)", and on page 139 of the House engrossed bill, in lines 3 and 4, strike out "and the following appliances of the household type:"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 184: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 184, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 139, line 11, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "485" and insert "486"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 185: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 185, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "487"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 188: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 188, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "15"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 191: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 191, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "488"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 193: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 193, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "489"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 194: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 194, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 144, line 11, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 197: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 197, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "489", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 198: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 198, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "a producer or importer of gasoline. The provisions of section 3443 shall be applicable to the floor stocks tax imposed by this subsection so as to entitle, subject to all the provisions of such section, (1) any manufacturer or producer to a refund or credit of such tax under subsection (a) (1) of such section, and (2) any person paying such floor stocks tax to a refund or credit thereof where gasoline is by such person or any other person used or resold for any of the purposes specified in subparagraphs (A) (i), (ii), and (iii) of subsection (a) (3) of such section "

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 199 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 199, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 145 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "January" in lines 6, 12, and 13 and insert "April".

On page 145, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "April" and insert "July".

On page 146, line 9, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January" and insert "April".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 200: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 200, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "490"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 210: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 210, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 147, line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "482" and insert "492"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 211: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 211, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "493"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 213: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 213, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 148, line 15, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "484" and insert "494"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 214: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 214 and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 149, line 15, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "485" and insert "495".

On page 149 of the Senate engrossed amendments, after the quotation marks in line 24 insert the following: "The determination as to the applicability of the tax imposed by section 3475 in the case of the transportation of any excavated material, other than transportation to which the amendment made by this subsection applies, shall be made as if this subsection had not been enacted and without inferences drawn from the fact that the amendment made by this subsection is not expressly applicable to the transportation of such other excavated material.";

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 215: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 215, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following. "496"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 216: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 216, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 150, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "487" and insert "497".

On page 150 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "January" in lines 15 and 22 and insert "April".

On page 151 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "January" in lines 10 and 18 and insert "April".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 217: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 217, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows On page 151, line 22, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "488" and insert "498"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 219: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 219, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 501. Maximum tax for new corporations.

"Section 430 (relating to imposition of tax) is hereby amended as follows:

"(1) By adding at the end of subsection (a) thereof, as amended by section 121 of this Act, the following:

" '(3) in the case of a corporation for which an amount is determined for the taxable year under subsection (e), the amount determined under such subsection.'

"(2) By redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

"(3) By inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"'(e) New corporations:

"'(1) Alternative amount: In the case of a taxpayer which commenced business after July 1, 1945, and whose fifth taxable year ends after June 30, 1950, the amount referred to in subsection (a) (3) shall be—

"'(A) If the taxable year is the first or second taxable year of the taxpayer, an amount equal to 5 per centum of the excess profits net income for the taxable year, except that if the excess profits net income exceeds $300,000, the amount shall be the sum of $15,000 plus the amount determined under subparagraph (E) of this paragraph.

"'(B) If the taxable year is the third taxable year of the taxpayer, an amount equal to 8 per centum of the excess profits net income for the taxable year, except that if the excess profits net income exceeds $300,000, the amount shall be the sum of $24,000 plus the amount determined under subparagraph (E) of this paragraph.

"'(C) If the taxable year is the fourth taxable year of the taxpayer, an amount equal to 11 per centum of the excess profits net income for the taxable year, except that if the excess profits net income exceeds $300,000, the amount shall be the sum of $33,000 plus the amount determined under subparagraph (E) of this paragraph.

"'(D) If the taxable year is the fifth taxable year of the taxpayer, an amount equal to 14 per centum of the excess profits net income for the taxable year, except that if the excess profits net income exceeds $300,000, the amount shall be the sum of $42,000 plus the amount determined under subparagraph (E) of this paragraph.

"'(E) The amount determined under this subparagraph shall be—

"'(i) if the taxable year ends before April 1, 1951, an amount equal to 15 per centum of the excess of the excess profits net income for the taxable year over $300,000.

"'(ii) if the taxable year begins on January 1, 1951, and ends on December 31, 1951, an amount equal to 17¼ per centum of the excess of the excess profits net income for the taxable year over $300,000.

"'(iii) if the taxable year (other than a taxable year described in clause (ii) ends after March 31, 1951, an amount equal to 15 per centum of the excess of the excess profits net income for the taxable year over $300,000.

"'(2) First five taxable years: For the purpose of this subsection—

"'(A) The taxable year in which the taxpayer commenced business and the first, second, third, and fourth succeeding taxable years shall be considered its first, second, third, fourth, and fifth taxable years, respectively.

"'(B) The taxpayer shall be considered to have been in existence and to have had taxable years for any period during which it or any corporation described in any clause of this subparagraph was in existence, and the taxpayer shall be considered to have commenced business on the earliest date on which it or any such corporation commenced business:

"'(1) Any corporation which during or prior to the taxable year was a party with the taxpayer to a transaction described in section 445 (g) (2) (A), (B), or (C), determined as if the date 'July 1, 1945" were substituted for the date "December 1, 1950" in section 445 (g) (2) (C).

"'(ii) Any corporation if a group of not more than four persons who control the taxpayer at any time during the taxable year also controlled such corporation at any time during the period beginning 12 months preceding their acquisition of control of the taxpayer and ending with the close of the taxable year; but only if at any time during such period (and while such persons controlled such corporation) such corporation was engaged in a trade or business substantially similar to the trade or business of the taxpayer during the taxable year. For the purpose of this clause, the term "control" means the ownership of more than 50 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote, or more than 50 percent of the total value of shares of all classes of stock. A person shall not be considered a member of the group referred to in this clause unless during the period referred to in this clause he owns stock in such corporation at a time when the members of the group control such corporation and he owns stock in the taxpayer at a time when the members of the group control the taxpayer. For the purpose of this clause, the ownership of stock shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 503, except that constructive ownership under section 503 (a) (2) shall be determined only with respect to the individual's spouse and minor children.

"'(iii) In case the taxpayer during or prior to the taxable year was a purchasing corporation (as defined in part IV), the selling corporation (as defined in such part) whose properties were acquired in the part IV transaction; but this clause shall not apply unless for the taxable year or for any preceding taxable year the conditions of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 474 (c) were satisfied with respect to such transaction.

"'(iv) Any corporation which, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, is determined by one or more additional applications of clauses (i) to (iii) to stand indirectly in the same relation to the taxpayer as though such corporation were described in any such clause.

If as of the beginning of December 1, 1950, the adjusted basis for determining gain upon sale or exchange of the aggregate assets theretofore acquired by the taxpayer in transactions described in clauses (i) and (iii) (or acquired in the ordinary course of business in replacement of such assets) and held by it at such time constituted less than 20 percent of the adjusted basis for determining gain upon sale or exchange of its total assets held at such time, then transactions described in such clauses occurring prior to such date shall be disregarded in determining the date as of which the taxpayer shall be considered to have commenced business

"'(3) Limitation: The provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not apply to a taxpayer which derives more than 50 per centum of its gross income (determined without regard to dividends and without regard to gains from sales or exchanges of capital assets) for the taxable year from contracts and subcontracts to which the provisions of title I of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 (or the provisions of any prior renegotiation act) are applicable.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 220: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 220, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 160, line 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments insert, after "corporation", the following: "at the time it renders such services or assistance".

On page 160, line 12, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "renders" and insert "rendered".

On page 160, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "constitutes" and insert "constituted".

On page 161, line 1, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "owns" and insert the following: "at the time it rendered such services or assistance owned".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 221: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 221, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. On page 161, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out the quotation marks and insert the following: "In computing the average base period net income for such substituted period, the excess profits net income for January, February, and March of 1950 shall be computed by use of the 'weighted excess profits net income', as defined in section 435 (e) (2) (E), for the taxable year in which such months fall.'"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 222: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 222, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 164, line 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "regulation" and insert "regulations".

On page 165, line 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out the period and quotation marks and insert the following: ", and such monthly excess profits net income shall be in lieu of the monthly excess profits net income determined under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 462 (b).'".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 224. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 224, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC 506. Adjustments for changes in inadmissible assets in case of banks.

"(a) Amendment of section 435 (g): Section 435 (g) (relating to net capital addition or reduction) is hereby amended by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (11) and by adding after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph:

"'(8) Adjustments for changes in inadmissible assets in case of banks: In the case of a bank (as defined in section 104)—

"'(A) If the increase in total assets for the taxable year exceeds the net capital addition computed without regard to the adjustment under paragraph (1) for an increase in inadmissible assets, then the net capital addition for the taxable year shall not be less than the excess of—

"'(i) the amount determined under the first sentence of paragraph (1) over

"'(ii) an amount which bears the same ratio to the increase in inadmissible assets for the taxable year, determined under paragraph (5), as the amount computed under such first sentence bears to the increase in total assets for the taxable year.

"'(B) If the decrease in total assets for the taxable year exceeds the net capital reduction computed without regard to the adjustment under paragraph (2) for a decrease in inadmissible assets, then the net capital reduction for the taxable year shall not be less than the excess of—

"'(i) the amount determined under the first sentence of paragraph (2) over

"'(ii) an amount which bears the same ratio to the decrease in inadmissible assets for the taxable year, determined under paragraph (5), as the amount computed under such first sentence bears to the decrease in total assets for the taxable year.

For the purpose of this paragraph, the increase or decrease in total assets for the taxable year shall be computed in the same manner as the increase or decrease in inadmissible assets for the taxable year is computed under paragraph (5), except that

such computations shall be made with respect to all assets, whether admissible or inadmissible assets as defined in section 440.'

"(b) Amendment of section 438: Section 438 (relating to new capital credit changes) is hereby amended by adding after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

"'(g) Adjustments for inadmissible assets in case of banks: In the case of a bank (as defined in section 104), if the increase in total assets for the taxable year (determined in the manner provided in the last sentence of section 435 (g) (8)) exceeds the net new capital addition computed without regard to the adjustment under subsection (b) for an increase in inadmissible assets, then the net new capital addition for the taxable year shall not be less than the excess of the amount determined under the first sentence of subsection (b) over an amount which bears the same ratio to the increase in inadmissible assets for the taxable year, determined under section 435 (g) (5), as the amount computed under such first sentence bears to such increase in total assets for the taxable year.'

"(c) Amendment of section 435 (f): Section 435 (f) (relating to capital additions in base period) is hereby amended as follows:

"(1) By inserting immediately after the word 'reduced' in paragraph (1) thereof the following. '(but not below zero)'.

"(2) By adding at the end of paragraph (1) thereof the following:

"'For special rule in the case of banks, see paragraph (6).'

"(3) By renumbering paragraph (6) as paragraph (7), and by adding immediately after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"'(6) Yearly base period capital of banks: In the case of a bank (as defined in section 104), the yearly base period capital for any taxable year shall be determined as follows:

"'(A) A tentative yearly base period capital shall be computed under paragraph (1) without regard to paragraph (1) (A).

"'(B) The tentative yearly base period capital so determined shall be reduced by the amount determined under section 440 (b) relating to inadmissible assets). For the purpose of this subparagraph, the computation under section 440 (b) shall include only the daily amounts (described in such section) for the first day of such taxable year.'"

"(d) Effective date of subsection (c) (3): The amendment made by subsection (c) (3) (adding a new paragraph (6) to section 435 (f)) shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, and, at the election of the taxpayer made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, shall be applicable to all taxable years ending after June 30, 1950."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 225: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 225, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 169 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out lines 9 to 20, inclusive, and insert the following:

"'(9) Decrease in inadmissible assets:

"'(A) Except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (B) (relating to banks), the excess of the amount computed under paragraph (2) (A) or (B), whichever is applicable to the taxpayer (whether or not any amount is determined under the first sentence of paragraph (2), over the amount, if any, computed under the first sentence of paragraph (2) shall be considered the net capital addition for the taxable year or shall be added to the next capital addition otherwise determined under paragraph (1), as the case may be. The amount of the excess so determined shall be subject to the exceptions and limitations provided in paragraph (10).

"'(B) In the case of a bank (as defined in section 104), the computation under subparagraph (A) shall be made by substituting for the amount computed under paragraph (2) (A) or (B) whichever of the following amounts is the lesser:

"'(i) An amount which bears the same ratio to the decrease in inadmissible assets as the sum of the equity capital (as defined in section 437 (c)) and the daily borrowed capital (as defined in section 439 (b)), each determined as of the first day of the first taxable year ending after June 30, 1950, bears to the total assets as of the beginning of such day;

"'(ii) If paragraph (8) (B) is applicable, the amount computed under paragraph (8) (B) (ii).'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 226: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 226, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 172 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out line 25 and all that follows over to and including the period in line 3 on page 173 and insert the following: "'Government obligations' means obligations described in section 22 (b) (4) any part of the interest from which is excludible from gross income or allowable as a credit against net income; but such term shall include only such obligations as in the hands of the taxpayer are property described in section 117 (a) (1) (A)."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 227: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 227, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 175 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out line 11 and all that follows through line 17 on page 177 and insert the following:

"'(h) Alternative average base period net income.

"'(1) Eligibility requirements: A taxpayer which commenced business on or before the first day of its base period shall be entitled to the benefits of this subsection if—

"'(A) the aggregate excess profits net income (if any) for the 12 months selected under paragraph (2) (B) is less than 35 per centum of one-half of the aggregate excess profits net income for the 24 months remaining under such paragraph; and

"'(B) normal production, output, or operation was interrupted or diminished because of the occurrence, within 12 months preceding (i) the first day of the 12-month period selected under paragraph (2) (B) (i), or (ii) the first day of any period of 6 or more consecutive months selected under paragraph (2) (B) (ii), of events unusual or peculiar in the experience of such taxpayer.

This subsection shall have no application unless the taxpayer has an aggregate excess profits net income for the 24 months remaining under paragraph (2) (B).

"'(2) Computation: If the taxpayer is entitled to the benefits of this subsection, its average base period net income computed under this subsection shall be computed as follows:

"'(A) By determining under subsection (b) the period subject to adjustment under this section. For the purposes of subparagraph (B) but not for the purposes of paragraph (1) (B) such period shall be considered a period of 36 consecutive months.

"'(B) By selecting from such period whichever of the following 12 months results in the higher remaining aggregate excess profits net income—

"'(i) the 12 consecutive months the elimination of which produces the highest remaining aggregate excess profits net income, or

"'(ii) the 12 months which remain after retaining the 24 consecutive months which produce the highest remaining aggregate excess profits net income.

"'(C) By computing for each of the 12 months selected under subparagraph (B) a substitute excess profits net income computed under subsection (e).

"'(D) By computing the sum of—

"'(i) the aggregate of the substitute excess profits net income, as determined under subparagraph (C), for the 12 months selected under subparagraph (B), but the amount computed under this clause shall not exceed one-half of the aggregate excess profits net income for the 24 months remaining under subparagraph (B), and

"'(ii) the aggregate of the excess profits net income for each of the 24 months remaining under subparagraph (B), computed in the manner provided by the second sentence of section 435 (d) (1).

"'(E) By dividing by three the amount ascertained under subparagraph (D).

"'(3) Aggregate excess profits net income: The "aggregate excess profits net income" for any period shall be computed for the purposes of this subsection in the same manner as under subsection (b).'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 228: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 228, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 178 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out line 10 and all that follows through the word "the" in line 11 and insert "The"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 231: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 231, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 181, line 3, of the Senate engrossed amendments insert, after "Commission or", the following: "if the rates for such furnishing or sale are subject"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 234: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 234, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. On page 183 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out line 15 and all that follows through line 21 on page 184 and insert the following:

"'(1) The adjusted basis of the taxpayer's total facilities (as defined in section 444 (d)) as of the beginning of its base period (when added to the total facilities at such time of all corporations with which the taxpayer has the privilege under section 141 of filing a consolidated return for its first taxable year under this subchapter) did not exceed $10,000,000;

"'(2) The basis (unadjusted) of the taxpayer's total facilities (as defined in section 444 (d) at the close of its base period was 250 per centum or more of the basis (unadjusted) of its total facilities at the beginning of its base period;

"'(3) The percentage of the taxpayer's aggregate gross income which was from contracts with the United States and related subcontracts was (A) at least 70 per centum for the period comprising all taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941, and ending before January 1, 1946, (B) less than 20 per centum for the period comprising all taxable years ending after December 31, 1945, and before January 1, 1950, and (C) less than 20 per centum for the period comprising all taxable years ending after December 31, 1949, and beginning before July 1, 1950; and

"'(4) The average monthly excess profits net income of the taxpayer (computed in the manner provided in section 443 (e) for—

"'(A) the period comprising all taxable years ending with or within the last 24 months of its base period, and

"'(B) the last taxable year ending before the first day of its base period,

are each 300 per centum or more of the average monthly excess profits net income (so computed) of the taxpayer for the period comprising all taxable years ending with or within the first 24 months of its base period'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 235: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 235, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 517 Base period catastrophe.

"Section 459, as added by section 516 of this Act, is hereby amended by adding after subsection (a) thereof the following new subsection.

"'(b) Base period catastrophe:

"'Eligibility requirements: A taxpayer shall be entitled to the benefits of this subsection only if it was engaged throughout its base period primarily in manufacturing and if—

"'(A) the taxpayer suffered during the last thirty-six months of its base period a catastrophe by fire, storm, explosion, or other casualty which destroyed or rendered inoperative a production facility constituting a complete plant or plants having in the hands of the taxpayer immediately prior to the catastrophe an adjusted basis equal to 15 per centum or more of the adjusted basis of all the taxpayer's production facilities at such time,

"'(B) as a result of such catastrophe the taxpayer's normal production or operation was substantially interrupted for a period of more than twelve consecutive months; and

"'(C) the taxpayer, prior to the end of its base period, replaced such production facility with a production facility which at the end of its base period had in its hands an adjusted basis not less than the adjusted basis immediately prior to the catastrophe of the production facility destroyed or rendered inoperative.

"'(2) Computation: The taxpayer's base period net income determined under this subsection shall be the amount computed under subparagraph (A) or the amount computed under subparagraph (B), whichever results in the lesser tax under this subchapter for the taxable year for which the tax is being computed:

"'(A) The amount computed under section 435 (d) by substituting for the excess profits net income for each month in the taxable year in which the catastrophe described in paragraph (1) occurred an amount equal to the aggregate, divided by the number of months in the base period preceding such taxable year, of the excess profits net income for each month (computed under section 435 (d) (1)) in the base period preceding such taxable year. The average base period net income computed under this subparagraph shall, for the purpose of section 435 (a) (1) (B), be considered an average base period net income determined under section 435 (d).

"'(B) The amount computed under section 435 (e) (2) (G) (i) and (ii).'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 236: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 236, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 187, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments insert after the semicolon the following: "and"

On page 188, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments insert after the semicolon the following: "and either"

On page 188, line 9, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "consolidation began; and" and insert the following: "operations were consolidated; or"

On page 188, line 21, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "consolidation began" and insert the following: "operations were consolidated".

On page 188, line 23, of the Senate engrossed amendments insert after the period the following "In determining such excess amount proper adjustment shall be made for increase in labor costs and newsprint following such consolidation. Proper adjustment shall also be made for any case in which a taxable year referred to in this subsection is a period of less than twelve months."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 237: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 237, and agree to the same with and amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 519. Television broadcasting companies.

"Section 459, as added by sections 516 to 518 of this Act, is hereby amended by adding after subsection (c) thereof the following new subsections

"'(d) Television broadcasting companies;

"'(1) In general. In the case of a taxpayer engaged in the business of television broadcasting throughout a period beginning before January 1, 1951, and ending with the close of the taxable year, the taxpayer's average base period net income determined under this subsection shall be the amount computed under paragraph (2) or (3), whichever is applicable

"'(2) If engaged in television broadcasting at close of base period: If the taxpayer was engaged in the business of television broadcasting at the close of its base period, the average base period net income computed under this paragraph shall be computed as follows:

"'(A) If the taxpayer was engaged during its base period in any business or businesses other than television broadcasting, by computing the average base period net income under section 435 (d) for such other business or businesses (determined without regard to income, deductions, losses, or other items attributable to the television broadcasting business).

"'(B) By multiplying such part of its total assets (as defined in section 442 (f)), for the last day of its base period, as was attributable to the television broadcasting business by—

"'(i) the base period rate of return determined under section 447 (c) for the industry classification which includes radio broadcasting, or

"'(ii) if the taxpayer was engaged during its base period in the business of radio broadcasting, its individual rate of return computed under paragraph (4),

whichever rate of return produces the greater average base period net income under this subsection. If the amount computed under this subparagraph is computed by the use of the rate of return specified in clause (i), the amount so computed shall be reduced by an amount equal to such portion of the total interest paid or incurred by the taxpayer, for the period of 12 months following the close of its base period, as is attributable to its television broadcasting business.

"'(C) By adding the amount computed under subparagraph (B) to the amount, if any, computed under subparagraph (A).

"'(3) Commencing television broadcasting after base period and before 1951: If the taxpayer acquires its television broadcasting business after the close of its base period and before January 1, 1951, the average base period net income computed under this paragraph shall be computed as provided in paragraph (2), except that—

"'(A) the applicable rate of return under paragraph (2) (B) shall be multiplied by such part of its total assets (as defined in section 442 (f)), for the last day of the calendar month in which it first engaged in such business, as was attributable to such business, and

"'(B) the reduction specified in the last sentence of paragraph (2) (B) shall, if applicable, be equal to such portion of the total interest paid or incurred by the taxpayer, for the period of 12 months following the month in which it first engaged in such business, as is attributable to such business.

"'(4) Individual rate of return: The individual rate of return shall be computed as follows:

"'(A) By determining the amount of the taxpayer's total assets (as defined in section 442 (f)) attributable to the business of radio broadcasting for the last day of each month in its base period.

"'(B) By computing the aggregate of the amounts ascertained under subparagraph (A) and dividing by 48.

"'(C) By computing for each month in the base period the excess profits net income of the radio broadcasting business (determined without regard to income, deductions, losses, or other items attributable to any other business), by adding such amounts for all of the months in the base period, and by dividing by 4

"'(D) By dividing the amount computed under subparagraph (C) by the amount computed under subparagraph (B).

"'(5) Rules for application of subsection:

"'(A) For the purpose of section 435 (a) (1) (B), an average base period net income determined under this subsection shall be considered an average base period net income determined under section 435 (d); but, in computing the base period capital addition under section 435 (f), the computations under such section shall be adjusted, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, so as to exclude therefrom items attributable to the television broadcasting business.

"'(B) If any part of the total assets referred to in paragraph (2) (B) or paragraph (3) (A), whichever is applicable, were acquired, directly or indirectly, through the use of assets attributable at any time during the base period to a business of the taxpayer other than television broadcasting, the amount determined under paragraph (2) (A) shall be properly adjusted by eliminating from the excess profits net income (computed for the purpose of paragraph (2) (A)) for each month prior to such acquisition such portion thereof as is attributable to the assets used, directly or indirectly, for such acquisition. For the purpose of this subparagraph, the excess profits net income for any month shall be attributed to such assets on the basis of the ratio, as of the beginning of the day of the acquisition, of such assets to total assets (as defined in section 442 (f)) determined without regard to assets attributable to the television broadcasting business.

"'(C) The Secretary shall by regulations prescribe rules for the application of this subsection, including rules for the computation of the taxpayer's net capital addition or reduction.

"'(6) Application of part II: The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for the application of part II for the purpose of this subsection in the case of an acquiring corporation or a component corporation in a

transaction described in section 461 (a) which occurred prior to January 1, 1951.

"'(e) Basis of assets: For the purposes of this section, any reference to the adjusted basis of property or to the basis (unadjusted) of property means the adjusted basis or the basis (unadjusted), as the case may be, for determining gain upon sale or exchange.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 238: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 238, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 520. Increase in capacity for production or operation.

"Section 444 (f) (relating to increase in capacity for production or operation) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(f) Rules for application of section

"'(1) The benefits of this section shall not be allowed unless the taxpayer makes application therefor in accordance with section 447 (e).

"'(2) If, during its first taxable year ending after June 30, 1950, the taxpayer completed construction of (including the installation of the machinery or equipment for use in) a factory building or other manufacturing establishment, such factory building or other manufacturing establishment and such machinery or equipment shall, for the purpose of determining whether there is an increase in capacity under the provisions of subsection (b), be considered to have been added to its total facilities on the last day of its base period if—

"'(A) the taxpayer, prior to the end of its base period, had completed construction work representing more than 40 per centum of the total cost of construction of such factory building or other manufacturing establishment, and

"'(B) the completion of such factory building or other manufacturing establishment was in pursuance of a plan to which the taxpayer was committed prior to the end of its base period.

This paragraph shall not apply in determining the amount of the taxpayer's total assets for the purpose of subsection (c).'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 239: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 239, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following.

"SEC 521. Excess profits credit based on income in connection with certain taxable acquisitions.

"(a) General rule: Subchapter D (relating to the excess profits tax) of chapter 1 is hereby amended by inserting immediately following section 472 the following new part:

"'Part IV—Excess Profits Credit Based on Income in Connection With Certain Taxable Acquisitions Occurring Prior to December 1, 1950.

"'SEC. 474 Excess profits credit based on income—certain taxable acquisitions.

"'(a) Definitions: For the purpose of this part—

"'(1) Purchasing corporation: The term "purchasing corporation" means a corporation which, before December 1, 1950, acquired—

"'(A) In a transaction other than a transaction described in section 461 (a), substantially all of the properties (other than cash) of another corporation, of a partnership, or of a business owned by a sole proprietorship; or

"'(B) Properties of another corporation or of a partnership if (i) such properties constituted, immediately prior to the acquisition, substantially all of the properties (other than cash) of one or more separate businesses of such other corporation or such partnership, (ii) such other corporation or such partnership was engaged in one or more separate businesses other than those described in clause (i), and (iii) substantially all of the properties (other than cash) of such other corporation or such partnership were acquired, in furtherance of a single plan of complete liquidation for such other corporation or such partnership, by the purchasing corporation, and by one or more other persons, in transactions other than transactions described in section 461 (a).

"'(2) Selling corporation: The term "selling corporation" means a corporation, a partnership, or a business owned by a sole proprietorship, as the case may be, properties of which were acquired by a purchasing corporation in a transaction described in paragraph (1).

"'(3) Part IV transaction: The term "part IV transaction" means a transaction described in paragraph (1).

"'(b) Average base period net income of purchasing corporation: The average base period net income of a purchasing corporation, if computed with reference to this part, shall be determined under section 435 (d). The average base period net income under section 435 (d) of a purchasing corporation shall be determined by computing its excess profits net income either with or without reference to this part, whichever produces the lesser tax under this subchapter for the taxable year for which the tax is being computed. If computed with reference to this part, the excess profits net income of a purchasing corporation for any month of its base period shall be its excess profits net income (or deficits therein), computed without reference to this part, and increased or decreased, as the case may be, by the addition or reduction resulting from including—

"'(1) In the case of a transaction described in subsection (a) (1) (A), the excess profits net income (or deficit therein) for such month of the selling corporation, or

"'(2) In the case of a transaction described in subsection (a) (1) (B), the excess profits net income (or deficit therein) for such month of the selling corporation properly attributable to the business or businesses acquired by the purchasing corporation and properly allocable to such purchasing corporation.

The excess profits net income of a purchasing corporation for any month, recomputed as provided in the previous sentence, shall not be less than zero.

"'(c) Limitations: This part shall apply only if each of the following conditions is satisfied.

"'(1) The selling corporation (A) did not, after the part IV transaction (or the last transaction described in subsection (a) (1) (B)), continue any business activities other than those incident to its complete liquidation, and (B) within a reasonable time after ceasing business activities, completely liquidated in a transaction other than a transaction described in section 461 (a), and ceased existence.

"'(2) During so much of the base period of the purchasing corporation and of the period thereafter as preceded the part IV transaction, the properties acquired in the part IV transaction were substantially all of the properties (other than cash) which were used, or which in the ordinary course of business replaced properties used, by the selling corporation (or by a component corporation, as defined in section 461 (b), of such selling corporation) in the production of the excess profits net income (or deficit therein) which under subsection (b) increases or decreases the excess profits net income of the purchasing corporation. For the purpose of this paragraph, if a business in the hands of both the selling corporation and the purchasing corporation was operated under a substantially identical franchise or license, granted by the same person, such franchise or license shall be deemed acquired by the purchasing corporation from the selling corporation.

"'(3) The business or businesses acquired in the part IV transaction (including the properties so acquired or properties in replacement thereof) were operated by the purchasing corporation from the date of such transaction to the end of the taxable year or were transferred during the taxable year by the purchasing corporation in a part II transaction to which the provisions of section 462 (b) (4) are applicable.

"'(d) Special Rules:

"'(1) For the purpose of subsection (a) (1), the properties of a selling corporation shall be considered to have been acquired by a purchasing corporation only if acquired from—

"'(A) such selling corporation, or

"'(B) persons who received the properties upon the liquidation of such selling corporation and who forthwith transferred such properties to the purchasing corporation in a transaction other than a transaction described in section 461 (a).

"'(2) The computations required by this part in the case of a selling corporation which is a partnership or a business owned by a sole proprietorship shall be made, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, as if such partnership or such business owned by a sole proprietorship had been a corporation.

"'(3) In no case shall more than 100 per centum of the excess profits net income (or deficit therein) for any month of a selling corporation be allocated to the purchasing corporation or, in the case of transactions described in subsection (a) (1) (B), to the several persons (or to any one or more of such persons) receiving the properties of such selling corporation in such transactions.

"'(e) Successive transactions.

"'(1) Part IV transaction following part IV transaction: In the case of a selling corporation which was a purchasing corporation in a previous part IV transaction, or which acquired properties of a purchasing corporation in a transaction to which section 462 (b) (4) is applicable, the computations under this part with respect to the selling corporation shall be made without regard to the previous part IV transaction.

"'(2) Part IV transaction following part II transaction. Subject to the provisions of paragraph (1), in the case of a selling corporation which was an acquiring corporation as defined in section 461 (a) in a previous transaction, its excess profits net income (or deficit therein) which increases or decreases the excess profits net income (or deficit therein) of the purchasing corporation under subsection (b) (1) or (2), and its capital changes which are taken into account under this part in determining the capital changes of the purchasing corporation, shall be determined with the application of the rules of part II to such selling corporation with respect to the part II transaction.

"'(3) Part II transaction following part IV transaction: For rules applicable in the case of a part II transaction following a part IV transaction, see sections 462 (b) (4), 463 (c), and 464 (c).

"'(f) Regulations: The Secretary shall by regulations prescribe rules for the application of this part. Such regulations shall include the following rules:

"'(1) Base period capital addition: Rules (consistent with the principles of section 464) for the determination of the base period capital addition of the purchasing corporation by reference to the capital changes

of the selling corporation and of the purchasing corporation.

"'(2) Net capital addition or reduction: Rules (consistent with the principles of section 463) for the determination of the net capital addition or reduction of the purchasing corporation by reference to the capital changes of the selling corporation and of the purchasing corporation.

"'(3) Excess profits net income: Rules (consistent with the principles of section 462 (i)) for the determination of the amount of excess profits net income (or deficit therein) of the selling corporation attributable to the business or businesses acquired by a purchasing corporation in a transaction described in subsection (a) (1) (B) and properly allocable to such purchasing corporation.

"'(4) Duplication: Rules for the application under this part of the principles of section 462 (j) (1) and the other provisions of part II relating to the prevention of duplication.

"'(5) Excess profits credit: In the event that the part IV transaction occurred in a taxable year of the purchasing corporation which ended after June 30, 1950, rules (consistent with the principles of section 462 (j) (1)) for the determination of the excess profits credit of such corporation for the year in which the transaction occurred

Such rules shall not include the principles of section 461 (c) (relating to the excess profits credit of the component corporation), of section 462 (b) (2) (relating to constructive excess profits net income for months during which a corporation was not in existence), of section 462 (l) (relating to minimum average base period net income in the case of certain acquiring corporations), or of such other provisions of part II as relate to sections 435 (e), 442, 443, 444, 445, or 446.'

"(b) Technical amendments.

"(1) Section 435 (a) (3) (relating to amount of excess profits credit) is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', and in the case of certain taxable acquisitions, see part IV of this subchapter'.

"(2) Section 461 (relating to definitions under part II) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(g) Component corporation which was a purchasing corporation in a previous transaction See section 462 (b) (4) for rules applicable if the component corporation was a purchasing corporation (as defined in part IV) in a previous part IV transaction, or if (as an acquiring corporation in a previous part II transaction) it was subject to the provisions of section 462 (b) (4).

"'(h) Definition of part II transaction: For the purpose of this subchapter, the term "part II transaction" means a transaction described in section 461 (a).'

"(3) Section 462 (b) (relating to the method of recomputing the excess profits net income of an acquiring corporation under part II) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(4) If the average base period net income of the acquiring corporation is determined under section 435 (d) with reference to this subsection, and if the provisions of section 474 (b) (relating to the computation of excess profits net income in the case of certain purchasing corporations) were applicable to the component corporation immediately prior to the part II transaction (or would have been applicable if such part II transaction had occurred in a taxable year of the component corporation ending after June 30, 1950), then the excess profits net income (or deficit therein) of the component corporation shall, for the purpose of this subsection, be determined with the application of the provisions of section 474 (b). For the purpose of this paragraph, if a component corporation was an acquiring corporation in a previous part II transaction and, immediately prior to the later part II transaction, the provisions of this paragraph were applicable to such component corporation, its excess profits net income (or deficit therein) shall be determined with the application of the provisions of the preceding sentence. This paragraph shall be applicable to an acquiring corporation only if—

"'(A) the properties acquired by the acquiring corporation from the component corporation include substantially all of the properties (other than cash), or properties acquired in the ordinary course of business in the replacement of properties, which the component corporation acquired either from the selling corporation in the part IV transaction or from a previous component corporation subject (immediately prior to such acquisition) to the provisions of this paragraph;

"'(B) the business or businesses acquired by the acquiring corporation were operated by the acquiring corporation from the date of such transaction to the end of the taxable year or were transferred during the taxable year by the acquiring corporation in a part II transaction to which the provisions of this paragraph are applicable; and

"'(C) in the event that the part II transaction is one described in section 461 (a) (1) (E), the provisions of section 462 (l) (6) are satisfied'

"(4) Section 462 (l) (6) (relating to allocation rules in the case of transactions described in section 461 (a) (1) (E)) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1), if an acquiring corporation in a transaction described in section 461 (a) (1) (E) determines its average base period net income under section 435 (d) by recomputing its excess profits net income under the provisions of section 462 (b) (4), the amount of the component corporation's excess profits net income for any month which shall be taken into account by the acquiring corporation shall be such portion of the component corporation's excess profits net income for such month as is determined on the basis of the earnings experience of the assets transferred and the assets retained by the component corporation.'

"(5) Section 463 (relating to capital changes) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) Component corporation which was a purchasing corporation in a previous transaction: The Secretary shall provide by regulations for the application of this section in cases to which section 462 (b) (4) is applicable'

"(6) Section 464 (relating to capital changes during the base period) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) The Secretary shall provide by regulation for the application of this section in cases to which section 462 (b) (4) is applicable'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 240: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 240, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 522. Strategic minerals.

"Section 450 (b) (1) (relating to corporations engaged in mining of strategic minerals) is hereby amended by inserting after 'chromite,' the following: 'bauxite,'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 241: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 241, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 199, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "510" and insert "506 (d)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 245: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 245, and agree to the same with the following amendments: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "or to the benefit of a hospital, or an institution for the rehabilitation of physically handicapped persons, which maintains or is building for proper maintenance a hospital or institution staffed or to be staffed by qualified professional persons for the treatment of the sick and/or the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped"

On page 150, line 25, of the House bill strike out the quotation marks and insert the following: "The determination as to whether an organization other than one described in this subsection is exempt under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code from taxation for any taxable year beginning before January 1, 1951, shall be made as if this subsection and section 301 (b) of this Act had not been enacted and without inferences drawn from the fact that this subsection and the amendment made by section 301 (b) are not expressly made applicable with respect to taxable years beginning before January 1, 1951.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 246: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 246, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment and insert the following:

"SEC. 602. Excess profits credit based on income.

"(a) Percentage of average base period net income taken into account:

"(1) In general: Paragraph (1) (A), and paragraph (2), of section 435 (a) (relating to excess profits credit based on income) are each amended by striking out '85 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '83 per centum'.

"(2) Taxable years beginning before July 1, 1951, and ending after June 30, 1951. Section 435 (a) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs.

"'(4) Calendar year 1951: In the case of a taxable year beginning on January 1, 1951, and ending on December 31, 1951, there shall be used, for the purposes of paragraph (1) (A) and paragraph (2) in lieu of 85 per centum of the average base period net income, an amount equal to 84 per centum of the average base period net income

"'(5) Taxable years (other than calendar year 1951) beginning before July 1, 1951, and ending after June 30, 1951: In the case of any taxable year (other than a taxable year described in paragraph (4)) beginning before July 1, 1951, and ending after June 30, 1951, there shall be used, for the purposes of paragraph (1) (A) and paragraph (2), in lieu of 85 per centum of the average base period net income, an amount equal to the sum of—

"'(A) that portion of an amount equal to 85 per centum of the average base period net income which the number of days in such taxable year prior to July 1, 1951, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year, plus

"'(B) that portion of an amount equal to 83 per centum of the average base period net income which the number of days in such taxable year after June 30, 1951, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year.'

"(b) Effective date: The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1951."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 247: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 247, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 200, line 13, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "602" and insert "603".

On page 201 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out lines 15 to 25, inclusive, and insert the following:

"'(A) shall not, with respect to any such tax, exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such tax actually paid to such foreign country as the value of property which is—

"'(i) situated within such foreign country,

"'(ii) subjected to such tax, and

"'(iii) included in the gross estate

bears to the value of all property subjected to such tax; and

"'(B) shall not, with respect to all such taxes, exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to the tax imposed by section 810".

On page 202, line 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "taxes" and insert "tax".

On page 205 of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out all after line 23 over to and including line 12 on page 206 and insert the following.

"'(A) For the purposes of paragraph (2) (A), "such taxes paid to the foreign country" shall, with respect to any tax paid to the foreign country, be the amount computed under section 813 (c) (2) (A) "

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 248: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 248, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "604", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 249: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 249, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows On page 208, line 21, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "604" and insert "605"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 250: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 250, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 209, line 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "605" and insert "606", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 251: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 251, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. On page 210, line 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "606" and insert "607", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 252: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 252, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 211, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "607" and insert "608"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 253: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 253, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows On page 211, line 9, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "608" and insert "609"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 254: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 254, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 610. Reversionary interests in case of life insurance.

"If refund or credit of any overpayment resulting from the application of section 503 of the Revenue Act of 1950 was prevented on October 25, 1950, by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than section 3760 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to closing agreements, and other than section 3761 of such code, relating to compromises), refund or credit of such overpayment may, nevertheless, be made or allowed if claim therefor was filed after October 25, 1949, and on or before October 25, 1950."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 255: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 255, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. On page 212, line 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "610" and insert "611", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 256: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 256, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows· On page 214, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "611" and insert "612"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 257: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 257, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 214, line 14, strike out "612" and insert "613", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 258: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 258, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 215, line 6, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "613" and insert "614"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 259: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 259, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows On page 216, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "614" and insert "615"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 260: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 260 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "616"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 261: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 261, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 216, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "616" and insert '617"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 262· That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 262, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC 618. Prohibition upon denial of Social Security Act funds.

"No State or any agency or political subdivision thereof shall be deprived of any grant-in-aid or other payment to which it otherwise is or has become entitled pursuant to title I, IV, X, or XIV of the Social Security Act, as amended, by reason of the enactment or enforcement by such State of any legislation prescribing any conditions under which public access may be had to records of the disbursement of any such funds or payments within such State if such legislation prohibits the use of any list or names obtained through such access to such records for commercial or political purposes."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 263: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 263, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 619 Removal of tax exemption from expense allowances of the President, the Vice President, the Speaker, and Members of Congress.

"(a) Expense allowance of the President: Section 102 of title 3 of the United States Code is amended by striking out 'no tax liability shall accrue and for which no accounting shall be made by him' and inserting in lieu thereof 'no accounting, other than for income tax purposes, shall be made by him.'

"(b) Expense allowance of the Vice President. Section 111 of title 3 of the United States Code is amended by striking out 'for which no tax liability shall occur or accounting be made by him' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for which no accounting, other than for income tax purposes, shall be made by him'

"(c) Expense allowance of the Speaker of the House of Representatives: Subsection (e) of the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives', approved January 19, 1949 (Public Law 2, 81st Congress), is amended by striking out 'for which no tax liability shall occur or accounting be made by him' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for which no accounting, other than for income tax purposes, shall be made by him'.

"(d) Expense allowances of Members of Congress Section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by striking out 'for which no tax liability shall incur, or accounting be made' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for which no accounting, other than for income tax purposes, shall be made'.

"(e) Effective dates: The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall beçome effective at noon on January 20, 1953, and the amendments made by subsections (c) and (d) shall become effective at noon on January 3, 1953."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 264: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 264, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TABLE OF CONTENTS

"TITLE I—INCREASE IN INCOME TAX RATES

"Part I—Individual income taxes

"Sec. 101. Increase in surtax for 1951, 1952, and 1953.
"(a) Rates and surtax.
"(b) Limitation on tax.
"Sec. 102. Individuals with adjusted gross income of less than $5,000.
"Sec. 103. Inapplicability of certain penalties and additions to tax.
"(a) Penalties for failure to file return.
"(b) Additions to tax.
"Sec. 104. Computation of tax in case of certain joint returns.
"Sec. 105. Effective date of part I.

"Part II—Corporation income taxes

"Sec. 121. Increase in rate of corporation normal tax.
"(a) Amendment of section 13.
"(b) Maximum tax.
"(c) Mutual insurance companies other than life or marine.
"(d) Regulated investment companies.
"(e) Business income of certain section 101 organizations
"(f) Amendment of section 15.
"(g) Technical amendment.
"Sec. 122. Credits of corporations.
"(a) Dividends received credit.
"(b) Credit for dividends paid on certain preferred stock.
"(c) Western hemisphere trade corporations.
"Sec. 123 Computation of alternative capital gains tax.
"Sec. 124 Filing of corporation returns for taxable years ending after March 13, 1951, and before October 1, 1951.
"Sec. 125. Effective date.

"Part III—Fiscal year taxpayers

"Sec 131 Fiscal year taxpayers
"(a) Amendment of section 108.
"(b) Computation of excess profits tax.
"(c) Technical amendments

"TITLE II—WITHHOLDING OF TAX AT SOURCE

"Sec. 201. Percentage method of withholding.
"Sec. 202. Wage bracket withholding.
"Sec. 203. Additional withholding of tax on wages upon agreement by employer and employee.
"Sec 204. Effective date.

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS INCOME TAX AMENDMENTS

"Sec. 301. Tax treatment in case of head of household.
"(a) Surtax in case of head of household.
"(b) Computation of tax by collector.
"(c) Effective date
"Sec. 302 Payments to beneficiaries of deceased employees
"(a) Amendment of section 22 (b) (1).
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec 303. Joint and survivor annuities.
"(a) Amendment of section 22 (b) (2).
"(b) Amendment of section 113 (a) (5).
"(c) Effective dates
"Sec. 304. Income from discharge of indebtedness.
"(a) Amendment of section 22 (b) (9).
"(b) Amendment of section 22 (b) (10).
"Sec 305 Compensation of certain members of the armed forces
"(a) Amendment of section 22 (b) (13).
"(b) Definition of service in combat zone
"(c) Withholding on wages.
"(d) Effective dates.
"Sec. 306. Involuntary liquidation and replacement of inventory.
"(a) Amendment of section 22 (d) (6) (F) (iii).
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec 307. Medical expenses.
"(a) Amendment of section 23 (x).
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec. 308. Standard deduction.
"(a) Method of election.
"(b) Change of election.
"(c) Effective date
"Sec. 309. Expenditures in the development of mines.
"(a) Deduction of expenditures.
"(b) Adjusted basis for determining gain or loss upon sale or exchange.
"(c) Technical amendment.
"(d) Effective date.
"Sec. 310. Gross income of dependent of taxpayer.
"(a) Increase in amount of gross income permitted.
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec. 311. Credit for dividends received.
"(a) Dividends from foreign corporation engaged in trade or business in the United States.
"(b) Technical amendment.
"(c) Effective date.
"Sec. 312. Joint return after filing separate return.
"(a) Change of election.
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec. 313. Mutual savings banks, building and loan associations, cooperative banks.
"(a) Mutual savings banks.
"(b) Building and loan associations and cooperative banks.
"(c) Exemptions from excess profits tax.
"(d) Federal savings and loan associations
"(e) Bad debt reserves.
"(f) Dividends paid to depositors
"(g) Deduction for repayment of certain loans.
"(h) Definition of bank
"(i) Definition of domestic building and loan association.
"(j) Effective date
"Sec 314 Income tax treatment of exempt cooperatives.
"(a) Amendment of section 101 (12).
"(b) Technical amendments.
"(c) Information returns
"(d) Effective date
"Sec 315 Surtax on corporations improperly accumulating surplus.
"(a) Long-term capital gains.
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec 316 Election as to recognition of gain in certain corporate liquidations.
"(a) Amendment of section 112 (b) (7).
"(b) Basis of property
"(c) Effective date
"Sec 317 Certain distributions of stock on reorganization
"(a) Distributions not in liquidation.
"(b) Basis of stock
"(c) Effective date
"Sec 318 Gain from sale or exchange of taxpayer's residence.
"(a) Nonrecognition of gain in certain cases
"(b) Technical amendments.
"(c) Effective date.
"Sec 319. Percentage depletion.
"(a) Allowance of percentage depletion.
"(b) Technical amendment.
"(c) Effective date
"Sec. 320. Redemption of stock to pay death taxes
"(a) Amendment of section 115 (g) (3).
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec 321. Earned income from sources without the United States.
"(a) Exclusion from gross income.
"(b) Withholding of tax on wages.
"(c) Effective dates
"Sec 322 Capital gains and losses
"(a) Treatment of long-term capital gains and losses.
"(b) Alternative tax
"(c) Technical amendments.
"(d) Effective date.
"Sec 323. Sale of land with unharvested crop.
"(a) Treatment of gain or loss.
"(b) Treatment of deductions.
"(c) Effective date.
"Sec 324 Sales of livestock
"Sec 325 Tax treatment of coal royalties.
"(a) Definition of property used in the trade or business.
"(b) Gain or loss upon certain disposals of timber or coal.
"(c) Clerical amendment.
"(d) Technical amendment.
"(e) Conforming amendments.
"(f) Effective date.
"Sec. 326. Collapsible corporations.
"(a) Definitions with respect to collapsible corporations.
"(b) Limitations on application of section 117 (m).
"(c) Effective date.
"Sec. 327. Dealers in securities—capital gains and ordinary losses.
"Sec. 328. Treatment of gain on sales of certain property between spouses and between an individual and a controlled corporation.
"(a) Disallowance of capital gain treatment
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec. 329. Receipts of certain termination payments by employee.
"(a) Taxability to employee as capital gain.
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec 330. Net operating loss carry-over.
"(a) Loss for taxable year beginning before 1948.
"(b) Allowance of three-year loss carry-over from taxable years 1948–1949.
"(c) Effective date.
"Sec 331 Stock options.
"(a) Option subject to stockholder approval.
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec 332 Credit for taxes of foreign corporations
"(a) Foreign subsidiary of a domestic corporation
"(b) Foreign subsidiary of a foreign corporation
"(c) Clerical amendment.
"Sec 333 Information at source on payments of interest.
"Sec 334 Abatement of income tax for certain members of armed forces upon death.
"Sec. 335. Employees' trusts.
"(a) Amendment of section 165 (b)
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec. 336 Life insurance companies.
"(a) Tax for 1951.
"(b) Adjusted normal-tax net income for 1951.
"(c) Technical amendments.
"(d) Effective date.
"Sec. 337. Tax treatment of certain investment companies.
"(a) Inclusion of certain registered management companies in the definition of regulated investment company.
"(b) Technical amendment.
"(c) Effective date.
"Sec. 338 Exchanges and distributions in obedience to orders of Securities and Exchange Commission.
"(a) Definition of system group.
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec 339. Taxation of business income of State colleges and universities.
"(a) Amendment of section 421 (b).
"(b) Unrelated trade or business.
"(c) Effective date.
"Sec 340. Family partnerships.
"(a) Definition of partner.
"(b) Allocation of partnership income
"(c) Effective date.
"Sec. 341. War losses.
"(a) Tax upon war loss recovery.
"(b) Basis of recovered property.
"(c) Credit for foreign taxes.
"(d) Effective dates.
"Sec. 342. Deduction of expenditures for mine exploration.
"(a) Deduction of mine exploration expenditures.
"(b) Adjusted basis for determining gain or loss upon sale or exchange.
"(c) Effective date.
"Sec 343. Definition of employee.
"(a) Amendment of section 3797 (a).
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec. 344. Nonbusiness casualty losses.
"(a) Removal of limitation.
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec 345. Abatement of tax on certain trusts for members of armed forces dying in service.

"Sec. 346. Life insurance departments of mutual savings banks.
"(a) Computation of tax.
"(b) Technical amendment.
"(c) Effective date.
"Sec 347. Publishing business carried on by tax-exempt organization.
"(a) Treatment as related trade or business.
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec 48 Deduction with respect to certain unrelated business net income.
"(a) Unrelated business net income.
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec 349. Nondistributable income of personal holding companies.

"TITLE IV—EXCISE TAXES

"Part I—Tax on admissions and cabarets

"Sec 401 Removal of tax on free admissions.
"Sec 402 Exemptions from admissions tax.
"(a) Reinstatement of prewar exemptions.
"(b) Amendment of section 1701 (a) and (b).
"(c) Admissions to municipal swimming pools, etc.
"Sec 403 Effective date of amendments relating to admissions
"Sec 404 Tax on cabarets, roof gardens, etc.
"(a) Ballrooms and dance halls.
"(b) Effective date.

"Part II—Tax on cigarettes

"Sec 421 Tax on cigarettes.
"(a) Increase in rate.
"(b) Effective date
"Sec 422. Floor stocks tax and floor stocks refund on cigarettes.
"Sec 423 Reduction of tax on tobacco and snuff
"(a) Reduction in rate.
"(b) Effective date.

"Part III—Retailers' excise taxes

"Sec 431. Retailers' excise tax on toilet preparations
"(a) Baby oils, etc
"(b) Sales to barber shops, etc.
"Sec 432 Effective date of Part III.

Part IV—Diesel fuel

"Sec 441 Diesel fuel used in highway vehicles
"(a) Imposition of tax.
"(b) Effective date

"Part V—Liquor

"Sec 451 Increase in tax on distilled spirits from $9 to $10 50 per gallon.
"(a) Distilled spirits generally.
"(b) Imported perfumes containing distilled spirits
"(c) Floor stocks tax
"Sec 452 Wines
"(a) Increase in rate of tax
"(b) Floor stocks
"Sec 453 Fermented malt liquor.
"(a) Increase in tax on fermented malt liquors from $8 to $9 per barrel.
"(b) Floor stocks tax
"Sec 454 Floor stocks refunds.
"(a) Amendment of section 1656 (a).
"(b) Amendment of section 1656 (b)
"Sec 455. Clerical amendment.
"Sec. 456 Effective date of Part V.

"Part VI—Occupational taxes

"Sec 461. Dealers in liquors.
"(a) Wholesale dealers in liquors
"(b) Retail dealers in liquors.
"(c) Wholesale dealers in malt liquors.
"Sec. 462. Drawback in the case of distilled spirits used in the manufacture of certain nonbeverage products.
"(a) Drawback.
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec. 463. Tax on coin-operated gaming devices.
"Sec. 464. Effective date of Part VI.

"Part VII—Wagering

"Sec. 471. Wagering taxes
"(a) Imposition of taxes.
"(b) Technical amendment
"Sec. 472 Effective date of Part VII.

"Part VIII—Manufacturers' excise taxes

"Sec. 481. Automobiles, trucks, and parts or accessories.
"(a) Increase in tax on trucks.
"(b) Increase in tax on passenger automobiles and motorcycles.
"(c) Increase in tax on parts or accessories.
"(d) Rebuilt parts or accessories
"(e) Technical amendment.
"(f) Parts or accessories for farm equipment.
"(g) Effective date of subsection (f).
"(h) Removal of tax on tires for toys, etc
"Sec. 482 Navigation receivers sold to the United States
"(a) Exemption on sales to United States of certain radio sets.
"(b) Tax-free sales of radio parts
"(c) Refund in case of use of parts
"(d) Refund in case of resale to United States.
"(e) Use of manufacturer of taxable parts
"(f) Effective dates
"Sec 483. Tax-free sales of refrigerator components to wholesalers for resale to manufacturers.
"Sec 484 Sporting goods.
"Sec 485 Electric, gas, and oil appliances.
"Sec 486 Adjustments of tax rates on photographic apparatus and film; repeal of tax on certain items
"(a) Items subject to tax
"(b) Floor stocks refund on bulbs
"Sec 487 Imposition of tax on mechanical pencils, fountain and ball point pens, and mechanical lighters for cigarettes, cigars, and pipes.
"Sec 488 Repeal of tax on electrical energy.
"(a) Repeal of tax
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec. 489 Tax on gasoline.
"(a) Increase in rate
"(b) Floor stocks tax and refund
"Sec 490 Effective date of Part VIII

"Part IX—Miscellaneous excise tax amendments

"Sec 491 Reduction of tax on telegraph dispatches
"(a) Reduction of tax.
"(b) Effective date
"(c) Amounts paid pursuant to bills rendered
"(d) Rate reduction date
"Sec 492 Exemption of certain overseas telephone calls from the tax on telephone facilities
"(a) Telephone calls from members of armed forces in combat zones.
"(b) Effective date
"Sec. 493 Exemption of fishing trips from tax on transportation.
"(a) Exemption.
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec. 494. Tax on transportation of persons.
"(a) Exemption of certain foreign travel.
"(b) Effective date
"Sec. 495. Transportation of material excavated in the course of construction work.
"(a) Amendment of section 3475.
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec. 496. Articles from foreign trade zones.
"(a) Imported articles.
"(b) Previously tax-paid articles.
"Sec. 497. Refunds on articles from foreign trade zones.
"(a) Imported articles.
"(b) Previously tax-paid articles.
"Sec. 498. Tax refunds on spirits lost in floods of 1951.
"(a) Authorization.
"(b) Destruction of spirits.
"(c) Credit.
"(d) Regulations.

"TITLE V—EXCESS PROFITS TAX

"Sec. 501. Maximum tax for new corporations.
"Sec 502 Payments from foreign sources for technical assistance, etc.
"(a) Amendment of section 433 (a) (1).
"(b) Amendment of section 433 (b).
"Sec 503 Average base period net income in case of certain fiscal year taxpayers
"Sec 504. Average base period net income—alternative based on growth in case of new corporations.
"(a) General rule
"(b) Amendment of Part II
"Sec 505 Average base period net income—alternative based on growth
"Sec 506. Adjustments for changes in inadmissible assets in case of banks.
"(a) Amendment of section 435 (g).
"(b) Amendment of section 438
"(c) Amendment of section 435 (f).
"(d) Effective date of subsection (c) (3).
"Sec 507 Decrease in inadmissible assets
"Sec 508 Election with respect to certain inadmissible assets
"(a) Amendment of section 440.
"(b) Amendment of section 433 (a) (1).
"(c) Amendment of section 433 (b).
"Sec 509 Alternative average base period net income
"(a) Amendment of section 442
"(b) Technical amendments.
"Sec 510 Definition of total assets for purposes of sections 442–446.
"Sec 511 Average base period net income—change in products or services.
"Sec 512 Average base period net income—new corporation
"Sec 513 Excess profits credit—regulated public utilities.
"Sec 514 Consolidated returns of regulated public utilities.
"Sec 515 Nontaxable income from certain mining properties
"Sec. 516 Transition from war production and increase in peacetime capacity.
"(a) In general.
"(b) Technical amendments
"Sec 517 Base period catastrophe.
"Sec 518 Consolidation of newspapers
"Sec 519 Television broadcasting companies
"Sec 520 Increase in capacity for production or operation.
"Sec 521 Excess profits credit based on income in connection with certain taxable acquisitions
"(a) General rule
"(b) Technical amendments.
"Sec 522 Strategic minerals
"Sec. 523 Effective date of title V

"TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS AND AMENDMENTS

"Sec. 601 Exemption of certain organizations from income tax for prior taxable years.
"Sec 602 Excess profits credit based on income.
"(a) Percentage of average base period net income taken into account.
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec. 603 Foreign estate tax credit.
"(a) Credit against basic estate tax.
"(b) Credit against additional estate tax.
"(c) Reversionary or remainder interest.
"(d) Extension of period of limitations, etc., in case of recovery of taxes claimed as credit.
"(e) Effective date.

"Sec. 604. Estate and gift tax treatment of United States bonds held by certain nonresident aliens.
"(a) Estate tax.
"(b) Gift tax
"Sec. 605. Estate tax exemption for works of art loaned by nonresident aliens.
"(a) Amendment of section 863 (c).
"(b) Effective date.
"Sec. 606. Exemption from additional estate tax of members of armed forces upon death.
"Sec. 607. Transfers conditioned upon survivorship.
"Sec. 608. Transfers with income reserved
"Sec. 609. Transfers taking effect at death.
"Sec. 610. Reversionary interests in case of life insurance.
"Sec 611. Income pursuant to award of Interstate Commerce Commission.
"Sec. 612. Credit in prior taxable years for dividends received on preferred stock of a public utility.
"Sec. 613. Consolidated returns—includible corporations.
"Sec. 614. Time for performing certain acts postponed in case of China Trade Act corporations.
"Sec 615. Treaty obligations.
"Sec. 616. Reorganization Plan Numbered 26 of 1950.
"Sec. 617. Claims under the Renegotiation Act.
"Sec. 618. Prohibition upon denial of Social Security Act funds.
"Sec. 619. Removal of tax exemption from expense allowances of the President, the Vice President, the Speaker and Members of Congress.
"(a) Expense allowance of the President.
"(b) Expense allowance of the Vice President.
"(c) Expense allowance of the Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"(d) Expense allowances of Members of Congress.
"(e) Effective dates."

And the Senate agree to the same.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
W. D. MILLS,
RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
TOM CONNALLY,
HARRY F. BYRD,
E D MILLIKIN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4473) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

Amendment No. 1: The House bill provided for an increase in individual income-tax rates by a percentage increase of 12½ percent of the tax liability under existing law, with an over-all effective ceiling rate of 90 percent of the net income of the taxpayer. The House bill also increased the alternative tax on capital gains by 12½ percent. The Senate amendment eliminated the increase in the alternative tax on capital gains and provided, in general, for an increase of 11 percent of the present tax liability, or 8 percent of the amount by which the surtax net income exceeds present taxes, whichever produced the lesser increase in tax. The Senate amendment provided an over-all ceiling rate of 88 percent of the net income of the taxpayer.

Under the conference agreement the increase in the combined normal tax and surtax under existing law will, in general, be 11¾ percent of the present rates or 9 percent of the amount by which the surtax net income exceeds present taxes, whichever is the lesser, except that the increase in the first surtax bracket will be only 11 percent. Special rates are provided for the calendar year 1951 so as to reflect November 1, 1951, as the effective date of the increase in tax. The ceiling rate of 88 percent contained in the Senate amendment is retained under the conference agreement, and no increase in tax is provided with respect to the alternative tax on capital gains. Under the House bill no termination date was provided for the increase in the taxes The Senate amendment provided for the termination of the increased rates on January 1, 1954, and the conference agreement retains the termination date

Amendments Nos 2 and 3 These amendments are clerical. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5: The House bill provided for an increase in the normal tax on corporations, in general, from 25 to 30 percent of normal tax net income, applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950. The Senate provided for an increase in the corporation normal tax from 25 to 27 percent and an increase in the corporation surtax from 22 to 25 percent. Under the Senate amendment, the increases in normal tax and surtax were to be effective as of April 1, 1951, and were to terminate on December 31, 1953. Special rates were provided for the calendar year 1951 to reflect the April 1 effective date. Under the conference agreement on amendments 4 and 5, the normal tax is increased from 25 to 30 percent as provided in the House bill with no increase in the surtax. The increase in normal tax is to be effective as of April 1, 1951, with a normal tax rate of 28¾ percent for the calendar year 1951. The conference agreement provides that the increase in normal tax is to terminate as of March 31, 1954.

Amendment No. 6: The House bill amended section 430 (a) (2) of the code (relating to maximum excess profits tax) so as to increase the percentage used under existing law for computing the maximum excess profits tax from 62 to 70 percent The Senate amendment provided a new method for computing the maximum excess profits tax which, in general, was 16½ percent of the excess profits net income for the calendar year 1951 and was 17 percent of the excess profits net income for taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951. The 17 percent figure of the Senate amendment was comparable to a 69 percent figure under the method provided in the House bill. The House recedes with an amendment which adopts the Senate method of computing the maximum tax but increases the 17 percent figure to 18 percent (comparable to the House bill 70 percent figure) for taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951. Under the conference agreement the maximum excess profits tax for the calendar year 1951 is 17¼ percent of the excess profits net income for such year.

Amendments Nos. 7, 8, and 9: Senate amendments Nos. 7 and 8 amended section 207 (a) (tax on certain insurance companies), 362 (b) (tax on regulated investment companies), section 421 (a) (tax on business income of certain tax exempt organizations), and section 26 (relating to credits for corporations) of the code to make changes conforming to the action of the Senate with respect to the corporate normal and surtax rate increases. These amendments also made other technical conforming changes in the code. Senate amendment No. 9 struck out section 123 of the House bill which provided for the allowance of only one surtax exemption and one minimum excess profits credit to certain controlled groups of corporations. The House recedes on amendments Nos. 7 and 8 with conforming amendments and an amendment adding a new section 15 (c) to the code (relating to disallowance of surtax exemptions and minimum excess profits credit) and the House recedes on amendment No. 9.

The new subsection (c) of section 15 applies to the situation where a corporation, on or after January 1, 1951, transfers property (other than money) to one or more corporations created for the purpose of acquiring such property, or to one or more corporations not actively engaged in business at the time of such acquisition, if after such transfer the transferor corporation or its stockholders, or both, are in control of the transferee during any part of a taxable year of such transferee corporation. In such case the transferee corporation shall not be allowed either the $25,000 exemption from surtax or the $25,000 minimum excess profits credit unless it establishes by the clear preponderance of the evidence that the securing of the $25,000 exemption or the $25,000 minimum excess profits credit, or both, was not a major purpose of the transfer of the property to it by the transferor. The term "control" is defined as the ownership of stock possessing at least 80 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote or at least 80 percent of the total value of shares of all classes of stock of the corporation. Under the amendment the ownership of stock is to be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 503, except that constructive ownership under section 503 (a) (2) is to be determined only with respect to the individual's spouse and minor children. The Secretary, to the extent not inconsistent with the provisions of the new subsection, is granted the same authority as under section 129 (b) to allow in whole or in part a surtax exemption or a minimum excess profits credit which might otherwise be disallowed under the subsection or to apportion such exemption or credit among the corporations involved For example: Corporation A transfers on January 1, 1952, all of its property to corporations B and C in exchange for the entire stock of such corporations. Immediately thereafter corporation A is dissolved, its stockholders becoming the stockholders of B and C. Assuming that a major purpose for such transfers is to secure additional surtax exemptions and minimum excess profits credits, the Secretary has the authority to allow one such exemption and credit and to apportion such exemption and credit between corporations B and C. It is provided that the subsection shall not be applicable to any taxable year with respect to which the tax imposed by subchapter D of chapter 1 (relating to the excess profits tax) is not in effect It is not intended that the new subsection shall in any way delimit or abrogate any of the existing provisions of the code (including sec. 129), or any principle established by judicial decision, which have the effect of preventing the avoidance of income or excess profits taxes.

Amendment No. 10: This amendment strikes out all of section 124 of the House bill which provided, in the case of corporations, for an increase from 25 percent to 28.125 percent of the alternative tax (under sec. 117 (c) (1) of the code) on capital gains. The House recedes with an amendment changing the section number from 124 to 123, and providing for an increase of the alternative tax from 25 percent to 26 percent, effective in the case of taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, and before April 1, 1954. Under the conference agreement, the amendment will have no effect on

taxable years beginning before April 1, 1951, even though the taxable year ends after that date, but the 26-percent rate will apply in full to a taxable year ending after March 31, 1954, if the taxable year begins before April 1, 1954

Amendment No. 11: This amendment provides, in general, that corporations subject to a tax imposed by chapter 1 of the code for a taxable year ending after March 31, 1951, but prior to October 1, 1951, shall after the date of the enactment of the bill and on or before January 15, 1952, make a return for such taxable year with respect to such tax and such taxable year. The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No 12· This amendment, which corresponds to section 125 of the House bill, provides the effective date of part II of title I. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 13: This amendment, relating to the computation of tax by certain fiscal year taxpayers, corresponds to subsection (a) of section 131 of the House bill with such changes as are necessary to reflect the normal tax and surtax rates and the termination dates provided by the Senate amendments The House recedes with amendments conforming to the conference action with respect to the corporate income tax rates

Amendments Nos 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 These amendments are clerical amendments The House recedes

Amendment No 22 This amendment strikes out part I of title II of the House bill providing for the withholding of tax at the source on dividends, interest, and royalties. The House recedes

Amendment No 23 This amendment, which corresponds to part II of title II of the House bill (relating to increase in withholding of tax at source on wages) amends section 1622 (a) of the code by changing the percentage rate of withholding from 18 percent to 20 percent in the case of wages paid on or after November 1, 1951, and before January 1, 1954 It also amends section 1622 (c) (1), relating to wage-bracket withholding, to provide new tables which reflect the increased tax rates It also provides, as did the House bill, for additional withholding of tax on wages upon agreement by employer and employee and provides that the amendments made thereby shall be applicable only with respect to wages paid on or after November 1, 1951 The House recedes.

Amendments Nos 24, 25, 26, and 27: These amendments are clerical and conforming amendments. The House recedes

Amendment No. 28 Section 301 of the House bill amended section 12 (c) of the code to provide for a head of a household approximately one-half of the income-splitting benefits provided for a husband and wife who file a joint return Under the Senate amendment the head of a household was afforded approximately one-fourth of such benefits. The House recedes with an amendment conforming to the House action in affording approximately one-half of such benefits and making the necessary changes in the surtax tables to conform to the conference action with respect to individual income tax rates and effective date provisions.

Amendment No 29. Under the House bill, a taxpayer might qualify as a head of a household by reason of such household constituting the principal place of abode of a descendant of a stepson or stepdaughter of the taxpayer. Under the Senate amendment, such descendants are eliminated from the category of persons in respect of whom the taxpayer may qualify as head of a household. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 30: This amendment adds subsection (b) to section 301 of the bill to provide that in the case of a head of a household who elects the benefits of section 51 (f) (1) of the code (relating to tax computed by collector in case of wage earners) the tax shall be computed by the collector under supplement T without regard to the taxpayer's status as head of a household The House recedes.

Amendment No 31: This amendment amends section 22 (b) (1) of the code (relating to exclusion of life insurance proceeds from gross income) to provide for a limited exclusion for amounts paid by an employer to the beneficiaries of an employee by reason of the employee's death. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 32· This amendment amends sections 113 (a) (5) and (22) (b) (2) of the code to provide that the basis of a survivor's interest in a joint and survivor annuity, the value of which is required to be included in the estate of a decedent annuitant dying after December 31, 1950, shall be considered to be acquired by "bequest, devise, or inheritance" and that such basis (that is, the value of such survivor's interest at the time of the decedent's death) shall be considered, for purposes of determining the amount to be included in the income of the survivor, to be the consideration paid for the survivor's annuity The House recedes

Amendment No. 33 This amendment provides for the permanent enactment of section 22 (b) (9) of the code, relating to exclusion from gross income of income attributable to the discharge of certain indebtedness in the case of a corporation which consents to reduction in basis of its properties in an amount equal to the income excluded, and extends for three years the application of section 22 (b) (10), relating to the exclusion of income of a railroad corporation attributable to the discharge of its indebtedness in a receivership proceeding The amendment is similar to H. R. 2416, which was passed by the House on April 12, 1951 (H Rept No. 311). The House recedes

Amendment No 34: This amendment makes certain changes in section 22 (b) (13) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the additional allowance for certain members of the Armed Forces

Section 22 (b) (13) of existing law excludes from gross income certain compensation received for active service in the Armed Forces of the United States for any month during any part of which the recipient served in a combat zone after June 24, 1950, and prior to January 1, 1952 This amendment extends this latter date from January 1, 1952, to January 1, 1954.

This amendment also extends the exclusion to certain compensation received for active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, for any month during any part of which the recipient was hospitalized at any place as a result of wounds, disease, or injury incurred while serving in a combat zone after June 24, 1950, and prior to January 1, 1954, provided that during all of such month there are combatant activities in some combat zone. The House recedes

Amendment No 35: This amendment revises section 22 (d) (6) (F) (iii) of the code, which provision was added to section 22 (d) (6) by Public Law 919 (81st Cong., 2d sess.), so as to vary the application of the rule with respect to replacement of involuntary liquidations of inventories in certain cases where such replacement is made during taxable years ending after June 30, 1950, and prior to January 1, 1953. The effect of the amendment would be to permit the replacement of the World War II involuntary liquidations during taxable years ending after June 30, 1950, and prior to January 1, 1953, without requiring that the involuntary liquidations occurring during such years be first replaced, thus enabling the replacement of the World War II liquidations to be made in time to permit them to qualify for the benefits of section 22 (d) (6). The House recedes.

Amendment No. 36: This amendment amends section 23 (x) (relating to the deduction of medical expenses) by eliminating the 5 percent limitation with respect to the deduction of medical, dental, and so forth, expenses paid during the taxable year, not compensated for by insurance or otherwise, for the care of the taxpayer or his spouse if either the taxpayer or his spouse attains the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year. The limitation with respect to the maximum deduction allowable under section 23 (x) remains unchanged. The amendment is effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950 The House recedes.

Amendment No. 37: This amendment adds paragraph (7) to section 23 (aa) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide, in general, that an election to take or not to take the standard deduction for any taxable year may be changed after the time prescribed for filing a return for such year. The House recedes

Amendment No 38· This amendment is clerical The House recedes.

Amendment No 39 Section 302 of the House bill would add a new subparagraph (D) to section 23 (a) (1) of the code providing, in general, that all expenditures paid or incurred after December 31, 1950, in the development of a mine or other natural deposit (other than an oil or gas well), to the extent paid or incurred after the existence of ores or minerals in commercially marketable quantities has been disclosed, shall be deducted ratably as the produced ores or minerals benefited by such expenditures are sold. Section 302 of the House bill also amended section 113 (b) (1) by adding a new subparagraph (J) thereto to provide for adjustment to the basis of the mine or deposit for amounts allowed as a deduction under new subparagraph (D) as added to section 23 (a) (1)

The Senate bill made technical changes in the House provisions and inserted the substance of subparagraph (D) as added to section 23 (a) (1) by the House bill in a new subsection (cc) to be added to section 23 of the code. The Senate bill also added a provision to the new subsection (cc) which, in general, would allow the taxpayer to elect to deduct development expenditures either in the taxable year paid or incurred or ratably during the taxable years in which the produced ores or minerals benefited by such expenditures are sold. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos 40 and 41 These amendments are clerical The House recedes

Amendment No. 42· This amendment changes section 25 (b) (1) (D) of the code to increase the gross income test of a dependent from $500 to $600. The House recedes

Amendment No 43 This amendment adds to section 26 (b) of the code a new paragraph to provide for a dividends received credit in the case of dividends received from a foreign corporation (other than a foreign personal holding company) subject to taxation under chapter 1 of the code which for a stipulated uninterrupted period of time has been engaged in trade or business within the United States and has derived during such period 50 percent or more of its gross income from sources within the United States

The House recedes with an amendment under which the dividends received credit will be allowed with respect to dividends received from such a foreign corporation in an amount equal to—

(A) 85 percent of the dividends received out of its earnings or profits of the taxable year (computed as of the close of the taxable year without diminution by reason of any distributions made during the taxable year) without regard to the amount of the

earnings or profits at the time the distribution was made, but such amount shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to 85 percent of such dividends received out of such earnings or profits as the gross income of such foreign corporation for such taxable year from sources within the United States bears to its gross income from all sources for such taxable year, and

(B) 85 percent of the dividends received out of that part of its earnings or profits specified in clause (1) of the first sentence of section 115 (a) accumulated after the beginning of such uninterrupted period, but such amount shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to 85 percent of such dividends received out of such accumulated earnings or profits as the gross income of such foreign corporation from sources within the United States for the portion of such uninterrupted period ending at the beginning of the taxable year bears to its gross income from all sources for such portion of such uninterrupted period

The determination of earnings or profits distributed in any taxable year shall be made in accordance with section 115 (b) of the code.

The application of this amendment is illustrated by the following example: Corporation A (a foreign corporation filing its return on a calendar-year basis) whose stock is 100 percent owned by Corporation B (a domestic corporation filing its return on a calendar-year basis) for the first time engaged in trade or business in the United States on January 1, 1940, and qualified under this amendment for the entire period beginning from that date and ending with December 31, 1951. Corporation A had accumulated earnings or profits of $50,000, immediately prior to January 1, 1940, and had earnings or profits of $10,000 for each taxable year during the uninterrupted period from January 1, 1940, through December 31, 1951. It derived for the period from January 1, 1940, through December 31, 1950, 90 percent of its gross income from sources within the United States, and in 1951 derived 95 percent of its gross income from sources within the United States. During the calendar years 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, and 1944 corporation A distributed in each year $15,000, during the calendar years 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950 it distributed in each year $5,000; and during the year 1951, $50,000. For 1951 a dividends-received credit of $31,025 will be given corporation B with respect to the $50,000 received from corporation A, computed as follows:

(1) $8,075 which is $8,500 (85 percent of the $10,000 of earnings or profits of the taxable year) multiplied by 95 percent (the portion of the gross income of A corporation derived during the taxable year from sources within the United States) plus

(2) $22,950 which is $25,500 (85 percent of $30,000 (that part of the earnings and profits accumulated after the beginning of the uninterrupted period)) multiplied by 90 percent (the portion of the gross income derived from sources within the United States during that portion of the uninterrupted period ending at the beginning of the taxable year).

If, in the foregoing example, corporation A for the taxable year 1951 had incurred a deficit of $10,000 (shown to have been incurred prior to December 31), and if it had distributed $50,000 on December 31, 1951, the dividends-received credit which corporation B would receive would be $15,300, computed by multiplying $17,000 (85 percent of $20,000 earnings or profits accumulated after the beginning of the uninterrupted period) by 90 percent (the portion of the gross income from United States sources during that part of the uninterrupted period ending at the beginning of the taxable year).

Amendment No. 44: This amendment adds to section 51 of the code (relating to individual returns) a new subsection (g) providing for the filing of a joint return by a taxpayer and his spouse for a taxable year for which a joint return could have been made under section 51 (b) even though the time prescribed by law for filing the return for such taxable year has expired. This provision is effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 45: This amendment adds section 313 to the bill which relates to income-tax treatment of mutual savings banks, building and loan associations, and cooperative banks, effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951. The House recedes with an amendment.

Subsection (a) of section 313 as agreed to in conference repeals section 101 (2) of the code (relating to exemption from tax of mutual savings banks).

Subsection (b) amends section 101 (4) of the code to repeal the exemption from tax of building and loan associations and cooperative banks. Credit unions without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit will remain tax-exempt under section 101 (4) of the code

The amendment to section 101 (4) of the code made by subsection (b) will also continue to exempt from tax corporations or associations without capital stock organized prior to September 1, 1951, and operated for mutual purposes and without profit for the purpose of providing reserve funds for, and insurance of, shares or deposits in (A) domestic building and loan associations (as defined in sec 3797 (a) (19)), (B) cooperative banks without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit, or (C) mutual savings banks not having capital stock represented by shares

Subsection (c) amends section 454 of the code to add to the list of corporations exempt from the excess profits tax any mutual savings bank not having capital stock represented by shares, any domestic building and loan association (as defined in sec. 3797 (a) (19)), and any cooperative bank without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit.

Subsection (d) amends section 5 (h) of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 132, 12 U. S. C., sec. 1464 (h)), to remove the language in such section exempting Federal savings and loan associations from Federal income tax, war-profits, and excess profits taxes, in the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951. These associations will not, of course, be subject to the excess profits tax, by reason of the amendment made by subsection (c).

Subsection (e) amends section 23 (k) (1) (relating to deduction from gross income of bad debts) to provide rules with respect to a reasonable addition to a reserve for bad debts in the case of a mutual savings bank not having capital stock represented by shares, a domestic building and loan association, and a cooperative bank without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit. Where 12 percent of the total deposits or withdrawable accounts of the institution's depositors at the close of the taxable year exceeds the sum of its surplus, undivided profits and reserves at the beginning of the taxable year it may take a deduction for a reasonable addition to a reserve for bad debts for such year in any amount determined by it to be a reasonable addition for such year, except that such amount shall not be greater than the lesser of (A) the amount of its net income for such year computed without regard to this provision, or (B) the amount by which such 12 percent of its total deposits exceeds its surplus, undivided profits, and reserves at the beginning of such year. Where the sum of the institution's surplus, undivided profits, and reserves at the beginning of the taxable year equals or exceeds 12 percent of its total deposits or withdrawable accounts at the close of such year, any deduction for such year for a reasonable addition to a reserve for bad debts will be determined under the general provisions of section 23 (k) (1). In determining a deduction for a reasonable addition to a reserve for bad debts, and in determining the sum of the surplus, undivided profits, and reserves, there will be taken into account surplus, undivided profits, and bad debt reserves accumulated prior to the close of December 31, 1951 (i. e., during the period for which the institution was not subject to taxation).

Subsection (f) amends section 23 (r) (relating to the deduction from gross income of certain dividends paid by banking corporations) to provide that in the case of mutual savings banks, cooperative banks, and domestic building and loan associations (for definition of domestic building and loan associations, see section 3797 (a) (19) as added by section 313 (1) of the bill), there shall be allowed as deductions in computing net income any amounts paid to, or credited to the accounts of, depositors or holders of accounts as dividends on their deposits or withdrawable accounts, if such amounts may be withdrawn on demand subject only to customary notice of intention to withdraw. For example, if an institution has the right to receive 30 days' notice prior to the withdrawal of a deposit or of any amounts paid or credited to the account thereof, the amounts credited will nevertheless be considered as withdrawable on demand subject only to customary notice of intention to withdraw.

Subsection (g) amends section 23 of the code (relating to deductions from gross income) to provide a deduction for repayment of certain loans by a mutual savings bank not having capital stock represented by shares, a domestic building and loan association (as defined in section 3797 (a) (19) of the code) or a cooperative bank without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit. It provides that amounts paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year in repayment of loans made prior to September 1, 1951, by the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof which is wholly owned by the United States, or by a mutual fund established under the authority of the laws of any State, shall be allowed as a deduction in computing net income of the taxpayer. An example for this purpose of an agency or instrumentality wholly owned by the United States would be the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Subsection (h) amends section 104 (a) of the code (defining the term "bank") to include, within the definition of bank, a domestic building and loan association.

Subsection (i) amends section 3797 (a) of the code (relating to definitions for the purpose of the Internal Revenue Code) to define the term "domestic building and loan association" to mean a domestic building and loan association, a domestic savings and loan association, and a Federal savings and loan association, substantially all the business of which is confined to making loans to members. This amendment is of a clarifying nature and is not intended to change the existing meaning of a domestic building and loan association.

Subsection (j) provides that the amendments made by the section shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951.

Amendment No. 46: This amendment in general amends section 101 (12) of the code to subject tax-exempt cooperatives to normal tax and surtax on earnings not definitely allocated to the accounts of patrons.

The House recedes with an amendment making a clerical change, and with the following additional amendments. First, it is provided that amounts allocated to patrons with respect to income not derived from patronage, if made after the close of the taxable year and on or before the fifteenth day of the ninth following month, shall be considered as made during the taxable year to the extent such allocations are attributable to income derived before the close of the taxable year. Second, it is made clear that in taking into account patronage dividends to patrons with respect to their patronage in computing the net income of the cooperative, it is immaterial whether such dividends relate to patronage of the taxable year of the cooperative or to patronage of preceding taxable years. Third, the provision of the Senate amendment relating to withholding on patronage dividends in the event withholding is required on corporate dividends is stricken from the bill. Fourth, it is provided that the provisions of subsection (f) of section 148 (relating to information returns of patronage dividends paid by corporations), as amended by the Senate amendment, shall not apply in the case of any corporation (including any cooperative or nonprofit corporation engaged in rural electrification) exempt from taxation under section 101 (10) or (11) or in the case of any insurance corporation subject to a tax imposed by supplement G.

Under the conference agreement, patronage dividends allocated by a cooperative to its patrons will not be treated as taxable income to the cooperative.

Amendment No. 47: This amendment, which adds a new subparagraph (D) to section 102 (d) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, provides that the excess of the net long-term capital gain for the taxable year over the net short-term capital loss for such year, less the taxes imposed by chapter 1 of the code attributable to such excess, shall be deducted from the net income in computing section 102 net income. However, the fact that such excess is not to be taken into account in the tax basis on which the penalty tax under section 102 is imposed will not prevent capital gains from being taken into consideration in determining whether earnings or profits of a corporation have been permitted to accumulate beyond the reasonable needs of the business. The House recedes

Amendment No. 48: This amendment amends section 112 (b) (7) of the code (relating to election as to recognition of gain in certain corporate liquidations), so as to make it applicable to cases in which the liquidation is pursuant to a plan adopted after December 31, 1950, and the transfer of all the property under the liquidation occurs within one calendar month in 1951 or 1952. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 49: This amendment amends sections 112 (b) and 113 (a) of the code to provide for the nonrecognition of gain in certain cases, where, pursuant to a plan of reorganization, a shareholder of a corporation which is a party to the reorganization receives stock (other than preferred stock) in another corporation which is a party to the reorganization without the surrender by such shareholder of stock. This amendment is applicable with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this act, but applies only with respect to distribution of stock made after such date. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 50: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 51: Section 303 of the House bill provides in general, that any gain from a sale of property used by the taxpayer as his principal residence will not be recognized if the taxpayer within a period beginning 1 year prior to the date of such sale and ending 1 year after such date purchases property and uses it as his principal residence except to the extent that the taxpayer's selling price of the old residence exceeds his cost of purchasing the new residence. Th Senate amendment provides that, where the taxpayer is constructing the new residence, such period shall include 18, rather than 12, months after such sale. If the taxpayer commenced construction of the new residence more than 1 year prior to the date of the sale of the old residence, in determining the taxpayer's cost of building the new residence there will be included only so much of the cost as is attributable to the construction made during the period beginning 1 year prior to the date of the sale of the old residence and ending 18 months after such date. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 52: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 53: The House bill granted a percentage depletion allowance at the rate of 5 percent in the case of deposits of asbestos, sand, gravel, stone (including pumice, scoria, and slate), brick clay, tile clay, shale, oyster shell, clam shell, granite, and marble. The Senate amendment granted percentage depletion in the case of asbestos at the rate of 10 percent and added to the above list sodium chloride and, if produced from brine wells, calcium chloride, magnesium chloride, potassium chloride, and bromine The Senate amendment removed slate from the parenthetical clause following stone and included it as a separate item in this 5-percent category. The House bill increased the 5-percent rate of percentage depletion now allowed for coal to 10 percent. The Senate amendment followed this treatment in the case of coal and included in this new 10-percent category those minerals which the House bill would have allowed percentage depletion at a rate of 15 percent. These minerals are borax, fuller's earth, tripoli, refractory and fire clay, quartzite, perlite, diatomaceous earth, metallurgical grade limestone, and chemical grade limestone. The Senate amendment also added wollastonite, magnesite, dolomite, brucite, and calcium and magnesium carbonates to this 10-percent list, and added aplite and garnet to the list now allowed percentage depletion at the 15-percent rate

The bill, as passed by both the House and Senate, made technical amendments to section 114 (b) (4) (A) which do not alter its substance. The House bill changed the parenthetical clause, stating that thenardite produced from brines or mixtures of brine would be allowed percentage depletion, to state that thenardite, including thenardite from brines or mixtures of brine, would be permitted such allowance The Senate amendment achieved the same effect by striking the parenthetical clause.

The amendments made by both Houses are applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950.

The House recedes with an amendment which restores borax, fuller's earth, tripoli, refractory and fire clay, quartzite, diatomaceous earth, metallurgical grade limestone, and chemical grade limestone to the 15-percent category in which they appeared in the House bill and which removes potassium chloride from the list of minerals to which the Senate bill granted the percentage depletion allowance at the 5-percent rate. Potassium chloride is entitled, under existing law, to percentage depletion allowance at 15 percent. Under the conference agreement calcium carbonates are granted an allowance of 10 percent, while marble, which is a calcium carbonate, receives 5 percent. It is intended, in any case where a mineral is specifically provided for at a stated rate of percentage allowance, that the specific provision will govern over the allowance provided (whether higher or lower) for a more general classification.

It is the intention, in including stone in the 5 percent percentage depletion category, to limit such term to its commonly understood meaning. This depletion would be allowed in the case of common stone which is crushed for use in building roads but would not be allowed in the case of precious stones such as diamonds.

Amendment No 54: Section 115 (g) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code provides in substance that section 115 (g) (1), relating to the treatment as dividends of amounts distributed in redemption of stock, shall be inapplicable where the redemption is of stock the value of which is included in determining the value of the gross estate of a decedent provided, among other limitations, that the value of the stock in such corporation comprises more than 50 percent of the value of the net estate of the decedent. Under the Senate amendment, the 50-percent limitation would be reduced to 25 percent. The House recedes with an amendment under which the value of the stock of the corporation must comprise more than 35 percent of the value of the gross estate of the decedent The amendment would be applicable with respect to distributions in redemptions made after the date of enactment of the act.

Amendment No. 55: This amendment amends section 116 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to apply the exemption of earned income received from sources without the United States to (1) an individual citizen of the United States who has been a bona fide resident of a foreign country or countries for an uninterrupted period which includes an entire taxable year or (2) an individual citizen of the United States who during any period of 18 consecutive months is physically present in a foreign country or countries for a total of at least 510 full days in such period. Amounts paid by the United States or any agency thereof do not come within the provision of this amendment The amendment further amends the Internal Revenue Code to adapt the provisions respecting collection of income tax at source on wages to the substantive changes made to section 116 (a) of the code, and to eliminate withholding of Federal income tax with respect to wages which are required by law of any foreign country to be withheld upon for income taxes of such foreign country. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment Nos. 56, 57, and 58: These are clerical amendments. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 59: This amendment strikes out the provision of the House bill which provided for an increase, in the case of individuals, of the alternative tax on capital gains from 25 percent to 28.125 percent The House recedes with an amendment providing (effective in the case of taxable years beginning after October 31, 1951, and before November 1, 1953) for an increase of the alternative tax from 25 percent to 26 percent. Under the conference agreement, the amendment will have no effect on a taxable year beginning before November 1, 1951, even though the taxable year ends after that date, but the 26-percent rate will apply in full to a taxable year ending after November 1, 1953, if the taxable year began before that date.

Amendment Nos. 60, 61, and 62: These are clerical amendments. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 63: This amendment provides rules for the application of section 117 (j) in cases where land bearing an unharvested crop is sold. The provision applies in cases where the land has been held for more than 6 months. The period that the crop has been on the land is immaterial. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 64: The House bill contained a provision which, effective for taxable years after 1950, amended section 117

(j) (1) of the code to provide that the term "property used in the trade or business" includes livestock held by the taxpayer for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes for 12 months or more. The Senate amendment restates this provision to provide that the term "property used in the trade or business" includes livestock, regardless of age, held by the taxpayer for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes, and held by him for 12 months or more from the date of acquisition. The Senate amendment also provided that the term does not include poultry except that the term does include turkeys regardless of age, held by the taxpayer for breeding purposes, and held by him for 12 months or more from the date of acquisition. The Senate amendment also included rules respecting effective date. The House recedes with an amendment striking out the reference to turkeys. This provision of the bill is not intended to change the present application of section 117 (j) of the code to race horses in any situation in which such race horses fall within the term "property used in the trade or business"

Amendments Nos. 65 through 72: Section 307 of the House bill (which corresponds to section 325 of the Senate bill) extended capital gains treatment to certain coal royalties. The Senate amendments added certain additional rules and conforming amendments to other sections of the code. The House recedes on amendments Nos. 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, and 72, and recedes on amendment No. 67 with an amendment which strikes all references to timber, and which provides that the provisions in regard to coal added by the bill shall have no application for the purpose of applying section 102 or subchapter A of chapter 2, including the computation under section 117 (c) (1) of a tax in lieu of the tax imposed by section 500

Amendment No. 73: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 74: The House bill provided that the amendments relating to collapsible corporations shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950 This amendment limits the effective date to taxable years ending after August 31, 1951, and limits the application of the amendment to gains realized after such date. The House recedes.

Amendment No 75: This is a clerical amendment The House recedes.

Amendment No. 76 Section 309 of the House bill added a new subsection (n) to section 117 of the code to provide rules for the treatment of capital gains and ordinary losses by a dealer in securities in order to prevent the dealer from obtaining the most beneficial tax result by a shift in securities from one account to another or by insufficient identification of securities alleged to be within a particular account. Under the amendment the provisions of section 117 (n) are made inapplicable to the extent that these provisions are inconsistent with the provisions of section 117 (i) relating to bond, etc , losses of banks. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 77: This amendment strikes out section 310 of the House bill. The House recedes with an amendment which adds a new subsection (o) to section 117 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide that in the case of a sale or exchange, directly or indirectly, of depreciable property (1) between husband and wife, or (2) between an individual and a corporation in which he, his spouse, and his minor children and minor grandchildren own more than 80 percent of the value of the outstanding stock, any gain recognized to the transferor shall be considered ordinary income and not capital gain. The transfer of the property can be from the corporation to the stockholder or from the stockholder to the corporation. The property transferred must be property which in the hands of the transferee is property of a character which is subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 23 (l) of the code. This amendment shall be applicable only with respect to sales or exchanges made after May 3, 1951.

Amendment No. 78: This amendment adds a new subsection to section 117 of the code, to provide that certain payments received by an employee after the termination of his employment, which under existing law are taxable as ordinary income, shall be treated as gains from the sale or exchange of a capital asset held for more than 6 months. The House recedes with clerical amendments and with an amendment which provides that such payments (commencing after termination of the employment) must be payable for a period of not less than 5 years or for the period of the employee's life following the termination of his employment.

Amendment No. 79: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, amends section 122 (b) (2) (relating to the amount of net operating loss carry-overs) to provide for a 4-year carry-over of 1948 and 1949 net operating losses by both corporate and noncorporate taxpayers, and for a 4-year carry-over of 1946 and 1947 net operating losses by certain new corporations. The amendments to section 122 (b) (2) are made applicable in computing the net operating-loss deduction for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948. The House recedes with an amendment which eliminates the provisions of the Senate amendment for the carry-over of 1946 net operating losses by new corporations, reduces from four to three the number of years to which the 1947 net operating loss may be carried forward by new corporations, and reduces from four to three the number of years to which 1948 and 1949 net operating losses may be carried forward by all taxpayers.

Amendment No. 80: This amendment amends subsection (d) of section 130A, relating to definition of the term "restricted stock option," to provide that if the grant of an option is subject to stockholder approval, the date of the grant of the option shall be determined as if the option had not been subject to stockholder approval.

The amendment is made effective as if it had been enacted as a part of section 218 of the Revenue Act of 1950. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 81: This amendment adds to the bill a new section 331 pursuant to the provisions of which (1) a domestic corporation which owns at least 10 percent of the voting stock of a foreign corporation from which it receives dividends in a taxable year will, for purpose of computing the foreign tax credit of such domestic corporation, be deemed to have paid a proportion of certain foreign taxes paid, or deemed to be paid, by such foreign corporation, and (2) such foreign corporation will, for the purpose of the above computation, be deemed to have paid a proportion of certain foreign taxes paid by any other foreign corporation from which it receives dividends in a taxable year, if the former foreign corporation owns a majority of the voting stock of the latter foreign corporation. The House recedes with a clerical amendment and an amendment pursuant to which (2) above will be operative if the former foreign corporation owns 50 percent or more of the voting stock of the latter foreign corporation.

Amendment No. 82: This amendment amends section 147 of the code to give to the Secretary the authority to require information returns reporting payments of interest, regardless of amount. Under existing law, except in the case of certain payments, information returns may not be required from persons making payment of interest unless the payment is $600 or more. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 83: This amendment adds a new section 154 to supplement D of chapter 1 of the code, relating to returns and payment of taxes.

Such section 154 provides that, where any individual dies after June 24, 1951, and prior to January 1, 1954, while in active service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, if his death occurred while serving in a combat zone, as determined under section 22 (b) (18) of the code, or at any place as a result of wounds, disease, or injury incurred while so serving, (1) the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the code will not apply with respect to the taxable year in which falls the date of his death, or with respect to any prior taxable year which ended on or after the first day he was so serving in a combat zone after June 24, 1950, and (2) the tax (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts) imposed by chapter 1 of the code and under the corresponding title of each prior revenue law for all taxable years preceding those specified in (1) above, which is unpaid at the date of his death shall not be assessed, and if assessed the assessment shall be abated, and if collected shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 84: This amendment amends section 165 (b) of the code, relating to distributions to an employee by a trust which qualifies for exemption under section 165 (a).

Under section 165 (b), amounts distributed or made available to an employee by such a trust (in excess of the employee's contributions) are taxed to the employee only in the years in which distributed or made available and, if the total distributions are paid to the employee in one taxable year on account of the employee's separation from the service, the amount of the distribution (to the extent exceeding the employee's contribution) is taxed at capital gain rates (as from sale or exchange of a capital asset held for more than 6 months).

Under the amendment, where such a total distribution occurs in 1 taxable year and consists in whole or in part of securities of the employer corporation, that part of the excess (of the amounts distributed over the amount of the employee's contributions) as consists of net unrealized appreciation attributable to that part of the total distributions made in securities of such employer corporation shall be excluded from income in the year of distribution, and shall be subject to tax only when the securities are sold (or otherwise disposed of in a taxable transaction). The amount of the net unrealized appreciation which is excluded shall in the hands of the recipient not be included in the basis of the stock or other securities distributed.

The House recedes with an amendment providing that the proposed treatment is also to apply to securities issued by a parent or subsidiary corporation of the employer corporation.

Amendment No. 85: Under section 311 of the House bill, the special rule for 1949 and 1950, set forth in section 202 (b) (2) of the code for use in determining the reserve and other policy liability credit of life insurance companies, would have been extended to apply to taxable years beginning in 1951 Under this amendment there is substituted for this provision a system for taxing such companies, but only for taxable years beginning in 1951, which is different from that contained in present law. Under this system, in lieu of allowing life insurance companies an adjustment of their normal tax net income and of their corporation surtax net income, by means of the reserve and other policy liability credit, for purposes of a tax imposed at the regular corporate rates, a low-rate tax is imposed on the normal tax net income of such companies without allowance of any

such credit. Under the Senate amendment there is imposed for 1951 a tax equal to 3¾ percent of the first $200,000 of the 1951 adjusted normal tax net income of such companies and 6½ percent of the amount in excess thereof. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 86: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 87: This amendment makes technical and clarifying changes in the section of the House bill providing for tax treatment under supplement Q of chapter 1 of the code of certain registered management investment companies certified by the Securities and Exchange Commission as principally engaged in furnishing capital to corporations principally engaged in development or exploitation of inventions, technological improvements, new processes, or products not previously generally available. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 88: This amendment for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, makes a minor change in the definition of "system group" contained in section 373 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code. Under this amendment, in determining whether one or more of the corporations in a utility system owns the required 90 percent of each class of the stock of another corporation in the same system, there is disregarded not only stock which is preferred to both dividends and assets, which type of stock may be disregarded for this purpose under present law, but also stock which is limited and preferred as to dividends but which is not preferred as to assets, provided that the total value of such stock is less than 1 percent of the aggregate value of all classes of stock which are not preferred as to both dividends and assets. This amendment is applicable to all taxable years affected by exchanges and distributions made after December 31, 1947. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 89: This amendment subjects governmental colleges and universities, and corporations wholly owned by such colleges or universities, to the supplement U tax on their unrelated business net income, effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 90: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 91: This amendment provides for retroactive application to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1938, and before January 1, 1951, of the provisions added by the bill to the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the treatment of family partnerships for income tax purposes, which provisions are applicable generally to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950. The House recedes with an amendment revising the effective date provision to provide that the amendments made by the bill with respect to family partnerships shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, and to provide rules for cases where the taxable year of the partner differs from that of the partnership.

In applying the proposed treatment of family partnerships to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, where the taxable year of a partnership begins in 1950 and ends within or with, as to all the family partners, taxable years which begin in 1951, the proposed treatment shall apply to all distributive shares derived by the family partners from the taxable year of the partnership beginning in 1950; however, where a taxable year of the partnership ending in 1951 (whether beginning in 1950 or 1951) ends within or with a taxable year of a family partner which began in 1950, the proposed treatment is not applicable to any of the distributive shares of income derived by the family partners from such taxable year of the partnership.

Amendment No. 92: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the bill as it passed the House, amends section 127 of the code to provide an alternative treatment of war loss recoveries, applicable at the election of the taxpayer. Under the amendment the amount of the recovery, to the extent that it does not exceed the allowable deductions in prior taxable years on account of the destruction or seizure of property in respect of which the recovery is received, is excluded from gross income for the taxable year in which the recovery is received In lieu of including such amount in gross income for the taxable year of the recovery, there is to be added to the tax imposed by chapter 1 for such taxable year the total increase in the tax under chapter 1 and chapter 2 for all taxable years which would result by decreasing, in an amount equal to such part of the recovery so excluded, deductions allowable in prior taxable years with respect to the destruction or seizure of the property. To the extent that the amount of the recovery exceeds the allowable deductions in prior taxable years on account of the destruction or seizure of the property, such amount is treated for the taxable year of the recovery as gain on the involuntary conversion of property and is recognized or nonrecognized as provided in section 112 (f). This amendment also provides a new rule for the determination of the unadjusted basis of property where the alternative treatment of the recovery is applicable pursuant to election made by the taxpayer. The House recedes with amendments which revise section 127 (c) (3) (A) and (5), and make minor changes in the phrasing of section 127 (c) (3) (B) and (C) and section 127 (d) (2). The effective date of the amendment is also changed so that it will be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941.

Section 127 (c) (3) (A), relating to the definition of "amount of recovery" for the purposes of the new alternative treatment is revised under the conference agreement so that in the case of recovery of the same property or interest considered under section 127 (a) as destroyed or seized, such property or interest may be included in the amount of recovery at its fair market value, determined as of the date of recovery or at the option of the taxpayer at the adjusted basis (for determining loss) of such property or interest in the hands of the taxpayer on the date of the loss Subparagraph (A) is also revised to provide that for the purposes of section 127 (c) (3) (B) and (C) (but not section 127 (d) (2)) the amount of recovery shall be reduced by the amount of the obligations or liabilities with respect to the property recovered, if the taxpayer for any previous taxable year chose under section 127 (b) (2) to treat such obligations or liabilities as discharged or satisfied out of such property, and such obligations or liabilities were not so discharged or satisfied prior to the date of the recovery.

These two new rules incorporated into section 127 (c) (3) (A) may be illustrated by the following examples:

Example (1): The taxpayer on December 11, 1941, owned Blackacre, a property located in Germany. The adjusted basis of such property in the hands of the taxpayer on such date was $1,000,000. Under section 127 (a) such property was deemed destroyed or seized in the year 1941 and the taxpayer's loss of $1,000,000 was an allowable deduction for such year whether or not the taxpayer claimed such deduction. A recovery with respect to such loss is required to be taken into account under section 127 (c). Assume that in 1946 the taxpayer recovered this property and that on the date of recovery it had a fair market value of $500,000. If the taxpayer elects to proceed under the provisions of section 127 (c) (3), he has an option to include in the amount of the recovery respecting this property either the fair market value on the date of the recovery ($500,000) or an amount equal to the adjusted basis of the property as of the date of the loss ($1,000,000). Assuming the taxpayer had no previous recovery with respect to this property, its unadjusted basis under section 127 (d) (2) for the period subsequent to recovery would be $500,000 or $1,000,000 depending upon whether the taxpayer chose to include the property in the amount of recovery in 1946 at its fair market value on the date of the recovery or its adjusted basis as of the date of loss If the taxpayer chooses to treat $1,000,000 (the adjusted basis of the property on the date of the loss in 1941) as the amount of the recovery, there would be added to the tax for 1946 the total increase in the tax which would result by decreasing from $1,000,000 to zero the amount of the deduction allowable in 1941 on account of the destruction or seizure of Blackacre. If the taxpayer chooses to treat only $500,000 (fair market value on date of recovery) as the amount of the recovery, there would be added to the tax for 1946 the amount of the total increase in tax resulting from decreasing to $500,000 the amount of the deduction allowable in 1941. If the $1,000,000 allowable as a deduction in 1941 did not result in any tax benefit, then there would be nothing to be added to the tax for 1946, whether the taxpayer chooses the amount of the recovery as $500,000 or as $1,000,000

Example (2): The taxpayer on December 11, 1941, owned an industrial plant in Germany. The adjusted basis of such property in the hands of the taxpayer on such date was $5,000,000. The property on such date was subject to a mortgage of $3,000,000. Under the provisions of section 127 (b) (2) the taxpayer chose to treat the mortgage as discharged or satisfied out of the property. Assume that in 1946 the taxpayer recovered this property and that on the date of recovery it had a fair market value of $5,000,000, and is still subject to the mortgage of $3,000,000. If the taxpayer elects to have the provisions of section 127 (c) (3) apply, the amount of the recovery respecting this property for the purposes of subparagraph (B) is considered to be $2,000,000. Since this amount is equal to the allowable deduction in 1941 under section 127 (b), all of such amount is excluded from gross income in 1946, however, there is to be added to the income tax for such year the total increase in the tax under chapter 1 and chapter 2 for all taxable years which would result from eliminating the allowable deduction of $2,000,000 in 1941. For the purposes of paragraph (C) the amount of recovery is likewise considered to be $2,000,000 so that there is no amount to be treated for 1946 as gain from the involuntary conversion of the property. However, this rule which reduces the amount of the recovery on account of liabilities and obligations is not applicable in applying the provisions of section 127 (d) (2). Under that section the amount of the recovery in respect of the property is $5,000,000, and since there was no amount considered as gain upon involuntary conversion of the property in 1946, such amount is not reduced and the basis of the property is $5,000,000.

Under the conference agreement, as under existing law and the Senate amendment, property considered as destroyed or seized under section 127 (a) of the code is considered as not being in existence from the date of the loss to the date of its recovery. Thus, depreciation on the recovered property is not allowable for the period between the date of the loss and the date of the recovery.

Section 127 (c) (5), relating to the election by the taxpayer to have the provisions of section 127 (c) (3) apply to war loss recoveries, has been revised under the conference agreement to provide that if the taxpayer elects to have the provisions of paragraph (3) applicable in any taxable year in which he recovers any money or property in respect of property considered under section 127 (a) as destroyed or seized, the provisions of paragraph (3) shall be applicable to all taxable years of the taxpayer beginning after December 31, 1941. Such election once made is irrevocable. The election by the taxpayer is to be made in such manner and at such time as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe. However, no election may be made after December 31, 1952, by the taxpayer unless he receives war loss recoveries during a taxable year ending after the date of enactment of the Revenue Act of 1951.

If under an election made by the taxpayer the provisions of section 127 (c) (3) are applicable to any taxable year, the period of limitations provided in sections 275 and 276 of the code for the assessment and collection of (1) the amount to be added to the tax for such taxable year under section 127 (c) (3), and (2) any deficiency for such taxable year or for any other taxable year to the extent attributable to the basis of the recovered property being determined under section 127 (d) (2), shall not expire prior to the expiration of 2 years following the date of the making of such election. Any amount and any deficiency specified in clauses (1) and (2) of the preceding sentence may be assessed at any time prior to the expiration of such 2-year period, notwithstanding any law or rule of law which would otherwise prevent such assessment and collection.

Paragraph (5) further provides that if section 127 (c) (3) is applicable to any taxable year pursuant to the taxpayer's election, and credit or refund of any overpayment resulting from the application of section 127 (c) (3) to such taxable year is prevented on the date of the making of such election, or within 1 year from such date, by any law or rule of law (other sec. 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to compromises), credit or refund of such overpayment may nevertheless be made or allowed if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from such date.

Paragraph (5) further provides that in the case of any taxable year ending before the date of the making by the taxpayer of an election, no interest shall be paid upon any overpayment resulting from the application of the provisions of section 127 (c) (3) to such year, and no interest shall be assessed or collected with respect to any amount or any deficiency specified in clauses (1) and (2) above, for any period prior to the expiration of 6 months following the date of the making of such election by the taxpayer.

Amendment No 93: This amendment adds a new subsection (ff) to section 23 of the code (relating to deductions from gross income), providing that expenditures paid or incurred during the taxable year for the purpose of ascertaining the existence, location, extent, or quality of any deposit of ore or other mineral, and paid or incurred prior to the beginning of the development stage of the mine or deposit, may be deducted in computing net income for the taxable year, except to the extent that such expenditures exceed $75,000. The subsection further provides that the taxpayer may elect to treat as deferred expense any portion of such deductible amount, in which event such deferred portion shall be deductible on a ratable basis as the units of produced ores or minerals discovered or explored by reason of such expenditures are sold. No deduction may be taken under this new subsection if in any four preceding years (not necessarily consecutive years) the taxpayer, or any individual or corporation (who has transferred to the taxpayer any mineral or ore property under circumstances which make the provisions of pars. (7), (8), (11), (13), (15), (17), (20), or (22) of section 113 (a) of the code applicable to such transfer), has taken a deduction, or elected to treat exploration expenditures as deferred expense, under the new subsection. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 94: This amendment would have added a new subsection (n) to section 115 of the code to provide a special rule for the treatment of gain upon the complete liquidation of a corporation where the distribution in liquidation included stock in another corporation to which unimproved real estate had been transferred in anticipation of such liquidation. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No 95: This amendment adds paragraph (20) to section 3797 of the code to provide in substance that a full-time life insurance salesman who is an employee under the definition contained in the Federal Insurance Contributions Act shall be considered to be an "employee" for the purpose of applying the provisions of chapter 1 (such as sections 22 (b) (2) (B), 23 (p) and 165) which determine the effect of contributions for the benefit of, and distribution to, "an employee" under a stock bonus, pension, profit-sharing, or annuity plan. The amendment is applicable to taxable years beginning after 1938 The House recedes.

Amendment No. 96. This amendment would allow in full, for purposes of computing the net operating loss (as defined by sec. 122 (a) of the code) of a taxpayer other than a corporation, deductions allowable under section 23 (e) (2) (relating to losses incurred in a transaction entered into for profit) and section 23 (e) (3) (relating to losses of property not connected with a trade or business, if the losses arise from fire, storm, shipwreck, or other casualty or from theft). Under existing law, in computing the net operating loss in the case of such a taxpayer, section 122 (d) (5) limits the deductions otherwise allowable under section 23 of the code which are not attributable to a trade or business regularly carried on by the taxpayer to the extent of the gross income not derived from such trade or business. The House recedes with an amendment which removes from the present limitation in section 122 (d) (5) deductions for losses sustained after December 31, 1950, in respect of property, if the losses arise from fire, storm, shipwreck, or other casualty, or from theft. The amendment will enable a taxpayer who is an individual to take such losses into account in computing a net operating loss which may be carried back 1 year or carried forward 5 years. The amendment is made applicable in computing the net operating loss deduction for taxable years ending after December 31, 1948.

Amendment No 97: This amendment relates to the abatement of tax of certain irrevocable trusts to the extent that the income is owned by any individual who dies on or after December 7, 1941, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or of any of the other United Nations and prior to January 1, 1948.

The House recedes with an amendment which provides, that, in the case of a trust which accumulated income for a beneficiary who died on or after December 7, 1941, and before January 1, 1948, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or of any of the other United Nations, there shall be allowed as a deduction in computing the net income of the trust for any taxable year the income of the trust for such taxable year, before diminution for income taxes with respect thereto, which was, or would have been but for such diminution, accumulated for such beneficiary.

This deduction shall be allowed, however, only if (1) the income accumulated was for a taxable year of the trust which ended with or within a taxable year (ending on or after December 7, 1941) of such beneficiary during any part of which he was a member of such military or naval forces, or, in the case of the taxable year of the trust during which such beneficiary died, the income accumulated was for the period in such taxable year prior to the death of such beneficiary, and (2) the amount of such accumulated income was, without regard to this amendment, taxable to the trust, and (3) the income for such taxable year accumulated for the beneficiary, if not distributed to him prior to his death, was payable by the trust at or after his death only to his estate, spouse, or lineal ancestors or descendants.

Amendment No. 98: This amendment (effective for taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this bill) would require a net worth statement to be filed with the return of any individual who during the taxable year received gross income in excess of $10,000 from one or more unlawful trades or businesses. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 99: This amendment amends the life insurance company provisions of the code to provide that the life insurance department of a mutual savings bank is to be taxed as a life insurance company. This amendment is a corollary of amendment No. 45, relating to the taxation of mutual savings banks. The amendment is applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951.

The House recedes with an amendment which adds a new section 110 to the code to provide the method for computing the tax of a mutual savings bank authorized under State law to conduct a life insurance business and which conducts such a business in a separate department the accounts of which are maintained separately from the other departments of the bank The tax is to consist of the sum of (1) a partial tax computed under sections 13 and 15 of the code upon the net income of the bank determined without regard to any items of income or deductions properly allocable to the life insurance department; and (2) a partial tax upon the net income of the life insurance department determined without regard to any items of income or deductions not properly allocable to such department at the rates and in the manner provided in supplement G with respect to life insurance companies. In determining the net income for purposes of such partial taxes no account shall be taken of any transactions between the insurance department and the bank or any other department thereof.

The amendment is applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951.

Amendment No. 100: This amendment adds at the end of section 422 (b) of the code (relating to definition of unrelated trade or business for the purpose of determining the unrelated business net income subject to the supplement U tax) a special rule with respect to publishing businesses carried on by colleges and universities. This amendment is applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950 and prior to January 1, 1953. The purpose of this amendment is to afford an organization (exempt under sec. 101 (6) and subject to supplement U) which owns a publishing business limited opportunity to conform or relate such publishing business to its educational or other exempt purposes within the time specified in the amendment, and thus be relieved of supplement U tax thereon for taxable years preceding the taxable year in which the activity becomes related. The House recedes with a clarifying amendment.

Amendment No. 101: This amendment, for taxable years beginning prior to Janu-

ary 1, 1954, treats as related, for the purposes of the tax imposed by supplement U, an unrelated trade or business carried on by certain educational organizations. The House recedes with an amendment which adds at the end of section 442 (a) (relating to the definition of unrelated business net income for the purpose of the supplement U tax) a special rule with respect to unrelated trades or businesses carried on in partnership by certain educational organizations. The amendment is applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, and prior to January 1, 1954

Amendment No 102: This amendment adds a new subsection (e) to section 504 of the code relating to the computation of undistributed subchapter A net income for purposes of the imposition of the surtax on personal holding companies. Subsection (e) will provide for the deduction, for purposes of computing undistributed subchapter A net income, of an amount by which the undistributed subchapter A net income determined without regard to subsection (e) exceeds the amount which could be distributed on the last day of the taxable year as a dividend (1) without the violation of any action, regulation, rule, order, or proclamation made under the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 16, 1917, as amended, or the First War Powers Act of 1941, and (2) not subject to a lien in favor of the United States The amendment is applicable to taxable years beginning after 1939. The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No 103: This is a technical amendment to provide that the fifth sentence of section 1700 (a) (1) of the code, added by Public Law 124, Eighty-second Congress, shall be stricken from the code as surplusage upon elimination of the second sentence as provided in the House bill. The House recedes

Amendment No 104: This amendment retains the substantive provisions of the House bill, but differs therefrom in the following respects

(a) Whereas the House bill would grant an exemption from the admissions tax in the case of shows or performances the proceeds of which inure exclusively to the benefit of certain organizations, such as religious, charitable, and educational groups, no such exemption would apply, under the Senate amendment, in the case of any motion-picture exhibition Under the Senate amendment, to come within the exemption privilege, a religious institution must be a church or a convention or association of churches; an educational institution, to be entitled to the exemption, must have a regular curriculum and student body; and a charitable institution must be supported, in whole or part, by Federal or State funds or by contributions from the general public

(b) The Senate amendment eliminates the pre-1941 exemption in the case of admissions all the proceeds of which inure exclusively to the benefit of societies for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals and the pre-1941 exemption in the case of societies or organizations conducted for the sole purpose of maintaining a cooperative or community center motion-picture theater.

(c) Whereas the House bill would exempt admissions to agricultural fairs and to any exhibit, entertainment, or other pay feature conducted by the fair association as part of the fair, the Senate amendment limits the exemption to the general admission charge to the fair only.

(d) The exemption granted under the House bill in the case of benefits conducted for or on behalf of police or fire departments, their members or heirs has been further limited to provide that the proceeds from such benefits must inure exclusively to the benefit of the police or fire department or to a retirement, pension or disability fund for the members or their heirs.

(e) The Senate amendment also makes it plain that an exemption from the admissions tax is to apply to operas as well as symphonies which receive their support from voluntary contributions

The House recedes with an amendment which provides an exemption from tax on admissions, the proceeds of which inure exclusively to the benefit of an organization organized prior to October 1, 1951) which is exempt under section 101 (6) of the code and which is operated for the purpose of conducting an annual chautauqua program of educational, cultural, and religious activities at a permanent location

The bill restores the provisions of section 1701 (c) of the code without change, so that admissions to concerts conducted by a civic or community membership association (such as orchestras, choral societies, etc) will be exempt from tax

Amendment No 105. This is a clerical amendment The House recedes

Amendment No 106 This amendment grants an exemption from the admissions tax covering admissions (1) to a home or garden which is temporarily opened to the general public as part of a program carried on by a society or organization for such purpose and (2) to historic sites, houses, and shrines, and museums conducted in connection therewith, maintained and operated by a society or organization devoted to the preservation of such places. The House recedes.

Amendment No 107: This amendment provides that the increase in the rate of tax with respect to cigarettes shall be reduced to the present rate of tax effective January 1, 1954 The House recedes with an amendment fixing the rate reduction date as April 1, 1954

Amendments Nos 108 and 109: These are clerical amendments. The House recedes.

Amendment No 110: This amendment makes provision for a floor-stocks refund on tax-paid cigarettes which are held for sale on January 1, 1954, the rate reduction date specified in the bill as passed by the Senate. The House recedes with an amendment fixing April 1, 1954, as the inventory date to correspond with the change made in the rate reduction date and an amendment fixing July 1, 1954, as the date before which claims for refund must be filed.

Amendment No 111: This amendment provides for a reduction in the rate of tax on snuff and chewing and smoking tobacco from 18 cents per pound to 10 cents per pound The House recedes with a technical amendment.

Amendment No 112: This amendment strikes out the provisions of section 431 of the House bill imposing a retailers' excise tax upon mechanical lighters for cigarettes, cigars, and pipes Such articles will be taxed at the manufacturers' level at the rate of 15 percent (see amendment No. 189). The House recedes.

Amendments. Nos. 113 and 114: These amendments are clerical. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 115 and 116: These amendments provide that the retailers' excise tax shall not apply with respect to the sale of miniature samples of cosmetics, toilet articles, lotions, powder, etc., taxable under section 2402 (a) of the code, made by a manufacturer or distributor to a house-to-house salesman for demonstration purposes only unless such samples are resold by the salesman. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 117. This amendment is clerical. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 118: This amendment strikes out all of the provisions of the House bill relating to the imposition of a tax of 2 cents per gallon upon any liquid sold or used as a fuel in a Diesel-powered highway vehicle. The House recedes with an amendment which restores the House provisions but provides that effective April 1, 1954, the rate of tax on such fuel will be reduced to 1½ cents per gallon.

Amendments Nos. 119 and 120: These amendments are clerical. The Senate recedes

Amendments Nos. 121 and 122: These amendments provide that the increase in tax imposed with respect to distilled spirits generally and to imported perfumes containing distilled spirits shall be reduced to the present rate of tax effective January 1, 1954. The House recedes with an amendment fixing April 1, 1954, as the rate reduction date in lieu of January 1, 1954

Amendments Nos 123, 124, 125, and 126: These amendments are clerical. The Senate recedes

Amendments Nos 127, 128, and 129: These amendments provide that the increase in tax with respect to wines of the various classifications specified shall be reduced to the present rate of tax effective January 1, 1954. The House recedes with an amendment providing that the rate reduction date shall be April 1, 1954.

Amendment No 130: This amendment is clerical The Senate recedes.

Amendment No 131: This amendment provides that the increase in tax imposed with respect to certain sparkling wines, liqueurs, and cordials shall be reduced to the present rate of tax effective January 1, 1954. The House recedes with an amendment establishing the rate reduction date as April 1, 1954

Amendments Nos 132, 133, 134, 135, and 136 These are clerical amendments. The Senate recedes

Amendment No 137: This amendment provides that the increase in the rate of tax imposed with respect to fermented malt liquors shall be reduced to the present rate of tax effective January 1, 1954. The House recedes with an amendment providing that the rate reduction date shall be April 1, 1954.

Amendments Nos 138, 139, and 140: These amendments are clerical. The Senate recedes

Amendment No. 141: This amendment provides for floor stocks refunds with respect to tax-paid distilled spirits, wine, and beer held for sale upon the termination of the tax rate increases proposed for these products in the bill. The House recedes with an amendment fixing the inventory date to be used in determining the amount of refunds as April 1, 1954, in lieu of January 1, 1954, and with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 142. This is a clerical amendment The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 143. This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendments Nos. 144, 145, and 146: These amendments are clerical. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos 147, 148, and 149: These amendments provide that the increase in the occupational tax for wholesale dealers in liquor, retail dealers in liquor, and wholesale dealers in malt liquor, respectively, shall be reduced to the present rate on and after January 1, 1954. Under the House bill, the increase in rates was permanent. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 150: This amendment is clerical. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 151: The House bill provided for an increase in the rate of drawback on distilled spirits used in certain nonbeverage products. The Senate amendment makes technical revisions in this provision so as to provide for reduction of the amount of draw-back after December 31, 1953, to correspond with the reduction in the rate of tax on distilled spirits on and after

January 1, 1954. The House recedes with clerical amendments and with an amendment providing that the reference to drawbacks made after December 31, 1953, shall be changed to March 31, 1954, to take into account the change in the rate reduction date.

Amendment No. 152: This amendment is clerical. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 153: This amendment eliminates the increase in tax proposed under the House bill on bowling alleys and billiard and pool tables. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 154: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 155: This is a clerical amendment The Senate recedes.

Amendment No 156: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendments Nos. 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, and 162. These amendments are clerical The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 163: This amendment is technical and makes it clear that any person who is liable for tax under subchapter A of chapter 27A of the code, as added by the bill, or who is engaged in receiving wagers for or on behalf of any person so liable, and who commenced the activity which makes him subject to tax, or who was engaged in receiving such wagers, prior to the day on which such tax becomes effective shall be required to pay the special tax imposed by subchapter B of chapter 27A. The House recedes with clerical amendments.

Amendments Nos. 164 and 165: These are clerical amendments. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No 166: This amendment provides that the increase in the rate of the manufacturers' excise tax with respect to trucks, busses, etc., shall revert to the present rate of tax effective January 1, 1954. The House recedes with an amendment providing that the rate reduction date shall be April 1, 1954.

Amendment No. 167: This amendment eliminates the present tax of 7 percent upon the sale of house trailers, including parts and accessories therefor. This amendment will become effective on the first day of the first month which begins more than 10 days after the date of enactment of the bill, thus, the tax would apply with respect to the sale of house trailers made prior to such effective date and notwithstanding that such purchases may be paid for on an installment plan after such date. A house trailer would be considered as sold prior to such effective date if the right of possession thereto passed to the purchaser prior to such effective date.

The amendment also provides that the increase in the rate of the manufacturers' excise tax with respect to automobile chassis and bodies, motorcycles, trailers, and semitrailers (other than house trailers) suitable for use in connection with automobiles, shall revert to the present rate of tax with respect to sales made on and after January 1, 1954. The House recedes with an amendment providing that the rate reduction date shall be April 1, 1954.

Amendment No. 168: This amendment provides that the increase in the rate of the manufacturers' excise tax with respect to parts and accessories for automobiles shall revert to the present rate of tax with respect to sales made on and after January 1, 1954. The House recedes with an amendment providing that the rate reduction date shall be April 1, 1954

Amendment No. 169: This is a technical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 170: This is a clerical amendment. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 171: This is a technical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 172: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 173: This amendment provides that a manufacturer of refrigerator components may sell such components tax free to a wholesaler or dealer if such components are purchased for resale to a manufacturer of refrigerator equipment and provided the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury relating to such sales are complied with. The House recedes with clerical amendments.

Amendment No 174: This amendment (a) revises the taxable list of sporting goods in the House bill to exclude baseballs and baseball equipment, (b) reinstates certain items taxable under present law but excluded under the House bill, (c) retains the present 10 percent rate of tax with respect to fishing equipment, and (d) increases the rate of tax, like the House bill, with respect to the remaining sporting equipment to 15 percent. The House recedes, with an amendment providing that snow toboggans and sleds 60 inches or less in length, and skates, shall not be subject to tax and that the increase in the rate of tax shall revert to the present rate of tax effective April 1, 1954

Under the provisions of the Act of August 9, 1950 (the Dingell-Johnson Act), an amount equal to the revenue accruing from the tax on fishing rods and equipment is authorized to be appropriated for assistance to the States for fish restoration and management projects. The amendments made by this bill will not affect such authorization nor the permanency of such Act.

Amendment No. 175. This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 176: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No 177: This is a clerical amendment. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 178: This amendment strikes out electric direct motor-driven fans and air circulators of the industrial type and electric air heaters of the blower type from the list of items subject to the manufacturers' excise tax under section 3406 (a) (3) of the code. Senate amendment No 182 exempts from the tax all appliances listed in such sections which are of the industrial type.

The House recedes with an amendment which provides that the tax imposed by section 3406 (a) (3) of the code shall not apply to electric direct motor-driven fans and air circulators of the industrial type, and shall apply in the case of all other appliances listed in section 3406 (a) (3), including those added to such list by the bill, only to such appliances of the household type.

Amendment No. 179: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a technical amendment to conform to the action of the conferees with respect to amendment No. 178.

Amendment No. 180: This amendment adds electric exhaust blowers to the list of items subject to the manufacturers' excise tax The House recedes.

Amendment No. 181: This amendment strikes out the provision of the House bill which would have added electric shavers to the list of appliances subject to the manufacturers' excise tax under section 3406 (a) (3) of the code, and adds electric garbage-disposal units to such list. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 182: This amendment provides that the tax imposed by section 3406 (a) (3) will not apply to appliances of the industrial type. The substance of this amendment is covered by the action of the conferees with respect to amendment No. 178. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 183: This amendment makes the provisions of section 3441 (b) (relating to sale price of a taxable article) applicable to a situation where a manufacturer has a plan of negotiating the sale of an article to the ultimate user for and on behalf of the retailer of such article. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 184: The House removed certain items from the list of articles subject to the manufacturers' excise tax on photographic apparatus, imposed by section 3406 (a) (4) of the code, and subjected the items upon which the tax is retained to a uniform 20 percent rate.

The Senate amendment (a) retains the present list of photographic items subject to tax and subjects such items to a uniform tax rate of 15 percent with respect thereto and (b) provides that the tax on a sale of unexposed 35-millimeter color positive-print motion-picture film shall be computed, in lieu of on the price for which so sold, on the price for which an equivalent quantity of unexposed 35-millimeter black-and-white positive-print motion-picture film is sold. The House recedes with an amendment which restores the House provision with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 185: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendments Nos 186 and 187: These are clerical amendments. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 188 and 189: The House bill imposed a manufacturers' excise tax, at a rate of 20 percent, on mechanical pencils, fountain pens, and ball point pens. Senate amendment No. 189 adds to this list mechanical lighters for cigarettes, cigars, and pipes (the House had imposed a tax on these items at the retail level; see amendment No. 112), and Senate amendment No. 188 provides a rate of tax of 10 percent on all these items. The House recedes on amendment No. 189, and recedes with an amendment on amendment No. 188 fixing the rate of tax on these items at 15 percent.

Amendment No. 190: This is a technical amendment The House recedes

Amendment No 191: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No. 192: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 193: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 194: This amendment provides that the increase in the rate of tax on gasoline shall be reduced to the present rate of tax effective January 1, 1954. The House recedes with an amendment fixing the rate reduction date as April 1, 1954.

Amendments Nos. 195, 196, and 197. These are clerical amendments. The House recedes on amendments Nos. 195 and 196 and recedes with a clerical amendment on amendment No. 197.

Amendment No. 198: This is a technical amendment. The House recedes with a further technical amendment providing that the credit and refund provisions of section 3443 of the code shall be applicable to the floor stocks tax imposed on gasoline.

Amendment No. 199: This amendment provides for a floor stocks refund on certain gasoline held for sale on January 1, 1954, the date provided by Senate amendment No. 194 for termination of the increase in tax on gasoline The House recedes with an amendment fixing April 1, 1954, as the inventory date to correspond with the change made in the rate reduction date.

Amendment No. 200: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendments Nos. 201, 202, and 203: These are clerical amendments. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 204: The House bill reduced the rate of tax on domestic telegraph, cable, or radio dispatches from 25 percent to 20 percent. The Senate amendment further reduces the rate of tax to 15 percent. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 205, 206, 207, 208, and 209: These are clerical amendments. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 210: This amendment provides that no tax shall be imposed under section 3465 (a) (1) (A) of the code on any payment received for any telephone or radio telephone message which originates within a combat zone, as defined in section 22 (b) (13), from a member of the Armed Forces of the United States performing service in such combat zone. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 211: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 212: This amendment strikes out the provisions of the House bill which would impose a tax on the transportation of crude petroleum and liquid products thereof by water from one point in the United States to another when such transportation is performed by the owner of the crude petroleum and liquid products thereof. The House recedes.

Amendment No 213. This amendment provides that no tax shall be imposed with respect to the transportation of persons by water on a vessel which makes one or more intermediate stops at ports within the United States, Canada, or Mexico on a voyage which begins or ends in the the United States and ends or begins outside the northern portion of the Western Hemisphere if the vessel in stopping at such intermediate ports is not authorized both to discharge and to take on passengers The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 214. This amendment provides that section 3475 of the code, relating to the tax on the transportation of property, shall not apply to the transportation of earth, rock, or other material excavated within the boundaries of, and in the course of, a construction project and transported to any place within, or adjacent to, the boundaries of such project The House recedes with an amendment providing that the determination as to the applicability of the tax imposed by section 3475 in the case of the transportation of any excavated material, other than transportation to which the amendment made by this subsection applies, shall be made as if this subsection had not been enacted and without inferences drawn from the fact that the amendment made by this subsection is not expressly applicable to the transportation of such other material.

Amendment No 215: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No. 216 This amendment provides for a refund of tax on cigarettes, distilled spirits, wine, and beer equal to the difference between the tax paid on such items and the amount of tax made applicable on and after January 1, 1954, brought from a foreign trade zone into customs territory of the United States on and after January 1, 1954, the rate reduction date specified with respect to the taxable articles in question. The House recedes with a clerical amendment and with an amendment fixing the determinative date as April 1, 1954, in lieu of January 1, 1954.

Amendment No. 217: This amendment provides that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make refund, or allow credit, in the case of a distiller or rectifier, if he so elects, in the amount of the internal revenue tax and customs duties paid on spirits previously withdrawn, and lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the 1951 floods, provided certain conditions are met. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 218: This amendment is clerical. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 219: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the bill as passed by the House, provides in a new subsection (e) (1) of section 430 for the computation of an alternative amount of excess profits tax for each of the first five taxable years of corporations which commenced business after July 1, 1945. The amount computed thereunder would be the maximum excess profits tax if less than the amount computed under section 430 (a) (2). Under the Senate amendment, the maximum tax would not exceed the following percentages of the first $400,000 of the excess profits net income: 5 percent if the taxable year is the first or second taxable year (determined from the commencement of business), 8 percent for the third taxable year, 11 percent for the fourth taxable year, and 14 percent for the fifth taxable year. Under the Senate amendment, if, for any such year the excess profits net income exceeds $400,000, the excess over $400,000 is subject to the same maximum tax as in the case of other corporations.

The amendment also provides rules in subsection (e) (2) for determining, for the purpose of the subsection, when a taxpayer shall be considered to have commenced business and to have had taxable years determined by reference to the date of commencement of business of certain other corporations. It contemplates that the Secretary will, by regulations, provide for the determination of constructive taxable years by reference to the annual accounting period first established by the taxpayer

The Senate amendment also provides, in effect, that the benefits of the special limitation provisions under section 430 (e) (1) shall be denied to any taxpayer which derives more than 50 percent of its income for the taxable year from contracts or subcontracts to which title I of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 or to which any prior renegotiation act is applicable.

The House recedes with an amendment. Paragraph (1) of subsection (e) is amended to make it clear that the provision is applicable only to taxpayers whose fifth taxable year ends after June 30, 1950 Clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (E) of subsection (e) (1) are amended to conform the percentage figures specified therein to those provided by the conference agreement on Senate amendment No 6 A change is made in each of subparagraphs (A) to (D), inclusive, of subsection (e) (1), which makes the percentages therein specified applicable to only the first $300,000 of excess profits net income instead of to the first $400,000 of such income as provided in the Senate amendment, and a conforming amendment is made to subsection (e) (1) (E). Amendments are made to paragraph (2) of subsection (e) to make clear that in determining a constructive date of commencement of business and constructive taxable years from such date thereunder, a new determination shall be made each taxable year in the light of the facts for such year. An additional amendment is made to clause (i) of subparagraph (E) to make clear that such clause applies without regard to the provisions of section 445 (g) (1). An additional amendment is made to clause (ii) of such subparagraph to make clear that, for the purpose of such clause, a person shall not be considered a member of a group of persons who control the taxpayer and another corporation unless during the period specified in such clause he owns stock in the corporation at a time when the members of the group control such corporation and he owns stock in the taxpayer at a time when the members of the group control the taxpayer. A change is made in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2) of subsection (e) to the effect that transactions described in clauses (i) and (iii) shall be disregarded in determining the date as of which the taxpayer shall be considered to have commenced business if the adjusted basis of the aggregate assets acquired by the taxpayer in such transactions before December 1, 1950 (or acquired in the ordinary course of business in replacement of such assets), constituted less than 20 percent of the adjusted basis of the taxpayer's total assets as of December 1, 1950. A change is also made in paragraph (3) of subsection (e) to provide that the gross income of the taxpayer for the taxable year from contracts and subcontracts subject to renegotiation shall, for the purpose of applying the limitation provided by such paragraph, be determined without regard to capital gains and dividends received. Such gross income is the gross income after renegotiation.

Amendment No. 220: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, provides for exclusion in the computation of excess profits net income, for both excess profits tax taxable years and base period years, of payments made to a domestic corporation by its related foreign corporation as remuneration for certain technical services rendered. The House recedes with clarifying amendments and an amendment which amends the definition of related foreign corporation to provide that, in order to be a related corporation, 10 percent or more of the stock of the foreign corporation must be owned by the domestic corporation at the time the specified services are rendered.

Amendment No. 221: This amendment adds section 503 to the bill, for which there is no corresponding section in the House bill. This section permits a taxpayer with a fiscal year beginning before January 1, 1950, and ending after March 31, 1950, in computing its average base period net income under the general average method provided by section 435 (d) of the code, to use the period of 48 consecutive months ending March 31, 1950, instead of its base period, if such computation produces a lesser excess profits tax for the taxable year.

The House recedes with an amendment which provides that the excess profits net income for the first 3 months of 1950 shall be subject to the percentage limitations provided in section 435 (e) (2) (E) if such months fall in a taxable year ending after June 30, 1950.

Amendment No. 222: This amendment extends to a new corporation which commenced business before the end of its base period the right to qualify under section 435 (e) of the code for the alternative average base period net income based on growth for the purpose of determining its excess profits credit based on income. The House recedes with technical amendments.

Amendment No. 223 This amendment extends the benefits of section 435 (e) (2) (G) (special alternative average base period net income for a corporation whose excess profits net income for 1949 is not more than 25 percent of its excess profits net income for 1948) to a taxpayer qualifying for growth treatment under section 435 (e) (1) (B) even though it also qualifies as a growth corporation under section 435 (e) (1) (A). The House recedes.

Amendment No. 224: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding section in the House bill, provides limitations in the case of a bank, as defined in section 104 of the code, on the amount of the inadmissible asset adjustment to the net capital addition or reduction for the taxable year, to the net new capital addition for the taxable year, and to the base period capital addition. This amendment also amends section 435 (f) (relating to capital additions in the base period) to make clear that the yearly base period capital of any taxpayer (whether or not a bank) shall not be reduced below zero by the inadmissible asset adjustment.

The House recedes with clarifying amendments and with an amendment dealing with the effective date of the provision applicable to the base period capital addition of banks, making such provision retroactive only at the election of the taxpayer.

Amendment No. 225: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, adds two new paragraphs (9) and (10) to section 435 (g) (relating to net capital addition or reduction) in order to provide, if certain conditions are met, that a decrease in inadmissible assets, to the extent in excess of the net capital reduction (if any) for the taxable year, shall be an addition to the excess profits credit computed under the income method. The principal condition to be met is that where there is a decrease in inadmissible assets there must also be a corresponding increase in operating assets before any increase in the credit is allowed.

The House recedes with clarifying amendments and with an amendment providing a special rule for the treatment of a decrease in inadmissible assets in the case of a bank.

Amendment No. 226: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the bill as passed by the House, permits a dealer in wholly tax-exempt Government securities to elect to increase its excess profits net income by the interest (with certain adjustments) on such obligations, and to treat such obligations as admissible assets. The House recedes with a technical amendment and an amendment which extends the application of the section to Government obligations any part of the interest from which is allowable as a credit against net income

Amendment No. 227: This amendment adds section 509 to the bill, for which there is no corresponding provision in the bill as passed by the House. Section 509 adds a new subsection (h) to section 442 (relating to abnormalities during the base period) which in general permits a taxpayer in certain cases, after selecting the 36 months in the base period which result in the highest excess profits net income or lowest deficit in excess profits net income, to eliminate from such 36 months the 12 months having the lowest excess profits net income, or highest deficit, and to use a substitute excess profits net income computed under section 442 (c) for such 12 months. As passed by the Senate, the provision was applicable only to a taxpayer which commenced business before the beginning of its base period and only if the aggregate of the excess profits net income for each of the 12 months for which a substitute excess profits net income is to be computed is less than 35 percent of one-half of the aggregate of the excess profits net income for each of the 24 months remaining after selecting the 12 months to be so adjusted

The House recedes with technical amendments, and also adds other amendments which further limit the application of this new subsection. The first of these additional limitations requires that in order to be entitled to the benefits of subsection (h), the taxpayer's normal production, output, or operation must be interrupted or diminished because of the occurrence (in the 12 months prior to the period for which a substitute excess profits net income is computed) of events unusual or peculiar in the experience of the taxpayer. Under this limitation there is no requirement that a causal connection be shown between the event and a decline in excess profits net income in the period for which a substitute excess profits net income is to be used.

The second limitation added by the conference agreement appears as a new sentence added to paragraph (1) and prevents a taxpayer from using new subsection (h) in cases where the aggregate excess profits net income for the 24 months, which remain after selecting the 12 months for which a substitute excess profits net income is to be computed, is an amount less than zero.

Amendment No. 228: This amendment provides that in determining total assets under section 442 (f), to which factor the industry rates of return are applied in computing average base period net income under various excess profits tax relief formulas, the sum of the cash and other property included shall be reduced by the amount of the indebtedness (other than that included in the definition of borrowed capital) to a member of a controlled group which includes the taxpayer. The House recedes with an amendment changing the effective date from taxable years ending after the date of enactment of the bill to taxable years ending after June 30, 1950.

Amendment No 229: This amendment changes section 443, which section provides for the case of a change in products or services occurring during the last 36 months of the base period, so as to include certain base period commitments. The House recedes.

Amendment No 230: This amendment provides that in determining total assets under section 445 (c), which factor is used by a new corporation in computing its average base period net income for any of its first three years (if that year is an excess profits tax taxable year), the net capital addition or reduction shall be computed without regard to the 75 percent limitation as to borrowed capital and loans to members of a controlled group. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 231: This amendment provides that a corporation engaged as a common carrier in the furnishing or sale of transportation of oil or other petroleum products (including shale oil) by pipeline shall be eligible to qualify under section 448 for the alternative excess profits credit provided for regulated public utilities if such corporation is subject to the jurisdiction of a public service or public utility commission or other similar body of the District of Columbia or of any State. The House recedes with an amendment requiring that the rates for such furnishing or sale be subject to the jurisdiction of the public service or public utilities commission.

Amendment No 232. This amendment provides that for the purpose of filing a consolidated return with its railroad lessee corporation (using the alternative credit provided by section 448 for regulated public utilities), a railroad lessor corporation meeting certain requirements shall be considered a corporation subject to section 448. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 233: This amendment adds section 515 to the bill, for which there is no corresponding section in the bill as passed by the House. Section 515 allows to producers of potash, sulfur, and metallurgical grade and chemical grade limestone the alternative method for computing nontaxable income from exempt excess output provided in section 453 (b) (2) of the code where the properties were in operation during the normal period. Where these mineral properties were not in operation during the normal period, the net income from such properties is accorded the benefits of section 453 (b) (4) now available in the case of metal and coal mines, timber blocks, and natural-gas properties. The House recedes.

Amendment No 234: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, adds section 459 (a) to the code to provide a special credit for certain corporations under specified circumstances relating to a transition from wartime to peacetime production and to an increase in peacetime capacity. The House recedes with clarifying amendments.

Amendment No. 235: This amendment adds section 517 to the bill. There is no corresponding section in the House bill. Section 517 amends section 459, as added to the code by section 516 of the Senate amendment No. 234, by adding a new subsection (b). This new subsection grants to a taxpayer which suffered a catastrophe during the last 36 months of its base period, if certain conditions are met, two alternative methods of computing its average base period net income. The taxpayer may use whichever results in the lesser excess-profits tax for the taxable year. The first alternative allows such a taxpayer to substitute for the excess profits net income for each month of the taxable year in which the catastrophe occurred, the average of the excess profits net income for the months in the base period preceding the taxable year in which the catastrophe occurred. If the taxpayer computes its average base period net income under the first alternative, it will not be denied the benefits of its base period capital addition. The second alternative allows the taxpayer to compute its average base period net income under the growth alternative of section 435 (e) (2) (G) (i) and (ii) of the code.

The House recedes with technical amendments which separate new subsection (b) into two paragraphs The first paragraph sets forth eligibility requirements, and the second paragraph sets forth the computation of average base period net income under this subsection.

Amendment No 236: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, adds a new subsection (c) to section 459 of the code, and is applicable in the case of a taxpayer engaged primarily in the newspaper-publishing business which, after the first half of its base period and before July 1, 1950, consolidated its mechanical, circulation, advertising, and accounting operations with such operations of another newspaper-publishing corporation in the same area In order to be eligible for the benefits of this subsection the taxpayer must meet certain specified requirements.

In the case of a taxpayer eligible for the benefits of this subsection, the average base period net income under the Senate amendment shall be an amount computed under section 435 (d) plus an amount equal to the excess of the average of the amounts paid or incurred as expenses in the conduct of the mechanical, circulation, etc., operations during the two taxable years of the taxpayer next preceding the taxable year in which such consolidation began over such amounts paid or incurred during the first taxable year of the taxpayer beginning after such consolidation. The expenses referred to are those which are taken into account in computing net income. This section is inapplicable to any taxable year of the taxpayer unless the consolidation was continued throughout such taxable year.

The House recedes with amendments, one of which provides that the eligibility requirements in paragraphs (3) and (4) section 459 (c) shall be in the alternative. Another amendment provides that in determining the excess amount of expenses proper adjustment shall be made for increases in the unit cost of labor and newsprint (due to wage and price increases) following such consolidation. It is contemplated that such adjustment shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. The House also adds an amendment to provide for appropriate adjustments for any case in which a taxable year referred to in this new subsection is a period of less than 12 months.

Amendment No. 237: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, provides a special credit for corporations beginning the television broadcasting business before January 1, 1951. It provides for a computation of an individual rate of return in the case of corporations

engaged in the radio and television broadcasting business and for an application of such rate of return (or of the industry rate of return for the industry which includes radio broadcasting) to the assets of the taxpayer employed in the radio and television broadcasting business, or in the case of an acquisition of the television broadcasting business after the base period, to its assets employed only in the television business. In the case of a corporation engaged solely in radio and television broadcasting, this rate of return is applied to its total assets. In the case of a corporation engaged in another business or businesses, the credit includes an average base period net income computed with respect to such other business or businesses. The House recedes with an amendment providing in all cases that the industry rate of return or the individual rate of return, as the case may be, shall be applicable only to the assets of the corporation used in the television broadcasting business. The amendment also provides that the average base period net income computed in connection with the taxpayer's nontelevision business shall be only the average base period net income computed under section 435 (d) (relating to the general average of earnings during the base period); that the base period capital addition shall be allowable with regard to the taxpayer's nontelevision business; and that, in the case of corporations which first engaged in the television broadcasting business after the close of the base period and before January 1, 1951, the television assets against which the industry rate of return or the individual rate of return are to be applied shall be those held on the last day of the calendar month in which the corporation first engaged in the television broadcasting business.

The House amendment changes the provision in the Senate amendment for the elimination of duplication in the computation of a credit under this section by providing specifically the method to be used in eliminating such duplication. It is provided that if any portion of the television assets used in computing the television portion of the credit was acquired, directly or indirectly, by the use of assets attributable at any time during the base period to a business of the taxpayer other than television broadcasting, the excess profits net income with respect to such other business shall be properly adjusted by eliminating the portion thereof attributable to the assets used in the acquisition of the television properties for months prior to such acquisition. The excess profits net income attributable to such assets is determined by reference to the ratio of such assets to the total assets of the taxpayer other than properties used in television broadcasting.

Amendment No. 238: This amendment adds a base period commitment rule under section 444, which section provides for the computation of the average base period net income by applying a base period industry rate of return to the total assets of the taxpayer in case of an increase in capacity for production or operation occurring during the last 36 months of the base period. The House recedes with an amendment revising the Senate provision. As amended, the commitment rule provides that if, during the first taxable year ending after June 30, 1950, the taxpayer completed construction of a factory building or other manufacturing establishment (for example, an oil refinery), including the installation of the machinery or equipment for use in such factory building or such other establishment, such factory building or such other establishment and such machinery or equipment shall for the purpose of determining whether there is an increase in capacity under the provisions of section 444 (b), but not for the purpose of computing the average base period net income under section 444 (c), be considered to have been added to its total facilities on the last day of its base period. The provision is applicable only if (A) the taxpayer, prior to the end of its base period, had completed construction work representing more than 40 percent of the total cost of construction of such factory building or such other establishment, and (B) the completion of such factory building or such other establishment was in pursuance of a plan to which the taxpayer was committed prior to the end of its base period.

Amendment No. 239: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, provides for the addition of a new part IV to subchapter D of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with the excess profits credit based on income in connection with certain taxable acquisitions before December 1, 1950. Under this amendment a "purchasing corporation" as defined in the part, would, in certain cases, obtain the use of the income experience of a "selling corporation" for the purpose of computing its excess profits credit. The House recedes with an amendment making changes for purposes of clarification and in order further to define the scope of application of the part.

The Senate amendment includes in the definition of a purchasing corporation any corporation which acquired substantially all of the assets of another corporation or of a partnership in a transaction other than a part II transaction. The amendment made by the House includes in this definition a corporation which has acquired substantially all of the properties of a business owned by a sole proprietorship. The definition in the Senate amendment also includes a corporation which acquired only part of the assets of another corporation in a transaction other than a part II transaction provided the properties acquired were substantially all the properties of a separate business of the other corporation and that such acquisition was in furtherance of a plan of complete liquidation by such other corporation. The purchase under the same circumstances of a separate business which constituted part of the assets of a partnership is added to the definition by the House amendment. The House amendment also deletes a provision which included in the definition of "purchasing corporation" a corporation which receives assets as paid-in surplus or as a contribution to capital from another corporation which had acquired those assets as a purchasing corporation.

This provision under the conference agreement will in general cover those cases in which assets constituting the whole of a separate business of "a selling corporation" were acquired from a corporation, sole proprietorship, or partnership. It does not cover an acquisition in a tax-free transaction, for example, a case in which a corporation is liquidated to its stockholders and they in turn place all or part of the assets in a new corporation in a tax-free transaction.

The House amendment makes clear that the part provides for the use by the purchasing corporation of an average base period net income computed only under section 435 (d) (the general average of earnings method), that, under the part, the deficits as well as the excess profits net income of the selling corporation for any month shall be reflected in the computation, and that the excess profits net income to which reference is made is that of the corporation in the case of an acquisition of substantially all of the assets of a selling corporation and is the portion thereof properly allocable to the business or businesses acquired in the case of an acquisition of only part of the assets, representing one or more separate businesses of a selling corporation.

The Senate amendment provides that, for part IV to apply, the selling corporation must, immediately after the transaction, discontinue all business activities and be completely liquidated in a transaction other than a part II transaction. The House amendment changes this requirement to provide that the selling corporation must not have engaged in any business activities after the part IV transaction other than those incident to its complete liquidation and must, within a reasonable time after such cessation of business activities, have been completely liquidated (whether before or after the part IV transaction) in a transaction other than a part II transaction. Such liquidation must terminate the selling corporation's existence.

The Senate amendment further provides that the properties acquired in the part IV transaction must be substantially all of the properties which were used by the selling corporation (or by a component corporation of such selling corporation) in the operation of the business whose assets were acquired by the purchasing corporation. The House amendment provides that such properties must be those used by the selling corporation in the production of the excess profits net income or deficit therein which is used in the computation of the credit provided by this part.

The Senate amendment further provides that the business acquired in the part IV transaction must have been operated by the purchasing corporation from the date of such transaction to the end of the taxable year. The House amendment provides that such business must be operated by the purchasing corporation until the end of the taxable year unless transferred by it, during the taxable year, in a part II transaction to which the provisions of the new section 462 (b) (4) of the code are applicable.

The House amendment adds three special rules. The first provides that, for the purpose of the definition of a purchasing corporation, properties shall be deemed acquired from the selling corporation if they are purchased directly from the selling corporation of if they are purchased from its stockholders, provided such stockholders did not transfer them to the purchasing corporation in a part II transaction. This provision is applicable only in a case in which the selling corporation was first liquidated to its stockholders and the properties were forthwith sold by them to the purchasing corporation. The second special rule provides for the determination under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of all of the computations required by this part as if the business or businesses which were purchased from a partnership or sole proprietorship had been operated by a corporation. The third special rule is that in the case of the purchase of less than all of several businesses operated by a corporation or partnership, the amount of excess profits net income allocable to all or any number of the purchasing corporations or other persons receiving such properties upon the liquidation of the selling corporation shall not exceed 100 percent of the excess profits net income of the selling corporation. Thus, in a case in which a selling corporation has an excess profits net income for any month of $100 existing by reason of one of its businesses having an income of $300 and another having a loss of $200, the amount of the excess profits net income available to either or both of the parties receiving the two businesses shall not exceed $100 for such month.

The House amendment adds a new subsection (e) dealing with successive transactions and providing that if one part IV transaction succeeds another part IV transaction, the excess profits net income of the first selling corporation is not made available to the second purchasing corporation,

The excess profits net income, however, of the first purchasing corporation is available to the second purchasing corporation but, for that purpose, it must be computed without regard to the excess profits net income of the first selling corporation. It also provides that the excess profits net income of a selling corporation under this part includes the amount previously available to it under part II with respect to a previous part II transaction. Thus, where corporation A had previously merged with corporation B in a transaction described in section 461 (a), the purchase by corporation C of the assets of corporation B under the circumstances outlined in this part will make available to corporation C the excess profits net income (or deficit) of both corporations A and B, as determined under part II for corporation B for the period prior to the merger, as well as the excess profits net income of corporation B for the period after the merger

The Senate amendment provided for the promulgation of rules by the Secretary, consistent with the principles of part II, for the application of this part. For the purpose of clarification, the conference agreement specifically provides for the promulgation of such rules with respect to (1) base period capital addition, (2) net capital addition or reduction, (3) excess profits net income, (4) duplication, and (5) the excess profits credit of the purchasing corporation for the taxable year in which the transaction occurs if such taxable year is a year which ended after June 30, 1950 It is also provided that the Secretary shall not apply the principles of certain specified provisions of part II.

It is not intended by this specific enumeration of principles to be followed by the Secretary that the general authority to prescribe rules for the application of this part shall be restricted except as specifically provided. Such regulations may include other principles appropriate to the determination of the computations provided by this part.

The Senate amendment contains technical amendments to the code, which technical amendments are revised by the House amendments. Included in these technical amendments as revised are provisions for the application of part II in cases where a corporation acquired in a part II transaction properties of a corporation which was a purchasing corporation in a previous part IV transaction In general, the amendments provide that the income experience of the original selling corporation shall be used by the acquiring corporation in determining its average base period net income under section 435 (d) with reference to part II For these provisions to be applicable, however, substantially all of the properties acquired in the part IV transaction (or replacements thereof in the ordinary course of business) must have been transferred in the part II transaction, or, if the part II transaction involved a component corporation which acquired the properties in a previous part II transaction, substantially all of the properties of such component corporation must have been acquired by the acquiring corporation. The business operated by the selling corporation must have been continuously operated by the acquiring corporation to the end of the taxable year, unless the business is transferred by the acquiring corporation during the taxable year in a part II transaction to which the provisions of section 462 (b) (4) are applicable. If the acquiring corporation obtained the properties in a part II transaction of the type described in section 461 (a) (1) (E) ("split-up"), the provisions of the following amendment to section 462 (1) (6) must be satisfied: Section 462 (1) (6) is amended to provide that if the component corporation in the part II transaction was a purchasing corporation in a previous part IV transaction, and if section 462 (b) (4) is applicable, the allocation of the excess profits net income of the component corporation to the acquiring corporation must be based upon the earnings experience of the assets transferred rather than upon the fair market value rule of allocation provided in section 462 (1), this provision being applicable whether or not the other parties to the part II transaction agree to such an allocation. The technical amendments, as revised, further provide that section 463 and section 464, relating to capital changes of the acquiring corporation, shall be applied under regulations promulgated by the Secretary with respect to cases in which the part II transaction follows a part IV transaction.

Amendment No. 240: This amendment adds section 522 to the bill, for which there is no corresponding section in the bill as passed by the House Section 522 adds bauxite to the list of minerals deemed strategic under section 450 (b) (1) of the code for the purpose of exempting from the excess-profits tax the portion of the adjusted excess profits net income attributable to the mining of such mineral. The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No. 241: This amendment provides that, except as otherwise provided in section 510 of the bill, the amendments made by title V of the bill, as passed by the Senate, shall be applicable with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1950. The House recedes with amendments conforming to the conference agreement with respect to amendments Nos. 224 and 228. Accordingly, the amendments made by title V are applicable with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1950, except as otherwise provided in section 506 (d) of the bill (relating to base period capital additions of banks).

Amendments Nos. 242, 243, and 244: These amendments are clerical. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 245 This amendment deals with possible tax liability for taxable years beginning prior to January 1, 1951, in the case of certain organizations carrying on trades or businesses the profits of which were dedicated exclusively to exempt purposes. Specifically, this amendment adds to the list of feeder organizations covered by the House bill, those organizations all of the profits of which inure to the benefit of a hospital or to an institution for the rehabilitation of physically handicapped persons which maintains or is building for proper maintenance such a hospital or institution staffed or to be staffed by qualified professional persons for the treatment of the sick and/or the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped, or to an eleemosynary corporation under State law exempt under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The House recedes with an amendment striking out the reference to "an eleemosynary corporation under State law exempt under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code," and with a clarifying amendment providing that no implication is to be drawn from the amendment as to the tax status for taxable years prior to 1951 of so-called feeder organizations not dealt with in section 302 of the Revenue Act of 1950 as amended.

Amendment No. 246: The House bill provided that the percentage of the average base period net income to be taken into account in computing the excess-profits credit based on income shall be reduced from 85 percent of the average base period net income to 75 percent thereof. This reduction was effective, under the House bill, as of January 1, 1951. The Senate amendment struck this provision of the House bill. The House recedes with an amendment under which the percentage of the base period net income is reduced from 85 to 83 percent, effective July 1, 1951, and in the case of the calendar year 1951, to 84 percent. Provision is made under the conference agreement for the case of a fiscal year beginning before July 1, 1951, and ending after June 30, 1951, so that a proportionate part of the decrease in the excess profits credit will be reflected.

Amendment No. 247: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, amends sections 813 and 936 of the code to provide that, where property included for Federal estate tax purposes in the gross estate of a resident or citizen of the United States is situated in a foreign country and subjected to a death tax by such country, a credit shall be allowed against the estate tax for such foreign death tax. The amendment applies only with respect to estates of residents and citizens dying after the date of enactment of the bill.

The House recedes with clarifying amendments

Amendment No. 248: This is a clerical amendment The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No 249: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, amends section 863 (c) of the code to extend the estate tax exemption granted by that section with respect to works of art loaned by a nonresident alien to the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D C. to works of art loaned to other public galleries or museums. The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No. 250: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, makes certain changes in section 939 of the code, relating to the estate tax treatment of certain members of the Armed Forces.

The amendment provides that the tax imposed by section 935 (the additional estate tax) shall not apply to the transfer of the net estate of a citizen or resident of the United States dying after June 24, 1950, and before January 1, 1954, while in active service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, if such decedent (1) was killed in action while serving in a combat zone, as determined under section 22 (b) (13), or (2) died at any place as a result of wounds, disease, or injury suffered, while serving in a combat zone (as determined under section 22 (b) (13)) and while in line of duty, by reason of a hazard to which he was subjected as an incident of such service.

The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No. 251: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, adds a new section to the bill to provide that in the case of a decedent dying after March 18, 1937, and before February 11, 1939, the determination of whether property is included in the gross estate of the decedent as a transfer intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after his death shall be made in conformity with the provisions of article 17 of Regulations 80, as amended by Treasury Decision 4729 The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 252: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, amends section 7 (b) of Public Law 378, Eighty-first Congress (the Technical Changes Act of 1949). Section 7 (b) now provides that the provisions of section 811 (c) (1) (B) of the code, providing for inclusion in a decedent's estate of property transferred with reservation of rights in income, shall not be applicable to transfers made before March 4, 1931 (and, in some cases, before June 6, 1932), if the decedent died before January 1, 1950. Under the amendment, inapplicability of section 811 (c) (1) (B) is extended to estates of decedents dying before January 1, 1951. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 253: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, amends section 7 (b) of Public Law 378, Eighty-

first Congress (the Technical Changes Act of 1949) to provide that the provisions of section 811 (c) (1) (C) of the code (relating to inclusion in gross estate of transfers intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death) shall not apply to transfers made before September 8, 1916. The effect of the last sentence of this section, which makes section 7 (c) of such public law inapplicable to overpayments resulting from the enactment of this section of the bill, is to limit refunds of such overpayments to those situations in which the refund is not prohibited by the statute of limitations or some other law or rule of law. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 254: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, permits the making of refund or credit of any overpayment resulting from the application of section 503 of the Revenue Act of 1950, if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from the date of enactment of the bill, even though the making of such refund or credit is otherwise prohibited by the statute of limitations or any other law or rule of law (other than sec. 3760 or 3761 of the code which relate, respectively, to closing agreements and compromises). The effect of section 503 of the Revenue Act of 1950 was to provide that proceeds of life insurance policies attributable to premiums paid on or before January 10, 1941, should not be included in the gross estate of the insured person for estate tax purposes by reason of the fact that the premiums were paid by him, unless on January 10, 1941, or thereafter he had substantial rights in the life insurance policy. The House recedes with an amendment providing that claim for credit or refund must be made after October 25, 1949, and on or before October 25, 1950.

Amendment No. 255: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, provides that in the case of the award made on December 4, 1950, by the Interstate Commerce Commission as retroactive compensation for the transportation of mail, such compensation shall be deemed to be income which accrued in the taxable year in which the services to which such compensation relates were rendered. It is provided that no interest shall be assessed for deficiencies created by the inclusion of such income in prior years and that the period for assessment and collection of such deficiencies shall be extended to the date closing the period for assessment and collection for the taxable year of the taxpayer which includes December 4, 1950. The amendment also amends section 292 of the code to provide that in the case of retroactive mail payments, if such payments are required to be included in income in the year or years in which the mail was carried, no interest shall be due with respect to deficiencies resulting from such inclusion for any period prior to 30 days after the award of payment is granted. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 256: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, adds to the bill a new section 611 which provides with respect to certain taxable years a special rule to be followed whereby in the computation of corporation surtax net income certain amounts received as dividends on the preferred stock of a public utility will not be disregarded in computing the credit for dividends received.

Section 116 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1943 so amended section 26 (h) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code that, in the computation of the credit for dividends paid on the preferred stock of a public utility, amounts distributed in the current taxable year with respect to dividends unpaid and accumulated in any taxable year ending prior to October 1, 1942, were to be excluded from the amount of dividends paid on its preferred stock during the taxable year. The 1943 act did not contain a conforming amendment so that in the computation of corporation surtax net income the 85-percent credit for dividends received would always be allowed with respect to such amounts as were to be excluded in computing the credit for dividends paid on the preferred stock of a public utility.

Pursuant to new section 611, in the case of taxable years beginning before April 1, 1951, the 85-percent credit for dividends received will be allowed in the computation of corporation surtax net income with respect to those amounts which are to be excluded in computing the credit for dividends paid on the preferred stock of a public utility. In the case of the calendar year 1951 and taxable years beginning after March 31, 1951, see the amendments made to section 26 (b) of the code by section 122 of the bill (amendment No. 8). The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 257: This amendment for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, provides that if an affiliated group making a consolidated return with respect to the first taxable year of the group ending after June 30, 1950, included a corporation described in section 454 (f) of the code, pursuant to the consent provided in section 141 (e) (7) of the code, such corporation may withdraw such consent at any time within 90 days after the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1951. If such consent is withdrawn under this provision, the tax liability of the affiliated group and its several members for the taxable year shall be determined, assessed, and collected as if such corporation had never joined in the making of the consolidated return. The House recedes with a clerical amendment

Amendment No. 258: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, adds to the bill a new section 613 pursuant to which the due date for filing income tax returns of, or for paying the income tax by, China Trade Act corporations for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1948, and ending before October 1, 1953, shall be not later than December 31, 1953. The due date thus prescribed shall apply, however, only with respect to any such corporation and any such taxable year as the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to such regulations as he may prescribe, may determine to be reasonable in view of circumstances in China. New section 613 recognizes that certain China Trade Act corporations, despite the situation existing in China, are fully able to comply with requirements of existing law as to the time for filing returns and paying the tax

The due date of December 31, 1953, hereby prescribed is subject to the power of the Secretary to extend, as in other cases, the time for filing returns or paying the tax. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 259: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, adds a new section which provides that no amendment made by the bill shall apply in any case where its application would be contrary to any treaty obligation of the United States. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 260: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 261: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, extends for 4 months the date on or before which a claim for net renegotiation rebates arising under the World War II Renegotiation Act may be filed. Section 201 (c) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, approved on March 23, 1951, sets the expiration date as June 30, 1951. This amendment extends such date to October 31, 1951. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 262: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, adds to the bill a new section relating to prohibition upon the denial of payments by the Federal Government to a State under title I, IV, X, or XIV of the Social Security Act. These titles relate to grants by the Federal Government to States for aid to needy aged individuals, needy dependent children, needy blind individuals, and needy permanently and totally disabled individuals, respectively. The Federal Government and the States share the cost of these assistance programs. A State is not entitled to payments from the Federal Government unless the State plan for assistance has been approved by the Federal Security Administrator. Under existing law a State assistance plan in order to be approved must, inter alia, provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of the assistance program The Senate amendment provides that no State or any agency or political subdivision thereof shall be deprived of any grant-in-aid or other payment to which it otherwise is or has become entitled pursuant to title I, IV, X, or XIV of the Social Security Act by reason of the enactment or enforcement by such State of any legislation prescribing any conditions under which public access may be had to records of the disbursement of any such funds or payments within such State The House recedes with an amendment which imposes a condition that the State legislation providing public access to the records of disbursement must prohibit th use of any list or names obtained through such access to such records for commercial or political purposes.

Under this amendment, as agreed to by the conferees, the State of Indiana, which has a law which permits public access to the records of disbursements of public welfare funds but which contains, inter alia, a prohibition upon the use of any lists or names so obtained for commercial or political purposes of any nature, will be entitled to receive its payments under the Social Security Act in the future and will also be entitled to receive any such payments which have been withheld because of the enactment and enforcement of the Indiana law.

Amendment No. 263: This amendment, for which there is no corresponding provision in the House bill, amends the provisions of existing law which provide the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the Members of Congress an expense allowance which is tax-exempt and for which no accounting is made. Under this amendment, the President would receive $150,000 a year for his services, instead of the $100,000 plus the $50,000 tax-exempt expense allowance he now receives Under existing law, the President neither pays tax on nor accounts for this $50,000. Under this amendment, $50,000 would be added to his compensation and his $50,000 tax-exempt expense allowance would be eliminated. Likewise, the salary of the Vice President, and that of the Speaker of the House, would be increased by $10,000 and his $10,000 tax-exempt expense allowance would be eliminated. And, similarly, the salary of each Member of Congress would be increased by $2,500 and his $2,500 tax-exempt expense allowance would be eliminated. This amendment would become effective, with respect to the President, on January 20, 1953, and with respect to the Vice President, the Speaker, and Members of Congress, on January 3, 1953.

The House recedes with an amendment which eliminates the provisions of the Senate amendment increasing the compensation of the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the Members of

Congress but which removes the tax-exempt status of the expense allowances of such officials. The expense allowance provided the President by section 102 of title 3 of the United States Code and that provided the Vice President by section 111 of title 3 of the United States Code shall be taxable on and after January 20, 1953; the expense allowance provided the Speaker of the House by subsection (e) of the first section of Public Law 2, Eighty-first Congress, approved January 19, 1949, and that provided each Member of Congress by section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.) shall be taxable on and after January 3, 1953. The President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and each Member of Congress will be required to account for such expense allowances insofar as is necessary for the purpose of deducting such expenses for income-tax purposes.

Amendment No. 264: This amendment struck out the table of contents to the bill and inserted a new table of contents conforming to the amendments to the bill made by the Senate. The House recedes with an amendment to conform the table of contents to the action of the conference committee.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D DINGELL,
W. D. MILLS,
RICHARD M SIMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. DOUGHTON (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House be dispensed with, and that the same be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, in the very limited time I have available, I shall only be able to briefly mention some of the important differences between this conference report and the one considered by the House on last Tuesday.

I would have much preferred that there be a greater difference between these two conference reports. I feel confident that many of you would prefer a greater difference in the two conference reports, but such changes as have been made are in the right direction, and the pending conference report is an improvement over the conference report considered last Tuesday.

As one of the House conferees I was especially anxious to try to secure at least some difference on three important points. One was a reduction of the individual income tax in the lower-income bracket; some increase of the capital gains tax, and some increase of the excess-profits tax. Those three points are covered in this pending conference report, and to that extent I think make this conference report an improvement over the conference report considered last Tuesday.

The increase in tax in the first bracket of individual income-tax rates is reduced from 11½ percent to 11 percent. This change will reduce the yield of the bill by $68,000,000 in a full year of operation, of which $43,000,000 or 63 percent, will go to taxpayers with adjusted gross income of less than $5,000.

The maximum rate on long-term capital gains for individuals and corporations is increased from the present 25 percent to 26 percent. This increase will raise approximately $16,000,000 in the case of individuals and $12,000,000 in the case of corporations, or a total of $28,000,000 increase in revenue annually.

The effective date of the cut-back of the average earnings credit under the excess-profits tax, from 85 percent to 83 percent, is changed from January 1, 1952, to July 1, 1951. This will increase the liabilities on 1951 profits by $60,000,000. This would have the effect of reducing the percentage to 84 percent for the calendar year 1951, and beginning January 1 next year it goes to 83 percent.

As I said a moment ago, it is estimated that this change in the effective date will increase the revenue for 1951 by $60,000,000.

With respect to excise taxes, only a very slight change was made. The present manufacturers' excise tax on skates was removed, and a 10 percent manufacturers' excise tax on garbage disposal units was included.

Rural electrification cooperatives and telephone cooperatives and certain mutual insurance companies exempt under section 101 (10) or (11) of the Internal Revenue Code, and mutual insurance companies taxable under supplement G of the Internal Revenue Code, are exempted from the requirement of filing information returns with respect to patronage dividends or refunds made to their patrons.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, there is one other important point to which I would like to invite attention. An important provision is included in this conference report for losses for new corporations. The conferees agreed to an amendment to the conference report which would permit new corporations, that is, corporations organized on or after January 1, 1946, to carry over their 1947 losses for 3 years. It is estimated that this provision of this conference report will result in $10,000,000 loss of revenue, but we had presented to us the case of many new corporations, many organized by veterans of World War II after their return from service, and it was felt they should have one additional year to carry forward their losses. That has been provided in this conference report.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, as has been so ably pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], the conference report on the Revenue Act of 1951, now before the House, is, realistically speaking, identical with the conference report reported by the House 3 days ago. It is true, of course, that during the two hours that the conferees met a few minor changes in the method of collecting the $5,800,000,000 in new taxes were made, but the net result revenuewise is just the same. In essence, the only difference between this conference report and the conference report submitted 3 days ago is that $68,000,000 of direct individual income taxes have been shifted over to an additional indirect tax on all the housewives and consumers of the country. This was done by making the first-bracket individual income-tax rate 22.2 percent instead of 22.3 percent—or a saving of one-tenth of 1 percent on the first $2,000 of taxable income. Instead, however, of really making even this very small concession to our low-income groups, the new conference report provides that the same $68,000,000 will be collected indirectly by the corporations from the people and sent along to the Treasury in that way. Six of one or half a dozen of the other—that is about the size of it.

Oh, yes; in addition to this, the new conference report levies a tax on garbage-disposal units which will bring in another $2,000,000 from our housewives and young married couples making their start in life and makes a commendable adjustment in the excise taxes by removing skates from the list of sporting items subject to the 10-percent manufacturer's excise tax. This will save the youngsters and their families about $2,000,000 a year.

This report also reduces the contemplated revenue of the first report by another $10,000,000 by providing that new corporations—that is corporations organized after January 1, 1946, may carry over their 1947 losses for 3 years instead of for 2 years under existing law. This is also a good amendment

I had hoped, of course, to be able to come back and report to you that the Republican conferees had been successful in reducing the heavy tax burden on the people provided for in the first conference report. I know that this is what you wanted and what the people wanted and what you had a right to expect. We tried but we failed. We specifically proposed that the tax increase on individuals be reduced to 11 percent of the tax or 8 percent of the take-home pay as provided for in the Senate amendments. This would have been a real saving to the people.

I also proposed to improve the conference report by remedying the inequitable situation in the case of family partnerships; by eliminating the new tax on mutual savings banks, building and loan associations, and the small farmer cooperatives. I felt it was my responsibility—and the responsibility of the Republican conferees—to give the House a chance to vote on at least something better than the House rejected just 3 days ago.

But as it now stands this second conference report has all the defects of its individual provisions as did the first. And for those of us who believe that this is excessixe taxation without justification the issues are exactly the same as they were 3 days ago. There is nothing new in this conference report which can change that position because it is

one of principle and firm conviction. Either we believe in Government economy or we do not believe in Government economy.

I can think of no more disastrous blow to the American people than to tell them that in 3 days this Congress has bowed to the pressure of the Truman administration for more taxes.

I can think of no greater blow to the stability of the economy and the faith in the American people that we are doing our best to preserve our solvence and liberty at home than for this House to reverse its mandate to President Truman to make a real effort at Government economy.

This legislation is too important.

Its repercussions on the economy; its burden on the people; and its influence on our very national existence are too great to be influenced by a mere shifting of the direct individual tax burden on some of our taxpayers to an indirect tax on all of our consumers.

The whole country was cheered by the gallant stand this House made 3 days ago. My office, and I am sure this is true with you all, has been flooded with praise for the stand that we have taken against waste and extravagance; against the reckless and exhorbitant rate of Federal spending for nonessential Government services during this emergency period.

In rejecting this same conference report 3 days ago this body struck a real blow for liberty, a real blow in favor of the free-enterprise system, and a real blow against creeping socialism.

Are we now to yield to the Truman spenders?

Are we now to go back to our people and tell them that we were not strong enough in our convictions to stand up against the pressure of the Truman administration for higher taxes and higher spending?

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that this House will again stand firm, and that before levying any new taxes on the people we are prepared to make a realistic evaluation of the limit of our capacity to support ourselves and the free world.

We are prepared to demand—and get—a reduction in Federal spending.

We are prepared to demand that the people of this country shall not be called upon to pay for graft, corruption, and bribery.

No, Mr. Speaker, the times are too perilous and the issues are too grave for this great body to be so fickle, so unwise, and so lacking in conviction as to reverse the action taken just 3 days ago.

Today for the first time in many long years the American people have hope in their hearts that the end of the reckless spending by the Federal Government of their earnings and savings has arrived, that they will be permitted to work and build a decent home for themselves and their children, that there will be some incentive for them to work and produce, and that there is hope that we shall not lose the cold war at home.

The American people know that if President Truman were willing to cooperate with this Congress and with the American people a reduction of Federal spending could be made. They know that as a result of the action taken 3 days ago this Congress recognizes that fact.

It will be a shameful thing if we fail them now. I know we will not do so.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard some mention of a reduction in the income tax in the low-income groups between this conference report and the first conference report. I have a table here which shows that reduction and let me show you how those in favor of this second conference report intend to obtain the votes of the working men and women of this country.

With a taxable income of $800 the tax saving in this conference report is 20 cents; on a $1,000 taxable income the saving will be 40 cents. That may swing some more votes in the House, but it certainly will not persuade the honest men and women of my district.

And on a $2,000 income the saving will be $1.40. I wonder if that is supposed to be the big appeal to the lower-income groups.

And those who have a taxable income of $3,000 and have a family to support are going to get a reduction of $2 in their taxes on their whole year's salary.

So I suppose they know they have the votes corralled and they can go back and say that they saved you 20 cents on $800, and on $1,000 they saved you 40 cents. And oh, how the working men and women of the country will be grateful for this. This is so ridiculous that it is unworthy of comment and it is an insult to the honest people of the country.

But the majority conferees must have had a lot of fun figuring how the people would be fooled because, although they saved 20 cents or so on low-income groups, they knew they had already put an excise tax on liquor, beer, wine, cigarettes, gasoline, and autos.

And they must have reasoned that, although they had given this little pittance of relief in this second conference report, that they had more than taken away this reduction by these excise increases and that the people would never feel it.

Is that not a fine thing to tell our people? But, Mr. Speaker, I believe the people should know the facts, and if you read your telegrams and letters, you will find that the people want to know what we, their Representatives, are really doing.

And let me call your attention to something else, and that is the pledge that you Members made in your last campaign. You went out and beat your breasts and said in your platform, "We will not disturb the farm cooperatives; no, we will not tax them." But what will you do now when you talk to them? Are you going to say, "Yes, we did not keep our promise the last time, but if you trust us once more we will keep our pledges." Gentlemen, we cannot afford as a Congress, whether it is the Republican side or the Democratic side, to go back to the people at this time of suffering and tell them we have imposed excessive taxation.

The time has come for this Congress to represent character and firmness in its dealing with the affairs and the lives of the people of this country.

I have a suspicion that our distinguished Speaker is going to take the floor, a man for whom I have profound respect, a man who has prestige and power next to that of the President of the United States. His influence is great. He is a fine man, and I love him, and everybody here does. When he takes the floor here today to try and bring you back in favor of voting for this bill, I just wonder if it would not have been a great thing on his part if he had taken the floor and said to you gentlemen over there, "I am urging you to adopt the Hoover report and other measures for government economy," and then you would have saved more than is in this tax bill Would that not have been admirable, instead of urging the passage of this third tax increase bill when you know there will be a surplus? I say to you the time has come for us to play this game square with the American people. They are making sacrifices enough. Every telegram with a star on it that comes from Korea means somebody in that family has been lost. The casualties are mounting over there, and yet here we are with still another tax increase bill, a discriminatory tax bill, an unjust tax bill. I say to you that the time has come now for us to be men and stand up for the people. They should have a Congress that they can depend upon to halt this unnecessary and mounting spending. We are carrying out the very plan of Stalin of spending ourselves into weakness and insolvency.

My colleagues, if you are fighters, as I believe you are, stand up for the rights of the people and vote against this conference report.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, what my friend from New York said just now does not exactly square with his votes on matters of interest to labor, to whom he makes such a strong appeal at this moment. As I recall, too, I do not think he was quite as much interested at any time, and I do not think he is as much interested now, in the boys in Korea as he is in trying to save a tax dollar.

I go on the theory that, if you save the tax dollar at this critical moment, you must sacrifice your own son or somebody else's son. I am willing to spend the money for buckshot so that the boys in Korea, whoever's sons they may be, will have it there in ample quantity to defend themselves and this Nation.

As for myself, I will take my chances with labor on the record and compare it with any of the men and women sitting on the minority side, and labor will repay me in kind.

Mr. Speaker, I shall make no pretense that the second conference report has made any substantial change in the tax bill we originally brought back from conference. Under the circumstances, however, it was a big undertaking even to try to modify the bill at all. Some slight concessions were made to low-income taxpayers, and taxpayers with capital gains would not be exempt completely from any additional tax load.

The curse originating in Indiana, known as the Jenner amendment, is still in the bill. This provision is obviously intended to intimidate and debase every old-age pensioner, dependent widow, and orphan as well as the blind and disabled, and to label and victimize them as objects of scorn by snoopers.

Right now I will say that this, too, originated with Republicans and was supported by the Republicans, and was insisted upon by the minority members of the conference group from the House. I was not for it, and never will be for it. If I had my way, Mr. Speaker, and were I a citizen of Indiana I would lead a march on Indianapolis, and I would scatter that legislature to the four winds; and I would get justice for the old-age pensioner, for the widow and her dependent children, for those who are blind, handicapped, and crippled. That is how far I would go on the Jenner amendment. But I could not get support from the minority side in conference. So what is the use talking about your sentiments for the little fellow, when you do not act on them?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. No, I cannot yield. I have just a few minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I was wondering how the gentleman was going to vote on it now.

Mr. DINGELL. I am going to vote for the bill despite the curse from Indiana, the Jenner amendment, because of the inflationary effect if we do not get some additional revenue.

This amendment is sponsored by those who have always opposed the social security system. Does anybody doubt that? Refer to the original report in 1935 and see how the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means voted as they signed the minority report. They now seek by devious methods to undermine the structure. Unfortunately, I say, this scarlet label is still in the bill with the full approbation of its sponsors. This is a matter, however, that will have to be treated by the people separately, and justice meted out in the States which might follow Indiana's shameful lead.

The amendment in the tax bill does not make mandatory the publication of names of recipients of public assistance, but only makes much publicity permissive. The mandatory prohibition against publicity by the States has, however, been uprooted and thrown aside and social-security recipients are now entirely at the mercy of their own State legislatures. Of course, those who have sponsored this outrageous rider can be expected to be held to account.

The most important consideration, in my opinion, is the limited total revenue which this bill provides. If I can be permitted to express my personal view, the failure to enact the bill would have immediate and dangerous effect toward greater inflation. Even the House bill with its $7,200,000,000 additional revenue did not meet with my approval because I felt at least $10,000,000,000 in additional taxes were required and possible, nor do I approve of the unequal distribution of the additional tax load.

Had I had my way, I should have made changes both in who pays the higher taxes and how much, with reversal in favor of small individual income taxpayers and small corporations. Further than that, I would have striven to reach the $10,000,000,000 mark so that we might have had a better chance of retaining our pay-as-we-go fiscal policy. But my wishes, although shared by many of the majority members of the committee, did not prevail. Nevertheless, the $5,750,000,000 provided by the pending bill will tend to lessen the inflationary gap.

Just one final word to those who voted against the last conference report. If you kill the bill this time, it will be your last chance. It will be entirely up to you to make excuses to your people when they are seared by the fire of inflation. It is well and good to receive and take into account letters of condemnation from sincere and patriotic sources, with which I, too, agree. But, in the final analysis, the responsibility is yours and mine, and we must choose the course that is best for the country. In this instance, that course is to approve the conference report, even though you do not fully agree with it, as I must confess, I do not.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter. It is not a difficult matter to understand. Of course, any tax bill has ramifications that would lead one into the realm of indecision, and so forth, but let us consider what is before us from the standpoint of reason, what is the right and sensible thing to do. The House passed a bill about 6 weeks ago which provided for the collection of $7,200,000,000 in taxes. We quite generally on our side voted against it; they quite generally on the Democratic side voted for it. The margin was not very wide. The other body took the bill that the House passed and reduced it by $2,000,000,000. What is the most important topic of conversation when you go home and meet your constituents? The people talk about two subjects: One is that the Government is spending too much money, and that the taxes are too high. And the other subject is Truman's war. When we, the House conferees, went into conference with the members of the conference from the other body they were $2,000,000,000 lower than we were. We came out of that conference the first time with another bill halfway between the $7,200,000,000 and the $5,200,000,000—about $6,000,000,000. The amount raised above the Senate figure was raised by the gentleman from the Democratic side of this House. They raised it up. We Republicans did not raise it up. We were then in favor of holding the total down. We would have much preferred to have taken the Senate's figures than the House figures or the conference figures. We are now in favor of holding it down, and your constituents are in favor of holding it down. Many of you voted that way when we had this bill before us 2 or 3 days ago. Why do I say that you can hold this tax bill down? We do not need to pass this tax bill today. Let me prove it to you. Ten months ago the President called us down to the White House and said, "I have to have $10,000,000,000 right now"; that was the first bite. Then he said, "I have to have $6,000,000,000 more soon." That is the second bite. He said, "I have to have it this year." He has not received that money yet, nor any part of it; nobody has given it to him, and he seems to be doing pretty well with his extravagant spending. We have four or five billion dollars down there in the Treasury that will carry us over until the first of the year. We do not have to pass this bill today. Again I say we do not have to pass this bill today. Nathan Cohen, the representative of the CIO, was wise when he sent that letter a few days ago to our good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]. I saw a copy of that letter. Nathan Cohen put up a pretty good fight for the people whom he represents. Generally speaking, he represents the working people. He said, "You have the tax bill too top-heavy." Or it is too heavy at the bottom, if you want to put it that way. That was a pretty convincing argument to make. No doubt his influence will change some votes. But what have you done for him and his group?

I repeat, now, what are you giving Nathan Cohen for his people? Just a shameful pittance of about $2 a year. Is that what you are going to give these deserving people? Why is it not more statesmanlike and more honorable to simply say to him and to the world, "Let us put this thing off. We have got all mixed up." We are not legislating dispassionately. We owe it to all the people of the country to be fair to them. Do you know one of the principal changes we made when we had the last meeting of the conference committee? We took out skates from under the excise tax and we put garbage cans under an excise tax. That is what we did. We taxed garbage cans and we took out skates. Two million dollars on each one of them, and in doing so I think we just skated ourselves into the garbage can. That is about what we have done. I think we ought to realize our position and go back to our people and say, "We have voted against a tax bill that we did not need and a tax bill that is poorly drawn and is unfair in its application" for our last effort was clearly an effort to make some changes that would get more votes for the passage of this measure today.

Mr. Speaker, it has now been 9 months since the House Ways and Means Committee began its study of this tax bill. That committee worked on it about 5 months. The Senate gave about 2 months to it, and with all this work and oratory we are raising about $6,000,000,000 in taxes. Just a short time ago this House voted to give $7,000,000,000 to Europe after about 3 hours of debate. We are struggling hard to raise $6,000,000,000, yet we gave away—

not to Americans but to Europeans and Asiatics—more than $7,000,000,000 in 3 hours; we had better be careful.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, permit me to repeat what I said at the time the tax bill was before the House last June, namely, that you cannot save money by action on a tax bill. You do not economize on a tax bill. You economize and save money and cut out waste at the time the authorization bills are before the Congress. You save and you cut out waste at the time the appropriation bills are before the Congress. But once you have authorized it and once you have appropriated the money, you have created an obligation. To all intents and purposes you have spent the money. So that whether we turn down this conference report today or not, it is not going to mean any economy, any saving, or any elimination of waste. Why? The Government still has the opportunity to obligate itself and obligate future generations by selling bonds and by going further into debt. You are not near your statutory debt limitation as yet. So the administration has the opportunity to acquire money in other ways than by taxing. You are not going to save money or eliminate waste, in my judgment, by refusing to adopt this conference report.

There is but one real question before the House. That is, Is the House of Representatives going to face up to its responsibilities? In my judgment, it is just that simple. Under any standards of morals or integrity, if a family incurs a financial obligation it has a responsibility to meet it. Both a moral responsibility and a legal responsibility. You have got a responsibility to pay your bills. It does not make any difference whether some of those bills were incurred by your wife or yourself by extravagance, there is still that obligation, and you have to pay them. I think that is true here. A government is no different than an ordinary family, your family and mine, as far as its obligations are concerned. The Government incurs obligations, and this Congress has been authorizing them. In just the last hour we authorized $673,000,000 of additional expenditures in this fiscal year. Are we going to cut that out by passing this bill? No. What was the vote on one of those bills? On the bill authorizing $255,000,000 there were seven votes against it. On the bill authorizing $418,000,000 there were 26 negative votes. Is this Congress which passed those bills by such overwhelming votes, 339 to 7 and 315 to 26, going to reverse itself now and say, "Oh, yes, that is fine. We are spending the money but we are not going to tax in order to collect the money to pay those bills?"

If we have any integrity at all, Mr. Speaker, if we have any conscience, I think we will face up to our responsibility, the responsibility that is ours today, and do our best. I will concede that I do not believe we can do the complete job of paying all of the bills that are being incurred; we are spending beyond our ability to tax. Even with this tax bill you are going to have a deficit in fiscal 1952, but I think we should at least do our best to meet those obligations out of today's taxes. I think that this generation should pay the bills incurred by it. This conference report should be adopted.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of this body but feels responsibility to his Nation. He knows that so far as possible bills should be paid as they are incurred. Each of us knows that from his or her own experience in the home; but we know over and above that, that if the head of the household has complete and untrammeled authority and ability to go out and spend and spend, and borrow and borrow, that individual, if he does so, will lead his family, or in our case our country, to the day when they no longer can borrow, when they no longer can pay their taxes or raise more dollars.

My objection to this bill is that we have reached what, in the mature judgment of two committees of the Congress, is the ceiling. As I told you the other day, one of the most distinguished Members of the other body has said there will be no more tax bills increasing individual taxes unless we are actually engaged in war. In effect he said, and I agree with him, that we have reached that point in our taxation where increased taxes will lessen the take; we have reached the saturation point. We should not reach that point where we must curtail when we need increased production, curtail the incentive to produce more and more of the things we need to carry on a war.

We did nothing whatever in the conference which should induce anyone who opposed it several days ago to change his or her mind and vote for this bill now. There was nothing we could do to bring together the difference of opinions expressed by the conferees of the two bodies. I think a great service has been done to the country by the earlier vote on the conference report. I think the country is beginning to realize now that we have reached a point in taxation beyond which we cannot go. We Representatives here, of both political parties, those representing labor and those representing any other group that may have Representatives in this body, realize that we have reached the climax in taxing the people of the country, and we are afraid of that with which we may be confronted, another war. Where would we get more money with which to conduct another war? Would we take it off the people who are being taxed today? We are objecting because we know that any additional tax burden would lessen the incentive, would result in decreased production. Are we going to jeopardize the savings of the people? For they must save money in times of war as well as in times of peace. In short, Mr. Speaker, we are at a critical hour. Upon our action today will depend what the people will think of this Congress next year and in the future. Let us stand up and say to the public at home: "We, your Representatives, have recognized the maximum of taxation that can be imposed upon you." Let us do that by opposing the conference report.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain my position.

I shall support the conference report today, not because I believe that it is substantially better than the one presented to the House in the original conference report last Tuesday, but because the best interest of the country seems to require it.

I have no apology for the fight that I made the other day in helping to defeat the original report. I said then that the people were entitled to know just what they were swallowing, and that the millions of lower income taxpayers are not getting a square deal.

We cannot, however, postpone tax legislation until a later date, when the tax-writing machinery may have been wrested from the ultra-conservative—indeed reactionary—Members of the other body, and restored to the House of Representatives which, under the Constitution, being the body closest to the people, is the one which should have the predominate role on this subject.

I believe the fight that has been made may awaken the American people to the necessity for maintaining a more careful scrutiny of the manner in which our tax laws are written.

I also trust that this experience may strengthen the hand of the Members of the House of Representatives when in the future they confer with representatives of the other body in working out any differences between the two Houses on a tax bill.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is no other responsible course than to support the conference report; but I do so with great reluctance.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, when this tax bill was before the House the first time I called it an economic monstrosity and said I did not see how any Member of Congress could vote for it. Since that time the Senate has rewritten the bill entirely; it has been revised in conference; it has been rejected by this House, then microscopic changes made in conference, and now it is again before us for action. I still say it is an economic monstrosity, and that I cannot see how any Member can vote for it. In fact, I cannot see how any Member can vote for a tax increase of any kind at this time I have asked for this time to tell you why you should not vote for this tax bill.

First. Twelve years ago Uncle Sam was collecting a maximum of $5,000,000,000 in Federal taxes, today he is collecting about $60,000,000,000—12 times as much. That means our Federal taxes have increased 1,200 percent in the last 12

years—an average increase of 100 percent each year for 12 years. Should we increase Federal taxes still more?

Second. Congress passed two tax bills last year upping Federal taxes something over $10,000,000,000 in 1 year—the increase in taxes alone last year amounting to twice what our total Federal tax bill was in 1940. Should we again soak the already overburdened American taxpayer?

Third. Today the national debt of all European countries put together—leaving out only Russia—is $115,000,000,000. Our total national debt is $257,000,000,000, more than twice as much as all of Europe put together. And this does not take into account the $40,000,000,000 to $50,000,000,000 of outstanding obligations that Uncle Sam owes, obligations incurred by the Export-Import Bank, the RFC, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the International Bank, the International fund, and several other Federal loaning agencies. This means that we owe three times as much as all of Europe, and since the population of Europe is twice the population of the United States, we have a per capita debt upon every man, women and child in America six times as heavy as the per capita debt upon every individual European.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of these facts our Foreign Affairs Committee tells us we must aid the Europeans to the tune of $7,500,000,000; our Foreign Affairs Committee tells us we must arm the Europeans to the tune of $4,000,000,000; because they cannot afford to arm themselves.

We subsidize the Socialist-Labor government of England at the expense of the American taxpayer. We ship coal and steel to England today and go without ourselves. Before the war, England used to export both steel and coal to the Continent. Today she imports both steel and coal. That is what her socialist-labor government has done for her economy—and we have to keep on supporting her. Isn't it nearly time to stop giving away our resources? Isn't it time to call a halt on this taxing spree?

Mr. Speaker, whether you realize it or not there is a tax rebellion going on in this country. It is reflected in our mail. It is spreading like a prairie fire, and within a very few years it will result in a tax ceiling being placed upon the power of Congress to levy taxes. I shall welcome that day, because in my opinion it is the only way we can stop this vicious cycle that has our Nation in its toils, the spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect cycle, that F. D. R. initiated. Let us place a small road block in the path of this cycle by again turning thumbs down on this tax bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the House conferees have endeavored to do in part what the membership of the House requested us to do last Tuesday. We have gone back into conference with the managers on the part of the other body in an effort to improve the bill. It has been said that little improvement has been made. On Tuesday I thought very little improvement could be obtained. Some changes, however, have been made.

Here is the question before us today? Are those who voted on Tuesday against the report in a position today to vote for it? I think so. I want to explain why. The other day, on Tuesday, it was possible, if the report was defeated, as it was, for the House to obtain a second conference with the Senate. Those of you who voted against the report evidently wanted that second conference, and you wanted us to do what we could in a second conference, which we did.

Now the Senate has acted. So far as this particular bill, H. R. 4473, is concerned, there is no further opportunity for another conference. If the House refuses to accept this conference report today, this bill is dead. There is no chance to go back again, under the rules. You have done your best to get what you wanted. We have done our best to get what you wanted, but it has been impossible to do it completely. Are the needs of the people of the United States such that we are justified in killing this bill? Do you save the American people anything if you kill it? Let me ask if there is anyone in the sound of my voice who thinks the American people are going to be saved anything if you defeat this tax bill? You know better than that. The American people are going to pay for Government spending either through taxes or through inflation, one or the other. You know that is true. Mr. Allan Kline, of the American Farm Bureau, has pointed it out to all of us. He is as sound as can be on that point. No, we do not save the American people anything by rejecting the tax increase. Actually in the long run, if we do not follow a policy of pay-as-we-go in Government expenditures to the maximum extent that we can we will be costing this generation and future generations a lot more than the mere payment of taxes in this generation. We know that.

Now, there are many things in the bill as now agreed to in conference that are highly desirable. Let us not, I beg of you, destroy legislation that has been in the making for some 7 or 8 months. If we kill it today, you know and I know that we will have it right back on our doorsteps after the first of January if not sooner.

We in the Congress have always measured up to our responsibilities as Members of the Congress and the legislative trustees of the welfare of the American people. If we do not do it now, we shall have to do so later. We do not accomplish anything, therefore, by killing this report. By adopting it today we shall do the maximum we can to further protect and safeguard the fiscal structure of our Government.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly agree with the pertinent observation and telling remark make by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] that if this conference report is rejected today tax legislation for this session is dead. There is no question about that in my mind.

I thoroughly agree with the pertinent and effective observation made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] that the question before the House is whether or not the House is going to shape up to its responsibility. Both observations have a direct relationship to one another.

There is no question in my mind that many Members of the House, particularly some on my own side, voted against the conference report the other day because they wanted to serve notice that in future conferences between the House and the Senate on tax measures the views of House should be upheld. I think in that respect they have accomplished their purpose. Today those same Members can vote to accept this bill.

There are parts of this bill that I do not like, but I never knew a tax bill with all of whose provisions I was in agreement. By voting to accept this conference report I am not voting to approve the parts of the bill I do not like, but I am voting because of the over-all necessity, the fact that $5,800,000,000 in additional revenue is involved, and that this is vital for the national interest of our country.

In my opinion, the Eighty-second Congress, the first session of which we are about to close, will go down in history as playing a most important part in shaping the destinies and kindling the hopes of the people everywhere. The first session has made a courageous and magnificent record in this respect. This Congress has thrown the might of our great Nation in defense of freedom in the global struggle against the slavery and viciousness of international communism and imperialism. On the basis of appropriations already passed by the House, failure to adopt the conference report will mean a deficit of between $8,000,000,000 and $9,000,000,000 for the current fiscal year. Such a deficit will affect our ability to maintain the credit of our country, which above all is vitally important because without a sound fiscal policy we cannot long maintain our own national security. Such a deficit will also fan the fires of inflation, which hurts everyone, but in particular it hurts the people with small income.

The appropriation bills have already been passed. Our responsibility and the duty of the Congress is to meet the obligation which we, ourselves, have incurred. The conferees have done the best they can under the circumstances. It is vitally important that this additional revenue in the national interest of our country be raised. That is the paramount question involved, coupled with the responsibility of individual Members of this body to courageously meet the responsibility which confronts us. I urge as strongly as I can, the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring up for consideration the conference report on H. R. 4473. The House rejected the conference report on this bill last Tuesday, and the House appointed new conferees who again conferred with the Senate conferees on the bill. I might say to the House that we made every effort to again get the Senate conferees to agree to the original provisions of the House bill, particularly those relating to the rates of the individual income tax, the effective date of the corporation normal and surtax, and a reduction of the average earnings credit for excess profits tax purposes from 85 percent to 75 percent. The Senate conferees refused to agree to the provisions of the House bill, and we were forced to give ground on these points, as we did in the conference report submitted last Tuesday. However, we were able to secure certain concessions from the Senate conferees which brings the conference report for consideration today closer to the House bill than the conference report which was submitted last Tuesday. Among the concessions which we were able to secure from the House conferees are the following:

First. A reduction is made in the first bracket rate so that the increase in that bracket on individuals is an 11-percent increase instead of 11½ percent. This change alone will reduce the yield from individual income tax under the former conference report, which was presented to you, by $68,000,000. Of this additional reduction $43,000,000, or 63 percent, will go to taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes of less than $5,000 and it will provide more of the increase in tax on those with incomes over $5,000. The following table will show that about 40 percent of the total increases on individuals under the bill will be borne by those under $5,000 and about 60 percent of the increase will be borne by those with incomes above $5,000:

Revenue effects of conference agreement on individuals

[Money amounts in millions of dollars]

Adjusted gross income class	Liability under present law [1]	Increase over present law from conference agreement	
		Amount	Percent
Under $5,000	$8,684	$951	39.2
Over $5,000	14,771	1,478	60.8
Total	23,455	2,429	100.0

[1] Normal tax, surtax, and alternative tax on net long-term capital gains.

NOTE.—Estimates include rate changes and head of household provisions.

There are some who say that we are taxing the higher incomes too little and the smaller incomes too much. But this statement is not borne out by the facts. The following table will show the actual tax burden paid by those in the low brackets as well as the high brackets. It will be seen that in the top bracket the Government collects from a single person 88 cents on every dollar earned while in the first bracket only about 5.6 cents of every dollar is taken in taxes:

Comparison of individual income-tax liabilities under present law and the conference agreement on H. R. 4473

SINGLE PERSON, NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before exemptions	Amounts of tax		Effective rates (percent)	
	Present law	Conference agreement	Present law	Conference agreement
$800	$40	$44.40	5.0	5.6
$1,000	80	88.80	8.0	8.9
$2,000	280	310.80	14.0	15.5
$3,000	488	542.40	16.3	18.1
$4,000	708	788.40	17.7	19.7
$5,000	944	1,052.00	18.9	21.0
$8,000	1,780	1,992.00	22.3	24.9
$10,000	2,436	2,728.00	24.4	27.3
$15,000	4,448	4,968.00	29.7	33.1
$20,000	6,942	7,762.00	34.7	38.8
$25,000	9,796	10,940.00	39.2	43.8
$50,000	26,388	28,466.00	52.8	56.9
$100,000	66,798	69,688.00	66.8	69.7
$300,000	247,274	252,164.00	82.4	84.1
$500,000	429,274	436,164.00	85.9	87.2
$1,000,000 [1]	870,000	880,000.00	87.0	88.0

MARRIED COUPLE, NO DEPENDENTS

$1,500	$60	$66.60	4.0	4.4
$2,000	160	176.60	8.0	8.9
$3,000	360	399.60	12.0	13.3
$4,000	560	621.60	14.0	15.5
$5,000	760	843.60	15.2	16.9
$8,000	1,416	1,576.80	17.7	19.7
$10,000	1,888	2,104.00	18.9	21.0
$15,000	3,260	3,644.00	21.7	24.3
$20,000	4,872	5,456.00	24.4	27.3
$25,000	6,724	7,508.00	26.9	30.0
$50,000	19,592	21,880.00	39.2	43.8
$100,000	52,776	56,932.00	52.8	56.9
$300,000	222,572	229,352.00	74.2	76.5
$500,000	403,548	412,328.00	80.7	82.5
$1,000,000	858,518	872,328.00	85.9	87.2

Comparison of individual income-tax liabilities under present law and the conference agreement on H. R. 4473—Continued

MARRIED COUPLE, 2 DEPENDENTS

Net income before exemptions	Amounts of tax		Effective rates (percent)	
	Present law	Conference agreement	Present law	Conference agreemnnt
$3,000	$120	$133.20	4.0	4.4
$4,000	320	355.20	8.0	8.9
$5,000	520	577.20	10.4	11.5
$8,000	1,152	1,281.60	14.4	16.0
$10,000	1,592	1,773.60	15.9	17.7
$15,000	2,900	3,236.60	19.3	21.6
$20,000	4,464	5,000.00	22.3	25.0
$25,000	6,268	7,004.00	25.1	28.0
$50,000	18,884	21,088.00	37.8	42.2
$100,000	51,912	56,032.00	51.9	56.0
$300,000	221,504	228,272.00	73.8	76.1
$500,000	402,456	411,224.00	80.5	82.2
$1,000,000	857,456	871,224.00	85.7	87.1

[1] Taking into account the following maximum effective rate limitations present law 87 percent; conference agreement, 88 percent.

Capital gains subject to the 25-percent alternative rate did not bear any increase under the conference agreement submitted to the House last Tuesday. Under this conference agreement the alternative rate is increased from 25 percent to 26 percent for both individuals and corporations. This will bring in an additional $28,000,000 in revenue.

With respect to corporations the Senate conferees took the House increase of five percentage points in the normal tax. The only difference between the corporate normal and surtax under the House bill and the conference agreement is that under the House bill the increase in the corporate rate was made effective January 1, 1951, as compared with April 1, 1951, under the conference agreement. The Senate conferees refused to recede on this point, and the House conferees were obliged to agree to an effective date of April 1, 1951. The effect of this conference action is to impose a top normal and surtax rate on corporations for the calendar year 1951 of 50¾ percent and a top rate for the calendar years 1952 and 1953 of 52 percent.

In regard to the excess-profits tax we were able to secure another concession from the Senate conferees which was not in the conference agreement submitted last Tuesday. It will be recalled that under the conference agreement then submitted the average-earnings credit of 85 percent was reduced to 83 percent and made effective January 1, 1952. Under the conference agreement now before you the decrease in the credit from 85 percent to 83 percent is made effective as of July 1, 1951, instead of January 1, 1952. This change alone will increase the liabilities on 1951 profits by $60,000,000.

In connection with our corporation tax rates, I would like to submit the following table which shows the amount by which we have increased corporation taxes since the Korean war:

Estimated increase in corporation tax liability resulting from Revenue Act of 1950, Excess Profits Tax Act, and conference bill

Estimated liability under pre-1950 law	[1] $17,040,000,000
Gross increase [2] liabilities due to—	
(a) Revenue Act of 1950	2,480,000,000
(b) Excess Profits Tax Act	4,160,000,000
(c) 1951 conference bill	2,545,000,000
Total increase in liability	9,185,000,000
Total gross liability	26,225,000,000
Percentage increase in liability over pre-1950 percent	53.9

[1] Includes alternative tax on capital gains amounting to $300,000,000

[2] Estimates of increases do not include structural changes.

NOTE.—Estimates based on corporate profits before tax of $48,000,000,000.

It will be noted that the total increase on corporations under the Revenue Act of 1950, the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950, and the pending bill totals $9,185,000,000. Furthermore, the rates that we are now imposing on corporations are much higher than the rates levied on corporations in Canada, Great Britain, and France. A rate of 52 percent on the ordinary income of corporations makes the Government more than an equal partner in the corporate enterprise.

Another provision adopted by the conferees is one eliminating information returns as to rural electrification cooperatives and mutual insurance companies with respect to patronage dividends or refunds made to their patrons. Rural

electrification cooperatives are not included in the provisions of the bill levying a tax on the unallocated reserves of cooperatives formerly exempt under section 101 (12) of the Internal Revenue Code. It is, therefore, not deemed advisable to require rural electrification cooperatives to file information returns as to such payments.

In regard to excise taxes, we agreed to a Senate amendment taxing garbage-disposal units resulting in an increase in revenue of $2,000,000. The Senate conferees agreed to a House provision exempting skates from the 10 percent sporting goods tax, which resulted in a loss in revenue of $2,000,000.

The conferees also agreed to an amendment which would permit corporations organized in the base period to carry over operating losses for 1947 for a period of 3 years. Under the bill, all corporations are permitted to carry over their operating losses for 1948 and 1949 for a period of 3 years.

Summing up the efforts of our conferees to get together with the Senate conferees, the following is the effect on the revenue:

Full year changes

1. Reducing the burden on the individual income taxpayers	−$69,000,000
2. Increasing the capital gains tax	+28,000,000
3. Excise—no change	0
Total effect for full year	−41,000,000

Nonrecurring changes

1. Changing the effective date of the excess profits tax	+$60,000,000
2. Carry-over of 1947 losses	−10,000,000
Net gain from nonrecurring items	+50,000,000

The conferees also agreed to certain other technical changes which plugged certain loopholes. These are:

(a) Holding period for timber: The present method for computing the holding period in the case of timber subject to the provisions of section 117 (k) (2) would be retained. Under the present law the holding period runs only to the date of the contract for disposal of the timber, instead of the date of the cutting of the timber as under the bill.

(b) Coal royalties: The provision giving capital gain treatment to coal royalties would be made inapplicable in computing the income subject to the surtax on improper accumulations under section 102 and the surtax on personal holding companies under section 500.

(c) Termination payments to employees: The provision in the bill giving capital gain treatment to lump sum payments received at retirement upon the release of rights to future profits of the employer would be restricted to cases where the employee was entitled to such profits either for the duration of his life or for at least 5 years after retirement.

I wish to insert two tables at this point in the RECORD. Table I shows the full year effect of the conference agreement and also the effect upon the fiscal year 1952 receipts. Table II compares the individual income tax burden in 1944–45, the highest wartime years, with that in 1948–49, present law and the conference agreement.

TABLE I.—*Estimated effect of the conference bill on tax liabilities in a full year of operation and on collections in the fiscal year 1952*

[In millions of dollars]

	Full year effect	Fiscal year 1952 effect
Individual income tax	2,280	1,190
Corporate income and excess profits taxes	[1] 2,207	[1] 787
Excise taxes	1,204	[2] 787
Total	5,691	2,764

[1] Net increase after allowing for reduction in individual income taxes due to lower dividends.
[2] Assumes excise tax changes are effective November 1, 1951.

TABLE II.—*Comparison between the individual income tax burden in the years 1944–45, 1948–49 and under present law, with that under H. R. 4473 as agreed to by the conferees for the years 1952 and 1953*

A. SINGLE PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income (after deductions but before exemptions)	Amount of tax			Increase in tax liability due to 1950 act		Amount of tax under H. R. 4473	Increase in tax liability of H. R. 4473 over present law		Cumulated increase in liability due to the 1950 act and H. R. 4473	
	1944–45	1948–49	Present law	Amount	Percent		Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
$600	$23									
$800	69	$43	$40	$7	20.5	$44	$4	11.0	$11	33.7
$1,000	115	66	80	14	20.5	89	9	11.0	22	33.7
$1,500	240	149	180	31	20.5	200	20	11.0	50	33.7
$2,000	345	232	280	48	20.5	311	31	11.0	78	33.7
$3,000	585	409	488	79	19.2	542	54	11.1	133	32.5
$5,000	1,105	811	944	133	16.4	1,052	108	11.4	241	29.7
$8,000	2,035	1,546	1,780	234	15.1	1,992	212	11.9	446	28.8
$10,000	2,755	2,124	2,436	312	14.7	2,728	292	12.0	604	28.4
$15,000	4,930	3,894	4,148	554	14.2	4,968	520	11.7	1,074	27.6
$20,000	7,580	6,089	6,942	853	14.0	7,762	820	11.8	1,673	27.5
$25,000	10,590	8,600	9,796	1,196	13.9	10,940	1,144	11.7	2,340	27.2
$50,000	27,945	23,201	26,388	3,187	13.7	28,466	2,078	7.9	5,265	22.7
$100,000	69,870	58,762	66,708	8,036	13.7	69,688	2,890	4.3	10,926	18.6
$500,000	444,350	[1] 385,000	429,274	44,274	11.5	436,104	6,890	1.6	51,164	13.3
$1,000,000	900,000	[1] 770,000	[2] 870,000	100,000	13.0	[3] 880,000	10,000	1.1	110,000	14.3

B. MARRIED COUPLE [5]—2 DEPENDENTS

$2,000	$45									
$3,000	275	$100	$120	$20	20.5	$133	$13	11.0	$34	33.7
$5,000	755	432	520	88	20.5	577	57	11.0	146	33.7
$8,000	1,585	974	1,152	178	18.3	1,282	130	11.3	308	31.6
$10,000	2,245	1,361	1,592	231	17.0	1,774	182	11.4	413	30.3
$15,000	4,265	2,512	2,900	388	15.4	3,236	336	11.6	724	28.8
$20,000	6,785	3,888	4,464	576	14.8	5,000	536	12.0	1,112	28.6
$25,000	9,705	5,476	6,268	792	14.5	7,004	736	11.7	1,528	28.0
$50,000	26,865	16,578	18,884	2,306	13.9	21,088	2,204	11.7	4,510	27.2
$100,000	68,565	45,643	51,912	6,269	13.7	56,032	4,120	7.9	10,389	22.8
$500,000	442,985	358,677	402,456	43,779	12.2	411,224	8,768	2.2	52,547	14.7
$1,000,000	[2] 900,000	769,314	857,456	88,142	11.5	871,224	13,768	1.6	101,910	13.2

[1] Maximum effective rate limitation of 77 percent.
[2] Maximum effective rate limitation of 90 percent.
[3] Maximum effective rate limitation of 87 percent.
[4] Maximum effective rate limitation of 88 percent.
[5] Income earned by 1 spouse.

Mr. Speaker, the gravity of the situation, and the importance of the vote soon to be cast, in my opinion, cannot be exaggerated. It is reflected in the following letter which I have just received from the Secretary of the Treasury:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, October 19, 1951,

Hon ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR CHAIRMAN: I am greatly concerned about the situation which would face our Government if the tax bill, H. R. 4473, which is before the House today, should fail to pass. I know that you and your colleagues have worked for a long time to enact legislation for the purpose of strengthening our fiscal position. My purpose in writing this letter is to point out the serious consequences which would follow from the defeat of this measure.

Without the enactment of this legislation, the receipts of the Federal Government are expected to fall short of anticipated expenditures in the current fiscal year 1952 by about $10,000,000,000. While expenditures in fiscal year 1953 cannot be estimated accurately at this time, it is clear that the deficit may well be in excess of $15,000,000,000.

Failure to pass this tax bill would make it impossible for us to follow the pay-as-we-go policy which has the full endorsement of

the entire country. We are all aware of the inherent dangers of the large deficits which will result from an inadequate tax program. The cost of running the Government will be increased on two scores: the cost of procuring the materials necessary for adequate defense would rise, and the cost of managing the public debt would grow. Furthermore, with such large deficits facing us, there is grave danger that the inflationary pressures resulting from the defense program will become unmanageable.

I know that you are as disturbed as I am about the present situation and the urgent need for the revenues which would be produced by this bill. However, even though some of the provisions of this bill may be unwarranted, I feel that the need for revenue is so great that I cannot help but convey to you again my deep concern lest this bill be not enacted.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W SNYDER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

The rejection of the first conference report by the House created a very difficult situation for the managers on the part of the House. We did the best we could, especially those of us who wanted a tax bill. The majority of the conferees wanted a tax bill. The minority of the conferees, judging by their action and by their expressions on the floor of the House, do not want any tax bill at all. I think that is a fair statement.

Those who did want a tax bill made every effort in the first conference to get a tax bill as nearly as possible to the bill as it was passed by the House. We all know that at a conference, differences of view on many difficult questions must be resolved, and a common understanding must be reached. The majority members did all we could. On the other hand, the minority members on almost every vote where there would be a loss of revenue through the adoption of an amendment proposed by the other body, as compared to the House bill, voted from the very beginning for practically every such Senate amendment, and did not vote to carry out the wishes of the House, as I understand is the duty of conferees, so far as they are able. Instead, from the beginning, they voted for practically every Senate amendment that would lose money, and against every Senate amendment which would increase the revenue, thereby demonstrating definitely that they were against any tax bill.

When the conference report was before the House before, some Members on the majority side voted against it because they thought it was not an adequate and satisfactory tax bill. They wanted more revenue, with less burden on those with low incomes, while those on the minority side wanted no tax bill at all, and if there was to be any tax bill, they wanted the tax burden on a different class of people. Those on my left who voted against the bill, and those on my right who voted against it, were as far apart as they could possibly be in their reasons.

Now, we went back to conference and struggled the best we could. We obtained important concessions which have been explained by the other majority members who have already spoken. The conference report now before the House on which we will soon vote was signed by 10 of the 12 conferees. It was signed by all conferees of the other body, both Democrats and Republicans, and by five of the seven conferees of the House. So the question before us today was decided by the conferees by a vote of 10 for and 2 against approval of the conference report.

The question is whether or not this House will stand up and vote for a revenue bill that will support its previous action in making appropriations. That is the question we must answer—shall we stand up and keep the faith.

I have been criticized by some of my colleagues for voting to reduce some appropriations and voting against others, because I knew that pay day was coming. But I do not hold up my own judgment against a majority of this House or a majority of the other body, and repudiate what this Congress has done. The sovereignty of this Government and the honor and integrity of the Congress is at stake today.

We labored for 8 months as earnestly as we could to bring out the very best bill we could. Then in conference we did the very best we possibly could. If you want a better tax bill than you have now, I say to you in all sincerity you must get a better Committee on Ways and Means, because we have done all that we could and the best we could. There is no use to refer the problem back to us, in the hope that we can do a better job, because we have done our everlasting best to bring out a tax bill that is equitable and fair.

I hope this conference report will be overwhelmingly adopted, and the financial integrity of the Government maintained by our action here today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HART). The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply impressed with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] when he said, "Are we going to measure up to our responsibilities?" Do we believe in integrity in the fiscal affairs of this Government? If this conference report is defeated today, not only the bonds of business institutions but the bonds of the Government of the United States will go down tomorrow or late this afternoon.

Somebody referred to the boys in Korea. That is a favorite thing to say in certain spirit, but I think the boys who are fighting in Korea, offering up their all for this country, would appreciate it if we here, more prosperous than we have ever been before in our history, with the national income last year $236,000,000,000, would stand up to our duties and obligations. I would think that they in their sacrifices would want us in our prosperity to pay our way at home instead of leaving it to them to pay when they come back here.

These are some of the things that pass through my mind as I go along. Why should we not? Let me repeat, when we are more prosperous than we ever were, when we are the most powerful nation economically that exists in the world today or ever did exist in the world, why should we not out of our plenty not fasten upon the backs of future generations any more burden of debt than is absolutely necessary?

Let us measure up to our responsibility today; and that responsibility lies on both sides of the aisle, on one side just as much as on the other. Let us measure up to that responsibility. Let us maintain the integrity of the finances of this Government as far as we can and not add to the great and crushing debt that we now have.

I have the faith to believe, and I always have faith in this House, the faith to believe that in a few moments you will measure up to your responsibility.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, neither the chairman of this committee nor the majority leader has reported any assurance from the President or any responsible spokesman for the administration that if this tax increase is voted, the administration will hold down actual cash expenditures for 1952 to an amount not in excess of the cash income of the Government from this and previous tax bills.

Nor has the chairman of this committee, nor anyone authorized to speak for the majority, given any assurance from the President or any administration spokesman that if this bill is voted, the administration will not ask for appropriations in the next session of this Congress in an amount exceeding the estimated cash income of the Government from this bill and previous tax bills.

Nor has the chairman of the committee, nor anyone on behalf of the majority party in the House, given assurance to the House that if this tax bill is voted, the majority party will firmly oppose the enactment of appropriations in the next session of this Congress in an amount exceeding the estimated cash income of the Government from this and previous tax bills.

Convincing assurance of administration recognition that there is a limit beyond which the national tax burden must not go and that enactment of this bill would in fact result in a balanced budget, would, I know, have a decisive effect upon the action of some Members of the House today.

I, for one, do not intend to go on voting tax increases that simply mean more money for a reckless administration to pour into a bottomless pit, and do not mean balanced budgets and some limitation upon inflation.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the first conference report in the tax bill as presented here 2 days ago. I do not regret that action. Even those supporting the conference report conceded and admit that it was a vicious bill, and that it cast too great a burden on the small taxpayer and was a sad departure from the bill as adopted by this House. Too great a share of the reductions caused by the concessions to

the Senate went to those in the higher brackets. The infamous Jenner amendment itself was sufficient reason for me to vote against that conference report.

The new report makes some, though much too few, concessions to the small individual taxpayer. The burden, however, still remains too great in favor of the large taxpayer. The Jenner amendment still remains in the bill.

I am informed by our leadership and by the conferees that there is absolutely no possibility of getting any further concessions. Further delay may also cause the loss of many millions of dollars is excise taxes. I am against deficit spending and I recognize that some kind of tax bill must be passed by Congress.

It is therefore with great reluctance but recognizing the reality of facts that I have come to the conclusion of necessity of voting for this conference report. In doing so, however, I intend to continue with new vigor to fight for such adjustments in the future as would more evenly spread the burden of taxation.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, again I find it necessary to remind the Members of the House that I do not profess to be an experienced legislator. As I have told the Members before, I am a small-business man. I ran for Congress because I felt a few basic business principles should be applied to the Federal Government—the biggest business in the world.

Likening the tax bill to a business problem I would like to cite an example that arises each year in my own small business. I attempt to anticipate the gross volume in sales for the year, then I appropriate 4 percent of the anticipated gross figure for advertising. This past year I planned to spend $15,000 in an advertising program. At the end of the first 6 months' operation, I saw that it was going to be impossible to do the gross business I had anticipated doing and therefore found it necessary to cut the advertising budget.

Applying that reasoning to the problem we face today in Congress, I think it would be more advisable to cut the appropriations as outlined in the bill printed below.

There is no doubt that the Congress of the United States has appropriated more money than the American taxpayer can afford to pay. Let us admit our mistakes and reduce the appropriations in the same amount as is being asked for in the tax bill.

A bill to provide for reductions in appropriations made during the present Congress

Be it enacted, etc, That every amount appropriated during the present Congress is hereby reduced by a uniform percentage which will result in a reduction of $5,691,000,000 in the aggregate amount of all appropriations made during the present Congress.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, whether or not this session of the Congress adjourns today is more or less immaterial to me, since I am interested primarily in working out a property tax bill. A tax bill we must have—nothing being certain in this world except death and taxes—and I want one that will not bear down on our people any more than is absolutely necessary.

As we all know, this tax legislation has been the subject of months of careful study, first by the House Ways and Means Committee and then by the Senate Finance Committee. As time went on their efforts were constantly thwarted by the tremendous demands of the administration for money, much of which is desired for its economic-aid program, whereby our substance is spread over the face of the earth—and I mean this literally and not figuratively. This is done under the guise of preventing the spread of communism. Personally, I feel that the old adage that you cannot buy friends still holds true.

Even this week a committee of Congress refused to authorize the sale of some ships to—now read carefully—the Republic of Korea until Korea shows more interest in our cause, which is to make the battle scrap available to our own steel industry and to have Korea greatly increase its output and sale to us of tungsten—our most critical material.

The one visible result of this country's give-away program in the Far East has been the ease with which the Japanese Treaty was signed—and this was only accomplished after the kinds and amounts of our aid to the various countries involved were laid on the line.

But to get back to the tax bill. On Tuesday, along with other Members of the House who have been endeavoring to get the administration to cut Government expenditures so that taxes may be reduced, I voted to return the tax bill to the conferees for further study. This action was largely a protest against the administration's consistent refusal to cooperate in cutting expenditures, since the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committee had already succeeded in reducing the President's orginal tax demands by almost one-half.

I do not say that the further consideration of the conference committee has reduced the amount of the tax bill to its irreducible minimum, but its approach is so near this minimum that I am going to vote for acceptance of the conference report now before us, which is signed by some of the ablest men in the House and Senate.

I will leave it to the American people to decide in 1952 which course they want to follow—the administration's tax-and-spend policy or the policy of those of us who believe in cutting Government expenditures to the absolute essentials and that it is not possible to save the world without destroying our own economy, which of course is just what Joe Stalin is hoping we will do.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, I was among those who voted against the tax bill. For that action I have no apologies. Now we are considering a revised bill and, it is with a great deal of reluctance and hesitancy, that I shall cast my vote for this tax bill. I am doing so against my better judgment. I am doing so, not because my sense of loyalty to the people of my district—who are preponderantly in the lower-income brackets—is less, but because my sense of loyalty to the country as a whole is greater.

We might as well state it frankly and openly: the tax bill which we have under consideration here today is unfair and inequitable; it is too lenient to those of higher income and it is too harsh on those in the lower-income brackets.

I had hoped all along that we would end up with a bill which would provide the necessary funds to meet our expanded national needs in these crucial days of international tension and uncertainty. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that the international situation has not improved one iota. Our men are still fighting in Korea and are facing a second winter there. All efforts to negotiate a peace or a cease-fire in Korea have thus far failed. On the contrary, the situation has worsened in other parts of the world, most recently in several countries in the Middle East, which will require even greater alertness and preparation on our part.

When I voted "no" on Tuesday, I was very much impressed with the figures quoted that day by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], who pointed out that in the tax reductions made in the original House bill relating to personal income, the conference committee cut such income by $254,000,000, but only 23 percent went to people having an income of less than $5,000, while 77 percent would benefit people in the higher-income brackets. That was one of the reasons which prompted me to vote against the bill.

Today we have a compromise tax bill with some very minor—almost insignificant—revisions. This, too, is far from satisfactory. Let me cite only one example, one in which many millions of people in this country are vitally interested. The formula for increasing individual income taxes has been revised to provide a rise of 11 percent on the first $2,000 of income after personal exemptions and other deductions. Not only is this still too high for the low-income people, but I should like to see this formula extended to include all those of the so-called middle-income class; namely, those earning up to about $5,000 or even $6,000. In so doing, we would give these people and their families an opportunity to maintain a more decent standard of living under present inflationary conditions.

Mr. Speaker there are those who would seek to dismiss last Tuesday's action by this House in rejecting the tax bill as a "momentary manifestation of temper" by one or more groups in this Chamber. It goes much deeper than that. The fact that this is the first time in recent American history that a tax bill has been defeated after it was brought from conference should serve as an indication that greater consideration must be given to the needs of the lower-income groups when considering tax bills in the future.

Because our country needs these funds so urgently at this time, I will reluctantly cast my vote in favor of the tax bill, though I am very much displeased with it.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, consideration of the conference reports on tax

legislation is one of the two opportunities which Members of the House have to place on the record their views about these measures.

I have long been opposed to the closed-rule method of legislating. It fosters a take-it-or-leave-it philosophy among Members of the House which is hardly beneficial to the sound workings of the legislative process.

Because of the overriding importance of avoiding deficit financing as nearly as we can and fighting inflation with every means at our command, I am going to take this legislation. I will vote for the conference report as I did when it was first before the House. The House well knows of my opposition to several provisions of this bill, but I desire that it be apprised of my views especially as to increased excise taxes on automobiles.

One of our greatest sources of revenue in the past has been through the money derived from excises levied on items deemed luxuries. The first of these taxes was imposed as far back at 1791—what it was levied on is unimportant. It so happened that it was whisky—whether that is a luxury or not, is in itself a debatable question not to be entered on at the moment. What is also a debatable question, is the definition of the word "luxury." Webster defines a luxury as "something expensive and difficul to obtain." If we are to accept that definition, then many of the items subject to excise levies today are incorrectly classified.

We have listed under taxable luxury items such commodities of every-day usage as tobacco, electricity, automobiles, movies, toilet preparations, and too many other adjuncts to our daily living for me to take time to enumerate them.

It seems to me that when a commodity reaches the state of almost universal consumption by a vast majority of the population, even the low-income group, in its day-to-day living habits, then that commodity can no longer be classified as a luxury. Rather, it is a necessity.

It is in this classification that I place the automobile. When 59,000,000 adults ride in an automobile every day, and when 56 percent of all daily passenger-car use is directly connected with the business of making a living, then the ownership of an automobile can hardly be called a luxury.

Is it a luxury for the minister to use a car in carrying out his duties of the church? A group of clergymen was queried recently on the necessity of the automobile to their calling; the survey disclosed that the average clergyman covers approximately 13,400 car-miles per year on church business. In rural areas and small towns where there is no public transportation, this figure rises to approximately 22,000 miles. Should the underpaid clergyman be further burdened by higher automotive taxes, because he finds it necessary to use an automobile in the discharge of his clerical duties?

Is the housewife who uses the family car to drive her children to school when no school bus or other transportation is available, is she indulging in luxury driving?

It may be hard for those of us who come from large or even smaller cities where a transportation system is taken for granted, to realize that there are many, many communities where the individual passenger car is the only means of getting from one place to another. Within the past 10 years or so there has been an almost unprecedented mushrooming of suburban communities and developments. Many of these communities are established beyond the city line of transportation, and are not large enough to support a system of their own. If the thousands of suburbanites who live in such areas are to follow the normal pattern of living, the use of the automobile is absolutely essential. The facts are the number of persons in both suburban and rural areas who are not served by any kind of public transit at all totals 13,000,000. There is no luxury here in the use of a car.

The dependence of a population on the family car was brought home to all of us here in Washington earlier this year. The recent transit strike was an inconvenience to a great many people—but thanks to the many private cars pressed into daily service, neither business nor the individual suffered too greatly.

My own city of Detroit, which was strike-bound for 59 days, offers a telling example of our twentieth century dependence upon the automobile. When Detroit's transit system went dead last spring, the suddenness of the strike caused considerable inconvenience and dislocation in its first few days. But by the end of the first week, passenger cars had practically filled the gap. The volume of traffic on Detroit's streets increased approximately 15 to 20 percent above the pre-strike level. Car-pools and share-the-ride clubs were formed, and from all reports, business went on much as usual. Factories reported absenteeism only 1 to 6 percent above normal, and retail trade was off only about 5 percent as compared with the same period last year. Facts and figures like these definitely place the automobile in the category of an essential—and essentials are not subject to the 3 percent excise increase.

In the early days of country, no one thought it odd if the housewife took the family buckboard into town to do her shopping, nor was the youngster who rode a horse to school looked upon as a plutocrat. Why, then should their modern counterparts who drive not one horse, but the power of many horses for exactly the same purpose, be taxed on the basis of luxury?

I say that the automobile is no more a luxury today, than is the plowhorse. And this is no far-fetched analogy, either. About 70 percent of all farms have at least one passenger car today. To the farmer, these cars are far from a luxury—the farm-owned passenger car is called into every possible kind of service. Surveys have shown that of all the trips the average farmer makes by car, 78 percent are in the nature of a necessity, directly connected with the business of farming. Of every 100 miles traveled by the average farm car, 67 are directly connected with making a living. To the farmer, the passenger car is one of his most essential tools.

But the passenger car is not the only automotive vehicle essential to the farmer. The motortruck, another farm necessity that could not, by the longest stretch of the imagination be termed a luxury, is also subject to an increased tax. Actually, the light farm truck is the real work-horse of the up-to-date farm. These trucks not only help the farmer in stepping up production, but make possible a much wider and faster distribution of all farm products, and appreciably reducing spoilage.

In the cattle industry, the farm truck has practically revolutionized the character of the entire industry. Cattle which were formerly driven to range by long and tedious trail-driving, today are trucked to range or market, saving days of tiring, tedious work, and benefiting both animals and men. I do not think anyone could call this use of the automobile a luxury. Nor is the truck that rushes our fire-fighters to the scene of a conflagration; nor the one that clear our roads of snow block; or the one that hauls our refuse. Yet all of these service trucks are technically automobiles, and therefore subject to an increased tax.

For the past year our national industrial effort has again taken on the stepped-up production necessitated by a state of national emergency. This means that thousands of workers are being recruited by plants and factories engaged in producing the implements of war. The ownership of a private automobile has in many instances determined the ability of a worker to accept employment in a defense plant. During World War II a survey of 749 plants made by the Michigan Highway Department disclosed that 75 percent of 434,648 employees quizzed, came to work in their own cars. Reports from 94 plants in different parts of the country employing a total of 140,000 war workers, showed that 73 percent rode to work either in their own cars, or by car pool. To these workers on whom the Nation is still so highly dependent, the ownership of a car is not a luxury. It is bread and butter.

The automobile industry itself is a large-scale employer. Both directly and indirectly it is the support of one out of every seven jobs in the whole country. Just think, there are over 9,000,000 people in these 48 States who are dependent on the manufacture, sale, and general use of the automobile. The man at the filling station, the garage mechanic who tunes up your car, the fellow who makes or sells you a needed part or accessory and the one we seldom see who works in the oil refinery—he is just one of these nine millions dependent on the continued sale and manufacture of the automobile. What would happen to him and his counterparted millions should there come a time when Mr. Public who now chalks up 7 percent or $95 of the total purchase price of his car to taxes, decide that an additional 3 percent or approximately $135 of the new-car purchase price is pushing him just too hard? I know what would happen, and so do you. We would be faced with a buyer's strike that would have

disastrously telling effects on both the Government coffers, kindred industries, and employment. In fact there is not a phase of our economy—not to mention our defense effort—which would not be most seriously affected.

Such a possibility should not be laughed off on the assumption that what the people want, the people will always buy, even at great sacrifice. There can come a time when a commodity, however, necessary, can be taxed right off the market. Should this happen to the automobile because of excessive taxation, the result would be a tragic and disastrous breakdown of national economy Furthermore, the whole purpose of the taxation would have defeated itself. It has never been the intent of taxation—except in national emergencies—to reduce the consumption of a taxed product. Rather, such levies always have been imposed with the full knowledge, even hope, that the tax will be a producer of revenue. Up till now, the reasoning of our tax writers has proved them canny psychologists of human nature. But if my mail is a fair indicator of the temper of the auto-buying public, then I would say that the saturation point in new-car buying has been reached. I am, therefore, opposed to the increased automobile excise tax provisions of this bill. I will not oppose the bill but it is high time that the importance of the automobile, in its relation to our way of life, should be appraised, not as a luxury, but as a necessity.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment the conferees should have eliminated the so-called Jenner amendment. This matter ought to be determined only after careful hearings and full debate.

In regard to making the rolls of those receiving assistance for dependent children and old-age assistance open for public inspection, I have serious doubts that such policy would be the answer to charges that there are chiselers and frauds on such rolls, now.

No good citizen is going to condone fraud and cheating, regardless of where it may be found; but will the opening of the rolls, to the public, prevent such evil or materially assist in bringing about proper punishment for those guilty?

The very fact that so much has been said about this matter, of late, and so many specific instances have been cited, pretty well proves that by proper diligence the cheats and frauds, on these rolls, may be discovered under the present law; and I think every one knows that any specific charge may be thoroughly investigated, and any guilty parties prosecuted by grand juries and prosecuting attorneys, now. The opening of the rolls to the public could easily have some very bad effects. It could easily result in holding thousands of legitimate recipients up to public obloquy and act as a serious deterrent to worthy people who would be reluctant, and in many instances would refuse, to apply for aid when in justice and fairness they should apply. As a matter of fact, it could greatly impair, if not defeat, the real purpose of the law. Then again, it could cause harassment and great annoyance to those, on the rolls, by subjecting them to a steady barrage by commercial and political interests, looking only for their money and vote. So my suggestion is that we not be rushed into a change in the law but should give the request for its repeal careful and full consideration.

Now, as to the old-age-assistance feature of the matter, I offer a solution. If the old-age pension bill, H. R. 2681, which I introduced, or some good bill along this line becomes law, it will completely solve this question.

The bill provides, in substance, for a direct universal Federal old-age pension to all citizens 60 years of age, or over, who are not earning sufficient income to be required to file a Federal income tax return. This is, in my judgment, a reasonable, workable, and feasible pension bill. It is offered as an amendment to the present social security law, as to the old-age-assistance feature, and would not create any new bureau, or bureaus, as the existing Bureau of Internal Revenue could furnish the Social Security Board needed information as to income-tax returns.

There now exists in this country, according to reliable information—see page A6048 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 2, 1951—approximately 15,000 separate old-age pension systems including Government assisted and private systems All of them could not and would not be brought under one Federal system, all at once, it is true, but eventually they would in my judgment, voluntarily elect to do so

Of course, the consuming public now pays and always will pay for all of the systems, whether private or public; and would not one single plan be preferable and more economic and less confusing that 15,000 separate plans, all having the same objectives? Just think of the tremendous cost and bookkeeping in administering 15,000 plans

I have heard it said many times, in defense of existing public old-age pensions, or retirement plans—while we have provided only old-age assistance for those needing the help most—that those now coming under them, such as Members of the Supreme Court and Federal judiciary, generally, Members of Congress and Federal employees, generally, that their groups pay their own money into the systems. Technically this is true, but in reality, it is not true. Historically, and in every instance that I can recall, when a Federal old-age pension—retirement—plan has been set up, the salaries of those who would participate have been raised so they could pay into the system. Consequently, taxes were raised and the public has paid and continues to pay the bill. This same principle is true in regard to retirement programs in private industry. When retirement systems are set up, wages of the workmen are raised so they can pay into the fund, or the company itself pays into the fund. In either event, prices of consumer goods are raised to meet this added expense of the company, and the consuming public pays the bill.

I do not object to these retirement programs; as a matter of fact, I am strongly in favor of them, but what I do object to is that millions of those who need pensions, or retirement, most, do not get them at all but they get only old-age assistance, which means that they are treated as second-rate citizens. A case worker decides how much they shall get, which is always far below the pension group. They are subject to checks and quizzes and are, in fact, regimented citizens. They cannot do many things without losing their small monthly checks. For instance, they can only own a very small amount of property, can only have a very small income, and must report and explain to the case worker visits they have made to relatives when they go for an extended visit to loved ones in adjoining States. Who ever heard of a retired Federal employee having to make such reports? What a howl of protest would go up if they were required No; what they draw is theirs, but only partly is this true of those drawing old-age assistance. Through their lives they have paid taxes and have worked and added to the economy of our society, the same as others. Why should not they be treated the same?

INCREASED PERCENTAGE DEPLETION ALLOWANCE FOR COAL

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Senate Committee on Finance in agreeing to raise the percentage depletion allowance for coal to 10 percent is recognition by that body of a long-standing discrimination against the vital coal industry. It is recognition of an inequity which the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation admitted more than two decades ago. It is an acceptance of the action taken in 1950 and again in mid-1951 by the House Ways and Means Committee and the House of Representatives itself.

Those of us who have been close to the coal industry for many years cannot but feel that the coal industry has been discriminated against in an unjust and unfortunate way. Even worse, the whole Nation itself has suffered and will continue to suffer by reason of the failure earlier to give equitable treatment to the producers of coal. While we need a strong and sound coal industry, taxation has heretofore joined with other instrumentalities for gradually weakening it

Depletion allowances in the tax law are statutory deductions from gross income designed to permit the mine owner to secure a tax-free return of his capital. Coal is a wasting asset. When it is taken out of the ground and sold, the mine owner has lost part of his assets. The proceeds from the sale are in part a reimbursement for the expense of producing the coal, and in part a reimbursement for the capital which he has lost. Obviously, no industry can long endure under the present extremely high tax rates if that industry is not allowed to recover tax-free its expenses of operation. Neither can a coal mine continue to operate if it is not permitted to recover tax-free the capital it has lost by reason of the removal of part of its assets.

For many years the coal industry operated at a loss. For example, the bituminous-coal industry as a whole lost

money in each of the 15 years preceding 1940. In the years following 1940 most coal companies did make a profit but it has been small in relation to investment. The record is such that investment is not attracted to the industry. It is unfortunately true that the principal, if not the sole, source of capital to provide for the future producing capacity of coal, is from the retained earnings and the nonexpended income deductions for depreciation, depletion, and amortization. It can thus be seen why an increase in the depletion allowance to 10 percent would be so hopeful to the coal industry.

Coal is vital to our economic strength in peace and in war. It is indispensable in peace. It is even more important in war. Without it steel cannot be produced. Adequate transportation cannot be maintained. Sufficient steam and electric power cannot be generated. General manufacturing would be paralyzed. The health and safety of the Nation would be endangered. The entire economy of the Nation would collapse.

In peace time coal is our most important source of energy because it supplies about half of our total demands. In a national emergency the needs for coal expand rapidly. The importance of coal is seen from the fact that it takes 6 pounds of coal to make 1 pound of smokeless powder, 2 tons of coal to make a 1-ton bomb, and 220 tons of coal to make a modern tank. Huge tonnages of coal will be needed for the expansion of our electric-power industry and the manufacture of artificial gas. Similarly, steel expansion will put pressure on the supplies of high-grade coking coal. Even beyond these, so well known by everybody, will be the demands for the increased production of chemicals and the expansion of general manufacturing. Railroads and ships will need more coal to haul their greater loads and there will be export demands under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act. Our entire rearmament program could be seriously handicapped by a shortage of coal.

For many years the oil and gas industries in computing their taxable income have been permitted to deduct 27.5 percent of their gross income as a depletion allowance. Coal on the other hand—which has been losing its market to oil and gas—has been allowed to deduct only 5 percent while certain other metals and nonmetals have been allowed either 15 or 23 percent. It has finally become recognized that the 5-percent allowance to coal is of little practical value to the coal industry. The coal industry is peculiarly in need of more favorable tax treatment—instead of discriminatory tax treatment—because of the inroads which alternative sources of energy, particularly oil and gas, have made in the potential markets of coal. Unfortunate though the discrimination has been in the past, the increased rates of tax proposed in the new bill would make that discrimination even more unbearable.

One thing I wish to make clear is that the loss of revenue is much less than a superficial examination might suggest. There is a good possibility that the result may actually mean an increase in revenue. If the result of increased depletion allowances is new capital investment and greater national security—and I argue that that will be one result of increasing the coal depletion allowance—then the Government may well gain rather than lose any revenue by reason of this action. The additional funds available to coal companies will lead to new investment, new research, the opening of more efficient mines, better machinery, etc. But even beyond that, our national security cannot be measured in terms of revenue losses resulting from an increased depletion allowance for coal. Coal is absolutely essential to national security Impediments to a continued guaranteed source of coal should be removed.

Many who look about them have seen coal gradually replaced as a fuel for cooking, for heating, for power. They see the giant Diesels pulling long trains of railroad cars and conclude that coal has become of minor significance in the economic life of the Nation today. It is true that the industry has been hampered by the tax discrimination. Competing fuels have had other advantages as well. But what I wish to make clear is that the great strides forward made by oil and gas have not yet eliminated coal as a fuel. And what is more, this Nation will rue the day that through tax discrimination it forces the closing of coal mines throughout the country while overlooking the fact that oil and gas cannot do the whole job. The coal industry has no quarrel with the oil and gas industry. It simply feels that it should not be discriminated against and rendered so economically unprofitable that it must close down.

Coal can never be entirely replaced by oil and gas. Yet coal has recently been priced out of some markets by oil and gas because of its high production costs. Coal mining today pays higher average hourly earnings than other types of mining and almost any manufacturing industry. In only a few industries demanding highly skilled workers is the wage per hour greater than in coal mining. Because the cost of coal is high, the population is turning more and more to oil and gas, items with definitely limited supply. We are all acquainted with the recent declarations of the inability of the natural gas industry to meet the demands that will be made upon it this year. We should not through preferential tax treatment encourage this diversion from the use of a well-nigh inexhaustible supply of power to an exhaustible one. A recent survey concluded that the estimated fuel reserves of the United States are as follows: Coal, 95.4 percent; oil shale, 3.6 percent; natural gas, 0.5 percent; petroleum, 0.5 percent. We must keep our coal mines at work and make it possible to provide further mechanization and research that will enable them to meet the competition of the tax favored oil and gas industry. An increased depletion allowance is one thing that will help to do just that.

That the coal industry has some life in it still is evidenced by the fact that production in 1950 was about 10 percent greater than in 1949 and production this year will perhaps see another 10-percent rise. However, most of these increases are the direct result of the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. We must continue to think of coal also as a peacetime necessity as well as a faithful servant in time of war. The coal industry must be kept alive in time of peace or it will not be available in time of war. It must be understood that no longer are there coal seams capable of being speedily developed Outcrop underground and open pit mines are very nearly exhausted, and the seams lying in the most favorable older coal-producing areas are believed to be already largely depleted. No longer can we hope to open thousands of small mines to meets a war emergency. We will have to depend on more completely mechanized mines of large capacity. The coal industry needs money to do research toward greater mechanization and to make coal more acceptable to the average consumer. Instruments must be devised to make coal more simple to use, efficient and clean in the home. Greater improvements must be invented to make all operations automatic. More research must be done for cheaper mining of coal and cheaper transportation. More work must be done on coal-burning gas turbines for railway locomotives.

In conclusion, the coal industry has had a very tough road in recent years. All it asks is removal of discrimination. The favored oil and gas industry has replaced it in many particulars as a source of heat and power. We have given great emphasis to the development and rapid exhaustion of a definitely limited supply of oil and gas. The greater expansion of these two sources will result in their more rapid depletion while making less use of a supply of coal still good for hundreds of years. A sounder national policy would be to conserve our more quickly exhaustible oil and gas and make greater use of coal. To accomplish that, coal must be made more attractive both as to price and efficiency. A 10-percent depletion allowance will be one item which will be helpful in making it possible for the coal industry to work toward those goals.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 185, nays 160, answering "present" 7, not voting 76, as follows:

[Roll No. 214]

YEAS—185

Abbitt	Bolling	Chelf
Abernethy	Bonner	Cole, Kans.
Adair	Boykin	Colmer
Addonizio	Bray	Cooley
Albert	Brown, Ga	Cooper
Andersen, H Carl	Brownson	Corbett
Andrews	Bryson	Cotton
Anfuso	Buchanan	Cox
Aspinall	Buckley	Crosser
Bailey	Burleson	Crumpacker
Bakewell	Burnside	Davis, Ga.
Barden	Burton	Davis, Tenn.
Battle	Byrne, N. Y.	Deane
Beamer	Byrnes, Wis.	DeGraffenried
Beckworth	Camp	Denton
Bennett, Fla.	Carlyle	Dingell
Bennett, Mich.	Case	Dollinger
Bentsen	Celler	Dorn
	Chatham	Doughton

Doyle	Jones, Ala.	Patman
Durham	Jones, Mo.	Patten
Eberharter	Jones,	Pickett
Elliott	Hamilton C.	Poage
Ellsworth	Jones,	Polk
Evins	Woodrow W.	Preston
Feighan	Judd	Price
Fernandez	Karsten, Mo.	Priest
Fisher	Kean	Rabaut
Flood	Kee	Rains
Fogarty	Kelly, N. Y.	Ramsay
Forand	Kerr	Reams
Ford	Kilburn	Richards
Forrester	Kilday	Riley
Frazier	King	Rivers
Fugate	Kirwan	Roberts
Gary	Klein	Robeson
Gathings	Kluczynski	Rodino
Gordon	Lanham	Rooney
Gore	Lantaff	Scott,
Grant	Larcade	Hugh D., Jr.
Greenwood	LeCompte	Seely-Brown
Gregory	Lesinski	Smith, Miss.
Hale	Lind	Smith, Va.
Halleck	McCarthy	Spence
Harden	McCormack	Staggers
Hardy	McGrath	Stanley
Harris	McKinnon	Steed
Harrison, Va.	McMullen	Stigler
Hart	Machrowicz	Stockman
Harvey	Mahon	Tackett
Havenner	Merrow	Teague
Hedrick	Mills	Thomas
Heffernan	Morris	Thompson, Tex.
Heller	Morton	Tollefson
Hillings	Multer	Trimble
Holifield	Mumma	Vorys
Holmes	Murdock	Walter
Hope	Murray, Tenn.	Whitaker
Howell	Norblad	Whitten
Hunter	Norrell	Wickersham
Ikard	O'Brien, Ill.	Willis
Jarman	O'Neill	Yates
Javits	O'Toole	Yorty

NAYS—160

Allen, Ill.	Gross	Poulson
Andresen,	Gwinn	Radwan
August H.	Hall,	Rankin
Arends	Edwin Arthur	Reece, Tenn.
Auchincloss	Hall,	Reed, Ill.
Ayres	Leonard W.	Reed, N. Y.
Baker	Hand	Rees, Kans.
Barrett	Harrison, Wyo.	Rhodes
Bates, Mass.	Hays, Ohio	Rogers, Colo.
Beall	Herter	Rogers, Mass.
Belcher	Heselton	Rogers, Tex.
Bender	Hill	Sadlak
Berry	Hoeven	St. George
Betts	Hoffman, Ill.	Saylor
Bishop	Hoffman, Mich	Schwabe
Blatnik	Horan	Scott, Hardie
Boggs, Del.	Hull	Scrivner
Bolton	Jackson, Wash.	Scudder
Bow	James	Secrest
Brehm	Jenison	Shafer
Budge	Jenkins	Sheehan
Buffett	Jensen	Short
Burdick	Jonas	Simpson, Ill.
Bush	Kearns	Simpson, Pa.
Butler	Keating	Sittler
Canfield	Kersten, Wis.	Smith, Kans.
Cannon	Lane	Smith, Wis.
Carnahan	Lovre	Springer
Chenoweth	McConnell	Taber
Chiperfield	McCulloch	Talle
Chudoff	McGregor	Taylor
Church	McGuire	Thompson,
Clevenger	McMillan	Mich.
Coudert	McVey	Vail
Cunningham	Mack, Wash.	Van Pelt
Curtis, Mo	Madden	Van Zandt
Curtis, Nebr.	Magee	Velde
Denny	Marshall	Vursell
Devereux	Martin, Mass.	Weichel
Donohue	Meader	Welch
Donovan	Miller, Md.	Wharton
Eaton	Miller, Nebr.	Wheeler
Elston	Miller, N. Y.	Widnall
Fallon	Morano	Wier
Fenton	Morgan	Wigglesworth
Fulton	Moulder	Williams, Miss.
Furcolo	Nelson	Williams, N. Y.
Gamble	Nicholson	Wilson, Ind.
Garmatz	O'Brien, Mich.	Winstead
Gavin	O'Hara	Withrow
George	O'Konski	Wolcott
Goodwin	Ostertag	Wolverton
Graham	Patterson	Wood, Idaho
Granahan	Philbin	Woodruff
Green	Potter	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7

Clemente	Mason	Sutton
Dolliver	Mitchell	
Hinshaw	Riehlman	

NOT VOTING—76

Aandahl	Fine	Passman
Allen, Calif.	Golden	Perkins
Allen, La.	Granger	Phillips
Anderson, Calif.	Hagen	Powell
Angell	Hays, Ark.	Prouty
Armstrong	Hébert	Quinn
Baring	Herlong	Redden
Bates, Ky.	Hess	Regan
Blackney	Irving	Ribicoff
Boggs, La.	Jackson, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.
Bosone	Johnson	Roosevelt
Bramblett	Kearney	Sabath
Brooks	Kelley, Pa.	Sasscer
Brown, Ohio	Kennedy	Shelley
Busbey	Keogh	Sheppard
Cole, N. Y.	Latham	Sieminski
Combs	Lucas	Sikes
Crawford	Lyle	Thornberry
Dague	McDonough	Vinson
Davis, Wis.	Mack, Ill.	Watts
Dawson	Mansfield	Werdel
Delaney	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Tex.
Dempsey	Miller, Calif.	Wood, Ga.
D'Ewart	Morrison	Zablocki
Dondero	Murphy	
Engle	Murray, Wis.	

So the conference report was agreed to

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr Granger for, with Mr. Mansfield against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against

Mr Lyle for, with Mr. Hinshaw against.

Mr. Fine for, with Mr. Riehlman against.

Mr Prouty for, with Mr. Anderson of California against

Mr. Allen of California for, with Mr. Hagen against.

Mr Davis of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Dondero against.

Mr. Hays of Arkansas for, with Mr. Hess against

Mr. Engle for, with Mr. Werdel against.

Mr. Rogers of Florida for, with Mr. Clemente against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr Phillips against.

Mr. Hébert for with Mr. McDonough against

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr Busbey against.

Mr. Zablocki for, with Mr Martin of Iowa against.

Mr Keogh for, with Mr. Dempsey against.

Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Quinn against

Mr Sieminski for, with Mr Delaney against.

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana for, with Mr. Angell against

Mr Miller of California for, with Mr. Kearney against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Mitchell against.

Mr. Sabath for, with Mr. Sutton against.

Mr Combs for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr Thornberry for, with Mr. Dolliver against

Mr. Bates of Kentucky for, with Mr. Regan against

Until further notice:

Mr. Perkins with Mr Blackney.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Jackson of California.

Mr Murphy with Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Johnson.

Mrs Bosone with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Bramblett.

Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Redden with Mr. D'Ewart.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Dague.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Golden.

Mr. Dawson with Mr. Aandahl.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Florida, Mr. ROGERS. If present the gentleman would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Florida, Mr. HERLONG. If present he would have voted "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. SABATH. I voted "nay." If the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. SABATH, were present he would have voted "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in this roll call I voted a resounding "nay." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. COMBS. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I therefore recall my vote and answer "present."

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LYLE. If present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on this roll call I voted "nay." I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York, Mr. FINE. If present he would have voted "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with my colleague from Texas, Mr. THORNBERRY who is absent because of illness in his family. I voted "nay" on this roll call. Mr. THORNBERRY, if present, would have voted "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. EATON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5684) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. GARY, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. CANNON, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. COUDERT, and Mr. TABER.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT AMENDMENTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3669) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was on objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1215)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R 3669) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That section 1 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting in the last sentence of subsection (f) thereof the phrase 'one hundred twenty-six' for the phrase 'fifty-four' and by adding after subsection (p) thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(q) The terms "Social Security Act" and "Social Security Act, as amended" shall mean the Social Security Act as amended in 1950.'

"SEC. 2 Subsection (a) of section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting in the first sentence thereof, after 'enactment date,' the following 'and shall have completed ten years of service,'; and by inserting in the first sentence of paragraph 5 of said subsection a period after the phrase 'regular employment' and striking out all of that sentence following that phrase.

"SEC. 3 Subsection (c) of section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase 'sixty days', the phrase 'six months'.

"SEC 4 Section 4 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase 'sixty days' in subsection (k) thereof the phrase 'six months'.

"SEC 5 Section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by adding after subsection (d) thereof the following new subsections:

"'(e) Spouse's annuity: The spouse of an individual, if—

"'(i) such individual has been awarded an annuity under subsection (a) or a pension under section 6 and has attained the age of 65, and

"'(ii) such spouse has attained the age of 65 or in the case of a wife, has in her care (individually or jointly with her husband) a child who, if her husband were then to die, would be entitled to a child's annuity under subsection (c) of section 5 of this Act,

shall be entitled to a spouse's annuity equal to one-half of such individual's annuity or pension, but not more than $40: *Provided, however,* That if the annuity of the individual is awarded under paragraph 3 of subsection (a), the spouse's annuity shall be computed or recomputed as though such individual had been awarded the annuity to which he would have been entitled under paragraph 1 of said subsection: *Provided further,* That, if the annuity of the individual is awarded pursuant to a joint and survivor election, the spouse's annuity shall be computed or recomputed as though such individual had not made a joint and survivor election: *And provided further,* That any spouse's annuity shall be reduced by the amount of any annuity and the amount of any monthly insurance benefit, other than a wife's or husband's insurance benefit, to which such spouse is entitled, or on proper application would be entitled, under subsection (a) of this section or subsection (d) of section 5 of this Act or section 202 of the Social Security Act; except that if such spouse is disentitled to a wife's or husband's insurance benefit, or has had such benefit reduced, by reason of subsection (k) of section 202 of the Social Security Act, the reduction pursuant to this third proviso shall be only in the amount by which such spouse's monthly insurance benefit under said Act exceeds the wife's or husband's insurance benefit to which such spouse would have been entitled under that Act but for said subsection (k).

"'(f) For the purposes of this Act, the term "spouse" shall mean the wife or husband of a retirement annuitant or pensioner who (i) was married to such annuitant or pensioner for a period of not less than three years immediately preceding the day on which the application for a spouse's annuity is filed, or is the parent of such annuitant's or pensioner's son or daughter, if, as of the day on which the application for a spouse's annuity is filed, such wife or husband and such annuitant or pensioner were members of the same household, or such wife or husband was receiving regular contributions from such annuitant or pensioner toward her or his support, or such annuitant or pensioner has been ordered by any court to contribute to the support of such wife or husband; and (ii) in the case of a husband, was receiving at least one-half of his support from his wife at the time his wife's retirement annuity or pension began

"'(g) The spouse's annuity provided in subsection (e) shall, with respect to any month, be subject to the same provisions of subsection (d) as the individual's annuity, and, in addition, the spouse's annuity shall not be payable for any month if the individual's annuity is not payable for such month (or, in the case of a pensioner, would not be payable if the pension were an annuity) by reason of the provisions of said subsection (d) Such spouse's annuity shall cease at the end of the month preceding the month in which (i) the spouse or the individual dies, (ii) the spouse and the individual are absolutely divorced, or (iii), in the case of a wife under age 65, she no longer has in her care a child who, if her husband were then to die, would be entitled to an annuity under subsection (c) of section 5 of this Act.'

"SEC. 6. Subsection (a) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by changing '2 40' to '2.76', '1.80' to '2.07', and '1.20' to '1.38'.

"SEC. 7. Subsection (b) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out all of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following paragraph.

"'The retirement annuity or pension of an individual, and the annuity of his spouse, if any, shall be reduced, beginning with the month in which such individual is, or on proper application would be, entitled to an old age insurance benefit under the Social Security Act, as follows: (i) in the case of the individual's retirement annuity, by that portion of such annuity which is based on his years of service and compensation before 1937, or by the amount of such old age insurance benefit, whichever is less, (ii) in the case of the individual's pension, by the amount of such old age insurance benefit, and (iii) in the case of the spouse's annuity, to one-half the individual's retirement annuity or pension as reduced pursuant to clause (i) or clause (ii) of this paragraph: *Provided, however,* That, in the case of any individual receiving or entitled to receive an annuity or pension on the day prior to the date of enactment of this paragraph, the reductions required by this paragraph shall not operate to reduce the sum of (A) the retirement annuity or pension of the individual, (B) the spouse's annuity, if any, and (C) the benefits under the Social Security Act which the individual and his family receive or are entitled to receive on the basis of his wages, to an amount less than such sum was before the enactment of this paragraph.'

"SEC. 8. Subsection (e) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out the phrase 'and not less than five years of service'; by changing the phrase 'subsection 2 (a) (3)' to 'section 2 (a) 3 or the last paragraph of section 3 (b)'; by changing '3.60' to '$4.14', and '$60' to '$69'; and by changing the period at the end of the subsection to a colon and inserting after the colon the following: *'Provided, however,* That if for any entire month in which an annuity accrues and is payable under this Act the annuity to which an employee is entitled under this Act (or would have been entitled except for a reduction pursuant to section 2 (a) 3 or a joint and survivor election), together with his or her spouse's annuity, if any, or the total of survivor annuities under this Act deriving from the same employee, is less than the amount, or the additional amount, which would have been payable to all persons for such month under the Social Security Act (deeming completely and partially insured individuals to be fully and currently insured, respectively, and disregarding any possible deductions under subsections (f) and (g) (2) of section 203 thereof) if such employee's service as an employee after December 31, 1936, were included in the term "employment" as defined in that Act and quarters of coverage were determined in accordance with section (5) (1) (4) of this Act, such annuity or annuities, shall be increased proportionately to a total of such amount or such additional amount.'

"SEC. 9. Section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out subsection (h) thereof.

"SEC 10. Subsection (i) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by redesignating it as subsection (h).

"SEC 11. Subsection (a) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting 'and Widower's' after 'Widow's'; by inserting 'or widower' after 'widow'; by inserting 'or his' after 'her', by inserting 'or he' after 'she', by striking out the phrase 'three-fourths of', and by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon, and by inserting after the colon the following: *'Provided, however,* That if in the month preceding the employee's death the spouse of such employee was entitled to a spouse's annuity under subsection (e) of section 2 in an amount greater than the widow's or widower's insurance annuity, the widow's or widower's insurance annuity shall be increased to such greater amount.'

"SEC. 12. Subsection (b) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out the phrase 'three-fourths of'; and by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and inserting after the colon the following: *'Provided, however,* That if in the month preceding the employee's death the spouse of such employee was entitled to a spouse's annuity under subsection (e) of section 2 in an amount greater than the widow's current insurance annuity, the widow's current insurance annuity shall be increased to such greater amount.'

"SEC. 13. Subsection (c) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase 'one-half' the phrase 'two-thirds.'

"SEC. 14. Subsection (d) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting, ', no widower,' after 'widow'; and by substituting for the phrase 'one-half' the phrase 'two-thirds.'

"SEC. 15. Subsection (e) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting for the phrase 'one-half' the phrase 'two-thirds.'

"SEC. 16. Subsection (f) (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting 'widower,' after the phrase 'widow,' where this phrase first appears in the first sentence, and after

the phrase 'widow,' wherever this phrase appears in the fourth sentence, and by substituting in the first sentence for the word 'eight' the word 'ten.'

"SEC. 17. Subsection (f) (2) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting ', widower,' after the word 'widow' wherever this word appears, by inserting 'or her' after the words 'his' and 'him' wherever these words appear; by inserting immediately before ', or to others' in the first sentence the following: ', and to others deriving from him or her, during his or her life,', by changing the period at the end of said subsection to a comma and by inserting after the comma the following: 'except that the deductions of the benefits which, pursuant to subsection (k) (1) of this section, are paid under section 202 of the Social Security Act, during the life of the employee to him or to her and to others deriving from him or her, shall be limited to such portions of such benefits as are payable solely by reason of the inclusion of service as an employee in "employment" pursuant to said subsection (k) (1).'

"SEC. 18. Subsection (g) (2) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) If an individual is entitled to more than one annuity for a month under this section, such individual shall be entitled only to that one of such annuities for a month which is equal to or exceeds any other such annuity. If an individual is entitled to an annuity for a month under this section and is entitled, or would be so entitled on proper application therefor, for such month to an insurance benefit under section 202 of the Social Security Act, the annuity of such individual for such month under this section shall be only in the amount by which it exceeds such insurance benefit. If an individual is entitled to an annuity for a month under this section and also to a retirement annuity, the annuity of such individual for a month under this section shall be only in the amount by which it exceeds such retirement annuity.

"'(3) In the case of any individual receiving or entitled to receive an annuity under this section on the day prior to the date of enactment of the provisions of this paragraph, the application of paragraph (2) of this subsection to such individual shall not operate to reduce the sum of (A) the annuity under this section of such individual, (B) the retirement annuity, if any, of such individual, and (C) the benefits under the Social Security Act which such individual receives or is entitled to receive, to an amount less than such sum was before the enactment of the provisions of this paragraph.'

"SEC. 19. Subsection (h) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(h) Maximum and minimum annuity totals: Whenever according to the provisions of this section as to annuities, payable for a month with respect to the death of an employee, the total of annuities is more than $30 and exceeds either (a) $160, or (b) an amount equal to two and two-thirds times such employee's basic amount, whichever of such amounts is the lesser, such total of annuities shall, prior to any deductions under subsection (i), be reduced to such lesser amount or to $30, whichever is greater. Whenever such total of annuities is less than $14, such total shall, prior to any deductions under subsection (i), be increased to $14.'

"SEC. 20. Subdivision (ii) of paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended, by substituting '$50' for '$25'.

"SEC. 21. Subsection (j) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out all of the third sentence thereof after the phrase 'the month in which' (including the proviso), and substituting the following: 'eligibility therefor was otherwise acquired, but not earlier than the first day of the sixth month before the month in which the application was filed.'

"SEC. 22. (a) Paragraph (1) of subsection (k) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting '(i)' after the word 'determining' and by inserting in said paragraph after the word 'Act' where it first appears the following: 'to an employee who will have completed less than ten years of service and to others deriving from him or her during his or her life and with respect to his or her death, and lump-sum death payments with respect to the death of such employee, and (ii) insurance benefits with respect to the death of an employee who will have completed ten years of service'; by striking in said paragraph after '1947,' the following: 'to a widow, parent, or surviving child,'; by inserting before the word 'occurring' the phrase 'of such an employee', by inserting after the phrase 'such date' the following: ', and for the purposes of section 203 of that Act'; by substituting in said paragraph '210 (a) (10)' for '209 (b) (9)'; and by inserting at the end of such paragraph (1) the following sentence: 'In the application of the Social Security Act pursuant to this paragraph to service as an employee, all service as defined in section 1 (c) of this Act shall be deemed to have been performed within the United States.'

"(b) Subsection (k) (2) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by substituting the following:

"'(2) (A) The Board and the Federal Security Administrator shall determine, no later than January 1, 1954, the amount which would place the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund (hereafter termed "Trust Fund") in the same position in which it would have been at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, if service as an employee after December 31, 1936, had been included in the term "employment" as defined in the Social Security Act and in the Federal Insurance Contributions Act.

"'(B) On January 1, 1954, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and at the close of each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, the Board and the Federal Security Administrator shall determine, and the Board shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for transfer from the Railroad Retirement Account (hereafter termed "Retirement Account") to the Trust Fund, interest for such fiscal year at the rate specified in subparagraph (D) on the amount determined under subparagraph (A) less the sum of all offsets made under subparagraph (C).

"'(C) At the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Board and the Federal Security Administrator shall determine the amount, if any, which if added to or subtracted from the Trust Fund would place such Trust Fund in the same position in which it would have been if service as an employee after December 31, 1936, had been included in the term "employment" as defined in the Social Security Act and in the Federal Insurance Contributions Act. For the purposes of this subparagraph, the amount determined under subparagraph (A), less such offsets as have theretofore been made under this subparagraph, and the amount determined under subparagraph (B) for the fiscal year under consideration shall be deemed to be part of the Trust Fund. Such determination shall be made no later than June 15, following the close of the fiscal year. If such amount is to be added to the Trust Fund, the Board shall, within ten days after the determination, certify such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury for transfer from the Retirement Account to the Trust Fund; if such amount is to be subtracted from the Trust Fund, the Administrator shall, within ten days after the determination, certify such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury for transfer from the Trust Fund to the Retirement Account. The amount so certified shall further include interest (at the rate determined in subparagraph (D) for the fiscal year under consideration) payable from the close of such fiscal year until the date of certification. In the event the Administrator is required under the provisions of this subparagraph to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury an amount to be transferred to the Retirement Account from the Trust Fund, the Administrator, in lieu of such certification, may offset the amount determined under the first sentence of this subparagraph against the amount determined in subparagraph (A), as diminished by any prior offsets and the offset shall be made to be effective as of the first day of the fiscal year following the fiscal year under consideration.

"'(D) For the purposes of subparagraphs (B) and (C), for any fiscal year, the rate of interest to be used shall be equal to the average rate of interest, computed as of May 31 preceding the close of such fiscal year, borne by all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt, except that where such average rate is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum, the rate of interest shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum next lower than such average rate.

"'(E) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer to the Trust Fund from the Retirement Account or to the Retirement Account from the Trust Fund, as the case may be, such amounts as, from time to time, may be determined by the Board and the Federal Security Administrator pursuant to the provisions of subparagraph (B) and (C) of this subsection, and certified by the Board or the Administrator for transfer from the Retirement Account or from the Trust Fund.'

"SEC. 23. (a) (1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (l) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting '"widower",' after '"widow",' where this word first appears, by substituting '216 (c), (e), and (g)' for '209 (j) and (k)', and by substituting '202 (h)' for '202 (f)'

"(2) The said paragraph (1) is further amended by striking out subdivision (i) thereof and inserting in lieu of such subdivision the following:

"'(i) a "widow" or "widower" shall have been living with the employee at the time of the employee's death; a widower shall have received at least one-half of his support from his wife employee at the time of her death or he shall have received at least one-half of his support from his wife employee at the time her retirement annuity or pension began.'

"(3) The said paragraph (1) is further amended by inserting in subdivision (ii) after the phrase 'such death' the following: 'by other than a step parent, grand parent, aunt, or uncle'; and by amending subdivision (iii) to read as follows: '(iii) a "parent" shall have received, at the time of the death of the employee to whom the relationship of parent is claimed, at least one-half of his support from such employee.'.

"(4) Paragraph (1) of the said subsection (l) is further amended by substituting for all the matter which follows subdivision (iii) the following: 'A "widow" or "widower" shall be deemed to have been living with the employee if the conditions set forth in section 216 (h) (2) or (3), whichever is applicable, of the Social Security Act are fulfilled. A "child" shall be deemed to have been dependent upon a parent if the conditions set forth in section 202 (d) (3), (4), or (5) of the Social Security Act are fulfilled (a partially insured mother being

deemed currently insured). In determining for purposes of this section and subsection (f) of section 2 whether an applicant is the wife, husband, widow, widower, child, or parent of an employee as claimed, the rules set forth in section 216 (h) (1) of the Social Security Act shall be applied;'.

"(b) Paragraph (4) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting after the table the following: 'If upon computation of the compensation quarters of coverage in accordance with the above table an employee is found to lack a completely or partially insured status which he would have if compensation paid in a calendar year were presumed to have been paid in equal proportions with respect to all months in the year in which the employee will have been in service as an employee, such presumption shall be made'

"(c) Paragraph (6) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(6) The term "wages" shall mean wages as defined in section 209 of the Social Security Act (except that for the purposes of section 5 (i) (1) (ii) of this Act such wages shall be determined without regard to subsection (a) of said section 209). In addition, the term shall include (i) "self-employment income" as defined in section 211 (b) of the Social Security Act (and in determining "self-employment income" the "net earnings from self-employment" shall be determined as provided in section 211 (a) of such Act and charged to correspond with the provisions of section 203 (e) of such Act), and (ii) wages deemed to have been paid under section 217 (a) of the Social Security Act on account of military service which is not creditable under section 4 of this Act'

"(d) Paragraph (7) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting before the word 'had' the phrase 'completed ten years of service and will have', and by inserting in the parenthetical phrase in subdivision (1), after the word 'quarter' the following: 'which is not a quarter of coverage and'.

"(e) Paragraph (8) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(8) An employee will have been "partially insured" at the time of his death, whether before or after the enactment of this section, if it appears to the satisfaction of the Board that he will have completed ten years of service and will have had (i) a current connection with the railroad industry, and (ii) six or more quarters of coverage in the period ending with the quarter in which he will have died or in which a retirement annuity will have begun to accrue to him and beginning with the third calendar year next preceding the year in which such event occurs.'

"(f) Paragraph (9) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by changing the language before the first proviso to read as follows:

"'(9) An employee's "average monthly remuneration" shall mean the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the sum of (i) the compensation paid to him after 1936 and before the quarter in which he will have died, eliminating any excess over $300 for any calendar month, and (ii) if such compensation for any calendar year is less than $3,600 and the average monthly remuneration computed on compensation alone is less than $300 and the employee has earned in such calendar year "wages" as defined in paragraph (6) hereof, such wages, in an amount not to exceed the difference between the compensation for such year and $3,600, by (B) three times the number of quarters elapsing after 1936 and before the quarter in which he will have died:'; by inserting in the second proviso after the word 'quarter' the following: 'which is not a quarter of coverage and'; and by changing the period at the end of said proviso to a colon and adding the following: '*And provided further*, That if the exclusion from the divisor of all quarters beginning with the first quarter in which the employee was completely insured and had attained the age of 65 and the exclusion from the dividend of all compensation and wages with respect to such quarters would result in a higher average monthly remuneration, such quarters, compensation and wages shall be so excluded'

"(g) Paragraph (10) of subsection (1) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 as amended, is amended by substituting '$300' for '$250' and '$14' for '$10'.

"SEC 24 Section 17 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out 'subsection (b) of'.

"EFFECTIVE DATES

"SEC 25. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided the amendments made by this Act shall take effect with respect to benefits accruing under the Railroad Retirement Acts and the Social Security Act after the last day of the month in which this Act is enacted, irrespective of when service or employment occurred or compensation or wages were earned: *Provided, however*, That, in the recomputation pursuant to this Act of survivor annuities heretofore awarded, the basic amount shall not be recomputed

"(b) The amendments made by sections 3, 4, and 21 of this Act shall apply to benefits awarded in whole or in part on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

"(c) The amendments made by sections 16 and 17 of this Act shall take effect with respect to deaths occurring on or after the date of enactment of this Act

"(d) In the case of any retirement or survivor annuity awarded under the Railroad Retirement Acts prior to the date of enactment of this Act and currently payable, if such annuity was awarded to, or with respect to the death of, any individual who has completed less than ten years of service, then the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to such annuity as if such individual had met the requirement of ten years of service which is imposed as a condition to benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended by this Act. In addition, the spouse of any such individual shall not, during such individual's lifetime, be barred from a spouse's annuity under such Act by reason of the fact that such individual has completed less than ten years of service

"(e) Where the parent of a deceased employee has, prior to the date of enactment of this Act, been awarded a survivor annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act which is currently payable, the entitlement of such parent to a survivor's annuity in accordance with the amendments made by this Act shall be determined without regard to whether or not such employee died leaving a "widow" or "widower", as defined in this Act.

"(f) All joint and survivor annuities heretofore and hereafter awarded shall be governed by the law under which the election of the joint and survivor annuity was made, except that the individual who made the election shall have the right to revoke the same in such manner and form as the Board may prescribe

"An election shall be deemed to have been revoked if before or after the enactment hereof the spouse for whom the election was made predeceased the individual who made the election. Upon revocation of the election, or death of the spouse, as herein provided, the individual's annuity shall be increased to the amount which would have been payable had no election been made, such increased annuity shall, subject to the provisions of section 2 (c) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, begin to accrue on the first of the calendar month following the calendar month in which the election was revoked or the spouse died but not before the calendar month next following the month of enactment hereof.

"(g) All pensions due in months following the first calendar month after the month of enactment hereof, shall be increased by 15 per centum.

"(h) The increase in retirement annuities provided by this Act shall apply also to annuities heretofore awarded under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935, and the term 'spouse' as used in this Act shall include the wife or husband of an employee who has been awarded an annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 The provisions of this Act shall not apply to annuities heretofore paid under the Railroad Retirement Acts in lump sums equal to their commuted values.

"(i) The annuity of the spouse of an employee who has been awarded an annuity under section 3 (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 or under section 2 (a) 2 (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 prior to its amendment by Public Law 572, 79th Congress, shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, be one-half the annuity such employee would have received had the annuity been awarded at age sixty-five

"(j) All recertifications by the Railroad Retirement Board required by reason of the provisions of this Act other than section 9 shall be made without application therefor. Recertifications pursuant to section 9 of this Act shall be made only upon application therefor in such manner and form, and filed within such time as the Railroad Retirement Board may prescribe

"AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

"SEC 26 Section 1 (k) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by adding before the period at the end of the first paragraph thereof the following '*Provided further*, That any calendar day on which no remuneration is payable to or accrues to an employee solely because of the application to him of mileage or work restrictions agreed upon in schedule agreements between employers and employees or solely because he is standing by for or laying over between regularly assigned trips or tours of duty shall not be considered either a day of unemployment or a day of sickness'

"SEC. 27 Subsection (a-1) of section 4 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by striking out all of subdivisions (iii) and (iv) thereof.

"SEC. 28 The provisions of sections 26 and 27 of this Act shall become effective with respect to registration periods beginning on and after January 1, 1952"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and for other purposes."

ROBERT CROSSER,
LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAUL DOUGLAS,
LISTER HILL,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
WAYNE MORSE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3669) to amend

the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill strikes out all of the House bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment for both the House bill and the Senate amendment, and that the Senate agree to the same.

The differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted in the following outline, except for incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees and minor and clarifying changes

TRANSFER OF EMPLOYEES WITH LESS THAN 10 YEARS OF SERVICE TO SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill provided that workers with less than 10 years of railroad service at the time of retirement, and the survivors of workers with less than 10 years of railroad service, should draw their benefits from the Social Security system rather than from the railroad retirement system. The bill as passed the House did not contain these provisions. The conference substitute follows the provisions of the Senate amendment.

$300 A MONTH TAX BASE

The bill as passed the House made no change in the tax base for purposes of determining the tax to be levied on employer and employee under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act; that is, the tax continued to be applicable with respect to only so much of the compensation in a month as did not exceed $300. The Senate amendment to the text of the bill changed this so as to make taxable, beginning January 1, 1952, so much of the compensation in a month as did not exceed $350. The conference substitute follows the House bill in this respect and makes no change in the tax base.

$300 A MONTH CREDIT PROVISION

The Senate amendment coupled with its change in tax base a change in the amount of compensation which could be credited in computing annuities under the Railroad Retirment Act, raising the maximum amount of creditable compensation in any one month from $300 to $350. This amendment would have been effective with respect to service after December 31, 1951. The bill as passed the House contained no comparable provision for increasing the maximum creditable monthly compensation. Since the conference substitute made no change in the tax base, it follows the House bill with respect to the maximum creditable monthly compensation.

PROVISIONS RELATING TO DUPLICATION OF BENEFITS

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill contained certain technical provisions relating to the adjustment of benefits applicable in the case of an individual entitled to two or more benefits, either under the Railroad Retirement Act alone, or under that Act and the Social Security Act. The bill as passed the House did not contain these provisions. The conference substitute follows the language of the Senate in this respect

GUARANTEE THAT BENEFITS WILL BE NOT LESS THAN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

The bill as passed the House provided a guarantee, for employees with not less than 10 years of railroad service and a current connection with the railroad system (and for the survivors of such employees), that the benefits which they received under the railroad retirement system would be not less than they would have received if their railroad service had been creditable under the Social Security system. The Senate amendment to the text contained a similar provision, but contained no requirement that there be a current connection. The conference substitute follows the Senate amendment in this respect.

REVOCATION OF JOINT AND SURVIVOR ELECTIONS

The bill as passed the House contained a provision under which a retirement annuitant who had made a joint and survivor election would have the right to revoke that election. The House bill further provided that any joint and survivor election would be automatically deemed to have been revoked if the spouse in whose favor the election was made should have predeceased the individual making the election. The Senate amendment contained the provision relating to the automatic revocation in case the spouse predeceased the individual making the election, but it contained no provision establishing a right to revoke. The conference substitute adopts the language of the bill as passed the House in this respect.

RECOMPUTATION OF ANNUITIES PREVIOUSLY AWARDED

The Senate amendment struck out section 3 (h) of the Railroad Retirement Act, thereby making possible the recomputation of an annuity which had been previously awarded on the basis of additional creditable service and compensation accumulated after the annuity had begun to accrue. The bill as passed the House contained no such provision. The conference substitute adopts the language of the Senate amendment.

WIDOWER'S AGE-65 ANNUITY

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill provided an annuity for the widower of a deceased railroad employee, where such widower had attained 65 years of age and had been receiving at least one-half of his support from his wife employee at the time of her retirement or death. The bill as passed the House contained no such provision. The conference substitute follows the language of the Senate amendment in this respect.

ADJUSTMENTS BETWEEN THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACCOUNT AND THE FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND

The bill as passed the House did not provide for any adjustments between the Railroad Retirement Account and the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund. The Senate amendment to the text provided for annual financial adjustments between these two funds, with the first such adjustment being made at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 The language of the Senate amendment was designed to establish the principle that the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund should be maintained in the same position it would have been in if there had been no separate railroad retirement system The conference substitute follows the language of the Senate amendment on this point.

AMENDMENT TO THE TITLE

The amendment to the title agreed to in conference conforms the title to the changes embodied in the conference substitute.

ROBERT CROSSER,
LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the part of the two Houses have agreed on a bill in regard to the Railroad Retirement Act amendments, H. R. 3669. Personally, I am not altogether satisfied, as I rather imagine you would expect. It is, however, better to some extent than what we had, and I believe always in making whatever progress we can at the moment.

No lengthy speech is required from me to tell you how badly I am disappointed. I think it was a very great blunder on the part of the House that they acted as they did. I think the Members will find sooner or later that the issues dealt with in H. R. 3669, which was a very carefully worked out bill, will come back to bother them again. That bill not only provided benefits as far as we could reasonably do so, but it also provided revenue to the full extent necessary. The House saw fit to disregard our recommendations in that respect, however, and we, of course, submit to the will of the House.

I think this is better than having a man go on without any relief at all, and perhaps a little later we can do something better.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pleasure and extreme satisfaction that I come before the House this afternoon as one of the conferees on the bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and report that an agreement has been reached. I am sure it is also gratifying to the membership of this House to know that we are presenting to you a conference report that meets with the general approval of all interested parties.

I wish to compliment all who have worked so sincerely, so honestly, and so ably in an effort to present to this House legislation that will prove helpful to the beneficiaries under the Railroad Retirement Act.

While there have been differences of opinion at times between some of the railroad brotherhoods as to the approach in this matter, while there have been differences of opinion in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and while there have been differences of opinion in the House, yet, as a result of our endeavors, we bring before you today this conference report which represents general approval of the different brotherhoods as well as the unanimous approval of your conferees of both Senate and House. Therefore we present to you a conference report that meets with such general approval of all interested parties that it can be supported, in my opinion, by the membership of this House regardless of what may have previously been individual views with respect to any of the questions that were in controversy.

It is my intention to ask for a roll-call vote on the adoption of the report in order that the membership of this House may have the opportunity of demonstrating to those who are interested in this matter that the House is unanimously in favor of granting relief to the pensioners, to the annuitants, and to the survivors of retired railroad workers.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I would like to take this opportunity to pay a sincere compliment to the gentleman from New Jersey.

He and I have not always seen eye to eye in all matters concerning railroad affairs, but I wish to state publicly that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] has always tried to do the very best for the railroad men that he could. I consider he has accomplished a magnificent effort in this recent legislation, and I wish to compliment him for the fine results that have come from the conference committee for which he in large part is responsible.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Is this report a unanimous report?

Mr. WOLVERTON. It is a unanimous report May I say in reply to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] that I want to pay a compliment to all members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Never have they worked harder, more sincerely and with more conviction and with a greater desire to accomplish results that would be worthwhile and beneficial to our retired railroad workers and their survivors than they have with respect to this legislation. It has been a pleasure to be associated with a group that has worked so zealously and with such great ability and sincerity of purpose as has characterized the members of the committee, and to which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] has contributed so much in attaining the present results.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Has this conference report been agreed to and is it acceptable to the operating as well as the non-operating brotherhoods?

Mr. WOLVERTON. There has been no voice raised against it, to my knowledge. On the other hand, every voice I have heard has been raised in favor of it.

Mr. FULTON. Have there been any voices of the nonoperating brotherhoods raised specifically agreeing to it?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Yes. Now, let me inform the membership as to what is contained in this conference report.

The bill as reported by the conference committee retains practically all the provisions of the bill passed by the House and adds thereto certain provisions contained in the bill passed by the Senate. Its only omissions are from the bill passed by the Senate. The following are the principal features of the bill passed by the House, all of which have been retained in the bill reported by the conferees:

First. It provides for uniform increases of 15 percent in retirement annuities and pensions, 33⅓ percent in survivor annuities, and 25 percent in lump-sum death payments.

Second. It fixes the benefits payable under the Social Security Act as the minimum for corresponding benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act.

Third. It provides for credit for railroad service after age 65 in the computation of benefits.

Fourth. It provides for supplementing the annuity of a retired employee by an annuity to his wife when both are 65 or more years of age, the supplemental annuity to the wife being equal to one-half the annuity of the retired employee subject to a maximum of $40 per month.

Fifth. It provides for the payment of survivor annuities to widowers in the same amounts as are payable to widows.

In addition to the foregoing provisions which were retained from the bill as passed by the House, the bill as reported by the conferees retains the provisions of the bill as passed by the Senate establishing an arrangement between the railroad retirement system and the Social Security System in the nature of a reinsurance of the risks of the former by the latter. Under this arrangement, there will be transferred to the social-security trust fund such part of the taxes collected for the support of the railroad retirement system as equals the taxes that would have been paid under social security if railroad employment had been covered thereby. In return for the amount thus transferred to it, Social Security will assume all responsibility for the payment of benefits to railroad employees who at time of retirement or at time of death have less than 10 years of railroad service, and in addition will reimburse the railroad retirement fund for such portion of all benefits paid under the railroad retirement system as equals the benefits which would have been payable under the Social Security Act if railroad employment had been covered thereby. The actuaries of the Railroad Retirement Board estimate that this arrangement will result in a net saving to the railroad retirement system of about $95,000,000 a year.

The bill as reported by the conferees omits the provision contained in the bill passed by the Senate increasing taxes on both the railroads and railroad employees for the support of the railroad retirement system by raising the taxable compensation from $300 per month to $350.

The bill as reported by the conferees also retains a provision contained in the bills as passed both by the House and Senate which makes a technical amendment to the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to remove a restriction on the payment of unemployment and sickness benefits applicable only to certain classes of employees and which the operating employees regard without this amendment as highly discriminatory against them. The amendment eliminates this inequity.

It will also be noted that the bill does not contain the proposed $50 per month limitation work clause, that would have denied to retired workers the right to earn more than $50 per month while receiving an annuity. This provision was not acceptable to either House or Senate. Consequently, a retired worker can continue to earn as much as he can after retirement from railroad service without forfeiting his retirement annuity.

Now, let me explain in a few minutes just what was in conference. The bill that was passed here 2 days ago, known as the Harris compromise bill, was offered as a compromise between the Senate bill and the so-called Hall bill. It adopted many of the Senate provisions. This was done in an effort to compromise with the Senate. It was done because we realized the remaining days of the session were short, and we must come as nearly as possible to an agreement if we were to get any legislation whatsoever for these people who are in such great need. Therefore when we went into conference there were really only two questions to be considered. One was whether to adopt the integration language in the Senate bill or that which was provided in the House bill and, second, whether there should be any increase in the tax base. After consideration of these matters your conferees agreed to accept the language of the Senate bill with respect to integration of the Railroad Retirement Act with social security in a manner that would not prove a detriment to either the railroad worker or the railroad retirement fund. And the Senate conferees agreed to accept the House version that there should be no increase above the present $300 base for tax purposes. This brought us together. It resulted in a unanimous conference report.

In conclusion I want to mention this further fact, that one of the most important things we have done in our effort to improve the status of the retired railroad worker and his survivors is to pass the resolution that provides for a joint study of this whole subject by a joint committee from the Senate and House to be made within the next few months in order that there will be a report, we hope, not later than the early days of the next session. That study will show what if any additional benefits can be given to the pensioners, annuitants, and survivors, and what means can be taken to retain the stability of the retirement fund without increasing the tax base or the rate of taxes to be paid by the workers.

Mr. Speaker, the need for increasing the amount of monthly benefits paid to retired railroad employees and to survivors of deceased employees is urgent. The necessary relief must be given at the earliest possible day.

For several years now the scale of the benefits to retired railway workers and their families has lagged far behind the steadily rising cost of living. This has produced a situation that cannot and should not be ignored any longer. The condition of some of these retired workers and their families, whom we seek to aid by increased benefits, is desperate. They need help and they need it now without further delay. This bill does the all-important thing, namely, increases benefits to all beneficiaries now under the railroad retirement system and thereby grants immediate relief to enable them to live more in accord with what they are entitled to have as a result of long years of service and the high rate of taxes that have been paid into the retirement fund. This bill provides the additional aid in an easy and effectual manner by providing an across-the-board increase of 15 percent to annuitants and pensioners and 33⅓ percent to survivors, over and above the amounts they now receive. This will be

effective immediately upon enactment of the bill

Mr. Speaker, I ask for the unanimous approval of the conference report by the House.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, the result of this conference report vindicates the legislative processes of the House. While not everyone is fully satisfied, and while there was some doubt in the past as to what bill we would finally get, I think the hard work done by the committee and by its able chairman and by the distinguished minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey, has resulted in achieving benefits for the railroad workers along lines which represent as satisfactory an adjustment as can possibly be made in this session.

All members of the committee were of one mind that there should be some relief for the beneficiaries under the railroad retirement system. The sole question motivating all of us was the kind of relief, the best method by which the fund could be administered with safety to the fund. I am very happy to see that we have come to a general agreement in the committee and in the conference. I hope the conference report will be accepted.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, since I took part in filing additional minority views, I am glad to say that as far as I know this conference report has the unanimous support of every member of the House committee.

I doubt if everyone will be entirely satisfied with each feature of the bill recommended by the conferees. But it will provide basically needed increases in benefits soon.

I want to join in expressing my appreciation of the outstanding contributions made in the important field of difficult and technical legislation by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] and the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. I know that every member of our committee regretted that we could not secure the united recommendations of the brotherhoods. In the absence of such argument, we all faced a task which seemed at times insoluble. That we now have the opportunity to support a unanimous conference report is due in no small measure to the wide knowledge and broad experience of those two of our colleagues.

I should add personally that I still share the concern, expressed by the chairman of the committee, as to whether the revenues and savings will be sufficient to take care of the increased benefits without jeopardizing the solvency of the retirement fund. But I am glad to support this report now with the assurance that has been given that this study to which the gentleman from New Jersey has referred will bring us exact information in a very short period of time as to the impact upon the fund of these increased benefits in terms of existing and prospective revenues and savings. And I might add that I hope that this study will reveal that we can make even further improvements and surely adjust any existing inequities without the necessity of any added taxes.

I do hope that the organization for the study can be completed soon, that the study will be thorough and that we may have the results at the earliest possible date.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, when the roll call took place on the tax bill conference report, I was in the corridor talking to a delegation of constituents from my district, and I did not hear the bells. Had I been here, I would have voted for the conference report on the tax bill as I previously voted for it on Tuesday.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy at this time to be able to take the floor to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], the conferees on the part of the House on the fine work they have done in ironing out the difficulties in this bill. We, on the Committee on Interstate Commerce have labored for many, many months to bring out a bill which would please all the conflicting interests, particularly among the railroad brotherhoods. I must say I am sorry they cannot agree. It is difficult, apparently, for these laboring groups to get together, and it is therefore understandable why it is so difficult for us to get together. But in this conference report, we do approach some degree of unanimity. Everybody seems to be satisfied, as far as this bill goes. Before I leave the well of the House, I want to pay special tribute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. He deserves more credit than anybody else in the House, not only for this particular bill, but for the great work he has done on behalf of the railroad employees over the years. As I have pointed out on numerous occasions, he is the father of the original railroad retirement bill, and of the amendments thereto. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] will be spared to us by the good Lord, not only for ourselves, because we love him, but also on behalf of the railroad employees and all the others in whose behalf he has labored so diligently. May he be with us for many, many years to come.

Mr. CROSSER. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to add my praise for the distinguished chairman of our committee, and for the other members of the conference committee on the part of the House for the splendid job they have done in working out this highly controversial and highly technical piece of legislation, which has been before our committee for the past 8 months. I hope certainly that no one will vote against this bill. The bill should be passed, and should be passed unanimously. This is the culmination of 8 months of hard work on a very highly controversial and complex problem, which has been worked out to the apparent satisfaction of all concerned.

Mr. CROSSER. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. I also wish to commend the members of the conference committee. They have done a splendid job. We all realize that legislation is the result of compromise. I think they have worked out a good bill, which should have our unanimous approval.

Mr. Speaker, I am most happy that an early agreement was reached by the conferees on this legislation. I have been anxious for a bill to be passed as quickly as possible, so that our retired railroad workers, and their survivors, could receive these increased benefits without further delay. I am hoping that the checks going out next month will carry the increase provided for in this bill.

It is obvious that we have not completed our task of revising the Railroad Retirement Act and bringing it up to date. The special committee to be appointed to make a further study of the act has a tremendous responsibility. Any legislation dealing with the Railroad Retirement Act is necessarily very technical and complicated. Long study is required to become familiar with the terms and provisions of the same. The report of this committee will be awaited with great interest by all who are interested in railroad retirement legislation.

I would have preferred to see the integration with the Social Security Act receive further study before we acted on this proposal. However, it will still be possible to make necessary changes in this procedure before the provisions of this bill become operative. Railroad men are paying much more for their retirement benefits than workers under social security. They are entitled to receive pensions that are commensurate with what they contribute to the fund. I know that it is almost the unanimous opinion of railroad workers that they do not want to be placed under social security. I want to see them continue to have a separate and independent retirement act of their own, although I recognize that some integration with social security may be most beneficial and desirable.

Inquiries are being made concerning the amendment which I offered to this bill, which gives retired railroad employees the opportunity to revoke any joint and survivor annuity agreements heretofore executed. I have been asked if a revocation can be made retroactively, so that the pensioner would be entitled to a refund of the amount deducted from his retirement payments over the years. This provision is not retroactive, but will provide immediate relief for those who are still receiving the reduced annuities. It also provides that where the

spouse has died the annuity is immediately increased to the full amount payable had no election been made.

I feel that this is a matter that should have the attention of the special study committee. In some cases, the spouses have been dead for several years, and the pensioner has continued to receive the reduced annuity. It would appear that he should be entitled to some refund. We must ascertain how many would be affected and the amounts involved.

Also, those who are still holding these annuity contracts will inquire as to the benefits that have accrued, and what adjustment can be made if they elect to revoke. In my amendment I did not attempt to go into this feature of the matter, but hope this subject will be given close study by the special committee to the end that appropriate legislation may follow.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, my mind goes back to the Seventy-ninth Congress, when almost exactly at this hour on a Friday the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], chairman of this great committee, was successful in having passed an amendment to this very important piece of legislation. I want to compliment him and this committee for again performing this very creditable act for the benefit of a group of our working people and their dependents—the railroad workers—the equal of any of our citizens in Americanism.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr BECKWORTH].

Mr BECKWORTH. Mr Speaker, as one who was privileged to serve on the conference committee, I feel that we have got the very best bill we could possibly get at a time like his It is true that those of us who supported the Crosser bill have not been able to get as much as we had hoped for in the beginning, especially for the lowest income groups, such as widows and children, but there are some very fine features in the bill that we bring you for approval this afternoon. One of them is the fact that the spouse will get up to $40 a month. We feel that is a very good provision.

It is true that perhaps the matter has not been examined as carefully as it should be from an actuarial soundness point of view. However, there is provided a study which we trust can be utilized in such manner that any deficiencies that may exist can be taken care of at an early date. Certainly railroad management, railroad labor, and all of us have a responsibility to keep this fund solvent. As for me, I want to see that at the very earliest date we review the whole picture in such manner that the solvency of this fund is maintained, even if more legislation is required.

I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the constant and incessant effort which has been put forth by the chairman of our committee in behalf of this legislation. That effort has been conducive to getting a bill as strong as we have here today. I recall on one occasion that he worked a long time in order to get a bill, and it was only through a discharge petition which he worked very diligently to get signed, that he was able to bring that bill before the House. Although one may disagree with the gentleman from Ohio at times, certainly no one can fail to credit to him the greatest sincerity. We all know he is trying to do all possible for a worthy segment of our laboring people, namely, the railroad laboring man.

As we move forward, let us hope and trust that the welfare of this group will be improved from time to time.

I am for this conference report. It has many fine features, and every member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and those who served on the conference committee have contributed all possible to bring about a good, worth-while piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want the RECORD to show at this point that this bill fails to rectify a senseless provision of the basic law whereby a railroad pensioner, to qualify for compensation, must quit his present nonrailroad and part-time job forever, although he can walk across the street and take another nonrailroad, part-time job and qualify.

This ridiculous proposition is best described by the following representative case which was called to my attention.

A former railroad employee, with a disability status, was erroneously held responsible by the Railroad Retirement Board for some $2,000 in alleged overpayment of pension. His pension was withdrawn. The Board later rescinded that ruling, absolving the employee of any fault in connection with the alleged overpayment, but now, because the pension was withdrawn, and because of the language of the present basic law, the employee must quit forever the part-time nonrailroad job which he has held for a number of years and in which he is earning less than the maximum allowable. I say again, that although he must quit his present job forever, to be eligible for pension reinstatement, he can walk across the street and take another nonrailroad, part-time job and then be eligible for pension reinstatement.

Obviously, this makes no sense whatsoever. The technicality in the present law, creating such situations, should be struck out in fairness to the retired railroad employees the law was designed to protect.

Those members of this and the other body appointed to the recently created joint committee to investigate the railroad retirement situation, should insist that the basic law be amended at the earliest possible opportunity to eliminate the unjust provision which I have discussed.

I will be glad to open my files in this case and to cooperate in any other possible manner.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the conference report. I was a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce when the original retirement act was proposed; I served on the subcommittee, and I served on the conference committees dealing with it. There were many obstacles encountered in developing the original retirement act and at that time we did the best we could under the circumstances. It has long needed amendment. I think these are very worth-while amendments.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following the debate on this bill and to include certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this conference report. Except with one major item, it is almost the same in every other respect as the substitute amendment, which I offered to the bill when we had it under consideration Tuesday and which was adopted by a large vote.

I am satisfied with the result under the circumstances. This is not satisfactory in every respect to all but it is, as has already been said, about the best that we could hope for. With the one exception, I am completely satisfied with this final result and that is the question of integration with social security. In fact, on the major issues, it is identical with what I proposed in my substitute Tuesday.

It is gratifying, Mr. Speaker, that near accord can be obtained as in this instance on legislation of as great importance to so many people as this. I want to commend the conferees for reaching an agreement so quickly in order that this legislation may be completed before this Congress adjourns and those who would benefit thereby may be given the relief we seek to provide for them with this legislation.

I do want to pay my tribute to our esteemed chairman of the committee, as well as my compliments to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], Mr. HALL, of New York, who offered the substitute in the committee, which was reported and in fact, all members of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the efforts over the past several months on a highly controversial and difficult problem.

The Members of this House are familiar with the tenseness that prevailed in and out of the committee, even up to the time that we presented it to you a few days ago. There are and have been extreme viewpoints. I offered the substitute in an effort to bring these viewpoints more closely together, using the bill passed by the Senate as a basis.

After the action of the House in adopting the substitute, I was pleased when I learned that most of those who could not heretofore get together on this legislation decided to meet and discuss the problem under the circumstances. I was even more pleased when I learned that the groups affected—the nonoperating groups, some of the operating groups, and those representing the railroad industry—came to an agreement, which is presented to us here today in this conference report.

As I have said, this is not entirely satisfactory to all, and, in all fairness, some of the operating groups did not reach accord with the others I have just mentioned. They are in accord with all provisions except the question of integration. They feel that question should be left to the study which has been authorized by the House and Senate under a joint committee.

In that all of these groups have agreed on these provisions as I have explained with a single exception, this conference report should, and no doubt will, have the unanimous approval of this House. We want to get something definitely adopted in order to provide some relief for those under the Railroad Retirement Act who need it so badly to help alleviate the increased cost of living.

You perhaps would like to know just what this will do and what relief it will give to those under the Railroad Retirement Act.

In brief, this unanimous report presented will provide:

First. Increase of pensions and annuities 15 percent.

Second. Increase in survivor annuities 33⅓ percent.

Third. Increase in lump-sum benefits 25 percent.

Fourth. A spouse's annuity with a maximum of $40.

Fifth. Employees with less than 10 years of railroad service and their survivors are transferred to social security. They would no longer be an obligation under the railroad retirement system. My substitute, which was adopted Tuesday, did not contain this provision. The Senate position therefore prevailed.

Sixth. Further integration and correlation by adjustments between Railroad Retirement Act and the old-age and survivor insurance trust fund. This annual financial adjustment between the two funds would become effective some time during the year of 1953. The Senate prevailed on this question of further integration.

Seventh. The taxable base remains the same as under present law, $300 per month. On this point the position of the House, as I provided in my substitute, prevailed. There is no increase in the taxes to be paid to the fund by increasing the taxable base.

Eighth. Likewise, the House provision prevailed on the $300 a month credit provision. The Senate proposed the maximum amount of creditable compensation would be increased from $300 to $350. This was coupled with their proposal to increase the taxable base. The compensation credited in computing annuities remains the same under present law.

Ninth. Credit for service after 65.

Tenth. Increase in annuity benefits for the individual who elected a joint-and-survivor annuity and whose spouse has died.

Eleventh. Increase in time limit for filing application for annuities from 60 days to 6 months.

Twelfth. Guaranty for employees with more than 10 years of service of benefits under railroad retirement would not be less than what they would have received under social security.

Thirteenth. Revocation of joint and survivor elections, that is, any joint and survivor elections would be automatically revoked if the spouse in whose favor the election was made should have predeceased the individual or employee making the election. In this report, the House provision prevails.

Fourteenth. Adjustment of benefits applicable in the case of an individual entitled to two or more benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act alone or under it and the Social Security Act.

Fifteenth. An annuity for a widower after 65 if at least one-half support provided by wife employee at the time of her retirement or death.

There is no $50 work-clause provision. This was eliminated by action of both the Senate and House and consequently, was not an item of consideration in the Congress.

The fact that this has been finally agreed to by so many who have had such wide divergence in their views seems to me quite evident that this is a very good bill and deserving of your consideration and support.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is the bill retroactive so that it might take care of some widows of railroad men who have not been covered heretofore?

Mr. HARRIS. I would have to know just what type of survivors the gentleman has in mind before I could answer. If he has reference to those the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] was interested in a few days ago, it does not.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In regard to this relationship with social security that we are establishing, is it not true that this committee that will study the Railroad Retirement Act may come up with recommendations concerning that feature?

Mr. HARRIS. As I explained to the House a few days ago, this cannot go into effect under the provisions of the language until after January 1, 1953, or sometime during 1953 or about January 1, 1954; consequently, there will be time for that study to be made.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the day we had this matter under consideration, I offered a substitute amendment to the bill that was pending before the committee at that time. As it was reported in the RECORD there were substantial errors in connection with the reporting of it. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected to show the entire content of the substitute amendment which I offered at that time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the pending conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, Government assistance both to defense housing through the law recently passed and to private housing through FHA mortgage guaranties carries an obligation that all Americans should benefit on a basis of equality and without discrimination or segregation from this use of Federal money or Federal credit. Yet the FHA does not require affirmatively that mortgagors, to qualify for insurance, disregard racial considerations in the selection of their tenants and leaves this to the mortgagors' determination. I have assurance today in a letter from the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency—which is appended—that the needs of members of minority groups for community facilities and services will be served without discrimination according to the policy followed by the Federal Government under the Lanham Act in World War II. This leaves open the question of defense housing mortgage guaranties. An Executive order should fill in the gap and make the same provision for defense housing mortgage guaranties. An Executive order should fill in the gap and make the same provision for defense housing mortgage guaranties and for FHA mortgage guaranties as is reflected by the appended letter for defense housing community facilities:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D. C., October 11, 1951.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JAVITS: This is in response to your letter of September 21 inquiring about the regulations of this Agency relating to the community facilities and services authorized by Public Law 139, with particular reference to the manner in which they deal with segregation and discrimination.

As you know, the existing regulations of the Federal Housing Administration do not relate to this question since FHA operates a program of mortgage insurance for privately financed and constructed housing. The relationship between the FHA and a private builder making use of the insured mortgage system is quite different from that which will exist between the Federal Government and the local bodies in connection with the community facilities program authorized by Public Law 139.

Because this law has so recently been enacted and because the nece sary appro-

priations for its administration have not yet been passed by the Congress, the procedures and regulations applying to Federal aid for the provision of community facilities and services have not yet been issued. We are now developing procedures for the granting of aid for those community facilities and services for which this Agency has direct responsibility. As you know, the authorities contained in Public Law 139 for the provision of community facilities and services are similar to those exercised by the Federal Government under the Lanham Act in World War II. Borrowing from the experience of World War II, the new law specifically provides that aid for community facilities and services should be programed to meet the needs created by the immigration of defense workers and military personnel. If the immigrants are members of minority groups, it is our intention that the program for community facilities and services shall reflect this fact and that the needs of these groups should be served without discrimination In fact, the report of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency in this bill specifically provides that, "In the provision of housing by the Federal Government * * * and in the provision, or operation and maintenance of community facilities and services assisted * * * there shall be equality of treatment of persons of all races, religions, and national origins who are served by them"

I hope this will clarify our position in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND M FOLEY,
Administrator.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 341, nays 0, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 215]

YEAS—341

Abbitt	Buckley	Dorn
Abernethy	Budge	Doughton
Adair	Burdick	Doyle
Addonizio	Burleson	Durham
Albert	Burnside	Eaton
Allen, Ill	Burton	Eberharter
Andersen, H Carl	Bush	Elliott
	Butler	Ellsworth
Andresen, August H	Byrne, N Y.	Elston
	Byrnes, Wis	Evins
Andrews	Camp	Fallon
Anfuso	Canfield	Feighan
Arends	Cannon	Fenton
Aspinall	Carlyle	Fernandez
Auchincloss	Carnahan	Fisher
Bailey	Case	Flood
Baker	Chatham	Fogarty
Bakewell	Chelf	Forand
Barden	Chenoweth	Ford
Barrett	Chiperfield	Forrester
Bates, Mass	Chudoff	Frazier
Battle	Church	Fulton
Beall	Clemente	Furcolo
Beamer	Clevenger	Gamble
Beckworth	Cole, Kans.	Garmatz
Belcher	Colmer	Gary
Bender	Cooley	Gathings
Bennett, Fla	Cooper	Gavin
Bennett, Mich.	Corbett	George
Bentsen	Cotton	Goodwin
Berry	Coudert	Gordon
Betts	Cox	Gore
Bishop	Crosser	Graham
Blatnik	Crumpacker	Granahan
Boggs, Del.	Cunningham	Grant
Bolling	Curtis, Nebr.	Green
Bolton	Davis, Ga.	Greenwood
Bonner	Davis, Tenn.	Gregory
Bow	DeGraffenried	Gross
Boykin	Denny	Gwinn
Bray	Denton	Hale
Brehm	Devereux	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Brown, Ga.	Dollinger	
Brownson	Dolliver	Hall, Leonard W.
Bryson	Donohue	
Buchanan	Donovan	Halleck
Hand	McMullen	Rooney
Harden	McVey	Sadlak
Hardy	Machrowicz	St. George
Harris	Mack, Wash.	Sasscer
Harrison, Va.	Madden	Saylor
Harrison, Wyo.	Magee	Schwabe
Hart	Mahon	Scott, Hardie
Harvey	Mansfield	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Havenner	Marshall	
Hays, Ohio	Martin, Mass.	Scrivner
Hedrick	Mason	Scudder
Heffernan	Meader	Secrest
Heller	Merrow	Seely-Brown
Herter	Miller, Md.	Shafer
Heselton	Miller, Nebr.	Sheehan
Hill	Miller, N. Y.	Short
Hillings	Mills	Simpson, Ill.
Hinshaw	Mitchell	Simpson, Pa.
Hoeven	Morano	Smith, Kans.
Hoffman, Ill	Morgan	Smith, Miss.
Hoffman, Mich.	Morris	Smith, Va.
Holmes	Morton	Smith, Wis.
Hope	Moulder	Spence
Horan	Multer	Springer
Howell	Mumma	Staggers
Hull	Murdock	Stanley
Hunter	Murray, Tenn.	Steed
Ikard	Nelson	Stigler
Jackson, Wash	Nicholson	Stockman
James	Norblad	Sutton
Jarman	Norrell	Taber
Javits	O'Brien, Ill.	Tackett
Jenison	O'Brien, Mich.	Talle
Jenkins	O'Hara	Taylor
Jensen	O'Konski	Teague
Jonas	O'Neill	Thomas
Jones, Ala.	Ostertag	Thompson, Mich
Jones, Mo.	O'Toole	
Jones, Hamilton C.	Patman	Thompson, Tex.
	Patten	Tollefson
Jones, Woodrow W	Patterson	Trimble
	Philbin	Vail
Judd	Pickett	Van Pelt
Karsten, Mo.	Poage	Van Zandt
Kean	Polk	Velde
Kearns	Potter	Vorys
Keating	Poulson	Vursell
Kee	Preston	Walter
Kerr	Price	Weichel
Kilburn	Priest	Wharton
Kilday	Rabaut	Wheeler
King	Radwan	Whitaker
Kirwan	Rains	Whitten
Klein	Ramsay	Wickersham
Kluczynski	Rankin	Widnall
Lane	Reams	Wier
Lanham	Reece, Tenn	Wigglesworth
Lantaff	Reed, Ill	Williams, Miss
Larcade	Reed, N Y.	Williams, N. Y
LeCompte	Rees, Kans.	Willis
Lesinski	Rhodes	Wilson, Ind.
Lind	Richards	Winstead
Lovre	Riehlman	Withrow
McCarthy	Riley	Wolcott
McConnell	Rivers	Wolverton
McCormack	Roberts	Wood, Idaho
McCulloch	Robeson	Woodruff
McGrath	Rodino	Yates
McGregor	Rogers, Colo	Yorty
McGuire	Rogers, Mass.	
McKinnon	Rogers, Tex.	

NOT VOTING—87

Aandahl	Dingell	Miller, Calif.
Allen, Calif.	Dondero	Morrison
Allen, La.	Engle	Murphy
Anderson, Calif	Fine	Murray, Wis.
Angell	Fugate	Passman
Armstrong	Golden	Perkins
Ayres	Granger	Phillips
Baring	Hagen	Powell
Bates, Ky.	Hays, Ark.	Prouty
Blackney	Hébert	Quinn
Boggs, La.	Herlong	Redden
Bosone	Hess	Regan
Bramblett	Holifield	Ribicoff
Brooks	Irving	Rogers, Fla
Brown, Ohio	Jackson, Calif.	Roosevelt
Buffett	Johnson	Sabath
Busbey	Kearney	Shelley
Celler	Kelley, Pa	Sheppard
Cole, N. Y.	Kelly, N. Y.	Sieminski
Combs	Kennedy	Sikes
Crawford	Keogh	Sittler
Curtis, Mo.	Kersten, Wis.	Thornberry
Dague	Latham	Vinson
Davis, Wis.	Lucas	Watts
Dawson	Lyle	Welch
Deane	McDonough	Werdel
Delaney	McMillan	Wilson, Tex.
Dempsey	Mack, Ill.	Wood, Ga.
D'Ewart	Martin, Iowa	Zablocki

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Perkins with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Armstrong
Mr Morrison with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Deane with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Quinn with Mr Anderson of California.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Dondero.
Mr Keogh with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr Kersten of Wisconsin
Mr. Celler with Mr. Latham.
Mr Baring with Mr. Sittler.
Mr. Sieminski with Mr Cole of New York.
Mrs Bosone with Mr. Crawford.
Mr Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin
Mr Mack of Illinois with Mr D'Ewart.
Mr Miller of California with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Engle with Mr. Buffett
Mr. Fine with Mr Brown of Ohio.
Mr Granger with Mr McDonough.
Mr. Fugate with Mr Martin of Iowa.
Mr Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Bramblett.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Golden
Mr Brooks with Mr Allen of California.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr Phillips.
Mr Sikes with Mr Johnson.
Mr Regan with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr Redden with Mr Murray of Wisconsin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S Con Res 52. Concurrent resolution to make a change in the enrollment of Senate bill 355, the so-called postal salary increase bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 355) entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department."

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SURRENDER AT YORKTOWN, VA

Mr ROBESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBESON. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of the surrender of the British Army, under Lord Cornwallis, to the Continental Army of Gen. George Washington at Yorktown, Va., which is in my district.

This afternoon suitable exercises which are held annually on the 19th of October are in process at Yorktown, to celebrate the anniversary of that event in our national history.

It seems to me that it might be helpful to us and to all citizens to direct our thought to the significance in our national history of this eventful climax to the arduous but courageous struggle of our forefathers.

Descendants of this heroic volunteer citizen army under General Washington are today gathered on that same surrender field. Other descendants are scattered throughout our own country and many are serving in our Armed Forces in distant places.

It seems important to me, Mr. Speaker, that we should be more mindful of our heritage of freedom. We are responsible for legislation which gives authority to send our young men to the battlefields of the world and to dissipate our resources and distribute our wealth. Might we not be also mindful that our forefathers won our heritage not solely because of the power and might of military strength or of physical resources, but because of their abiding faith in the power of prayer to an Almighty God.

Cornwallis marched to his surrender between rows of ragged, weary and wounded American freemen. The fifers played The World Turned Upside Down. Mr. Speaker, then, as well as now, the "world was upside down." Then Americans righted their world through their faith in God. They can right the world of today in that same manner.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY FOR SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time tomorrow, October 20, for the Speaker to declare a recess.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ALLOCATION OF STEEL FOR SCHOOLS AND HOSPITALS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 474) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas amounts of steel, copper, and aluminum have not been allocated in sufficient quantity or otherwise made available for the construction of educational and hospital facilities; and

Whereas the education and health of the American people is vital to the strength of this Nation; and

Whereas the education and health of the American people has a direct relationship to our military strength and economic productivity; and

Whereas there is a demonstrated need for additional schools and hospitals, and for expansion of existing schools and hospitals; and

Whereas an adequate and dependable supply of steel, aluminum, and copper are critical items in the programs to alleviate existing school and hospital inadequacies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the National Production Authority and the Defense Production Administration should reconsider its allotments of steel, copper, and aluminum in such manner as to provide a greater quantity of such metals and products fabricated from such metals for the construction of and additions to schools and hospitals as may be required better to protect the educational and health standards of the people of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, will the gentleman explain briefly what the situation is with reference to these schools and hospitals?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the special subcommittee of which I am chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor has been throughout this week holding hearings getting in the official record the condition as it exists over the Nation in reference to the critical situation that has developed in the lack of critical materials for our elementary and secondary and higher institutions of learning throughout the land.

Today the committee had before it the NPA and the DPA officials, and our attention was called to the fact that the other body late yesterday adopted a resolution expressing the sense of the other body that the allocation of these critical materials for schools should be revaluated and reallocated with an idea of upping the percentage going to the schools. They held out the hope that if this body took similar action it would result in getting that steel.

Mr. HESELTON. Is it not true, No. 1, that this also applies to hospital construction or additions?

Mr. BAILEY. That is true.

Mr. HESELTON. Secondly, that the proposed allocation for the first quarter of 1952 in steel, for instance, was in the neighborhood of 92,000 tons while school authorities stated they would need a minimum for necessary construction of 250,000 tons?

Mr. BAILEY. That is true.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I would like to say as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor that there were considerable complaints, I do not know how many, that came to me from all over the country. There was a lot of trouble with the hospital and school programs. I set up a committee consisting of Mr. MORTON, Mr. TACKETT, and Mr. BAILEY to act as chairman. They have done a fine job. All three of them are intensely interested in the matter. They have attended the meetings regularly and they have made a very searching inquiry into the situation. They unanimously concur in the advisability of adopting this resolution in order to strengthen the position which they have contended is the proper position.

Mr. HESELTON. I agree with what the gentleman said and I want to add my congratulations to him, to the gentleman from West Virginia and the subcommittee.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Is this resolution sufficiently broad to enable the subcommittee to determine whether or not there is actually a shortage of steel or whether the inability of people who need to obtain it is due to the maladministration of the control program?

Mr. BAILEY. Let me say to the gentlemen that all of that was brought out in the hearings. We had the NPA and DPA officials before us, and we have the situation at the point now where the NPA and DPA officials want the sense of the House and Senate so that they can say to some other people who have been getting probably a little more than they should have gotten that here is the sense of the Congress that something be done about these schools, and we will have to take a little bit here and there until we get enough.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Is it not true that the amount of steel used in our war effort is 20 percent, and that the cut in allocation for schools has been 53 percent?

Mr. BAILEY. I do not know whether the gentleman is quoting the exact figures.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Well, much larger in schools than should be necessary.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me say to the gentleman that you will find all of those facts in the hearings which will be available shortly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I inquire if the gentleman's committee went into any examination as to whether the industrial enterprises of the country are receiving a fair share of the steel or are they being reduced too greatly?

Mr. BAILEY. We went into that. We went into other features, such as the allocation going to railroad companies, transportation companies, to automobiles, the exportation of steel, and the exportation of scrap steel. We covered the field thoroughly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What did the gentleman find out about the little manufacturers?

Mr. BAILEY. What manufacturers?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Well, those that use just a little bit of steel, for instance, the small-tool manufacturers.

Mr. BAILEY. May I say to the gentleman that if you do not need more than 2 or 3 tons of steel you do not have to have authority. You can buy it anywhere.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If you can.

Mr. BAILEY. You can buy it without getting authority.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. You can buy it if you can get it?

Mr. BAILEY. That is true.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman advise us whether this will make possible not only the completion of school buildings that are under way but the starting of some new school buildings? I have a district up in my area that has grown like a mushroom because of hundreds of new houses for veterans. The number of children has grown so rapidly and they have no school at all so they have to take the children in busses to five different school districts as far as 8 miles away. Now then, is it possible to start a school building in that area under the terms of the act?

Mr. BAILEY. Let me say that the allocations which are already made, 96,000 tons of structural steel for the first quarter in 1952, are sufficient to keep all of the projects going which are already started. We are after some additional allocations so that the 600 projects that are presently ready for approval and contract can go ahead.

Mr. JUDD. I compliment the gentleman. They can start some of these desperately needed new projects then?

Mr HESELTON. In connection with some of the remarks made by the gentleman regarding exports, there is a substantial quantity of steel the end use of which no doubt could be used for construction of high schools in this country.

Mr. BAILEY That angle was covered, and I think he will find some interesting reading

Mr JAVITS Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York

Mr. JAVITS It is a fact that this will in no way interfere with the defense effort; on the contrary, the amount allocated is very small compared to these nondefense uses which my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts has described I want to compliment the gentleman and his committee. I think they have done a real service by this resolution.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this is to make an announcement that the Senate has just overridden the President's veto by a vote of 50 to 10, I understand. I hope the House will stay in session, Mr. Speaker, until it passes and overrides the veto of the so-called amputee car bill for the paraplegics and the blind.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I would like for this to be clearly understood. There is no force or authority in this resolution. It is to express the sentiment of the House. One further thing with reference to the amount of steel that is going into the defense effort and industries involved in defense work. They get their steel anyway. There is no possible conflict between that and the sentiment expressed in the resolution offered by the gentleman.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I would like to inquire of the gentleman if they went into the NPA program as to the allocation of steel for churches and religious institutions? What the gentleman said about schools is entirely true But we have a peculiar situation in our State. Under Federal court order our State operates for the equalizing of our school system for the white and the colored. We have a $75,000,000 bond issue, but we cannot build a school. I had a church matter up with the NPA, and they have a blanket order that the church institutions cannot get the steel. They have taken it out against the religious institutions, and I think it is a terrible and a sad commentary on the slipshod manner those in charge of this program have run it

Mr BAILEY May I say to the gentleman that there is no existing rule with respect to allocating steel for the construction of churches. They are under construction all over the country. The fact of the matter is that there is complaint that the churches are getting too much, and the schools are not getting enough

Mr. ALBERT Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT May I ask the gentleman from West Virginia whether this asks for more steel for the purpose of starting new buildings as well as those that are already under construction?

Mr. BAILEY. The allocation already made for the first quarter would take care of the already existing projects that have been authorized It would take care of a little better than 300 of the 600 and some new projects, that are awaiting allocation of the steel, but it does not take care of any other situation, and it is not adequate and will not be adequate over probably the second and third quarters.

Mr. ALBERT. I commend the gentleman on his efforts in connection with this matter.

(Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a resolution.)

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I favor this resolution and urge its enactment. While I realize that there is great shortage of steel for many needs I think that priorities should be given to schools and hospitals. Certainly it is much more justifiable to make these allocations for this purpose than certain other civilian needs which we could do without during the emergency. And it is obvious that shipments of steel to other countries to enable them to build gambling establishments, hotels, and resorts should certainly be stopped. The subcommittee has given deliberate consideration to this matter and in my opinion has come up with the right answer.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who care to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD and that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENDING THE IMPORT DUTIES ON ZINC

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5448) to provide for the temporary free importation of zinc

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the chairman of the committee kindly explain the purpose of the bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to suspend the import duties on zinc until April 1, 1953, or the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President, whichever is earlier. Under the committee amendment, the President would be required to revoke the suspension of duties if the price of zinc should fall below 18 cents per pound.

The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and its early enactment is recommended by the Economic Stabilization Agency, the Bureau of the Budget, the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Defense Production Administration, and the Defense Materials Procurement Agency.

Despite efforts to expand domestic production of zinc, the supply still is only about two-thirds of our current requirements for military and civilian needs. Although the suspension of duties on zinc-bearing materials will still leave a gap between domestic and world prices, there will be added incentive to foreign producers anxious to create American markets to ship their ore to this country.

Since the provision for reinstatement of the duty in the event the price of zinc should fall below 18 cents per pound affords protection against injury of domestic producers of zinc, your committee believes that there should be no objection to the prompt enactment of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand there is a 2-year limit on the bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON That is right. Those who believe in the low tariff like

the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts ought to be satisfied.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to suspend the import duties on zinc-bearing materials and articles which are imposed under paragraphs 77, 393, and 394 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. The items and duties involved are set forth in table 1 in the general statement.

The suspension would apply beginning with the day following the date of enactment of the bill and ending with the close of March 31, 1953, or the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, whichever is earlier. A committee amendment adds a proviso whereby the President shall revoke the suspension of duties when, for any one calendar month, the average market price of slab zinc—Prime Western, f. o. b. East St. Louis—for that month has been below 18 cents per pound.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the import duties imposed under paragraph 393 and 394 of title I of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall not apply with respect to imports entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the period beginning with the day following the date of the enactment of this act and ending with the close of March 31, 1953, or the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, whichever is earlier.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "paragraph 393" and insert "paragraphs 77, 393"

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That when, for any one calendar month during such period, the average market price of slab zinc (Prime Western, f. o. b. East St. Louis) for that month has been below 18 cents per pound, the Tariff Commission, within fifteen days after the conclusion of such calendar month, shall so advise the President, and the President shall, by proclamation, not later than twenty days after he has been so advised by the Tariff Commission, revoke such suspension of the duties imposed under paragraphs 77, 393, and 394 of the Tariff Act of 1930, such revocation to be effective with respect to articles entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption after the date of such proclamation.

"In determining the average market price of slab zinc for each calendar month, the Tariff Commission is hereby authorized to base its findings upon the average monthly price of slab zinc (Prime Western, f. o. b. East St. Louis) reported by the Engineering and Mining Journal's 'Metal and Mineral Markets'."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

H. R 5650. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res 36 Concurrent resolution authorizing the appointment of 14 Members of Congress to participate in a public discussion of problems of common interest with representatives of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S 622) entitled "An act to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes."

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I hereby submit my resignation from the Committee on Education and Labor.

E Y BERRY,
Member of Congress, South Dakota.

The SPEAKER Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 475), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That E Y. BERRY, of South Dakota, is hereby elected to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS ON INTERNAL REVENUE CASES

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5048) relating to the statute of limitations in the case of criminal prosecutions of offenses arising under the internal revenue laws.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania will take a minute to explain the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, I will cite a case to illustrate a situation found in many areas of the country: If an income tax payer lives in the District of Columbia, he files his income tax return in the city of Baltimore. The statute of limitations on behalf of the taxpayer never operates because he does not live within the judicial district in which the crime, if there is a crime, is committed, for the place of the crime is at law the local place of the filing of the income tax return. The purpose of this bill is to correct that situation. I might add, according to the information given to the committee, that there are a great number of areas in the United States where a taxpayer makes his home outside of the judicial district in which the income tax return is filed.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I understand that in the first circuit, I believe it was, the court has felt that where a taxpayer is absent from his district on business or for any other reason, the statute of limitations is tolled for the number of days, or for the period of time when he is outside of his district. Certainly, it seems to me that this legislation ought to go far enough so that when the statute runs, it will run. If the period is fixed at a certain time, at the expiration of that time, the right of the United States should be concluded so far as proceeding with any criminal action.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I will say to the gentleman that this was designed to cover the case which I have mentioned and does not cover the situation the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. WALTER. Does it apply only in the District of Columbia?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. No; it applies nationally. There is a proviso, of course, that if anybody is fleeing justice, then title 18 of the United States Code shall apply, which tells the operation of the statute.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What provision is made for the extension of the statute of limitations in cases which come up now? That is, on the passage of this bill, would the statute of limitations be the 3-year period from the time that the law becomes effective, or would it be retroactive?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I will read the second section of the bill, which will answer the gentleman most quickly:

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall apply to offenses committed on, before, or after the date of the enactment of this act, except that the amendment shall

not apply in the case of an offense committed before the date of such enactment if with respect to such offense the indictment is found or the information is instituted on or before the date of such enactment.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Did the gentleman say on or before the date of enactment?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. On or before the date of enactment.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If a man had committed a crime prior to this, and 1 year had transpired so far as the running of the statute of limitations is concerned, and we enact this law, then how long does the prosecutor have in which to file an information or get an indictment from the grand jury?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The period of the limitation of the statute beginning on the date of the crime.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is it 3 years from the time that this is enacted?

Mr. MILLS. If I may be permitted to answer the gentleman, as I recall, the answer would be 6 years.

If the gentleman will permit me further, is it not a fact that the bill which the gentleman has before the House at the moment is concurred in by the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. MILLS. The bill was reported from our committee unanimously, and it only applies in the case of a conspiracy to evade or defeat any tax or the payment of tax.

Mr ROGERS of Colorado. Suppose we enact this law, does the prosecutor then have 6 years in which to prosecute from the time of the effective date of this act, or is he limited to a period of time, measuring from the time that the act was committed?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Under this bill, the statute in favor of the taxpayer will begin to run on the date of the filing of the return.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If he had committed the act 5 years ago, and we pass this law, the prosecutor cannot prosecute?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. If he had committed the act 5 years ago, there is 1 year remaining in which the prosecutor can proceed. That is my understanding.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That the second paragraph of section 3748 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to periods of limitation for criminal prosecutions) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"In the case of offenses arising under title 18, U. S. C., section 371, or under the corresponding provision of prior law, where the object of the conspiracy is to attempt in any manner to evade or defeat any tax or the payment thereof, the period of limitation shall also be 6 years. The time during which the person committing any of the offenses mentioned in this subsection is not present in the United States shall not be taken as any part of the time limited by law for the commencement of such proceedings, except that this sentence shall not apply for any period during which such person is serving as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States. For the purpose of the preceding sentence, the term 'United States' when used in a geographical sense means the States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, the District of Columbia, the possessions of the United States, and the Canal Zone. Where a complaint is instituted before a commissioner of the United States within the period above limited, the time shall be extended until the discharge of the grand jury at its next session within the district. In the case of a person fleeing from justice, see title 18, U. S. C., section 3290."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall apply to offenses committed on, before, or after the date of the enactment of this act, except that the amendment shall not apply in the case of an offense committed before the date of such enactment if with respect to such offense the indictment is found or the information is instituted on or before the date of such enactment.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. On page 2, in line 15, strike out "see" and insert immediately before the period in line 16 the following: "shall apply"

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. CANNON, Mr. MAHON, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. TABER, and Mr. SCRIVNER.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD with reference to the report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the field of atomic energy we are crossing the threshold of developments that have far-reaching significance for ourselves and for the entire free world—and, I might add, for the men in the Kremlin. Some of these developments are discussed in a report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which I now file with the House.

We have an opportunity, if we seize it boldly, to strengthen our atomic defenses to the point where any would-be aggressor could only assure his own downfall if he dared molest us. A few days ago Mr. Gordon Dean, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, declared officially that—

Every dollar of the American taxpayer's money that you spend on the atomic-energy program, up to the tune of approximately $5,000,000,000 additional in capital plant and equipment, with an allowance for approximately $700,000,000 a year for operating that plant and equipment, over and above our present program, would be dollars very well spent.

By this method we can build atomic fire power and thus make enormous gains in our capacity to prevent a new global war or to win it if it comes. I estimate that the money measure of an all-out atomic program is, roughly, $6,000,000,000 per year for a few years.

You may say that $6,000,000,000 per year for a few years is a startling amount of money, and I agree with you. I suggest, however, that these sums are not large compared to the total funds spent for national defense and compared to the security we can purchase for each dollar paid out of the Treasury.

I would like to call the attention of the House to this little-appreciated fact: Only 3 cents in every dollar expended for military preparedness since the end of the last war has gone for our best weapon—the atomic weapon. Winston Churchill, Gen. Omar Bradley, and a great many other leading statesmen and soldiers of the free world tell us that atomic energy is the reason why Soviet Russia has not dared attack in Europe. Yet we have spent 3 cents in the military dollar to buy this supreme deterrent. What could we not buy with 6 cents or 10 cents?

At this point I insert in the RECORD a table I have had prepared showing the exact figures for atomic spending as compared with military spending generally.

Total actual expenditures for atomic energy—including peacetime uses—as compared with actual military expenditures for the fiscal years 1946 through 1951 are shown in the tabulation below. Total actual expenditures for these years for atomic energy—less 10 percent for funds devoted to peacetime uses—average just under $500,000,000 a year. Of the total defense spending — atomic weapon and military — during these years, atomic weapons account for about 2⅝ cents on the defense dollar:

Fiscal year	Actual expenditures on atomic energy (in millions)	Actual military expenditures (in millions)
1946	$320	$39,492
1947	332	14,316
1948	479	10,961
1949	622	11,914
1950	550	11,889
1951	[1] 920	19,200
Total	3,223	107,772
Less	322	
	2,901	

[1] Estimated.

About one-eighth of fiscal year 1946 had elapsed before hostilities ended. To make rough allowance for that fact, the

fiscal year 1946 figures given above are only seven-eighths of the totals listed in the budget records. The first column does not include spending by the Defense Department, from January 1, 1947, onward, for NEPA, NEPS, Sandia, and so forth—because these outlays are deemed to relate more closely to delivery of atomic explosives or more closely to nonnuclear aspects of nuclear propulsion that to the development and manufacture of atomic weapons as such; also because the omissions here, if debatable, are counterbalanced by equally debatable omissions in column two. The second column of figures does not include civil-functions expenditures by the Corps of Engineers; or other activities—such as the Coast Guard, or State contributions to National Guard units—which are not paid from Defense Department funds.

On January 30, 1950, the Commission officially authorized George H. Hall, a correspondent for the St Louis Post-Dispatch, to state that from 10 to 25 percent of the 1951 AEC budget request would be devoted to possible peacetime uses. On February 10, 1950, Acting Chairman Sumner Pike estimated before the joint committee that from 15 to 20 percent of atomic energy funds has been devoted directly to peacetime uses. The 10-percent figure assumed above is 7.5 percent under the mean of these estimates.

Now there is a 2 to 3 year lead time between the date when we start building a new atomic plant and the date when we begin to get out material that can be used in a weapon. For that reason I do not anticipate any possibility of reducing our over-all military spending for 2 or 3 years, even though we greatly step up our atomic effort. Of course we might possibly feel we could cut back on some conventional weapons which themselves are 2 or 3 years away. But this is problematical, and even after 2 or 3 years I see no guarantee of economies and savings.

The point is that the last war is estimated to have cost the world several trillions of dollars, and another war would cost tens of trillions. I will not attempt to assess the staggering price in human life. If an all-out atomic program in the United States can avert a future cataclysm, that would be the greatest saving in blood and treasure I can imagine. Measured against this yardstick $6,000,000,000 a year for a few years is cheap indeed.

But suppose we are not successful in our struggle to prevent another war. After all, we can never be completely sure that the Soviet dictators will not, in defiance of all reason and regard for their own self-interest, plunge mankind into the holocaust. If this should happen, atomic weapons offer us real promise of winning quickly. Needless to say, no one can foretell such a result with anything like certainty. But the possibility is there.

When you consider that an atomic counter-offensive against aggression might compress into a few weeks or months two or three or four times the punishment which we gave Nazi Germany over the entire span of the last war—when you consider this comparison, it becomes realistic to hope that, in case of another war, we could win victory in 10 percent of the time otherwise necessary. Here again is an incalculable saving in blood and treasure—a saving to be had if we exploit the atom to the utmost in our national defense.

Some of us, I think, have made a mistake in stressing and dramatizing the awesome power of the bomb to the exclusion of its finite quality. It certainly is not an absolute weapon—that is why we need it in great numbers. But it is a new and cheaper kind of explosive. The obsolete Nagasaki model was equal in energy release to 20,000 tons of TNT—not pounds but tons. Making allowances for the fact that many little and scattered explosions cause more damage than one big concentrated explosion, it still remains true that the TNT force needed to equal the havoc caused by one A-bomb costs hundreds of times as much. It is just plain cheaper to purchase fissionable materials for atomic weapons than ordinary materials for conventional bombs.

Of course, this comparison leaves out of account the delivery problem. Our American atomic stockpile is useless either as a deterrent to war or as a war-winning instrument unless it can be delivered surely and with precision to the appointed targets. I certainly do not need to remind the Members of the House how difficult and how expensive is the problem of effective delivery. You must have bases. You must have trained men. You must have planes and missiles and ships. You must have many kinds of costly materials and costly equipment.

These factors are so complex and include so many imponderables that firm cost comparisons are out of the question. But I do call attention to the obvious, namely, that one plane or one missile or one artillery shell can deliver an atomic weapon whereas many hundreds of planes or missiles or artillery shells would be required to deliver the equivalent in conventional explosives.

Atomic weapons are truly unique in one other respect. If we can achieve genuine peace, if we can reach a time when vast armed forces are no longer needed, the stuff of atomic weapons—the active material which accounts for upwards of 90 percent of their cost—need not be thrown away. It need not be left to rust and decay. Unlike a tank or a naval carrier or a bomber, each of which has little or no value except for military purposes, atomic material can be put to constructive use to drive commercial ships and to furnish electrical power. Atomic bombs are not only insurance for war—they are also precious insurance for peace.

Such are some of the main reasons why I have supported and why I shall continue to support an all-out atomic program. Here is one place where it is crystal clear that we cannot afford small plans or timid ideas.

The main factor which once limited our effort was raw materials. Uranium, the basic requirement, occurs plentifully in the earth's crust but seldom in concentrated deposits. A world-wide search for unranium sources has been under way during the past half decade, and likewise we have been searching for effective means of processing low-grade ore. The raw materials situation, to summarize a long story in a word, has greatly improved, and I expect it to improve still further.

The truth is that we can have as much uranium as we want, within limits, provided that we are willing to pay the cost. I have done my best to help dispell the illusion that supplies of uranium are a rigid and fixed quantity. Like copper or steel or manganese or any other raw material, uranium production can be increased very much in proportion to the amount of money and effort we decide to expend upon it.

After the ore, once obtained, has been treated, it goes to specially equipped plants for conversion into brown oxide and removal of impurities. The next step, also a complicated one, sees the brown oxide converted into "green salt." At this point the path branches, depending upon whether the material is destined for plutonium piles or U-235 separation plants. In one case the green salt must be reduced to metal billets, another industrial project of complexity; and the billets are then processed into slugs of suitable size and shape for insertion in reactors. In the other case, however, material in the green salt stage becomes converted, again through special and large-scale plants, into uranium hexafluoride. Such is the "feeding" operation, one often neglected in public discussion although it engages an entire specialized segment of the Nation's chemical industry.

The next phase of the producton chain is more familiar: It either involves manufacture of the toxic, man-made element, plutonium, or else separation of the fissionable isotope U–235, as contained in uranium hexafluoride, from the 140-times more plentiful isotope U–238 That the plants performing these tasks are novel, that they cost hundreds of millions, that they pose far-reaching safety problems, and that the quantities of ingenious equipment represent an order of magnitude once unknown, has by now become commonplace knowledge.

The site of the Hanford plutonium works covers some 400,000 acres, more than half the area of Rhode Island. Richland, the community attached to Hanford, has a population approaching 25,000 persons. Oak Ridge, Tenn., a site of U–235 production facilities, occupies a 93-square-mile Government reservation, and the number of residents living in the town itself exceeds 35,000.

When uranium hexafluoride, enriched in the isotope U–235, has emerged from the great cascade of stages at a gaseous diffusion plant, there remains final chemistry and other processes. At Hanford, the plutonium, after it appears in irradiated slugs, is separated chemically from residual uranium and fission products; and the radiation hazard requires that many cubic yards of concrete shield remotely controlled apparatus from the

nearest human workers. The plutonium, too, must undergo various additional processes.

Here the material is at the threshold of use, either as an atomic explosive or as fuel for an atomic reactor. With the right auxiliary equipment, itself a techno-scientific-industrial challenge of the highest order, the energy residing in the nucleus of the atom may be released almost instantaneously—on the order of microseconds—with fantastic explosive violence. The identical material, surrounded by different auxiliary equipment, can be made to release its latent energy slowly, in the form of heat and radiation—for research, eventually for industrial power, and for the general economic, academic, and physical well-being of mankind.

At the same time, the two-faced nature of this force again thrusts itself forward; for the same atomic reactors which hold forth the promise of altering and enriching human life may likewise serve, in time, to power a warship or a military aircraft. Even further, the fissionable material inserted in or manufactured by a reactor is translatable to bomb use through modern technology.

Behind the long sequence of mining, processing, producing, fabricating, and assembling, lie intangible ideas. The secrets of the weapon could not have been captured and the secrets of future improved weapons and reactors will remain hidden without the investigations of many men, some working in laboratories, others working only with pad and pencil, and often concentrating upon matters seemingly devoid of relation to any practical use. Science presupposes cross-fertilization of minds, "playing by ear," exploration of details, and pursuing this path or that path as vaguely apprehended deductions and experimental evidence may suggest. The tentative and unpredictable quality of basic research is well known to all who have traced the events that brought forth the first atomic bomb. But upon this delicate foundation rests our ability to excel foreign rivals and thus to earn continuing military supremacy.

It has been my responsibility to serve as chairman of the Reactor Development Subcommitee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and I have therefore followed with particular attention our national efforts to exploit the complex and extraordinary instruments known as reactors. Some people call them "atomic furnaces"—not exactly a scientific term but one which conveys the essential idea. They are the machines which can harness the power of the atom to turn a propeller and drive industrial turbines, apart from their role in producing active material for bombs or for more reactors.

In the first few years after the recent war, the development of reactors was disappointingly slow. Every technical expert had a different idea and there was much study and exploration of this approach or that—but not enough concrete and tangible forward progress. We have been working hard to remedy that situation and some real advancement has now been accomplished.

Improved reactors are under way at Savannah River. We have just finished a new research instrument known as the experimental breeder reactor. This is located at Arco, Idaho, the Nation's reactor-testing station. The experimental breeder will furnish valuable information about possibilities of making more active material than is actually inserted into the machine. This so-called breeder process has immense significance both for military and peaceful purposes.

Another reactor project of keen interest is the nuclear-powered submarine. A prototype is under construction at Arco, and I think my colleagues are pleased with the energetic efforts which have been brought to bear upon this project. We are also pleased that a firm contract has been let for the development and prototype construction of a nuclear-power plant and fuselage for an aircraft. This particular enterprise has been of outstanding interest to us over a period of time and I think we may truthfully say that we ourselves have had not a little to do with the advancing strides now being taken.

Still another especially important reactor project involves the so-called materials-testing reactor. This instrument is under way at Arco, and as its name suggests, it is designed to test materials so that we may gain knowledge for the development of still more advanced reactor machines.

My subcommittee is keenly interested in the current study program involving eight private industrial firms. These are exploring the possibility of offering to build reactors wholly or partly at their own expense, with the dual purpose of producing power for sale to the public and plutonium for sale to the Government. I recommend that the complex factors entering into such a possibility be brought rapidly to a point of crystallization, so that they may be properly evaluated and judged.

To make a few general comments on the program, I am impressed by the rapid progress being made in weapons development, and I look for still more rapid progress. What we are doing will, I think, revolutionize concepts of warfare. The time will come when an aggressor can hardly afford to mass his troops in a dense concentration for an attack—for he would thus expose himself to atomic bombs used tactically against him. I think the new tactical atomic weapons are of major interest to all three services, the Army and the Navy no less than the Air Force.

I believe that the Armed Forces can afford to assign more men and devote more time to the study of how atomic energy affects their plans and to the actual training of personnel to implement these plans. I do not mean to be critical. Probably none of us have been as completely alert as we would like to be.

At the same time testimony recently given the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy indicates to me that there is wide room for improvement in the amount of time and effort which the Armed Forces spend on mastering atomic-energy problems.

The basic law establishes what is known as a Military Liaison Committee for the express purpose of keeping the Armed Forces informed about all military aspects of atomic development I think it unfortunate that the members of this Military Liaison Committee have time-consuming assignments apart from their committee work. There is a role for many full-time military people in the atomic-energy business, and I would hope that the top ranking officials in the Defense Department will find it possible to give these particular problems increasing attention

No man is wise enough to foresee all the consequences of the new era of "atomic plenty" into which we are moving. We only know that, in self-defense, we must move into this new era as vigorously and as rapidly as we can. I believe that the hopeful aspects of the atom will, in the scales of history, far outweigh its destructive threat.

SITE FOR NEW FEDERAL BUILDING, NEWNAN, GA.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4551) to provide for the acquisition of a site for the new Federal building in Newnan, Ga., adjoining the existing Federal building there as an economy measure before land value has increased as a result of land improvement.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, I understand this is simply an addition to the post office upon which they have had an option, and unless they take it up it will cost them a great deal more.

Mr. TRIMBLE. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the General Services Administrator be authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a plot of land one hundred and forty-five feet long and eighty-eight feet wide situated at the southwest corner of Spring Street and Perry Street, and immediately east of and adjoining the present post office site in the city of Newnan, Ga., for use as site for the erection of a new Federal building Such plot of land is more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point where the south line of Spring Street intersects with the west line of Perry Street, thence westerly along the south line of Spring Street eighty-eight feet to the northeast corner of the present Post Office lot, thence southerly along the east line of said Post Office lot one hundred and forty-five feet to a point; thence easterly and parallel with the south line of Spring Street eighty-eight feet to the west line of Perry Street; thence northerly along the west line of Perry Street one hundred and forty-five feet to the place of beginning.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "easterly" and insert "westerly."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALARIES OF POSTMASTERS, SUPERVISORS, AND EMPLOYEES IN THE FIELD SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 52.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 355) to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, to make the following correction, namely: In the language contained in the conference report on page 2, table of grades and salaries of employees in the automatic grades, under "Examiners of Equipment and Supplies," strike out "4,470" and insert in lieu thereof "5,470."

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this simply is a typographical error that is being corrected.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3554) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, briefly, this applies to only five counties in the whole United States and they are in southern Maryland. This bill has the approval of the Committee on Agriculture. It simply attempts to synchronize the period between the closing of the market and the date of the computing of stocks on hand in those five counties.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And it only applies to Maryland?

Mr. SASSCER. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 301 (b) (3) (C) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C., sec. 1301 (b) (3) (C)), is amended to read as follows:

"(C) 'Carry-over' of tobacco for any marketing year shall be the quantity of such tobacco on hand in the United States at the beginning of such marketing year, which was produced in the United States prior to the beginning of the calendar year then current, except that in the case of Maryland tobacco it shall be the quantity of such tobacco on hand in the United States on January 1 of such marketing year, and except that in the case of cigar-filler and cigar-binder tobacco the quantity of type 46 on hand and theretofore produced in the United States during such calendar year shall also be included."

(b) Section 301 (b) (16) (B) of such act, as amended (7 U. S. C., sec. 1301 (b) (16) (B)), is amended by inserting immediately after "at the beginning of such marketing year" the following: "(or on January 1 of such marketing year in the case of Maryland tobacco)."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H R 5329. An act to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S 210. An act authorizing the naturalization of Jesus Juan Llanderal; and

S. 1046. An act to readjust postal rates.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3669) entitled "An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, and for other purposes."

FUMIKO THERESA SHIBATA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1023) for the relief of Fumiko Theresa Shibata.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Fumiko Theresa Shibata, the Japanese fiancée of Sgt Tobias A. Herrera, a citizen of the United States presently serving in the United States Armed Forces, and that the said Fumiko Theresa Shibata shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Fumiko Theresa Shibata is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Sgt. Tobias A. Herrera, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Fumiko Theresa Shibata, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Fumiko Theresa Shibata, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Fumiko Theresa Shibata as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTOMOBILES FOR AMPUTEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to make this brief announcement for the benefit of the Members: S. 1864, which is the amputees' automobile bill, has been passed by the Senate over the President's veto. The question of passing the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, will come up in the House tomorrow, and under the Constitution there must, of course, be a roll call.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. At what time do we meet tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have already secured consent for the House to meet at 10 o'clock.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, at the time the vote was had on the Railroad Retirement Act amendments, H. R. 3669, I was unavoidably and unexpectedly absent from the Chamber. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

WAR WITHOUT END: THAT IS TRUMAN'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under the Truman foreign policy what can the people of this country look forward to? There is only one promise: endless war. Our sons and daughters are pawns in the hands of internationalists who want to rule the world and make money at it.

Undeclared war in Korea is the result of this foreign policy, a "limited war," says the President but with unlimited killing of American youth; a "limited

war" contrary to the letter and spirit of our Constitution and in contemptuous disregard of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that our foreign policy means endless war. Fifteen months ago, it was Korea. Then this same foreign policy compelled the President to involve us in the British-Iranian oil dispute. That interference in the internal affairs of another country has failed—and miserably.

And now, Mr Speaker, we poke our collective nose into the British-Egyptian dispute. The Secretary of State reminded the Egyptian Government of its international obligations.

What an insult to a proud people. Of course, we could not expect less from the present administration which cannot deny that it intends to support the cause of a bankrupt colonialism all over the world—in Hong Kong, in French Indochina, in the Middle East, in Egypt, and in North Africa.

Have we the gall to support the British on the Suez with military assistance? It would not surprise me, Mr. Speaker, if the President made that move.

Mr. Speaker, this insane foreign policy is driving 200,000,000 people from the Atlantic to Pakistan into the arms of Russia. The Moslem world wants to be friendly to the United States but our policies scorn this friendship.

Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson prefer to support colonialism while the American people condemn it. In one breath we profess to be for the freedom of people everywhere. In another, by our actions, we resist their struggles for liberty.

Inconsistency appears to be a cornerstone of our foreign policy.

Are we for liberty and freedom of the so-called backward nations or not? All this talk about our desire to help these people is New Deal hogwash, when we look at the record.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States to have a right to know how many wars we are engaged in now and how many we are committed to in the future. The Korean fiasco is well-known, but I am quite sure they do not realize we have taken on another war in French Indochina.

There has been no official announcement, of course, and no declaration of war by the President or the Congress but we have it on the word of General Tassigny, who was in the United States a few weeks ago, that the war in Indochina could be won in a matter of months because of the help the United States has pledged.

This means that we are at war in French Indochina on the side of French colonialism. We shall furnish the weapons, munitions, men, and other requirements with American dollars. Asiatic people will construe this as an unfriendly act.

By what authority, Mr. Speaker, did President Truman enter into that arrangement with the French? Certainly the Congress has not approved it.

To my colleagues in this House, I say the time has come to insist that Congress have something to say about agreements that are made without authority in law. We cannot avoid this responsibility.

Are we legislators in our own right or are we legislative puppets?

Mr. Speaker, we have lost the friendship of 200,000,000 people. In French Indochina we are driving the people into the arms of the Russians. It is a well-known fact that they are demanding freedom from French imperialism and if the French are successful in the present military operation, the United States will be the enemy of every Asiatic.

I repeat again, Mr. Speaker, that our foreign policy today means perpetual war for the men and women of this country.

This is the promise of Truman's foreign policy—war without end.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 5745) to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

BENEFITS UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, in these trying days of looking for new and additional sources of revenue in order to finance our defense and rearmament program, we are not overlooking the need for increase in salaries of many groups of our workers. But we are neglecting many of our loyal workers who have low salaries but will still have to help bear the burden of the increased taxes. These workers are our State road workers, our municipal workers, and others who depend on the State and counties for their salaries. We all know our State and local government bodies are overburdened now with increased costs of meeting their financial responsibilities.

During the last session of the Eighty-first Congress it was my pleasure to work for the increased benefits under the social security law for this group of people, who had never had any assurance that when old age came they would be housed, fed, and clothed. This aid to the State road workers and the municipal employees had long been overlooked by the Congress. Although these benefits made great strides in meeting the needs, they cannot cover the increased cost of living and the higher taxes now.

I am quick to state that I do not know the solution to this problem, but recognition of the plight of this group is a paramount issue and I feel it should be called to the attention of the Congress. This segment of society has been neglected too long when it comes to better wages, yet no group gives better service. Think of the road workers who are called out in the very worst of our winter weather, night and day, to keep our high ways open to the onrushing traffic.

May each Member of this Congress, in his own way, seek to find the solution to this very pressing problem which affects the lives of millions of our loyal American citizens.

ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing an amendment to the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. The purpose of my amendment is to provide, in the organization of each Congress, that the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint, among the nine Representatives of the House, on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, at least three persons who have not served on the joint committee during any prior Congress. The decision as to which of the incumbent members shall be displaced, will rest with the Speaker of the House.

The purpose of this amendment is to provide a means whereby more Members of the House may become responsibly informed with regard to our atomic energy program and atomic energy policy. Of necessity, a heavy curtain of secrecy has been kept over our atomic energy program. Consequently, this special committee, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, has not been able to report to the House of Representatives or to the people of the United States in the manner which is ordinarily expected of special committees and of regular committees of the Congress of the United States.

It appears that it would be impossible to provide such reports, even though they were limited in circulation to the Members of Congress, without taking the risk of serious security leaks. On the other hand, it is essential that the representatives of the American people do have a knowledge of this program and policy, even though such knowledge cannot be widely publicized. My proposal to expand or to provide for a rotation of members on the committee seeks to accomplish this objective without endangering the security of our atomic energy program.

Within recent weeks, members of the Atomic Energy Committee, as well as

officials of the Atomic Energy Commission, have issued statements regarding atomic energy and atomic warfare which are apparently contradictory. There has been talk of fantastic weapons; of the mass production of devices of war based upon the use of atomic force. On the other hand, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Lovett, has bluntly warned that we cannot expect any immediate change in the weapons with which we must fight today's wars. There has been much speculation as to the significance of Russia's explosion of the second bomb. There have been guesses as to the number of bombs which Russia has stockpiled, but not certain or positive statements.

Even though it may be a long time before anything even remotely approaching a full and comprehensive report regarding this vital question of atomic energy and atomic weapons can be given to the American people, I believe that it is in keeping with the principles of representative government that the representatives of the people should have this knowledge, to the extent that it is practicable to give this information to them. My proposal to provide for the appointment of new members to the Atomic Energy Committee is a practical means of attaining this objective.

If the work of the committee was of a highly technical nature, a strong case could be made against my proposal. The technical work in relation to atomic energy is of a highly scientific nature and it is not likely that any member of the committee would master this field of knowledge. The principle function of the committee is one of policy determination. Because of the vital importance of this program and also because under the present arrangement very few Members of Congress have any certain knowledge of either program or policy, I am proposing this plan of rotation in order that more Members may come to know more of the program and have a direct part in the direction of this program and in the determination of the policy, both as it affects the wartime use of atomic energy and also the possible peacetime applications.

The bill is as follows:

A bill to provide a new method for the appointment of Members of the House of Representatives to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 15 (a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (42 U. S. C., sec. 1815 (a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) (1) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to be composed of nine Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance not more than five members shall be members of the same political party.

"(2) Of the members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives during the Eighty-third Congress and each subsequent Congress, at least three shall be persons who have not served on the joint committee during any prior Congress. The three new members to be appointed under this paragraph during each Congress shall, unless sufficient vacancies otherwise exist in the membership of the joint committee, replace three incumbent members of the committee. The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall have authority whenever necessary to designate which of the incumbent members shall be replaced."

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. GORE asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 30 minutes.

TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, we owe it to the country to stop passing hodgepodge and complicated tax legislation. Subsequent to the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1928, over 23 years ago, our tax laws have been enacted at a very rapid rate and without due consideration In many cases, we have had two revenue acts a year and in some years more than that. The poor taxpayer is bewildered and confused. He has had to hire lawyers and accountants to assist him in rendering his return to the Government, and in many cases, even with the most expert advice it has been impossible for him to prepare a correct return. It is important that our tax laws be simple and understandable—that they be certain in application and capable of economical and effective administration It is also important that they be fair and equitable.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we put an end to this hodgepodge legislation We need to start afresh and review our tax laws from stem to stern. We owe it to the country to do this and to try to bring some order out of this chaotic condition. This country is one of the few countries in the world where so large an amount of taxes is collected through self-assessment and with the voluntary cooperation of the taxpayers. But our laws are becoming so complicated and unfair that it is important that we take another look at the Internal Revenue Code and completely revise it. If we do not, we face a complete breakdown of our voluntary-assessment system. We must assist and protect the honest taxpayer in his efforts to make correct renditions to his Government. We must see to it that he is treated fairly. He cannot plan ahead if we continually change the tax laws and the amount of taxes he owes to the Government. Our present complicated and discriminatory tax laws make it impossible for the taxpayer to comply with and meet this objective. It is for this reason that I believe a complete study and review of our internal revenue laws should be made. The committee, which my resolution has created for this purpose, is composed of members who have had long experience in tax legislation. They know the problems of the taxpayer and realize the need for immediate action on this matter. It is a nonpartisan committee, having equal membership from both parties, six from the majority and six from the minority. I feel confident that this committee can go a long way toward meeting the objective, if we have a moratorium from tax legislation until this study has been completed. It is for this reason that the resolution provides that no further tax legislation shall be considered, except in a situation of extreme emergency, such as a declaration of war, until the committee completes this study and renders its report.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I regret to see the Congress driving for final adjournment, perhaps tomorrow, without having acted upon one of the Nation's most pressing problems—Federal aid to education. It should be made the first order of business when Congress reconvenes next January.

Education is one of the sure foundations upon which the future of our Nation depends.

Continuation of what we know as the American way of life depends upon a citizenary well-schooled in the history and background of our Nation We have for generations had the greatest elementary and high-school program of any nation in the world. This year almost 1,000,000 teachers serve in our 90,000 school districts to teach approximately 25,000,000 American school children.

However, we should be concerned with more than the mere size of our vast educational program. We should be so much concerned that we become determined to provide for every boy and girl in the Nation the best and most complete education of which he or she is capable. We should guarantee with our national resources that no segment of our school-age population is denied educational opportunities adequate to any demand which his individual needs and the national welfare may place upon him. We should be concerned if salaries in rural schools are so low that they discourage the best trained teachers from accepting appointments in rural areas or if any other conditions serve to deny a good education to any boy or girl because he or she happens to be born in a community poor in material wealth but with a high population of school-age children.

In fact, we must face up honestly to some of the basic conditions which create differences in educational opportunities between the predominantly rural and the predominantly urban States as well as between farm and urban regions of the same State.

These differences are not limited to a small number of States. To dispel the

possibility of such a conclusion the following table is presented:

School-age children per 1,000 total population, 1948

State	Children per thousand population	State	Children per thousand population	Difference	Percentage difference
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Nevada	171	Tennessee	243	72	42
New Jersey	173	North Dakota	246	73	42
New York	174	Kentucky	250	76	43
California	175	Utah	251	76	43
Connecticut	178	Georgia	258	80	45
Rhode Island	180	Arkansas	261	81	45
Illinois	182	North Carolina	261	79	43
Oregon	182	West Virginia	261	79	43
Massachusetts	183	Alabama	266	83	45
Washington	189	Mississippi	276	87	46
Maryland	192	New Mexico	277	85	44
Delaware	193	South Carolina	280	87	45

Thus each of the predominantly rural States in column (3) above has at least 42 percent more children to educate than does any State in column (1).

Since those States with the most children to educate per thousand population also have correspondingly fewer adults to pay taxes, the actual difference in the burden of financing education is still greater than the above figures indicate. Our farm States simply produce more children.

FARM STATES HAVE LOWEST INCOMES AS WELL AS THE MOST CHILDREN

Income per person varies enormously from our poorest to our more well-to-do States. Furthermore, our 12 lowest income States are, without a single exception, predominantly farm States, ranging from 63 to 82 percent rural.

In support of this statement we need only to note the United States census report and mark the degree to which those States with more children are strictly rural in character. South Carolina is 75 percent rural, according to the United States census classification of 1940. Both Arkansas and Mississippi are 80 percent rural. In contrast to these predominantly rural States stand New Jersey and New York, each of which is only 20 percent rural, and Massachusetts with an 11 percent rural population.

Income per person in Mississippi, an 80 percent rural State, was $753 in 1948. In our most fortunate State, which is only 20 percent rural, personal income to all its residents averaged more than $1,800 per person.

Translated into income per school pupil, the differences between States are still more striking. Personal income of New York citizens averages $10,500 per child of school age. In Arkansas that figure is $2,600.

URBAN AREAS DOUBLE RURAL EXPENDITURES FOR SCHOOLS

A 1934 study showed urban expenditures per child of $86.42 per pupil and rural expenditures of only $43.10 per child—Herlihy, Lester B., Urban and Rural School Expenditures, School Life, volume 21, page 272, June 1936. In spite of increased expenditure today for both rural and urban schools, the vast differences still continue between the educational opportunities offered our rural boys and girls and those available to children who grow up nearer to our centers of industry and commerce.

In 1947–48 four of our strictly rural States were limited in their educational expenditures to the following averages: Mississippi, $60; Arkansas, $87; Tennessee, $90; and Georgia, $98.

In that same year the average expenditures per school child in four of our industrialized States stood as follows: In Massachusetts, $211; in Illinois, $243; in New Jersey, $249; and in New York, $256.

ONE MILLION FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND CHILDREN IN ONE-ROOM SCHOOLS

According to the November 1950 issue of the Phi Delta Kappan, 1,500,000 farm children were enrolled in one-room schools last year. With all due credit to the great service which the one-room school has rendered and still continues to render, there are certain unalterable limitations which are inherent in the one-room school. Most obvious shortcoming of the one-room school is the crowded schedule and the consequent limited time the teacher can give to each pupil and class. For example, in an eighth grade one-room school the teacher must ordinarily divide her time among 20 or more classes each day. It becomes more difficult year by year to attract adequately trained teachers to serve in one-room rural schools at the meager salaries available.

SALARIES OF URBAN TEACHERS TWICE THOSE PAID IN RURAL SCHOOLS

In 1942 the average salary of urban teachers in the United States was $2,013. Rural teachers averaged $1,018—study of agricultural and economic problems of the Cotton Belt before Special Subcommittee on Cotton of the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Eightieth Congress, first session, July 7 and 8, 1947. Salaries of both groups have risen in the past 8 years but wide disparities still exist.

In 1947–48 the 12 States in which teachers' salaries averaged from $1,256 to $2,062 were States ranging from 60 percent to 80 percent rural. In greatest contrast stood 12 of our more highly industrialized States with average salaries for teachers ranging from $3,016 in Illinois to $3,690 in California.

LOW SALARIES AND LOW STANDARDS IN FARM STATES

In 1948 the governors conference called for a State-by-State school survey. The Council of State Governments sponsored the study. Results showed that 10,000 Mississippi teachers and over 5,000 teachers in both Arkansas and South Carolina were paid less than $1,500 salary for that school year. In contrast again the predominantly urban States of Massachusetts, New Jersey, and New York reported no teachers on so low a salary.

INEQUALITIES THE RULE, NOT THE EXCEPTION

If wealth and income were distributed in like manner and proportion as school-age children, the problem of paying teachers and of financing education generally would be much less difficult. On the contrary, as shown above, large numbers of children and small incomes go hand in hand among the States and communities. The result is that, far from being a land of equal opportunity, America to many farm boys and girls is a land of unequal opportunity.

WE DO EQUALIZE AT THE STATE LEVEL

In order to assist in equalizing educational opportunity for the youth of our States and Nation, State-aid equalization laws have been set up in most States. If we genuinely believe that America is or should be a land of equal opportunity for all, it follows that equalization of educational opportunity should be approached on a Nation-wide scale. Since those States with the highest proportion of children and the lowest income per person are nevertheless making the greatest effort to support education and still find themselves so limited financially that rural school teachers are generally paid only one-half the salaries paid to urban teachers, Congress should pass legislation to assist the States to establish and maintain a minimum level of educational opportunity.

FISCAL COOPERATION BETWEEN STATE AND SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The existing State equalization laws constitute a clear-cut type of fiscal cooperation between the local school districts and the States. The State generally depends upon a tax base different from that of the local district. The State-aid program therefore constitutes a genuine supplement to the local school finance program.

MINIMUM EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY FOR EVERY CHILD IS NATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Obviously, equalization between States can come only through Federal assistance. Congress can and does levy taxes wherever the income is found, such revenue to be expended where needed. A moderate Federal-aid-to-education program is needed to supplement the financial efforts of the States. Since it is rural children who suffer most from poor schools, farm organizations cannot afford to be laggard in their support of that objective.

FEDERAL-AID FORMULA MUST BE OBJECTIVE

The determining factor in any proposed Federal-aid-to-education program will be the degree of objectivity with which such legislation can be written and administered. The law must be so written that the funds in largest amounts will go to the States and communities where the needs are most acute. This will assure better schools for the farm children of the Nation.

The method for determining State allotments of Federal aid should be clearly set forth in an objective formula which is not subject to political manipulation. Such a formula should take into consideration three basic factors: First, the number of school-age children in the State; second, the total personal income of the people of the State; and, third, the effort to support education being made

within the State as indicated by the percentage of the total income spent for education.

MINIMUM ALLOTMENT TO MORE FORTUNATE STATES

On the ground that poorly supported schools exist in all States, and particularly in the rural areas of all States, it follows that a minimum allotment per child should be available in every State. This allotment to improve education in the low areas of every State would go far toward providing adequate opportunities for the children and youth in the rural areas of each State.

RURAL SCHOOLS WILL BECOME PROGRESSIVELY MORE CROWDED

Births recorded during the past 5 years indicate that the Nation must be prepared to provide schooling for 1,000,000 additional children each year for several years to come. Invariably the larger percentage of this increase will be in the predominantly rural States. Likewise, within each State the greater increase in birth rate and therefore in school enrollments continues to be in rural areas of the State.

TRADITION OF FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION

We have had an unbroken record of Federal-State cooperation in fiscal matters. Congress began making public school land grants 150 years ago. The Land Grant College Act was written more than 60 years ago. Between 1830 and 1900 Congress granted over 200,000 square miles of land to privately owned railroads. Wilson signed the Smith-Hughes law to provide Federal funds for setting up agriculture and home economic courses in our schools. Congress cooperates with the States in helping support plans for crop insurance, soil conservation, and rural electrification. Five hundred million dollars is assigned this year from the Nation's budget to supplement State highway building programs. In many other programs Congress shares with all of the States a reasonable part of the cost; such is not the case, however, with our public schools. To the present date education for American boys and girls unfortunate enough to be born in our poorest State is limited by the meager resources of that State. The wealthy State shares its resources to insure bank deposits in all States but not to help educate future citizens. Congress taxes the wealth where it is to help build highways where they are needed but not improve the educational opportunities of the farm children of the Nation.

NATIONAL SECURITY NECESSITATES ADDITIONAL SUPPORTS FOR EDUCATION

Partial mobilization for defense has sharply highlighted our critical shortage of trained manpower. Now that we are confronted with the immediate prospect of all-out mobilization this shortage becomes a national calamity.

It is always too late to prepare for an emergency. Present and future manpower comes chiefly from rural United States. Considerably more than half our children and youth still live in rural areas. They go to rural schools. Their preparation is that which is being given in rural schools. Their limitations reflect the limitations of rural schools. Unfortunately, a much larger percent of our rural youth as compared with urban youth throughout the United States do not go to high school. Thousands attend substandard elementary schools and many have no school to attend.

Those States which are predominantly rural have a higher rate of rejections for both educational and health deficiency than do the States which are predominantly urban.

When every trained and healthy man is sorely needed now and for years to come to protect our lives and our homes, then the more adequate preparation of our manpower in all schools, rural and urban, becomes a matter of first importance.

Rural schools suffer under the greatest handicaps. They do not have the money; they cannot get the money from local or State sources to do the job which must be done to prepare our youth for defense. The Federal Government should assume some responsibility for guaranteeing adequate training for all youth.

We cannot safely wait for the elementary schooling until they are 19 years of age and are in the military camps.

If the boys are not trained at home, they must be trained too late and at enormous expense by agencies strictly military, with money entirely Federal, and under a control which is completely military. We cannot afford to continue to reject enormous numbers from military service because of educational deficiency.

Objections to general Federal aid to education wither to insignificance in the face of such compelling national emergency as we face.

The Nation cannot afford to reject so many men for educational deficiency; neither can it afford to wait to train them In the interest of national safety that job must be done at home by local schools before the boys reach the age at which they must devote their time to essential military and technical training.

There is not now and there will not be for the next 10 years sufficient time to teach prospective military men in military camps the essentials and fundamentals which they should have learned in the elementary grades and in high school.

We need more than manpower. We need trained manpower. Man for man, we are outnumbered. Our real hope lies in the training and development we can give our youth.

We can have the highest quality manpower if our public-school system is built up in all phases and in all areas.

Farming groups are largely producing the children and youth who can save the Nation. Those children and youth are not getting the chance to which they are entitled and they are not being prepared for the most critical need which this Nation has for their trained services.

Federal aid to education will permit those children, youth, and young men to get their training at home in civilian institutions at the time in their lives when they ought to have it. The farm organizations carry a very heavy responsibility for pushing the program for better rural schools.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

Mr. GARY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5684) making appropriation for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

Mr. CANNON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5915) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. RANKIN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'NEILL (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) and to include a speech by Mr George A. Tesoro.

Mr. FLOOD and to include a speech made by him on the Schuman plan.

Mr. FLOOD to revise and extend his remarks on the tax revenue bill and to include his own statement on coal depreciation increase.

Mr. WALTER and to include an editorial.

Mr. BAKEWELL.

Mr VAN ZANDT.

Mr. JAVITS in three separate instances in each to include extraneous material.

Mr VELDE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr BOGGS of Delaware (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHEEHAN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts and to include a letter from General MacArthur.

Mr. MAGEE and to include a speech.

Mr. ASPINALL and to include an article from a newspaper.

Mr. MURDOCK in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RABAUT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WICKERSHAM and to include a radio address.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include a statement by Dr. John Cronin.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee and to include an editorial which appeared in tne National Municipal Review.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. YORTY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRYSON and to include a newspaper clipping.

Mr. KILDAY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CORBETT and to include an exchange of letters between the commanding officer of Fort Lee and the parents of servicemen.

Mr. SHORT in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter; also to include an address delivered before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress by Mr. Samuel B. Morris, a member of the Water Resources Policy Commission set up by President Truman last year, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $287.

Mr. REED of New York to revise and extend his remarks on the revenue bill conference report and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES in two instances and in one to include an editorial from the Charlotte Observer.

Mr. GWINN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FURCOLO.

Mr. ELLIOTT (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr CROSSER (at the request of Mr. FRIEST).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SHEPPARD, for 30 days, on account of official business.

Mr ZABLOCKI, for Friday, October 19, on account of official business.

Mr. HAGEN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), on account of illness in his family.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1236. An act for the relief of Rhoda Akiko Nishiyama;

H. R. 4473 An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes;

H J. Res 284. Joint resolution authorizing the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the observance and memorialization on April 9, 1952, of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John Howard Payne, author of that family hymn of America, Home Sweet Home, and

H. J. Res. 289. Joint resolution to terminate the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 57. An act for the relief of Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin;

S. 118. An act for the relief of Nouhad Ann Khoury;

S. 519. An act for the relief of Moy Chin Shee;

S. 575. An act for the relief of Robert Jose Toribio;

S. 582. An act for the relief of Emma Burr;

S. 635 An act for the relief of Hans Lenk;

S. 775 An act for the relief of Dr. Anthony M. Opisso;

S. 839. An act for the relief of Alice Ibrahim, Hannan Ibrahim, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Roselleen Schut;

S 921. An act to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947;

S. 954. An act for the relief of Dr. Charles Gordon Rennick Sell;

S. 1048 An act for the relief of Myrtle Harding;

S. 1274. An act for the relief of Vera Oumancoff;

S. 1436. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller;

S. 1622. An act to amend section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946;

S 1640. An act for the relief of Cathy Dana Besser;

S. 1912 An act to provide for conveyance of certain land to the city of New Orleans;

S. 1952. An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes;

S 1970. An act for the relief of Louis E. Gabel;

S. 2007 An act for the relief of Sharon A. Gates, and

S 2027. An act for the relief of Leo Kieve.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, October 20, 1951, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

895 A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'an act to create a revenue in the District of Columbia by levying a tax upon all dogs therein, to make such dogs personal property, and for other purposes' "; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

896. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Security Council, Executive Office of the President, transmitting attachment A to National Security Council determination No. 9, pursuant to section 1302, Public Law 45 (Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951); to the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs.

897 A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 31, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on the Louisiana and Texas Intracoastal Waterway, La., and Tex., with a view to determining if it is advisable to modify the existing project in any way at this time, particularly with reference to the construction of a side channel to and through St. Mary's Bay and Mission River to Refugio, including a turning basin at the latter point. This investigation was requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 24, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R 5063. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, to permit the interstate movement, for immediate slaughter, of domestic animals which have reacted to a test for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test for brucellosis; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept No. 1216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 95. Resolution authorizing the committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 1217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Report pursuant to Public Law 585, Seventy-ninth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr TRIMBLE: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 4551 A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site for the new Federal building in Newnan, Ga., adjoining the existing Federal building there as an economy measure before land value has increased as a result of land improvement; with amendment (Rept. No. 1219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union

Mr. BROWN of Georgia: Joint Committee on Defense Production. First annual report, pursuant to section 712 (b) of the Defense Production Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency H. R. 5745. A bill to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages, without amendment (Rept. No. 1221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CANNON: Committee of conference. H R. 5215. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1222). Ordered to be printed.

Mr GARY: Committee of conference H. R. 5684. A bill making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. 1223). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. YORTY:

H R 5817. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, so as to reduce the amount of the deductions which may be made on account of outside income from the benefits payable to certain individuals thereunder, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H R 5818 A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the public-school authorities of Valencia County, N Mex , in the construction and improvement of public-school facilities, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 5819. A bill to finance the exploration, development, production, and production expansion of critical and strategic minerals and metals within the United States, its Territories, and insular possessions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 5820. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the unauthorized use of the name or character "Smokey Bear"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R 5821. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to insure that materials and equipment needed to complete construction of schools and hospitals and churches programed before September 8, 1950, are made available for that purpose; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H R. 5822. A bill to provide for the temporary free importation of aluminum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 5823 A bill to finance the exploration, development, production, and production expansion of critical and strategic minerals and metals within the United States, its Territories, and insular possessions, to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr AYRES.

H R 5824. A bill to provide for reductions in appropriations made during the present Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H R. 5825. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of an additional number of aliens of Italian nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R 5826 A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the substitution, for draw-back purposes, of box shook; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr WINSTEAD.

H R. 5827. A bill to authorize the interservice transfers of officers and enlisted persons of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services

By Mr. DINGELL:

H R 5828. A bill to provide for the refund or credit of the internal-revenue tax paid on fermented malt liquors lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the floods of 1951 where such fermented malt liquors were in possession of (1) the original taxpayer, or (2) a wholesale fermented malt liquors dealer, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R 5829 A bill to establish a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H R. 5830. A bill to provide a new method for the appointment of Members of the House of Representatives to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R 5831. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture

H. R 5832 A bill to amend the definition of parity prices for agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REED of New York.

H J Res. 348 Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Revision of Internal Revenue Laws; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr CELLER:

H. J. Res. 349. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a National Arts Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BAKEWELL:

H. Con. Res. 169. Concurrent resolution calling for the dismissal of J. Howard McGrath as Attorney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res 472. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation regarding hospitalization, medical and surgical care of veterans; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 473. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 472; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. Res 476. Resolution to authorize the United States Corps of Engineers to make a survey of the headwaters of the Warrior River and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. Res. 471. Relating to allocations of materials for schools and hospitals; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr BARRETT:

H R 5833. A bill for the relief of Carolina Montini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H R 5834. A bill for the relief of Arnaldo Senese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H R 5835 A bill for the relief of Gerassimos Doryzas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R 5836. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States and others, who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of the outbreak of hostilities in Korea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H R 5837 A bill to incorporate the Future Homemakers of America, and for other purposes, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr DAGUE:

H R 5838 A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lillian Coolidge, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr GREENWOOD

H R. 5839 A bill for the relief of Arnold Jacobs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H R 5840. A bill for the relief of sureties in certain immigration cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr JUDD:

H R 5841 A bill for the relief of Winston Bros Co and the Utah Construction Co; Roy L. Bair & Co and James Crick & Sons, J. A. Terteling & Sons, Inc; and T E Connolly, Inc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H R 5842 A bill for the relief of Fajwel Goldblat (also known as Felix Fibich) and Judith Goldblat (also known as Judith Berg Fibich); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R 5843 A bill for the relief of Shizue Sai and her minor child, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr WEICHEL:

H R 5844. A bill for the relief of Robert Vernon Jensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:

H R 5845. A bill for the relief of Michael Osamu Kobayashi, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

480 By Mr. KILDAY: Petition of Rev. Clyde W. Coleman, pastor of the South Flores Baptist Church, of San Antonio, Tex., and 49 others, petition of Rev. Elvious Pepper, pastor of the Mitchell Terrace Baptist Church, of San Antonio, and 17 others, and petition of Rev. Dick Scott, pastor of Black Creek Baptist Church, of Devine, Tex., and 42 others, with reference to existing conditions in Army camps and in cities where Army camps are located, with reference to the sale of intoxicating liquor on military reservations, and placing taverns and taprooms "off limits," and making it a Federal offense to sell intoxicating liquors to anyone in training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

481. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of Mrs. Aletta L. Dillon, of Cedar Falls, and 50 other residents of Iowa, in support of bills H. R. 2187, 2188, 1749, 3494, 3263 and in opposition to bills H. R. 264, 3073, 3235, 1206, 1736, 2382, and 3624; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

482 By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT: Resolution passed by the City Council of Philadelphia, Pa., urging that the Government of the United States acquire and maintain as a patriotic shrine the land at the southwest corner of Seventh and Market Streets in the city of Philadelphia where the Declaration of Independence was drafted and prepared; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

483 By the SPEAKER Petition of deputy, city of Los Angeles, Calif., relative to the Senate bill modifying the so-called Capehart amendment, relating to covering expenses that may be considered in fixing price ceilings by the Office of Price Stabilization; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, October 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who art without beginning or end of days, who countest the nations as the dust of the balance, who puttest down the mighty from their seat and exaltest the humble and the meek: Allowed by Thee, we have been called to be servants of the Nation in a tense and tortured time when the world has been plowed with violence and when wars and rumors of war vex the earth; in such a day Thou hast summoned us to mend the flaws of our own democracy and to erase its blemishes, and to unleash the might of freedom against rampant evil bent on enslaving all people. Through this crucial period we have been, at best, unprofitable servants. As we come to the end of a chapter of our stewardship in these momentous times, there must be recorded this day "What I have written, I have written."

Now, unto Thy holy keeping we commit ourselves and all that has here been done and said. Pardon and overrule what has been done unworthily, or left undone or done amiss. Strengthen all that has been worthily achieved as we have followed flickering lights in a dark hour. And may the Lord bless us and keep us, and make His face to shine upon us, and give us peace, peace in our own hearts, peace in this dear land of ours, peace throughout all the earth. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 19, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 20, 1951, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 509. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718d), as amended;

S. 1450. An act to provide for the exchange of certain lands owned by the United States of America for certain privately owned lands; and

S. 1713. An act for the relief of Charles Cooper.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 52) to make a change in the enrollment of Senate bill 355, the so-called postal salary increase bill.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3554. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H R. 4551. An act to provide for the acquisition of a site for the new Federal building in Newnan, Ga., adjoining the existing Federal building there as an economy measure before land value has increased as a result of land improvement;

H. R 5048. An act relating to the statute of limitations in the case of criminal prosecutions of offenses arising under the internal revenue laws, and

H. R. 5448. An act to provide for the temporary free importation of zinc.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H R 3554. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 4551 An act to provide for the acquisition of a site for the new Federal building in Newnan, Ga., adjoining the existing Federal building there as an economy measure before land value has increased as a result of land improvement; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R 5048 An act relating to the statute of limitations in the case of criminal prosecutions of offenses arising under the internal revenue laws; and

H. R. 5448. An act to provide for the temporary free importation of zinc, to the Committee on Finance.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bennett	Chavez	Frear
Benton	Connally	Fulbright
Butler, Md.	Cordon	George
Butler, Nebr.	Duff	Green
Cain	Dworshak	Hayden
Capehart	Ecton	Hendrickson
Carlson	Ellender	Hickenlooper
Case	Ferguson	Hill
Hoey	McCarran	Robertson
Humphrey	McClellan	Russell
Hunt	McFarland	Saltonstall
Johnson, Tex.	McKellar	Schoeppel
Johnston, S. C.	McMahon	Smathers
Kefauver	Millikin	Smith, N. J.
Kerr	Monroney	Sparkman
Kilgore	Moody	Stennis
Knowland	Morse	Thye
Langer	Murray	Watkins
Lehman	Neely	Welker
Magnuson	O'Conor	Williams
Malone	O'Mahoney	Young
Maybank	Pastore	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senators from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER and Mrs. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr BRICKER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday there are certain bills on the calendar which are now to be called. The bills were placed at the foot of the calendar yesterday.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SURVEY REPORT ON GREEN RIVER WATERSHED, KENTUCKY-TENNESSEE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a survey report dated May 1950, on the Green River watershed, Kentucky and Tennessee, which with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Jacksonville (Fla.) Townsend Club No. 18, protesting against the opening of welfare rolls to public exposure, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2330. A bill for the relief of Antonios Emanuel Ragusis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S 2331. A bill for the relief of Walayat Khan, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

S 2332 A bill for the relief of Fumiko Ito Stewart, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON (by request).

S. 2333. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Niarchos, Sofia Niarchos, and Gika Niarchos; and

S 2334 A bill for the relief of Miguel Narciso Ossario, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr KEFAUVER:

S. 2335. A bill to incorporate the Future Homemakers of America, and for other purposes, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S 2336 A bill for the relief of Nicholas B. Perry for losses sustained through confiscation of property by Rumania and Hungary, or either of said countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S 2337 A bill to provide for the national defense by enabling the States to make provision for maternity and infant care for wives and infants, and hospital care for dependents, of enlisted members of the Armed Forces during the present emergency, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading)

By Mr. LANGER.

S 2338. A bill to authorize pay to delegates representing Indians of California from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr MAGNUSON (by request):

S 2339. A bill amending section 34 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat 411), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTON (by request):

S 2340 A bill for the relief of certain Greek aliens, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE:

S 2341 A bill to establish a special grazing district in the State of Nevada; to provide for the conservation and protection of the public lands, and their use for mineral development, grazing and agriculture, fish and wildlife and recreation resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MALONE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading)

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S 2342. A bill to facilitate home mortgage loans to veterans desiring to purchase or

construct their homes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr MAYBANK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BENTON, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MOODY, Mr MURRAY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. LANGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. IVES, and Mr. HENDRICKSON):

S 2343 A bill to amend the immigration laws so as to eliminate discrimination based on race and sex; to provide for the use of unused immigration quotas; to provide nonquota status for parents of citizens, orphans, and alien members and former members of the Armed Forces; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S 2344 A bill to provide for construction-differential subsidies in the case of air carriers engaged in international air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr McCARRAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAIN:

S 2345. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the centennial of the institution of the Territorial government of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

S 2346 A bill to authorize the retirement of non-Regular officers of the Army and Air Force having more than 30 years' active Federal service under the same conditions presently provided for such officers having less than 30 years' service, and for other purposes; and

S 2347. A bill to change the effective date of certain provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, relating to the mandatory retirement or separation of certain Regular Army officers; to the Committee on Armed Services

(See the remarks of Mr. CAIN when he introduced the last two above named bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr LANGER:

S. J. Res 111 Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada, relating to the development of the resources of the Great Lakes-St Lawrence Basin for national security and continental defense of the United States of America and Canada, providing for making the St. Lawrence Seaway self-liquidating, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Foreign Relations

By Mr KEFAUVER:

S J. Res. 112 Joint resolution to provide an extension of time for the authorization for certain projects for local flood protection in the Tennessee River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works

By Mr CHAVEZ:

S. J. Res. 113 Joint resolution to prohibit the exportation of steel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHAVEZ when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

HEALTH CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the national defense by enabling the States to make provision for maternity and infant care for wives and infants, and hospital care for dependents, of enlisted members of the Armed Forces during the present emergency, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2337) to provide for the national defense by enabling the States to make provision for maternity and infant care for wives and infants, and hospital care for dependents, of enlisted members of the Armed Forces during the present emergency, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The explanatory statement by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN ON LEGISLATION FOR HEALTH CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF SERVICEMEN

This bill for health care for dependents of servicemen has a twofold purpose.

First, to declare the policy of Congress, and to provide that in a period of national emergency in which substantial numbers of our young men are called upon to serve in the Armed Forces of the United States, maternity and infant care may be assured to their wives and infants.

Second, to establish as a national policy, and to provide that during the present national emergency, hospital care should be assured for all of the dependents of enlisted members of the Armed Forces.

This bill is being introduced, at this final point in the session, so that it may have careful study and consideration by the many groups and agencies who have been and are very properly concerned over the problem of health care for dependents of servicemen These groups are both social-service groups and groups primarily interested in the welfare of our servicemen.

This bill is intended primarily as a framework against which the problem described above can be weighed, measured, and studied. The exact form the legislation should finally take must be assessed against a showing of existing or probable need for this legislation. This will require study and inquiry by the health subcommittee, whose staff is already at work on this aspect of the matter

The programs provided for in this bill are of the utmost importance to the men in our Armed Forces and their families whose welfare is, I know, the common concern of all of us It is my hope that we can work out legislation that will meet the need, and which will have general approval

Under the bill, these programs would be administered by the several States with funds appropriated by the Federal Government. The States would, consistent with economy and efficiency and in conformity with the provisions of the bill, utilize voluntary nonprofit agencies or organizations in the health or medical field which are in a position to render services in the administration of the program at the State level.

The programs provided for by the bill would, in general, be administered in accordance with principles which were developed during the World War II emergency maternity and infant care program.

Title I of the bill provides for a Federal-State program of emergency maternity and infant care for the wives and infants of enlisted members of the Armed Forces. Under the bill, hospital, medical, nursing and related services in connection with pregnancy and childbirth would be provided for the wife of any enlisted member of the Armed Forces. In addition, hospital, medical, nursing, and related services in connection with care of infants of enlisted members of the Armed Forces would be provided for. These services would be made available to the child of any enlisted member of the Armed Forces who has not attained the age of 5 years.

Title II of the bill is designed to protect enlisted members of the Armed Forces and their dependents from the unpredictable and income-consuming costs of hospital services. It authorizes the provision of hospital services to any dependent of an enlisted member of the Armed Forces as a bed patient. This means that under the bill, bed and board and such nursing services, laboratory services, ambulance service, use of operating room, staff services, and other services, drugs and appliances as are customarily furnished by a hospital to its bed patients, either through its own employees or through persons with whom it has made arrangements for such services, drugs, or appliances would be provided. Medical or surgical care, however, except as provided in title I in connection with maternity and infant care, and except as generally furnished by hospitals as an essential part of hospital care, would not be provided Similarly, hospitalization by hospitals which furnish primarily domiciliary care would not be provided.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr KEFAUVER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to make certain basic revisions in our immigration laws, chiefly designed to bring the quota system up to date, and remove the ancient relics of racial discrimination and discrimination against women from our immigration code. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2343) to amend the immigration laws so as to eliminate discrimination based on race and sex; to provide for the use of unused immigration quotas; to provide nonquota status for parents of citizens, orphans, and alien members and former members of the Armed Forces; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The explanatory statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

This bill, of bipartisan sponsorship, is the result of long study and review of our immigration laws. It is the product of con-

sultation with and deliberation among more than 30 voluntary agencies and great religious groups and organizations which are concerned with immigration and the handicaps to its orderly and humane functioning.

Under the terms of this bill, the outmoded system of quota distribution, devised in 1924, and based on our population in 1890, would be modified so as to permit the orderly entry into the United States of the same number of persons already provided for by law, namely, 154,277 annually. This number, as originally laid down in our immigration law of 1924, which has never had a basic revision, is now inflexibly allocated among national origin groups, largely from Western Europe.

Thus, of the total number of persons annually eligible to enter the United States as immigrants under our quota laws, more than one-third of the total, or 65,721 quota numbers are allocated to persons of British descent and citizenship. Other large quotas are available for natives of France, Ireland, and other countries of northern and Western Europe.

These quotas are not being fully used. There is no prospect of their being fully used. Meanwhile, quotas for persons from southern and Eastern Europe—the ones who really need asylum, the ones for whom the United States could really provide home and haven, are far oversubscribed and mortgaged far into the future.

This is especially true of Italy, Greece, and the countries behind the iron curtain. Refugees from the latter areas especially, huddled in the overcrowded cities of Western Germany and Austria and Western Europe generally, look desperately across the Atlantic in the hope and dream of somehow finding haven here. These individuals have fled from behind the iron curtain, often at the risk of their lives, seeking the boon of freedom. The least we, in this country, can do at this time is to make room for the admission of some of these refugees to the maximum extent possible under our quota laws, consistent with the requirements and interests of our national security.

Nor do I wish to understate the importance of providing for the admission of numbers of Italians and Greeks who dream vainly now of joining their relatives in this country.

There is also the Middle East, with its refugees, some of whom should have the right to enter this country even under the limitations of our quota system.

Under the terms of the bill we have today introduced, the unused portion of these quotas would be pooled and allocated to persons of other national origins, like Italians, Greeks, Poles, Hungarians, and Arabs—to mention a few.

Under the terms of this bill, preferences would be established for political and religious persecutees, for relatives of American citizens, for relatives of aliens now resident in the United States, and for persons with special skills and talents especially needed in this country.

Under other terms of the bill, nonquota preference would be granted to persons who had served in the Armed Forces of the United States, and to their wives and children, and to orphans who are brought over for adoption by American citizens.

Another provision of the bill would strike out the archaic discrimination based on sex now existing in our immigration laws. Under present law, certain preferences are given to wives of American citizens but not to husbands. This kind of discrimination would be deleted from the entire body of our immigration code.

Still another vital provision would strike out the unsupportable discrimination based on race which now bars persons of certain oriental races from admission as immigrants into the United States under any circumstances.

A further important provision of the bill would establish a statutory Board of Immigration Appeals, to be appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate, to replace the present Board established by administrative regulations.

Other provisions are as follows:

1. To delete the present exemption of immigration proceedings from the terms of the Administrative Procedures Act.

2. To make eligible for admission into this country reformed Communists and Fascists who can prove that they are reformed and are now devoted to democratic principles; and also to make eligible individuals whose membership in Communist and Fascist organizations occurred or ended before they reached the age of 16.

I hope that this bill, which does not include, by any means, all the desirable improvements in our immigration laws, will provide a basis for a new approach to the whole subject of immigration. This is vital if we are to discharge successfully our responsibilities as world leaders and to demonstrate to the world that we are sincere in advocating principles based on equality of men of all races and nations.

From a purely selfish point of view, we can use the special skills, talents, and labor of these individuals in our expanding and dynamic economy.

MORTGAGE LOANS TO VETERANS DESIRING TO PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCT HOMES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to facilitate home mortgage loans to veterans desiring to purchase or construct their homes.

I offer this proposal as one way of helping to solve a problem which has been a subject of great concern and a cause of much discussion in our committee during the last few months—the tight market for VA-guaranteed home loans.

I am introducing it at this time in order to give the veteran groups, the mortgage lenders, the home-building industry, the Government agencies concerned, and the public generally an opportunity to consider and study this legislation, so that when we return next session the Banking Committee will be able to make a determination as to what it should do with respect to this proposal in the light of the considered judgment of all those interested parties whom I have already mentioned and in the light of the conditions existing in the mortgage market at that time.

The legislation originated out of a discussion which took place on the Senate floor when the conference report on the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 was being considered. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was discussing the provision for direct loans to veterans and referred to the fact that the present authorization is almost exhausted and that unless the fund could be revolved by the sale of the existing mortgages which have been issued under the direct loan provisions of the act, not many new mortgage loans could be made. At that point, it occurred to me, and I so suggested to the Senator from Alabama, that we might help solve the problem by permitting the national service life insurance fund to invest some of its funds in these Government-guaranteed mortgages and thus provide a market for the mortgages held in the Veterans' Administration direct-loan portfolio. As of July 1, 1951, the national service life insurance fund amounted to $5,411,700,000, and the bill I am introducing would permit the fund to invest 20 percent of the moneys in VA-guaranteed home loans. At the present time it is my understanding that the fund is invested in a special issue of 3-percent treasuries. Since the net yield on these VA-guaranteed mortgages would be somewhere in the neighborhood of 3½ to 3¾ percent, the income of the fund would be increased to the advantage of the veterans and the Government would not have to pay the 3-percent interest on the funds so invested, as it does now on the national service life insurance fund, but could obtain its funds in the open market at a lower rate.

I am aware that this is a very complicated subject and deserves and will get a great deal of careful study and consideration before our committee takes any action on it. However, as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee I am terribly concerned about the present difficulties which veterans are confronted with in financing their home purchases, and I feel it is my duty and responsibility to do everything in my power to assist in working out ways and means of solving such problems.

The bill (S. 2342) to facilitate home mortgage loans to veterans desiring to purchase or construct their homes, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CONSTRUCTION-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDIES IN CASES OF CERTAIN AIR CARRIERS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for construction-differential subsidies in the case of air carriers engaged in international air transportation, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2344) to provide for construction-differential subsidies in the case of air carriers engaged in international air transportation, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The explanatory statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN

The bill which I have just introduced is designed to preserve the capacity of American manufacturers to produce the most advanced types of large transport aircraft.

For many years the American manufacturers have occupied a position of world leadership in the production of transport aircraft. A recent civil aeronautics board survey reports that 80 percent of the aircraft currently being used by scheduled common carrier airlines of the world are manufactured in the United States. The most modern of American-built transport aircraft today are being used almost exclusively by both American-flag and foreign air

carriers on all the major competitive international air routes. Lockheed Constellations, Douglas DC-6's, and Boeing Stratocruisers at this moment are flying the Atlantic and Pacific under the flags, not only of the United States, but also of Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Sweden, Belgium, and other countries.

There is no foreign-built aircraft which today is effectively competing in transoceanic service with these American-built aircraft.

There is no foreign-built aircraft which today is effectively competing in transoceanic service with these American-built aircraft.

This world-wide demand has enabled the American manufacturers to develop a tremendous capacity for producing modern, high-quality aircraft, and the significance of this capacty, from the national-defense viewpoint, cannot be over emphasized. No one can forget the brilliant response made by the American aircraft manufacturers in World War II when the allies' need for aircraft was so urgent. Fleets of American-made bombers turned the tide of the war. But had it not been for the extensive experience and existing capacity of those manufacturers, their brilliant contribution might never have been achieved.

But we can see, or foresee, the rapid emergence of an imminent threat to the continuing capacity of the American manufacturers to develop and produce modern transport aircraft.

Various European manufacturers, recognizing that the established American ability to produce the conventional reciprocating-engine type aircraft could not effectively be met, have devoted their efforts to developing, with extensive Government technical and financial assistance, new and advanced types of engines and airframes for the aircraft of the future. Turbines and jets have successfully been adapted to transport aircraft by foreign manufacturers.

Turbo-jet and turbo-prop commercial transport aircraft, with their greater speed and other advantages, may soon be appearing in competitive international air transportation The Civil Aeronautics Board, in its recent survey of this subject, stated:

"A recent innovation is BOAC's use of the Handley Page Hermes turbo-prop aircraft on some of its scheduled services While another turbo-prop aircraft of British manufacture (the Vickers Viscount), the British jet (DeHavilland Comet), and the Canadian jet (Avro Jetliner) have not as yet been put into regular use on scheduled services, they are being given trial tests which may result in their being placed in regular service relatively soon."

Foreign air carriers have already indicated their intention to adopt these more advanced planes, and if such adoption proves to be commercially successful, the American-flag international air carriers will certainly be compelled to do likewise to maintain their competitive status.

Thus, possibly for the first time, the American aircraft manufacturers soon may be faced with foreign competitors placing on the world market transport aircraft superior to anything now being produced in the United States. Moreover, in view of the technical and financial assistance that foreign governments are and have been putting into their own aircraft production, plus the lower production costs encountered in foreign countries, there is a very serious possibility that American manufacturers, acting independently, will not be able to offer a comparable product at a competitive price on the world market. The inescapable consequences of such a situation, unless remedial action is taken promptly, will be that the foreign manufacturers soon will displace the American manufacturers as suppliers of the modern types of commercial transport aircraft to the airlines of the world.

Such a development would inevitably result in a drastic curtailment of transport aircraft production in Amercan aircraft plants, and in the absence of actual production, the highly significant productive capacty of those plants could not be maintained.

To avoid the ominous implications of such a development, my new bill proposes to establish a construction-differential subsidy which will enable American aircraft manufacturers to produce for American-flag international air carriers the most modern transport aircraft, of whatever type the future may hold, at a price competitive with comparable aircraft constructed by foreign manufacturers. Such a subsidy will enable the American manufacturers to retain at least the very sizable proportion of the world aircraft market represented by the American-flag international air carriers; and to the extent that such a subsidy will help defray the high initial cost of originating new types of aircraft, the American manufacturers may thus be assisted toward attaining a status whereby they could compete without subsidy in the sale of such aircraft in the world market generally and in the American domestic market

This bill follows in principle the construction-differential subsidy procedure which has been applicable to American merchant marine construction since 1936. The Civil Aeronautics Board is authorized to grant the American-flag international air carriers a construction-differential subsidy for the purchase of aircraft from American manufacturers for use in international air transportation. To qualify for the subsidy, the air carrier must submit to the Board detailed information regarding the proposed aircraft. The Board, in conjunction with other interested agencies, will review the plans and will certify them for a construction-differential subsidy to the extent that such plans effectuate the purposes of the Civil Aeronautics Act The construction-differential subsidy, to be paid by the Board, will be equal to the excess of the price of the proposed aircraft produced by an American manufacturer over the price of comparable aircraft produced by foreign manufacturers. The subsidy is restricted to aircraft produced for use in international air transportation. If such subsidized aircraft is used by an American-flag international air carrier in other than international air transportation, a proportionate repayment of the subsidy to the Government, based on the remaining economic life of the aircraft, is required The purpose of this restriction is to limit the construction-differential subsidy to the international field, where the initial competitive impact is felt, and to prevent international air carriers, who also operate domestic routes, from competing with such subsidized aircraft against other domestic air carriers.

Unless the Congress enacts some such legislation as this, the American aircraft-manufacturing industry may soon find itself irretrievably behind the parade, instead of being in the position of leadership which we in America have come to expect of it, and which is so important to this Nation. I therefore commend this bill to my colleagues for careful study between now and the reconvening of the Congress to the end that there may be some hope for action on the measure early in the next session.

RETIREMENT OF NON-REGULAR OFFICERS OF THE ARMY AND AIR FORCE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the retirement of non-Regular officers of the Army and Air Force having more than 30 years of active Federal service under the same conditions presently in effect for officers having less than 30 years of service.

As presently written, the law discriminates against officers who have served over 30 years. I have had an analysis of the existing law made by the legislative counsel and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD as an explanation of my bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2346) to authorize the retirement of non-Regular officers of the Army and Air Force having more than 30 years' active Federal service under the same conditions presently provided for such officers having less than 30 years' service, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAIN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The analysis is as follows:

Section 5 of the act of July 31, 1935 (49 Stat 507, as amended; 10 U S. C., 943a) provides in pertinent part that non-Regular officers of the Army must be retired in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army when they have completed "not less than 20 or more than 30 years' active Federal service in the Armed Forces of the United States, at least 10 years of which shall have been active commissioned service" Officers who qualify for retirement under that provision receive retired pay equal to 2½ percent of the active duty base and longevity pay "of the rank with which retired" multiplied by the number of years of service credited to them for pay purposes, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of such active duty base and longevity pay

If Colonel Cox were eligible to retire under that section, and did in fact retire prior to January 1, 1957, he would be eligible under subsection 203 (f) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 (Public Law 810, 80th Cong) to be retired in the temporary grade held at the time of his retirement, and to receive retirement pay based on that grade. Thus he could retire with the grade and retired pay of a lieutenant colonel. As the enlisted and commissioned active service of Colonel Cox now exceeds 30 years, he cannot qualify for retirement under section 5 of the act of July 31, 1935, as amended.

As stated in the attached third endorsement of the Adjutant General, dated July 12, 1950, Colonel Cox is eligible for reenlistment and retirement as a master sergeant If he were to follow that course, he would upon retirement be advanced on the retired list, pursuant to subsection 203 (e) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, to the highest temporary grade held by him between September 9, 1940, and June 30, 1946, and he would be eligible to receive retirement pay at the rate prescribed by law for his length of service at the time of retirement but based upon such temporary commissioned grade. Thus, in determining his retired grade and pay he would receive no benefit from any temporary promotion received by him after June 30, 1946. Moreover, as subsection 4 (c) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 (37 U. S. C., 33 (c)) affirmatively prohibits the making of a cash settlement for unused accrued leave in the case of any person discharged for the purpose of entering into an enlistment in his branch of the Armed Forces, Colonel Cox would lose the benefit of payment for his accrued leave computed on the basis of his active duty pay as a commissioned officer. However, his present unused leave could be carried over into his enlistment as a master sergeant, and upon retirement as an enlisted man he would be

granted such payment based upon the active duty base and longevity pay of a master sergeant.

The distinction in treatment described above appears to be the result of the historical evolution of the pertinent statutes. Prior to 1935, commissioned officers of the Regular Army could retire for years of service only after the completion of 30 years' service, and such retirement was accomplished under section 1243 of the Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 943) in the permanent grade held at the time of retirement, with retirement pay equal to 75 percent of the base and longevity pay of that grade. In 1935 that section was supplemented by a provision (49 Stat. 507; 10 U. S. C. 943a) which permitted commissioned officers of the Regular Army to retire in their permanent grades if they had served not less than 15 or more than 29 years, with retired pay computed at the rate of 2½ percent of their active duty pay in such grades multiplied by the number of their years of active service credited for pay purposes. Section 202 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 amended that provision (1) to apply only to officers having not less than 20 or more than 30 years' service, and (2) to permit non-Regular officers to retire thereunder if they had completed at least 10 years of active commissioned service. No comparable amendment was made to section 1243 of the Revised Statutes to permit non-Regular officers to retire thereunder after more than 30 years' active service Accordingly, under present law non-Regular officers of the Army having more than 30 years' active service are accorded less favorable retirement than that granted to such officers who have less than 30 years' service, and are therefore eligible for retirement pursuant to section 5 of the act of 1935, as amended by section 202 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948.

If proposed legislation is desired to accord to non-Regular commissioned officers having more than 30 years' service the same benefits now available to such officers having less than 30 years' service, it is suggested that such result could be obtained by a bill which would (a) repeal section 1243 of the Revised Statutes, and (b) strike from section 5 of the act of July 31, 1935, as amended, the limiting phrase "or more than 30," thereby making that section the basis for the retirement for years of service of all commissioned officers having more than 20 years' service.

Respectfully submitted

JOHN C. HERBERG,
Assistant Counsel.

JUNE 26, 1951.

CHANGE OF EFFECTIVE DATE OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to change the effective date of certain provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, relating to the mandatory retirement or separation of certain Regular Army officers, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me in support of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2347) to change the effective date of certain provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, relating to the mandatory retirement or separation of certain Regular Army officers, introduced by Mr. CAIN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN IN SUPPORT OF BILL

I recommend not only that the Personnel Policy Board support the Army's proposal that the date June 30, 1953, appearing in section 514 (d) (3) Officer Personnel Act of 1947 be changed to June 30, 1956, but that in the act compulsory retirement be fixed at not less than age 60.

In support of this recommendation I quote from chapter 3 of the report by the Advisory Commission on Service Pay, with which I am in complete agreement:

"In planning a retirement program, it is of the greatest importance that the philosophy or purpose upon which it is founded is sound and will continue sound as far as can be seen into the future.

"There are a number of such purposes which can be offered as bases for a retirement plan for the members of the uniformed forces For example, it can be urged that an adequate retirement program is essential to attract the right kind of men to the services; that a retirement program is necessary to meet the Government's broad social obligations with respect to its employees; or that a retirement program is essential as an aid in administration, that is, that without such a plan, undesirable men and those who cannot advance in grade cannot be separated from the services And finally, it can be urged that a sound retirement plan is an essential tool in meeting the superannuation problem, using this phrase in its broadest possible sense.

"All these and perhaps other reasons may be advanced for a retirement program, but in the opinion of the Commission, the only reason not subject to serious debate, and which has a philosophy behind it that can be upheld without important challenge, is that the fundamental purpose of a retirement plan (accompanied by compulsory retirement at a fixed age) is to meet the superannuation problem. One can hardly disagree that the services must be kept alert and vigorous if they are to perform their function successfully in critical times The services can scarcely be kept alert and vigorous and provide the kind of leadership necessary to win wars unless men are compelled to retire from active service at reasonable ages and there is immediately available to them an appropriate retirement benefit.

"A study of military benefit programs as far back as they can be traced, indicates that this concept is uppermost in the minds of those who established and continued them. To the taxpayer who finally pays the bill—and it is and will be a substantial bill—the philosophy of meeting the superannuation problem, including not only age but other factors affecting ability and competence, is the only one which for the long pull will make sense to the citizen and strike most reasoning people as being good business for the Government.

"The Commission's plan to cover the problems of voluntary and involuntary retirement, is based on this fundamental principle; it is designed primarily to meet the many problems of superannuation. The proposed death benefit plan is a logical corollary; it considers the problem of the survivors of those who die in the services or after retirement"

"Recommendation 23. E. Compulsory retirement for age of officers should be that fixed by law, but in no case below age 60."

"DISCUSSION

"As stated, a sound retirement system is essential to solving the superannuation problem. The services must be kept young, vigorous, and efficient; a sound retirement plan with a proper compulsory retirement age will permit youth and brains to rise to the top in time to be effective. This emphasis on youth is more important in the military services than in most other activities of Government and industry because of the physical demands of war conditions when the Regular Establishment becomes the nucleus around which the civilian elements are organized This vitalization purpose is not new, it was the fundamental premise of the present retirement system as established 80-odd years ago Other concepts of fair treatment and the traditional concepts of retirement for those taking up the profession of arms are also important and have been given consideration but the Commission does not believe them to be controlling"

"The seven services, because of the different nature of their missions, have varying ages at which personnel must be retired under the law. The Commission recommends that in no case should mandatory retirement for age of officers be below age 60"

I am of the sincere opinion that not only is it unwise to compel the bulk of our officers to retire in their early fifties (which is what the operations of the present provisions of the act will do) and thus lose to the Department of Defense experience and mature judgment expensively bought just at the time when it can be capitalized on most profitably but that neither the Congress nor the country will tolerate it when they come to the full realization of what the retirement provisions of the present Personnel Act will do if allowed to stand.

PROHIBITION OF EXPORTATION OF STEEL

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to prohibit the exportation of steel, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the joint resolution by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res 113) to prohibit the exportation of steel, introduced by Mr. Chavez, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The explanatory statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

I have sent to the desk for referral to the proper committee of the Senate a joint resolution to prohibit the export of steel from the United States. I do not seek any immediate action on this measure Rather, I want the Senators to look into the steel picture as it affects their States during the recess with respect to schools, hospitals, roads, and small business, and then after January 3 we can take up the measure.

In the first quarter of 1952 there is authorized for export 1,067,500 tons This is about 5 percent of the total domestic production for the quarter

Doubtless some of this steel is going directly into military assistance abroad. If this is true, I think the military should be the claimant agency. We should combine the claimants as we have the budget requests, so we know exactly who is claiming steel and for what.

I sincerely hope that steel which is exported is not going into structures and materials abroad which are being denied steel here at home. In the past, I have found foreign countries could get things which

we could not. I believe the Senate should examine into this whole situation at the earliest possible moment next year.

The joint resolution as I introduced it today is severely drastic, and it will have to be modified before any action is taken on this measure. There will have to be certain exceptions, I am sure, but I believe we ought to find out what these exceptions are before allowing them, and then we should allow only these and no more.

This 1,067,500 tons of steel allowed for export when distributed back to our own schools, roads, hospitals, and small business would mean a material difference

The United States consumers are being asked to squeeze down hard on demand. I wonder if those to whom the exports are going are being pushed as hard.

Those who receive the exports have powerful lobbies in the Military Establishment and the State Department, and the warring of the Soviets. It combines into an effective argument before the National Production Administration.

Those domestic consumers who lobby for Americanism are accused of being selfish or resisting the war effort. The foreign sources say "we want to help win the war," and often it doesn't turn out that way at all. At home all we can say is we want to help our fellow citizens

I hope the Senators will give this matter considerable thought while they are in their home States during this recess

INVESTIGATION OF PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF MISSOURI PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.

Mr. McMAHON (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. LONG, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. KERR, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 229), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Whereas the Missouri Pacific Railroad Co and its affiliated companies serving 11 States and operating more than 10,000 miles of railroad has for 18 years been in bankruptcy resulting from the depression following 1929; and

Whereas it is highly desirable to return this railroad to its owners without further extended litigation which will attend the proposed plan of reorganization, and

Whereas during the period of bankruptcy the system spent from its earnings approximately $675,000,000 for retirement of debt, payment of interest on bonds, and for the improvement of the physical plant, including particularly the purchase of new equipment, reduction of grades, and other improved operating facilities, thereby enhancing the equity of the stockholders and increasing the net earning capacity of the railroad, and

Whereas since 1947 there has been extraordinary industrial development in the territory served by the Missouri Pacific which has greatly increased the earning powers of the railroad, and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission has certified three different plans of reorganization, the last of which again eliminates participation by the common-stock holders and allows but slight participation for the preferred-stock holders after finding that the claims of bondholder-creditors have been fully satisfied; and

Whereas the new plan of reorganization and the report embodying it states that the fair depreciated value of the properties is $715,222,053 and advises, on the basis of capitalizing earnings for various periods, there are bases for capitalization as high as $952,331,711 and the trustee has stated the total system assets are of a value of $835,052,387 and yet the Commission in its final determination fixes $612,000,000 for the permissible capitalization; and

Whereas during the recent period 1941-50 the system has earned after taxes $405,187,320 available for the payment of interest and dividends; and

Whereas on the basis of these earnings figures and after allowing for interest on all outstanding bonds, taxes, and dividends on the preferred stock, there have been average earnings during the period 1941-50 of $17.55 per share on the old common stock, but despite this earnings record, the proposed plan of reorganization would completely wipe out the interest of the old common-stock holders, and

Whereas unless the present plan is modified so as to give the old common-stock holders some recognition in the reorganized company, they will be forced to appeal the plan through the Federal courts, thereby delaying the discharge of the railroad from bankruptcy for a period of several years, and

Whereas there has been vast improvement since 1949 in the national economy and the sectional areas served by the Missouri Pacific Railroad which will permanently increase the earning power of the railroad, and

Whereas it is alleged that the railroad is now solvent and no longer in need of reorganization under the Bankruptcy Act; and

Whereas irregularities are alleged in the voting, counting and certification of the ballots on the pending reorganization plan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the changed conditions affecting the earning power of the railroad that have occurred in recent years, the present need for reorganization of the railroad, the alleged irregularities in the voting, counting and certification of the ballots on the pending reorganization plan, the denial of participation of the old common-stock holders, and the limited participation of the old preferred-stock holders under the pending reorganization plan and such other matters as the committee shall deem necessary to a just and expeditious release of the railroad from reorganization proceedings. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

A statement prepared by him relative to Gen Harry Schmidt, United States Marine Corps

By Mr SMITH of New Jersey:

A statement prepared by him and editorials from the Elizabeth (N J) Daily Journal and the Bergen (N. J.) Herald in regard to the fight against cancer.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Statement prepared by him concerning the proposal to create a national association, or of federation, of citizens crime commissions.

By Mr. CASE:

Article entitled "Australians Asking if Gold Standard Is on Way Back," written by Albert E. Norman and published in the Christian Science Monitor of October 17, 1951.

By Mr. MALONE:

Debate on the American Forum of the Air on the subject Box Score for the Eighty-second Congress, held on October 14, 1951, and participated in by Senator KERR, Senator MALONE, Representative ROONEY, and Representative HALL.

Resolution regarding William N. Oatis, adopted by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Aerie No. 487, Winnemucca, Nev, on September 10, 1951, and identical resolutions adopted by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Aerie No. 1213, Las Vegas, Nev., and Aerie No. 1006, Carson City, Nev.

Testimony of Mr. Robert Yellow Tail, of Lodge Grass, Mont., on February 26, 1948, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in hearings on Senate bill 2037

"Nevada's Place in America Today," winning essay in the senior division of the Statewide American Legion essay contest in Nevada, by Robert Quinlan, a graduate of the 1951 class at Carson City, Nev., high school.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by Secretary of Commerce Sawyer before Ohio State University Advertising Conference at Columbus, Ohio, on October 19, 1951.

By Mr CARLSON:

Resolutions affecting Federal-State relations, adopted by the Forty-third Governor's Conference at Gatlinburg, Tenn., on October 3, 1951.

By Mr LANGER

Address delivered by Assistant Secretary of the Interior William E Warne, before the Service Clubs at Bismarck, N Dak.

Article entitled "North Dakota Comes Into Its Own," written by Leo A Borah and published in the National Geographic magazine of September 1951

Editorial entitled "An All Canadian Seaway" published in the Bismarck Tribune of October 5, 1951.

Copy of letter addressed to the Christian Century by Gerald Kennedy, of the Methodist Church, Portland, Oreg.

By Mr. McMAHON:

Article entitled "General Overcomes His Modesty," written by Lowell Mellett and published in today's Washington Evening Star

By Mr HILL:

Editorial entitled "Hemorrhage From a Sore Toe," printed in the Montgomery (Ala) Advertiser of October 18, 1951

By Mr THYE:

Editorial entitled "RFC Has Proved Target of Politics From Very First," by Ralph Thornton, published in the Minneapolis Star of October 11, 1951

By Mr KERR:

Resolution of National Association of Railway and Utilities Commissioners, resolution of Mountain Pacific States Conference of Public Service Commissions, and address before the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, Charleston, S C., October 16, 1951, by Mr Clyde B Aitchison

By Mr MORSE:

Address to be delivered by Mr. MOODY before the Economic Club of Detroit, Monday, October 22, 1951.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

Address delivered by him at a luncheon of the Associated Third Class Mail Users, at Milwaukee, Wis., October 18, 1951.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Article entitled "Air Power and Morality," published in the Spotlight, regarding the use of the airplane as an instrument of peace.

Article entitled "How To W'n the United States Senate in 14-Ah, Simple Lessons," written by James Reston and published in the New York Times of October 19, 1951.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

Editorial entitled "One Man Crusade," published in the New Orleans State of October 19, 1951, dealing with the activities of the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

By Mr. CAIN:

Broadcast by him on the program entitled "American Youth Forum," on September 15, 1951, discussing the question of universal military training

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Excerpts from pamphlet entitled "The Crime of Genocide," prepared by the Serbian National Defense Council of America.

Letter to New York Times by Kenneth Haskell Mantell, on Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills.

By Mr. MORSE:

Address entitled "Columbia, the River of the West," delivered by W. L Williams before the Thirty-eighth Annual Convention of the Pacific Coast Association of Port Authorities.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Report regarding policies and practices of the National Shipping Authority in the appointment of general agents and in the allocation of vessels to such agents, from C H. McGuire, Director, National Shipping Authority, dated October 1, 1951.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H R. 5745) to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3877) for the relief of Erlinda Maria Bowers.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR IN CHINA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of a letter which I addressed to Assistant Secretary of State Dean Rusk, relative to the 30 or more Americans who are being held prisoners by the Communists, to which reference was made in the article entitled "China's 'Oatis Cases,'" written by Marguerite Higgins, and published in the Washington Post of October 2, 1951; a copy of the article by Miss Higgins; a letter, dated October 15, 1951, from Assistant Secretary Dean Rusk, in response to my letter, and a copy of a State Department press release dated May 21, 1951, dealing with the subject.

I may say that Mr. Rusk has personally furnished me with the names of the individuals involved, but has asked that I agree with his request that the names not be released at this time.

There being no objection, the material referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 3, 1951.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, State Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RUSK: With further reference to our telephone conversation of yesterday, I would appreciate it very much if you would send me a list of the 30 Americans who are now being held by the Chinese Communists as mentioned in Marguerite Higgins' column in the New York Herald Tribune and Washington Post of yesterday Enclosed is a copy of the article which I had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 2. It is possible that the number may be greater than the thirty she mentions and in any event what I would like to have is full information as to all Americans now being detained by the Chinese Communists, the nature of their detainment, the period of time they have been in custody, and a brief biographical statement relative to each such person.

I would appreciate it very much if this information could be sent to me this week.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

[From the Washington Post, October 2, 1951]

CHINA'S OATIS CASES

(By Marguerite Higgins)

AMERICANS JUST VANISHED

HONG KONG, October 1.—Anguished Americans waiting here for news of friends and relatives in China's jails, wonder whether the United States has not adopted an international double standard regarding the Chinese Communists. There are at least 30 "Vogeler" or "Oatis" cases in China today. They are cases which would undoubtedly cause the greatest indignation if they had been perpetrated in Eastern Europe. But the sufferings of the Americans in China seem to cause comparatively hardly a stir

In one sense, the Chinese treatment is far more cruel than the mock trials of Eastern Europe Oatis and Vogeler, at least in theory, knew the charges against them. Their families had an approximate idea of their fate But since January, when the number of arrests began to mount in Communist China, most Americans have just vanished Their families have no means of knowing where they are or whether they are dead or alive.

A tragic example is the case in Shanghai of Robert T. Bryan, lawyer, former municipal advocate, and certainly one of the best known and beloved Americans in the Far East. He was literally yanked out of his bath in his Shanghai home on the morning of February 12. The Chinese secret police gave him enough time to get dressed and put together a bundle, then marched him off, ignoring the pleas of his wife to tell her where he was being taken.

Mrs. Bryan has remained in Shanghai, a lonely figure in the rapidly shrinking foreign colony. A foreign diplomat, who came out of the city last month, said she has borne up well. The only crack in her morale came one day several months ago On that occasion she left home for a few hours and returned to find a Chinese policeman at the door, bearing the message that during her unusually long absence her husband had tried to reach her. Mrs Bryan was never able to confirm whether the policeman's message was the truth or mere psychological warfare.

EUROPEANS SHARE FATE

The arrested Americans are divided just about equally between missionaries, Catholics and Protestants, and businessmen. The total of 30 represents those positively known to be in prison or under house arrest. There may be more.

Although the Americans seem to be the most numerous victims, their fate is shared to a degree by all nationalities as a result of the violent antiforeign campaign being whipped up by the Government which clearly would prefer to operate its own "public trials" and liquidation campaigns without having to worry about observation of foreigners. It is generally conceded that the Chinese Communists aim at nothing less than the elimination of all foreign-sponsored educational, church and medical activities. They are also moving slowly to bring about the gradual shut-down of consulates and the forcing out of foreign businesses.

The antimissionary campaign is carried out mainly by inciting Chinese to indulge in public denunciations of foreign churchmen who are then imprisoned or expelled

The "Resist United States Aid Korea Journal," published in Peiping on September 12, states that "according to incomplete figures for this area in May, June, July, and August the number of imperialist elements denounced in the accusation campaign reached 113, most of whom belong to the Catholic Church and are mainly American, French, Spanish, Italian, Belgian, Dutch and German. The number of persons expelled from China, as requested by the patriotic Chinese religious followers and the people of all circles reached 33 Some others have been put under control, arrested, ordered to apologize and repent, or sentenced to prison terms."

The Communist journal added "The foreign imperialist missionaries with a saintly mask asserted that they singly devoted themselves conscientiously to the work on the propagation of religion and relief and that they were above politics. But irrefutable evidence exposed in various places has proven that these imperialists under the cloak of religion are out-and-out counter-revolutionaries. According to figures checked by the Peiping government the number of children murdered by the foreign missionaries throughout the nation reached more than 100,000"

By resorting to such flamboyant and absurd charges, it is no wonder that a certain amount of "mass feeling" has been whipped up against foreigners.

The greatest scandal in China is the death in Woochow jail of Dr. William Wallace, Southern Baptist American authorities here have been sufficiently satisfied by the evidence to report to Washington that his death was most likely the result of Communist mishandling.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
October 19, 1951.

Hon. WILLIAM F KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: Subsequent to your letter to me of October 3, 1951, and my conversation with you in your office, I have had further investigations made on the subject of Americans detained in Communist China One troublesome aspect is the difficulty of obtaining accurate and up-to-date information on just what the situation is in many sections of Communist China We have no official representation whatever and the representation of friendly governments is severely limited.

While the Department has made public the general situation of Americans in China (e. g., its press relea e of May 21 which is attached), it has not given publicity to the names of individuals, as in numerous cases either the persons themselves or their relatives or associates desire that no publicity be given for fear of impairing rescue moves or for fear of serious consequences to the individuals themselves

The Department has been endeavoring for some time to obtain, through efforts of the British Government which has undertaken to assist in the protection of American citizens in China, the release of American citizens or, as a minimum measure, to secure for them the basic rights of communication with the outside, adequate counsel and a fair and open trial upon any charges brought against them Other governments having nationals in China are also confronted with the same problem and have

made similar moves. It is not desirable, in connection with our main concern in rescuing these Americans, to make a public announcement at this time about precise measures which are now in course directed toward the release of our citizens.

Almost without exception, Americans now in China were clearly warned of the dangers and difficulties which they might encounter if they elected to remain behind in China at a time when facilities for leaving the country were available. This factor in no way reduces the concern or responsibility of the Department of State to do everything which can be done to protect our citizens on the mainland of China The great majority of Americans caught in the turbulence of recent events in China have succeeded in leaving the country safely. We now estimate that there are about 300 Americans still in mainland China and it is recognized that, whether specific individuals are under arrest or not, the position of most of them is unsatisfactory.

Every feasible means will continue to be used in an effort to assist those who wish to leave China to do so.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

AMERICANS DETAINED BY COMMUNIST AUTHORITIES IN CHINA

The Department of State has been extremely concerned for an extended period of time over the imprisonment by Chinese Communist authorities of a number of American nationals, now believed to number more than 30. At least some are definitely known to have been allowed no communication with anyone outside In most cases the local Chinese Communist authorities have given no explanation of the arrests or any information concerning the welfare or whereabouts of the persons arrested Access has been denied to legal counsel and to British officials, who have been representing American interests in Communist China since the closure of our consulates. This Government has been in constant communication on this subject with the British Government

On April 30 the British Charge d'Affaires at Peiping, acting on instructions of the Foreign Office, made representations to the responsible Chinese Communist authorities at Peiping on behalf of all Americans arrested, as well as the United Kingdom, Canadian, and Australian nationals under arrest. He appealed to these authorities to take appropriate steps to permit those imprisoned to have access to legal counsel and to friends outside. It was hoped that their speedy release would be effected, on humanitarian no less than on equitable grounds No reply has yet been received by the British Government from the Chinese Communist authorities.

The Department of State has also been concerned for some time over the continued denial by Chinese Communist authorities of exit permits to certain Americans, including a number of Shanghai businessmen, some of whom have been endeavoring for over a year to leave China. Arbitrary refusal to permit aliens to depart from a country is of course a violation of the elementary principles of international law and practice

JAPANESE AND GERMAN STEEL PRODUCTION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I received from the Department of the Army in response to a request for information on the steel production and the export of steel from Germany and Japan, which I made in light of the shortage of steel for school construction purposes during the last few days.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosure were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF
LEGISLATIVE LIAISON,
Washington, D. C., October 19, 1951.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

(Attention Mr. George F. Wilson.)

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: In accordance with your informal request for information concerning Japanese and German steel production, I have had the attached tabulation prepared by the Munitions Board, which I trust will furnish you the desired data.

In the event you desire further information on this subject, I shall be happy to endeavor to obtain it for you.

Sincerely yours,

T A. YOUNG,
Deputy Chief for Personnel and Administration.

German production and exports of steel, 1950

[Metric tons]

1. Ingots	
Production	11,814,000
Exports	[1] 2,151,000
Percent exported	10 9
2 Principal exports and markets:	
(a) Cast iron pipe	81,000
Australia	22,000
Turkey	11,500
Netherlands	8,000
(b) Cast iron cylinders	9,000
Saar	3,300
Italy	900
Hungary	700
(c) Heating ironware	7,000
Netherlands	2,800
Bulgaria	1,550
Turkey	1,400
(d) Bathtubs	3,500
Italy	400
Switzerland	400
Belgium	300
Australia	440
(e) Processed cast iron	5,000
Netherlands	1,200
Switzerland	400
Denmark	300
(f) Steel blocks	95,000
Great Britain	25,000
Argentina	19,000
Italy	16,000
(g) Iron bars (8 millimeter)	33,000
Iran	7,000
Sweden	5,200
Switzerland	2,700
2. Principal exports and markets—Continued	
(h) Iron in other forms	454,000
Sweden	55,000
Netherlands	50,000
Egypt	30,000
Hungary	28,000
Denmark	23,000
Switzerland	21,000
(i) Hoop iron	83,000
Netherlands	15,700
United States	8,600
Sweden	6,000
Italy	6,000
Greece	5,000
(j) Sheets (4.76 millimeters)	158,000
Sweden	40,000
United States	31,700
Netherlands	19,700
Finland	8,500
(k) Sheets (1–4.76 millimeters)	123,600
Hong Kong	26,400
United States	19,500
Italy	10,100
(l) Sheets (under 1 millimeter)	67,600
Italy	12,900
United States	5,400
Netherlands	5,200
Sweden	4,800
(m) Tin plates	47,700
Netherlands	11,100
China	7,900
Spain	7,000
Sweden	6,500
(n) Galvanized sheets	21,900
Union of South Africa	5,700
Switzerland	3,200
Denmark	2,000
(o) Corrugated sheets	9,800
Union of South Africa	1,900
Norway	1,900
Turkey	1,500
(p) Hot-drawn wire	114,200
United States	44,600
Great Britain	22,100
Sweden	6,600
Turkey	6,300
(q) Cold-drawn wire	36,500
Union of South Africa	3,500
Netherlands	3,200
Australia	3,000
Belgium	2,800
(r) Processed wire	55,300
Union of South Africa	12,000
Australia	8,500
United States	4,900
(s) Steel pipe	102,500
Netherlands	17,800
United States	9,300
Great Britain	7,900
Denmark	6,700

[1] Exports are in the form of pipes, bars, rails, etc., consequently not strictly comparable. Greater detail and comparable data, if at all available, would require a considerable amount of time in translation and preparation.

2 Principal exports and markets—Continued

(t) Processed pipe (over 2 millimeters)	89,600
United States	15,200
Netherlands	12,900
Hong Kong	4,800
Venezuela	4,500
(u) Processed pipe (under 2 millimeters)	8,200
United States	5,900
(v) Rails	100,500
Egypt	28,300
Arabia	20,500
Turkey	14,000
(w) Railroad sleepers (ties)	34,200
Turkey	20,300
Switzerland	9,500
Netherlands	2,300
(x) Fish bed plates	19,300
Netherlands	7,600
Argentina	3,600
Italy	2,300
(y) Railway axles and irons	16,000
Hungary	2,500
Belgium	2,000
Netherlands	1,600
(z) Processed goods of malleable iron	65,900
Netherlands	10,200
Australia	7,500
Turkey	6,400
Yugoslavia	4,800
Belgium	4,300
(aa) Pipes and tubes, other than drawn	65,900
Netherlands	6,300
Brazil	5,700
India	5,200
Pakistan	3,800

Official sources: Department of Commerce.

Japanese steel production and exports, 1950

[Metric tons]

1 Steel ingots:	
Production	4,838,520
Exports	78,706
Percent exported	---
Finished steel total:	
Production	3,471,336
Exports	461,218
Percent exported	10.3
2 Principal exports and markets:	
(a) Steel bars not over 15 millimeters	*Exports* 21,262
Darien	2,583
China, North	5,841
Thialand	3,227
Australia	3,368
(b) Steel bars over 15 millimeters	60,398
China, North	22,674
Formosa	6,370
Hong Kong	2,540
Thailand	4,211
Argentina	19,315
Australia	1,977

2. Principal exports and markets—Continued

	Exports
(c) T bars, angle steels	13,673
China, North	7,173
Formosa	1,870
Argentina	3,038
(d) Steel wire rods	12,030
China, North	8,025
Argentina	2,467
( ) Steel rail	15,119
Formosa	7,290
Thialand	7,809
(f) Steel plate, uncoated not over 0 9 millimeter thick	16,203
China, North	6,761
Argentina	6,101
Australia	2,066
(g) Steel plate uncoated not over 3 millimeters thick	8,810
China, North	1,913
Argentina	3,706
Australia	2,050
(h) Steel plate uncoated not over 5 7 millimeters thick	13,745
China, North	5,996
Hong Kong	1,775
Argentina	1,783
Australia	3,261
(i) Steel plate uncoated over 5 7 millimeters thick	53,545
China, North	12,591
Hong Kong	4,933
United States	14,355
Argentina	6,586
Australia	6,901
(j) Tin plate	2,744
Australia	[illegible],697
(k) Galvanized sheet	149,305
China, North	16,288
Hong Kong	10,159
Philippine Republic	18,465
Nigeria	11,248
Australia	55,064
(l) Steel band hot rolled over 50 millimeters wide	6,303
Argentina	6,255
(m) Steel wire uncoated	26,053
China, North	3,194
Philippine Republic	10,542
Argentina	9,503
(n) Steel wire coated	26,617
Formosa	7,056
Hong Kong	4,681
Thailand	2,130
India	5,049
Australia	3,354
(o) Steel pipe not over 45 millimeters	7,642
China, North	4,869

2. Principal exports and markets—Continued

	Exports
(p) Steel pipe not over 150 millimeters	5,751
China, North	2,374
Argentina	1,956
(q) Steel pipe over 150 millimeters	4,961
Formosa	3,418
Okinawa	1,539
(r) Steel pipe coated with base metals	6,248
Darien	1,086
Argentina	2,772

Official sources: SCAP.

THE YALTA TELEPHONE DIRECTORY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter I received from the Department of the Army in response to an inquiry for the telephone directory of the Yalta Conference.

I may say that the letter was stamped "Restricted," but on my own responsibility I am asking that the letter be printed in the RECORD in order to show what I believe is an extreme case of the practice of stamping of letters under present security regulations. The letter makes reference to the telephone directory which was used at the Yalta Conference in February 1945. In the letter I am informed that the telephone directory is still classified "Restricted."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER,
Washington, D. C., October 8, 1951.

Hon WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: Reference is made to your letter of September 5, 1951, in which you requested a copy of the Argonaut telephone directory.

Since writing to you on September 10, we have located a copy of the directory, which I have enclosed. The directory is classified "Restricted." However, should this classification be changed, you will be advised.

Since this publication is out of print, it is requested that it be returned to this office at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

K B LAWTON,
Major General, United States Army,
Deputy Chief Signal Officer.

HAVEN AFFORDED BY SWEDEN TO REFUGEES FROM BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for approximately 2½ minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New York may proceed for 2½ minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on September 11, I introduced a bill to provide permanent residence in this country for 84 Estonians who had fled to these shores from the terror and tyranny behind the iron curtain.

These individuals came by way of Sweden, and they crossed the Atlantic in small boats, daring the hazards of the open sea rather than the greater hazards of a possible return to Estonia.

At the time when I introduced that bill, I made a statement in which I indicated that had these people remained in Sweden they would have been forcibly repatriated to Estonia, inasmuch as Sweden had recognized the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union.

The representatives of the Swedish Government in the United States have informed me that I was mistaken in part of my statement. They have advised me that Sweden generally gives asylum to refugees from behind the iron curtain, and that 30,000 of these refugees are now living in Sweden.

I very much regret that my remarks were interpreted as casting any reflection on the great and courageous people of Sweden or their fine government. I know how nobly they have stood up in the face of the Soviet terror and of the Soviet threat which is so near to them and hence so much more terrible. I commend the Swedish Government with all my heart for its bold stand in giving haven to these refugees whom the Soviet Government would like to get back in order to send them to slave-labor camps or worse.

However, the individuals who fled to this country from Sweden, and for whom I sought to provide permanent residence, did have a very real and practical fear of being within such easy reach of the Soviet terror. Just across the border the iron curtain hangs. There is no telling what the future might hold, so these people came to the United States to seek refuge here. That refuge should and will, I hope, be granted.

In any event, I am sorry that anything I said in connection with the original introduction of this bill might have given the wrong impression about Sweden, that brave and stalwart country which defies the terror while living under its shadow.

SENATOR WHERRY OF NEBRASKA

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution expressing the sympathy and affection of the Senate to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who has been absent from our sessions for some weeks because of illness. I shall ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration and adoption of the resolution. I am sure that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will be happy to express their warm regards.

The junior Senator from Nebraska, KENNETH WHERRY, has demonstrated many times at this session of the Congress that he possesses a real spirit of cooperation and a real desire to expedite the business of the Senate by meeting in a gentlemanly manner all the difficulties which arise upon this floor. His candor, his frank and forthright expression of his views and the views of the minority, his straightforward approach to all questions, are qualities which have endeared him to me.

While he has always maintained very strongly the rights of the minority, he has very seldom allowed partisan considerations to interfere with the necessary work of the Senate. I have been happy to have him just across the aisle from me, and I have missed him greatly in the weeks of his absence. It is my fervent hope that he will soon be well again, and that he will soon be raising his powerful voice in this Chamber.

I know that all Members of the Senate join me in sending him our best wishes and our prayers for his swift recovery and his return to the fellowship of this body.

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas our deeply respected and widely admired colleague, the junior Senator from Nebraska, has recently been compelled to remain absent from the deliberations of the Senate, due to illness; and

Whereas the Senate, like his fellow countrymen, has a high regard for his ability, his energy, his integrity, and his devotion to the public service as minority leader of this body; and

Whereas the action by the Senate in making known the esteem and affection in which he is held by his colleagues may hasten his recovery and his return to his post among us: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the junior Senator from Nebraska be informed of the unanimous and wholehearted wish of the Senate for his complete and rapid recovery from his illness, and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be instructed to convey the sense of this resolution, suitably expressed and inscribed, to the junior Senator from Nebraska, together with the cordial regards of all Members of this body

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and unanimously agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as acting minority leader, I should like to join the majority leader in presenting the resolution which has just been unanimously adopted, concerning the minority leader [Mr. WHERRY]. If the Senator from Arizona does not object, I should like to do that in order that the resolution may express the views of the minority party as well as of the majority party.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am most happy to have the distinguished Senator's name on the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution has already been adopted, and it will probably have to be reconsidered, in order to have that done.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the name be inserted in the resolution, as though it had not been previously adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I know of no Member of the Senate who has given more liberally of his energies and abilities to the work of his office than has the junior Senator from Nebraska. He has literally worn himself out, and I believe that that is one of the causes of his present ill health. I know we all wish him well. I am confident he will be in his accustomed place as the minority leader when the Senate reconvenes in January. When I say that we earnestly wish him a speedy recovery, and we congratulate him upon the service he has rendered to the Senate of the United States, I know I express the sentiment and feeling of every Senator on the minority side.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR McFARLAND AND SENATOR WHERRY

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for one minute and a half.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Mexico may proceed for one minute and a half.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we are about to conclude the work of the Senate for the first session of the Eighty-second Congress. I feel duty-bound to express what I believe to be the consensus of opinion of the majority, namely, that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] has done a wonderful and most useful work as majority leader. He has just finished his first session as majority leader. I am sure his leadership has been patriotic, loyal, and in every sense American, and all of it under very trying circumstances. I hope he and his fine family obtain a much needed rest during the short adjournment.

Mr. President, I also wish to pay tribute to the minority leader, the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. Although we of the majority may not always see eye to eye with him, nevertheless we respect his opinions and his sincerity of purpose. We hope and pray that he will soon be restored to full health.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am very glad to say a word in addition to what the Senator from New Mexico has just said in paying tribute to the leadership of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], and also in paying tribute, in connection with the resolution adopted a few minutes ago, to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, a Senator can speak at this time only by unanimous consent.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I apologize.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HOEY AND SENATOR FULBRIGHT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Mississippi may proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this session of the Senate has been termed by some an investigating session. We have had many investigations, and many Members of the Senate could be compli-

mented for the way they have conducted those investigations. I shall mention very briefly two Senators who have especially impressed me in connection with the investigations. My reference to these two Members of the Senate certainly should not be regarded as a failure on my part to recognize the fine work done by other Senators.

I wish to refer with particular appreciation, Mr. President, as a Member of this body to the splendid work done by the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] in conducting the many investigations he has carried on here, particularly during this year. He brings to those investigations an atmosphere of judicial fairness, coupled with a high personal and official integrity which inspires confidence among his colleagues and among the people of this great Nation. In addition, he is trained in the law and has a fine mind which is vigorously and consistently devoted to thoroughness and impartiality of the very highest order. He has worked long hours without the fanfare of publicity nor the desire for same and has analyzed and presented the evidence and reports with care and with an impartiality that rises above persons and party. The result is an abiding confidence in his work and that of the subcommittee by the Members of the Senate and by the people of the Nation.

I commend the senior Senator from North Carolina for his splendid contribution in the work of the Senate.

Incidentally, Mr. President, let me say that the Senator from North Carolina was not aware that I would make these remarks; I am making them in official capacity as a United States Senator and in appreciation of the very fine work he has done with impartiality, fairness, and a splendid judicial approach He is rendering a great service to the Nation.

Mr THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr STENNIS Mr. President, I have only 2 minutes in which to speak.

Mr. President, I also wish to refer especially to the work of the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. His RFC investigation, to my mind, is one of the outstanding events in the Congress in the past several years. While he was under what I would call an attack by the executive department of the Government he stood his ground and did his duty with a detached impersonal approach and a detached fairness and thereby carried out, I believe, the best and very highest traditions of the legislative branch of the Government. The investigation he carried on and the exposures he made are of untold benefit to the welfare of the United States. Instead of yielding or compromising when unjustified criticisms were heaped upon his head he stood on principles and courageously exposed fact and conditions in Government which greatly needed correction.

I wish to commend him, as an official of the Nation and as one of the Members of the Senate, for the very fine approach he took and the work he did. Of course, this work was shared with the other members of the subcommittee, who share in the credit. I desire to commend Senator FULBRIGHT for his leadership and members of the subcommittee for their efforts.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota if I have time in which to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR HOEY, SENATOR FULBRIGHT, AND SENATOR RUSSELL

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, may I be recognized in order that I may concur in what the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has said?

The VICE PRESIDENT. At this time a Senator can be recognized only by unanimous consent, for the Senate is operating under a unanimous-consent agreement in regard to consideration of the remaining bills on the calendar.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to be recognized for one-half a minute

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered; and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to concur in the very able remarks of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I desire to concur in what he has said about the admirable manner in which the two Senators to whom he referred, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], conducted the investigations of which they were in charge.

Mr. President, I should like to add but one other name, and that is the name of Senator RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, who deserves the highest commendation for the able and impartial manner in which, as chairman of two committees sitting jointly, he conducted the extensive hearings growing out of what is known as the MacArthur incident last spring.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make certain remarks, to extend about 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the tributes which have been paid here today have all been magnificently justified I rise only to add a word to the sentiments spoken by the Senator from Minnesota regarding the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I was rather an active member of the joint committee which conducted the hearings in the so-called MacArthur case. As chairman of the two committees sitting jointly the Senator from Georgia performed this most trying task and discharged this most exacting responsibility with an efficiency and a courtesy which will long be remembered, not only by those who participated in the investigation, but I dare suggest it will form a model for investigations to be conducted in the future by this body. The Senator from Georgia is an ornament to the Senate, and I certainly congratulate him upon his fine work.

ASSIGNMENT TO AND UTILIZATION BY THE UNITED NATIONS OF ARMED FORCES FROM THE UNITED STATES

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, there is great concern among some of our Maryland people as to the possible implications of certain proposals scheduled to be presented to the General Assembly of the United Nations at its meeting in Paris next month regarding the assignment to, and the utilization by, the United Nations of Armed Forces from the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a telegram from Mrs. John Frisch, chairman of the Minute Women of Maryland, and other citizens who are protesting the proposed action by this country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BALTIMORE, MD.

HON. HERBERT O'CONOR,
United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D C

The Minute Women personally delivered to A J Bourbon, your administrative assistant, on October 9, a copy of the Acheson plan showing the plan to put our Armed Forces under the United Nations. An emergency such as in Egypt would give the General Assembly of the United Nations the power to put the United States in war as already demonstrated in Korea. The United Nations agenda calls for a vote to be taken to establish a collective measures committee who will designate an executive military authority to command all United Nations forces in the event of an emergency. The question of the establishment of the international military authority should be faced by the Senate before the vote is taken in Paris by the General Assembly next month. We believe this to be the life or death decision of our great Nation and are counting on you to accomplish this important message as our representative

Mrs John Frisch, Chairman, Minute Women of Maryland, United States of America; Virginia Star Freedom, Chairman, Against Un-American Activities, National Society of Mareen Duval Descendants, Harry J. Moores, Talbot T. Speer (publisher), John Logan Campbell, Representative, Kiwanis Club and Maryland Action Guild, Baltimore, William Henry Evans, Jr; Ex-Naval Lt Edwin H. Cole; Josephine H. Holloway; Charles M Stewart, Jr.

INQUIRY AS TO PRINTING IN THE RECORD FOLLOWING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. CAIN What is the proper form in which to make a request to have miscellaneous matters printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, following the coming adjournment of the Congress?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no particular formula. The Senator may ask unanimous consent that in an edition of the RECORD which will be printed following the adjournment, certain matters, which will be specified, shall be printed.

Mr. CAIN. It is then necessary to specify the matters to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, is it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that is the proper rule.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Chair.

AID TO MEDICAL EDUCATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have a half minute in which to make a brief statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, recently the Senate was told that we should not pass S. 337, the bill which would enable our medical, dental, and nursing schools to enroll and train the greatly increased number of doctors and nurses this country needs. We were told that our defense budget is so huge that we cannot afford to spend the relatively insignificant amount called for by this bill.

Mr. President, I believe that such so-called economy is not economy at all. It is pure, unadulterated waste. The fact is, Mr. President, that if we fail to make this necessary expenditure, we shall not only be wasting billions but we shall also be endangering the entire defense effort.

Because it so thoroughly explains and supports my reasoning—which is that of the majority of your Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—I ask unanimous consent to set forth at this point in the RECORD a brief article by Dr. Howard A. Rusk which appeared in a recent issue of the New York Times, and which explains with great clarity the direct relationship between our supply of doctors and nurses and the success of our defense effort.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH GUARDS FOR WORKERS LACKING IN UNITED STATES MOBILIZATION—COSTLY SICKNESS ABSENTEEISM DEMANDS HIGH PRIORITIES FOR MEDICAL SERVICES

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

The Nation has been warned repeatedly in the last few weeks that despite the truce talks in Korea there can be no let-down in defense mobilization. Since the economic requirements of our military program are predicated upon basic security needs and not upon developments in any particular area, our build-up in military strength, obviously, must continue as planned.

In the second quarter of this year defense production accounted for 10 percent of our gross national output. To reach our mobilization objectives, however, it will be necessary to double this ratio. This will require not only more workers in the labor force, but increased efficiency and output by each individual worker.

One of the greatest factors in individual worker output is health. Sickness absenteeism in industry now claims 400,000,000 to 500,000,000 man-days a year, with an estimated $4,200,000,000 loss in earnings to workers and a corresponding loss of production and profits.

Experience, however, has shown these losses can be greatly reduced through adequate in-plant medical services. During World War II sickness absenteeism rates in industrial plants with inadequate or poor medical services varied from 4 to 6 percent daily as compared to 2 to 3 percent in plants where good medical services were available. A number of companies have reported that the introduction of good industrial health services in peacetime has reduced sickness absenteeism by one-third.

INTEREST IN WORKER NOT NEW

American industry has been concerned with the health of its workers since the first industrial workplace in the Colonies, a glass-bottle factory, was established in Jamestown, Va., in 1607 to manufacture glass baubles and trinkets for trade with the Indians. As early as 1776, Benjamin Franklin asserted that the West India gripe was lead colic, due to drinking Jamaica rum made in stills in which the heads and coils were made of lead. As a result, the Massachusetts Legislature prohibited the use of lead still heads and worms. It was not until 1837, however, that the first scientific paper on industrial medicine was published by the Medical Society of the State of New York. Its author was Dr. Benjamin W McCready, later one of the founders of the Bellevue Hospital Medical College and of the New York Academy of Medicine.

As industry has grown and become more complex, the problems of employee health have multiplied and industrial health can now be defined as the science and art of preserving health through the recognition, evaluation, and control of environmental causes and sources of illness in industry."

As Dr. Anthony L. Lanza, of New York University, a leading authority in industrial medicine, has said, industrial medicine involves the application of two skills—medicine and engineering. It is concerned with the environment of the industrial worker as well as with the effects of that environment upon his physical and mental structure.

It is difficult to estimate the cost of a good industrial health program for any one industry, as costs vary with the size, hazards, and health needs of the establishment and the quality and scope of the services given.

Unfortunately, the great majority of workers today are employed in plants that have little or no medical services except routine preemployment physical examinations. About 70 to 75 percent of the Nation's workers are employed in the 99 percent of the Nation's industrial plants that have less than 500 employees. These plants do not, for the most part, employ physicians. Most depend entirely on their insurance companies for medical and surgical care of injured employees and little about preventive health services.

As with many other health services, the key to the provision of the industrial health services that will be needed if we are to meet our production goals is the training of personnel. Today there are only about 2,000 full-time industrial physicians in the Nation, 13,133 industrial nurses (as compared to 300 prior to World War II) and 650 industrial hygiene engineers. To meet the increased needs of defense mobilization due to increased industrial activity and larger numbers of women, older-age and disabled workers entering the labor force, the Council on Industrial Medicine of the American Medical Association has estimated that we will need 1,600 more industrial physicians, 5,320 more industrial nurses, and 400 more industrial hygiene engineers.

The tragedy is that almost no physicians now are undergoing such training. Although six medical schools in the Nation offer excellent postgraduate courses in industrial medicine, some had no students last year and others but a small handful, most of whom were foreigners.

TWO REASONS FOR PREDICAMENT

There are two reasons for this. First, the income of most full-time salaried physicians is substantially less than that of those engaged in independent practice; and, second, young doctors are attracted to surgery, internal medicine, and the specialties in which they deal with the dramatic, acute phases of disease rather than prevention.

The recent widely publicized study on the income of physicians shows that although there are some notable exceptions in certain large industries, the incomes of industrial physicians as a group are not as large as those of physicians in private practice or in salaried positions in many of the other specialties. The survey showed that the average full-time salaried industrial physician had an annual net income of $9,115. As a result, industrial practice has attracted but 1.1 percent of the full-specialized and 2.4 percent of the partly specialized physicians in the Nation.

As the services of this additional trained personnel are as essential to defense as is the production of armament itself, methods for meeting this should be given similarly high priorities. Our Nation's industrial workers cannot give their full potential to defense with finger-wrapping, first-aid type medical services.

AUTHORIZATION OF FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION TO MAKE COMMITMENTS TO PURCHASE CERTAIN MORTGAGES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 5745) to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages which was read twice by its title.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of this bill, which has just been passed by the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5745) to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 3, after the words "provision of", it is proposed to strike out "subparagraph" and insert "subparagraphs (C) and."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall appreciate it if the Senator will repeat his statement. I was detained in conversation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may explain to the Senator that this bill has just been passed by the House. I understand it had the support of both Mr. WOLCOTT, whom I believe sponsored it in the committee, and Mr. SPENCE. It is in the nature of an amendment to the National Housing Act, to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to enter into advance commitment contracts, with a proviso:

That not to exceed $3,500,000 of said authorization shall be available for such commitments in any one State.

It is a very short bill. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the House committee's report, and the draft of the report I intended to make for the Banking and Currency Committee on S. 2290.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report and the draft of the intended Senate report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT No. 1221

The Committee on Banking and Currency to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5745) to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the Federal National Mortgage Association to enter into advance commitments to purchase FHA section 213 mortgages with respect to which the Federal Housing Commissioner has issued, prior to June 29, 1951, a commitment to insure or a statement of eligibility. The amount of advance purchase commitments which the Federal National Mortgage Association would be authorized to make would be limited to $30,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and provision is further made that not more than $3,500,000 of said authorization would be available for such commitments in any one State.

This prohibition against advance commitments is not applicable to mortgages (1) covering defense housing programed by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator in an area determined by the President or his designee to be a critical defense housing area, or (2) with respect to which the Federal Housing Commissioner has issued a commitment to insure pursuant to title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, or (3) covering housing intended to be made available primarily for families who are victims of a catastrophe which the President has determined to be a major disaster.

Paragraph (G) of section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act, as amended, generally prohibits the Federal National Mortgage Association from entering into commitments to purchase eligible mortgages unless the mortgage is insured or guaranteed at the time of the contract.

Section 213 of the National Housing Act was enacted into law in April 1950. It provides a medium for the insurance of veterans cooperatives through which, by banding together in a common venture, veterans would be able to secure adequate housing at substantial savings. Although this program is a recent one, substantial interest in its benefits has culminated in the commencement of several cooperative housing projects. Several hundreds of veterans have invested down payments amounting to as much as $1,200 per veteran in these housing projects and have subsequently been unable to derive any benefits due to the fact that mortgage money has not been available to finance the completion of the projects. This legislation would permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase the definitive mortgage and thus enable the veteran to secure the financing necessary for the construction of their projects. Your committee has been advised that some 3,000 people would be the direct beneficiaries of the proposed legislation. In view of the hardship faced by these veterans who have invested a substantial amount of money to acquire a home for their families, your committee recommends the enactment of this legislation which will insure the projects being carried forward to completion.

ADVANCE MORTGAGE PURCHASE COMMITMENTS BY THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION WITH RESPECT TO COOPERATIVE HOUSING

(Report to accompany S. 2290)

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2290) to amend the National Housing Act to let the Federal National Mortgage Association purchase section 213 mortgages, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the bill do pass.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

Section 301 of the National Housing Act prohibits the Federal National Mortgage Association (with certain exceptions) from purchasing or agreeing to purchase any mortgage if the original principal amount exceeds or exceeded $10,000 per family unit or if the loan is not an existing loan insured or guaranteed by the Federal Housing Administration or the Veterans' Administration. These limitations may be found in subparagraphs (C) and (G) of section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act. With respect to certain cooperative housing projects which the FHA would insure under section 213 of the National Housing Act, S 2290 would waive these limitations, thereby permitting the FNMA to enter into advance commitment contracts to purchase mortgage loans which might exceed $10,000 per family unit and which would not be insured by the FHA prior to the advance commitment. Such mortgages, however, would be required to be insured by the FHA prior to actual purchase by the FNMA Under the bill, not more than $30,000,000 of such advance commitment contracts could be outstanding and not more than $3,500,000 could relate to mortgages covering property in any one State The bill also limits such advance commitment contracts to mortgages related to projects for which the Federal Housing Commissioner has issued a "statement of eligibility" prior to June 29, 1951.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is to relieve severe hardship which has resulted for many FHA-aided cooperative housing projects. In accordance with congressional policy and directives contained in the Housing Act of 1950 and earlier legislation, these projects received special FHA mortgage insurance aids. At the time when the projects were undertaken, these aids, along with the general availability of residential mortgage funds, appeared sufficient to assure their ultimate financing even without the availability of advance FNMA mortgage purchase commitments. After considerable expenditures had been made for organization and legal expenses, land acquisition and improvement, and partial construction, many of the cooperatives found that a sudden national shortage of mortgage funds had left them in a position where they could not complete their projects.

The general shortage of mortgage funds which occurred early this year, after the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve Board agreed to a change in the policy governing support for Government bonds, affected the entire residential mortgage market. However, cooperative housing, which was just beginning to gain recognition and acceptance in financial circles as a result of the encouragement provided by the Housing Act of 1950, was hit with much greater severity than more established forms of residential financing. Cooperatives organized to build individual homes, the titles to which would be transferred to the individual cooperators, were particularly hard hit.

Cooperative projects which have received FHA certificates of eligibility on or after June 29, 1951, have not suffered the same severe degree of hardship since these projects have been required by the FHA to obtain prior assurances of financing However, unless relief is afforded for the earlier projects, severe losses will be suffered by the cooperatives and their members. A high percentage of the membership of FHA-aided cooperatives are veterans and their families. Unless relief is afforded along the lines of S. 2290, the basic purpose of the aid which the Congress has previously made available for pioneer cooperative housing projects will be largely negated.

We have been informed by the Federal Housing Administration that the $30,000,000 authorization for FNMA advance mortgage commitments would be sufficient, in the light of the limitation with respect to commitments in any one State, to furnish the necessary relief as intended by the bill. If in any one State, it is found that applications for advance commitments exceed the authorized amount, it is the view of your committee that preference should be given on the basis of the relative extent of the cooperatives' need and hardship. Thus, consideration could be given to such factors, among others, as the relative danger of financial loss, the amount of expenditures already made by the cooperative, the extent to which construction has advanced, and the degree of hardship which would be suffered by individual members of the cooperative if the advance commitment is not made available.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The amendment would simply include another paragraph. The bill will have to go back to the House after we place the amendment in it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Can the Senator explain very briefly the purpose of the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have the House report and the draft of the report I intend to file here. I believe I can explain rather briefly the bill without reading the reports. At the time of the passage of section 213, to provide a cooperative housing program, it was assumed that 4 percent interest rate would be sufficient to induce capital to purchase mortgages and up to the spring of this year our assumption appeared justified. Since then, however, largely because of the change in the policy of the Federal Reserve Board with reference to the support of the Government bond market, the mortgage market has tightened up considerably and section 213 mortgages, which the mortgage market is relatively unfamiliar with, were very difficult to sell. A number of cooperative housing projects had received eligibility statements from the FHA prior to June 29, 1951. There are many veterans involved in the projects, and the report of the House committee states that many veterans have paid down as much as $1,200, and now they are unable to sell their mortgages because of the tight mortgage market. The bill authorizes "Fannie May" to make advance commitments to purchase not more than $30,000,000 worth of mortgages for the whole country and no more than $3,500,000 in any one State.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the bill does, then, is to provide for an extension to $30,000,000 throughout the whole country, because of the ruling of the Federal Reserve Board——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am sorry. The Federal Reserve Board is in no way involved. I merely cited that as one of the causes of the tightness in the mortgage market. The bill does not change the interest rate. All it does is to authorize "Fannie May" to obligate its own funds for this amount. It furnishes a market up to $30,000,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is because the interest rate on mortgage loans has gone higher since the change in regulations?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It simply means that investors are not so much interested in purchasing these mortgages as they were prior to that change. A year ago, when the bill was passed, mortgages of this kind could be disposed of more readily. The change in the money market has made them unattractive. The bill applies only to those projects for which eligibility statements were issued by FHA prior to June 29, 1951. Mr. President, I should like to point out before concluding, as I did in the report I intended to make for the committee on this bill, if in any one State, it is found that applications for advance commitments exceed the authorized amount, it is the view of the Committee on Banking and Currency that preference should be given on the basis of the relative extent of the cooperatives' need and hardship. Thus, consideration could be given to such factors, among others, as the relative danger of financial loss, the amount of expenditures already made by the cooperative, the extent to which construction has advanced, and the degree of hardship which would be suffered by individual members of the cooperative if the advance commitment is not made available.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes whereby the bill (H. R. 5745) was passed, the amendment to it was ordered to be engrossed, the bill was ordered to a third reading, and also the vote by which my amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I now ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment which I offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

The bill (H. R. 5745) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the first bill which was passed over.

WITHHOLDING OF PATENTS DETRIMENTAL TO NATIONAL SECURITY

The bill (H. R. 4687) to provide for the withholding of certain patents that might be detrimental to the national security and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. MCCARRAN] that as I view it, the bill denies the relief provided by section 3 to persons who at the time of making claim, or at the time of invention, are employed by the United States. I wish to offer an amendment which would limit this denial of relief to persons employed full time at the time of invention. Thus the amendment would remove as bars to relief employment at the time of making claim, or part-time employment at the time of invention.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Do I correctly understand that the Senator is offering an amendment?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am. I was going to ask the distinguished Senator if he has a copy of the amendment.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I have a copy of the amendment; and, so far as I have authority to do so, I would accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4687) to provide for the withholding of certain patents that might be detrimental to the national security, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas offers an amendment which the clerk will read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, line 13, after the word "representative", it is proposed to strike out "who, when he makes a claim, is in the employment or service of the United States, or", and in line 14, after the word "the", to insert "full-time".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr President, I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 19, after the word "Claims", it is proposed to insert "or in the district court of the United States for the district in which such claimant is a resident".

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, this amendment has a single purpose, and a very simple one. Under the language of the bill as reported from committee, a claimant is given the right to sue in the Court of Claims, to recover just compensation for the damage caused him and the reasonable value, if any, of the use of the invention by the Government It has been pointed out that it might be a severe inconvenience on some claimants to have to come to Washington to prosecute their claims in the Court of Claims; and it has been suggested that the right should be given to bring an action in the United States district court for the district in which the claimant is a resident.

Force was lent to this argument by the fact that in the recently-passed Mutual Security Act of 1951, the right of a claimant to sue in his own Federal district court as well as in the Court of Claims, was preserved.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, the purpose of which is to give the same right under this bill that is given under the Mutual Security Act of 1951, namely, the right of a claimant to bring his action either in the Court of Claims or in the United States district court for the district of which he is a resident.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to write into permanent law provisions relative to patents. This bill will grant to the Secretary of Commerce under certain conditions the authority to keep inventions secret and to withhold the issue of a patent when necessary for the national security.

The first act of this nature was the act of October 6, 1917. In 1940 Public Law 700 was enacted to make the provisions of the act of October 6, 1917, effective for 2 years. In 1942 Public Law 609 was enacted to keep Public Law 700 in effect during World War II. Thus it will be seen we have had a number of temporary acts relating to the withholding of patents.

The existing world situation, together with the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty and the possibility of a treaty with Germany, indicates that these temporary laws will soon become of no force and effect. It is, therefore, necessary, in order to protect the security of the United States as it may be affected by the disclosure of patents, that positive legislation be enacted for this purpose.

This legislation provides for an appeal to the Secretary of Commerce by a patentee It provides for the right of a patentee to sue in the Court of Claims for damages for the withholding of his patent and provides for reasonable compensation for the use of this patent. This latter provision may also be litigated in the Court of Claims in order to determine just compensation.

After careful study of the proposed legislation, which was the result of hearings in the House, the committee was of the opinion that this bill is meritorious and should be considered favorably.

Mr. President, there is one section of this bill with respect to which the representatives of the Minority Policy Committee, the Republican Calendar Committee, have made a suggestion. This is the section of the bill having to do with precluding court action by Federal employees, against the Government, with respect to patent matters dealt with under this bill.

It was the view of the Minority Calendar Committee, as I understand it, that this provision is unduly harsh.

After this point had been raised by the Minority Calendar Committee, I had the matter taken up with the National Inventors Council, so as to get an expert opinion; and I found in that organization a measure of concurrence with the view expressed by the Minority Calendar Committee.

Accordingly, I have expressed my willingness to assent to an amendment which would make this provision less restrictive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ESTATE OF SUSIE LEE SPENCER

The bill (S. 1045) for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this bill in relation to what it does, because it has been before the Senate previously, and I understand it was vetoed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill would pay the sum of $7,500 to the estate of Susie Lee Spencer, of Spartanburg, S. C. The death of the decedent resulted from an accident caused by the negligence of fellow employees at the Norfolk naval shipyard during wartime, according to the finding of the naval investigating officer.

The question of contributory negligence suggested by the facts in this case has been resolved in favor of the claimant by the committee, upon review of the law of Virginia which is the jurisdiction wherein the accident occurred.

The Department of the Navy, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice oppose enactment of this bill upon consideration of the bill in reference to the limitations on recovery in such a case under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. The committee is of the opinion that this petition for redress of grievances should not be so narrowly considered, and upon consideration of all the circumstances recommends favorable consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1045) for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Susie Lee Spencer, of Spartanburg, S. C., the sum of $7,500, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Susie Lee Spencer sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Navy locomotive at the Norfolk naval shipyard, Norfolk, Va., on December 11, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ESTATE OF CARLOS M COCHRAN

The bill (S. 1097) for the relief of the estate of Carlos M. Cochran was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object, I note that there are some unusual characteristics involved in this measure. May we have an explanation of it?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill provides for payment of the sum of $5,000 to the estate of Carlos M. Cochran of Miami, Fla. The decedent met his death while serving as a private in the Army at a training base in this country during wartime.

The decedent was suffering some mental disability, and on the day of his death was apprehended by a gate sentry just beyond the boundaries of the training base. The decedent escaped the custody of the gate sentry and started to run away. The gate sentry commanded him to halt, and when the command was disregarded the gate sentry fired his weapon, a shotgun, directly at the fleeing man; one pellet from the shotgun blast went through his heart, killing him instantly.

The Department of the Army and the Department of Justice recommended that the bill be not favorably considered. However, the committee is of the opinion that the decedent met his death through the wrongful use of excessive and unwarranted force by the gate sentry involved, in the attempt by the latter to maintain custody of the decedent, and therefore the committee recommends favorable consideration of the bill.

Mr SCHOEPPEL. Mr President, I know that the Committee on the Judiciary has given most careful consideration to this measure, and, as I understand, the distinguished Senator from Nevada feels that there are certain circumstances involved which would really take this bill out of the category of a measure establishing a precedent which might well be considered to be wide open.

Mr McCARRAN The matter of establishing a precedent in passing a bill of this kind was a most serious question with the Committee on the Judiciary After a long and careful study of the bill it was the judgment of the committee that it would not establish a precedent because of the peculiar nature of the circumstances surrounding the incident.

Mr SCHOEPPEL I appreciate that statement of the chairman of the committee as a matter of record which might be looked back to later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1097) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Carlos M Cochran, late of Miami, Fla., the sum of $5,000 Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such estate against the United States on account of the death of the said Carlos M Cochran in line of duty, while he was serving as private first class, in the military forces of the United States (XC-31162193), when he was shot by a sentry at the north auxiliary gate on Highway No. 98 at Tyndall Field, Fla., on December 19, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ALASKA JUNEAU GOLD MINING CO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the next bill sent to the foot of the calendar for consideration today.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H R 596) for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr President, I am compelled to object to this measure, and ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

MARK G. RUSHMANN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next bill passed over will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 430) for the relief of Mark G. Rushmann.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, this is one of the bills which went to the foot of the calendar for consideration today. I merely wish to state that, in my judgment, the bill establishes such a wide-open precedent that it is one which should receive most careful consideration before it is passed. Therefore I think it should not be passed at this time on the call of the calendar, and I object

The PRESIDINC OFFICER Objection is heard, and the bill goes over

INCOME TAXES ON GAINS ON INVOLUNTARY CONVERSION OF PROPERTY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next bill passed over.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3590) relating to the income-tax treatments of gain realized on an involuntary conversion of property

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments, on page 6, line 5, after the word "be", to strike out "assessed."" and insert "assessed."; after line 5, to insert:

This subsection shall not apply, in the case of property used by the taxpayer as his principal residence, if the destruction, theft, seizure, requisition, or condemnation of residence, or the sale or exchange of such residence under threat or imminence thereof, occurred after December 31, 1950."

And in line 12, to reletter the subsection from "(e)" to "(f)."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the amendment reported to the bill is a technical amendment which was carefully considered by the Senate Committee on Finance. There is no objection to the bill as such, but the technical amendment necessarily will send the bill back to the House. The Senator from Connecticut has another amendment which I think he wishes to offer to the bill, to which there is likewise no objection, because it presents the strange situation of a taxpayer asking that the excise taxes on his property remain in effect

until next April 1, although under the tax bill passed yesterday excise taxes were taken off altogether. The question of floor stocks is involved, and the problem is presented since the purchasers and merchants who deal in electric heating pads have some on hand. Therefore I agreed to accept the amendment. Is the Senator from Connecticut ready to offer it?

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I call up the amendment, and I am very grateful for the understanding shown by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, in view of the fact that the heating-pad industry largely centers in the State of Connecticut, and the additional revenue to the Treasury is estimated to amount to as much as $350,000

May I have unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement I have prepared regarding the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would not the Senator like to offer the amendment first?

Mr. BENTON. I thought I had offered the amendment. I do offer it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 10, after the word "by" insert "the first two sections of".

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 490 of the Revenue Act of 1951, the effective date of so much of the amendment made by section 485 of such act to section 3406 (a) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code as relates to electric heating pads shall be April 1, 1952.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, observing a distinguished former newspaperman now presiding, I call his attention to the saying that when a man bites a dog it is news. Most certainly this is the first time I ever heard a man asking that taxes imposed on him should not be removed, but should be kept in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut that his statement be printed in the RECORD at this point?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENTON

When a man bites a dog—and when a businessman asks Congress not to repeal his taxes—that's news

So I am arising, Mr. President, to offer an amendment to H. R. 3590 that will retain the 10 percent excise tax on heating pads until April 1, 1952.

This levy is repealed in the tax bill we have just enacted. But the heating-pad industry, which is centered in Connecticut, has asked Senator MCMAHON and me to help them keep the tax in effect for another 4 months.

It has been estimated for me that this will mean an additional yield to the Government of $350,000 in revenue. I cannot vouch for this figure. Manifestly it means revenue and just how much must depend on volume of sales.

The problem stems from the fact that the tax bill repealed contains no provision for floor-stock refunds in dealers' inventories on which the tax has already been paid.

Tens of thousands of dollars will be lost to the manufacturers unless some relief is provided, because approximately 75 percent of the entire year's business has been shipped within the past 90 days. Under the new tax bill, dealers will look to the manufacturers for refunds on the unsold goods in inventory, and the losses to manufacturers would be very serious in view of the fact that the Treasury will not underwrite such refunding.

In the winter season is the time when 90 percent of the pads are sold and a delay in removing the tax thus would reduce losses through refunds to a minimum that could be borne by the industry.

In view of the benefit to the Government and the correction of an inequity to the industry, I feel this amendment should be favorably considered by the Senate.

H. R. 3590 amends section 112 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the income-tax treatment of gain realized on an involuntary conversion of property.

PROPOSED RELIEF TO ELECTRIC HEATING PAD INDUSTRY IN CONNECTION WITH REMOVAL OF EXCISE TAX

The pending tax bill removes the 10 percent excise tax on electric heating pads, but contains no provision for floor-stock refunds on dealers' inventories on which the tax has already been paid. Tens of thousands of dollars will be lost to the industry unless some relief is provided, because approximately 75 percent of the entire year's business has been shipped within the last 90 days. Dealers will look to the manufacturers for refunds and the losses would be very serious.

Having been advised of the impossibility of amending the pending tax bill to include a floor stock tax refund, it is proposed that a special law be enacted postponing the effective date of bill as it applies to electric heating pads to April 30, 1952. The winter season is when 90 percent of the pads are sold, and a delay in the removal of the tax as above suggested, would reduce losses to a minimum, which could be borne by the industry.

Such action would result in additional revenue to the Government of upward of $350,000

The heating-pad industry has asked me to propose delaying the removal of the excise tax on electric heating pads to April 30, 1952. In view of the benefit to the Government and the correction of an inequity to the industry, I feel this amendment should be favorably considered by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to inquire whether any other amendment except that offered by the Senator from Connecticut has as yet been offered to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only the committee amendments, perfecting amendments, which have been agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Those amendments relate solely to the subject matter of the bill, do they not?

Mr. GEORGE. They are purely technical amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So that there has been no substantial change in the bill from the manner in which it was reported by the committee, except with respect to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut. Is that statement correct?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct; there has been no other change.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. DORA TROOST

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I have here a matter to which I draw the attention of the leaders on both sides, and I shall submit a unanimous-consent request.

There has come into my hand House bill 5397, which provides for the renaturalization of a woman who has been away from this country for some time. The purpose of the bill is to restore to Mrs. Dora Troost United States citizenship, notwithstanding any period of residence in a foreign state, provided that she returns to the United States for permanent residence within 1 year following the effective date of the act.

The beneficiary of the bill is a native of Mexico who was naturalized in the United States on November 28, 1945. She has three children who are United States citizens, all of whom are residing in the United States. She has been in the Netherlands West Indie with here husband for over 3 years, and is thereby considered to have lost her United States citizenship, by reason of such residence in a foreign country.

Therefore, Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary I report favorably without amendment a bill (H. R. 5397) for the relief of Mrs. Dora Troost, and I submit a report (No. 1056) thereon I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator what precedent this bill will create? If renaturalization is granted to a woman who has been out of the country for over 3 years, are there other cases which may be similar, and are such cases taken up individually? What is the practice?

Mr. MCCARRAN. Every case stands on its own feet and on its own merits. This case would not be presented by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary at this time if, first of all, the facts of the case had not been examined thoroughly by the committee's staff; and, secondly, if we did not believe the case had sufficient merit so that it should be taken up out of the regular course and enacted at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, time is of such essence that the chairman of the committee is taking this unusual course.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have no objection unless the calendar committee has objection.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that we have checked this matter, and the calendar committee has no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5397) for the relief of Mrs. Dora Troost.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO JOSEPH PICKETT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3838) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Joseph Pickett.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be stated

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK On page 1, line 10, after the word "acres", it is proposed to insert "The prior disposition of the homestead lands of Joseph Pickett is hereby ratified and confirmed"

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, this amendment was suggested by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior For all practical purposes the bill without the amendment would probably clear up the situation. However, in view of the recommendation of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, I think it would be best to adopt the amendment which he has suggested.

Mr O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What Assistant Secretary suggested the amendment?

Mr ECTON. It is recommended by Assistant Secretary Dale E. Doty.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendment was not presented to the committee when the committee had the bill under consideration.

Mr. ECTON. No. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that that was an oversight

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I understand, there is no objection on the part of the Interior Department to the amendment.

Mr. ECTON. The Interior Department recommends the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr ECTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO LAURA A. CRAIG

The bill (H. R. 3840) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Laura A. Craig was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO LOUIS W. MILLIKIN

The bill (H. R. 4219) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Millikin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO URSULA RUTHERFORD OLLINGER

The bill (H. R. 4351) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Ursula Rutherford Ollinger was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO MARY RUTHERFORD SPEARSON

The bill (H. R. 4352) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary Rutherford Spearson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

The bill (H. R. 3937) to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat 1061) to provide for the operation, management, maintenance, and demolition of federally acquired properties following the acquisition of such properties and before the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SABINE RIVER COMPACT BETWEEN TEXAS AND LOUISIANA

The bill (H. R 4288) granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Sabine River by the States of Texas and Louisiana was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACQUISITION OF GILA PUEBLO, ARIZONA, BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The bill (S. 2169) authorizing the acquisition by the Secretary of the Interior of the Gila Pueblo in Globe County, Ariz., for archeological laboratory and storage purposes, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Over

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard

Mr McFARLAND Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr CHAVEZ I will withhold my objection for a moment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, this bill involves some property near Globe, Ariz., known as the Gila Pueblo, which consists of several buildings in excellent condition. The buildings were erected by a private individual for archaeological purposes. They cost many times the price for which the Government can now obtain them. These buildings would constitute a fine monument for the Government. The property is valuable. I hope the Senator will not object to the Government having the advantage of this property at the price stipulated. I cannot see why there should be any objection to the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I presume there is some merit in the request of the Senator from Arizona. However, the Senator from Arizona knows that the larger portion of the area of Arizona is in the hands of the Federal Government. All this bill would do would be to add more land to the holdings of the Government, land which is possibly now on the tax rolls of Arizona. If it were transferred to the Federal Government it would be taken off the tax rolls. For that reason I do not see why the bill should pass by unanimous consent on the call of the calendar. I object.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further withhold his objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. McFARLAND. No one depreciates the idea of the Federal Government taking over private land holdings any more than does the junior Senator from Arizona, and particularly in Arizona where it already is the largest land owner. However, this property is of particular value to the State. Because of the archaeological history involved and the work which has been done in the past making this a noteworthy monument it is believed that this property will be more valuable to the State if it is placed in the hands of the Federal Government than it would be if it were to remain in private ownership. Of course, if we have to take the bill up in the regular order, we can do so, but the property will deteriorate that much more in the meantime.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me say one further word. Once upon a time the State of New Mexico owned the Carlsbad National Monument. It was the property of the State of New Mexico. Foolishly we passed a bill similar to the bill which is now under discussion, and we have been sorry ever since. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The Clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

FREE IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN KINDS OF TWINE

The bill (H. R 1005) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask some questions with regard to the bill. As I understand, the bill would permit free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material. My interest in it is that in Massachusetts there is located one of the largest factories for making twine in the country, the Plymouth Cordage Company. Other cordage companies are also interested.

I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia this question: Is not the definition of twine given in the bill very indefinite? I ask the question because I feel that there should be some protection given not only to the American manufacturer, who wants to be protected from the importation of cheaper grades of twine than the type he manufactures, but also to the American farmer, so that

he may buy imported twine, if he so desires, which would work in his combine, and not fail him.

I know that in the committee an amendment was offered to define twine, and I should like to read to the Senator from Georgia that definition, with the thought that possibly he could give me an idea as to whether it represents his interpretation of what the bill means. The definition is:

All binding twine and baler twine manufactured from New Zealand hemp, henequen, manila, istle or Tampico fiber, sisal grass, or sunn, or a mixture of any two or more of them, of single ply, measuring not exceeding 750 feet to the pound containing not less than 8 percent of oil by weight, treated to repel insects and rodents, and in the case of baler twine to resist mildew, and chiefly used in harvesting agricultural crops.

It is my understanding that if that definition of what it meant by baler twine were included it would be a very proper bill, because it would keep up the grade of the twine which would come into this country and be of value not only to the farmer but to the manufacturer also.

I would appreciate it very much if the chairman of the Committee on Finance would state whether the definition which I have read represents his understanding of what is meant by the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. A portion of that definition, of course, is provided in the law, and I call attention to paragraph 1622 of the Tariff Act of 1932. It reads as follows:

All binding twine—

That is the present law; the bill adds—

and twine chiefly used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials—

That is the only language added; then follows the remander of section 1622—

manufactured from New Zealand hemp, henequen, manila, istle or Tampico fiber, sisal grass, or sunn, or a mixture of any two or more of them, of single ply and measuring not exceeding 750 feet to the pound.

Thus far the definition is prescribed by law. With reference to the oil content of the baler twine, I must frankly say that I do not know, except that from the actual use of the baler twine I should think that if it had no oil it would be a very inferior type of twine, and could not be easily used in the modern reaper, binder, combine, or other machines in which such twine is used.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know what the oil content should be under any proper definition.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. THYE. The oil is the result of a treating process designed to keep insects away from the twine. If twine were not treated crickets would cut it the very first night it was put in the bundle or bale. Oil is used as a treating process to protect the twine from insects. The act has protected the producer and the user of the twine, so far as binding a bundle or bale is concerned. What is being done today is to keep pace with progress in America, because the harvester has been replaced by the combine. In order to salvage the straw, the baler goes into the field and picks up the straw and bales it. It is a part of the revolution in agriculture. That was the only reason why producer and farm organizations have asked for the same consideration for baler twine as was extended to the binder twine in earlier years.

A bale can be bound with either wire or twine. Some farmers prefer twine, while others prefer wire. With this duty on the twine, of course, the cost of binding a bale is higher. Therefore, they have asked that the duty be waived.

Mr. GEORGE. I would think that in general the definition which was read by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would be the definition the customs officials would adopt. I am speaking generally, because I have no very definite knowledge about how the twine is treated and what the oil content is. I agree entirely with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] that twine must have oil treatment in order to make it usable and in order to preserve it against rodents and insects.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the purposes stated by the Senator from Minnesota. I use baler twine myself on my little place in Massachusetts. What I should like to emphasize as best I can is this: Do not the words "chiefly used for baling hay," and so forth, let down the whole restrictive content of paragraph 1622? I may say that when baler twine came in it would come in as a very inferior grade, if it were argued that it would be chiefly used for baling hay. That is what I should like to have the RECORD show.

Mr. GEORGE. I would say that the section is rather vague, but I believe the customs officials can be relied upon to define it in a way that would substantially agree with the definition which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has suggested.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If that be true, I do not believe that the citizens of Massachusetts who are interested in this subject would have any great objection. Is it not true that a lawsuit will have to be brought or an interpretation made by the Customs Court in order to get a regulation interpreting the provision?

Mr. GEORGE. I believe that is correct. I think the Department will have to work out an interpretive regulation, which will probably be passed upon by the Customs Court. That was true in the case of binding twine when we put it into the Tariff Act of 1930.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the feeling of the Senator from Georgia that such a ruling by the Customs Court should in substance carry out the definition I read and which the Senator feels is proper?

Mr. GEORGE. I think so. I should say so

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Georgia. Under those circumstances I will not submit the definition I have read as an amendment to the bill, because we can get the same result by a Customs Court interpretation and a regulation based thereon.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator very much. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a telegram which I received this morning from the American Farm Bureau Federation, National Farmers' Union, Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Grange.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 20, 1951.*

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
United States Senate:

Any proposed rider amendments to H. R. 1005 of unrelated nature are a threat to enactment of this vital legislation at this session of Congress. We hope you will oppose such moves and give the American farmer prompt relief in the supply of baler twine which is important in food production.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION.
NATIONAL FARMERS UNION.
COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES.
NATIONAL GRANGE.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may correct a misstatement of mine?

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I said that my Massachusetts constituents would not object. Of course, they object to the bill, but, in view of the remarks of the Senator from Georgia, the bill is improved considerably.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield, I should like to assure the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that in connection with the consideration of the House bill, there was considerable discussion along the line of the amendment, or definition, or description the Senator from Massachusetts has just read. For his information, I may say that the four farm organizations whose telegrams were just placed in the RECORD, in connection with their endorsement of this measure, and the representatives of the Cordage Institute, as I understood, were practically in agreement on the definition the Senator read into the RECORD a few moments ago.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement made by the Senator from Nebraska, because I know he is interested in this matter, and I know he wants to have the best possible ball of twine made available, as does the Senator from Minnesota. So I hope the regulation will be interpreted in the proper way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 1005) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1320. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between certain officers of the Public Health Service and comparable officers of the Army, and for other purposes;

S. 1629. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, to permit the interstate movement, for immediate slaughter, of domestic animals which have reacted to a test for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test for brucellosis; and for other purposes;

S 1931 An act for the relief of Joyce Jacqualyn Johnson;

S 1980. An act for the relief of Adelheid Wichman (now Adelheid Waltschies);

S. 2041. An act for the relief of Meiko Shindo; and

S. 2228 An act for the relief of William Elden Joslin.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendents of the Senate to the bill (H R 5684) making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 6 to the bill, and concurred therein.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H R 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 17, 26, 28, 32, 37, 40, 48, 56, 57, 58, 59, 70, 93, and 101 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 14, 27, 33, 35, 36, 39, 40, 73, 87, 105, and 110, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R 3889 An act to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes, and

H R 5593 An act authorizing the Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority, hereby created, and its successors, to construct, maintain, and operate bridges over Sabine Lake, at or near Port Arthur, Tex.; to construct, maintain, and operate all causeways, approaches, and appurtenances pertaining thereto; and to finance said objects by the issuance of bonds secured by the said properties and income and revenues; and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H R. 5329. An act to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 5411. An act to amend Public Laws Nos. 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense-housing areas, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H R 4749. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to return certain lands to the Police Jury of Caddo Parish, La; and

H. J Res 351. Joint resolution providing that the second regular session of the Eighty-second Congress shall begin at noon on Tuesday, January 8, 1952.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 170) providing for the printing of 35,500 additional copies of the public law enacted during the Eighty-second Congress, first session, entitled "Revenue Act of 1951," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4749) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to return certain lands to the Police Jury of Caddo Parish, La., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REVENUE ACT OF 1951

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 170, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 35,500 additional copies of the public law enacted during the Eighty-second Congress, first session, entitled "Revenue Act of 1951," of which 3,000 copies shall be for the Senate Document Room, 30,000 copies for the House Document Room, 1,000 copies for the Senate Committee on Finance, and 1,500 copies for the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS—DEPUTY DIRECTOF FOR MUTUAL SECURITY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Foreign Relations I ask unanimous consent to report favorably the nomination of Richard M. Bissell, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security; and I request the immediate consideration of the nomination. Mr. Bissell is to be next in authority to Mr. Harriman. We could not bring forward Mr. Bissell's nomination until Mr. Harriman's nomination had been confirmed. Therefore, I should like to have Mr. Bissell's nomination confirmed at this time, because the nomination is a very important one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none.

The question is, as in executive session, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I happen to know Mr. Bissell because he comes from Massachusetts. He has been Deputy Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, and more recently he has served as Acting Administrator of the ECA. He is well-qualified for the new position to which he has been nominated. The confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Harriman as Director for Mutual Security makes it important that the nomination of Mr. Bissell to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security be confirmed before the end of this session. I know of no objection to the nomination, and I see no reason why the nomination should not be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and without objection, the President will be notified immediately of the confirmation of the nomination.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, now that we are proceeding as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the one nomination on the Executive Calendar be considered at this time, as in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Joseph Charles Duggan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF NARCOTICS LAWS

The bill (H. R. 3490) to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotics laws, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none; and, without objection——

Mr. O'CONOR Mr. President, I think it would be unfortunate to have this bill passed without having a brief comment made.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the necessity for and the benefits to be derived from more stringent legislation to curb the widespread traffic in narcotic drugs.

The recent Nation-wide indignation, which directly stems from investigations and hearings by the Senate Crime Committee, indicates the gravity of the problem.

When the Senate extended the life of our committee, and I was designated chairman, we made this problem our No.

1 assignment. Unfortunately, before that, only scant attention had been given this curse; and in those instances the activity was confined to a single locality. Our investigation was launched on a Nation-wide basis, and the revelations and disclosures were such that we concluded it was imperative that drastic action be taken.

Our Senate committee came to the conclusion that, first, the illicit traffic in narcotics constitutes an evil of such great proportions that, unless curbed, it will endanger the social structure of the United States and inflict irreparable harm to the youth of the Nation.

Second, the increase in the use by younger people of drugs has been shocking. Not only do the records of hospitals reveal this, but information gathered by the committee points unmistakably to the upward trend in this narcotic addiction.

Third, because the traffic in narcotic drugs pays hugh profits to the most depraved of the criminal elements, the peddlers are ready to wreck the lives of children in order to obtain the enormous income.

Fourth, penalties for violations must be increased. Short sentences do not act as a deterrent to the professional peddlers, and suspended sentences defeat the very purposes of the laws.

Our committee held hearings at the United States Public Health Service hospital at Lexington, Ky., and secured first-hand information as to the extent of this problem and the terrible results of addiction. Later we held public hearings, and the information that was disclosed proved conclusively that this problem is a challenging one. Unfortunately, some of the Federal courts in the past have not faced this situation realistically, and, as a result, short sentences have been imposed. The professional drug peddler responsible for the widespread use has been able to return to his illicit trade all too soon.

Our experience in the survey of criminal activities showed clearly that lengthy sentences imposed promptly after conviction of criminal offenses have a very salutary effect. The history of other instances of drastic legislation, both at the Federal level and at the State level, leaves no doubt that criminals are aware of this situation. Consequently, our committee took the lead in urging the enactment of legislation for lengthy sentences for this type of offense. I, as chairman of the committee which projected this Nation-wide effort, express the hope that this proposed legislation will be enacted and made effective forthwith, inasmuch as offenses of this type require lengthy prison sentences, in accordance with the provisions of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3490) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KEFAUVER subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me, to permit me to make a unanimous-consent request for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. MALONE. Yes; if I may do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with the passage of House bill 3490, Calendar No. 997, a bill amending the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotics laws, a brief statement, together with excerpts from the testimony of Dr. Anslinger, as to the great importance of that measure.

There being no objection, the statement and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

This bill (H. R. 3490) which is the same as the Senate bill 1695 filed by me and sponsored by Senators O'CONOR, HUNT, TOBEY, and WILEY, the members of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, is one of the most important proposals made in this session of Congress. Its enactment will put into effect recommendation No. 12 of the Senate Crime Committee as set forth in the third interim report. It sets up mandatory penalties for persons convicted of narcotic selling and other violations. Sentences after the first one cannot be suspended.

I shall not discuss the lives and homes wrecked by narcotic violators. It is one of the Nation's foremost problems Mr Anslinger, the very capable head of the Federal Narcotics Bureau, is doing an excellent job with the staff furnished him and with the weak laws now on the statute books. He feels and the Crime Committee feel that this mandatory-penalty law was the one most needed piece of legislation in the effort against the narcotic peddlers.

The Senate Crime Committee in its third interim report has this to say as to the need for this legislation:

"XII. THE PENALTIES AGAINST THE ILLEGAL SALE, DISTRIBUTION, AND SMUGGLING OF NARCOTIC DRUGS SHOULD BE SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASED

"We have seen that there has been a serious increase in the narcotics traffic, particularly among teen-agers. One of the ways to curb that traffic is through the imposition of severe penalties Mr Harry Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics, testified before this committee that—

" 'The average prison sentence meted out in the Federal courts is 18 months. Short sentences do not deter. In districts where we get good sentences the traffic does not flourish * * * Both the League of Nations and the United Nations have recommended more severe sentences as one of the best methods to suppress the traffic.

" 'In many countries that has been very effective.

* * * * *

" 'There should be a minimum sentence for the second offense The commercialized transaction, the peddler, the smuggler, those who traffic in narcotics, on the second offense if there were a minimum sentence of 5 years without probation or parole, I think it would just about dry up the traffic.'

"In the light of this testimony, Congress should pass legislation to provide for increased penalties for drug peddlers and others engaged in the commercialized aspects of the drug traffic. Mandatory penalties of imprisonment of at least 5 years should be provided for second offenders. Such legislation is now pending in the House of Representatives where it is receiving the careful consideration of the Committee on Ways and Means."

Following this report S. 1695 was filed by the junor Senator from Tennessee on June 18. Meantime Congressman BOGGS had filed and was pushing for passage of this legislation in the House of Representatives. Congressman BOGGS, Senator GEORGE and their associates on the Ways and Means and Finance Committees are to be congratulated on bringing this legislation to final passage.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT DUTIES ON LEAD AND ZINC

The bill (H. R. 4948) to suspend certain import duties on lead was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MALONE. Reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire as to the particular reason for the consideration of this measure at this time.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this bill should be considered in connection with another one, which I have before me at this time.

Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I now ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, House bill 5448, to provide for the temporary free importation of zinc; and I submit a report—No. 1057—thereon. House bill 5448 was considered by the House of Representatives, and would have reached the Senate some days earlier, but for the exacting work required to be done on the 1951 Tax Act.

Mr. President, House bill 5448 is in almost exactly the same position as House bill 4948; and at this time I wish to call attention to the facts in regard to both those bills, the lead bill and the zinc bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, House bill 5448 will be received and will be placed on the calendar, and will be reached later.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that both the general counsel in the Office of Defense Mobilization and Mr. Charles E. Wilson, the Director, are concerned about these two bills, both the lead bill and the zinc bill, the lead bill now being before the Senate. They advised the committee that there was a shortage of lead, and it was necessary to procure additional quantities of lead in connection with the war effort and the defense program.

Mr. Howard Young, the Deputy Director of the Defense Materials Purchasing Administration, of which Mr. Jess Larson is Administrator, called me yesterday with reference to both the zinc bill and the lead bill. His purpose in calling was to suggest that the zinc bill be added to the lead bill, by way of amendment. However, in the meantime the House acted on the zinc bill, which has just been reported.

Mr. Howard Young stated that he is from the zinc industry itself, and knows the industry and knows that the industry is most anxious to have this duty temporarily suspended. He stated that it was most important that that be done.

Personally I do not know Mr. Young; but he is said to be the head of the Metals Purchasing Administration under Mr. Larson, as I have stated, and is president of the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., of St. Louis, Mo., which has a dozen or more zinc mines throughout the country, and is one of the largest producers.

He testified before the House Ways and Means Committee, in executive hearing, on the zinc bill; and he stated that he is on leave from his company, but that he also was speaking for the lead industry and the zinc industry. He urged the passage of both bills. The bills do not completely suspend the duty, I may say to the distinguished Senator, because both the bills contain this provision:

Provided, That when, for any one calendar month during such period, the average market price of slab zinc—

I am now reading the zinc provision, because it is substantially the same as the lead provision—

(prime western, f. o. b. East St. Louis) for that month has been below 18 cents per pound, the Tariff Commission, within 15 days after the conclusion of such calendar month, shall so advise the President, and the President shall, by proclamation, not later than 20 days after he has been so advised by the Tariff Commission, revoke such suspension of the duties imposed under paragraphs 77, 393, and 394 of the Tariff Act of 1930, such revocation to be effective with respect to articles entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption after the date of such proclamation

In determining the average market price of slab zinc for each calendar month, the Tariff Commission is hereby authorized to base its findings upon the average monthly price of slab zinc (prime western, f. o. b. East St. Louis) reported by the Engineering and Mining Journal's Metal and Mineral Markets.

That same provision in substance is inserted in the lead bill, except, I believe, that the markets for lead are New York and New Jersey. These matters were pressed upon both the Ways and Means and Finance Committees by Mr. Wilson's office and Mr. Larson's office. That is the only available information I have.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask whether these bills have been considered at hearings held by the Finance Committee of the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. The bills have been considered by the committee, but we had no testimony further than the testimony which was submitted to the House committee.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this legislation is but a continuation of the principle of the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which puts into the hands of the Secretary of State the right to remake the industrial map of the United States and to favor foreign production over local or domestic production. It admits to the taxpayers of America that their money will be invested in the foreign exploration and development of new deposits and new supplies of zinc and lead.

These items would join the long list of free trade items. Private money will not be invested in new exploration and development of ores in America unless there is a floor under wages and investments because it is almost certain that as soon as the emergency is over such investment would be destroyed.

Mr. President, the same thing happened in regard to copper. The same principle is involved. The junior Senator from Nevada in the debate on that subject said that very soon the Government would be paying 2½ or 3 cents more for foreign copper than for domestic copper; and that has happened. This paying of more for foreign copper began immediately after the duty was removed and within 3 weeks after the junior Senator from Nevada made the prediction on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, with our taxpayer's money, the Government even makes loans for the exploration and development of new ores in foreign countries.

Our taxpayers' money is being misused in financing business ventures which should be financed with private capital.

If we would adopt the principle of a fair and reasonable competitive market in this country for the goods of other nations, private investors would then know that there would be a floor under their investments and sufficient private capital would be available.

In connection with these bills offered, I wish to point out, Mr. President, that the Government does not pay duty on anything coming into this country used for national defense, if the Government buys it. I point out further that if a private concern should buy abroad and use such material in the manufacture of war goods which are subsequently sold to the Government, the Government would collect the duty, then pay the duty, which would amount to no duty being paid, making no difference whatever.

What the proposed legislation does is to upset the entire economic situation of the United States of America, and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard by the Senator from Nevada, and the bill will go over.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to refer to Calendar No. 779 (H. R. 2546) for the relief of Charles W. Vanderhoop.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are two more bills yet to be called.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I reserve my request.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the objection? I wanted to make inquiry as to whether the objection was made to the zinc bill, also.

Mr. MALONE. Yes, and not only to zinc and lead, but to every other item proposed for similar treatment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The zinc bill has not been called up.

Mr. GEORGE. I so understand.

CANAL FROM CAPE MAY HARBOR TO DELAWARE BAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next bill, by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. The bill (H. R. 4055) to authorize for an additional 1-year period, the use of rivers and harbors appropriations for maintenance of the canal from Cape May Harbor to Delaware Bay and the railroad and highway bridges over such canal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MALONE. Where are we now? Have we disposed of the zinc, or is it yet to come?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The zinc bill is yet to be called on the calendar. We are now on Calendar 999, House bill 4055. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TEMPORARY FREE IMPORTATION OF ZINC

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is one more bill remaining, which was placed on the calendar by unanimous consent, known as the zinc bill. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. The bill (H. R. 5448) to provide for the temporary free importation of zinc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia whether I correctly understood him to say that the industry, that is, the producers of zinc and lead, are favorable to both this measure and the one relating to lead, which was objected to by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. GEORGE. I am so advised. Only within the week a ceiling price has been placed upon both lead and zinc, and the industry regards both these measures as advisable. But, of course, the Senator from Nevada having objected to the lead bill, I merely inquired whether he also desired to make objection to the zinc bill.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator understand that I mean the producers of lead and zinc, not these who use those products in industry? Are they favorable to these measures? In other words, are the operators of the lead mines and the zinc mines favorable to these measures? That is what I should like to know?

Mr. GEORGE. No objections have been made by any of the producers. Mr. Howard Young, president of the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., St. Louis, which has more than a dozen zinc and lead mines throughout the country, and which is one of the largest producers, testified before the House Ways and Means Committee, and in executive session, that the producers themselves desired the passage of these bills.

Mr. WATKINS. The reason I am calling it to the attention of the Senator is that I have not received, so far as I recall, any communication from Utah mines with respect to either of these bills. Were hearings held before the Senate committee?

Mr. GEORGE. The bills were called and there was no objection. Purely technical matters were inquired into. The committee took no testimony.

Mr. WATKINS. Is the Senator sure that the producers in these fields knew of this proposed legislation?

Mr. GEORGE. I am quite sure they did know of it. I have read what Mr. Young himself said. He is now the President of the Metal Marketing Division in Mr. Larsen's organization, and he is also connected with making loans to the lead and zinc industry.

Mr. WATKINS. If the producers do not object, I shall not object to either of these bills.

Mr. GEORGE. I have received not one word of objection to either of the bills. Nothing has reached the committee to indicate that there was objection. The committee itself made an amendment to the lead bill to bring it more into line with the recently established ceiling prices which have been raised on both lead and zinc.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] a question with reference to these measures?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Utah may inquire of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. WATKINS. Is the Senator from Nevada aware of the fact that the producers are quite agreeable to these bills?

Mr. MALONE. There are two classifications of persons involved. One consists of men who are now producers; the other consists of those who would like to become producers.

Mr. WATKINS. As I understand from the information which I have received in the past few minutes, the producers themselves are satisfied with the proposed legislation. They think it might have been much worse, and they are quite willing to accept it. We are vitally interested in the success and well-being of the industry. I would be one of the first to object to these measures if there were objection on the part of our producers. I was just wondering if the Senator from Nevada had considered the fact that the industry itself is not objecting.

Mr. MALONE. I have arrived at my position after carefully considering all the factors. For a period of 5 years I have debated this subject on the Senate floor.

It is well established that I am interested in the American producers. A small miner in my State, one who possibly does not have money enough to send us a telegram, goes into the hills and finds enough ore to permit him to keep eating, but here on the Senate floor we tamper with the tariff until that miner cannot make a living.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not a fact that the tariff is of little consequence and that the producers are amply protected in the price?

Mr. MALONE. I think this New Deal administration has meddled with the price so long that no one knows what is going on. The administration will fix a price by which the industry can live, and then tomorrow it will change it. The administration boys have full leeway. And we have evidence that Congress will not stop them.

We hope that condition will end sometime, for, if it does not, the administration will cook up something which will completely wipe out private investments.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is it not true that suspension of duties on both lead and zinc will merely provide additional profits for producers of these minerals abroad, but will in no way help to stimulate domestic production and will continue the disadvantages under which our own mining industry is laboring at the present time?

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Idaho is exactly correct. He has put his finger on the sore spot. It would simply mean that the foreign price, which recently has been considerably higher than the domestic price, will continue, giving foreign producers the advantage. The Government has removed the last vestige of protection that an American investor might reasonably expect, and calamity would come if the President suddenly ran out of emergencies.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Instead of trying to increase the profits of mineral producers abroad, would it not be more advantageous if some objectives were initiated to stimulate production on the part of small-mine operators throughout the United States so they will be able to cope with the high costs of production and do something to increase the availability of lead and zinc in this country?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if this Congress had the gumption to lay down the principle of fair and reasonable competition as a basis for a tariff or an import fee, not merely on minerals, but on textiles and every other product, the situation would be greatly improved. Why vote for tax bills which would be unnecessary if we followed the American principle? We have been going down the wrong road the past 18 years. The set-up of our entire economy has been so arranged that our taxpayers have to finance the war plants, the exploration abroad, and the development, with no hope of a return on the investment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing for the Senators from the West to speak for their industry. If they object to these bills, they take the responsibility.

Mr. MALONE. I will take the responsibility.

Mr. GEORGE. There has been a ceiling price put upon the two products, and I think the Senator will see that it is to the advantage of the industry to accept these bills as they came from the House. But if there is objection——

Mr. MALONE. We have plenty of time I intend to make a short speech immediately following this discussion.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not mind the Senator making a speech, but we are operating under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator wants to call that rule, I will start from here. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

CHARLES W. VANDERHOOP

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to call up Calendar 779 (H. R. 2546) for the relief of Charles W. Vanderhoop in the amount of $639 39. I have spoken to the majority leader, to the minority calender committee, and to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who objected to the consideration of the bill. It involves a man who retired from the Coast Guard in December 1937. He had no knowledge of his claim until the Comptroller General made a ruling on October 28, 1937, so he had less than 2 months within which to bring his claim within the statute of limitations. He was on a far away island. There is a precedent for this bill, and I hope there will be no objection to the consideration of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2546) for the relief of Charles W. Vanderhoop.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr President, originally I had asked the calendar committee of the minority to enter objection to this bill. My reason for objecting to it was that it seemed to be a bill to waive the statute of limitations, and ordinarily I am opposed to waiving the statute of limitations unless there is good sound reason for it and the case does not set a precedent. We should either enforce the statute of limitations, or we should repeal it. The number of bills which are coming before the Judiciary Committee asking for the waiving of the statute of limitations has alarmed many members of that committee.

I have heard the explanation of House bill 2546 by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, and I am convinced that it is probably one of the exceptions which will not set a general precedent, to which I am opposed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WATKINS. Therefore, I shall not object

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION TO PRINT MATTERS IN THE APPENDIX AFTER THE ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be given leave to have matters printed in subsequent issues of the RECORD following the adjournment of the Congress. I understand that is the customary order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, does that mean that it can be done without Senators asking special consideration, that Senators may place in the RECORD such matters as they desire?

Mr. McFARLAND. Until the last issue of the RECORD is made up, I am

asking that Senators may insert matters.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it a general permission, or do Senators have to ask permission specially.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am asking for general permission in behalf of all Senators.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I desire to get a little matter straightened out, then I shall yield the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to get the matter just discussed straightened out

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has just asked unanimous consent that certain materials may be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Is there any limitation upon the type of material which may be placed in the RECORD, or the length of the material?

Mr. McFARLAND. This is the customary end-of-a-session request. Of course, if the matter did not comply with the rules as to the length, it could not be printed in the RECORD

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In other words, if permission is asked for the insertion of more than the customary two pages, there must be an estimate of the cost filed with the material?

Mr McFARLAND. That is my understanding.

Mr WATKINS. Is it not true that if the material is a speech by a Senator himself, or a letter from a Senator in his own language, the rule relating to two pages does not apply? I should like to have that matter cleared up.

Mr McFARLAND. It is my understanding that the rule does not apply to a Senator's speech; but when he attempts to put into the Appendix material not his own, or material falling in one of the excepted classes, it does apply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that under the rule regarding printing there is no restriction as to the length of statements Senators may have printed in the RECORD or the Appendix of the RECORD if they are their own statements

Mr. McFARLAND Yes, Mr. President, that applies to the remarks of Senators and Representatives, the President or Vice President, or members of the Cabinet. It would not apply to other matters sought to be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The words of a Senator issued in a statement, speech, or otherwise, do not fall under the rule

Mr McFARLAND. That was my understanding of the ruling heretofore made.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator from Arizona and the Chair.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I now wish to comment on the parliamentary procedure immediately ahead. We have concluded the call of the calendar.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I have been seeking to get into communication with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to file a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate passed House bill 320, and before the Senator from Arizona leaves the subject of the calendar entirely, I should like to have an opportunity to find whether the Senator would object to that motion being called up.

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall not object to that later, if unanimous consent is sought. However, I now want to get something before the Senate. Was the Senator from Oklahoma intending to ask unanimous consent, or to call the motion up for consideration?

Mr. KERR. I was intending to call it up for consideration if the Senator from Illinois were available to participate.

Mr. McFARLAND. The senior Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KERR Yes.

Mr McFARLAND. I understand he is not in the city.

Mr. KERR. I understand that, but I am going to talk with his assistant, who has been handling the matter for the Senator.

Mr SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Kansas

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I was unable to hear the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. What is the calendar number of the bill to which the Senator from Oklahoma referred?

Mr KERR The Senator may find it in the present calendar under "Motions for reconsideration."

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is H R 320.

Mr SCHOEPPEL Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Do I understand correctly that the parliamentary situation with reference to the calendar call just concluded is that there will be no calling up of any other bills heretofore passed over on the call of the calendar unless by motion or by unanimous consent?

Mr McFARLAND. Yes; that is the way it would have to be done.

Mr SCHOEPPEL. I desired to be sure we had finally concluded the call of the calendar

Mr. McFARLAND. As I understand, we have concluded the call of the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand we have concluded the regular call of the calendar, but Senators are not precluded from calling up any bill on the calendar which has been previously called. They can ask unanimous consent to take a bill up. I believe that is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. Senators are precluded in the present situation, because there is a motion pending. I desire to get a bill before the Senate. Of course, a motion can be set aside by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr McCLELLAN. Would the able majority leader be willing to have taken up today Calendar No. 543, Senate bill 913, to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States? It is a bill in which some of us are very much interested, a bill which I think is of considerable merit, a measure which has been given most careful study by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and which was reported unanimously by the committee. I believe all the members of the committee save one became cosponsors of the bill

I may say to the able majority leader that this is a bill which, if it will accomplish what is hoped, is one of the most constructive pieces of legislation to come before this body. It is a matter which I should like to have disposed of at this session, in order that the House may take it up early in the next session. If the bill were passed, we would be able to make some progress toward setting up the machinery to service appropriation committees, and keep a watch over the budget.

Mr. President, if the majority leader will yield further——

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr McCLELLAN. In the Washington Evening Star of yesterday afternoon there appeared a news article regarding a speech by a distinguished Cabinet member, the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer. I call attention to this because it is right in line with the bill which I am anxious to have considered. I shall not read all of the article, but I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

SAWYER HITS WASTE, AID TO INCOMPETENT IN UNITED STATES BUDGET SET-UP—COMMERCE SECRETARY ASKS DRASTIC REVISIONS AND FEWER SERVICES

COLUMBUS, OHIO, October 19.—Secretary of Commerce Sawyer said today the Government's budget practices encourage spending instead of saving, and keep incompetents on the public pay roll.

Drastic decisions must be made to revise the budget system and cut out less essential services, the Secretary added.

Otherwise, he suggested, the Government's currency and credit would be debauched and "the backbone of our capitalistic system" could be destroyed.

The Cabinet member's blast, in a speech prepared for an Ohio State University advertising conference, came as a surprise in view of President Truman's recent vigorous defense of the Federal budget The President had sharply criticized those who attack the budget.

Secretary Sawyer ridiculed what he called the Government's mania for new agencies, commissions, and study groups. He singled out two new offices for criticism.

Creation by Congress of a Small Defense Plants Administration, Mr Sawyer said, will result in "the new agency being added to old ones." He added: "The work could have been done by existing agencies effectively and with a great saving of the taxpayers' money."

The second example of what he called needless creation of Federal offices was the establishment of a new administration to supervise all foreign aid, also done by Congress. Secretary Sawyer said establishing a separate agency as a "Santa Claus department * * * in the long run would produce an unbearable drain upon the taxpayers."

Secretary Sawyer said various proposals for streamlining the Government by reorganization can save a little of the taxpayers' money, but not much.

"To accomplish great savings we will be forced to cut down or get rid of certain functions now being performed," Secretary Sawyer said. Any specific proposals along this line, he added, will be greeted by a howl of protest and anger from every affected individual or group throughout the country.

Mr. Sawyer suggested:

1. Federal departments should be allowed to keep any money left over at the end of a budget year instead of turning the surplus back to the Treasury as is now required. The current practice has resulted, Mr. Sawyer said, in "frantic efforts—and I use the word frantic advisedly"—to spend any surplus moneys.

2. Bosses of Federal agencies should be given more power over hiring, firing, and promoting employees than they have now under the civil-service system.

3. Instead of appropriating funds piecemeal to bureaus and agencies within a department, Congress should make one appropriation to the head of the department to permit the executive to do a better management job and hold costs to a minimum.

4. If Congress decrees a percentage cut in a department budget, it should let the department head distribute the cut as he sees fit instead of forcing a curtailment in all activities without regard to their need.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The article reads:

Secretary of Commerce Sawyer said today the Government's budget practices encourage spending instead of saving, and keep incompetents on the public payroll.

Drastic decisions must be made to revise the budget system and cut out less essential services, Secretary Sawyer added.

I shall not read further.

The purpose of the bill is to create a joint committee of Congress patterned after the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. The joint committee would supervise the budget, in the sense of examining it, going into the departments and agencies with an adequate, trained staff to find out where the waste is, and where savings can be made, and to inform the Congress and the Appropriations Committees, when appropriation bills come before us, as to where cuts can be made judiciously, instead of resorting to a meat-ax operation, as we now have to do, without any intelligent information as to where the cuts can be made.

This is important legislation. There is a need for it. If this is not the right approach, there is need for some kind of approach to the problem. I was hoping that the bill might be brought up and passed by the Senate and sent to the House, in order that action might be obtained over there early in the next session.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has done a great deal of work in connection with this particular legislation. It is important legislation. I know that he has given much thought to it. In my judgment he is entitled to have the Senate consider his bill and I have told him so several times.

However, we all know that the bill is controversial. I know that my own colleague [Mr. HAYDEN] is interested in it. I shall not undertake to state his position. I am sure other Members, some of whom are not present today, desire to express their views with respect to it. If we are to adjourn today, I feel that it is my duty not to take up major controversial matters unless by unanimous consent, and unless notice has previously been given that a particular bill would be taken up. Notice has not been given that this bill would be taken up.

As my good friend from Arkansas himself said, the House would not consider the bill in this session. I will say to him that I will take the legislation up with the Policy Committee, and I will use my influence to see that his bill receives early consideration.

Mr KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield if I have the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the statement by the able Senator from Arkansas referring to the speech by the distinguished Secretary of Commerce, I wonder if the Senator would yield to me for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the full text of the Secretary's speech.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to do so. In fact, I tried to get in touch with the Secretary this morning to obtain a copy so that I could insert the full text of his speech in the RECORD. I am very glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the full text of the address delivered by Secretary of Commerce Sawyer at the Ohio State University advertising conference, at Columbus, Ohio, on October 19, 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator from Arizona yield to me for a brief comment on this subject?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy that the Senator from Arkansas has called the attention of the Senate to the bill which he and many other Senators have sponsored. I know that his committee has given a great deal of attention to the subject. However, it is a matter of such great importance to the fiscal policy of the Government that in my judgment there ought to be a full-dress debate on the floor.

The Senator from Arkansas is walking along the road that we should follow. The greatest danger that confronts our country now arises from inflation—inflation here at home and inflation abroad, which will be occasioned by the expenditure of huge sums, particularly for military purposes, and also for other purposes. It is utterly impossible under the present system to make the proper review of the expenditures of this Government. We must find a way in the next session of Congress to cut down expenditures in whatever field they happen to be. My own judgment is that the greatest savings can be made in the military field. Eighty-four percent of all the expenditures of the Government during this fiscal year are war-connected in one way or another.

We are now on the road to authorizing additional expenditures which may invite another deficit. The bill to which the Senator from Arkansas has referred is one which in my judgment is in the public interest, and ought to be considered. I am glad that the majority leader has given his assurance to the Senator from Arkansas that this bill will be given a place at the beginning of the next session.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is an important and influential member of the majority policy committee and his judgment will be extremely persuasive with his colleagues.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to express my appreciation to the majority leader for the assurance that this subject will be given some priority of attention early in the next session.

I realize that this bill ought to be considered. The committee has worked hard on it. We have done our best We believe that we have reported a good bill. From the time I introduce the bill I have endeavored to obtain the best help and counsel I could get in trying to draft a bill which would actually accomplish some of the most desirable and necessary economies.

Let me say further to the majority leader that in view of the fact that Congress is scheduled to adjourn today I shall not press for consideration of the bill at this time, because there are Senators who probably wish to discuss it. There may be some features or provisions of the bill which should be thoroughly discussed.

However, I wish again to emphasize that when the Congress reconvenes I shall do everything in my power to obtain consideration for the bill in the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me for just a word?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say just one sentence to the Senator from Arkansas. I think he knows the subject.

There is another reason for waiting until the first of the year. The minority

leader [Mr. WHERRY] has a bill of his own on the calendar on this subject. He is much interested. Under all the circumstances I am glad that he will have an opportunity to discuss the question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What I am trying to do is to make certain that the bill will receive consideration early in the next session.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope Senators will now let me straighten out the calendar situation for the opening days of the second session. I want the Senate to know what we propose to do when we reconvene. Of course, we are not going to adjourn at this moment, since the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] desires to make some remarks, and there are several conference reports yet to be considered. However, I wish to have something before the Senate, and I want the Senate to know what we are going to take up when we return.

Pursuant to the colloquy with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] yesterday dealing with his motion to proceed to consider Senate bill 2104, I now withdraw the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2104 in behalf of the junior Senator from Arkansas, and move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1976 That is the so-called home rule bill for the District of Columbia.

Of course, we are not going to complete consideration of the home rule bill today. I know that my good friend from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has a few remarks to make, either for or against the bill. However, I want him to have sufficient notice as to when the bill is coming up. He will thus have a little more than 2 months to prepare his remarks. I am told that the longer one takes to prepare a speech the shorter the speech. So I thought it advisable to make the home rule bill the unfinished business for next session, because I am afraid that with so little time for preparation now the Senator from South Carolina would not be able to let us adjourn today.

I am sure, however, that if we give him plenty of notice, he will be able to proceed rapidly next January.

Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield first to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have no objection to having the majority leader say that his motion is pending to take up the home rule bill. So far as I am concerned, I intend to begin speaking immediately if he insists on going any further than saying that his motion is pending to take up the home rule bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. I merely wanted the Senate to know what was coming up initially in the next session.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Arizona has made his motion to take up the home-rule bill, and the motion is before the Senate. I do not object to that, but I am not going to give up what I have to say with regard to the motion to take up. We can discuss the motion at the same time that we discuss the bill itself.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the fact that obviously there is going to be considerable discussion in the early part of the next session with regard to the home-rule bill, I was wondering whether the able Senator from Arizona, our majority leader, would not give consideration to taking up the bills granting statehood to Hawaii and Alaska.

The two great Territories have been waiting at the door, so to speak, for admission to statehood for a long period of time. I believe it is obvious to any of us who are interested in the subject—and I see on the floor the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] who I know has a deep interest in the question—that unless the bills are taken up early in the session, when they can be adequately discussed, it will mean that another session of Congress will pass without these two great Territories having had a chance to be admitted into the Union.

I sincerely plead with the majority leader that he give consideration to giving the statehood bills the right of way early in the session.

Mr McFARLAND. I have stated on several occasions that the statehood bills were on the agenda for early consideration The Senator from California I believe, knows it is our firm intention to take those bills up at the earliest opportunity after we reconvene With all due respect to my good friend from South Carolina, the home-rule bill was passed in 1 day during the last session. I do not believe it will take very long to dispose of it next January. I do not believe there is very much opposition to it, although I may be wrong.

Let me make clear again that I have also given notice that immediately following disposition of the home rule bill we will proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2104, Calendar Number 745, the so-called fats and oils repeal bill in which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are interested. After that bill is disposed of, we will determine the next order of business but the so-called statehood bills will receive prior consideration at that time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad that the Senator from California has referred to the statehood bills. I believe the RECORD is clear that the policy committee of the majority party in the Senate, at one of its meetings during this session, decided that the statehood bills would have priority of consideration at the beginning of the new session.

The Governor of Hawaii has been in the city during the past week or 10 days. I have had numerous conferences with him. I know from him and others that the people of the Territory of Hawaii are waiting anxiously upon the action of this Congress with respect to the statehood legislation.

I want the RECORD to be perfectly clear that it will be my purpose, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to take the earliest practicable step in the new session to bring up for consideration the statehood bills for Alaska and Hawaii. The people of those two Territories are entitled to have a decision made by Congress, and nothing will be left undone at the beginning of the next session to bring that about.

I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. The senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has been very diligent in moving the statehood bills forward not only in his own committee but before the policy committee. The bills were not taken up for floor action, as he well knows, because we were working almost entirely on important national defense matters and appropriation bills. Of course, they will be given early priority in the next session.

The District of Columbia home rule bill is in the same category but should not take as long to consider. I feel it should be disposed of promptly and I have agreed that we would make the fats and oil bill the second order of business. That bill, also will not take very long to consider, in my judgment. Thereafter we will decide on the order of succeeding bills but the statehood bills and the measure referred to by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are both on the calendar and will receive our early attention.

MANPOWER POLICY OF DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MALONE obtained the floor.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Utah, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have been receiving strong protests from fathers of members of the Utah National Guard whose sons have been trained in the National Guard as artillerymen, but apparently have been recently assigned to front-line duty in Korea as infantrymen.

Governor J. Bracken Lee of Utah has also wired me that reports reaching Utah indicate that men trained for specific assignments in Utah National Guard units are being transferred out of these units to other duties not consistent with their training.

The Governor states:

> We have several examples wherein National Guard artillerymen have been transferred into infantry units for front-line duty in Korea I am preparing letter protesting this action of the Army since it violates definite pledges made to National Guard enlistees nullifying the training they have received and places them in new duties without adequate preparation.

One of the members of the Utah National Guard who was trained as an artilleryman was killed in action a short time ago in Korea. According to the dispatches, he was serving with an Infantry regiment, having been transferred from the Utah National Guard to this position. My information is that

he was not given any training as an infantryman, at least not adequate training, before being sent up to the front to engage in combat.

The people of Utah are becoming very alarmed and indignant over recent policies of the Defense Department with respect to these assignments and the rotation plan which has been put in effect in the Far East Command.

I have sent a letter of inquiry and protest to General Collins, Chief of Staff of the Army. I hope I shall receive a prompt explanation of what appears to be a very dangerous policy if it is being carried out extensively.

Mr. President, the fathers of many of the Utah National Guard men are veterans of World War I and World War II. They know what it means to fight without adequate training or to be trained for one branch of the service and suddenly to be shifted to another branch and then be ordered into battle.

The people of my State have shown their patriotism through two World Wars and their National Guard units are now bearing some of the heaviest fighting in Korea and have been doing so for at least 6 months. They have won distinction as fighters in several severe battles. The people of Utah are rightly very proud of them. There is no lack of patriotism among the Utah people, and, in protesting against what they believe is a wrong policy, they feel they are performing a patriotic duty, even though some of the matters called to public attention may be embarrassing to those in charge of the armed services.

Mr. President, I am not attempting to pass judgment on the Defense Department; I am not attempting in any way to take over its functions, but as one representative of the men who have to do the fighting and the dying, I feel that this matter deserves the utmost consideration by those who are in charge of our fighting forces.

A question has come to my mind many times with respect to some of the policies of our commanding officers. In the present circumstances, if it should be true that artillerymen without training other than that given to the artillery are being sent into the front lines fighting with infantry regiments, then that action must have been taken either as one of necessity or as the result of blunders on the part of someone in command at lower levels.

In thinking over this situation, Mr. President, I am led to contrast the circumstances which I have called to the attention of the Senate and the situation which exists in Formosa. Only yesterday, Admiral Charles Maynard Cooke, retired, testified before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate, of which I am a member.

Admiral Cooke has just returned from 2 years in Formosa as head of a mission which has been furnishing technical and military advice to the Nationalist Chinese. During the war, Admiral Cooke was Chief Strategic and Policy Adviser to Admiral King, Commander in Chief of the United States Navy. From 1946 to 1948, Admiral Cooke was in command of all United States forces in China.

Admiral Cooke told our committee that there are many hundreds of thousands of able-bodied Chinese soldiers who for various reasons, many of them intensely personal, are bitterly anti-Communist. Quite a number of these men are well-trained and, with the proper equipment, could give a good account of themselves in Korea, relieving some of our troops who have been there a long time and, because of necessity, have not yet been rotated.

These Chinese soldiers fought on the mainland, and were forced to retreat to Formosa. Since that time they have learned of the torture and death of many of their relatives. They are consumed with a desire to defend the liberties of their country and to beat back the aggressor.

It is incomprehensible to me, as it is to many of the people of my State, that the United Nations, or the United States, which seems to be running the war on the anti-Communist side in Korea, should hesitate for one moment to allow these Chinese soldiers, who form the hard core of anti-communism in Asia to take their place in battle, and thus relieve many thousands of our own men who have been up to the front, without relief, for such long periods of time.

If only a portion of this anti-communist Chinese Army were permitted to fight their bitter enemies, there would be no need to send artillerymen to take the place of infantrymen in the front lines in Korea

Mr. President, this matter is not a new one. It has been debated time and again in the Halls of Congress and throughout the Nation. Yet for some reason the administration and those in charge of the United Nations forces in Korea refuse to permit the Chinese patriots to fight to defend their own freedom and to avenge the slaughter of their loved ones.

Nationalist China is a member of the United Nations. The war in Korea is said to be a United Nations' action to stop and punish an aggressor who has breached the peace of the world. Requests have gone out to all United Nations members to contribute forces and to aid in the Korean conflict.

Nationalist China has offered thousands of trained fighting men for service in Korea. These offers have been refused.

At one time it was said that the Chinese forces in Formosa could not be used because their use might provoke Red China or Russia to intervene in the war in behalf of North Korea. But it has been nearly a year since the Red Chinese did intervene and became the aggressor. So that excuse is no longer valid. The American people ought to rise in their wrath and demand that all those willing to fight communism in Asia, particularly those who have special rights to carry on that fight, should be used in every battle and at every point where they can be used effectively.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah permit me to interrupt him at this time; and will the Senator from Nevada yield to me at this time, without disturbing in any way his right to the floor?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if unanimous consent is given that there may be a colloquy at this time between the Senator from Utah and the Senator from California, I shall be very happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah whether he is familiar with the fact that the offer of the Republic of China of 33,000 of their best troops, 4 days after the aggression took place in Korea—which is the offer the able Senator from Utah has just mentioned—constitutes the offering of as many troops as all those which the other members of the United Nations, excluding the United States, have placed in Korea until this very day, some 16 months after the war began in that area of the world.

Mr. WATKINS. I have heard that stated as a fact, and I think it is a fact.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Senator from Utah realize that the other members of the United Nations, aside from the United States of America, have put into Korea only 10 percent of the forces which have been sent to Korea by the United States alone?

Mr WATKINS. That is a generally accepted fact, and it is one which in my opinion reflects upon the other members of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that Admiral Cooke also told our committee that the equipment so vitally needed by these Chinese Nationalist forces was coming in slowly and in small amounts. In other words, there seems to be priority elsewhere for arms and munitions which could be used to good advantage in Asia, where it is most needed, and where a bitter war is now being waged against us.

Mr. President, Admiral Cooke's testimony should be brought home to every American throughout the land. His entire statement was a damning indictment of our far eastern policy which resulted in the loss of China to the free world, and which has made necessary more than 90,000 casualties to our own forces in the last 16 months.

Mr. President, Admiral Cooke appeared and testified before the committee. I have had assembled some excerpts from his testimony, and I now ask unanimous consent to have them printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE TESTIMONY OF ADMIRAL CHARLES MAYNARD COOKE, WHO APPEARED BEFORE THE SENATE INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCTOBER 19, 1951

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Admiral Cooke, are any Chinese troops sent into Korea at all?

Mr. COOKE. No; no troops going to Korea.

Senator WATKINS. You mean Nationalist, do you not?

Mr. COOKE. Nationalist troops, yes. Nationalist troops, you mean?

Mr. MORRIS. That is right.

Mr. COOKE. No, none have gone.

Mr. MORRIS. Have the Chinese volunteered to send any to Formosa?

Mr. COOKE. Yes. Of course, that is a matter of public knowledge, and they offered to send them there a few days after the war broke out.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes. Well, I am asking you, Admiral Cooke, if you have any special knowledge since then.

Mr. COOKE. Except this: That they had it under immediate consideration as soon as the news of the invasion of Korea took place. The actual offer was made that week, I think a few days later, and after the Seventh Fleet was put in the picture.

Mr. MORRIS. Admiral Cooke, do you think that Chinese forces should be sent to Korea?

Mr. COOKE. Very much so, for a number of reasons. Would you like for me to——

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, I would like you to recite them, Admiral.

Mr. COOKE. Well, the first is that I consider that China is a proper member and a faithful member of the United Nations, and should support the opposition to aggression in Korea, which was a continuance of the Russian aggression in China itself.

Secondly, I felt that it would very much improve the efficiency of the Chinese troops.

In other words, I feel, and I suppose most of us do, that the efficiency of our own divisions may be doubled or certainly very much increased by the war experience. Of the Chinese Army, there were the three divisions which were offered to be sent up there, and had they been up there during this time, or had any experience up there, it would improve very materially their capability of defending Formosa itself.

In other words, we are now spending money to improve the defense of Formosa. We would probably double the effectiveness of their defending army if we had had some troops, say of the strength of an army, about 30,000 men—in Korea during this period.

There was another thing that bore on the subject:

When the question was being considered of offering troops to go there, there was doubt expressed among Chinese and, I suppose, among the people here—I was in Formosa at the time—that it might bring the Chinese Communists into the Korean war. It was my view, to those Chinese I talked to, and I stated it, that I didn't think it would have any effect on it whatsoever.

If the Chinese Communists were going in—they were moving troops up there anyhow at that time—it would take place regardless of what the Nationalist troops did.

Well, the offer was made, and, of course, it was not accepted. One other aspect that developed after the Chinese Communists did come into the war, in late November, was that this would be the means to encourage disaffections from the Chinese Communists back to the Nationalist side, because some of them had previously been Nationalist troops, among other things.

Mr. MORRIS. It would be a greater inducement to surrender to a Chinese troop than an American.

Mr. COOKE. That is a matter of speculation, but it is a view that was shared by most people.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, have you any questions?

Senator WATKINS. I am wondering if there is any reason why he cannot tell us what the present situation is in Formosa with respect to these Nationalist troops.

Mr. COOKE. Well, that question was asked, in part, this morning.

Senator WATKINS. It is regretted that I could not stay all morning.

Mr. COOKE. Well, in part, I felt that I probably shouldn't answer that. The United States is sending equipment out there to reinforce the strength, and just what equipment they are sending and how strong it is, I thought, maybe, was a confidential matter of security, and I should not touch upon it.

Senator WATKINS. I would not insist upon it.

Mr. COOKE. But I would go on to say this: That the troops have very fine spirit. There is no question about that in my mind, they are good fighters. Their equipment, of course, has got to be reinforced. The British, for instance, left the mainland at Dunkirk and didn't take much equipment with them. The Chinese, coming over to Formosa, they did take more with them, but still they didn't have enough anyhow, and they didn't get it all over there, and so they are deficient. Their organization and training can be improved. It is improving, but it needs more improvement. Our people are engaged in doing that, as some of my group were beforehand.

Senator WATKINS Is it not, as a matter of fact, the largest group of anti-Communist forces in Asia?

Mr. COOKE. I think so.

Senator WATKINS. That is from outside of the United Nations?

Mr. COOKE. Yes, definitely.

Senator WATKINS. The regular troops

Mr. COOKE Yes, a very large group. The fighting spirit of the men is very good. The caliber of the leadership, in which they have been deficient in the past, is improving, and so they have a very fine force, a very fine body of men, I think, which, with certain amount of war experiences, such as in Korea, or maybe reactiviation on the mainland, would come up to a very high style It will not be the same as an American division, no, but they will be as good as the Communist divisions.

DEFENSE EFFORTS OF WESTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

Mr KNOWLAND Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me briefly, with the understanding that in doing so he will not lose the floor? I ask unanimous consent to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MALONE. Very well.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article appearing in the New York Times on October 18, 1951, in the form of a special dispatch from The Hague, the Netherlands. According to the article, apparently the Government of the Netherlands resented certain testimony which was given before the House Appropriations Committee, relative to the contributions being made by the Netherlands Government in the matter of the mutual defense system which has been established.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I think the two Houses of Congress, through their Appropriations Committees, are entitled to the facts in regard to what is being done to help themselves by the nations we are aiding. I wish to serve notice that when the next arms implementation bill comes before the Congress, we shall expect to obtain more information than we got this year, not less.

At this time I also wish to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from pages 208 and 209 of the hearings of the House Appropriations Committee at the time when these questions relative to the Netherlands were raised.

There being no objection, the editorial and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of October 18, 1951]

THE HAGUE RESENTS DEFENSE CRITICISM—DUTCH FOLLOW DANES IN PROTEST OVER PUBLICIZED TESTIMONY BY UNITED STATES ARMY DIRECTOR

THE HAGUE, THE NETHERLANDS, October 17—The Netherlands, following Denmark's lead, is advising Washington of her objection to a statement of Brig. Gen. George S Olmsted, director of the United States Defense Department's military assistance program, that termed the defense efforts of several Western European countries, including the Netherlands, inadequate.

General Olmsted's testimony before an appropriations subcommittee of the House of Representatives was considered by the Dutch Cabinet. Irrespective of the merits of his appraisal, the Dutch feel that it was highly improper for an official United States spokesman to express himself on a matter that at this moment is the subject of a far-reaching inquiry by a North Atlantic Pact committee in Paris.

The Netherlands Government has just received two exhaustive questionnaires from the Paris group: one asks information about economic resources and potentialities; the other seeks data about the military situation. It is thought here that the search for a formula on the apportionment of a defense contribution is prejudiced by such statements as that of General Olmsted's.

The Netherlanders' sense of propriety has been offended, and it helps little to explain to them at General Olmsted's statement is the sort of thing that just happens in Washington and was not intended to have any connection with the study authorized by the North Atlantic Treaty Council.

FIGURES ESTIMATED UNILATERALLY

In addition, the Netherlands Government has a specific reason for feeling outraged. General Olmsted listed Dutch defense expenditures in the current fiscal year as $520,000,000 This does not represent Dutch expenditures but a unilateral United States estimate of what they should be Dutch officials were irritated when they learned a few months ago that this figure was being used confidentially in international discussions. Now that it has been employed publicly, they feel indignant.

Actually, the Dutch defense budget for the current year is about $394,000,000. By adding extra budgetary expenditures, mainly in counterpart funds, the total defense spending probably will not exceed $430,000,000.

The first project for the use of counterpart funds for defense production was announced today by the Economic Cooperation Administration. It has approved a Dutch proposal to spend 175,000,000 guilders (about $45,600,000) to purchase three-quarter-ton weapon carriers and two-and-a-half-ton prime movers of new Dutch design.

A further release of 55,000,000 guilders is being considered for the manufacture of communications equipment and munitions.

DUTCH ASK UNITED STATES FOR TRANSCRIPT

WASHINGTON, October 17.—The State Department has received from the United States Embassy in The Hague a request for recent testimony before a House appropriations subcommittee relating to the Mutual Defense Assistance program.

The request was made on behalf of the Netherlands Government. Presumably The Hague is interested in sections dealing with the Dutch rearmament effort, and a copy of the testimony will be sent.

EXCERPTS FROM HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, ON MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1952, PART I, PAGES 208 AND 209

Mr. BISSELL That is correct, sir.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I put in the regular figures These are the same figures I have given in the case of other countries.

MILITARY EXPENDITURES

First, what is the military job that we hope and expect that the Netherlands will undertake?

In fiscal 1951 military expenditures were $280,000,000 On the basis of our present planning and of the present appropriation request we believe that they will be able to increase that to $400,000,000 during the current fiscal year.

On the basis of the higher figure for aid, the authorization request, we had hoped that they could raise their total military expenditures as high as $525,000,000.

I would like to give you figures which will give those totals as a percentage of the gross national product. That was some 5 percent of the gross national product in the fiscal year just ended. The higher figure of $525,000,000 which we believe would be attainable with somewhat more economic aid would be 9.1 percent of the gross national product

I suppose that the figure of $400,000,000 is in the neighborhood of 7 percent of the gross national product

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH In other words, the gross national product is $5,600,000,000.

Mr. BISSELL The exact figure is $5,538,000,000 In other words, in round numbers, $5,600,000,000, Mr. Wigglesworth; that is correct.

This is the next set of figures I mentioned. That was during fiscal 1951 We hope that from $5,538,000,000 it can be increased to $5,688,000,000, in other words, by about $150,000,000 in fiscal 1952.

We believe in the case of the Netherlands that there will be a very slight decline in total consumption, from $3,468,000,000 to $3,429,000,000, in terms of constant dollars.

We believe there can be a percentagewise slightly greater decline in total capital investment, from $1,578,000,000 to $1,521,000,000.

In other words, the increase in military expenditures in the case of the Netherlands will absorb the whole increase in the gross national product; and, in addition, will have to be accomplished in part through cut-backs of both consumption and of capital investment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House, having proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 1864) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes, returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the Senate, in which it originated, and passed by the Senate on reconsideration of the same, it was

Resolved, That the said bill do pass, two-thirds of the Representatives present having voted in the affirmative.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S 210. An act for the relief of Jesus Juan Llanderal;

S. 622. An act to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

S 657. An act to amend and clarify the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, and for other purposes,

S 1023 An act for the relief of Fumiko Theresa Shibata;

S 1046. An act to readjust postal rates;

S 1311. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Yellowstone River,

H. R. 610. An act for the relief of Dr. Stanislaus Karstka and Dr. Marthewan Garstka;

H. R 658 An act for the relief of Harold W Britton,

H. R 853 An act for the relief of Maximilian Otto Ricker-Huetter and Mrs Eugenia Ricker-Huetter,

H R 884. An act for the relief of Johanna A Stoots,

H R. 980. An act for the relief of Kikue Uchida,

H R 1457. An act for the relief of Antranik Ayanian,

H R 1628 An act to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest-fire-control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont., and for other purposes,

H R 1851 An act for the relief of Ark Ping Jee Nong (Ngon);

H R 1672 An act for the relief of Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association,

H R. 2176 An act for the relief of the Fort Pierce Port District;

H R 2290 An act for the relief of Ralph Ambrose Thrall and Minnie Hazel Thrall;

H R 2506 An act for the relief of Mazunari Saito and Isao Saito,

H. R 2547. An act for the relief of Yoshiko Ito,

H R. 2632. An act providing for the permanent residence of Sisters Adalbisa Bellagamba, Maria Rina Montecchio, Anna Taricco, Maria Caterina Crevani, Elizabeth Baggio, Rosa Portale, Lorenzina D'Amico, Assunta Bonfigilio, Maria D'Amico, Lorenzina Scellato, Luigia Andreina Fratelli, Elena Montecchio, and Maria Bellesso;

H. R. 2791. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs Richard E Deane,

H R 3003. An act to authorize Rear Admiral Emory D. Stanley, United States Navy, retired, to accept employment with the Government of Peru;

H R 3281 An act for the relief of Fanny Tsihrintge Papan;

H R 3548 An act to provide that payment to States and Territories for care given to certain disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States shall be effective from the date such care commenced;

H R 3669 An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Insurance Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and for other purposes;

H R. 4027. An act to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands,

H R. 4035. An act for the relief of Donald I. Hamrock, Robert N. Lensch, Russell E. Ryan, and Helen P. Stewart,

H. R. 4049. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts certain lands and improvements comprising the Castle Island Terminal Facility at South Boston in exchange for certain other lands;

H R 4181. An act for the relief of Leroy Peebles;

H. R. 4203. An act to ratify and confirm Act 7 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945;

H R 4567 An act for the relief of Roy Sakai;

H. R. 4692 An act to authorize the appointment of Joseph F. Carroll as a permanent colonel in the Regular Air Force;

H R 4808. An act to provide for the granting of an easement for a public road through the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge in Dare County, N. C.;

H. R 4922. An act for the relief of Patricia Ann Eddings;

H. R 4928. An act to provide that the interests of the United States in certain real property shall be conveyed to the city of Newport, Ky;

H. R 4929. An act for the relief of Michael Bernard (Cervea);

H R 4930. An act for the relief of Charles H Craft,

H R 4940 An act for the relief of Suzie Ballard;

H R 4945 An act to authorize the use of appropriations for refunding moneys erroneously received and covered for the refund of forfeited bail,

H R 4969 An act for the relief of Susa Yukiko Thomason,

H R 5062 An act to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status;

H R 5104 An act for the relief of Mrs. Inge L Curtis,

H R. 5230 An act providing for the conveyance to the State of North Carolina of the Currituck Beach Lighthouse Reservation, Corolla, N C,

H R 5329 An act to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia;

H R 5405. An act to amend section 207 (a) of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress;

H R 5730 An act for the relief of William Lund Main; and

H J Res 308 Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim January 13 of each year as Stephen Foster Memorial Day.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from North Dakota not to exceed 2 minutes, if I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I shall not speak at this time, then; I cannot finish in 2 minutes what I wish to say.

Mr. MALONE. How long does the distinguished Senator from North Dakota think he will require?

Mr. LANGER. I wish to make a motion; that is all. It may take me 5, 10, or 15 minutes

Mr. MALONE. Then I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I would rather not confine my remarks to 5 minutes. I shall speak later, in my own time.

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RAILWAY AND UTILITIES COMMISSIONERS, RESOLUTION OF MOUNTAIN PACIFIC STATES CONFERENCE OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSIONS, AND ADDRESS ENTITLED "VALUATION: THE STATE COMMISSIONS, AND SECTION 19A," BY CLYDE B. AITCHISON

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield, to permit me

to make a brief statement and an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. MALONE. I yield for that purpose, if it is understood that I may do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted at Charleston, S. C., on October 18, 1951, by the National Association of Railway and Utilities Commissioners; and also a resolution adopted on October 17, 1951, at Charleston, S. C., by the Mountain Pacific States Conference of Public Service Commissions. I further ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an address delivered by Hon. Clyde B. Aitchison, for 20 years a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, perhaps the leading authority in the United States in the field of transportation, which address was delivered before the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, at Charleston, S. C., on October 16, 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERR. And, Mr. President, if the Senator would yield for a unanimous-consent request concerning a report——

Mr. MALONE. There will be plenty of time for all reports.

Mr. KERR. I withdraw the request.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. KERR. I withdraw the request.

Mr. MORSE. Reserving the right to object to the insertions in the RECORD——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no unanimous consent request pending.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, yes, there is, for insertions in the RECORD, and I am reserving the right to object to that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. I understood the Senator from Oklahoma to offer for insertion in the RECORD what purport to be certain resolutions adopted by some corporate body, and I should like to have, before we adjourn the Senate today, a clarification of the rules of the Senate in regard to insertions of resolutions in the RECORD. Let me first assure my friend from Oklahoma that I think they ought to be inserted in the RECORD, and I think they ought to be inserted in the RECORD by unanimous consent. But let me refresh the memory of the Presiding Officer. Some weeks ago the junior Senator from Oregon offered certain resolutions on the floor of the Senate, by way of a unanimous-consent request, and he was advised of a ruling by the Chair the day preceding, to the effect that the resolutions could not be introduced by unanimous consent, but would have to be submitted to a committee—I believe the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration—and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration would then pass judgment on whether the resolutions could subsequently go into the RECORD. The junior Senator from Oregon served notice that never would any resolution offered by him have to go through that procedure, because he would read them first; and he did read them on that occasion, at some length. But I said then that I thought the ruling of the Chair should be clarified. It never has been clarified, and I have just been waiting for this opprtunity, Mr. President, to get the matter clarified before Congress adjourns.

Reserving the right to object, the parliamentary inquiry I put to the Presiding Officer is whether the resolutions offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, which apparently are resolutions which were adopted by an appropriate body in convention assembled, have to be submitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration before they can be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and, if so, I should like to have the Presiding Officer tell us why there is any such ruling, and upon what rule of the Senate the ruling is based.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOODY in the chair). It is the opinion of this Presiding Officer that by unanimous consent the resolutions and address which have been offered by the Senator from Oklahoma can go into the RECORD, if there is no objection.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Presiding Officer that I completely agree with that ruling. I am very happy to have it, and by that ruling we, I think, erase what up to this minute has been a very unfortunate precedent established in this session of the Congress. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

SO-CALLED FREE TRADE A BONUS TO FOREIGN MANUFACTURERS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to continue the debate which was terminated under the 5-minute rule.

The chairman of the Finance Committee offered two bills, removing the tariff and import fees from commodities. This is simply a continuation of administration policy adopted 18 years ago.

The administration is thoroughly saturated with a one-economic-world philosophy, merging gradually into a one-political-world philosophy. The administration has divided the markets of this country with other nations of the world, giving the users of the sweatshop labor of Europe and Asia full access to our machinery and bringing in the foreign manufactured products without restraint, in direct competition with the workers and investors of this country.

WRECKING ECONOMY OF AMERICA

We are sending from five to nine billion dollars into foreign countries without laying down any conditions whatever, completing the wrecking of the economy of this country. We have printed money freely, with no consideration to any gold base for the money, to carry out this philosophy. The administration has not been checked on the amount of money it prints.

If taxes are raised much higher, no one will be able to pay them. Already in some cases the taxes amount to a capital levy. The Truman administration has followed the fallacious theory that taxes must be raised to siphon off increases in wages and to take any money which an investor may have earned from his investments. This is wrecking our economic system. We are living off of borrowed money. We are selling new bonds, borrowing more money, as rapidly as we can and printing money against the bonds. As soon as the administration runs out of emergencies, then the economy will crumble.

BIG APPROPRIATIONS AND HIGH TAXES COULD BE AVOIDED

Mr. President, there would be no need for such a gargantuan appropriation if we could be sure of a floor under wages and investments, and should restore the metal base, the gold, to our currency, stopping this senseless printing of money, and stopping this throwing of money around everywhere in the world without any conditions attached.

Mr. President, instead of a continuation of gift-loans to foreign nations, we could accept the currencies of other nations for our goods. They say they are short of dollars—that great hoax sold to the American people. Mr. President, the shortage comes about because they put a price in dollars on their money which no one will pay. For example, the British pound is fixed at $2.80, but $2.20 is all that anyone is willing to pay.

The budget could be balanced and taxes could be reduced by the simple expedient of three things: first, put gold behind our own money and stop the irresponsible printing of currency; second, establish a basis of fair and reasonable competition for the goods of foreign nations in the markets of this country through the flexible import-fee principle; and third, accept the currencies of other nations for the purchases of goods in this country, putting the foreign money into a special fund in the Treasury to purchase the goods of those foreign nations.

DO NOT SHUT DOOR OF OPPORTUNITY ON AMERICANS

Mr. President, I am interested in the producers of the United States. I refer to the producers of lead and zinc, textiles, petroleum, crockery—every type of manufactured product in this country. I am also interested in people who want to become producers, the little people who are prospectors for metals and minerals and people who would like to go into other businesses. Let us not shut the door of opportunity on those people too small to establish foreign branch plants and take advantage of foreign low-wage standards.

A market for American business was supposed to have been developed in foreign countries through the great Marshall plan, the ECA, Point 4, UNRRA, and other trick organizations for which the people of this country fell. Because of cheap sweatshop labor, those nations send goods back into this country in competition with the investors and workers of this country, forcing American workers out of their jobs.

That is all I will say on the subject at this time. I wish to go on to another matter.

ARID LANDS OF THE WEST

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the public land problem has been before Congress for 150 years. The objective of the States and the Federal Government, with respect to public-domain lands should be the development of the highest possible taxable value of the property. With that comes the greatest good to the greatest number of our citizens.

It has been the policy of the Congress since the passage of the Preemption Act of 1841 to hold the public lands of the United States in trust for the States until such lands could be passed into private ownership and put on the tax rolls of the respective States.

Mr. President, Government supervision is necessary for forest reservations and other public lands of considerable value. Permits granted to the people using such lands for grazing in connection with the patented feed-producing lands are limited in time and extent and therefore there is no assurance that any livestock unit will remain intact.

These lands remained in public ownership because they could not be taken up under any existing congressional act.

THREE FACTORS IN LIVESTOCK UNIT PLAN

The livestock units in arid areas are affected by three factors, all related. First, there are the patented feed-producing lands in those areas; second, there are water rights both for irrigation and stock-watering purposes; and third, we have the spring, summer, fall, and winter grazing lands.

The latitude and elevation of an area determine the climate and, therefore, the category into which the area falls. The law provides that the fees charged and method of use are subject to change at the discretion of the supervising department, whether it be the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior.

140 ACRES FOR EACH COW UNIT

Some time ago, the United States Geological Survey made a survey of arid lands in the mountain States, and in States such as my own State of Nevada it was determined that it required an individual average of 140 acres for a cow unit per year. A cow and a calf are considered as a cow unit. It required an average of 40 acres for a sheep unit, a ewe and a lamb.

When we say 140 acres to a cow unit or 40 acres to a sheep unit, it does not mean the maximum or the minimum, but the average. There is some very good range, mostly in the forest reserves, where a very small area will take care of a sheep unit or of a cow unit, while, at the same time, there are areas, particularly in the southern part of Nevada, where it is impossible for a cow or a sheep to walk far enough in a day to get enough to eat.

Some of the areas which the Department of the Interior considers necessary to supervise have been used for 60 or 70 years by the owners in rounded out units, and they have made beneficial use of all the lands over which it is possible for cattle and sheep to graze. There is no feed value whatever except that which can be harvested through the livestock.

Therefore, inasmuch as the livestock owner does not control all three factors, he is not considered a good credit risk at his bank, and must fall back upon the returns from the forced sale of his livestock, or Government loans.

The public ranges have been taxed through the owned feed producing ranches for 60 years inasmuch as the taxable value of such owned lands was dependent upon the third factor of the livestock unit, the range.

160-ACRE LIMIT NOT SUITABLE FOR ARID LANDS

The Homestead Act, providing for the application to the Government for 160 acres of land upon payment of a $16 filing fee, worked very well in the agricultural areas of what became the Wheat and Corn Belt. However, when the western semiarid and arid lands were reached, the conditions were so different that it was finally made possible for an individual to file upon as much as 960 acres, including the additional homestead and the grazing homestead.

In western mountain States, where rainfall is so light that it requires up to 140 acres for a cow unit, according to the United States Geological Survey, 960 acres would only run 7 or 8 head of cattle. Therefore, it is readily seen we are considering townships rather than sections when we discuss a family unit of 200 to 300 head of cattle or a band of sheep, running from 1,500 to 2,000 head. There is so much difference in the carrying capacity and value of these lands that no uniform method has ever been devised by Congress for filing upon the lands with the idea of private ownership.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WELKER. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Nevada on his speech with respect to the arid lands of the West. Few Senators on the floor of the Senate, or occupants of the galleries, appreciate the magnitude of the question which confronts the State of the Senator from Nevada, of the Senator from Idaho, and the other Western States.

Does the Senator from Nevada know of some of the bright boys in the Bureau of Land Management who went into the State of Idaho a few months ago and cut one of our best ranges from 40 to 75 percent, due, they alleged, to the overgrazing by the cattle industry in that particular area?

Would the Senator be alarmed to know that notwithstanding the fact that they cut these life-long producers of cattle 40 to 75 percent, when they realized that there was an abundance of grass and feed on the same range, permitted an outsider, a man from a far distant area, a man who had never grazed cattle or sheep in that area, to come within that region and usurp the rights of our private owners to graze the grass, the grass of which the permanent owner had been deprived by the arbitrary action of the Bureau of Land Management?

ONLY WAY TO HARVEST THE FEED IN DESERT

Mr. MALONE. I would say, in answer, that for 40 years the junior Senator from Nevada has been familiar with the arid ranges, and how they are utilized by the cattle and sheep, the only manner of utilization possible, the only way to harvest the feed in the mountains and deserts of this sparse-feed country, where the annual rainfall ranges from only 3 inches to a high of 12 or 14 inches.

Can the Members of the Senate visualize a desert area where one might drive 50 or 100 miles without seeing a habitation, where the rainfall is only 3, 5, or 6 inches, and that mostly in the wintertime, when the snow comes. There is often no rain at all during the summer, except for a cloudburst in the mountains, and that does more harm than good when it washes out deep ravines and floods the valleys. Usually there is no available feed at all in those desert areas except in the winter, when the grazing stock eat snow for water.

"EXPERTS" DO GREAT HARM

The uninitiated, when they go there, are unable to see any feed at all. As a matter of fact, when we send one of these theoretical grazing men turned out by the eastern schools into that area, and he gets away from the towns, he is amazed and horrified that people are living in a country such as Nevada or Idaho Of course, he makes out all right where there is a concentration of population, night clubs, and things of that sort; he understands that kind of life, but rarely the range.

The junior Senator from Nevada in the early days walked over most of the mountains and deserts of Nevada, and a good share of Idaho, California, and Utah, carrying a transit.

Nevada is the sixth largest State in the Union, containing more than 110,000 square miles. The nature of the lands is almost incomprehensible to an easterner or middle westerner.

As the junior Senator from Idaho has said, almost irreparable harm has been done by those men who could see no connection between the ranches and the feed-producing lands. They could not see that the ranches had no value without the range, the third factor in the livestock unit.

In a meeting of grazing men not so long ago, the head grazier of a Government-grazing district cornered a livestock man who had been born on the range, and asked him, "Just who is the best judge of the time when this range ought to be used, and the number of livestock to be put on a certain piece of range?" The old man, without hesitation said, "The cow."

SIZE OF RANGE DETERMINED BY WATER

There are little ranches in the mountains, the size determined by the amount of water coming down in the spring and carrying over through the summer. If there is no late water they have only grass hay. Sometimes alfalfa will be grown, and sometimes a little grain if there is enough water late in the summer. But, generally speaking, the ranches are limited to grass hay.

Ordinarily the ranchers figure about a ton to a cow unit, and if they do not use it this year, they leave it in stacks for next year. If the owner does not

have enough, he will lose some of his stock. Our people recently went through a bad year.

UNIT PLAN INTERFERED WITH

Government individuals interfere with the livestock unit, whereby a man with, say, 100 head or 150 head of stock would sell off a little during a dry period and increase his herds during a wet cycle.

The rancher has the feed-producing unit to produce hay for the heavy winter; he has the spring, summer, fall, and winter rains; and he has his water rights and feed-producing lands. Those three factors make up the livestock unit. Anyone who interferes with any one of the three factors does an irreparable harm to the livestock unit. Much harm can come from taking away a part of the range, thus reducing the carrying capacity of the unit, without reducing the investment. The results of work over a period of 40 or 50 or 60 years can be ruined forever.

Mr. WELKER. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. Can the Senator advise me what recourse, if any, the cattle raiser, the sheep raiser, or the livestock producer has in the arid West when he is told by the United States Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management, "You will cut down your grazing herds from 40 to 75 percent"? All during that time we see gentlemen dressed in green driving jeeps around our terrain investigating the area, with the intention of building green park benches, public rest rooms, and swimming pools all over the public domain which has made the intermountain area a great livestock producing area. What relief have the cattle men of the West in view of such dictatorial practices?

PROTECT LIVESTOCK UNIT

Mr. MALONE In answer to the distinguished Senator from Idaho, I would say that I am about to introduce a bill which would make a special case of certain dry ranges in southern Nevada. It would embrace about 7,250,000 acres. It would protect the livestock unit as it now exists, with full protection and conservation of recreation, fish, wildlife, mineral resources, and agriculture.

Under existing conditions the livestock producer has no protection. The forest reserves are set up and dominated by people of the eastern States. They are dominated by the eastern States simply because there were more forest reserves in the eastern States. They started there. Thirty or forty years ago there was no protection for grazing. There being no range protection and no protective State laws, those in charge of the forest reserves were asked to come in and take over the summer ranges in many of the western States. Some large areas which had no forests at all were included.

Under the forest reserve or Taylor Grazing Act system, there is no protection to the stockman; the word of the ranger is final. If he says to the livestock producer that he must reduce his herds by half, the livestock producer has to reduce them by half. And it is well known that many of these official rangers have no understanding of the necessity for preserving the herds over a dry period, and cutting them down gradually so as not to break the rancher, allowing him to build up again over the same area when the cycle starts the other way.

TAYLOR GRAZING ACT INVADED WEST

Then the Taylor Grazing Act invaded the West. Under it the carrying capacity of the permittee can be cut in the same manner as in the forest reserve areas. Also, the fees may be raised at any time it is desired by Government officials. The Forest Service and the Taylor Grazing Act Administration, now called the Bureau of Land Management, have complete control over one of the three factors of the livestock unit, therefore they control the entire operation.

Up until the time Mr. Ickes came into office it had been the policy of the United States Government to hold in trust the public lands for the States until such time as they could be taken up under some existing or proposed congressional act

CHANGE OF ESTABLISHED POLICY

Mr. Ickes changed the policy. He found about 170,000,000 acres in the West, including 5,000,000 acres of forest reserve and 55,000,000 acres of public land in Navada alone. So he immediately changed the policy. From that time on we were to save for the United States Government all the lands which theretofore had been held for the States for ultimate private ownership. The lands were now to be in Federal Government ownership in perpetuity.

Then there began a program of "improvement" for the benefit of tourists. The State of Nevada, the State of Idaho, and other States were to be the happy hunting ground of people on the move. The Federal Government forgot all about the development of taxable property in and for the States and the Government.

The only way the small amount of feed on these ranges can be utilized is through grazing livestock Therefore the lands in the State of Nevada, particularly when they are used in the natural manner, through feed-producing ranches, fall into units, running from a few head of livestock to several thousand, or from a small band of sheep to several bands of sheep.

No method could be utilized for breaking up these large units unless the range could be transferred along with the sale of the feed-producing ranches. Therefore, when the Government retains full control of the range, preventing its transfer in conjunction with the feed-producing ranches, it prevents the very thing which it pretends to want, namely the breaking up of the large livestock units in the West

If we can work out a method such as the junior Senator from Nevada is about to propose, so that the range can be transferred from the present user to a user who will purchase a part of the feed-producing ranch, without diminution, the oversize livestock units will naturally break up into smaller units.

MALONE BILL (S. 2341) TO ESTABLISH A GRAZING DISTRICT

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a special grazing district in the State of Nevada, not affecting other States or other areas in the State of Nevada, to provide for the conservation and protection of the public lands, and their use for mineral development, grazing and agriculture, fish and wildlife and recreation resources, and for other purposes, and request that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2341) to establish a special grazing district in the State of Nevada; to provide for the conservation and development of the public lands, and their use for mineral development, grazing and agriculture, fish and wildlife and recreation resources, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

Be it enacted, etc, That it is the purpose of this act to establish a Nevada special grazing district, and to provide for the conservation and protection of the public lands and their use for mineral development, grazing and agriculture, fish and wildlife and recreation purposes, and for other purposes.

SEC 2 There is hereby established a Nevada special grazing district (hereinafter referred to as the "grazing district"), which shall consist of the following described public lands situated in Eureka, Lander, and Nye Counties, Nev, exclusive of national forests, Indian reservations, the Railroad Valley Wildlife Refuge, and shall include the following described lands

MOUNT DIABLO MERIDIAN

T. 10 N, R 35 E, that part in Nye County.

Tps 9 and 10 N., R. 36 E., unsurveyed, those parts in Nye County.

Tps 8 to 12 N, R 37 E, partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye County.

Tps. 14 and 15 N, R. 37 E, partly unsurveyed, those parts in Lander County.

Tps. 7 to 19 N, R 38 E, partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 6 to 19 and 23 to 26 N, R. 39 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps 4 to 8, 12 to 14 and 16 to 28 N., R 40 E, partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties

Tps. 3 to 8 and 12 to 30 N, R. 41 E, partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties

Tps. 2 to 10 and 12 to 32 N, R 42 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps 1 to 15 and 17 to 32 N., R. 43 E, partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 1 to 8, 10 to 17, and 19 to 32 N, R. 44 E, partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps 1 to 9 and 13 to 32 N, R 45 E, partly unsurveyed.

Tps 1 to 3, 7 to 14, and 17 to 32 N, R 46 E, partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 32 N, R 47 E, partly unsurveyed.

T. 8 N., R. 47½ E.

Tps. 1 to 8 and 13 to 32 N, R 48 E, partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 24 and 25 N., R. 48½ E.

Tps. 1 to 13 and 18 to 26 N., R. 49 E., partly unsurveyed

Tps. 4 and 5 N, R 49½ E.

Tps. 1 to 26 N., Rs. 50 and 51 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps 1 to 3 N., R. 51½ E.

Tps. 1 to 11 and 15 to 26 N., R. 52 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 11 and 15 to 26 N., R 53 E , partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 9 and 15 to 26 N., R 54 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Eureka Counties.

Tps 3 to 9 and 19 to 24 N , R 55 E , partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Eureka Counties.

Tps. 4, 5, 6, and 9 N., R. 56 E

Tps. 5, 6, 7, and 9 N., R. 57 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 6 to 9 N., R 58 E., unsurveyed.

SEC 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), through the Bureau of Land Management, shall, upon the application of one or more range users within the district, conduct a survey of the lands comprising the grazing district for the purpose of ascertaining and determining the boundaries of the portion or portions of such lands which heretofore have been customarily used for grazing purposes by each person who on such date is using any of such lands for such purpose. Upon such adjudication, the Secretary, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall grant to each such person a permit authorizing such person hereafter to use for grazing purposes the portion or portions of such land heretofore customarily used by such person for such purpose Each permit so issued shall specify the boundaries of the land with respect to which such permit is effective.

(b) If the person to whom any such permit is issued customarily has, prior to the effective date of this act, enjoyed exclusive use of any such land for grazing purposes, he shall be tendered an exclusive permit which shall entitle the holder to exclusive use for grazing purposes of the lands described therein. If such person customarily has, prior to such date, used any such land for grazing purposes jointly with any other person or persons, there shall be issued a joint permit which shall entitle the holders thereof to joint use for grazing purposes of the lands described therein.

(c) The issuance of any permit pursuant to this section shall constitute a revocation of any permit previously issued by the Secretary under any other provision of law for the use for grazing purposes of the lands described in the permit issued hereunder

(d) Any permit issued pursuant to this section may be revoked by the Secretary upon his determination, after notice and hearing, that—

(1) the holder or holders thereof have failed for a period of 2 years to make substantial use for grazing purposes of the land described therein; or

(2) the lands described therein are required for use, under any other provision of law for any use (including, but not limited to, agricultural, mining, fish and wildlife, recreation and conservation uses) other than grazing, and that the continued use of such land for grazing purposes will substantially interfere with its employment for such other intended use.

SEC. 4 (a) As soon as may be practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall give notice, by publication or otherwise, to all persons who heretofore, have customarily used for grazing purposes any of the lands comprising the grazing district, concerning—

(1) the time and place at which such persons may file applications for the issuance of permits hereunder; and

(2) the time and place at which a hearing or hearings will be conducted for the purpose of ascertaining the facts upon which the adjudications required by section 2 (a) of this act will be made.

(b) Each such application shall specify (1) the location of the lands of the applicant and the number of acres contained therein, (2) the location and number of acres of the lands within the grazing district for which application is made, and (3) water rights, including domestic stock watering, irrigation, mining or industrial permits, certificates or applications pending under the State laws; and vested rights claimed, and (4) owned or leased lands within the area applied for including commensurate feed producing property, and (5) such other facts as may be prescribed by the Secretary in order to enable him to make an equitable determination of all applications.

(c) In making adjudications pursuant to section 2 (a) of this act, the Secretary shall, insofar as practicable, comply with the designations of the applicants with respect to the division of lands within the grazing district, but notwithstanding the designation of specific lands by any applicant, the Secretary may issue to such applicant a permit for the use of other lands In any case in which more than one person makes application for the use of the same lands within the grazing district, the Secretary shall determine the priority of such rights, and if determined to be equal, shall endeavor to effect an agreement among such persons with respect to the division of such lands or to the joint use thereof In any case in which a person's application for the use of designated lands is denied, in whole or in part, such person may amend his application to include other lands, upon application to the Secretary

(d) Any person who has filed any such application, and who is aggrieved by any adjudication made by the Secretary thereon, may within sixty days after receipt of notice of such adjudication file in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada a civil action for a determination of his rights under this act, and such court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine any such action, and to issue such order as shall be determined by such court to be proper. Any order so entered shall be subject to review pursuant to sections 1291 and 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

SEC 5 (a) The Secretary may make such rules and regulations as he deems necessary governing the surrender, transfer, and assignment of permits, but no such rule or regulation shall prohibit (1) the transfer of a permit, or (2) the assignment of a permit, or the assignment of the right to use a portion of the lands covered by such permit, or, in the case of a joint permit, the assignment of a part of the lessor's right to the use of such lands, to a lessee of the lands, or portion thereof, owned by the holder of such permit

(b) Upon the application of two or more persons holding permits for the use of the lands concerned, the Secretary may modify any permit with respect to (1) the extent of the lands covered by such permit or (2), in the case of a joint permit, the number of users of the lands covered by such permit. Before making any such modification, the Secretary shall give due consideration to the rights and privileges of any other person or persons holding a permit, and may deny the application when such rights and privileges would be adversely affected by the modification requested.

SEC. 6. (a) In case of any dispute between two or more persons holding permits under this act, the Secretary shall, at the written request of any party to such dispute, determine the rights and privileges of the respective parties under their permits The Secretary shall hold such hearings and receive such testimony as he deems necessary for a proper determination of any such dispute. If the Secretary should find any infringement by any party to such proceeding of the permit of another person, he shall issue such orders and take such action as may be necessary to correct such infringement.

(b) Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Nevada to enjoin (1) any violation of an order of the Secretary issued under subsection (a) and (2) any infringement by a person who is not a holder of a permit issued under this act or the rights and privileges of any person under a permit issued under this act.

SEC. 7. Except as specifically required by this act, the Secretary shall not exercise any supervision over the activities of any person holding a permit, and, except as specifically required by other laws, shall not exercise any supervision over the lands comprising the grazing district with respect to the use of such lands for grazing purposes. Nothing contained in this act shall preclude the exercise by the Secretary or any other officer of the United States of his authority under any other act (other than the Taylor Grazing Act) with respect to the development or preservation of the natural resources of the public domain.

The actual costs attributable to the initial determination and adjudication of such rights and the issuance of permits under this act shall be apportioned equally among the five fiscal years following the fiscal years in which such costs are incurred.

SEC. 8 The Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 9. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to advance in carrying out the provisions of this act Such necessary expense for adjudication purposes to be returned to the Treasury of the United States as herein provided.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on Thursday, February 15, 1951, the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, established Grazing District No 6, which would be affected by the bill I have just introduced. I ask unanimous consent that the order of the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, establishing Grazing District No. 6, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the order was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

[Misc. 57324]

NEVADA

Established Grazing District No 6

FEBRUARY 9, 1951.

Under and pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior by the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat 1269, 43 U S C. 315 et seq.) as amended, known as the Taylor Grazing Act, and in accordance with Departmental Order No 2583 of August 16, 1950, § 2 22 (15 F. R 5645) Nevada Grazing District 6 is hereby established, the exterior boundaries of which shall include the following described lands exclusive of National Forests, Indian Reservations, the Railroad Valley Wildlife Refuge, and existing grazing districts:

NEVADA—MOUNT DIABLO MERIDIAN

T. 10 N , R. 35 E . that part in Nye County.

Tps. 9 and 10 N , R. 36 E . unsurveyed, those parts in Nye County.

Tps. 8 to 12 N., R. 37 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye County.

Tps. 14 and 15 N., R. 37 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Lander County.

Tps. 7 to 19 N., R. 38 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 6 to 19 and 23 to 26 N., R. 39 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 4 to 8, 12 to 14, and 16 to 28 N., R. 40 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 3 to 8 and 12 to 30 N., R. 41 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 2 to 10 and 12 to 32 N., R. 42 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 1 to 15 and 17 to 32 N., R. 43 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 1 to 8, 10 to 17, and 19 to 32 N., R. 44 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Lander Counties.

Tps. 1 to 9 and 13 to 32 N., R. 45 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 3, 7 to 14, and 17 to 32 N., R. 46 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 32 N., R. 47 E., partly unsurveyed.

T. 6 N., R. 47½ E.

Tps. 1 to 8 and 13 to 32 N., R. 48 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps 24 and 25 N., R. 48½ E.

Tps. 1 to 13 and 18 to 26 N., R. 49 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 4 and 5 N., R 49½ E.

Tps. 1 to 26 N., Rs. 50 and 51 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 3 N., R 51½ E.

Tps. 1 to 11 and 15 to 26 N., R 52 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 11 and 15 to 26 N., R. 53 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 1 to 9 and 15 to 26 N., R. 54 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Eureka Counties.

Tps. 3 to 9 and 19 to 24 N., R. 55 E., partly unsurveyed, those parts in Nye and Eureka Counties.

Tps. 4, 5, 6, and 9 N., R. 56 E.

Tps. 5, 6, 7, and 9 N., R. 57 E., partly unsurveyed.

Tps. 6 to 9 N., R. 58 E., unsurveyed.

The area described includes approximately 7,367,000 acres of public lands.

The Federal Range Code for Grazing Districts (43 CFR, Part 161) as amended, shall be effective as to the lands embraced herein from and after the date of publication of this order in the Federal Register, except that the lands embraced herein shall not be subject to section 161.8, paragraphs (b), (c), (d), and (e), until 1 year from the date of such publication.

MARION CLAWSON,
Director.

[F. R. Doc 51-2216; filed, Feb 14, 1951; 8:45 a. m.]

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a copy of a letter written by me under date of December 20, 1950, to the Secretary of the Interior.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 28, 1950.

Hon. OSCAR CHAPMAN,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In accordance with our conversation dealing with the remaining lean desert-range areas located in the three counties of Lander, Eureka, and Nye in my State of Nevada, I am attaching an outline of suggested legislation that could furnish a feasible approach to the problem.

I am advised that there are 7,367,000 acres included in the area divided between the three counties as follows:

Lander County	2,445,502
Eureka County	1,357,806
Nye County	3,563,692
Total	7,367,000

The approximately 200 acres to the cow unit annually, that your people estimate is necessary on the average—some areas will require much more and some less—just about approaches the "roller skate" requirement for the cow to cover that much area in time to get enough to eat.

The new approach for this thin production area is not proposed as a cure-all but simply as a method for your department to bridge an impossible situation where you cannot possibly charge enough rental for the use of such lands, to return the cost of supervision to the Government.

This approach will provide a method for the Government to become entirely familiar with the actual conditions—to advise in the matter of mining development, fish and game conservation and the development of the recreation facilities, without injuring the established livestock units, which I am sure is your real objective.

If you agree with me that the new approach should be tried out and in the event it does not merit continuation after a reasonable time, I will personally advocate the repeal of the legislation and in no event is any other area affected by the special act.

I will await your call to further discuss the details and will introduce the proper legislation when we are agreed upon procedure.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. MALONE.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a memorandum written by the Assistant Director, United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, to the Secretary of the Interior.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D. C. December 26, 1950.

Memorandum to the Secretary of the Interior

From Assistant Director.

Subject: Nevada Grazing District No. 6.

Tabulated below is the information requested by telephone covering precipitation and average grazing capacity in Esmeralda, Eureka, Lander, and Nye Counties, Nevada:

County:	*Rain in inches per annum*
Eureka	6.26–12.17
Lander	6.17–12.22
Nye	3.07–12.29

Source: Weather Bureau.

Carrying capacity: Estimated average, 12 acres per animal-unit month.

WILLIAM ZIMMERMAN, JR.
Assistant Director.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table issued by the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, showing the area in acres of vacant public lands in the State of Nevada. The table is dated June 30, 1949.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management—area, in acres, of vacant public lands, by States and counties, June 30, 1949—Nevada

Counties	Outside grazing districts	Within grazing districts
Churchill		2,113,270
Clark	95,081	2,487,470
Douglas		198,994
Elko		5,985,800
Esmeralda	2,011,285	
Eureka	1,357,806	519,064
Humboldt	110,718	4,108,618
Lander	2,445,502	142,548
Lincoln	94,365	5,270,201
Lyon	280	656,438
Mineral		1,566,351
Nye	5,093,579	1,325,596
Ormsby		49,190
Pershing	137,480	2,640,929
Storey		77,417
Washoe	146,760	2,408,217
White Pine		4,347,877
Total, Nevada	11,492,856	33,896,040

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to read from page 87 of the report of the State engineer of Nevada for the period January 1, 1931, to June 30, 1932, inclusive. I may say that it is my own report, as I was State engineer from 1927 to 1935. I read as follows:

It is not generally realized by people of the midwest and eastern States just how small our western development really is in comparison to the total development of the United States, or the obstacles that must be surmounted for further development.

Nevada, for example, has a total area of 70,285,440 acres, of which less than 500,000 acres are actually under cultivation, or approximately three-quarters of 1 percent (0.75 percent). The total irrigated acreage in the 17 Western States is approximately 18,500,000 acres, which is, in itself, insignificant compared to the estimated total of 400,000,000 cultivated acres in the United States. Approximately 1,500,000 acres of the 18,500,000 have been brought under cultivation on the Government reclamation projects.

Mr. President, the report is dated 1933. It will be understood, therefore, that there has been some increase in acreage since the time the report was written. I read further:

Our policy with respect to utilization is outlined in detail under "The State Range Commission," on page 71, but in general our policy with respect to national legislation has been to have it so drawn that our State laws in this connection would be recognized when they were not discriminatory between the States, and that such legislation would not be operative except by the request of the State involved or the actual users of such range, feeling that we would be amply protected in that event, and at the same time would not be preventing other States from securing such supervision as they might desire.

This was the policy of the State Range Commission.

STATE RANGE COMMISSION

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the

marked excerpts of the State Engineer's report.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The legislature created what is known as the State range commission in 1929 for the purpose of determining and reporting to the 1931 legislature the "principles, laws, or policies that should apply to the grazing user of the natural range forage resources of the publicly owned lands within Nevada * * * that should prevail for the best public interest." The State engineer was made a member of that body by law. The report of this commission, dated March 4, 1931, to the Legislature of the State of Nevada follows·

The commission: Hon. F. B. Balzar, governor, chairman; Hon. J. F. Shaughnessy, secretary, Hon. George W. Malone, State engineer, member.

CONCLUSIONS

1. That the highest development of the livestock industry of the State is dependent upon the proper use of the public lands for grazing purposes.

2. That such proper use is only possible to the extent that a user or users can be assured of the benefits from his or their particular range

3. That the present economic set-up, including existing equities and investments, must not be disturbed.

4. That future prospecting and mining, and water development for irrigation purposes must not be disturbed.

5. That any method of range unit control must provide like protection to all rightful users, regardless of the size of such units.

6. That the taxable value of the outlying ranches used for livestock purposes is directly dependent upon the range factor of the livestock unit.

7. That, if protection is afforded such range units, agreements will be made, in the case of more than one user entitled to the same range, and that the result will be the building up of the range values in accordance with good practice.

8. That, if encroachments upon the legitimate user or users are prevented, then further improvements will be made upon the ranges, particularly the development of water for stock-watering purposes upon the winter ranges, where large investments for this purpose are necessary.

9. That if a method can be found for the protection of range units by legislative action, allowing the economic trends of the industry to develop, it would be unsound to invite supervision of the ranges by either the Federal Government or State, necessitating large expenditures by these agencies and a corresponding tax upon the livestock industry.

* * * * *

BASIS OF POLICY

It is concluded, however, that any method adopted must provide a system or policy that will, over a period of years, develop along the following general lines:

1. That the maximum taxable property and business revenues may be developed in the State through this natural resource, pending the time that the public lands may be taken up under the regular land or mining laws, with due regard to the expense and efficiency of such system.

2. That due to the requirements of the industry upon these lands of little value, requiring as they do in most cases balanced winter, summer, spring and fall ranges and ranch units, these economic units developed over a long period of years must not be upset, and that any method adopted must encourage development along the natural trends of the industry.

3. That prospecting and mining for minerals, nonmetallic products and other resources, or legitimate homesteading of lands where water may be developed, either surface or underground, for irrigation purposes must not be interfered with in any manner.

4. That any method adopted must provide the same protection for all livestock units, regardless of the size of such units.

There are approximately 55,000,000 acres of unreserved, unappropriated public domain in Nevada, in addition to approximately 5,000,000 acres within the Forest Reserve boundaries and of the unreserved area. Government reports show that an average of 40 acres for a sheep unit and 140 acres for a cow unit are required for grazing purposes. The low feed value of these areas creates a unique condition on the Nevada public domain that must be met.

The maximum of taxable property and business revenues can only be developed through the natural conditions surrounding the industry. It has been demonstrated in this State that a livestock unit must consist of a balanced summer, winter, fall and spring range. The winter range may consist all or in part of ranching property where sufficient feed can be raised to take care of the stock through the winter season. These ranches must be balanced against, the range units.

The value of the outlying ranches, where transportation conditions make it infeasible to raise agricultural products for the market, is dependent upon the range units. It is well known that the taxable values of the ranches is directly dependent upon the value of such range unit, and that when any of the range is lost, the carrying capacity of the unit is decreased without a decrease in the investment, the value of the whole unit thus being impaired.

* * * * *

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That any public land legislation passed by the Congress of the United States should recognize policies and methods adopted by the State law regulating the movement of livestock on the public domain that are not discriminatory between the States.

2. That the operation of any method inaugurated by the Congress, providing for supervision of such public lands, should be made optional with the State involved or with associations or districts made up of the "established users" of such range lands.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a marked excerpt from a memorandum entitled "Vacant Public Lands, Areas by States, and Other Information," issued by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

The excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC-LAND LAWS

The principal public-land laws governing the acquisition of title to vacant public lands are as follows:

1 The homestead laws permit acquisition of agricultural lands through settlement, cultivation, and improvement. For further information, request Information Bulletin No 3 and Circular No. 1728.

2 The desert-land laws permit acquisition of arid, irrigable lands through cultivation, improvement, and payment of $1.25 per acre. For further information, request Circular No. 1731.

3. The public-sale laws permit acquisition at public auction of isolated tracts and rough and mountainous tracts at not less than their appraised value. For further information, request Circular No. 1732.

4. The mining laws permit acquisition of mineral lands after valid discovery and development of specified minerals. For further information, request Circular No. 1278.

5. For general information on acquisition of vacant public lands in Alaska, request Information Bulletin No. 2.

6. For veterans' rights and privileges, request Circular No. 1720.

The principal public-land laws governing the leasing of vacant public lands are as follows:

1. The Taylor Grazing Act permits use of forage lands outside of grazing districts under lease For further information, request Circular No. 1705.

2 The Small-Tract Act permits use under lease of not more than five acres of lands chiefly suitable for home, health, recreational, convalescent, cabin, camp, and business sites. The leases often contain an option to purchase at appraised value at the expiration of 1 year. For further information, request Circular No. 1724.

3 The mineral-leasing laws permit exploitation of specified minerals upon payment of rentals and royalties. For further information, request circulars governing the mineral in which you are interested.

The regulations covering the acquisition of title to, or rights in, the vacant public lands under the above acts and other laws are published in title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations of the United States of America, copies of which can be found in many local libraries.

AREA OF VACANT PUBLIC LANDS

The following tabulation shows the area of vacant public lands, by States, as of June 30, 1949:

Area of vacant public lands, as of June 30, 1949 (in acres)

State	Outside of grazing districts	Within grazing districts	Total
Alabama	27,358		27,358
Arizona	2,447,718	10,348,968	12,796,686
Arkansas	136,023		136,023
California	13,429,073	2,862,054	16,291,127
Colorado	660,730	7,431,260	8,091,990
Florida	24,248		24,248
Idaho	483,433	10,643,438	11,126,871
Indiana	11		11
Kansas	3,023		3,023
Louisiana	7,335		7,335
Michigan	15,646		15,646
Minnesota	93,125		93,125
Mississippi	17,577		17,577
Missouri	1,004		1,004
Montana	1,541,331	5,233,533	6,774,864
Nebraska	28,717		28,717
Nevada	11,492,856	33,896,040	45,388,896
New Mexico	507,016	14,144,627	14,651,643
North Dakota	98,000		98,000
Oklahoma	25,957		25,957
Oregon	911,815	12,001,109	12,912,924
South Dakota	318,768		318,768
Utah	207,423	23,768,142	24,065,565
Washington	493,278		493,278
Wisconsin	6,151		6,151
Wyoming	3,099,889	13,504,330	16,604,219
Total	36,167,505	133,833,501	170,001,006

In addition to these lands, there are approximately 270,000,000 acres of vacant public lands in the Territory of Alaska

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a newspaper article entitled "First Advisory Board Meeting of Central Nevada Grazing Distric No. 6, Held in Austin," published in a recent issue of the Eureka Sentinel.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST ADVISORY BOARD MEETING OF CENTRAL NEVADA GRAZING DISTRICT NO. 6 HELD IN AUSTIN

First advisory board meeting of the Central Nevada Grazing District No. 6 was held at Austin, Tuesday, September 18. This board was elected at Tonopah in May and consist

of six sheepmen and six cattle representatives.

The sheep representatives are: Pete Elia, Elko; Tony Smith, Tonopah; Frank Arcularus, Honopah; Phil Etcheverry, Eureka; Stanley Ellison, Tuscarora; Pete Etcheverry, Eureka.

Cattle representatives are: Dick Magee, Austin; Charles Damele, Eureka; Charles Keogh, Tonopah; Emil Walti, Eureka; Henry Filippini, Battle Mountain; Jack Bordoli, Tonopah.

The meeting opened at 10 o'clock a. m., with Boyd Hammond, Assistant Regional Chief, and Monte Rohwer, Range Manager, representing the Bureau of Land Management, conducting the meeting.

The chief purpose of this meeting was to organize the board, to elect chairman, vice chairman, and secretary.

Dick Magree was elected chairman; Charles Damele, vice chairman and Frank Arcularius, secretary.

Two members selected from the advisory board to serve on the State grazing board were Charles Keogh of Tonopah, representing the cattlemen, with Charles Damele of Eureka his alternate; Tony Smith of Tonopah, sheep representative, with Frank Arcularus as his alternate.

The Federal range code, under which the Taylor Grazing Act is administered, was discussed with respect to the duties of advisory board members and general provisions on the qualifications of livestock operation on the Federal range.

Applications for grazing privileges for the 1952 grazing season will be mailed soon to applicants, to be followed up with field meetings to be held in the various towns of the new district where representatives of the department will be available to aid those who wish assistance

These meetings are scheduled as follows: Battle Mountain, October 2–5; Austin, October 15-19; Tonopah, October 20–26; Eureka, October 29 to November 2

It was announced that Battle Mountain has been selected as the office city for the new grazing district.

Meetings will be held in more centrally located towns as needed to eliminate as much trouble as possible for livestock operation.

Mr. MALONE Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Nevada's New Grazing District in Operation," published in the Pioche Record of September 22, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEVADA'S NEW GRAZING DISTRICT IN OPERATION—7,250,000 ACRES IN CENTRAL NEVADA NOW UNDER FEDERAL CONTROL

RENO.—Actual operation of central Nevada's huge newly created grazing district began last week when a meeting of the advisory board and representatives of the Bureau of Land Management met at Austin. Announcement was made by Luther T. Hoffman, regional administrator of San Francisco.

The new grazing district, which is the fifty-ninth and last established by the Bureau of Land Management, was set up on February 9, 1951. The action drew loud and vehement protest from many Nevada cattle and sheep men, but they were of no avail.

The new Nevada grazing district No. 6, totaling more than 7,250,000 acres of public domain lands in Nye, Lander, and Eureka Counties, is the last of the large public-land areas to come under regulated use according to terms of the Taylor Grazing Act passed by Congress in 1934.

ELECTION HELD IN MAY

The meeting at Austin followed the advisory board election of May 10, when six cattlemen and six sheepmen were elected by the livestock operators to represent them in acting on their applications for licenses or permits to graze livestock on the Federal ranges.

Those elected to the board were: Cattlemen—Richard Magee, Austin; Charles Damele, Eureka; Emil Walti, Beowawe; Charles Keough, Tonopah; Henry Filipini, Battle Mountain; Alfred Bordoli, Tonopah. Sheepmen—Frank Arcularius, Tonopah; Filbert Etcheverry, Eureka; Pete Etcheverry, Eureka; Pete Elia, Elko; Stanley Ellison, Tuscarora; and Tony Smith, Salt Lake City.

The purpose of the first meeting was to elect officers of the board, representatives to the State advisory board council and discuss plans for getting the district under way in issuing grazing leases for the coming year.

OFFICERS NAMED

As officers of the new board, Richard Magee of Austin was elected chairman; Charles Damele of Eureka, vice chairman, and Frank Arcularius of Tonopah as board secretary.

To represent the district and the State advisory board council, Charles Keough was elected to represent the cattlemen with Charles Damele as alternate cattle representatives

Sheep representative to the State council is to be filled by Tony Smith with Frank Arcularius, Jr, as alternate

The Bureau of Land Management was represented at the meeting by Boyd Hammond, regional chief, branch of grazing; and Monte Rohwer, range manager, both of Carson City.

E. R Greenslet, regional chief of range management, said that plans were made to meet the livestock operators during October to assist them in filling out their grazing applications The regular advisory board meeting to act on the applications will be held early in December.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Eureka County, Nev. Eureka County is one of the counties which contains a considerable area of land affected by the bill introduced by me The resolution was passed on April 5, 1951. It is signed by Charles Damele, chairman, and J. T. Smith and Mary R. Bailey, members. It is attested by Ed Delaney, the county clerk.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Board of County Commissioners of Eureka County, Nev, after hearing the sentiments and opinions expressed by various livestock growers of central Nevada, various mining operators, and members of local fish and game associations, concerning certain legislation now being introduced by Senator GEORGE W MALONE, in the United States Senate, decided that in view of the unanimous desire of the aforesaid groups to have such legislation favorable considered, to communicate with the said Senator MALONE and by resolution commend the principle of the legislation he is now introducing dealing with an intelligent and fair adjudication of range lands, based on the customary use of such lands by the users thereof. Whereupon, upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried the Board of County Commissioners of Eureka County, Nev., hereby resolve as follows:

"RESOLUTION

"That a resolution be prepared and transmitted to Hon GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator of Nevada, endorsing and recommending favorable consideration and action upon the pending legislation now, or soon to be introduced in Congress, whereby such legislation will have for its purpose an intelligent and fair adjudicated of range lands, based upon the customary use of such lands by the users thereof; that such range lands shall be free of intervention by adjudicating officials working with a view toward redistributing such range, or making any charge whatsoever for its use.

"That this board feels Senator MALONE has the best interests of the livestock industry; the mining industry; and fish and game preservation in mind in the introduction of such legislation.

"That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the Board of County Commissioners of Eureka County, Nev., under date of May 5, 1951, and that a copy thereof be sent immediately to Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada."

In witness whereof, we have hereunto set our hands and seal this 5th day of April 1951.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF EUREKA COUNTY, NEV.,

CHARLES DAMELE,
Chairman.

J. T. SMITH
Member.

MARY R. BAILEY,
Member.

Attest:

ED DELANEY, *County Clerk.*

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the Farm Bureau of Eureka County, Nev.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Farm Bureau of Eureka County, Nev., after reviewing and hearing the sentiments and opinions expressed by farm and livestock groups at and within said county, concerning certain legislation now being introduced in the United States Senate, by Hon. GEORGE W MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada, decided in view of such unanimous approval in regard to said legislation, to communicate with the said Senator MALONE, and express the approval of the Farm Bureau of Eureka County, Nev., with the principles of such legislation, whereby range lands will be adjudicated on a fair and intelligent basis of customary use of such lands by the bona fide users thereof; that no adjudicating officials will have the power to redistribute range lands, or charge for the use thereof. Whereupon, upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the Farm Bureau of Eureka County, Nev., hereby resolves as follows:

"RESOLUTION

"That a resolution be prepared and transmitted to Hon GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator of Nevada, endorsing and recommending favorable consideration and action upon the pending legislation now, or soon to be introduced in Congress, whereby such legislation will have for its purpose an intelligent and fair adjudication of range lands, based upon the customary use of such lands by the users thereof; that such range lands shall be free of intervention by adjudicating officials, working with a view toward redistributing such range, or making any charge whatsoever for its use.

"That this bureau feels Senator MALONE has the best interests of the livestock industry; the mining industry; and fish and game preservation in mind in the introduction of such legislation.

"That a copy of this resolution be transmitted immediately to Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE."

Witness our hands and seal this 5th day of April 1951.

FARM BUREAU OF EUREKA COUNTY, NEV.,
CHRIS ZUMWALT,
President.

Attest:

WILLIAM MARSHALL,
Vice President.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a petition addressed to me signed by residents and citizens of Eureka County, Nev.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator from Nevada,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned residents and citizens of Eureka County, Nev., and businessmen engaged in various business ventures at and within said county, have been definitely informed that the Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada, has now, or proposes in the immediate future to introduce certain legislation in the United States Senate that will have a very important bearing on the future of the public range lands, thereby affecting our livestock industry; mining industry, and fish and game preservation; that said legislation will have for its purpose an intelligent and fair adjudication of range lands based on the customary use of such lands by the actual and bona fide users thereof; that such legislation will also provide that no adjudicating officials can redistribute such range lands, or charge for their use.

We, the undersigned residents, citizens, and businessmen of Eureka County, in recognition of the importance of such legislation in protecting the aforesaid industries, do hereby respectfully petition Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada, to exert every effort in support of said legislation, with the assurance that we, the undersigned, commend and support such legislation.

In witness whereof we hereby sign our names this 14th day of April 1951.

Johnson W. Lloyd; Hiram Kitchen; A. F. Beale; J. B. Beale; Isadore Sara, Jr.; Victor Berinana; Joe Lorholus; Fred J. Eather; McCrawford; Martin M. Ford; Charles Vaccaro; Jason V. Hooper; J. B. Rebaliath; Rex Osborow; J. B. Ruterman; Peter Laboule; Fred Jaurequay; all of Eureka, Nev.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a resolution of the Eureka County Livestock Growers, Inc. The resolution was adopted on April 9, 1951, and it is signed by LeRoy W. Etchegaray, president; Pete Etcheveny, director; and Mrs. Juanita Damele, secretary.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Eureka County Livestock Growers, Inc., in and for the county of Eureka, State of Nevada, at a regularly held meeting of such association, duly called and held at Eureka, Nev., on this 9th day of April, 1951, with a large majority of all members present, and with President LeRoy Etchegaray, presiding, and all other officers present, went into the matter of range and water conditions, and particularly certain legislation now being introduced in the United States Senate by the Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada. The said Eureka County Livestock Growers, Inc., has been definitely informed that Senator GEORGE W. MALONE is, at the present date, introducing legislation in the United States Senate that will prove of great value and benefit to the livestock industry; the mining industry; and to fish and game preservation; that said legislation introduced by Senator MALONE will have for its purpose an intelligent and fair adjudication of range lands based on the customary use of such lands by the actual and bona fide users thereof; thereby protecting such users against infringement of interlopers; that such legislation will provide that no adjudicating officials will have authority to redistribute such range, or charge for its use; that said Eureka County Livestock Growers, Inc., is not now in full possession of the legislation as introduced by Senator MALONE, but being advised as to its principle, and having full confidence in the said GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada, do hereby on motion duly made by Jerry Etcheverry, seconded by Bernard Damele, and unanimously carried by vote of all members of the association present, unanimously resolve as follows:

"RESOLUTION

"The Eureka County Livestock Growers, Inc., in and for the county of Eureka, State of Nevada, at its regular meeting held this 9th day of April 1951, at Eureka, Nev., do hereby unanimously resolve: That a resolution be prepared and sent by this association to the Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada, resolving and setting forth that this association is completely in accord and favor of the legislation he is now introducing in the United States Senate, whereby such legislation has for its purpose a fair and intelligent adjudication of range lands based on the customary use of such lands by the actual and bona fide users thereof; thereby protecting such users against infringement of interlopers; that such legislation will prove of great value and benefit to the livestock industry; the mining industry; and to fish and game preservation; that by such legislation no adjudicating officials will have a right to redistribute range lands, or charge for its use; that this association recognizes that Senator MALONE has the best interests of the livestock industry; the mining industry, and fish and game preservation in mind in the introduction of the aforesaid legislation: Therefore it is further unanimously

"*Resolved*, That the Eureka County Livestock Growers, Inc., is in complete accord and favor of the legislation introduced by Senator MALONE, and that a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of said association; that a copy of such resolution be mailed immediately to the Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada."

In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands and seals, this 9th day of April, 1951.

EUREKA COUNTY LIVESTOCK GROWERS, INC.,
LEROY W. ETCHEGARAY,
President.
PETE ETCHEVENY,
Director.

Attest:

MRS. JUANITA DAMELE,
Secretary.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a similar resolution adopted by the Central Nevada Livestock Association, of Central, Nev. The resolution is signed by Richard Magee, president, and Charles Damele, director.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Central Nevada Livestock Association, of Central, Nev., at a regularly held meeting of such association, duly called and held at Austin, Nev., on this 20th day of April 1951, with a large majority of all members present, and with President Richard Magee, presiding, and all other officers present, went into the matter of range and water conditions, and particularly certain legislation now being introduced in the United States Senate by the Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada. The said Central Nevada Livestock Association, has been definitely informed that Senator GEORGE W. MALONE is, at the present date, introducing legislation in the United States Senate that will prove of great value and benefit to the livestock industry; the mining industry; and to fish and game preservation; that said legislation introduced by Senator MALONE will have for its purpose an intelligent and fair adjudication of range lands based on the customary use of such lands by the actual and bona fide users thereof; thereby protecting such users against infringement by interlopers; that such legislation will provide that no adjudicating officials will have authority to redistribute such range, or charge for its use; that said Central Nevada Livestock Association is not now in full possession of the context of the legislation as introduced by Senator MALONE, but being advised as to its principle, and having full confidence in the said GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada, do hereby on motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried by the members hereof, we do unanimously resolve as follows:

"RESOLUTION

"The Central Nevada Livestock Association at a regularly held meeting of such association, duly called and held at Austin, Nev., do hereby unanimously resolve: That a resolution be prepared by this association and sent to the Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada, resolving and setting forth that this association is completely in accord and favor of the legislation he is now introducing in the United States Senate, whereby such legislation has for its purpose a fair and intelligent adjudication of range lands based on the customary use of such lands by the actual and bona fide users thereof; thereby protecting such users against infringement by interlopers; that such legislation will prove of great value and benefit to the livestock industry; the mining industry; and to fish and game preservation; that by such legislation no adjudicating officials will have a right to redistribute range lands, or charge for its use; that this association recognizes that Senator MALONE has the best interests of the livestock industry; the mining industry; and fish and game preservation in mind in the introduction of the aforesaid legislation: Therefore it is further unanimously

"*Resolved*, That the Central Nevada Livestock Association, is in complete accord and favor of the legislation introduced by Senator MALONE, and that a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of said association; that a copy of such resolution be mailed immediately to the Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada."

In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands and seal this 20th day of April 1951.

CENTRAL NEVADA LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
RICHARD MAGEE, *President.*
CHARLES DAMELE, *Director.*

Attest:

MADISON LOCKE,
Secretary.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have before me a number of letters and postal cards in support of this measure. These communications have come to me from the citizens and residents of the dis-

trict involved. In order to save the time of the Senate, I will not read these, but I ask unanimous consent to have these letters and postal cards printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and postal cards were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCKE'S SERVICE STATION,
Tonopah, Nev., April 21, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I understand you are introducing some legislation of importance to the mining industry, this legislation being some reform in the management of the public lands.

As the owner of several mining properties in Nevada I am very much in favor of your proposals.

Yours truly,

M. E. LOCKE.

EUREKA, NEV., *April 19, 1951.*

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I was very much pleased to learn that you were preparing an amendment to the Taylor grazing law. Adjudication of the range land would seem to be the only salvation for the livestock man. As I understand it, your amendment did not take into consideration a per head fee. Do you think that there would be any better chance of getting this amendment before the Senate if it included a reasonable per head fee which had some definite limit? I would not think that the livestock owner would object to the fee providing the restrictions were removed.

As a Eureka County cattleman for close to 60 years (I have operated the Three Bar Ranch for 52 years), I believe I have lived through a period of time which has been a transformation from the old way of life with its attendant freedom, to the present period of Government control by bureaucracy which day by day is becoming more of a crime against the people, not only those in the livestock industry, but those in every walk of life.

Does anyone in their right mind for one moment believe that this country, and by this I mean anything west of the Mississippi, but principally the more arid regions of the West, such as Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, and others, would have been settled yet had there been the present restrictions of the SEC law on the miners and the Taylor grazing law to restrict the stockman? Would there have been a Homestake, Butte, Leadville, Couer d'Alene, Bisbee, Virginia City, Goldfield, Tonopah? You know there would not.

Would every little stream, spring, and mudhole that would water a few head of cattle or sheep be taken up and improved? Would every area of sagebrush land that showed a little grass have been improved and made into a home that has supported people in this country up to the third generation? You're damn right it wouldn't.

Perhaps under the present administration, had it existed at that time, subsidies would have been handed out and Government control of the people would have had a 50-year better start. By this time, in all probability, it would have surpassed Russia of the present.

We, the United States, are supposed to be a democracy, with fair and impartial representation in Washington and which we advertise to the rest of the world as a model for them to worship and emulate. What is there to admire, worship, or use as a pattern in our 1951 form of government? This Nation, today, is becoming as corrupt and depraved as France before the fall of the Bastille, or the Roman Empire at its height.

We, the people, have reached a new low in cynicism and apathy. We need a change in leadership and a change in policy, both foreign and domestic, immediately, not next month or next year. Now. At the same time, our whole system of government needs a complete overhauling. We should put more businessmen at the head of the various departments, not someone's best friend or the man that contributed the most to his campaign fund. All the bureaus under the various departments should be cut to the bone. Why can't Hoover's report be brought to light again and some action taken to follow up his recommendations?

I have been a life-long Republican, but from the information that I derive from the newspapers and the radio commentators, I am afraid the numerous statesmen of the party are confusing the issue in Washington, but not the public. This is no time to play political ball when the future of the United States may be at stake. You know as well as I that if the population of this country was as unified as any foreign country composed of one nationality, conditions as they exist now would have probably been altered by force.

I hope, Senator, that you will not take any of the above as criticism of either yourself or your policies, as I believe the State is behind you completely.

Very truly yours,

BERNARD DAMELE.

NEVADA STATE FARM BUREAU,
Reno, Nev., April 19, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: We are forwarding a resolution of the Eureka County Farm Bureau to back the stand of the letter I wrote you regarding their grazing district recently.

The Nevada State Farm Bureau has no policy resolution regarding this grazing district. However, it is our primary function to support our county farm bureaus in any of their problems or programs.

Your attention and consideration to this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Cordially,

NEVADA STATE FARM BUREAU,
BILL HOWARD,
Executive Secretary.

EUREKA, NEV.,
April 11, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
Washington, D. C.:

Taylor grazing bill will handicap our livestock operations. Therefore, as a rancher, livestock raiser, and taxpayer, I do not want Taylor grazing.

FRED ETCHEGARAY.

EUREKA, NEV.,
April 11, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MALONE: I as a taxpayer, livestock owner, and user of public domain, feel that Taylor grazing would be detrimental to our sheep and cattle industries of central Nevada.

I am opposed to Taylor grazing.

MARY JEAN ETCHEGARAY.

EUREKA, NEV.,
April 11, 1951.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: I would appreciate it ever so much if you could amend the Taylor Grazing Act, as I cannot see where it benefits anyone in this area as it is.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

FRED MINOLETH.

EUREKA, NEV.,
April 11, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Chamber, Washington D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: As a lifetime resident of Nevada, and a stock raiser, I believe your plan of adjudication of the public-land remaining in this area is the only answer to a healthy livestock industry.

Sincerely,

M. M. HARCOURT.

EUREKA, NEV., *April 11, 1951.*

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: I as a taxpayer, livestock owner, and user of the public domain do not want Taylor grazing in central Nevada.

Sincerely yours,

LEROY W. ETCHEGARAY.

EUREKA, NEV., *April 16, 1951.*

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a livestock owner and rancher; have been in this business all my life with plenty of opportunity to observe conditions both inside and outside of the grazing districts. These grazing districts are a loss financially to the Government and to the stockmen. Outside livestock and ranges are in much better condition with less dissension and hard feelings between everyone concerned. The ranges themselves are mostly dust, rocks, and sagebrush. The Taylor Grazing Act is obsolete. The distance between a drink of water and a spear of grass is too great. Why can't they give the stock and stockmen a rest?

Sincerely,

MRS. TESSIE DAMELE.

PALISADE, NEV., *April 16, 1951.*

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: We do hope you will do everything in your power to keep Central Nevada out of Taylor Grazing and can adjudicate the range in the same way the water is adjudicated in Nevada.

Sincerely,

MARY BAILEY AND SONS.

EUREKA, NEV., *April 11, 1951.*

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: In my utmost disapproval of the Taylor Grazing Act, I implore you to please make amendments to the act or abolish it.

As a stockman I can very readily see what an offset and a hindrance it is to this country.

Yours truly,

CHRIS ZUMWALT.

EUREKA, NEV., *April 11, 1951.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

More Government control will ruin our livestock industry; therefore as a taxpayer rancher and livestock raiser I am opposed to the Taylor Grazing.

PHYRNINA ETCHEGARAY.

EUREKA, NEV., *April 18, 1951.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
UNITED STATES SENATOR,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: On April 9, at one of our livestock meetings, Mrs. Charles Daniels read us your telegram in regard to Layton grazing.

I congratulate you on your endless efforts to help us people in Nevada. If we had more fighting Senators like you, we would certainly be a lot better off.

I would like to explain my future in ranching as I see it now. If Layton grazing stays in effect and we are forced to reduce our herd and have to pay additional fees to run our stock, I will be forced out of business. At the present time I believe I am an asset to the State of Nevada and also the United States as I am self-employed, but under Layton grazing and Government supervision I will be a liability to the State of Nevada and the United States as I will have to be put on the unemployment list. I believe the above applies to many more like myself that are just starting in business.

This is a very small area to have fought so long and still fighting for their freedom. They realize that every and any business that is put under Government supervision is another step closer to losing the freedom that made the United States what it was years ago and still partially remains.

When our forefathers, in 1776, signed the Declaration of Independence they deposited to the account of every person in America, then and for all time, the greatest wealth in the world—freedom. Let us not now in 1951, or any other time in our lives, overdraw that account so that the coming generation will not be able to draw on that great wealth.

It is up to the fighting Senators like yourself to do so. God pray that you will and can find enough true American Senators to help you, because by yourself I realize it is a lost battle.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

FRED MINOLETH.

GRASS VALLEY RANCH,
Austin, Nev., March 29, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
Senator from Nevada,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MOLLY: Enclosed you will find a list of the livestock owners who signed the petition sent March 7 to the Secretary of the Interior. You will note that most of the substantial ranchers of central Nevada are represented, among them two members of advisory boards in adjacent grazing districts.

As well as this petition, hundreds of cards and letters were sent spontaneously to the Secretary of the Interior, sent by bankers, store owners, ranchers in neighboring grazing districts, all protesting the formation of the new district.

Resolutions protesting the formation of the new district were passed by the board of county commissioners in Nye, Lander, and Eureka Counties.

Gov. Charles Russell endorsed a petition signed by the directors of the Central Nevada Livestock Association and sent it to the Secretary of the Interior with the recommendation that grazing district 6 be not set up.

Both you and Congressman BARING have taken steps to prevent the formation of this new district in central Nevada. Senator MCCARRAN is shrouded in silence. I don't know what he is doing.

If ever a community has tried to show that it is unanimously opposed to an unwarranted scheme of bureaucratic expansion, central Nevada has certainly done so. However, the Secretary of the Interior has brushed off petition, recommendation by the Governor of Nevada, letters, resolutions of county commissioners as what he poetically terms "some organized resistance."

In reply to my letter of March 7, I received—not from the Secretary of the Interior, himself but from an Assistant Secretary, Dale E. Doty—a letter which was a rehash of Clawson's letter to you. Clawson did not like your proposed bill, did he? But obviously he would not like anything which infringes on the power of the Bureau of Land Management.

With regard to the statement of the Bureau of Land Management that central Nevada is in urgent need for supervision of the use of the area * * * to prevent overgrazing and so on. There has been no range survey made by the Bureau of Land Management on which to base their statement that the land is being abused. To the best of my observation the range in central Nevada is in as good condition—and in some instances much better—than the range in adjacent grazing districts.

In Assistant Secretary Doty's letter to me and in a copy of a letter sent Baring by Chapman, there is reference made to the objections of central Nevada ranchers to paying the grazing fee. At no time have we objected to paying the fee. What we do object to is having the Bureau of Land Management so mismanage the range that after 15 years of their care a cut of 50 percent in livestock permits become necessary as it did last year in Elko County.

If, as the Department of Interior maintains, the grazing districts are such a success in Nevada districts 3 and 5, why do we—who hear the ranchers' story, have such a horror of being put in a district? Could it be that the success exists chiefly in the minds of the bureaucrats who administer these districts?

I am sorry I can't get up another petition to send you. It never entered my head to send you one in the first place because I knew that you fully understood the feeling against a district in central Nevada and were already doing what you could to prevent it being set up. But since the reception of our petition, etc., by Mr. Chapman, I can see we were wasting our time when we addressed our protests to him.

I and the rest of the central Nevada ranchers sincerely appreciate your efforts in our behalf. I feel sure that it is still possible to prevent the formation of this new district. Any suggestions you can give us will be gratefully received.

Very sincerely yours,

RICHARD MAGEE,
President, Central Nevada Stockmen's Association.

FEBRUARY 19, 1951.

To the Honorable OSCAR CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior:

We, the undersigned stockmen of central Nevada, do most earnestly petition that no further steps be taken to set up a Taylor grazing district in central Nevada at this time. We believe that due to the exceptionally low carrying capacity of the range lands involved, it would be impossible for the Bureau of Land Management to adjudicate and administer a Taylor grazing district except at serious financial loss. We feel that now, when every effort at domestic economy is being made, it would be most regrettable for any bureau of the Government to spend money on a venture which none of the people living in the area feel to be essential to the well-being of the land and the users thereof.

Since the inception of the Taylor Grazing Act, the overwhelming majority of central Nevada ranchers have been opposed to the establishment of a Taylor grazing district in central Nevada because they do not feel these particular range lands can best be administered in that way. They have made every effort to conserve the range they use. There have been no instances of range abuse in the area where it is now proposed to form a new Taylor grazing district. If there had been such abuses, the formation of a Taylor grazing district might be understandable and its expense might be warranted. But what can possibly be gained by inflicting on central Nevada a Taylor grazing district that it does not want, that it does not need, and that will of necessity be run at a financial loss?

Petition to Chapman signed by the following livestock owners:

Richard Magee, Austin; William J. Streshley, Austin; Marie Streshley, Austin; Mr. and Mrs. Earl Carl, Smokey Valley, Round Mountain; Mr. and Mrs. John Yelland, Smokey Valley, Round Mountain or Austin; Chester Perrine, Smokey Valley, Austin; J. E. Pardick, Smokey Valley, Austin; G. S. Moore, Smokey Valley, Round Mountain; Emma Rogers, Smokey Valley, Round Mountain; Darrough Brothers, Smokey Valley, Round Mountain; B. W. Rogers, Smokey Valley, Round Mountain; Dan Berg, Smokey Valley, Round Mountain; Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Carver, Smokey Valley, Round Mountain; Robert Cornell, Round Mountain; Gene Cornell, Round Mountain; O. Francisco, Round Mountain; Armando Francisco, Round Mountain; Mr. and Mrs. Will J. Farrington, Round Mountain; Mrs. Charles McLeod, Smokey Valley, Austin; Frank Rogers, Smokey Valley, Austin; Peter Damele, Austin; Peter Jason Damele, Austin; Bernard G. Damele, Austin; Elizabeth Martin and son, Eureka; Bill Givens, Austin.

Mr. and Mrs. W. L. Peterson, Austin; Domingo Segura, Eureka; Dan Filippini, Beowawe (sold out since signing); Fritz Walti, Beowawe; William H. Walti, Beowawe; Emil A. Walti, Beowawe; Steve Allen, Beowawe; Clarence G. Allen, Beowawe; Mrs. Estella Allen, Beowawe; Emil Baumann, Beowawe; Walter E. Baumann, Beowawe; Ernest O. Baumann, Beowawe; Alma Woods, Austin; Fermin Espinal, Austin (partner of Bertrand Arambel); Adelaide Callaghan, Austin; A. F. Bordoli, Tonopah; Alma Fallini, Tonopah; R. A. Fallini, Tonopah; John Carter, Tonopah; Martha Bordoli, Tonopah; Virginia Fallini, Tonopah; E. W. Fallini, Tonopah; Mrs. E. W. Fallini, Tonopah; Helen Fallini, Tonopah; Joe B. Fallini, Tonopah; Edward P. Murphy, Tonopah (sold out since signing); C. J. Howard, Tonopah; June Howard, Tonopah.

Charlene Locke, Tonopah; Joe Clifford, Jr., Tonopah; Roy Clifford, Tonopah; Joe Clifford, Sr., Tonopah; Marguerite Boscovich, Tonopah; Bozo Boscovich, Tonopah; Mrs. Roy Clifford, Tonopah; Mrs. Joe Clifford, Sr., Tonopah; Mrs. Joe Clifford, Jr., Tonopah; Willis Walch, Adaven; Edna Walch, Adaven; Joe B. Fallini, Jr., Tonopah; Melvin J. Filippini, Tonopah; Emma Ornelas, Tonopah; Hamilton Ott, Round Mountain; Albert Hooper, Tonopah; Charles E. McLeod, Smokey Valley, Austin; Frank G. Arcularius, Tonopah; Bill Palmer, Tonopah (partner of Murphy; sold out); John Weeks, Reese River; Willie Bill, Reese River; Mr. and Mrs. Henick Smith, Reese River; Wickson Charly, Reese River; Casey Birchim, Reese River; Mr. and Mrs. Emmett Rasse, Reese River; Mrs. Lucy Pete, Reese River; Mr. Jim Frank, Reese River; Archie Hooper, Reese River.

Joe O'Toole, Austin; Bart O'Toole, Austin; Duman Hooper, Reese River; Mabel Jackson, Reese River; Mr. and Mrs. Gene Boots, Reese River; Mr. James Babbs, Reese River; Mr. Carl Dyer, Reese River; George O'Toole, Austin; Arthur O'Toole, Austin; Irene Hayden, Austin; Laurence O'Toole, Austin; Alice O'Toole, Austin; Grover Pardee, Austin; Roy L. McCann, Reese River; David A. Stevens, Tonopah; John D. Callaghan, Austin; Roy A. Brown, Austin; Charles D. Keough, Tonopah; W. W. Whitaker, Fallon; A. D. Drum, Jr., Fallon; Jim Daniels, Goldfield; Chris Dahlstrom, Goldfield; Chas. Cecchisi, Gold-

field; Claire Borgerson, Gold Point; Rudenick, Bozarth & Tayler, Lida; Oasis Ranch, Inc., Oasis; E. Seminario, Dyer.

G. L. Morris, Austin (sold out his share in Kingston since signing); St. John Laborde, Austin; Bill Gondolfo, Austin; James Hayden, Austin; W. D. and M. E. Caton, Austin; John Anselabehere, Austin; Dolly Ruth Anselabehere, Austin; Adam Welch, Battle Mountain; Ramon Ourbide, Battle Mountain; W. T. Jenkins Co. by Louise Marvel, president, Battle Mountain; Charley Welch, Battle Mountain; Henry Filippini, Battle Mountain; Mary Jean Etchegaray, Eureka; Leroy Etchegaray, Eureka; Bernard Damele, Eureka; Charles Damele, Eureka; Jos. Flynn, Eureka; Floyd Salgowski, Eureka; Mary E. Bailey & Sons, Eureka; Stephen Damele & Sons, Eureka; Mary Jean Ithurralde, Eureka; James Ithurralde, Eureka; John Iron, Eureka; J. M. Rabalaeti, Eureka; Raymond Labarry, Jr., Eureka; Raymond Labarry, Sr., Eureka; Mary Jean Labarry, Eureka.

Louie Goyhonetche, Eureka; James Hunter & Son, Eureka; Reinhold Sadler, Eureka; Floyd Sadler, Eureka; Ted M. Thompson, Eureka; Pete Etcheverry, Eureka; Mrs. Emma Schaefer, Eureka; Floyd Shaefer, Eureka; A. C. Florio, Eureka; Fred Minoletti, Eureka; M. M. Harcourt, Eureka; Chris Zumwolt, Eureka; Fred Etchegaray, Eureka; John Jay Casey, Tonopah; Eleanor L. Titus, Tonopah; Eugene Lee Titus, Tonopah; Sarah Locke, Tonopah; Leroy Sharp, Tonopah; Ellen Sharp, Tonopah; James G. Sharp, Tonopah; Lina Sharp, Tonopah; Emery Garrett, Currant; Marison E. Locke, Tonopah; Madison L. Locke, Tonopah; H. L. Titus, Tonopah; John Titus, Tonopah; Shirley, Chiatovich & Humphrey, Silver Peak; W. M. Chiatovich, Silver Peak; Carroll L. Humphrey, Tonopah; Allen H. Roberts, Round Mountain; Wm. Walter, Tonopah; Milton Russell, Tonopah and Fallon.

NYALA, NEV.,
April 7, 1950.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to thank you for your efforts in the past in keeping us out of a grazing district, especially at our March 1 meeting.

What was the outcome of your meeting with Mr. Chapman? I am enclosing a clipping from the Tonopah meeting.

Anything you can do to stall or down this movement will be greatly appreciated.

Yours respectfully,

HOWARD N. SHARP.

(Clipping attached:)

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT TO PRESS FOR TAYLOR GRAZING DISTRICT

Members of the Central Nevada Stockmen's Association have been notified by the Department of the Interior, Washington, through the Bureau of Land Management, stockmen occupying some 7,000,000 acres of unappropriated land, mostly desert, in central Nevada, will be organized into a Taylor grazing district—No. 6—within 90 days after March 1.

This is a followup to the adjourned meeting held in Tonopah Wednesday, March 1, 1950, at which time Government officials were primed to get the organization actually underway. Reading of a telegram received by the Eureka County Livestock Association from Senator GEORGE MALONE, stating that Secretary of the Interior Chapman would not press further action against the stockmen in forcing them to either organize a grazing district or accept lease provisions of section 15 of Taylor Grazing, without further conference with MALONE, served to bring about an immediate adjournment of the Tonopah meeting.

Meantime the central Nevada association is attempting to introduce through Senator PAT MCCARRAN amendments to the Federal range code which, if adopted, would make it much easier on the stockman affected when and if district 6 is organized.

TONOPAH, NEV.,
March 2, 1950.

SENATOR GEORGE MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MALONE: After attending the meeting in Tonopah yesterday, March 1, we think even less of a grazing district.

They said we could not count our ranch property and our wells, pipelines, and water developments as base property for priority in the district. It had to be one or the other.

They also said the public lands would be open for lease if we did not form a district yesterday.

Mr. MALONE, could you get a bill through Congress to repeal section 15 of the Grazing Act if you cannot repeal the whole act or do away with the Bureau?

Respectfully,

Mrs. HOWARD SHARP.

FALLINI BROS.,
Twin Springs, Nev., March 2, 1950.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MALONE: We just attended a meeting in Tonopah March 1 in regard to the Taylor grazing district 6, which includes Eureka, Nye, Esmeralda, and Lander Counties. Now as you know the majority of the stock and land owners always voted out and still do. Thanks to your telegram, we did succeed to postpone the forming of district 6.

Mr. Greenslit was chairman. He stated that all the districts under him were self-supporting, but I still have my doubts about that.

Now anything that you can do to keep us out of the Taylor grazing district and section 15 (lease act) will be highly appreciated by all of us.

Personally I feel that it is a detriment to the stock raiser for several reasons: (1) You have that extra tax. (2) You cannot run your own business—they will tell you how many head to run on a certain time of year on a certain range. Now if a person has been in the business all his life, he is going to take care of his range better than a man that just comes in and trys to tell him how he should run it. (3) The way I understood Mr. Greenslit say, they would not recognize State water rights as priority holdings on the range. Now, I want to tell you this, that my brothers and I have spent several thousands of dollars in developing water, and improving the range. And we have been here all our lives. I think the tax sheets for several years will prove that we have been making a success of the business.

We do not raise much hay, and have to depend on the range, which most of the other stockmen do in this section. So if our water rights that have cost us several thousands of dollars are no good, we would have to quit the business. It would be impossible for our outfit to lease this range, and most of the others feel the same. The majority does not want either one of the acts.

If we still have a democracy, it looks to me like majority should rule. We have voted to stay out of the Taylor Grazing Act and also section 15 by a big majority at all times and still do.

We are members of the Central Nevada Livestock Association and the majority are opposed to the Taylor Grazing Act or section 15. So anything that you can do to help us keep out will be highly appreciated.

Thanking you for past favors.

Sincerely,

E. W. FALLINI.

JIGGS, NEV., *February 16, 1950.*

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am aware from following your record that you have a pretty thorough knowledge of the existing conditions which are vital to the industries of Nevada, but thought I would write and give you my views on some of the things which I have been watching and perhaps might give you some new ideas of what we livestock producers of Nevada are up against.

From your recent addresses I know that you are on the right track when you advocate State control of range rights, as it stands to reason that individuals who are in this country and know the conditions could handle range problems better than under the remote-control system from Washington, D. C.

Many of us have spent a lifetime and all of our capital in building up a livestock outfit which is entirely dependent on the right to graze our stock on the public domain.

Under the Taylor Grazing and Forest Service we do not own our grazing rights although we have paid for them, and they constitute 75 percent of our capital investment.

I contend that these rights should be irrevocably tied to the livestock producer's property as they are the greater part of his capital investment, and I do not believe the Government should have a right to cancel or revoke his permit except under very drastic conditions, as cancellation of a permit is equivalent to confiscating his whole capital investment, as no livestock ranch in Nevada can operate without range and all of these millions of acres of so-called public domain are absolutely worthless to the State of Nevada or to the United States without the livestock producers making them valuable.

The State of Nevada is almost wholly dependent on the livestock industry for existence and this range problem is very vital to everyone living within the State.

We understand that supervision of range is necessary, but not confiscation.

Whenever the Government takes a grazing permit from a livestock producer it means confiscation of his ranch and whole capital investment, as the ranch property is absolutely worthless without range rights.

Anyone who has lived in Nevada knows that the State would fold up overnight if the livestock industry goes under.

Up to the present time the Government has not confiscated a person's capital investment, but under our present Socialist regime we cannot tell what to expect. I, for one, am sure that people of the United States will produce five times as much under the individual-enterprise system than they ever would under Socialist control.

We have a glaring example of what Socialists can do for a government when we observe the once powerful British Empire.

Another thing I would like to mention is grazing fees, which are supposed to go up or down following the livestock prices. When we sold beef last year we took from 30 to 35 percent lower prices than we received the previous season. However, the reduction of forest fees is set at 12½ percent. Why the discrepancy, and who has the right to set these fees? Evidently the range users have no say in the matter.

Well, Senator MALONE, our only hope of salvation lies in the integrity of our representatives in Washington, so I will close and

say: Long live the Republicans, and may they eventually come out on top, although I feel sorry for the party that tackles the almost impossible task of trying to bring order out of the chaos which the past 18 years has made of the United States Government.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE E BRAY.

TONOPAH, NEV.,
January 20, 1950

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE We are writing to you relative to the formation of the proposed grazing district in central Nevada. We are sure that we speak for the majority of the stockmen when we say that we do not wish to be included in any grazing district If a district is organized it will be in opposition to the will of the people concerned

A year ago we were told, at a meeting of the stockmen in Tonopah, that we must choose between going into a district or leasing The majority of those present preferred the district to the lease, but it was understood that we did not choose either if we could remain as we have been under our State laws

We are already operating at a disadvantage, and our margin of profit is very small. Much of the range land is of little or no value and our operations are scattered over a large area This makes it difficult to patrol the range so our losses are heavy due to straying and from cattle rustlers Then, too, our county tax rate is very high and any additional fees or taxes would be hard to meet.

We wish to thank you for your help in the past, and any effort you can make in our behalf will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

HARVEY L. TITUS.
ELEANOR TITUS.
EUGENE TITUS.
JOHN TITUS.
SARAH LOCKE.
MADISON LOCKE.

HOT CREEK RANCH,
Tonopah, Nev., January 18, 1950.

Hon. GEORGE W MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: I heard your speech before the annual farm bureau meeting in Ely and was much in agreement with the ideas that you expressed there You are on the right track and we want you to know that we stockmen out here are in agreement with you.

At our meeting of the Central Nevada Livestock Association the other day we decided to let the Bureau of Land Management make the first move because they have not molested us to date. But, that doesn't mean that we are for any form of supervision because we are not.

We feel that any help that you can give us in stalling this off will be greatly appreciated by all of our group.

Thanking you for your interest and with best wishes,

Yours very truly,

JOE WILLIAMS.

STONE CABIN RANCH.

Senator GEORGE W MALONE,
United States Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Agreeable with your request when you were in Tonopah I wish to say that speaking for myself and our immediate neighbors and cattle ranchers, we are all unalterably opposed to the Taylor Grazing Act for this part of Nevada, and for Nevada as a whole, for the reason that owing to the wide diversity of character of land comprising the public domain, it could not be made operative

For example one area for a wide area may not produce enough feed to support a goat while another area might be considered fourth-class sage brush grazing land. It simply can't be made to work in Nevada and we feel that if your Taylor Grazing Act is forced upon us or even the Leasing Act, the majority of the cattle people will simply be forced out of business

We hope you will do all in your power to defeat passage of the act.

Respectfully yours,

JOE CLIFFORD, Jr.

EUREKA, NEV., *January 3, 1950.*

Hon. GEORGE W MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D C:

Continue the fight against Taylor Grazing Act and Government control of livestock men.

EUREKA COUNTY LIVESTOCK GROWERS,
MRS JUANITA DAMELE, *Secretary*

TONOPAH, NEV.,
January 13, 1950.

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR Through your advice during your recent visit to Tonopah, I am writing to give you my feelings on the present Baring bill, as well as my feelings toward forming a Taylor grazing district in this area around Tonopah

Since talking with you I have read the Baring bill, but I know that in reading it there was only a very small part of it which I could understand However, I do think the Baring bill if it goes through, would enable the Department to set this entire area up as a district. So far as my part anything done that can at least detain the passing of this bill would be greatly appreciated, and I am certain you can realize the same attitude from at least 90 percent of the active ranchers using this area today

As for the formation of a grazing district, I can say we are still very much against it. Under the present range code of a district it just does not seem possible it can work satisfactorily or efficiently in an area of this type where it takes so many acres to run one cow or a sheep, making it completely impossible to administer from the fees of the livestock using it. Also, there's the fact that this area is a desert area, and droughts, as you know, are not uncommon, which only causes flexibility in carrying capacities of these ranges Each and every rancher in the area, to my best belief, have in the past, and are still developing, water wherever possible, and best suited to the range, but aside from this fact, we are all depending largely on snow for stock watering, and in a condition as this, our ranges have to be very flexible as to boundary lines, for in desert areas snowstorms are very spotty, and there are many occasions when you see stock from several neighboring outfits using one area where the snow happens to be

We had a meeting of our association a short time ago, and rather than trying to give you the details in this, I'm sending a clipping from which you can get the scope of our thoughts. It seemed the majority thought it best to keep as quiet as we can since we have at one time told the Government we would form a district. Now if we started to fight back and change our minds, they would think now we didn't know what we wanted, but I can assure you when the time comes we will be fighting 95 percent against it.

I certainly wished you could have been here to our meeting, for you could have given an awful lot to it, for I know I certainly gained from the talk you gave, and I'm looking forward to other meetings.

Sincerely,

FRANK G. ARCULARIS.

(Clipping attached)

CATTLEMEN DECIDE TO LET INTERIOR DEPARTMENT MAKE FIRST MOVE ON GRAZING ACT

Among the resolutions adopted Saturday at the meeting of the Central Nevada Stockman's Association held in the Tonopah justice court, and attended by 60 stockmen from Nye, Esmeralda and Lander Counties, was one introduced by E. W Fallini, Twin Springs, asking that the association post a reward of $500 for information leading to the arrest and conviction of persons charged with "rustling" stock belonging to members. The resolution was passed and Secretary-Treasurer Joe Williams authorized to engage District Attorney William J. Crowell to draw up the necessary papers, bond, and attend to other matters necessary to make the offer legal and binding In introducing his resolution, Fallini remarked he "understood there was considerable rustling going on at the present time"

VOTE TO LET "SLEEPING DOGS" LIE

After much debate and consideration of suggestions tendered by various members, concerning action of the Interior Department in forcing stockmen of Nye, Esmeralda, Eureka, and Lander Counties to either apply for formation of a Taylor grazing district, or accept leasing provisions of section 15 of the act, it was voted to let the matter rest as it is, leaving the issue to the Government, and for Government action. It was the consensus that any attempt to ask Nevada's Representatives in Congress to take this or that stand, on any angle of the issue involved, might logically result in decision of the Interior Department to move more or less precipitately, bringing the whole thing to a head now instead of later.

WILLINGNESS INDICATED

"We have not heard a word for over a year after we notified the Interior Department that, out of necessity, because of Department pressure, we are willing to have the Government proceed with formation of a Taylor grazing district in this area in preference to a general acceptance of leasing under provisions of section 15 of the act," President Dick Magee stated, "and I believe we will be better off if we just continue as we are, and make no move of any kind In other words, it is strictly up to the Interior Department to show its hand now—not up to us"

Reason why the Interior Department has made no move toward processing the acreage involved is believed due to failure of Congress to appropriate adequate funds for administration purposes

EUREKA COUNTY NOT REPRESENTED AT MEETING

There was no direct representation from Eureka County, where stockmen are fairly well organized under the title of Eureka County Stock Growers' Association, but a telegram was read from A. C. Florio, former Nye County stockman, and now president of the Eureka association, urging members of the central Nevada group to continue their fight against "usurpation of rights of the stockmen," an application fully expressing opinion of 100 percent of stockmen present at Saturday's meeting. Inasmuch as the Interior Department has threatened all stockmen using Nevada lands as yet unappropriated, now shrunk to approximately 10,000,000 acres, and all in the four counties mentioned here, with "range trespass" unless they either apply for leases, enter existing grazing districts, or organize one of their own, members voted at the meeting held here in December 1948 to accept as graciously as possible the Department's demand.

LEASING FAVORED

With exception of a small group of stockmen, chiefly centered in the Fish Lake valley areas of Esmeralda County, where it is declared advantageous to lease in preference to joining organization of a new grazing district, all stockmen present favored the latter alternative.

FALLINI BROS.,
Twin Springs, Nev., December 30, 1949.
Senator MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I understand that we, the people of Nye County, are in favor of the Taylor Grazing Act. I wish to state, as to my opinion, after having many conversations with most of the ranchers in Nye County, that 98 percent of these said ranchers are strictly opposed to the Taylor Grazing Act, and also the Lease Act.

We, the ranchers of this desert country, have had our heart and soul in our work, improving these ranges and have spent the most of our income improving the water holes, also sinking wells, erecting windmills, and gas pumps, also going to the expense of large storage tanks, troughs, and corrals.

The largest portion of this country is wasteland and we have had several droughts in the last 20 years, also a disastrous winter in 1946 and 1949, which killed a lot of our stock, on account of deep snows and extreme cold weather.

We were under the impression that our State water applications were sound enough for us to spend this money on improvements on this said range. If people didn't think the State applications of Nevada were sound, and that their ranges would be protected, I believe there would have been but very little improving done.

I feel that the red tape connected with the Taylor bill would affect our business in many ways and the extra tax would be disastrous. I also believe the Taylor bill would be a detriment to the Government, as I don't believe it would be self-supporting from fees taken in to administrate the program.

We hereby plead that you do all that is in your power to protect us.

Sincerely,

JOE B. FALLINI.
MRS. J. B. FALLINI.

FALLINI BROS.,
Twin Springs, Nev., December 30, 1949.
Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing this letter, asking you as a personal favor, to help us cattlemen in Nye County, Nev., keep out of the Taylor Grazing Act, and also the Lease Act.

We have plenty of taxes and expenses, and I don't think we need additional burdens and taxes.

I can say that 98 percent of the stockmen in Nye County do not want the Taylor Grazing Act or the Lease Act. We were told about a year ago, that we had only one alternative, the Taylor Grazing Act, or the Lease Act. Naturally we voted for the Taylor Act, as we could not pay the taxes on the Lease Act.

I can tell you and our other Representatives in Congress that we have enough burdens now, without Taylor Grazing and Lease Act.

I am speaking for myself, and, I think, 98 percent of the cattlemen in Nye County, Nev.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND A. FALLINI.

TONOPAH, NEV.,
December 26, 1949.
Hon. Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MALONE: I am making an attempt to tell you why I do not want the Taylor grazing.

First, it means more taxes on an overtaxed business.

Second, it means putting someone to supervise my business, that I have spent a lifetime in building up.

Third, the range has been developed to its fullest extent, so there could be no benefit there.

It all sums up to the facts, if we are left to continue like we are we can continue to operate. But if we have to pack a bigger load we won't be able to operate.

Yours respectfully,

H. N. SHARP.

STONE CABIN,
December 24, 1949.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Agreeable with your request when you were in Tonopah, I wish to say that speaking for ourselves and our neighbor cattle ranchers, we are all unalterably opposed to the Taylor Grazing Act for this part of Nevada and for Nevada as a whole.

For the reason that owing to the wide diversity of characters of land comprising the public domain, it could not be made operative.

For example, one area for a very wide area may not produce enough feed to support a goat, while other areas might be considered fourth-class sagebrush grazing land. It simply can't be made to work in Nevada, and we feel that if Taylor Grazing Act is forced upon us, or even the Leasing Act, the majority of the cattle people will simply be forced out of business. We hope you will do all within your power to defeat passage of the act. The Clifford family is one of the oldest cattle raisers in the State of Nevada. I do believe the cattlemen have been hit hard enough last winter; my own loss was 35 percent.

With best regards to you and ever yours, your old friend.

JOE CLIFFORD, SR.

I have been in the cattle business for over 50 years.

HOT CREEK RANCH,
Tonopah, Nev., December 23, 1949,
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Agreeable with your request when you were in Tonopah, I wish to say that speaking for ourselves and our immediate neighbor cattle ranchers, we are unalterably opposed to the Taylor Grazing Act for this part of Nevada, and for Nevada as a whole, for the reason that owing to the wide diversity of characters of land comprising the public domain, it could not be made operative.

For example, one area for a very wide area may not produce enough feed to support a goat, while other areas might be considered fourth-class sagebrush land or sagebrush grazing land, it simply can't be made to work out in Nevada, and we feel that if the Taylor Grazing Act is forced upon us, or even the Leasing Act the majority of cattle people will simply be forced out of business.

We hope you will do all within your power to defeat the passage of the act.

Respectfully,

MELVIN J. FILIPPINI.

HOT CREEK RANCH,
Tonopah, Nev , December 22, 1949.
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Agreeable with your request when you were in Tonopah, I wish to say that speaking for ourselves, and our immediate neighbor cattle ranchers, we are unalterably opposed to the Taylor Grazing Act for this part of Nevada and for Nevada as a whole, for the reason that owing to the wide diversity of character of land compiling the public domain, it could not be made operative; for example, one area for a very wide area, may not produce enough feed to support a goat, while other areas might be considered fourth-class sagebrush grazing land. It simply can't be made to work in Nevada, and we feel that if the Taylor Grazing Act is forced upon us, or even the Leasing Act, the majority of the cattle people will simply be forced out of business. We hope you will do all within your power to defeat the passage of the act.

Respectfully,

ELDON WALCH.

HOT CREEK RANCH,
Tonopah, Nev., December 22, 1949.
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Agreeable with your request when you were in Tonopah, I wish to say that speaking for ourselves and our immediate neighbor cattle ranchers, we are unalterably opposed to the Taylor Grazing Act for this part off Nevada, and for Nevada as a whole, for the reason that owing to the wide diversity of character of land comprising the public domain, it could not be made operative.

For example, one area for a very wide area may not produce enough feed to support a goat, while other areas might be considered fourth-class sagebrush grazing land. It simply can't be made to work out in Nevada, and we feel that if the Taylor Grazing Act if forced upon us, or even the Leasing Act, the majority of cattle people will be simply forced out of business.

We hope you will do all within your power to defeat the passage of this act.

Respectfully,

EMMA NAY WALCH.

GOLDFIELD, NEV.,
December 22, 1949.
Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR I am writing you in regards to the Taylor Grazing Act or the leasing under section 15.

This is to tell you that I do not want either of them where I am ranging cattle in Nye and Esmeralda Counties and wish that you will do all in your power to prevent this part of the county from being put under either of the acts as 50 percent or more of my cattle range has had to be developed by drilling wells and cleaning springs before it could be used for cattle range, and with that expense on the development and maintenance of the range is all the business can afford; any additional expense of grazing fees would be the killing of the business. I am speaking from my whole life's experience in these two counties.

Yours respectfully,

JIM DANIELS.

STONE CABIN RANCH, NEV.,
December 19, 1949.
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Agreeable with your request when you were in Tonopah, I wish to say that speaking for ourselves and our neighbor cattle rancher, we are all unalterably opposed to the Taylor Grazing Act for this part of Nevada and for Nevada as a whole.

For the reason that owing to the wide diversity of character of land compiling the public domain, it could not be made operative.

For example, one area, very wide area, may not produce enough food to support a goat, while other areas might be considered sagebrush grazing land.

It simply cannot be made to work in Nevada and we feel that if the Taylor Grazing Act or the leasing Act is forced upon us the majority of the cattle people will be simply forced out of business. We hope you will do all you can in your power to prevent this act.

Respectfully,

BOZO BOSKOVIAL.

STONE CABIN RANCH, NEV.,
December 19, 1949.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C

MY DEAR SENATOR: Agreeable with your request when you were in Tonopah, I wish to say that speaking for ourselves and our immediate neighbor cattle ranchers, we are all unalterably opposed to the Taylor Grazing Act for this part of Nevada and for Nevada as whole

For the reason that owing to the wide diversity of character of land compiling the public domain it could not be made operative. For example, one area, very wide area, may not produce enough food to support a goat, while other areas might be considered fourth-class sagebrush grazing land.

It simply cannot be made to work in Nevada and we feel that if the Taylor Grazing Act is forced upon us or even the Leasing Act, the majority of the cattle people will simply be forced out of business

We hope you will do all in your power to defeat passage of the act.

Respectfully,

ROY CLIFFORD.

TONOPAH, NEV.,
October 6, 1949.

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: I have received your letter regarding the Baring bill, H R 2914. I am pleased to hear that no action has been taken on this bill to date, and I am certain that a majority of the ranchers in central Nevada feel the same way.

You inquired in your letter whether the ranchers expressed a wish to go into a district at the meeting held in Tonopah on last December 4. The vote taken was to determine whether we preferred leasing or forming a district. The majority voted for the latter, as there was some doubt as to how leasing would work out. I can assure you, however, that we prefer neither if it is possible to remain as we are.

Thanking you for the interest you have taken in this matter, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

HARVEY L. TITUS.

NO OTHER LANDS AFFECTED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, let me say that the measure just introduced is supported by the interested organizations and individuals in the three counties concerned; and it would establish a precedent in dealing with range lands of small value within the public land area of the State of Nevada. No other State would be affected. As a matter of fact, no part of the State of Nevada not directly described in the detailed land description in the bill would be affected by it.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION TOO COSTLY

I believe this bill would constitute a step forward in dealing with public land. An investigation will show, Mr. President, that it is almost impossible to collect sufficient funds from the use of such lands to pay for the cost of administration. Mr. President, generally speaking, more money is spent in supervision and for alleged improvements of the range than is collected for its use. This means a continuous drain on the Federal Treasury, a continuous expense to the other taxpayers of the Nation.

ADJUDICATION OF THE RANGE

The only time any range in the West is ever overgrazed is when those who use the range are unable to protect it from outsiders. In the measure which I have introduced it is proposed that there be an adjudication of the range, similar to that which is done by the engineers who adjudicate the use of the waters in the arid States. Under adjudication no one is entitled to take water from a person who has previously used the water. The use establishes "water rights."

Mr. President, in the measure I have introduced, I call for an adjudication of the range rights, in order to determine what use the present holders have been making of the range. If the range has been used by one person, under the provisions of this bill he will receive a permit for that use. If the range has been used by a community or group of persons, that will be determined, and the matter will be handled accordingly.

NO INTERRUPTION IN DEVELOPMENT

Under the provisions of the proposed legislation, the present users of the portion of the range which those users have been trying to develop for future use will be able to continue with their plans. No supervision will be necessary, for no one will deliberately ruin land which he is given the right to use. Those who favor the Taylor Grazing Act supervision still hark back to the old times when there was no adjudication of the range rights by the Government or State. In those days, in order for a person to protect his range, he had to make a dust bed out of it.

In 1914, I began to work on the ranges as surveyor and engineer for cattle and sheep outfits. I surveyed the range. The only way one could protect his rights ways by means of script—soldier script, Indian script, and other script—and by the purchase of water holes and the buying out of anyone who could interfere with the use of the range.

The State of Nevada later passed a Stock Water Act. The State understood what was necessary in respect to regulation of the range. The act was passed while I was State engineer. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, supervision of the range to that extent came under my jurisdiction.

PRIOR RIGHTS—TRESPASSERS

That act provided that an application for a stock watering permit on a range which was substantially utilized could be rejected, by virtue of an existing right. The act made a trespasser out of anyone who grazed such lands without a water right. The State of Nevada was then well on its way toward the development of an adequate regulation of the range.

TAYLOR GRAZING ACT OBJECTIONABLE TO PEOPLE WHO CAN HANDLE OWN BUSINESS

The Taylor Grazing Act was passed by Congress in 1934; and that act gave the Secretary of the Interior or other Cabinet officers or lesser officials the right to tell the people of a range or grazing community what they must do in regard to the use of the range.

As will be noted from the letters and other communications which I have placed in the RECORD today, the people think they can handle their own business better. They do not need to have additional Government funds expended in their midst. They will not interfere with the use of the Federal lands for mining, agriculture, fish, wildlife, recreation, or any other purpose. They are simply interested in their established right to use the land for grazing.

SPECIAL CASE, NOT RELATED TO OTHER AREAS

Mr. President, it is time that the Congress reviewed that policy. This area of land is one on which there is very light rainfall and very little feed for livestock: in fact, on this land perhaps as little feed is produced as on any public lands in the United States. The land would, under the provisions of this bill, be handled as a special case.

Such handling of this area in south central Nevada would not affect any Government regulation of any other area; in fact, this proposed legislation would not affect any regulations concerning Indian reservations, forest reservations, parks, or official withdrawals for any other purpose.

If the plan operates as the junior Senator from Nevada thinks it will, the idea might spread, and that would be good; if it does not, he will be the first one to recommend repeal of the act.

The principle of public land development and use through the provisions of S 2341, just introduced, is that the use of the range is an integral part, one of three factors, of the necessary livestock unit; and that such integrated use is the only way the arid public ranges can be converted into taxable property.

Such customarily adjudicated use could be lost by nonuse, and in no way would interfere with the conservation and development of such public lands for other purposes.

AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. President, I wish at this time to refer briefly to an entirely different matter: the difficulty between the British and the Egyptians in the Suez Canal area. We note in today's dispatches that Egyptian tanks and artillery pulled back from the bristling British defense perimeter in the Suez Canal zone. A dispatch from London said the Egyptians retired after having received a polite warning from the British commander to stay out of the British-occupied area. However, the Egyptians made a new threat on paper to expel the British, and Moslem extremists demanded refuge against the British troops. The canal area was set off and placed on a war footing.

COLONIAL SLAVERY SYSTEM CENTERS IN ENGLISH TRADE

Mr. President, in connection with the address which the junior Senator from Nevada made 2 or 3 days ago about the situation in that area, I wish to call at-

tention to a dispatch dated October 11 of this year by Mr. George Sokolsky. He is a well-known columnist and a great historian, having had valuable experience throughout the world. Mr. Sokolsky says:

The colonization of Asia and Africa by European countries moved into stride as the steamship replaced the sailing vessel. Increased mobility, developing navies, and the rising industrialization of countries using steam-driven machinery (to which later was added electricity) gave Western Europe and subsequently the United States an advantage not only over primitive lands but even over formerly great countries such as China, India, Iran, Egypt, and to a degree, Russia

Power lay in coal and its utilization.

Great Britain became in the nineteenth century the principal colonial and capitalistic power on earth, centering in London control over shipping, banking, and insurance. While Amsterdam and Paris competed with London, both were subordinated to it, and when the United States entered the market for international finance and commerce, New York and Boston also subordinated themselves to London.

Mr. President, Mr. Sokolsky goes on to say:

The British were sound entrepreneurs, but in all countries the natives regarded them unfavorably The first actual expulsion of the British occurred on July 4, 1776, when, at Philadelphia, American colonials declared their intention of separating from the mother country. This tendency might have spread were it not for the Durham report concerning Canada (1839), which laid the basis for the dominion system.

Actually, this system strengthened British colonialism. While giving a large measure of independence to Anglo-Saxon areas, it became possible more freely to exploit the weak and backward countries.

Two wars and oil have destroyed Great Britain's advantage. The wars wasted Great Britain's accesses to and control of universal liquid capital; oil altered the relationship of geography to physical power. Oil not only has replaced coal as the major fuel of commerce and industry; it has altogether reorganized military force, making the airplane, the submarine, the tank, mobile artillery new and different factors in military control

Whichever Nation is in possession of oil or has free access to oil, possesses power. Within Great Britain itself there is no oil. In the remaining British commonwealth, oil is not significant.

The point needs to be made in passing that two new factors enter this situation, electronics and atomic fission, which may even further lessen the power of the major empires in due course.

The principal petroleum-producing areas are the United States, the Middle East, and Venezuela. The following figures are for 1949:

Oil reserves: Middle East, 4,404,300,000 metric tons.

United States, 3,722,900,000.

Venezuela, 1,287,700,000.

Others, 1,165,100,000.

The total oil reserves for the entire world on January 1, 1949, were 10,580,000,000 metric tons. Although new reserves have been found since then, I prefer to use these checked and authoritative figures.

By the term "Middle East" is meant Bahrein, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Saudi-Arabia, Kuwait, and Oatar. The two largest reserves are in Kuwait and Saudi-Arabia. The known oil reserves referred to showed 35.19 percent for the United States and 41.63 percent for the Middle East.

This is the world's supply of oil.

Mr. President, Mr. Sokolsky traces the history of power, and he points to atomic power as the coming power which will completely destroy all such domination. He points out that the oil-producing areas destroy the domination of the coal-producing countries. In line with that statement and the debate on the Senate floor 2 days ago, I would say it is time for the United States to stop, look, and listen when it comes to the point of making a decision as to whether to support the empire-minded nations in their domination of the so-called backward nations. Those colonial nations are not so backward as to prevent their having developed their oil-producing areas, and I would say again, the nations which have been dominated for 300 years are on the move.

There is no possibility that the United States will be able to hold for Britain, the Netherlands, France, and Belgium, the colonial nations of the world. The colonies are not going to stay put.

Mr. President, I continue the column, These Days, by George Sokolsky:

The reserves of Soviet Russia are not given In the Soviet area there are fields in Baku and in Rumania It is also known that there are fields in Chinese Turkestan. The dimensions, development and production of these fields are not reported A figure of 34,000,000 metric tons of produced oil is given for Soviet Russia, which is very small.

From the standpoint of reserves, the Middle Eastern countries stand out as largest. Newly found reserves in those areas are reported to be very extensive

In 1950 nearly all Middle Eastern fields were held as concessions by British and American oil companies or as partnerships between such companies and the governments.

The oldest of these concessionaries is the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co, which in 1933 succeeded to part of the holdings of William Knox d'Arcey to whom a concession was granted in 1901. The Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. is owned as follows: British Government, 52 5 percent; Burma Oil Co, 25 percent; individuals, 22 5 percent. The Iranian Government nets about 15 percent as royalties and taxes.

The Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. also owns 23 75 percent of the Iraq Petroleum Co., the other partners being the Shell group, Compagnie Francaise des Petroles, Standard Oil of New Jersey, Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., and C S. Gulbenkian. Anglo-Iranian and Iraq Petroleum own a number of other companies in various parts of the Middle East.

There then is the principal seat of potential power for industrial, commercial, and military purposes.

The issues are:

1. Shall the British and American interests control and exploit these reserves?

2 Shall the native nations control and exploit them?

3. Will Soviet Russia conquer these countries by war or revolution in order to control and exploit them?

ARE WE TO HOLD STATUS QUO THROUGHOUT WORLD?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in the October 18 issue of the New York Journal American, Mr. Sokolsky has another article starting with these words:

Beginning with Woodrow Wilson's 14 points and his advocacy of the League of Nations, the United States accepted, not without considerable internal opposition, the role of leadership in world affairs. What that meant in practical terms has been that the United States has succeded to what had been for at least two centuries Great Britain's place in international affairs.

In another part of the dispatch Mr. Sokolsky asks:

How deeply are we going into Egypt? Are we entering upon a police action in the Suez Canal? Will the British do it alone, or shall we step in, and what if the British go it alone and the Egyptians defeated * * * there is no telling what can happen in these nationalistic days when some men fight for powers and others fight for * * *.

Is this Suez Canal just plain old-fashioned imperialism, or is it one of those United Nations resolutions to maintain everywhere the status quo of 1945?

I call attention, Mr. President, to the fact that the President of the United States has said that we intend to hold the status quo of 1945. He has said that whenever anyone begins to move, there the American troops will be found. I want to warn the United States Senate that we may be heading into something that is not thoroughly understood, and that now is the time to study it.

Mr. President, I think it is time that the United States Congress take this situation in hand to determine where the administration is leading us and do something about it.

England says that it is protecting the Suez Canal. Now, let us analyze that. From whom is she protecting it? From whom are we protecting her? I suppose from Russia. That is the only nation we had in mind when we appropriated around $100,000,000,000 in one year.

England cannot protect the Suez Canal from Russia. It would take the interference of the United States of America to protect that area. Britain could not protect the Suez Canal any more than Egypt could protect it.

ENGLAND IN EGYPT TO HOLD SUDAN AND NILE TRADE

Let us get at the bottom of the question and study it a little more. What are the British there for? They are there for one thing, of course, and that is to dominate the economy of Egypt and to keep control of the Sudan country and upper Nile.

If the United States must do the fighting and the financing anyway—I just pose this question—should we not do a little financing of Egypt and support Egypt's troops? Egypt has more than 100,000 troops ready to move into the area. They say that Britain has broken their treaty with them; that Britain was to furnish them with certain arms so that the troops would be ready to fight. They have paid for the arms and have not received them.

WHICH SIDE IN TRADE WAR DO WE TAKE, AND WHY?

Let us find out whom we are protecting, and why. If we are to help an empire-minded nation in its selfish, unfair, immoral farming of the Sudan country and interfere with the economics of another sovereign country, let us admit that fact.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the RECORD at this point the article by George E. Sokolsky, as it appeared in the October 18, 1951, issue of the New York Journal-American and other newspapers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEADER'S ROLE BRINGS UNITED STATES TROUBLE ON MANY FRONTS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Beginning with Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points and his advocacy of the League of Nations, the United States accepted, not without considerable internal opposition, the role of leadership in world affairs. What that meant in practical terms has been that the United States succeeded to what had been for at least two centuries, Great Britain's place in international affairs

There has been no evidence that any large element of the American people aspired to this role. At no time since the defeat of the Paris treaty in the Senate in 1920 has any kind of referendum been submitted to the American people over the role this country is to play in international relations. In no political campaign since Warren Harding was elected President has an issue of peace or war, of international leadership, of imperialism been submitted to the American people.

The grand-scale developments in this field, involving this Nation in war and in bloodshed, are the result of day-by-day administrative decisions and acts which face our people as faits accomplis

There is no use speculating on what might have happened had Willkie or Dewey debated these questions or if Senator Vandenberg had not pursued the bipartisan foreign policy. The fact is that by agreement between Democratic and Republican leadership, the foreign policy of this country and the actual implementation of that policy have never been submitted to the American people Nor has the entire, truth concerning it been documented so that the people understand what has happened and what the cost has been

We have been going back and forth over the China situation with a bitterness and recrimination that is now strictly personal and is likely to be a principal issue in the next Presidential campaign

Yet, for most Americans that issue is not clear Shall they believe Harold Stassen or Philip Jessup, Louis Budenz or Owen Lattimore? Are they to believe Gerard Swope about the Institute of Pacific Relations or the documents found in E C. Carter's barn in Lee, Mass ? Is JOE MCCARTHY a liar or even crazy or is Dean Acheson hiding something that is itching to come out?

The public will have to know one day why they are struck with the Korean war. They will have to know why to date there have been 90,000 casualties in what was obviously an avertible war. No brilliant publicity planning can save the architects of that error.

But that is not all that will have to be understood. This role of leadership is becoming burdensome. Here we are involved in Iranian oil. What are we going to do in Iran? Are we going to force the Persians to capitulate to the British? Are we proposing to make those people hate us? Do we plan to drive them into Russia's arms? Are we trying to convince the entire Moslem world that the United States is their enemy?

What decision of the American people, in Congress assembled or at an election, has authorized anyone to give the Moslem world from Casablanca to Pakistan cause to hate the United States? It was apparently intended to include Iran in the Truman containment document, which somehow was watered down to Turkey and Greece. Why Turkey and not Iran? Why Greece and not Formosa?

How deeply are we going into Egypt? Are we entering upon a police action on the Suez Canal? Will the British do it alone or shall we step in too? And what if the British go it alone and the Egyptians defeat them? After all, Israel beat the British and the Egyptians combined. There is no telling what can happen in these nationalistic days when some men fight for power and others for glory.

Is this Suez Canal just plain old-fashioned imperialism or is it one of those United Nations resolutions to maintain everywhere the status quo of 1945?

What happens if Iraq, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Yemen and even distant Pakistan get into this quarrel between Islam and Britain, are we not involuntarily involved under the North Atlantic Pact? Should not NATO act, with Eisenhower, at the head of a European army consisting of American troops?

Leadership is not just words and speeches; it involves fighting, constant, interminable war. Leadership has brought to our shore the permanent war. We worry about Joe Stalin, but that is only one front. What of the Islam front? The Indian front? The Indo-Chinese front? The Philippines front?

It is a big world and nobody loves the leader.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on October 19, Mr. Sokolsky wrote another very significant article. It would be informative if those who do not have time to read history would take a short look at what he has to say. If we question what he says it might be well to inquire into it

ENGLAND FATTENS OFF OF COLONIES

It is a very enlightening dispatch. It is George Sokolsky's article of October 19, 1951, appearing in the Washington Times-Herald and other newspapers. I ask unanimous consent to have it appear in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

If the Moslems succeed in forcing Great Britain out of the Middle East, little of importance will be left to the Empire but the self-governing dominions To Disraeli, India, was the richest jewel in Victoria's crown—and when India was lost, the Empire moved on its march of death

From Elizabeth to Victoria, the British builded an amazing world out of sea power. They pushed Spain and Holland aside, defeated France and combining military zeal with commercial skill brought the continents together by ships and goods and the movement of men and money. Truthfully, it could be said that the sun never set on the Union Jack or for that matter on British trade

It was England's German King George III, and his stupid ministers who lost the Thirteen American Colonies Such British statesmen as Burke and Pitt understood the error in their day and fought hard against the King's and Lord North's lack of statesmanship The United States of America came into being, but the northern colonies, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, and other areas taken from France, eventually became Canada and remained loyal

British policy in Europe and Asia had ever been to permit no power to overwhelm either continent. In the balance of power, Great Britain played the middleman's role and profitably survived most wars.

However, the balance of power could not maintain the peace of Europe as long as the pressures of nationalism burst forth like geysers. British policy has generally been to discourage nationalism such as Joan of Arc or the French revolution or the Germany of Bismarck produced. Even the Italy of Mazzini frightened the British, as did, in time, the Italy of Mussolini. If only the world would stay put, the British could always keep open the avenues of commerce.

But the world would not stay put and always so-called weak and backward nations pressed their claims upon the strong and decaying powers. The Crimean War saved Turkey from an emerging Russia but it did not save Turkey from its own decay, just as all the agreements and treaties defining colonial spheres of influence in Asia and Africa staved off war in the first decade of the twentieth century but not in the second decade nor in the third and fourth.

It is Moslem nationalism which now faces Britain in Egypt, Iran, Iraq, and, it is to be assumed, everywhere in Asia as far as Pakistan. It is not only that the Moslems feel the growing pains of resurrected nationalism, but as a practical matter, it no longer pays to be tied in with British policy or British trade

Since World War I, what remained of the Turkish Empire in the Middle East was carved up among the great Moslem families into Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Jordan. Persia was changed into Iran; Palestine became Israel; Syria and Lebandon became sovereign; forgotten Yemen emerged. And oil made the Moslems rich, richer than they had been in all their history since Mohammed went on the hegira from Mecca to Medina.

Egypt is the heart of the Moslem world It is historically the oldest existent nation in the human story. It is rich because of the Nile and the Suez Canal. It is rich because the British rescued it from the Osmanli, from the Turkish Empire

The stakes are enormous, not only for Egypt, but also for Soviet Russia. The dangers are now greatest for the United States that has assumed the responsibility of maintaining the status quo of 1945, which means that the nationalistic impulses of such countries as Egypt, Iran, Iraq, India, Pakistan or any other nation are to be restrained in the interest of Great Britain

But the Moslem world does not want to be restrained It is on the march from Pakistan to North Africa. It is a world that can no longer be ignored. It has the will to establish itself as the third great power—the United States, Soviet Russia, and Islam. A powerful nationalistic leaven moves all of Asia—east Asia and west Asia, from the Pacific to the Mediterranean. Not Russia, Britain or America will stop this movement.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, Lincoln said that if this Nation was ever destroyed it would be not from without, but from within

TRICKS NOT SEPARATE; PART OF PATTERN

For 18 years, the taxpayers of this Nation have assumed that each piece of legislation proposed by the administration was a separate unit to be considered on its own individual merits. The taxpayers may not have liked it in any case, but each act taken by itself might have been assimilated without great harm to the country, and, notwithstanding the fact that common sense told them it was wrong, they have continually accepted such legislation through sufferance rather than approval. This acceptance was due largely to the fact that the weavers of the pattern were clever enough to arrange certain benefits as bait for various groups of citizens.

What the public, and the Congress, apparently did not see was the pattern of a plot which is eating the heart out of our economic system: First, through the recognition of Communist Russia in 1934, without any safeguards whatever; second, through the removal of the metal base for our money system in 1934, laying

the groundwork for unlimited spending; third, through the application of the so-called reciprocal trade, dividing our markets with the nations of the world; fourth, through deficit financing, resulting in inflated printing-press money almost without limit; fifth, through the sending of billions to foreign nations, on the Karl Marx principle, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need."

As the pieces of the mosaic fall into place, the pattern of a "one economic world," planned by the theorists of all nations, including our own, should be plain to the citizens of this Nation, and should frighten them into action.

OUR DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICIES

We need a new administration with no vested rights in past mistakes—an administration which can shed from the Federal Government payroll the leeches and the hangers-on that have accumulated over the past 18 years, and can reestablish integrity in Government; an administration that will not tolerate disloyalty, either from ignorance or deliberate intent, an administration that will again place loyalty and integrity at the top of the list of qualifications for office

It is time the American Government adopted American policies which will insure our security and continued well-being as a nation

PRESENT STATE OF THE UNION

What is the effect of our present foreign policy? What is the effect of our present domestic policy? How did we get this way? What possessed a thrifty and intelligent people to sit idly by and watch an administration filled with improvident individuals and business failure dissipate our assets and divide our markets and our wealth with the nations of the world?

Here is the state of the Union under domestic and foreign policies which have lead us through a Second World War—and for what? For the privilege of spending untold millions, the greatest sum of money of all time, to prepare for world war III?

WISHFUL THINKING AND ALICE-IN-WONDERLAND THEORIES

For 18 long years, people have bowed to wishful thinking and Alice-in-Wonderland theories: The theory that deficit financing is sound economy, that the more we owe the greater our wealth; the theory of reciprocal trade, the principle that the more goods we can import from foreign sweatshop labor, the more jobs we create in America; the theory that taxes must be continually raised to siphon off any increase in wages and in business capital to prevent inflation.

NATIONAL DEBT—NATIONAL ASSETS

Our national debt is in excess of $256,000,000,000. In 38 of the 48 States the States' per capita share of the national debt is greater than the assessed value of its property.

The administration and the Congress of the United States, in a few short years, have dissipated the wealth of the Nation which was built up over a century of time.

DISCARDING THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

The political "one worlders" are now ready for a fateful step to modify the Constitution so that the United States may join an Atlantic federation of nations. In such federation, each nation being equal, the foreign nations, without the formality of submitting such proposal to the Congress of the United States, could tax us for their support by the simple expedient of basing taxation on ability to pay, just as Russia is now proposing for the United Nations.

INFLATION

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada condemns the inflation achieved by the removal of the metal (gold) base for our money, deficit financing, the sale of almost unbelievable amounts of Government bonds, all resulting in a disastrous flow of newly printed money into the market It is utter idiocy to say that inflation can be stopped by fixing prices on goods and services at the consumer level without determining the cost of such goods and services.

BONUS TO FOREIGN MANUFACTURERS—FOREIGN GIFT LOANS—TAXES

Granting a bonus to foreign manufacturers, through what the Democrats like to call "reciprocal trade," foreign gift-loans and other economic sleight-of-hand tricks, will work just so long as the American taxpayers are able and willing to pick up the check.

We do this by paying increased taxes, by purchasing additional Government bonds with savings, and by paying higher prices for the necessities of life.

Mr. President, the people doing the work in this Nation will pay the taxes, even down to the $40 a week stenographer. She will find about $8 deducted each week for taxes to support these sleight-of-hand performances

ONE-HALF OF OUR PEOPLE'S SAVINGS, INSURANCE, AND WAGES STOLEN

Inflation, caused by the administration, has stolen nearly one-half of all of the savings, insurance, and wages of the American people. The administration admits that the purchasing power of the 1939 dollar is now 53 cents.

One difference between an individual and a sovereign government is that the individual is finished with his unbusinesslike practices when his bank quits him, while a government is not finished with its impractical schemes until the money it prints has no value or the public votes it out of office.

THE FOREIGN NATION "DOLLAR SHORTAGE" HOAX

The "dollar shortage" theory as an excuse for gift loans to foreign nations is the greatest hoax ever sold to a trusting public. Any nation fixing a fictitious dollar value on its own currency, demanding more dollars for its currency than it is worth in the markets of the world, will certainly be short of dollars.

The manipulation of the exchange value of their money by foreign nations is a common practice for trade advantage and is a form of piracy.

A FORWARD-LOOKING PROGRAM

An American domestic and foreign economic policy, which will insure this Nation's security and continued well-being, must be adopted while our country is still solvent. Only by such a program can we continue to set an example for weaker nations to follow. Such a program should include the following steps:

THE DOMESTIC POLICY

First. Establish in this country a market for the goods of foreign nations on a basis of fair and reasonable competition, protecting our workers and investors against unfair competition of foreign low-wage producers. There is no issue of high or low tariff or import fee, but the proposition of a flexible import fee to make up the differential between the wage standards here and abroad.

Second. Make the Western Hemisphere self-sufficient for any emergency; encourage production particularly of strategic and critical materials throughout the Western Hemisphere, including South America, Canada, and Alaska, thus in time of emergency, the Western Hemisphere could be made self-sufficient, and the transportation lines kept open

Third Establish a sound currency: Determine the degree and extent of the current inflation, and fix the price of gold to conform—establishing a gold standard. The price of silver should be tied to the price of gold as a standard, inasmuch as approximately half the people of the world have used silver for money for the past 2,000 years.

Fourth Regain for the Congress its power as one of the three independent branches of the Government set up by the Constitution Congress must resume its constitutional authority to regulate foreign commerce, regulate money, and approve treaties and agreements with foreign nations Many of these constitutional duties of the Congress have been taken over or modified by the executive branch during the last 18 years

Fifth Return to the States all rights of regulation and sovereignty not specifically given to the Federal Government by the Constitution of the United States. Many such rights have been exercised by the Federal Government through congressional inertia or actual legislative acts during the past 15 years.

THE FOREIGN POLICY

First. End the ruinous administration policy of showering foreign nations with gift-loans of money taken out of the pockets of American taxpayers to make up the phony "dollar shortage." Accept reasonable amounts of foreign currency at the current rate of exchange, for the purchase of goods and services in this country, and then use such currency in the purchase of goods in the respective foreign countries.

Second. As a condition of such relationship, require a free exchange of the currencies of foreign nations between themselves, and in terms of the dollar upon the New York and London exchanges.

Third. As a further condition, require that foreign nations protect the integrity of private investments in their respective countries.

Fourth. As a further condition, require that there be established equal

access to the markets of those areas which we are committed to defend, providing that any nation may protect its own workers and investors through tariffs or import fees, but that no third nation may fix quotas, money exchanges, or other subterfuges to preclude the United States from trading with that nation upon an equal basis.

Fifth. Extend the 128-year-old Monroe Doctrine to include the areas in Asia and Europe that is necessary for us currently to defend for our own security and well-being.

THE ESTABLISHED FOREIGN POLICY OF OTHER NATIONS

It must be recognized that the foreign policies of the nations of Europe and Asia are based upon the principle voiced by one of England's great Prime Ministers, Lord Palmerston, in 1858, when he said that—

We (the English) have no eternal allies and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interests are eternal and perpetual, and those interests it is our duty to follow.

Mr. President, we have a current example of the English adhering to those principles.

This foreign policy was reiterated by another great Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, in 1945, when President Roosevelt's suggestion that England relinquish her claim to Hong Kong was answered with a statement which was heard around the world:

I did not become the King's Prime Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire.

That was saying in another way that their interests, and not their friendships, are permanent.

We also must acknowledge and protect our permanent interests. This is a sound principle, which we have not followed. No sovereign nation has a right to sacrifice the interests of its people. Congress has shown very little indication of understanding where our ultimate interests lie.

DISCLAIMER

SWEATSHOP LABOR COMPETITION

I oppose the administration's bonuses to foreign manufacturers, the so-called "reciprocal trade" policy, which puts the sweatshop labor of Europe and Asia in direct competition with the workers and investors of this Nation, thus threatening the American high standard of living.

INFLATED CURRENCY

I oppose the administration's inflated currency policies, which started in 1934, with the cutting loose of our money system from the metal—gold—base, and is aggravated by the sale of additional Government bonds to cover continuous deficit financing, resulting from the unnecessary sending of billions of dollars to foreign nations and the vast amount otherwise wasted by the administration.

Between $50,000,000,000 and $30,000,000,000 was supposed to have been spent on the military between VJ-Day and the outbreak of the great police action in Korea, and we had nothing to show for this huge sum.

The administration and the Congress of the United States should treat the taxpayers' money in the same manner that the cashier of a bank treats depositors' money, as a trust to be fully accounted for to the people who furnish the money.

RUINOUS TAXATION

I oppose the policy of the administration of raising taxes to siphon off raises in wages and invesement profits, supposedly to prevent inflation, on the theory that the Government can spend the private citizen's money without causing inflation, but that if it is spent by the man who earns it for the comforts of life, it will upset the economy and cause inflation. I favor taxation for necessary revenue only.

FOREIGN DOMINATION

I warn against the domination of our economy and our foreign policy by the Fabian-Marxist school of thought which we have been following. This one-economic-world philosophy has led to gift loans of billions of our taxpayers' dollars to foreign nations, to make up their balance of trade deficits each year, and threatens to level our standard of living with those of other nations of the world.

We have inadvertently adopted the Socialist policy between nations which Marx enunciated more than 100 years ago for application within a nation when he said, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need."

CONCLUSION

This Nation needs a dose of common horse sense and old-time religion.

We need an administration which will reestablish the integrity of government and encourage integrity between individuals and between nations, and assure respect for American citizens at home and abroad.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two newspaper articles, which appeared in the October 16, 1951, issue of the Reno Evening Gazette and in other papers.

There being no objection, the news articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEED INTEGRITY IN GOVERNMENT, REPUBLICANS TOLD—DESIRE FOR POLICY TO BRING SECURITY VOICED BY MALONE

"We need an administration which will reestablish integrity of government and encourage integrity between individuals and between nations, and assure respect for American citizens at home and abroad," Senator GEORGE W. MALONE Monday told a Western States Republican conference in Seattle.

And the well-attended meeting of national committeemen and other Republican leaders from the West heard another Nevadan voice a demand for a change in party policy to lure the country's big labor vote.

POLICY FOR LABOR

"We're going to have a set policy for labor," said Harold Stocker, of Las Vegas, chairman of the Nevada State central committee.

He told a meeting of State chairmen that he thought the workingman has had a justifiable case against the Republican Party.

But Edward Ingle, of Washington, D. C., head of the GOP radio and speakers bureau, reported the job of appealing to the labor vote may be sizable.

He said that the recent convention of the American Federation of Labor in San Francisco was told that the A. F. of L.'s political action committee needed $9,000,000 for its purge drive against Republican and some Democratic Congressmen.

The labor issue came up after delegates attending a meeting of national committeemen from the West gave a standing ovation to Guy G. Gabrielson, national committee chairman.

Gabrielson's resignation has been demanded by some Republicans in connection with a loan to his firm from the Reconstruction Finance Corp.

PRAISE CHAIRMAN

"There is not one member of the national committee who does not stand in praise and enthusiasm of Mr. Gabrielson," said Harlan I. Peyton, of Spokane, national committeeman from Washington State.

In a prepared speech, Senator HERMAN WELKER (Republican, Idaho) declared that "never in the history of America has a national administration been so utterly saturated with crime, corruption, communism, and confusion."

Senator MALONE told the conferees that we need a new administration with no vested interests in its past mistakes, one which can shed from the Federal payroll the leeches and hangers-on that have accumulated over the last 18 years, and can reestablish integrity in government.

It is time, he said, that the American Government adopted American foreign and domestic policies which will insure our security and continued well-being as a nation.

Charging that for 18 long years people have listened to wishful thinking and Alice-in-Wonderland theories, MALONE cited the national debt in excess of $256,000,000,000 and said that the administration and the Congress in a few short years have dissipated the wealth of the Nation which was built up over a century of time.

Inflation, caused by the administration, has stolen nearly one-half of all the savings, insurance, and wages of the American people, he charged. He said he was opposed to the policy of raising taxes to siphon off wage raises and investment profits, supposedly to prevent inflation, on the theory that the Government can spend the private citizen's money without causing inflation, but that if it is spent by the man who earns it for the comforts of life, it will upset the economy and cause inflation.

"This Nation," he concluded, "desperately needs a liberal does of common horse sense and old time religion."

REPUBLICAN MEETING CONSIDERS BOYCOTT

SEATTLE, October 16.—Republicans today considered demands for a Government boycott of cheap-labor foreign goods and a protest against concealed attempts by the United Nations to govern American fisheries.

These proposals and others with a western tang were placed before an 11-State Republican regional conference called to work out vote-getting strategy for the 1952 elections.

The resolutions committee, headed by George Hansen, of Salt Lake City, recommended that the party's national platform—

Advocate excluding foreign products of underpaid labor where it hurts American workmen and farmers;

Strongly deplore concealed attempts by the United Nations to exercise sovereignty over our fisheries and further manipulating them for political purposes;

Oppose the valley authority method of river-basin development because it would put almost unlimited powers in the hands of appointive officials;

Favor United States return to the gold standard;

Support immediate statehood for Hawaii and allowing Alaskans to elect the Territorial Governor, now appointed by Washington.

Conference delegates turned to the resolution after a heavy round of speechmaking themed to why the Democrats should be kicked out of office—and how.

NOMINATION OF ROGER M. FOLEY TO BE COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, in a special meeting today the Senate Committee on Finance unanimously approved the nomination of Roger M. Foley, of East Milton, Mass., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Massachusetts, to fill an existing vacancy. I ask unanimous consent to report the nomination, and I also ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received.

Is there objection to the present consideration, as in executive session, of the nomination of Roger M. Foley to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Massachusetts, to fill an existing vacancy? The Chair hears none, and the nomination is confirmed.

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS REGULATIONS RELATING TO PRESUMPTION OF SERVICE CONNECTION FOR PSYCHOSES

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on the call of the calendar a few days ago House bill 320, a bill to amend Veterans Regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for psychoses developing to a compensable degree of disability within 3 years from the date of separation from active service was passed unanimously. Shortly thereafter the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

I have discussed the subject with the distinguished Senator from Illinois today. He is unable to be in the city. He says that while he still feels that the bill should not have passed he will not ask for any further delay in the consideration of his motion to reconsider.

On that basis, Mr. President, I ask for immediate consideration and denial of the motion to reconsider.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR I yield.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I understand the Senator from Oklahoma has talked with the Senator from Illinois, and that the Senator from Illinois has no objection to the motion being brought up.

Mr. KERR. I have talked with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr MCFARLAND. Will the Senator make his request in the form of a unanimous consent request?

Mr. KERR I am making it in the form of a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Very well. I understood the Senator.

Mr. KERR. I submit my request in the form of a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the withdrawal of the motion to reconsider?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I think we ought to have in the RECORD a very brief explanation of what the bill does.

Mr. KERR. I shall be very glad to give the distinguished Senator an explanation.

The House passed a bill which created a presumption of service connection for any psychosis which developed with reference to World War II veterans for a period of 3 years following separation from the service.

The Senate Finance Committee amended the bill so as to limit the presumption in favor of the veterans for 2 years, and then limited the benefit to priority for entrance into a veterans' hospital and for out-patient treatment.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] with reference to H. R. 320, which a member of his staff has given to me, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

I regret exceedingly that I must continue my objection to H R. 320, which provides a presumption of service connection for psychoses developing to a compensable degree of disability within 2 years from the date of separation from active service, as reported by the Senate Committee on Finance

Present laws and regulations provide for a 1-year presumptive period after separation for most chronic diseases, including psychoses The question at issue here is, Shall the Congress extend a blanket presumption of service connection to cover all cases of psychoses developing within 2 years (in the case of the Senate bill) or 3 years (in the House version of the bill) or shall the Veterans' Administration be permitted to judge each individual case on the basis of its complete medical history, as required by law, in order to determine service connection?

I believe it should be the latter. I base that belief on the following statement of the Veterans' Administration, contained in its letter to the Finance Committee, which apears on pages 2 to 4 of the Finance Committee report.

"Psychoses may result from any one of a number of factors such as an inherent or hereditary defect There is nothing in the circumstances of military service in time of war which creates a presumption of fact that a delayed manifestation of a psychosis some time after discharge is in any way related to the fact or circumstances of service. If circumstances of service so conflicted with the mental make-up of the individual as to cause a psychosis, they would have done so at that time and not many months or years after service However, because of the difficulty of determining the exact cause of a psychosis, it would rarely be possible to secure affirmative evidence to rebut the presumption of service connection proposed by the bill."

I should like to point out, parenthetically, that while the Senate committee report, on page 1, in the explanation of the bill, states that the bill, as reported by the committee, provides for a rebuttable presumption of service connection. However, the language of the bill itself which appears on line 10 of page 2, omits the phrase "in the absence of affirmative evidence to the contrary" contained in the House version of the bill, and merely provides that psychoses developing within 2 years of separation shall be deemed to be service-connected. That is, the presumption is not a rebuttable one—it is an absolute presumption.

I would like to emphasize that there is nothing either in law or in regulation to preclude the Veterans' Administration finding a service-connection if a thorough examination, by skilled medical authorities, of all available evidence furnished by lay as well as by medical authorities, indicates that such a service-connection is warranted.

Not only is such a possibility not precluded—it is actually encouraged both by statutory declaration and by the regulations of the Veterans' Administration. I should like to call attention to the provisions of Public Law 361 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 20, 1941. That law requires (1) that in considering the question of service connection, "due consideration shall be given to the places, types, and circumstances of his service as shown by his service record, the official history of each organization in which he served, his medical records, and all pertinent medical and lay evidence", and (2) that the Veterans' Administration "shall resolve every reasonable doubt in favor of such veteran: Provided that service connection of such injury or disease may be rebutted by clear and convincing evidence to the contrary The reasons for granting or denying service connection in each case shall be recorded in full."

In other words, that law, as well as pertinent Veterans' Administration regulations, which repeat substantially the same language, give the veteran the benefit of any doubt, and actually seem to place the burden of proof on the Veterans' Administration. Yet they do allow the VA to examine each case individually, on its merits, as determined by a thorough study of all the information The bill H R 320 forbids such an individual case-by-case examination, and provides for a blanket presumption

Now it may be that in actual practice, despite these laws and regulations, the Veterans' Administration does in fact refuse to consider any psychoses developing after the 1-year period as service connected. If this is the case, then the practices of the VA should be corrected by administrative direction stimulated, if necessary, by congressional prodding. But I do not believe it should be corrected by extending the presumptive period, in the absence of medical foundation therefor.

One final point· The bill as reported by the Finance Committee restricts the benefits derived from a determination of service-connection to priority with respect to hospitalization. I should like to point out that, if my own State of Illinois is any example, the Veterans' Administration hospitals are completely filled, as to their neuropsychiatric wards, and many service-connected psychotics are now in State hospitals. There are also a great number of non-service-connected veterans psychosis cases in these public hospitals.

The effect of this bill would not be to move any additional service-connected psychosis cases into VA hospitals, since these are filled What it means, essentially, is that a great many non-service-connected psychosis cases who are now in State hospitals at State expense would remain in these hospitals, at Federal expense.

I should also like to point out that the reason that many VA hospitals are filled to capacity is that there are great numbers of non-service-connected cases in those VA hospitals, who entered when there were not sufficient service-connected cases to fill all the beds, and who apparently cannot be removed but in any case are not being removed from VA hospitals, to make way for the service-connected cases still in State hospitals.

Figures substantiating this are to be found on page 147 of the Veterans' Administration Report for 1950. During the fiscal year 1950, there were 45,503 psychotic

patients in VA hospitals. Of these only 21,875 were service-connected while 23,628, or over 50 percent, were non-service-connected cases. In "other Government and private hospitals," on the other hand, there were 1,317 psychotic patients, of which 329 were service-connected and 831 non-service-connected. I ask that a table showing these figures be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

I believe that we are setting a dangerous precedent in this bill, by extending, without sound medical foundation, the presumptive period for a chronic disease, the VA hospital facilities for which are already filled to capacity, if the State of Illinois is any example. So what we may really be doing, by this bill, is require, without any individual examination, that the Federal Government pick up the check for many veterans who are already hospitalized at State expense

VA patients remaining in VA and non-VA hospitals, June 30, 1950, from tables 8, p. 147, Annual Report of Veterans' Administration for fiscal year 1950

	Psychotic patients only		Other Government and private hospitals
	VA hospitals	Other Federal hospitals	
All patients	45,525	926	1,711
Veterans	45,503	926	1,706
Service-connected	21,875	461	1,317
Non-service-connected	23,628	465	389
Others	0	0	0
Nonveterans	22	0	5
World War II	18,841	570	1,242
Service-connected	12,316	269	1,021
Non-service-connected	6,525	301	221
Others			
World War I	23,280	308	452
Service-connected	7,662	161	287
Non-service connected	15,618	147	165
Others			
Spanish-American War	919	15	4
Service-connected	24	2	1
Non-service-connected	895	13	3
Others	0	0	0

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that either the motion be rejected or that I be permitted to move that it lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is withdrawn. That disposes of the matter.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. With regard to the action taken concerning the bill referred to by the Senator from Oklahoma, H. R. 320, providing for a presumption of service connection for any psychosis, I am not sure that the RECORD in its present state will be sufficiently clear so that technical objection may not be raised to the action which the Senate took with reference to it.

Therefore, I make this parliamentary inquiry to the Presiding Officer. Is my understanding correct that the RECORD now stands that the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to reconsider was in effect withdrawn by proxy through the Senator from Oklahoma, which then leaves the RECORD in the situation where the bill automatically passes and goes to the White House?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was informed that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] was withdrawing the motion to reconsider, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. However, the Chair has since been informed that the Senator from Oklahoma did not have authority from the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to withdraw the motion in his name. Therefore, the Senate will have to vote on the motion to reconsider. The Chair understands that the Senator from Illinois is perfectly willing that the Senate vote on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma tried to make it clear that he did not have authority from the Senator from Illinois to withdraw the motion to reconsider, but that in conversation the Senator from Illinois had stated that he would not object to the Senate's considering his motion to reconsider, and therefore the Senator from Oklahoma asked unanimous consent that the motion be considered and rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed by the Senate.

The motion to reconsider was rejected.

MEETING OF SECOND SESSION OF EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Joint Resolution 351, providing that the second regular session of the Eighty-second Congress shall begin at noon on Tuesday, January 8, 1952, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent to report from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service the nominations of 48 postmasters which have been acted upon by the full committee.

I may say that only 9 members of the committee are present in the city, but 12 members have agreed to report them favorably. I ask for the immediate consideration of the nominations. They have been reported in regular order, and no Senator from any State has opposed any of them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc. Without objection, the President will be notified immediately of the nominations confirmed.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5684) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see p. 13752 House proceedings, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 20, 1951.)

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLER. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to point out, as we approach the end of the session, that the three appropriation bills which are coming before us today in the form of conference reports, and the other appropriation bills which have been passed for the first session of the Eighty-second Congress appropriate a total of $97,696,326,891.

This amount was exceeded only by the second session, Seventy-seventh Congress, in 1942, when there was appropriated $147,000,000,000. In the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress in 1943, there was appropriated $114,000,000,000. Both of those, of course, were in the World War II period and represented war budgets.

These figures are compared with $61,200,000,000 appropriated during the last session of Congress, the previous peacetime high.

They are compared also with $35,700,000,000 appropriated by the first session of the Eightieth Congress, which was the postwar law.

This record total includes $6,000,000,000 in permanent appropriations, for interest payments on the public debt, and similar items. It excludes permanent appropriations for trust funds, which are not charges against revenue, and it also excludes the $817,000,000 carry-over for foreign aid and the $550,000,000 authority to use excess equipment for foreign aid.

The total is 4¾ billion dollars below the President's requests for these appropriations.

The total is made up as follows:

Fiscal year 1951, supplemental, $6,808,581,632; fiscal year 1952, regular, $71,582,962,024; fiscal year 1952, supplemental, including foreign aid, $13,217,948,060; and fiscal year 1952, permanent, $6,068,835,175. The grand total is $97,696,326,891.

The budget requests of the President totaled $102,380,301,185.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope we can get an early vote on the report. Every Senator knows the facts about the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Tennessee asks for a vote, may I ask the Senator from Michigan whether the figures which he has given include also carry-overs and unexpended sums.

Mr. FERGUSON. These are only appropriations.

Mr. GEORGE. They are new appropriations?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; new appropriations.

Mr. GEORGE. New appropriations?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. What is the total?

Mr. FERGUSON. $9,696,326,891; it is a staggering figure.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to make one comment, and ultimately the country will understand it, although perhaps not now· Human nature being what it is, unless there is strict economy on the part of government, we cannot avoid all sorts of criminal abuses in the administration of governmental affairs.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr President, I appreciate that statement made by the Senator from Georgia, following my remarks, because I believe the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, who is chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, is very familiar with what is going on and where we are going.

I brought this matter to the floor today because I believe that as we near the end of the session, and after many Senators have voted on issues of economy, all of us should be mindful of where this appropriating process will lead us. The words "billions of dollars" mean very little to the people; but when we say that the billions of dollars which are appropriated by the Congress and are spent by the executive agencies are only the result of the collection of taxes from the people themselves, the people begin to understand the meaning of the words used to describe the extremely large appropriations and expenditures. In short, Mr. President, Congress acts as trustee for the taxes which are collected, which later are made available to the executive branch of the Government for expenditure. Inasmuch as we in Congress are acting as trustees for the people in connection with the collection of the taxes, I believe Congress has the duty of calling to the attention of the people, as well as the duty of considering very seriously itself, the fact that the appropriations already have amounted to more than $97,000,000,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator from Michigan have a breakdown of that amount, to show how much of it is for national-defense purposes?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I do not have that before me.

Mr. FERGUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I was asked a very pertinent question by the majority leader as to the amounts of appropriations for defense. I have obtained further figures from the Appropriations Committee and I should like to make a statement to become a part of my remarks at that point. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a part of my previous remarks.

The regular defense bill was $56,900,000,000; public works for the military were $4,000,000,000; mutual security was $7,300,000,000; the fourth supplemental appropriation for 1951 is $6,400,000,000. These make a total of $74,600,000,000 out of the total of $96,696,326,891. These are the appropriations for national defense, rounded off, which the distinguished majority leader had previously requested me to furnish.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement of the Senator will be printed as a part of his original remarks.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator from Michigan have a breakdown to show how much of that amount will be spent during the present fiscal year?

Mr FERGUSON. No; I do not Expenditures data, of course, is obtainable only from the executive departments, and what I have been giving is the sum of congressional authorizations for expenditure.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I think I can help the Senator from Michigan in regard to that matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask the Senator from Minnesota to wait a minute. I shall yield a little later.

Mr President, the annual budget message of the President estimated 57.3 percent of appropriations for fiscal 1952 would be spent in the fiscal year. The salient fact is that the Government is not able to spend the money as fast as Congress appropriates it, and is not able to spend the money even as fast as they anticipate that it will be appropriated.

The appropriation figures I have given will not show up in the deficit for this particular year, and I know the Senator from Georgia had in mind the fact that these figures will show up at some time in the very near future.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, Mr. President; and if the Senator from Michigan will allow me to make a little more explicit what I mean——

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Then let me say that I mean exactly this, and nothing less, that the wanton waste of public funds is corruption itself; and we cannot prevent corruption in government when reckless expenditures of public moneys, such as we are witnessing now, are taking place

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, what the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee has just said is certainly a profound truism, because as we treat the dollars, so will those who spend the dollars treat them. If we treat lightly the dollars we appropriate, those who spend the dollars will, also, treat them lightly, to the point of corruption.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I simply wish to say that, in fairness, I think the amount referred to should be broken down. Later I shall endeavor to place in the RECORD a breakdown of that amount.

Mr. President, I do not think we should label with the word "corruption" the appropriations which Congress makes for the purpose of the national defense. To the contrary, I think such appropriations are most necessary.

In accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement which already has been reached, I shall place in the RECORD a statement of just what the Congress has done in order to preserve our democracy.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me at this point, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. What difference does it make whether the money is spent this year or next year? The money has been appropriated, and it will be spent.

We may talk about national defense and leadership; but I wish to state that the test of good leadership is whether it results in keeping the people of the country out of trouble, instead of getting them into trouble.

During the past 20 years my observation has been that we have had one emergency after another; our leadership has gotten us into that trouble, and then has asked the Congress to make huge appropriations to help bail out the administration.

The test of good leadership is whether it is able to keep the people out of trouble, rather than get the people into trouble.

All this huge amount of money has been appropriated, and much of it has been spent, and all of it will be spent. It makes no difference, really, whether the money is spent this year or next year, or whether it is spent for war purposes or for other purposes. The fact is that it will be spent. The sums which Congress has appropriated, and which have been spent or which will be spent, are amazing in amount. If this process is not stopped, it will bankrupt the country.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, that is altogether true and I want to add a further point. The 97 billion dollars to which I have referred, even if not all of it is spent this year, will help to build up and make all the hotter the fires of inflation which will consume the savings, the insurance, and even the property of the people of this country. All will go up in flames of inflation, because every dollar that is appropriated will be spent, and to that extent just that much more will be taken away from the civilians, in the form of consumers' goods.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has referred to the expenditures for purposes of national defense. The Senator from Michigan and I are on the Military Affairs Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. One thing which we must develop at all times is a greater cost consciousness on the part of those who are responsible for the defense

establishments. We know that approximately $70,000,000,000 of the expenditures will be made for the armed services, which, in my opinion, are not yet nearly as cost conscious as they should be.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's statement. What he has said is entirely true.

Let me refer to one example: The Signal Corps of the United States Army desired to have an office building in the city of Philadelphia. That was last year. They did not request of the Congress specific appropriations for the purpose of permitting the purchase of the office building. They had the choice of acquiring one of two buildings. One building could have been occupied within approximately 30 days, as shown by the record. However, instead of acquiring that building, at a lower cost, the Signal Corps, because of political pressure—and the record shows this—bought the Penn Athletic Club Building, and transferred funds for that purpose, and then notified the two Armed Services Committees of the Congress, and finally the Appropriations Committees, that they were going to transfer those funds in order to buy that building.

The Signal Corps estimated that the cost of repairing the building would be either $1,500,000 or $2,000,000, in order to put the building into proper condition for occupancy. They said that could be done within 90 days

In the last appropriation bill the facts are disclosed, namely, that instead of being able to occupy the building within 90 days, 10 months now have passed. They do not have the entire building, though they have now spent $2,100,000 more than the estimate. Think of it, Mr. President—instead of its costing $1,500,000, it is costing $2,100,000 more than that. So the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts may well say that there is not the consciousness.

Where are they going to get this $2,100,000? Are they going to come to this Congress to disclose that it cost them that much more? No, they are going to take it from a fund for operation and maintenance. By no stretch of the imagination should any agency be permitted to take permanent capital expenditures out of funds for building maintenance and operation. I call it to the attention of the Senate now because it shows the excessive amounts we are appropriating for maintenance and operation, when it is possible for them to remove $2,100,000 from those funds and apply it to permanent capital structures. So the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and all those Senators who serve upon this committee know that more care and more attention must be given to these appropriations.

Mr. President, the time has come when we must have a board of civilians who will sit down impartially to figure out not only the amount of money which we can afford to spend, but to determine whether this money should be spent, whether we should take a building such as the Penn Athletic Building, and how much it will actually cost for a real survey, instead of merely taking these figures as if they did not amount to anything, knowing they could come back to the Congress to obtain an increase. We need a real board and a real physical examination of all these problems. This Congress needs a budget officer.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will yield to the Senator in a moment. Congress needs a budget officer. It needs as many employees as there are in the Office of the Director of the Budget, who is now under the control of the White House. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's remarks, and I join with him in what he is saying. I should like to ask the Senator whether he knows that there is on the calendar a bill to create a joint budget committee of the Congress and to staff it, and to keep them on duty 12 months of the year, every day in the year, to do the very job the Senator says we need to do.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I am well aware of it. I have long been in favor of such a bill I have been cosponsor of a similar bill Incidentally, the bill to which the Senator refers contains a proposal which the Senator from Michigan, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr BYRD] have been advocating for a number of years, and which will be a significant advance if we can get it enacted. The original proposal was that before any bill is passed by the Congress there should be attached to the report an estimate as to the cost of operation under that bill for the ensuing period of 5 years. That is the bill to which the Senator refers, as I have mentioned.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That provision is in the bill. It does not come from the Budget Director, but it is to come from this committee after it has made a study of it, and after it has collaborated with the Director of the Budget and others to presen to the Congress an estimate of what it is going to cost in a period of operation of 5 years.

Mr. FERGUSON Mr. President, that is the only way we are going to have control of the budget. This afternoon we are going to pass three bills making supplemental appropriations. Before the signature of the President is even on the original appropriation bill, before we get it out of committee, there are already started what are known as deficiency appropriations, new appropriations. It is contended in connection with practically all of them that they are submitted because it is necessary for them to cover the legislation which we are passing daily. The fact is that when we pass legislation here we do not have positive knowledge of what it is going to cost in the future for the operation of the legislation we pass. We will never get real economy in Government until we begin to pay attention to the fiscal consequences of the legislation we pass.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to say to my distinguished senior colleague that I am delighted to hear his support of the McClellan bill. I would point out to him that the majority leader this afternoon agreed to have that bill considered early in the next session. I am counting on the Senator's support. We of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments are counting on his support to help push it through the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, it has my support. I have been working for its purposes for years. Mr. President, our distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has been on his feet while I have been making these remarks—and I am sorry that I have taken so long, the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. President, is another person who appreciates that this is an enormous job. Within the past few days he has appointed a subcommittee, or he will do so within the next few days, a subcommittee which will be authorized to make what we call field investigations as to how we can effectively curtail appropriations. We hope that he may become chairman of that subcommittee, and that it will cover not only the domestic but also the foreign field in the matter of field investigations, in order that we may keep in closer touch with these appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

Mr FERGUSON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to obtain the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, these bills have been discussed time and again. I refer to the two bills which are now coming up. They have priority. I am perfectly willing to answer any questions which any Senator may wish to ask, but I ask that action be taken on the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report on the bill, H. R 5684, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on a certain amendment of the Senate to House bill 5684, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U S., *October 20, 1951.*

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 to the bill (H. R 5684) making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and concur therein

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For confeernce report see pp. 13755–13758, House proceedings, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 20, 1951.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5215, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U S ,
October 20, 1951.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 17, 26, 28, 32, 37, 40, 48, 56, 57, 58, 59, 70, 93, and 101 to the bill (H R 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and concur therein, and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

"ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For an additional amount for 'Administering the public debt,' $500,000: *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation shall be used to pay for time and space for advertising the savings-bond program by press, radio, or television."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: ". *Provided further*, That not to exceed $3,000 of appropriations for the fiscal year 1952 under this head for acquisition of land may be used for purchase in the name of the United States in trust 20 acres of land in Placer County, Calif , for the use of the Indians of Auburn Rancheria."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In line 4 of said amendment after the word "countries" insert "(not exceeding 450)."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert. "*Provided*, That the limitation contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, on the amount available to the Commission for personal services is hereby amended to read, 'of which not to exceed $30,400,000 shall be available for personal services'. *Provided further*, That section 605 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, of 1952, shall not be applicable to the Commission."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

"The limitation fixed in Public Law 137 granting $1,100,000 to the Displaced Persons Commission for loans pursuant to section 14 of the act, is hereby decreased to $600,000, and the limitation fixed in Public Law 137 granting $4,375,000 to the Displaced Persons Commission for the expenses of transporting to the United States displaced persons of German ethnic origin, is hereby decreased to $3,400,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert. "$31,500,000 "

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert: "$1,100,000 "

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment In lieu of the sum of $5,450,000 named in said amendment, insert: "$5,000,000 "

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment: In line two of said amendment, change the section number to "SEC 1001 "

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment In line one of said amendment, change the section number to "SEC 1310 "; and before the period in the last line of subsection (d), insert: ", and each annual and supplemental budget estimate shall include a statement comparing the average grade and salary provided for in each item of appropriation or fund allowance therein with similar figures reported for the two previous periods", and strike out all of proposed subsection (e).

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment In line one of said amendment, change the section number to "SEC. 1315 ", and in the last sentence of subsection (a) insert before the period: ". *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to personnel engaged in the preparation or distribution of technical, scientific, or research publications, the reporting or dissemination of the results of research or investigations, the publishing of information or other work required by law to carry out the duties of such Department or Agency other than work intended for press, radio and television services, and popular publications", and before the period in the last line of said amendment, insert: ", nor shall any such provision in this or any other Act limit appropriations which may be used to compensate persons in the Office of Defense Mobilization who are engaged in informing the public about the progress and purposes of the defense mobilization program, or persons in the agencies assigned functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, who are engaged in informing consumers, agriculture, business and labor, about rules, regulations, and orders, issued by such agencies under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 14, 27, 33, 35, 36, 39, 40, 73, 87, 105, and 110.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I understand that the third and last conference report on an appropriation bill is on its way to the Senate, so I shall resume my seat and yield to my friend from West Virginia, who wishes to speak at this time.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, verbosity, unlimited and intolerable, is ruthlessly scourging the United States Senate, wasting legislative time, squandering the taxpayers' money, provoking the ridicule of the Nation and impairing the reputation of the greatest lawmaking body in the world.

It has been written that in the sixty-fourth year of the Christian era the nefarious Nero, the last of the Caesars, fiddled while Rome burned. Since the fiddle was not invented until hundreds of years after this monster committed suicide, he must have possessed a miraculous artifice for wasting time, whether with or without musical accompaniment, as devastating as that which the Senate has distressingly demonstrated by talking tediously and tastelessly for more than 9 months, while communistic fires burned with fervent heat not only in Rome, but all over the world. During this unparalleled burning the faces of countless millions of fearful men and women have grown pallid in the ghastly light of the awful conflagration.

This Congress should have redeemed all the pledges contained in the 1948 Democratic platform, properly discharged all its other first-session duties and adjourned, sine die, as required by statute, not later than the last day of July. But in the evening twilight of the twentieth day of October we are still here, lingering, loitering, and chattering in willful defiance of the law and in flagrant violation of the commandment:

> Use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do, for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking

And why did we not complete our legislative task in the 7 months wisely allotted to us for that desirable consummation? What unfriendly fate thwarted our prudent purpose to render unlimited service to humanity in its hour of greatest need and danger? What malevolent thief robbed us of our lofty will to work while opportunity's sun was still high and bright in heaven? What calamitous visitation, fate or destiny for 290 days enfeebled all things senatorial except senatorial tongues? Hamlet adequately answered all these questions when, to an inquiry made by the garrulous Polonius, he replied, "Words, words, words." Thus the distracted Dane concisely voiced the spirit of Pope's admonitory lines:

> Words are like leaves, and where they most abound
> Much fruit of sense beneath is rarely found.

Hamlet also anticipated the semblance of Cowper's lament:

> Our wasted oil unprofitably burns
> Like funeral lamps in old sepulchral urns.

If an explanation of this answer were sought, it would probably be found in the fact that three or four Senators on each side of the political dividing aisle are apparently blood relatives of the Pilgrim's Progress character, named Talkative, the son of Saywell, who lived

in Prating Row. It should be remembered that this Talkative wasted his time just as we have wasted ours during the last 9 months and 17 days.

And how talkative has the Senate been? Please lend me your eyes and ears while I answer by illustration as well as argumentation. Attention is invited to the mountainous pile of books on the desk before me. It is composed entirely of the numerous volumes of the record of what the Congress has said and done since the 3d day of last January. This precious heap of books which weighs a hundred pounds is an authentic, modern imitation of the ancient Tower of Babel, from which the pestiferous affliction known as the confusion of tongues descended upon a defenseless, dumbfounded, and bedeviled world.

Now please behold this Winston red letter, long primer type Holy Bible. It weighs 2 pounds and 10 ounces. The tower composed of the records made by confused tongues weighs more than 38 times as much as this Holy Book.

The Bible contains, among many other things, the story of the creation of the whole vast universe, including everything, from the tiniest grain of sand to the most stupendous star. It also contains the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount, which together constitute the only complete, perfect and imperishable law ever written for the government of mankind. This revered book is the repository of the sublime Psalms of David, the priceless Proverbs of Solomon, "Isaiah's wild seraphic fire," the glad tidings of the resurrection of the dead, and the blessings of life everlasting, in the palaces of Paradise, where happiness never ends, friends never part and loved ones never say good-by. All these holy things and too many more to mention here are fully described in the 1,149 pages of the Bible. But senatorial speeches and observations made during the present session of the Congress fill 7,920 pages of the RECORD—more than six times the number of pages the Bible contains.

The all-wise Creator, with only 773,692 words, in the Bible, tells the people of all time and place all that it is necessary for them to know in order to achieve unfailing prosperity, peace and happiness on this narrow bank and shoal of time and unending bliss in eternity's boundless domain.

With the reminder that there are 773,692 words in the Bible, the best purchasable hat in Washington is now offered as a reward to any Member of this body who will arise and guess within a million of the number of words Senators have officially uttered in this Chamber since the third day of last January. Depressing silence and monitory immobility indicate that no one purposes to hazard the making of a ridiculous conjecture. Therefore, fortify yourselves against the shock of the startling announcement that the expression of senatorial irrelevancy, loquacity, and verbosity since the third day of last January has required the astronomical total of 11,780,000 words—more than 15 times the number utilized in making the greatest book ever written and telling the greatest story ever told.

The Bible contains 3,566,480 letters. The best purchasable television set in Washington will be given as a reward to any Senator who will guess within 5,000,000 of the number of letters contained in the words that Senators have uttered on this floor during the last 9 months and 17 days. Ominous silence and the obvious lack of a volunteer to demonstrate his guessing intelligence quotient admonish me to tell the Senate and the world that the stupendous, stunning, staggering number of these letters is 58,125,000—more than 16 times the number used in the Bible to describe the glory of God and proclaim His everlasting omniscience, love and law.

On the average, each Senator has consumed 78 pages of the RECORD during the present session of Congress. But more than a majority of the Senators should be congratulated upon the fact that their consumption of RECORD pages during the session has been far below this average. A third of the Members should be severally cited for having consumed fewer than 16 pages, while a half a dozen have earned the lasting gratitude of the taxpayers by heroically resisting temptation, during the entire session, and economically using fewer than 10 pages of the RECORD to express their views.

With hope for the benefit assured by the maxim, "Open confession is good for the soul," let me, with unfeigned embarrassment publicly confess that I have consumed 15⅓ pages of the RECORD during the last 290 days.

The consumption of more than a hundred pages of the RECORD is chargeable to each of three Republican and three Democratic Senators. Without mentioning names, the Senate is informed that one distinguished Republican Member has completely filled 184 pages of the RECORD with his remarks. Other material that he has inserted has filled 125 pages more, making his total consumption of the RECORD 309 pages. It is a matter of common knowledge that the vocal organs of a small number of Democratic Senators have been not only overstrained but completely robbed of rest ever since this session began. The most voluble of our distinguished Democrats has, during this session, filled 132 pages of the RECORD with his talk, the greater part of which has been in behalf of the thrilling, imaginary consummation known as economy. This Senator has, with remarks and insertions, consumed a total of 159 pages.

The cost of printing the RECORD is $85 a page. The average cost for each Senator to date is $6,638.50.

The total cost of the recordation of all senatorial speeches, verbosities and irrelevancies during the present session is $646,272.

The cost to the taxpayers of the 309 pages used by the most talkative Republican Senator is $26,265. The cost of the 159 pages consumed by the most talkative Democratic senatorial crusader for economy is $13,515.

Consistency, thou fascinating jewel of sophisticated humbuggery, loquacity, and confusion, cease, oh cease to lead illustrious, irrepressible windbags astray by the blinding and bewildering light of thy "alluring ray."

It would be interesting to hear from one of the few who have been the longest in preaching economy and the shortest in practicing it how much he thinks the $646,272 collection of verbosity contained in this monumental mosaic of records from the realm of confused tongues is really worth. In my opinion, the world's champion auctioneer could not sell the entire colossal conglomeration for a hundred-thousandth part of its cost—or, in round numbers, six dollars—no cents.

It is an unpleasant but obvious truth that our waste of time in the making of the roaring redundancies and the raging insipidities contained in these RECORDS is exclusively responsible for our having been chained here since the last day of July as inescapably as poor Prometheus was bound to the rock.

But for our irrepressible prattle all the Senate committees, except the four most overburdened ones, could have completed all their important work and the Senate could have finally disposed of it before the first day of June. Could our constant chatter have been suppressed the four excepted committees, namely those on Finance, Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations, under the able and skillful leadership of their eminent chairmen, Senators GEORGE, MCKELLAR, RUSSELL, and CONNALLY, respectively, could have completed all their arduous tasks long before the 31st of July—the day on which the Congress should have adjourned as required by law.

Upon the famous Semitic trial of the world-old issue, "if a man die shall he live again," Zophar, upon cross-examination, impatiently asked the afflicted Job, who had spoken approximately 2,500 words, the important question, "Should a man full of talk be justified?" The answer to this inquiry, made first by Job's friends, and later by the Almighty, was, in substance, an unconditional, emphatic "No." If we could call Zophar from the echoless shore to speak to us, as the Witch of Endor called Samuel from the dead to speak to the regal Saul, we should urge the critical Naamathite to express his opinion of a few unnamed Senators, each of whom has spoken on this floor more than a quarter of a million words during this session. The printing of the remarks of each of these Senators has cost the taxpayers more than $10,000; an average of more than $1,000 a month; more than $33 every day since the third of last January—the date on which this session began. It may be safely assumed that Zophar, while delivering his opinion, would be constantly encouraged by loud and frequent shouts of approval such as,

> Lay on, Macduff,
> "And damn'd be him that first cries,
> "Hold, enough!"

The few, but preeminently active, honorable windbags of the Senate, who unduly love the sound of their own voice, should be mindful of the tragic fate of Narcissus. He became so infatuated with

his image, reflected by a pool of water, that he loved himself to death.

Not only history, but mythology, with its captivating comedies and awesome tragedies, might repeat itself in this unromantic age and even in this unromantic Chamber. Excessive love of voice, like excessive love of self, might become disastrous. It might eventually allure a few Senators into talking themselves to death. Let us hope that our honorable, verbose Members will, by prompt reformation, deliver themselves from the peril of ignoble extinction, and their colleagues from the hazards of having to mourn untimely deaths, lower the Senate flag to half staff, and wear crepe on their sleeves.

To the credit of the Senate, a large majority of its Members have not abused their privilege of free speech or their constitutional right to talk their colleagues or the visitors in the galleries to sleep. A large majority of the Senators, with whom I am happy to be included, would not, in any conceivable circumstances, favor the slightest restriction on legitimate commendation, criticism, discussion or debate. But nevertheless it is high time for the innocent majority, cooperatively and vigorously, to endeavor to find some appropriate way to protect themselves against the daily libels in the press and comic strips, and the hourly slanders in hotel lobbies and on the streets to the effect that all United States Senators are "blow-hards," gashouses," "hot-air artists," "windbags," "twaddlers," and "blatherskites," regardless of the fact that fewer than 10 of the 96 Members of this great legislative body are guilty of these disparaging verbosity charges and loquacity insinuations.

If the wearisome few are suffering from undelivered speeches, imprisoned in their capacious brains or breasts, which they purpose to liberate here next January, we earnestly entreat them to spare us, and relieve themselves by delivering these accumulated masterpieces of platitudinous prolixity, profundity and ponderosity during the approaching vacation in highly secluded places, "far from the madding crowd's ignoble strife" where the only auditors will be hoot owls, turkey buzzards and shitepokes. These, when vexed, as they certainly would be, could take the wings of the morning, noon or night and fly far, far away.

The Senate has too long endured the scourge of notorious verbosity. This hydra-headed, saber-toothed, insatiate monster has for many years been progressively gnawing the Senate's reputation. It has devoured the Senate's time, abused its patience and obstructed its progress. At last,

> The time is ripe, and rotten-ripe, for change;
> Then let it come: I have no dread of what
> Is called for by the instinct of mankind.

Surely the instinct of the American people calls for the eradication of the Senate's unequaled verbosity.

Anyone who will invent, discover, formulate or find a solution of the problem of ridding this body of the nuisance and nonsense of irrelevant, useless talk will thereby earn the gratitude of the Nation and deserve the erection in his honor of "storied urns and animated busts" more imposing and beautiful than any ever raised in country churchyards by loving hearts or lavish hands.

Let us, in the following well-known quotations, find encouragement to undertake promptly and energetically the difficult task of healing the Senate of its distressing, chronic mouth disease:

> In all labor there is profit, but the talk of the lips tendeth only to penury.
>
> As empty vessels make the loudest sound, so they that have the least wit are the greatest babblers.
>
> The habit of common and continuous speech is a symptom of mental deficiency.
>
> The less a man thinks, the more he talks.
>
> They always talk who never think.
>
> He that hath knowledge spareth his words.
>
> Even a fool, when he holdeth his peace, is counted wise.
>
> A fool's voice is known by a multitude of words
>
> A fool's mouth is his destruction.

Mr President, if it be true that a word to the wise is sufficient, sagacious Senators will heed these quoted warning words and in the future shun the broad, crooked highways of wasteful verbosity, loquacity, irrelevancy and confusion, and walk in the straight and narrow paths of economical usefulness, terseness, propriety and peace.

Let us firmly resolve that during the next session of the Congress we will vigorously strive, with the weapons of common sense, to lay the senatorial Tower of Babel as low as the walls of Jericho after the Levites had blown their trumpets against them.

In a great Shakespearean tragedy we learn that the Tribune Flavius, in rebuking the commoners for rejoicing in Caesar's triumph, said:

> Go, go, good countrymen, and, for this fault,
> Assemble all the poor men of your sort,
> Draw them to Tiber banks and weep your tears
> Into the channel, till the lowest stream
> Do kiss the most exalted shores of all.

We urge those who, during the present session, have most extravagantly wasted senatorial time and the taxpayers' money by persistently talking when the Senate should have been working to go to Potomac's banks and weep their penitential tears into the channel till its lowest stream do also kiss the most exalted shore of all. And let these exclusive proprietors of prattle, after having thus purged themselves of their vocal transgressions and verbal sins, return here on the eighth day of next January and diligently help to write upon the future's snow-white pages patriotic, humanitarian accomplishments so outstanding and beneficent that they will shame the past, glorify the present, and richly bless mankind till

> The trumpet of the Lord shall sound, and time shall be no more.

Henceforth let us habitually do noble senatorial deeds instead of idly talking all day long, and thus

> Make life, death and that vast forever
> One grand sweet song.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and concur therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 19, and 25 to the bill, and concurred therein; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 7, 8, 18, 24, and 26, to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S 355) to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and it was signed by the Vice President.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate

The report was read.

(For conference report see pp. 13762–13763, House proceedings, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of today.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5650, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S., *October 20, 1951.*

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 19, and 25 to the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"Not to exceed $2,000,000 of the appropriation in this chapter for defense community facilities and services shall be available to the Office of Education for payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools in critical defense

housing areas pursuant to section 10 of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874), as amended, and for providing school facilities and making grants pursuant to title III of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815), as amended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 5411, Eighty-second Congress."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$250,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: "$2,500,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$500,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in lines 9 and 10 of said amendment insert: "$1,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 602. None of the funds appropriated in this chapter shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work where cost estimates exceed $25,000 to be performed within the continental United States without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 604. No part of the funds made available by this act or any other act of the present Congress shall be used for the construction, replacement, or reactivation of any laundry or dry-cleaning facilities in the United States, its Territories, or possessions, as to which the Secretary of Defense does not certify, in writing, giving his reasons therefor, that the services to be furnished by such facilities are not obtainable from commercial sources at reasonable rates."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 7, 8, 18, 24, and 26.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

SALARIES OF POSTMASTERS AND POSTAL EMPLOYEES—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF BILL.

The Chair laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 4255) to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, assistant postmasters and supervisory officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes, passed by the House of Representatives on September 20, 1951.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, since the Senate has passed a bill on this subject, and it has been already enacted into law, House bill 4255 should be indefinitely postponed, and I so move.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS TO FORMER SENATOR RANSDELL, OF LOUISIANA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 230) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate hereby extends to the Honorable Joseph E Ransdell, of Louisiana, who served as a Member of the House of Representatives from 1899 to 1913 and as a Member of the Senate from 1913 to 1931, its cordial greeting on the occasion of his 93d birthday, which occurred on October 7, 1951, and expresses its admiration and gratitude for his long and devoted service to his country.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit a copy of this resolution to Senator Ransdell at his home at Lake Providence, La.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on Sunday, October 7, former Senator Joseph E. Ransdell celebrated his ninety-third birthday in his home town at Lake Providence, La.

He enjoys good health. He is still active. His mind seems undiminished in vigor.

He served Louisiana with distinction as a Member of the House of Representatives and of the Senate. His service in the House, from December 1899 to March 1913, included 12 years on the House Rivers and Harbors Committee; his service in the Senate from March 4, 1913, to March 4, 1931, included 18 years on the Senate Commerce Committee where he was particularly active in all matters relating to flood control.

He presided over the Rivers and Harbors Congress for 14 years, after having been active in its organization in January 1906; he authored the act of 1906 to eradicate Texas fever in cattle; the act of 1917 to create a national home for lepers—located at Carville, La.; the act of 1917—Ransdell-Humphreys bill; the first direct Federal appropriation for flood prevention; and the act of 1930 to establish in Washington the National Institute of Health.

He took a prominent part in the passage of the omnibus flood-control act of 1928, the culmination of nearly 30 years of diligent effort toward the prevention of floods and the improvement of rivers and harbors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and unanimously agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H Con. Res 171. Concurrent resolution providing that when the two Houses of Congress adjourn on Saturday, October 20, 1951, they stand adjourned sine die; and

H. Con. Res. 172. Concurrent resolution providing that, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a resolution (H. Res. 479) informing the Senate that a committee of two Members had been appointed to join a similar committee of the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Resolution 479, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES,
October 20, 1951.

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President I move that the Vice President appoint a committee of two Members of the Senate, to joint a similar committee appointed on the part of the House, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some further communication to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] as the committee on the part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 171, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concuring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, October 20, 1951, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate concur in the resolution of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 172, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Rep-

resentatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate concur in the resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the Secretary be, and he is hereby, authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives after the sine die adjournment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that, notwithstanding the final adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the President of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

PROPOSED CITIZENS' ADVISORY BOARD FOR RADIO AND TELEVISION

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, it is only because of the great urgency of the matter to which I am about to refer and because time is running out that I ask for recognition at this hour. I shall not take more than ten or twelve minutes. I think it is important to speak on this subject before Congress adjourns, because I know that many Members of the Senate are going to hear a great deal about it when they go back to their respective States. I am sure that some of my colleagues have already received letters from radio-station operators and owners in their States on the subject to which I shall address myself. It is because of this situation that I feel impelled to make a brief statement to the Senate prior to adjournment.

It is about six months since I first called the attention of the Senate to the great potential capacity of television to serve the public interest. Six months ago we had just seen a dramatic demonstration of this potential capacity during the hearings of the Kefauver committee. Indeed, it was my conversation with the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], who served on that committee, which prompted me first to speak to the Senate on that subject. The junior Senator from Wyoming joined me in submitting a resolution calling for a Senate study of the vastly exciting possibilities opened up by television for adult education, for school use, and for the civil life of our Nation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for the gavel pounding. This is a most important subject, and I would appreciate the attention of my colleagues.

I pointed out when the resolution was offered that, with the imminent unfreezing of nearly two thousand television channels and their allocation into private hands, the entire future of television, the future of what I call the most extraordinary communications instrument ever devised, surpassing the invention of printing, the invention of the motion picture, or any of the other great strides forward in the possibilities of communication between people, might be crystallized, and possibly irrevocably crystallized, for generations to come.

Later, at the suggestion of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. McFARLAND], who is chairman of the subcommittee to which the resolution was referred, we substituted for that resolution a much more specific set of proposals in the form of a new resolution and a bill. Joining us in sponsorship of these later measures were the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Still later we modified both these measures on the advice of present and past members of the Federal Communications Commission.

The most important among our proposals is the bill which would create a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television. This Board would consist of eleven outstanding private citizens—not Government officials—principally from the fields of education, publishing, public service, and civil life, to be selected by the President, to meet perhaps quarterly, and to be provided with a staff. The eleven appointees, of course, would be subject to confirmation by the Senate.

The principal function of this Board would be to issue an annual advisory report to the Congress, to the Federal Communications Commission, and to the public, reviewing the year's progress, or lack of progress in the public service rendered by radio and television, and making suggestions as to how such public service could be further developed.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. McFARLAND) and his colleagues on the subcommittee have thus far given two days to hearing testimony on the bill and on the resolution. Thus far the witnesses have been entirely proponents, those favoring the resolution and the bill. The committee has indicated that it will hold further hearings after Congress reconvenes with further proponents, as well as opponents, to be heard. Chairman Wayne Coy of the Federal Communications Commission has not yet testified.

Among the opponents will be representatives of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters. The staff of the Association professes to see in the proposed Citizens Advisory Board a threat of what it calls "indirect censorship." I have repeatedly explained how such a board could not possibly constitute such a threat. It is unimaginable that any President would appoint to this board eleven men and women who would set themselves up as a board of censors; and it is inconceivable to me that the Senate would even confirm the nominations of eleven men and women, serving in an advisory capacity, as a board of censors.

The sensitivity of the industry to any possible criticism, even by an advisory board, is so great that I have no doubt that the association will continue to circularize its members, and that Members of the Senate will be hearing from some of their constituents to the effect that the first amendment to the Constitution is in danger.

Mr. President, the association breaks itself down throughout the country into seventeen local groups. A week or so ago I heard from eight of those groups which had theretofore met in local meetings and had all adopted resolutions condemning the proposed Citizens' Advisory Board.

Because of this allegation under the leadership of the officials of the Radio Trade Association, I wish to read into the RECORD a formal statement on this subject which I have just received from the American Civil Liberties Union. The American Civil Liberties Union, with its long experience in fighting for freedom of thought and expression, and fighting against suppression and against censorship, does not issue a statement of this kind lightly. Its members are dedicated to one objective, and one objective only, and that is the objective of freedom for the individual. Its record is known to all of us. Its statement wholly refutes the fears and charges of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters. On the contrary, its statement shows that the proposed Citizens Advisory Board, far from developing a system of censorship, would have a result exactly the opposite. It would stimulate freedom and diversity of expression.

So here we have the case of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters resisting a proposal which, far from running counter to the spirit of the first amendment, actually would reinforce the freedom of speech to which the first amendment is dedicated. This freedom, of course, undergirds all our other freedoms.

Mr. President, because of the lateness of the hour and the desire to adjourn as early as possible, I shall read only two sentences from this statement, but I ask unanimous consent that the entire statement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION SUPPORTING IN GENERAL S. 1579, A BILL ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIO AND TELEVISION

The American Civil Liberties Union believes that the best guide to the health of democracy and civil liberties is the degree to which free expression prevails in our Nation. And we believe that free expression should not be confined to subjects on which our people share similar opinions. Freedom of speech in our democracy is most meaningful when it specifically emphasizes comment on controversial issues which are constantly before the public for consideration.

It is this debate—the interchange of ideas—which is the best example of a free society in action, and is the surest guaranty of preserving freedom. It is the element which distinguishes a free democratic land from that of a Communist dictatorship.

In actively defending the principle of free expression, the American Civil Liberties Union has repeatedly stressed as a corollary of that principle the importance of diversifying speech through as many channels of communication as are possible. Specifically in the field of radio and television, we have emphasized the need for a diversified program schedule so that opposing points of view can be presented to the public.

The radio and television industry has done a great deal to disseminate information and to promote discussion through its facilities. But the establishment of a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television is one means of improving on that record. In its capacity as an advisory board, it can study and recommend how the principle of diversity can be faithfully followed and how numerous points of view on different issues of public concern can be expressed, within the limits of time and available facilities. The FCC Blue Book of 1946, in our opinion, pointed up the necessity of studying the allocation of time by radio stations so that the public interest is safeguarded by a balanced and diversified program schedule.

The statement has been made that the proposed advisory board will ultimately wield the power of censorship over program content or exert pressures which will interfere with the normal operations of radio and television stations. As an indefatigable watchdog of civil liberties, the American Civil Liberties Union is ever vigilant to any threat of censorship and we would be the first to register our opposition to this measure if we believed that censorship control over programs was the motive behind the bill. We should expect that the personnel of the board, which must be approved by the Senate, will be persons of the highest caliber—as are the members of a similar advisory board counseling the State Department on its information program—and devoted to the principle of a free and responsible radio-TV system in the United States. We understand, too, from our reading of the bill that the board's function is advisory; the bill does not propose that it usurp any of the work of the Federal Communications Commission.

The American Civil Liberties Union supports this bill because it places emphasis on the question of reserving television channels for educational stations, the Radio Committee of the Union, which is composed of lawyers, educators and specialists in various field of radio and television, has declared itself in favor of the principle of reserving TV for educational stations, in accordance with our general policy of promoting diversity in the ownership of media of mass communications.

Our dedication to freedom of information and expression also leads us to comment affirmatively on point (e) 3 of section 6, which deals with the advisory board's study of the types of control over programing exercised by commercial sponsors, and the effect of such control on the development of high-quality public service radio and television programs. In addition to observing if such control does not interfere with a balance schedule, a continuing study of this kind would be helpful to persons holding minority or unpopular opinions—or accused of having these beliefs—and whose opportunities to air these views are sometimes curtailed because of pressures exerted on commercial sponsors. This situation has arisen on several occasions, unfortunately after the speaker had been invited to participate in a program and his appearance announced to the public. Cancellation under these circumstances, we submit, is a denial of the spirit of our constitutional guarantee of free speech, although perhaps not a technical violation.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I read from the statement:

It is this debate—the interchange of ideas—which is the best example of a free society in action, and it is the surest guaranty of preserving freedom. It is the element which distinguishes a free democratic land from that of a Communist dictatorship.

In actively defending the principle of free expression, the American Civil Liberties Union has repeatedly stressed as a corollary of that principle the importance of diversifying speech through as many channels of communication as are possible. Specifically in the field of radio and television, we have emphasized the need for a diversified program schedule so that opposing points of view can be presented to the public

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. For the information of the distinguished majority leader, I will say that I shall speak for about three or four more minutes. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the Senator from Connecticut has stated, I joined him in the resolution and in the bill. It seems to me that the work of the Senator from Connecticut in this respect is extremely important. Before television moves too far along in definite grooves, it is important to have diverted a few educational and informational channels. I hope the Senator from Connecticut will keep up his good work.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I am extremely grateful for the expression of the Senator from Massachusetts. I know of the Senator's leadership in this field in his State, and the work he has done for the Lowell group in Boston. I know the pressure to which he and his associates will be subjected, because the subject is extremely unpopular with very powerful interests in our States, namely, the radio station operators and owners. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I wish to commend the Senator from Connecticut for the efforts he has made and for the fight he has been waging to assure that a part of our television facilities be preserved for educational purposes. Once we lose them, once they become devoted to noneducational purposes, we can never reclaim them. Now is the time to make the fight. I want to congratulate and commend the Senator from Connecticut on the battle he is waging.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am most grateful for the Senator's expression.

Mr. President, when the FCC issued its temporary order setting up ten percent of the television frequencies for educational institutions, the National Association of Broadcasters met and adopted a resolution condemning the action of the FCC and condemning the FCC for allocating ten percent of the allocations to what the national association referred to as "a limited use for a limited purpose."

It is as though we were to say that our school buildings should be torn down and turned into apartment houses because they have such a limited use and serve such a limited purpose.

Worse than that, and equally alarming to me, are the rules that have slipped into the FCC regulations in recent years, by which educational institutions, under present rules, are bound when they get an allocation.

There is only one channel set up in my State of Connecticut for educational purposes, whereas the State commissioner of education wants four channels. There is only one channel set up in the great State of Massachusetts. There is not a single one set up in the State of New Jersey. As I pointed out before, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Jersey are not without a record of leadership in the field of education. Two allocations have been made for all three States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BENTON. I shall yield in a moment. First I wish to finish my explanation to the Senator from Alabama. Under an FCC regulation, if an educational institution secures one of these small number of licenses, it is prohibited from taking any money from anyone for any purpose. If it does so, it loses its license. That is to say, if Harvard University, for example, obtains a license in Boston and decides in its judgment to put on the Boston Symphony and to accept money in connection with putting on the Boston Symphony from a sponsor, or if it decides to sell extension courses, to try to teach people by television, and it charges a fee, just as it charges students who come to the university at night to take courses, it automatically becomes a commercial institution, even though the course may be operated for philanthropic purposes by a great university, such as Harvard University.

That is how far the rules of the FCC have infiltrated into our communications system to prevent the development of educational television.

I shall be glad to yield for a question to the Senator from Oregon, if he wishes to query me; but I shall have concluded my remarks in 3 or 4 minutes, unless I am interrupted.

I should like to quote from a letter sent on September 7 to the president of NAB by Mr. Paul Porter, former Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, now a highly respected and successful lawyer with important clients in the communications field. It is a significant letter which has come to me from a man whose law practice consists largely of clients in this field and who has the background of having been Chairman of the FCC. In this letter Mr. Porter is referring to a confidential news letter issued by the NAB, which Mr. Porter interprets in part as a personal attack upon me.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now?

Mr. BENTON. I shall read only two paragraphs from the letter. Yes, I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I find myself in accord with the feeling of the Senator from Con-

necticut with regard to the use of television for educational purposes. I should like to hear the Senator's comment on the fact, if he is aware of it, that, for example, we in Oregon have yet to receive from the Federal Communications Commission the allocation of a television channel for any purpose. I mention that in connection with the Senator's statement, to show how we in Oregon have been discriminated against in the television field.

Does the Senator from Connecticut think that action can be justified, in view of the argument he is making about television as a great medium of education for the American people?

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am referring to the so-called "freeze" in connection with television. In my State there is only one television station, and the great Hartford area has no television station.

Two thousands channels are now about to be allocated, and of course they will be allocated to Oregon and to other parts of the country. That very fact raises the issue of what will be done in that field in the case of existing property rights which, in turn, can stand in the way of the development of public-service stations and educational programs.

I read now from the letter from Mr. Porter:

> What you as president of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters should realize is that the American people are deeply aroused over the potential of television as a social force. It can bring great benefit or become an indifferent or detrimental influence in our society.
>
> I do not believe you can foreclose discussion of these vital considerations by ill-conceived efforts to smear those who are sincerely concerned about the use of this great media in our daily lives. The interest of men like Senators BENTON, BRICKER, SALTONSTALL, and HUNT in these problems is a reflection of the widespread concern of the people of this country on this subject I am sure that the industry itself treats this in a sincere and objective manner, and I suggest that unless the staff of its association takes a similar attitude it will do the industry a disservice and may invite really unpalatable remedies. Serious proposals by responsible people should not be met by slick innuendos or vilification. Nor should this vital question of public policy be obscured by unwarranted charges of censorship The industry has a duty to oppose censorship, but it will endanger its future if it cries "wolf" recklessly and heedlessly. If Government really undertook censorship, I am sure that you would find Senators BENTON, BRICKER, SALTONSTALL, and HUNT resisting such a course with all possible vigor But that is not the issue here, and, in my opinion, you are doing a great disservice to your membership by these tactics or personal attack:

Finally, Mr. President, I should like to refer to, and place in the RECORD, a letter which I have received this month from Mr. Raymond Rubicam. I now ask unanimous consent to have his letter printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, Mr. Rubicam has retired from the advertising agency business. Of course, he is one of the great names in the history of American advertising. I think most practitioners in that field will agree that during the thirties and forties, no advertising man was more highly admired and respected than was Mr. Rubicam. The agency he founded, Young & Rubicam, is one of the three or four largest in the world, and Mr. Rubicam himself is one of the great pioneers in the field of radio programing He and the agency he founded helped set the present entertainment pattern in the field of radio broadcasting and, of course, in the field of television, which developed from radio broadcasting

After retirement from his agency, Mr. Rubicam served for 2 or 3 years as the successor of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], as chairman of the research subcommittee of the Committee for Economic Development.

Mr President, I make this reference to show that Mr. Rubicam is highly respected by the entire business community

With his permission, I sent his letter to the distinguished editor, Norman Cousins, of the Saturday Review of Literature. I hoped Mr. Cousins might wish to publish the letter Somewhat to my surprise, my telephone rang the minute the letter reached Mr. Cousins' desk; he telephoned at once to me to express his gratitude for my sending the letter to him. He told me that any number of editors would be proud to publish the letter I understand that the letter will be published as an article, over Mr. Rubicam's name, in next week's issue of the Saturday Review of Literature. If my colleagues do not happen to see the letter in that publication, I hope they will read the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am sure the Senate as a whole will agree with me that the letter speaks loud with the voice of experience and authority, coming as it does from a man who has operated from almost the very beginning in the advertising field.

Mr. President, I now conclude my remarks by expressing the hope that the Senators who have patiently listened to me today will read the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow.

EXHIBIT A

SCOTTSDALE, ARIZ., *October 3, 1951.*

Hon WILLIAM BENTON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: Radio broadcasting as conducted in the United States has come nowhere near serving the American people as well as it ought to have served them. I am convinced that a large part of the reason lies in the domination of radio by the advertiser. Since I am no longer in the advertising business these views will be called, by many of my former associates, the newly acquired righteousness of a reformed sinner, but the fact remains that even when I was most active in advertising and in radio I held the same views, and would have welcomed a reduction of the percentage of radio time available to advertisers, and an enlargement of the public's opportunity to hear programs which would have little worth for the advertiser but great worth for the public.

After that introduction, I need not say that it would be in my view a tragedy to see the development of television confined by the limitations that have characterized radio At the same time I would like to make it clear that I am a fighting believer in the constructive value and, in fact, the indispensability of advertising in a modern free economy. I believe that the public will benefit if television continues to be a major advertising medium. What I am opposed to is what amounts practically to a monopoly of radio and television by advertisers to the point where the public's freedom of choice in programs is more of a theory than a fact, and to the point where the public service of the two media is only a shadow of what it could be.

For the most part only sellers of products of the broadest mass appeal can afford to use radio and television advertising, therefore, for the most part, only audiences of the largest sizes are of value and interest to the advertiser If the advertiser's program does not appeal to the number of people he wants and needs in order to maintain and increase his sales, he either grades his program down so as to reach more people, or if he cannot do that he gives up the program in favor of a new one that will reach more Obviously television ought to have numerous programs of the wide popular appeal that the advertiser is looking for, but programing, instead of practically ending there, should only begin there. Radio programing in the United States has been comparable to a school system in which everything stopped at the elementary grades designed for the largest number of students, and which consequently had no colleges, universities, or postgraduate schools to serve the rest of the population.

This kind of allegation has been regularly denied by the broadcasting industry, which quotes this and that program of cultural or educational character, but anyone who twirls a dial any day or night anywhere in the country knows that those programs are so few in number that they have only slightly more relation to the general character of radio than the singing of the Star-Spangled Banner at prize fights has to prize fighting.

Educators rightly protest against our national habit of saddling the schools and colleges with most if not all of the blame for our educational shortcomings. The educators point out that schools and colleges have the human being under their tutelage only a few years of his life, and even in those years have him only part of the time, and that most of his education comes from what he hears, sees, reads, and does away from the classroom In the field of print people have a lot better chance of escaping the worst than they have in radio There are printed publications specializing in almost every field of human interest, inquiry, thought, activity Such publications far outnumber the publications of mass circulation, and collectively they penetrate and serve the whole population, although their individual circulations are relatively small. It is also true of publishing that even those newspapers and magazines which typically take the low road to popularity often do more to serve minority interests and minorities among their readers than radio does

One reason for radio's limitations by comparison with the printed word has been the physical restriction on the number of stations we can have. But another reason, and I am sure a more potent one, is that advertisers in newspapers and magazines do not select or control the editorial contents of those publications—and that many printed vehicles carry no advertising at all In radio the advertiser largely determines what the public is offered in entertainment and information through his power of acceptance or rejection of programs, and because he is the sole source of broadcasting revenue. And the almost universal necessity for huge audiences to make the advertising pay has been a constant pressure downward on over-all

standards, and has led on the whole to a throttling of variety.

The infinite variety permitted by printed publication has helped bring man a long way in civilization. Without its stimulation to the many-sided occupations and talents of people, whether in work or recreation, the United States would never have become the accomplished nation it is. The further progress of American character, personality, and ability demands that individuals continue to be aided in following out many different lines of interest, inclination, and talent. While much of this job will continue to be done by the printed word, we nevertheless face an age in which a higher and higher percentage of what our minds take in will be taken in through radio and television. Their danger is that if misconducted they will make for a population standardized on a narrow base and a low level of preoccupation. In the end they are certain to overpower the printed word as an influence on people, and we are fools if we do not set them up to serve as much of our lives and to throw light on as many of our problems as they can.

The advertiser began paying for the public's radio because at the time that broadcasting started there seemed no way of collecting from listeners for the programs they selected, and the only way of collecting from the public at all seemed to be by means of a Government tax on radio sets, a proposal which understandably did not find favor, and which might very easily have brought radio too much under Government influence. But the seemingly insoluble problem which then existed of collecting directly from the public for its radio programs does not now exist in connection with television in view of such inventions and proposed services as Phonevision, Subscriber-Vision, and Telecoin, permitting programs to be received exclusively by those who pay for them. Such services could afford to broadcast, and could make money on, a wide range of programs appealing to much smaller groups or people than the advertiser would find profitable. When an advertiser sells goods as a result of a radio or television program the money he takes in must pay for his product as well as his program, hence his necessity for huge audiences. But the money taken in by the subscription broadcasters would go only to pay for the program. This, together with the fact that subscription broadcasters could charge prices generally comparable with motion picture admissions (more than many advertisers received for product and program), would make small audiences profitable. This in turn could mean that television broadcasting might eventually cover a range of subject matter almost as wide as the printed word now does. In entertainment, instead of radio's relatively invariable menu of crooning, crime, and gag-making, we might have not only current plays and movies, as has been pointed out, but everything else from the classics to woodworking-as-a-week-end hobby. I have seven grandchildren and, by a second marriage, two young children, ages 6 and 8, and I would feel a lot less helpless about their picture of the world if we had subscription television as well as advertising television.

Subscription broadcasting of television programs would create a new field for the free-enterprise system and would further the healthy competition we know we must have in business to keep it free and keep it serving us well. How can this proposal be seen in any other light?

As much as we need more varied entertainment in television, our need for more and better educational and informational programs is even greater. It seems to me that commercial subscription broadcasters could make important contributions in these fields, but that would be secondary to what could be done by stations devoted primarily to broad public education by qualified institutions, and it was very good news to me that the FCC had tentatively reserved a percentage of our potential television licenses for stations devoted to educational broadcasting. I note your questioning, and that of the New York Times and others, as to whether the FCC's ten percent is enough, and as to whether the proposed channels will provide enough power. These are matters about which I can have no opinion without far more information than I now have about all aspects of the problem. I suspect that most Members of Congress as well as people in general are in the same boat; and therein lies, to me, the importance of your fight for more time and more specific study—before it is too late—of what we ought to do from here on about the whole field of television. I could not agree more with anything you have said on the subject than I do with your statement that once we get set on the wrong lines with the remainder of our station assignments it will be too late to undo the damage.

Television, made free to serve the full range of public interest, and not confined to the narrow range of advertiser interest, is the best hope I know of to help us meet the strain which modern complexity puts on the process of self-government in a free society. With science rushing changes at us which affect every corner of our lives and bring every corner of the world closer, our need for greater grasp is desperate. (Our need for greater grasp of television is an example.) Our survival as a free people depends on our ability to acquire it. Apart from television's power to entertain, its power to inform is far beyond anything we have known, and probably far beyond what we now see.

You said in one of your earlier speeches in the Senate that the present international conflict is primarily and most importantly a war for men's minds. I imagine that many people who agree with you think that the way to win this war for men's minds around the world is to tell them a better story about democracy and freedom than the Soviets tell about communism. This is only part of the way to victory, much the lesser part. Regardless of what we say about ourselves via the Voice of America or other means, the kind of a people we are in action at home will speak much louder and in greater volume. No medium like television has ever before existed to reflect our character and actions now, and to help mold them for the future. Except for our military defense, what question is there before the country which is half as important as the question of the uses that will be made of television?

In asking for the creation of a National Citizens Advisory Commission to aid the public, the Congress and the FCC in thinking through the problems of this new force that has been thrust upon us, you are certainly on as sane and reasonable ground as any man could be on. You do not pretend to know all the answers, nor do you ask that the Government dictate the answers. What you ask is that the problems and possibilities be given the respect and study they deserve—and the public airing they ought to have—by a group of qualified citizens so that the best answers can be found. How can we afford to do less? And if we should have started on this earlier, as some say, we can still be thankful that you are fighting for it now, while there is still time.

My hat is off to you for your fight.

Yours sincerely,

RAY.

EXPRESSIONS OF APPRECIATION BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before the motion to adjourn is put, the Chair would like to wish all Senators a much deserved rest during the vacation between today and the 8th of January; and the Chair wishes to thank all Members of the Senate for the unfailing courtesies they have shown the Chair.

The Chair wishes the same for all the employees of the Senate who have worked industriously for 10 months in undertaking to make the record of our performance as efficient as possible. The Chair wishes for them a very happy and restful vacation, and a return in January strengthened in body and mind.

The Chair would also like to express, for himself, and on the part of the Senate, his appreciation to the press, the newspaper reporters who sit day after day in the press gallery and disseminate information concerning our work. The Chair wishes to thank them not only for their patience but also for their forbearance in view of our shortcomings as a body. The Chair also wishes for them a very restful and well-deserved and happy vacation between now and January.

INDEPENDENT AND NONSCHEDULED AIR TRANSPORTATION OPERATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] for a moment, because I wish to make a very few comments about the work of the committee of which he is chairman.

Mr. President, as this session draws to a close, I should like to call attention to the excellent work of the Select Committee on Small Business. Amid the various recriminations, charges, allegations and suspicions which have been brewing during the Eighty-second Congres , this committee has proceeded with outstanding harmony to do a job which may well have an abiding effect on our economy. Under the chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] we find that the committee has struck a significant blow for the competitive-enterprise system, not by the negative method of attacking the large corporations, but by the affirmative steps which it has taken to advance and strengthen the small-business enterprisers.

Among its varied accomplishments has been the work of that committee in the field of aviation. The excellent report on irregular aviation and its potential role in civil air transportation offered the first solution to the problem of finding a proper place for this important and creative new segment of our air transport industry.

Regrettably, certain members of the Civil Aeronautics Board seem prone to ignore this report, and to continue blindly to conduct what appears to be an actually punitive campaign against the small independents—a campaign which apparently penalizes them for efficiency, service, and economy.

Recently one of these independents, Modern Airlines, was ordered to stop flying. The Senator from Alabama protested so effectively that this line was granted the right to continue flying. However, another line, Air Transport Associates, which flies from Seattle to Alaska, was ordered to cease flying, on the grounds that it was operating too frequently and regularly. I understand that the curtailing of its flights has resulted in considerable business upheaval

and actual hardship to the citizens of Anchorage and other Alaska communities. In fact, in Alaska there are a great number of groups and large numbers of persons who are exceedingly concerned about the conduct of the Civil Aeronautics Board in relation to this particular air transport service.

While the Congress is not in session, it is entirely possible that the Civil Aeronautics Board may intensify its campaign to eliminate the independent airlines, using the technique which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has described as "strangulation by administrative regulation."

Mr. President, I, for one, would not like to return to the Congress in January to find that the Civil Aeronautics Board had continued its policy of stalking, tracking down, and executing whatever embryo competition exists in our civil aviation. The fact that the independent airlines have grown to an almost $200,000,000-a-year industry, in the face of such unwarranted administrative hostility by the Civil Aeronautics Board, is excellent proof that in America there is a real place for a nonsubsidized aircarrier industry.

Therefore, Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama whether he has in mind any program which will protect that segment of the aviation industry in the next few months, which may prove to be the critical period in the development of independent aviation. I should like to know whether the Senate Select Committee on Small Business intends to remain vigilant and watchful in regard to this problem while the Congress is not in session; and in that connection I now ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alabama may be permitted to make a very brief reply to my question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am very glad the distinguished Senator from Oregon has brought up this question, because it is one of considerable concern. I had hoped that before Congress adjourned I might have an opportunity to sit down with the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board and discuss with them this very important matter.

I have not been able to do so; but I have instructed the staff of our committee to stay in touch with the Civil Aeronautics Board and continue discussions pertaining to this matter.

Mr. President, what the Senator from Oregon has said is absolutely true. I commend to the careful reading of every Senator the report of the Small Business Committee on this particular problem. The report is very brief. We made only a few recommendations; but one of them in particular was that especial attention be given to Alaska.

The Governor of Alaska testified before our committee, and a number of other citizens of Alaska also testified as to the importance of the nonscheduled air carriers, in order to have fresh food brought to Alaska.

Immediately upon cancellation of the line which was serving Alaska, we received some very vigorous protests from merchants, from the Governor of Alaska, and from a great many others. It is a matter of great concern to the people of Alaska; and we should not forget that Alaska is often referred to as perhaps the weakest link in our defense chain. Certainly anything which weakens air transportation into Alaska further weakens the defense chain of which Alaska is an important part.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. CAPEHART rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon has the floor. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask the able Senator from Alabama a question. Does he feel that the Civil Aeronautics Board erred in canceling the contract or permit of the airline about which he is talking?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is a rather complicated matter, but it has not been an easy matter. I desire to say in all fairness to the Civil Aeronautics Board that it is a very difficult and complex problem to handle, and after the report and recommendation of the Small Business Committee, they agreed to withdraw the strangulation regulation which they had issued and to make a study of this problem, which they thought might require 18 months. By the way, they withdrew the order which had been directed against the line to which the Senator from Oregon referred. But when they did that they imposed a penalty on the other line the name of which as I recall is Air Transport Associates.

It did not mean much to me when I heard that that was the line from which they had withdrawn permission, or as they call it, the "certificate of exemption." I did not realize that that was a line which was serving Alaska; but it is.

My own personal feelings are that they ought to withdraw the order against Air Transport Associates, that they ought to pay special attention to the service which Alaska needs and requires, and they ought to carry on the study and work out some kind of program whereby the Nation will get full benefit of the economic defense value of the nonscheduled carriers.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then, I gather from the Senator's explanation that he is not prepared to say whether he thinks the Civil Aeronautics Board did or did not err in canceling the license.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad the able Senator from Indiana pursues his subject. The question has been one relative to the regulation, which has been outstanding for a very long time, and which has granted the nonscheduled carriers a certificate of exemption and permitted them to operate, provided their operations would be infrequent and irregular. Who knows what the term "infrequent and irregular" means? Consequently the carriers have all been in doubt. They did not know whether it meant that they could fly every other day, or three times a week, or what it might mean.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Finally, the Board has recognized that when it issued this strangulation order, it said they could fly only three times a month between certain designated points, and only eight times a month between other points.

Mr. CAPEHART. The point is, of course, that the Congress passed the law which the Senator has just described.

Mr SPARKMAN. There is some question in the law.

Mr. CAPEHART. Therefore, the Senator, as chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, is not prepared, I gather from what he has said, to tell us whether he thinks the Civil Aeronautics Board did or did not err in canceling the permit.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will put it in this way: I believe from the standpoint of policy they did. I am not prepared to say they did so far as the law is concerned.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator, as chairman of the committee, prepared to say that he holds to the point of view that the CAB should allow more air service into Alaska rather than less?

Mr. SPARKMAN That is correct. Pending the study which they are making of the entire set-up, I certainly believe they ought to try to work out some arrangement whereby air transportation may be continued into Alaska.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am about through. I only wish to say in conclusion that I am very glad to have the concurrence of the Select Committee on Small Business and to know that the committee is going to maintain its vigilance over this problem of aviation, because I think any study of the record will show that the small airline companies are being unfairly discriminated against by the CAB. Once again we need to be constantly on guard against the development of a subsidized monopoly, in this instance, in the field of aviation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question along the line of his remarks?

Mr. MORSE I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am deeply interested in the remarks of the Senator, and in the subject matter which he is discussing. I know that Senators want to conclude the business of the session, and in order to save time, I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon will allow me to ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the subject.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement by Mr. CHAVEZ is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

It would be improper for me to try the patience of this body with any lengthy discussions, at this late hour, of the problem involved in the relationship between administrative agencies and the Congress.

However, there is one matter which should be dealt with before adjournment, since serious and perhaps irreparable damage may take place, during our absence, unless proper warning is given at this time. On August

29, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] addressed the Senate, speaking in his capacity as chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business. That committee had completed a most able and detailed report on the problem of the independent air-carriers, the so-called nonskeds, in our civil aviation industry That report called upon the CAB to follow a definite and positive program regarding these useful, unsubsidized aircarriers which have pioneered and developed valuable new frontiers in flying. That report also called upon the Civil Aeronautics Board to cease and desist from its program of eliminating these independent enterprises for flying "too regularly and too frequently" It asked that violations be set aside until a new policy is set forth which allows a proper and legal place in aviation for carriers which have so clearly demonstrated their ability to fly safely and serve the public with the lowest cost and most rapid transportation ever achieved in the history of man's mechanical and economic ingenuity This unanimous Senate Small Business Committee report was issued on July 10 of this year .

As I indicated, Senator SPARKMAN was constrained to address the Senate on August 29, because the CAB had just executed another independent airline This was done without any notice being given to the Senate Small Business Committee or heed being paid to the report of that committee That particular airline has been reinstated, largely as a result of the forthright stand of the Senator from Alabama

The junior Senator from Alabama was aroused, and I feel that if anything, he showed great restraint and forebearance in this matter. I quote a few of the Senator's remarks

"I have been disappointed in the fact, first of all, that the Civil Aeronautics Board apparently has made no effort to work out a program whereby this tremendous asset to the economy, the security, the defense of the United States may be maintained I believe that, if necessary, legislation should be enacted to safeguard against such a death sentence as the Board promulgated some time ago. Certainly I believe that we ought to express most strongly our disapproval of the slow death by strangulation that they are practicing now by administrative order. We recognized the danger from the very beginning, that one by one, as they come up to apply for exemption, the Board could refuse to give them exemption, their right to continue to operate for another year, and, therefore, they would be forced out of business Instead of all of them being forced out of business at once, they are gradually being forced out as they come up, one by one It may be a slower death, it may be less painful, but it is just as certain and it is just as harmful and just as destructive to the economy and the security of the country We should keep our implied pledge when we sold our surplus airplanes to those young veterans in order that they might go into the business.

"Clearly, the majority of CAB seems bent on ignoring the Senate Apparently the CAB would like to turn its back on the solution to this problem which was offered by the Senate Small Business Committee and which recognized, along with the CAB and the rest of the air industry, that irregular flight by large passenger equipment are unfeasible and uneconomical. The CAB's decision in this recent case is but a further example of the Board's unwillingness to recognize any of the economic realities of aviation.

"Certainly such a policy by this administrative agency, carried on in spite of the express wish of a committee of Congress, and in defiance of the economic forces which are so potently at work in air transportation today, must lead this Board to a position where all of its decisions, and its very competence will be seriously questioned. Our committee sought an equitable solution and set forth a possible course. But we have yet to see any action by the Board indicating that it is sincerely trying to expand civil aviation with broadest possible public service as its goal. Instead, we see continued the attitude of a Board that is insensitive to the will of Congress and to the needs of the community."

I am not discussing the merits of free competition in aviation and the role of independent small business—matters about which the senior Senator from New Mexico feels most strongly. I am talking about the willful and flagrant disregard on the part of administrative agencies for the express wishes and purposes of the Congress. We set up these agencies, we appropriate the public funds for their operation and we find, after a few years, that they have become a law unto themselves, operating solely within their own discretion, relying upon the tremendous preoccupation of the Congress to give them immunity. We are too occupied on too many fronts to give detailed personal attention to each and every agency. We cannot appoint "watchdog committees" to oversee these agencies which cover the complex phases of American life We must rely upon the good faith of the various administrative heads not to flout the will of Congress and not to play fast and loose with the public interest

Recently the CAB announced that it was undertaking a detailed study of the problem of the 63 large irregular air carriers, and that, according to the CAB's announcement, "the scope of its investigation would include all matters relating to and concerning non-scheduled-air transportation operated by these 63 carriers, and whether or not there is a need for this non-scheduled air transportation in addition to and supplemental to the regular and frequent air transportation performed by the scheduled air carriers over specific routes"

Now, they also stated that pending the completion of this investigation they would continue to enforce their constrictive and limiting regulations, and they announced that they would use "the same tests and the same standards" which they have been using up to the present for the elimination of these independent enterprises. If the board pursues this policy all the independent carriers will be out of business by the time the study is completed

As if to illustrate this, the CAB issued an order suspending an independent air carrier, Air Transport Associates, Inc., which flies from Seattle to Alaska, bringing much of the fresh food and freight which is the salvation of the struggling Alaska communities. The board's death sentence on this airline was issued on August 29, simultaneously with its order for a complete study of the problem.

Now that Congress is adjourning, what indication is there that the next few months will not see a continuation of this process of "strangulation by regulation," as Senator SPARKMAN describes it, and what assurance do we have by the time the CAB has completed its story, it will not with its left hand have liquidated the most important independent lines, and thus have broken the backbone of the competitive branch of air transportation?

I submit that if we return in January and find that the vendetta against the independents has been continued, and we find that other nonskeds have also received or are about to receive the treatment of the Air Transport Associates, we will be in the position of coroners holding an inquest over the corpse of free enterprise in aviation.

If, during the intervening months another nonsched independent is put out of business, I think this would be an act of bad faith on the part of the CAB toward the Congress.

I hope that the able Senator from Alabama, and his distinguished colleagues of the Senate Small Business Committee, will continue their vigilance, and protect the freedom of our skies for safe, economical, forward-looking aviation. I do not believe that the spacious skies which we sing about in our patriotic anthem were meant to be cut up and subdivided for the exclusive use of a few subsidy-minded corporations. There must be no monopoly in civil aviation, and the best guaranty against monopoly is a healthy spirit of free competition.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MOODY ORDERED PRINTED IN THE RECORD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a speech by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY]. It is an advance copy of a speech which it has been my privilege to read today, and which he will deliver next Monday evening, October 22, to the Economic Club of Detroit It is an exceedingly able speech, which is deserving of a reading by his colleagues in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TERMINATION OF A STATE OF WAR WITH GERMANY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in connection with the motion I made to reconsider the vote by which the Senate passed House Joint Resolution 289, terminating the war with Germany—a motion which failed to achieve its purpose because of the unusual celerity with which the wheels of our legislative machinery turned yesterday—I ask unanimous consent that the text of a letter which I wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with a memorandum relating to the constitutionality of the proviso in House Joint Resolution 289.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 21, 1951.

Hon TOM CONNALLY,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At the time that House Joint Resolution 289 (to end the war with Germany) was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, I entertained some doubts as to the wisdom of such reference The decision to end the war is naturally a matter with which the Foreign Relations Committee is concerned, but the proviso of that resolution which retains the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act is a matter with which the Committee on the Judiciary is vitally concerned I have made an extensive study of the matter, and it leads me to suggest that this resolution be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There are two sound jurisdictional reasons why the Committee on the Judiciary should have House Joint Resolution 289 referred to it. Both of these are set forth in the Reorganization Act of 1946. That act gives the Committee on the Judiciary jurisdiction over (a) the revision and codification of United States statutes, and (b) measures relating to claims against the United States.

Of primary concern to the Judiciary Committee is the proviso which relates to the Trading With the Enemy Act. There is a serious question of the constitutionality of this proviso, since it is subject to the construction that the United States may continue to vest property which was subject to vesting prior to January 1, 1947. As an incident of that problem, another legal question arises as to whether this proviso does in fact authorize continued vesting of German property.

Section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, which was enacted as part of the War Claims Act, gives rise to other constitutional questions. That section prohibits the return of vested property to nationals of Germany. If vesting may still take place, that will amount to confiscation since section 39 prohibits a return At least as far as friendly German aliens in this country are concerned, it is doubtful that this provision would be constitutional.

I am certain, Senator, that you appreciate my concern in this matter, and you may rest assured that I will attempt to satisfy any questions you may care to address to the Committee on the Judiciary in this regard.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 289 TERMINATING WAR WITH GERMANY

This resolution provides that any property or interest therein which was subject to vesting or seizure under the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, or which has already been vested or seized under that act prior to January 1, 1947, shall continue to be subject to the provisions of that act. The language of House Joint Resolution 289 authorizes the future vesting of property. Under the resolution, property which could have been vested prior to the termination of the state of war may still be vested pursuant to the act There is no indicaton in the House report accompanying House Joint Resolution 289 that this resolution seeks to enable continued vesting after passage of the resolution. It indicates that the resolution enables the United States to continue to hold vested property seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Section 5 (b) (1) of the Trading With the Enemy Act authorizes the vesting of any property or interest of any foreign country or national thereof during time of war or during any other period of national emergency declared by the President

Section 7 (c) of the Trading With the Enemy Act provides for the seizure of any property belonging to, or held for the benefit of, any enemy by the Alien Property Custodian. Under section 2 of the act "enemy" is defined as "any individual * * * of any nationality, resident within the territory * * * of any nation with which the United States is at war."

The Provisions in House Joint Resolution 289, with respect to continued vesting, is that any property or interest therein "shall continue to be subject to the provisions of that act in the same manner and to the same extent as if this resolution had not been adopted." The language importing that the property might be seized may be surplusage, but some proponents of this part of the proviso assume that the seizure can be accomplished.

The language of the proviso is broad enough to subject it to the possible construction that the state of war is ended except for the Trading With the Enemy Act. If the state of war is continued in this regard when in fact it has terminated in all other respects, it is not consistent with the cases (cited below) decided under the war power of the Constitution. It is certainly not consistent with the policy of this resolution as stated in the House report accompanying it. That policy is stated to be friendship between Germany and the United States, so that the German people may be brought more closely into the Western Alliance.

House Joint Resolution 382, which was approved March 3, 1921, sought to provide the termination date for the state of war in the First World War. It provided in regard to the Training With Enemy Act that it should be excepted from the operation and effect of this resolution. This would indicate that Congress after the First World War allowed the state of war to continue in relation to the Trading With the Enemy Act. If this proposition is correct, then continued vesting after World War I was still possible under the act, although there was no express provision for it as there is in this resolution.

Continuing the state of war in this regard raises another problem under sections 9 and 33 of the act. Congress must continue to provide additional periods in which claims may be filed for the return of this property or the constitutionality of this power to continue vesting is at best doubtful. *Stohr* v. *Wallace* (see subsequent discussion)

There is likewise a constitutional question as to whether Congress may retain a state of war in regard to one particular piece of legislation such as the Trading With the Enemy Act Under article I, section 8, clause 11, Congress can declare war That condition or state exists until terminated by proclamation, treaty, or joint resolution. (See House report accompanying H J. Res. 289). As an incident of ending the state of war, it would appear wholly logical that Congress may adopt a piecemeal method and exclude ending the state of war in regard to one act, such as the Trading With the Enemy Act. To do so, however, may accomplish three doubtful aims: (1) It first of all maintains in operation an office of the executive branch with vesting powers when the need for such an activity is doubtful; (2) it secondly adopts a policy of vesting property during otherwise peaceful times when the purpose of vesting enemy property has ceased to exist. The policy behind the Trading With the Enemy Act has been to prevent economic interests under the control of the United States from being used against the United States during an actual period of conflict; (3) and thirdly the exception created by this resolution in regard to the Trading With the Enemy Act defeats in part the primary objective of the resolution, which as expressed in the House report is to restore friendly relations between Americans and Germans

The cases which have upheld the constitutionality of the Trading With the Enemy Act do little more than provide a background upon which the decisions, which now confront the committee, can be made. Seizure under section 7 (c) has been held to be within the war powers of Congress and not to be a denial of due process. *Great Northern Ry. Co.* v. *Sutherland Alien Property Custodian* (278 U. S. 182, 47 S. Ct 315 (1927)).

It has likewise been held under section 7 (c) that seizure without the right of the owner to have his claim determined before seizure is constitutional in view of the right to bring suit under section 9 to get it returned. *Stohr* v. *Wallace* (269 F. 827 (DCNY 1920) affirmed 255 U. S. 239, 41 S. Ct. 293 (1921)).

In *Biesantz* v. *Supreme Council of Royal Arcanum* (175 N. Y. S. 46, 106 Misc. Rep. 549 (1919)) that the summary seizure of property is the exercise of the right conferred on Congress under article I, section 8, clause 11, and section 9 of the act satisfies the fifth amendment as to due process.

In *Henkels* v. *Miller* (4 F. (2d) 968 (CCANY 1925)) reversed on other grounds (271 U. S. 298, 46 S. Ct. 524 (1926)), the court held that Congress in time of war may authorize the seizure of property believed to be enemy owned, if adequate provision is made for its return in case of mistake.

In the light of these decisions, if House Joint Resolution 289 does provide for vesting property, it would not stand up constitutionally. The Trading With the Enemy Act is authorized under the war power (*Stohr* v. *Wallace*, supra), and it is strictly a war measure Clearly when the state of war is terminated, the authority under that clause ceases. Furthermore, the entire policy of the Trading With the Enemy Act is designed to prevent property under the control of the United States from being used against it in time of war. With the termination of the state of war that policy likewise ceases.

Aliens, as well as citizens, are entitled to the protection of the due process clause of the fifth amendment, *U. S* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203, 62 S. Ct. 552 (1942)), citing *Russian Fleet* v *U S* (282 U S. 481 at p 489) Undoubtedly the vesting of the property of a friendly alien, especially one residing in this country, would be a violation of this amendment

If a technical state of war is allowed to exist in regard to this one act, the constitutional arguments against continued vesting may disappear, but the three above-mentioned policy arguments against the proviso remain.

Another constitutional problem will be resolved perhaps in the next term of the Supreme Court. Section 39, which is a recent amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act, denies returns of property to German and Japanese nationals. *Guessefeldt* v. *McGrath* upheld the literal interpretation of that section, but did not go into the constitutional issues when a German national was denied return of his property. *Nagano* v. *McGrath*, in applying the same section, indicated that if interpreted literally so as to deny all returns, there were grave doubts as to the constitutionality of section 39 under the fifth amendment In both cases applications are now pending before the Supreme Court. (Both cases are subsequently discussed.)

Section 39 probably is entirely valid in its application during time of war Just as positively the same section, if sought to be enforced after the termination of the war, appears invalid, at least in regard to friendly aliens.

ELIMINATION OF THE PROVISO

If the proviso in House Joint Resolution is eliminated, there is a conflict of opinion whether any return can be made to a German or Japanese national (sec. 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, sec. 12, 62 Stat 1246, 50 U S. C. App). Section 39 was passed as a part of the War Claims Act. Its language is specific and sweeping in denying return of "any property or interest therein of Germany or Japan or any national of either such country vested * * * at any time after December 17, 1941 * * * to former owners thereof or their successors in interest."

In *Guessefeldt* v *McGrath* (U S Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia circuit, May 3, 1951) (present Supreme Court Docket No. 204) section 39 was interpreted literally and consequently no national of Germany, wherever resident or however loyal, etc., can recover property any longer. As long as this interpretation is given effect, the elimination of the proviso will have no effect on whether Germans are considered enemies or just aliens.

Just prior to the decision in the Guessefeldt case, *Nagano* v. *McGrath* (U. S Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, February 26, 1951) (present Supreme Court Docket No. 169) was decided. In that case, it was determined that section 39 was not intended to repeal section 9 (which allows the party

whose property was taken to sue for a return) and consequently friendly alien residents could recover untainted American property. In this opinion, the court admitted that section 39, if literally construed, would prohibit a return to any national. The court in the Nagano case felt, however, that Congress did not intend "to deprive non-enemy-alien residents of the United States of their existing right to recover property owned by them."

Under this decision, it would seem that Germans residing in Germany during the war would still be unable to get their property. Unfriendly German aliens would likewise be excluded from a recovery. But Germans residing in this country who fall into the category of nonenemy residents would be entitled to a recovery. And to this extent the War Claims Fund would be diminished.

TRIBUTES TO THE VICE PRESIDENT AND THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am sure I voice the sentiments of every Member of this body, the employees of the Senate, and the members of the press, when I say that the words spoken by the great Vice President of the United States, expressing his wishes for a pleasant vacation, are fully reciprocated by each and every one of us. When the Senate reconvenes again, we shall expect to see the Vice President in his accustomed place, with all of his wisdom, the fruition of years of experience, with all of his sense of fairness, as well as his sense of humor, which combine to make him a great American

Mr. President, before the Senate shall adjourn sine die I should like to give expression of my admiration for the services performed during this session of the Senate by the distinguished majority leader, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND]. Not in my time, and I know of few instances in parliamentary history, has any man occupied that position who has been confronted with more difficult problems than has the Senator from Arizona. They have not only been difficult problems, but new problems of great perplexity have arisen when we did not have the lamp of experience to guide us in our deliberations.

The Senator from Arizona has brought to bear in the discharge of his duties a patience far beyond that possessed by most of the human family. He has brought to the arduous duties of majority leader an understanding of human nature, great ability, and perseverance that have enabled him to make a magnificent record of service.

Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion about this Congress, but I predict that when the historian of the future looks beneath all the confusion which has attended some of our deliberations, when he peers beyond the numerous investigations which have been held, and hearings of one kind or another, he will say that this session of Congress had a record of solid legislative achievement. I say that without fear, because I believe during this session of Congress we took steps which will contribute to the strengthening of America, to the solidification of the free world, and to arresting the aggression of forces that threaten the rights and liberties of mankind everywhere.

A man of lesser strength of character would have folded up under the terrific pressure brought to bear upon him. I am proud to have served in this body with the distinguished Senator from Arizona and to have endeavored to assist him in his many duties, and I am proud to claim him as a friend.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I desire to express my gratification for the words of the Senator from Georgia. I appreciate the tribute he has paid to the Vice President, who is not only one of the most remarkable men, but one of the greatest Americans in our history.

I had the honor to serve with the distinguished Senator from Georgia on the Democratic Policy Committee under the chairmanship of our distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Arizona. I think I should say, and I think the Senator from Georgia will agree with me, that in that committee we have a pretty keen insight into the many vexing, and I may say, at times almost unfathomable problems. The majority leadership is always in a position of tremendous responsibility and always requires the greatest ability and skill, but I believe that in all my years of service, both in the House and in the Senate, I have never known a time when the majority leader carried such great burdens or had such a difficult task as the majority leader has had during this session of the Congress.

I join with the Senator from Georgia in commending the patience, the devotion, and the character of the distinguished majority leader, and to testify how ably and well he has performed the duties entrusted to him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr President, it is particularly pleasant for me to join with the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the committee of which I am a member, in the remarks he has just made. I may say to the Vice President that he wields his gavel with a sense of humor which is always delightful and which makes us glad he is coming back in January to wield it again. Even when his face looks severe and he wields the gavel hard, he wields it with fairness and with utter absence of partiality.

Mr. Vice President, on behalf of Senators on this side of the aisle, I wish you a pleasant vacation. We hope that your speeches will be as friendly and favorable to us on this side of the aisle as they will be to those on the other side of the aisle, because I know you are capable of making them so.

I wish the minority leader [Mr. WHERRY] were here to express the sentiments of Members on this side of the aisle. I know what he would say regarding the majority leader. I know he would say that it is easy to work with him, that he is courteous, fair, and temperate in his dealings with us on this side of the aisle. In the brief time in which I have been occupying the chair of the acting minority leader we have had a good time together; we have worked together, and, so far as I know, we have not added too much to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in working to bring the session to a close.

I hope the majority leader will have a happy time in Arizona. While it was hot in Arizona he kept us here; while it was cool in Massachusetts in the middle of the summer he kept us here. Now he sends me to snow and he goes back to warm weather in Arizona.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In reference to the speeches which the Chair will make during the recess, he is reminded of the man who had for most of his life gone to town every Saturday and returned in an inebriated condition. One Saturday his wife said to him "Will you please come home sober tonight?" He said, "I will do my best."

She said, "Let us kneel down and pray."

He prayed, "Lord, help me to do right."

Getting nearer to town, he said, "Lord, help me to do about right"

Going into town, and knowing what would happen, he said, "Lord, help me to do as right as the circumstances will permit." [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the genuine expressions of admiration and respect made by the junior Senator from Georgia concerning the distinguished Vice President and the very able majority leader. I am very grateful for the opportunity of having worked under the leadership and direction of both of them during the first session of this Congress.

I have been rather closely associated with the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MACFARLAND] from early in the morning until late in the evening. I have always found him to be a fair, patient, tolerant Senator and a very able leader. This session of Congress has been one of the most significant, in my judgment, in the history of the Republic. It has also been one of the most unique. It is unique, I think, because of the type of legislation we have considered and enacted rather than for the quantity that has been passed. I think the quality of the legislation that has been passed by this body is largely the result of the counsel, leadership, and assistance of the great majority leader, with the aid of the minority leader [Mr. WHERRY], and the acting minority leader [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I believe historians will show that this has been a preparedness Congress, a Congress which has looked to the future instead of to the past, and when its history is finally written I know that in it the able leader of the majority will play a prominent part.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the sentiments which have been expressed particularly regarding our majority leader.

About 30 minutes ago I went to his desk and said to him, "Mac, you have not disappointed anyone. You have been patient, you have been courageous, you have been helpful, you have been a genuine leader."

Mr. President, while of course our first thoughts turn to our majority leader, I wish to say for the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who is ill, and who is not present this evening, that he has been most cooperative, and has at all times shown a spirit of helpfulness in expediting the work of the Senate, and he certainly has extended me courtesies, for which I am grateful.

I feel that I would be remiss if I did not say that the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the majority whip, has been simply marvelous to all of us.

Mr. President, I desired to express these sentiments for the RECORD.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. It is a pleasure and privilege not only to endorse but to claim as my own the sentiments which have been so generously and eloquently expressed with respect to the great man who presides over this body, and with reference to our esteemed, respected, and able majority leader [Mr. MCFARLAND] and his great assistant, the able junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. Under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Arizona and his outstanding assistant, our colleague from Texas, it is my conviction that the majority party has been instrumental, in this session of the Congress, in proving its worthiness of the confidence of the people.

Mr. President I should like to say just a word of esteem and affection for the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who is absent today because of illness. I have written him a letter in which I told him that I miss him, and, frankly, I do. In my opinion the welfare of his party has certainly been ably guarded by those who were here, but I cannot help feeling that it would have fared better had he been present. I wrote him that I was torn between two emotions, a feeling of gratification that his party was not doing any better than it was in his absence, and at the same time a personal desire to see him return at as early a time as possible, but in such a manner as not to further the cause of his party too much.

I would not say that there was any similarity in my feeling toward the majority leader to that expressed by one who was referring to the fact that his best friend had run off with his wife, and who was expressing his deep disappointment at what had occurred. He said, "I certainly hope they return early, because I miss him so much."

Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for yielding to me for this expression, and say to him and to the other Members of this great body, on this side of the aisle, as well as those on the other side, that I had great joy in serving with him and with them, and I extend my very best wishes to the Members of the Senate for a fine vacation and for a safe return.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. As one who did not vote for the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] in the Democratic caucus when we met to choose a majority leader in January, I take great pleasure in associating myself with the Senator from Georgia and the other distinguished speakers in expressing my admiration for the fine and helpful manner in which the majority leader has discharged the great responsibilities of his office.

I agree with the Senator from Georgia that there has never been a time, there certainly has not been within my memory, when the country was faced with so many serious problems, so many tremendous difficulties, in meeting which the action of the Congress meant so much to the security and welfare of our country. To have been an able and successful majority leader during that period is a pinnacle which few people have had the privilege of attaining, and which few people could have discharged so well as the present majority leader, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND].

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. The quality of the work we have performed in the Senate is for the American people to judge, but the friendship with the type of men with whom we have been associated during our service in the Senate is a privilege which each of us can enjoy, as we come to appraise and to judge the caliber of these men.

I am sure I bespeak the sentiments of the younger Members of this august body when I say that all the Senators who are serving in the Senate, including the lady from the great State of Maine, have been most courteous to us at all times.

A short time ago we had a little party in which the new Members extended their felicitations to our distinguished majority leader. I stated at that time that each of us had the highest respect and admiration for him, and that respect and that admiration grew from day to day. He has always been very courteous, he has always been very sympathetic and understanding, and he has earned for himself a well-deserved affection. I earnestly hope that he and his family will enjoy a well-earned period of rest and relaxation, that they will find invigoration, and that he will come back in January and give to the country the quality of leadership he has heretofore furnished on behalf of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I would not stop with these words, because there are many others who deserve our praise and gratitude. The Vice President of the United States has always been understanding and courteous to the younger Members of the Senate. Also to Felton Johnston, secretary to the majority, to Charlie Watkins, the Parliamentarian, and to all the other officials of the Senate, we are deeply grateful for the fine treatment they have extended to us. I hope they will all enjoy themselves during the vacation period.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in but a moment I shall yield the floor. I was not upon the floor of the Senate when a resolution was passed extending the cordial good wishes of the Senate for an early recovery to the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. I should be false to a friendship which I highly prize, which I prize beyond words, if I did not take this occasion to profess my profound sorrow that sickness has taken him from the Senate for such a length of time, and to express my earnest hope that he will experience an early recovery and will be his own ebullient, fighting self when the Senate reconvenes in January 1952.

Mr. President, I served with the Senator from Nebraska when he was majority leader and while he has been minority leader. I have been arrayed against him in legislative strife. There have been occasions when he and I have seen eye to eye and fought side by side. He is a fine, stalwart American, with a highly developed sense of fairness and fair play. He has made a great contribution to the functioning of this body. As one who prizes his personal friendship, I wish to add my expression of sincere hope that he will soon be fully restored to health and return to this body and to his friends.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made in tribute to the Vice President, and also to the leaders of the Senate. It is a difficult task to preside over a body composed of 96 Members from 48 States, representing various philosophies of government and different ideas. The Vice President discharges that duty with great care and judgment. I am sure that all Senators feel that as a presiding officer he has been fair in his judgments, even though at times we may exercise the parliamentary prerogative to appeal from the decision of the Chair. That casts no reflection whatever upon the decision of the Chair, which is rendered honestly, and which is right as he sees it.

The majority leader has a very difficult position. He fills it very ably, and with great distinction. It requires great ability, energy, and effort to fill that position. I know I speak also for all members of the minority in expressing affectionate appreciation of the courtesies he extends to us daily.

I am sure that the burden of work in the Senate has caused the illness of the minority leader [Mr. WHERRY]. We all regret his absence at this particular time because of illness. We wish for him a speedy recovery. In his absence the minority has had the good fortune to have the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] available to discharge the functions of acting leader, which he has done with his characteristic competence and good will.

These men must carry on the work of the Senate. Their positions are difficult to fill, in view of the great variety of opinion in the Senate. However, we recognize that they are discharging their duties honestly and with the judgment which God has given them. We appreciate their service

This is the outstanding legislative body in all the world. It is composed of 95 men and one woman. Its Members carry on the great traditions of the United States of America, which believes in a government of laws and not of men. Here we help make the laws which are binding upon all our citizens There is no greater trust than the work of the Congress of the United States. I am sure that every Member of each body feels that responsibility and seeks to meet it courageously and conscientiously.

If it were not for the great personalities in the Senate and the friendships which we develop among Senators, whether they be on the minority side or the majority side, it would be impossible to carry this great burden. It would wear out the souls and spirits of men But we are daily revitalized by our friendships with these men and those other employees of the Senate who serve along side us I want to express my personal appreciation to each of them—the members of the committee staffs, the Parliamentarian, the official reporters, the secretaries and all others, not neglecting the pages All of them serve their jobs loyally and with good will. It is in such an atmosphere that we as Senators are constantly revitalized and enabled to carry forward our own tasks.

In closing, I wish all Senators and all members of the staff connected with the Senate a very pleasant vacation I know that they deserve it because of their work here I hope that everyone will be able to return in January refreshed and revitalized by reason of the strength which we receive from back home, from the people in whose name we seek to carry on the great tradition of the making of laws for the Government of our Nation.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to say one word about my friend, the able majority leader. If there must be a Democrat as majority leader, I hope it will always be McFARLAND.

Mr GREEN. Mr. President, I have not hitherto joined in the chorus of praise and gratitude to the Vice President and to the majority leader and minority leader, because I thought that almost everything had been said that could be said. I wish now to state that I heartily approve those tributes of praise and gratitude.

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am not surprised to hear the expressions of praise and commendation for our majority leader [Mr. McFARLAND]. I remember that when we were looking around to choose someone to be majority leader we considered many points. One of the points we considered was that we wanted someone who had the necessary tact and ability to meet all the problems we might face in the Senate this year and next year. We decided upon the junior Senator from Arizona. I am satisfied today, after listening to both Republicans and Democrats praise our majority leader, that we did not make a mistake. I know that in the future we will find that he will continue to be the great leader that he has shown himself to be during this session.

DISCONTINUANCE OF TRIS COFFIN'S TELEVISION PROGRAM

Mr MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD, without taking the time to read it, a statement which I have prepared relative to Tris Coffin's television program

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

Many of us who have appeared on Tris Coffin's television program, or who have watched it were surprised to learn that Thursday that it will not longer be on the air It will be replaced, I suppose by lady wrestlers or the strained comedy that burdens television these days

I know many will share my view that this program, Washington Report, brought to the American public important issues clearly and without the rancor that seems to be a "must" in so many television public events programs Tris Coffin was giving real public service, and I regret that DuMont Television has not kept it on the air

There should be a place for this kind of sympathetic, factual approach to the issues you and I face every day in this Chamber How can our people make up their minds if they cannot see both sides of the issues that concern us I know there must be others who are sorry this valuable program must disappear

ABOUT INFLATION

Mr. FERGUSON Mr President, I have received a letter from a constituent in Michigan who demands to know what a Republican is doing about inflation I have replied to his letter, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks my reply to that constituent

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR MR ——— Your letter asks many questions which I will try to answer as best I can, but they all center around the special squeeze which present day inflationary conditions puts upon the middle class Every class is hit by inflation, but people on relatively fixed incomes suffer most I join wholeheartedly with you in your indignation over this situation and I will tell you what Republicans have been trying to do about it. But first I will try to answer your specific questions

You ask: "What is the answer of the Republican Senator to a question—not about the expense of executive spending in the Federal Government at this time—but about the threat of inflation to most of the middle class"?

This question apparently does not want me to mention Federal spending, yet expects me to say something constructive about avoiding inflation Surely, it is not contended that there is no connection between the two.

The prime cause of inflation is Federal Government spending. This is elementary economics. For 20 years the New and Fair Deal based their political success on lavish spending and today the country is paying the price for it in inflation.

What do you think happens when the Government uses every conceivable device to pump more money into the economic stream than it collects in taxes? By constantly enlarging spending programs the Government causes four things to happen: (1) Your taxes have to be raised to meet part of the deficit The administration has added millions of people to the tax rolls and has raised taxes again and again since it has been in office The latest raise results in Government taking a quarter or more of your income. (2) The national debt is increased This increases both the present and future cost of Government which you and your children, and their children, will have to pay. (3) The Government has to borrow from banks to make up the deficit caused by overspending This increases the money supply and pumps it into the economic stream with an inflationary result (4) Excessive appropriations lessen the supply of goods and services for civilian consumption Government employment is not productive and diverts manpower from productive enterprise, thus lessening the potential supply of goods Government consumption of materials lessens the actual supply for civilian use The combined result is to increase the gap between available goods and services and the demand, which is known as the inflationary gap because it drives up prices for the supply that is available to the consuming public

Government spending goes mainly for three broad purposes (1) To provide tremendously expanded welfare services for the sick and aged, for veterans, for workers' social security, unemployment and relief assistance, for hospitals, schools, and children's lunches, and so on, (2) for enlarged public-works programs, housing, aids, subsidies, and grants to farmers, loans to industry, and (3) loans, grants, and aids to foreign countries, and the financing of World War II followed by the present gigantic rearmament and military program No matter how worthwhile all of these activities may be, the Government financing of them put billions of dollars into the pockets of our people without producing anything to spend it on War goods are destroyed Foreign-aid programs send resources and goods out of the country Social services in the country are free Some farm and industrial production is increased by subsidies and loans, but not enough to take up the slack But the money paid in wages for the production of all the goods removed from the economic system, and the extra money pumped into the system by Government borrowing, remains. The result is a tremendous oversupply of money relative to goods and services Inflation is the certain result

Inflation makes it possible for Government to do many things in a hurry for farmers, workers, business, young and old people, and for the sick and destitute, which the private economy may not be able to do for itself, or could do only over a longer period of time.

Many of these benefits are very worth while, but the Government cannot do every worth-while thing any more than a family can with its own income without paying a price for it The fallacy lies in the people's belief, encouraged by the Democrat administration to gain votes and remain in power, that Government can give them something for nothing That is why the people are surprised and angry now that Government largess demands a price. The price is inflation, steadily increasing taxes, Government interference in people's lives and business, Government favoritism and corruption, and a dangerous tendency toward socialism with all that socialism implies. The proof of these ill effects is on every page of our newspapers.

The fallacy is further compounded by the people's belief that Government subsidies and controls is the solution for painful inflation. You ask why we should not give subsidies, impose price ceilings and rent con-

trols. This is just what the administration encourages you to do. Having got us into the mess, it is forced to look around for fake panaceas in order to shift the blame for the consequences of its own unwise policies. And in certain emergencies there is just enough truth in the need for subsidies and controls to make the demand for them seem plausible.

But the same people who are persuaded to demand food subsidies, price and rent controls, do not want increased taxes or credit and wage controls. But subsidies come out of taxes and the way the administration handles them, they barely increase production or lower prices. Credit controls curb the people's spending and the people do not like them. Yet credit control is absolutely necessary to curb inflation. Moreover, Government cannot embark upon a program of controls without including wage controls. Wages are the largest element in the price of goods, and if they are not controlled, prices must rise. Industry can absorb some of the rise in costs from increased wages by increasing the volume of production and lowering profit margins. But there is a limit to increasing production and if every cent of profit were taken, it could not begin to offset the wage increases.

Consequently, industry must pass some of the increased costs on to the public in the form of higher prices. A vicious cycle sets in by which wages are left free to rise, resulting in higher prices, which in turn leads to demands for higher wages, and so on. The effect spreads all through the economic system Those who cannot get upward wage and income adjustments fast enough—like teachers and people living on savings, insurance and pensions—are hit the hardest.

Ceilings on prices cannot stop inflation any more than putting a ceiling of 98 5 degrees on a thermometer can stop a fever. Controls in an economic system suffering from Government spending and inflation are like holding the lid down on a steaming pot while the fire underneath increases. They create dangerous maladjustments in the system which adversely affect many groups of individuals and disrupt the working of the system. They encourage Government favoritism They inevitably lead to black markets which are just as inequitable as inflation and more vicious In time, production itself breaks down because ceiling prices take the incentive out of enterprise. And as conditions go from bad to worse, Government is forced to extend and to tighten its controls until Government itself becomes vicious and oppressive. This has been the effect of Government controls in every country whenever in history they were imposed. We experienced a taste of it in 1946.

In emergencies like war, controls are necessary and they work after a fashion because the patriotic fervor of the people supports them There is no such public support in peacetime and for a very good reason: controls are incompatible with the people's liberties and freedom.

Your letter asks what I and other Republicans are doing about inflationary conditions. In the first place, Republicans are not in control of Congress and there is no Republican administration in the White House and executive branches of the Government. This limits what Republicans can do because they have no power to pass legislation and they have no say in administration policies. Democrats exercise all this control. Your question should really be directed to them because they are responsible for existing conditions. If your home is not managed well, it would be unfair to put the blame on your neighbor or ask what he intends to do about it.

A political party is somewhat different though, because it has a responsible public duty to perform. In the role of opposition party without power, it is the duty of Republicans to critically appraise the promises and performances of the Democrat administration which is in power; to call the Democrat administration to account whenever it fails in discharging the public trust; to expose mistakes and actions harmful to the public interest; and to offer constructive suggestions for the solution of public problems.

As one Senator of the opposition, I have done every one of these things in Congressional committees on which I serve, in debate on the Senate floor, in interviews to the press, over the radio and TV, and in public addresses throughout the country. While it is most unpopular to do so, I have taken the lead in exposing waste, criticizing Government's padded budgets, and taking active steps to enforce economy in spending. I have offered countless suggestions on how to handle the public business at less cost and more efficiently.

Others of my party have done likewise. The record is far too long and detailed to restate here. This letter is long enough as it is. No single, simple solution can cure the pains which the national interest now suffers from unwise and irresponsible Government policies.

The Republican Party as a whole offers the philosophy, the principles, and competent men of honesty and integrity who would systematically reduce Government spending, eliminate waste and corruption, balance Government income with outgo without sacrificing the real welfare of our people, lower taxes, reduce the size of the Federal Government and its heavy impact upon the lives of all our people. We have done more than promise better government. We have demonstrated it.

Since 1933, the Democrats have had a majority in Congress during 17 years, and the Republicans have had a majority only in 1947–48. For 16 out of the 17 years Democrats were in control of Congress, the Government was operated in the red. Taxes were pushed up for everyone and millions who never had to pay taxes were added to the rolls. When the Democrats took over in 1933, the Government was spending just under five billions a year for everything The current budget will be close to eighty-one billions! The national debt in 1933 was twenty-three billions; today it is two hundred and fifty-seven billions. Is there any wonder that the value of your dollar has shrunk to 54 cents? Production doubled in 20 years, but the money supply forced up by the Government has increased five times. More dollars compared to goods make inflation inescapable.

During the 2 years Republicans were in control of Congress, the budget was balanced (with a huge surplus which President Truman now adds to his laurels as he did in dedicating the new Accounting Office building recently). Taxes were lowered and the public debt was reduced. Inflation was arrested and prices in 1947 and 1948 began to fall to reasonable proportions. The Eightieth Congress did this over the stubborn resistance of the President and his executive departments.

The Republican remedy was very simple but absolutely fundamental. They cut government expense. Government spending was cut from $61,000,000,000 in 1946 to thirty-four billions in 1948. They applied the same common sense remedy you would have to use in your family finances if you found yourself spending more than you took in. If individuals do that too long, their credit is ruined and bankruptcy follows. Governments do not go bankrupt. They destroy the integrity of the currency (inflation); they may be forced to repudiate their debts (Government bonds); and they may be forced to put Government into business (socialism) because unwise policies discourage private persons from producing.

I do not know whether this discussion convinces you or not, but it is the way I see things and the beliefs I hold. I have written at length to you because you are the kind of person the country must depend upon to make Government trustworthy and responsible for the public welfare. I regret to say that in my opinion, we do not have such government under the present administration.

Yours sincerely,

HOMER FERGUSON,
United States Senator, Michigan.

GOLD THE ONLY ACCEPTABLE INTERNATIONAL CURRENCY

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I wish now to pay a few words of tribute to one of the elder statesmen. On October 15, a noteworthy, if not historic, event took place on the floor of the Senate. On that date my distinguished colleague, and good friend the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] made the statement that gold is the only acceptable international currency. For many years Senators from the Western States have maintained that silver was also an acceptable international currency, and I am happy now to hear that the most distinguished leader of the silver Senators has finally realized that gold is the only acceptable international currency. I now look forward confidently to the support of the Senator from Nevada in my efforts to repeal the silver purchase laws, thus removing the pretense that silver is acceptable on a par with gold as money.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3838) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Joseph Pickett.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 320) to amend Veterans Regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for psychoses developing to a compensable degree of disability within 3 years from the date of separation from active service.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 5215. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5684. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

PRINTING OF STUDY OF BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY (S. DOC. NO 87)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we have heard a great deal said in the Senate and elsewhere relating to bipartisanship in our foreign policy, or the lack of it. I have given considerable thought and study to this subject. Recently I have had prepared for me a study on

bipartisan foreign policy activities over the past few years. Because I feel it is a valuable document, and would be of interest to all Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 20, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S 210 An act for the relief of Jesus Juan Llanderal;

S. 355. An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department;

S. 622. An act to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes,

S 657. An act to amend and clarify the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, and for other purposes;

S. 1023 An act for the relief of Fumiko Theresa Shibata;

S 1046 An act to readjust postal rates; and

S 1311. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Yellowstone River

JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE BILL

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement which I have prepared on S. 913, the joint Budget Committee bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCHOEPPEL

Mr. President, as a cosponsor of Senator MCCLELLAN'S budget bill, S. 913, I wish to say a few words in support of that proposal which was the unanimous report of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments I urge strong Senate support for this very important proposal so as to increase the chances of favorable action in the other House

Mr. President, there are many praiseworthy aspects of this basic proposal but I shall take time to speak on only two of them. The first big advantage of S. 913 in my book is that the bill brings to bear for all Members of the Congress, something like the immense reservoir of talent, knowledge, and experience which are available to the executive branch for its work on budget and spending proposals. As the title of S. 913 states, its purpose is to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

Mr President, it is high time that we provide ourselves with the absolutely necessary professional staff to assist us in meeting our responsibilities All too frequently, busy Members of this Senate do not have the time, the aptitudes, the special training, or the experience to formulate even intelligent questions to ask the experts from the executive branch who defend the spending proposals on which we must act.

Moreover, those experts cannot be expected to volunteer any help or knowledge which is not directly in accord with a proposed appropriation bill as submitted to us. Such an appropriation bill may have been cut severely by the President of the United States, with perfect propriety, in fitting any given program into the program of the Government as a whole. When that occurs, the official concerned must, of course, remain loyal to his chief, and must subsequently plead for only the program and the dollar amounts which the President has seen fit to allow him.

But, Mr President, the Congress is under no such obligation to agree with the views of the President of the United States as to what the country needs in this or that field of Federal activity. In fact, if we do not agree, we have both the duty and the responsibility of modifying appropriation bills accordingly, either up or down. This readjustment of many, many budget items, some very technical indeed, cannot, however, be done properly under present conditions. We need adequate professional staff, preferably on a joint basis to serve both Houses, without waste and extravagance, as provided in S 913.

Mr President, I turn now to the second of the two points to which I am restricting myself in this brief discussion of the advantages of S. 913. I refer to the provision of the bill which I proposed as an amendment to Senator MCCLELLAN'S original bill, S 913, and which, to my great personal satisfaction, was adopted by the full Senate Expenditures Committee That amendment requires that, whenever standing committees in either House render reports on bills calling for future appropriations, they must include in those committee reports dollar estimates of anticipated new costs over the next 5 years

In addition, S. 913, as reported, includes the further good provision that, at least annually, the joint budget committee must report on total estimated costs for the same years on all the proposals in this category which have been enacted by the Congress. In other words, not only are cost estimates to be available for each proposal reported by a committee, but in addition periodic summaries are to be made available of costs under all of such proposals which have been enacted by the Congress

This cost-estimate idea is not new with me, Mr President. It is substantially the same as was included in two resolutions introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, first session—both favorably reported by the Senate One of these was Senate Concurrent Resolution 35, introduced by Senators FERGUSON, BRIDGES, and BYRD

The other was Senate Concurrent Resolution 38, introduced by Senator WHERRY, plus the three Senators I have just mentioned, plus four additional Senators, namely, Senators BUTLER, REED, SALTONSTALL, and YOUNG The former proposal related to cost estimates alone, whereas the latter merged it with other additional provisions

Mr President, I vigorously support this cost-estimate idea because of my belief that one of the basic reasons why we now stagger under such a tremendous Federal budget is because good-naturedly the various committees of the Congress, and then the Congress as a whole, have all too frequently gone along with a new and otherwise attractive program under the specious plea that it would cost little or nothing Perhaps any single new authorization has not involved too great immediate payments. But taken together, they have helped materially to pile up a financial load that threatens to break the backs of the American taxpayer.

It is high time that all legislators be put on notice, Mr. President, whenever new programs are under consideration which pile up mandatory costs which future Congresses cannot avoid. That valuable notice is contained in S. 913. Of course, the warning may still be disregarded but if we do so, our voters back home have the information to hold us responsible.

Mr. President, there are other valuable features of this bill but I do not have the time to discuss them at this time. I close with expressions of my deep personal appreciation to Senator MCCLELLAN, chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, with whom I have had the privilege of serving. He has given generously and patriotically of his time and effort in a truly cooperative consideration and modification of this bill by all members of the Senate Expenditures Committee regardless of party. S 913, beyond question, helps to put our fiscal house in order, and to keep it in order, as we meet the challenge of the greatly increased services of modern government, and as we assume immense new military burdens to meet the deadly Communist menace.

THE WORK OF THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement which commends the members of my committee and deals with some of the work that has been done by the committee this year. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the RECORD as if I had made it on the floor of the Senate. I make the request so that I will not take up the time of the Senate by reading it. Therefore, I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The time of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service during the first session of the Eighty-second Congress has been almost equally divided between postal matters and legislation affecting the Civil Service Commission and the employees of the Federal Government other than postal employees

One hundred and seventeen Senate bills, three House bills, five joint resolutions, and six resolutions were referred to this committee during the first session.

Hearings were held on a great portion of these measures and serious study and consideration were given to all I believe that the outstanding record this committee has compiled during this first session of the Eighty-second Congress is well known to all and I desire at this time to give credit where credit is due.

The Post Office Subcommittee of which the junior Senator from Kentucky, Senator UNDERWOOD, is chairman gave consideration to 51 bills and 3 resolutions affecting the postal service.

Serving with Senator UNDERWOOD on this most important committee having jurisdiction over one of the largest agencies of any government in the world were the junior Senator from Kansas, Senator CARLSON, and Senator PASTORE of Rhode Island This committee reported to the Senate 12 major and important bills Of course, the greater portion of the time of this subcommittee was spent in the consideration of S 355, the bill to readjust postal salaries which was finally approved by Congress on Friday of this week and is now on the President's desk awaiting his signature This committee worked long and hard in the consideration of this bill to work out the many details in this legislation. This subcommittee and the committee as a whole were in complete agreement that it was nothing more than simple justice to adjust the salaries of the approximately 500,000 postal employees from the postmaster in the largest office to those in the smallest office of the fourth class and all employees in the automatic grades.

The committee as a whole considered the postal rate bill, S. 1046, and reported to the Senate what we considered a just and equitable bill that would wipe out much of the

Post Office Department deficit. I regret that the views of the Senate conferees and the members of my committee did not prevail and that a bill was not finally enacted to increase the postal revenue approximately $400,000,000 so as to appreciably reduce the post office deficit.

I am particularly glad that the conferees agreed to retain in the rate bill the Carlson amendment setting up a joint committee of both Houses to study carefully all questions relating to postal rates. This is a rich field for constructive work and should result in a more equitable distribution of postal rates in the future and a better understanding on the part of the Congress as to the true picture with respect to the postal deficit. It is the opinion of my committee that such a joint operation is the only solution to the postal rate problem. As I said on the floor Friday of this week, the trouble in the past has been that the two Houses through their respective committees have held hearings and made studies as to postal rates and have always found themselves too far apart when the time comes for final action.

During the first session of this Congress 1,325 nominations for postmasters were referred to the committee for confirmation. After careful consideration of each nomination 1,177 were reported to the Senate, recommending approval—12 were withdrawn and 136 remain on the committee calendar due to the fact that the two Senators in the respective States have not approved such nominations.

The Civil Service Subcommittee of which the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], is chairman has been one of the busiest of this or any other Congress. Serv-1 g with the able Senator from Rhode Island were Senators MONRONEY and BUTLER of Maryland.

This subcommittee considered more than 40 bills and reported 20 to the full committee for appropriate action—at least 10 of these were finally enacted into law.

Included in this group were important and major legislation such as—

The Graduated Leave Act, approved by Congress yesterday.

The Federal Employees Pay Act of 1951, adopted by Congress on Friday of this week.

The modified Hoover Commission proposal to decentralize the examining and recruitment procedures of the Civil Service Commission which passed the Senate Friday of this week and now awaits action in the House of Representatives.

The bill S 354 now on the Senate calendar, a complete revision and adjustment of the many overtime laws now on the statute books affecting Federal employees

These and many more bills which I will not discuss at this time testify to the hard and efficient work done by this subcommittee.

Another very important subcommittee headed by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], while not as spectacular as the aforementioned, has put in many hours of hard work on retirement legislation.

Serving with the very able Senator from Florida are Senators DUFF and MONRONEY.

They have considered many retirement bills during this session, one of the most important being S. 995 which proposes to rewrite the present cumbersome and many times amended retirement law for Federal employees.

Their progress in this field has been somewhat impeded by the failure of the Civil Service Commission to cooperate fully, but we all feel that this is a major step, and that this proposed legislation should and will be reported to the Senate very shortly after the beginning of the second session, so that full consideration may be given to the merits of this proposal here on the floor of the Senate.

I do not believe that any chairman of a committee has had at his right hand the services of a more able or conscientious group of Senators than the junior Senator from South Carolina has had during this session of Congress. I say this without reference to majority and minority. In our committee, political alinement is left at the door of the committee room, and without exception, the committee actions were harmonious in every respect and at least 90 percent of the actions taken by the committee were unanimous.

My very close friend the very able junior Senator from Kansas, Senator CARLSON, has worked very hard on each and every bill referred to the committee for consideration, and without his undivided attention and assistance on the postal rate bill, I doubt that we could have met this challenge with much success.

Senators LANGER, WELKER, BUTLER, DUFF, and BENNETT all deserve special commendation for their extremely important contributions to the success of this committee.

Mr. President, a great deal of false and misleading charges have been leveled at this committee by the citizens committee on the Hoover Commission reports and I desire at this time to set the RECORD straight. Some of these statements no doubt were made by those who had been misinformed, but I regret to say that indications are that many of the misleading statements have been made deliberately and even after correct information has been supplied.

The true facts with regard to the recommendations of the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government (the Hoover Commission) are set out in the printed hearings of the bills introduced in the Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congresses to implement these recommendations.

It will be recalled that the reorganization of the Civil Service Commission was effected by plan No. 5, and of the Post Office Department under reorganization plan 3, both enacted during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

During the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, following close cooperation between the post office committees of both Houses and between the committees and the Postmaster General and the Comptroller General, Public Law 712 was enacted to provide improved procedures with respect to the financial control of the Post Office Department. This is in effect and has already proved a step forward in efficiency and decentralization of the postal service.

At the beginning of this session of Congress only three items contained in the original Hoover report affecting the postal service and only one affecting Federal personnel generally were left to be considered by the committee. Of these four recommendations, only two remain to be considered by the committee in the second session of the Eighty-second Congress. No. 1, that the postal service be decentralized into 15 regions under regional directors of post and district superintendents; No. 2, that the confirmation of postmasters by the Senate be abolished.

Recommendation No. 1 has met with strong objection on the part of the Postmaster General, who has approved most of the other recommendations of the Hoover Commission. He has stated to the committee without qualification that recommendation No. 1 will positively result in no saving to the Post Office Department, but on the contrary would cost the Department at least $5,000,000 annually to administer such a decentralization, without improving the service at all.

With respect to recommendation No. 2, the confirmation of postmasters has been the subject of many a false blast from the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report. Representatives of this Citizens Committee have appeared before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on several different occasions and have been questioned at length by the members of the Senate committee regarding this proposal. This Citizens Committee has failed in every respect to support its charges that its recommendation would remove politics from the appointment of postmasters and that it would save the Government any money at all. As you well know, the present law enacted in 1938 and often referred to as the O'Mahoney Act, permits postmasters in the Presidential office to be selected in two ways. from an eligible list, generally three; the highest resulting from a competitive examination or resulting from a noncompetitive examination if the Post Office Department appointee has the necessary civil-service status as a postal employee. Both examinations are held by the Civil Service Commission. This would not be changed under the provisions of the pending bills, the only change being that hereafter the Postmaster General would personally make the appointment instead of the President, and there would be no review by the Senate of each nomination.

These, Mr. President, are the true facts as to the Hoover Commission recommendations. Many false statements have been made and probably will continue to be made, but I want the Members of this body to know that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has not pigeonholed or ignored any of the recommendations of this Commission, many of which were very worth while and which have been enacted into law. When this Senate or any committee thereof ceases to have the right to make the final decision as to legislation but must be dictated to by this so-called Citizens Committee, our present form of Government is in danger.

THE RURAL TELEPHONE PROGRAM

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article prepared by me dealing with the rural telephone program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RURAL TELEPHONE PROGRAM

Two years ago Congress enacted legislation to enable the extension and improvement of telephone service in the rural areas of our country.

Almost all of us were aware of the decline in telephone service on the farms of America. We were concerned over figures which showed fewer farm telephones in use in 1945 than in 1920. We found that much less than half of our farm families had any kind of telephone service and that much of this was obsolete and unreliable. This was a condition that seriously impeded farming operations and posed a continuing threat to the security of our rural families.

Fifteen years earlier we had grappled with a somewhat analogous problem in rural electrification. To cope with the farmers' need for electric power we set up the Rural Electrification Administration, and year by year we watched its operations as it loaned money and offered technical advice to locally owned and locally controlled groups of rural citizens who undertook the job of bringing electricity to the farms and to smal rural industries. The pattern was tested and proven. Now about 85 percent of our farms have electric power, and the repayment on the Government loans is one of the finest records to be found anywhere.

We used this same tested pattern in designing legislation to help rural people to have good telephone service.

The telephone loan program has made a good start in the brief time since its establishment. With very limited increase in REA's administrative budget and with the addition of a small number of telephone engineers and telephony specialists, the agency has been able to shoulder the new assignment

The difficult task of organizing and setting up procedures for a new program has been accomplished. This done, the telephone program is now beginning to move ahead in high gear. Already telephone bells are sounding in farm homes where the phone never rang before, and antiquated crank sets are giving way to modern dial equipment.

Much hard work looms ahead for the coming months and years, for the job of bringing modern telephones to the far corners of rural America is only beginning and the task is formidable. The telephone program today is in about the same position that the rural electrification program was in its early days.

Now, as then, we have given REA a mandate to help farm people provide for themselves an essential service which large numbers of rural people had been unable to obtain without such help. Now, as then, REA is challenged to help local farm groups supply this service at reasonable rates throughout sparsely settled areas in which private capital has not seen sufficient profit opportunities to be persuaded to invest

And now that the telephone loan program is gaining momentum after its initial organizing period, opposition is already being developed by some of the very people who failed to do the job of providing adequate rural telephone service Charges are being made that REA proposes to socialize the telephone industry—the same baseless charges that were sounded against the rural electrification program when it first showed unmistakable signs of succeeding

Amid all the shouting about socialization, there are contradictory complaints that the REA telephone program has accomplished nothing while costing the taxpayer great sums of money It is significant that both of these conflicting charges—of doing nothing, on the one hand, and of threatening to take over the telephone industry, on the other—originate from the same source. That is, from a small and very short-sighted segment of the telephone industry. It comes largely from a few companies that have refused to extend service at reasonable rates to families in sparsely settled communities, yet object in dog-in-the-manger fashion to seeing rural people provide good telephone service for themselves with the aid of low-cost financing At this point I want to make it very clear that I am not speaking of the many small independent companies who welcome the opportunity which the REA loan program is giving them to improve and expand their service—an opportunity, I might add, which had not been forthcoming from the resources of private financing organizations.

Talk of a drain on the taxpayer to subsidize rural telephones is without foundation. As in the rural electrification program, telephone loans must be repaid with interest in a maximum of 35 years This means that no loan can be made without ample assurance that the enterprise is economically sound and that the Government will be paid back in full. As an added safeguard, REA requires telephone borrowers to put up an equity from 10 to 50 percent of the value of the completed system.

In making sure that the telephone program will not cost the taxpayer money—and that all loan funds will be returned to the United States Treasury—REA has moved cautiously in making its loans, conforming to the careful loan procedures employed generally by responsible lending organizations.

REA's record of loan repayments by rural electric borrowers has always seemed to me a phenomenal success. I know of no credit agency, public or private, that has equaled it. Up to the end of September REA has collected $310,258,000 including payments on principal in advance of due dates totaling about $35,000,000. Less than one-quarter of 1 percent of payments are overdue more than 30 days This splendid record is cogent evidence that the rural telephone loans will also be repaid without loss to the Government.

The cost of the telephone-loan program, then, is the relatively small appropriation for REA's administrative expenses. And this expenditure is more than justified as an investment in rural development and social welfare, which will benefit the whole Nation.

What about the charge that the telephone program has accomplished nothing?

By mid October REA had made telephone loan allocations totaling about $48,800,000 to more than 133 borrowers. The loans will enable them to build or improve almost 43,000 miles of pole line bringing up-to-date telephone service for the first time to 92,000 new subscribers and improved service to 83,000 existing subscribers

By the first week of September 84 borrowers under the REA telephone program had selected engineers Forty of these had submitted area-coverage designs to REA for approval, and more than half of these designs had been approved Seventeen were all ready to go their central office equipment By the end of September actual advances totaling over a million dollars had been made to 17 borrowers

A few of these companies already have telephones connected, many more will be connected during the favorable fall construction weather

This to my mind is substantial progress for less than 2 years This progress is the more significant considered in light of the fact that not only did the REA telephone program have to set up shop before it could begin making loans—but also that the work of administering the telephone loans was done by a very small staff This already limited staff has recently been reduced of decreased appropriations to the point where progress of the program may be impaired.

The recent increase in the volume and venom of attacks upon REA is actually a testimonial to the progress of the rural-telephone program, though such is furthest from the intent of the instigators of the campaign. Those who went through the struggle to get low cost electric service on the outlying farms of America will remember that the power companies at first said it could not be done, then promised to cooperate with REA, while still shaking their heads over the impracticability of the plan. This period of skeptical well-wishing was quickly succeeded by cries of socialism and waste of public moneys. Years characterized by the building of spite lines and a concerted campaign to enact restrictive legislation in State assemblies or to bog down rural-electrification projects by subjecting them to unnecessary delaying, and often unfriendly commission jurisdiction followed. These road blocks to progress in rural electrification were all plausibly endorsed by selfish power interests in the name of free enterprise, and reduction of Government spending.

Fortunately rural people of the thirties knew what they wanted and refused to be stopped short of their goal by specious arguments or underhand maneuvers. It is no accident that today about 85 percent of the farms of America have central station electric service as compared to a little more than 10 percent in 1935 when REA was established.

Now the telephone program is moving into a similar phase of attack. In some States, small independent companies or co-ops that apply for telephone loans have suddenly been approached with offers of private financing. Sometimes the offers are made by the same companies that had previously turned down the applicant. But now the financing is proffered with warnings that if the applicant borrows from REA he will be saddled with gold-plated construction requirements, fancy engineering fees, and Government interference in his business.

The attack takes many forms, but the intent is the same—to stop the program. In one instance a group of small mutuals decided to consolidate and get a telephone loan. They came to this decision after a large neighboring commercial company informed them that it could no longer continue to give them switching service unless the mutuals converted to dial at their own expense. Undsr the company proposal, each subscriber would be required to invest about $175 So the mutuals applied to REA for a loan When REA made a loan allocation to enable the co-op to develop its own up-to-date system—but not until then—the commercial company approached the individual mutuals and offered to buy them out and supply their members with modern telephone service without added construction costs. One of the mutuals succumbed to the offer This forced the others to follow along, as the remaining group was too small to support a modern dial system on a sound economic basis As a result, the REA loan application was reluctantly canceled by the mutuals Just the same, it is as clear as a sunny day that the REA telephone program brought modern telephone service to the subscribers on those mutual lines Even here you can chalk up real accomplishment by the REA loan program, though it does not show up on the loan records

In States where farm leaders have introduced legislation with a view to making it easier for cooperatives to qualify for an REA telephone loan, enemies of the program have been active in trying to defeat such measures Where they have failed, they have sought to add restrictive amendments calculated to hamstring the program In one State a model law was passed only to be vetoed by the governor in the closing days of the legislature with a stinging charge of attempted socialization.

All these activities are calculated to delay and impede the telephone loan program and to spread doubt and confusion If they succeed, the rural telephone program will indeed bog down.

I, for one, do not believe this sabotage of the program will succeed; but it would be foolish to underestimate the strength and ruthlessness of the attacks

Rural families who want and need and rightly should have telephone service comparable to that enjoyed by city people should be on the alert against unscrupulous onslaughts on the REA telephone loan program If they are wise, they will examine the motives of those who make the charges and ascertain the true facts. They will not passively view from the sidelines the attack on the program that has brought them electric power and will make it possible for them to have modern telephone service. They will recognize the campaign for what it is—an attempt to make the little fellow dependent for telephones on the big companies and financing concerns which have failed to serve him in the past. They will recognize the attempt and fight it. Owners of independent companies who are sincerely trying to expand and improve their service to meet the needs of farm areas in their territory are paying little attention to warnings against the rural telephone program They, too, must be on guard, for the REA program is designed to help them, not to compete. The REA does not own a mile of line or even a single pole.

The farmer well knows that his electric co-op is not socialism—but democracy at the grassroots of America. From his own

experience he can refute claims that the REA telephone loan program is calculated to socialize the telephone industry. He has no cause to be afraid to speak out for what he knows to be a sound program, though its enemies try to pin a Socialist label on it.

Those who are trying to scuttle the telephone program charge that REA standards are too high—they call them gold plated. But these standards were adopted after consultation with experts in the private telephone industry, and over a period of time the better construction will effect savings in maintenance costs which will prove cheaper in the end and eventually make lower rates possible than would so-called cheap construction. Even on the score of original investment, REA specifications have in many instances been able to effect a savings as compared to industry costs.

REA is continually on the alert to find and test out promising possibilities for cutting costs of providing dependable telephone service in sparsely settled areas while maintaining high standards.

Early in May, for example, REA installed two channels of an experimental subscriber carrier system in the plant of Gulf Service Telephone Co. at Foley in my own State of Alabama. Results to date have been promising Soon an experimental radio link will also be installed. If this electronic equipment proves as useful as expected in coping with the particular problems to which it is being adapted, then it can be recommended by REA to other borrowers with similar needs. But, as a guardian of public funds, REA is obligated to ascertain that any proposed construction economies are real economies before it can conscientiously recommend their use in Government-financed telephone systems.

The materials situation is another problem of concern to many REA borrowers. Generally speaking, materials are scarce and prices high. But the situation varies with different projects, locations, and suppliers and can improve or deteriorate quickly. For example, some have been told they could expect delivery on inside plant equipment in 200 days, but others have been informed that the wait would be as much as a year.

Determined and systematic effort on the part of local people is required in order to qualify for a rural telephone loan to provide new or improved telephone service. I am convinced that REA is making every effort to simplify loan procedures to make it as easy as possible for borrowers to comply with them. But the primary responsibility for meeting loan requirements necessarily rests with the borrower.

In spite of the considerable time and work involved in meeting loan requirements, applicants who have already seen their loan applications through to the point where they are about ready to start construction are looking ahead with enthusiasm. Where new telephones have actually been installed, many families who had not signed up originally as subscribers began asking for service. A case in point is the experience of the Fredericksburg & Wilderness Telephone Co. of Chancellor, Va After this company switched over to dial, the demand for telephones shot up far beyond the most hopeful estimates of the management.

Yes, American farmers are really serious about wanting telephone service they can depend on to speed up their business operations and bring them closer to their neighbors, to their doctor, trading center, and church. They need good telephones more than ever because of the defense emergency which calls for top production in the face of labor shortages and mechanical breakdowns.

The large number of telephone loan applications pouring into REA proves how serious farmers are about wanting telephones. By the middle of October, REA had on hand 518 applications from 39 States and Alaska, asking for loans totaling $82,426,877.

Undoubtedly some of these applications are for proposed systems which are not economically feasible or for other reasons cannot measure up to loan requirements as set up by REA in conformity with the telephone amendment to the Rural Electrification Act. But in any case, the volume of applications exceeds many times the funds currently made available by this Congress for telephone loans. Certainly the great number of applications is significant as a measure of the desire and need of farmers for telephones.

In view of this need and the record of the REA program in farm electrification, I foresee the day when the great majority of farm families will have dependable telephones—along with the good electric service they have today.

USE OF INCOME FROM TIDELANDS OIL FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by me entitled "Oil For the Lamps of Learning." It deals with the amendment, sponsored by 18 Members of the Senate to the so-called tidelands bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL FOR THE LAMPS OF LEARNING

My purpose in addressing the Senate today is to defend a priceless and incalculable national heritage against a determined effort upon the part of a dissatisfied minority of the States to snatch that heritage from the American people. I refer, of course, to the miscalled, misnamed and misrepresented tidelands bill which, whatever its pretended objective, is designed to make a forty billion dollar gift from the people of the United States to the three States of California, Louisiana, and Texas.

The bill, which has passed the House of Representatives, H. R. 4484, and is now before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is claimed by its sponsors to be variously a tidelands bill, a quitclaim bill and a bill to restore the historic rights of the States. I shall demonstrate to the Senate today, that H. R. 4484 is none of the things which its sponsors claim it to be. It is a giveaway bill which permits a few States with the help of big oil companies to grab from the people of the United States the inestimable oil resources of the marginal sea—and even beyond this, to stick their fingers in the untold wealth of the great Continental Shelf.

It would give me great personal pleasure, in ordinary circumstances, to support the enactment of any legislation which would be of particular benefit to the people of California, Louisiana, or Texas. But we are dealing here with an issue which is more important than any single State, more important than any single industry, more important than any special or local or private interest. We are dealing with a great national asset, declared by the Supreme Court of the United States to belong to the people of the United States: An asset which may prove essential to our national economic well-being in time of peace and vital to our common defense against threatened aggression; indeed, indispensable to our very national existence in time of war.

The oil resources of the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf are too great to be dealt with as the plaything of a political game or the pawn of a financial grab.

In an earlier speech in the Senate I pointed out that the ablest petroleum geologists in the oil industry, including the Geological Survey of the United States Department of the Interior, estimate the offshore oil reserves of the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf at 15,000,000,000 barrels. More than a year ago Dr. E O. DeGolyer, of Dallas, Tex., who has an international reputation as one of the most outstanding petroleum geologists in the world—if not the outstanding—stated in Life magazine that there may be 10,500,000,000 barrels of oil along the coasts of Texas and Louisiana alone At present prices these 15,000,000,000 barrels are worth over $40,000,000,000.

In addition to the huge reserves of undersea oil off the coasts of California, Texas and Louisiana estimates published by the American Petroleum Institute and the American Gas Association say there are also fabulous quantities of gas According to a bulletin of last December, published jointly by the American Petroleum Institute and the American Gas Association, estimates of proven gas reserves off the coasts of these three States total a little over 140 trillion cubic feet of gas The commercial unit of gas measurement is 1,000 cubic feet—called an M c f. This would place the gas reserves at 140 billion M c. f. The price of gas per M. c f. varies a little in different areas but if we take 7 cents per M c f as a fair figure for the purpose of arriving at the value of the gas reserves and multiply it by the 140 billion M. c f., we find that the gas is worth almost $10,000,000,000

We have seen the pressures that have been exerted, the false fronts that have been constructed We have seen the parade of scarecrows that has been led up and down the aisles and in and out of the committee rooms of both Houses of Congress. Despite the false fronts, despite the specious arguments, despite the political pressures, I do not believe that the United States Senate is willing to assume the responsibility of giving away $40,000,000,000 worth of the people's property. Indeed, I do not believe that the House of Representatives, which has already passed this legislation, will be willing on the final showdown to assume such a responsibility.

Today it is my purpose to analyze the legislation which has already passed the House of Representatives, H R 4484, and to strip from it the false labels intended to conceal this unprecedented proposal for give-away and grab. Some of these labels are designed to frighten the American people and the American Congress. Others are designed to lull them into a desired sense of serenity as to what the legislation proposes to do Let us, therefore, take a look at the record and see just what the sponsors of this bill propose to do with the Nation's offshore oil reserves.

In the first place, the very name by which the bill has been tagged is a spurious name. It has been called a tidelands bill. The fact is that the bill has nothing whatever to do with the tidelands, just as the litigation which preceded it had nothing to do with the tidelands. The tidelands, properly called, are the lands around the coast which lie between the high-water mark and the low-water mark of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and the Gulf of Mexico. The Federal Government has never asserted the slightest claim to the ownership or dominion over the tidelands or the oil or other minerals which may lie beneath them. For more than a century the Supreme Court of the United States has held, and in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases this holding has been reaffirmed, that the States—here I quote the Court of the California case—are seized of "ownership of lands under inland navigable waters such as rivers, harbors, and even tidelands down to the low-water mark." This determination was made originally by the Supreme Court at a very early period in our history. It was specifically held by the Supreme Court in the Pollard case involving my own State of Alabama that the Federal

Government has no right of ownership in the tidelands.

The whole question of a threatened Federal claim to ownership of the tidelands, lands under the rivers, harbors, bays, inlets, and other navigable waters lying inside the low-water mark of the sea, is a bugaboo designed to get the backing of the other 45 States behind the 3 States which seek to have the Federal Government give them $40,000,000,000 worth of oil.

The tidelands and other inland navigable waters are definitely not involved in this controversy. What is here involved and what was involved in the three historic cases of *United States* v. *California, United States* v. *Texas,* and *United States* v. *Louisiana* was the ownership of the rich oil lands lying under the marginal seas—that is, lying beyond the low-water mark out to the 3-mile limit. These lands are constantly under the waters of the sea and their ownership had never been adjudicated prior to the decision of the Supreme Court in these cases that followed the discovery of oil, a few years ago. The three States involved asserted that they were the owners of the oil, while on the other hand the Attorney General contended that the Federal Government was the owner. The Attorney General's contention was upheld by the Supreme Court in each of the three cases.

The purpose of the give-away bill is to overrule the Supreme Court's decisions and to give away the oil which lies under the marginal sea. Title III of the give-away bill goes even beyond the marginal sea and proposes to give to the States an interest in the royalties derived from oil in the Continental Shelf—that is, the submerged lands of the American Continent which lie beyond the 3-mile limit. Title III of the give-away bill deals with a proposition which was never considered by the Supreme Court in any of the three cases to which I have referred and goes far beyond the most fantastic claims ever made by the proponents of State ownership or State control.

So I again emphasize this is not a tidelands bill. This is a bill to give away the Nation's oil under the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf.

This give-away legislation, H. R 4484, has also been misnamed a "quitclaim bill" Now, those of my colleagues who are lawyers will clearly realize what a false label this is. If my neighbor and I both claim a certain strip of ground that falls within the boundaries of our respective properties, we may wish to settle the matter without litigation. Each of us may have been advised by his lawyer that he has a good title to the property in question One of us must be wrong. Each of us thinks he is right, but in the absence of some court decision, neither of us can be sure which is right Under these circumstances, it might be desirable for us to compromise the matter rather than to incur the expense, the delay, and the bad feeling incident to a lawsuit. If that is the way my neighbor and I feel about the controversy, it would be natural for one of us to pay the other a sum of money, in return for which the rival claimant would abandon his claim and put an end to the controversy. If we resorted to that procedure, then one of us would give a quitclaim deed to the other relinquishing all claims to the disputed property.

If, Mr President, there had never been any litigation between Texas, California, and Louisiana and the Federal Government; if there had never been a judicial determination as to the ownership of the oil lying under the marginal sea—if these things had never happened, then it might be proper to talk about a quitclaim bill But all questions of claim have been settled. There has been litigation, and there has been a solemn determination of all the issues by the highest judicial tribunal known to our constitutional system, the Supreme Court of the United States. How, after the suits have been brought, the briefs submitted, the arguments made, and the cases decided—how, Mr. President, can there be any serious talk about quitclaims to $40,000,000,000 worth of oil? The Supreme Court of the United States has consistently held that this oil belongs not to the States but to the Nation. There is no controversy to be settled, nothing to be quitclaimed.

If my neighbor and I, instead of compromising our differences had gone to law and if the courts had decided that the property in dispute belonged to me and not to my neighbor, then there would be no question of my quitclaiming anything. If my neighbor wanted the property, and if I were willing to sell it, perhaps he might buy it from me. Or, if I were sufficiently generous, I might even give it to him. But the newspaper, Labor, the organ of the Railway Brotherhoods, put the oil issue in a nutshell when it stated "$40,000,000,000 is too much to give away."

Let us not fool ourselves with childish prattle about quitclaim and compromise. This is not truly a proposal to quitclaim anything or to compromise anything. It is a proposal for the people of the United States to make to three States the biggest gift in history.

The sponsors of this give-away legislation have referred to it as a bill to restore the historic rights of the States to the submerged lands underlying the marginal sea. As I have already pointed out, title III of H. R. 4484, reaches far beyond the marginal seas and I shall in this connection discuss it in a few moments at greater length But even if this legislation were confined to handing over to the States just the oil underlying the marginal sea, it would still be incorrect to call it a bill to restore the historic rights of the States. No decision of the Supreme Court had ever held that this property belonged to the States, for the matter had never been litigated. While it may be true that the States claimed certain rights, or assumed certain rights, the Supreme Court, in the Texas, California, and Louisiana cases, held that these claims and assumptions were not valid.

Sometimes, the proponents of this legislation talk of the historic rights of the States as if the States and their lessees had been drilling oil wells in the marginal seas for centuries The fact is that it was only a few years ago that anyone suspected the existence of something to fight about. Then, when these three States and the Federal Government had reason to believe that valuable reserves of oil existed beneath the marginal seas, the controversy started to brew. Those who propose this give-away legislation cannot, by the skillful manipulation of words, bamboozle the Congress and the American people into accepting the proposition that because the States have made mistaken claims and mistaken assumptions as to the ownership of this oil the Nation is thereby obligated to hand them the greatest bonanza in history.

Now, Mr. President, that we have removed some of the false fronts and false labels from this give-away bill, I think it only fair that we should consider and analyze some of the arguments which have, in my opinion, been most unfairly advanced in support of the give-away proposal.

For example, it has been argued by men of great influence and for whom I have great admiration and respect that there is an element of socialism in the ownership by the Federal Government of these great oil resources which lie under the marginal seas and the Continental Shelf. With all possible respect to those who make this argument, my answer is that it is demonstrably absurd. From the very beginning the Federal Government has owned and controlled the mineral resources of the public lands. I have never heard it argued, and I do not believe that it could be seriously argued, that the provisions of the Federal Mineral Leasing Act are socialistic. On the contrary, private business has operated and prospered under that law. The whole history of the Federal Government's policies and operations under the act is a repudiation of any contention that Federal dominion over a great national asset is a form of socialism. Socialism is no more or no less socialism because the particular government involved happens to be that of one State or that of all the States. The sole question involved in this controversy is whether these particular resources should remain the property of the Federal Government, which they are today, or whether they should be given to the three States. How can it be said that ownership of oil by the State of Texas, California, or Louisiana is private enterprise while the ownership of the oil by the Federal Government is socialism? In either case it is a governmental unit which owns and exercises dominion over the oil. In either case it is a private enterprise, operating under a lease from either the State or Federal Government, which will operate the business of producing, refining and selling the oil.

I do not propose at this time to enter into any detailed discussion as to the proper method of leasing these lands. That is not the question with which I am dealing. I am talking about the basic principle of private enterprise and I assert—indeed, I do not believe that any man who has studied the question even casually can reasonably deny—the only question involved is not whether private business shall withdraw the oil but rather under what conditions it shall be withdrawn by private business. On the one hand, the proponents of the give-away bill contend that it is socialistic for the Federal Government to retain its rights as adjudicated by the courts. On the other hand, the same proponents contend that there is somewhere a sinister plot on the part of private enterprise to obtain leases from the Federal Government under the Mineral Leasing Act. I submit in all fairness that they cannot have it both ways. Their whole argument stumbles over its own inconsistencies.

The whole issue of socialism is a phony issue—a goblin dressed up to frighten the American people into giving this oil to a few States which do not own it and to the particular private oil interests with which these States have allied themselves.

In fact, Mr. President, the entire argument advanced by the proponents of this give-away bill is a fantastic procession of goblins and ghosts

Another one of these Halloween creations is the argument that the Federal Government is using or will seek to use its rights in the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf to invade the boundaries of the States and take away the inland waterways. I have already, in dealing with the manner in which this give-away proposal has been misnamed the tidelands bill, dealt with this specious argument to some degree. Without this particular bugbear it would have been impossible for the three States which seek the $40,000,000,000 gift from the Federal Government to enlist under their banner so many of the officials, and particularly the attorneys general of various States, from which this give-away bill seeks to snatch away valuable rights and resources. The officials in such States have been led to believe that somehow there hangs over them a threat upon the part of the Federal Government to invade the boundaries of the States and take away their harbors, their bays, their docks, and the resources of their inland waterways.

This argument is so false and so misleading that only the subtle and well-financed

propaganda of skilled advocates could ever have sold such a bill of goods. In the first place, the Attorney General on behalf of the United States has repeatedly and specifically disclaimed any ownership by the Federal Government of the tidelands and the inland waterways. The Federal authorities have repeatedly and affirmatively declared that the States possess and have always possessed the ownership in the inland waterways and their resources and that the only power that the Federal Government may exercise is its constitutional authority respecting navigation and commerce on their waters. The declarations by the executive department of the Federal Government have been sustained and affirmed by the unbroken line of decisions of the Supreme Court up to and including the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases. But the proponents of the give-away bill say that is not enough for them. And why is it not enough? Because this whole campaign to get their hands on the oil of the marginal sea is built on confusing the marginal-sea ownership with the ownership of the tidelands and inland waterways.

Their sincerity was put to the acid test in the House of Representatives when the give-away bill was under construction. At that time, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] offered in the nature of a substitute legislation which would have had the Congress confirm by specific legislation the unchallenged title of the States to the resources of the tidelands and inland waterways. Those who want the give-away shouted down the offer.

So, I contend that not only is the issue of the inland waterways a bugbear, but this is a bugbear in which the proponents of the give-away bill do not even themselves believe.

Then, there is another one of these goblins I should like to discuss for a few moments. That is the argument that this legislation is necessary to thwart or frustrate a grab on the part of the Federal Government. Sometimes the proponents of the give-away bill are explicit about this and sometimes they are a little vague, but when their argument is analyzed it boils down to the proposition that the executive department of the Federal Government and the United States Supreme Court joined in a conspiracy to steal this $40,000,000,000 worth of oil from California, Louisiana, and Texas for the Federal Government. While the proponents of the give-away bill are sometimes a little gingerly in their language, it is perfectly clear that when their guard is down what they have really intended is an attack upon the Supreme Court of the United States. Now, I am the last man in the world, certainly one of the last in the United States Senate, who should or would ever argue that our courts are beyond criticism, or that mistakes upon the part of the judiciary cannot be corrected by the Congress. This argument goes far beyond the question of conflicting legal viewpoints. It is, at least in its extreme manifestations, a little short of an attack upon the integrity and the competence of the United States Supreme Court.

The argument is too preposterous to mention except for the purpose of showing the extent to which the proponents of the give-away are willing to go to get their hooks on this fabulous store of oil.

We may agree or disagree with the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Certainly in the past there have been decisions of that body with which I did not agree. I have not hesitated to criticize the decisions. At no time, however, have I ever questioned the integrity or devotion to duty of the Court and when those who seek a $40,000,000,000 gift from the Federal Government attack a decision of the Supreme Court, the highest judicial body in the Nation, as a Federal grab, I regard it as a shocking assault upon the integrity of the judicial process. A court exists to decide cases and in any decision somebody must lose.

Incidentally, the attack upon the Court is also an attack upon the Attorney General of the United States and the other Federal officials who defended the Government's ownership which was upheld by the Court.

I cannot refrain from mentioning the name of Mr. Justice Clark, who as Attorney General presented the Government's case so capably and effectively. No man loves the State of Texas more devotedly than her native son, Tom Clark, who has brought to her such credit and distinction. I am sure that it was painful to him—as indeed it is to me—to be found in opposition to her desires. But Tom Clark had a higher duty; his duty to his conscience and his oath; and he lived up to his duty, regardless of sentiment or personal attachment. I do not think that even the most vehement supporter of Texas' claims will be heard to say that Tom Clark would participate in a sordid grab at the expense of the State he loves.

Who, then is alleged to have instigated the grab? Mr. President, is not the guilt, if guilt there must be, chargeable to the Senate of the United States? The very issue now under consideration was squarely presented to this body on August 19, 1937—just 14 years ago. On that date, the Senate unanimously adopted Senate Joint Resolution 208, declaring that the oil resources of the marginal sea are asserted to be the property of the United States. The resolution further undertook to authorize and direct the Attorney General to institute legal proceedings for the purpose of establishing the rights of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I repeat that this joint resolution passed the Senate unanimously, without a dissenting voice.

Who will rise to say that the Senate in 1937 was instigating a Federal grab?

Indeed, Mr. President, if there is an element of grab, and I think there is, it is a grab not by the Federal Government but a grab to take away from the people of all 48 States that which the courts have determined belongs to them. It was not a grab upon the part of the Federal Government for the Supreme Court to determine that this oil was national property. It was an adjudication. Once an adjudication was made and the ownership of the oil determined, then it is a grab when those who do not own the oil seek to take it away from those who do own it. So I say that the question which today should concern the Congress and the American people is not how to give this oil away, but how to keep it and use it in the national interest. That is why, I, along with 17 other Members of the Senate have proposed legislation to dedicate this precious, priceless, irreplaceable national asset to the common defense and to the education of America's children.

In my discussion, Mr. President, I have attempted to dispose of the legal shams which pretend to prop up the rickety myth of justification behind H. R. 4484.

I turn now to two considerations of national policy which must impel the Congress to retain this offshore oil for the people of the United States. Both of these policy considerations are embodied in the so-called oil-for-education amendment which my colleagues and I have introduced.

I am pleased to say that the number of sponsors of the oil-for-education amendment has increased to 18. They are besides myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The first consideration of national policy is our national security. Can anyone be unaware of what is taking place in Iran—the oil life line of half the world? Surely none are so simple as to imagine that Russia in her schemes and her overtures to the Iranian Government has any other purpose than to get her hands on the oil that she now lacks for her huge war machine.

While we still hope for a safe solution of the Iranian oil crisis, we would be faithless guardians for our people if we did not, as prudent men, act on the assumption that the oil of the Middle East might be lost to Western Europe and to us. In such case all free nations must look to this hemisphere. In such case our oil becomes not alone a national resource to be conserved and guarded for the future welfare of our children but a national resource which must be preserved by a watchful government, if our Nation is to survive.

A modern army travels not on its stomach but on oil. The Wehrmacht ground to a shuddering halt because of lack of oil. The American Air Force made its first great raids on the Axis against the Ploesti oil refineries in World War II and it kept up a steady attack until Hitler had no oil. The vaunted Luftwaffe and the Japanese Air Force—what was left of them—stayed on the ground because they had no oil. Oil is strategic target No. 1 for the very simple reason that if a nation does not have oil it has neither offense nor defense.

The Federal Government, charged under the Constitution with the responsibility for national defense, must at all costs conserve its oil for our defense.

Our first Secretary of Defense, the able and tragic James Forrestal, who understood so well that oil was the sinew of arms called the offshore oil "our most priceless possession." With his long background of experience as wartime Secretary of the Navy, he strongly opposed the giveaway bills which were the predecessors of the present H. R. 4484. If he were alive today—whether in public office or as a private citizen—I know his voice would be raised once again in warning that this oil must be preserved under Federal control.

The point I have just made has been made no better anywhere than in a recent editorial from the Atlanta Journal. It says:

"While all this focuses the attention of the world on oil from foreign countries, the Congress of the United States attempts to fritter away one of our greatest potential sources of oil right here at home."

"There is only one proper use for the offshore oil fields: That is, as a reserve for national defense to power the Army, Navy, and Air Force of this country if and when other sources are depleted."

"If we allow States and individual companies to chip away at this resource until it is lost, the time may come when we will have committed national suicide for lack of the fuel to maintain our Armed Forces.

"The St. Louis Post-Dispatch," which has led the fight for national control of offshore oil, has stated the case unanswerably:

" 'Whether under the false cry of States Rights or the frank admission of private greed, no one must be allowed to exhaust today what may be indispensable to the Nation's existence tomorrow. Against any effort to put our fighting oil to any smaller purpose than the defense of the Nation, the only course is to fight.' "

Only the Federal Government can determine the defense needs for oil. Only the highest experts of the Army, the Navy, and

the Air Force in collaboration with the technicians of the Interior Department can weigh the fluctuating supply and demand of oil. They are the ones who must weigh the chances in Iran, they must determine how easily and how soon the great Middle East pipeline may be sabotaged, they must evaluate the availability of the tankers of the western allies, they must decide how much oil can safely be diverted from the Western Hemisphere to Western Europe, should Middle Eastern oil fall to Russia This sort of thing cannot be done by State governments.

The oil-for-education amendment offers a two-edged weapon for national defense:

During the present emergency the royalties from this offshore oil may be used for the urgent needs of national defense

Once these needs are met, once the sinews and muscles of our war machine are sufficiently strong that Russia must prudently pause, it is our proposal that the royalties from this oil should then be used in all the States for educational purposes. For we cannot longer neglect the education of our children if we expect as a nation to remain intelligent enough to recognize international danger and to be able to preserve our freedom. As the United States Commissioner of Education, Hon Earl James McGrath, said recently:

"Life does not stop while we build the Nation's military strength Children are born and grow up They go to school and to college You cannot put a generation into educational cold storage and then later put them into an educational hothouse

"The necessities of the long pull before us are not merely military essentials There are equally basic essentials in nonmilitary areas To provide the essentials in all areas is our continuing objective Only thus can we meet the demands of the long pull which lie before us—a period in which the preparedness of the Nation must be at hitherto undreamed-of peacetime levels, which at the same time the basic essentials of life and growth must be provided for all our people, including all the children."

We face a future world where in terms of sheer quantitative manpower our children may be outweighed 4 or 5 to 1. It may be even 10 to 1 if the Soviet manages to consolidate the continent of Asia And as we analyze why we have not already been overwhelmed by the totalitarian tide, the most fundamental answer is that we have had the foresight for over a century to invest more of our national wealth in the education of our children than any other nation

I suggest that America's organizational and productive capacity—which is the root of our own security and is the last great hope of the free world today—is the direct result of two mighty American inspirations about education. The first of these inspirations was public support for free schools with good educational standards, first dreamed of and fought for by Thomas Jefferson and later accomplished in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by Horace Mann, of Brown University, Rhode Island, and our second inspiration was the policy of dedicating revenues from our public lands to education.

Several months ago when we introduced the "oil for education" amendment on the floor of the Senate, I tried to indicate that this precious heritage of education for all our people was in danger of becoming a myth. At that time I cited the dilapidated condition of our schools, the huge increases in our child population, and the alarming exodus of our inadequately paid teachers from the teaching profession into better-paying pursuits.

Last month the Office of Education released its annual enrollment estimates. These new estimates point to the highest enrollment of students ever recorded—more than 33,000,000 elementary, high school, and college students. Elementary school enrollment jumped by nearly a million last year as the wartime baby crop began to become of school age. A veritable tidal wave of 6-year-olds will hit the schools over the next 4 years. Ten thousand new elementary school teachers are required just to meet the swollen enrollment this year.

As for the general school situation all we need to do is to state the increased enrollment figures. Once that is done the problems they reveal are frighteningly obvious. Once more let United States Commissioner of Education McGrath speak:

"Ninety-nine thousand new teachers will be needed to fill positions left vacant by retirement, resignation, or death during 1951–52.

"Additional numbers of children enrolled will require 21,600 teachers who did not teach last year.

"Of the 120,600 total, elementary schools will need 87,000 new teachers; high schools, 33,000.

"Expanded school enrollments in 1951–52 will call for 25,000 new classrooms. To replace obsolete facilities an additional 18,000 classrooms should be provided. One of every five schoolhouses now in use throughout the United States should be abandoned or extensively remodeled because they are fire hazards, obsolete or health risks."

Think of it—one of every five schoolhouses are today fire hazards, obsolete, or health risks

Ever since the depression, and I remind you that was 20 years ago, school construction has failed to keep pace with the demand for classroom facilities. This had been true for three reasons—first, the depression years; second, the ban on construction during World War II; and, third, the awaited drop in building costs after the war did not occur, as we all know

The result of this 20 years of delay is obvious today to every parent and teacher, to every State and local government, and, in fact, I do not believe there is any citizen who is unaware of it.

According to the recent annual report of Dr Willard E Givens, executive secretary of the National Education Association, the situation is incredibly bad Dr. Givens says.

"At least a quarter of a million children are attending school only on a half-day basis, and many thousand others are attending school in basements, rented store buildings, and other quarters not suited for school purposes. The inadequate toilet facilities, faulty ventilation, dust-laden air, and uncontrolled noises that are found far too often in old, outmoded buildings still in use are a threat to the health of children "

The National Education Association's estimate of the need in the next 10-year period from 1950 to 1960 is that a half million new elementary- and secondary-school classrooms must be built. At present prices NEA estimated the cost at $13,500,000,000.

Miss Selma Borchardt, vice president of the American Federation of Teachers in reporting upon the unanimous action of the federation in endorsing the oil-for-education amendment at its national convention last month declared that "the Nation's schools face their most severe crisis in our country's history." The federation emphasized the urgent need for Federal funds to aid American education in the crisis.

It has long been clear that many local communities which have in the past almost wholly borne this financial responsibility can no longer do so, even when they tax themselves to the limit.

But vastly more important than the bricks and mortar are the people who prepare our children with knowledge and teach them to think.

The school teacher is the central figure in the education process. We entrust the minds and the character of our most precious resource—our children—to the teacher for many hours of the day. We look to the teacher to mold the children for the responsibilities of manhood and womanhood. Inevitably the character and influence of the teacher are woven into the character of the entire Nation.

Yet we are guilty of shocking neglect of our teachers. We have never given them the recognition, the appreciation, and the financial security they deserve. Poorly paid even before World War II, their situation is much worse today. Their earnings have not kept pace with earnings in general Rising costs have forced thousands upon thousands of teachers from the classrooms out of financial necessity, and they are still leaving The drain is greatest among our best trained teachers. Teachers with emergency certificates are becoming less the exception than the rule Teacher-training colleges cannot even begin to meet the huge demands for teachers from the dwindling graduating classes as young people abandon their teaching ambition to economic necessity.

The only way to get the 80,000 teachers needed during the school year which started last month is to pay them adequately.

Now let me turn briefly to the situation in our colleges Contrary to the trend in the elementary and high school—our colleges and universities have this fall suffered their second consecutive drop in enrollment The New York Times reports the student loss this year at 250,000, a 10 percent drop from last year Besides the draft and the drawing to a close of GI education programs, there is a third reason Our birth rate in the depression years was, as is always true in depressions, quite low The depression babies are now entering the colleges. Today, we have a situation in our colleges and universities that is just the opposite of what it will be a few years from now when the tremendous crop of war and postwar babies are ready for their training as our doctors, lawyers, teachers, engineers, chemists, and as leaders in other professions and businesses When that period arrives we must have colleges ready to receive them It is our duty to keep alive our facilities for college training I am willing to agree that a certain amount of economizing in tight times is not only necessary but encourages efficiency in any institution, whether it be a college, a business or a government But we must be most careful that we do not cripple vital functions. Colleges today train most of the people who will someday be our leaders.

All our colleges are having serious financial trouble, whether they are State institutions, land-grant colleges, the large private universities, or the small college The New York Times survey to which I referred shows that half our independent liberal arts institutions are operating in the red The colleges that are hardest hit are the small colleges with enrollments under 500 They may be small colleges for women or city colleges without a campus These are the kind that too often do not have the endowment of a large private college and, of course, do not have the tax support of the State institutions. But if you will look through Who's Who in America and pick at random the names of the men and women whom you regard as important on the national scene you will be surprised at how many received their educations in these small colleges. I invite you to look at the Congressional Directory and see how many of our colleagues in both Houses of Congress received their education in such institutions.

The large colleges are having serious difficulty in receiving funds from the sources which have supported them in the past as estate and inheritance taxes no longer make it possible for rich people to give large support to such institutions. The downward trend of college enrollment means that tuition, so often the backbone and the mainstay of so many of our higher institutions, is dwindling.

Yet a college is much more than bricks and mortar, ivy and campus. It is essentially the sense of tradition, the pride of excellent teaching over the years that distinguishes the good college from the mediocre one. Once again, I remind you that if this world stays in its present uneasy state our colleges and universities will have to have help if they are to survive and be able to support the war and post-war baby population which this September has overrun the first grade.

In 1930 we spent 3.1 percent of our national income for schools, including teachers' salaries. In 1951 this dropped to 2.5 percent. We should be able to do better than this. In 1939, for example, we spent $2,289,000,000 for all public school costs. In the same year of 1939 we spent almost that much for tobacco; more than that by one-third for alcoholic beverages. That was more than a decade ago. Our performance today is even worse. In 1949 we spent $5,000,000,000 on schools. In the same year of 1949 we spent $8,000,000,000 for alcoholic beverages; $4,500,000,000 for tobacco, $2,000,000,000 for amusements alone—three times as much for luxuries as we did for education.

Can we honestly say our pride in education, our respect for the teaching profession, our concern for our children are all we claim they are?

Mr. President, I have thus far devoted myself to an exposé of the false arguments espoused by the proponents of H R 4484 and I have tried to set forth for you the size of the educational problem which confronts these United States.

I now turn to an explanation of our "Oil for Education" amendment. While it, like other legislation, is not a panacea it will go far toward curing the financial crisis in today's education without placing a further burden on the back of the taxpayer. I should like to answer some of the questions on the purpose of this amendment which have been raised by other Senators and by educators, parents, teachers and citizens in every State in the Union. I report with pleasure, Mr. President, that I have been gratified at the great show of interest in this measure as reflected in my mail. I was well aware that the serious problems of education were weighing heavily on the minds and hearts as well as on the pocketbooks of our citizens. The mail that I am receiving shows how widespread and acute is this concern.

I want to emphasize again that the "Oil for Education" amendment proposes no new departure into unchartered seas It is simply a continuation of one of our oldest and wisest national policies—a policy that was advocated and fought for by that far-sighted Massachusetts statesman, President and Member of Congress, John Quincy Adams.

That policy is the use of revenues from public lands for educational purposes.

From the earliest beginnings in colonial times many of the colonies earmarked public lands for the support of schools. The earliest case was in Virginia in 1618. Colleges started with the aid of land grants in the various colonies include Harvard in Massachusetts, William and Mary in Virginia, Yale in Connecticut, Princeton in New Jersey, and others in South Carolina and Georgia.

After the American Revolution we were faced with a situation which was similar in some respects to the present demands of the three coastal States for the national property in the submerged lands lying beyond the low-tide mark. Individual States laid claim to the territories west of the Appalachians. In 1780 the Congress passed a resolution containing a pledge that these western lands would be disposed of for the benefit of all States. In 1785 and 1787 ordinances were passed by the Congress which specifically set aside a portion of the public lands west of the mountains for school purposes. In speaking of the ordinance of 1787, Daniel Webster declared:

"I doubt whether one single law of any lawgiver, ancient or modern, has produced effects of more distinct, marked, and lasting character than the ordinance of 1787. It set forth and declared it to be a high and binding duty of the Government to support schools and advance the means of education."

Many of the great State universities were started with the aid of the public lands dedicated to education by the ordinances of 1785 and 1787. In the next three-quarters of a century many additional laws were passed by the Congress setting aside Federal lands or the proceeds thereof for educational purposes in the several States. None of these laws were, however, as general in effect and as significant as the Morrill Act passed by Congress in 1862 and signed into law by President Abraham Lincoln. This act granted to each State 30,000 acres of Federal land or land script for each Senator and Representative in the Congress to which the State was entitled for the establishment and maintenance of colleges for the benefit of agriculture and mechanical arts States in which there were no Federal public lands, or which did not contain sufficient amount of public land to satisfy the grant, were issued land script which could be sold by the State and redeemed by the purchasers of the script from public lands located in other States.

The land-grant colleges are an integral part of the public higher educational system in the South and West. It is possible that easterners have too easily forgotten that this support from the Federal Government is given to their most prized educational institutions too. Do we recall, for example, that the great Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge, Mass., which this Nation has long regarded as a pinnacle of engineering and scientific capacity and to which Washington turns when we need scientists to lead our scientific defense effort—is a beneficiary under the Morrill Act?

And the people of New York well know that Cornell University, at Ithaca, where my distinguished colleague on the other side of the aisle, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] once taught, and which is a pioneer of scientific agriculture in this country, is a land-grand college receiving aid from the Federal Government through the Morrill Act.

After the land-grant colleges had become fairly established throughout the Nation with the assistance provided by the land grants under the Morrill Act, many of the States experienced difficulty in supporting these colleges In a number of subsequent acts the Congress provided for the further endowment, support, and extension of the services of these institutions. Thus, from a far-sighted and intelligent use of a portion of the national domain there has arisen a system of great educational institutions upon which the higher education of a major portion of our population primarily depends. No one can estimate what this wise use of public-land resources for education has meant to the development and progress of the United States. Benefits accruing to the Nation from this fruitful and far-sighted policy of educational endowment has been great beyond measure. These institutions of learning have contributed importantly to the rise of the United States to its present position of strength and world leadership.

Public funds applied to free education for all at the primary and secondary level, together with public funds applied through land-grant college endowments at a higher level, have had the effect of piling up the reserves of generations of educated youngsters that give us the competence by which our Nation solves its productive problems to a degree never approached by any other nation in all history.

For generation after generation these land-grant colleges have been turning out young men and women as top-flight engineers, farmers, doctors, teachers, and as leaders in many other essential professions and skills.

It is indeed no accident that a scientific idea originating anywhere in the world always finds its quickest practical application in the United States. That is because the seed generated by the genius of the world falls upon a cultivated ground of engineering know-how.

It is no accident—but is instead the accumulated payoff of generations of great agricultural teaching—that year after year, despite the vagaries of the weather, we have been producing bumper crop after bumper crop from seeds which originated in foreign countries. And we have used these crops not only to feed ourselves but to help a starving world all the way to India. No one, I may say, is more aware of this than our ECA administrators and point 4 program administrators.

You and I know that merely putting American machinery and American capital into even the highest foreign civilizations abroad will not produce anywhere near the same end result as that same machinery always produces here at home. The simple reason is that when the machinery arrives there is not available the skilled manpower to work it, and more importantly, the skilled know-how to maintain it.

We struggle constantly with the problem of how to raise the standard of living in the world. The Middle East is much in the news today. We have heard the stories of the returning travelers who tell of American agricultural machinery parked in corners of Iran while the peasants to whom it was offered have reverted to the old agricultural tools with which they were born. Why? Because, once the machinery was received, Iranian people simply did not have the knowledge either to operate that machinery effectively or the training to give loose nuts and bolts their needed maintenance.

In the nation which we look to as most like ourselves—the British Isles—with a population of 50,000,000, some 60,000 boys and girls will go to college this year America with a population only 2½ times that of the British Isles will send 35 times as many boys and girls—2,000,000—to college this year though this enrollment will be over a quarter million less than went to college last year.

The real solution to the need for more teachers, more agriculturists, more scientists, more chemists, physicists and engineers, more doctors, more professional and business leaders is to apply to the royalties from the offshore oil our traditional policy of dedicating the revenue from public lands to education.

At the last commencement exercises of Yale University, its new president, Dr Griswold, in telling of the financial problems of educational institutions as he saw them, said that in his dreams there was "an oil well under Woodbridge Hall" I would say to Dr Griswold and to all our other educators that they need dream no more of oil wells; that our amendment offers to education oil wealth that is the equivalent of an oil well on the campus of every college, high school and grammer school in America.

The proposal embodied in the oil-for-education amendment is, entirely in accordance with our continuing national tradition of devoting the proceeds of public lands to the support of education. The adoption of this proposal would be a historic act comparable to the ordinances of 1785 and 1787 and to the Morrill Act of 1862.

I have been asked the question:

"How concretely do you propose to apply these funds to education?"

The answer of the sponsors of this bill is simple, and if I may say so, is eminently practical also. We have said, time and time again, that it is of the utmost importance that we do not get involved in some controversy over how precisely the funds are to be applied until such time as we have first made sure that this priceless asset of $40,000,000,000 worth of oil is earmarked for the purposes of education. After we have accomplished this, there will be time enough to work out the details of their application.

Our amendment provides that a national council of 12 educators be appointed to study the question of aids for education and to report back to the Congress the results of its study and its recommendations for action by Congress. This council of educators is to consist of 12 members, 4 to be appointed by the President, 4 by the Speaker of the House, and 4 by the President of the Senate.

The sponsors, drawn from both political parties, view this amendment as a nonpartisan attempt to aid education We have always visualized that the members of the Council must be nonpartisan. Although we did not so include it in our amendment the companion bill in the House introduced by Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana provided that two of each four to be appointed by the President, Speaker and Vice President, shall be Democrats and the other two shall be Republicans. We shall be happy at the proper time to include such a provision in our amendment.

But far more important, at least to the minds of the 18 sponsors of the amendment than the political label which such men may happen to wear, is the quality of the educators to be selected

It is our thought that they should be selected from such qualified sources as the heads of the great educational foundations; from among the heads of our colleges and universities, large and small, and from the most able men and women in the secondary and elementary fields.

It is a great undertaking that the sponsors of this amendment propose. It is essentially a task to be done for education by educators. They are the men and women who have lived with, and are living with the essential financial problems which beset our schools

We must bring the best intellects as well as the best informed and most experienced minds to serve on the Council.

Out of a study by the Council undoubtedly will come intelligent and equitable ways to help relieve the financial straits of our elementary and secondary schools. And surely sound methods will be found for helping to relieve the agonizing difficulties of colleges and universities, medical schools, dental schools, nursing schools, technological schools, and research institutions by techniques such as scholarships and grants-in-aid for specific training and research projects. The possibilities challenge the imagination.

Here we are given the opportunity—and this one, I can assure you, really does knock but once—to devote the Nation's wealth under the sea to our children. Such a dream as this "oil for education" proposal can come alive only when we have such a stupendous sum as $40,000,000,000.

I have mentioned some objectives for study by the National Advisory Council. Actually, if they were to call me before them I would say to them but one thing—and I say it now. I would quote to them the words of that great Frenchman, L'Enfant, whose genius turned a swamp into the most beautiful of all American cities, the city of Washington. You remember that he said:

"Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood."

Sometimes, Mr. President, we have seen men more frightened by opportunity than by failure. In brief moments of quiet, amidst the struggles and frustrations of daily problems, we dream of great things that might be. We have our large hopes and our vain imaginings—but they seem so unreal that we are ashamed to speak of them. Instead, we treasure them as little private refuges from life's disappointments.

How often have all of us thus dreamed of some vast bonaza which would give us the bricks and the mortar, the men and the women, the institutions and the instrumentalities to offer our children what they really need.

Then, like Aladdin, we rub the lamp, and the genie is before us tugging to do our will. But, instead of seizing the moment, we hesitate, and the will, enfeebled by the very magnitude of the challenge, quails before success and loses the golden, never-to-be-repeated chance

Such is the classic history of failure. Let us not fail now We have rubbed the lamp, and the genie is before us, saying, "Masters, I will build your schoolhouses. Masters, I will give your teachers a living wage. Masters, I will save your colleges. Masters, I will endow you with generations of trained and capable intellects. Masters, I will give you the alchemy of a strong and successful democracy. I am here to serve you."

Our answer must be: "Serve, and serve well."

Mr HILL. Mr President, a short time ago I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a telegram which I received under date of September 6 from Mr. Irvin R. Kuenzli, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Teachers, in which Mr. Kuenzli advised me of the unanimous endorsement by the federation of the amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 20, known as the oil-for-education amendment. The endorsement was given at the annual convention of the federation in Grand Rapids, Mich., last month.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD two resolutions of the American Federation of Labor that were adopted at the seventieth annual convention of the federation in San Francisco, Calif., last month.

The resolutions endorse and pledge the full support of the American Federation of Labor to the oil-for-education amendment. Both these resolutions were unanimously adopted by the convention.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USE OF INCOME FROM UNDERSEA OIL FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Whereas Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, one of the greatest educational statesmen our country has produced, has asked that instead of turning submerged oil lands now held by the Federal Government over to the oil interests for exploitation for personal gain at the threatened loss of national security, that the income from this property be turned over expressly for educational use: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Federation of Labor give full support to this proposal to use the income from submerged oil lands to further public education.

OIL LANDS REVENUE FOR EDUCATION

Whereas the security of the United States is imperiled by enemies of our functional democracy; and

Whereas in this situation every American citizen must be rendered capable of contributing his maximum effort in behalf of our country, and this entails achievement of his highest learning capacity; and

Whereas it is universally recognized that a financial crisis exists in the schools and colleges of this country—a crisis so severe that the quality of American education is seriously endangered and will continue to suffer to an increasing extent unless substantial financial assistance is forthcoming from the Federal Government to help meet this problem of national concern; and

Whereas necessary demands on the Nation's general funds for other important and essential purposes incident to the emergency, indicate the urgency of providing funds from sources in addition to those available through taxation; and

Whereas the House of Representatives had not only failed to provide for such educational needs through tax revenues, but has actually also passed a bill which would remove from the people's use the greatest presently known source of nontax revenue—the returns available from undersea oil; and

Whereas this bill, passed by the House and now before the Senate, would, in effect, surrender this great financial yield to large financial interests that are striving to overrule the United States Supreme Court's decision that the undersea oil belongs to all the 48 States, and

Whereas Senator LISTER HILL, long known to us as a courageous fighter for the rights of American citizens, has sponsored—with the cooperation of other Senators—an amendment to the nefarious House bill which would apply the royalties realized from undersea oil to the support of education—primary, secondary, and higher education. Therefore be it

Resolved by the American Federation of Labor in annual convention assembled in San Francisco, Calif., That we endorse, and pledge our full support to, the amendment proposed by Senator LISTER HILL which provides that royalties from undersea oil be applied for the support of education in the United States, and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator LISTER HILL and to Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana, with a letter expressing to each of them the appreciation of the American Federation of Labor for their vision and foresight as evidenced by the amendment, and assuring them of the Federation's support in working toward adoption by Congress of their constructive proposals in the public's interest.

RESPONSE BY MAJORITY LEADER

Mr McFARLAND. Mr. President, I desire to express my deep appreciation for what has been said here this evening in regard to my work. But I desire particularly to join Senators who have expressed their love and admiration for the President of the Senate. He has always been generous in his time to counsel and advise with me. I believe that you, Mr. President, have been most fair to every Member of the Senate.

I wish also to express my appreciation to the staff of the Senate. They have worked with us for many long hours, longer hours than many people know have been spent by them in work.

I express my sincere appreciation to the majority whip, my dear friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who has been a devoted colleague and an energetic worker. Nor should we forget the service of the page boys. And all of us are indebted to the official reporters, whose devotion to duty and long hours at a difficult and thankless task is beyond our ability to praise. In particular I wish to commend Mr. Fred A. Carlson,

one of the Official Reporters, who is ill, and I wish for him a speedy recovery. I desire once again to express my appreciation to all who have helped the Senate in its work. All have contributed toward making this Congress a success.

Earlier in the afternoon we heard a speech by the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. He spoke about the time that is needlessly consumed in the Senate.

I believe there are those who feel that I have not consumed as much time as I should have consumed; that I should have responded to various political speeches that have been made from time to time on the floor of the Senate. But I have had the feeling that we had an important legislative duty to perform here, that these are different times that required our undivided attention, and that the record speaks for itself. I have tried to devote what energies I have and what ability I have in an attempt to make the record a little better.

I wish to say just one further word with regard to Government officials, many of whom have been unfairly and perhaps even recklessly criticized.

I picked up Time magazine yesterday evening, and I read an article about the President of the United States. No one can say that Time magazine is partisan to the Democratic Party, or is hesitant to criticize the administration I shall not read the whole article, but only the first paragraph:

Harry Truman is not an eloquent man. But he is a peace-loving, God-fearing man, who can, on occasion, speak eloquently as the voice of a Nation that is peace-loving and God-fearing, too. This week he did so, when, as a fellow-Baptist, he addressed the ground-breaking ceremonies at the Baptists' new Wake Forest College just outside of Winston-Salem, N. C.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Time magazine of October 22, 1951]

THE PRESIDENCY—"WE STAND IN NEED"

Harry Truman is not an eloquent man. But he is a peace-loving, God-fearing man who can, on occasion, speak eloquently as the voice of a Nation that is peace-loving and God-fearing, too. This week he did so when, as a fellow Baptist, he addressed the ground-breaking ceremonies at the Baptists' new Wake Forest College just outside of Winston-Salem, N. C.

Said the President of the United States: "I am afraid that some people here and abroad believe that the creation of armed defenses must inevitably lead to war. This is not the case. We do not think war is inevitable" He was willing to consider the difficult question of coexisting with communism, but under conditions that would render world communism powerless to threaten the security of the free world. "So long as one country has the power and forces to overwhelm others, and so long as that country has aggressive intentions, real peace is unattainable. As our strength increases, we should be able to negotiate settlements that the Soviet Union will respect and live up to."

He kept the sharp, political edge from his voice even when he touched briefly, without naming it, on McCarthyism. "To the sowers of suspicion, and the peddlers of fear, to all those who seem bent in persuading us that our country is on the wrong track and there is no honor or loyalty left in the land I would say one thing: 'Take off your blinders and look toward the future. The worst danger we face is the danger of being paralyzed by doubts and fears. This danger is brought on by those who abandon faith and sneer at hope.' Yet, at heart, I do not greatly fear such men, for they have always been with us, and in the long run they have always failed.

"When the accounts of history are rendered, it is the going forward that will constitute the record—not the hesitations and the mistakes—not how you refrained from wrong, but how you did right. For six long years now we have contended, with all the weapons of mind and spirit, against the adherents of the false god of tyranny. These positive acts have not been easy to do. They have brought upon us the hatred and threats and curses of the enemies of freedom—and may bring upon us even worse troubles. Nevertheless, if this Nation is justified by history, it is these things that will justify it, and not the negative virtue of meaning no harm.

"God forbid that I should claim for our country the mantle of perfect righteousness. We have committed sins of omission and sins of commission, for which we stand in need of the mercy of the Lord But I dare maintain before the world that we have done much that was right"

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that the article singing the praises of the President of the United States described him as speaking for a God-fearing and God-loving people Regardless of whether we agree with the President, that is the kind of President we have.

With respect to some of the statements which have been made on the floor of the Senate, I think I should say there always will be, regardless of what administration or what party may be in control some Government employees who are not trustworthy. In any group of a million or more people, there are some lacking in some respects. None of us is perfect Yet, the percentage of those in Government unworthy of trust is amazingly small; on the whole they are just what Time described the mass of the people of the United States—God-loving and God-fearing people.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I had intended to say something about the record of this session of the Congress. However, I do not care to take the time of the Senate to do so at this time. Therefore, I am placing in a subsequent edition of the RECORD an analysis of what I think this session of Congress has accomplished.

I think I should say, however, that I am proud that I serve in the Senate of the United States, and that I am a Member of the Eighty-second Congress. Those of us who serve here represent the Government which is the best in the world. It is demonstrated to be the best because the largest numbers of persons who seek entrance into our country come from the countries which criticize us the most. We who serve in the Senate are Members of the greatest deliberative body in the world. I am proud of the record the Senate has made during this session of the Congress. I wish to express my appreciation to Senators on both sides of the aisle for helping to make the record we have made.

This Congress will go down in history as a national-defense Congress. This Congress has done more than has any so-called peacetime Congress—that is outside a period of global war—for the defense of the United States of America.

This Congress has devoted itself almost unstintingly to authorizations and appropriations designed to build up our strength as a bulwark for the whole world against aggressive communism. In so doing, I believe this Congress has done more to bring about eventual peace in a troubled world.

Mr. President, as we adjourn this evening, my feeling is a mixture of joy and sadness: joy because I shall be returning home to visit again with my friends and neighbors in my State and discuss with them our problems; sadness because I shall miss my colleagues and associations here, even though I shall be gone for only 2 months.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr President, in behalf of the 250,000 American boys fighting in Korea and in behalf of the 85,000 to 95,000 American boys who have been casualties in Korea, I feel that as one Member of the United States Senate I should say that I do not believe we are at peace, and I do not think this session of Congress has been a peacetime session. To the contrary, we have been appropriating money and we have been doing many other things in the national defense effort, in order to protect those who are fighting for us in Korea and who are giving their utmost to win the Korean war. In their behalf, and as one Member of the United States Senate, I do not want them to receive the impression that we think the Nation is at peace and that we are neglecting them and that we think we are not at war, because we are at war.

Mr McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not wish at this time to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Indiana on the Korean conflict. No one feels more deeply than do I about our American boys who have shed their blood in Korea, fighting under the flag of the United Nations.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was stating my view.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, your committee appointed to wait upon the President and inform him that the Congress is ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make, has performed that duty, and the President has advised us that he has no further communication to make to Congress.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Therefore, Mr. President, in accordance with the terms of House Concurrent Resolution 171, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned sine die.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned sine die.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Senate, the Vice President, under the authority of House Concurrent Resolution 172, signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 1320. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between certain officers of the Public Health Service and comparable officers of the Army, and for other purposes;

S. 1629. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, to permit the interstate movement, for immediate slaughter, of domestic animals which have reacted to a test for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test for brucellosis; and for other purposes;

S. 1931. An act for the relief of Joyce Jacqualyn Johnson;

S. 1980. An act for the relief of Adelheid Wichman (now Adelheid Waitschies);

S 2041. An act for the relief of Meiko Shindo;

S 2228. An act for the relief of William Elden Joslin;

H R. 320. An act to assure hospitalization and out-patient treatment by the Veterans' Administration of World War II veterans who develop an active psychosis within 2 years from the date of separation from active service;

H. R. 1005. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material;

H. R 2094. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2207 An act for the relief of Numa A. Winstead;

H. R. 2546. An act for the relief of Charles W. Vanderhoop;

H R 3490 An act to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotic laws, and for other purposes;

H. R 3590 An act relating to the income-tax treatment of gain realized on an involuntary conversion of property;

H R 3838 An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Joseph Pickett;

H. R. 3840. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Laura A. Craig;

H R 3899. An act to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes;

H R. 3937. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), to provide for the operation, management, and maintenance, and demolition of federally acquired properties following the acquisition of such properties and before the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4055. An act to authorize for an additional 1-year period the use of rivers and harbors appropriations for maintenance of the canal from Cape May Harbor to Delaware Bay and the railroad and highway bridges over such canal;

H. R. 4219. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Milliken;

H. R. 4288. An act granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Sabine River by the States of Texas and Louisiana;

H R. 4351. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Ursula Rutherford Ollinger;

H. R. 4352. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary Rutherford Spearson;

H. R. 5397. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dora Troost;

H R 5411. An act to amend Public Laws Nos. 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense housing areas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5593. An act authorizing the Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority, hereby created, and its successors, to construct, maintain, and operate bridges over Sabine Lake, at or near Port Arthur, Tex.; to construct, maintain, and operate all causeways, approaches, and appurtenances pertaining thereto; and to finance said objects by the issuance of bonds secured by the said properties and income and revenues; and for other purposes;

H. R. 5650. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5745. An act to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages;

H J. Res 330 Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Trade Fair, Inc , Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; and

H J. Res. 351. Joint resolution fixing the date of the meeting of the second regular session of the Eighty-second Congress.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on October 22, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S 1320. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between certain officers of the Public Health Service and comparable officers of the Army, and for other purposes;

S. 1629. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, to permit the interstate movement, for immediate slaughter, of domestic animals which have reacted to a test for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test for brucellosis, and for other purposes;

S. 1931. An act for the relief of Joyce Jacqualyn Johnson;

S 1980. An act for the relief of Adelheid Wichman (now Adelheid Waitschies);

S. 2041. An act for the relief of Meiko Shindo; and

S. 2228. An act for the relief of William Elden Joslin.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to sine die adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that he had approved and signed acts, as follows:

On October 22, 1951:

S. 1959. An act to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

On October 23, 1951:

S. 467. An act to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota.

On October 24, 1951:

S. 11. An act to provide for the appointment of conservators to conserve the assets and provide for the personal welfare of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, not amounting to unsoundness of mind, or physical incapacity;

S. 264. An act to provide for granting to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and the White House and United States Park Police forces additional compensation for working on holidays;

S. 355. An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department;

S. 466. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Army certain property in St. Louis, Mo.;

S. 537. An act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934;

S. 622. An act to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

S. 752. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission;

S. 945. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947;

S. 1335. An act to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail;

S. 519. An act for the relief of Moy Chin Shee;

S 582. An act for the relief of Emma Burr;

S 954 An act for the relief of Dr. Charles Gordon Rennick Sell;

S 1274. An act for the relief of Vera Oumancoff;

S 1640. An act for the relief of Cathay Dana Besser;

S. 1912. An act to provide for conveyance of certain land to the city of New Orleans;

S. 1967. An act to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes; and

S 1970. An act for the relief of Louis E. Gabel.

On October 26, 1951:

S. 210. An act for the relief of Jesus Juan Llanderal;

S. 635 An act for the relief of Hans Lenk;

S 839. An act for the relief of Alice Ibrahim Hannan Ibrahim, Ellen Issa Zakaria, Ruth Naomi Schut, and Reseileen Schut; and

S 2244. An act to amend certain housing legislation to grant preferences to veterans of the Korean conflict.

On October 29, 1951:

S. 118. An act for the relief of Nouhad Ann Khoury;

S. 575. An act for the relief of Robert Jose Toribio;

S. 657. An act to amend and clarify the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, and for other purposes;

S. 775. An act for the relief of Dr. Anthony M. Opisso;

S. 1023. An act for the relief of Fumiko Theresa Shibata;

S. 1048. An act for the relief of Myrtle Harding;

S. 1931. An act for the relief of Joyce Jacqualyn Johnson;

S. 1980. An act for the relief of Adelheid Wichman (now Adelheid Waitschies);

S. 2007. An act for the relief of Sharon A. Gates;

S. 2027. An act for the relief of Leo Kleve; and

S. 2041. An act for the relief of Meiko Shindo.

On October 30, 1951:

S. 1046. An act to readjust postal rates;

S. 1311. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Yellowstone River;

S 1482 An act for the relief of the town of Mount Desert, Maine;

S. 1622 An act to amend section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946,

S 1629 An act to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, to permit the interstate movement, for immediate slaughter, of domestic animals which have reacted to a test for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test for brucellosis; and for other purposes,

S 2228. An act for the relief of William Elden Joslin; and

S 2233 An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended

On October 31, 1951

S 57. An act for the relief of Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin,

S 921. An act to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947,

S 1320 An act to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between certain officers of the Public Health Service and comparable officers of the Army, and for other purposes, and

S 1952 An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes.

DISAPPROVAL OF SENATE BILL AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The message also announced that on October 31, 1951, the President had vetoed the bill (S. 1436) for the relief of Mrs Marie Y. Mueller.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received October 20 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Gen Mark W Clark, Army of the United States, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the state of Vatican City.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

John Thomas Schneider, of the District of Columbia, to the position of Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 20 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Joseph Charles Duggan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

MUTUAL SECURITY AGENCY

Richard M. Bissell, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Roger M Foley, of East Milton, Mass., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Massachusetts.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Gurley C. Pitts, Altus.
Joe G. Hornberger, Manila.

CALIFORNIA

Norman R Brown, Arroyo Grande.
Geraldine J. Joiner, Adin.
Martha E. DeVilbiss, Big Bear City.
Karl W. Traylor, Blairsden.
Ella Kaye Curran, Bostonia.
Wyvonne E. Ingram, Brisbane
Clifford A. Ham, Colton.
Oliver A. Thorson, Darwin.
Winston S. Oaks, Lakeside
Richard E. Beechly, Lamont.
Bernard T. Finnin, Mojave.
Marshall G. Winn, Philo
George M Gallagher, Point Reyes Station.
Worth Keene, Seal Beach.
Marvin H Moest, Warner Springs.

FLORIDA

Madge K. Casey, Gulf Hammock.

HAWAII

Louis J. DeCoite, Keahua.

IDAHO

Elsie E Moore, Donnelly.
Lloyd J Passey, Paris.

INDIANA

Wilson Flack, Vernon.

MARYLAND

Homer C Shaffer, Crellin.

MICHIGAN

William J McGill, Davison
Ruth A Howe, Houghton Point.
Kenneth R Ruthig, Minden City.
Leland S Jennings, Saginaw.
Evelyn M Evans, St Joseph.

MISSISSIPPI

Julian B Gardner, Columbus
Leonard C Gibson, Jr, Crawford.
Nathan A Riley, Dorsey.

MISSOURI

Dixie E Myers, Green Ridge
Warren H Feldman, Stanberry.
John W Nelson, Versailles.

NEW JERSEY

Robert J Noce, Englishtown.
Clifford C Emens, Monmouth Junction.
George T Knapp, Mullica Hill
Edith M Jackson, Princeton Junction.

OHIO

Paul A Miller, Jackson
Walter G Sawyer, Lockbourne
Walter E Bennett, Okeana.

PENNSYLVANIA

Helen M Smith, Blairsville.
John William Strayer, Dover.
Andrew W Kovach, Grindstone.
Charles F Gregory, Lake Winola.
Frank H Keller, Linden
Sarah V Webster, Sewickley.
Brace S Knabenshue, Warren.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1951

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, who art always manifesting Thy grace and loving kindness, grant that we may be truly grateful for the many material and spiritual blessings which Thou hast vouchsafed unto us during this session of Congress.

Help us to continue to covet and cultivate more earnestly the durable satisfactions of life. God forbid that we should ever misdirect our aspirations and energies by putting the emphasis in the wrong places and on the wrong things.

May we understand that the peace and freedom, which we prize so highly, and for which we are contending, cannot be secured and maintained by our own human wisdom and might but by Thy spirit pervading and sustaining our individual and national life.

We pray that Thou wilt bestow upon our Speaker, the Members of Congress, and all who have served in various capacities, the seal of Thy approval and Thy fatherly benediction. May we have within our minds and hearts the testimony that we have sought to fulfill the duties of our high vocation with a pure and steadfast devotion to Thee and our fellow men.

May the Lord bless us and keep us; the Lord make His face to shine upon us and be gracious unto us; the Lord lift upon us the light of His countenance and give us peace. Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States by Mr Hawks, one of his secretaries, announced that on the following dates the President had approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles.

On October 10, 1951:

H R 744 An act for the relief of Wladimir Peter Lewicki, Mrs Heedwige Lewicki, and George Wladimir Lewicki;

H R 1253 An act for the relief of Jack A. Witham,

H R 2562 An act amending section 437 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H R 3026 An act for the relief of Joseph A Ferrari; and

H R 3128 An act for the relief of Elaine Dovico.

On October 11, 1951:

H R 676 An act for the relief of Mrs. Aimee Hoyningen-Huene,

H R 1203 An act to authorize officers designated by the Secretary of the Air Force to take action on reports of survey and vouchers pertaining to Government property;

H R. 1598. An act for the relief of Hanoh Sarapanovschi (also known as Hanoh Charat, Gizela (Gizele) Sarapanovschi (nee Levy) and Philippe Sarapanovschi,

H R. 3932 An act to provide vocational rehabilitation training for veterans with compensable service-connected disabilities who served on or after June 27, 1950;

H R 4121 An act for the relief of Rafael Alemany,

H. R 4127 An act for the relief of Mrs. Doris Ellen Young;

H R 4496 An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

H R 4756. An act for the relief of George Francis Hammers;

H R. 5013 An act to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea;

H. R 5102 An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif, area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval installations and defense-production plants in such area; and

H J Res. 340. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1952.

On October 12, 1951:

H. R. 3205. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 2 years after separation from

active service shall be presumed to be service-connected.

On October 15, 1951:

H. R. 5257. An act to amend section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), to increase the amount available as an emergency relief fund for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges damaged by floods or other catastrophes.

On October 16, 1951:

H. R. 1227. An act to amend further the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947, as amended;

H. R. 3504. An act for the relief of Nison Miller; and

H. R. 5504. An act to amend section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 to increase the amount available for the construction of access roads certified as essential to the national defense.

On October 17, 1951:

H. R. 4475. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

On October 18, 1951:

H R. 990. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased;

H. R. 4205. An act to provide retirement benefits for the Chief of the Dental Division of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5054. An act making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 1864) entitled "An act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the Senate, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill do pass, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 610. An act for the relief of Dr. Stanislaus Garstka and Dr. Marthewan Garstka;

H. R. 658. An act for the relief of Harold W. Britton;

H. R 853. An act for the relief of Maximilian Otto Ricker-Huetter and Mrs. Eugenia Ricker-Huetter;

H. R. 884. An act for the relief of Johanna A. Stoots;

H. R. 980. An act for the relief of Kikue Uchida;

H R. 1457. An act for the relief of Antranik Ayanian,

H. R. 1628. An act to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest fire control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont., and for other purposes;

H. R. 1672. An act for the relief of Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association;

H R. 1851. An act for the relief of Ark Ping Jee Nong (Ngon);

H. R. 2176. An act for the relief of the Fort Pierce Port District;

H. R. 2207. An act for the relief of Numa A. Winstead;

H. R. 2290. An act for the relief of Ralph Ambrose Thrall and Minnie Hasell Thrall;

H. R. 2506. An act for the relief of Masunari Saito and Isao Saito;

H. R. 2547. An act for the relief of Yoshiko Ito;

H. R. 2632. An act providing for the permanent residence of Sisters Adalgisa Bellagamba, Maria Rina Montecchio, Anna Taricco, Maria Caterina Crevani, Elizabeth Baggio, Rosa Portale, Lorenzina D'Amico, Assunta Bonfiglio, Maria D'Amico, Lorenzina Scellato, Luigia Andreina Fratelli, Elena Montecchio, and Maria Bellesso;

H. R 2791. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Richard E. Deane;

H. R. 3003. An act to authorize Rear Admiral Emory D. Stanley, United States Navy, retired, to accept employment with the Government of Peru;

H. R 3281. An act for the relief of Fanny Tsihrintge Papan;

H R. 3548. An act to provide that payments to States and Territories for care given to certain disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States shall be effective from the date such care commenced;

H. R. 3877. An act for the relief of Erlinda Maria Bowers;

H R 4027. An act to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands;

H R 4035. An act for the relief of Donald I. Hamrock, Robert N Lensch, Russell E. Ryan, and Helen P. Stewart;

H R 4049. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts certain lands and improvements comprising the Castle Island Terminal Facility at South Boston in exchange for certain other lands;

H. R. 4181. An act for the relief of Leroy Peebles;

H. R. 4203. An act to ratify and confirm Act 7 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945;

H R. 4567. An act for the relief of Roy Sakai,

H. R 4692. An act to authorize the appointment of Joseph F. Carroll as a permanent colonel in the Regular Air Force;

H. R. 4808 An act to provide for the granting of an easement for a public road through the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge in Dare County, N. C;

H R 4922. An act for the relief of Patricia Ann Eddings;

H R 4928. An act to provide that the interest of the United States in certain real property shall be conveyed to the city of Newport, Ky.;

H. R. 4929. An act for the relief of Michael Bernard (Cervera);

H. R. 4930. An act for the relief of Charles H. Craft;

H. R. 4940. An act for the relief of Suzie Ballard;

H R 4945. An act to authorize the use of appropriations for refunding moneys erroneously received and covered for the refund of forfeited bail;

H R. 4969. An act for the relief of Susa Yukiko Thomason;

H. R. 5062. An act to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status;

H. R. 5104. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inge L. Curtis;

H. R. 5230. An act providing for the conveyance to the State of North Carolina of the Currituck Beach Lighthouse Reservation, Corolla, N. C.;

H. R. 5405. An act to amend section 207 (a) of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress;

H. R. 5730. An act for the relief of William Lund Main;

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim January 13 of each year as Stephen Foster Memorial Day; and

H. J. Res. 330. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3899. An act to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5411. An act to amend Public Laws Nos. 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense housing areas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5425. An act to authorize construction at Air Force installations, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5593. An act authorizing the Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority, hereby created, and its successors, to construct, maintain, and operate bridges over Sabine Lake, at or near Port Arthur, Tex.; to construct, maintain, and operate all causeways, approaches, and appurtenances pertaining thereto; and to finance said objects by the issuance of bonds secured by the said properties and income and revenues; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 465. An act for the relief of Oswald A. Drica-Minieris;

S. 544 An act for the relief of Joseph Rossabi, Corrine Rossabi, Mayer Rossabi, and Morris Rossabi,

S. 560. An act for the relief of Dr. Louis S K. Yuan;

S. 589. An act for the relief of Sister Edeltrudis Sailer;

S 750. An act for the relief of Edward Chi-Kan Lam;

S. 968. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to mutual military aid in an emergency;

S. 993. An act for the relief of Robert Wendell Tadlock;

S. 1135. An act to provide a recruitment procedure for the competitive civil service in order to insure selection of personnel on the basis of open competition and merit, and for other purposes;

S 1255. An act for the relief of Leopold Kahn, Jr;

S. 1292. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the criminal penalty for persons convicted of gathering or delivering certain defense information to aid a foreign government in time of peace;

S. 1320. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between certain officers of the Public Health Service and comparable officers of the Army, and for other purposes;

S. 1359. An act for the relief of Virgine Zartarian (also known as Vergin Zartarian);

S. 1368. An act to amend subsection (a) of section 1107 of the District of Columbia Code of 1901, as amended, by section 2 of the act of December 20, 1944 (D. C. Code, sec. 15-403 (a)), and to amend section 467 of the District of Columbia Code of 1901 (D. C. Code, sec. 16-323);

S. 1538. An act for the relief of O. E. Hambleton and Mrs. Harriet Elizabeth Hambleton;

S. 1560. An act for the relief of Camilla Pintos;

S 1620. An act for the relief of Tory Lee Eakin;

S. 1636. An act for the relief of Theodore Alexander Vlandy;

S. 1650 An act to provide for the release of the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract or parcel of land conditionally granted by it to the city of Savannah, Chatham County, Ga.;

S 1683. An act for the relief of Carlos Tannoya,

S 1709. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 1839. An act for the relief of Willy Giroud;

S. 1925. An act for the relief of Gregory Joseph Coles;

S. 1931 An act for the relief of Joyce Jacqualyn Johnson;

S 1932 An act to authorize the establishment of facilities necessary for the detention of aliens in the administration and enforcement of the immigration laws, and for other purposes,

S 1980 An act for the relief of Adelheid Wichman (now Adelheid Waitschies);

S 2041. An act for the relief of Meiko Shindo,

S 2054 An act for the relief of Tomizo Naito,

S 2078 An act to authorize the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard), and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes;

S 2119. An act for the relief of Claudia Tanaka,

S 2160 An act to authorize the Attorney General to admit persons committed by State courts to Federal penal and correctional institutions when facilities are available;

S. 2165. An act to prevent unauthorized acceptance or wearing of foreign decorations by officers of the United States,

S 2172 An act for the relief of Mieko Takamine;

S 2198 An act to amend section 1708 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the theft or receipt of stolen mail matter generally;

S 2228 An act for the relief of William Elden Joslin;

S 2251 An act to amend the Federal property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the decentralization of certain Government personnel, and for other purposes,

S 2252. An act to clarify the act of August 17, 1950, providing for the conversion of national banks into and their merger and consolidation with State banks, and

S. 2271. An act for the relief of Carol Ann Hutchins (Sybille Schubert).

SALARY INCREASE—METROPOLITAN POLICE AND OTHERS

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5329) to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That (a) the annual compensation (including basic salary and additional compensation in lieu of overtime pay and night pay differential) of each officer and member of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, as increased by the act entitled 'An act to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia', approved July 14, 1945, as amended and by the act entitled 'An act to increase the compensation of certain employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes', approved June 30, 1949, shall be further increased by 10 percent (plus 8 percent of such 10 percent as additional compensation in lieu of overtime pay and night pay differential) except that in no case shall such compensation be increased by less than $300 per annum or by more than $800 per annum The proviso contained in the first sentence of the first section of said act of June 30, 1949, is hereby repealed; but no officer or members covered by this section shall, by reason of the enactment of this section, be paid with respect to any pay period, basic salary, or basic salary plus additional compensation at a rate in excess of $11,130 per annum.

"(b) (1) Each employee of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose salary is fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, except the Superintendent of Schools, shall receive, in addition to the compensation already provided by such act and by the act of June 30, 1949, compensation at the rate of 10 percent of the aggregate compensation provided by such acts, except that in no case shall the additional compensation provided for in this paragraph be increased by less than $300 per annum or by more than $800 per annum.

"(2) The basic and maximum salaries for all salary classes in title I of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, except class 29, are hereby increased by 10 percent, except that in no case shall any such basic or maximum salary be increased by less than $300 per annum or by more than $800 per annum

"(c) In the exercise of the authority granted by section 81 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code as amended, the Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized and directed to grant additional compensation to policemen, firemen, and school teachers employed by the Canal Zone Government, whenever additional compensation is granted to employees of the District of Columbia employed in similar or comparable positions The additional compensation for such Canal Zone employees shall be effective as of the date any additional compensation is granted to similar or comparable employees of the District of Columbia

"SEC 2 Authority is hereby granted to the Commissioners and to other wage-fixing authorities of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Interior and the President of the United States, in their discretion, to grant additional compensation at rates not to exceed those prevailing without regard to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C 665), additional compensation at rates not to exceed those prevailing in the District of Columbia for similar or comparable employment to each employee in or under the municipal government of the District of Columbia, National Capital Parks and the Executive Mansion Grounds, whose compensation is fixed and adjusted from time to time by a wage board, or whose compensation is fixed without reference to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or whose compensation is limited or fixed specifically by the provisions of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1952.

"SEC. 3. (a) Public Law 159, Eighty-second Congress is hereby amended by striking out section 3 thereof.

"(b) This section shall be effective October 8, 1951.

"SEC 4. (a) This act shall become effective as of the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951

"(b) No retroactive compensation or salary shall be payable by reason of the enactment of this act in the case of any individual not in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid a retired officer or employee for services rendered during the period beginning with the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951, and ending with the date of his retirement."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Georgia how the bill now differs from what came out of the House Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The bill as it came out of the Committee on the District of Columbia provided for a $400 across-the-board flat-figure increase in order that it might correspond with the House bill as it existed at that time carrying pay raises for other Federal employees. As the gentleman will recollect, that bill was amended in the Senate to provide for a 10-percent increase with a floor of $300 and a ceiling of $800. This amendment is to carry those same terms for the firemen, policemen, and teachers in the District. It also carries, as the bill originally carried, an increase for the per diem employees in the district.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is the gentleman able to tell us about how much more this would cost than the original bill, which came out of the House District Committee?

Mr DAVIS of Georgia. I am not prepared to give the gentleman the exact figures, but it is my understanding it will not cost quite as much.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The least they can get is $300, and the top figure is $800?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is according to the provisions of the pay bill passed yesterday?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think I read some place that the average pay under the Federal pay bill was about a $600 raise across the board. Does that apply to this bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I have not calculated this bill, I will say to the gentleman on that basis, since it was amended by the other body, but it places these District employees on the same basis as other Federal employees.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 216]

Aandahl	Eaton	Martin, Iowa
Abbitt	Engle	Meader
Allen, Calif.	Evins	Miller, Calif.
Allen, La.	Fernandez	Mitchell
Anderson, Calif	Fine	Morgan
Anfuso	Fugate	Morrison
Angell	Garmatz	Moulder
Arends	Golden	Murphy
Armstrong	Gore	Murray, Wis.
Ayres	Granahan	O'Toole
Bakewell	Granger	Passman
Baring	Green	Patman
Barrett	Hagen	Perkins
Bates, Ky.	Hall,	Phillips
Bender	Edwin Arthur	Powell
Berry	Harden	Preston
Blackney	Harrison, Wyo.	Prouty
Boggs, Del.	Harvey	Quinn
Boggs, La.	Hébert	Radwan
Bolling	Heller	Ramsay
Bonner	Herlong	Redden
Bosone	Hess	Regan
Boykin	Hope	Ribicoff
Bramblett	Horan	Riehlman
Brooks	Irving	Rogers, Fla.
Brown, Ohio	Jackson, Calif.	Roosevelt
Brownson	Jarman	Sabath
Buckley	Jenkins	Scott,
Buffett	Johnson	Hugh D., Jr.
Busbey	Jonas	Shafer
Butler	Judd	Sheehan
Byrne, N. Y.	Kean	Shelley
Celler	Kearney	Sheppard
Chudoff	Kelley, Pa.	Sikes
Clemente	Kelly, N. Y.	Sittler
Cole, N. Y.	Kennedy	Smith, Kans.
Combs	Keogh	Smith, Miss.
Coudert	Kilburn	Staggers
Crawford	Klein	Stockman
Curtis, Mo	Lantaff	Tackett
Dague	Larcade	Taylor
Dawson	Latham	Thornberry
Deane	Lucas	Vinson
Delaney	Lyle	Vursell
Dempsey	McCarthy	Watts
Denny	McConnell	Werdel
D'Ewart	McDonough	Wilson, Tex.
Dingell	McGregor	Wood, Ga.
Dollinger	Mack, Ill	Yates
Dorn	Mack, Wash.	Zablocki

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 280 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTOMOBILES FOR DISABLED VETERANS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the Senate:

The Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (S 1864) entitled "An act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the Senate, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill do pass, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

The Clerk read the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the Senate of the United States:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, S. 1864, Eighty-second Congress, an act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the enactment is to authorize payment of not to exceed $1,600 on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance for any veteran of World War II, or of service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to a date to be determined by the President or the Congress, who is entitled to compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for the loss, or loss of use, of one or both hands or feet, or for defective vision to a prescribed degree.

Previous laws acorded a similar benefit to each World War II veteran entitled to compensation for loss, or loss of use, of one or both legs, at or above the angle, with the requirement that the veteran be qualified to operate the vehicle. Although the authority for that program expired on June 30, 1951, nearly all of the eligible World War II veterans with leg disabilities have already qualified for and received a conveyance. The principal effect of the present proposal on World War II veterans would be to grant assistance in obtaining a vehicle to those with service-connected disabilities of the upper extremities and to those with seriously impaired vision. It would also qualify veterans of the emergency period beginning June 27, 1950, for this benefit for the first time.

This proposal is very similar in essential respects to S 2115, Eighty-first Congress, which was passed by the Congress in the fall of 1949, and on which I withheld my approval for reasons set forth at length in a memorandum of disapproval of October 31, 1949.

It is significant that the considerations set forth in that memorandum of disapproval were accepted as sound by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare when it reported favorably on the original version of S 1864, Eighty-second Congress, on July 25, 1951. At that time the bill would have simply extended the previous World War II program of assistance in obtaining automobiles for veterans with compensable leg disabilities to include those suffering the same types of disabilities in the active service since June 27, 1950. Apparently recognizing the necessity for restricting this benefit to those having a definite need, in addition to compensation and other existing benefits, for assistance to overcome the handicap of decreased mobility, the committee stated that it had "confined this bill to the same sound standards of rehabilitation which have governed this program since its inception for the benefit of World War II veterans." The Senate accepted and passed the original bill embodying this principle.

However, the bill as finally adopted by both Houses of the Congress is subject to most of the basic objections raised against S. 2115, Eighty-first Congress. While, unlike the previous bill, this one does not include World War I veterans, it does depart materially from the principle upon which the original World War II program was founded, by extending the program to include veterans with disabilities of the upper extremities and blind veterans. As indicated with reference to S 2115, the factor of materially diminished mobility, which was an underlying basis of the original program of automobiles for disabled World War II veterans with injury or loss of lower limbs, would be largely disregarded in the cases of the relatively large group of veterans with disabilities of the upper extremities who would be brought in by this bill. In addition, this proposal would dispense with the requirement of the original program that the veteran must be able to drive the vehicle, at least in those instances where someone else is available to drive for him. S. 1864 would, with respect to a considerable proportion of the beneficiaries, abandon the principle upon which the original program was based.

The question of policy arising from this legislation should certainly be determined on a more solid basis than the theory that the proposed benefit is a desirable convenience. The proper test is whether it would be a necessary, sound, and substantial part of the program of rehabilitation and readjustment which the Government is obligated to provide for veterans seriously disabled in the service.

The broad program which has already been placed into effect is based upon the concept that the best help which can be given the disabled veteran is that which directly assists him to the maximum extent possible in overcoming his service disability. Sound measures to this end include medical and hospital care, prosthetic appliances, vocational rehabilitation training, and liberal rates of monthly compensation, including additional amounts for dependents in severe cases. Blind veterans may be provided with guide dogs and electrical or mechanical equipment to aid them in overcoming their physical handicap. Special increased rates of compensation are granted to those with specific disabilities, such as the loss of one or both hands or feet, or blindness. Veterans who would benefit by S 1864 receive monthly compensation payments ranging from $102 to $360, with extra amounts in most cases for those with dependents. To these benefits the bill would add a payment on one automobile, which would necessarily afford but a temporary type of assistance.

It is difficult to perceive how this bill would fit into the existing benefit structure, for the reason that in a great many instances the benefit provided would not be geared to a peculiar and urgent need for rehabilitative assistance of this nature and would not be in keeping with the underlying objective of assisting these disabled veterans to be as nearly as possible self-reliant and self-sustaining members of society.

As I pointed out in the statement on the Eighty-first Congress bill any proposal to make gifts of specific nonmonetary benefits to a selected group of disabled veterans easily leads to serious inequalities. The previous World War II automobile program sought to avoid these inequalities by restricting the benefit to those with leg injuries constituting a material handicap to their mobility. The present bill would include more than 9,400 World War II veterans and an unknown but substantial number of veterans of the present emergency, with disability of the upper extremities. About 9,200 of these World War II veterans would have loss, or loss of use, of only one hand or arm. Many of these would have a disability rating of only 60 or 70 percent, with only slight impairment of mobility, if any, while at the same time a much greater number of veterans rated as 100 percent disabled, but without the specific disability covered by this proposal, will not receive automobiles. It would be easy to find wholesale discriminations as the result of enactment of this legislation. For example, of the estimated 11,700 World War II veterans who would become eligible for assistance in obtaining automobiles under this legislation, approximately 41 percent or 4,800 would be cases rated for compensation

purposes as disabled 70 percent or less, while only some 3,000 would be rated as 100 percent disabled. At the same time, at least 70,000 World War II veterans receiving compensation for 100 percent disability from the Veterans' Administration will have been unable to qualify for automobiles under either this or the prior law.

What was stated by way of conclusion in the memorandum of disapproval on S 2115, Eighty-first Congress, is just as applicable in testing the merits of this legislation·

"When we move beyond the provision of individually fitted prosthetic appliances for disabled veterans into the field of compensation, the sound and equitable method of meeting the needs of disabled veterans is through the provision of a carefully considered scale of compensation rates paid in cash on a monthly basis This is our long-tested practice from which I believe we should not depart."

Although I am impelled for the foregoing reasons to withhold my approval from S. 1864, I would be glad to approve legislation which would limit eligibility to veterans of World War II and to each person who, after June 27, 1950, and until termination of the present emergency, has served in the military forces of the United States, and who is entitled to compensation for the loss, or loss of use of, one or both legs at or above the ankle.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 18, 1951.*

Mr RANKIN (interrupting the reading of the message). Mr. Speaker, since this message has been printed, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the message be dispensed with and that the same be printed at this point.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the veto message.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

The question is, Will the House, upon reconsideration, agree to pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the bill which the President vetoed, S. 1864, provides for the payment of $1,600 toward the purchase price of an automobile, or other conveyance for veterans of World War II and veterans of the Korean conflict, who are entitled to compensation for the loss of, or loss of use of one or both feet, or one or both hands, or who are blind.

A broader bill providing coverage of World War I veterans, and with the provision of a $1,600 cash payment in lieu of an automobile or other conveyance, was unanimously reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and has twice passed the House but failed to pass the Senate. The conferees agreed upon this bill limiting the coverage to World War II veterans and veterans of the Korean conflict, and eliminating the cash benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce first that the Senate passed the bill and conference report and overrode the President's veto on yesterday with a large vote of 54 to 10. S. 1684 has the endorsement of the American Legion, the DAV, the VFW, and the Amvets. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] led the fight to override the veto in a brilliant and kind manner.

Many of the Members believe that the present bill provides for a cash payment, but that was taken out in conference. The House bill had a cash payment of $1,600, or $1,600 toward the purchase of a car. This provides for only $1,600 toward the purchase of an automobile.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks a letter from Dr. Rusk, who is head of all the medical services of the United States for the President.

A year after the original car bill passed, which was an amendment put in in the Senate by Senator Magnuson as a rider to a Senate bill, which provided automobiles for the feet, Dr Rusk wrote a very fine article in the New York Times saying that a bill should be introduced and passed that would provide automobiles for the arms and for the paraplegics, men whose hands were not strong enough to use automobiles.

The article by Dr Rusk follows.

REHABILITATION—ANOMALIES ARE NOTED IN THE LAW ON CARS FOR AMPUTEES—EARLY ADJUSTMENT IS HELD LIKELY AS THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS CONVENES

(By Howard D Rusk, M D)

In ward 3D at the Veterans Hospital in the Bronx, New York City, two severely disabled men occupy adjoining beds Both are victims of spinal-cord injuries which have left them partially paralyzed Both are classified as being totally disabled Both draw maximum Government pensions They differ, however, in degree of paralysis. The first is a paraplegic suffering from paralysis of both legs; the second is a quadraplegic with paralysis not only of the legs but of both arms and the trunk. Two weeks ago the paraplegic received a new specially equipped 1946 automobile from the Government. Ironically, the quadraplegic, even though his disabilities are much more severe, is not entitled to receive a car.

The widely publicized "cars for amputees" bill which was passed by Congress last session denies a car to the second man because of his inability to pass an examination for a State driver's license The act, Public Law 663, provides that veterans who have lost one or both legs, or the use of their legs, as a result of military service are entitled to a car at Government expense, but only if they hold a State driver's permit This automatically excludes veterans paralyzed in the upper extremities.

ONE HUNDRED IN DIRE NEED FOR CARS

The number of men in military and veterans hospitals who suffer paralysis of both upper and lower extremities is less than 100. Their need for cars, however, is even greater than the paraplegics and leg amputees who, with prosthesis and rehabilitation can, in most cases, learn to walk. The man paralyzed in all extremities is unable to walk or use public conveyances. His chances for rehabilitation and recreation are contingent upon his traveling.

Amputees and paraplegics have many avenues open to them for employment, while men with paralyzed arms are unable to augment their Government pensions by earning money, except in rare cases. Thus, from a financial standpoint, they are in greater need. Without a car, they are completely home-bound. The fact that they themselves cannot drive should not mean they are to be imprisoned within the four walls of their homes. Members of their families and friends can drive for them. The important thing is that they are not permanently home-bound

When the bill providing cars for amputees was pending in Congress last July, this column warned that the bill, as framed, would create inequalities, for its provisions were restrictive and did not establish need as the basis for its benefits.

BRADLEY CONCURS IN VIEW

This same vein was taken by General Bradley, Veterans' Administrator, and the major veterans organizations. Those inequalities are shown by the paradoxical situation in which the most seriously disabled veterans are denied cars at Government expense while they are given to those with lesser disabilities.

Many veterans who suffered double arm amputations are bitter about the law, as they feel that they, too, have been discriminated against as their disabilities are more serious and incapacitating than the loss of one or both legs These men are able to drive with the aid of special controls and many hold State drivers' permits The law, however, restricts benefits to leg amputees and those who have lost the use of their legs.

Another anomaly of the law is evidenced by a letter received this past week from a paralyzed first lieutenant in the Army-Navy General Hospital, Hot Springs, Ark This officer is not eligible for a car because he is still in the Army and the law applies only to "veterans" Although he lost the use of his limbs in service, he will be hospitalized for such a long period before being discharged from the Army, he may not become a veteran before the law expires in June of next year. The obvious intent of Congress was to furnish this man with a car, but the technicalities of the law prevent it

Although General Bradley vigorously opposed the law last summer in its present form, the VA took immediate steps to carry out its provisions Within 30 days the first car, a hydromatic Oldsmobile sedan, was delivered to Richard A Tennelly, of Washington, an ex-Marine combat correspondent who lost his left leg at Iwo Jima.

ONLY 75 CARS DELIVERED

Up until October 1, out of 8,000 applications, only 75 cars had actually been delivered The VA attributes this to the unavailability of cars from manufacturers The Disabled American Veterans in the lead editorial of the last issue of their official organ point out that the maximum amount which can be paid for a car under the law is $1,600 which includes all accessories, special driving controls and taxes. The veteran is not permitted to purchase a more expensive car and personally pay the difference The price of cars has risen since the law was passed. This, plus delivery costs to those living at great distance from the factory, often brings the price of the car above the established ceiling The DAV suggests the technicalities of the law can be circumvented by eligible veterans purchasing cars without any accessories except the necessary driving controls and then purchasing additional accessories later from their own resources. If this does not bring the car within the limit of $1,600, the other alternative is to go to the factory and drive the car home, thus eliminating delivery costs. The latter course, however, is often most impractical

Sales taxes in many States help bring the car's cost above the price limit. The DAV

calls attention to the fact that in Ohio cars purchased under the act are exempt from sales taxes and suggest this practice should be adopted in all States

LAW WAS PASSED AS RIDER

Public Law 663 was passed by Congress in the closing days of last summer's session, and then only as a rider on the servicemen's terminal leave law which was "must" legislation. The critics of the bill at that time, including this writer, did not question the fairness of the principle of automobiles for certain disabled veterans at Government expense or the need of many disabled veterans for automobiles. They did, however, question the feasibility of the law as drawn, believing it sacrificed thoroughness and equality for the sake of expediency.

With the reorganization of the House of Representatives in the coming session, due to the Republican majority, it is assumed that Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, ranking Republican member of the House Veterans Committee, will replace Representative JOHN RANKIN as head of that committee. Mrs. ROGERS was one of the original sponsors of the cars for amputees bill and has long been a champion in the cause of the disabled veteran. Mrs. ROGERS will, if appointed to the post, probably work for immediate revision of the present law to remove the present unjust and illogical restrictions. It should be one of the first items of business on the crowded agenda of her committee.

The letter to President Truman from the AMVETS is as follows:

OCTOBER 16, 1951.

The Honorable HARRY S TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR PRESIDENT AMVETS respectfully request that you sign the bill, S. 1864, which is now pending before you.

As far back as 1946 AMVETS requested that the automobile amputee bill be amended to include authorization for automobiles for those veterans who lost or lost the use of one or both arms. Our position since that time has been that equity would not be served unless such an amendment were enacted into law. Also, since 1946 AMVETS have requested at appropriate times that amendatory legislation be forthcoming which would permanently extend Public Law 663 for those World War II veterans who had lost or lost the use of one or both legs.

The original intent of the legislation subject matter as repeatedly outlined by the Congress was that it was to be a law which would provide a form of rehabilitation to certain seriously disabled veterans. It was a law to aid these individuals in locomotion inasmuch as they had considerable difficulty on public transportation conveyance. AMVETS believe that this difficulty in locomotion applies to arm amputees as well as to leg amputees.

We believe there have been a great many individuals who have not been able to take advantage of the original legislation due to circumstances beyond their control. It has been our experience to find many veterans who, as a result of long periods of hospitalization in service hospitals, have not been able until now to be eligible for the benefits of Public Law 663. It has also been our experience to find that a great many veterans who would otherwise have been eligible for the benefits of Public Law 663 have not been able to take advantage of the law due to their inability to pass State driving tests, with such inability once again being traceable to their service-connected disability.

In addition to the inequities outlined above, we bring to your attention that there are many Korean veterans who have lost or lost the use of their arms or legs. These individuals would be entitled to an automobile to assist them in that difficult period of rehabilitation immediately following discharge if S. 1864 were to become law. In this regard, the official position of AMVETS is that those benefits which have previously been extended to veterans of World War II should be extended to include veterans of the Korean conflict.

In view of the statements made herein AMVETS request your approval of S. 1864.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. SMITH,
National Commander.

It is a very strong article. Also, in talking with him over the telephone I found him very much interested in the blind. They have great difficulty in mobility, and this automobile can be driven by a member of the family—the man himself, of course, could not drive it. He could then go to and from his work and become a productive person again in the industrial world.

I would like to have inserted as a part of my remarks a very fine letter from the Blinded Veterans Organization thanking everyone in the Senate and House for what he has done toward the passage of this legislation, which is as follows:

BLINDED VETERANS.

DEAR MRS ROGERS: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Blinded Veterans to express our views on the merits of S 1864, conference report 1096, which was vetoed by the President last Thursday.

First, I should like to express the sincere appreciation of the Blinded Veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict, for whom our organization speaks to the Members of the Senate who voted to override the veto today. We earnestly hope that your colleagues in the House of Representatives will find it possible to vote to override the veto also.

The members of the Blinded Veterans Association feel that the reasons which prompted the Seventy-ninth Congress to enact Public Law 663 was to enable World War II veterans who have lost or had lost the use of a limb with automobiles hold true for blinded veterans.

Blinded veterans feel that their economic rehabilitation would be enhanced by the ready availability of the use of an automobile Lack of mobility, one of the greatest problems confronting the blinded veterans, would be virtually eliminated. With a wife, sister, brother, or other member of the family able to drive him to and from work the blinded veteran will, who finds public transportation too difficult to master would be able to go out and earn his own way, thus regaining a large degree of the independence the loss of sight robbed him of.

The cardinal point of the philosophy of the Blinded Veterans Association is the vital importance of gainful employment to the blinded veteran Through a job the blinded veteran again becomes a productive member of the American community, a contractor to the economic life of the Nation, a taxpayer, a whole man.

In these days of great effort to build the defenses of the Nation it is doubly important that every citizen, disabled or not, do his part, consequently any aid which enables the blinded veteran to overcome the handicap of blindness and work side by side with his fellow citizen for the common welfare is important.

The Blinded Veterans Association believes that an automobile to increase the mobility of the blinded veteran is such an aid, a tool of rehabilitation to enable him to participate more fully in the productive life of his country.

We know that you will vote to override the veto. We sincerely hope that your colleagues in the House of Representatives will also vote to override. You and your colleagues may be sure of the heartfelt gratitude of the Nation's war blinded for your untiring effort on our behalf.

Respectfully,

IRVING SCHLOSS,
National Rehabilitation Officer.

They mention the very things I have spoken of. They are extremely grateful, Mr. Speaker, but we are the ones who should be grateful to them, because we would have no country without these men.

The President spoke of discrimination in his veto message; most of our legislation is somewhat discriminatory. Certainly the G. I. bill of rights is discriminatory. There is discrimination in the way men are taken into the service, and certainly in the way they are sent to Korea there is discrimination, as I said, in most of our legislation.

Another factor to bear in mind is that because of this bill a great deal of money will go back into the Treasury through the excise taxes on the automobiles and the taxes the men will have to pay.

Everyone says we cannot do too much for the seriously disabled. Now is the time to prove you mean it. All these men are service-connected and terribly wounded or injured. All of the Members who say this is discriminatory have no other measure to offer in its place to eliminate the discrimination. Most of our legislation is discriminatory. Certainly it was discriminatory to veterans to send arms and munitions to Russia and China to be used by them to cripple our boys. It is discriminatory to send help to foreign countries when our own people are hungry.

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include letters and articles.)

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I believe the House on this occasion ought to take a little time to think about what we are doing if we override the President's veto. I think the best illustration of what we may be doing and possibly doing improperly is an example that came to mind last night as I was thinking of this problem. Suppose any one of us should go out to Walter Reed Hospital today, walk through a ward and come across two beds, one occupied by a veteran of World War II or the Korean conflict who had lost his leg, and the other alongside of him by a veteran who had a broken back but who is equally incapacitated.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield ?

Mr. FORD. I will when I have completed my statement.

As I understand this legislation—and if I am incorrect I shall be glad to be corrected—we are going to give a new automobile up to the extent of $1,600 to the veteran who lost a part of his leg; but we are not going to give any comparable additional compensation, material or otherwise, to the veteran with the broken back, even though he may be just as incapacitated and just as deserv-

ing as the individual in bed alongside of him.

Then, of course, we get into another field. Are we under this legislation going to give an automobile involving $1,600 to veterans who are incapacitated because of respiratory disability? Are we going to give an automobile to individual veterans who suffer from the terrible disease multiple sclerosis? If these questions can be answered, so that we treat all alike, I will be glad to vote to override the President's veto. I should like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi or the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts to point out to me or the House that there are not discriminatory features in this legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. The bill reported by the Veterans' Committee provided that the veteran would have a choice as to whether he took the money, or a car. In other words, they might take the sum of money or the automobile. It was virtually an increase in their compensation as the bill was reported by the Veterans' Committee of the House. But this is a Senate bill.

Mr. FORD. I do not think the gentleman from Mississippi has answered my question. Has the gentleman explained that there are no discriminations or if there are discriminations, can the gentleman rationalize why they exist? That is all I want to know.

Mr. RANKIN. The veteran who has lost the use of his limbs will come under this bill

Mr. FORD. That is true as I understand it.

How about the veteran who has a respiratory difficulty?

Mr. RANKIN. They will not be included, unless they lose the use of a limb.

Mr. FORD. How about veterans with multiple sclerosis?

Mr. RANKIN. If he lost the use of his hands or arms or his legs he would come under this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The purpose of this bill is to give the men mobility, as the gentleman knows, make it possible for them to go and get work, and to and from work. We have multiple sclerosis cases that will come under it if they have lost the use of their limbs. The foreign-aid bill is discriminatory. Many veterans' and other bills are discriminatory. The gentleman knows it is discriminatory in the House when we pass rivers and harbors legislation.

Mr. FORD. I would like to say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that I did not support the conference report on the civil funds appropriation bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thought the gentleman said "discriminatory." Let me say to the gentleman that during the flu epidemic at Government hospitals they did not have enough people to take care of the soldiers and some of them unfortunately lost their lives because they did not have care. That did not prevent us from taking care of all the men that we could If the gentleman wants to pass other legislation, of course, that is all right, but we have this here. It is a great incentive to these men. There is a man with a broken back out at Walter Reed Hospital and he said, "I do not suppose I will come under this bill." I said, "Yes, you will." Those men make plans. They get out of bed when they can, they get jobs, and it is rehabilitation. Doctors out at Walter Reed Hospital and at other hospitals told me they hoped the bill would pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman from Michigan has hit right at the core of the problem This is discriminatory legislation. The gentleman from Michigan is acting with his usual courage and good judgment in announcing that he intends to sustain the President's veto and I am happy to associate myself with that position.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Does this include World War I veterans who have lost one hand or one foot, the same as World War II veterans or the Korean veterans?

Mr. FORD. In reply to the question asked by the gentleman from Arkansas, it is my understanding this legislation does not take in World War I veterans. As I understand it, the House bill approved by this body did go back and take care of World War I veterans, but in conference that was stricken. It now only covers World War II veterans and those who have suffered similar disabilities in the Korean war.

Mr. NORRELL. Does not the gentleman think that if we do this we ought to do it for all veterans who are injured in the same way?

Mr. FORD The gentleman from Arkansas is correct. I certainly think we ought to pass legislation for all disabled veterans, adequately increasing their compensation on a monthly basis if that is necessary to rehabilitate them as a whole group. I would support such legislation. But in good conscience I cannot support legislation that is discriminatory, giving one veteran a benefit which is not accorded another even though the other has an equally terrible disability. I could not approve legislation for one veteran who has a terrible disability and then deny that same benefit to another with a comparable disability. It does not make sense to me, and as a result I shall vote to sustain the President.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. Does not this bill compare with a bill that we passed I think in the Eighty-first Congress? That was a bill just for leg amputees or leg disabilities. This goes into the question of arms as well.

Mr. FORD. This legislation helps those with part of their arm amputated, and the blind. I do not recall precisely what the Congress enacted previously.

Mrs ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The House and the Senate passed a bill which provided automobiles for the arm amputees and for the blind and it was vetoed by the President. It did not come back for a vote. It was vetoed after we adjourned, so that there was no opportunity to override the veto. I am sorry the President vetoed this bill. I think he had bad advice, but he did send it back so that we could override.

Mr. FORD. I do not often vote with the President, but he is certainly right in this instance

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. Does this bill provide any financial benefit in lieu of an automobile for a veteran who is permanently and totally disabled because of a mental disability?

Mr. FORD. This legislation does not give any additional financial benefits or other benefits to a veteran who has suffered a mental disability as a result of his war service. In addition, this bill, does not prevent the veteran in any way whatsoever from selling the automobile the day after he receives it.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the pending legislation provide for a chauffeur for these blind veterans?

Mr. FORD As I understand the legislation, it does not provide for a chauffeur. In the legislation we had before us not too long ago, which the President also vetoed, there was an additional authorization for blind veterans, who need an attendant.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois

Mr. SPRINGER. If we ever had any legislation here which in effect legislated for chauffeurs, I do not remember it.

Mr. FORD Does not the gentleman recall the legislation which increased the amount from $60 to $72 up to $120? In those cases they could have someone, with the additional funds, help to drive the car that they might get under this legislation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Those are so totally disabled that they are in need of an attendant to take care of them in their homes. They are bedfast people. You are giving the wrong inference about this, if I may say so, if you are inferring that that is true.

May I say this; within the past month I have had a letter from a man I have

been interested in in my own town, who has a job that he could have gone to back a month ago if he had any way to get about. He is a bright boy, a graduate of the University of Illinois. He was in the war and he completed his course under the GI bill of rights. But, he has no way to get about unless he has a car; there is no way he can handle his job unless he has a car. He just cannot walk the distance that would be required of him to do it and get about in the kind of a job he has. He does not have any income whereby he could provide transportation. But this is not the kind of a bill that you think it is, that this is merely compensatory only. I think this is a rehabilitation bill. I do not think that this is the kind of a bill that the gentleman from Michigan inferred it is. I think that it is a rehabilitation bill.

Mr. FORD. It is a rehabilitation bill for a limited number of veterans. It is not a rehabilitation bill for every veteran who is disabled and who cannot get around. That is the trouble.

Mr. SPRINGER. I will say that is true.

Mr. FORD. Can the gentleman defend it then?

Mr. SPRINGER. If I was flat in bed and there was not any way I could get around. The purpose of this bill is not to supply a man with a chauffeur, but to supply a man with an automobile in case he is able to be rehabilitated. I have no objection to doing something for those men flat on their backs; I would be willing to go along with any reasonable legislation, but I will say that this particular legislation is only for this class of veterans who are capable of being rehabilitated.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. First, may I say that I certainly join with the gentleman from Michigan in the position he has taken. I think I know a little something about the problems of a paraplegic and the problems of rehabilitation. Certainly you are not going to rehabilitate anybody by just giving a select group of disabled persons $1,600 in a lump sum, either in cash or for the purchase of a car. That is not rehabilitation. I certainly want to associate myself with the views expressed by the gentleman from Michigan. If I recall correctly, we opposed this bill when it was before the House in the first instance.

Mr. FORD. That is right.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. My understanding is that the automobile proposal was originally an amendment to provide a method of getting around for men who were so incapacitated that they had difficulty in walking yet could drive a car. In the gentleman's opinion, does this bill represent a radical and complete departure from that original concept?

Mr. FORD. In my estimation, it does, but my principal objection is that it is discriminatory. For that reason I intend to vote to sustain the President.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the conferees on this bill. Very frankly, it went further than I expected it to go and further than I wanted it to go.

It is easy to stand on this floor and say it is discriminatory legislation. I wish some of you who think it is would come over on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and help us work out some legislation that is not discriminatory. I can name you a hundred ways where you discriminate against certain veterans.

There are boys who went through the war and took all the combat there was to take, and went through all the hell there was to go through, yet they came home and there was no way they could get benefits under the GI bill. There are other boys who stayed at home and went out 10 or 15 miles from home at an air base or an air field, and made more money than they ever made before in their lives, and have gotten a $4,000 or $5,000 education since then, besides. That is not fair, either.

As far as I am personally concerned, this is the last bill of this kind I intend to vote for. Certainly, there is no justification for giving a man a car who lost an arm when there is a man with 100 percent disability because of mental trouble or being shot through the chest or stomach and is completely disabled, who is not getting a car.

This thing was started before I ever came to Congress, when they gave cars to the boys with a leg off. As I said before, this bill goes further than I think it should have gone. If you want really to learn something about a boy—the gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned paraplegics—go out and get in a car with a boy that is paralyzed from the waist down and see what it means to him to be able to get out and ride around town and look people in the face. It does more for them than any of you would realize.

This is the last piece of legislation of this kind I intend to support, but I intend to vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I can see far more reason for voting to override this veto and provide these servicemen with cars than I can for the building of a forty or fifty million dollar Truman airport at Grandview, Mo.

Mr. TEAGUE. I have no comment to make on that. I do not know anything about the airport. But at least this legislation is for disabled boys who are going to gain something from it.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Does this apply to a case of almost total loss of mobility due to a brain injury as well as a case where a leg is lost?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes. A man that had a bullet wound through the right brain would have trouble in the left limbs. This is based on the loss of or loss of the use of the limbs. In that case this bill would give him a car.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I have been in some of these battles on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with the gentleman from Texas. I have the greatest respect for his position on any of these measures. However, it does seem to me that where you do have discrimination, where you do, as the gentleman himself has said, have provisions here that go too far, the only way you can force any of the legislative committees of this House to bring in the kind of legislation that would suit the gentleman from Texas is to protest against that which has been done and with which he does not agree. It seems to me the proper thing to do is to vote to sustain the President's veto on this measure, and hope that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will come out with something that we can support at a later date.

Mr. TEAGUE. The gentleman well knows that originally the Committee on Veterans' Affairs came out with a bill that went much further than this one. I feel that this is a compromise. I think it is the best that you can get. It goes much further than I would go. So far as the veterans who are blind, you cannot do enough for them. I am in favor of giving them everything. There is nothing that I would want to have happen to me less than to lose my eyes. You cannot do too much for them. You cannot repay them no matter what you do for them.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. But this hardly appears to be the proper method to do it. Would not a real system of compensation that takes these things into consideration be the proper answer to this—a proper system of compensation across the board?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes; and we have done well in that way. We have done very well for all veterans as far as that is concerned. As I said before, it is not exactly the bill that I want, but I am going to vote for it.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. BENTSEN. I want to preface my remarks by saying that I, too, join in my admiration of the work of the gentleman on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. But, if this is an inequity, we must draw the line some place. Why must we put one more of these inequities on the statute books? Why do we not face the issue now, and start at this point to clean the records, and to pass equitable legislation on the books?

Mr. TEAGUE. So far as I am concerned, there is one place that we are doing something wrong, and that is in giving a car to a man with an arm off. There are very few men with arms off who would come under this bill. Of

course, anything that we do is only a drop in the bucket. But, it is not easy to solve these problems. If any of you think it is easy to sit on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and try to make all veterans' legislation equal, you are just mistaken.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], a member of the committee.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, no one could more eloquently express it than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] has as to the position of those Members of the House who are members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Let me say this to you, there is no legislation that you are going to bring in here, which is going to cover every single veteran equally. At least there is very little legislation, that is going to cover every single veteran equally. It just cannot be done For instance, I have a cousin who went to the University of Illinois for 4 years He served just a little over 6 months in the last war. I do not believe he got any further away than Biloxi, Miss., and as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] said, he received an education worth more than $5,000 A friend of mine went to Europe and lost a leg. He got his leg shot off. He went back to the veterans' hospital It is not possible for him to go to college because he does not qualify under the GI bill to get what he wants. So he gets nothing under that. But, he does say, "I would like to have some help, if you will give it to me to rehabilitate myself to do the job I have to do in life." This is just one of those things that affects the classes of veterans differently. I do not think anyone objected, or does object, to a man going to college and getting his degree, and yet that is discrimination. It is discrimination in favor of this particular class of veterans who may be qualified for that kind of help under the GI bill. It is true that some of us are not in favor of giving an automobile to those with an arm off. There are some of us who were not in favor of the tax bill yesterday, and who did not agree with us. But, that vote was a compromise. I think the majority of the House, at least more than half of the House, voted in favor of it. I do not think we are ever going to be able to come here with a bill on veterans' legislation that is going to satisfy everyone. It seems to me we ought to judge this on the merits—particularly this bill and to determine whether or not this is going to do some good for these veterans who are classified under this particular bill. That is the sole issue to be determined in this case. I think it is a good bill. I have talked to several of these veterans who will come under the bill. I have had lunch with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts several times in the dining room here when she has brought these young men in from Walter Reed Hospital. I can see their problem. Unless, they have some way of getting around, and unless they have some means of qualifying for a job, they are going to be very seriously handicapped in their future, as I see it. I think this is one way of correcting this situation.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH I would like to ask this question, as the mother of two veterans, and as one who would do everything that is necessary for a wounded veteran. But are we now permanently guaranteeing these veterans in these defined classes an automobile; or does the bill limit the receipt of the automobile to the first one provided, and what happens to the veterans' rehabilitation if something happens to the original automobile?

Mr. SPRINGER. No, we do not. This is only an effort in that direction. We are getting the automobile for him to start with We are not guaranteeing that he is going to have one forever. When a man gets out in life and starts to earn, he will probably be able to earn sufficient to replace the automobile himself But we are trying to get him on his feet and get him started

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to say to the gentleman that I wish to go along with all support possible, but I think that we need just as much to be wise as we wish to be helpful. Personally, I will have to support the gentleman from Michigan [Mr FORD] in saying that this is discriminatory legislation. The problem needs further study.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentlelady is entitled to her opinion.

Mr. HILLINGS Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr HILLINGS I have great respect for the gentleman from Illinois, but I too am a veteran of the last war. I join in the position taken by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]. I would be happy to support this legislation if it were merely an extension of present law. However, it adds a number of new provisions and discriminates against many disabled veterans.

Would the gentleman be able to tell me what the actual cost of this particular legislation is going to be?

Mr. SPRINGER. About $17,000,000.

The SPEAKER The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Illinois two additional minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. It seems to me that the most effective sentence in the President's veto message is this, and I would appreciate the gentleman's views with regard to it:

Many of these—

Meaning veterans to benefit—

would have a disability rating of only 60 or 70 percent and only slight impairment of mobility, if any, while at the same time a much greater number of veterans rated as 100-percent disabled, but without specific disability covered by this proposal, will not receive automobiles.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, that is entirely possible, but that is the exception.

Mr. KEATING. Does that not lead to such serious discrimination that we should vote to sustain the veto?

Mr. SPRINGER. Is the gentleman asking me my opinion?

Mr. KEATING Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. I would say positively no.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, the gentleman feels that that would apply only to a few veterans?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think that is true. In all veterans' legislation you will have a few that will be discriminated against.

Mr KEATING Would there not be a large number here?

Mr. SPRINGER. No; not nearly as many as you would have under the GI bill of rights, to send them to college.

Mr MILLER of New York Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr MILLER of New York. Have we not missed the whole point in this discussion this morning as to discrimination? It is obviously true, of course, that those who have respiratory diseases or other ailments do not get the benefit of this legislation, but this legislation is not designed solely to help veterans, but to help society in general. Here you are dealing with a specific group that is mentally and physically sound, capable of doing a full day's work, except for loss of mobility. If you pick out this particular group and give them something whereby they can go to and from work and to occupations, it permits them to rehabilitate themselves and make an income for themselves and contribute to society, and thus benefit society in general

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the gentleman has stated it better than I.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the problem is not simply giving something away to disabled veterans; the problem is rehabilitating those who have already suffered and have been impaired for the good of this country. We veterans who have come back whole cannot sit here and see some of these disabled fellows deprived of the chance of getting a job just because they are deprived of mobility. It is not necessary under this bill to have the disabled behind the wheel of the car. I have veteran friends who are disabled, and they have people and relatives driving for them

In my own business I could hire disabled veterans if they had a way to get to and from work. I know some who cannot be hired by any business because they have no way of getting to work, and they have not the money saved up to make the capital outlay for a car. The people who have veterans in the family who are disabled know the drain on the family budget. In a veteran family with

nobody disabled in it, it is a little hard to realize the extra expense and the trouble of getting the disabled veteran started in a job. The fact is that most times the disabled veterans have not the money saved up, and many times they have used all their savings for medical expenses. When you have that situation this bill then puts the veteran in a position to give him a chance to earn a living instead of being a burden on the family. It makes a great difference to the veteran, the family and the community to have the veteran working and producing.

I would urge that we at this time override the President's veto and vote for these disabled veterans who have done so much for the country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that just a couple of weeks ago this House overwhelmingly overrode the veto of the President of the United States on non-service-connected disability legislation, overwhelmingly; there were only 45 who voted against it. There is far more merit to this bill than there was to that, if you are talking about it from the standpoint of discrimination. I hope those who voted to override the last time will see their way clear to do so for this meritorious proposition.

MR. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, until about a year ago or a little more, it was my privilege to have in my district one of the largest and most important paraplegic hospitals run by the Veterans' Administration. I have seen hundreds of cases where veterans who were unable because of paraplegia to get about, have finally secured for themselves a job. They drive their own car to work, they either drive themselves or are driven, thereby rehabilitating themselves into a useful position in society. I am not sure whether it is necessary to include in this bill men with one arm or with one foot because they can get around, but a paraplegic cannot get around without assistance. This was provided in a previous bill.

There is discrimination in this bill. That discrimination, however, is such that it just does not do some things for some veterans that it might do some things for, but it does some things for quite a few veterans who need to have things done for them. Because it leaves out some, in my opinion is no reason to vote against it.

The only reason I can think of for supporting the President's veto on this bill is because it does include certain veterans who, for my part, I do not think it is necessary to be included, hence it adds to the expense of the bill.

I would like to see a real rehabilitation measure come along. If a man is an active neuropsychiatric he is completely unable to do anything, there is not any rehabilitation that you can supply him with by furnishing him an automobile. The only reason I can think for giving an automobile, and it is a good one, is to enable an otherwise able man to get to and from his work.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, as I understand this legislation, it is obviously intended to help one certain group of veterans. I do not think there can be any answer to the question that in this sense it perhaps is discriminatory; but, on the other hand, I think we must realize that we have to take these matters as they come up. This legislation, and only this legislation, is before us right now.

There was apparently a question at one time as to whether or not a man who is blind might need a seeing-eye dog. It was decreed that seeing-eye dogs were to be supplied such people. I am certain if anyone rose in this body and said that that was discriminatory, because we were not doing the same thing for people who can see, there would not have been a great deal of stock taken in that argument.

Right now the problem apparently is to determine how are we able to help a very few veterans who have a certain condition. Perhaps we would like to help all of them in one way or another. The passage of this legislation does not mean by any stretch of the imagination that we are foreclosing others who may find themselves in a different type of situation where they need a different type of assistance.

I think the important thing is not to discriminate against people who need this assistance. Today we are faced with only one problem, and that is, Are we going to help these people who are in need of this assistance? Tomorrow it may be another group, not these same veterans, perhaps some others. But that is not the question right now.

I realize that there has been very little activity in connection with this legislation. There has not been any political pressure because the matter affects only a very few. I do not think any of the Members have received more than three or four letters from veterans on this matter. In my district I doubt whether there are four or five people who will be affected. It is not a situation where we are being pressured by a great many veterans. But that is not the deciding question. The question is whether they should have the help. If we owe them that obligation we should stand by it and do it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that the group of veterans affected by this bill are very cruelly disabled. They are the ones without hands or feet, and many of us are trying in this minor way to help these veterans.

Mr. FURCOLO. We are asked to do for them that which they cannot do for themselves. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is to be commended for the great work she has done. The able gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] is also entitled to the gratitude not only of the veterans but also of the people of the Nation for having sponsored this legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to override the President's veto of this bill, with no apologies whatsoever.

Those who argue that the President's veto should be sustained base their approach on the theory that this bill creates inequities as between classes of veterans. But, Mr. Speaker, they overlook the fact that this bill cures several existing inequities in the present law. It extends the benefits heretofore existing for one class of veterans to two additional classes, those who have lost arms, and those who have lost their eyesight.

Since the law was first passed granting automobiles to veterans of World War II who had lost, or lost the use of, one or both legs at or above the ankle, veterans of the same war who lost, or lost the use of, one or both arms, and those who were blinded as a result of their service have felt that the law discriminated against them. The bill before us erases that discrimination or inequity.

The automobiles provided by this law go to veterans of the Korean war, as well as World War II veterans.

I introduced the bill, H. R. 4233, on this subject on May 23, 1951. This bill, as introduced by me, applied to veterans of World War I, World War II, and of the Korean war—those serving after June 27, 1950, who have lost, or lost the use of, one or both feet or hands, or who are blind. A cash payment of $1,600 was provided for veterans who did not wish to receive an automobile. On June 13, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs favorably reported my bill, and the House passed it on June 20.

The measure was referred to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, where it was disregarded by that committee. The committee reported instead the bill, S. 1864, which limited the automobile benefits to leg amputees of World War II and of the Korean war.

After passage of this bill by the Senate, the House Committee on Veterans Affairs struck out all the Senate provisions and again reported favorably the proposal embodied in my bill, H. R. 4233. This was passed by the House of Representatives September 17 and sent to conference.

As a member of the conference committee, I can state that the House conferees, consisting of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], and myself, were able to retain in the conference report most of the provisions of my original bill, H. R. 4233. To obtain agreement of the conference it was necessary to restrict the benefits of the bill to veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict It was also necessary to forego the provision for a cash

payment of $1,600 to those veterans who did not desire a car under the terms of this bill.

However, we made one real improvement to the original bill, in conference, when we provided that an automobile might go to a veteran, to be operated for him by another person in the event that he could not qualify under the original terms of the bill to operate it himself.

There is no restriction in the bill against sale or transfer of the automobile. Therefore, it is believed that any veteran entitled to a car may sell the same at any time he desires to do so and thus provide himself with the cash proceeds of the sale for the purpose of transporting himself or for any other purpose.

The conference report was adopted by both Houses, sent to the President, and vetoed by him on Wednesday or Thursday of this week

Now, the question before us is whether we will vote to override the President's veto, and make this bill the law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, as this session of Congress rushes toward a close today, I want to call attention to the fact that there are only a few thousands of the boys who can qualify under this bill.

This is an effort to rehabilitate those gentlemen who have been called upon to make a great sacrifice of their bodies upon the altar of their country. It is an effort to rehabilitate and weave them back into the fabric of American economic life so that they can contribute to, as well as enjoy, the opportunities offered by this country to all its citizens.

Mr Speaker, I have voted for practically all the legislation to bring rehabilitation to Western Europe and the Far East, and other areas of the world where we are extending a helpful hand in a supreme effort to rebuild a world torn by the wars of this last decade.

To me, it is unthinkable to say, for instance, to a handicapped veteran under the terms of this bill, living on one of the farms of America, that he cannot go out and obtain for himself a means of conveyance, a tractor, if you please, or a jeep or a truck, or an automobile, in the face of the billions of dollars we are spending for rehabilitation work abroad. I cannot say to this veteran that we cannot afford to spend $1,600 to help him get on the road to recovery and integration into the economic life of this Nation.

As a Nation, we cannot do too much to rehabilitate those who have borne the brunt of our wars. To fail to encourage and provide opportunities for the disabled is a waste of precious human resources that we cannot afford.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Members will vote to override the President's veto and thereby write this bill into law.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have never economized on disabled veterans. I have economized to the *n*th degree on many Government functions as you know. My colleagues we should not lose sight of the fact that it was the Congress of the United States who sent these boys into World War I and World War II. Of course, it was the President of the United States who sent our boys into Korea, many of whom are now coming back maimed. Every Member of Congress, of course, must vote his or her own convictions, and they will do that. I have and will continue to economize in thousands of other places, but I never have and never will practice economy on our disabled veterans, widows and orphans of deceased veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs at the time this bill was considered. I am inclined to agree that it does not treat everybody fairly, but I am also inclined to agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] that it is a pretty difficult job to write legislation that will treat everyone exactly equitably.

I think it is a well-known truism that adversity tries the souls of men. I do not think a boy who has fought in Korea and has lost an arm or a leg could be tried in a much more difficult situation. I am going to vote to override this veto believing that this legislation may help to bring those boys back into the family of American citizens and give them a feeling that people care about them. It will help them get started on the road to taking their place as normal citizens among us again.

Someone mentioned before that there has not been any pressure on this bill. I know of one boy from my district who will be affected There may be more. However, I have not received a single letter and there has not been any organized pressure about this bill. I feel pretty good about voting for a bill that is not a pressure bill at all but is a bill to help these boys who are unorganized and who have no pressure group to speak for them.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, we are about to determine, as is provided under the Constitution, whether or not this measure becomes law, the views of the President notwithstanding. Overriding the President's veto of any measure is not commonly resorted to but is entirely proper. During my service in the House it has been my duty to vote under similar circumstances on veto measures I have voted to sustain the President and I have voted to override his veto.

I am sure there is not a Member of the House who is not becoming more and more impressed with the fact that somehow we must curtail Government expenditures. To be sure, we must continue to provide adequate funds for national defense. More than three-fourths of every Federal tax dollar now collected goes for the payment of wars, past, present, or future security. It is questionable whether or not the civilization that we love and cherish can continue to exist if required to spend such a sizable portion of income for war.

And I have sought to economize but I cannot begin to economize by refusing to provide for those who have so freely given of life and limb for our protection. I intend to vote to override the President's veto.

You and I are living today in a period of preparedness. This state is a very complex condition and, unless we know exactly what we are preparing for, there is a good chance that we will be all ready for something which never comes, and that we will be unprepared for what actually does occur. I have only a few minutes to talk to you now and, most certainly, I cannot outline for you a complete program of preparedness even if I were competent to do so. Consequently, I want to spend my time on one form of preparedness which may not be more important than the others, but which appears to me to be receiving less attention than it should.

In the first place, we all agree that the non-Communist world must be prepared to protect itself in a military way and to counteract Communist intervention anywhere that it may appear. That, we are doing in the United States, at a constantly increasing rate with rising costs in terms of men and money and materials. This is the state of preparedness which we hear about continually and which can scarcely be overemphasized.

But military preparedness alone is not enough. Every non-Communist nation must stand, energetically and consistently, for those economic and political conditions whose absence has been one of the causes of the spread of communism and dictatorship in so many parts of the world We must preach and practice democracy at home and abroad, and we must not only share or ideals but also the results of our material prosperity, in order that people in nondemocratic countries may understand clearly what we stand for and how successful our ideals are in their operation. This is a kind of preparedness that may, in the long run, be a greater protection to us than all the armies and atomic weapons and natural resources and industrial capacities which we are depending upon, and which we are developing at such a cost.

The matter of cost of preparedness is the real heart of this problem. Cost can mean expenditure of money, cost can mean consumption of human labor, cost can mean use of raw materials. But it can mean something more fundamental than any of these. If we also must expend the basic values of our civilization, to preserve our bare lives, What will be the use of living? Men fight for self-preservation but they fight more fiercely for a faith whose values they believe to be supreme. Communism apparently provides such a fighting faith—a few years ago, men died for a faith called fascism.

But men will not so fight for an ideal, not even an ideal as great as democracy, unless its meaning is clear to them. Our great American rights and privileges have developed gradually and, because we have possessed them for generations,

we cannot even imagine what our life would be without them. But if we are going to continue to live in such a world as has existed since the beginning of World War I, some 35 years ago, we are going to be forced into recognition of the fact that our liberties are in constant danger. First a world war, then 10 years of boom, then 10 years of depression, then another World War, finally, 5 years of what it is ironical to call peace—with the prospect that the present emergency may last 1 or 20 years—must we not recognize the danger that the cumulative impact of these departures from our accustomed way of living will change the very fundamentals of our American way of life?

What are these fundamentals which we take so much for granted? Just such simple things as the right to individual choice. The right to reject, to choose, to decide is the very essence of individual responsibility. It is the basis of our economic system of free enterprise, and of our freedom to choose our religion. We can read or not read the daily newspapers, our radio is free, we can think and say what we like, we can live where we please. Our whole lives furnish example after example of this basic, democratic right of free choice.

My great fear is that the recurrence of emergencies for three or four or five decades, will cut deeply into this power of free decision, the chief ingredient of American growth and liberty. It is inevitable that, in an emergency, Government must make many of the decisions that individuals and private groups once made for themselves. If the emergency is of short duration, we will not become accustomed to our loss and there is slight danger that it will become permanent. But supposing the present emergency, possibly in an even more dangerous form, should last 10 or 20 years, as many persons think it might—what about the young persons who will have been born and who will have lived to their majority, accustomed to restraint rather than the freedom which our generation has known? That is the great danger—that in concentrating our effort on military and economic preparedness to defend our physical existence, we may sacrifice so many of the ideals of our democracy that we will save our lives—but not our way of life. I maintain that we can prevent this catastrophe if we are fully aware that it is an imminent danger.

The first thing we must do is to create a constant awareness of the danger involved in every so-called temporary loss of individual freedom. If such sacrifices are demanded as part of the price we must pay to protect ourselves against aggression, be certain that there is a real need for each loss. If someone says, "We cannot hold regular elections because of the emergency," or "We must turn all the railroads over to the Government because of the emergency," or "We must restrict the publication of information which citizens need to understand their Government," be certain beyond shadow of doubt that there is actual danger in our continuing established present practices, or that the preparedness program will be greatly expedited by our sacrifice. Many unscrupulous persons are trying, and they will continue to try, to push through programs of change which would be given little consideration under normal circumstances, but which they now disguise as a part of preparedness.

As for those prized American freedoms, rights, and opportunities which must be taken from us temporarily, let us not forget them for 1 day. As someone said, when we give up any of our freedoms we must be sure to keep the claim check that says, "Return to bearer on demand." We must mobilize the strength of our spiritual leaders—just as we mobilize men for war and industrial production. These leaders must make it their responsibility to remind us older citizens of what we have given up in the cause of protecting America, and they must teach every boy and girl, young man and young woman, that there is a part of his American heritage which he does not presently enjoy but which he must not forget to claim and secure. This is a long-range program of preparedness—preparedness for the continuance unimpaired of democracy, as we have known it in the United States, and the American principle of personal freedom.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in listening to this debate, it seems to me there is only one objection to the bill and only one reason has been advanced for sustaining the veto, namely, that the bill in its present form might discriminate against a few disabled veterans. Is not that a small view to take? If we sustain the President's veto, we will not help the poor, disabled boy who is discriminated against. He will be in exactly the same position he is in now We will be discriminating then against the boys the bill is intended to help.

It reminds me of the man who wanted to tear down his neighbor's house because he could not have one of his own. That is the attitude of the opposition so far to this bill and in favor of sustaining the veto.

Let us take two boys over in Walter Reed Hospital or any hospital in the United States. One is disabled with a broken back or some other injury. He is not, we will admit, included in this bill. In the bed next to him is a boy with his legs or arms off, who will be included in the bill. Do you suppose the boy with the broken back for one minute would want us to sustain the veto simply because he is not included and his buddy is? Did you ever find a disabled veteran who wanted to punish another disabled veteran because he himself would not be included? When you simmer it all down that is all there is to the opposition to this bill that has been advanced this far.

Discrimination? In heaven's name, did not this Congress agree yesterday to a conference report that every Member of this House admits has in it discriminatory provisions? Have we ever passed a bill that was not discriminatory? I can show you discriminations as the result of the GI bill. Therefore, if we take the position of the opposition to this bill, we should go back and repeal the GI bills of rights and every other piece of veterans' legislation that has been passed up to date, simply because it has discriminatory provisions in it. Mr. Speaker, this bill should pass, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding. It will help many worthy disabled veterans. It should not be defeated on the theory that it is not broad enough to cover all disabled veterans. If there are some not included in this bill who should be, then justice can be done them in subsequent legislation. Let us do what we can now by passing this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as most of you who have paid any attention to the roll calls know I have probably voted against more appropriations than has the average Member. I was inclined to vote to sustain the President's veto, even though I do not think very much of his general policies for we most certainly should cut down appropriations, for even the President might be right once in a great while. In this case, I do not believe I can go along with him—that may be a source of great grief to him, I am sure—but as long as the House is voting to spend billions upon billions of dollars abroad, and I think that is wrong, perhaps to vote to override the veto in this case might result in a few of these dollars, just a few of these dollars, reverting to the veterans when otherwise those dollars would go abroad. I may say, I am influenced to some extent by the hope that the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I see the distinguished ranking minority member present, will have less money to send abroad if I vote to give this money to the veterans.

Those who have consistently voted for the Marshall plan for so many of the appropriations which have sent our dollars abroad by the billion and who now cast an economy vote to sustain the President are not, I am sure, voting to uphold the veto just because only a few, a very few, voting veterans will be deprived of this particular benefit. No doubt they are today in favor of economy—perhaps in January they will be great liberals again—sending billions all over the world. Today I will just vote to give a little something to a few veterans, and in January, and while I am here, make my economy move when asked to give billions to people in other countries who do not seem willing to help themselves.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks on this bill at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, my vote is "No" on overriding the President's veto of S. 1864, providing $1,600 for the purchase of automobiles for World War

II and Korean veterans who have lost one or both hands or feet or suffered defective vision because of military service.

I believe that with the sustaining of the veto a bill can be enacted in the next session of the Eighty-second Congress which would conform with the bill under which veterans of World War II have previously secured this means of transportation and rehabilitation. I would be especially interested in taking care of our Korean boys in this regard.

Every speaker in favor of overriding the veto has said it is discriminatory and some have indicated that it is the last bill of this nature for which they will vote. They are at least frank.

From my own experience, having been the operator of approximately 150 trucks, I know there are some amputations of the leg that do not interfere with a man accepting and handling well a job as a truck driver. In fact, there are several such men on our payroll. Also, with the invention of the new type drives, such as dynaflow and hydramatic, there is no necessity for good, efficient and safe operators to have two limbs I know also that there are many jobs that a man with one arm can do efficiently, having during my business career endeavored to help the physically handicapped whenever possible. However, there is no argument in the fact that men with the latter disability do not need an automobile with which to go to and from their places of employment.

Again may I say that I would be entirely in favor of a bill along the lines of the previous legislation that provided this transportation for veterans who have lost one or both legs, since I feel such assistance is very helpful in establishing their self-confidence and rehabilitation.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to sustain the President's veto of S 1864, a bill to provide automobiles for certain classes of disabled veterans. This bill authorizes the payment of $1,600 on the purchase of an automobile for a veteran of World War II, or of service on or after June 27, 1950—which is meant principally to include veterans of the present Korean war—who have lost, or lost the use of, one or both hands or feet, or who is blind.

Previous laws provided a similar benefit to a World War II veteran who lost, or lost the use of, one or both legs at or above the ankle and who was able to drive an automobile. I am most heartily in favor of this sort of assistance. The object is to compensate veterans who cannot get about like the rest of us are able to do by providing them with automobiles, which, in most instances, have special equipment to enable their veteran owners to drive about in near normal fashion. Thus, the veteran is able, by himself, to get to and from a job which he might not otherwise be able to hold. Furthermore, it allows him recreational opportunities and gives him a sense of independence which assist greatly in his mental and physical rehabilitation.

However, this new legislation extends the $1,600 auto payment to veterans who have lost, or lost the use of, one or both hands, or who are blind. Now, as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and a veteran of World War II myself, I am most sincerely sympathetic with all disabled veterans, and I shall support, as I always have supported, reasonable and proper legislation for their benefit. But I do not believe that it is reasonable or proper to extend the law in question beyond its present scope.

I believe that Congress should, at regular intervals, determine whether or not current rates of compensation for disabled veterans are adequate. That is the reasonable and proper thing to do. If they are not adequate, then they should be raised to the point where they are adequate.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to vote to sustain the President's veto. I want to make it clear, however, that I favor extension of existing legislation so as to provide assistance in obtaining automobiles to veterans of World War II and to each person who, after June 27, 1950, and until termination of the present war, has served in the military forces of the United States, and who is entitled to compensation for the loss, or loss of the use of, one or both legs at or above the ankle.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to understand the Presidential veto of S. 1864, an act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles by certain disabled veterans.

The purpose of the enactment is to authorize payment of not to exceed $1,600 on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance, not only for veterans of World War II, but also for the Korean war veterans. This legislation would take care of, not only those qualifying veterans of the Korean conflict, but would also take care of the eligible World War II veterans who were not taken care of when just such a program expired on June 30, 1951.

It is all the more difficult for me, Mr. Speaker, to understand this Presidential veto when we consider that the Korean war veterans were sent there, not by act of Congress, but by Presidential act. It was a congressional decision which sent World War II veterans into battle and this Congress, by previous legislation, has honorably and justly discharged its obligation wherever possible with regard to the disabled veteran. As a Member of this Congress, I will not, by my vote, change that policy.

I am going to vote to override that veto, not only because of the direct help we are giving to the veteran himself, but we must be ever mindful of the indirect help to society whenever we take a constructive step to rehabilitate the disabled veteran.

There has been perfectly ridiculous argument that this legislation would discriminate against a small group who would not be taken care of in this legislation. What a small view, Mr. Speaker. Why then attempt to sustain this unwarranted veto when such action would discriminate against the large group affected thereby.

This is not charity legislation. It is part of our obligation and I sincerely trust that we override the veto by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, we have in the veto of this bill a demonstration of unmitigated gall on the part of President Truman.

It was Truman and Truman alone who sent American boys into Korea in what he called a police action.

It was Truman who therefore is responsible for sending these men into action last winter wholly unprepared for the zero and subzero temperatures from which was reaped a tragic harvest of amputees.

Truman has not the slightest hesitancy in demanding that Congress appropriate billions of dollars and give him or his hirelings blank-check authority to shovel out money all over the world, yet he has the gall to veto this measure.

His action in this case is disgraceful and an insult to American servicemen.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, recently I voted to support the veto of the President to House bill 3193 This was a bill to give pensions to veterans whose disability had no necessary connection with military service. It was estimated this bill would add $400,000,000 a year, when it reaches its peak some time within the next 50 years. I was opposed to this bill when it came up on the Consent Calendar. I voted against it when it came up for consideration in the House, and I voted to support the President when he vetoed it. It seemed quite clear to me that this was class legislation; that it had no reference in any connection with military service or war and was an added burden that the economy of the Nation could not well stand.

Today on consideration of the veto of the President to S. 1864, which would give an automobile to certain totally and permanently disabled veterans whose disability was service connected, my vote was to override the veto. This was entirely consistent with my former vote. In this case, it was a feeble effort to replace some of the pleasure and abilities that these veterans lost on the battlefield. It was only one automobile and at a price which was fixed and modest. It would cost not to exceed $17,000,000 if all veterans who were qualified to receive an automobile would apply for it, and the cost is not recurrent in other years.

These automobiles, I am sure, will help these veterans to readjust themselves to an abnormal mode of living. To some of them it will be a means of enabling them to earn a livelihood. That is a small investment for so worthy a cause. For this group of veterans I am convinced that I speak for the vast majority of the people of the Ninth Ohio District when I vote to give them the opportunity to have an automobile.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 223, nays 53, answered "present" 3, not voting 149, as follows:

[Roll No. 217]

YEAS—223

Abernethy	Goodwin	O'Toole
Adair	Gordon	Patten
Addonizio	Graham	Patterson
Albert	Grant	Philbin
Andersen, H. Carl	Greenwood	Pickett
	Gregory	Poage
Andresen, August H.	Gross	Polk
	Gwinn	Poulson
Anfuso	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Price
Aspinall		Priest
Auchincloss	Hall, Leonard W.	Rabaut
Bailey		Radwan
Baker	Hand	Rains
Bakewell	Harris	Rankin
Bates, Mass.	Hart	Reams
Battle	Havenner	Reece, Tenn.
Beall	Hays, Ark.	Reed, Ill
Beamer	Hays, Ohio	Rees, Kans.
Beckworth	Hedrick	Rhodes
Belcher	Herter	Richards
Bennett, Fla.	Hill	Riley
Bennett, Mich.	Hinshaw	Rivers
Betts	Hoffman, Ill.	Roberts
Bishop	Hoffman, Mich.	Rodino
Blatnik	Holifield	Rogers, Colo
Bolton	Holmes	Rogers, Mass.
Bow	Howell	Rogers, Tex.
Bray	Hull	Rooney
Brehm	Ikard	Sadlak
Brown, Ga.	Jackson, Wash	St George
Bryson	James	Sasscer
Buchanan	Jarman	Saylor
Budge	Javits	Schwabe
Burdick	Jensen	Scott, Hardie
Burleson	Jones, Ala.	Scrivner
Burnside	Jones, Woodrow W.	Scudder
		Secrest
Bush	Karsten, Mo.	Seely-Brown
Canfield	Kearns	Short
Cannon	Kee	Sieminski
Carlyle	Kersten, Wis.	Simpson, Ill.
Carnahan	Kilday	Smith, Wis.
Case	King	Springer
Chenoweth	Kirwan	Steed
Chiperfield	Kluczynski	Stigler
Clevenger	Lane	Sutton
Cole, Kans.	Lanham	Talle
Colmer	Lesinski	Teague
Cooper	Lind	Thomas
Corbett	Lovre	Thompson, Mich.
Crosser	McCulloch	
Crumpacker	McGrath	Thompson, Tex.
Cunningham	McGuire	Tollefson
Davis, Ga.	McMillan	Trimble
DeGraffenried	McMullen	Vail
Denton	McVey	Van Pelt
Devereux	Machrowicz	Van Zandt
Dondero	Madden	Velde
Donohue	Magee	Vorys
Donovan	Mahon	Weichel
Doyle	Mansfield	Welch
Eaton	Martin, Mass.	Wharton
Elliott	Merrow	Whitaker
Ellsworth	Miller, Md.	Whitten
Fallon	Miller, N. Y.	Wickersham
Feighan	Mills	Widnall
Fenton	Mitchell	Williams, N. Y.
Fisher	Morano	Willis
Flood	Morris	Wilson, Ind.
Fogarty	Murdock	Winstead
Forand	Nicholson	Withrow
Frazier	O'Brien, Ill.	Wolcott
Fulton	O'Brien, Mich.	Wolverton
Furcolo	O'Hara	Wood, Idaho
Gamble	O'Konski	Yorty
Gathings	O'Neill	
Gavin	Ostertag	
George		

NAYS—53

Andrews	Ford	Mason
Bentsen	Forrester	Miller, Nebr
Burton	Gary	Morton
Byrnes, Wis.	Hale	Multer
Camp	Halleck	Mumma
Chelf	Hardy	Nelson
Church	Harrison, Va.	Norblad
Cooley	Hefferman	Norrell
Cotton	Heselton	Reed, N. Y.
Cox	Hillings	Robeson
Curtis, Nebr.	Hunter	Simpson, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	Jenison	Smith, Va.
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Mo	Spence
Dawson	Keating	Stanley
Doughton	Kerr	Taber
Eberharter	LeCompte	Wheeler
Elston	McKinnon	Woodruff
Fernandez	Marshall	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Potter	Walter	Williams, Miss.

NOT VOTING—149

Aandahl	Durham	Meader
Abbitt	Engle	Miller, Calif.
Allen, Calif.	Evins	Morgan
Allen, Ill.	Fine	Morrison
Allen, La.	Fugate	Moulder
Anderson, Calif.	Garmatz	Murphy
Angell	Golden	Murray, Tenn.
Arends	Gore	Murray, Wis.
Armstrong	Granahan	Passman
Ayres	Granger	Patman
Barden	Green	Perkins
Baring	Hagen	Phillips
Barrett	Harden	Powell
Bates, Ky.	Harrison, Wyo.	Preston
Bender	Harvey	Prouty
Berry	Hébert	Quinn
Blackney	Heller	Ramsay
Boggs, Del.	Herlong	Redden
Boggs, La.	Hess	Regan
Bolling	Hoeven	Ribicoff
Bonner	Hope	Riehlman
Bosone	Horan	Rogers, Fla.
Boykin	Irving	Roosevelt
Bramblett	Jackson, Calif.	Sabath
Brooks	Jenkins	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Brown, Ohio	Johnson	
Brownson	Jonas	Shafer
Buckley	Jones, Hamilton C.	Sheehan
Buffett		Shelley
Busbey	Judd	Sheppard
Butler	Kean	Sikes
Byrne, N. Y.	Kearney	Sittler
Celler	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Kans.
Chatham	Kelly, N. Y.	Smith, Miss.
Chudoff	Kennedy	Staggers
Clemente	Keogh	Stockman
Cole, N. Y.	Kilburn	Tackett
Combs	Klein	Taylor
Coudert	Lantaff	Thornberry
Crawford	Larcade	Vinson
Curtis, Mo.	Latham	Vursell
Dague	Lucas	Watts
Deane	Lyle	Werdel
Delaney	McCarthy	Wier
Dempsey	McConnell	Wigglesworth
Denny	McCormack	Wilson, Tex.
D'Ewart	McDonough	Wood, Ga.
Dingell	McGregor	Yates
Dollinger	Mack, Ill.	Zablocki
Dolliver	Mack, Wash.	
Dorn	Martin, Iowa	

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Quinn with Mr Angell.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Engle with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Coudert
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Redden with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Taylor.
Mr Regan with Mr Harvey
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Busbey.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Fine with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. Clemente with Mr. Harrison of Wyoming.
Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Buffett.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Butler.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Denny.
Mr. Passman with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Bramblett.
Mr Baring with Mr. D'Ewart.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Armstong.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Green with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Preston with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Golden.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Bolling with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Irving with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Lantaff with Mr. Sittler.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Ribicoff with Mr. Mack of Washington.
Mr. Tackett with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Vursell.
Mr. Deane with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Fugate with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mr. Lyle with Mr. Johnson.
Mr. Lucas with Mr. Brownson.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House I qualify to vote on this measure. However, in view of the fact that I am a service-connected amputee of World War II, thereby being personally affected by this legislation, I do not feel qualified to vote either yea or nay. I therefore ask that my vote be recorded as "present."

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, I qualify and vote "present" for the same obvious reason.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5745) to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill briefly?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase not to exceed $30,000,000 of securities issued to construct veterans' cooperative housing. It applies only to commitments that were made by the FHA to insure these mortgages prior to June 29, 1951. It is to meet a condition that has occurred by reason of the fact that many veterans have made contracts and have paid their money for the purpose of securing cooperative housing. The securities cannot be floated. The only way these projects can be completed at the present time is by the Federal National Mortgage Association making commitments to purchase these securities.

The veterans and the others who will be occupants of these projects have paid their money. Unless this is done and unless some relief is afforded, they will be the losers. It is not a bill for the benefit of the builders. It will benefit

those who have paid their money in order that they may secure cooperative housing. I think housing is an investment in national contentment and good citizenship, and I think it should be stimulated in every reasonable way. This bill does not change in any way the fundamental law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (G) of section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act, as amended, the Federal National Mortgage Association is authorized to enter into advance commitment contracts which do not exceed $30,000,000 outstanding at any one time, if such commitments relate to mortgages with respect to which the Federal Housing Commissioner has issued, prior to June 29, 1951, pursuant to section 213 of the National Housing Act, as amended, either a commitment to insure or a statement of eligibility: *And provided further*, That not to exceed $3,500,000 of said authorization shall be available for such commitments in any one State.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCHOOLS IN CRITICAL DEFENSE HOUSING AREAS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5411) to amend Public Laws 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense housing areas, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment:

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 6, line 13, after "State", insert ", and education provided under this section shall be available to the children for whom it is being provided on the same terms, in accordance with the laws of the State in which the Federal property is situated, as free public education is available to other children in such State."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. BAILEY. My colleague will recall that some days ago the House approved the bill, H. R. 5411. The Senate in acting on the same legislation decided that it would be advisable to bring Public Law 874, which is the maintenance and operation provision of the operation of schools in our critical areas, in line with the same provision that was placed in Public Law 815. It will affect probably as many as five or six of the larger bases where we are conducting schools solely on the bases. It permits the education authorities to operate those schools in conformity with the provisions of the laws of the particular State.

I trust that the House will concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM ELDEN JOSLIN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2228) for the relief of William Elden Joslin.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is this bill similar to several others we have passed?

Mr. WALTER. This is a bill that will enable an Army officer and his wife to bring to the United States an infant that was adopted by this couple some months ago.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, William Elden Joslin, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Technical Sergeant and Mrs. Ivan E. Joslin, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING CERTAIN TITLES OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3899) to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 11, preceding section 18 insert:

"SEC. 17b. Section 2 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 2. Principals

"'(a) Whoever commits an offense against the United States or aids, abets, counsels, commands, induces or procures its commission, is punishable as a principal.

"'(b) Whoever willfully causes an act to be done which if directly performed by him or another would be an offense against the United States, is punishable as a principal.'"

Page 13, preceding section 22 insert:

"'SEC. 21a. Section 708 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'This section shall not make unlawful the use of any such design or insignia which was lawful on August 31, 1948.'"

Page 15, line 11, after "country", insert ", or for or on behalf of any government or any person or persons purporting to act as a government within a foreign country."

Page 17, strike out all of section 28 and insert:

"SEC. 28. Section 1115 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words 'the field service of the Division of Grazing of the Department of the Interior', appearing in such section, and in lieu thereof inserting 'the field service of the Bureau of Land Management', so that such section will read as follows:

"'§ 1114 Protection of officers and employees of the United States

"'Whoever kills any judge of the United States, any United States Attorney, any Assistant United States Attorney, or any United States marshal or deputy marshal or person employed to assist such marshal or deputy marshal, any officer or employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, any post-office inspector, any officer or employee of the secret service or of the Bureau of Narcotics, any officer or enlisted man of the Coast Guard, any officer or employee of any United States penal or correctional institution, any officer, employee or agent of the customs or of the internal revenue or any person assisting him in the execution of his duties, any immigrant inspector or any immigration patrol inspector, any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture or of the Department of the Interior designated by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior to enforce any Act of Congress for the protection, preservation, or restoration of game and other wild birds and animals, any officer or employee of the National Park Service, any officer or employee of, or assigned to duty in, the field service of the Bureau of Land Management, any employee of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture, or any officer or employee of the Indian field service of the United States, while engaged in the performance of his official duties, or on account of the performance of his official duties, shall be punished as provided under sections 1111 and 1112 of this title.'"

Page 20, strike out all of section 36a and insert

"SEC. 36a Subsection (c) (6) of section 90 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the word 'Washington', so that the subsection will read as follows:

"'(6) The Swainsboro Division comprises the counties of Bullock, Candler, Emanuel, Jefferson, Jenkins, and Toombs.

"'Court for the Swainsboro Division shall be held at Swainsboro.'"

Page 24, strike out section 48 and insert:

"SEC. 48. Section 1291 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after 'Canal Zone' in such section, the words ', the District Court of Guam', so that such section will read as follows

"'The courts of appeals shall have jurisdiction of appeals from all final decisions of the district courts of the United States, the district court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of Guam, and the District Court of the Virgin Islands, except where a direct review may be had in the Supreme Court.'"

Page 26, after section 53 insert:

"SEC. 53a (a) Upon the filing of a complaint in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia wherein remedy is sought under section 4915 or section 4918 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (35 U. S. C., secs. 63 and 66), without seeking other remedy, if it shall appear that there is an adverse party residing in a foreign country, or adverse parties residing in a plurality of districts not embraced within the same State, the court shall have jurisdiction thereof and process shall, unless the adverse party or parties voluntarily make

appearance, be issued against all of the adverse parties and served anywhere within the United States, except that process issued against parties residing in foreign countries pursuant to this section may be served by publication or otherwise as the court may direct.

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall be deemed to be in effect as of September 1, 1948."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, am I correct in understanding that this bill is merely clarifying and corrective as to certain titles of the code, and that in only one instance is there any substantive law involved, and that is, as I recall, where an appeal is permitted from the District Court of Guam to the Ninth Circuit? Also that it has the approval of the Judicial Conference?

Mr. BRYSON. That is true.

Mr REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETURNING CERTAIN LANDS TO POLICE JURY OF CADDO PARISH, LA.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4749) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to return certain lands to the Police Jury of Caddo Parish, La.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is land which was originally given to the Federal Government for an experiment station, and that now the Federal Government, having abandoned the experiment station, wants to return the land.

Mr. POAGE That is correct. There is an amendment which strikes out the long, legal description, or at least cuts it down some.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to return, by appropriate conveyance, to the Police Jury, Parish of Caddo, State of Louisiana, without cost, that certain tract of land obtained by the United States comprising thirty-eight and eight-tenths acres, donated by the Police Jury of Caddo Parish, in the year 1930, to the United States of America for use in pecan production research, lands being no longer needed by the United States for that purpose and being described more particularly as follows. Thirty-eight and thirty one-hundredths acres of land beginning at a point on the east right-of-way line of the Forbing-Red Bluff Road, also referred to as the Grappe Line Road (this point being north forty-seven degrees and seven degrees east thirty-five feet from the intersection of the Grappe line with the south line of the northwest quarter of section 22 west of the Grappe line); thence north forty-seven degrees and seven degrees east one thousand one hundred forty and five-tenths feet to an iron pipe at the head of a drain, thence along the center of this drain north fifty-three degrees thirty-eight degrees east one hundred and eighty-five feet, thence north sixty-four degrees fifty degrees east two hundred ninety-two and eight-tenths feet, thence north fifty degrees fifty degrees east four hundred and seventy-three feet, thence north thirty-nine degrees twenty degrees east one hundred ninety-five and five-tenths feet; thence north forty-nine degrees seventeen degrees east four hundred five and five-tenths feet to an iron pipe, thence north forty-three degrees four degrees east five hundred and forty-six feet to the southeast right-of-way line of Forbing Leonard Road, thence southwestwardly along this right-of-way line of the Forbing-Leonard Road to the intersection with the east right-of-way line of the Forbing Red Blu . Road or Grappe Line Road, thence south thirty-eight degrees seventeen degrees east one thousand two hundred and forty-two feet along this right-of-way to the point of beginning, containing thirty-eight and eighty one-hundredths acres, being part of the forty-two acre tract of land purchased by Mrs Cecilia L Ellerbee from J B Railsback, in township 16 north range 13 west, Caddo Parish, Louisiana: *Provided*, That the conveyance by the Secretary of Agriculture to the police jury of Caddo Parish shall contain a reservation to the United States of all fissionable materials in the land together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "acres", insert "more or less in township 16 north, range 13 west, Caddo Parish, Louisiana"

Page 1, line 11, after "research", insert "being the same lands obtained by the Police Jury of Caddo Parish from Mrs Cecelia Leonard Ellerbe, said"

Page 2, line 3, after "purpose", strike out all down to and including line 12, page 3.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING INTERSTATE MOVEMENT OF SLAUGHTERED DOMESTIC ANIMALS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1629) to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, to permit the interstate movement, for immediate slaughter, of domestic animals which have reacted to a test for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test for brucellosis; and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Texas explain the bill?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, this bill would allow the movement in interstate commerce of animals that have reacted to a test for brucellosis, or paratuberculosis, which are both diseases which we believe to be actually communicable although they have not been so defined by the Department of Agriculture as yet. Frankly, the reason for not defining them as communicable diseases is that under the present law, if they were so defined, the reacting animals could not move in interstate commerce, and could not be shipped to the most advantageous selling points. For instance, in South St. Paul, they could not be shipped across from Wisconsin, and in Kansas City, they could not be shipped across from Missouri. Of course, that would greatly interfere with the movement of the cattle. These cattle are killed for human consumption The meat is good provided it is properly handled.

Mr MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are health and safety provisions fully taken care of?

Mr POAGE Yes, we think that the health angle is fully protected. We believe by making this change we will have better enforcement than we could have if we attempted to prohibit the movement from one State to another, because then the owner of the animal would not report reactors. We feel that by doing this, it would both help enforcement and save a considerable amount of indemnities which are paid by the Government. If the indemnity must be paid upon the price that is received in a noncompetitive market, the amount that the Government must pay out will necessarily be more

Mr. GROSS Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts I yield.

Mr. GROSS. This is designed purely for slaughter purposes for interstate shipment?

Mr. POAGE. For slaughter purposes, yes; but there is one further exception. Where an individual sells animals that are later found to be afflicted with brucellosis or paratuberculosis, they may be returned to the same man who sold them. You understand, you might sell an animal that might be shipped across the State line, and then develop a reaction. Under this bill it could be returned to you.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, it is a unanimous report from the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what about cattle moved from one State to another for feeding purposes, which within a few weeks will go to market?

Mr. POAGE. This does not allow movement from one State to another for feeding purposes. It is required that all animals be branded with a "B" on the jaw when they have these diseases. This allows them to move only for slaughter-

ing purposes, or, in the one instance which I mentioned, for return to the owner.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 11 of the act of Congress approved May 29, 1884, entitled "An act for the establishment of a Bureau of Animal Industry, to prevent the exportation of diseased cattle, and to provide means for the suppression and extirpation of pleuropneumonia and other contagious diseases among domestic animals" (21 U. S. C. 114a), is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the words "Bang's disease of cattle" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "brucellosis of domestic animals."

SEC. 2. The said act is hereby further amended by adding, at the end thereof, the following new section:

"SEC. 13. Domestic animals which have reacted to a test recognized by the Secretary of Agriculture for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test recognized by the Secretary of Agriculture for brucellosis, may be shipped, transported, or otherwise moved from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to any other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia for immediate slaughter in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe to prevent the dissemination of said diseases from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to any other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia The Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, permit domestic animals which have been moved from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to any other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, for breeding purposes, and which, subsequent to such movement, have reacted to a test for brucellosis or paratuberculosis recognized by the Secretary of Agriculture, to be reshipped in interstate commerce to the original owner at the point of origin."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 5063) was laid on the table.

SABINE LAKE BRIDGE AND CAUSEWAY AUTHORITY

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 5593, an act authorizing the Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority, hereby created, and its successors, to construct, maintain, and operate bridges over Sabine Lake, at or near Port Arthur, Tex.; to construct, maintain, and operate all causeways, approaches, and appurtenances pertaining thereto; and to finance said objects by the issuance of bonds secured by the said properties and income and revenues, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 6, line 16, strike out all after "affairs" down to and including "entity" in line 22.

Page 8, line 25, strike out all after "same," over to and including "it," in line 2, page 9.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain this amendment?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House a few days ago, and cleared the other body yesterday with the amendments that have just been read. The language cut out of the bill as it passed the House granting this authority authorized to borrow money from the Government or agencies of the Government of the United States. The testimony showed that they did not intend to exercise that right so the Senate said, in effect has said by these amendments "If you do not intend to use it, we will cut it out."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. They cut out the authority to borrow money from the United States Government?

Mr. TRIMBLE. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And that is all the amendment does?

Mr. TRIMBLE. That is the only change in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1320) to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between certain officers of the Public Health Service and comparable officers of the Army, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Reserving the right to object, I do so, Mr. Speaker, in order to explain the purpose of this legislation. This bill, S. 1320, is to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between certain officers of the Public Health Service and comparable officers of the Army.

This bill specifies that the chief dental officer of the Public Health Service shall have the same grade, pay, and allowance as the officer of the Dental Corps selected and appointed as Assistant Surgeon General of the Army.

The principal purpose underlying this bill is to establish parity among the chief dental officers of the various services. A step in this direction has already been taken by the Congress through its passage of H. R. 4205, which gives the chief dental officer of the Navy the status corresponding to that of chief dental officer of the Army. In addition, this bill would perform the desirable purpose of assuring due recognition to the dental profession in the top administrative structure of the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that Public Health has authority now to provide for this comparable grade and status of the Chief of the Dental Section in the Public Health Service, but has not as yet put it into effect. Perhaps, due to the fact that there are two other employees who seek similar recognition, Coast Guard and Chief Engineer.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I am not aware of all the details you have stated, but I understand the bill is necessary to accomplish the purpose I have stated.

Mr. HARRIS. And it is the intention to adopt this bill as passed by the Senate yesterday, in order to promote the Chief of the Dental Health Service to this comparable position and rank, and give consideration to the other two positions at a later time when the committee can get to it? I think, under the circumstances, this bill should be accepted and approved.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I am in accord with the thought expressed by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], and for the reasons I have already given withdraw the objection I made to obtain an opportunity to explain the bill and ask that the House approve the bill.

I understand that to be the purpose of the legislation. It should be in it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 206 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 207, 58 Stat. 684), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Surgeon General, during the period of his appointment as such, shall be of the same grade, with the same pay and allowances, as the Surgeon General of the Army; the Deputy Surgeon General while assigned as such, shall have the grade corresponding with the grade of major general, with the pay and allowances thereof; and the Chief Dental Officer, while assigned as such, shall have the grade, with the same pay and allowances, as is prescribed by law for the officer of the Dental Corps selected and appointed as Assistant Surgeon General of the Army."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADELHEID WICHMAN (NOW ADELHEID WAITSCHIES)

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1980) for the relief of Adelheid Wichman, now Adelheid Waitschies.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill.

Mr. WALTER. This is another one of those bills for the relief of an infant adopted by Army personnel. The officer's tour of duty is about to expire, and he and his wife want to bring the baby back home at the end of the month.

Mr. GRAHAM. I might say the child is 3 years old.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child Adelheid Wichman (now Adelheid Waitschies) shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Mr. and Mrs Otto Waitschies, citizens of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up for consideration S. 1980, for the relief of Adelheid Wichman, now Adelheid Waitschies, which passed the Senate yesterday and is now on your desk.

I had a companion bill, H. R. 5110, introduced in behalf of this child but due to the lateness in the session, the Judiciary Committee was not able to take the matter up.

My primary reason for making this request is that a woman from Montana is leaving this month for Europe and she will be returning in December at which time she will be glad to bring Adelheid Waitschies Wichman back with her, providing that this child can receive her visa. If the House will consider S. 1980 today and it is signed by the President, the American consul will be authorized to issue a visa to the child without waiting for a quota number.

Mr. and Mrs. Otto Waitschies of Glasgow, Mont., adopted this girl as well as her brother because their parents are dead. Mrs. Waitschies is an aunt and went to Europe this past spring to bring the children back with her. She was permitted to bring the little boy but the girl did not qualify under the Displaced Persons Act; consequently she had to leave her in Germany. The only way this child can come any time soon is by special legislation such as has passed the Senate, or wait a couple of years under the quota system.

I have submitted to the House Judiciary Committee copies of the adoption papers, character recommendations, and the like, as well as copies of correspondence from the American consul concerning these children.

I am submitting a copy of a letter I sent to the Subcommittee on Immigration on October 3 which goes into detail on the background of the case.

No report from Justice Department on this bill because it was introduced late in the session.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOYCE JACQUALYN JOHNSON

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1931) for the relief of Joyce Jacqualyn Johnson.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Joyce Jacqualyn Johnson, a minor half-Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Sgt. and Mrs Prather Johnson, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEIKO SHINDO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2041) for the relief of Meiko Shindo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of that Act, the minor child, Meiko Shindo, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Captain and Mrs. Elmer F. Reavis, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON THE AMPUTEE AUTOMOBILES FOR DISABLED VETERANS BILL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill giving automobiles for disabled veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE PRICE OF FREEDOM IS COURAGE

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. If there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, some days ago I noted a certain full page editorial in a great Philadelphia newspaper, paid for as an advertisement by a leading merchandise house in that city of brotherly love.

The editorial began by quoting the world's democratic leaders over the span of history in their inspired and successful attempts to articulate the problems of their day. The editorial then reminded its readers that they could learn from the wise words of the democratic patriots of both the ancient and immediate past. The words of Pericles of ancient Athens supplied the keynote: "The price of freedom is courage."

This editorial brought home to me a realization that indeed American courage is not dead; and that the long heritage of courageous action against the ills that have beset us over the years since the original settlers arrived to found a new life again can see us through the hard years that most certainly lie ahead before peace and stability return to this troubled world.

It is about this quality of courage that I wish, with tremendous faith and long-term optimism, to speak to you today for a few minutes.

We have come a long way from those turbulent days of the revolution when we were able, with not many other advantages except courage, to win our independence and establish the kind of government which has become a model for people all over the world. Our Government now stands firmly established and has given us the opportunity to become the foremost Nation on earth.

And yet we are facing the greatest crisis in all our history. The insidious doctrines of communism has played upon men's weaknesses and lack of moral courage in many areas of the world and has, in some of those areas managed, through a monopoly of coercion, to establish garrison police states which are now alined against the free nations of the world. Soviet imperialism is so rich in the weapons and methods of crude force and has so completely terrorized the peoples under its domination that much of the rest of the world is, or was until we recently asserted positive leadership, paralyzed with fear. The United States now is in the vanguard of a world mobilizing against the creeping tentacles of Communist slavery. This country is determined to prevent the choking off of the great moral and ethical beliefs and the opportunities for real progress which are our heritage.

But even within our borders, in this great bulwark of freedom, we have seen signs of subversion, of treasonable action, and repeated attempts to propagandize, to weaken, to confuse.

Wherein, then, lies the optimism of which I spoke a moment ago? Where else but in the courage that is the price of freedom. Franklin D. Roosevelt admonished us not too long ago, when we were facing up to another kind of crisis situation, that "the only thing that we have to fear is fear itself, which paralyzes needed effort to convert retreat into advance." Under his leadership we were able to overcome whatever fears we might have entertained in those trying days of economic chaos and were able to start up the road to economic recovery. Time and time again the American people have made manifest their courage and have thus staved off disaster. Is it too much to expect that they will assert this quality now? Not at all. They have already responded to the call. The American people know where they are going. And they are showing to the rest of the world that the solution to the economic and political problems which are a hard reality in the world does not lie in abject surrender to a fallacious ideology and enslavement under totalitarianism,

Benjamin Franklin, who perhaps is respected and beloved in Europe and Asia almost as much as in the land of his birth, said in 1759, that "Those, who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety."

We in America are convinced of the wisdom of Franklin's words as we have never before been convinced. Western Europe has lately been taking inspiration from our determined adherence to these words and is making active efforts both to forestall communism and to develop positive plans of action to meet the social and economic problems which heretofore created the confusion upon which communism preyed. Asia, too, is beginning to see that nationalist aspirations cannot long develop under imperialistic control from Moscow. The problems of Asia are many but it becomes manifest that with courage and the rejection of the easy way of false promises they can be tackled and eventually solved.

Courage then, is the hope, the positive blessing, of free peoples everywhere. The "blood, sweat, and tears" offered by Mr. Churchill to his heroic British people during the low point of the last war may indeed be our lot in greater proportion than at present, but if we never falter and hold resolute our beliefs in freedom, we cannot but deem the goal worth while. The peoples to be pitied are not ourselves but rather those lost souls who have gained, perhaps, a little temporary safety by giving up their liberty. The peoples of Eastern Europe had long aspired to democratic government, but the onslaught of communism has left them neither the prospect of peace nor democracy. It has been said that nowhere are there more anti-Communists than within the iron curtain. But the Communist monopoly of coercion, with its system of secret police, garish rewards, and cruel punishments, is so complete that even a majority of people do not have the means to stage effective revolt. These wretched people were unable or unwilling to pay the price of freedom and now they are paying the price of enslavement.

I spoke a moment ago of the renewed courage of Western Europe and the parts of Asia which still remain free. The nations of these areas are making determined efforts now to resist the temptations which have heretofore been placed before them by an unscrupulous international communism. In Asia the commonwealth nations and associated countries are going forward with the new Colombo plan for economic development. Our point 4 plan is designed to assist just such efforts of self-help. The Colombo plan is modest and represents at best only a fraction of what must be done to stave off the economic and political chaos upon which communism and totalitarianism breed in Southeast Asia. But the fact is that such an effort is being made and its promise of action is inspiring and encouraging peoples who were growing cynical and weary of wordy promises.

In Europe at this moment plans are taking shape for the creation of a huge integrated defense force under the leadership of our own General of the Armies "Ike" Eisenhower. Now that our encouragement and cooperation has given the Europeans the economic base and the moral persuasion needed they are going ahead to dynamic action. The courage of a free Europe is not likely to falter.

Courage begets courage. If we helped to inspire courage in Western Europe and even among those nations in Asia which pretend to neutrality, then, no less does the manifestation of this new courage in them further inspire us. It is a glorious phenomenon. The kind of thing of which history is made. We can imagine that for the first time in a long and infamous history the men in the Kremlin are fearful for both their nefarious cause and their very lives. A little of this expanding courage has even seeped through the tightly drawn iron curtain and there are evidences that underground activities and individual nonconformity are growing in those unhappy Soviet-dominated regions.

But to be courageous is not merely a matter of painting a rosy picture. It is more a matter in these times of faith in our determined and unrelenting effort to resist tyranny. The grave present, we may expect, will give way to an even graver future. It is then that our courage will be tested. And it will stand the test.

Arnold Toynbee, the learned English scholar, not so long ago wrote a history of civilization which was acclaimed the world over. In his lengthy and erudite work Mr. Toynbee notes that history is a series of challenges and responses. He points out that history is replete with the wreckage of once glorious civilizations that failed to meet the challenge with which they were confronted. These civilizations surrendered rather than make a fighting response. Fortunately, Americans have had a history which has conditioned them to the stern, the courageous response. Perhaps President Truman was thinking of Toynbee when he stated last year that "the future of civilization depends on what we do now, and in the months ahead."

I urge upon each of you the task of helping to shoulder the terrible burdens which have been made necessary by our support of the democratic way of life. I ask you to take increased courage from the examples set by our brave lads in Korea. If there be times when momentarily our courage falters—and it is to be expected that there will be—we must remember then the words of Patrick Henry, "Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?" Americans know full well the answer to that question.

THE ROAD TO PEACE

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the desire for peace is foremost in the minds of all real Americans. Peace means to us freedom to move, to speak, to laugh, to play, to work, to plan our future, to pass on to our children a happy, healthy economy. War means fear and curtailment. It means uncertainty and regimentation. It means separations and sacrifices. Today the awfulness of war hangs over every home. Although some persons maintain that there is no war today but merely a "police action," the dread and grief are the same to all those homes throughout the country from which come the toll of soldiers killed and wounded at the rate of 2,000 a week.

For a moment let us try to analyze this drift from peace to war. The war that we fear comes from the followers of communism. Communists say openly again and again that there can be no peace in the world until either we or they conquer the other by revolution or by war. We recognize communism as the greatest menace to our way of living, to our Government, and to our homes.

Then what is communism? Communism is the philosophy of government in which the state is supreme. The people within the state are subjects or slaves to the state. Their movements, their sustenance, their very existence is meted out to them by the various agencies of the state. For people who enjoy the privileges of freedom to think, to act, to have, to improve, communism is a slaveholder of the worst sort. For those who have sunk so low that they have nothing whatsoever to lose, and not a glimmer of hope for a brighter tomorrow, communism becomes a shell of refuge, a will-of-the-wisp shadow of security. Communism might be called a philosophy for the hopeless.

It follows then that one of the most effective methods of furthering communism is to reduce peoples of the world to a state of hopelessness, of economic distress, of distrust and dissatisfaction. Therefore, anything that tends to break down a happy, healthy economy is a step toward communism. In the United States any condition that cripples the freedom and rights of labor, that stifles initiative of our people, that limits the free enterprise system leads toward communism which we must combat in one way or another.

We abhor war. The very idea of war against communism can alter our thoughts and our actions. For one thing, it can cause us to become involved needlessly in a war. For instance, any thinking person knows that when several little boys get together in name calling, threatening, sword rattling, a fight is very likely to ensue. By the same natural laws, when nations resort to caustic diplomatic notes, to boasts of new and more deadly armament, to additional fortifications and conscription, the chances of war far exceed those of peace.

Dread and fear, whether it be based on fact or on propaganda, can remove freedom and peace from our way of living. When we attempt to censor the press, when we put controls on goods to direct their flow from civilian use to military consumption, when we regulate and regiment both labor and industry, we are definitely proceeding toward unrest, despair, and trouble, and away from freedom and peace.

Frankly, I feel that the road to peace lies in a different approach to our problems than that which our Government is following. I feel that our Government has become too far removed from the thinking of our people. The answer to peace lies not in Washington but back in our home districts where the people are thinking and living cleanly and fairly. The answer to me is back in the rolling hills of southern Indiana.

In southern Indiana, if we have neighbors who are quarrelsome, who cause trouble and discord, we leave them alone. We do not do business with them or go to see them or stop to argue over the fence. We leave them alone—a sort of boycott. We know that if we continue to visit and to deal with that quarrelsome, pugnacious neighbor, trouble will inevitably result. It would be only in rare instances, when the persons become a real and active menace to the welfare and safety of the community, that any action would be taken to remove them from the community. But let me assure you that once some action started, it would not be a holding action. It would be a complete and thorough clean-up.

This homey principle of conduct might very well be applied to the community of nations Every American citizen knows that Russia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the other Russian satellite countries have and will continuously, in every way possible, quarrel with us, attempt to put us in disrepute, and in general make our dealings with them miserable and discountenancing. It would seem that people in high governmental positions of our country have forgotten these fundamental truths. Our leaders seem to enjoy a constant bickering, quarreling, and name-calling. We continue to buy millions of dollars worth of goods from Communist countries although they imprison, by kangaroo courts, our respected citizens. These countries insult us and bring us into disrespect, yet we cajole and confer; we write notes and wheedle. If our Government could only brush the stuffy cobwebs out of international diplomacy and apply to international dealings the same common sense that we use in our own communities, much international tension would cease.

For some years we have been told that peace, or victory in case of all-out war, is dependent upon having friendly, prosperous, loyal, and well-armed allies. No one is going to dispute the importance of having friendly relations with other nations of the world. Man instinctively wants friends. He wants others to like him. But back in Indiana we early learn that to have a friend, we must be a friend in sincerity, in sympathy, and in understanding. There is no way to purchase friendship.

No nation in history has given so generously of her resources to other countries as has the United States. This Congress has given away this year, not counting the money that we are spending with these countries, about $8,000,000,000. In rough figures, that averages $2,000,000 for each of the 11 counties in my district. The President has said that this same amount is to be given for 2 more years, making a total of $25,000,000,000, or $6,000,000 for each of the counties in my district. In all we have given more than $115,000,000,000 to other countries. This averages $33,000,000 for each of the 11 counties in my district. That is more than the taxable wealth of most of them.

If this money is saving the world from destruction, from want, from the terrors of war and from communism, it is perhaps well spent despite our own privations. But let us evaluate the trend of world events during this period in which we have given away so much money. Russia's satellite countries have increased to 13, and there is a definite aggressive movement to add Korea, Indochina, the Philippines, and Greece. The peoples under the control of communism have increased from approximately 200,000,000 to 800,000,000, a 300-percent increase. Communism is dominating the greater part of two continents. Communism has increased its hold many, many fold.

At the close of the last war, the United States was highly respected and her GI's were loved in every station around the world. Today we do not hold that same position of respect and love. We are far more often tolerated for what we can be expected to give than loved for the spirit and culture that we represent.

Again let me cite to you what happens in a small American community where there is want and need. Neighbors bring in some of their own goods, but they make no attempt to keep the needy one indefinitely. They help him to help himself—to get a job, to get in a crop, to establish himself as a self-supporting member of the community. Our officials in Washington seem to recognize only one solution to the problems of the Orient or of the world and that is to give hand-outs to the people in order to alleviate hunger and want. In Korea in 1946, I personally saw our Government giving much-needed medical supplies to certain "big shots," who in turn distributed them to the needy at a profit. I personally checked that profit and found it to be 10,000 percent. Such giving hurt the Koreans rather than helped them, and brought hate for us rather than good will. If we could get our statesmen in Washington, who seem to have drifted away from the common thinking, to apply these same homey principles in world relief, we would have been stopping communism instead of allowing it to ride roughshod over the world.

There is a growing feeling in the United States that, while some of our aid to the world has been worth while, much of our global give-away program is worse than futile. On the whole our citizens have an unselfish desire to help build a better and a happier world. But these same citizens know that the promiscuous giving of the wealth and resources of the United States to other countries and peoples serves no useful purpose. On the contrary, it tends to wreck the existing economies and ways of living of these peoples and countries. I sincerely believe that the professional American do-gooders in trying to change and remodel other national economies according to their way of thinking, are doing more harm than good to the peoples of those countries.

There is an increasing effort on the part of many well-informed and unselfish individuals and groups in America to change our Government's apparent plan from that of dominating and supporting the underprivileged of the world to a plan of helping these peoples through education and assistance so that they may solve their own problems in their own way.

One small project in which I am personally interested is that of sending technicians to Korea to help and to train the Koreans themselves in making and in fitting artificial limbs for the thousands of their people, both military personnel and civilians, that have lost arms and legs as a result of the war. If we succeed in this project, the American taxpayer will be saved millions of dollars; this effort will serve as an example to our Government of the real American way to assist the peoples of the world. In addition, the Koreans' own part in the program will bring respect and confidence to them. That is the Christian way of helping others, and it is also the true American way.

Again we are approaching that season of the year in which we of the United States set aside a day of thanksgiving for the privileges of freedom Just a few weeks beyond Thanksgiving Day, we will all bow in solemn reverence and remembrance of the birth of the Prince of Peace who would bring peace on earth and good will toward all men. I trust and pray that as we go through these weeks, we may all get inspiration and resolution to bring forth, in a very concrete and practical way, a real and lasting peace on earth and a sincere good will toward all men.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

OCTOBER 20, 1951.

HON SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation from the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, effective immediately.

Respectfully submitted,

CARL ELLIOTT.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5684) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1223)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5684) "making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 4, and agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 6.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
CLARENCE CANNON,
R B. WIGGLESWORTH,
FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B RUSSELL,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
GUY CORDON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5684) making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1—Military assistance, title I. Appropriates $4,818,852,457 as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,072,476,271 as proposed by the House

Amendment No. 2—Economic and technical assistance, title I· Appropriates $1,012,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $961,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 3—Economic and technical assistance, title I: Appropriates an additional $10,000,000 to carry out the provisions of section 115 (e) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, as proposed by the House instead of $9,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 4—Economic and technical assistance, title I: Corrects language.

Amendment No. 5—Economic and technical assistance, title I: Deletes provision of the Senate denying funds to any nation of which a dependent area fails to comply with any treaty to which the United States and such dependent area are parties, as proposed by the House. The conferees are agreed that this amendment is eliminated because the matter is now pending before the International Court of Justice. The conferees desire that this action be brought to a conclusion as expeditiously as possible.

Amendment No. 6—Assistance to Spain: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 7—Military assistance, title II: Appropriates $396,250,000 as proposed by the House instead of $376,437,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8—Economic and technical assistance, title II: Appropriates $160,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $152,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9—Military assistance, title III: Appropriates $535,250,000 as proposed by the House instead of $508,487,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10—Economic and technical assistance, title III: Appropriates $237,155,866 as proposed by the House instead of $225,298,073 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11—Military assistance, title IV: Appropriates $38,150,000 as proposed by the House instead of $36,242,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12—Technical assistance, title IV: Appropriates $21,245,653 as proposed by the House instead of $20,183,370 as proposed by the Senate.

J VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
CLARENCE CANNON,
B B. WIGGLESWORTH,
FREDERIC R COUDERT, Jr.,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I merely want to explain very briefly the changes that have been made in this bill by the Senate and the agreement of the conferees with reference thereto. The Senate made three changes.

In the first place, it cut the amounts in the bill 5 percent across the board.

The aggregate reduction as the result of this 5-percent cut amounted to $374,000,000. Then $100,000 000 was specifically added for Spain, which resulted in a net reduction of $274,000,000 in the House figures. The Senate also added an amendment concerning Morocco.

The conferees agreed to accept the Spanish amendment. Then instead of the 5-percent cut across the board, the Members will probably remember that during the discussion of the bill on the floor of the House it was stated that there was in the title I military-assistance item provision for a reserve of $450,000,000, which had not been allocated and could be used for Spain, Yugoslavia or any other country that might require aid. We thought that any funds taken from the bill should be taken from that reserve. Therefore we agreed upon a cut of $253,623,814 in title I military assistance.

There is, however, added to that fund the $100,000,000 for Spain so that the net cut of the amounts in the House bill is $153,623,814.

So far as the Morocco amendment is concerned, that involves some question of treaty rights, which has been referred to the International Court, and we thought it would be very improper for the Congress to take any action on that matter while the case is pending before the Court. Consequently the Moroccan amendment was stricken from the bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I was interested in the Moroccan amendment because several cases have been brought to my attention where there does seem to be serious discrimination against Americans doing business there. There is an ex-GI running a little bus line, who has written me in that connection. Was the basis of the elimination of that provision simply the fact that this matter was now in the courts?

Mr. GARY. It is so stated in the conference report.

Mr. KEATING. And it would be appropriate for me to advise him and others who have written me that the conferees in nowise passed on the merits of the controversy, in any way, or felt that it was proper for them to do so.

Mr. GARY. I will say to the gentleman from New York that all he would have to do is to send him a copy of the statement of the managers on the part of the House. You will find in the statement the following:

Amendment No 5, economic and technical assistance, title I Deletes provision of the Senate denying funds to any nation of which a dependent area fails to comply with any treaty to which the United States and such dependent area are parties, as proposed by the House. The conferees are agreed that this amendment is eliminated because the matter is now pending before the International Court of Justice. The conferees desire that this action be brought to a conclusion as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the gentleman's explanation. Did he and the other conferees obtain any information on the likelihood of a decision from the International Court?

Mr. GARY. We did, and we were advised that the International Court has agreed to take up the case as soon as it disposes of the case that is now under consideration

Mr. KEATING. In other words, it is the next case pending.

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. After that case is disposed of, if it should be adverse to the interests of these American nationals in Morocco, it would be appropriate then to reconsider in this body and in the other body the situation which they might present to us.

Mr. GARY Absolutely.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS On the issue of the amendment affecting Spain, in the House, as I recall, the matter considering the whole situation, it was essentially left to the executive branch.

Mr. GARY. It still is. The amendment reads:

Assistance to Spain· For economic, technical, and military assistance, in the discretion of the President under the general objectives set forth in the declaration of policy contained in the titles of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 and the Mutual Security Act of 1951, for Spain, $100,000,000.

Mr. JAVITS. It is common knowledge that our people over there are engaged in negotiations. It is also common knowledge that we, for ourselves and to give proper regard to the views of France, Great Britain, and our other European friends who are so concerned about the nondemocratic nature of the Spanish Government are very anxious to see free institutions and a democratic system established in Spain. I believe at the very least and in view of the very grave doubt about doing anything in this quarter we must have and keep a free hand. Taking the other body's action

as an accomplished fact we cannot change, we should at least keep freedom of action.

Mr. GARY. That is the reason it was left in the discretion of the President.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What does that leave the net amount of the bill?

Mr. GARY. The net amount of the bill is $7,328,903,976.

Mr. DONDERO. That is divided into two categories, one for military, the other for civilian. Will the gentleman give the House the figures on both?

Mr. GARY. There has been absolutely no change whatever in the House figures so far as economic aid is concerned. The only change has been in the military aid. The bill now contains $5,788,502,457 for military assistance and $1,440,401,519 for economic assistance.

Mr. DONDERO. That is the figure in which I thought the House would be interested.

Mr. GARY. I may say to the gentleman that even the economic aid is now all pointing up to military assistance. We are giving economic assistance only in those instances where it will increase the military potential

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I notice the conference report in the two instances mentions that amendment No. 6 pertaining to $100,000,000 earmarked for Spain is in disagreement.

Mr. GARY. That is in technical disagreement. It has to be voted on separately under the rules. The conferees agreed on the item, but there has to be a separate vote. We had to bring it back to the House under a technical disagreement.

Mr. O'KONSKI. In other words, there will be a vote in the House on that?

Mr. GARY. There will be a separate vote in the House on that amendment.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, that is because there is not legislative authority for the type of language the Senate included, so it has to be brought back that way.

Mr. GARY. That is right.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Will it be in order to offer a motion to recede and concur after the vote comes up?

Mr GARY. The chairman of the conferees will make that motion to recede and concur at the proper time.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, if we approve this $100,000,000 gift to Spain, we will simply be underwriting a blank check to the President of the United States to spend that money as he sees fit; is that right?

Mr. GARY. There is no program for it.

Mr. GROSS. There is no program for it?

Mr. GARY. No; there is no program for it.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. There are already $150,000,000 of unallocated funds which the President can spend any way he wants to, so you are not really giving him anything in addition.

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. But that does not make it any more palatable.

Mr. GARY. The House has passed on that, may I say to the gentleman.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. My understanding is that in title I with regard to the military part of title I having to do with Europe, there is in the conference report the $100,000,000 for escapees and people residing in iron curtain countries, except insofar as that might be affected by the 5-percent cut; is that not correct?

Mr GARY. Not $100,000,000. It was $10,000,000.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I think it was $100,000,000 for the escapees and people residing within the iron-curtain countries, to be used at the discretion of the President.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is speaking now of the Arab refugees?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. No, no; of the escapees from Eastern European countries

Mr GARY There is no change in that as it was passed by the House, not even as to the 5-percent cut, because the 5-percent cut was eliminated.

Mr KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I wish to state I intend to support this measure. I think it is a very good measure to oppose communism.

Mr JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I fail to see any provision in this conference report, which provides that nations behind the iron curtain, that is nations dealing with Russia and its satellites, shall have no benefits under this bill.

Mr. GARY. That was taken care of in the authorizing legislation.

Mr. JENSEN. Why was it not put in this appropriation bill?

Mr. GARY. It has never been in the appropriation bill, but it is unnecessary because the matter had been cared for in the authorizing legislation. You do not have to have two laws to cover one subject.

Mr. JENSEN. Then, in a few words, will the gentleman explain to the House as best he can, just what our position is regarding aid to the foreign nations who deal with Russia or her satellites?

Mr GARY. I am very sorry to say to the gentleman that I do not have the language which was put in that bill before me at the present time. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] who I see has risen to his feet to answer that question.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Those provisions were in the Battle bill, which passed as a separate measure sometime ago, and an amendment which was put in by the other body, which ties into this, the mutual security authorization, was approved some days ago. But, that is legislation which is completed, and I do not see why it would appear in that appropriation bill

Mr. GARY. It could not appear in an appropriation bill because we cannot put legislation in an appropriation bill. What I am trying to say to the gentleman, is that it is legislation, and consequently our committee did not go into consideration of it at all. Therefore, I do not have before me the exact language of the present law. Had it been a matter for our committee to consider, then we would have taken it up.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, the gentleman knows that if we were to stay completely within the strict rules of the House, there would be no legislation on appropriation bills. The gentleman also knows that we place a lot of legislation in appropriation bills whenever it is necessary

Mr GARY. I know that, and I know the gentleman from Iowa tries very hard to do that, and at times gets away with it. But I do not see any use in putting it in twice. Of course, the gentleman will understand that I mean no disrespect to him however.

Mr. JENSEN. The main purpose that I have in mind is to ascertain once more, if we are furnishing money by the billions to our supposed friends all over the world, and yet they are dealing with our enemies who are killing our boys in Korea.

Mr. GARY. There is no question that has been more carefully considered than that. The House has disposed of it and consequently our committee did not consider it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER Mr. Speaker, I voted against this bill when the authorization bill was under consideration and when the appropriation bill was under consideration. I am going to be perfectly frank with the House. I think the bill carries at least $2,000,000,000 more than it should to meet any responsibility that we have in the world in connection with it. I believe that is all that could be effectively and honestly spent. I am afraid that a great deal of it is going to be wasted.

The conference report is $153,000,000 below the figure which the House of Representatives fixed for it. For that reason I signed the conference report.

There is $100,000,000 here for Spain. The $153,000,000 is arrived at after deducting the $100,000,000 for Spain I think that Spain is about the only place in Europe, outside of Greece and Turkey, where we will get real and aggressive support. For that reason, when a motion is made to recede and concur in the Senate language with reference to Spain, I shall support that motion.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If there is no program for this expenditure, how do we know that the $100,000,000 is justified or not?

Mr. TABER. We do not know, but it is more justified than most of the rest of the items. You can tell just as much about it as you can from the justifications of the military end of the other items. The justifications were very deficient insofar as the other items were concerned.

Mr. GROSS. There is no program set up, there is no condition whatever that this tyrannical, dictatorial government in Spain must end, as a condition to our giving them aid. I am surprised that there is not $100,000,000 in the bill for another dictator, Mr. Peron.

Mr. TABER. I do not know that Mr. Peron would stand up and fight against Russian Communists.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is it not a fact that negotiations between the United States and Spain are going on now, and that the program will depend to a large extent upon the result of those negotiations?

Mr. TABER. That is correct. In addition to that, the Spanish picture is this: They have the best land, the best temperature, and the best climate for flight fields and that sort of thing in the whole of Europe. They are also surrounded on their land borders by mountains, in such shape that their territory is more readily defensible than any of the other countries. It is, therefore, more valuable to us.

I wish now to take just a moment to speak about the details of the appropriation. I have given it to you roughly in dollars, but I think I ought to say it for the RECORD.

As this bill passed the House it carried $7,482,527,790; in addition to that there were unexpended balances in other items that ran it up to about $8,490,000,000. As the bill passed the Senate the direct appropriations were $7,206,000,000 plus.

The conference report carries $7,328,000,000 plus.

I feel that I shall be obliged to support the conference report, and I feel that upon its merits I should support the Spanish amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. A moment ago the gentleman said that there was no money in this bill for Peron and that the reason for it might be that we had no assurance that Peron would fight with us. I ask the gentleman why we are selling the Peron government two modern cruisers at 10 cents on the dollar if we have no assurance that they are going to be with us?

Mr. TABER. I do not know; frankly, I do not understand that.

I think that is all I care to say at this time.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this conference report for the appropriations for the Mutual Security Act when it shall presently come up today. I believe that this measure, if properly implemented, can constitute a real offensive against Stalin's police state. In this cold war against communism, we must do more than merely try to contain it. In that provision of the mutual security law which authorizes the use of up to $100,000,000 to aid selected persons who are escapees from or residing in the iron-curtain countries, to form them into national military units or for other purposes, we have the opportunity to go on the offensive in the cold war. Let us make some trouble for Joe Stalin in his own back yard.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 3, line 5, insert:

"Assistance to Spain: For economic, technical, and military assistance, in the discretion of the President under the general objectives set forth in the declaration of policy contained in the titles of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 and the Mutual Security Act of 1951, for Spain, $100,000,000."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the amendment and the conference report was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REVENUE ACT OF 1951

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 170).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 35,500 additional copies of the public law enacted during the Eighty-second Congress, first session, entitled "Revenue Act of 1951," of which 3,000 copies shall be for the Senate document room, 30,000 copies for the House document room, 1,000 copies for the Senate Committee on Finance, and 1,500 copies for the House Committee on Ways and Means.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution. (H. Res. 477).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That CARL ELLIOTT, of Alabama, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Education and Labor.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS OF HOUSE COMMITTEE TO ATTEND ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 36, Eighty-second Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to discuss problems with the consultative assembly of the Council of Europe the following Members on the part of the House: Messrs. COX, SMITH of Virginia, O'TOOLE, REAMS, JUDD, ELLSWORTH, KEATING.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1222)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5215) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 24, 43, 44, 49, 50, 51, 54, 60, 61, 62, 63, 67, 69, 84, 86, 88, 91, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107 and 108.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 29, 30, 31, 45, 46, 53, 55, 68, 72, 74, 80, 89 and 90, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$275,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $1,000,000; and appropriations granted under this head shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 25 additional passenger motor vehicles."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,000,000", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,287,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$265,965,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"EXPENSES, GENERAL SUPPLY FUND

"For an additional amount for 'Expenses, general supply fund', $75,000; and the limitation under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, on the amount available for personal services, is increased from '$8,201,000' to '$8,236,000' "

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3 875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 47 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$339,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$22,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$26,250,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$39,737,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"Office of the Secretary

"Salaries and Expenses, Defense Production Activities

"For expenses necessary to enable the Department of Agriculture to carry out its functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, $1,500,000 "

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$98,053,375", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 81 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 82 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,195,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$56,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 108: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows Restore the matter stricken by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"SEC 1313 None of the funds provided by this Act shall be used to pay employees at a rate in excess of that paid for comparable work under the regular appropriations provided to the Departments concerned in the regular 1953 appropriation Acts", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figure stricken out and inserted insert "1316"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 17, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 48, 56, 57, 58, 59, 70, 73, 87, 93, 101, 105, and 110.

CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN TABER,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I

District of Columbia

Amendment No 1—Office of Civil Defense: Authorizes $275,000, instead of $234,000 as proposed by the House and $600,000 as proposed by the Senate The conferees have agreed that at least $25,000 of the increase above the amount proposed by the House shall be used for the purchase of medical supplies.

CHAPTER II

Legislative branch

Amendments Nos. 2 through 9. Reported in disagreement

CHAPTER III

Justice, Commerce and Judiciary

Amendment No 10—Immigration and Naturalization Service: Appropriates $1,000,000, instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes the purchase of 25 additional passenger vehicles, instead of fifty as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 11—Federal Prison System Reported in disagreement The conferees have agreed that none of these funds shall be obligated until final plans for construction of the Federal jail at Anchorage, Alaska, within the funds allowed have been approved by the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress.

Amendment No 12—Civil Aeronautics Administration Appropriates $944,605 as proposed by the Senate for Federal airport claims

Amendment No 13—The Judiciary: Appropriates $70,000 as proposed by the Senate for fees of commissioners.

CHAPTER IV

Treasury-Post Office

Amendment No 14—Bureau of the Public Debt Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 15: Inserts new heading

Amendment No. 16—Post Office Department, General Administration. Authorizes $1,000,000, instead of $1,315,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17—Post Office Department, Clerks, first- and second-class post offices: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 18. Changes title number.

Amendment No. 19—Reconstruction Finance Corporation: Authorizes $17,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $16,500,000 as proposed by the House. The increase above the House figure is approved to meet additional workload resulting from increased disaster loans provided under H J Res. 341, rather than the international situation

CHAPTER V

Labor-Federal Security

Amendment No. 20—Bureau of Employment Security, Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,287,500, instead of $1,075,000 as proposed by the House and $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount approved is to finance operations for the entire fiscal year 1952

Amendment No. 21—Bureau of Employment Security, Farm labor supply revolving fund: Appropriates $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22—Federal Security Agency, Office of Education: Appropriates

$5,700,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,000,000 as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER VI

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 23—Bureau of Land Management: Inserts language increasing the personal services limitation for 1952 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24—Bureau of Indian Affairs, Health, education and welfare services: Strikes out Senate proposal to appropriate $79,000 for public assistance to Indians in New Mexico.

Amendment No. 25—Bureau of Indian Affairs, Resources management: Inserts language increasing the limitation for personal services for 1952 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 26 and 27—Bureau of Indian Affairs, Construction: Reported in disagreement. The conferees were shocked at the poor administration shown by the Bureau of Indians Affairs in connection with amendment number 27: first, because of the complete failure of officials of the Bureau to exercise proper care and judgment in permitting construction of Government houses on private property in error; and second, while this error was known to Interior Department officials for more than a year, no action was taken to bring this matter to the attention of Congress until just a few weeks prior to the expiration of the option period.

Amendment No. 28—Bureau of Reclamation: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 29—Geological Survey: Appropriates $150,000 as proposed by the Senate, and increases the personal services limitation for 1952.

Amendment No. 30: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 31—Fish and Wildlife Service, Investigation of resources: Appropriates $150,000 as proposed by the Senate, and increases the amount available for personal services by $22,500.

Amendment No. 32—Fish and Wildlife Service, Construction: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VII

Independent offices

American Battle Monuments Commission

Amendment No. 33—Salaries and expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Atomic Energy Commission

Amendment No. 34—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $265,965,000, instead of $260,000,000 as proposed by the House and $271,928,655 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35—Limitation on personal services: Reported in disagreement.

Displaced Persons Commission

Amendment No. 36—Salaries and expenses: Reported in disagreement.

General Services Administration

Amendment No. 37—Renovation and Modernization, Executive Mansion: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 38—Operating expenses: Appropriates $2,850,000 for operating expenses, General Services Administration, instead of $3,080,000, as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No. 39—Emergency operating expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 40—General Supply Fund: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 41—Expenses, General Supply Fund: Appropriates $75,000, instead of $256,000, as proposed by the Senate; and increases the limitation under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, on the amount available for personal services to $8,236,000, instead of to $8,409,500, as proposed by the Senate.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendment No. 42—Alaska Housing: Appropriates $3,875,000, instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the House, and $4,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Motor Carrier Claims Commission

Amendments Nos. 43 and 44—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriate $100,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $124,000 as proposed by the Senate; and place a limitation of $66,500 on funds available for personal services, instead of $82,000 as proposed by the Senate. It is the intention of the conference committee that the appropriation contained in this bill is to provide funds for all purposes, including liquidation, and that no additional request for funds is to be submitted at a later date.

National Science Foundation

Amendments Nos. 45, 46, and 47—salaries and Expenses: Provide that funds shall be available for award of graduate fellowships, as proposed by the Senate; make funds available for attendance at meetings, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriate $3,500,000 for salaries and expenses, instead of $300,000, as proposed by the House and $6,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48: Reported in disagreement.

Selective-service system

Amendments Nos. 49, 50, 51, and 52—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $30,154,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $31,800,000, as proposed by the Senate; place a limitation of $1,856,000 on funds available for expenses of National Administration, Planning, Training and Records Management, instead of $2,184,000 as proposed by the Senate; place a limitation of $6,454,000 on funds available for State Administration, Planning, Training, and Records Servicing, instead of $7,598,000, as proposed by the Senate; and place a limitation of $339,500 on funds available for expenses of special boards, instead of $250,000, as proposed by the House and $429,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Veterans' Administration

Amendment No. 53—Servicemen's Indemnities: Strike out the provision of the House providing $5,000,000 for this purpose, as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Commerce

Maritime activities

Amendment No. 54—State Marine Schools: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $409,050 for this purpose.

General provisions

Amendment No. 55: Inserts a heading, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 56, 57, 58, and 59: Reported in disagreement.

Department of Defense—Civil functions

Amendment No. 60: Eliminates headings inserted by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61—Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works: Eliminates appropriation of $168,000 proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 62—Flood control, general: Eliminates appropriation of $1,750,000 proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the elimination of this item and item 61 do not in any way reflect on the merit of these projects. It was felt that they should be submitted in the regular manner and considered in the future on their merits.

CHAPTER IX

Foreign aid

Amendment No. 63: Changes chapter number.

Amendments Nos. 64 and 65—Department of the Army—Civil Functions, Government and Relief in Occupied Areas: Appropriate $22,500,000 instead of $21,800,000 as proposed by the House and $24,500,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provide $6,250,000 for administrative expenses, instead of $6,000,000 as proposed by the House and $6,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66—Department of State, Government in Occupied Areas: Appropriates $26,250,000, instead of $25,750,000 as proposed by the House and $26,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER X

Emergency agencies

Amendment No. 67: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 68—Office of Defense Mobilization: Appropriates $1,711,250 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,850,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 69—Defense Production Administration: Appropriates $2,800,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $3,330,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 70—Defense Production Administration: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 71—Department of Commerce, Salaries and expenses, defense production activities: Appropriates $39,737,500, instead of $39,450,000 as proposed by the House and $40,025,000 as proposed by the Senate. It was agreed by the conferees that reductions required under the amount approved shall be made in such manner as to not eliminate entirely any of the organization units of the Department engaged in defense production activities.

Amendment No. 72—Defense Transport Administration: Appropriates $2,543,750 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 73—Department of the Interior, Salaries and expenses, defense production activities: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 74—Federal Security Agency, Salaries and expenses, defense production activities: Appropriates $400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 75—Department of Agriculture, Salaries and expenses, defense production activities: Appropriates $1,500,000, instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate; and eliminates language authorizing the transfer of these funds from appropriations under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935. It was agreed that defense production activities of the Department should not be financed from "section 32" funds.

Amendment No. 76—Department of Labor, Salaries and expenses, defense production estimates: Appropriates $2,000,000, instead of $2,451,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 77—Housing and Home Finance Agency, Salaries and expenses, defense production activities: Appropriates $700,000, instead of $774,225 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 78—Department of Justice, Salaries and expenses, defense production activities: Appropriates $100,000, instead of $226,625 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 79—Economic Stabilization Agency: Appropriates $98,053,375, instead of $75,000,000 as proposed by the House and $121,106,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 80—General Services Administration: Appropriates $9,250,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 81—Small Defense Plants Administration: Appropriates $350,000, instead of $462,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 82—Federal Civil Defense Administration, Operations: Appropriates $11,195,000, instead of $10,755,000 as proposed by the House and $11,635,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 83—Federal Civil Defense Administration, Federal Contributions: Appropriates $7,750,000, instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the House and $14,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 84—Federal Civil Defense Administration, Civil Defense Procurement Fund: Eliminates $5,000,000 proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 85—Federal Civil Defense Administration, Emergency Supplies and

Equipment: Appropriates $56,000,000, instead of $50,000,000 as proposed by the House and $60,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 86—Federal Civil Defense Administration, Protective Facilities: Eliminates $6,500,000 proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 87—Emergency Agencies, General provisions: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XI

Claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments

Amendment No. 88: Changes chapter number.

Amendments Nos. 89 and 90: Insert language relative to Senate Document Numbered 63 and appropriate $13,860,400 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $13,791,464 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 91: Changes section number.

CHAPTER XII

Reductions in appropriations, contract authorizations, and authorizations to borrow from the Treasury

Amendment No. 92: Changes chapter number

Amendment No. 93· Reported in disagreement

CHAPTER XIII

General provisions

Amendment No 94: Changes chapter number

Amendments Nos. 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, and 100 Change section numbers.

Amendment No 101· Reported in disagreement

Amendments Nos. 102, 103, 104· Change section numbers.

Amendment No. 105: Reported in disagreement. The elimination of subparagraph (e), which exempts the Post Office Department from certain provisions of this section, should in no way prejudice the position of this Department with respect to the appointment of permanent employees within the provisions of subparagraph (a). In connection with the information requested under subparagraph (d), the conferees feel that it would be desirable to have figures showing annual personnel turn-over included in the reports submitted.

Amendments Nos. 106 and 107: Change section numbers.

Amendment No. 108: Inserts amended language concerning the pay of employees in defense activities.

Amendment No. 109: Changes section number.

Amendment No. 110. Reported in disagreement

Amendment No. 111: Changes section number.

CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN TABER,
GLENN R DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this is the catch-all supplemental appropriation bill customarily submitted at the end of the session, making needed provision for the several departments, and in this case providing especially for civil defense and the emergency agencies.

The budget estimates considered by the House aggregated $2,302,871,116. The committee reported to the House and the House approved $1,586,587,216.

The Senate, out of budget items of $2,314,491,657, approved $1,745,383,006.

In conference we have agreed, as submitted in this report and as summarized in the the statement just read, to a total of $1,676,246,976 that is $638,244,681 less than the budget estimate submitted to the two Houses. It is an increase over the House figure of $89,659,666 and a decrease of $69,136,030 in the amount of the Senate bill.

We also submit with the report 33 amendments on which agreement has been reached but which under the rules must be brought back for separate action by the House. The committee of conference reached an agreement on all items and the 33 amendments are merely technical disagreement. On adoption of the conference report they will be taken up seriatim.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the House went into conference on a very large number of amendments, and the net result of it was reasonably satisfactory. We were able to get a deal with the Senate that was as good as could be expected. While the bill is a little larger than it was when it left the House, it nevertheless is way below the budget estimate. It will stand today at $626,000,000 below the budget, and that is rather a healthy condition.

Under all the circumstances, I think we have provided very liberally for the agencies that are involved and for the activities that were submitted to the Congress in this bill by the budget. Nevertheless, we have been able to cut down the amounts that were asked for by a little better than 25 percent. Under all the circumstances, I feel that the report should be adopted.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. COOPER]. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider en bloc 22 of the amendments, on all of which we propose to move to recede and concur. The motion is at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 17, 26, 28, 32, 37, 48, 56, 57, 58, 59, 70, 93, and 101, and concur therein.

The Senate amendments referred to are as follows:

Senate amendment No 2 Page 3, line 3, insert the following:

"SENATE

"SALARIES OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

"Office of the Secretary· For an additional amount (effective on the first day of the first month following enactment of this act) to increase the basic salary of parliamentarian from $8,000 to $12,500 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; and for the basic salary of assistant parliamentarian to be selected by the parliamentarian, $5,940; $7,120, and the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1952 hereby is amended accordingly."

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 3, line 15, insert the following:

"For payment to Eleanor M. Fellows, widow of Frank Fellows, late a Representative from the State of Maine, $12,500,"

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 3, line 18, insert the following:

"For payment to Winifred Gillette, widow of Wilson D. Gillette, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, $12,500 "

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 3, line 21, insert the following·

"For payment to Ruth M. Vaughn, widow of Albert C Vaughn, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, $12,500."

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 4, line 14, insert the following·

"For payment to Ida Stefan, widow of Karl Stefan, late a Representative from the State of Nebraska, $12,500."

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 4, line 14, insert the following·

"For payment to James C. Davis, contestee, for expenses incurred in the contested election case of *Lowe* v. *Davis*, as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $1,275 "

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 4, line 18, insert the following·

"For payment to Thomas B Curtis, contestee, for expenses incurred in the contested election case of *Karst* v. *Curtis*, as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $1,460."

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 4, line 22, insert the following:

"For payment to Raymond W Karst, contestant, for expenses incurred in the contested election case of *Karst* v. *Curtis*, as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $1,889 "

Senate amendment No. 11 Page 6, line 7, insert the following:

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

"For an additional amount for 'Buildings and facilities,' $400,000, for construction of a complete Federal jail at Anchorage, Alaska, on a site to be selected by the Attorney General "

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 9, line 13, insert the following

"CLERKS, FIRST- AND SECOND-CLASS POST OFFICES

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for Clerks, first- and second-class post offices,' $600,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Clerks, third-class post offices, 1947' "

Senate amendment No. 26. Page 13, line 6, insert the following:

"Construction· For an additional amount for 'Construction,' $575,000, to remain available until expended; and the limitation under this head in the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act, 1952, on the amount available for personal services is increased by '$142,950': *Provided*, That no obligation shall be incurred under appropriations granted under this head for construction of school facilities at Ponemah, Minn., until school district No. 45 of the State of Minnesota shall have deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation an amount equal to the proceeds of the insurance collected on the destroyed Ponemah school plant "

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 13, line 22, insert the following:

"BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

"Construction and rehabilitation: For an additional amount for 'Construction and rehabilitation,' $2,285,000, to remain available until expended, of which $285,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund, and the limitation under this head in the Department of the Interior Appropriaiton Act, 1952, on the amount available for personal services is increased by $465,500."

Senate amendment No. 32: Page 14, line 17, insert the following:

"Construction: For an additional amount for 'Construction,' $530,000, to remain available until expended; and the limitation under this head in the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act, 1952, on the amount available for personal services is increased by '$67,425.' "

Senate amendment No. 37: Page 17, line 6, insert the following:

"RENOVATION AND MODERNIZATION, EXECUTIVE MANSION

"For an additional amount for 'Renovation and modernization, Executive Mansion,' $261,000, to remain available until expended."

Senate amendment No. 48: Page 20, line 6, insert the following: "to remain available until expended."

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 24, line 5, insert the following:

"SEC. 701. Section 404 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952 (Public Law 137, August 31, 1951), is hereby amended by inserting the words 'principal or primary' between the word 'whose' and the word 'duties' in the first sentence thereof."

Senate amendment No. 57: Page 24, line 10, insert the following:

"SEC. 702. Section 605 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952 (Public Law 137, August 31, 1951), is hereby amended by striking out the second proviso thereof and inserting in lieu of said proviso the following: ': *Provided further*, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 percent of the total provided for in the budget estimates for 1952, this section shall cease to apply'."

Senate amendment No. 58: Page 24, line 18, insert the following:

"SEC. 703. The provisions of section 1414 of this act and the provisions of section 604 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, shall not apply to persons employed by the General Services Administration in the performance of functions or related assisting or supporting functions in connection with the publication of the Federal Register."

Senate amendment No. 59: Page 24, line 24, insert the following:

"SEC. 704. The provisions of section 604 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1952 shall not apply to those persons engaged in functions of the Civil Service Commission related to (1) the preparation and issuance of material relating to the recruitment of personnel for the Federal service, and (2) the compilation of the Official Register of the United States."

Senate amendment No. 70: Page 36, line 6, insert the following: ": *Provided*, That transfers (not to exceed 10 percent) between the appropriations 'Salaries and expenses, Defense Production Administration' and 'Salaries and expenses, Defense Production Activities, Department of Commerce' may be made by agreement between the Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator of the Defense Production Administration with approval of the Bureau of the Budget."

Senate amendment No. 93: Page 45, line 9, insert the following: "except that the recission proposed for the Bureau of Indian Affairs under 'Construction' shall be $4,240,000 instead of $4,340,000 as set forth in said document."

Senate amendment No. 101: Page 48, line 22, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That section 409 of the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1952, shall not apply to the administrative expense limitations fixed by that act for Federal intermediate credit banks and for production credit corporations, or to the appropriation for the Farm Credit Administration except the portion thereof provided by direct appropriation from the General Fund of the Treasury."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri that the amendments be considered en bloc?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 8, line 1, insert the following:

"BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

"ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

"For an additional amount for 'Administering the public debt', $500,000: *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation shall be used for advertising the savings bond program by press, radio, or television."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

"ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

"For an additional amount for 'Administering the public debt', $500,000: *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation shall be used to pay for time and space for advertising the savings bond program by press, radio, or television."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 13, line 17, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That balances in prior year appropriations under this head for acquisition of land may be used for purchase in the name of the United States in trust 20 acres of land in Placer County, Calif., for the use of the Indians of the Auburn Rancheria."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, That not to exceed $3,000 of appropriations for the fiscal year 1952 under this head for acquisition of land may be used for purchase in the name of the United States in trust 20 acres of land in Placer County, Calif., for the use of the Indians of Auburn Rancheria."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 33: On page 15, line 8, insert:

"AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

"The funds provided in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, shall be available to the Commission for the employment of personnel in foreign countries without regard to the limitations on the amounts available for personal services contained therein and without regard to the provisions of section 605 thereof."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In line 4 of said amendment after the word "countries" insert "(not exceeding 450)."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 15, line 17 insert ": *Provided*, That the limitation contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, on the amount available to the Commission for personal services is hereby amended to read, 'of which not to exceed $9,642,111 shall be available for personal services for that activity designated "administrative services"': *Provided further*, That section 605 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, shall not be applicable to the Commission."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided*, That the limitation contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, on the amount available to the Commission for personal services is hereby amended to read, 'of which not to exceed $30,400,000 shall be available for personal services': *Provided further*, That section 605 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, shall not be applicable to the Commission."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 36: Page 16, line 5, insert:

"DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

"The limitation fixed in Public Law 137 granting $1,100,000 to the Displaced Persons Commission for loans pursuant to section 14 of the act, is hereby decreased to $500,000, and the limitation fixed in Public Law 137 granting $4,375,000 to the Displaced Persons Commission for the expenses of transporting to the United States displaced persons of German ethnic origin, is hereby decreased to $3,000,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

"The limitation fixed in Public Law 137 granting $1,100,000 to the Displaced Persons Commission for loans pursuant to section 14 of the act, is hereby decreased to $600,000, and the limitation fixed in Public Law 137 granting $4,375,000 to the Displaced Persons Commission for the expenses of transporting to the United States displaced persons of German ethnic origin, is hereby decreased to $3,400,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not consume the 5 minutes. I shall be brief, indeed. I want to call attention to the Members of the House, particularly to the members of the Committee on Appropriations, that the item in this first supplemental appropriation bill of $5,700,000 as payments to school districts is wholly inadequate to finance the enlarged provisions of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, as covered in H. R. 5411, just approved by the House in today's session.

I am sure the Members of the House will realize that a substantial supplemental appropriation will have to be forthcoming when the Congress reconvenes in January.

Mr CANNON Mr Speaker, in response to the suggestion of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], we provide on page 12, line 9, of the bill under "Payments to School Districts," an appropriation of $5,700,000 for that purpose. This is the full amount approved by the Department. That is, the Department tells us that this amount is ample for the purpose at this time.

With reference specifically to the authorization provided in the bill H R. 5411, to which the gentleman refers, provision in full is made for that purpose in the second supplemental bill, which we expect to report to the House before adjournment tonight

Mr. BAILEY. I appreciate the information which the gentleman has just given.

Mr. CANNON. We are glad to cooperate with the gentleman from West Virginia, who has taken such interest and rendered such effective service in the handling of this important item.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 39. Page 16, line 14:

"EMERGENCY OPERATING EXPENSES

"For necessary emergency expenses of the General Services Administration not otherwise provided for, for operation, maintenance, protection, repair, alterations, and improvements of public buildings and grounds to the extent that such buildings and grounds are under the control of the General Services Administration for such purposes as are provided for in Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, as amended; rental of buildings or parts thereof in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including repairs, alterations, and improvements necessary for proper use by the Government without regard to section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U S. C. 278a); restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; furnishings and equipment; protection of vital records; and payment of per diem employees employed in connection with any of the foregoing functions at rates approved by the Administrator of General Services or his designee, not exceeding current rates for similar services in places where such services are employed, $35,692,350. *Provided,* That of this amount, such sums as may be determined by the General Services Administrator to be necessary may be paid into other appropriations of the General Services Administration only for purposes of accounting. *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available to effect the moving of Government agencies from the District of Columbia to accomplish the dispersal of departmental functions."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$31,500,000"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No 40: Page 18, line 19.

"GENERAL SUPPLY FUND

"For an additional amount for the 'General supply fund', established by section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U. S C 219), for replacement of losses of inventory and equipment resulting from flood damage to the Federal Supply Center, Kansas City, Kans., $1,430,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$1,100,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri

The motion was agreed to

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 73; Page 37, line 7:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Salaries and expenses, defense production activities

"For expenses necessary to enable the Department of the Interior to carry out its functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, including purchase (not to exceed four) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; employment of aliens; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriations; $5,450,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum $5,450,000 named in said amendment, insert "$5,000,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No 87: Page 42, line 21

"EMERGENCY AGENCIES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 1101 The appropriations and authority provided in chapter XI of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, approved June 2, 1951, under the heading 'Expenses of defense production' and 'Federal Civil Defense Administration', shall be available from and including April 1, 1951, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority All obligations incurred during the period April 1 to June 1, 1951, inclusive, in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof"

Mr CANNON Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows In line 2 of said amendment, change the section number to "Sec 1001"

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No 105: Page 51, line 5, strike out the following

"SEC 1310 Immediately upon the enactment of this act and until termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950:

"(a) The Civil Service Commission and the heads of the executive departments, agencies, and corporations shall make full use of their authority to require that initial appointments to positions in and outside the competitive civil service shall be made on a temporary or indefinite basis in order to prevent increases in the number of permanent personnel of the Federal Government above the total number of permanent employees existing on September 1, 1950. *Provided,* That any position made vacant by call to military service or by transfer to a national defense agency shall not be filled except on a temporary basis. All transfers (except at the same or lower grade and salary), reinstatements, or promotions to positions in the Federal Civil Service shall be made on a temporary or indefinite basis. All appointments, reinstatements, transfers, and promotions to positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949 shall be made with the condition and notice to each individual appointed, reinstated, transferred, or promoted that the classification grade of the position is subject to post-audit and correction by the appropriate departmental or agency personnel office or the Civil Service Commission All transfers of permanent employees at the same grade and salary made on a temporary basis since September 1, 1950, shall be changed to a permanent basis as of the effective date of this act. Nothing in this paragraph shall operate to impair the permanent status of employees who are changed to a temporary or indefinite basis or to alter their retention status under reduction-in-force procedures from that in existence prior to September 1, 1950.

"(b) The Civil Service Commission shall facilitate the transfer of Federal employees from nondefense to defense activities and encourage the retention of employees in defense activities, and shall provide for reemployment rights in the activities from which such employees are transferred.

"(c) The Civil Service Commission shall make full use of its authority to prevent excessively rapid promotions in and outside the competitive civil service and to require correction of improper allocations to higher grades of positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. No person in any executive department or agency whose position is subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be promoted or transferred to a higher grade subject to such act without having served at least 1 year in the next lower grade.

"(d) From time to time, but at least annually, each executive department and agency shall (1) review all positions which since September 1, 1950, have been created or placed in a higher grade or level of difficulty and responsibility of work or in a higher basic pay level, (2) abolish all such positions which are found to be unnecessary, (3) with respect to such positions which are found to be necessary, make such adjustments as may be appropriate in the classification grades of those positions which are subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or in the basic pay levels of those positions which are subject to other pay-fixing authority. Not later than January 1 of each year each department and agency shall submit a report to the Post Office and Civil Service Committees and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives concerning the action taken under this paragraph, together with information comparing the total number of employees on the payroll on December 1 and their average grade and salary with similar information for the previous December 1."

"SEC. 1410. Immediately upon the enactment of this act and until termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950:

"(a) The Civil Service Commission and the heads of the executive departments, agencies, and corporations shall make full use of their authority to require that initial appointments to positions in and outside the competitive civil service shall be made on a temporary or indefinite basis in order to prevent increases in the number of permanent personnel of the Federal Government above the total number of permanent employees existing on September 1, 1950. *Provided*, That any position vacated by a permanent employee called to military service or transferred to a national defense agency shall not be filled except on a temporary or indefinite basis. All reinstatements and promotions in the Federal civil service shall be made on a temporary or indefinite basis, and all permanent employees who are transferred from one agency to another shall retain their status as permanent employees in the agency to which transferred at the grade or basic pay level of their permanent positions in the agency from which transferred. All appointments, reinstatements, transfers, and promotions to positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949 shall be made with the condition and notice to each individual appointed, reinstated, transferred, or promoted that the classification grade of the position is subject to post-audit and correction by the appropriate departmental or agency personnel office or the Civil Service Commission. All transfers of permanent employees made on a temporary or indefinite basis since September 1, 1950, shall be changed to a permanent basis as of the effective date of this act: *Provided*, That such employees shall retain their status as permanent employees in the agency to which transferred at the grade or basic pay level of their permanent positions in the agency from which transferred.

"(b) The Civil Service Commission shall facilitate the transfer of Federal employees from nondefense to defense activities and encourage the retention of employees in defense activities, and shall provide reemployment rights for permanent employees in the activities from which such employees are transferred.

"(c) The Civil Service Commission shall make full use of its authority to prevent excessively rapid promotions in the competitive civil service and to require correction of improper allocations to higher grades of positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. No person in any executive department or agency whose position is subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be promoted or transferred to a higher grade subject to such act without having served at least one year in the next lower grade *Provided*, That the Civil Service Commission for positions in the competitive service and the head of the employing agency for positions outside the competitive service may by regulation provide for promotions of two grades in one year (1) to positions not higher than GS-5, (2) to positions not higher than GS-11 which are in a line of work properly classified under the Classification Act of 1949 at two-grade intervals, (3) to positions in the same line of work when the employee has completed a training period under a training program approved by the Civil Service Commission for positions in the competitive service, or approved by the head of the employing agency for positions outside the competitive service; and (4) of an employee of the agency concerned when there is no position in the normal line of promotion in the grade immediately below that of the position to be filled. *Provided further*, That this subsection shall not apply to any case involving an employee who is within reach for appointment to a higher grade position on a competitive civil service register, or being advanced up to a grade level from which he had been demoted or separated because of reduction in force

"(d) From time to time, but at least annually, each executive department and agency shall (1) review all positions which since September 1, 1950, have been created or placed in a higher grade or level of difficulty and responsibility of work or in a higher basic pay level, (2) abolish all such positions which are found to be unnecessary, (3) with respect to such positions which are found to be necessary, make such adjustments as may be appropriate in the classification grades of those positions which are subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or in the basic pay levels of those positions which are subject to other pay-fixing authority Not later than July 31 of each year each department and agency shall submit a report to the Post Office and Civil Service Committees and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives concerning the action taken under this paragraph, together with information comparing the total number of employees on the payroll on June 30 and their average grade and salary with similar information for the previous June 30

"(e) The provisions of this section, other than the proviso to the first sentence of subsection (a) and other than the last sentence of subsection (a), shall not be applicable to positions in the field service of the Post Office Department.'

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In line 1 of said amendment, change the section number to "SEC. 1310"; and, before the period in the last line of subsection (d), insert ", and each annual and supplemental budget estimate shall include a statement comparing the average grade and salary provided for in each item of appropriation or fund allowance therein with similar figures reported for the two previous periods"; and, strike out all of proposed subsection (e).

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 110: Page 58, line 18, insert the following:

"SEC 1414 (a) No part of the money appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, by this or any other act to the Department of Labor or the Federal Security Agency which is in excess of 75 percent of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the aggregate budget estimates for personal services submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by such Department or such agency, respectively, during such fiscal year in the performance of—

"(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by a similar title, or

"(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2)

"(b) No provision in any act appropriating funds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, shall be deemed to limit the amount of any appropriation made to any Department, agency, or corporation which may be used to compensate persons engaged in the performance of functions described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) of this section, if the aggregate number of persons employed during such fiscal year by such Department, agency, or corporation in the performance of such functions does not exceed four at any time."

Mr. CANNON. Mr Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows

In line one of said amendment, change the section number to "SEC 1315", and in the last sentence of subsection (a) insert before the period " *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to personnel engaged in the preparation or distribution of technical, scientific, or research publications, the reporting or dissemination of the results of research or investigations, the publishing of information or other work required by law to carry out the duties of such department or agency other than work intended for press, radio, and television services, and popular publications", and, before the period in the last line of said amendment, insert ", nor shall any such provision in this or any other act limit appropriations which may be used to compensate persons in the Office of Defense Mobilization who are engaged in informing the public about the progress and purposes of the defense mobilization program, or persons in the agencies assigned

functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, who are engaged in informing consumers, agriculture, business, and labor, about rules, regulations, and orders, issued by such agencies under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the several votes by which the conference report and the amendments were agreed to and lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS ON THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that had I been present during the vote on the conference report on the railroad retirement bill I would have supported it, I would have voted "yea"

RÉSUMÉ OF APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr CANNON. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a résumé of all of the appropriations passed at this session of Congress and remarks thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DATE OF CONVENING OF SECOND SESSION OF EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. J. Res. 351) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows.

Resolved, etc., That the second regular session of the Eighty-second Congress shall begin at noon on Tuesday, January 8, 1952.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 4 o'clock p. m.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. CANNON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT No. 1226)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows.

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 22, 23, 27, 32, and 33, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 3 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$100,000", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 13. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "including not to exceed $25,000 for necessary administrative expenses in connection with said title,", and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 14 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,250,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,428,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$41,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,000,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$800,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 18, 19, 24, 25, and 26

CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN J ROONEY,
JOHN TABER,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B RUSSELL,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C O'MAHONEY,
STYLES BRIDGES (except as to amendment No 37),
HOMER FERGUSON (except as to amendment No. 37),
GUY CORDON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H R 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Amendment No. 1: Reported in disagreement

CHAPTER II

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Amendment No. 2—Defense community facilities and services: Appropriates $4,000,000 instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No 3—Salaries and expenses, defense community facilities and services: Appropriates $250,000 instead of $200,000 as proposed by the House and $300,000 as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No 4—Office of Education: Reported in disagreement

CHAPTER IV

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 5—Resources management: Reported in disagreement.

Bureau of Reclamation

Amendment No 6: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 7—Construction and rehabilitation: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 8—Construction and rehabilitation: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER V

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Civil Service Commission

Amendment No. 9—Salaries and expenses. Appropriates $1,400,000 instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Trade Commission

Amendment No. 10—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $100,000 instead of $200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendment No. 11—Office of the Administrator, defense housing: Inserts "(for accounting purposes only)" as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12—Defense community facilities and services: Appropriates $11,250,000 instead of $7,500,000 as proposed by the House and $15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 13—Revolving fund for development of isolated defense sites: Authorizes use of the fund for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate, modified to limit such expenses to not to exceed $25,000.

Amendment No 14—Revolving fund for development of isolated defense sites Appropriates $6,250,000 instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $7,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15—Federal National Mortgage Association: Increases administrative expense limitation to $3,428,000 instead of $3,397,500 as proposed by the House and $3,460,000 as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No 16—Office of the Administrator: Increases administrative expense limitation to $225,000 instead of $212,250 as proposed by the House and $237,250 as proposed by the Senate

Amendment No 17—Federal Housing Administration: Increases amount available for administrative expense by $41,000 instead of $38,250 as proposed by the House and $45,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Renegotiation Board

Amendment No 18—Salaries and expenses Reported in disagreement.

Corporations

Amendment No 19—Inland Waterways Corporation. Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF DFFENSE, MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS

Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Amendment No 20—Military construction, Army Appropriates $1,000,000,000 instead of $1,158,520,748 as proposed by the House and $937,069,698 as proposed by the Senate.

It is the opinion of the conferees that the Secretary of Defense cause to be made a restudy of the hospital-construction program with the view to better utilization of existing structures, and that no funds provided in this bill be used for hospital construction in the United States without the specific approval of the Secretary of the Department involved and the Secretary of Defense.

It is felt that construction estimates are too high and that by reconsideration of each project and more careful planning, and an orderly letting of contracts, many economies can be effected and costs reduced. If it develops that the funds provided will not permit the construction of all projects approved, the services shall select for construction those projects which are of the greatest urgency and which are on the list approved for construction by the conference committee, postponing other projects for future consideration.

Department of the Navy

Amendment No 21—Public works: Appropriates $800,000,000 instead of $897,628,460 as proposed by the House and $723,271,460 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 22—Refund to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission: Appropriates $1,096,392 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of the Air Force

Amendment No. 23—Acquisition and construction of real property: Appropriates $2,071,200,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,112,172,550 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24—Section 602: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 25—Section 603: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 26—Section 604: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 27: Changes section number as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER VII

EMERGENCY AGENCIES

Amendment No. 28: Strikes out chapter heading inserted by the Senate.

Amendment No 29—Office of Defense Mobilization, salaries and expenses: Strikes out language as proposed by the Senate relative to certain information personnel

Amendment No 30—Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses, defense production activities: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate an additional $300,000 for expenses of the Petroleum Administration for Defense Funds for this activity for 1952 are included in the recommendations of the conferees on the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952

CHAPTER VII

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

Amendment No. 31: Restores chapter number as proposed by the House

Amendment No. 32 Inserts "Senate Document Numbered 79, and" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 33 Appropriates $1,885,416 as proposed by the Senate instead of $610,912 as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER VIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No 34: Restores chapter number as proposed by the House.

Amendment No 35 Restores section number as proposed by the House.

Amendment No 36 Restores section number as proposed by the House.

Amendment No 37. Strikes out the proposal of the Senate relating to persons engaged in information activities.

Amendment No 38: Restores section number as proposed by the House

CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN J ROONEY,
JOHN TABER,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 5650, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, we submit the conference report on the last appropriation bill of the session, the second supplementary appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952.

The bill agreed upon by the conferees is $959,109,966 below the budget estimate.

The conference report represents a complete agreement on the part of the managers of the two Houses. Several amendments in technical disagreement will be taken up following disposition of the report.

Roughly speaking, including this bill, out of total estimates of a little more than $96,300,000,000, the Congress has this session appropriated approximately $91,600,000,000.

As soon as final figures have been rechecked I will submit for the RECORD the usual summary for the session.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes to us in a very unusual way. In spite of the fact that the other body added a number of things that we had to fight over, the final figure is almost $300,000,000 below what it was when it passed the House. Frankly, I am pleased at the way the conference has worked out. There are some items that I did not want to agree to, but they were small. I think the House would be interested in two or three figures at this time. I am going to put them in the RECORD, under the permission which was given to me this morning. As I have it, the budget estimates to the House on deficiency items for 1951 were $7,317,000,000. The House passed $6,942,000,000, and the final figure in the law was $6,808,000,000. On the 1952 items, the final budget estimates were $96,292,000,000. The figures that passed the House were $91,597,000,000, a reduction below the budget estimates of $4,705,000,000. I think every Member of the House ought to be proud of that record. The final figure on the 1952 budget, or the 1952 law, was $92,231,000,000 or $4,061,000,000 below the budget figures. I think that is all I care to say at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New York for his untiring efforts to save the taxpayers of the country some money. I understand that this appropriation bill still contains $13,000,000 for the completely unnecessary expenditure with reference to a cow pasture airport at Grandview, Mo.

Mr. TABER. I fought against that with the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr GROSS. I understand that. I know perfectly well the gentleman did, but I know this bill is full of fat that ought to be trimmed out I doubt very much that there has been trimmed out of this bill $360,000 for an officer's hotel, or what amounts to an officer's hotel at Naha, on Okinawa. Only yesterday, I received a letter telling of expenditures on a very small military installation, which has just been completed. At that installation, there are $30,000 worth of storm windows that cannot be used because they do not fit. In the officers' quarters, there are solid brass nickel plated toothbrush holders. At this small military installation, they put in 16 toilet paper holders, costing $16 apiece. It is time we cut out that kind of fat in these appropriation bills, and save the taxpayers of this country some money.

Mr. TABER. I think there is something I ought to say about the Okinawa situation. The Congress did not appropriate money for the purpose of building any such operation. There has been a

big building built there. I complained to the Assistant Secretary of the Army about 6 or 8 weeks ago, and an investigation was had and the final result has been that they found a very considerable amount of money which the contractor had to pay back. I cannot give you the exact figures because they are not here yet and will not be until after the contract has been renegotiated. They did find there was being built, without any presentation or justification to the Appropriations Committee, a great big building on top of the hill. What the purpose of it was, I do not know, but it was being built out of hand-cut stone. It was thoroughly disgusting.

These things that the gentleman has told us about, the brass fixtures, are completely out of line, and the Appropriations Committee just does not intend to stand for that kind of stuff.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to inquire of the distinguished gentleman from New York the action of the conferees on the second supplemental appropriation bill under the Office of Education. You made some changes in an amendment put in by the Senate. Would you be kind enough to explain to the House about that amendment and those changes?

Mr. TABER. There was amendment No. 2. I will give my recollection, and I would like to be corrected if I do not state it correctly.

The House had provided $1,000,000 for some community facilities. The Senate raised it to $10,000,000 The conference agreed on $4,000,000 for that activity, and then in amendment No. 4, where there was a provision to provide funds for operating schools in places where the armed services have locations, the Senate put in this amendment No. 4 and provided that the cost of operating those schools should be taken out of the funds that are provided for building schools. We eliminated that part of it, but provided that the deficiency in the funds for operating schools should be paid out of one-half of that $4,000,000. So that the result was that amendment No. 2 was increased $2,000,000 for the original purposes, and $2,000,000 for the school expense.

The way the language stood we could not manage it any other way. There was no chance to have a straight appropriation for the operation of the schools, as would have been better tactics if it had been possible in the legislative situation.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to compliment the House conferees for getting even that small amount of money, and I would like to make this observation, that as soon as the Congress reconvenes in January it will be necessary to make some adequate supplemental appropriation for carrying out the enlarged provisions of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, as provided in H. R. 5411, which was passed by the House today.

Mr. TABER. I presume that is so.

Now, just so that I will not seem to be taking credit for that, I will say the suggestion for working that out did not come from me. It came from the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. BAILEY. Will you thank him for me?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the military public-works portion of the second supplemental appropriation bill was reduced so drastically by the other body. The House conferees were able to secure restoration for the Army of the sum of about $63,000,000. For the Navy we were able to secure the restoration of about $77,000,000. It was not possible to secure additional funds for Air Force construction.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that funds for military construction are just as essential as funds for airplanes, guns, and ammunition, and I wish to go on record as having opposed the drastic reductions which were made in the military public-works program. Legislation is a matter of compromise, and in order to secure some sort of bill on the closing day of the session it was necessary to agree on some figure for inclusion in the final version of the bill.

I trust that the three services will exercise the greatest economy and the best of planning in the expenditure of military public-works funds. I trust that every possible saving, consistent with military demands, will be made. It is apparent that when the new Congress convenes additional funds will be urgently required for the military public-works program. I felt that it was in the best interest of national defense and in the interest of economy to provide substantially the budget estimates for military public works.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 1, line 9, insert the following.

"Effective January 1, 1952, Public Law 479, Seventy-ninth Congress, under the heading "Contingent expenses of the Senate", paragraph 8, page 7, is amended by striking out the word 'fifty' and inserting in lieu thereof 'sixty', and by striking out the words 'two hundred and fifty' and inserting in lieu thereof 'three hundred'."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 3, line 9, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"Appropriations granted in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1952, under the heading 'payments to school districts' and 'School construction', shall be respectively available for payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools in critical defense housing areas pursuant to section 10 of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874), as amended, and for providing school facilities and making grants pursuant to title III of the act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815), as amended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 5411, Eighty-second Congress."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"Not to exceed $2,000,000 of the appropriation in this chapter for Defense community facilities and services shall be available to the Office of Education for payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools in critical defense housing areas pursuant to section 10 of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874), as amended, and for providing school facilities and making grants pursuant to title III of the act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815), as amended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R 5411, Eighty-second Congress."

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Missouri just exactly what the bill means unless we pass it? I do not know the number.

Mr. CANNON. The bill to which the gentleman refers is the bill H. R. 5411, which passed the Senate yesterday and will become a law as soon as the President signs it.

Under the authorization provided by that bill, and in conformity with Public Laws 815 and 874, the pending bill appropriates $2,000,000 to implement the new law.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 4, line 17, insert the following:

"RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

"For an additional amount for "Resources Management," for the development of additional water supplies on the Navajo Reservation, $500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That development shall be made after consultation and approval of the Navajo Tribal Council."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows.

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and concur there-

in with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$250,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 5, line 2, insert the following:

"Construction and rehabilitation: For an additional amount for 'Construction and rehabilitation', $3,200,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,500,000 "

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8. Page 5, line 5, insert

"Construction and rehabilitation: For an additional amount for 'Construction and rehabilitation,' $750,000, to remain available until expended "

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$500,000 "

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 9, line 9, insert:

"RENEGOTIATION BOARD

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, purchase (not to exceed three) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U S C 55a); at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals, and rents in the District of Columbia, $1,500,000. *Provided*, That the board is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, to place not more than five positions in grades 16, 17, or 18 of the general schedule established by said act, and such positions shall be in addition to the number authorized by said section "

Mr CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in lines 9 and 10 of said amendment insert "$1,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I make will appear in the RECORD just prior to the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 10, line 1, insert:

"CORPORATIONS

"INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

"The provisions of section 605 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952 (Public Law 137, 82d Cong) shall not apply to the operating personnel of the Inland Waterways Corp "

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and concur therein

The motion was agreed to

The SPEAKER The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows.

Senate amendment No. 24 Page 14, line 5, insert

"SEC 602 None of the funds appropriated in this chapter shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work to be performed within the continental United States without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor "

Mr CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows. In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 602 None of the funds appropriated in this chapter shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work where cost estimates exceed $25,000 to be performed within the continental United States without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 14, line 10, insert:

"SEC. 603. None of the funds appropriated in this chapter shall be expended for additional costs involved in expediting construction: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense, or his designee for the purpose, shall establish a reasonable completion date for each project, taking into consideration the type and location of the project, the climatic and seasonal conditions affecting the construction and the application of economical construction practices."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement:

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 604: Page 14, line 18, insert:

"SEC 604 No part of the funds made available by this act or any other act of the present Congress shall be used for the construction, replacement, or reactivation of any laundry or dry-cleaning facilities in the United States, its Territories or possessions, as to which the Secretary of Defense does not certify, in writing, after consultation with representatives of the laundry and dry-cleaning industry affected, that the services to be furnished by such facilities are not obtainable from commercial sources at reasonable rates "

Mr CANNON Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert

"SEC 604 No part of the funds made available by this act or any other act of the present Congress shall be used for the construction, replacement, or reactivation of any laundry or dry-cleaning facilities in the United States, its Territories or possessions, as to which the Secretary of Defense does not certify, in writing, giving his reasons therefor, that the services to be furnished by such facilities are not obtainable from commercial sources at reasonable rates "

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the conference report just passed

The SPEAKER. Is there object to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H R 1005. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material,

H. R 2546. An act for the relief of Charles W. Vanderhoop,

H R 3490 An act to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotic laws, and for other purposes;

H R 3840. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Laura A Craig,

H. R 3937. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat 1061), to provide for the operation, management, maintenance, and demolition of federally acquired properties following the acquisition of such properties and before the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4055. An act to authorize for an additional 1-year period the use of rivers and harbors appropriations for maintenance of the canal from Cape May Harbor to Delaware Bay and the railroad and highway bridges over such canal;

H. R. 4219. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Milliken;

H. R. 4288. An act granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Sabine River by the States of Texas and Louisiana;

H. R. 4351. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Ursula Rutherford Ollinger;

H. R. 4352. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary Rutherford Spearson;

H. R. 5397. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dora Troost; and

H. Con. Res. 170. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the Revenue Act of 1951.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 320. An act to amend Veterans Regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for psychoses developing to a compensable degree of disability within 3 years from the date of separation from active service;

H. R. 3590. An act relating to the income-tax treatment of gain realized on an involuntary conversion of property;

H. R. 3838. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Joseph Pickett; and

H. R. 4687. An act to provide for the withholding of certain patents that might be detrimental to the national security, and for other purposes.

INVOLUNTARY CONVERSION OF PROPERTY—INCOME TAX TREATMENT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3590) relating to the income tax treatment of gain realized on an involuntary conversion of property, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 6, line 5, strike out "assessed." and insert "assessed. This subsection shall not apply, in the case of property used by the taxpayer as his principal residence, if the destruction, theft, seizure, requisition, or condemnation of residence, or the sale or exchange of such residence under threat or imminence thereof, occurred after December 31, 1950."

Page 6, line 9, strike out "(e)" and insert "(f)."

Page 7, line 4, after "by" insert: "the first two sections of."

Page 7, after line 15, insert:

"SEC. 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of section 490 of the Revenue Act of 1951, the effective date of so much of the amendment made by section 485 of such act to section 3406 (a) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code as relates to electric heating pads shall be April 1, 1952."

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the passage of H. R. 3590 with the Senate amendment giving relief to Casco Products, of Bridgeport, and all the heating-pad industry. The bill removes an undue hardship described in my remarks as contained in the RECORD of October 16.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSE BOWL GAME

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I have an announcement to make which I trust will be of considerable importance to certain Members of the House of Representatives. Since the House today agreed to meet next January 8 for the commencement of the second session of the Eighty-second Congress, a rare opportunity is presented to certain Members, and, I hope, to every Member of this House. On January 1, next New Year's Day, a football game will be played in the famous Rose Bowl in Pasadena, Calif. I have the honor to represent the district in which the Rose Bowl is located, and I believe I am the only Member of this Congress who is a member of the Tournament of Roses Association. The school from which a team will come which will play another team on the west coast in the Rose Bowl has not as yet been selected, of course. However, the Members of Congress from that State I have no doubt may be able to facilitate their acquisition of suitable tickets to the Rose Bowl game through me.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman is making arrangements for tickets for all of us, I assume.

Mr. HINSHAW. Last year I was able to help the Members from the State of Michigan fairly well. This year, of course, Michigan will not be able to play, under the agreement. I have no idea what team is going to win the Midwest Big Ten Conference nor which one will win the West Coast Conference. But, whatever team wins the Midwest Conference, the Members of that State may call upon me for assistance. So far as Members of Congress from other States are concerned, I will do my utmost, but I should like to say this, that my assistance will be given solely to Members in their personal capacity. I regret that I may not be of assistance to their friends.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The Big Ten always wins that contest, does it not?

Mr. HINSHAW. I said the Big Ten. That agreement is still in force.

If Members will write to me at my office here in Washington, to reach me before December 15, stating their requirements and where they may be addressed up to game time, I will do my best to help them.

JOSEPH PICKETT

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3838) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Joseph Pickett, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 10, after "acres.", insert "The prior disposition of the homestead lands of Joseph Pickett is hereby ratified and confirmed."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this applies to only one individual?

Mr. MORRIS. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 479) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] as a committee to notify the President.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 470) authorizing expenses of conducting studies and investigations of certain matters pertaining to immigration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 469, Eighty-second Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, within or without the United States, not to exceed $30,000, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of experts and clerical assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the House Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Virginia if he anticipates offering an amendment to reduce the amount carried in the resolution?

Mr. STANLEY. If there is no objection to the consideration of the resolution, at the proper time I shall offer an amendment.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker, with the thought in mind that the gentleman is going to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under the authorizing resolution the subcommittee of the Judiciary is directed to conduct studies within or without the continental United States, in accordance with the preamble of the resolution. In the preamble of the resolution it is stated that there are at least 10 million refugees and expellees in Western Germany and Austria, and there are many more people considered as surplus population in Italy and Greece.

May I inquire of the author of the resolution if it is his intention or the intention of this subcommittee to propose another quota for displaced persons coming into this country?

Mr. WALTER. It is not the intention to recommend any increase in the quota from any of the nations in the world.

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman state the purpose of the conference with the other countries?

Mr. WALTER. The conference will be held in France where the committee will be the guests of the French Government. The French Government has invited to attend this conference 11 nations which have indicated an interest in attempting to bring about a solution of the problems caused by the presence of these people who cannot be absorbed in the economies of the countries where they are now located. The participation of the United States in this entire program will be to the extent of endeavoring to supply the shipping, which is now being used by IRO and by the Displaced Persons Commission. But, it is not the intention to recommend any increase in the number of aliens who will come to the United States.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. WALTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STANLEY. On page 1, line 5, after "will exceed", strike out "$30,000" and insert "$18,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING TREATMENT FOR VETERANS FOR PSYCHOSIS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 320) to amend Veterans' Regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for psychoses developing to a compensable degree of disability within 3 years from the date of separation from active service, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That for the purpose of hospital and medical treatment, including out-patient treatment, authorized under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, a veteran of World War II (as defined in Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended) developing an active psychosis within 2 years from the date of separation from active service in such war shall be deemed to have incurred such disability in such active service."

Amend the title so as to read. "An act to assure hospitalization and out-patient treatment by the Veterans' Administration of World War II veterans who develop an active psychosis within 2 years from the date of separation from active service."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill and the amendments?

Mr. RANKIN. The House provided for 3 years presumptive period. The Senate cut it down to 2 years. That is the main difference.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And you are asking to accept the amendment?

Mr. RANKIN. We are asking to accept the amendment under the circumstances, because it is the only opportunity we have to take care of these presumptive service-connected cases I will say to the gentleman that after the First World War we made it more than 6 years. The war closed in 1918 and we extended the presumptive period to January 1, 1925, if I remember correctly. We attempted to make this one at least 3 years. I think it ought to be as much as it was after World War I, but this is the best we could get from the other body. In order to take care of as many of these men as possible, we accepted the amendment for the time being, and hope to amend the legislation at the next session of the Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE CROSS IS AWARDED TO AN AMERICAN HERO

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a short statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to ask the membership of the House to join with me in paying tribute to one of the heroes in our Armed Forces. He is Corp. Earl C. Phoenix, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. E. C. Phoenix, of Emporia, Kans.

Corporal Phoenix stood at attention at Fort Riley, Kans., a few days ago and was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, one of the highest decorations, for extraordinary heroism.

Corporal Phoenix was a member of the Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment of American Twenty-fifth Division that was sent to the Chungyen Reservoir last November 27 to help rescue United Nations troops They had been cut off by Chinese Communist units. The weather was bitter cold and the Americans were under terrific fire. Corporal Phoenix was twice cut off by the Reds and was wounded in the fighting on each occasion. He was wounded a third time before he got orders to get out the area as best he and his immediate companions could.

Corporal Phoenix and four other remaining members of his company crawled 6 miles through rice paddies and over rough terrain to get back to the American lines. He was flown back to this country for treatment of the three wounds he had sustained. He was allowed a brief furlough to spend with his family at home. He has again reported for duty.

So, fellow citizens and friends of Corp. Earl C. Phoenix, Jr. salute this great American hero. They join in congratulating him upon receiving the Distinguished Service Cross recognizing his extraordinary heroism, by acting beyond the call of duty.

TRINIDAD, COLO., BOY PRISONER OF WAR IN CHINA

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter today which touched me deeply. The letter comes from the mother of a boy who is now a prisoner of war in China. The family lives in my home town of Trinidad, Colo. This mother has just received a letter from her son and she is, of course, greatly concerned over him. He was reported as missing in action last April, and nothing was heard from him until the receipt of this letter, which is dated August 8, 1951.

In this letter the mother quotes from the letter received from her son, and I consider his message of such importance that it should reach every Member of this House. He wrote to his mother as follows:

MOM AND DAD: If there is any way or anything you can do at home to hurry up a peaceful settlement of this war, do it, and it will hurry my return home.

The mother states in her letter to me:

All through his letter he asks us to work and pray for peace. And he asked me to write you and ask you to do what you can to bring about a lasting peace.

Mr. Speaker, as this session of Congress is about to adjourn, we have no greater obligation resting upon us than to use our influence in every possible way to bring an end to this Korean war. Let us not sit complacently by and permit this tragic situation to continue through another winter. We should heed the plea of this boy in Prisoner of War Camp No. 3 in China. We dare not fail.

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT TO DELEGATION FROM AMERICAN HUNGARIAN FEDERATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include the remarks of the President of the United States to the delegation from the American Hungarian Federation on October 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the following is the remarks of the President to a delegation from the American Hungarian Federation, October 12, 1951:

Thank you very much. I appreciate that. I appreciate what you have said very much.

Our only effort in the world is for world peace. We want all the peoples of the world to enjoy the same individual liberties which we enjoy. We had hoped, after our conversations at Yalta and Potsdam, that that would be the case with Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, but it is not, I am sorry to say.

We are going to continue our efforts to see if we can't get freedom in those countries as we enjoy it here.

You people know that you don't have to be afraid here. You are not going to be arrested because you don't think like I do. You are not going to be arrested because somebody says you are wrong in your political beliefs.

And that is what I would like to see in the whole world. And as long as I am President, I shall keep working for that sort of arrangement.

I can't tell you how much I appreciate this scroll.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Your committee appointed to join a committee of the Senate to inform the President that the Congress is ready to adjourn, and to ask him if he has any further communications to make to the Congress, has performed that duty. The President has directed us to say that he has no further communication to make to the Congress.

ONE OF MR. TRUMAN'S IRON CURTAINS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include certain extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's recent order designed to suppress a free press and free speech is not his first contribution to the lowering of an iron curtain which has prevented, and which will continue, as long as he goes unchecked, to prevent courageous, patriotic Americans from exposing the activities of the Communists.

I have a very vivid recollection of an occasion when Mr. Truman balked the effort of a House committee to expose the communistic influence which instigated and carried on a strike against the GSI, a nonprofit organization operating cafeterias for the benefit of Federal employees here in Washington.

In furtherance of that effort, a meeting was held in the White House on the morning of February 10, 1948. The President, Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach, John R. Steelman, and Clark M. Clifford were present. The purpose was to force GSI to yield to the demands of the Communist-dominated union.

The committee learned then of Mr. Truman's attempt to aid some of the officers of the union who had refused to deny that they were Communists. The committee desired to learn just what Mr. Truman did say with reference to forcing the GSI to yield to the demands of these Communist-dominated union officials. It twice subpenaed Mr. Steelman, who was present at the conference and who had first-hand knowledge.

In reply to the subpena, Mr. Steelman wrote:

MY DEAR MR CONGRESSMAN: * * * After the receipt of each of these subpenas, I promptly informed the President, and in each instance the President directed me, in view of my duties as his assistant, not to appear before your subcommittee.

On the advice of the President, Mr. Steelman refused to appear in answer to a legal subpena properly served. The refusal was a direct violation of a Federal statute.

That day the iron curtain was drawn by Mr. Truman over his own activities when he attempted to exercise his influence in behalf of a Communist-controlled union.

The foregoing, all a matter of record, is but one specific instance of an attempt to suppress a free press and free speech.

Others might be cited.

One will answer the purpose as well as a dozen and this one is of long standing and has been a persistent effort of Communists and Communist-dominated organizations to prevent the exposure of Communist activities to overthrow, here in America, our constitutional Government.

Last year the House voted to cite Joseph P. Kamp, vice president of the Constitutional Education League, for "contempt of Congress" because he failed to comply with the demands of a subpena purporting to have been issued by the so-called Buchanan lobbying committee. At that time it was contended that the subpena had been illegally issued by the chairman of the committee without the knowledge or approval of the committee; that, therefore, no citation should be voted.

It was further argued on the floor of the House that Joseph Kamp had been harassed and was being victimized because he had courageously championed the cause of constitutional government. Because he had exposed and denounced the Communist and other Red elements engaged in an effort to destroy our country and its Constitution, bring it under the control and domination of Red Russia.

Nevertheless, the House—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 10, page 14004—voted to cite Joseph Kamp for contempt.

He was indicted. He was convicted.

After his conviction, and only 2 weeks ago, the verdict of the jury was set aside after some very peculiar circumstances had been presented to the court.

It was discovered that some members of the jury had been told that Mr. Kamp, or someone who looked like Mr. Kamp, had been engaged in Nazi activities. That false charge was a typical lie, a Communist smear. Other startling facts in connection with the prosecution of Mr. Kamp have also been disclosed in a sworn statement which he submitted to the United States probation officer. Some of this new information fully justifies the demand made at the Lobbying Committee's hearings, for an investigation of the staff of the committee. This new information and the evidence submitted by the prosecution and Mr. Kamp's trial, tends to show that subversive communistic elements had managed to use the committee and the power and prestige of the House in their efforts to interfere with the anticommunistic activities of Mr. Kamp, the organization of which he is vice president, and other similar organizations.

So that there may be a fair understanding of what Communists and communistic organizations are attempting to do, let me very briefly state the situation:

The Constitutional Educational League, of which Mr. Kamp is an officer, and certain other organizations have, for many year, been engaged in publishing and circulating pamphlets, the purpose of which was to aid in a better understanding of constitutional government, to advocate that we, as a people and a government, adhere to the principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

There has never, at any time, been any claim that the publications of Kamp or the organization which he represents, or the books which it sold, violated any State or Federal law, or any postal regulation. There never has been any claim that those who purchased the pamphlets or books, or made contributions, violated any law of State or Nation or any postal regulation.

There has never been any claim on the part of those who are persecuting Mr. Kamp—attempting to silence him and other individuals or organizations who are engaged in similar activities—that the pamphlets published or books sold by any of them could not be purchased in the open market.

What Kamp's persecutors have been attempting to do, is to secure from him a statement showing the names and addresses and the amount paid by all those individuals who either purchased the publications or books, or contributed to the maintenance of the organization he represents.

Do I hear you say, "Why, then is this information wanted?"

The information is wanted so that the efforts of those patriotic Americans who are supporting the attempt to maintain constitutional government may have pressure of some kind put upon them to discontinue purchasing such pamphlets or books, making such contributions to Kamp and others who are making a similar effort, in the hope that Kamp and others who are attempting to expose communism, may be muzzled. This effort is not new.

A similar effort and persecution by the Communists broke the health of Martin Dies, drove him from the House of Representatives. Such efforts have for long protected individuals like Hiss, Coplon, and many, many others who have followed the Communist Party line.

In the interest of justice and fair play, and because of the un-American treatment which Joseph Kamp has been forced to endure for several years, it is my intention when the new Congress convenes in January, to make some effort to lay the facts in connection with his case before the Congress and the people.

As a preliminary to that effort and so that the Members of the House can acquaint themselves with some of the allegations put forth by Mr. Kamp, I am reading his statement for your consideration. This statement is his statement, not mine It is his letter to the probation officer written after his conviction but before the setting aside of the verdict.

To comply with the rules of the House, I have deleted the names of certain individuals mentioned in this statement. I read:

AUGUST 16, 1951.

MR MORRIS KUZNESOF,
United States Probation Officer,
Federal Building,
New York, N. Y

MY DEAR MR KUZNESOF When I called at your office at your request you said you had been instructed to ask me whether I would be willing, if given the opportunity, to purge myself of contempt by now surrendering to the Buchanan committee a list of the names of the contributors and book purchasers called for in its subpena?

I told you that it was impossible for me to do so, if for no other reason, because the so-called Buchanan committee is no longer in existence I said further that I would make a more complete answer, by letter, so that my position could not be misunderstood.

My attorneys have since advised me that my technical response is sufficient, and that I am under no obligation to make an additional explanation

Nevertheless, I am of the opinion that the court is entitled to know my attitude

I do submit, however, that your question, as you put it, is not pertinent to my situation. Neither the Congress, as such, nor any committee of the Congress, has made any lawful demand upon me for anything. The subpena to which you referred was illegal, having been issued by Mr Buchanan without prior committee authorization. Members of the Buchanan committee and other members of Congress have publicly declared the subpena to have been illegally issued. There has been no judicial determination to the contrary.

To make your question fit the facts and circumstances in my case it would have to be rephrased to ask: "If given the opportunity, would you purge yourself by making available to the Communist enemies of our country the names of the good, patriotic Americans who supported your campaign against communism, as called for in the subpena issued in the name of the Buchanan committee by its Communist-sponsored chairman, at the instance of agents and dupes of the Communist conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States?"

In suggesting that the question be put in this form I am not trying to be captious, or smart I simply desire to emphasize the true situation in my case, which no citation by Congress, no indictment, and no jury verdict, can change

The demand for the names of contributors to the Constitutional Educational League's campaign against communism, and for the names of purchasers of our anti-Communist books, was made as part of a continuing Communist conspiracy which dates back 14 years to 1937, when the head of a Communist spy ring, in his capacity as chief counsel of the so-called La Follette committee, first caused a congressional subpena to be issued calling for the names of our financial supporters

Furthermore, there is an abundance of evidence to show that there has been a connecting conspiracy, extending back at least 18 years to 1933, on the part of Communist and Communist-aiding elements to use the power and prestige of Congress to interfere with and to prevent the exposure of the Communist plot to overthrow our Government

The persecution to which I am being presently subjected stems from this Communist conspiracy to discourage and destroy all effective opposition to communism

Unfortunately for me the rules of evidence, and judicial constructions of the law, have thus far prevented me from bringing the facts surrounding this Red conspiracy to the attention of either the court, or the jury However, since it is the duty of your office to advise the court as to every circumstance which has, or had, a bearing on my present and past conduct, and since the facilities of the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation are available to assist your office in providing the court with a true picture, I believe that the following data should be called to your attention, so that you may use the facilities at your disposal to verify it, and that the court should be advised of your findings

It may seem far-fetched to charge that the Communists have been able to use the power of prestige of Congress for their own subversive purposes (in my case as well as in other situations); but, nevertheless, it has happened Here are the facts:

The first instance, to my knowledge, of such misuse of congressional authority by Communist-aiding outsiders—including some of the same identical elements involved in my present case—occurred in 1934 when a wanted ex-convict named Morris Czech, alias Frank Prince, was permitted to act as chief investigator for the so-called McCormack-Dickstein committee, although never officially appointed or placed on the committee's payroll He was an agent of the Communist-aiding Anti-Defamation League, and he was sponsored, perhaps unwittingly, by the majority leader of the House of Representatives, Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

Czech, or Prince, sabotaged the committee's investigation of communism by confining its activity almost exclusively to an inquiry of Nazi and Fascist movements, and minimizing the Communist danger. In fact, Prince had refused to consider looking into Communist activities until the American Federation of Labor brought its influence to bear.

When Congress created the so-called Dies committee in 1937, it was suggested to Chairman Martin Dies that Czech, or Prince, be placed in charge of the investigation; but Chairman Dies learned of Czech's criminal record and Anti-Defamation League affiliation, and refused to employ him. Then Dies made a further investigation and discovered that two investigators who had been recommended to him by a Government agency (not the FBI) were both members of the Communist Party. However, despite Chairman Dies' vigilance, an agent of the Communist-aiding Antidefamation League managed to be appointed to the committee's staff He called himself John Metcalf, but his real name was Oberwinder When Chairman Dies discovered that Metcalf, or Oberwinder, while an investigator for the Dies committee, was also on the payroll of the Anti-Defamation League, Dies discharged him.

It was with this background knowledge of Communist finagling with congressional committees that I first was faced with a demand by "congressional investigators" for the names of contributors to our campaign against communism When I refused to comply, the so-called La Follette committee issued a subpena calling for production of the names

However, I never was given an opportunity to challenge the subpena. Week after week the committee postponed the date of my appearance. I wired the President of the Senate, John N Garner, demanding the right to be heard I appeared at a public hearing, and the committee refused to hear me, probably because in a public statement addressed to the committee and released to the press, I promised to prove that the "committee's activities are the culmination of a conspiracy entered into between John L Lewis, representatives of Communist and other Red organizations, and the chairman of the committee, Senator La Follette " You will find this statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 29, 1938.

Because the La Follette committee was authorized to investigate violations of civil liberties, and our activities had been confined to the publication of literature exposing communism, I said also: "We challenge (the committee's) right to conduct an investigation into our affairs. We question, likewise, the validity of its subpena But out of respect for the Senate of the United States, we will appear in answer to its summons. We stand ready to answer any and all questions pertaining to our activities. We could have no purpose in trying to hide them. We are proud of our accomplishments in the field of patriotic education "

Months later, I got a brief note: "Subpena No. 1082 d t heretofore served on you has been withdrawn "

Obviously, somebody in authority connected with the committee was afraid of what I might have had to say; but you need draw no inference from the foregoing, because all the facts as to how the so-called La Follette committee, or to be more correct, the Senate Civil Liberties Committee, came to be organized, and who ran the committee, are available in the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation

On consulting the FBI files you will find that this alleged congressional investigation was not planned by the United States Senate, nor by any Mem r of the Senate. It had its inception at a fraction meeting of the Communist Party held in the home of Ella Winter in Carmel, Calif. The FBI has a full account of how the investigation was planned, because one of its agents, posing as a Communist, was in attendance at this meeting. Subsequently, another meeting of the Communists and their stooges was held at the Cosmos Club in Washington at which Senator La Follette agreed to head the investigation, and to appoint John Abt as chief counsel.

Whittaker Chambers has since testified, under oath, that John Abt was the head of

the original Communist cell organized within our Government in 1934, and Elizabeth Bentley has testified that Abt headed the Perlo group in the Communist espionage apparatus, and that she met members of the Red spy ring, and received stolen secret Government documents from them in Abt's New York apartment.

The so-called La Follette committee was run by John Abt and Charles Kramer, a member of the La Follette staff. Kramer was also named at congressional hearings as a member of the Communist spy ring.

So, when I was first faced with a congressional subpena it was not Congress, but these Communist spies who wanted to know the names of the good, patriotic Americans supporting our campaign against communism.

The second demand for these same names came in 1944 when the same Communist spy ring leader, John Abt, met in secret session with members of the so-called Anderson committee and demanded that they find out where Joe Kamp gets his money.

I appeared before the committee voluntarily. I told the committee I knew the forces responsible for the committee's interest in our affairs. I identified Abt. I told the committee that Abt's wife, Jessica Smith, was editor of the Moscow-financed, Communist propaganda magazine, Soviet Russia Today. Mrs. Abt had been the wife of Harold Ware, who organized the original Communist cell in the Government, and Abt's sister, Marion Bachrach, was in charge of public relations for the Communist Party, and is now under indictment for violation of the Smith Act.

I pleaded with the Anderson committee to tell me by what authority it presumed to order and the names of our contributors, since it was authorized only to investigate political expenditures; and we had never engaged in politics, as such. The record will show that Chairman Anderson tried to evade the question, and then bluntly refused to make an answer. Under the circumstances, I said, I could not betray the names of good Americans to the Communists. Furthermore, I charged that subversive outsiders were manipulating and meddling in the affairs of the committee, and I told the committee that I could not cooperate in what I said was an attempt to use the Congress to further the conspiracy to Sovietize America.

It was understandable that the committee could not believe my charges—at the time, before there had been any spy ring exposés, they seemed too incredible. So I was cited, indicted, convicted, and sentenced to jail for contempt of Congress. And in my recent trial the prosecutor attempted to prejudice the court against me by calling the court's attention to this prior conviction. The prosecutor did not, however, apprise the court of the following facts with which he was familiar and which your office can easily verify.

On April 21, 1948, a member of the Anderson committee, the late Representative Ralph Church, in a speech on the floor of the House, not only substantiated the truth of my charges, but added to them. He also introduced a resolution to rescind the citation for contempt voted against me, on the ground that the citation was not the legal act of the committee.

In his speech Mr. Church declared that he sponsored the rescinding resolution in an attempt to rectify * * * an injustice which resulted from the fact that outsiders managed somehow to inject themselves into the affairs of the so-called Anderson Committee on Campaign Expenditures, of which I was a member.

Congressman Church told how false information had been planted with the committee, how important testimony had been deleted from the printed record without the knowledge of the members of the committee, and how documents had been removed from the committee's files.

(It is significant that during my recent trial the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in response to a subpena, reported that he was unable to find in the files of the Buchanan committee any of the memoranda called for and which the court had ruled was pertinent to my defense. The Clerk also disclosed that the transcript of the minutes of the executive meetings of the Buchanan committee were also missing from the files.)

In his speech Mr. Church told the House of Representatives that the documents missing from the Anderson committee files had been taken by one James H. Sheldon, whom he accused of having manipulated the Anderson committee for subversive purposes. He named Sheldon as an organizer for the American League Against War and Fascism, "the largest and most active of the Communist movements which was identified as a subversive Communist front by the Department of Justice." He said also that Sheldon was a "front" for the "International Labor Defense, which was branded as the legal arm of the Communist Party by former Attorney General Biddle."

FBI files on "Prof." or "Dr." Sheldon will, no doubt, show also that Sheldon attended an international Communist conference behind the iron curtain in 1948, that his organization, the so-called Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League To Champion Human Rights, had been financed, at the time of the Anderson committee hearings, by a wealthy alien refugee, and that Sheldon and his organization acted as fronts for the Communist-aiding Antidefamation League.

A memorandum in the files of your Washington office will disclose that, following my conviction in this previous case, this same James H. Sheldon volunteered to supply your office with a complete report on me and my activities, and that the offer was turned down after the Department of Justice had advised the chief probation officer that Sheldon represented a "pinkish" organization and that if his report was accepted he might claim that he had something to do with putting Joe Kamp in jail.

It would appear from this that the Department of Justice was well informed about Sheldon, about his organization, and about his methods. The Justice Department knew, also, that Sheldon did have something to do with the Communist-inspired frame-up which resulted in my indictment and conviction, and which it pressed in spite of this guilty knowledge.

However, the Justice Department's belated precaution did not stop Sheldon from boasting about his being responsible for putting me in jail. On October 20, 1950, Sheldon sent a begging letter to his sucker list in which he wrote:

"Whenever the league has had the money necessary to carry through its investigation to the point of securing public exposes and court action, we have succeeded. With your help we will be able to deal with these merchants of evil in the same effective way that we dealt with Joseph P. Kamp, now serving a sentence in prison."

Sheldon was not alone in claiming credit for my incarceration. Walter Winchell, who, before it became popular to be anti-Communist, financed and distributed Communist propaganda, and who, even now, acts as a mouthpiece for the Communist-aiding Anti-Defamation League, told his radio audience that he had been working for 10 years to put me in jail, and that at last, he had succeeded.

Only a few months ago Rex Stout, a former editor and part owner of the Communist weekly, New Masses, and now head of the so-called Friends of Democracy, a front for the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, told an audience in Ridgewood, N. J., that he and his organization were responsible for putting me in jail.

All three of them—Sheldon, Winchell, and Stout—were telling the truth, because they are all part and parcel of the same despicable, un-American conspiracy through which the Communist forces have been able to create, influence, infiltrate, and manipulate congressional committees for their own stealthy, subversive purposes—in my case, to destroy effective opposition to communism.

It is significant that these same three individuals and all of these same previously mentioned subversive elements were once again involved in the scheme to use the Buchanan committee in another attempt to secure the names of our good American supporters. There was no demand for these names by Congress. Chairman Buchanan was acting in secret, without the knowledge or authority of his own committee, as was clearly demonstrated and admitted by the prosecution at my trial. Chairman Buchanan may have been an innocent dupe; but he was acting, not for the Congress, but on behalf, and as part, of the Communist-aiding conspiracy which is being detailed in this letter.

In view of these circumstances, it should be of serious interest to all good Americans, and especially to an investigative agency of an administration which professes to be against communism, that * * * was the head of a Red organization founded by Communist spy ring leader John Abt and the confessed Communist, Lee Pressman, an organization branded by the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities as a "cover up" for the Communist Party conducting a campaign to destroy the American system of government.

It is of added moment that among the organizations openly affiliated with Mr. Buchanan's unit were the Communist-aiding B'nai B'rith, the International Workers Order, cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General, and recently disbanded by the State of New York because of its Communist identity, the Young Communist League of West Pennsylvania, and five local units of the Communist Party.

Furthermore, Mr. Buchanan owed his election to Congress to four leading Communists in his district, two of whom have since been indicted for refusing to tell the Committee on Un-American Activities if they are, or were, Communists. And the Communist newspaper, the Daily Worker, endorsed "Frank Buchanan, who has a good record, particularly in the fight against the Un-American Activities Committee."

So that you may more easily check with the FBI, as to the truth of my charges, the four Communists, referred to above as having been mainly responsible for the selection of Frank Buchanan as a candidate for Congress, are T. J. Fitzpatrick, Frank Panzio, Joseph Godfrey, and Albert Smith. And the meeting of the provisional section committee of the Communist Party at which his candidacy was initiated was held at Croation Hall, McKeesport, Pa., on November 15, 1946.

It may or may not be a coincidence that two former aides of the Communists' candidates for President and Vice President in the last election were the most important members of the Buchanan committee's staff. Lucien Hilmer, staff director, was an employee of Henry A. Wallace, and Jerome Spingarn, in charge of research, was in the office of Senator Glen H. Taylor. Hilmer had also been the attorney for George Shaw Wheeler, the American traitor who, just last year, denounced the United States, and then fled behind the iron curtain.

It is not a coincidence, however, that Louis Little was named a committee's counsel for the sole purpose of investigating the patriotic organizations the Communists have long been determined to destroy. Little had been the attorney for America's leading Communist propagandist, John L. Spivak, a protege of Walter Winchell.

In response to the public invitation by Chairman Buchanan, published in the New

York Times, in which he said that the Buchanan committee was holding its public hearing to give the representatives of these patriotic organizations an opportunity "to answer why they refused to give our investigators information concerning their financial angels," I prepared and offered a statement explaining our position, but Chairman Buchanan refused to hear me.

Two days later, however, Congressman CLARE E HOFFMAN, of Michigan, presented my statement to the House of Representatives; and it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 8, 1950 Among other things it calls attention to the fact that the Communist-aiding Antidefamation League had its agent on the Buchanan committee staff. I told the Buchanan committee:

"He is your chief counsel, Louis Little. He is a member of B'nai B'rith, which in itself is a reputable fraternal organization to which many good Americans of the Jewish faith belong, but, like the labor unions and the Government, the B'nai B'rith has been infiltrated by Communist agents. They are in control of its committee, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, which does the dirty work for the Communists Aside from its pro-Communist complexion, the Anti-Defamation League is a vile racket which promotes hate, breeds intolerance, and maintains its own sinister gestapo spy network Respectable Jews are ashamed of it. Alert Americans of the Jewish faith bitterly denounce it

"It is headed by New York Supreme Court Justice Meier Steinbrink, and has other reputable window dressing, but it is made up largely of thieves, spies, racketeers, and character assassins * * *

"Two months ago the B'nai B'rith, of which your chief counsel is a member, was given an editorial dressing down by the Jewish Daily Forward for the pro-communism and libels against America which appeared in its monthly magazine

"Three months ago the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith issued its annual report in the form of a smear book which made violent and vicious false attacks against the leading movements fighting communism in the United States The book, A Measure of Freedom, was 'plugged' day after day by Walter Winchell

"The author of the book and the chief director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith is a man who calls himself Arnold Forster.

"If you can get President Truman to let you look at the FBI files, you will discover that Forster's right name is Fastenberg, and that he was a member of the Communist spy ring "

Your office, unlike Congress, does not have to ask President Truman's permission to get FBI's information on Arnold Forster FBI reports are available to you for the purpose of advising the court in matters pertaining to cases within the court's jurisdiction.

Because it was of no direct concern to the Buchanan committee I did not call attention, in my statement, to the fact that letters and documents stolen from my files were quoted in Forster's report It is of interest in this matter, however, because during my recent trial an attempt was made to introduce in evidence photostats of other letters and documents (one of which had been forged), which the prosecution's witness brazenly declared he knew had been stolen from my files. (The prosecutor's witness, Benedict F. Fitzgerald, Jr., who had been counsel to the Buchanan committee, had received his appointment through the good offices of * * *.) Although the court excluded the photostats of the stolen documents, the incident is of significance, because of their obvious source, and the attempt to use them in furtherance of the Communist conspiracy indicated herein.

In my statement I also told the Buchanan committee how the information secured by its investigators was being used in an attempt to destroy or interfere with the efforts of patriotic organizations by killing off their financial support. I charged that the Friends of Democracy was already boasting that it had the names of contributors to organizations which the Buchanan committee was then investigating. I cited a confidential memorandum sent by the Friends of Democracy to its principal supporters. I told the committee:

"This memorandum was sent out after your investigators had started going through the files of at least two of the organizations named It is significant to me that this miscalled Friends of Democracy was able to boast to its supporters that a list of such contributors has been obtained and Friends of Democracy is in the midst of a project of approaching these contributors * * * Letters are being sent to the boards of directors of the corporations * * * Some of the meetings of the boards of directors of these big corporations have already been attended * * * when this project is completed, Friends of Democracy is certain that 70 to 75 percent of the support of these subversive groups will be eliminated "

"Note that word 'subversive,' which this outfit is applying to reputable patriotic and business organizations which only endeavor to uphold, defend, and protect the American way of life—organizations such as the Constitutional Educational League, the Freedoms Foundation, the National Industrial Conference Board, the Committee for Constitutional Government, America's Future, Constitution and Free Enterprise Foundation, the Foundation for Economic Education, and the National Association of Manufacturers "

Lest there be any question as to the kind of "subversive" organizations the Friends of Democracy was determined to put out of business, let me recall, as an example, that the chief sponsor of Freedoms Foundation is Gen Dwight B Eisenhower

As for Friends of Democracy, I have already identified its president as a former editor and part owner of the Communist weekly, New Masses An even better idea of its Communist complexion can be had by observing that 17 members of its national committee have a total of 191 Communist-front citations in the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities, including 54 affiliations with organizations designated as "subversive and Communist" by the Attorney General

There is one other development which, while it may be a matter solely for the consideration of the court, is nevertheless pertinent to the subject of this letter, as a further indication of the lengths to which the subversive elements will go in order to achieve their dishonorable and disloyal ends. During the 4 days of my trial the prosecutor and the prosecutor's witness were in constant consultation, right in the courtroom, with the attorney for, and director of the Washington office, of the Anti-Defamation League.

It may be perfectly proper for the Government prosecutor, William Hitz, to accept the advice and counsel of more competent legal talent; but it is noteworthy that the attorney in this instance, one, Herman Edelsberg, was a member of the National Lawyers Guild, a Communist-front cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as "the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions," and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

Before his appointment as the Washington director of the Anti-Defamation League, Herman Edelsberg was thrown out as counsel of the United Gas, Coke and Chemical Workers, CIO, because of his Communist connections His wife, incidentally, was a member of the Washington Book Shop, cited as "subversive and Communist" by the Attorney General.

At the beginning of my trial a member of the jury panel, one Hyman Goldblatt, admitted membership in B'nai B'rith, and characterized the Anti-Defamation League as "our organization." As a result he was stricken from the jury. But he remained in the courtroom during the entire trial, conferred constantly with Herman Edelsberg and was seen talking with five different members of my jury at various times during the trial. Whether he said anything that may have influenced the jury against me may never be known

This circumstance, however, is one which fits into the pattern of what can happen when an honest citizen dares champion an unpopular cause—such as defending the United States of America from its enemies within

In the light of all the foregoing facts, which are only a small part of what I could set forth, your question, regardless of how it is phrased, amounts to just this: If given the opportunity (and in order to escape a prison sentence) would I be willing to surrender to this Communist conspiracy, and deliver to these enemies of our country the names of its courageous supporters and defenders so that they may be harassed, reviled, and persecuted?

My answer is an emphatic "No"

Not if I spend the rest of my life in jail.

You asked me another question If given the opportunity, would I accept probation, instead of a jail sentence?

I was faced with that question once before when these same Communist conspirators, and their dupes and stooges, brought about my first conviction for contempt of Congress The court, the prosecutor, the chief Probation Officer and my own attorney tried to prevail upon me to accept probation in order to keep from going to jail.

At that time I told the court: "If Your Honor please, I hesitate to accept probation because it would imply that I have not been a good citizen, that I had done something wrong, that I need to be rehabilitated Despite the verdict, I have done nothing wrong. I have always been a good citizen, and I will always continue to be a good citizen. A period of probation could not make me anything more, nor anything less than a good citizen "

I said, also: "The court could better understand my attitude if it were aware of all the facts in this case. All the facts have not been before this court. However, I would like to have the court know that this whole proceeding had its inception with the head of the Communist spy ring."

I suppose that the court thought that my remark about the head of the Communist spy ring having been responsible for the developments which resulted in my conviction must have been a figment of my imagination So I was sentenced to, and served, 4 months in jail.

My attitude on probation has not changed.

This time, however, there is no need for the court to be under any misapprehension as to the truth, because I am giving you the facts herein, facts which can easily be substantiated (or disproved) by the FBI And it is your duty to advise the court in the circumstances

I submit, in answer to your question, that, if the charges I have made are true, then, in spite of any jury verdict, and regardless of any other legal consideration, it would be against public policy to put a citizen in jail for having done his patriotic duty to his country. It would be doing in America what our hated enemies, the Communists, are doing and have done behind the iron curtain, to good Americans like Robert Voegler and Bill Oatis.

Furthermore, it would put the stamp of judicial approval on the control and manipulation of congressional committees, by outside elements, for subversive purposes.

I am positive that the court will not condone a Communist frame-up, and will not permit the Communist to use the judiciary, as they have used the Congress, for their own treasonable ends.

I am certain that when the court is advised by your office, on the basis of FBI verification, that everything I have said herein is true, the verdict will be set aside, and the false charges against me will be dismissed.

I expect justice—in the American tradition.

I am not, and could not be, guilty of contempt of Congress. No one has more respect for the Constitution of the United States and American institutions, including the Congress, than have I. My entire adult life has been devoted solely to defending and maintaining constitutional government, and to combating all those un-American forces which threaten to overthrow it.

It is only because I have been so vigorous in my opposition to those who would destroy our Government and its institutions that I am being victimized by the Communist, pro-Communist, and Communist-aiding conspirators enumerated herein.

I should add that, if what I have set forth in this letter is not true, then I do not deserve probation, or any other consideration.

In order to emphasize the truth of my every statement, and because I want what I have said to be accepted in the full sense of my complete responsibility for the same, I am submitting the foregoing under oath.

JOSEPH P KAMP,

P. S.—I am taking the liberty of sending copies of this letter to the court, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, Chairman John W. Wood, of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and * * *, chairman of the Senate Internal Security Committee.

The foregoing statement by Joseph Kamp was, as is indicated, given to Morris Kuznesof, United States probation officer in the New York district, on August 16, 1951.

Whether it played any part in the setting aside of the verdict rendered against Joseph Kamp, I have no knowledge.

Of one thing we may be certain, and that is, that, over the years, there has been a persistent, determined effort to silence Joseph Kamp to end his fight against Communists and their supporters—an effort carried on by individuals and groups financially and politically powerful, which, over the radio and through the press, are given or purchase publicity. The American press has all too long "been asleep at the switch," left to individuals and organizations—many of them without funds—the task of protecting freedom of the press, freedom of speech.

Joseph Kamp, in his fight in behalf of a free press and free speech, has served one term in jail because he refused to give to a House committee the information sought by John Abt, a Communist, and which I, for one, think the committee had no power to request. Unless Congress takes action, or the jury which again tries him for the refusal to divulge this information to the Buchanan committee, renders a verdict of not guilty on the pending charge of contempt of Congress, Kamp will again go to jail. Apparently, he is willing to suffer imprisonment again, as he did before, in behalf of his cause. But that is no reason why the Congress should continue to permit the use of its name and authority to continue the persecution.

While those who would overthrow this Government by force, while those who would support the Communists in that attempt, may not be able to silence Kamp, the fact that he has served, that he may again serve, a term in jail, that he has been subjected to persecution and unfair treatment through the use of Government authority, may silence others, certainly will limit, if it does not stop, the effort to maintain constitutional Government here in America.

MEN ARE FIGHTING AND DYING IN KOREA, OTHERS STRIKING AND SHIRKING AT HOME

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, while our men are fighting and dying in Korea, others here at home are striking and loafing. Several hundred thousand young men, who enlisted or were conscripted to serve their own country, have been sent by Truman, at the instigation of United Nations, to fight, and some of them to die, in Korea.

Thousands of others, many of them hungry and without sufficient clothing, are prisoners of war held by the Communists.

In less than 20 days there were 2,000 casualties in Korea To date we have had more than 80,000 casualties.

Mr. Acheson and Mr. Truman, both of whom are responsible for this war, will neither take our men out of Korea, nor permit them there to fight to win that war.

Here on the home front men and women, some of whom have their own flesh and blood in Korea, are, through slowdowns, work stoppages, and strikes, impairing the ability of those who are fighting this war to successfully defend themselves or to win a quick victory.

Scarcely a day goes by that the press does not announce that, somewhere in the United States, men are on strike in industries engaged in supplying either the food, the clothing, the weapons, the ammunition, the munitions of war, which are needed on the battle front by our fighting men.

What are we thinking of when we conscript men for the defense of our country, then send them, at the request, not of our people, not of the Congress, but of an international organization, U. N., to fight in a war, the real purpose of which neither they nor we have ever been told?

What is in the minds of those who, knowing that these men are fighting and dying, yet go on strike and deprive them of the things which are necessary for their own protection, which they must have if the war is to be won? Of what is Mr. Average American Citizen thinking when he permits that to happen, to continue day after day and month after month?

A multitude of illustrations could be given.

Let me, at the moment, call your attention to just one. At Kalamazoo, Mich., Ingersoll products division of Borg-Warner Corp. is engaged in the production of amphibious landing vehicles for the Navy.

The employees of that company are out on strike. That strike has stopped the production of landing vehicles which are needed by the Navy and which, if produced and used, might save the lives of our men, some of whom, fighting in Korea, may be residents of the city of Kalamazoo—not long ago, one mail brought the information that five young men of the Fourth Congressional District had been killed in Korea.

Do those employees of Ingersoll, who are on strike, ever stop to think that it may be that in Korea a Kalamazoo boy lies wounded, in need of medical attention, perhaps dying, and that one of the landing craft which might have been turned out at Ingersoll—but which was not—might have, had it been produced and been used by the Navy, lessened his suffering, saved his life, by carrying him from shore to a hospital ship for treatment?

I have no complaint with those who, in ordinary times, with or without reason, quit their jobs and go on strike. That is their right as American citizens. No man can be forced to work against his will, though sometimes hunger, the desire for clothing and shelter, or one's ambition, will cause a man to labor, even though he does not receive adequate compensation for his effort.

However, in time of war, when a young man is conscripted from his home, from school or college, from his sweetheart, his wife, his children, and sent abroad to fight in behalf of some other nation, it is my contention that it is not only the moral but the legal obligation of every one of us who remains here at home to do his utmost to support that young man wherever he may be sent, whatever he may be doing.

If this war, with its ever-mounting list of casualties continues, as it apparently will if the politicians here and abroad have their way, there may come a time when this Government will direct men, and perhaps women, not only to serve in the armed services but to serve in industries.

THOSE WHO OBSTRUCT THE WAR EFFORT

If slowdowns, work stoppages, and strikes continue to increase, it may be that the people will insist that workers be drafted. On the other hand, it is possible that the "little dictators" in Washington, who have shoved through the draft for the armed services, confident of their power, may force through legislation to draft agricultural and industrial workers.

Any man or group, given a little power, always strives for greater authority. The administration has already been given too great arbitrary power. Those in its favor today may be its victims tomorrow.

But, to get back to the strike in Kalamazoo, Mich., this strike, if my information is correct, is not because of a desire for improved working conditions or higher wages. The sole purpose of the strike is to force Ingersoll to agree that Borg-Warner Corp., wherever they may be located, whatever they may be

producing, shall agree that Borg-Warner Corp.—the parent corporation—shall bargain with the top international union

This strike was called and is carried on in an effort to prevent Ingersoll bargaining and settling any controversy which might arise with local 447.

It was called and carried on to force the local Borg-Warner Corp.—that is, Ingersoll—to accept any agreement made between the corporation and the international.

The international union closed this factory and carried on this strike and prevented the production of amphibious landing craft in an effort to deprive the Kalamazoo employees of Ingersoll of the right to bargain and settle with Ingersoll any grievances which they might have against that company.

The International UAW-CIO attempted, it attempts in other places, to deprive the local workers of the opportunity of the right to talk and bargain with the employer at the local level.

There are some places in Michigan where the international would not succeed in that program One place is in Berrien County. There a courageous sheriff, Erwin Kubath, and an aggressive, able prosecutor, Joseph Killian, have enforced the law, and they demonstrated by their actions, which did not bring, but prevented bloodshed, in local strikes, that the law applies to members of unions just as it does to other citizens.

There a union leader was convicted when he willfully, maliciously, turned over an automobile, causing damage of more than $100. He was convicted by a jury. His conviction was affirmed by the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan He was sent to jail. But Governor Williams, the "great humanitarian," pardoned him and thus notified the people of Michigan that he, Governor Williams, would not—in this case at least—permit the sentence of the court to be carried out if the man convicted belonged to a labor union.

Perhaps Governor Williams thinks that by that pardon he will gain political support. But every honest, decent, law-abiding citizen is disgusted by such an arbitrary use of the pardoning power.

Perhaps the UAW-CIO international in calling this strike in Kalamazoo has in mind the Shakespeare strike where, because of lack of law enforcement by the chief of police and the sheriff, citizens were beaten, a truck was burned, property was destroyed, and many of those who committed those offenses, who violated the law, went unpunished.

It may be the UAW-CIO thinks, because of its previous experience, it can "get away" with violence and rioting in Kalamazoo.

Perhaps this international has in mind the action of Judge Pugsley who, after some of those who violated the law were convicted, when brought to court were let off with what, from a practical standpoint, were nominal fines or no fines at all.

What the city and county of Kalamazoo needs is a good stiff dose of law enforcement, a dose of "equality under law."

There is no reason why, again from the eastern side of the State, should come the goon squads of the UAW-CIO, take possession of the city's streets, defy the law-enforcing officers, and, by force and violence, slow down or prohibit the manufacture of amphibious landing vehicles needed by the Navy to protect and assist the citizens of Kalamazoo as well as men from other communities throughout the Nation who are fighting in Korea.

Let the law-enforcing officers, backed by public opinion and the press of the city—as the press has to date—enforce the law. Let the judges impose adequate punishment, and then if Governor Williams wants to pardon the convicted men, upon his shoulders will rest the disgrace and responsibility.

If men are to be conscripted and sent to fight in Korea, some of them to die, the least we here at home can do is to abide by the law. Why send men to fight and die to establish international law if we have no law enforcement which here will protect our own citizens?

THE EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

Mr McCORMACK. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 hour and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection

Mr. McCORMACK Mr. Speaker, the Eighty-second Congress will go down in history as that which, more than any legislative body ever assembled, shaped the destinies and kindled the hopes of human beings the world over.

I arise to review the courageous and magnificent record of the first session of this Congress, now drawing to an end, and to say I am proud, with each of you, that we have met, with prayer and with firm determination in action, the threat against human freedom.

This Congress has thrown the might of the greatest nation on earth in defense of freedom in the global struggle against the slavery of communism.

The Eighty-first Congress, with foresight and fearlessness, committed us to world leadership in this struggle The Eighty-second Congress has implemented this solemn purpose by marshaling the Nation's men and resources It has put a chill into the men of the Kremlin, and has fired with renewed faith the hearts of free men the world over.

We have armed the free world—with spiritual force, economic vitality, and with military strength.

There has never been anything like it in all history.

We have spread the defenses of freedom from the top to the bottom of the earth, and all around it We have appropriated billions for atom bombs, for planes and other weapons. We have built a fighting power. We have let free men know that we will fight with them on their own soil, to preserve their liberties along with ours.

Mr. Speaker, our whole effort, all our striving, is for peace. We seek to preserve peace through strength. It is the way. We will not appease a dictator; we will not compromise freedom.

It is an astounding thing, what we have done, and how the people have accepted the sacrifices, to defend freedom. The old isolationism has all but vanished.

Both the Congress and the country have responded with confidence and courage to the challenges of a shrunken world in a jet-propelled, atomic era.

Who then would but cheer this work of the Eighty-second Congress, that now is only 10 months old? Who would say that we should have acted differently? And who would say that we have not put first things first? Who is here to suggest that we change what has been done in accomplishing our major purposes; the defense of freedom.

Of course, the imperialistic designs of communism caused an abrupt change in the whole concept of legislative programing. The work of the Eighty-second Congress cannot be compared with any previous Congress in which the survival of freedom was not then a pressing problem.

We have had to put aside temporarily some legislation of merit, while we shaped the answer to the one great problem before us. When a just peace for all people has been won, and world stability achieved we can turn again to the pursuits of peace

We have had to find a way to provide armaments without wrecking our economy at home—for a crippling of the greatest production system in the world would bring as much joy to communism as a victory in battle.

We have had to proceed carefully. We have had to be sure. The challenge of these days does not permit second-guessing.

The criticism we hear most is that this Congress has been slow and reluctant. I say to you that this is high commendation of the Congress. For the problems are so grave, and the risks so great, we would be foolish to rush into any action without time to gather all the facts and study and meditate upon them. And of course, we have been reluctant to appropriate billions of the people's money and levy new taxes and put new controls on our economy, without first being sure that our own safety as a Nation requires it.

We have had to do the job of a wartime Congress without the unifying impetus of an all-out war.

The careful considerations by the Congress canot be twisted to appear as uncertainty and "do nothing," which impression some Republicans, in and out of Congress, have tried to create. Any effort to do so will fall flat in the face of facts.

The impatience of many serious people, wanting America to act swiftly in its new role of world leadership, is a wholesome thing. We are grateful to these people. They get things done.

Our work cannot be judged alone by the number of bills passed, but what is in the bills we pass. We are getting the job done in the democratic way. The Eighty-second Congress will complete its program designed to protect America's liberties and to help free peoples stay free.

In the light of broad historical perspective the trend of great events is seen as a clear pattern which, when viewed close at hand, is not always discernible.

So it is, too, with the actions of the Congress.

I sometimes regret that the day-to-day reports of our work overemphasize the controversial and thus tend to distort and to confuse, in the minds of the people, the actual and ultimate product of our deliberations. That is the way, however, of our free and democratic processes. For my own part, I would not want to sacrifice one iota of our freedoms of discussion and of the press.

But the only true gage by which to determine how well we have performed our task is to measure what has been done against what needed to be done.

When we convened on January 3, we faced the momentous task not only of supplying our Armed Forces with the immediate means and manpower to fight in Korea but also of providing for the long-range build-up of our military power and of our industrial production to reach a peak 2 years hence.

We faced the obligation of aiding our allies of the free world both militarily and economically to assure their readiness to meet any thrust by an enemy anywhere in Europe or in Asia.

We faced the responsibility, moreover, of maintaining the stability of our economy to support the program abroad while at the same time meeting normal requirements of our civilian population at home. We had to protect the interests of working people and the programs of vast benefit to our farmers.

We had to perform, in addition, the regular essential housekeeping duties of the Congress, such as raising revenue, providing appropriations, and enacting much other needed legislation on the domestic and international fronts.

It was our job, in short, to make this Nation and its allies so strong as to deter an attack by any would-be aggressor. It was our job to wage peace by making ourselves strong enough to deter attack, and in such event to defeat the aggressor.

The Eighty-second Congress can boast that it has provided—short of all-out war—for the greatest mobilization of America's economic, military, and manpower resources in our history.

We have likewise provided a program for cementing our relations with friendly nations all over the globe into a mutual-security alliance designed for the protection of each against military aggression.

We have made possible the conversion of our industrial system to defense purposes while still maintaining the output of civilian consumer goods. Guns, planes, tanks, ammunition, and other equipment are rolling off the assembly lines in greater number each day. Our mines, mills, factories, and shops have been put in a position to produce those military items at speeds and in quantities, should it be necessary, that will dwarf the miracles of production wrought in World War II.

All the genius of our technical know-how, our engineering and mechanical skills and craftsmanship, and the business and managerial ingenuity of our free enterprise system have been mustered in this supreme effort to convince the masters of the Kremlin that an assault upon the aroused free world can be, for them, only useless, tragic, and an invitation to ultimate defeat.

This gigantic program under the Defense Production Act is superimposed upon the national economy's normal functions of supplying the requirements of the civilian population. Controls have been necessarily imposed. They serve the dual purpose of allocating materials between the military and civilian output and combating the inflationary pressures resulting from huge governmental expenditures.

Large military establishments are inherently distasteful to Americans. As a democratic and peace-loving people, we have a traditional aversion to big standing armies. But these considerations have yielded to the natural instinct of self-preservation in recognition to the danger to our institutions from the international Communist conspiracy.

We have provided for more naval vessels, including the construction of atomic submarines, more ships for our merchant fleet, the construction of a network of air bases around the world and the expansion of existing facilities and installations of the various branches of armed services. We have authorized vital programs of research contributing to the perfection of amazing new weapons.

Should the Communist dictatorship now execute its plot for world domination by seeking to further extend and impose its totalitarian will upon the people of free nations, it will find us prepared—by the programs authorized and financed by this Congress.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that when the American people evaluate the record and measure the achievements of this Congress on the basis of how well it did the job that world conditions placed in its hands, they will approve and commend.

At no other time since the founding of the Republic have the hopes, the aspirations, the destinies of so many millions of people been so fully and significantly linked with the actions of an American Congress. And no other Congress has more fully measured up to its responsibility.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think it my duty here to set down a summary of the will and the work of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, for future generations to see the problems we faced and how we dealt with them.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The Mutual Security Act of 1951 is the outstanding accomplishment of the Eighty-second Congress to date in the field of international affairs. It signalizes the opening of a new phase in the effort of the free world to discourage Communist aggression. It marks a turning point in our campaign for peace.

Not so long ago, a war-shattered Western Europe lay supine and helpless, its mines and factories of the Saar and the Ruhr a beckoning, tempting prize for aggrandizement by the Soviet war machine. The Communist efforts to encompass within its orbit this helpless half a continent, with all its potential material wealth and technical skills, was thwarted when we gave aid to Greece against the Red guerrillas, to Turkey in its stand against encroachment of the Dardanelles, to Italy and France when internal subversion threatened, to Berlin when our airlift beat the blockade. And, finally, the Marshall plan miraculously accomplished in 3 years—a year ahead of schedule—the economic rehabilitation and recovery of Europe.

NEW EMPHASIS

Now, restored to stability, both materially and spiritually, these nations are in position to contribute to the common defense without endangering the standard of living of their populations.

Under our new program of foreign aid, the natural successor to the Marshall plan, we will send them arms and equipment for their troops. This is the military feature of this program. We will furnish them the materials and machinery needed to produce defense material themselves. This is the economic aid.

The Mutual Security Act thus not only signifies the intent of the United States itself to participate in the joint arrangement but provides help to those who are helping themselves. As President Truman pointed out in signing this measure: "Their contributions are as important as our own. We must never forget that we are just as dependent on the efforts of other nations as they are on ours."

The law establishes a Mutual Security Administration under the President with direct and complete supervision over various phases of the program administered by the military, the State Department, and other agencies of our Government. The total authorization is $7,483,400,000. On this authorization, $7,328,903,976 was promptly appropriated.

ARMY OF FREEDOM

Of the total expenditure authorized, almost $6,000,000,000 is for weapons and other equipment for the growing army of freedom under General Eisenhower in Europe, the embattled small nations in Asia and the Pacific, and our allies in the Near East, Africa, and the American Republics. The remainder is for economic assistance to countries in the different geographic areas. This assistance includes technical and material aid to strengthen the economic foundations and develop the resources of underdeveloped nations whose weakness might otherwise make them likely victims of an aggressor.

RECIPROCAL TRADE

Proving our desire for peace, one of our first acts was to renew for another 2 years the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, as a treaty of commerce and friendship for all nations that respect freedom and want to be friends. It has been demonstrated time and again that when commerce does not freely cross national boundaries, armies, in time, will cross them.

Enactment of this measure was a renewed token of the peaceful intent of the United States, of our desire to encourage the flow and exchange of goods by negotiations with like-minded countries for the removal of trade barriers.

This was the seventh time that the Congress has expressed its faith in prin-

ciples which have become the cornerstone of our foreign economic policy and which were inaugurated under a Democratic administration in 1934.

Our action emphasized again our abandonment of the theory of economic isolationism and self-sufficiency and the substitution therefor of the practice of buying as widely as possible from others if we are to sell our own goods abroad. We have long since learned the lesson that international trade is a two-way street, equally as beneficial to both participants, and that a great excess of exports over imports is not, in the long run, a favorable balance of trade either for ourselves or for the rest of the world.

The new act, while it contains safeguards to avert damage to the interests of domestic industry and agriculture, also includes Republican-sponsored restrictions similar to those enacted by the GOP Eightieth Congress. Fortunately, these cannot hamper the program to the same degree, since no general tariff and trade conference will take place before this law comes up for renewal in the next Congress.

Under provisions of this law, the benefits of concessions are denied to the products of the United Soviet Socialist Republics and its satellites.

NO GUNS FOR COMMUNISTS

Another act of this Congress is designed to shut off the flow of war materials into the countries behind the iron curtain. It imposes a ban on the export of military items to Communist-controlled nations from the United States and provides for restrictions on American aid to other countries making such exports The effect of this important legislation is to close the cracks through which material which might later be used against the free nations has been seeping into Communist hands, whether in Europe, or China or elsewhere in the world.

At the same time, we extended the authority of the President to control exports thus putting our Government in a position to regulate the flow abroad of items most essential to the needs of our allies in exchange for critical and strategic materials to enhance our own stockpiles for defense requirements.

In line with this policy are the laws to suspend taxes and import duties on scrap metal to June 30, 1952, and on copper to February 15, 1953, or the end of the national emergency.

AID FOR INDIA

In keeping with the best traditions and the highest ideals of our country, the Eighty-second Congress responded to the appeal of India for aid to feed the hungry millions of that famine-stricken land. We authorized the Government to send up to 2,000,000 tons of food grains to that country during 1951. The $190,000,000 emergency loan authorized for this purpose is financed over a long period of years. Its liberal terms are such as not to burden India during its present critical period when it is confronted with vast problems growing out of its newly won independence, and a series of natural catastrophes from floods, earthquakes, and droughts.

GERMAN WAR ENDS

An era in history ended when this Congress passed a joint resolution officially terminating a state of war with Germany.

Although no peace treaty with Germany has yet been signed, this action by the Congress clears the way for that country to resume normal relations with us, to regenerate itself, and to resume its place among the society of nations.

It was a coincident commentary upon the suffering and long-felt wrongs wrought by the Nazi regime that at this session we also passed a law extending for 6 months, to December 31, 1951, the period for admission of displaced persons to the United States.

GOAL IS PEACE

While taking every necessary measure for the defense and the security of this country against the threats of attack by communism, this Eighty-second Congress has made unmistakably clear the sincere hopes and the desires of our people for peace

By adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 we reaffirmed the friendship of the American people for all the people of the world, including the inhabitants of the Soviet Union

At the same time that we have sought to have these heartfelt expressions pierce behind the iron curtain to our fellow human beings imprisoned there we had no hesitancy in denouncing the police-state methods of their rulers.

This Congress, in House Concurrent Resolution 140, gave voice to public condemnation of the arrest and conviction of William N Oatis, an American newspaperman, by the Communist Government of Czechoslovakia and demanded the severance of trade relations with that country until he is freed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The legislative program for promoting our great national defense effort falls naturally into three categories: First, gearing our economy to high production; second, build-up of our military manpower and machinery; and, third, tightening our internal-security safeguards.

First. The Defense Production Act is the main instrumentality for our economic and industrial mobilization.

This Congress extended to June 30, 1952, the broad basic powers of the President to fix priorities for and to allocate defense materials and facilities, to buy raw materials, guarantee and make loans for expansion of plants engaged on defense work, and to control consumer credit, prices, wages, salaries, and rents.

Carrying out the expressed intent of the Congress that small business should share in greater proportion in the defense effort, we created the Small Defense Plants Administration.

This new independent agency, under the President, was granted powers to make contracts with the Government for subletting to small manufacturing plants, or to facilitate the channeling of contracts to them, provide technical and managerial aids, finance equipment and plants, recommend loans and perform other helpful functions.

A $50,000,000 revolving fund was authorized to finance the operations of the agency.

The amended act relaxed somewhat the curbs on installment buying of automobiles and household appliances, on home purchasers in critical defense housing areas and authorized rent increases up to 20 percent above 1947 ceilings—with intervening increases calculated against that percentage.

It is also authorized subsidies for domestically produced materials, except agricultural products, and fixed controls over imports of fats and oils, peanuts, dairy products, rice and rice products to prevent interference with markets for our own similar products.

The need for adjustment of some provisions of the price-control features of the amended act is generally recognized in the Congress. When we return for our second session, shifts in the economic situation and experience in administration of the law as it now stands may call for a number of changes.

Second. With enactment of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, the Eighty-second Congress took a historic step.

This law, which also extended selective service to July 1, 1955, established for the first time a National Security Training Corps into which—during peace or war—the youth of the country can be called for 6 months of basic training.

This departure from precedent evidenced the determination of a democracy in an era of international tension to be prepared at all times to preserve its security by the establishment of a reserve manpower pool.

The act raised to 5,000,000 the personnel ceiling on the active-duty strength of the Armed Forces until July 31, 1954, fixed the minimum draft age at 18½, the term of service at 24 months, and established other eligibility and deferment conditions.

For the maintenance of our expanded Army, Navy, and Air Force for the fiscal year 1952, this Congress has appropriated the huge sum of nearly $57,000,000,000, a record-breaking figure for any similar period when we have not been engaged in an all-out war.

We passed legislation authorizing, and providing, funds for a vastly expanded naval fleet through a $2,700,000,000 program of ship conversion and construction, including a 57,000-ton flush-deck aircraft carrier, equipped to handle atomic bombers.

We provided a $5,800,000,000 program of construction of new air bases and expansion of old bases, not only at home but at strategic points around the globe.

We increased the limit on expenditure of funds for building experimental-type atomic submarines and made available to the United States Maritime Board reserve funds for construction that will expand our merchant fleet.

We have increased from $10,000,000 to $45,000,000 the authorization for construction of access roads certified as essential to national defense.

Other bills, in the mill and on the way toward final passage, will facilitate vital research and development work on guided missiles and other new weapons, and reorganize on a basis of equality all of the Reserve components of the armed services.

Third. In the interest of vigilantly guarding our Government from subversive influences, this Congress has provided ample funds for both the House Un-American Activities Committee and an Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

To facilitate action against secret agents who may have infiltrated through use of false documents, the statute of limitations for prosecution of violations of passport and citizenship laws has been extended to 10 years.

Clarification of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, under which admission of aliens is regulated, has been enacted.

Strict Government control over electromagnetic radiation in time of war or national emergency has been authorized.

Pending for final action is a measure authorizing purchase by the Federal Communications Commission of additional sites for radio monitoring stations. The House has passed bills authorizing construction of a $1,500,000 geomagnetic station and to permit withholding of certain patents whose publication might be detrimental to national security.

Also awaiting action by the Senate is a House-passed bill to transfer to the Department of Justice the World War II prisoner-of-war camps in order to have these facilities available should the FBI suddenly be called upon to make a wholesale round-up of Communists.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

The growth of the national economy, from depression years, has been phenominal. Business, labor and agriculture, all are enjoying unprecedented prosperity. This Congress has been and will continue to be alert to protect and promote the interests of the farmer, the worker in industry and all segments vital to our economy. It has enacted legislation beneficial to people who work in the factories and on the farms.

Moreover, we have granted pay increases to postal and other Government employees to bring their income more nearly into line with living costs.

Great programs for utilization of our great national resources through reclamation, irrigation, water power, and flood-control projects already have been authorized and are under way. This Congress has taken steps to promote these programs.

COST OF WAR

The Eighty-second Congress has enacted a new tax bill making increases in personal and corporate income taxes and in other levies to provide additional revenues of $5,691,000,000.

In spite of the fact that voting for taxes is supposed to be politically unpopular, the majority of the Members of Congress realized the utmost necessity for this action, faced up to the responsibilities of the situation, and are to be commended for their courage.

This Nation has never been richer, its wealth is still expanding, industry and the individual are prosperous, and we are enjoying the highest standard of living even in this period of a changeover to a defense economy. If we are to keep our fiscal house in order, these new revenues are needed to put our extraordinary defense expenditures on, at least partly, a pay-as-you-go basis. Analysis of the President's budget for 1952 shows that about 83 percent of it is either for obligations incurred for past wars, for the present conflict in Korea, or for national defense.

Nevertheless, with the needs of State and local as well as Federal Governments increasingly tapping all sources of revenues, the House of Representatives has indicated the necessity for a resurvey of the whole field. It authorized the Committee on Ways and Means to make a thorough investigation and study of overlapping and duplication of taxes.

To make available to the Treasury funds for the defense effort which might otherwise be paid out and a means of aiding the fight against inflation by encouraging savings, the Congress authorized continued payments of interest on E bonds to investors who hold them beyond the maturity date.

To further bolster revenues and to assure that overpayments on defense contracts will revert to the Government, the Congress passed a Renegotiation Act for the administration of which a newly-established Board has already been appointed. It has been estimated that, possibly, $1,000,000,000 may be obtained from this source.

At the same time, by amending the Assignment of Claims Act, we gave encouragement to banks and other financial institutions to lend to contractors engaged on Government defense projects.

We have voted for increases in the postal rates that should yield approximately $117,000,000 in additional revenues and reduce the postal deficit to that extent. And further economy in the postal system will be effected by reducing the size and weight of packages carried by parcel post.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

This Nation owes no greater debt than to those who bear arms in its defense. In recognition of this obligation this first session of the Eighty-second Congress has been especially active and generous in support of measures for their benefit.

We authorized $10,000 free life insurance policies for members of the Armed Forces. We extended to those who served in Korea the hospital, medical, and housing benefits available to World War II veterans and provided for vocational rehabilitation and training for all veterans with service-connected injuries incurred after the date of the Red invasion of North Korea, June 27, 1950.

We have increased to $120 monthly the pension to World War veterans needing a full-time attendant, even though their disabilities are not service-connected. We have authorized the Veterans' Administration to pay $1,600 toward purchase of automobiles for blinded or amputee veterans, or give them the equivalent in cash.

In addition, the Congress voted permission for veterans of both World Wars to renew their term insurance and permit the use of dividends to pay premiums on national service life-insurance policies.

The pensions for veterans of the Spanish-American War have been made uniform. The period in which it may be presumed that multiple sclerosis developed by veterans is service-connected has been fixed at 3 years.

Uniformed members of the armed services have been exempted from payment of admission taxes to movies and other places where it applies; the privilege of free transportation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces abroad has been extended for 2 years, as well as the privilege of free postage for those in Korea and other specified areas.

To protect veterans buying their homes under the GI bill of rights, treble damage actions were provided against sellers who demand or accept more than the appraised price of the property.

The time limit for admission of alien spouses and minor children of citizens in the service has been extended; also the time for former prisoners of war to file claims under the War Claims Act.

The Congress enacted a law to provide distinctive lapel buttons for relatives of servicemen who have lost their lives, and has under consideration other measures for the benefit of survivors.

Passed by the House and pending in the Senate are measures to increase the monthly rates of compensation and pensions to veterans and their dependents; increasing the limit of disability payments under national life-insurance policies from $50 to $100 a month. To correct an inequality in the present law, the Congress authorized lump bonuses to members of the Army and Air Force who, prior to October 1, 1949, reenlisted for an indefinite period.

HOUSING

The Defense Housing and Community Facilities Act of 1951 is the most important piece of domestic legislation enacted by this Congress as it concentrated, necessarily, on foreign affairs and defense matter.

The effect of this $1,600,000,000 measure is to encourage construction of new homes where most needed—in defense production areas and the vicinity of military installations. The law also eased credit restrictions on low- and medium-price housing throughout the country.

The mortgage-insuring authority of the Federal Housing Administration was increased by $1,500,000,000. Funds of $10,000,000 for the purchase of housing and $15,000,000 for loans to stimulate production and distribution of prefabricated houses were provided. The Federal National Mortgage Association was authorized to make advance commitments to purchase up to $200,000,000 in mortgages in critical areas.

The emphasis in this act is upon private enterprise which is encouraged to build, but where private industry fails to meet the needs then the Government, after giving 90 days' notice, may step in and build up to $50,000,000 worth of public housing.

In addition, the act authorized creation of a fund of $60,000,000 for loans and grants for the construction and operation of such community facilities as waterworks and hospitals if these cannot be financed by any local source.

Direct housing loans to veterans were renewed under the act and the purchase of homes costing less than $12,000 was made easier for all home buyers.

Mr. Speaker, that is the record of the major work of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress. I believe that, in the years to come, every Member here can look back with great pride at his membership in this great body that is measuring up to its destiny of leadership of the free nations of the world.

ADJOURNMENT DATE OF FIRST SESSION OF EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 171) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, October 20, 1951, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY FOR THE SIGNING OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H Con. Res. 172) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table

AUTHORITY TO CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION TO SPEAKER TO MAKE CERTAIN APPOINTMENTS NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PRINTING OF REPORTS OF INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reports filed with the Clerk following the sine die adjournment by committees authorized by the House to conduct investigations, may be printed by the Clerk as reports of the Eighty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND UNTIL LAST EDITION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. McCORMACK Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege, until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extensions of remarks, but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred, or to any speech delivered, subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL TO THE CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H Res 480) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows.

Resolved, That the reports of the Comptroller General of the United States made to the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (50 Stat 597), during the recesses of Eighty-second Congress shall be printed during such recesses as House documents of the second session of the Eighty-second Congress

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table

RESPONSE TO BE MADE TO COURT SUBPENAS AND SUMMONSES

Mr. McCORMACK Mr Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 481) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That in all cases involving the failure of witnesses to appear or refusal of witnesses to answer questions before committees of the House of Representatives properly certified pursuant to the provisions of section 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended now or hereafter pending during the first session of the Eighty-second Congress in any court of the United States where subpenas duces tecum may be issued by the due process of said court and addressed to Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives or any officer or employee of the House of Representatives directing them to appear as witnesses before the said court at any time and to bring with them certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives wherein such documentary evidence is needful in any said court of the United States that Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House or any officer or employee of the House be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpenas duces tecum so issued, but shall not take with them any papers or documents on file in their office or under their control or in their possession as officers or employees of the House, and be it further

Resolved, That when any said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpenas duces tecum then any said court through any of its officers or agents have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers in possession or control of said officers or employees that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and paper by the said officers or employees shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said officers or employees; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted by the clerk to any of said courts whenever such subpenas are issued as aforesaid.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

MARINE CORPS BILL, S 677

Mr MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to call to the attention of the House the fact that on June 30, 1951, the Committee on Armed Services reported S. 677, more popularly known as the Marine Corps bill, to this House by a vote of 26 to 1. This bill would be an amendment to the National Security Act of 1947 and embodies in it, as evidenced by Report No. 666, of the House Armed Services Committee, that the United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, should consist of four full-strength combat divisions, four full-strength air wings and not less than an enlisted strength of 300,000 and not more than an enlisted strength of 400,000 during peacetime and with no limit on the strength of the corps during time of war.

Section 2 of the bill provides for another amendment to the National Security Act which would place the Commandant of the Marine Corps as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, increasing their number from four to five. The purpose of this legislation is very clearly outlined in the committee report which I commend to all of you. It is, and I quote:

First, to require the maintenance of a versatile expeditionary force in readiness, always combat ready, which will include four full-strength marine divisions, four full-strength marine air wings, and other forces organic thereto; second, to add the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the membership of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in order

to broaden the base of planning and deliberations of that body, as well as to provide the Marine Corps with needed direct representation at this level.

All of you gentlemen know that over the period of the last several years, certain of my colleagues and myself have endeavored to obtain passage of legislation which would place the Marine Corps on a firm footing so far as our National Defense Establishment is concerned. This bill has been the culmination, not of a few days, but actually the culmination of many years' work. It represents not just the views of this Speaker but the views of over seventy-some Members of the House of Representatives as evidenced by their introducing exactly the same bill that I introduced on January 24 past.

For your information this bill was also introduced by 44 Senators and, in a slightly watered-down form so far as the Commandant's position is concerned, was passed by the Senate by unanimous resolution on May 4 of this year. It should be obvious that a matter such as this, which commands the attention of more than 100 Members of the Congress of the United States in the form of legislation which they have sponsored, has not been lightly considered.

The report of the House committee is thorough and most revealing. I will give you a few excerpts from that report after I tell you the purpose of my making this speech.

I want you all to know that this legislation should be one of the first pieces of legislation brought before this House when we return after the first of the year The reasons that it has not been brought before the House as yet are several. A reading of the House committee report makes it obvious that, although the Congress of the United States wants this law and the people of the United States want this law, the Defense Department is opposed to it. Yet, my colleagues, I want you to know that not one valid reason has been brought forth in the hearings, either before the House or Senate committees, to back up this position of the Defense Department.

Now I want to quote to you one cardinal statement from the testimony of that late great admiral, Forrest Sherman, appearing at page 772 of the House report. In fairness to Admiral Sherman, I want you to know that he opposed this bill. However, a close reading of his testimony and a summing up of his testimony indicates that he was for something in the nature of this bill, even though opposed to it as drawn. The admiral stated, and I quote:

Before concluding my statement, I wish to advise the committee that I believe that there has been in recent years a very deep apprehension among the marines as to the future of their corps. It is important to me that this apprehension be alleviated. Although I do not support the features of this particular bill, I am convinced that there can be an undesirable effect on the morale of a splendid military organization if this bill fails and nothing else is substituted.

I think it is also interesting to note that portion of Admiral Sherman's testimony appearing at page 767 of the House report where the admiral states, and I quote:

In the present world situation, the Fleet Marine Force should include a reinforced division on the east coast, a reinforced division in the western Pacific, at least a brigade and possibly a division on the west coast, and a reinforced battalion in the Mediterranean, all with corresponding air units.

It is obvious that, even in the admiral's view as an opponent of this bill, the Marine Corps should consist of not less than three divisions plus one battalion additional. It is obvious that there is really little disagreement anywhere in this field except as evidenced by the testimony of Admiral Sherman, General Collins, and General Vandenberg. They have a fear that the day will come when the Marine Corps will get more of the defense dollar than they think it should have as opposed to what their services get. There is, likewise, an absolute refusal upon the part of the Department of Defense to recognize the Marine Corps in fact as to what it is in law, namely, a separate military service within the Department of the Navy.

I want to quote from one more portion of the House report, namely, a statement made by its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], appearing at page 862, and I quote:

Now, I think it is necessary for us to clear that up and see if we are in accord with that statement. Because as I interpret it, the Department of the Navy consists of two separate military services. The United States Marine Corps and the United States Navy. Now, bear in mind the title is the "United States Marine Corps." It is not the "Navy Marine Corps." Therefore, why doesn't that evidence that these are two separate branches of the service: The United States Marine Corps and the United States Navy, being administered by the Secretary of the Navy?

Now let me refer to this: Admiral Colclough, as the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, testified in the Senate, 1946.

"The Marine Corps has been held for years to be a separate service, although it operates within the Navy and under the Secretary of the Navy."

So it is an entirely separate service, is it not, and not a corps of specialists within the Navy?

I might add that this situation has obtained since 1798. Gentlemen, I want you all to know that it is my feeling and belief that, immediately upon our returning in January, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee will go before the Rules Committee and ask for a rule on this bill. I want him to know that he has my wholehearted support on his endeavors in this matter. I have every confidence that the Rules Committee will issue a rule calling this bill up for an immediate vote. At that time, gentlemen, it is my hope and conviction that this House will pass that bill by an overwhelming majority.

In conclusion, let me remind you that the Marine Corps is not standing still today. The events of the past week in Korea where an entire combat battalion, fully equipped, was transported to the front lines without a single casualty via helicopter shows that the Marines are not only the first to fight, but that they are in the very forefront of the development of our most modern concept of war.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. As a former marine, I know that the gentleman from Montana has at heart always the best interest of this great corps of fighting men. I wish to add my hope to his that when this Congress convenes in January this will be one of the first orders of business. I introduced the same kind of legislation that the gentleman speaks of. I would like to see, and have always felt, that since the last war we should have four full strength divisions of marines, and with each combat division of ground troops of marines there should be one full wing of air marines to support each ground division, because no branch of the service has initiated and perfected so completely fighters and fighter bomber ground support for the combat troops as has the Marine Air Corps. I repeat, for the purpose of emphasis, this should be early considered when we come back in January, and I would like to pledge to the gentleman from Montana my continued support for his valiant efforts in support of the Marines.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his well-placed remarks.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PATTERSON. May I say to the gentleman from Montana that he has done a great service in furthering the passage of this legislation, especially from the committee. His testimony has been outstanding, and he is carrying on the real traditions of the Marines in furthering the benefits of the Marine Corps. I, too, feel like he does, that this bill should be the very first order of business in the new year, and the bill itself should not be compromised to any extent. We should definitely have the Commandant of the United States Marine Corps represented on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, representing the 400,000 men to make up the rest of the corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut. He has expressed my thoughts exactly.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

HIGH PRICES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, as the Members from city districts go home, they will find that they have just begun to hear rather than stopped hearing about high prices—it is bad news at home. The situation will be a lot worse in 1952 than it is even today. By failing to act on needed amendments to the wage and price controls in the Defense Production Act, I believe the Congress is not meeting this responsibility. Inflationary pressures attributable to defense expenditures are expected to increase by about $20,000,000,000 next year; another over-all price rise in the 5-percent to 15-percent range should come as no surprise unless current tendencies are checked.

The amendments requiring all manufacturers' direct and indirect overhead on a per-item basis to be passed on to the consumer in maximum prices and giving distributors constant pre-Korean percentage mark-ups despite increases in selling prices will certainly cause price advances and prevent very much in the way of price rollbacks.

But the principal area in which consumer cost increases are to be expected is in the price of food. The preferential arrangement in the law for agricultural products providing that they may not be subjected to control until they reach 100 percent of parity—though price supports generally are at 90 percent of parity—is keeping, according to figures I have, 56.5 percent of all the foods which go to make up the Retail Price Index outside of price control and subjecting only 24.5 percent of the foods in the index to price control. The practical embargo on the imports of cheese and fats and oils contained in the Defense Production Act is not only causing mischief to our trade relations but is a definite price raising influence.

Yet added to all of this the Department of Agriculture is engaged in an all-out drive to induce farmers to remove some of their crops from market and to put them under Government loan with the likely result of forcing up the cost of living. The excuse for this is that over-all farm prices are now about 7 percent below the high of last February. But the high of last February was about three times the 1939 figure and an all-time high. Also, what is not taken into consideration at all is the enormous increase in agricultural production estimated for 1951 to be about 6 percent greater than 1950 which should be passed on to the consumer in lower prices without in any way endangering any reasonable relationship between the income of the farmer and the city consumer. It is estimated, for example, that if the Department of Agriculture's drive succeeds in bringing farm prices up to 100 percent of parity where they will be subject to control, wheat will rise about 11 cents a bushel and rice—in which one of the major campaigns is being put on by the Department—will rise $1 per hundred pounds. Even if forced up to this extent some Government officials are saying that it will not be enough and that agricultural products ought to go up 10 percent more. It is reported also that price supports are costing more than in 1950. These actions of the Department of Agriculture are unnecessary and can only provoke higher costs of food and clothing for the moderate-income family.

Mr. Speaker, I have called attention many times to the real dangers in this situation. I believe they are coming to a focus in the year 1952—good relations and complete understanding between urban and city dwellers are vital to our country. A concrete floor under agricultural prices with proper adjustment for increases in productivity and for technological changes has validity in terms of national economic stability in normal times. But a higher and preferential ceiling endangering the whole price structure and the fight against inflation in a time of national emergency does not have equal validity. I do not believe that any American farmer any more than any American worker needs such an inducement to produce.

I hope that members from the farm areas will be discussing this whole situation with their constituents at home so that when they return they may lend their support to amendments to the price and wage control law which will by January, I fear, be before us on a national emergency status.

City Members should also, I believe, give very serious consideration to a Department of Consumers and a congressional committee for consumers. We are beginning more and more to see that our future as a free society is in a consumers' economy as the best kind of a free economy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman trying to blame the farmers for the high price of food?

Mr. JAVITS. Today, the point I am making is that the Department of Agriculture, which at one and the same time that we are spending a great deal of money, and putting forth a great deal of effort through the office which Mr. DiSalle heads to bring about price control, is engaged in a big campaign to get people to keep their products off the markets in order to make them go even higher in price. The point of my talk today is on this action of the Department of Agriculture. I am not quarreling with the farmers. The farmers are doing just what they can under existing law, and if the farmer has, as I think he has, a preferential position, it is not anything that he wished on himself, but is something that we gave him. If it is to be corrected, because it is improper or ought not to be, then we ought to correct it after proper evidence.

Mr. GROSS. From a price standpoint, the gentleman well knows the farmers do not have any preferential price position because the farmers do not control the prices of the products they market.

Mr. JAVITS. Nor does anybody else control the price of the products they market when they take their chance in the open market. I have never been against—and I am for, a concrete floor under prices for the farmers.

Mr. GROSS. Based upon the cost of production?

Mr. JAVITS. Based upon what their necessities are in a stable economy. The point I make now is that in this price-control law, we have fixed the standard based on 100 percent of parity. That means not that the farmers like everybody else are frozen where they stand, but that their prices can go up yet further. That is a spiraling influence on the cost of living, and as I said before, my argument today, however, is not on that particular point, but on the fact that the Department of Agriculture in addition to that is engaging in a big campaign to get them to keep their products off the market.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder when the gentleman thinks this country is going to get on a stable economy.

Mr. JAVITS. Certainly, I think we are not going to have a stable economy by spiraling the cost of living still higher. I think we can have a stable economy on two bases: One if the plans which we make now to boost our production 50 percent really becomes effective with American labor and management cooperating, which I am confident they will. And second, if we undertake first a fair and effective price control, which we do not have today to hold prices in line until fundamental influences of greater savings in economies of government, which I agree with, and I know the gentleman has been a very ardent advocate of, and which must be made, and of increased taxation which we have had to put on due to the necessities which we face, and credit regulation which is a part of what is called an orthodox way of controlling inflation have their effect.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYS of Arkansas). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make the suggestion that the departments stagger their work on Saturdays and Mondays. The closing of the departments on Saturdays is working a tremendous hardship, for instance, on the veterans and also the Members of the Congress. They cannot get anything done or secure any kind of service on Saturday. For instance, today, if they had been working, a recommendation could have come down immediately for an appropriation for the automobile bill. Now I understand it will have to go over until January. That should not happen. Some of the personnel could have worked today and some could work Monday. Those who work on Monday could have been off today. This is a great inconvenience for the Members of Congress and more of an inconvenience for the claimants before the Veterans' Administration. It works a real hardship. That is true of other Government departments.

Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to express the appreciation of all veterans who come under the so-called amputee car bill legislation. It means that they can be rehabilitated and they are extremely grateful.

Before we close, Mr. Speaker, I believe the House would like to send messages of greetings to the boys in Korea who are fighting for us. It will not be a merry Christmas for them or happy Thanksgiving, but they would be pleased if we sent them messages of greetings to say that we appreciate what they are doing for us and that we are undyingly grateful.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Why should you have to send them a message? You are looking out for them. Do they not already know that?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Oh, I do what I can, but all of us are interested in the soldiers. They like to

have us say so. This is something I would like to have us all do. I know that we all think of them and we are all interested in their welfare. We honor and respect those great heroes for what they are doing, particularly those in the terrible Korean conflict. We want to send the same messages to our veterans in hospitals, also of all wars.

I would like to wish all the Members of the House a very happy Thanksgiving, a very merry Christmas, and a very happy New Year. I would like to wish the personnel, the clerks, the stenographers, the messengers, all the able personnel attached to the House, a very happy Thanksgiving, a merry Christmas, and happy New Year. They have worked tirelessly, and we are extremely grateful to them for everything they have done—their patience, their efficiency. The pages, the telephone boys, the guards, the doormen, and the line telephone operators, and naturally all the clerks and special aids. Good luck to them and to every one of you.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H Con Res. 171. Concurrent resolution providing for the sine die adjournment of the Congress, and

H Con Res. 172. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed and found truly enrolled.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5650) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 4, 5, 7, 8, 18, 24, and 26 to the above-entitled bill.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment the Speaker may have authority and permission to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions that have been properly enrolled

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HON SAM RAYBURN

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this opportunity at the end of a very long session of the Congress, during which we have all tried to do what we believed to be right for our country, to say just a word of thanks to our Speaker for his just methods with all of us.

I have been in Washington, first in the gallery and then on the floor, for many years, and I have watched a number of Speakers. I pay tribute to SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, with a very full heart. I do not always agree with him but I do always respect him, as I am sure every Member does.

There have been moments when I have had a deep feeling of sympathy for Mr. RAYBURN, especially on a certain Friday night when he had had word that all of his hay had burned. One of my sons has a farm and I have a real sense of what hay means to a farmer. But in addition to being a renowned Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is a good farmer, and he found a way to get some hay though he has suggested that he had to go out and cut it himself.

This unexpected time gives me opportunity to thank the Members of the House for their great courtesy to me at various times during this session. Indeed, through the 12 years of my service here I have had nothing but the greatest courtesy. Indeed, I have had assistance from Members on both sides of the aisle on many occasions.

Soon after we reconvene in January I hope there will be brought to this floor by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a bill which will help us increase the number of nurses in this country, H R. 910.

The bill covers scholarships for practical nurse students, for regular nurse students who will become registered nurses, and also for those who are already registered nurses for additional postgraduate work in order to fit themselves to become teachers and supervisors. That is one of the most important parts of a large nursing program. We need 60,000 additional nurses before 1954.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes, indeed.

Mr. PRIEST. I concur, of course, in what the gentlewoman has said about our distinguished Speaker, and what she has said on the nurse bill. The gentlewoman appeared before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and gave a very convincing statement. It was one of my regrets that due to the heavy log jam of legislation and hearings before the committee, we were not able to report some legislation during this session in line with the gentlewoman's proposals. I hope that can be done early next year.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I say to the gentleman that I have had conversations with the chairman of the committee who assured me he will bring it up before the whole committee immediately after the first of the year. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thought a moment ago when the gentlewoman was expressing gratitude and thanks to all of us on both sides of the aisle that the expression of gratitude and thanks is not a one-way street. We owe that to you. I want to express my share of it thus publicly. The gentlewoman has been a valuable Member of this body in all the years that she has been here. I have been here during those same years, and I have observed her work and have valued it especially with regard to Indian affairs, and with regard to work on those committees on which we served together. I want to thank her for that.

Mrs. BOLTON. I deeply appreciate the gentleman's kind words. It has been a great privilege to be a Member of this House. I hope I have been a constructive Member. I certainly have tried to be, and I have appreciated working with the gentleman on those matters to which he in his turn has contributed so much. May I say that there are few matters more deeply affecting our self-respect as Americans as the work on the Indian Affairs Committee to which the distinguished gentleman from Arizona gives so much. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Now there is another friendly, hard-working Member there behind the committee table, sitting quietly with his hand up to his face, the distinguished majority leader to whom I would like to pay my respects. He has helped me many times to get bills out of committee, and through the Committee on Rules. I shall be looking to you, Mr. MCCORMACK, after the first of the year once again to help me on the nurses' bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will put myself on record now as being in favor of it. I hope we will be more successful in getting legislation of that type out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce than I have been for the last 3 years in trying to get some of that legislation out.

Mrs BOLTON. I am sure that after the first of the year, we will be very successful—we will work together.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another bill perhaps of particular interest to men because it has as its goal equal rights for men. The Army has had thumbs down on any trained nurses who happen to be males. As a matter of fact, the neuropsychiatric divisions of our hospitals need men nurses very, very much. We must have them. Oh, there are administrative difficulties, but these can be licked if properly attacked. I am very happy to announce there seems to have been a change of heart in the medical divisions of the Army.

One reason I am staying over a little while before I go home is to have a conference with the Surgeon General of the Army, and of course the Navy and the Air Force, but the main problem is in the Army, with the hope that we can work out some method by which men who are registered nurses can have recognition and can be given positions of responsibility, to which they have a right.

Mr. Speaker, I am only sorry that it is not midnight, because at other times we have gathered together and the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] has told us some of his wonderful stories. Quartets first on this side and then on the other have given of their best. Various others have contributed something which has whiled away these rather quiet moments when everybody is thoroughly weary. Why should we be weary? Some say we have not worked at all. Why, we have only been here since 10 o'clock this morning. What is that? But it is not midnight and we are not in recess.

So the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] who has always given us a song must hold himself in check. What an appropriate moment it would be for those of us who are still here to sing Home Sweet Home. Let me remind you of the resolution that was passed but a day or two ago by this House, thanks to your courtesy, and immediately in the Senate, creating a commission to be appointed by the President which would set up suitable memorials to the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John Howard Payne, who wrote Home Sweet Home. Most of us do not remember that it appeared in opera in London. There are two additional verses that have turned up in this very interesting discussion of the possibilities of celebrations. Mr. Leander McCormick-Goodhart, who lives just across the river, has a letter written by Mr. Payne to Miss Bates in London, in which he added two verses to the song. I am hoping that Margaret Truman will consider making a recording of the song for our commemoration. Thinking it would be very suitable if we had our White House songstress do that, I have written Miss Truman asking whether she would consider making such a record and perhaps even going on television, so that we would have an added incentive for others to join in the memorial.

Mr. Speaker, deeply as I regret it, I feel that in another moment I must really let you have the rest of my time. But I do want to thank the page boys and all the rest of the people who serve us so well. They have had no vacation either. Their summertime is over just as ours is. Instead of going back to the Fourth of July we are all going back to Thanksgiving. We will certainly give thanks for the privilege of being back in our districts for just a little while. Are we to be criticized for wanting to go home? Why should we be? Is it not a part of our responsibility to be in our own districts at least a part of the year to know what our own people are thinking and feeling? I shall go back to my district as soon as I get through with my work here, and I expect to be there until the first of the year. A great many Members are doing the same thing. I think it is a part of our job to go back home. But it is also a deep need of our hearts and minds for home is a very sweet place to each of us. May I add just a word to welcome a former Member of this House, Mrs. Georgia Lusk. Georgia, we miss you, and it is always good when you are here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the opening of the doors, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time, wishing you all a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FLOOD in five instances and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. WILLIS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACHROWICZ in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include an editorial.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE in two instances, in each to include articles.

Mr. HOLIFIELD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE (at the request of Mr. FEIGHAN) in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RILEY and to include an article by the Honorable Hunter Gibbs.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado and to include articles and an editorial appearing in the Denver Post.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in two separate instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GOODWIN in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho in three instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HESELTON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENISON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin and to include a record of the votes cast by him in the first session of the present Congress.

Mr. MEADER (at the request of Mr. BRAY).

Mr. MORANO and to include two editorials.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a table with reference to appropriations.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin and to include a report to the people to the Second District of Wisconsin on his voting record in the first session of the Eighty-second Congress.

Mr. REAMS and to include an editorial.

Mr. CANNON in two instances; in one to include correspondence with the Attorney General, and in the other correspondence with the Chairman of the Board of the Inland Waterways Commission.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi (at the request of Mr. RANKIN) and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. MARSHALL) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD in five instances and to include therewith certain material.

Mr. ELLIOTT in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GORDON.

Mr. MULTER in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CROSSER (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) in two instances, in one to include an address, and in the other to include a memorandum from the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. PRIEST and to include an address by Commissioner Cross of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and in another instance to include excerpts from an article in the Labor Law Journal.

Mr. BATTLE and to include a speech.

Mr. BOYKIN in nine instances, in each to include a newspaper article.

Mr. EVINS and to include a statement.

Mr. STEED and to include excerpts from a speech.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include a speech by Dr. John W. Cronin.

Mr. TEAGUE (at the request of Mr. POAGE) and to include extraneous matter).

Mr. POAGE and to include a speech.

Mr. WALTER and to include a letter from the Queen of the Netherlands to the President of the United States.

Mr. BECKWORTH in two instances and to include certain extraneous material.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HUNTER.

Mr. MILLER of New York and to include a latter received from the secretary of the West Point Association.

Mr. DINGELL and to include an article from Drew Pearson's column which appeared in the Washington Post of October 19, which is a sad commentary upon the free press of this Nation.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an address he made over the Voice of America.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FUGATE (at the request of Mr. STANLEY), for October 20, 1951, on account of official business in his district.

Mr. LANTAFF, for Saturday, October 20, 1951, on account of official business.

THANKS AND APPRECIATION FROM THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say just before adjournment that the Chair is deeply grateful to each and every Member of the House for his manifold courtesy to him during almost 10 long and laborious months.

It is my wish to each one of you that when you are among your own people at home you may find them reasonably prosperous and happy and that you will be restful and happy with them.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table, and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 465. An act for the relief of Oswald A. Drica-Minieris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 544. An act for the relief of Joseph Rossabi, Corrine Rossabi, Mayer Rossabi, and

Morris Rosabi, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 560 An act for the relief of Dr. Louis S. K Yuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 589 An act for the relief of Sister Edeltrudis Sailer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 750 An act for the relief of Edward Chi-Kan Lam; to the Committee on the Judiciary

S. 968 An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to mutual military aid in an emergency, to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 993 An act for the relief of Robert Wendell Tadlock; to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 1135 An act to provide a recruitment procedure for the competitive civil service in order to insure selection of personnel on the basis of open competition and merit, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S 1255 An act for the relief of Leopold Kahn, Jr , to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 1292 An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the criminal penalty for persons convicted of gathering or delivering certain defense information to aid a foreign government in time of peace, to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 1359 An act for the relief of Virgine Zartarian (also known as Vergin Zartarian); to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 1368 An act to amend subsection (a) of section 1107 of the District of Columbia Code of 1901, as amended, by section 2 of the act of December 20, 1944 (D C Code, sec. 15-403 (a)), and to amend section 467 of the District of Columbia Code of 1901 (D C Code, sec 16-323); to the Committee on the District of Columbia

S 1538 An act for the relief of O E Hambleton and Mrs. Harriet Elizabeth Hambleton, to the Committee on the Judiciary

S 1560. An act for the relief of Camilla Pintos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 1620. An act for the relief of Tory Lee Eakin, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 1636 An act for the relief of Theodore Alexander Vlandy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S 1650 An act to provide for the release of the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract or parcel of land conditionally granted by it to the city of Savannah, Chatham Co , Ga , to the Committee on Armed Services.

S 1683 An act for the relief of Carlos Tannoya, Committee on the Judiciary.

S 1709 An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; Committee on the Judiciary.

S 1839 An act for the relief of Willy Giroud, Committee on the Judiciary

S 1925 An act for the relief of Gregory Joseph Coles; Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1932 An act to authorize the establishment of facilities necessary for the detention of aliens in the administration and enforcement of the immigration laws, and for other purposes, Committee on the Judiciary.

S 2054 An act for the relief of Tomizo Naito, Committee on the Judiciary.

S 2078 An act to authorize the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard), and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes; Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S 2119. An act for the relief of Claudia Tanaka; Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2160. An act to authorize the Attorney General to admit persons committed by State courts to Federal penal and correctional institutions when facilities are available; Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2165. An act to prevent unauthorized acceptance or wearing of foreign decorations by officers of the United States; Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2172. An act for the relief of Mieko Takamine, Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2198. An act to amend section 1708 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the theft or receipt of stolen mail matter generally; Committee on the Judiciary.

S 2251. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the decentralization of certain Government personnel, and for other purposes, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments

S 2252 An act to clarify the act of August 17, 1950, providing for the conversion of national banks into and their merger and consolidation with State banks, Committee on Banking and Currency.

S 2271. An act for the relief of Carol Ann Hutchins (Sybille Schubert); Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H R 610 An act for the relief of Dr Stanislaus Garstka and Dr Marthewan Garstka;

H R 658 An act for the relief of Harold W Britton,

H. R 853 An act for the relief of Maximilian Otto Ricker-Huetter and Mrs Eugenia Ricker-Huetter;

H R. 884. An act for the relief of Johanna A Stoots,

H R 980 An act for the relief of Kikue Uchida,

H R 1457. An act for the relief of Antranik Ayanian;

H R 1628 An act to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest-fire control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont , and for other purposes,

H R 1672 An act for the relief of Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association;

H R 1851. An act for the relief of Ark Ping Jee Nong (Ngon),

H R 2176 An act for the relief of the Fort Pierce Port District;

H R 2290 An act for the relief of Ralph Ambrose Thrall and Minnie Hazell Thrall;

H R 2506 An act for the relief of Masunari Saito and Isao Saito

H R 2547 An act for the relief of Yoshiko Ito,

H R 2632 An act providing for the permanent residence of Sisters Adalgisa Bellagamba, Maria Rina Montecchio, Anna Taricco, Maria Caterina Crevani, Elizabeth Baggio, Rosa Portale, Lorenzina D'Amico, Assunta Bonfiglio, Maria D'Amico, Lorenzina Scellato, Luigia Andreina Fratelli, Elena Montecchio, and Maria Bellesso,

H R 2791 An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs Richard E. Deane;

H. R 3003. An act to authorize Rear Adm. Emory D Stanley, United States Navy, retired, to accept employment with the Government of Peru;

H. R. 3281 An act for the relief of Fanny Tsihrintge Papan;

H. R. 3548. An act to provide that payment to States and Territories for care given to certain disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States shall be effective from the date such care commenced;

H. R. 3669. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and for other purposes;

H R. 3877. An act for the relief of Erlinda Maria Bowers;

H. R. 4027. An act to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands.

H. R. 4035. An act for the relief of Donald I. Hamrock, Robert N. Lensch, Russell E. Ryan, and Helen P. Stewart;

H R. 4049. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts certain lands and improvements comprising the Castle Island Terminal Facility at South Boston in exchange for certain other lands,

H R 4181. An act for the relief of Leroy Peebles,

H. R 4203 An act to ratify and confirm Act 7 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945;

H. R. 4567 An act for the relief of Roy Sakai,

H R 4692 An act to authorize the appointment of Joseph F. Carroll as a permanent colonel in the Regular Air Force,

H R. 4808 An act to provide for the granting of an easement for a public road through the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge in Dare County, N. C.;

H R. 4922 An act for the relief of Patricia Ann Eddings,

H R 4928 An act to provide that the interests of the United States in certain real property shall be conveyed to the city of Newport, Ky ;

H. R 4929. An act for the relief of Michael Bernard (Cervera).

H R 4930 An act for the relief of Charles H Craft;

H R 4940. An act for the relief of Suzie Ballard.

H R 4945 An act to authorize the use of appropriations for refunding moneys erroneously received and covered for the refund of forfeited bail

H R 4969 An act for the relief of Susa Yukiko Thomason,

H R 5082 An act to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status,

H R. 5104 An act for the relief of Mrs. Inge L. Curtis,

H R 5215 An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

H R 5230 An act providing for the conveyance to the State of North Carolina of the Currituck Beach Lighthouse Reservation, Corolla, N C ;

H R 5329 An act to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia,

H. R 5405 An act to amend section 207 (a) of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress;

H R 5730 An act for the relief of William Lund Main,

H R 5684. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H J. Res 308 Joint Resolution authorizing the President to proclaim January 13 of each year as Stephen Foster Memorial Day.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 210 An act for the relief of Jesus Juan Llanderal;

S 355. An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department;

S. 622. An act to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

S. 657. An act to amend and clarify the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, and for other purposes;

S. 1023. An act for the relief of Fumiko Theresa Shibata;

S. 1046. An act to readjust postal rates;

S. 1311. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Yellowstone River;

S. 1320. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between certain officers of the Public Health Service and comparable officers of the Army, and for other purposes;

S. 1931. An act for the relief of Joyce Jacqualyn Johnson;

S. 1980. An act for the relief of Adelheid Wichman (now Adelheid Waltschies);

S. 2041. An act for the relief of Meiko Shindo; and

S. 2223 An act for the relief of William Elden Joslin.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 19, 1951, present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1236. An act for the relief of Rhoda Akiko Nishiyama,

H. R. 4473. An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res 284. Joint resolution authorizing the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the observance and memorialization on April 9, 1952, of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John Howard Payne, author of that family hymn of America, Home Sweet Home; and

H. J. Res. 289. Joint resolution to terminate the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 171, the Chair declares the first session of the Eighty-second Congress adjourned sine die.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the first session of the Eighty-second Congress adjourned sine die.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE SPEAKER AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 51, Eighty-second Congress, and the order of the House of October 20, 1951, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did, on October 22, 1951, appoint as members of the Joint Committee on Railroad Retirement Legislation the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. BECKWORTH, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. WOLVERTON.

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 224, Eighty-second Congress, and the order of the House of October 20, 1951, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did, on October 30, 1951, appoint as members of the United States Commission for the Observance of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Death of John Howard Payne the following Members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Mr. LANE, Mr. CHELF, Mr. ARENDS, and Mrs. BOLTON.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS ENROLLED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, subsequent to sine die adjournment, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 320. An act to assure hospitalization and out-patient treatment by the Veterans' Administration of World War II veterans who devolp an active psychosis within 2 years from the date of separation from active service;

H. R. 1005. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for bailing hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material;

H R 2094 An act to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H R. 2207. An act for the relief of Numa A. Winstead;

H R. 2546. An act for the relief of Charles W. Vanderhoop;

H. R. 3490. An act to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotic laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3590. An act relating to the income-tax treatment of gain realized on an involuntary conversion of property,

H. R. 3838. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Joseph Pickett;

H. R. 3840. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Laura A. Craig.

H R. 3899 An act to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3937. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), to provide for the operation, management, maintenance, and demolition of federally acquired properties following the acquisition of such properties and before the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R 4055 An act to authorize for an additional 1-year period the use of rivers and harbors appropriations for maintenance of the canal from Cape May Harbor to Delaware Bay and the railroad and highway bridges over such canal;

H. R. 4219. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Milliken;

H. R. 4288. An act granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Sabine River by the States of Texas and Louisiana;

H. R. 4351. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Ursula Rutherford Ollinger;

H. R. 4352. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary Rutherford Spearson;

H R. 5397. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dora Troost;

H. R. 5411. An act to amend Public Laws Nos. 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense-housing areas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5593. An act authorizing the Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority, hereby created, and its successors, to construct, maintain, and operate bridges over Sabine Lake, at or near Port Arthur, Tex.; to construct, maintain, and operate all causeways, approaches, and appurtenances pertaining thereto; and to finance said objects by the issuance of bonds secured by the said properties and income and revenues, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5650. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

H R 5745. An act to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages;

H. J. Res. 330. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 351. Joint resolution fixing the date of the meeting of the second regular session of the Eighty-second Congress.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER announced that, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 172, Eighty-second Congress, he did on Sunday, October 21, 1951, sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

S. 1629. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, to permit the interstate movement, for immediate slaughter, of domestic animals which have reacted to a test for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test for brucellosis; and for other purposes;

H R. 320. An act to assure hospitalization and out-patient treatment by the Veterans' Administration of World War II veterans who develop an active psychosis within 2 years from the date of separation from active service;

H R 1005. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material;

H. R. 2094. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H R. 2207. An act for the relief of Numa A Winstead;

H R 2546. An act for the relief of Charles W Vanderhoop;

H R 3490 An act to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotic laws, and for other purposes;

H R. 3590. An act relating to the income-tax treatment of gain realized on an involuntary conversion of property;

H R. 3838. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Joseph Pickett;

H. R. 3840. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Laura A. Craig;

H R. 3899. An act to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes;

H. R 3937. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1949 (62 Stat. 1061) to provide for the operation, management, maintenance, and demolition of federally acquired properties following the acquisition of such properties and before the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4055. An act to authorize for an additional 1-year period the use of rivers and harbors appropriations for maintenance of the canal from Cape May Harbor to Delaware Bay and the railroad and highway bridges over such canal;

H. R. 4219. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Milliken;

H. R. 4288. An act granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Sabine River by the States of Texas and Louisiana;

H. R 4315. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Ursula Rutherford Ollinger;

H R 4352. An act authorizing the secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary Rutherford Spearson,

H R 5397. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dora Troost;

H R. 5411 An act to amend Public Laws Nos 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense housing areas, and for other purposes;

H. R 5593. An act authorizing the Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority, hereby created, and its successors, to construct, maintain, and operate bridges over Sabine Lake, at or near Port Arthur, Tex; to construct, maintain, and operate all causeways, approaches, and appurtenances pertaining thereto and to finance said objects by the issuance of bonds secured by the said properties and income and revenues, and for other purposes;

H R 5650 An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

H R 5745. An act to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages,

H J. Res 330. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill, to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; and

H. J Res 351 Joint resolution fixing the date of the meeting of the second regular session of the Eighty-second Congress.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, subsequent to sine die adjournment, reported that that committee did on October 22, 1951, present to the President for his approval bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H R 320 An act to assure hospitalization and out-patient treatment by the Veterans' Administration of World War II veterans who develop an active psychosis within 2 years from the date of separation from active service,

H R 610 An act for the relief of Dr. Stanislaus Garstka and Dr. Marthewan Garstka,

H R 658. An act for the relief of Harold W. Britton,

H R 853 An act for the relief of Maximilian Otto Ricker-Huetter and Mrs Eugenia Ricker-Huetter,

H R 884. An act for the relief of Johanna A. Stoots,

H R 980 An act for the relief of Kikue Uchida,

H R 1005 An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material;

H. R. 1457. An act for the relief of Antranik Ayanian,

H R 1628 An act to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest-fire-control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont., and for other purposes;

H. R. 1672. An act for the relief of Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association;

H. R. 1851. An act for the relief of Ark Ping Jee Nong (Ngon);

H. R. 2094. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2176. An act for the relief of the Fort Pierce Port District;

H. R. 2207. An act for the relief of Numa A. Winstead;

H R 2290. An act for the relief of Ralph Ambrose Thrall, and Minnie Hazell Thrall;

H. R. 2506. An act for the relief of Masunari Saito and Isao Saito;

H R. 2546. An act for the relief of Charles W. Vanderhoop;

H. R. 2547. An act for the relief of Yoshiko Ito,

H. R 2632 An act providing for the permanent residence of Sisters Adalgisa Bellagama, Maris Rina Montecchio, et al.;

H. R 2791. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Richard E Deane;

H R 3003. An act to authorize Rear Adm. Emory D. Stanley, United States Navy, retired, to accept employment with the Government of Peru,

H R 3281. An act for the relief of Fanny Tsihrintge Papan;

H R 3490. An act to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotic laws, and for other purposes,

H R 3548 An act to provide that payment to States and Territories for care given to certain disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States shall be effective from the date such care commenced,

H R 3590 An act relating to the income-tax treatment of gain realized on an involuntary conversion of property,

H R 3669 An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and for other purposes;

H R 3838. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Joseph Pickett,

H R 3840 An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Laura A Craig;

H R 3877 An act for the relief of Erlinda Mari Bowers;

H R. 3899 An act to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes,

H R 3937 An act to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), to provide for the operation, management, maintenance, and demolition of federally acquired properties following the acquisition of such properties and before the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes,

H R 4027. An act to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands;

H R 4035. An act for the relief of Donald I Hamrock, Robert N. Lensch, Russell E. Ryan, and Helen P Stewart,

H R 4049. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts certain lands and improvements comprising the Castle Island Terminal Facility at South Boston in exchange for certain other lands;

H R 4055 An act to authorize for an additional 1-year period the use of rivers and harbors appropriations for maintenance of the canal from Cape May Harbor to Delaware Bay and the railroad and highway bridges over such canal;

H. R 4181. An act for the relief of Leroy Peebles,

H R 4203. An act to ratify and confirm Act 7 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945;

H. R. 4219. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Milliken;

H. R. 4288. An act granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Sabine River by the States of Texas and Louisiana;

H. R 4351. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Ursula Rutherford Ollinger,

H. R 4352 An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a a patent in fee to Mary Rutherford Spearson;

H. R 4567 An act for the relief of Roy Sakai;

H R. 4692 An act to authorize the appointment of Joseph F Carroll as a permanent colonel in the Regular Air Force,

H R. 4308. An act to provide for the granting of an easement for a public road through the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge in Dare County, N. C.;

H. R 4922 An act for the relief of Patricia Ann Eddings;

H R 4928. An act to provide that the interest of the United States in certain real property shall be conveyed to the city of Newport, Ky,

H R 4929 An act for the relief of Michael Bernard (Cervera),

H R 4930 An act for the relief of Charles H Craft,

H R 4940 An act for the relief of Susie Ballard,

H R 4945 An act to authorize the use of appropriations for refunding moneys erroneously received and covered for the refund of forfeited bail,

H R 4969 An act for the relief of Susa Yukiko Thomason;

H R 5062 An act to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status,

H R 5104 An act for the relief of Mrs Inge L Curtis,

H R 5215 An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes,

H R 5230 An act providing for the conveyance to the State of North Carolina of the Currituck Beach Lighthouse Reservation, Corolla, N C,

H R. 5329 An act to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia;

H R 5397. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dora Troost;

H R 5405 An act to amend section 207 (a) of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress,

H R 5411. An act to amend Public Laws 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense housing areas, and for other purposes,

H R 5593 An act authorizing the Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority,

H R 5650. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

H R. 5684 An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

H R 5730 An act for the relief of William Lund Main;

H R 5745 An act to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages;

H. J. Res. 308 Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim January 13 of each year as Stephen Foster Memorial Day;

H. J Res. 330. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Trade Fair, Inc, Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 351. Joint resolution fixing the date of the meeting of the second regular session of the Eighty-second Congress.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, after the sine die adjournment of the House of Representatives, notified the Clerk on November 3, 1951, that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On October 18, 1951:

H. R. 782. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Siegfried Oberdorfer; and

H. R. 4271. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Richard G. Adams and legal guardian of Dorothy Margaret Adams.

On October 19, 1951:

H R. 3430. An act for the relief of the estate of Nora B. Kennedy, deceased, and Mrs. Ann R. Norton;

H. R. 4154. An act for the relief of the estate of Jake Jones, deceased; and

H. J. Res. 289. Joint resolution to terminate the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany.

On October 20, 1951:

H. R. 824. An act for the relief of Luisa Monti;

H. R. 1100. An act for the relief of Eugenio Bellini;

H. R. 1252. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Miroslav Kudrat;

H. R. 1413. An act for the relief of Franz Geyling;

H. R. 1696. An act for the relief of Jack Warner and family;

H. R. 1764. An act to authorize the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force to settle, pay, adjust, and compromise certain claims for damages and for salvage and towage and to execute releases, certifications, and reports with respect thereto, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1908. An act for the relief of Helena Jange Chinn; and

H R. 2684. An act to provide for the sale, transfer, or quitclaim of title to certain lands in Florida.

On October 20, 1951—2:07 p. m., eastern standard time:

H. R. 4473. An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

On October 22, 1951:

H R. 732. An act for the relief of Konstontios N Bellos;

H. R 2210. An act for the relief of Hye Pah Kung;

H. R. 3221. An act for the relief of Joji Ikeda, a minor; and

H. R. 4740. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

On October 23, 1951:

H R. 1119. An act for the relief of Mario DiFilippo.

On October 24, 1951:

H. R. 794. An act for the relief of Arthur E. Hackett;

H. R. 1036. An act relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Smithsonian Institution and its constituent bureaus;

H. R. 1087. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," to empower the courts to remit or mitigate forfeitures under the Indian liquor laws;

H. R. 1628. An act to provide for the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of buildings and appurtenances essential for forest-fire-control operations of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at or near Missoula, Mont., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2322. An act to authorize the improvement of East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla.;

H. R. 3424. An act for the relief of Yumi Horiuchi;

H. R. 4270. An act for the relief of the estate of Jennie Gayle, deceased;

H. R. 4386. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4693. An act to amend section 77, subsection (c) (3), of the Bankruptcy Act as amended;

H. R. 4931. An act for the relief of Lewyt Corp.; and

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

On October 25, 1951:

H. R. 1005. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material;

H. R 1181. An act to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records;

H. R. 1215. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1236. An act for the relief of Rhoda Akiko Nishiyama;

H. R. 2094 An act to amend the act of August 17, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, to provide a basis for payment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,

H R 3281. An act for the relief of Fanny Tsihrintge Papan;

H. R. 3376. An act for the relief of Margaret K N Miller;

H. R. 5230. An act providing for the conveyance to the State of North Carolina of the Currituck Beach Lighthouse Reservation, Corolla, N. C.; and

H. R 5329. An act to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

On October 26, 1951:

H R. 1596. An act for the relief of N. H. Kelley, Bernice Kelley, Clyde D. Farquhar, and Gladys Farquhar;

H. R. 3298. An act to amend sections 303 (c) and 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended;

H. R. 3840. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Laura A. Craig;

H. R. 3937. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), to provide for the operation, management, maintenance, and demolition of federally acquired properties following the acquisition of such properties and before the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4550. An act to provide for the control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4692. An act to authorize the appointment of Joseph F. Carroll as a permanent colonel in the Regular Air Force;

H. R. 5131. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact of agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike System and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes;

H R. 5405. An act to amend section 207 (a) of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress; and

H. J. Res. 330. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

On October 27, 1951:

H. R. 2791. An act for the relief of Mr and Mrs. Richard E. Deane;

H R 4049. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts certain lands and improvements comprising the Castle Island Terminal Facility at South Boston in exchange for certain other lands;

H R. 4219. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Milliken;

H. R 4351. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Ursula Rutherford Ollinger,

H. R. 4352. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary Rutherford Spearson;

H R. 4945. An act to authorize the use of appropriations for refunding moneys erroneously received and covered for the refund of forfeited bail;

H. R. 5730. An act for the relief of William Lund Main;

H. J Res 284. Joint resolution authorizing the participation of the United States in the preparation and completion of plans for the observance and memorialization on April 9, 1952, of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John Howard Payne, author of that family hymn of America, Home Sweet Home; and

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim January 13 of each year as Stephen Foster Memorial Day.

On October 29, 1951:

H R. 610. An act for the relief of Dr. Stanislaus Garstka and Dr. Marthewan Garstka;

H. R 884. An act for the relief of Johanna A Stoots;

H. R 980. An act for the relief of Kikue Uchida;

H R 1457. An act for the relief of Antranik Ayanian;

H R 2290. An act for the relief of Ralph Ambrose Thrall and Minnie Hazell Thrall;

H R. 2506. An act for the relief of Masunari Saito and Isao Saito;

H. R. 2547. An act for the relief of Yoshiko Ito;

H. R 2632. An act providing for the permanent residence of Sisters Adalgisa Bellagamba, Maria Rina Montecchio, Anna Taricco, Maria Caterina Crevani, Elizabeth Baggio, Rosa Portale, Lorenzina D'Amico, Assunta Bonfiglio, Maria D'Amico, Lorenzina Scellato, Luigia Andreina Fratelli, Elena Montecchio, and Maria Bellesso;

H R 3548 An act to provide that payment to States and Territories for care given to certain disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States shall be effective from the date such care commenced;

H R 3877. An act for the relief of Erlinda Maria Bowers;

H. R. 4027. An act to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands;

H. R 4567. An act for the relief of Roy Sakai;

H R 4808. An act to provide for the granting of an easement for a public road through the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge in Dare County, N. C.;

H. R 4922. An act for the relief of Patricia Ann Eddings;

H. R. 4929. An act for the relief of Michael Bernard (Cervera);

H. R. 4930. An act for the relief of Charles H. Craft;

H. R. 4940. An act for the relief of Suzie Ballard;

H R. 4969. An act for the relief of Susa Yukiko Thomason; and

H R. 5062. An act to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status.

On October 30, 1951:

H. R 320. An act to assure hospitalization and out-patient treatment by the Veterans' Administration of World War II veterans who develop an active psychosis within 2 years from the date of separation from active service;

H. R. 853. An act for the relief of Maximilian Otto Ricker-Huetter and Mrs. Eugenia Ritter-Huetter;

H R 1851. An act for the relief of Ark Ping Jee Nong (Ngon);

H R. 2207. An act for the relief of Numa A Winstead;

H. R. 3003 An act to authorize Rear Adm. Emory D. Stanley, United States Navy, retired, to accept employment with the Government of Peru;

H. R 3669. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and for other purposes;

H. R 4035. An act for the relief of Donald I. Hamrock, Robert N. Lensch, Russell E. Ryan, and Helen P. Stewart;

H R. 4055 An act to authorize for an additional 1-year period the use of rivers and harbors appropriations for maintenance of the canal from Cape May Harbor to Delaware Bay and the railroad and highway bridges over such canal;

H. R 4181. An act for the relief of Leroy Peebles;

H. R 4203 An act to ratify and confirm Act 7 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945;

H R 4928. An act to provide that the interest of the United States in certain real property shall be conveyed to the city of Newport, Ky;

H R. 5104 An act for the relief of Mrs. Inge L. Curtis;

H R 5397 An act for the relief of Mrs. Dora Troost;

H R 5593. An act authorizing the Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority hereby created, and its successors, to construct, maintain, and operate bridges over Sabine Lake, at or near Port Arthur, Tex; to construct, maintain, and operate all causeways, approaches, and appurtenances pertaining thereto; and to finance said objects by the issuance of bonds secured by the said properties and income and revenues, and for other purposes,

H R 5745 An act to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages; and

H J Res 351. Joint resolution fixing the date of the meeting of the second regular session of the Eighty-second Congress.

On October 31, 1951:

H R. 658 An act for the relief of Harold W Britton,

H R 2176 An act for the relief of the Fort Pierce Port District,

H R 2546. An act for the relief of Charles W. Vanderhoop;

H R 3590. An act relating to the income-tax treatment of gain realized on an involuntary conversion of property;

H. R 3838 An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Joseph Pickett;

H. R. 3899. An act to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5684. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

On November 1, 1951:

H. R 4288 An act granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Sabine River by the States of Texas and Louisiana;

H. R. 5215. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5650. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

On November 2, 1951:

H. R 3490. An act to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotics laws, and for other purposes.

BILLS DISAPPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, after the sine die adjournment of the House of Representatives, on November 3, 1951, transmitted to the Clerk of the House a list of bills disapproved, together with his reasons for such action, as follows:

LOUIS R CHADBOURNE

H. R. 971. I am withholding my approval from H. R. 971, a bill for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne.

The purpose of this enactment is to authorize the payment to Louis R. Chadbourne, of Medford, Mass., of a sum equal to the retired pay to which he would have been entitled if he had been on the retired list of the Navy during the period from November 19, 1945, the date of his separation from active service, to March 1, 1949, the date on which he was actually placed on the retired list of the Navy.

During the period between 1942 and 1945 while the claimant was serving in the Navy he had certain intermittent symptoms which he called to the attention of service physicians on several occasions. One such occasion was during the course of the physical examination he received immediately prior to his release from active duty in 1945. He received no treatment for these symptoms, however, it apparently being felt that this was unnecessary in view of their mildness, their intermittent nature, and the fact that they did not cause the claimant any pain.

In 1946 the claimant underwent a major surgical operation for the condition which had given rise to the above-mentioned symptoms. He subsequently appeared before a Navy retiring board which found him incapacitated for active service by reason of a physical disability incurred in line of duty. As a result of this finding, the claimant was placed on the retired list of the Navy as of March 1, 1949, and from that date has been drawing the retired pay of a lieutenant commander.

It appears from the records of the Veterans' Administration that during the period from January 27, 1948, through February 28, 1949, the claimant received compensation from that agency in the total amount of $2,022.40 for the same disability for which he was subsequently retired. It will be noted at once that the period within which the Veterans' Administration benefits were paid lies wholly within the period for which retroactive retired pay would be paid under the provisions of the present enrollment. This means, of course, that the bill would have the effect of authorizing concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation for a period of more than a year. Such a result was, I am sure, entirely unintended, a conclusion which would seem to be supported by the fact that there is no reference anywhere in the legislative history of the bill, to disability benefits having been paid by the Veterans' Administration.

Like the Congress, I believe that this claim is a meritorious one which should be settled. But, I also believe, that had it known all the facts the Congress would have shared my conviction that any award to the claimant should be limited to the difference between the amount of retired pay to which he would have been entitled during the period in question and the amount of the disability compensation benefits he received during the same period. Legislation so limited would, in my opinion, be entirely unobjectionable However, the present measure, which does not provide a set-off for Veterans' Administration payments, appears to be illogical, inequitable from the standpoint of the Government, and violative of the principles underlying existing provisions of general law which prohibit concurrent payment of retired pay and disability compensation.

Accordingly, for the above-stated reasons, I feel obliged to withhold my approval from H. R. 971.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 27, 1951.*

BANK OF AMERICA NATIONAL TRUST AND SAVINGS ASSOCIATION

H R 1672. I have withheld my approval from H R 1672, an act for the relief of Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association.

The purpose of this bill is to pay to the Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association the sum of $20,403 65, representing the net loss sustained by that bank in connection with loans it granted under regulation V to finance the operations of San Jose Manufacturers, Inc., under a certain contract which that company had with the War Department during World War II.

It appears that early in 1941 the San Jose Manufacturers, Inc, was organized by certain citizens of San Jose, Calif., in order to effect a consolidation of the machinery and equipment of a number of small machine shops in that city so as to be able to assist the United States in the defense work program during World War II. The operations of San Jose were financed entirely by the claimant. The United States, in turn, through a regulation V loan, assumed 80 percent of any losses which might be sustained by the bank.

In January 1942, the San Francisco Ordnance District placed a letter order, later superseded by a formal contract, with San Jose for 98 105-millimeter howitzer carriages at a unit price of not to exceed $6,000. Delivery of the 98 gun carriages was required to be completed in November 1942. But up to February 1943, when San Jose was completely reorganized, none of the gun carriages had

been delivered to the Government, although an amount equal to the entire contract price for the carriages had been expended. However, all of the gun carriages ordered from San Jose were completed and delivered to the Government in January 1944.

It appears that upon the liquidation of San Jose, and after applying to its indebtedness to the bank all of the funds received from the sale of the assets of the corporation, as well as all of the funds received from the War Department in payment for said 98 gun carriages, there remained a balance due the bank of $348,676.98. Since 80 percent of this amount was covered by the V-loan guaranty, the net loss to the bank, after certain other minor adjustments had been made, amounted to $69,735.40. The award contained in the present bill was computed by diminishing this latter figure by $55,000, the amount of interest paid by San Jose to the bank, and then adding to the resulting figure the sum of $5,668.65, representing the cost to the bank of maintaining one of its officials in the San Jose office for the purpose of observing the manner in which the loaned funds were expended.

Ordinary business prudence requires that a financial institution, before making a large loan to a manufacturer to finance its production of goods under a contract, ascertain full details concerning the purpose of the loan, the manner in which the money is to be applied, the ability of the borrower not only to fulfill its obligations under its production contract but also to make repayment of the loan. In the present case it appears that the bank fully informed itself concerning all such matters, and that it, in fact, had one of its officers spend a large portion of his time in supervising the operations of San Jose.

On May 22, 1945, Under Secretary of War Robert P Patterson, in a statement concerning the refusal of the War Department to grant relief to the bank under the broad authority contained in the First War Powers Act, said:

> Almost from the outset the company [San Jose] had difficulty in organizing properly for the performance of the contract, and over a considerable period the Ordnance Department found it necessary to give it assistance of various types.
>
> When the concern had not been able to make delivery of any of the carriages contracted for even after the original completion date, the Ordnance Department felt that it would be impossible for it to fulfill its obligation. However, a chance of management was effectuated, and thereafter the Bank of America advanced additional funds to finance the completion of the contract.
>
> It is the bank's representation that because the Ordnance Department knew of its furnishing these additional funds, it tacitly agreed to increase the price under the contract. So far as I can ascertain no responsible Ordnance Department officer or employee who had knowledge of the facts at any time stated or implied that such was the case. The willingness of the Ordnance Department to see the bank advance additional funds was based on a hope that with the additional funds and under the new management, San Jose Manufacturers would be able to complete the contract, deliver the gun carriages, and reduce the amount of the loss both to the Bank of America and to the War Department which, as you know, guaranteed the V loan to the degree of 80 percent. The carriages were completed and the net loss to the bank was thereby very subsantially decreased.
>
> The initial mistake in the entire transaction appears to have been a belief on the part of San Jose Manufacturers that it could manufacture these carriages for $6,000, the maximum that Ordnance felt warranted in allocating to the project.
>
> The War Department was purchasing the same carriage from other manufacturers even then for less than $6,000. It is doubtful if it would have been justified in contracting originally at a higher price. There appears no basis on which it would now be proper for the War Department to increase the amount paid for these carriages over that originally contracted for. In reaching this conclusion, consideration has been given to the fact that the entire operation was carried out in an attempt to implement the desires generally expressed by Congress that small plants should be used as much as possible in the war effort.

The above-indicated facts make it clear that there is no equitable basis for payment of the proposed award, the effect of which would be to make the United States an insurer of all the losses which the bank sustained on its loans to San Jose.

If this bill were to be approved it could establish a precedent which would be extremely undesirable from the standpoint of the Government. Even though the War Department losses on V loans during World War II were relatively small, the fact remains that the success of essential loan-guaranty programs would be seriously jeopardized if, after meeting its obligation on the guaranteed portion of a loan, the Government were later compelled to pay a claim for the unguaranteed portion. I believe it would be most unwise to do anything which might tend to lessen the effectiveness of the guaranteed loan programs which have contributed so much to past and present mobilization efforts.

In my opinion, the instant bill is illustrative of a growing trend toward a philosophy which I find most disturbing. This is the disposition on the part of many individuals and organizations to assume in dealings with the Government that, no matter what contractual or other arrangements have been entered into, the United States should bear all the risk arising out of such dealings while they should receive all the profits. Such an attitude is manifestly inimical to the vitality of our free-enterprise system, the maintenance of which becomes a matter of increasing concern in view of its importance to the continued strength of the free nations.

For the foregoing reasons, I feel obliged to withhold my approval from H. R. 1672.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
November 2, 1951.

CRITICAL DEFENSE HOUSING AREAS, SCHOOLS

H. R. 5411. I am withholding my approval of H. R. 5411, a bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to schools in critical defense housing areas and for other purposes.

The basic purpose of this bill is meritorious. It would provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of elementary and secondary schools in those localities where defense activities of the Federal Government have created unusual burdens. Thus, this bill would complete the plan of Federal assistance now operating under the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of September 1951. In addition, it contains perfecting amendments which would improve the administration of an established program supporting the operation of local school facilities, where they are inadequate to meet the impact of expanded defense activities.

Unfortunately, however, the Congress has included one provision in this bill which I cannot approve. This provision would require a group of schools on Federal property which are now operating successfully on an integrated basis to be segregated. It would do so by requiring Federal schools on military bases and other Federal property to conform to the laws of the States in which such installations are located. This is a departure from the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, which required only that the education provided under these circumstances should be comparable to that available to other children in the State. The purpose of the proposed change is clearly to require that schools operated solely by the Federal Government on federally owned land, if located in any of 17 States, shall be operated on a segregated basis "to the maximum extent practicable."

This proposal, if enacted into law, would constitute a backward step in the efforts of the Federal Government to extend equal rights and opportunities to all our people. During the past few years we have made rapid progress toward equal treatment and opportunity in those activities of the Federal Government where we have a direct responsibility to follow national rather than local interpretations of nondiscrimination. Two outstanding examples are the Federal civil service and our Armed Forces, where important advances have been made toward equalizing treatment and opportunity.

Not every school operated on a Federal reservation has been integrated. It is never our purpose to insist on integration without considering pertinent local factors; but it is the duty of the Federal Government to move forward in such locations and in such fields of activity as seem best and appropriate under individual conditions and circumstances.

We have assumed a role of world leadership in seeking to unite people of great cultural and racial diversity for the purpose of resisting aggression, protecting their mutual security and advancing

their own economic and political development. We should not impair our moral position by enacting a law that requires a discrimination based on race. Step by step we are discarding old discriminations; we must not adopt new ones.

I believe the way is open for an effective administration of Public Laws 815 and 874 of the Eighty-first Congress, while the present Congress reconsiders the full implications of the amendments proposed in H. R. 5411. The objectionable provision was added during the closing days of the first session without the careful consideration necessary for such an important departure from national policy. I hope the Congress early in the next session will reconsider this matter carefully and will reenact legislation to provide the school aid urgently required in critical defense housing areas without the objectionable provision of H. R. 5411.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
November 2, 1951.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

898 A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the activities under section 1211 of Public Law 763, Eighty-first Congress, to provide war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

899. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a survey report dated May 1950, together with accompanying letters and appendixes, on the Green River watershed, Ky. and Tenn., pursuant to section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937 (H Doc No. 261); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Eleventh Intermediate Report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, a survey of procurement process (pt. 2) (Rept. No. 1224) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Twelfth Intermediate Report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, an inquiry into the operations of the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, with particular reference to the Division of Vocational Education (Rept. No. 1225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CANNON: Committee of conference. H. R. 5650. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1226). Ordered to be printed.

Mr GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No 1227. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARNAHAN.

H. R 5846. A bill to promote flood prevention and land and water conservation by encouraging the construction of check dams and other improvements for water flow retardation and sediment control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr COUDERT:

H R 5847 A bill to assist individuals to provide financial security upon retirement and to make provisions for surviving members of their families by allowing an income tax deduction for premiums paid on annuity and life insurance contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr DONDERO:

H R 5848 A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act with respect to the amount of active service which certain former members of the Armed Forces of the United States and its allies may be required to serve, to the Committee on Armed Services

By Mr FORD

H R 5849 A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide for payment of annuities to certain widows of retired employees without reduction in the annuities of such employees, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

By Mr MURRAY of Tennessee:

H R 5850 A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to impound mail in certain cases, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

By Mr REAMS:

H. R 5851. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Port Clinton, Ohio, of certain land owned by the United States and located in Ottawa County, Ohio, to the Committee on Armed Services

By Mr. JAVITS:

H R 5852 A bill to promote the cause of world peace by authorizing the President for a limited period to enter into agreements for reciprocal travel and study by selected nationals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr PRIEST:

H R 5853. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in extending and improving their program of health instruction, safety instruction, and physical education, for children of school age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANE:

H R 5854. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility in the vicinity of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr YORTY:

H. R. 5855. A bill to place the Federal budget on a biannual basis, to require that general appropriation acts provide funds for a period of two fiscal years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 5856. A bill to provide income-tax relief for parents of minor children under the age of 18, to reduce the percentage-depletion deductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 5857. A bill to authorize pay to delegates representing Indians of California from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

H R. 5858. A bill to authorize per capita payment to heirs of enrollees of Indians of California, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr FRAZIER:

H J. Res. 350 Joint resolution to provide an extension of time for the authorization for certain projects for local flood protection in the Tennessee River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr POULSON:

H. Res 478. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives to investigate and report upon the policies and practices of the Department of the Interior in the leasing or other disposition of Alaskan coal lands, to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr AYRES:

H R 5859 A bill for the relief of Antonio Cacciutto, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H R 5860 A bill for the relief of Viviani Quirino, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK.

H R 5861 A bill for the relief of Sime Bosotima, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr CROSSER:

H R 5862 A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Benczur, to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R 5863. A bill for the relief of Lilli Deininger Steinbrunn; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. JAVITS.

H R. 5864 A bill for the relief of Sachiko Kanemochi, to the Committee on the Judiciary

H R 5865 A bill for relief of Sylvia Abrams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H R. 5866 A bill for the relief of Alfredo Lettich; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi

H R 5867. A bill for the relief of Patricia Fletcher Cain, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H R 5868 A bill for the relief of Libero Ridolfi and Luigia Belardi Ridolfi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of the rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

484. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Walworth County Taxpayers Association passed on October 8, 1951, to make local relief rolls open to the inspection of the taxpaying public; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

485. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Jacksonville Townsend Club No. 18, Jacksonville, Fla., vigorously protesting the proposed opening of the welfare rolls to public exposure, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the third calendar quarter of 1951.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1951:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

File two copies with the Secretary of the Senate and file three copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
Place an "X" below the appropriate letter or figure in the box at the right of the "Report" heading below:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.
"QUARTERLY" REPORT To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT	P	QUARTER: 1st	2d	3d	4th
		(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) In General: This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee," state in Item "B" the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer." (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee.")
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer," write "None" in answer to Item "B."
(b) Separate Reports.—An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING.—(1) State name, address, and nature of business; (2) if this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—Section 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place ☐ an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) description, (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. *If* this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. *If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C 4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page.* Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

NOTE ON ITEM "D".—(a) In General. The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as contributor of $500 or more.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS)

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $_____Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense Money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or More (from Jan 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors? Please answer "yes" or "no": _____
14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last day of this Quarter, total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor* ("*Period*" from Jan 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285 00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) In General. "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1 $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than Item "1")
3 $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5 $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6 $_____Telephone and telegraph
7 $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8 $_____All other expenditures
9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11 $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14 $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of, the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following headings: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshblanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D C —Public relations service at $800 00 per month.
$4,150 00	TOTAL

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Strategic minerals, including manganese.
D. $400.
E. (4) $16.85; (5) $5.50; (6) $7.58; (7) $167.35; (9) $196.78; (10) $265.74; (11) $462.52.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally any legislation which will affect the aircraft industry. No specific bills at this time.
D. (6) $3,249.99.
E. (1) $3,249.99; (9) $3,249.99; (10) $7,519.83; (11) $10,769.32; (15) $3,249.99, Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York 1, N. Y.; public relations.

A. Nels Peter Alifas, Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington 1, D. C.
B. District No. 44, International Association of Machinists Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.[1]
D. (6) $1,999.98.
E. (7) $25; (9) $25; (10) $30; (11) $55.

A. R. G. Allman, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Until Section 8 of the War Claims Act of 1948 is passed and an equitable treaty with Japan is ratified, particularly with respect to American people and businesses.
E. (5) $30; (6) $20; (7) $50; (9) $100; (10) $600; (11) $900.

A. American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Federal aid to education, ECA and Point Four Program, Qualified Equal Rights Amendment, strengthening the United Nations school construction and teachers' pay, independent status to the United States Office of Education, and reciprocal trade agreements without peril points.
E. (4) $1; (9) $1; (10) $56.82; (11) $57.82.

A. American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Edificio Bearn, Plaza Santos Delgollado, Mexico, D. F.
C. (2) IRC, section 116 (a), to exempt from United States income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.

A. American Coalition, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) American Coalition is a patriotic, nonprofit organization representing organizations of like character, the purpose of which is to promote patriotism and a better understanding of the American form of government and to preserve it against attack.
D. (6) $1,074.30.
E. (2) $750; (4) $20; (5) $444.13; (6) $53.42; (9) $1,267.55; (10) $3,258.92; (11) $4,526.47; (15) $165, July, August, September, Smoot Sand & Gravel Corp., Washington, D. C., rent; $128.70, July 3, 1951, Collector of Internal Revenue, withholding and social security tax; $11.80, July 3, 1951, Fox-Jones Co., Washington, D. C., office supplies; $10, July 6, 1951, Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, copies of Government document; $22.61, July 10, 1951, Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co., service, etc.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. American Council of Style and Design, Inc., 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interest of Council is in securing adequate legislation to protect original commercial styles and designs on textile fabrics and other commodities.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) To protect and further the interests of the public and the dental profession in matters of patents, legislation, and regulations and to disseminate information which will assist the constituent and component societies in their problems involving the enactment and enforcement of legislation involving the dental health of the public or the practice of dentistry.
D. (6) $6,417.62.
E. (2) $5,673.48; (6) $78.12; (7) $805.86; (9) $6,557.48; (10) $13,324.64; (11) $19,882.12; (15) $2,500.08, Francis J. Garvey, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., salary as counsel for council on legislation; $1,316.34, B. J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., salary as legislative assistant; $1,041, O. O. Norberg, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., salary as secretary to Mr. Garvey; $741, Helen Hofener, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., salary as stenographer; $75, Barbara Hull, 142 Washington Avenue, Albany, N. Y., salary as stenographer; etc.[1]

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; 261 Constitution Avenue, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interests of the American Farm Bureau Federation cover primarily the fields of legislation affecting agriculture directly. (3) The Nation's Agriculture, issued monthly and a news weekly.
D. (7) $98,028 78.
E. (9) $221,700.05.

A. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of working people. (3) American Federationist.
E. (1) $7,635 08; (2) $12,951.20; (4) $3,778 13; (5) $1,190 40; (9) $25,554.81; (10) $53,286.29; (11) $78,841.10; (15) $3,778.13, Ransdell, Inc., 805 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C., printing; $7,635.08, Furman Feiner & Co., 117 West Forty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y., radio; $1,190.40, postage on American Federationist; $2,730, W. C. Hushing, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., salary and expenses; $2,340, W. J. Mason, 311 Holly Avenue, Takoma Park, Md., salary and expenses, etc.[1]

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S 1202, S. 1318, H. R. 3559, H. R. 3560, H R. 3581, H. R. 3640, H. R. 3747, H. R. 3762, H. R. 3769, H. R. 3805, H. R. 3809, H. R. 3836, H. R. 3848, H. R. 3902, H. R. 4012, H. R. 4748, H. R. 4051.
D. (6) $4,608.02.
E. (2) $1,000; (4) $95; (5) $150; (6) $50; (7) $50; (9) $1,345; (10) $4,460; (11) $5,805.

A. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The American Hospital Association is concerned about all legislation which may affect the ability of hospitals to render good care or which may affect hospital care for the American people.
D. (6) $11,193.08.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $6,245.70; (4) $889.54; (5) $482.51; (6) $516.52; (7) $415.61; (8) $693.20; (9) $9,248.08; (10) $21,007.86; (11) $30,250.94.

A. American Hotel Association,[2] 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $128,152 25.
E. (2) $11,577.79; (8) $530.37; (9) $12,108.16.

A. American Humane Association, 1617 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Robert F. Sellar, president, American Humane Association, Albany, N. Y. Head of a federation of societies and individuals for the prevention of cruelty, especially to children and animals.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) To promote the enactment of legislation coming within the field of work and conforming to the standards of the association and its federated societies. To discourage legislation in that field below such standards. (a and b) S. 1046, S. 1335, S. 1369, and H. R. 2982. Bills to readjust postal rates. H. R. 1870, to amend an act entitled "For the protection of the Bald eagle," especially in Alaska; also H. R. 7524, to protect the "Key deer" in a Florida Park; also H. R. 4668, to control the shipment interstate and from foreign countries of bulls used for bull fighting and the propagation of that type of stock.

A. The American Legion, National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C (2) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanism, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities, with particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agriculture development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies and the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services, etc. (3) American Legion magazine, Legislative Bulletin, and Merchant Marine Bulletin.
D. (6) $2,290.01.
E. (1) $1,635.28; (2) $11,086.69; (4) $2,391.22; (5) $1,106.66; (6) $465.41; (7) $605.24; (9) $17,290.50; (10) $50,654.56; (11) $67,945.06.

A. American Life Convention,[1] 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All prospective legislation which will or may affect the life insurance business.[1]
D. (6) $3,943.71.
E. (2) $2,786; (5) $485 66; (6) $193 58; (7) $478.47; (9) $3,943.71; (10) $7,013 99; (11) $10, 957.70; (15) $2,500, Robert L. Hogg, salary; $286, Emma F. Randel, salary; $416.66, Randall H. Hagner & Co., Inc., rent; $193.58, telephone and telegraph; $69, supplies and miscellaneous office expenses; $478.47, R. L. Hogg, travel, hotel, meals, taxi, tips, and miscellaneous expenses; total, $3,943.71.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary
[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The general legislative interest of the American Medical Association is to advance the science and art of medicine.[1] (3) Informational bulletins.
D. (6) $133,096 62.
E (2) $27,338 16; (5) $10,163.06; (6) $883 23, (7) $477 63; (8) $5,797.59, (9) $44,659.67; (10) $288,234.66, (11) $332,894.33; $81 50, J. S. Lawrence, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D C., staff sundry; $1,000, J S. Lawrence, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D C., postage; $309.99, Oles Envelope Co., 2510 Loch Raven Road, Baltimore, Md , office supplies and repairs; $883 33, H L Rust & Co., 1001 15th Street SW., Washington, D. C., rent; $157.80, Royal Typewriter Co , 1105 D Street SW , Washington, D. C., office equipment, etc , total $44,659.67.[1]

A. American Molasses Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) (a) Sugar Act; (b) Senate No. 1694; (c) title 7, chapter 34, United States Code, Sugar Production and Control; (d) Desire amendment with respect to molasses
E (2) $2,500, (4) $550; (6) $97; (7) $2,997 45; (9) $6,144 45; (10) $1,164.76, (11) $7,309.21.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver 2, Colo.
C (2) Price controls, slaughter quotas, land legislation, tax matters, etc. (3) American Cattle Producer.
D. (6) $16,929.35
E (2) $4,950, (6) $173 10; (7) $1,398 91; (8) $42 90, (9) $6,564 91; (10) $18,037.31; (11) $24,602.22.[1]

A. The American Optometric Association, Inc , development fund, c/o Dr Samuel L Brown, 111 East North Street, Fostoria, Ohio
C (2) S. 106, bill to amend the District of Columbia optometry law; S. 337, bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and Vocational Education Act of 1946; H R 146, bill to improve health services; H. R. 2707, bill to provide for Federal grants in aid for health; all bills pertaining to health and visual care; H. R. 4675 and H. R. 4528, bills to prohibit transportation of fireworks into any State.
E. (2) $3,650; (6) $53.59; (7) $33.40; (9) $3,736 99; (10) $5,805.64; (11) $9,542 63; (16) $3,736.99, William P. MacCracken, Jr., National Press Building, Washington, D. C., professional services and office expense.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Bills affecting the public health; such as H. R. 910, nurses education aid, H R. 5215, funds for National Science Foundation, H. R. 4473, hospital exemption from admissions tax, S 337, medical education aid.
D. (6) $452.51.
E. (2) $375; (5) $69; (6) $8 51; (9) $452 51; (10) $1,332 62; (11) $1,785.13.

A. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the paper and pulp industry, its operations, practices, and properties. Presently interested in House Joint Resolution 278, S. 719, and all stream-pollution legislation.
D. (6) $575.
E. (2) $375; (6) $100; (7) $100; (9) $575; (10) $1,045.88; (11) $1,620.88.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) National school health services bill, H. R. 3238; Public school construction bill, H. R. 3362; national child research bill, H. R. 1879; Federal aid for medical education, S. 337 and H. R. 2707; local public health units, H. R 274, S. 445; physically handicapped children's education bill, S. 3102, H. R 7396; school lunch appropriation, Children's Bureau appropriation; Cabinet status for the Federal Security Agency; Federal aid to day-care centers in defense areas; Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools; emergency maternal and infant care, S. 1245; defense housing and community facilities, H. R. 2988 and S. 349. (3) Washington Report on Legislation Affecting Children
E (2) $1,204 68; (5) $52.50; (6) $54 05; (8) $477 02, (9) $1,788 25; (10) $10,377 85; (11) $12,166 10, (15) $52 50, Paul Unger, 5651 Forty-first Street NW., Washington, D C , rent; $104 98, Kathleen Fahy, 141 North Carolina Avenue SE , Washington, D. C., miscellaneous expenses, $301 17, Kathleen Fahy, 141 North Carolina Avenue SE , Washington, D. C , salary; $140 74, collector of internal revenue, withholding tax, $23 35, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., telephone, etc., total, $1,788.25.[1]

A American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N Y
C (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $14,998.
E. (2) $5,525; (5) $3,400; (6) $243; (9) $10,760; (10) $22,226; (11) $32,986, (16) $2,400, J E Kane, API, Washington, D. C., salary; $669 93, J E Kane, API, Washington, D C , expenses; $179 13, J. E Kane, District of Columbia Petroleum Institute, Washington, D C., expenses; $3,000, J. L. Dwyer, API, Washington, D C , salary; $375 18, J L Dwyer, API, Washington, D. C., expenses, etc.[1]

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N Y
C (2) Legislative interests include all measures affecting the pulpwood industry, its practices or properties.

A American Pyrotechnics Association, 6711 Loch Raven Boulevard, Baltimore, Md.
C. (2) Pending and proposed legislation affecting the pyrotechnic industry, including but not limited to the following bills: H. R. 4528 and H R 4675.
D. (6) $2,500.
E (2) $2,500; (7) $485 09; (9) $2,985 09; (11) $2,985.09.

A. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees, and with its customers.[1]
D. (6) $68,110.13.
E (2) $8,750; (4) $268.87; (5) $785 83; (6) $945.52; (7) $507.28; (9) $11,257.50, (10) $14,875.43; (11) $26,132.93.

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) See legislative program.[2] (3) Agenda.
D. (7) $1,455.58.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.
[2] Not received by the Clerk.

E. (2) $250; (3) $500; (4) $130.97; (5) $401.12; (6) $39.15; (7) $134 34, (9) $1,455.58; (10) $3,665 28; (11) $5,120.86; (16) $55.30, J. M. Hood, reimbursement personal expenses; $44 93, J. M Hood, reimbursement personal expenses; $34 11, J. M. Hood, reimbursement personal expenses; $130.97, Wilson-Epes, printing agenda; $500, National St. Lawrence Project Conference, contribution, etc., total, $1,455.58.[1]

A. American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C (2) H R. 1535 and H R 5505.
D (6) $7,300.
E. (2) $8,687.10, (4) $580.12; (5) $1,020.81; (6) $180 03; (7) $173 56; (8) $1,111 19, (9) $11,752.81; (10) $27,794.03; (11) $39,546 84; (15) $872.24, Chas F. Noyes Co , 40 Wall Street, New York, N Y , rent and electricity; $564.15, Argo Photo-Offset Corp , 333 Avenue of Americas, New York City, printing and distributing literature, $57 73, Graham Stationery Co , 26 West Forty-fourth Street, New York City, stationery and supplies; $13 39, Aetna Printing Co , 64 Reade Street, New York City, stationery; $180 03, New York Telephone Co , post-office box 0, New York City, telephone service; etc.; total, $11,647 52.[1]

A America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D C
C (2) H R 1535, customs simplification bill
D (6) $4,080
E (2) $4,062 37; (5) $90; (6) $29 28; (7) $174.39; (8) $37 50, (9) $4,393.54, (10) $8,601.50; (11) $12,995 04; (15) $45, National Labor-Management Council, 424 Bowen Building, Washington 5, D C , rent, $12 50, the Trades Unionist, Washington, D C , printing letterheads, $29.53, O R Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C , traveling expenses, $10 38, C & P Telephone Co , telephone bill; $32.05, O R. Strackbein, expenses, etc [1]

A Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co , Keltys, Tex ; Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Forth Worth, Tex.; Fort Worth & Denver City Railway Co , Fort Worth, Tex ; Gulf, Colorado and Santa Fe Railway Co., Galveston, Tex ; The Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; Louisiana & Arkansas Railway Co , Kansas City, Mo.; International-Great Northern Railroad, Houston, Tex ; Missouri-Kansas-Texas of Texas, Dallas, Tex.; New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Railway Co , Houston, Tex.; Panhandle and Santa Fe Railway Co., Amarillo, Tex ; Paris and Mount Pleasant Railroad Co , Paris, Tex ; Quanah, Acme & Pacific Railway Co , Quanah, Tex.; Roscoe, Snyder & Pacific Railway Co., Abilene, Tex ; St Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway Co , Fort Worth, Tex ; St. Louis, Southwestern Railway Co. of Texas, St. Louis, Mo.; Southern Pacific Co , San Francisco, Calif.; Texas & New Orleans Railroad Co , Houston, Tex ; Texas South-Eastern Railroad Co , Diboll, Tex ; The Texas and Pacific Railway Co , Dallas, Tex ; The Texas Mexican Railway Co , Laredo, Tex ; The Union Terminal Co., Dallas, Tex ; Wichita Falls & Southern Railroad Co , Wichita Falls, Tex ; Wichita Valley Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.
C. (2) Generally legislation effecting Texas railroads. For: S. 1335 and H R. 3465, parcel-post rates, etc.; H. R. 2416, exclusion from gross income from discharge of indebtedness; S. 1657, air-mail subsidy separation; H R.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

4483 to amend section 307 (d) of the Interstate Commerce Act; H. R. 3587, third supplemental appropriation bill; S. 1603, bill to assure allocations for building and repair of freight cars and locomotives; S. 719, clarifying Robinson-Patman Act; H. R. 3282, Post Office appropriation bill, for clarifying amendment with reference to unlimited powers of Postmaster General as to mail movements. Opposed: House Joint Resolution 2 and Senate Joint Resolution 27, St. Lawrence seaway; H. R. 4473, tax bill as to withholding dividend and interest payments; H. R. 3880, Independent Office appropriation bill as to Long amendment giving borrowing power to Inland Barge Lines; H. R. 1998, to amend section 25 of the Interstate Commerce Act relating to communication systems and operating rules; S 1347 and H. R. 3669, and S 1353 and H. R. 3755, amending Railroads Retirement Act, but for Priest bill, H. R. 4641, on same subject; neither for nor against H. R. 4386, appropriations for civil functions of Army.

E. (2) $4,374.99; (8) $1,814.13; (9) $6,189.12; (10) $12,102.85; (11) $18,291.97.

A. Richard H Anthony, 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

B. The American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) H. R. 1535 and H R. 5505.

D. (6) $3,125.

E. (7) $150.04; (9) $150.04; (10) $454 60; (11) $604.64.

A Hector M Aring, 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C

B Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y

C. (2) Tax legislation, labor legislation, amendments to the Clayton Act, merchant marine legislation, price basing point legislation, Defense Production Act.

D. (6) $1,250.

E. (8) $509.89; (9) $509.89; (10) $1,916; (11) $2,425.89.

A. Arnold, Fortas and Porter, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Molasses Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) (a) Sugar Act; (b) Senate No. 1694; (c) title 7, chapter 34, United States Code, Sugar Production and Control.

D. (6) $2,500.

E. (4) $708 64; (6) $75.60; (7) $311.67; (8) $20.31; (9) $1,116.22; (11) $1,116.22.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

E. (11) $1,952.30.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D C.

C. (2).[1]

A. Association of American Railroads,[1] 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Generally to keep informed with respect to legislation affecting transportation; to support such legislation as members of the Association of American Railroads believe to be in their interest and in the interest of a sound national transportation policy; and to oppose legislation which they believe to be contrary to such interests. In addition to the support of or opposition to particular measures, the legislative activities during the quarter included the study and analysis of measures which were neither supported nor opposed, in an effort to determine their possible effect on transportation.[1] (3) What's New.

E. (2) $36,750.17; (3) $15,000; (5) $3,725.37; (6) $440.77; (7) $540.63; (8) $3,913.69; (9) $60,370.63; (10) $127,642.83; (11) $188,013.46; (15) $5,000, July 3, $5,000, August 6, $5,000, September 12, National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 815 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., contributions to expenses of the conference, which opposes the St. Lawrence waterway.

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) See report of George W. Morgan.

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies,[1] 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies. Specific legislative interests: Revenue Act of 1951 (H. R. 4473); proposed War Disaster Act of 1951 (S. 1848), and suggested amendment to the National Defense Appropriation Act (H. R. 5054), relating to effect on surety of contract cancellation. (3) Casualty and Surety Journal.

D (7) $1,658.72

E (2) $1,241 98, (4) $42 63; (5) $111 61; (6) $34.23; (7) $45 95; (8) $182 32, (9) $1,658.72; (10) $3,476.13; (11) $5,134.85.

A. Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any and all Federal legislative proposals which do or may affect the western railroads.

A. Atlantic Union Committee, Inc, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

D (7) $36,886 58.

E (2) $18,184 73; (4) $5,874 56; (5) $2,475 47; (6) $1,385.29; (7) $2,657 21, (8) $82 12; (9) $36,519 21;[1] (10) $90,973 13, (11) $127,492.34.

A. Awalt, Clark & Sparks, a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: F G Awalt, Samuel O. Clark, Jr, Raymond Sparks, and W. V. T. Justice, 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D C

B National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D C.

C. (2) Legislation that might affect the association and its members as going electric utilities[1]

D. (6) $6,250 02.

E (7) $40 91; (9) $40.91; (10) $41 81; (11) $82.72.

A. Charles E. Babcock, route 4, box 73, Vienna, Va.

B. The National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3025-3029 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) Patriotic legislation, restriction of immigration, improvement of free schools, suppression of communism, etc.

D. (6) $249 99.

E. (5) $60; (6) $2.33; (7) $50.50; (8) $1.71; (9) $124.64; (10) $220 56; (11) $345.20.

A. C. Lloyd Bailey, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The general legislative interest is to work where legislation is involved for the development of the United Nations into a world federation; the international control and reduction of armaments; recognition on the part of the United States Government of its responsibility for assuming its share of the burden for world-wide economic rehabilitation and development; protection of recognized civil liberties; and adequate recognition of rights of conscience. (3) The Washington Letter.

D. (6) $1,415.61.

E (6) $9 91; (7) $387.74; (8) $67.96; (9) $465 61; (10) $558 40; (11) $1,054.01.

A Charles B. Bailey, 2035 South Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (2) Various legislation affecting members of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks.

D. (6) $120.

A Frazer A Bailey, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B National Federation of American Shipping, Inc, 1809 G Street NW, Washington, D C.

C. (2) S. J. Res. 104, H R 3880, H. R 4480, S. 1674, S. 241, H. R. 4729, S. 1221, H. J Res. 4, S. J. Res. 27, H. R. 4740, S. 49, and H. R. 5215.

D. (6) $3,125.

A. John A Baker, 300 Independence Avenue SE, Washington, D C.

B Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office); 300 Independence Avenue SE, Washington, D C (legislative office).

C (2) Legislation of interest to the National Farmers Union.

A Mary Alice Baldinger, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D. C

B American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y

C (2) Legislative interests generally supported are antilynching (H R 28, S 127, S 1733); antipoll tax (H. R. 1320, S. 1734); omnibus civil rights (H. R. 29); FEPC (S. 1732); home rule for the District of Columbia (S 656); statehood for Alaska and Hawaii (S 49, S 50). Also immigration legislation including the omnibus immigration bill (S 2055) on which some sections are supported and some opposed.

D (6) $375.

E (5) $10 90; (6) $9 06; (7) $11 40; (8) $18 30, (9) $49 66, (10) $175.64; (11) $225 30.

A H M Baldridge, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y., and 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

B United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y., and 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) H R. 4521 and S. 1694.

A. Joseph H. Ball, 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D C.

B. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) The registrant is employed as vice president of the above-named employer and is not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. During the period for which this report is filed the registrant did, however, support, advocate, or oppose H. R. 4473 (revenue bill) and S. 1704 (foreign transfers of American ships).

D. (6) $1,250.

E. (7) $95.46.

A. Loren C. Bamert, P. O. Box 189, Ione, Calif.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Hartman Barber, room 407, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting labor, particularly railroad labor.
D. (6) $1,524 26.
E. (2) $244.35; (6) $220 29; (7) $184 76; (8) $80 97; (9) $730.37, (10) $1,374.77; (11) $2,105 14.

A. Joel Barlow, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 4473, which, when and if enacted, will be cited as the Revenue Act of 1951, and with proposals which may be made in this session of Congress affecting the tax status of mutual-savings banks. Section 101 (2) of the Internal Revenue Code exempts these banks from Federal income tax. Section 313 of H. R. 4473, as passed by the Senate, repeals the exemption of these banks under section 101 (2). The National Association of Mutual Savings Banks and the undersigned have been opposing enactment of such section 313.

A. James M. Barnes, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., Kingsland Underwriters Group, Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd.
C. (1) December 31, 1952 (2) To provide for completion of payments to Americans holding adjudicated awards of the Mixed Claims Commission. (3) None.

A. Arthur R Barnett, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C (See appended statement).[1]
C. (1) Of indefinite duration. (2) See appended statement, page 5. (3) None.
D.[1] (6) $4,125.
E (6) $5.55; (7) $497.41; (8) $91 67; (9) $594 63; (10) $1,076 23; (11) $1,670.86; (15) $12.50, July 11, 1951, the Tavern, Newark, N. J. (restaurant); $20.88, July 11, 1951, Hotel Delmonico, New York City (hotel); $11, August 18, 1951, Fan & Bills, Washington, D C. (restaurant); $12 50, August 30, 1951, the Colony, Washington, D C. (restaurant); $54 44, August 27, 1951, the Waldorf Astoria, New York City (hotel), etc.[1]

A. Irvin Barney, Jr, 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347 to amend Railroad Retirement Act. House Resolution 426 to integrate railroad retirement funds with social security. All legislation of interest to railroad employees and labor in general. (3) None.
D[1] $2,100.

A. A. K Barta, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Ethanol Committee, 810 Eighteenth Street NW.

A. A. K. Barta, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Proprietary Association, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Bills affecting proprietary medicines industry. H. R. 3298. (3) (a) Legislative bulletins. (b) Approximately 500. (c) Weekly. (d) Mimeographed.
E. (7) $125. (9) $125. (10) $250. (11) $375.

A. Frank E. Bass, Tennessee Education Association, 321 Seventh Avenue, North, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Legislative-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.—expenses only. (Tennessee Education Association, 321 Seventh Avenue North, Nashville, Tenn.—no part of salary alloted for legislative purposes).
C. No activity in connection with legislative interest was undertaken during this calendar quarter.

A. Earl C. Bassett, 304 North Lafayette St., Mobile, Ala.
B. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Bldg., Washington, D C.
C. (1) Legislative interstate terminated August 31, 1951. (2) Oppose all legislation looking toward the so-called St. Lawrence seaway development. Oppose all legislation such as Senate Joint Resolution 27 and all other legislation introduced regarding this matter. (3) None.
D.[1] (6) $1100.

A. James T. Begg, 2202 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National St Lawrence Project Conference, an organization formed for the purpose of opposing the St. Lawrence project
C. (1) Six months. (2) Opposing all measures looking to the approval of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project. Measures currently pending: House Joint Resolutions 2, 3, 4, 15, 102, 122, 159, House Resolution 2536; Senate Joint Resolution 27.
D[1] (6) $2,000.
E. (10) $988 50. (11) $988 50.

A. J A. Beirne, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union. (3) Nothing.

A. Bell, Taylor & Co., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B S H. Kress & Co, 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; McCrory Stores Corp., 1107 Broadway, New York, N Y; W. T. Grant Co., 1441 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; McLellan Stores Co, 55 Fifth Avenue, New York, N Y.; J. J. Newberry Co., 245 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; H. L. Green Co., Inc, 902 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Rose's 5-10-25-Cent Stores, Inc, Henderson, N. C.; Eagle Stores Co., Inc., 101 North Graham Street, Charlotte, N C.; W. W Mac Co, 101 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) Approximately September 1, 1951. (2) (a) 1951 Defense Production Act; (b) S. 1717; (c) S. 1717; (d) our studies, investigations, recommendations would in effect support the main provisions of S. 1717. (3) No publications issued or distributed.
D.[1] (6) $2,530.73.
E (5) $52.21; (6) $108.20; (7) $286 98, (9) $447.39; (10) $1,644.59; (11) $2,091.98; (15) Travel and hotel, $179.38; meeting expenses, $107.60; stenographer, messenger service, etc., $52.21; telephone tolls and telegrams, $108.20.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347 to amend Railroad Retirement Act. H. Res. 426 for integration of Railroad Retirement Fund with social security. All legislation affecting railroad employees in particular and labor in general. (3) None.
D.[1] (6) $3,000.

A. Wendell Berge, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Independent Industries, Inc., 1346 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Pending bills to abolish RFC, opposed; Fulbright bill to revice RFC, in favor.
E. (6) $4 62; (8) $14 16; (9) $18.78; (10) $412.78; (11) $431.56; (12) $190.77.

A. Wendell Berge, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, Inc., 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Legislative interest to continue to October 19, 1951; (2) H. R. 2945 and S. 1103; (3) None.
D.[1] (6) $3,000
E. (4) $4; (6) $21 33; (7) $213.73; (8) $10.36, (9) $249.42; (10) $284.54, (11) $533.96.

A. Preston B. Bergin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C (See p. 3)[1]
D[1] (6) $1,000.
E. (7) $2 50; (9) $2 50; (10) $9.80; (11) $12.30.

A. Kenneth W. Bergen, 84 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. The Merchants National Bank of Boston, executor.
C. (1) Uncertain. (2) Amendment to section 811 (c) (2) of Internal Revenue Code. (3) Typed memorandum submitted to Congressmen explaining legislative proposal.
E. (15) $33 94, July 8, railroad and plane fares, Washington, D. C.; $33.94, July 22, railroad and plane fares, Washington, D. C; $33 94, August 5, railroad and plane fares, Washington, D. C; $28.05, August 12, railroad and plane fares, Washington, D C.; $21 77, August 25, railroad and plane fares, Washington, D. C., etc.[1]

A. Joe Betts, 261 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) (See attached).[1]
D[1] (6) $1,900 02.
E. (7) $111 12; (9) $111.12; (10) $929 51; (11) $1,040.63.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. The firm represents companies engaged in the business of marine insurance and as members of the American Institute of Marine Underwriters; The Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States; American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange; American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) General questions affecting the insurance of ships and their cargoes against marine risks; reparations; subrogation. (a) Merchant Marine Act, 1936. (b) H. R. 2562, taxation of marine insurance; H. R. 2110, a private bill for relief based on subrogation. (3) None.
E. (6) $41.20; (7) $753.72; (9) $794.92; (10) $1,601.36; (11) $2,396.28; (15) $2,396.28.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Norman E. Biorn, 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (1) Legislative interests will continue indefinitely. (2) Federal and State taxation and governmental expenditure. (3) None.
D[1] (7) $152.75
E. (2) $150; (5) $2.25; (6) $5.50; (7) $48 18; (9) $205.93, (10) $403 74; (11) $609.67; (15) $205.93.

A. James C Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio
C. (1) Activities only on behalf of employer I do not consider that I come under the act (2) Only insofar as legislation affects my employer (3) None.
D[1] (6) $600
E (7) $500; (9) $500; (10) $1,000, (11) $1,500.

A. Wm Rhea Blake, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B National Cotton Council of America, post-office box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C (1) Indefinitely. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the Council is organized. (3) None
D[1] (6) $1,041 65.
E (7) $680.51; (9) $680 51; (10) $212 60; (11) $893 11.

A D A Bodary, 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo
C (1) Indefinitely (2) H R 3669 and 1347, to amend Railroad Retirement Act. House Resolution 426 to study integration of railroad retirement funds with social security; all legislation of interest to railway employees and labor in general. (3) None.
D[1] (6) $3,474 99.

A. Morton Bodfish, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C (1) Continuous. (2) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions. Opposition to Senate version of H R. 4473. (3) None
D[1] (6) $625.
E (6) $25 03; (7) $450 71; (9) $475.74; (10) $729 84; (11) $1,205.56, (15) $95.23. August 30, Eastern Airlines, $95 23; $23.83; August 9, Occidental Hotel, Washington, $23.83; $20.38, August 6, Hotel Statler, Washington, $20.38; $36 16, September 25, Hotel Statler, Washington, $36.16, etc.[1]

A. Maywood Boggs, 825 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders & Helpers of America—A F. of L.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 3669, S. 1347 (amendments to Railroad Retirement Act); S. 1959, S. 1973 (amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act); H. R. 5118 (unemployment compensation for Federal employees). (3) None.
D.[1] (6) $540.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John N. Bohannon, 75 Macon Avenue, Asheville, N. C. (when in Washington, 1026 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C).
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N Y.
C. (1) See first quarterly report heretofore filed. (2) Any legislation affecting business in general. (3) None.
D.[1] (6) $4,500.
E (5) $487.64; (6) $216 09; (7) $1,315 64; (9) $2,019.37; (10) $3 897 41; (11) $5,916 78.

A Sanford H Bolz, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B American Jewish Congress, Inc , 15 East Eighty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y
C. (1) Indefinite (2) General, to oppose anti-Semitism and racism in all its forms, and to defend civil rights incident thereto. (3) Specific, (a) and (b) H R. 2379 and S 716, omnibus immigration bills. (3) None.
D.[1] (6) $125.

A. Robert F Bonamarte, Sr , 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C
C (1) Indefinite (2) Legislation affecting the armed services and veterans (H R. 1181 amending sec 206 of the Reorganization Act of 1946) H R 5664 to provide for an increase in the pay and certain allowances of the members of the uniformed services. (3) None.

A Clarence J Bourg, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D C
B Farmers & Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, Saginaw, Mich
C (1) Permanently (2) S 1694, H. R. 4521, Public Law 140, re Sugar Act of 1948. (3) Sugar Beet Journal, monthly, sent to entire membership.
E (8) $110 75.

A Benjamin Edward Bowden, room 409, Labor Building, 10 Independence Ave SW, Washington, D. C.
B American Train Dispatchers Association, 10 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (1) Unable to state definitely how long legislative interests are to continue My interest is the passage of amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. (2) H. R 3669 to amend the Railroad Retirement Act (proponent), S. 1347 to amend the Railroad Retirement Act (proponent) (3) No publication caused to be issued or distributed in connection with any legislative activities.
D[1] (6) $914 88
E (6) $23 50, (7) $576 74; (9) $600 24; (10) $429 41; (11) $1,029 65.

A R B Bowden, 100 Merchants Exchange, St Louis, Mo., and/or 608 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (1) Indefinitely; started in 1896. (2) General legislation affecting the grain and feed trade. In past quarter, legislation proposing to equalize tax of cooperatives has been supported. (3) Articles written in our Weekly Newsletter to members urging their support of proposals to equalize co-op tax.
D.[1]
E. (7) (Est.) $15; (9) $15.

A. H. B. Boyd, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting sugar, particularly the Sugar Act of 1948, and related legislation. (3) None.
D.[1] (6) $4,500.
E (7) $1.75; (9) $175; (10) $3; (11) $4.75; (15) $1.75, July 26 and 31, various taxi operators, to attend committee hearings on H. R. 4521.

A. John S. Boyden, 351 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Ute Indian Tribe, Fort Duchesne, Utah.
C. (1) July 18 to August 7, 1951, inclusive. (2) (a) To provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, to provide for the division of certain tribal funds with the Southern Utes, and for other purposes. (b) S 1357; H. R. 3795. (d) For. (3) None.
D.[1]
E. (7) $494.33; (9) $494.33; (11) $194 33.

A. Charles M Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security. (3) (a) The Reserve Officer, the official magazine of the association, and the ROA Washington Newsletter contain articles and comments on legislation, although not published primarily for that purpose. (b) Approximately 60,000 copies of The Reserve Officer and 3,000 copies of the ROA Washington Newsletter. (c) The Reserve Officer is published monthly and the newsletter semimonthly. (d) The Reserve Officer, Benson Printing Co , Nashville, Tenn. ROA Washington Newsletter, Plymouth Printing & Duplicating Co , Washington, D. C.

A Ira P. Bradford, 1108 Sixteenth Street NW , Washington, D C
B Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill
C My interest is solely in seeking information regarding all matters pertaining to the oil industry and reporting to my employer.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio
C (1) As long as registrant holds present office and legislation affecting interest of employing organization is pending. (2) All legislation involving or in the direction of national prohibition, taxation of alcohlic beverages, etc. (3) The Brewery Worker.
D[1]
E (10 $189.46; (11) $189.46.

A Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. ,
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D C.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Any legislation affecting transportation matters in which members of the association are interested. No specific bills at this time. (3) None.

A. Glenn A. Brennan, 2731 Cleveland Street, Hammond, Ind.
B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (1) Thirty days. (2) Amendments to railway retirement, H. R. 3669, S. 1347. (3) Restrict weights and lengths of fourth-class mail, S. 1335.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Mr. James M. Brewbaker, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B National Association of Manufacturers.
C., D., E.[1]

A. O. O. Bright, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans, La.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the lumber manufacturing industry.
D.[1] (6) $1,200.
E. (7) $69; (9) $69; (10) $89.35; (11) $158.35.

A. H. E. Brinckerhoff, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) Legislative interests will continue during employment. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer. (3) None.

A. Dawes E. Brisbine, 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc , 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C
C (1) Continuous, as long as there be legislation pending before the Congress dealing with Federal grants-in-aid to States for highways, or repeal, modification, or extension of Federal excise taxes on motor vehicles, gasoline, oil, tires, or auto parts. (2) Such legislative interest is primarily for analysis and reporting—(a) Revenue Act of 1951; (b) H R. 4473, and the Senate version; (c) for modification of automotive excise tax provisions. (3) No publications have been issued except bulletins such as the attached[1] yellow information bulletin of July 18, 1951, for distribution among our member groups.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) General legislation affecting food processing and related actitives, including specifically. Amendments, Defense Production Act, S. 1717; S. 2170; H. R 3871
D[1] (6) $1,500.
E. (6) $100; (7) $700; (9) $800; (10) $865; (11) $1,665.

A. A. E. Brooks, 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
B. American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Edificio Bearn, Plaza Santos Degollado, Mexico, D. F.
C. (1) Two years. (2) IRC, section 116 (a) to exempt from United States income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad. (3) None.

A. William F. Brooks, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D C.
C. (1) Uncertain. (2) Revision or extension of the Defense Production Act of 1950.
D. and E.[1]

A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (1) Continuously. (2) We support or oppose legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interest of labor. (3) Our official publication is the Locomotive Engineers' Journal. It is issued monthly and occasionally discusses legislation.
D.[1]
E. (16) J T. Corbett, salary, $3,295.56; expenses, $758.97; Madge I. Harmer, salary as stenographer, $855; office rent, $351.27.

A. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C (1) Indefinitely. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting labor, more particularly railroad labor. (3) None.
D.[1] (6) $13,323 51.
E.[1] (2) $8,387.39; (7) $4,936 12; (9) $13,-323.51; (10) $9,548.40; (11) $22,871.91.

A. C R. Brown, room 411, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance-of-Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347, to amend Railroad Retirement Act, and House Resolution 426, to integrate railroad retirement funds with social security.
D.[1] (6) $2,977 22.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2)[1] Any legislation that might affect the members of the N. A. E. C. (3) None.
D[1] (6) $7,500.
E (2) $6,408.33; (5) $375; (8) $46 35; (9) $6,829.68; (10) $14,519 63; (11) $21,349.31; (15) $416 67, July 16, $416 67, August 1, Prentiss M. Brown, 2000 Second Avenue, Detroit, Mich , services; $450, July 16, $450, August 1, $450, September 12, B. M. Fitzgerald, 900 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C., services, etc.[1]

A. Paul W Brown, department 731, Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co , 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Postal legislation.
D.[1] (6) $356 46.
E (5) $0.80; (6) $136.21; (8) $137 01; (9) $162.09; (10) $299 10.

A. Russell B. Brown, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Legislative interests are continuing.
E (8) $17; (9) $17; (10) $81; (11) $98.

A. Thad H Brown, Jr., 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation, local, State, or Federal, which relates to the television-broadcasting industry.
D. (6) $4,816.61.
E. (9) $816.61.

A. William A. Bryans 3d, 1044 Gas and Electric Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Public Service Co. of Colorado, 900 Fifteenth Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Legislation having to do with activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Rural Electrification Administration, and tax matters.
E. (7) $1,902.11; (9) $704.58; (10) $1,902.11; (11) $2,606.69.

A. Jack Bryson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the motion-picture industry when introduced in Congress.
D. (6) $6,280.79.
E. (7) $1,278.44; (8) $798.15; (9) $2,076 59; (10) $3,525.72; (11) $5,602.31; (15) $918.65, Shoreham Hotel, food and entertainment; $185.93, Mayflower Hotel, food and entertainment; $173.86, Statler Hotel, food and entertainment.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
C (2) Potentially interested in all legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects. Specific legislative interest includes appropriations for civil functions of the Army, H. R. 4386.
D. (6) $1,350.
E (6) $20.10; (8) $31.83; (9) $51.93; (10) $113 77; (11) $165 70; (15) $17.25, July 23, Western Union, Washington, D. C., for telegrams.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N J.

A. The Budd Co , Philadelphia, Pa.
C (2) Corporate income and excess profits taxes.

A George Bugbee, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill
B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
C (2) Legislation affecting hospitals.
D (6) $1,343 74
E (7) $238 01; (9) $238 01, (10) $849 87.

A Harold J. Buov, business address, Hamilton Hotel, Washington, D. C.; home address, rural route No. 6, Decatur, Ill.
B International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders and Helpers of America (A F. of L.), Kansas City, Kans.
C. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347, amendments to Railroad Retirement Act.
D (6) $711 77.

A. Harold Burke, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N Y.
B United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 4521 and S. 1694.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, post-office box 860, Lexington, Ky.; lobbyist, Hugh W. Taylor, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $726.
E. (8) $4,763.38; (9) $8,462.97; (10) $13,-226.35; (15) $2,177.16, Hugh W. Taylor; $590.10, Inez M. Pontier; $295.50, Margaret Adair, salaries; $255, rent; $137.40, telephone and telegraph, etc.[1]

A. George B. Burnham, 111 First Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 5653 College Avenue, Oakland, Calif.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with clerk and secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislation for the relief of the Burnham Chemical Co., Senate Joint Resolution 23, House Joint Resolutions 181, 182, 183, 186, and 199.
D (6) $1,643 19.
E (2) $500; (4) $511 29; (7) $437 60; (8) $194.30, (9) $1,643 19; (10) $3,901.51; (11) $5,544.70; (15) $250, G. B Burnham, 111 First Street NE, Washington, D. C., $250, Pearl M. Burnham, 111 First Street NE, Washington, D C,; $237 18, Commercial Printing Co., 517 New Jersey Avenue NW, Washington, D. C., printing, $73 21, Spee-Dee-Que, 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C, printing, $69 40, S & S Mailing Service, 730 Eleventh Street SE, Washington, D. C., mailing, etc.[1]

A. F Hugh Burns, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D C
B Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
C (1) Unknown, (2) St Lawrence legislation.
D (6) $1,800
E (7) $781 49, (8) $16 41; (9) $697 80; (10) $1,310 94, (11) $2,008 84.

A Robert M Burr, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N Y
B National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N Y
C (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, and electric fans.
D (7) $549 22.
E. (7) $194 83; (9) $194 83; (11) $194.83; (15) $194 83.

A Orrin A Burrows, 1200 Fifteenth Street N.W, Washington, D C
B International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 Fifteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C
C (1) Indefinitely, as needed. (2) All legislation dealing with the electrical workers in particular and labor in general, such as attempts by Congress to reduce annual and sick leave of Federal employees, and H R 5118, which is supported as unemployment insurance of Federal workers.
D (6) $2,067.

A Eugene J Butler, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, D C
B National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D C
C (2) All legislation affecting religious, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations
D (7) $2,433 30
E (7) $182.01; (9) $182.01; (10) $388 44; (11) $570.45.

A Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N Y.
B Levitt & Sons, Inc, Manhasset, L. I., N. Y.
C (2) Legislation pertaining to housing, and specifically in defense housing bills, S 349; H R. 2988, now the Defense Housing Act of 1951 (3) Booklet, titled "Defense Housing, There Must Be a Law"
E. (1) $9,000; (2) $5,490; (4) $3,270; (6) $20; (9) $17,780; (10) $135; (11) $17,915.

A Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Opposing the proposed increase in the rate of Federal excise tax on distilled spirits.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (1) $9,000; (2) $10,991; (4) $135; (6) $10; (7) $35; (8) $235; (9) $20,406; (10) $41,585; (11) $61,991.

A. Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.
B W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co, Fort Madison, Iowa.
C. (2) Defense Production Act of 1950 and such other bills as may pertain to economic controls over industry, especially during emergency periods.

A. John W. Caffey, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 830 Southeastern Building, Greensboro, N C
B Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif
C (2) Wine excise taxes and other subjects relating to wine
D (6) $2,000
E (5) $2,158 40, (6) $139 27, (7) $1,924 11; (8) $10 19, (9) $1,231 97, (10) $2,875.80, (11) $7,107 77.

A C G Caffrey, 1625 I Street NW, Washington, D C
B The American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc, 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N C
C (2) H R 8304, H R 4473, H R 3871, S 1717, and S 2164
E (7) $75, (9) $75, (10) $225; (11) $305.

A Leonard J Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D C
B National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill
C (2) Retained as Washington counsel for all legal matters affecting NTEA, including legal aspects of various legislative proposals relating to taxation of cooperatives and other corporations enjoying tax exemptions or special privileges.
D (6) $2,000.

A R B Carothers, Paris, Tenn.
B H C Spinks Clay Co, Inc, Paris, Tenn; Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co, Cooley Clay, Kentucky Clay Mining Co, Mayfield, Ky; Bell Clay Co, Gleason, Tenn, United Clay Mines Corp, Trenton, N. J; Old Hickory Clay Co, Paducah, Ky
C. (2) Retaining percentage depletion allowance, title 26, section 114, Internal Revenue Code, also legislation to clarify family partnership law
E (6) $100, (7) $732.12; (8) $200, (9) $1,032 12, (10) $1,536.02, (11) $2,568 14.

A. T C Carroll, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich
B Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) At present working for passage of H R 3669 and S. 1347, to amend Railroad Retirement Act, also House Resolution 426 to integrate retirement funds with special security which we oppose.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 640 Shoreham Building, Washington, D C, and 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation of interest to natural gas industry.
D. (6) $3,602.68.
E. (1) $34; (2) $82; (4) $24 90; (6) $29 50; (7) $395.08, (8) $37 20; (9) $602.68; (10) $853.42; (11) $1,456.10.

A. Joseph K. Carson, Jr., 17 Battery Place, New York, N Y.
B. The Propeller Club of the United States, 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any matters affecting the welfare of the American Merchant Marine, arising under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and other legislation affecting the shipping industry.

A. Albert E Carter, 1026 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D. C.
B Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislative matters affecting company's interest.
D (6) $3,000.
E. (5) $598 24; (6) $171.65; (7) $547 45; (9) $1,317.34, (10) $1,928.54; (11) $3,245.88; (15) $598 24, Munsey Trust Co, rent; $171.65, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. and Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co; $312 50, Southern Pacific Railroad Co, travel; $234 95, University Club, Statler Hotel, Mayflower Hotel.

A. Clarence B Carter, post-office box 798, New Haven, Conn
B Railroad Pension Conference, post-office box 798, New Haven, Conn.
C (2) For enactment of H R 63 providing 30-year retirement regardless of age at half-pay based on 5 years of highest earnings.
E (6) $24 72, (9) $24 72; (10) $131.86; (11) $156 58

A D E Casey, 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D C
B American Taxpayers Association, Inc., 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D C.

A Larry Cates, 1185 National Press Building, Washington, D C.
B C N Sayen, president, Air Line Pilots Association, 3145 West Sixty-third Street, Chicago, Ill
C (2) Aviation Legislation and Railway Labor Act
D (6) $1,595 62.

A William E Chace, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D C.
B The National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eighty-first Congress as H R. 2756, in the Eighty-second Congress such as S 1693 and H. R. 1775.
D. (6) $20.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C
C. (2) S. 436, S. 1149, S. 1848, H R. 4473, H R 2820, H. R. 4484, H. R. 1535, H R 4963, and mutual security legislation. (3) Legislative Daily, Bill Outlook, Legislative Outlook, special numbers, etc[1]
D. (6) $623,578 49.
E (9) $27,654 66; [1] (10) $64,450 17; (11) $92,104 83.

A. Chase National Bank of the City of New York, 18 Pine Street, New York, N Y.
C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.
E (2) $120, (7) $26 90; (9) $146 90; (10) $752.97; (11) $899.87, (15) $146.90, Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.
C. (2) Promoting Senate Joint Resolution 29 and House Joint Resolution 156, a pro-

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

posed Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States. (3) The Christian Patriot.

D. (6) $2,223.07.

E. (2) $1,480.05; (4) $394.74; (5) $77.75; (6) $0.50; (7) $335.65; (9) $2,288.69; (10) $7,034.39; (11) $9,323.08; (15) $50, Mrs. T. B. Boyle, 914 Clay Street, Topeka Kans., office rent; $211.50, Floyd Burres Printing Service, Harrison Street, Topeka, Kans., printing; $162.50, Barrett Printing Co., Arlington, Kans., printing; $10, U. S. News and World Report, 435 Parker Avenue, Dayton, Ohio, magazine subscription; $810, Dr. A. J. McFarland, Sterling, Kans., salary; etc.[1]

A. Elisabeth Christman, 1034 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

A. Citizens' Committee on Foreign Policy, 100 East Fiftieth Street, New York, N Y.

C. (2) Foreign policy.

D. (6) $75.

E. (8) $71.82;; (9) $71.82; (10) $272.12; (11) $343.94; (15) $71.82, New Era Letter Co., Inc., 495 Broadway, New York City, N. Y., for letter-shop work.

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Pending and prospective legislation affecting the interest of the railway company.[1]

D. (6) $4,275.

A. David R. Clarke, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Metal Trades Association, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation affecting industry in general.

A. William W. Clary, 433 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Signal Oil & Gas. Co., Long Beach Oil Development Co., and Southwest Exploration Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation pertaining generally to oil and gas, including such bills as Senate Joint Resolution 20 and S. 940.

E. (7) $750; (9) $750; (10) $2,100; (11) $2,850.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Oppose any proposed legislation (such as S 491 and H. R. 4004, 81st Cong.), calling for the duplication of class I-A clear channel frequencies or the limitation of the power of class I-A standard broadcast stations; opposes ratification of the so-called NARBA agreement signed November 15, 1950.

D. (6) $29,833.38.

E (2) $5,625; (3) $64 04; (7) $293.60; (9) $5,982.64; (10) $12,294.20; (11) $18,276.84; (15) $999, salary of CCBS secretary Norma MaDan; $637.70, expenses of CCBS director, Ward L. Quaal; $79.90, expenses of CCBS secretary, Norma MaDan; $416.90, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C.; $57 01, Fox-Jones Co., Washington, D. C., office supplies; etc.[1]

A. Francis P. Cleere, 3831 Drysdale Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347, amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

D. (6) $180.

E. (7) $114.40; (9) $114.40; (11) $114.40.

A. Marcus Cohn, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Genocide, the President's civil-rights program, H. R. 2379, H. R. 2339, H. R. 2467, H. R. 2476, H. R. 2816, H. R. 3458, House Resolution 364, S. 349, S. 728, S. 1247, Senate Resolution 105.

E. (2) $93.75; (4) $44.15; (5) $78.55; (6) $6.90; (9) $223.35; (10) $389.23; (11) $612.58; (15) $450, Cafritz Co., 1404 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., rent; $808.98, Helene Braun, 2904 Argyle Drive, Alexandria, Va.; salary; $90, Regina Wolf, salary; $44.15, the Public Printer, Washington, D. C., reprints.

A. C. Fred Coleman, Lewisville, Ark.

B. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co., Lewisville, Ark.

C. (2) H. R. 3669, known as railroad-retirement bill.

D. (6) $960.

E. (7) $2,069; (9) $2,069; (11) $3,269.

A. Russell Coleman, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eighty-first Congress as H. R. 2756, in the Eighty-second Congress such as S. 1693 and H. R. 1755.

D. (6) $100.

A. Marvin J. Coles, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for the Promotion of Tramp Shipping Under the American Flag in Foreign Commerce, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. The committee is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American-flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades.

E. (6) $7.76; (7) $8; (9) $15.76; (10) $193 18, (11) $208.94.

A. Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., 335 Symes Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) General legislative interests of the group is the taxing of competitive business on the same basis without regard to exemptions under section 101 of the present Internal Revenue Code. Specific bills in which it is presently interested are H. R. 240, S. 892, and H. R. 1177.

D. (6) $140.

E. (4) $146.95; (5) $68.50; (6) 96 cents; (7) $348.82; (8) $1,462.50; (9) $2,027.73; (10) $990.29; (11) $3,018.02; (15) $137 95, Laman for Letters, Denver, Colo., mailing letters to membership; $68.50, Edna P. Hubbard, Symes Building, Denver, Colo., stenographic services; $92.67, Bart W. O'Hara, Symes Building, Denver, Colo., expenses; $201.48, United Air Lines, Denver, Colo., fare; $1,462.50, National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; $54.67, Brown Palace Hotel, Denver, Colo., luncheon.

A. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Opposing S. 75 and H. R. 1500; favoring Senate Joint Resolution 26 and House Joint Resolution 21. (3).[1]

E. (1) $1,052.77; (2) $10,450; (4) $2,081.84; (5) $1,551.88; (6) $1,106.65; (7) $3,526.40; (9) $19,769.74; (10) $49,285.99; (11) $69,055.73; (15) $665.97, Viola M. Adrian, 310 Lima Street, Burbank, Calif., salary and expense account; $16.92, Aldine Co., 232 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, office supplies; $90.88, Allen's Press Clipping Bureau, 124 West Fourth Street, Los Angeles, clipping service; $92.12, Citizen News, 1541 Wilcox Avenue, Hollywood, letterheads; $19.47, collector of internal revenue, Los Angeles, social security; etc.[1]

A. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Enactment of legislation leading to economy in governmental expenditures, stabilization of the price level, freedom of the press, freedom of contract, freedom of enterprise, freedom to work where and when one pleases, and free competition, and it opposes measures leading to communism, socialism, or fascism. It also favors upholding the fundamental principles set forth in the Constitution.

D. (6) $207,397.98.

E. (1) $1,285; (2) $61,269.86; (4) $87,181.24; (5) $30,402.74; (6) $10,830.41; (7) $9,530.32; (9) $200,499.57; (10) $371,520.42; (11) $572,019.99; (15) $1,784.78, Academy Letter Service, Detroit, mailing; $241.79, Addressing Machine & Equipment Co., New York, supplies; $42.67, Addressograph Multigraph Corp., New York, service; $207.22, Alpha Office Supply Co., New York, rentals and service; $990 33, American Airlines, Tulsa, Okla., travel, etc.[1]

A. Committee on National Affairs, 100 East Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.

E. (3) $100; (4) $3.28; (9) $106.28; (10) $1,118.54; (11) $1,224.82; (15) $100, Joe Jackson for Congress Citizens Committee, post-office box 2326, Wichita Falls, Tex., for the campaign of Joe Jackson.

A. Committee for the Nation's Health, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests are President Truman's national health plan as embodied in H. R. 27, and H. R. 54; also interested in S. 445, S. 337, H. R. 1781, H. R. 2152, H. R. 516, H. R. 910, H. R. 274, H. R. 913, H. R. 14, H. R. 149, H. R. 342, H. R. 146. (3).[1]

D. (6) $16,507.37.

E. (2) $4,643 75; (4) $326.34; (5) $1,131.17; (6) $185 66; (7) $224.03; (8) $126.16; (9) $6,637.11; (10) $22,413.21; (11) $29,050.32; (15) $750, estate of Henry K. Willard, 1416 F Street NW., Washington. D. C , rent; $170, Mark G. Detweiler, 1600 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $62.81, Julian Rosenthal, 23 West Seventy-third Street, New York, N. Y., insurance; $303.34, Katherine H. Hoffman, 313 Thirty-fourth Street NE., Washington, D. C., salary; $801.66, Richard H. Lohman, 1225 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary, etc.[1]

A. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, box 1107, Shreveport, La.

C. (2) Legislation affecting petroleum pipelines; S. 1889 at this time.

D. (6) $3,883.

E. (2) $9,575.72; (5) $462.01; (6) $277.21; (7) $304.51; (8) $1,334.56; (9) $11,954.01;

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

(10) $20,226 54, (11) $32,180.55; (15) $3,750, Gordon C. Locke, Munsey Building, Washington, D C, salary; $825.72, Barbara L. Coogan, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., salary; $5,000, Fayette B. Dow, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., legal services, etc.[1]

A. Committee on the Present Danger, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Universal Military Training and Service Act, Mutual Security Act of 1951, and appropriations for defense purposes.

D. (6) $27,374 50.

E. (1) $3,242 06; (2) $5,525 42; (4) $3,474 12, (5) $1,398.45; (6) $997 12; (7) $237 79; (8) $3,243 32; (9) $18,118 28, (10) $81,322.16; (11) $99,440 44; (15) $738, Kass Realty Co., 4461 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D. C., office rent; $1,278.92, Colortone Press, 1428 U Street NW., Washington, D. C., printing, $2,152.10, Byron S. Adams, 512 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C., printing, $49.39, Mutual Broadcasting System, Inc., 1440 Broadway, New York, N Y., recording radio addresses; $14.39, Press Intelligence, Inc., 412 Fifth Street NW, Washington, D C., newspaper clippings, etc.[1]

A. Committee for Promotion of Tramp Shipping Under American Flag in Foreign Commerce, 80 Broad Street, New York, N Y

C (2) Amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American-flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades. A bill to this effect has been introduced in the House as H. R. 5346.

D (6) $200

E (10) $1,116 91; (11) $1,116.91.

A. Committee for World Freedom, Congress of Clubs Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

C (2) Education on necessity of adequate national defense, military and economic aid to anti-Communist nations, and strengthening of organizations for international cooperation.

D (6) $403 90.

E (4) $78 90, (5) $180; (6) $25 67; (9) $284.57; (10) $485 92; (11) $770 49.

A. Arthur D Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW, Washington, D C.

B Amana Refrigeration, Inc., Amana, Iowa

A Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW, Washington, D. C

B Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc.

E (9) $404 32

Received during this quarter $404 32 as reimbursement for expenditures under Items E6 and E7

A D. C Cone, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C

B Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347 to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, and all legislation directly affecting the interests of railroad employees in particular and labor in general.

D. (6) $100.

A John C Cone, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B Pan American World Airways, Inc., 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D C.

C (2) Very infrequently interested in any legislation, but may be interested in supporting or opposing any aviation legislation.

---

[1] Not printed Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Conference of American Small Business Organizations, Inc., Mr. Fred A. Virkus, chairman, 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (1) Permanent. (2) Continue to favor Hoffman (Mich.) and Church (Ill.) bills to implement Hoover reorganization plan, and H R. 2620 on basing point. Also opposed to continued tax exemption of co-ops. (3) No special legislative publication this quarter.

D.[1] (6) $20,538.15.

E. (1) $6,395. (2) $6,900 04. (4) $1,981.55. (5) $2,020.59. (6) $208 04. (7) $25 66 (9) $17,530 88. (10) $40,360 68. (11) $57,891.56.

A. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., a federation of labor organizations.

C (1) Indefinitely. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, property, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives. (3) "Legis-letter."

D.[1] (6) $6,908.52.

E. (2) $1,662 50 (3) $2,000. (4) $1,058 50. (5) $430. (6) $1,000. (7) $100 32. (8) $657 20 (9) $6,908 52. (10) $13,643 80. (11) $20,552 32. (15) $900, July 1 to September 30, 1951, Marguerite Nadonley, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D C., clerical salary; $762 50, July 1 to September 30, 1951, Patricia Shilby, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D C., clerical salary; $100 32, July 1 to September 30, 1951, Nathan Cowan, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., travel; $2,000, August 13, 1951, CIO Housing Committee, 723 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D C., contribution; $118, July 18, 1951, Cornelius Printing Co, 912 Burlington Avenue, Silver Spring, Md., distribution costs, etc.[1]

A. Donald D Conn, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

B Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill. (See report of TAA)

C. (1) Legislative interests are to be continued permanently. (2) I am interested in all legislation having anything to do with transportation including all pending bills before the House and Senate.

D (See page 3)[1]

E (15) Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment this quarter, $281 06; expended during previous quarters, $691 02, total from January 1 through September 30, 1951, $972 08. (Detailed statement attached)[1]

A Julian D Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D C.

B American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D C.

C (1) Indefinitely (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc

D.[1] (6) $2,500

E (6) $24.35 (7) $49 59. (9) $73.94. (10) $109 34. (11) $183 28

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C (1) Indefinite. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the mutual savings banks.

D[1]

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Coal Association. Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and those affecting the coal industry. (3) None.

D.[1]

A. J Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Council of Coal Lessors, Inc., 316 Southern Building, Washington D. C.

C. (1) Terminated. This is final report. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and those affecting the coal industry.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington. D. C.

B National Lime Association, 927 Fifteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C.

C (1) Indefinite. (2) Legislative interests are general in character, and particularly those affecting the lime industry.

A. John T. Corbett, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington. D. C.

B Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. B of L E Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Legislation affecting labor and transportation. (3) Undersigned has issued no publications.

D. (6) $3,295 56.

E (5) $351 27; (6) $30 72; (7) $44 82; (9) $426 81; (10) $811.71; (11) $1,238.52.

A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York. N. Y.

B. None.

C. (1) and (2) (a-b) Until final congressional action on H. R. 1005, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit free entry of baler twine. (2) (d) Opposed to the bill.

D.[1]

E. (2) $400; (4) $226 54; (5) $21.81; (6) $15 87, (7) $26 15; (9) $690 37; (11) $690.37; (15) $97 94, September 14, 1951, Henry M. Schroen, Albee Building, Washington, D. C., mimeographing and mailing memoranda on H R. 1005; $17, September 25, 1951, Pope & Varnum, 295 Madison Avenue, New York City, stationery; $50, September 28, 1951, Cordage Institute, 350 Madison Avenue, New York City, mimeographing and mailing memoranda on H R. 1005, total, $162.94.

A. Frank W Cortright, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D. C.

B National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D C

C (1) Indefinitely. (2) (See answer to this question on p 3, attached)[1] (3) See answer to this question on p. 3, attached.)[1]

D[1] (6) $1,562 50.

E (1) $38 12; (7) $193 26; (9) $231 38; (10) $570 14; (11) $802 12; (15) (See explanatory note on p. 4 attached)[1]

A Harold B. Corwin, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D C

B Retired Officers Association, Inc.,[1] 1616 I Street NW, Washington, D C

C. (1) Indeterminate. (2) All legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature. (3) The Retired Officer.

D. (6) $1,080.

A. John M Costello, 3434 Porter Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B American League for an Undivided Ireland, care of Charles T. Rice, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City, N. Y.

C. (1) Legislative interests will continue indefinitely. (2) Any legislation which may

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

help to effectuate the unification of all Ireland. (3) No publication issued.
D[1] (7) $1,184.57.
E (4) $292 97; (6) $16.60; (7) $125; (9) $434.57, (10) $259.53, (11) $694.10.

A. Council for Clarification of Pricing Practices, 1 North La Salle Street, room 3500, Chicago, Ill
C. (1) Life of S 719 and H. R. 2820. (2) Good faith competit.on—S. 719 and H. R. 2820 (3) None.
D[1] (6) $2,350.

A Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1722 H Street NW., Washington, D. C
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Federal taxation, Federal expenditures, social security, and labor relations. (3) (See attached sheets)[1]
D[1] (7) $8,555.75.
E (1) $478 96, (2) $13,394 91; (4) $2,198 67; (5) $1,238.65; (6) $1,539.21; (7) $3,197.73; (8) $530 02, (9) $22,578 19, (10) $36,395 44; (11) $58,973.63, (16) $478 96, July 17, Carl P Herbert, professional and expense, $480, July 17–September 2, Dorothy Renick, stenographic services; $480, July 17–September 2, Catherine Looby, clerical work, $107.52, July 30, Piqua Chamber of Commerce, expense; $1,154.73, July 19–17–30, August 22, September 19–26, Alvin A. Burger, reimbursement on expense, etc[1]

A Paul L Courtney, room 1027, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill
B National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill
C (1) Legislative interests have terminated (2) Generally interested in legislation designed to correct existing income-tax disparities between competing business corporations. Specifically interested in the Revenue Act of 1951. (3) None.
D[1] (6) $2,500 02.
E (7) $1,117.18; (8) $220 45; (9) $1,337 63; (10) $1,766.86; (11) $3,104 49.

A. Nathan E. Cowan, 718 Jackson Place NW, Washington, D C
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D C
C (1) Indefinitely. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D[1] (6) $2,895.32.
E (7) $920; (9) $920; (10) $1,810; (11) $2,730.

A. Cox, Langford, Stoddard & Cutler, 1210 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. California Texas Oil Co., Ltd., 551 Fifth Ave, New York, N Y.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Bills, dealing with acquisition, allocation, transp rtation, or other regulation or control of materials and products used or marketed by California Texas Oil Co, Ltd, including H. R. 5113 (Mutual Security Act of 1951) and H. R. 4473 (Revenue Act of 1951). (3) None.
D.[1]

A. W. W. Coxe, 108 Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B Norfolk and Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
C. (1) Cannot say with certainty. (2) H R. 4473 Attempting to secure an amendment of Internal Revenue Code.
D.[1]
E. (6) $9.50; (7) $59.45; (9) $69.95; (10) $191.08; (11) $260.03; (15) $59.45, July 10, 11, 1951, Hotels and food (including taxi fares); Statler and Washington Hotels, Occidental Restaurant, Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Charles J. Crampton, 700 Insurance Building, San Antonio, Tex.
B. State Tax Association, P. O. Box 2559, Houston, Tex.
C. (1) A continuous study of State and Federal tax legislation and administrative rulings and court decisions in tax matters affecting community property taxpayers inequitably. (2) No specific legislation. (3) No publications issued.
E.[1] (7) $471.18; (9) $471 18; (10) $803 66; (11) $1,275 04; (12) $471.18; (15) $471.18.

A F. M Crance, 408–409 Young Building, Lynchburg, Va
B. Brotherhood of Maintenanc- of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347 to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and other bills pertaining to labor. (For H. R. 3669 and S 1347). (3) None.
D.[1] (6) $1,129.10; (12) $957.77.
E (2) $1,129 10; (7) $957 77; (9) $2,026 87; (10) $452 34, (11) $2,539.21.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions. (3) None.
D[1] (6) $41,115.97.
E. (2) $200,[1] (7) $14 40; (9) $214 40; (10) $516.44; (11) $730.84.

A Leo P. Cullinane, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Associated Businessmen, Inc, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D C
C. (1) Indeterminate. (2) Measures that would levy a tax on certain tax-exempt organizations. Specifically, H R. 4473, the general revenue bill of 1951, S. 892 and other revenue bills and tax legislation and social security measures (3) None.
D.[1] (6) $1,853 58

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D C.
B. General Refractories Co., 1520 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa A P. Green Fire Brick Co, Mexico, Mo. Harbison-Walker Refractories Co., Farmers Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. North American Refractories Co, Cleveland, Ohio.
C (1) Not determined. (2) H. R. 4473, the Revenue Act of 1951. (3) None.
E. (6) $9.50; (7) $3; (9) $12.50; (11) $12.50.

A Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B New Process Co, Warren, Pa.
C. (1) Not determined. (2) Postal rate legislation. H. R. 2982 to readjust postal rates. S. 1046, to readjust postal rates. (3) None.
D[1] (6) $1,500.
E (6) $27.28; (7) $18.85; (9) $46 13; (10) $271.96; (11) $318 09.

A. John C. Cuneo, post-office box 1054, Modesto, Calif.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) H R 2678 and 2679, the Townsend plan bills in Congress. (3) None.
D.[1] (6) $1,978 38.
E. (5) $545 61; (6) $157 24; (7) $185.26; (8) $39.69; (9) $927.80; (10) $4,134.78; (11) $5,062 58; (15) July 2, 1951, $14.85, Dr. Norman W. Pendleton, Los Angeles, reimbursement office cash postage $11.36, water-towels $2.64, incidentals 85 cents; July 2, 1951, $50, Harry Windus, 922 Jay Street, Modesto, office rent, July; July 5, 1951, $3.75, Western Union, Modesto, Calif., telegrams; July 10, 1951, $10, Elmer Weeks, Modesto, car parking; July 10, 1951, $3.98, Lee Bros., 1111 J. Modesto, Calif., adding machine ribbon and mimeo ink, etc.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 944 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation affecting tavern and restaurant industry.
D. (7) $1,500.
E (4) $18.93; (6) $10.75; (8) $7.65, (9) $37 33; (10) $320.23; (11) $357.56; (12) $6.85; (14) $45.61.

A Dairy Industry Committee, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation affecting the dairy industry. (3) A weekly newsletter to members mentioning legislative items when occasion arises.
D[1] (6) $6,600.

A. William V. Dameron, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D C.
C (1) Indefinite. (See report filed by International Association of Machinists.)

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn., and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B My client is the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.
C. (1) While H. R. 277 and similar legislation is under consideration. (2) Bill listed deals with distribution of motor-vehicle tires and prevention of manufacturers from selling goods at retail.
D[1] (6) $1,875
E (10) $10.95; (11) $10 95.

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn., and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D C.
B My client is the B F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio
C. (1) While H. R. 277 and similar legislation is under consideration (2) Bill listed deals with distribution of motor-vehicle tires and prevention of manufacturers from selling goods at retail.
D[1] (6) $1,875.

A. N. R. Danielian, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
C (1) Unknown. (2) (a) St. Lawrence legislation; (b) Senate Joint Resolution 27, House Joint Resolutions 2, 3, 4, 15, 102, 122, 159, 337, (c) proponents.
D[1] (6) $4,500
E. (7) $913.75; (9) $913.75; (10) $1,968.55; (11) $2,882 30; (15) N. R. Danielian, July 30, August 30, September 30, retainer, $4,500; N. R. Danielian, July 16, travel expenses, $463.75; N. R. Danielian, August, out-of-pocket expenses, $450.

A. Paul J. Daugherty, legislative affairs department, Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Defense Production Act (S. 2170), Revenue Act of 1951 (H. R. 4473).
D.[1] (6) $2,749.98.
E. (7) $115.42; (9) $115.42; (10) $329.94; (11) $445.36.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Aled P Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
B American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
C (1) To continue indefinitely. (2) Legislature affecting the meat-packing industry: (a) The Defense Production Act amendments of 1951 and Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1952, and for modification of Capehart amendment (b) S 1717, H. R 3871, H. R. 3973, S 2170 (d) For changes in the statutes and bills (3) None.
D (6) $2,692 34
E (5) $232 58, (6) $208.81; (7) $3,033 40; (8) $692 62, (9) $4,167 41, (10) $5,813 68; (11) $9,991 09.

A John H Davis, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D C
B National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D C
C (1) Indefinitely (2) H R 4473, Revenue Act of 1951, S 892, Revenue Act of 1951. (3) Washington situation
D.[1] (6) $3,874 98
E (7) $445 79, (9) $445 79, (10) $635 47; (11) $1,091 26

A Sherlock Davis, 1117 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D C
B United States Cuban Sugar Council, 30 Pine Street, New York, N Y
C (2) Anything which pertains to sugar or trade with Cuba Specific legislative interests, S 1694 and H R 4521, bills to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948 (Public Law 140, 82d Cong), and for other purposes

---

A Homer R Davison, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill
B American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
C (1) Indeterminate (2) Legislature affecting the meat-packing industry: (a) The Defense Production Act amendments of 1951 and Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1952 Modification of Capehart amendment (b) S 1717, H R 3871, H R. 3973, S 2170 (d) for changes in the statutes and bills
D[1] (6) $500
E. (6) $14 38, (7) $643 23; (8) $172 14; (9) $829 75; (10) $1,333 25, (11) $2,163

A Joseph M Dawson, 1628 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D C.
B Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, 1628 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D C
C (1) Indefinitely (2) All bills affecting the principle of separation of church and state and involving religious liberty, all legislation affecting matters on which the conventions make official pronouncements and entrust to this committee to present under the right of petition H R. 2094 has been our concern during this period We oppose the bill (3) Report from the Capital.
D. (See statement attached)[1]
E. (4) $57.54; (6) $30, (9) $87.54.

A Robert N Denham, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D. C.
B Continental Banking Co., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York City.
C (1) Indefinite; year to year. (2) Labor relations and general industrial regulatory legislation (3) None.
D[1] (6) $2,575.76
E (6) $11.30; (7) $64 46; (9) $75.76; (10) $133 30; (11) $209.06.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. William I Denning, 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D C
B. National Association of Magazine Publishers, 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C (1) For general legal representation in Washington (2) Activities limited to advising association in connection with postal rate matters (3) None.
D. (6) $1,875.
E (6) $4 13, (7) $1.; (8) 50 cents, (9) $5.63; (10) $246 87; (11) $252 50.

A Mr R T DeVany, 918 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D C (Attachment)[1]
B National Association of Manufacturers.
E (15) Transportation (railroad, taxicabs, [illegible] automobile expenses), $197 58; to hotels and restaurants for meeting expenses, rooms, etc , $195 37, to telephone and telegraph companies, $4 89; miscellaneous, $110 30; total, $508 14

A Leo A Diamond, 25 Broadway, New York, N Y
B Chadbourne, Parke, Whiteside, Wolff & Brophy, 25 Broadway, New York, N Y
C (1) Legislative interests are expected to continue until tax legislation is passed extending the 85-percent dividends received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources (2) See (1) above The proposed legislation was contained in section 120 of H R 6712 which was passed by the House of Representatives, second session, Eightieth Congress (3) No publication issued or caused to be issued.
D [1]

A John M Dickerman, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D C
B National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW , Washington, D C
C (1) Indefinitely (2) (See answer to this question on p 3 attached)[1] (3) (See answer to this question on p 3 attached)[1]
D[1] (6) $3,000.
E (7) $213 10, (8) $13 30; (9) $226 40, (10) $713 44, (11) $939 84, (15) August 14, 1951, Statler Hotel, Washington, D C , staff entertainment, $12 50, August 23, 1951, police benefit contribution, Washington, D C., $10.

A A W Dickinson, Ring Building, Washington, D C
B American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D C.
C (1) Indefinitely. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, and so forth. (3) None.
D[1] (6) $1,375
E (7) $35 45; (9) $35 45, (10) $52 75, (11) $88 20.

A. C B Dickson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) H R. 3408, H. R. 4473. (3) None.
D. (6) $3,900.

A. Disabled American Veterans, national headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B None
C. (1) The national legislative division of the DAV is a permanent division. This division performs only a minor part of DAV activities. The DAV's major work is performed by its national claims service. (2) The DAV is interested in all legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. The majority of bills in which we are interested are before Senate Finance Committee, Senate Labor and Public Welfare, House Veterans' Affairs, two committees on Post Office and Civil Service, and the two Armed Services Committees. (3) Articles pertaining to pending legislation in which the DAV is interested are published in our own newspaper, the DAV Semi-Monthly
E (2) $4,215, (7) $321.06; (9) $4,536 06; (10) $10,911.69, (11) $15,447 75.

A. Walter L Disbrow, 900 F Street NW , room 314, Washington, D C.
B Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW , room 314, Washington, D C
C (1) Legislative interests are expected to continue indefinitely. (2) General legislative interests are Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees Compensation Acts.[1]
D (6) $1,177 02.
E (10) $246 20, (11) $246 20.

A Wesley E Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B Independent Natural Gas Association of America, World Center Building, Washington, D C
C (1) I am employed permanently as general counsel for the association (2) General legislative interests include any matters affecting the natural gas industry Specific legislation for quarter includes tax bill. (3) None
D (6) $1,250
E (10) $1,001 64, (11) $1,001 64.

A Wesley E Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D C.
B National Building Granite Quarries Association, 114 East Fortieth Street, New York, N Y.
C (1) Indefinitely (2) Specific legislation for percentage depletion. (3) None.
D (6) $1,000

A. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D C
C (1) Indefinite (2) Legislation affecting the sale or distribution of petroleum products in the District of Columbia. (3) None
D (7) $479 13
E (2) $300, (8) $179.13, (9) $479.13, (10) $1,129 62; (11) $1,608 75, (16) $300, July 1, 1951, through September 31, 1951, John E. Kane, compensation, etc , $179 13, July 1, 1951, through September 31, 1951, John E. Kane, miscellaneous expenses

---

A District Lodge No 44, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C
B District Lodge No. 44 is subject to the direction of the International President and the General Executive Council of the I A. of M. and subject to the will of the membership of District No. 44 as per its bylaws.
C. (1) Its legislative interests will continue without date of termination. (2) Lobbying, i. e., supporting or opposing as the case may be legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general. Not more than 20 percent of its time and resources was spent on this work during the third quarter of 1951. For further particulars see page 3 under C-2 hereto attached.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D[1] (6) $11,691.98.
E (2) $4,774.89; (4) $500; (5) $525; (6) $1,609.70; (7) $679.61; (8) $2,489.80; (9) $10,579, (10) $15,671.53; (11) $36,829 53; (15) $100, July 3, 1951, N. P. Weathersby, Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C., salary and expenses; $35.74, July 3, 1951, N. P. Alifas (same), reimbursement for cash to typist; $300, July 3, 1951, N. P. Alifas (same), salary and expenses; $61.69, July 3, 1951, Mabel Almalel (same), secretarial service; $51, July 3, 1951, Nettie Bakersmith (same), clerical service, etc.[1]

A. Homer Dodge, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any proposed legislation or policies involving a constitutional question.
D.[1] (6) $870.

A. William C. Doherty, National Association of Letter Carriers, 1525 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 1525 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Inasmuch as we represent Government employees, and working conditions are dependent upon legislation, the legislative interest will continue indefinitely. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal and Federal employees. (3) None.
D.[1] (6) $1,500.

A. W. J. Donald, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) Duration not predictable. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, electric fans, and legislation with respect to amendment of the Labor Management Relations Act. (3) None.
D.[1] (7) $9.54.

A. James L Donnelly, 120 South Lasalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) All legislation of general interest to manufacturers. (3) Industrial Review and miscellaneous bulletins.
D.[1]
E. (10) $570.26; (11) $570 26.

A. Thomas J Donovan, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C (2) Legislation affecting excise taxes on alcoholic beverages.
D[1] (6) $22,750 61.
E. (1) $5,337.13; (4) $1,508.10; (5) $33 10; (6) $306 96, (7) $27.12, (8) $22,449.92; (9) $29,662.33, (10) $27,542.17; (11) $57,204 50; (15) $20,220.16, Glass & Lynch, 170 Broadway, New York, N. Y., retainer and miscellaneous expenditures, $5,337.13, Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y, public-relations counsel, $1,324.98, Select Multigraph Service, 76 Ninth Avenue, New York, N. Y., preparing and mailing letters and releases; $87.41, Western Union, New York, N. Y., telegrams, $219.55, New York Telephone, New York, N. Y., telephone, etc.[1]

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D.[1] (7) $75.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service, Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees Compensation Acts.[1]
D.[1] (6) $1,059.43.
E. (10) $52.70; (11) $52.70.

A. John E. Dougherty, 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad, including separation air-mail subsidies, railroad communications and operating rules, Federal barge lines, railroad retirement, St. Lawrence seaway, taxes, and transportation investigation.[1]
D[1]
E.[1]

A. Robert E. Dougherty, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interest of the lumber manufacturing industry.
D.[1] (6) $1,750.
E (7) $275; (9) $275; (10) $355.50; (11) $630 50.

A. Fayette B. Dow, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Pipeline Companies, Tulsa, Okla.
C. (2) Any legislation which, if enacted, would divorce pipelines that are subject to the Interstate Commerce Act from their existing owning companies.

A. Adin M. Downer, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the Armed Forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the National Encampment and the National Council of Administration. (3) VFW Foreign Service and VFW Legislative Newsletter.
D[1] (6) $1,625.
E (7) $21.15; (9) $21.15; (10) $44.65; (11) $65.80.

A. Sheridan Downey, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Long Beach, Calif., 1333 El Embarcadero, Long Beach, Calif.
C. (2) Legislative interests relate to all proposed legislation which will affect the controversy between the Federal Government and the city of Long Beach concerning title to the inland and territorial waters off the coast of California.
D.[1] (6) $9,000.
E. (2) $2,540; (5) $926; (6) $508.23; (7) $1,816.05; (9) $5,790.26; (10) $8,097.67; (11) $13,887.95.

A. Richard S. Doyle, 404 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Budd Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Corporate income and excess-profits taxes.

A. W. A. Dozier, Jr., 17 Molton Street, Montgomery, Ala.
B Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 527 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.
C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action, pending legislation and legislative actions are reported to all members of the association. (3) PR Notes.
D.[1] (6) $1,650.
E. (4) $225; (9) $225; (10) $450; (11) $675.

A. Robert M. Drysdale, Jr., Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Transportation legislation, air-mail subsidy bill, Hoover Commission bills, and 1951 tax revision bill. (3) Railway Progress.
D[1] (6) $1,000.
E. (2) $157.50; (4) $10; (5) $292.19; (6) $57.53; (7) $384.82; (9) $602.04; (10) $2,-010.01; (11) $2,612.05

A. Stephen M. DuBrul, 5–141 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Supported the enactment of Public Law 109; also supported amendments to H. R. 3871, S. 1397, and S. 2092.
E. (6) $56 41; (7) $852.90; (9) $909 31; (15) $301.08, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., lodging, meals, telephone, telegraph, laundry, valet, etc., $68.23, Plaza Hotel, New York, N. Y., lodging, meals, telephone, telegraph, laundry, valet, etc.; $104.01, Hotel Nicollette, Minneapolis, Minn., lodging, meals, telephone, telegraph, laundry, valet, etc.; $8.44, Michigan Bell Telephone, Detroit, Mich , telephone calls; $172.43, meals, Hotel Statler, Hamel's, Hall's, Harvey's, Cannon's, and Occidental, Washington, D C.; etc.[1]

A. Read Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw-cotton industry as w"l promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D.[1] (6) $375.
E. (7) $43.15; (9) $43.15; (10) $189.70; (11) $232.85.

A. William M. Dunn, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D C.
B. Communications Workers of America CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.

A. Matthew Dushane, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Seafarers International Union of North America, A. F. of L., 450 Harrison Street, San Francisco, Calif.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2). Various bills affecting the general welfare of the affiliated unions.
D[1] (6) $568.75.
E. (5) $41 25, (6) $10.50; (7) $120; (8) $25; (9) $196 75; (10) $290.50; (11) $487.25.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D C.
B American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N Y.
C (2) Petroleum legislation.
D[1] (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $375 18.

A George S Eaton, 906 Public Square Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B National Tool and Die Manufacturers Association, 906 Public Square Building, Cleveland, Ohio
C (2) H R 4473 and other bills especially affecting the interests of contract tool and die shops, which are small businesses.
D[1] (6) $100
E (2) $100, (9) $100; (10) $200; (11) $300.

A. John W. Edelman, 910 Warner Building, Washington, D C
B Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y.
C (2) Support: Health insurance, medical aid to education, rent control, housing, point 4, District home rule, social security, FLSA Oppose S 349, certain amendments to UMT bill, appropriations cut Voice of America program, Taft-Hartley law, rules change, ban on price roll-backs, Jenner rider.
D[1] (6) $1,980 79
E (7) $355 79, (9) $355 79, (10) $639.03; (11) $995 72

A Herman Edelsberg, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D C.
B Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N Y.
C. (2) Incidental to its basic educational purpose, registrant supports legislation which promotes the civil rights of all Americans, and opposes undemocratic discrimination against any Americans; more specifically, the program of the President's Committee on Civil Rights
D[1] (6) $140
E (7) $15, (9) $15; (10) $30; (11) $45.

A Joseph H Ehlers, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D C.
B. American Society of Civil Engineers.
C (2) H R 1726, H R 2752, House Joint Resolution 218, H. R 1637, S. 1144, and S. 644
E (8) $7, (9) $7; (10) $26 40, (11) $33 40.

A. Bernard H Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW , Washington, D C.
B. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D C.
C (2) Interested in S 1940 and other bills affecting education for Korean veterans; also interested in all other education bills affecting private business schools.
D. (6) $300.

A. Louis Eisenstein (a partner in the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison), 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D C.
B. Pabco Products, Inc., 475 Branna Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C (2) An amendment to section 444 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide more equitable excess profits tax relief for expanding companies.
D.[1] (6) $5,000.
E (6) $23.20; (7) $50; (8) $30.41; (9) $103 61; (11) $103.61.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Courtleigh W. Eliason, 5–139 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Registrant supported the enactment of Public Law 109, Eighty-second Congress; also supported amendments, discussed and proposed, to H. R. 3871, S. 1397, and S 2092.
E (6) $109.65, (7) $1,181 08; (9) $2,190 73; (15) $408.55, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D C, lodging, meals, telephone and telegraph, laundry, valet, etc; $55.62, Plaza Hotel, New York, N. Y, lodging, meals, telephone and telegraph, etc; $45, Baltimore & Ohio R. R., Detroit, Mich, transportation, $16.94, Michigan Bell Telephone, Detroit, Mich, telephone calls; $369 47, meals, Hotel Statler, Hamel's, LaSalle du Bois, Harvey's, Cannon's, Washington, D. C; Waldorf-Astoria, Reuben's, and Maramar's, New York City, Hotel Statler in Detroit.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Washington, D C
B Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio
C (2) Passage of H R 2678 and H R 2679.
D[1] (6) $910
E. (10 $135; (11) $135.

A Otis H Ellis, 402 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D C.
B National Oil Jobbers Council, 430 Syndicate Building, Minneapolis, Minn
C (2) Legislation which might affect the business interests of independent oil jobbers.
D[1] (6) $3,000.

A. John H Else, 302 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D C.
B National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW, Washington, D. C.
D[1] (7) $2,751
E (7) $143 38; (9) $143 38; (10) $283 70; (11) $427.08; (15) $143 38.

A Law Offices of Northcutt Ely,[1] 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW, Washington, D C.
C (2) Legislation affecting public power.
D[1] (6) 158 61.
E (7) $152 86; (8) 5 75, (9) 158 61; (10) $36 10; (11) $194 71; (15) $82.11, American Airlines, Washington, D. C, air passage; $76 75, T V Dillon, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., reimbursement of travel expenses.

A. Law Offices of Northcutt Ely,[1] 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D C.
B Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting California's rights in the Colorado River and other matters, including S. 75, to authorize the central Arizona project; House Joint Resolution 42 and counterparts, central Arizona project examination and report, and House Joint Resolution 21, Senate Joint Resolution 26 and counterparts, Colorado River litigation resolutions, S. 18, adjudication of water rights; H R 5102 and S. 234, San Diego Aqueduct; Public Law 136, Interior Department appropriations, 1952.
D[1] (6) $2,100.

A. Law Offices of Northcutt Ely,[1] 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 512 Sixteenth Street, Oakland, Calif.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Public Law 136, Interior appropriations, 1952
D[1] (6) $2,252.72.
E (6) $88.87; (7) $27.20; (8) $36.65; (9) $152.72; (11) $152.72; (15) $51.72, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co, Washington, D. C., long distance phone service; $37.15, Western Union Telegraph Co., Washington, D. C, telegraph service, $27.20, Theodore F. Stevens, Tower Building, Washington, D. C., reimbursement of travel expenses.

A Law Offices of Northcutt Ely,[1] 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D C.
B Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting California's rights in the Colorado River and other matters, including S. 75, to authorize the central Arizona project, House Joint Resolution 42 and counterparts, central Arizona project examination and report and House Joint Resolution 21, Senate Joint Resolution 26 and counterparts, Colorado River litigation resolutions, H R 2813 and S 943, Colbran project, S 18, adjudication of water rights; H. R. 5102 and S 234, San Diego aqueduct; Public Law 136, Interior Department appropriations, 1952.
D[1] (6) 2,948 59.
E (4) $125.87; (6) $7.23; (8) $15 49; (9) $148 59, (10) $557 06; (11) $705.65; (15) $125.-87, Henry Schroen, Albee Building, Washington, D C, mimeographing.

A. Law Offices of Northcutt Ely,[1] 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting California's rights in the Colorado River and other matters, including S 75, to authorize the central Arizona project, House Joint Resolution 42 and counterparts, central Arizona project examination and report and House Joint Resolution 21, Senate Joint Resolution 26 and counterparts, Colorado River litigation resolutions, H R. 2813 and S 943, Colbran project, S 18, adjudication of water rights; H. R. 5102 and S. 234, San Diego aqueduct; Public Law 136, Interior Department appropriations, 1952
D[1] (6) $6,276.90.
E (4) $30, (6) $28 80; (7) $222 35; (8) $35 75; (9) $316 90; (10) $440.64; (11) $757 54; (15) $13 87, Western Union Telegraph Co., Washington, D C, telegraph service; $15, Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D C, copies of committee hearings; $13, Rita Stapleton, Washington, D C, stenographic work; $17, Kathleen Maury, Washington, D C., stenographic work; $200, airline companies, hotels, etc., travel; etc[1]

A. Law Offices of Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
C (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the Central Valley project including Public Law 136, Interior Department appropriations, 1952, H R 413, Kings River water rights; H. R 6 and H R. 7, saltwater research; H R 1637, National Water Resources basic data; S 75, central Arizona project; H R. 5102 and S. 234, San Diego aqueduct, H R 5368, Santa Margarita River; S. 18, adjudication of water rights; S 943 and H. R. 2813, Colbran project.
D.[1] (6) $1,500.

A. Law Offices of Northcutt Ely,[1] 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 4963, civil functions appropriations bill, 1952; S. 528 and H. R. 1618, California levee and flood control damage; and H. R. 1307, flood control on Redwood Creek, Humboldt County, Calif.

A. Emergency Committee of Small and Medium-Size Magazine Publishers, 400 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interested in H. R. 2982 and S. 1046, postal rate legislation.
D.[1] (6) $1,500.
E (2) $2,500; (4) $170 73; (6) $99.70; (7) $262.11; (8) $16 65; (9) $3,049.19; (10) $7,039 91; (11) $10,089.10; (15) $1,500, Robert A Saltzstein, Ring Building, Washington 6, D. C., legal fees; $217.33, Harper & Bros., 49 East Thirty-third Street, New York, N. Y., travel expenses; $1,000, J. K Lasser & Co., 1440 Broadway, New York, N Y., accounting fee; $1,665, N. L. Fenker, 45 Tiemann Place, New York, N Y., overtime stenographic work; $155 72, Robert A. Saltzstein, Ring Building, Washington 6, D. C., telephone, telegraph, travel, food, and lodging; etc.[1]

A. K Blyth Emmons, 925 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D C
B National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to small business, either directly or indirectly. (3) Pulling Together.
D. (7) $675
E. (7) $255.01; (9) $255 01; (11) $255 01.

A. Leon J Engel, 20 Hopkins Place, Baltimore, Md
C (2) Excise taxes.
E. (8) $1; (9) $1; (10) $7 06; (11) $8.06.

A. The Ethanol Committee, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (10) $7,626.49, (11) $7,626.49.

A. Herman Fakler, National Press Building, Washington, D C.
B Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation dealing with wheat and wheat flour.
D[1] (6) $312 50.
E (8) $4.50; (9) $4 50; (10) $4.40; (11) $8 90.

A Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office), 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C. (legislative office).
C (2) The general legislative interests of this organization are all matters affecting the interests of farmers or matters which from time to time may be regarded by the Board of Directors as affecting the program of the National Farmers Union.
D[1] (6) $169,315.76.
E. (15) $34 40, Angus McDonald, Washington, D C., travel, telephone, and newspaper expense; $133.72, Benton J. Strong, Washington, D. C., travel, telephone, and newspaper expense; $10, Jerome Spingarn, Washington, D. C., postage, stationery, and telephone expense; $24.84, Consolidated Press Clipping, Bureaus, Washington, D. C., clipping service; $12, The National Press Club, Washington, D. C., dues, etc.[1]

A. Charles J. Farrington, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All Small Business Committee legislation; tax revision; funds for public roads; highway safety legislation.
D.[1] (6) $6,249.99.
E. (7) $1,135.35; (9) $2,048.47; (11) 3,183.82.

A. Donald D. Farshing, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D.[1] (6) $1,300.
E. (7) $109.95; (9) $109.95; (10) $305.95; (11) $415.90.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation—local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.[1]

A. Abner H Ferguson, 1139 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C
B United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C (2) All legislation affecting savings and loan associations and general mortgage lending.
D[1] (6) $800.
E (6) $30 30; (7) $9 65; (9) $39.95; (10) $14; (11) $53.95.

A. John A Ferguson, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., suite 501, Washington, D. C
B Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C (2) Pending tax legislation, and any other bills affecting the natural gas industry.
D[1] (6) $3,750.
E (7) $104 25; (9) $104 25; (10) $869.43; (11) $973.68.

A Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Fellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla; United States Sugar Corp, Clewiston, Fla; and American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.
C. (2) S 1694, H. R 4521, and Public Law 140.
E. (8) $18.76.

A. H. L. Filer, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) All legislation which might affect the New Haven Railroad and its subsidiaries (the Connecticut Co., New England Transportation Co)
D.[1] (6) $5,300.

A. Bernard M. Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the NAEC.
D.[1] (6) $1,350.

A. Stephen E. Fitzgerald, doing business as the Stephen Fitzgerald Co., 502 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; and Raymond C. Baker and Jay Richter, as employees.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Our function is a general one; the assignment is to assist the NAEC in articulating and expressing its point of view with respect to general legislative questions which affect the interests of the public and of electric light and power companies.
D.[1] (7) $14,951.20.
E. (4) $385.12; (6) $238.18; (7) $1,203.15; (8) $624.75; (9) $2,451.20.

A. F. Stuart Fitzpatrick, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D C.
B Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D C.
C. (2) Particularly interested in legislation in the general field of public works, city planning, urban redevelopment, and housing.

A. Roger Fleming, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; inflation control; Government credit policies; Federal Reserve policy; health; Federal Food and Drug Act amendment; repeal of resale price maintenance, antitrust legislation; education; Mexican farm labor importation; method of computing parity prices; farm machinery and supplies; baler twine; fertilizer; agricultural labor; amendment of National Labor Relations Act; Sugar Act extension; Marketing Facilities Act; increased lending authority for Export-Import Bank; amendment of Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; mutual security program (foreign aid); Customs Simplification Act; amendment of BIR code relative to tax treatment of livestock; legislation to authorize allocation of livestock for slaughter; grazing land; postal rates; St. Lawrence seaway; taxation; tobacco; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing; National Farmers Day; Department of Agriculture Reorganization; agricultural appropriations; ACP payments, REA, screw worm research appropriations, meat inspection appropriation.
D.[1] (6) $3,300.
E. (7) $75.20; (9) $75.20; (10) $2,055 27; (11) $2,130 47.

A Donald G. Fletcher, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association (also known as Conference for the Prevention of Grain Rust), 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Legislation affecting funds for research on plant-disease control and crop improvement; items in Agriculture Department's budget affecting research and control work on black stem rust through plant breeding and barberry eradication.
D. (7) $1,575.
E. (2) $125; (4) $60; (5) $77.83; (6) $18.09; (7) $211.38; (9) $492.30; (10) $2,501 23; (11) $2,993.53.

A. W. C. Flinn, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
C. (2) Potentially interested in all legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects.
E. (2) $1,350; (6) $20.10; (8) $31.83; (9) $1,401.93; (10) $2,813.77; (11) $4,215.70; (15) $1,401.93, Henry H. Buckman, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md., for professional services.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Florida Railroad Association,[1] 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla
C. (2) Crosser Bill amending Railroad Retirement Act, and S. 1335, parcel-post bill,
D[1] (7) $2,512.50.
E (2) $1,320; (6) $6.61; (7) $265 39; (9) $1,592, (10) $2,524.08, (11) $4,116 08; (15) $55 20, Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., Norfolk, Va., Pullman reservations; $76.18, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., room and meals.

A Mrs. J A Ford, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE, Washington, D C.
B Townsend Plan, Inc, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio
C (2) H R 2678 and H R 2679, bills to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60, to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys. (3) Townsend National Weekly.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, box 692 Valdosta, Ga.
C (2) Agricultural Appropriations Bill for 1952, H. R 3994, S. 1767, H R 2752, and S 1149. (3) The Forest Farmer.
E (2) $117.50, (7) $139 45; (9) $256.95; (10) $658 95; (11) $915.90.

A J Carter Fort, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D C.
B Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D C. (See report of Association of American Railroads for third quarter, 1951)
C (1) Indefinitely. (2) See rider C-2. (3) None
D.[1] (6) $7,479 99.
E. (7) $50.85; (9) $50 85; (10) $246 05; (11) $296 90; (15) see rider E-15[1]

A. Charles E Foster, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington, D C
B Disabled American Veterans, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C (1) The national legislative division of the DAV is a permanent division. This division performs only a minor part of DAV activities The DAV's major work is performed by its national claims service. (2) The DAV is interested in all legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. The majority of bills in which we are interested are before the Senate Finance Committee, Senate Labor and Public Welfare; House Veterans' Affairs, two Committees on Post Office and Civil Service, and the two Armed Services Committees.
D[1] (6) $1,785.

A L S Franklin, National Tax Relief Coalition, Greensboro, N C, Box 401.
C (1) As long as taxes and spending are excessive (2) We favor limitation on taxation in times of peace
D.[1]
E (2) $375; (7) $145; (9) $520; (10) $1,915, (11) $2,435; (15) $520.

A. George H Frates, Washington representative, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B National Association of Retail Druggists.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) To oppose legislation detrimental to independent retail druggists and to further legislation favorable to the profession. H. R. 3298, S. 1186, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Oppose H. R. 2820, S. 719. To work in the interest of amending the Miller-Tydings Act to protect fair trade. (3) NARD Journal.
D.[1] (6) $2,800
E. (2) $675; (5) $399; (6) $105; (9) $1,179; (10) $2,396, (11) $3,575.

A Dr. John H. Frederick, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill. (See report of T A. A)
C (1) Permanently. (2) All legislation having anything to do with transportation. (3) (See report of TAA.)
D. (See p. 3[1])
E (See p. 3.[1])

A Fred J. Fredrickson, Lafayette Hotel, Washington, D C. (Home address: 247 Third Street SW, Valley City, N. Dak)
B. North Dakota Resources Board, 311 North Broadway, Fargo, N Dak.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Legislation affecting the development and utilization of the land, water, and other natural resources of North Dakota, including authorizations and appropriations H R 3790 and H R 4386
D[1] (6) $2,253 27.
E (5) $27 34, (6) $113 39; (7) $963 54; (9) $1,104 27; (10) $3,149.06, (11) $4,253 33.

A. H Maurice Fridlund, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B National Federation of American Shipping, Inc, 1809 G Street NW, Washington, D. C
C (1) During Eighty-second Congress. (2) H. R 3715 and H R 3797 to amend Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950. For these bills or equivalent.

A Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D C
C (1) An indefinite time; the organization is established on a permanent basis. (2) The general legislative interest is to work where legislation is involved for the development of the United Nations into a world federation, the international control and reduction of armaments, recognition on the part of the United States Government of its responsibility for assuming its share of the burden for world-wide economic rehabilitation and development, protection of recognized civil liberties, and adequate recognition of rights of conscience. The following specific legislation has been supported McMahon resolution, Senate Resolution 47; Flanders resolution, Senate Resolution 42; Roosevelt resolution, H. R. 122; limiting debate after a reasonable time, by a majority vote of the Senate, appropriations for the International Children's Emergency Fund. Opposition has been expressed to the continuation of military conscription, the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951 (Public Law 51), to the enactment of UMT, to cutting down the United States share of United Nations expenses (part of H R. 4740), to the restrictive provisions of the omnibus immigration bill (S Res. 716). (3) The Washington Newsletter.
D.[1] (6) $7,034 50.
E. (2) $6,558.26; (4) $562.86; (5) $1,358 40; (6) $309.08; (7) $549 95; (8) $1,863.72, (9) $11,202.27; (10) $28,375 12; (11) $39,577.39; (12) $1,127.45; (13) $1,127 45; (15) $57 46, August 15-September 14, Addressograph-Multigraph Corp., 1200 Babbitt Road, Cleveland, Ohio, office supplies, addressograph plates; $10.71, August 6, R. P. Andrews Paper Co., 718 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., office supplies; $11, September 14, Burroughs Adding Machine Co., 401 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa, machine maintenance; $261.17, July 15-September 28, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., 725 Thirteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C., telephone, $588.42, August 15-September 17, National Savings & Trust Co, Fifteenth and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C, deposits on withholdings, etc.[1]

A. George M Fuller, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington, D C.
B National[1] Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington, D C.
C. (1) Indefinite (2) No particular bills, but any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry, American industry, and free enterprise.
D.[1] (6) $3,450.
E (7) $1,357.03; (9) $1,357.03; (10) $2,210.90, (11) $3,567 93; (15) $49.01, July 15-31, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., entertainment; $130, July, Congressional Country Club, Washington, D C., entertainment; $82 66, August 1-30, Statler Hotel, Washington, D C, entertainment; $31.97, August 1-31, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D C., entertainment, $29 54, August 10-22, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., entertainment, etc[1]

A Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.
C. (1) No legislative interest in this quarter.

A Fiffe & Clarke, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C 1) Indefinitely. (2) All legislation affecting the manufacturing industry
E. (7) $151.94; (9) $151.94; (11) $151 94.

A Charles E Gage, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., room 904, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (See attached statement.)[1]
C (1) (See attached statement)[1] (2) Any legislation affecting a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of tobacco products.
D[1]

A. M J Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B Minnesota railroads[1]
C. (1) Expect to be permanently interested (2) Interested in all matters affecting railroads and particularly Railroad Retirement Act and proposed amendments; Interstate Commerce Act and proposed amendments; and Federal Employers' Liability Act and proposed amendments Generally favor legislation favorable to railroads and oppose unfavorable legislation.
D.[1] (6) $500
E (7) $117 67, (9) $117 67, (10) $238 39; (11) $356 06, (15) $65, September 20, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D C, $26 11, September 21, Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C., $26.56, September 21, Pullman Co., Chicago, Ill.

A. Earl H Gammons, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y
C (1) Refer to letter filed with registration and registration Form B currently on file. (2) Legislation applicable to or affecting the radio and/or television industry, in-

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

cluding S. 658, S. 1579, Senate Resolution 127, H. R. 10, H. R. 73.

E. (4) $36; (7) $15; (9) $51; (10) $107.84; (11) $248.84; (15) $36, July 2, Broadcasting magazine, National Press Building, Washington, D. C., printing an editorial, Benton's Never-Never Land, plus mailing fee; $15, July 21, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., dinner, three persons.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

B The Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., 143 Liberty Street, New York, N. Y., agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., and other holders of awards of Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, World War I.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Legislation relating to World War I awards of the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, such as H. R. 6074, Eighty-first Congress. (3) Memorandum in support of H. R. 6074, Eighty-first Congress, dated March 1, 1950; have had 100 copies printed by Charles B Young, printer, New York

E. (6) $5; (7) $5.65; (9) $10.65; (10) $109 88; (11) $120.53.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C

B. The Oceanic Steamship Co., 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) (a) Appropriation in payment of balance of compensation due for requisition and use of vessels owned by Oceanic Steamship Co during World War II. (b) Inquiry with respect to H. R 5215 to determine if funds authorized, for payment of compensation to Oceanic Steamship Co. for use of its vessels, if requisitioned as proposed by Navy, and policy with respect to such requisition.

A. Gwynn Garnett, Acting Director, Department of International Affairs, American Farm Bureau Federation, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. Indefinite. (2) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; inflation control (Defense Production Act of 1950); Mexican farm-labor importation; fertilizer, agricultural labor; increased lending authority of Export-Import Bank; amendment of Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; mutual security program (foreign aid); Customs Specification Act; tobacco; Department of Agriculture reorganization; agricultural appropriations; ACP payments.

D.[1] (7) $2,124.96.

E. (7) $361.59; (9) $361.59; (10) $878 91; (11) $1,240.50, (15) $361.59; (16) $39.68, June 27, B. & O. Railway, Washington, D. C., transportation, Washington-Chicago; $42.32, June 30, Capital Airlines, Chicago, Ill., transportation, Chicago-Washington; $33.88, August 5, Southern Railway, Washington, D. C., transportation, Washington-Winston-Salem, N. C., and return; $94 48, August 24, B. & O. Railway, Washington, D. C., transportation, Washington-Chicago and return; $14.90, September 5, Sherman Hotel, Chicago, Ill., lodging (2 nights).

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers' Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk; news for dairy co-ops; legislative letter.

D.[1] (6) $2,261.50.

E. (8) $11.50; (9) $11.50; (10) $25.41; (11) $36.91.

A. Francis J. Garvey, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (1) Employed on a 3-year contract from December 1, 1948. (2) Explanation and analysis of Federal bills; rendering of advice concerning their relationship to ADA policy; preparation of testimony for witnesses before congressional committees; contacts with individual Members of Congress re legislation; administrative duties in connection with council on legislation; speaking engagements explaining legislative interests of the American Dental Association to various dental groups.

D. (6) $2,500.08.

E. ((7) $205.41; (9) $205.41; (10) $324.67; (11) $530.08.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N Y.

C (1) Indefinitely. (2) In general, legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc.; Bow amendment to Defense Act of 1950. (3) None, other than office-prepared information of general interest.

D.[1] (6) $4,887.72.

E. (2) $847.78; (4) $82.10; (5) $85.66; (6) $3,830.15; (7) $542.08; (9) $4,887 72; (11) $4,887 72; (15) $810, July 15, August 15, September 15, H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., allocated portion of salary as managing director of association; $78.85; July 1, August 1, September 1, Salter Management Corp., 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., allocated portion of rent; $3,188 04, August 14, the Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y., telegraph services; $141.51, September 7, Western Union Telegraph Co., 405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C., telegram services; $542.03, July 17, August 8, September 6, H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., out-of-pocket expenses.

A. Mrs. Paul Gebhard, 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church, United States of America, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. M. George, H. K. Brehmer, and C S. McMahon, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

C. (1) Until legislation referred to in column 2 hereof, is disposed of. (2) H. R. 2982, S 1046, H. R. 30, H. R. 525, H. R. 3392, H. R. 3465, Senate Joint Resolution 60, S. 1335, House Joint Resolution 235, S. 1369, H. R. 3298, S. 1186 (identical), S. 345.

D.[1]

A. J. M. George, H. K. Brehmer, and C. S. McMahon, constituting the partnership of George, Brehmer & McMahon, attorneys, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

B. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163–165 Center Street, Winona Minn.; a general trade association functioning for the direct selling of distribution.

C. (1) Until legislation referred to in column 2 hereof, is disposed of. (2) H. R. 2982, S. 1046, H. R. 30, H. R. 525, H. R. 3392, S. 1335, H. R. 3465, Senate Joint Resolution 60, House Joint Resolution 235, S. 1369, H. R. 3298, S. 1186 (identical), S. 345.

D.[1] (6) $3,000.

E.[1]

A. Leo E. George, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) Union Postal Clerk.

D. (6) $2,000.

A. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

E. (6) $153.80; (9) $153.80; (10) $7,200; (11) $7,353.80.

A. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (See statement attached.)[2]

A. John S. Gibson, suite 10–14 Sibbett Building, Douglas, Ga.

B. St. Marys Kraft Corp., St. Marys, Ga.

C (1) At least throughout the remainder of the calendar year, 1951. (2) An authorization and appropriation for certain dredging in North River, Ga., and St. Marys River, Ga. and Fla., which was given No. 827 by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, War Department, Washington, D. C. (3) No publication whatever.

D.[1] (7) $750.

E. (7) $232.28; (9) $232 28; (10) $244 69; (11) $476.97.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D C.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Bills pending before the Eighty-second Congress relating to public education.

D.[1] (6) $1,313 63

E. (7) $46.45; (9) $46.45; (10) $126.70; (11) $173.15.

A. C. C. Gilbert, Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.

B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free-enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system.

D.[1] (6) $1,725.

A. William Glazier, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif., National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, 86 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif. Both trade unions.

C. (2) General interest in legislation affecting trade unions and their members and the maritime industry as well.

D.[1] (6) $494.34.

E. (2) $373.33; (4) $20.77; (5) $108.50; (6) $72.05; (8) $27.51; (9) $602.16; (10) $1,092.47; (11) $1,694.63; (15) $233.33, salary paid during quarter for office secretary to Anne Bancroft, 2115 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.; $140, salary paid during quarter for office secretary to Mrs. Helen B. Shonick, 1468 Girard Street NW., Washington, D. C.; $95, rent paid to Atlantic Building Corp., 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; $72.05,

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[2] Not received by the Clerk.

Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., for telephone and teletype service.

A. Dr. H T. Gordon, P. O. Box 2214, Washington, D. C.
B The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway SE., Cleveland, Ohio.
C (2) H R 2678 and H R. 2679.
D[1] (6) $910.
E (7) $387, (8) $38; (9) $425; (10) $468.

A Lawrence L Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., suite 603, Washington, D C.
B American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill
C (2) Bills affecting the public health. such as H R. 910, Nurses Education Aid; H. R 5215, funds for National Science Foundation; H R 4473, hospital exemption from admissions tax; S. 337, medical education aid.
D[1] (6) $375.

A. Government Employees' Council, 900 F Street NW, Washington, D C
C (2) All legislation that affects Government employees
D.[1] (6) $5,664 39.
E (2) $3,314.12, (4) $536.06, (5) $420 02; (6) $99 94, (8) $557 64, (9) $4,927 78, (10) $9,267 15, (11) $14,194.93, (15) $2,534 12, July, August, September, Thomas G Walters, 900 F Street, NW, Washington, D. C, received for services, fees, per diem, etc., operations director, G E C, A F of L, $780, July, August, September, Gladys M Monroe, 900 F Street NW, Washington, D C, salary, secretary, G E C, A. F. of L

A. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St Louis, Mo
C (2) Senate Finance Committee, Williams amendment (favor) legislation relative to grain and feed (3)[1]
D[1] (6) $443.85
E (4) $60, (6) $42.90; (7) $102 16, (9) $205 06, (10) $38 50, (11) $293 56

A Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318 418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio
C (2) To promote general interests of locomotive firemen and enginemen
D[1] (6) $16 50
E (2) $3,786 55, (5) $404 37; (6) $94 75; (7) $1,069 08, (8) $38 53, (9) $5,[illegible]9 56, (10) $10,906 66, (11) $16,300 24; (15) $2,499 99, July 20, August 20, September 20, Jonas A McBride, 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D C, salary, $1,186 56, July 13, July 31, August 15, August 31, September 14, September 28, Glenn C Russell (employee), 310 Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C, salary, $100, August 17, Jo-Ann Jones, 1816 Twenty-second Street SE, Washington, D C, salary, $337 50, July 2, August 2, September 5, Labor, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D C, rent; $30, August 2, Jonas A. McBride, 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D C, postage, etc[1]

A Robert A Grant, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind
B Ethanol Committee, 810 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington, D C
C (2) Legislation fixing a tax on the ethyl alcohol used in pharmaceutical preparations, and particularly that section of H R 4473
E (6) $32 75; (7) $779 51; (9) $812.26; (10) $1,132 47; (11) $1,944.73.

A Cassius B Gravitt, Jr., 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislation affecting postmasters. (3) The Postmasters' Advocate.
D.[1] (6) $1,375.

A. David G. Gray, Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex
D[1] (6) $1,500
E (6) $95; (7) $3,625 53, (9) $3,720 51; (10) $6,274 98; (11) $9,900.51.

A Great Lakes-St Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington
C (2) St. Lawrence legislation, Senate Joint Resolution 27; House Joint Resolutions 2, 3, 4, 15, 102, 122, 159, 337, proponents.
D[1] (6) $10,613 50.
E. (1) $3,333 18; (2) $10,621.18 (4) $6,494,-21, (5) $1,421.14, (6) $906 83, (7) $1,430 39; (8) $2,965 28, (9) $27,172 21; (10) $56,010.48; (11) $83,182 69, (15) Hotel Book-Cadillac, Detroit, Mich, July 5, travel, $26 86, Railway Express Co., Washington, July 6, 25, August 21, September 15, 28, freight charges, $119 51, Norwood Office Supply Co, Washington, July 14, August 25, September 15, supplies, $18 99; Press Club, Washington, July 14, dues, $12; United Typewriter Co, Washington, July 14, typewriter, $91.29, etc.[1]

A Ernest W Greene, 731 Investment Building, Washington, D C
B Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, post-office box 2450, Honolulu, T H
C. (2) H R 4521, which extends the Sugar Act of 1948

A Weston B Grimes, 436 Bowen Building, Washington, D C
B Cargill, Inc, 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn
C (2) Agriculture and the processing and transportation of the products thereof, tax legislation, H R 4473, Revenue Act of 1951; H R 3436, transportation of United States grain in Canadian vessels; H R 3483, maintenance of 9-foot channel in Minnesota River, Public Law 96, Public Law 135.
D[1] (7) $22,955 24.
E (7) $2, (9) $2, (10) $6 50, (11) $8 50.

A Mrs Enid H Griswold, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N Y
B National Economic Council, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y
C (2) Any legislation to support private enterprise and maintain American independence, and to oppose any measures that work contrariwise
D[1] (6) $346
E (7) $46, (9) $46, (10) $39, (11) $85.

A John J Gunther, 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C
B Americans for Democratic Action, 1740 K Street, Washington, D C.
C (2) All bills covered by convention-adopted program of organization.
D[1] (6) $1,200.
E (7) $240 35; (9) $240 35; (10) $434 58; (11) $674 93

A Violet M Gunther, 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D C.
B Americans for Democratic Action, 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D C.
C (2) All bills covered by convention-adopted program of organization.
D.[1] (6) $1,462 50.
E. (7) $104 77; (9) $104.77; (10) $499.61; (11) $604.38.

A. David J. Guy, manager, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) H R. 4963.
D.[1] (6) $3,375
E. (7) $7.70; (9) $7.70; (10) $24 95; (11) $32.65.

A Frank E Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill
B The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building.

A Harlan V Hadley, 830 Transportation Building, Washington, D C
B Taxation Committee, Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich
C. (2) Legislation affecting Federal excise taxation on automotive products, including H R 4473 and H R 4473 as amended in Senate
D[1] (6) $625.
E (4) $436 72, (5) $10; (9) $446 72; (10) $1,173 89; (11) $1,620 61, (15) $436.72, July 27, 1951, Wolfe, Inc, 3630 West Fort Street, Detroit, Mich., printing presentation made to Senate Finance Committee.

A Hugh F Hall, 261 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, D. C.
B American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C (2) Inflation control (Defense Production Act of 1950), Government credit policies, repeal of resale price maintenance; antitrust legislation, amendment of Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; amendment of BIR Code relating to tax treatment of livestock, taxation, grazing land; St. Lawrence seaway, ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing, agricultural appropriations, ACP payments, REA, screw worm research appropriations, meat inspection funds appropriations; Department of Agriculture reorganization.
D[1] (7) $1,825 02
E (7) $26 55, (9) $26 55; (10) $309 04; (11) $335 59; (15) $26.55

A Radford Hall, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo
B American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C (2) Price controls, slaughter quotas, tax matters, etc
D[1] (6) $1,650
E (6) $87 43, (7) $563 30; (8) $4 10, (9) $654 83, (10) $3,161 73, (11) $3,816 56

A E C Hallbeck, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D C
B National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D C
C (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees (3) Federation News Service Bulletin
D (6) $2,874 96
E (7) $236.12; (9) $236 12; (10) $493 15; (11) $729 27.

A J. Stanley Halperin, 46 Cedar Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Women's Apparel Chains Association, Inc, 41 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The Revenue Act of 1951. H R. 4473, sole interest is with respect to section 123 of H. R 4473; registrant appeared on behalf of client in opposition to section 123.
D[1] (6) $2,500.
E. (4) $243 69; (6) $92.08; (7) $108.24, (9) $444 01; (11) $444 01; (15) $14 50, July 16, 1951, George W. Stamps, Cedar Street, Cedarbrook, Amityville, N. Y, for typing; $13 50, July 19, 1951, George W. Stamps, Cedar Street, Cedarbrook, Amityville, N. Y., typing;

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

$203 88, July 23, 1951, Wall Street Photo Print Service, Inc, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y., photo offsetting, $70.04; photo offsetting, $133 84.

A. Harry G. Hamlet, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
C (2) Legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, (3) The Retired Officer.
D.[1] (6) $750.

A. Joseph J. Hammer, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N Y.
D.[1] (6) $1,385 42.
E. (6) $5.30; (7) $255.12; (9) $260.42; (10) $1,238.24; (11) $1,498.66.

A. Murray Hanson, 1625 K Street NW, Washington, D C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 1625 K Street NW, Washington, D C, and 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Tax and other legislation affecting the securities business.
D[1]
E (2) $97.50; (5) $133.91; (6) $60 14; (7) $133 38; (9) $424.93; (10) $1,145.28; (11) $1,570 21.

A. Ralph W. Hardy, 1771 N Street NW., Washintgon, D C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D C.
C. (2) S. 658, H. R 3589, H. R. 2464, H. R. 2948, S. 537, Senate Joint Resolution 76, S. 1579, S 1526, H R 4229, H. R. 4231, H. R. 5470, S 1563, S. 1564, S 1624, S 2116.

A Richard F Harless, 1111 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Atlantic Union Committee, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 and House Concurrent Resolution 26.
D.[1] (6) $2,100.

A. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to transportation and legal and tax matters of interest to farmer cooperatives. (3) Washington situation.
D[1] (6) $2,274 84.
E (7) $66 43; (9) $66.43; (10) $190.73; (11) $257.16.

A. Harnischfeger Corp, Milwaukee, Wis.
C. (2) General interest in housing legislation, housing near military installations, defense productions and economic controls.
E. (2) $1,050; (9) $1,050; (10) $2,100; (11) $3,150, (15) $1,050, Donald M. Counihan, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C, legislative counsel.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., suite 55, Washington, D. C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., suite 55, Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) That which affects postal rates of controlled-circulation periodicals published by members of the above-named association.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (7) $8.73; (9) $8.73; (10) $64.20; (11) $72.93.

A. Winder R Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
C (2) Interested in passage of S. 241, to amend Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

A Merwin K Hart, Empire State Building, New York, N Y
B National Economic Council, Inc, Empire State Building, New York, N Y.
C (2) Legislative interests are in favoring any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence, and to oppose any measures that work contrariwise.
D.[1] (6) $568.14.
E (7) $68 14; (9) $68.14; (10) $216.49; (11) $284 63.

A. Stephen H Hart, 350 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B National Live Stock Tax Committee,[1] 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo
C. (2) Interested in general livestock tax matters including specifically proposed amendments to the Internal Revenue Code concerning capital gains on sale of breeding livestock and deduction of soil conservation, brush control, and other ranching expenditures.
D. (6) $1,903.35.
E (9) $703 35.

A Dow W Harter, 412-14 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B The B F. Goodrich Co, Akron, Ohio.
C (2) Legislation relating to the maintenance of facilities for the production of an ample supply of man-made domestic rubber in the United States for commercial and national defense purpose; also interested in the repeal or reduction of present excise taxes on tires and tubes, and in certain other changes in our tax structure, and, generally, in other legislative proposals relating to tires and other manufactured rubber products
D[1] (6) $1,875.

A. Fred A. Hartley, Jr., suite 35, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C.
B Western Medical Corporation., 415-423 West Pershing Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C (2) Legislative interests will continue during period of consideration of Durham-Humphrey bill.
D. (7) $5,000.
E. (4) $117; (7) $193 13; (8) $39.87; (9) $350; (11) $350; (15) $235.13; (16) $118.13, Pennsylvania Railroad, 626 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C, rail travel; $117, Thad E. Ragsdale, 306 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C., shorthand reporter.

A. Edward S. Hartman, rural route 2, Delavan, Wis.
B. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Tax equality legislation.
E. (10) $2,116.51; (11) $2,116.51.

A. John E. Hartshorn, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt and Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 4473, the Revenue Act of 1951.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Wade R. Hawes, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347, to amend Railroad Retirement Act; H. Res. 426 provides study of integration of railroad retirement funds with social security.
D (6) $63.40.

A Paul M Hawkins 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees, and with its customers.[1]
D.[1] (6) $3.375.
E (7) $146 50; (9) $146 50; (10) $112.55; (11) $259.05.

A. Kit H Haynes, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D C
B National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General agricultural and farmer cooperative legislation. (3) Washington Situation.
D.[1] (6) $2,025.
E. (7) $33.20; (9) $33.20; (10) $115 66; (11) $148.86.

A Joseph H Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C (2) Any and all Federal legislative proposals which may or do affect western railroads

---

A. John C Hazen, suite 808 Kass Building, 711 Fourteenth Street NW, Washington, D C
B National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N Y.
C (2) H. R. 3622, H R. 1535, H R. 5505, H R 5101, H. R. 5189, S. 1309, S 1046, S. 2170, H R 4473, H R. 1938, S. 1717, H R. 3871, all appropriation legislation S. 508, H. R 542, H R 538, S 1335, H R 3465 (3) Stores magazine and NRDGA Washington News Letter.
E (6) $19 65; (7) $39, (8) $2 50; (9) $61.15, (10) $158.43; (11) $219.58

A. Thomas P. Healy, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D C.
B Communications Workers of America-CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW, Washington, D C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.

A Felix Hebert, 602 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.
B Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurance Companies, Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.
C. (2) Amendment to Internal Revenue Code, section 207.
E. (7) $120.58; (8) $13.70; (9) $134.28; (10) $100.38; (11) $234.66.

A. K. W. Heberton, room 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interests cover any legislative proposals affecting the interests of the telegraph company.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (7) $119.72; (9) $119.72; (10) $281.30; (11) $401.02.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y. and 132 Third Street SE, Washington, D C.
B American Parents' Committee, 132 Third Street SE, Washington, D C.
C (2) National school health services bill, public school construction bill, national child research bill, Federal aid for medical education, local public health units, physically handicapped children's education bill, school lunch appropriation, Cabinet status for the Federal Security Agency, Children's Bureau appropriation, Federal aid to day-care centers in defense areas, Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, emergency maternal and infant care, defense housing and community facilities. (3) Washington Report on Legislation Affecting Children

---

A Leo J Heer, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, suite 822, Washington, D C
B National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill
C (2) Defense Production Act, S 1717 and H R 3871, favor certain amendments; H R. 4473, seeks relief for installment basis taxpayer (3) Washington Report and News Bulletin
D[1] (6) $500
E (7) $150, (9) $150; (10) $100; (11) $250.

A Robert B Heiney, 1133 Twentieth Street NW, Washington, D C
B National Canners Association, 1133 Twentieth Street NW., Washingtou, D. C
C (2) Defense controls and all measures directly affecting the food canning industry.
D[1] (6) $2,187 51
E (7) $104 75; (9) $104 75, (10) $121 90; (11) $226.65

A Robert E Hensel, 25 Broadway, New York, N Y
B Chadbourne, Parke, Whiteside, Wolff, and Brophy, formerly Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke, and Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N Y
C (2) Legislative interests to continue until tax legislation is passed extending the 85 percent dividends received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.
E. (6) $6.14; (9) $6 14, (10) $9 93, (11) $16 07, (15) $6 14.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N Y., and 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D C
C (2) Any legislation which affects either directly or indirectly the interests of local agents.[1] (3) The American Agency Bulletin.
D (6) $201 81
E (7) $201 81; (9) $201.81; (10) $327.74; (11) $529 55.

A. Ewart A. Hester, 433 Shoreham Building, Washington, D C.
B Law offices of Clinton M Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any proposed legislation affecting the brewing industry.[1]
D. (6) $2,500.

A. M. F Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee,[1] 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C (2) Legislation affecting the railroad industry as a whole and the railroad industry in particular.
E (2) $504; (7) $1,191.03; (9) $1,695 03; (10) $872 05; (11) $2,567 08.

A. Justin Hinders, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D.[1] (6) $947 99
E. (7) $1.65; (8) $13; (9) $14 65; (10) $64 27, (11) $78 92; (15) $12, National Press Club, Washington, D. C, dues

---

A Ray C. Hinman, 26 Broadway, New York, N Y.
B Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N Y.
D[1] (6) $1,460 23
E (6) $12 60, (7) $197 63, (9) $210 23; (10) $90 91; (11) $301 14.

A L S Hitchner, 528 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D C.
B National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 910 Seventeenth Street NW, 528 Barr Building, Washington, D C
C (2) Interested in the current investigation on the use of chemicals on foods being conducted by the select committee.

A Frank N Hoffmann, 718 Jackson Place NW, Washington, D C
B United Steelworkers of America, 1550 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity and general welfare, oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives
D (6) $1,999 98
E (7) $3,200, (10) $7,950, (11) $11,150.

A Donald D Hogate, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D C.
B Brantford Cordage Co, Brantford, Ontario
C (2) H R 1005, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of baler twine
D[1] (6) $3,000.
E (4) $26 86; (5) $75; (6) $22 85; (7) $86 50, (8) $11 22, (9) $222 43, (10) $601 40; (11) $823 83, (15) $26 36, Henry Schroen, 820 Albee Building, Washington, D. C., mimeographing

---

A Robert L Hogg, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill
B American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill
C (2) All prospective legislation which will or may affect the life-insurance business[1]
D[1] (6) $2,500
E (6) $14 75, (7) $463 72, (9) $478.47, (10) $462 46, (11) $940 93

A William J. Holloway, 2213 First National Building, Oklahoma City, Okla
B Service Pipe Line Co., Tulsa, Okla.
C Opposing S. 1139, S 1134, and S. 1218; favoring appropriations for Bureau of Valuations in Interstate Commerce Commission.
D[1] (6) $1,500
E. (7) $550; (9) $550; (10) $725; (11) $1,275.

A. Charles W. Holman, 1731 I Street, NW., Washington, D C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk (3) News for Dairy Coops and Legislative Letter.
D[1] (6) $4,130.90.
E. (8) $5.90; (9) $5 90; (11) $5.90.

A. Oscar W Holste, room 407, 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D. C.
B Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio
C (2) S 1347 and H R. 3669, and all legislation affecting labor, primarily railroad labor
D[1] (6) $955 50.

A Victor Hood, Twelfth and Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind
B The Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors' International Union of America, Twelfth and Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind
C (2) The District Barbers Act, Veterans' Regulation Act, and Defense Production Act
D[1] (6) $1,745
E (7) $490, (9) $490; (10) $1,873 79; (11) $2,363 79

A Richard Hooker, 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D C
B Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C (2) H R 3669 and S 1347, to amend Railroad Retirement Act; House Resolution 426, to study integrating railroad retirement funds with social security, and all legislation of interest to railroad employees and labor in general
D (6) $60 65.

A Jesse V Horton, P O Box 2013, Washington, D C
B National Association of Postal Supervisors, P O Box 2013, Washington, D C.
C (2) All legislation affecting the Postal Service and its employees, including supervisors (3) The Postal Supervisor.
D[1] (6) $2,125
E (7) $113 13; (9) $113 13; (10) $206 40; (11) $319 53

A Mrs. Hiram Cole Houghton, President, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW, Washington, D C
B. The President of the General Federation of Women's Clubs supports or opposes legislation, and asks the organization membership to do likewise when authority for such action has been provided through the adoption of a resolution in national convention.

A Robert B. House, Jr., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D C.
B Cummings, Stanley, Truitt and Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., representing New Process Co., Warren, Pa.
C. (2) Postal rate legislation.

A S. H Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, and all legislation directly affecting the interests of railroad employees in particular and labor in general.
D.[1] (6) $1,086.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Harold K. Howe, suite C, 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof.
D [1] (6) $2,649 99.
E. (2) $9 29, (7) $375 01; (9) $1,304.01; (10) $3,882.48; (11) $5,186.49.

A. Robert E. Howe, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C (2) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.[1]
D (6) $3,302.

A. Margaret B Howell, 2915 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C
C (2) To analyze and interpret legislation, pending or proposed, and to prepare reports related thereto, with particular emphasis on the corporate provisions of H R. 4473 and the application of H. R. 3871 (S. 1717), now Public Law 96, as related to steel.
D (6) ©2,700.
E (5) $435; (6) $115; (7) $1,483; (8) $150; (9) $2,183, (10 $1,000; (11) $3,183.

A. Hudson, Creyke and Lipscomb, 400 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
C (2) To obtain relief for applicants for leases on submerged lands and for those persons whose activities led the Government to assert title to submerged lands.
D (6) $1,200.
E (2) $1; (7) $3 75, (9) $4 75, (11) $4.75.

A. C A Hummel, 122 West Wasington Avenue, Madison, Wis
B. Wisconsin Railroad Association, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) All legislation affecting railroads and transportation generally.
D. (6) $464.
E (7) $559.91; (9) $559.91; (11) $559 91; (15) $144.91, Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. S, lodging; $72 03, Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C., lodging; $74 00, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., meals, $26, Arbaugh's, Washington, D. C., meals, $22, O'Donnell's, Washington, D C., meals, etc [1]

A. Carroll B. Huntress, 17 Battery Place, New York, N Y.
B National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C
C (2) Any legislation with refernce to the St Lawrence waterway and power project; House Joint Resolution 337 opposed
E (6) $68.69, (7) $1,018, (9) $1,086 69; (10) $2,466 20, (11) $3,552 89.

A. William C Hushing, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers
D.[1] (6) $2,730.
E. (2) $2,730, (6) $13 32; (8) $206.68; (9) $2,051; (10) $5,460; (11) $8,411.

A. Edgar S. Idol, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D C.
D.[1] (6) $1,887.50.
E (7) $12.50; (9) $12 50; (10) $314.24; (11) $326.74.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, Room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
E. (2) $250; (6) $8.55; (7) $184.18; (9) $442.73; (11) $442.73.

A. Imperial Sugar Co., Sugar Land, Tex.
C. (2) Extension of Sugar Act of 1948.
E. (2) $1,249.98; (7) $855.97; (9) $2,105.95; (11) $2,105.95.

A. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
C. (2) Opposed the proposal of a withholding tax on interest paid by banks.
E (11) $31,593 49.[1]

A Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., suite 501, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Pending tax legislation, and any other bills affecting the natural gas industry.
D [1] (6) $13,932 50.
E (2) $5,750; (5) $300; (6) $85; (7) $110 25, (9) $6,245.25, (10) $28,438.68; (11) $34,683.93; (15) $3,750, John A. Ferguson, 1026 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C, salary, $1,250, Wesley E. Disney, 1020 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $750, Louis E. Whyte, 4707 Chestnut Street, Bethesda, Md., salary, $300, Herbert Harvey Real Estate, Inc., 912 Seventeenth Street NW, Washington, D. C, rent.

A. Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.
E. (2) $2,387.15; (4) $50; (5) $596.14, (6) $12 31; (7) $109 42; (8) $2, (9) $3,157 02; (10) $14,203, (11) $17,360.02; (15) $1,585 20, James A Waggener, Indianapolis, Ind., salary; $102.65, James A Waggener, Indianapolis, Ind, traveling expenses, $564.15, Bettey Palmer, Indianapolis, Ind, salary, $50, Postmaster, Indianapolis, Ind, postage; $237 80, Fletcher Trust Co, Indianapolis, Ind., income tax withheld; etc.[1]

A. Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., Board of Trade Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Bills affecting equality of taxation.
D.[1] (6) $70.
E (3) $2,316; (4) $40 34; (9) $2,356.34; (10) $1,338 74, (11) $3,695 08; (15) $2,316, National Associated Businessmen, Inc., Washington, D C, contribution for services; $35 34, National Tax Equality Association, Chicago, Ill., 2,500 envelopes.

A. Indians of California, Inc., 225 Powell Street, San Francisco, Calif. Local address: 2838 Twenty-eighth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C (2) Legislation affecting Indians of California.
D. and E. (See attached pages [1])

A. William Ingles, 1624 I Street NW., Washington, D. C
C. (2) Legislation affecting industry.
D.[1] (6) $8,447.50.
E (2) $1,530, (5) $662 09; (6) $86.73; (7) $231.89; (8) $360; (9) $2,870.71; (10) $6,430.79; (11) $9,301.50.

A. J. Stuart Innerst, 426 North Raymond Avenue, Pasadena, Calif.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Work in the general field of constructive foreign policy, support of the United Nations; international reduction of armaments; and opposition to the enactment of the Universal Military Training and Universal Military Service Act of 1951.
D.[1] (6) $400.
E (5) $40.30; (7) $17.95; (9) $58.25; (10) $311.20; (11) $369.45.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.
D.[1] (6) $1,650.
E. (1) $750; (4) $250; (5) $150, (6) $200; (7) $300; (9) $1,650, (10) $3,300; (11) $4,950.

A. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2) H. R 2982; S 1046; H. 30; H 525; H 3392; H R 3465, Senate Joint Resolution 60; S 1335; House Joint Resolution 235; S. 1369; H R 3298; S. 345, S 1186 (identical).
D [1] (6) $3,000.
E [1] (4) $9.51; (5) $2.16; (9) $11 67; (10) $69 06; (11) $80 73.

A. Iowa Associated Businessmen, Inc, 468 Westwood Drive, Ames, Iowa.
C (2) H R 240, H. R. 1177, S 892, H R. 4473. We favor first three and oppose last bill
D.[1] (6) $2,905.
E. (2) $1,200 62; (4) $230 93; (5) $61.14; (6) $41.47; (7) $88 41; (8) $1,270 88, (9) $2,893 45, (10) $5,088 54; (11) $7,981 99, (15) $886 50, July 31, August 31, September 30, C. H. Chase, 463 Westwood Drive, Ames, Iowa, salary $300.00 per month less deductions; $314 12 15th and 30th each month, Miss Jeanne Marion, 425 Sixth Street, Nevada, Iowa, wages for secretarial work at 90 cents per hour, $70 88, July 2, 1951, Collector of Internal Revenue, Des Moines, Iowa, for Social Security and withholding tax during quarter, $26.57, September 25, 1951, Work Letter Service, Des Moines for special communications pertaining to membership dues, etc.

A Seward H Jacobi, The Insurance Building, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis
B Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, the Insurance Building, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) All legislation affecting business and industry. S 1717, Defense Production Act; H. R 4473, Revenue Act of 1951.
D.[1] (7) $2,750.

A. Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) H. R. 403, H. R. 1372, H. R. 2865, S. 865, S. 716, H. R 2379, H. R. 2816.
D [1] (7) $3,858 75.
E. (1) $1.67; (2) $900; (4) $81.68; (5) $193 77; (6) $78 52; (7) $18.84; (8) $47 17; (9) $1,321.65; (10) $3, 236.80; (11) $4,558.45; (16) $300, July, August, September, Etsu Masaoka, 300 Fifth Street NE, Washington, D C., for salaries; $600, July, August, September, Mike Masaoka, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C., for salaries; $174.99, July, August, September, rent for 3-months period; $56.25, September 10, August 21, 1951, July 26, July 5, United States Post Office, Washington, D. C., for postage; $53.72, July 11, August 13, September 11, Chesapeake and

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

Potomac Telephone Co., 728 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn.; Bell Clay Co., Gleason, Tenn.; United Clay Mines Corp., Trenton, N. J.; Old Hickory Clay Co., Paducah, Ky.; Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co., Cooley Clay Co., and Kentucky Clay Mining Co., Mayfield, Ky.
C. (2) H. R. 4473.
D[1] (6) $672.84.
E (6) $7 57; (7) $330; (8) $8 95; (9) $346.52; (10) $672.84; (11) $1,019.36, (14) $672.84.

A Peter Dierks Joers, Dierks Lumber & Coal Co., Mountain Pine, Ark.
B Dierks Lumber & Coal Co., 1006 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Flood Control Act of 1945—Millwood Dam. Legislation affecting lumber industry.

A Elmer Johnson, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting retired civil employees, particularly during this quarter, S. 995, S. 500, and H. R. 2732. (3) (a) The Annuitant
D[1] (6) $250.
E (2) $250; (7) $62.10; (9) $312 10; (10) $687 60; (11) $999.70, (15) $83.33, July 31; $83 33, August 31; $83.33, September 30—Elmer Johnson, 831 Rittenhouse Street NW., Washington, D. C, percentage of salary applicable to lobbying activities. $21 60, July 31; $22, August 31; $18 50, September 30—transportation, food, and entertainment.

A. Gilbert R Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D[1] (6) $2,916.
E. (10) $177 05, (11) $177.05.

A J P Johnson, Terminal Refrigerating & Warehousing Corp, Washington, D C
B National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses
C (2) H. R 1047, 2386, S 267; H R 26, 39, 1291; S 341; H. R 27, 54; H. R. 4133; S. 1222; H R 2678, 2679, H R 3305, S. 1140; H R. 9073, 9076, 9088; H. R. 4473.

A W. D. Johnson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B Order of Railway Conductors, O R. C. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
C (2) H. R. 1998, H R 3755, S 1353.
D[1]

A. Vernon A. Johnson, Lockheed Aircraft Corp, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C
B Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.
C (2) All legislation affecting aviation.
D.[1] (7) $4,432 40.
E. (6) $19.44; (7) $1,162.96; (9) $1,182.40; (10) $1,575.56; (11) $2,757.96; (15) $1,182.40.

A. Walter R. Johnson, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To confirm and establish title in the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries. S. 940, and similar bills.
D.[1] (6) $4,500.
E. (7) $71.32; (8) $125.00; (9) $1,096.32; (10) $1,616; (11) $2,712.32.

A. Johns-Manville Corp, 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Tax legislation, labor legislation, amendments to the Clayton Act, merchant marine legislation, price basing point legislation, Defense Production Act.
E (2) $1,250; (8) $509 89; (9) $1,759.89; (10) $3,582 66, (11) $5,342.55.

A. Bascom F. Jones, 930 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn. (See attached pages).[1]
B. Class I railroads operating in Tennessee.

A. Ernest Jones, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C (2) H. R. 3669 and S 1347 to amend Railroad Retirement Act. House Resolution 426 to integrate railroad retirement funds with social security.
D.[1] (6) $466.56.

A J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah
C (2) Extension of Defense Production Act Opposed to title IV Importation of Basque sheepherders—for. Tax increase legislation—capital gains provision affecting livestock—for Reorganization of Department of Agriculture, S. 1149 (3) National Wool Grower.
D.[1] (6) $2,499.99.
E (7) $895 18; (9) $895.18; (10) $3,192.45; (11) $4,037.63.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D C
E. (8) $9; (9) $9, (10) $42; (11) $51.

A O C Jones, Post office box 14, North, S C.
B The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St Louis, Mo.
C (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and all legislation directly affecting the interests of railroad employees in particular and labor in general.
D. (6) $77.58.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See page.)[1]
D[1] (6) $3,000
E. (7) $319 28; (9) $319 28; (10) $531.63; (11) $850.91.

A. The Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmotologists and Proprietors' International Union of America, Twelfth and Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) The District Barbers Act, Veterans Regulation Act, Defense Production Act. H. R. 2468, H. R. 2570, H. R. 2573, H. R. 1668, H. R. 5234. For all bills except H. R. 5234, against H. R. 5234.
(D) (6) One percent.
E. (2) $1,745; (9) $1,745; (10) $4,528.79; (11) $6,273.79.

A. H. B. Judd, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C H R 3669 and S. 1347 to amend the Railroad Retirement Act. H. Res. 426 to study integration of railroad retirement funds with social security.
D. (6) $94.45.

A John E Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y
C (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry and its customers. Percentage depletion allowance. National fuel policy.
D[1] (7) $2,100.
E. (7) $669.93; (9) $669.93; (10) $1,119 32, (11) $1,789.25; (15) $669 93; (16) $73. July 3, 1951, Shoreham Hotel, dinner meeting, $18.75, July 12, 1951, Statler Hotel, luncheon; $13.96, July 10, 1951, Pennsylvania Railroad, tickets; $22, July 25, 1951, Statler Hotel, dinner, $11, August 1, 1951, Statler Hotel, luncheon, etc.[1]

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C
C. (2) Legislation affecting the sale or distribution of petroleum products in the District of Columbia.
D[1] (7) $300
E. (8) $179 13; (9) $179.13; (10) $529 62; (11) $708 75; (15) $179.13.

A. The Kansas Independent Business Men's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans
C. (2) Tax equality and other legislation affecting independent business.
D[1] (6) $775
E (5) $160.05; (7) $101.04; (9) $261 69; (10) $335.05, (11) $596 74.

A Jerome J Keating, 1525 H Street NW, Washington, D C.
B National Association of Letter Carriers, 1525 H Street NW., Washington, D C.
C (2) All legislation pertaining to postal and Federal employees
D.[1] (6) $1,374

A Thomas J Keefe, 1319 F Street NW, Washington, D C.
B American Road Builders' Association, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the road building industry
D[1] (6) $2,583 34.
E (6) $39, (7) $1,254 09; (8) $177 79; (9) $1,470 88, (10) $2,891.58, (11) $4,362 46.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Retained as independent contractor by city and county of San Francisco, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, including civil functions appropriation, civil defense, payment in lieu of taxes, airports and aviation, merchant marine development, national defense appropriations, housing and urban developments, Transbay Bridge and taxation.
D[1] (6) $3,000.
E.[1] (5) $1,095; (6) $553.74; (7) $569.90; (8) $45; (9) $2,263.64; (10) $4,460.99; (11) $6,724.63.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Thomas F Kelly, 1070 East One hundred and Fifty-second Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
B Vacuum Cleaner Manufacturers Association, 1070 East One hundred and Fifty-second Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
C (2) Revenue Act of 1951.
D[1] (6) $1,450
E (2) $62, (4) $23 05; (5) $21 46; (6) $291,-74; (7) $616 89, (8) None; (9) $1,015 14; (10) $1,014 35; (11) $2,029 49; (12) $1,599 58.

A Moss H Kendrix, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D C
B National Educational Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A Isaiah L Kenen, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N Y
B American Zionist Council, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N Y
C (2) Legislation for financial aid to Israel (3) (See page 3)[1]
D[1] (6) $3,150
E (2) $3,437 65, (4) $2,869 16, (5) $750, (6) $746 73, (7) $3,063 15, (8) $55 19, (9) $10,921 88, (10) $12,685 75, (11) $23,607 63; (15) $93 28, July 21, July 28, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D C, hotel bills; $640 88, August 3, August 10, August 18, August 24, August 30, September 22, September 28, Du Pont Plaza Hotel, Washington, D C, hotel bills, $27 36, July 9, August 6, September 6, Duke Zeibert's, Washington, D C, hospitality; $82 39, August 6, Rocco's, Washington, D. C., hospitality, $32 67, August 6, September 7, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C, hospitality, etc[1]

A Mr Harold L Kennedy, 203 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co, Findlay, Ohio
C. (2) H R 3285, Senate Joint Resolution 20, S 940, H R 4484, 3408, 1233, S 719.
D[1] (6) $500.
E. (2) $125; (5) $67 50; (6) $40; (7) $35; (8) $25; (9) $292 50; (10) $655, (11) $947 50.

A. Miles D Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind
C. (2) (See statement attached)[1] (3) (See statement attached).[1]
D[1] (6) $3,000
E[1] (2) $1; (5) $4.50; (7) $67.40; (9) $72 90; (10) $447.32, (11) $520 22.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D C
B Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D[1] (6) $2,550.
E (2) $2,550, (9) $2,550; (10) $5,100, (11) $7,650.

A. Omar B Ketchum, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW, Washington, D C.
B Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States
C (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents (3) VFW Foreign Service and VFW Legislative Newsletter.
D (6) $3,000.
E (7) $94.75; (9) $94 75; (10) $181.25; (11) $276

A. H Cecil Kilpatrick, American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B The Budd Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Corporate income and excess-profits taxes, Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 and revenue bill of 1951; H R 4473; 64 Stat. ch. 1199, for amendment of Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Williford I. King, room 300, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N Y.
D[1] (6) $3,075.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B National Cotton Council of America, P. O Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C (2) Any legislation affecting raw cotton industry
D[1] (6) $300
E (7) $40 50, (9) $40 50, (10) $72 14, (11) $112 64

A W H Kittrell, Empire Bank Building, Dallas, Tex
B Melben Oil Co, Benedum-Trees Building, Pittsburgh, Pa
C (2) Legislation affecting the oil industry, especially, tidelands
D[1] (7) $3,000
E. (6) $636 43; (7) $2,491 31, (8) $692, (9) $3,819 74, (10) $7,642 96, (11) $11,462 70, (16) $1,514 55, various dates in quarter, Mayflower Hotel, Wshington, D C, lodging, including related expenditures; $815 26, various dates in quarter, American Airlines, transportation to and from Washington, D C.; $636 43, various dates in quarter, Southwest Bell Telephone Co, Dallas, Tex, long distance calls, $12 50, August, National Press Club, Washington, D C, dues, $30 50, August, Harvey's Restaurant, Washington, D. C, restaurant expenses, etc.[1]

A Robert F Klepinger, 1720 M Street NW, Washington, D. C.
B Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc, 45 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y.
C (3) Excise taxes (H R 4473; Ways and Means Committee).
D[1] (6) $750

A Allan B Kline, president and chief executive, American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, Ill (221 North LaSalle Street), Washington, D C (261 Constitution Avenue NW)
B American Farm Bureau Federation
C (2) Matters affecting American agriculture.
D[1] (7) $5,000.

A Robert E Kline, Jr, 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D C.
B Alloys Development Co., 2537 Koppers Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C (2) For the bill to extend terms of patents because of loss of use during World War II H R 4054.
E (6) $1 38, (7) $5; (9) $6 38 (10) $52 39; (11) $58 77.

A Robert E Kline, Jr, 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D C.
B Palmer-Bee Company, Detroit, Mich.
C (1) Indefinite; (2) Bills for relief of Palmer-Bee Co., to reimburse company for loss of $725,285.60 in manufacture of radar equipment for Navy. Bill for relief of Palmer-Bee Co. S. 116 and H. R. 3739.
E (6) $5.81; (7) $1; (9) $6.81; (10) $43 19, (11) $50.

A. A Joint Venture (list of members c/o Chas. Klint, P. O. Box 1962 attached to preliminary report).
C. (2) To obtain relief for applicants for leases on submerged lands and for those persons whose activities led the Government to assert title to submerged lands.
D.[1] (6) $2,000.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $1,800; (6) $2 30; (9) $1,802.30, (10) $6,400, (11) $8,202 30; (15) $1,802 30 paid September 28, 1951, to Hudson, Creyke & Lipscomb, 404 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. J Daun Knisely, 350 Kenwood Avenue, Delmar, N Y.
B Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Railroad Retirement Act amendments Changes in parcel-post packages
D (6) $160

A Burt L Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C
B The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D C

A Robert M Koch, 1424 K Street NW, Washington, D C
B National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc, 1424 K Street NW, Washington, D C
C (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers
E (7) $21 50, (9) $21 50; (10) $55 17, (11) $76 67.

A John Kolanda, room 413, Railway Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D C
B Railway Employees' Department, 608 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H R 3669 and S 1347 to amend Railroad Retirement Act. House Joint Resolution 426 to integrate railroad-retirement funds with social security All legislation of interest to railroad employees and labor in general
D[1] (6) $2,400.

A John A Kratz, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW, Washington, D C.
B The Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill
C (2) For the enactment of S 1000 and H R 3793, identical bills, to amend section 7 (h) of the Natural Gas Act.
D[1]
E (6) $8 64; (9) $8 64; (10) $51 14; (11) $59 78

A Alfred U Krebs, 1809 G Street NW, Washington, D C
B National Federation of American Shipping, Inc, 1809 G Street NW, Washington, D C
C. (2) S 354, House Joint Resolution 333, S 241, H. R 4729, S 1221, H. R 3871, H. R. 1535, H R 3436, H R 4473.
D.[1] (6) $500.

A Oscar R. Kreutz, 907 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW, Washington, D C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW, Washington, D C.
C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing Oppose legislation inimicable to interests of savings and loan industry; H. R. 4473, tax bill.
D.[1] (6) $3,750.

A. Edward H Kruse, Jr., 902 Fort Wayne Bank Building, Fort Wayne, Ind.
B. Wayne Pump Co., Fort Wayne, Ind.
C. (2) Revenue bill of 1951.
D. (6) $2,000.
E. (6) $12.63; (7) $428.58; (8) $5; (9) $446.21; (11) $446.21.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C (2) Legislation affecting water and power projects, flood control, and reclamation.
D.[1] (6) $3,492.
E. (7) $1,589.42; (8) $268.04; (9) $1,857.46; (10) $5,501.20; (11) $7,358.66.

A. Lake Carriers Association, Cleveland, Ohio.
C (2) Legislation pertaining to the Great Lakes maritime industry
E (2) $986.04; (8) $58; (9) $1,034.04.

A. Alfons Landa, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B Amana Refrigeration, Inc., Amana, Iowa.

A. Alfons Landa, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B Director of Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW, Washington, D. C
B American Fair Trade Council, Inc, 11 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
D (6) $1,000

A. Fritz G Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW, Washington, D C.
B National Patent Council, Inc, 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind
D (6) $1,500.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW, Washington, D C.
B State Tax Association, post-office box 2559, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) A continuous study of State and Federal tax legislation to bring about constructive cooperation between community property and common-law States for the development of a plan of tax equalization which will afford an equitable basis for income, estate, and gift taxation in the State and Federal tax structure; to support complete retroactive repeal of the 1942 estate and gift tax amendments as they apply to community property States in an unfair, discriminatory, inequitable manner; to support the elimination of Federal estate taxes and restore estate taxation to the several States; have supported and will continue to support the American Bar Association's recommendation for tax equalization.
D (6) $2,500.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW, Washington, D. C
B Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $900.

A. La Roe, Brown & Winn, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B Eastern Meat Packers Association, Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Defense Production Act of 1950 amendments· S. 2170, S. 2180, and S. 2104.
D.[1] (1) $1,500.
E. (5) $1,829.70; (7) $97.66; (9) $1,927.36; (10) $4,708 99; (11) $6,636.35.

A. La Roe, Brown & Winn, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Defense Production Act of 1950 amendments: S. 2104, S. 2170, and S. 2180.
D.[1] (6) $4,500.
E. (5) $1,829.70; (6) $490.05; (7) $21.67; (9) $2,341.42; (10) $5,171.48; (11) $7,512.90.

A. William V. Lavelle, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 71. Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C, and United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D [1] (6) $1,750.
E (7) $1,572; (9) $1,572; (10) $3,338; (11) $4,910.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D C
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D C.
D [1] (7) $6,000
E (7) $21 70, (9) $21 70, (10) $32.25.

A Joseph S Lawrence, M D, 1523 L Street NW, Washington, D C
B American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C (2) All bills (House and Senate) relating to health and medicine. (3) Informational Bulletins and Weekly letter published in Journal of American Medical Association
D [1] (6) $4,029 00
E (7) $239 65, (9) $239 65; (10) $1,075 39, (11) $1,315 04.

A John G Laylin, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D C.
B Kennecott Copper Corporation, 120 Broadway, New York, N Y
C (2) The general legislative interests are resolutions, bills and statutes relating to mining, smelting, and refining and to foreign or international investment, trade, or commerce [1]
D (6) $6,250
E (7) $30 61; (9) $30 61, (10) $311 19; (11) $341 80.

A A Alvis Layne, Jr.,[1] 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D C
B Associated Third Class Mail Users, Inc. 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C (2) H R 2945 and S 1103.
D [1] (6) $3,000.
E (4) $4; (6) $21.33; (7) $213.73, (8) $10.36; (9) $249.42, (10) $284.54, (11) $533 96.

A. Clarence F Lea, Ring Building, Washington, D C
B Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C (2) I am interested in all legislation having anything to do with transportation including pending bills before the House and Senate.
D. (6) $1,536.
E. (7) $36; (10) $418.33; (11) $454.38.

A. League of Women Voters of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) [2] (3) The National Voter.
D.[1] (6) $1,311 91.
E. (4) $1,006.51; (6) $10.35; (9) $1,016.85; (10) $1,398.64; (11) $2,415.49.

A. Ivan Lebedeff, 1250 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. National Economic Council, Inc, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B United States Cuban Sugar Council, 30 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the importation by the United States of sugar produced in Cuba.
D [1] (6) $6,488 77.
E (4) $132, (6) $20 35, (8) $176 42; (9) $338 77, [1] (10) $5,182 44, (11) $5,521 21.

A James R Lee, 604 Albee Building, 1426 G Street NW, Washington, D C
B Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N Y
C. (2) In general, legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association.

A Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D C.
C (2) Bills pending before the Eighty-second Congress relating to public education. (3) Legislative News.
E (2) $2,375 11, (4) $698.52; (5) $4 15; (6) $98 35, (7) $46 45, (9) $3,222 68; (10) $16,201 27, (11) $19,423 85, (15) 3651 20, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., multilithing and mailing

---

A. G. E. Leighty, 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D C.
C (2) H R 3669 and S 1347, to amend Railroad Retirement Act, House Resolution 428 to integrate railroad-retirement funds with social security, all legislation of interest to railroad employees.

A Joseph F Leopold, 936 National City Building, Dallas, Tex
B National Tax Equality Association, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C (2) Legislation relating to corporate income taxation; specifically interested in tax bill
D (6) $1,500
E. (7) $391.47; (8) $134.60; (9) $526.07; (10) $1,262.48.

A. Wilbur R. Lester, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B Kennecott Copper Corp., 120 Broadway, New York, N Y.
C (2) The general legislative interests are resolutions, bills, and statutes relating to mining, smelting and refining, and to foreign or international investment, trade or commerce [1]
D (6) $6,250
E (10) $7.74; (11) $7.74.

A. Arnold Levy, 829 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B Anthracite Institute, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
C (2) All legislation affecting the Anthracite Industry.
D.[1] (6) $4,591.18.
E. (6) $5.56, (7) $32.30; (8) $53 32; (9) $91.18; (10) $469.49; (11) $560.67.

A. George J. Lewis, Union Station Building, Lexington, Ky.
B. Kentucky Railroad Association, Union Station Building, Lexington, Ky.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[2] Not received by the Clerk.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the railroad industry.
D. (7) $500.
E. (7) $329; (9) $329; (10) $495.75; (11) $824.75

A. John R Lewis, 1103 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C (2) My interest is solely in seeking information regarding all matters pertaining to the oil industry and reporting to my employer.

A Frederick J Libby, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C.
B National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D C
C (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as: ECA bill, mutual assistance program, genocide convention, appropriations and supplementary appropriations, particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas, manpower legislation including military training and services, legislation and legislative inquiries concerning the war crimes procedures, proposals leading to the drafting of peace treaties, economic assistance (point 4), universal disarmament, expellees and displaced persons, educational exchange.
D. (6) $1,224 99.
E (10) $553.42; (11) $553 42.

A. Life Insurance Association of America,[1] 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y, and 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D C
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.[1]
D.[1] (6) $7,193 08.
E. (2) $5,220 57; (5) $1,568 70; (6) $210.95; (7) $192 86; (9) $7,193.08; (10) $12,049.13; (11) $16,242 21.

A. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N Y.
C. (2) General education concerning the effect of inflation on the purchasing power of life insurance, as it relates to Federal policies or measures which are deemed to be inflationary in character.
D.[1] (6) $3,360.08.
E. (2) $2,223 69; (4) $48 22, (5) $647.26; (6) $359 75; (7) $1,632 91, (8) $1,653 74; (9) $6,565 57; (10) $9,144.88; (11) $15,710.45; (15) $200, 116 Realty Corp., 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y, office rent; $75 16, Texas Co, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N Y., travel expense, $17 92, New York Telephone Co, 195 Broadway, New York, N Y, telephone tolls, $358 26, collector of internal revenue, New York, N. Y., social security and withholding tax, $72 72, New York State Unemployment Insurance Fund, Albany, N. Y., unemployment insurance, etc.[1]

A John W Lindsey. 1625 K Street NW., Washington D C.
B National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A Robert G Litschert, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D C
C (2) Legislation that might affect electric companies as going utilities.[1]
D[1] (6) $2,750.04.
E. (6) $34.30; (7) $416.98; (8) $91.45; (9) $542.73, (10) $1,227.01; (11) $1,769.74; (15) $12 10. Fan and Bill's, Washington D. C., luncheon; $40.19. Mayfair Hotel, St. Louis. Mo, room; $20, Public Utilities Advertising Association, 1951 dues; $11.40, Occidental Restaurant, Washington, D. C., luncheon; $32 49, Mayfair Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., room, etc.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A Norman M. Littell, 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. 46 Bands of Mission Indians of California[1]
C. (2) Legislative interests and all legislation pertaining to the 46 Bands of Mission Indians of California.
E (10) $41.42; (11) $41.42.

A. Norman M Littell, 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D C.
B The Navajo Tribe of Indians residing in Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado; address of Superintendent, Window Rock, Ariz
C (2) Legislative interests and all legislation pertaining to the Navajo Indians.
D (6) $1,875
E (10) $15.87; (11) $15.87.

A. Walter J Little, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B Major steam railroads of California[1]
C (2) Blatnik bill, St Lawrence Seaway, Railroad Retirement Act, and parcel post bills.
D[1] (6) $97 77.
E (4) $88 55; (5) $2,707.41; (7) $2,795.96; (8) $27 57; (9) $2,823 53.[1]

A. John M Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW, Washington, D C
B The American Tobacco Co., Inc, 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N Y.
C (2) Any legislation affecting a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of tobacco products, and specifically H. R 4473.

A. Gordon C Locke, 643 Munsey Building, Washington, D C
B Committee for Pipe Line Companies, box 1107, Shreveport, La.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to the pipeline industry and activities against any proposed legislation we think harmful to the industry.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. F. S Lodge, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D C
B The National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C
C (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eighty-first Congress as H R 2756, in the Eighty-second Congress such as S 1693, and H R 1755.
D (6) $25.

A. Charles E. Lofgren, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D C.
B Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C (2) Armed services personnel and veteran legislation.
D. (6) $1,650.

A. Lord, Day and Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N Y, and 1216 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Mrs. Frances B. Lucas, 1776 D Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B National Defense Committee, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, 1776 D Street NW., Washington, D C.
C. (2) In general, all legislation concerning defense and freedom, all bills concerning world government, such as S 56, S. 57, and S 66, and all bills relating to socialized medicine. (3) Press Digest and Daughters of the American Revolution magazine.
D. (7) $100.
E (7) $3.50; (9) $3.50; (10) $15.90, (11) $19.40; (15) $3.50.

A. James C Lucas, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees, and with its customers.[1]
D[1] (6) $750.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C, a partnership of which the partners are Scott W. Lucas and Charles A Thomas.
B Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D C.
C. (2) Interested in aiding the company as consultant counsel in connection with Federal tax matters affecting life-insurance companies
D (6) $1,250.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C., a partnership of which the partners are Scott W. Lucas and Charles A. Thomas.
B American Finance Conference, Suite 1200, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation which may deal with credit controls.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C, a partnership of which the partners are Scott W. Lucas and Charles A Thomas.
B. Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co., 623 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; Billiard and Bowling Institute of America, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York, New York, Bowling Proprietors Association of America, 6626 Gratiot Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C (2) Legislative interests in tax measures.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C, a partnership of which the partners are Scott W. Lucas and Charles A. Thomas.
B Trailer Coach Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General legislative interest in tax bills and other measures intended to classify trailer coachers as homes.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 605 Southern Building, Washington, D C., a partnership of which the partners are Scott W. Lucas and Charles A Thomas
B. Radar-Radio Industries of Chicago, Inc., 77 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in advising and counseling with the corporation concerning credit-control legislation as well as tax legislation affecting the industry.
D. (6) $1,250.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Dr. Carl E. Lunn, 2315 East Yale Street, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Townsend Plan for National Insurance Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Townsend Plan, known as H. R. 2679.
D.[1] (7) $59.60.

A. Gerald J. Lynch, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D.[1] (6) $900.
E. (5) $53.76; (6) $25.22; (9) $78.98; (10) $927.37; (11) $1,006.35.

A. A. L. Lynn, Huntington, W. Va.
B. Island Creek Coal Co. and Pond Creek Pokahontas Co., Hunting, W. Va.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the coal industry, such as taxes, transportation, government controls, Government expenditures, etc.
D. (7) $5,500.

A. John C. Lynn, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; Defense Production Act of 1950; Government credit policies; Federal Reserve policy; health; Federal Food and Drug Act amendment; education; Mexican farm labor importation; method of computing parity prices; farm machinery and supplies; baler twine; fertilizer; agricultural labor; amendment of National Labor Relations Act; Sugar Act extension; Marketing Facilities Act, increased lending authority for Export-Import Bank; amendment of Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; Mutual Security Program; Customs Simplification Act; amendment of BIR code relating to tax treatment of livestock; legislation to authorize allocation of livestock for slaughter; grazing land; postal rates; St. Lawrence Seaway, taxation; tobacco; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing; National Farmers Day; USDA reorganization; USDA appropriations; ACP payments, REA; screw worm research appropriations; meat inspection funds.
D.[1] (6) $2,475.
E. (7) $631.20; (9) $631 20; (10) $1,704.53; (11) $2,335 73; (15) $24 72, Haddon Hall Hotel, Atlantic City, N. J., lodging; $86.76, TWA Airlines, Washington, D C., transportation; $17.50, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., lodging; $18.34, Capital Airlines, Washington, D C., transportation; $20.41, B. & O. Railway, Washington, D. C., transportation, etc.[1]

A. A. E. Lyon, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting labor, especially railway labor, and all bills affecting Railroad Retirement Act.
D. (6) $600.

A. Avery McBee, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B Hill & Knowlton, Inc., public relations counsel to the Aircraft Industries Association.
C. (2) Legislation affecting aviation, the steel industry, and other industries.
D. (6) $325.

A. Jonas A. McBride, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, specifically H. R. 3669, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Edward A. McCabe, 1405 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (7) $155.25; (9) $155.25; (10) $270.19; (11) $425 44.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F. Street NW., Washington, D C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, Room 716, 900 F. Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government Employees and District of Columbia Government employees.
D. (6) $1,384.62.
E. (7) $10.40; (9) $10 40; (10) $20.60; (11) $31 40.

A. Frank J. McCarthy, 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H. Streets, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interest of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., including separation air-mail subsidies, railroad communications and operating rules, Federal barge lines, railroad retirement, St Lawrence seaway, taxes, and transportation investigation.
D. (6) $5,280
E. (9) $290 80.

A. J L McCaskill, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $1,061 48.

A. Bryson deHaas McCloskey, P. O Box 1657, Washington, D C.
B Homeowners Honest Service, Inc., York Road, Towson, Md.
C (2) [1]

A Warren C. McClure, Box 207, Camden, Ark.
B Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation relating to soil conservation and flood control.
D.[1] (6) $900.
E. (10) $233.51; (11) $233 51.

A. Angus McDonald.
B. Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 300 Independence Avenue, SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the National Farmers Union.

A. Rev. A. J. McFarland, D. D.
B. Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.
C. (2) Seeking to have placed in the Constitution of the United States, an acknowledgment of the Lord Jesus Christ, as this Nation's Saviour and Ruler House Joint Resolution 156 and Senate Joint Resolution 29. (3) The Christian Patriot.
D.[1] (6) $800.
E. (7) $350; (9) $350; (10) $1,275; (11) $2,625.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 Fourteenth Street, Washington, D C.
B. Taxpayers, United States of America.
C.[1]
D.[1] (7) $180.
E. (2) $180; (9) $180; (10) $360; (11) $540.

A. John R. McIsaac, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. M C. McKercher, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 386 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employees, S. 1347 and H. R. 3669.
D.[1] (6) $870.

A Royce B. McKinley, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to agriculture generally, with especial reference to legislation affecting the grain trade specifically or indirectly. Revision or extension of Defense Production Act of 1950.
D[1] (6) $1,500.
E. (8) $7; (9) $7; (10) $16; (11) $23.

A. Joseph V. McLaughlin, 923 Chestnut Street, Chattanooga, Tenn
B Railway Express Agency, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H R 3465 and S. 1335.
D[1] (6) $2,200.
E (7) $1,376.53; (9) $1,376.53; (10) $1,-377.65; (11) $2,754.18.

A. Robert E. McLaughlin, 400 De Sales Building, Washington, D C.
B National Association of Storekeeper-Gaugers.
C (2) All legislation affecting Federal classified employees, and particularly that which would affect storekeeper-gagers.
D (6) $350.
E (4) $12 80; (7) $91 60; (8) $17.63; (9) $122 03; (10) $4.95; (11) $126.98.

W. H. McMains, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the domestic distilling industry; specifically during the third quarter of 1951, H R. 2745 and H. R. 4473.

A. Joseph P McSparron, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C
C (2) Interested in substantially all legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingmen including all pending legislation dealing with railroad matters.
D[1] (6) $1,429.50.
E (2) $577.50, (7) $852; (9) $1,429 50; (10) $1,190.50; (11) $2,620.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B[1]
C. (2)[1] S. 106, S. 337, H. R. 146, H R. 2707, H. R. 4675, H. R. 4528, S. 1772, S. 1125, H R. 4473, H. R. 4507.
D. (6) $3,736.99.
E (5) $53.59; (6) $33 40, (8) $86.99; (10) $157.99.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1]. Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. James Edward Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Confectioners' Association, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Opposed excise tax on confectionery. Also supported proposals to amend H. R. 4521.

A. Lachlan Macleay, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo
C (2) Matters relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American Merchant Marine; soil conservation; flood control, regulation of domestic transportation
D. (6) $4,500
E. (7) $1,389.49 [1]; (9) $1,389 49; (10) $1,-253.74; (11) $2,643.23

A. W Bruce Macnamee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc , 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D C.
C. (2) H R. 3880, S. 241; H R. 4729, House Joint Resolution 4; Senate Joint Resolution 27; H. R 4740, H R. 3871; S. 1717; H R. 5215, H R. 5193, H R. 3587.
D [1] (6) $1,050.
E (7) $24 52, (9) $24 52; (10) $49.14; (11) $73 66.

A Mrs Margie Sornson Malmberg, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D C.
B American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
C (2) Interested in legislation affecting libraries and liabrarians. H R. 2982, S 1046, H R. 1535, S 1452, H. R 5229, H R. 5195, H R 5190, H R. 5216, H. R. 5227, H. R. 5221, and H R 5222
E (2) $1,000; (4) $103.71; (7) $219 03; (8) $68 60, (9) $1,391 34; (10) $3,901 53; (11) $5,292.87.

A Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW , Washington, D C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the members of the above named trade association.
D [1] (6) $600
E (6) $19 20; (7) $197 14, (9) $216 34; (10) $370 18, (11) $567 32.

A Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, route 2, Falls Church, Va
B National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D C.
C (2) All legislation affecting the bituminous coal industry.
D. [1] (6) $2,600.
E. (6) $19.20; (7) $197.14; (9) $216.34; (10) $370.18, (11) $567 32.

A. Mrs Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW , Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, 1 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
D [1] (6) $1,400.
E (8) $50 65, (9) $50.65; (10) $166.56; (11) $217.21.

A James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D C
B United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C
C. (2) H. R 1316, H. R. 3022, H. R. 1612, H. R 257, H R 2658, H. R 1019, H. R. 3282, House Joint Resolution 102, House Joint Resolution 7, House Joint Resolution 4, S. 1, S. 1040, S. 397, S. 990, S. 984.
D [1] (6) $3,302.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Baird H. Markham, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
B American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.
D [1] (6) $493 10.
E. [1] (4) $45; (6) $80.85; (7) $242.25; (9) $368.10, (10) $412.02; (11) $780.12; (15) $118, August 31, September 6, 22, 25, 1951, American Airlines, New York, N. Y., and Washington, D. C., transportation; $14.10, August 31, September 1, 1951, Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C., room and incidentals, $77.05, August 31, September 6, 22, 23, 25, 1951, Mayflower, Statler, and Carlton Hotels, Washington, D. C., meals and group luncheons and dinners, $80 85, August 31, September 6, 8, 13, 1951, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D C., New York Telephone Co., New York, N Y., use of telephone facilities; $45, August 31, 1951, United States Post Office, Washington, D C, stamps, mailing of material, $33 10, August 31, September 6, 22, 23, 25, 1951, various taxicab operators, Washington and New York, taxicab service.

A. John J Marr,[2] Raymond Heights, Darien, Conn.
B The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St Louis, Mo.
C (2) Legislation affecting railroad employees H R. 3669.
D. (6) $64

A Winston W Marsh, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW , Washington, D C.
B The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc , 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See attached page 3 for answers to items 1-3) [1]
D [1] (6) $105
E (7) $15 20; (9) $15 20; (10) $32 45; (11) $47.65

A R B Marston, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C
B National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A Paul Martin, Room 1027, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill
B National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C (2) Revenue Act of 1951.
D [1] (6) $2,500 02.
E (7) $212 98, (8) $44 25, (9) $257.23; (10) $277.78; (11) $635 01.

A Robert F Martin, 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Vitrified China Association, Inc., 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A Langdon P Marvin, Jr., 3032 Q Street NW., Washington, D C.
C (2) Air transportation costs. H R 508, S. 436 (Air Mail Subsidy Separation Bill).
E (4) $621.26; (6) $176.38; (9) $797 64; (11) $797.64.

A. Mrs Etsu M. Masaoka, 300 Fifth Street NE , Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) To promote the welfare of persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States, H. R. 2865, S. 2055.
D.[1] (6) $300.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary
[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) To oppose the welfare of persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.
D [1] (6) $600.

A Will Maslow, 15 East Eighty-fourth Street, New York
B American Jewish Congress, Inc., 15 East Eighty-fourth Street, New York.
C (2) To oppose anti-Semitism and racism in all its forms and to defend civil rights incident thereto.
D. [1] (7) $112.50.
E. (11) $90.

A. Walter J. Mason, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW , Washington, D. C.
B American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D C
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D [1] (6) $2,340.
E. (2) $2.340, (6) $18.56; (8) $213 44, (9) $2,572, (10) $5,382 75; (11) $7,952.75.

A. P H Mathews, Transportation Building, Washington, D C.
B Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D C.
C. (2) (See rider C-2.) [1]
D [1] (6) $4,399 98.
E. (7) $325 50; (9) $325 50; (10) $765 25, (11) $1,090 75, (15).[1]

A. Cyrus H Maxwell, M D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C (2) All bills relating to health and medicine
D.[1] (6) $2,835 27.
E (7) $62 85, (9) $62 85, (10) $121 99; (11) $184 84.

A Medical Association of State of Alabama, 527 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala
C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action.
D.[1]
E (2) $1,650, (4) $225, (9) $1,875, (10) $2,600; (11) $5,475

A. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D C.
C (2) Interested in legislation pertaining to the practice of medicine and all related services and that affecting the public health, including extension of social security into the field of the practice of medicine (3) Medical Annals of the District of Columbia.
D [1] (6) $951.45.
E. (8) $951 45; (9) $951 45; (10) $25,182 50; (11) $26,133 95.

A. E. A Meeks, 1110 F Street NW , Washington, D. C.
B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW , Washington, D C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects the interests of postmasters. (3) The Postmasters' Advocate.
D.[1] (6) $1,500.

A James Messer, Jr., 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Crosser bill amending Railroad Retirement Act (H. R. 3669), S. 1335, parcel post bill.
D.[1] (7) $1,320.

A. Ross A. Messer, post office box 1611, Washington, D. C. (room 512 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.).
B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, post office box 1611, Washington, D. C. (room 512 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.).
C. (2) All beneficial legislation affecting custodial employees of Post Office and GSA; (3) The Post Office and General Services Maintenance News.
D[1] (6) $500.
E. (7) $45.10; (8) $236 64; (9) $281 74; (10) $1,311.59; (11) $1,593.33; (15) $236.64, July 10, 1951, July 31, 1951, August 6, 1951, postmaster, Washington, D. C., postage and stamped envelopes.

A. Mr. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 436, 1149, 1848; H. R. 4473, 2820, 4484, 1535, 4963. (See attachment "A")[1]
D[1] (6) $1,312.
E (6) $9.63; (7) $9.15; (9) $18.78, (10) $158 95; (11) $177.73.

A. Harold M. Miles, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C (2) Measures affecting steam railroads.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills which affect the interests of milk dealers.
D[1] (6) $1,531
E[1] (2) $30, (3) $1,500; (7) $1; (9) $1,531; (10) $3,000; (11) $4,531.

A. Charles C. Miller, 1832 M Street NW, Washington, D. C.
B Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R 2823.
D[1] (6) $300.
E (4) $170.11; (5) $216 39; (6) $69 66; (7) $66 52; (8) $11.28; (9) $533.96, (10) $2,337.88; (11) $2,871 84.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D. C.
B Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
C. (2) General legislation affecting Dallas and Texas.
D[1] (6) $1,500.
E. (2) $75; (5) $402.15; (6) $9 92; (7) $369.44; (8) $43.49; (9) $900; (10) $1,764.80; (11) $2,664.80.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D. C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Second National Bank Building, Houston.
C. (2) For adequate river and harbor authorizations and appropriations; H. R. 4386.
D.[1] (6) $1,500.
E. (2) $50; (5) $40.08; (6) $27.61; (7) $200.50; (8) $7; (9) $325.19; (10) $1,324.88; (11) $1,650.07.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) For retention of existing depletion allowances in tax laws; H. R. 4473.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (5) $995.80; (6) $140.42; (7) $137.89; (8) $9.50; (9) $1,283.61; (10) $2,415.09; (11) $3,698.70.

A. Miller Gorham, Wescott & Adams, Room 3500, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Council for Clarification of Pricing Practices.
C. (2) Good faith competition—S. 719 and H. R. 2820.
E. (6) $141.28; (7) $1,760 44; (8) $761.95; (9) $2,663.67; (10) $2,381.51; (11) $5,045 18.

A. Justin Miller, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D C.
C. (2) Legislative interests: radio and television broadcasting industry.
D and E.[1]

A. Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C. (See individual report of Herman Fakler of Millers' National Federation, 847 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.)
D.[1]
E. (2) $312 50; (7) $4 50; (9) $317; (10) $279.40; (11) $596 40.

A. Charles J. Milton, 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N J
B. The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J
C (2) Legislative matters on insurance companies.
D.[1]

A Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., 520 Endicott Building, St Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Federal and State income taxation and governmental expenditures.
D[1] (7) $120
E. (1) $387 10; (4) $27.60, (5) $152 75; (9) $567.45, (10) $5,521 90, (11) $6,089 35; (16) $152 75, June, August, September, Norman E. Biorn, St. Paul, Minn., stenographic and postage; $37.60, August 9, St. Paul Letter Co., St. Paul, Minn, mailing and postage, $70, August 23, St. Cloud Daily Times, St. Cloud, Minn, advertising; $317, September 8, De Rosier, Inc, St. Paul, Minn., advertising.

A. Misssissippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., 301-303 Millsaps Building, post office box 1329, Jackson, Miss.
C. (2) Legislation relating to Government economy, Government regulation of business and taxation such as Mason bill, H. R. 240, Davis bill, H. R. 1177, and Senator WILLIAMS' bill, S. 892.
D.[1] (6) $920.
E. (2) $554.08; (4) $37 19; (5) $139 14; (6) $68.76; (8) $13.10; (9) $812.27; (10) $1,697 41; (11) $2,509 68; (15) $73 86, July 2, July 18, August 25, September 1, September 8, September 15, Alice Ann Moore, Jackson, salary by week; $13.10, July 3, collector of internal revenue, Jackson, social security, $295.50, July 4, July 16, August 2, August 15, September 4, September 15, Mrs. Marie F. Walker, Jackson, salary; $120, July 9, August 14, September 4, James M. Walker, Jackson, office rent for 3 months; $147.78, July 9, July 16, July 23, July 30, August 6, August 14, Alice Ann Moore, Jackson, salary, etc.[1]

A. Albert F. Versen, Missouri Valley Chapter Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.; voluntary nonprofit association.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. F. E. Mollin, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Price controls, slaughter quotas, land legislation, tax matters, etc.
D.[1] (6) $3,300.
E (6) $85 67; (7) $835 61; (8) $38 80; (9) $960 08; (10) $2,439.58; (11) $3,399 66.

A. Mr. L O. Monroe, National Association of Fan Manufacturers, Inc., 2159 Guardian Building, Detroit, Mich.
B National Association of Fan Manufacturers, Inc., 2159 Guardian Building, Detroit, Mich
C. (2) Federal excise tax legislation. H R. 4473. Favored clarifying amendment with respect to the tax on industrial fans
D[1]
E (7) $346.47; (11) $346 47.

A. Donald Montgomery, 734 Fifteenth Street NW, Washington D C.
B United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D.[1] (6) $1,300.
E. (6) $23; (7) $452 70; (9) $475.70; (10) $949.50; (11) $1,425.20.

A William W Mooney, 406 Bernice Building, Tacoma, Wash.
B Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.
C (2) Townsend plan bill in the Ways and Means Committee, H R 2678 and H. R 2679. (3) Townsend National Weekly.
D (6) $786.96
E (3) $12; (7) $327 63; (9) $339 63; (10) $576 22; (11) $905 85.

A George W. Morgan, 90 Broad Street, New York N Y.
B Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N Y.
C (2) Registrant did, however, support, advocate or oppose S. 1221 (ship warrants legislation).
D and E[1]

A. Fred W Morrell, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
D[1] (6) $375.
E. (6) $100; (7) $100; (9) $200; (10) $250; (11) $450.

A. The Morris Plan Corp. of America, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N Y.
C. (2) (a) Bank holding company bills and similar legislation. (d) Against
E. (10) $6,997.20; (11) $6,997 20.

A. Giles Morrow, 1220 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B Freight Forwarders Institute.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting freight forwarders.
D.[1] (6) $3,750.
E. (5) $24.81; (6) $5.38; (7) $24.85; (9) $55.04; (10) 92.31; (11) $147.35.

A. Henry S. Moser, 77 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Allstate Insurance Co., Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Amendment to House bill 4473.
D. (6) $3,200.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $3,200; (4) $50; (6) $41 40; (7) $841 96, (9) $4,133.36; (11) $4,133.36.

A. Harold G. Mosier, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B The Glenn L. Martin Co., Baltimore, Md
C. (2) All legislation in the aircraft field.
D (7) $3,000.
E. (6) $116 35; (7) $530.20, (8) $4 96; (9) $651 51, (10) $1,379 32, (11) $2,030 83; (15) $651 51; $116 35, Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co, Washington, D. C., telephone conferences, $443 30, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D C, entertainment and meals.

A. William J. Mougey, 802 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B General Motors Corp, 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit. Mich.

A Dr Emmett J Murphy, 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B National Chiropractic Insurance Co, Webster City, Iowa.
C (2) Legislative interest of employer is to promote the welfare of its policyholders and prevent discrimination against the chiropractic profession.
D (6) $300
E. (8) $300, (9) $300; (10) $600, (11) $900.

A. John S Murphy, member of firm of Boyce, Warren, Murphy and McDowell, 355 Boyce Building, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.
B American Pyrotechnics Association, 6711 Loch Raven Boulevard, Baltimore, Md
C (2) Pending and prospective legislation affecting the pyrotechnics industry, including but not limited to the following bills: H R 4528 and H. R 4675.
D. (6) $2,500.
E (4) $45 54, (6) $39 49; (7) $1724 38, (9) $1809 41, (11) $1809 41.

A Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N Y
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N Y.
C (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D (7) $75

A J. Walter Myers, Jr, P O. Box 692, Valdosta, Ga
B Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, P O Box 692, Valdosta, Ga.
C (2) Legislation affecting timberland owners and their interests. (3) The Forest Farmer

---

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW, Washington, D C
C (2) Generally interested in laws affecting businessmen, particularly with relation to taxation, labor, Government regulation of business, social security, and tax-privileged corporations in business. (3) Washington Report
E (2) $2,511 48, (4) $59; (5) $1,096 90; (6) $331 29, (7) $275 95; (8) $161, (9) $4,435 62; (10) $15,564 08, (11) $19,999 70; (15) $1,853 58, Leo Cullinane, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C, salary, $657 90, Helen Herman, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D C, salary; $59, Ward & Paul, 1760 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., transcript of hearings; $1,000, Mark Winkler Management, 1117 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., office rental; $24.01, Allpure Spring Water Co., 1225 Twenty-fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C., water-cooler rental and service; etc.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Association, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.
D.[1] (6) $1,076.72.
E (2) $750; (4) $75; (5) $230 22; (7) $21.50, (9) $1,076.72; (10) $2,110 87; (11) $3,187 59; (15) $750, Robert M. Koch, salary; $75, United States Post Office, Fourteenth and I Streets NW., Washington, D. C, postage; $150, Leo M. Bernstein, 1415 K Street NW, Washington, D. C, office rent; $24.32, Addressograph-Multigraph, 1206 H Street NW., Washington, D C, multilith supplies; $55 90, Mudge Paper Co, 1428 Church Street NW., Washington, D C., multilith paper; etc.[1]

A. National Association of Attorneys General, Suite 917, District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D C
C (2) To confirm and establish title in the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.
E. (2) $5,132 55; (4) $440 15; (5) $504 47, (6) $485 29; (7) $1,420 51; (8) $815 26; (9) $8,798 23, (10) $15,819 77; (11) $24,619, (15) $225, Riggs National Bank, Washington, D C, rental allowance, $324 19, United Air Lines, transportation; $350, Walter R. Johnson, expenses; $105 42, Ann M Conway, Washington, D C, salary; $128 70, collector of internal revenue, Baltimore, Md, withholding and social-security taxes, etc[1]

A National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn
C (2) H R 2982, S 1046, H R. 30, H R. 525, H R 3392, S 1335, H R. 3465, Senate Joint Resolution 60, House Joint Resolution 235, S 1369, H R 3298, S. 345, and S 1186.
D.[1] (6) $12,393 75
E (4) $40 96; (5) $4 36, (6) $8.11; (8) $2 64, (9) $56 07; (10) $685, (11) $741 07.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D C.
C (2) Legislation that might affect the companies as going electric utilities, etc.[1]
D.[1] (6) $25,122 57.
E (1) $14,522 27; (2) $72,444 37; (4) $753 84, (5) $4,860 64, (6) $1,813.60, (7) $3,937 55, (8) $3,743 61; (9) $102,075 88, (10) $221,470 46, (11) $323,546 34; (15) $309 94, American Airlines, Inc, 910 South Boston Avenue, Tulsa, Okla, transportation, $161.69, R P. Andrews Paper Co, First and H Streets SE, Washington, D. C, office supplies; $6,275 - 32. Awalt, Clark & Sparks, 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., counsel fee plus miscellaneous expenses; $259 74, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co, Baltimore, Md, transportation, $594 63. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington, D C., miscellaneous and traveling expenses; etc.[1]

A National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D C.
C (2) Legislation affecting the homebuilding industry.[1] (3) Washington Letter and the Correlator.
D.[1] (6) $8,347.96.
E (1) $1,841.17; (2) $4,622.05; (4) $5,788.94; (5) $600 37; (6) $604.12; (7) $84 13; (8) $165.95; (9) $13,706 73; (10) $30,137.96; (11) $43,844 69; (15) $500, John M. Dickerman, Washington, D. C., salary; $137.50, Judith Drewry, Washington, D. C., salary; $183.33, Margo McDowell, Washington, D. C., salary; $12, National Press Club, Washington, D. C., membership dues for J. M. Dickerman; $500, John M. Dickerman, Washington, D. C., salary; etc.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C
C. (2) Legislative interest in statutes or bills which affect the interests of independent tire dealers (3) Dealer News.
D[1] (6) $194 55.
E (2) $105, (4) $74 35; (7) $15 20, (9) $194.55, (10) $824 82, (11) $1,019 37.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents,[1] 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y.
C (2) Any legislation which affects, directly or indirectly, local property insurance agents[1] (3) American Agency Bulletins
D[1] (6) $2,585 63.
E (2) $3,284 96, (5) $461 01, (6) $559 54, (7) $1,479 88, (9) $5,785 39; (10) $11,340 45, (11) $17,125 84; (15) $2,499 96, Maurice G. Herndon, 207 Fairfax Road, Alexandria, Va, salary, $785, Margaret E. Yeager, 4115 Nicholas Avenue SW, Washington, D C, salary, $360, Washington Loan & Trust Co, Washington, D C, rent of office, $201 81, Maurice G Herndon, 207 Fairfax Road, Alexandria, Va, travel expenses; $525 43, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co, Washington, D. C., telephone service, etc.[1]

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 1525 H Street NW, Washington, D C.
C (2) All legislation pertaining to postal and Federal employees.
D[1] (6) $170,416 65
E (2) $3,674; (4) $12,046 52, (6) $4,518 35; (9) $20,238 87, (10) $17,233 99, (11) $37,472 86, (15) $12,046 52, Ransdell, Inc, 810 Rhode Island Avenue NW, Washington, D C, printing and mailing

---

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C (2) Interested in passage of H R. 5012 and H R 3207, Eighty-second Congress, first session, to amend Navy Ration Statute (34 U S. C 902a); and interested in any other legislation that may relate to margarine
E. (10) $36, (11) $36, (15) $30, Siert F. Riepma, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D C, salary.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N Y.
C (2) The general legislative interests consist of any legislation which the mutual savings banks have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing, legislative interests were H R 4473, opposition to proposals to repeal income-tax exemption of mutual savings banks; S. 114, S. 439, H R 2332, and H R. 1031.
E (2) $8,483; (6) $143.36, (7) $3,391 94; (9) $12,018.30, (10) $22,297 52, (11) $34,315.82; (15) $49 27, John W Sandstedt, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N Y., travel; $292.91, John W. Sandstedt, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N Y., conferences; $295, John W. Sandstedt, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., conferences; $22, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y, reimbursement of expenses; $13, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N Y, part reimbursement of traveling expenses; etc.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Association Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, room 512–513, Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Beneficial legislation affecting postal employees and General Services employees, and post-office custodial employees, and GSA in PBS employees, in particular. (3) The Post Office and General Services Maintenance News.

D.[1] (6) $9,493.46.

E. (2) $5 70; (4) $179 66, (5) $110; (6) $363.44; (7) $45.10; (8) $236.64; (9) $1,504.84; (10) $2,820.86; (11) $4,325.70; (15) $50, Ross A. Messer, post-office box 1611, Washington, D. C., salary; $70, Mildred Richardson, 2805 Fifth Street SE., Washington, D. C., wages; $179 66, Progressive Printing Co., H Street NE, Washington, D. C., printing; $110, New Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C., office rent; $17.08, Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone; etc.[1]

/. National Association of Postal Supervisors, P. O Box 2013, Washington, D C.

C (2) All legislation affecting the Postal Service and its employees, including supervisors (3) The Postal Supervisor.

D (6) $6,194

E (2) $2,125, (4) $2,106 71; (5) $225; (6) $246, (9) $4,702 71, (10) $8,581 41, (11) $13,284.12, (15) $2,125, salary to J V. Horton; Bates Duplicating Co., $91.55; Ransdell, Inc., $452 79, etc.[1]

A National Association of Real Estate Boards,[1] its Public Relations Department and its Realtors Washington Committee, 22 West Monroe Street, Chi go, Ill, and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.

D (6) $29,014 26.

E (1) $283 92; (2) $18,021 98; (4) $2,900 - 28; (5) $3,502 63, (6) $1,076 61; (7) $4,108.83; (8) $437.13; (9) $30,331 41; (10) $68,146 31; (11) $98,477.72; (15) $182.40, Luce Press Clipping Bureau, 21 Thames Street, New York, N Y., press clipping service; $75, Chittenden Press Service, Fourteenth and F Streets NW, Washington, D. C., release pick-up service and special delivery; $26.52, Advertisers Mat Service, 1428 U Street NW., Washington, D. C, mats; $1,350, John C Williamson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D C, legal services rendered; $180, Miles L Colean, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C., research service; etc.[1]

A National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 608 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

C (2) H R. 1047, 2386, S. 267, agricultural products; H. R. 26, 39, 1291, farm market facilities, S 341, commodity exchange regulations; H. R 27, 54, health insurance, H. R. 4133, unemployment insurance, S 1222 amending National Labor Relations Act; H. R 2678, 2679, pensions; H R. 3305, S. 1140, creating Department of Health; H. R. 9073, 9076, 9088, health insurance; H. R. 4473, taxes.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting retired civil employees, particularly during this quarter, S. 995, S. 500, and H. R. 2732. (3) The Annuitant.

D (6) $312.10.

E. (2) $250; (7) $62.10; (9) $312.10; (10) $627.60; (11) $999.70.

A. The National Association of Stevedores, 140 Cedar Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Public Law 177 and other bills of interest to the stevedoring industry.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C (2) A continued interest will be maintained in legislation affecting the welfare of the travel industry.

E. (2) $324.50; (4) $36; (5) $45; (6) $12; (9) $417.50; (10) $835; (11) $1,252.50.

A. National Association of U. S. Storekeeper-Gaugers, 4543 North Hicks Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) All legislation affecting Federal classified employees, and in that particular which would affect our position—United States storekeeper-gagers.

D. (6) $658.80

E. (2) $500, (9) $500; (10) $1,000; (11) $1,500; (15) $500, Robert E. McLaughlin and Francis M. Sullivan, in care of Roberts & McInnis, DeSales Building, Connecticut Avenue and DeSales Street, Washington, D. C., legal representation and advice.

A. National Board, YWCA, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N Y.

C (2) Legislation in relation to migrants; support of U N and its specialized agencies through continued appropriations; amendment of Senate rules relative to cloture; Federal aid to education, immigration legislation; ratification of genocide convention of the U N

E (2) $150, (4) $70; (6) $20; (7) $60, (9) $300; (11) $300.

A National Business Publications, Inc, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW, suite 55, Washington, D C.

C. (2) That which affects postal rates of controlled-circulation periodicals published by members of the above-named association

E (2) $600, (7) $873; (9) $608 73; (10) $1,264 20; (14) $1,872 93.

A National Canners Association, 1133 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D C

C (2) Defense controls and all measures directly affecting the food-canning industry.

D.[1] (6) $295,759 84

E (2) $3,687 51, (4) $65.62; (7) $1,369.54; (8) $1,565 62, (9) $2,935 16; (10) $6,390.18; (11) $9,325.34; (15) $2,187.51, Robert B. Heiney, Washington, D C., salary; $104.75, Robert B. Heiney, Washington, D. C., taxi, food, etc; $566.15, Walter L Graefe, Griffin, Ga, travel and telephone, $86.45, F C. Heinz, Pittsburgh, Pa, travel; $599 19, M E. Brooding, San Francisco, Calif., travel, etc.[1]

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All measures affecting bituminous coal industry.

D.[1]

E. (9) $27,523.49[1]

A. National Committee for Fair Emergency Excise Taxation,[1] 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Fair emergency excise taxation, H. R. 4473, Revenue Act of 1951.

D[1] (6) $6,950.

E. (2) $5,145.64; (4) $116.66; (6) $88 19; (7) $13.25; (8) $33.25; (9) $5,396.99; (10) $47,120.06; (11) $52,517.05; (16) $3,500, Leon Henderson, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., professional services; $953.25, Addison B. Clohosey, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., professional services and expenses; $13.25, H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., expenses; $29.87, Downtown Printing Co., 2 Duane Street, New York City, N. Y., printing; $900.62, Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., salaries, postage, printed matter, telephone and telegraph, and miscellaneous office services.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Committee To Limit Federal Taxing Powers, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to taxes and the national debt.

D (6) $729.

E (4) $301.20, (8) $13.77; (9) $314 97; (10) $204 70, (11) $519.67; (15) $12 45, Margaret E M. Crosby, 4305 Van Ness Street NW., Washington, D. C, expenses, $70 86, Columbia Processing and Distributing Co, 1814 M Street NW., Washington, D. C., letters, $40.29, Byron S. Adams, 513 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C., letterheads and envelopes; $25 19, Columbia Business Service, 1028 Twentieth Street NW, Washington, D C, letters; $56 10, The McArdle Printing Co, Twenty-fourth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C., printing, etc.[1]

A. National Committee for Strengthening Congress, 1135 Tower Building, Washington, D C

C (2) Legislative interests include any and all legislation dealing with the organization of Congress

E. (4) $74 10, (6) $3; (7) $1.80; (8) $2 80; (9) $81.70; (10) $731.95, (11) $813 65, (15) $81.70, Jones, Day, Cockley and Reavis, 1135 Tower Building, Washington, D C, postage, etc.

A National Consumers League, 348 Engineers' Building, Cleveland, Ohio

C (2) Labor legislation, such as minimum wage, social security, child labor, etc. (3) National Consumers League Bulletin.

D (6) $250 30.

E (2) $333 32; (4) $45; (5) $293.98; (6) $12.22, (7) $104.30; (9) $788 82; (10) $2,-252 99, (11) $3,041 81.

A National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association,[1] 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn, and 1008 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C (2) Any matters affecting the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry.

D (7) $507 37.

E (2) $365 80; (5) $99 65; (6) $41 92; (9) $507.37, (10) $487.52; (11) $994.89, (16) $312.50, Callaway and Reed, Dallas and Washington, retainer; $41.90, Western Union, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co, Southern Bell Telephone Co, telephone and telegraph; $53.50, Louise Paine, Memphis, Tenn, salary; $89 90, Callaway and Reed (Washington), United States Postmaster, International Business Machines, various office supplies dealers (Memphis, Tenn)., stationery, postage, office supplies, and repairs.[1]

A. National Cotton Council of America, post office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn

C. (2) Action on any legislation affecting the raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D. (6) $4,426.32.

E. (1) $181.15; (2) $2,594 17; (4) $190.57; (5) $201.90; (6) $367.63; (7) $890.90; (9) $4,426 32, (10) $10,645 92; (11) $15,072.24; (15) John Todd, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C., fee and expenses, $83 33; Albert R. Russell, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn., salary and expenses, $2,727.64; William Rhea Blake, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn., salary and expenses, $2,841.01; Read Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary and expenses, $1,920.35; Clifton Kirkpatrick, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn., salary and expenses, $862.64; etc.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Council Against Conscription, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C (2) Legislative interest in opposition to peacetime conscription. (3) Conscription News

D.[1] (6) $1,251 34

E (2) $121 08; (4) $385 16; (5) $97 39; (6) $2 11, (7) $75, (8) $26 83; (9) $707 47; (10) $9,762.04; (11) $10,469 51; (15) $116.94, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C., rent, telephone and telegraph, supplies; $8 08, Yoshimi Yancey, 521 Eighteenth Street NE, Washington, D. C, clerical help; $31 10, National Council of Churches, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y., printing, $116 20, United States Government Post Office, Washington, D C, and New York, N Y, postage, $82 03, Railway Express Co, Second and I Streets NW, Washington, D C, transportation of literature packages, etc[1]

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill

C (2) H R 2982, S 1046, H R 3465, and S. 1335, and all other similar legislation relating to the Postal Service.

D[1] (7) $6,087 76

E (1) $2,499 99, (2) $700; (4) $2,469 29, (5) $33 98; (6) $9 06; (7) $19 18; (8) $356 26; (9) $6,087 76, (10) $7,619 55; (11) $13,707 31; (16) $19 18, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., meals and lodging, $2,469 29, George F. McKiernan & Co, 1035 West Van Buren, Chicago, Ill, printing pamphlet, $345 06, Olson Letter Service, 19 South La Salle, Chicago, Ill., mimeographing, $2,499 99, Samuel O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D C, counsel fee, $54 24, Samuel O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C., expenses, etc.[1]

A National Council of Coal Lessors, Inc, 316 Southern Building, Washington, D C

C (2) Legislation affecting the interests of lessors of coal lands

E (2) $2,278 70, (4) $147 39, (5) $33 41; (6) $193 94, (8) $14 73; (9) $2,668 17; (10) $4,800 55; (11) $7,468.72; $10 71, Jarboe Printing Co., Washington, D C., stationery; $500, L. H Parker, Washington, D C, retainer, $49 25, Virginia Talbott, Washington, D C, salary, $15, Hotel Washington, Washington, D C, meeting room, $117 06, Jewell Ridge Coal Corp, Tazewell, Va., telephone, etc.[1]

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW, Washington, D C.

C (2) H R. 238, to amend Capper-Volstead Act, opposed; H R 240, Tax Equalization Act, of 1951, opposed, H R. 1177, act to change treatment of cooperative corporations and other organizations, opposed, S. 892 to provide special tax treatment for cooperatives, H. R. 4473, Revenue Act of 1951 (in favor of some provisions, opposed to others); H. R. 1005, to amend Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and so forth, in favor of, H R 1535, Customs Simplification Act of 1951, in favor of with amendments; S. 1149, agricultural reorganization bill, in favor of with amendments; S 2104, to amend Defense Production Act, opposed.

D (6) $28,868 74.

E. (2) $15,655.31; (4) $319 98, (5) $2,143 72; (6) $913, (7) $3,877.69; (8) $748 20; (9) $23,657.90; (10) $64,309 51; (11) $87,967.41, (15) $485.80, Interstate Properties, Inc, Washington, D. C., rent; $110.33, R P Andrews Paper Co, Washington, D C., office supplies and expenses; $50.75, John H. Davis, Washington, D. C., travel; $15.54, Western Union Telegraph Co, Washington, D. C., telegraph; $30, Story & Co, Washington, D. C., workmen's compensation insurance, and so forth.[1]

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadephia, Pa.

C (2) Restriction of immigration, suppress communism, patriotic legislation, support American free public schools. (3) Junior American

E (3) $340 82, (9) $340.82; (10) $782 98; (11) $1,123 80.

A National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington, D C

C (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as: ECA bill, mutual defense assistance program, genocide convention, appropriations and supplementary appropriations particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas, manpower legislation including military training and service, legislation and legislative inquiries concerning the war crimes trials procedures, proposals leading to the drafting of peace treaties, economic assistance, universal disarmament, expellees and displaced persons, educational exchange. (3) Peace action

D[1] (6) $6,467 57

E (2) $4,256 07, (4) $842 12, (5) $1,573 54; (6) $209 15, (7) $474 63, (8) $1,252 81, (9) $8,608 32, (10) $21,466 60, (11) $30,074 92; (15) $1,224 99, Frederick J Libby, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington, D C, salary, $625 51, National Publishing Co, Washington, D. C, printing, $171 36, Judd & Detweiler, Washington, D C, printing, $1,050, The Serimgeour Trust, Washington, D C, rent, $176 25, Union Trust Co, Washington, D. C, interest, and so forth[1]

A National Economic Council, Inc, Empire State Building, New York, N Y

C (2) Our legislative interests are in favoring any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence, and to oppose any measures that work contrariwise.

D[1] (6) $23,396 22.

E (2) $14,552 15, (4) $4,018 65; (5) $3,337 16, (6) $694 06, (7) $2,652 51, (8) $1,208 91, (9) $26,463 44, (10) $63,857 78, (11) $90,321 22, (15) $225 45, Brooklyn Eagle Press, Inc, 24 Johnson Street, Brooklyn, N Y, printing, $14 42, Elite Letter Service, 11 West Thirty-second Street, New York, N Y., mimeographing, $15 12, Elite Letter Service, 11 West Thirty-second Street, New York, N Y., mimeographing; $25 52, Pennsylvania Railroad, New York, N. Y., transportation, $68 14, Merwin K Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N Y., expenses, and so forth.[1]

A National Education Campaign, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill

B American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn, Chicago, Ill

C. (2) Any legislation for compulsory health insurance—S. 445, S 337, H R 54, H R 274, H R 910, H R. 913, S. 401. (3).[1]

D. (6) $50,932 25.

E (1) $16,434 42; (4) $34,497 83; (9) $50,932 25; (10) $26,255. 88; (11) $77,188.13; (15) $1,984 87, Lincoln Printing Co., 732 Sherman Street, Chicago, Ill, printing and mailing; $1,667 02, Mercury Press, 942 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif., printing and mailing; $9,341.50, Riley Printing Co., 732 West Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill; printing and mailing; $8,879 15, Medical Mailing Service, 2611 Indiana Avenue, Chicago, Ill., mailing; $182 11, Buckley-Dement Advertising Corp., 555 Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., mailing; etc.[1]

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C (2) All legislation that affects the building construction and electrical industries. (3) Qualified contractor

E. (2) $750; (8) $1,850; (9) $2,600.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N Y.

C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, and legislation with respect to amendment of the Labor-Management Relations Act.

D (7) $333

E (2) $494 11; (4) $1 80; (5) $158 30; (6) $4 19, (7) $209 49; (8) $1.57, (9) $869 46; (10) $287 74, (11) $1,157 20; (16) $354.39, R. M Burr, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N Y, salary, $130 18, Margaret Johnson, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N Y, wages, $194 83, R M. Burr, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N Y, expenses, $14 66, Eastern Air Lines, Inc, 10 Rockefeller Place, New York, N. Y., transportation.

A National Federation of American Shipping, Inc,[1] 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D C

C (2) Legislation affecting shipping, including S 354, House Joint Resolution 333, Senate Joint Resolution 104, H R. 3880, H R 4480, S. 1674, H R 4473, S. 241, H R. 4729, S 1221, House Joint Resolution 4, Senate Joint Resolution 27, H. R 4740, H R. 3870, S 1717, S 49, H. R 1535, H R 5215, H R 5193, and H R 3436.

D (6) $7,561 35

E (2) $5, 531 25, (4) $145 35, (5) $1,350, (6) $233 13, (7) $301 62, (9) $7,561 35, (10) $14,438 65, (11) $22,000, (15) $3,125, Frazer A Bailey, 1809 G Street NW, Washington, D C, salary; $500, Alfred U. Krebs, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D C, salary; $406 25, Alexander Purdon, 1809 G Street NW, Washington, D C, salary, $145 35, Guthrie Lithograph Co, 1150 First Street NW, Washington, D C, printing; $24 52, W Bruce Macnamee, 1819 G Street NW., Washington, D. C., expense accounts, etc.[1]

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y

D (7) $222,482 40.

E (2) $697 64; (4) $150, (5) $176 38, (6) $67 99, (8) $20 35; (9) $1,112.36; (10) $1,938 31; (11) $3,050 67, (16) $150, National Printing Co, Third and N Streets NE, Washington, D. C.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Room 502, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D C.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) The Union Postal Clerk and Federation News Service Bulletin.

D[1] (6) $126,993 31.

E. (2) $6,035 61; (4) $7,534 19; (5) $380; (6) $6,673.06; (8) $8,626.18; (9) $29,249.04; (10) $36,309.43; (11) $65,558.47; (15) $49.80, Postmaster, Washington, D. C, postage, $35, radio station WCFM, Washington, D. C., postage on transcriptions; $10.40, Ward & Paul, Washington, D. C., special edition of Ramspeck testimony; $165.81, Railway Express Agency, Washington, D. C., express charges; $30.60, Congressional Quarterly News Feature, Washington, D. C., subscription; etc.[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Federation of Private School Associations, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislative proposals that affect private non-tax-supported schools.
D. (6) $100.
E. (4) $165 88; (5) $10; (6) $53.13; (9) $229.01; (10) $903.02; (11) $1,132.03.

A National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Opposing S. 719, a bill to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that 'ts price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor; opposing H. R. 2820, a bill to clarify the right of sellers to engage in competition by in good faith meeting the equally low price of a competitor. (3) NFBA News Letter.
D. (6) $2,151.
E. (2) $1,550; (4) $534; (5) $30; (6) $32; (7) $5; (9) $2,151; (10) $87; (11) $2,238; (15) $1,050, Williams, Myers & Quiggle, 817 Munsey Building, Washington, D C., legal counsel; $500, Watson Rogers, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., salary.

A. National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation with reference to the revision or extension of the Defense Production Act of 1950.
D and E.[1]

A. The National Labor-Management Council, 424 Bowen Bldg, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation relating to the tariff and foreign trade. H. R. 1535, Customs simplification bill. The Tariff Issue Reviewed and Restated
D.[1] (6) $3,375.
E. (1) $146.86; (2) $1,845.25; (4) $409.99; (5) $463.62; (6) $58 37; (7) $149.20, (8) $48 85; (9) $3,122.14; (10) $6,427.83; (11) $9 549.97; (14) $93.65; (15) $135.50, July 2, the Bowen Building, 815 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C, office rent, July; $25, July 11, James S Holmes, Washington, D. C, bond for employee; $11 97, July 11, Bowman Service Corp., mimeographing; $12.30, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. (July 20), telephone bill; $31.30, July 31, O. R. Strackbein, expenses out-of-pocket, July, etc.

A. National Livestock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (See page 3 attached).[1]
D.[1] (6) $5,389.
E. (See page 3 attached).[1]

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of the lumber manufacturing industry. (3) National Lumber News.
D. [1] (6) $12,747.35.
E. (1) $2,247.08; (2) $3,251.01; (4) $1,147.45; (5) $202.87; (6) $52.45; (7) $1,542.03; (8) $1,500.10; (9) $9,942.99; (10) $25,374.94; (11) $35,317.93; (15) Darby Printing Co., Twenty-fourth and Douglas Streets NE., Washington, D. C., $486.97; R. P. Andrews Paper Co., First and H Streets SE, Washington, D. C., $151.44; Lithographic Photo Services, Inc., 1713 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., $108.70; Burton, Duer & Koch Paper Co., 1111 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C., $108.12.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) Dairy Director, News for Dairy Co-ops.
D.[1] (6) $47,340.13.
E[1] (1) $1,133.42; (2) $26,261.53; (4) $3,193.21; (6) $1,046.97; (7) $4,164.67, $75; (8) $1,426 22; (9) $37,301.02; (10) $91,187 93; (11) $128,488.95; (15) July 6, Kiplinger Washington, Agency, Washington, D. C., subscription, $18; Margaret K. Taylor, Hotel 2400, Washington, D. C., travel, $80; July 13, Morrison Hotel, Chicago, Ill., meeting expenses, $286 68; Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C., Government reports, $100; Congressional Quarterly News Features, Washington, D. C., subscription, $20.40; etc.[1]

A. National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 1636, H. R. 1637, H. R. 2646, H R. 3309, H. R. 3318, S. 40, S. 443, S. 1144, H R. 3790, H. R. 3973, H. R. 4386, H. R 3544, H R 2470, H. R. 4628, S. 1798, H. R. 4521, S. 18, S. 1789, and 11 other bills concerning reclamation. (3) Bulletin.
D. [1] (6) $14,420.
E. (2) $5,874.97, (4) $1,023.04; (5) $564; (6) $306 67, (8) $4,325 33; (9) $12,094 01; (10) $24,361.88; (11) $36,455 89; (15) $1,-124.98, salary paid Marguerite Kroger, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, Washington, D. C, office secretary, $41.25; Zelda Shapiro, in care of Miss Wiston, public stenographer, Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C.; $249.86, Franks Duplicating Service, National Press Building, Washington, D C., stenographic services; M Dorland, $10 10, Memory Lane Service, $63, Bellinger, paid by secretary-manager while on field trip, stenographic services—do not have addresses; etc.[1]

A. National Renderers Association, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the production, consumption, import, export, or taxation of any animal or vegetable fat or oil as well as all legislation affecting business, particularly small business.
D. [1] (6) $1,800.
E. (2) $644; (4) $93; (5) $103.55; (6) $101.65, (7) $324.80; (8) $9.73; (9) $1,276 73; (10) $3,319.79; (11) $4,596 52.

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y
C. (2) H. R. 4473, S. 508, H R. 2321, H. R. 542, H R 538, H. R 1938, S. 1335, H. R. 3465, S. 1309, H. R. 3362, H. R. 1535, H. R. 5505, H R. 5101, H. R. 2982, S. 1046, S. 2170, H. R. 5189. (See page 3.) [1]
D. [1]
E. (2) $2,250; (4) $2,288.29; (5) $517.60; (6) $19 65; (7) $51 90; (8) $3,75); (9) $5,-131.19; (10) $10,980 88; (11) $16,112.07; (15) $1,875, July 30, August 31, September 30, John C. Hazen, Kass Building, Washington, D. C., legislative representative; $61.15, July 30, August 31, September 30, John C Hazen, Kass Building, Washington, D. C., legislative representative; $375, July 30, August 31, September 30, Erskine Stewart, Kass Building, Washington, D. C., legislative representative; $14.15, July 30, August 31, September 30, Erskine Stewart, Kass Building, Washington, D. C., legislative representative; $517.60, July 30, August 31, September 30, Washington office, overhead; $743 09, August 31, Oscar Leventhal and Lehigh Printing Co., typesetting and printing summer issue of Retail Control.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Defense Production Act (S. 1717; H. R. 3871). Favor certain amendments. Tax H. R. 4473 (seeks relief for installment-basis taxpayer). (3) Washington Report, July 5; Washington Report, July 6; news bulletin Septemoer 6, Washington Report, September 20 All are bulletins mailed to membership. Average mailing, 8,500. Processed in association's Chicago office.
D. (See statement filed with registration.)[1]
E (2) $1,000; (4) $1,800; (5) $500; (6) $200; (7) $350; (9) $3,850; (10) $2,168.27; (11) $6,018 27.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor development, flood control, navigation, irrigation-reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects
D [1] (6) $952
E (1) $30; (2) $1,878 70; (4) $65 81; (5) $322 93; (6) $36 83; (7) $628 55; (8) $1,165 64, (9) $4,151.46; (10) $10,238.49; (11) $14,389 95; (15) $36 83, July 11, August 21, September 14, C & P Telephone Co., 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., telephone bills, $472.50, July 11, collector of internal revenue, Baltimore, Md., withholding tax second quarter, 1951; $11 53, September 14, Collector of Taxes, D. C., District Building, Washington, D. C, personal property tax, first half, 1952; $30, August 21, Congressional Secretaries' Club, Capitol Hill, Washington D. C., advertisement in Congressional Handbook; $10.93, July 11, August 21, Ginn's, 1417 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C, stationery; etc.[1]

A. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D C.
C (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project; House Joint Resolution 337 (opposed).
D.[1] (6) $15,500
E (2) $8,485 31; (4) $2,105.33; (5) $1,474 43; (6) $401 05; (7) $1,344 48; (8) $399.88; (9) $14 210 48; (10) $44,660 75; (11) $58,871 23; (15) $22 38, July 9, Whitehall Club, New York, luncheon meeting; $133, July 9, Carroll B. Huntress, expenses, railroads, hotels; $1,000, July 9, James T Begg, Cleveland, fee; $36.75, July 9, Albert M Wenk, mailing; $4 50, July 10, Superintendent of Documents, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 3 months; etc.[1]

A National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW, Washington, D. C.
B. Member associations of the league.
C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Oppose legislation inimical to interests of savings and loan industry. H. R. 4473, tax
D [1] (6) $2,004.52.
E. (2) $3,750; (4) $1,688.16; (9) $5,438 16, (10) $6,483.43; (11) $11,921.59, (15) $3,750, salary to Oscar R. Kreutz, executive manager; $1,396.33, June 12, 14, 25, 28, July 9, 16, 31, August 10, 17, 21, 30, September 10, 17, 25, 27, 28, national letters, printed by Batt, Bates & Co., Washington, D. C., national letters (June not reported in second quarter as Mr Kreutz was going abroad and reports had to be filed before his departure). $291 83, July 9, printing copies of statement of J J O'Malley before Senate Finance Committee. Batt, Bates & Co., Washington, D. C; September 5, 9, printing of circular letter to members on tax, Batt, Bates & Co., Washington, D C.

A. National Shrimp Canners & Packers Association, 904 Hibernia Bank Building, New Orleans, La.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the welfare of the members of the association supporting bills to impose a tariff on imported shrimp.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E (4) $10; (6) $2.19; (8) $5.89; (9) $18.08; (10) $2,613.06; (11) $2,631.14.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $5,000.
E. (2) $4,621 25; (5) $2,286.06; (6) $83.57; (9) $6,990 88; (10) $40,399 32; (11) $47,390.20; (15) $22 50, July 10, August 10, September 10, Accurate Answering, Washington, D. C., Washington office expense, $83.57, July 10, August 10 Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone, $106 77, September 10, Chicago & North Western Ry. Co, Chicago, Ill., Washington office expense; $35, August 10, Congressional Intelligence, Washington, D C., Washington office expense; $42 84, July 10, August 10, September 10, Congressional Quarterly, Washington, D C., Washington office expense, etc.[1]

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 Fifteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
C (2) All legislation and laws affecting the interests of professional engineers, specifically the following: The Taft-Hartley Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Walsh-Healy and Bacon-Davis Acts, the selective-service law, Air Fore organization, the armed services Reserve bill, Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, National Science Foundation, Hoover Commission bills. (3) Legislative Bulletin and American Engineer.
D[1] (6) $20,732 84
E (2) $875; (9) $875; (10) $1,750; (11) $2,625. (15) $50, September 15, United States Post Office, postage for Legislative Bulletin, $45, September 13, Colortone Press, printing Legislative Bulletin.

A National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General legislative interests relate to corporate income tax legislation. Specific legislative interest to tax bill now being considered by Congress.
D[1] (6) $44,562 03.
E (1) $8,256.87; (2) $10,290 67; (4) $9,-437.73, (5) $1,774.92, (6) $5,668.70 (7) $6,-022.54; (9) $41,451 43, (10) $88,418 99; (11) $129,870 42; (15) $104 50, July 2, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, Chicago, Ill, rail fare; $607 86, July 2, Joseph F. Leopold, 936 National City Building, Dallas, Tex, fee and expense, $5, July 10, Chase Studios, 1904 M. Street NW, Washington, D. C, pictures; $63, July 10, Harris & Ewing, 1313 F Street NW., Washington, D C., pictures; $20 33, July 10, Western Union, 427 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., telegrams, etc.[1]

A. National Water Conservation Conference, 341 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) All legislation relative to development, utilization, and conservation of natural resources.
D.[1] (6) $2,040.
E. (5) $848 36; (9) $848.36, (10) $1,759 78; (11) $2,608 14; (15) $150, July 3 and August 14, Mrs. Miriam Keller, 9402 Flower Avenue, Silver Spring, Md., rent of Washington office for months of July and August at $75 per month; $624 60, July 3, August 14, and September 5, E W. Rising, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., expenses of Washington office for months of June, July, and August, $50, July 28, James H. Allen, 341 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa., expenses of Philadelphia office for months of June and July; $23.76, September 20, Collector of Taxes, District of Columbia, personal property taxes for fiscal year July 1, 1950 to June 30, 1951.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (7) $1,356 69.
E. (2) $1,250; (5) $217.87; (8) $1.25; (9) $1,469.12; (10) $3,700.56; (11) $5,169.68.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) Extension of Defense Production Act. Opposed to title IV. Importation of Basque sheepherders, for tax increase legislation, capital gains provision affecting, reorganization of Department of Agriculture, S 1149 (3) National Wool Grower.
D[1] (6) $13,728 48.
E (2) $2,499 99; (7) $3,067 75; (8) $1,-256 86; (9) $6,824 60; (10) $12,034 53; (11) $18,859.13, (15) $2,499.99, July 30, August 30, and September 30, J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building; $1,810 27, July 9, W. H Steiwer, Fossil, Oreg; $13 26, July 9, Salt Lake Blue Printing Co., Salt Lake City, Utah, $18 60, July 9, Agriculture Center, Inc, 5144 Delmar Boulevard, St Louis, Mo; $192 60, July 17, J B. Wilson, McKinley, Wyo, etc[1]

A. Mr William S. Neal, 918 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C
B National Association of Manufacturers.
C (See attached paper.)[1]

A. Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr
C (2) Legislative interests—all legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives. Mason bill, H R 5064
D[1] (7) $2,550.
E (4) $264 32, (5) $66 69; (6) $40 79; (7) $17 60, (9) $389 40, (10) $1,076 45, (11) $1,465 85, (16) $124 46, July 3, 1951, Boomer's Printing Co, 1210 P Street, Lincoln, Nebr, printing and mailing memos on 1951 tax bill; $17 60, July 3, 1951, $40 79, August 13, 1951, Beghtol and Rankin, 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr, expenses of delegate to State meeting, miscellaneous telephone calls; $139 86, July 3, 1951; $43 81, August 7, 1951, Nebraska Farmer Printing Co., 1418 P Street, Lincoln, Nebr., printing letterheads, envelopes, letters, etc, $15 03, September 5, 1951, postmaster, Lincoln, Nebr., roll of 3-cent stamps.

A Samuel E Neel, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D C.
B Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the mortgage banking industry. (3) Washington Newsletter, Letter to Members, and the Mortgage Banker.
D.[1] (6) $5,168 45.
E. (2) $338 62; (5) $667 41; (6) $425 41; (7) $112 05; (9) $1,543 49; (10) $4,122 62; (11) $5,666.11.

A. C Roger Nelson, 910 Seventeenth Street NW, Washington, D. C.
B Dr. Walter Duschinsky, industrial designer, 93 Perry Street, New York, N. Y
C. (2) Legislation to grant permanent residence to client (S. 523).
E (4) $1.84; (8) $2.52; (9) $4.36; (10) $33 95; (11) $38.31.

A. G W. Nelson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Advocating legislation favorable to labor and opposing unfavorable labor legislation.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in substantially all legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.
D. (6) $900.

A. Herbert U. Nelson, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill, and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry. (Attached is a list of news releases issued during the quarter which bear on legislative subjects)[1]
D.[1] (6) $3,118 16.
E. (6) $8 16; (7) $1,860; (9) $1,868 16; (10) $4,194 12, (11) $6,062 28; (15) $50, July 6, 1951, Carey Winston Co., 739 Fifteenth Street NW, Washington, D C. Apartment rental for month of July; $17 50, July 9, 1951, Beatrice Fitzhugh, 2723 P Street NW., Washington, D C Cleaning apartment week ending July 7, 1951; $25, July 11, 1951, Beatrice Fitzhugh, 2723 P Street NW, Washington, D C. Petty cash, laundry, dry cleaning, pressing, and miscellaneous expenses in apartment, $14 09, July 13, 1951, Beatrice Fitzhugh, 2723 P Street NW., Washington, D C Cleaning apartment week ending July 14; $6 83, July 13, 1951, Collector of Internal Revenue, Baltimore, Md, social-security taxes for maid, Beatrice Fitzhugh, etc.[1]

A Donald F. Nemitz, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.
B Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.
C (2) Removal of exemptions granted by section 101 of IRC.
D.[1] (6) $472.
E (7) $97, (9) $97; (10) $14.70; (11) $111 70.

A. Harold F. Neumann, 112 Bowers Street, Jersey City, N J.
B New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc, 112 Bowers Street, Jersey City, N. J.
C. (2) Any laws or proposals adversely affecting business
E (4) $26; (5) $10; (6) $11.20; (9) $47 20; (10) $206 26, (11) $253.46.

A. New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc., 112 Bowers Street, Jersey City, N J.
C (2) Any laws or proposals adversely affecting business.
D[1] (6) $20
E. (4) $48.24; (5) $41 57; (6) $11 20; (8) $26; (9) $127 01; (10) $967.51; (11) $1,094 52; (15) July 28, 1951, $31.57, National Tax Equality Association, Chicago, Ill, reimbursement, NTEA ordered printed envelopes for us from the Ardmore Printing Co, Chicago, Ill.; July 28, 1951, $48.24, Kersting Letter Service, Union City, N J., printing; July 28, 1951, $47.20, Harold F. Neumann, Jersey City, N. J., telephone, telegrams, postage, and stenographer.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B[1]
C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.
E. (7) $841.01; (9) $841.01; (10) $4,917 99, (11) $6,769; (15) $349.04, July 8, 9, 10, 11, 12,

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

17, 18, Pennsylvania Railroad and miscellaneous; $110.06, July 6, 8, 12, various airlines; $381.91, July 9, 10, 11, Mayflower Hotel.

A. Russ Nixon, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D.[1] (6) $1,053; (7) $2,106; (8) $3,159.
E. (7) $130; (9) $130; (10) $280; (11) $410.

A. W. R. Noble, suite 509, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Farm Equipment Association, 207 Hotel DeSota Building, St. Louis, Mo., and National Retail Hardware Association, 333 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) All labor legislation, tax bills, the Defense Production Act, and all legislation affecting the retail farm equipment, and hardware trade. (3) Farm Equipment Retailing, and Hardware Retailer.
D. (6) $3,375.
E. (6) $257 68; (7) $459.85; (8) $410 20; (9) $1,127.73; (10) $715 65; (11) $1,843 38.

A. J. S. Hoffsinger, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D C
B. National Federation of Private School Association, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C
C. (2) All legislative proposals that affect private (non-tax-supported) schools.

A Christian P. Norgord, 1617 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Robert F. Sellar, president, American Humane Association, Albany, N. Y. Head of a federation of societies and individuals for the prevention of cruelty, especially to children and animals.
C. (2) S. 1046, S. 1335, S. 1369, H. R. 2982, H. R. 7524, and H. R. 4668.

A O. L. Norman, 1200 Eighteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5).[1]
D[1] (6) $4,041.68.
E (7) $591.93; (8) $12; (9) $603.93; (10) $1,600.25; (11) $2,204 18; (15) $12, July 23, 1951, National Press Club, Washington, D. C., dues; $353.13, August 17, 1951, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., entertainment; $16, August 13, 1951, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., lunch; $19.60, September 17, 1951, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., lunch.

A. North Dakota Resources Board, 311 North Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak. Fred J. Frederickson, Lafayette Hotel, Washington, D. C. (home address: 247 Third Street SW., Valley City, N. Dak.).
C. (2) Legislation affecting the development and utilization of the land, water, and other natural resources of North Dakota, including authorizations and appropriations. H. R. 3790 and H. R. 4386.
D.[1] (6) $2,650.
E. (2) $1,149; (5) $27.34; (6) $113.39; (7) $963.54; (8) $25.26; (9) $2,278 53; (10) $5,448.50; (11) $7,727 03; (15) $1,149, July, August, and September, Fred J. Frederickson, Lafayette Hotel, Washington, D. C. (home address: 247 Third Street SW., Valley City, N. Dak.). Salary for third quarter; $1,104.27, July, August, and September, Fred J. Frederickson, Lafayette Hotel, Washington, D. C. (home address: 247 Third Street SW., Valley City, N. Dak.). Reimbursed expenses for third quarter.

A. Harry E. Northam, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (See attached sheet).[1]

A. Northern Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturers Association, Washington Building, Oshkosh, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the timber industries of Wisconsin and Michigan, taxation, forestry, and labor-management relations.
D.[1]

A Peter Q. Nyce, 1266 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to land of the United States.

A. Jerauld T. Oberholtzer, 4904 Forty-seventh Avenue, Hyattsville, Md.
C (2) Railroad retirement legislation, H. R 3669, S. 1347, favoring.
D[1] (6) $1,800.

A E J. O'Brien, 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D C.
B Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) To work for passage of H R. 3669 and S. 1347, identical bills to amend Railroad Retirement Act, and other bills of interest to railroad employees and labor in general.
D.[1] (6) $171.25.

A. Edward H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H R. 27, to provide a national health insurance and public-health program. H. R. 54, to provide a program of national health insurance and public health.
D[1] (7) $6,757.50

A Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General interest in proposed legislation having direct or specific impact on the wool textile industry. H. R. 1612, H. R. 3871, H R. 5505, H. R. 1535, H. R. 5474.
D[1] (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $19.71; (7) $9.85; (9) $29.56; (10) $28.29; (11) $57.85.

A Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 1903 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. (See statement attached.)[1]
C. (See statement attached.)[1]
D.[1]
E.[1] (10) $3,000; (11) $3,000.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio. (See p. 3.)[1]
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests. Parcel-post bills, H. R. 3465 and S. 1335; railroad retirement bill, H. R. 3669; St. Lawrence waterway, House Joint Resolution 4.
D. (See p. 3.)[1]
E. (7) $203.10; (9) $203.10; (11) $203.10; (15) July 13, $99.35, E. C. Shively, reimbursement for travel, food, lodging, and entertainment expenses; September 28, $103.75, E. C. Shively, reimbursement for travel, food, lodging, and entertainment expenses.

A. Fred N. Oliver, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N Y, and Railroad Security Owners Association, Inc., 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 4473 (revenue bill of 1951). The savings banks have opposed proposals to include in the bill provisions repealing the income-tax exemption of mutual savings banks (sec. 101 (2) of the Internal Revenue Code).
D.[1] (6) $5,595.50.
E. (6) $125; (7) $1,039 85; (8) $100; (9) $1,264.85; (10) $857.21; (11) $2,122.06.

A. Clarence H. Olson, care of American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D C.
B The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) (See attached statement)[1]
D[1] (6) $1,837.50.
E. (7) $344.39; (9) $344 39; (10) $35 17; (11) $379 56.

A Sam O'Neal, public relations counsel, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Council on Business Mail, Inc, 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal rates and postal legislation.
D[1] (6) $2,500.
E (7) $100, (8) $60; (9) $160; (10) $320; (11) $480.

A. Sam O'Neal, Public Relations Counsel, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B Power Distributors Information Committee of Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Market Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
C (2) All legislation pertaining to public power.
D[1] (6) $1,875.
E. (7) $100; (8) $60; (9) $160

A. Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) H R. 3669 and S 1347 to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, and all legislation directly affecting the interests of railroad employees in particular and labor in general.
D (6) $112.02.
E. (6) $0.30; (7) $80.39; (9) $80.69; (11) $80.69.

A. Order of Railway Conductors of America, Order of Railway Conductors Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (2) $2,375; (7) $311.97; (9) $2,686 97; (11) $2,686.97.

A. Order of Railway Conductors of America, Order of Railway Conductors Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa
E (2) $1,218; (7) $682.67; (9) $1,900.67, (11) $1,900.67.

A. Order of Railway Conductors of America, Order of Railway Conductors Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (2) $2,125; (5) $873.60; (6) $68.05; (9) $3,066.65; (10) $6,666.93; (11) $9,733.58.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Order of Railway Conductors of America, Order Railway Conductors Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (2) $1,581.85; (7) $454.69; (9) $2,036.54; (11) $2,036.54.

A. Order of Railway Conductors of America, Order of Railway Conductors Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (2) $558.86; (7) $228.76; (9) $787.62; (11) $787 62.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D C
C. (2) Legislative interests are in large part but not exclusively exemplified by bills which in the Digest of Public General Bills issued by the Library of Congress are indexed under the captions "Public officers and employees," "Retirement," and "Income tax exemption."
D. (7) $21 05.
E (2) $179, (5) $2, (6) $2; (8) $4; (9) $187; (10) $551 12; (11) $738 12, (16) $150, Frederick V. Rand, 1359 Meridian Place NW., Washington, D C., salary, $29, Lila W Meyer, Route 1, Box 632, Annandale, Va , salary.

A. Thomas R Owens, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C
B United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare, oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,105
E. (8) $481; (9) $481; (10) $981 76; (11) $1,462 76

A Mrs Theodor Oxholm, 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B Volunteer worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc , 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting maternal and child health and welfare.
E. (10) $125.57; (11) $125.57.

A Robert S Palmer, 204 State Office Building, Denver, Colo
B Mining industry of the State of Colorado and other States, 204 State Office Building, Denver, Colo
C. (2) Matters pertaining to the mining industry of Colorado and other States, taxation assessment work, tariffs, and national defense matters.
D. (6) $410 56.
E. (9) $410 56; (10) $1,140.09; (11) $1,550 65.

A. S A Para, 10 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, D. C
B Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D C.
C. (2) Amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

A. Lovell H Parker, 614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, National Council of Coal Lessors, American Trucking Association, and Television Broadcasters' Tax Committee.
C. (2) Tax legislation affecting the bituminous coal industry, the highway freight industry, and the television broadcasting industry.
D. (6) $5,500.

A. George F. Parrish, 706 Security Building, Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
C. (2) Railroad retirement legislation.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $288.75; (9) $288.75; (10) $143; (11) $431.75.

A. James G. Patton, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office); 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D C. (legislative office).
C (2) Legislation on matters of interest to the National Farmers Union.

A. Randolph Paul (a partner in the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton and Garrison), 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Gillette Safety Razor Co , Boston, Mass.
C (2) Elimination of section 131 (b) (2) from the Internal Revenue Code, and amendment of section 127 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide more equitable treatment of war losses
E (6) $15.81; (8) $8 20, (9) $24 01, (10) $18 34; (11) $42 35.

A. Randolph Paul (a partner in the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton, and Garrison), 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D C
B Pabco Products, Inc , 475 Brannan Street, San Francisco, Calif
C (2) An amendment to section 444 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide more equitable excess-profits tax relief for expanding companies
D (6) $5,000
E (6) $23.20; (7) $50, (8) $30 41; (9) $103 61, (11) $103 61.

A Edmund W Pavenstedt, in care of White and Case, 14 Wall Street, New York, N Y
B International Minerals & Chemical Corp , 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C (2) (a) To amend section 34 of Trading With the Enemy Act to protect interests of domestic corporations owning stock in enemy corporations assets of which have been seized by the Alien Property Custodian; (b) opposing Treasury recommendation for reduction of rate of percentage depletion on nonmetallic minerals
E (7) $111 47; (9) $111 47; (10) $247 96, (11) $359 43.

A. Albert A Payne, 1737 K Street NW , Washington, D C
B Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C
C (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D (6) $2,000.
E. (6) $6 65, (7) $161 73; (8) $3; (9) $171.38, (10) $244 20, (11) $415 58.

A Merl B. Peek, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D C.
C. (2) Reclamation Act, 1902 (53 Stat. 1187, 43 U. S C. 485) and all amendatory and supplementary acts thereto; all other statutes relating to water and land conservation measures.
D. (6) $1,749 99.
E (7) $127.06; (9) $127 06; (10) $710 01; (11) $837 07.

A. George S. Peer, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 1005, to amend Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, etc.
D. (6) $1,624.98
E. (7) $91.76; (9) $91.76; (10) $185 06, (11) $276 82.

A. A. T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn
C. (2) All legislation which might affect the New Haven Railroad and its subsidiaries (The Connecticut Co., New England Transportation Co.).
D. (6) $1,996.50.

A. Pierson and Ball, 1007 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Radio Television Manufacturers Association, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D C
C. (2) Excess-profits tax and excise-tax bills.
D. (5) $4,487 50.
E. (9) $993.11.

A Albert Pike, Jr , 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N Y.
C (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $50.

A Harriet F Pilpel, 285 Madison Avenue, New York, N Y.
B Walter Field Co , 600-614 Fulton Street, Chicago, Ill
C (2) S. 1046 and H. R 2982, insofar as they affect the c o d service. (A bill to readjust postal rates)
E. (10) $279 17; (11) $279 17.

A Rufus G Poole, 1625 K Street NW , Washington, D C
B The Retail Shoe Committee for Equitable Taxation, 345 Hudson Street, New York 14, N Y
C. (2) Section 123 of H R 4473, the enactment of which section registrant opposes
D (6) $7,500.
E (6) $15 51, (7) $22 75; (9) $38.26; (11) $38 26, (15) $15 51, Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D C , telephone tolls.

A Pope, Ballard and Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B Basic Vegetable Products, Inc , Vacaville, Calif ; Gentry, Inc , Los Angeles, Calif ; Puccinelli Packing Co , Turlock, Calif ; and J R. Simplot Dehydrating Co , Caldwell, Idaho
C. (2) Tariff legislation and Trade Agreements Extension Act.
E (6) $2 88; (7) $.90; (9) $3 78; (10) $33 40; (11) $37.18.

A Pope, Ballard and Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B California Fruit Growers Exchange and California Walnut Growers Association, Los Angeles, Calif.; Northwest Nut Growers, Dundee, Oreg , and California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Agricultural and farmer cooperative matters; tariff and tax legislation; H. R. 1612, S. 983, H. R 4473, and H. R. 3973, for; H. R. 1535, against.
D (6) $3,000.
E (2) $1 75, (6) $35 52; (7) $8.25; (9) $45 52; (10) $377.65; (11) $423.17.

A. Pope, Ballard and Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Mushroom Growers Cooperative Association and Cultivated Mushroom Institute of America, both of Kennett Square, Pa.
C. (2) Tariff legislation and Trade Agreement Extension Act.
E. (10) $2.06; (11) $2.06.

A. Pope, Ballard and Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Parker Pen Co., Janesville, Wis.; W A. Sheaffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, Iowa, and Fountain Pen and Mechanical Pencil Manufacturers Association, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Tariff and tax legislation; H. R. 1612, for; H. R. 4473, against.
E. (4) $59 16; (6) $9 69; (7) $3.30; (9) $72 15; (10) $18 10; (11) $90.25; (15) $59.16, Byron S. Adams, 512 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C., printing.

A Frank M Porter, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

A. James E. Poulton, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D (6) $1,000
E. (7) $20 40; (9) $20.40; (10) $89 93; (11) $110 33.

A. Kenneth L. Pray, 1006 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B Schenley Distillers, Inc., and affiliated companies
C. (2) Reporting the status and content of proposals affecting Schenley Distillers, Inc., and affiliated companies.

A William H. Press, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
C (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia, of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.
D.[1] (6) $3.712.50.

A. William M. Price, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council of Canal Zone, Balboa, C. Z.
C. (2) All legislation affecting employes on the Canal Zone.
D. (6) $1,733.
E. (1) $30; (2) $175; (3) $100; (4) $90; (5) $60; (6) $150; (7) $1,125; (9) $1,720; (11) $1,720.
A Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Registrant is a member of the law firm of Oliver & Donnally, general counsel for the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York City, N. Y.
C (2) Tax revision hearings before Senate Finance Committee; H. R. 4473, in opposition to repeal of section 101 (2) of Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (7) $143.62; (9) $143.62; (10) $88.02; (11) $231.64; (15) $30.82, American Airlines, transportation.

A. The Proprietary Association, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting proprietary medicines industry.
D. (6) $33,155.61.
E. (7) $125; (8) $720; (9) $845; (10) $970; (11) $1,815; (15) $125, A. K. Barta, Washington, D. C.

A. The Prudential Insurance Co of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.
E. (2) $3,750; (7) $748 54; (9) $4,498 54; (10) $13,360 21; (11) $17,858.75; (15) $4,498.54, Milo J. Warner, Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio, services.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Dr. Walter Duschinsky, 93 Perry Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation to grant permanent residence to client (S 523).
(4) $1.84; (8) $2.52; (9) $4.36; (10) $33,-95; (11) $38.31.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1405 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) General legislative interests of client are those affecting foreign commerce of the United States, including tax and tariff legislation.
E. (6) $9 03; (8) $7 89; (9) $16 92; (10) $47 92; (11) $64 84.

A. Alexander Purden, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are concerned with the declaration of policy as expressed by the Congress in the 1936 Merchant Marine Act and such other legislation as may affect the development of an adequate merchant marine.
D (6) $4C3 25.
E. (7) $38.97; (9) $38.97; (10) $153 55; (11) $192.52.

A Edmund R. Purves, 1741 New York Avenue NW, Washington, D C.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation in relation to the architectural profession.[1]
D.[1] (7) $200
E. (4) $55; (9) $55; (10) $149.

A C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
C. (2) General legislative interest in matters affecting railroads.
E. (7) $623.81; (9) $623 81; (10) $538.20; (11) $1,162.01.

A. Ward L. Quaal, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), suite 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Opposes any proposed legislation (such as S. 491 and H. R. 4004, 81st Cong.) calling for the duplication of class I–A clear channel frequencies or the limitation of the power of class I–A standard broadcast stations and ratification of the so-called NARBA agreement signed November 15, 1950.
D.[1] (6) $5,625.
E. (3) $21.81; (7) $293.60; (9) $315.41; (10) $991.20; (11) $1,306.61; (16) $39.46, Congressional Hotel, food and refreshments; $64.46, Olney Inn, Olney, Md., food and refreshments; $22.80, Olney Theater, Olney, Md., theater tickets; $10.39, Wardman Park Hotel, food and refreshments; $10, Chicago American League Baseball Club, tickets, etc.[1]

A. Frank Quigley, 725 Thirteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Matters affecting Bell System communications: Revenue Act of 1951; Defense Production Act of 1950 (amended); Special Senate Committee to Investigate Crime, etc; unlawful transmission in interstate commerce, etc; transmission of gambling information; licensing by wire, etc.
D (6) $7,500.
E. (7) $724.66, (9) $724 60; (10) $1,354 52; (11) $2,079.18.

A. F. Miles Radigan, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington, D C
B National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington, D C
C. (2) Legislation that might affect the companies as going electric utilities[1]
D (6) $1,500.

A. Alex Radin, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C (2) Any legislation affecting the generation, transmission, and distribution of electrical energy by local, publicly owned electric systems, and the management and operation of such systems.
D. (7) $1,999.98.

A. Radio-Television Manufacturers Association, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C
C (2) Excess-profits tax or additional corporate income-tax bills and regulation W.
E. (2) $9,583.26; (6) $759.37; (8) $1,065 23; (9) $11,407 86; (16) $4,717.50; Pierson & Ball, Ring Building, Washington, D. C, professional services; $1,062 73, Pierson & Ball, Ring Building, Washington, D. C., expenses; $4,865.76, Boni, Watkins, Mounteer & Co, 37 Wall Street, New York, N Y, professional services and expenses; $759.37, Western Union Telegraph Co., Washington, D. C., telegraph service.

A. Leon Raesly, suite 624, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D C.
C. (2) S. 1671 and S. 1672.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, post-office box 798, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) Enactment of H R. 63 providing 30-year retirement, regardless of age, at half-pay based on five highest years of earning.
D. (6) $39.
E. (4) $21.22; (7) $24.72; (8) $4.71; (9) $50 65; (10) $435.50; (11) $486 15.

A. Railroad Security Owners Association, Inc, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests consist of any legislation which the members of the association have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association,[1] 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting labor, especially railway labor.
D. (6) $4,743.40.
E. (2) $2,744.09; (5) $1,958.64; (6) $40.67; (9) $4,743.40.

A. DeWitt C. Ramsey, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the aviation industry, including S. 1402 and H. R. 3914.

A. Donald J Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation involving silver; H. R. 1321, to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes
D (6) $4,249.98.
E (7) $1,044 31; (9) $1,044.31; (10) $1,296 17; (11) $2,340 48.

A. Frederick V. Rand, 1359 Meridian Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, post office box 381, Washington, D. C.
D. (7) $150.
E. (10) $6, (11) $6; (15) $6.

A. Jacob Reck, 1346 F Street NW., Washington, D C.
B. National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers Association, 1346 F Street NW , Washington, D C.
C. (2) Supported amendment to section 2402 of Internal Revenue Code eliminating tax on cosmetics sold to beauty and barber shops for use therein; supported amendment to Defense Production Act exempting beauty and barber shop services from price and wage controls.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (7) $33 60; (8) $33.60; (9) $14.90; (10) $48 50.

A Otie M Reed, 1731 I Street NW , Washington, D C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW , Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market th ir milk (3) News for Dairy Co-ops.
D (6) $4,251.
E (8) $1; (9) $1; (11) $1.

A. Albert L Reeves, Jr., 1625 K Street NW , Washington, D C.
B. Wilcox Electric Co , Inc., Fourteenth and Chestnut Streets, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) H. R. 1912, a bill for the relief of Wilcox Electric Co., Inc.
E (6) $11.56, (9) $11 56; (10) $1 13; (11) $12.69.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D C.
C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security. (3) The Reserve Officer and ROA Washington Newsletter.
E (2) $1,82[illegible]; (9) $1,825.

A Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW , Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, preparing statements for presentation to the cognizant committees, and drafting amendments where indicated, appearing before committees of Congress, principally the Committees on Armed Services, and Committes on Veterans' Affairs, and the committees dealing with various privileges, opportunities and obligations of the personnel involved. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $16,940.76.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are: Retention and improvement of the civil service retirement and United States employees compensation acts.[1]
D. (6) $10,379 74.
E. (2) $2,960.58; (4) $315 50; (5) $647 75; (6) $55.66; (8) $2,486.46; (9) $6,485.95; (10) $10,611 86; (11) $17,077.81; (15) $36 34, the C. & P. Telephone Co., P. O. Box 2601, Washington, D C , telephone service; $212 75, Commercial Office Furniture Co , 915 E. Street NW., Washington, D C , office supplies; $241.95, Collector of Internal Revenue, Baltimore, Md , withholding and social security taxes; $15 50, Shepherd Printing Co., 110 High Street, Portsmouth, Va , printing; $2,584 63, the Washington Loan & Trust Co , 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., trust fund, taxes, and rent; etc.[1]

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 Eleventh Street NW , Washington, D. C.
B Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.
D[1] (6) $200
E (7) $14.40; (9) $14 40; (10) $21 44; (11) $35 84

A. Charles R. Richey, 1405 K Street NW., Washington, D C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D[1] (6) $1,800
E. (7) $206 62; (9) $206 62; (10) $330 67; (11) $537 29, (15) August 17, 1951, Washington Hotel, lunch (4), $16; August 17, 1951, University Club, dinner (3), $12.

A Siert F. Reipma, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D C
B National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any specific legislation that may relate to margarine Also interested in passage of H. R 3207, Eighty-second Congress, 1st session, to amend Navy Ration Statute (34 U S C 902a). Also interested in passage of H R 5012 which is likewise designed to amend Navy Ration Statute.
D. (See p 3 attached)[1]
E (10) $6; (11) $6.

A. John J. Riggle, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D C.
C. (2) H R. 1535, S. 1149, S. 2104
D[1] (6) $2,325
E. (10) $75.44; (11) $75 44.

A. George D. Riley, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW , Washington, D. C.
B American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D.[1] (6) $2,340.
E. (6) $15.20; (8) $174.80; (9) $2,530; (10) $5,191; (11) $7,721.

A. H. J. Ripp, 811 North Twenty-second Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347 amending the railway Retirement Act and other legislation affecting labor generally.
D.[1] (6) $1,135.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., suite 3, Washington, D. C.
B. National Water Conservation Conference, 341 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa
C. (2) All legislation relative to development, utilization and conservation of natural resources, including bills to authorize projects appropriations for construction of projects.
E (2) $224 93; (4) $36 65; (5) $160; (6) $20.25; (9) $441 83; (10) $690 10; (11) $1,131.93, (15) $224 93, Mrs. Ann Glass, Washington, D. C., stenographic, July $67.84, August $64 69, September $56 15, Collector of Internal Revenue, Baltimore, Md. Taxes and wage deduction $36.25. $36 35, United States Post Office stamps July $10, September $5; Gist & Chairs, Washington, D. C. Mimeograph supplies July $12 44, August $7 21; Ditto, Inc , Washington, D. C. Paper $2. $160, Mrs. Miriam Keller, Simpsonville, Md. Office rent July $50, August $55, September $55 $20 25, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington Exchange Service July $8 25, August $6, September $6.

A E W Rising, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW , Washington, D. C.
B. Southwestern Idaho Water Conservation Project, Inc , post-office box 1576, Boise, Idaho Objective. To promote construction of projects for development of water and land resources of State of Idaho; also provide an adequate supply of power for Idaho from such projects
C. (2) All legislation affecting directly or indirectly the development and utilization of the land and water resources of the United States. Specifically interested in legislation pertaining to Snake and Columbia River Basins.
D[1] (6) $1,480
E (2) $39 92; (4) $23.30; (5) $172 14; (6) $56 25, (7) $561.06, (9) $852 67, (10) $728, (11) $1,580 67; (15) $39.92, Mrs Ann Glass, Washington, D. C., stenographic and Collector Internal Revenue, Baltimore, Md., July $10, August $25 92, September $4 $23 30, Ditto, Inc , Washington, D. C , September, paper, $23.30. $172.14, Miriam Keller, Simpsonville, Md , office rent, July $45, August $50, September $50; E. W. Rising, Washington, D. C., use of equipment, August $10. District of Columbia taxes, September $17 14. $56 25, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co , July $15 22, August $28 42, September $17 63; Western Union Telegraph Co , August $1.67, September $3.31. $761.06, travel for E. W Rising as follows: Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., July $30; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co , July $102; Pullman Co., August $15; Southern Railway Co., September $113.68. E. W. Rising, Washington, D. C. Travel expenses, meals, stationery, cab fares, auto service, and miscellaneous expenses July $123.81, August $115.70, September $60.87.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., suite 3, Washington, D. C.
B Western Beet Growers Association, post-office box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
C. (2) Legislation that may affect or limit right of American farmers to grow and market sugar beets. H. R. 4521, recently enacted by Congress.
D.[1] (6) $170.
E. (2) $20.02; (4) $28.72; (5) $40; (6) $11.88; (7) $164.24; (9) $264.86; (10) $471.95; (11) $736.81; (15) $20.02, wages, etc., Mrs. Ann Glass, Washington, D. C., stenographic,

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

July, $5, August, $5; collector of internal revenue, Baltimore, Md., July, for deductions, $5; District of Columbia, taxes, $5.02; $28.72, United States Post Office, Washington, D. C., stamped enveloped, $25.72; Ditto, Inc., paper, $3, $40, Mrs. Miriam Keller, Simpsonville, Md., office rent, July, $15, August, $10, September, $10; E. W. Rising, Washington, D C., use of equipment, $5; $11 88, Western Union Telegraph Co., Washington, D. C., $1.88; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., July, $5, August, $2, September, $3; $164 24, E W Rising, Washington, D C, travel expense, meals, taxi, stationery, and miscellaneous expenses, July, $25, August, $40 40, September, $27; Southern Railway Co., Washington, D. C., transportation for E W. Rising, $62 64, Union Pacific Railroad Co, Washington, D. C., transportation for E W. Rising, $9 20; tickets for travel in October.

A Rev George Mackay Robb, 2517 South Salina Street, Syracuse, N. Y.

B Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa

C. (2) Senate Joint Resolution 29 and House Joint Resolution 156. I am for these measures.

D [1]

E (10) $214 47; (11) $214 47.

A Paul H. Robbins, 1121 Fifteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C.

B National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 Fifteenth Street NW, Washington, D C.

C. (2) All legislation and laws affecting the interests of professional engineers, specifically the following: The Taft-Hartley Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Walsh-Healy and Bacon-Davis Acts, the selective service law, Air Force organization, the Armed Services Reserve bill, Great Lakes-St Lawrence seaway, National Science Foundation, Hoover Commission bills (3) Legislative Bulletin and American Engineer.

D [1] (6) $250.

A Dr Frederick E. Robin, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D C.

B Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (See attachment A [1])

C (2) Legislative interests: President Truman's national health plan as embodied in H R 27 and H R. 54; S. 445, S. 337, H R. 1781, H R 2152, H. R. 516, H. R. 910, H R. 274, H R. 913, H R. 14, H R 149, H. R 342, H R. 146 (3) (See attachment B.[1])

D [1] (6) $2,506.92.

E (7) $32.64; (9) $32.64; (10) $71.15; (11) $103 79.

A Frank W. Rogers, 914 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D C.

B Western Oil & Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Federal legislation affecting the petroleum industry in the States of Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, and Nevada.

D.[1] (6) $3,000.

E (7) $389 99; (9) $389.99; (11) $389 99; (15) $12, July 31, 1951, National Press Club, Washington, D. C., dues; $12 65, August 6, 1951, National Press Club, Washington, D. C., dinner; $17.50 August 13, 1951, Occidental Restaurant, Washington, D. C., dinner; $12.04, August 16, 1951, National Press Club, Washington, D. C., dinner; $58.75, August 21, 1951, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C., dinner, etc.[1]

A. Watson Rogers, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Opposing S. 719 and H. R. 2820.

D. (6) $500.

A George B Roscoe, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D C.

C. (3) Qualified contractor.

A Roland H. Rowe, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D C.

B United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

C (2) Legislation affecting interests of wholesale grocers. H. R. 4473, H R 2820, S. 719, S 1889

D.[1] (6) $72 60

E (9) $5.80, (10) $3; (11) $8.80. (See "D" attached)[1]

A. Forrest Rozzell, 506 Union Life Building, Little Rock, Ark.

A John Forney Rudy, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D C

B National Federation of American Shipping, Inc, 1809 G Street NW, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests are concerned with the Declaration of Policy as expressed by Congress in Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

D [1]

E (7) $238 13; (9) $238 13; (10) $476.30; (11) $714 43, (14) $238 13.

A Edward A Rumely, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

B Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N Y.

D.[1] (6) $6,096 34.

A Charles J Rush, 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B Washington Real Estate Board, Inc, 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW, Washington, D. C

C (2) All measures affecting the District of Columbia.

A Albert R Russell, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.

B National Cotton Council of America, P. O Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D.[1] (6) $128 12.

E (7) $87.17; (9) $87.17; (10) $821 10; (11) $908 27.

A. Francis M. Russell, 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc, 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting National Broadcasting Co., Inc., and/or its affiliated companies.

E. (6) $173.25; (7) $351.50; (9) $524.75; (10) $406.75; (11) $931.50; (15) $524 75 (16) $61, July 5, 1951, Willard Hotel, 10 persons; $72.75, July 14, 1951, Mayflower Hotel, 10 persons; $56, July 25, 1951, Mayflower Hotel, 9 persons; $64, August 30, 1951, Willard Hotel, 5 persons; $97.75, September 15, 1951, Willard Hotel, 10 persons.

A. Horace Russell, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill

C. (2) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the savings and loan business.

D.[1] (6) $2,750.

E (7) $595.43; (9) $595 43; (10) $253.98; (11) $849.41.

A. M. O. Ryan, 1405 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.

D [1] (6) $3,750.

E. (7) $298 45; (9) $298.45; (10) $641.60; (11) $940 05, (15) July 1, 1951, Solomons, Md., $40 30, August 24, 1951, dinner, Hot Shoppe, $16 20.

A Sterling St. John, Jr, 1317 F Street NW, Washington, D C.

C. (2) In opposition to H. R. 5263 (82d Cong) to amend the act of June 18, 1934, in order to extend foreign zone privileges to certain types of warehouses.

D.[1] (6) $902.

E. (10) $545 59; (11) $545 59.

A St Louis Local Meat Packers Association, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo

C (2 Account Defense Production Act.

D (6) $164 67.

E (6) $164 67; (9) $164 67; (10) $102.80; (11) $267.47.

A. Benjamin F. Saltzstein, 625 North Milwaukee Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

B. Hedwig Lydia Riedner, Astor Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis.

C. (2) S. 302, H R. 1620, H. R. 2656, amendments to Public Law 859, Eighty-first Congress

E (4) $12.13; (6) $87 83; (7) $164.61; (9) $264 57, (10) $172 26; (11) $396.83.

A Robert A Saltzstein, 910 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B Emergency Committee of Small and Medium Size Magazine Publishers, 400 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C (2) Interested in H R 2982, and S. 1046, postal-rate revision legislation.

D.[1] (6) $1,500.

E (2) $45, (6) $88 27; (7) $138 52; (9) $271 79, (10) $450.72; (11) $722 51; (15) $88 27, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co, $29 33, September 10, 1951, travel, Eastern Airlines, $45, September 25, 1951, Secretarial Service, Inc., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert A Saltzstein, 910 Ring Building, Washington, D C.

B Benjamin F. Saltzstein, 625 North Milwaukee Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

C. (2) S. 302, H. R. 1620, and H. R. 2656, amendments to Public Law 859, Eighty-first Congress. (3) Memorandum to members of House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, September 1951.

E. (4) $12 13; (6) $87.83; (7) $164 61; (9) $264.57, (10) $172 26; (11) $396.83; (15) July 30, 1951, $21.20, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; August 30, 1951, $35.57, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co; Sep-

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

tember 30, 1951, $31.06, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.

A. Charles E. Sands, 4211 Second Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B Hotel & Restaurant Employees & Bartenders International Union, 525 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Labor and social.
E. (5) $141; (9) $141; (10) $261; (11) $402.

A. L. R Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. John T. Sapienza, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The undersigned has been retained to advise the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks in connection with H R. 4473. (3) (See attached p. 3.[1])
D. (See p. 3 attached.[1])
E. (See p. 3 attached.[1])

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York 16, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interests are in legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health. Specific legislative interests include support of H. R. 910, H. R. 911, and S. 661. (3) The American Journal of Nursing.
D.[1] (6) $2,900.
E. (6) $6.25; (7) $134 06; (9) $140.31; (10) $129.65; (11) $269 96; (15) $14 51, July 20, American Airlines, New York, N. Y., transportation; $27 97, September 11, 14, Pennsylvania Railroad, New York, N. Y., and Washington, D. C., transportation; $30.60, September 14, Hotel Carlton, Washington, D. C., hotel rooms.

A. Stuart T. Saunders, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
C. (2) H. R. 4473. Attempting to secure an amendment of Internal Revenue Code. H. R. 1612 for an amendment to bill.
E. (6) $5 50; (7) $49 18; (9) $54.68; (10) $433.68; (11) $488.36; (15) $49.18, July 9, 10, 1951, hotels and food (including taxi fares); Carlton and Statler Hotels, Metropolitan Club, Colony Restaurant, Washington, D. C.

A. Henry P Schmidt, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C (2) H. R. 3669, S. 1347, amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act and all other legislation affecting labor generally.
D.[1] (6) $1,782 65.

A. Paul W. Schoen, P. O. Box 692, Valdosta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, P. O. Box 692, Valdosta, Ga.
C. (2) H. R. 3994, S. 1767, H. R. 2752, and S. 1149. (3) The Forest Farmer.
E. (2) $117.50; (7) $139.45; (9) $256.95; (10) $658.95; (11) $915.90; (15) $117.50, between July 11 and September 10 (inclusive), Paul W. Schoen, box 692, Valdosta, Ga., 5 days' salary at $700 per month; $139.45, between July 11 and September 10 (inclusive), Paul W. Schoen, box 692, Valdosta, Ga., travel reimbursement.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bill to amend Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; H. R. 3669 and S. 1347.
D.[1] (6) $2,000.
E (10) $13 80; (11) $13.80.

A. E. L. Schoenhals, 915 Kearns Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Tax Equality League of Utah, 915 Kearns Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) Repeal of Internal Revenue Code 101 (12).
E. (5) $356; (9) $356; (10) $206; (11) $556.

A. Mrs. Andrew Mackay Scott, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B League of Women Voters of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW, Washington, D. C.
C (2) (See program attached.)[2]
D.[1] (6) $48[1].25.
E. (8) $23; (9) $23; (10) $27.40; (11) $50 90.

A Jack Garrett Scott, 839 Seventeenth Street NW, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators.
C. (2) Field of transportation and the interests of intercity motor bus operators.

A. John W. Scott, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW, Washington, D. C.
B Harvey B. Jacobson, 1406 G Street NW, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (1) H. R. 3097, S. 17, and S. 1725 (82d Cong) and H. R. 1566, H R 4446, H. R. 8201, and substantially similar measures in the Senate (81st Cong.); (2) H. R. 3760 (82d Cong.) and H. R. 9133 (81st Cong.).
D.[1] (6) $900.

A. Mildred Scott, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D C.
C. S. 1202—opposed; S. 1318—for; H. R. 3559—for; H. R. 4748, H. R. 5051.
D.[1] (6) $300.

A. Vernon Scott and Loring A. Schuler, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Taxation, government regulation of business, and other legislation directly affecting business.
D.[1]
E. (7) $68 65; (9) $68.65; (10) $134 80; (11) $203.45.

A. Mark R. Shaw, 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Favor economic aid to Europe and Asia, point 4 program. Favor plans for universal disarmament. Favor full cooperation with U. N. in economic and social welfare. Oppose UMT, UMS, and military aid program. Other measures related to peace and war. (3) Peace Action.
D.[1]
E. (7) $274.63; (9) $274.63; (10) $72.75; (11) $347.38.

A. W. J. Sears, suite 210, Marsh Building, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Harry See, 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Advocating legislation favorable to labor and opposing unfavorable legislation.
E. (7) $522.42; (9) $522.42; (10) $177.14; (11) $699 56.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW, Washington, D. C.
B New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, 113 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange.
D. (6) $3,000.
E (6) $48.32; (7) $106.73; (9) $155.05; (10) $225 97; (11) $381.02.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW, Washington, D. C.
B New York Cotton Exchange, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N Y.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the New York Cotton Exchange.
D.[1] (6) $3,000.
E (6) $58.42; (7) $42.49; (8) $13.40; (9) $114 31; (10) $538 45; (11) $647.76.

A. A. Manning Shaw, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the NAEC.
D.[1] (6) $3,774.99.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C (2) H R. 4473, Revenue Act of 1951.
D.[1] (6) $175.75.

A. Robert H. Shields, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting sugar, particularly the Sugar Act of 1948 and related legislation.
D.[1] (6) $10,000.
E. (6) $40.13. (7) $88.15; (9) $128.28; (10) $136 01; (11) $264.29; (15) $27.15, July and August various taxicab operators, local transportation; $50, June 28, Shoreham Hotel, food and miscellaneous; $11, July 12, Mayflower, food.

A. Earl C. Shively, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests. Parcel post bills H. R. 3465 and S. 1335; railroad retirement bill, H. R. 3[illegible]9; St. Lawrence waterway, H. R. 4. H. R. 34[illegible]5 and S. 1335; H. R. 3669 and House Joint Resolution 4.
D. (6) 203.10.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[2] Not received by the Clerk.

E. (7) $203.10; (9) $203 10; (11) $203.10; (15) $18 96, September 24, 1951, Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Pullman expenses; $18 86, September 28, 1951, Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Pullman expenses.

A Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street, NW, Washington, D C

C (2) Legislation involving silver. H R. 1321, to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes.

D[1] (6) $7,015

E. (2) $6,109 98; (5) $1,159 32; (6) $874 53; (7) $1,067 89; (8) $402 86, (9) $9,614 58, (10) $18,447 38; (11) $28,061 96.

A Six Agency Committee, 315 South Broad, way, Los Angeles, Calif

C. (2) Legislation affecting California's rights in the Colorado River and legislation relating to reclamation and water resources policies including S 75, House Joint Resolution 42, House Joint Resolution 21, Senate Joint Resolution 26, H R 2813, S 943, S 18, H R 5102, and S 234.

D[1] (6) $9,600.

E (2) $5,560, (8) $316 90, (9) $5,876 90, (15) $2,380, July 23, 1951, Northcutt Ely, Tower Building, Washington, D C, retainer and per diem; $76 08, July 23, 1951, Northcutt Ely, Tower Building, Washington, D C, reimbursement of expenses; $1,000, August 17, 1951, Northcutt Ely, Tower Building, Washington, D C, retainer and per diem; $800, September 12, 1951, Northcutt Ely, Tower Building, Washington, D C, retainer and per diem, $220 33, September 12, 1915, Northcutt Ely, Tower Building, Washington, D C, reimbursement of expenses, etc[1]

A William E Skinner, 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D. C.

B Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen

C. (2) Work completed in connection with urging amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

A. Stephen G. Slipher, room 911, Seven hundred and eleven Fourteenth Street NW, Washington, D C

B United States Savings and Loan League.

C (See attached sheet).[1]

D[1] (6) $1,000.

E (7) $54 25; (9) $54.25, (10) $75 55, (11) $129 80

A Miss Elizabeth A Smart, 100 Maryland Avenue NE, Washington, D C

B National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

C (2) Legislation dealing with alcohol, international relations, narcotics, women, and children[1] (3) Weekly Washington Letter to Union Signal

D[1] (6) $624 28.

E (6) $30.88; (8) $94.39; (9) $125.27; (10) $347.90; (11) $473.17.

A Anthony W. Smith, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

C (2) Legislative interests are: Fisheries and electric power, Columbia Basin; appropriations, New England survey, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Parks Service; tidelands oil legislation; public housing authorizations and appropriations; Department of Agriculture reorganization bill.

D. (6) $84.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Dudley Smith, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C

B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) To amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948; H. R. 4521; S 1694; supported passage of H. R 4521 through both House and Senate.

D (6) $3,750

A George C. Smith, Jr., 1615 H Street NW, Washington, D. C.

B Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW, Washington, D C.

C. (2) General legislative interests include the improvement of government efficiency, elimination of waste, and economy in government

D (6) $2,500

E (6) $27 25, (7) $706 84; (9) $734 09; (10) $243.79; (11) $977 88.

A Harold O Smith, Jr, executive vice president, 400 Investment Building, 1511 K Street NW, Washington, D C

B United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc, Investment Building, Washington, D C.

A Howard J. Smith, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz

B Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz

C (2) S 75, Bridge Canyon Act, H. R 1500 and H R 1501, Bridge Canyon Act, known more frequently as Central Arizona project bill (3)[1]

D[1] (6) $10,960 77.

E (1) $71 55, (2) $7 882 95; (3) $640, (4) $2,233 98, (5) $1,246 77; (6) $228 23; (7) $854 31, (8) $129 72, (9) $13,287 51; (10) $39,542 86, (11) $52,830 37; (15) $59 40, George M Avey, 622 North Second Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz, art work, $12 15, Robert Markow, 1838 East Cypress Street, Phoenix, Ariz, photographs, $313 40, Howard J Smith, 1549 West Indianola Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz, salary, $161 07, Thomas E. Rippey, 341 West Roma Street, Phoenix, Ariz, salary, $89 52, Erma N Springer, 1813 West Clarendon Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz, salary, etc.[1]

A Lloyd W Smith, 425 Shoreham Building, Washington, D C.

B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill

C (2) Any legislation affecting directly or indirectly the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co[1]

D.[1] (6) $2,085.

A. Purcell L Smith, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation that might affect member companies as going electric utilities, etc.[1]

D.[1] (6) $16,250 01.

E. (6) $2031; (7) $456.25; (9) $476.56; (10) $955.58; (11) $1,432.14.

A. Robert E. Smith, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General education concerning the effect of inflation on the purchasing power of life insurance, as it relates to Federal policies or measures which are deemed to be inflationary in character.

D. (6) $900.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (10) $1,376.26; (15) $1,000, Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y., loan.

A. Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., 763 Broad Street, Newark, N J.

B Prudential Insurance Company of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.

C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.

A. Calvin K Snyder, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D C.

B Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW, Washington, D. C.

C (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

D. (6) $3,750.

E (6) $50 35; (7) $981 90; (9) $1,032.25; (10) $1,752 27; (11) $2,784 52; (15) $16.50, Congressional Country Club, Bradbury Hills, Md, dinner conference; $10 85, Colony Restaurant, Washington, D. C, dinner conference, $12 75, Hammel's Restaurant, Washington, D C., dinner conference; etc.[1]

A J D Snyder, room 1040, La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.

B Illinois Railroad Association, room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

C (2) Legislation affecting railroads.

D (6) $250

E (6) $8.55, (7) $184.13; (9) $192 73; (11) $192 73.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system. (3) Southern States Industrial Council Bulletin

D[1] (6) $23,479 50.

E. (2) $14,179 88; (4) $3,101 30; (5) $930 47; (6) $275 11; (7) $375 03, (9) $596 64, (9 $19,458 43; (10) $60,717 46; (11) $80,175,89; (15) $150, postmaster, Nashville, Tenn, postage, $64 86, Travel, Inc, transportation, $325, Mecklenburg Real Estate Co., rent; $12 14; Elliott Typewriter Exchange, office supplies; $43 80, Tennessee Manufacturers Association hospital fund, premiums on group hospital policies; etc.[1]

A. Spence, Hotchkiss, Parker & Duryee, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y

B Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C

C. (2) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Jerome H Spingarn, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D C.

B. United World Federalists, Inc., 125 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Measures to strengthen the U. N; aid and technical assistance to underdeveloped areas.

D. (6) $2,124.99.

A. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting maternal and child health and welfare.[1]

D. (6) $26.

E. (4) $132.26; (5) $63.24; (6) $31.53; (9) $227.03; (10) $1,545.47; (11) $1,772.50; (15)

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

$35, Congressional Intelligence, Washington, D. C., subscription; $22.50, Mail and Express Printing Co., 160 Varick Street, New York, fact sheets; $106.96, Elton T. Cowan, 133 West Nineteenth Street, New York, N. Y., annual reports; $31.53, telephone and telegrams.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) H. R. 166, H. R. 2129, S. 399, H R. 2423, S. 510, S. 2422, H. R. 2688, H. R. 2313, H. R. 2343, H. R. 1313, and S. 1125 and all bills before the various committees of Congress pertaining to improving our Retirement Act and secure additonal benefits for the rank and file of the industry covered by the act.

D. (6) $1,320.

E. (1) $257.50; (2) $1,320; (4) $1,400; (6) $36; (7) $155.11; (9) $3,168.61; (10) $7,731.36; (11) $10,999.97.

A. Howard M Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.

D. (6) $150.

E. (7) $36.20; (9) $36 20; (10) $43.25; (11) $79.45.

A. State Tax Association, P. O. Box 2559, Houston, Tex.

C. (2) Federal tax legislation and administrative rulings and court decisions in tax matters affecting community property taxpayers inequitably; tax equalization.[1]

E. (2) $883.12 ; (8) $1,146.24; (9) $2,029.36; (10) $3,742.34; (11) $5,771.70.

A. Otts D. Steinback, room 407, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347 and other legislation affecting labor, more particularly railroad labor.

D. (6) $1,088.

A. Charles I. Stengle, room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia government employees.

D. (6) $1,384.56.

E. (7) $39.60; (9) $39.60; (10) $86; (11) $125 60.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry. (3).[1]

D.[1] (6) $3,441.27.

E. (7) $126.96; (8) $14.31; (9) $141.27; (10) $835.10; (11) $976.37; (15) $12, National Press Club, Press Building, Washington, D. C., dues.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Erskine Stewart, Suite 808, Kass Building, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Revenue revision, LIFO, Defense Production Act, and all other proposed amendments thereto; all appropriation legislation, fur labeling, parcel post legislation, Fair Labor Standards Act, war damage insurance, customs simplification, unemployment compensation, postal rates, cotton labeling, consumers' research bureau.

D. (5) $375.

E. (7) $12.90; (8) $1.25; (9) $14.15; (10) $4.80; (11) $18.95.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry. (3).[1]

D.[1] (6) $2,203.90.

E. (8) $28.90; (9) $28.90; (10) $88; (11) $116 90, (15) $12, National Press Club, Press Building, Washington, D. C., dues.

A. Benton J. Stong, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

B Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office), and 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation of interest to the National Farmers Union.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the American merchant marine and transportation generally.[1]

D[1] (6) $1,000.

E (7) $18.30, (9) $13.30; (10) $94.08; (11) $112 38.

A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 1202, S. 1318, H. R. 3559, H. R. 3560, H. R. 3581, H. R 3640, H. R. 3717, H. R. 3762, H. R. 3769, H R. 3805, H. R. 3806, H. R. 3836, H. R. 3848, H. R 3902, H. R. 4748, H. R. 4051.

D. (6) $700.

E. (8) $100; (9) $100; (10) $290; (11) $390.

A O R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislation, tariff, and foreign trade.

D. (6) $3,000.

E. (7) $34 80; (8) $21; (9) $55.80; (10) $178.78; (11) $234.58.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Matters affecting the interest of the employees in the printing trades; H. R. 4059, relating to the manufacturing clause of the copyright law.

D. (6) $625.

A. O. H. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $1,624.99.

E. (7) $93.65; (9) $93.65; (10) $355.17; (11) $448.82.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Albert Stump, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

B. Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees, and with its customers.

D. (6) $625.

E. (7) $14 40; (9) $14.40; (10) $9; (11) $13 40.

A. J. E. Sturrock, P. O. Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.

B Texas Water Conservation Association, P. O. Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.

C. (2) Interested in all legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; opposed to all legislation creating Federal Valley Authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources.[1] (3) Texas Water.

D. (6) $2,275.

E. (2) $38, (5) $25.71; (6) $0.95; (7) $277.29; (8) $88.29; (9) $430.24; (10) $661.30; (11) $1,091.54; (15) $38, Billy White, Austin, Tex., janitor service; $87.99, Austin Club, Austin, Tex., dues, locker rental, entertainment, $15.06, United States Post Office, Austin, Tex., postage; $36 91, Braniff International Airways, Dallas, Tex., plane fare; $19 81, Burlington Lines, Amarillo, Tex., train fare, etc.[1]

A. Francis M. Sullivan, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C.

B Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV semi-monthly.

D. (6) $2,430.

A. A D. Sutherland, 104 South Main Street, Fond du Lac, Wis.

B. Bankers Farm Mortgage Co., Fond du Lac, Wis., in behalf of former bondholders of the Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank of Milwaukee, Wis., and F. A Carlton, 135 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (10) $173.80; (11) $173 80.

A. James A. Tawney, 504 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) All legislation affecting members of the Association.[1]

D.[1] (6) $1,350.

E. (7) $4; (8) $1; (9) $5; (10) $10; (11) $15.

A. James A. Tawney, 504 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Fan Manufacturers, Inc., 2159 Guardian Building, Detroit, Mich.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) H. R. 4473; section 3406 (a) (3) Internal Revenue Code.
E. (6) $2 50; (7) $5 89; (9) $8.39; (11) $8.39.

A Tax Equality Association of Montana, McKay Building, 107 East Main, Missoula, Mont
C (2) Repeal of the exemption contained in sections 101 (12) and (13) of the Internal Revenue Code and all bills so to do which apply to the conduct of business competition with goods and services produced for a livelihood by the citizenry.
D (7) $240
E (1) $1,307.30; (2) $86, (5) $190 89, (6) $24 75, (8) $85 72; (9) $1,694.66; (10) $2,-736 28, (11) $4 430 94.

A Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.
C. (2) Advocating revision of section 101, Internal Revenue Code.
D (6) $1,860
E (2) $521 25; (4) $53 97; (5) $210; (7) $147, (8) $8 09, (9) $940.31, (10) $2,176 83; (11) $3,117 14; (15) $31 56, postmaster, Louisville, Ky, stamps; $375, Donald F. Nemitz, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky, salary, $146 25, Dorothy Gates, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky, salary; $210, Kentucky Tax Research Association, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky, joint office expense, $50, Sheridan C. Barnes, Elizabethtown, Ky, traveling expense

---

A Tax Equality League of Utah, 915 Kearns Building, Salt Lake City, Utah
C (2) Repeal of Internal Revenue Code 101 (12). (3) Standard Examiner, Ogden, Utah
E. (1) $83 36; (5) $356, (9) $439.36, (10) $206, (11) $645.36.

A Edward D Taylor, 1903 N Street NW., Washington, D C.
B Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 1903 N Street NW., Washington, D. C
C (2) Legislation affecting the office equipment manufacturers industry, particularly excise taxes.

A Hugh W. Taylor, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc, 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky.
C. (2) Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and excise taxes on tobacco products
D (7) $2,500.
E (7) $214.55; (8) $49.34; (9) $263 89; [1] (10) $526 71, (11) $790 60.

A John Thomas Taylor, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general program of the American Legion as outlined by their national convention and executive committee as it affects veterans and their dependents and allied and kindred subjects dealing with our national security.
D (5) $2,400 60.
E. (7) $84 21.

A Margaret K. Taylor, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops.
D. (6) $2,268.70
E. (8) $18 70, (9) $18.70; (10) $20.75; (11) $39.45.

A Tyre Taylor, 1112 DuPont Circle Building, Washington, D C.
B Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C (2) The general legislative program of the Council with particular emphasis on legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free enterprise system.
D (6) $3,737 55.
E (5) $495 22, (6) $74 42; (7) $124 80; (9) $694 44; (10) $1,415 48, (11) $2,109 92, (15) $450, Ducirco, Inc., Washington, D C, rent; $81.08, American Airlines, Washington, D. C., plane fare; $74.42, C and P. Telephone Co., Washington, D C., telephone.

A Television Broadcasters' Tax Committee, 1771 N Street NW, Washington, D. C
C. (2) Tax legislation affecting the television broadcasting industry.
D [1] (6) $4,330
E (2) $1,500, (5) $24 46, (9) $1,524 46; (10) $3,000, (11) $4,524 46, (15) $1,500, Lovell H Parker, 614 Colorado Building, Washington, D C, retainer fee; $24 46, Birmingham Eccentric, Birmingham, Mich., stationery and envelopes.

A Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West Fifteenth Street, Austin, Tex
C (2) Interested in all legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; opposed to all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources.[1] (3) Texas water
D. (6) $11,842 89
E (2) $3,128 04, (4) $1,161.64; (5) $248.13; (6) $224 75, (7) $671.86; (8) $2,363.49; (9) $7,797 91; (10) $10,681 31; (11) $18,479 22; (15) $225, C. S. Heacock, Austin, Tex, office rent, $1,874 34, J E Sturrock, Austin, Tex., salary, $509 40, L A Wilke, Austin, Tex., salary, $531 80, Mildred Vaught, Austin, Tex., salary, $15.50, Raven Plumbing, Austin, Tex., plumbing service, etc [1]

A Chester C Thompson, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D C
B The American Waterways Operators, Inc, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D C.
C. (2) All matters affecting barge and towing vessel industry and water transportation [1]
D. (7) $6,000.
E (7) $145.30; (9) $145.30; (10) $141.72; (11) $287 02, (15) $145.30.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D C.
B Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.[1]
D [1] (6) $2,340.
E. (7) $171.39, (9) $171.39; (10) $378 44; (11) $559.83.

A. Arthur P. Tiernan, 201 Southeast Third Street, Evansville, Ind.
B. Vanderburgh County Medical Society, 201 Southeast Third Street, Evansville, Ind.
C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.

A. William H. Tinney, 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C (2) Any legislation affecting the interest of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.[1]
D. (6) $1,842 36.
E. (9) $161.45.

A S G Tipton, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C
B Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C.
C (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry.[1]
D. (6) $7,500.
E (7) $76 56; (9) $76 56; (10) $28.50; (11) $105 06.

A. Mary Titus, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C
B National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A Fred A. Tobin, 438 Bowen Building, 821 Fifteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C.
B International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, 222 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind
C (2) Legislation for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals
D. (7) $3,750.

A. H Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk (3) News for Dairy Co-ops.
D (6) $2,132.68
E. (8) $57.70; (9) $57.70, (10) $90.10; (11) $147 80.

A. John H. Todd, 1008 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn
C. (2) Any matters affecting the cotton compress and warehouse industry.
D. [1] (6) $312.50
E. (4) $6; (5) $23.66; (6) $30.79; (7) $1.03; (9) $61.48; (10) $30 85, (11) $92 33; (15) $22 48, July 13, August 24, July 24, Railway Express Agency, Washington, D. C., express charge, $17.20, July 23, August 23, September 21, Western Union, Washington, D. C, telegrams, $16 15, August 2, August 18, September 19, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co, Washington, D. C., phone service; $20.09, September 21, Bowman Service Corp., mimeographing.

A. Wallace Townsend, 306 Commercial National Bank Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Shreveport, La.
C. (2) My interests have been in the appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration in the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior.
D [1] (7) $919 56.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E (6) $65 12; (7) $254.44; (9) $319.56; (10) $202.49; (11) $522.05.

A. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill. (See page 3.) [1]
C. (2) (See p. 4.)[1]
D [1] (6) $99,113.61.
E.[1] (2) $4,575.48; (4) $1,103.60; (5) $397 57; (6) $146 52; (7) $530.06; (9) $6,753.23; (10) $12,207.73; (11) $18,960.96.

A. Matt Triggs, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Repeal of resale price maintenance; Mexican farm labor importation; farm machinery and supplies; baler twine; fertilizer; tobacco; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing.
D.[1] (6) $2,124.96.
E. (7) $425.87; (9) $425 87; (10) $627.80; (11) $1,053.67, (15) $80.50, June 26, American Airlines, Washington, D. C., transportation: Washington-Chicago, round trip; $18 80, June 28, Sherman Hotel, Chicago, Ill., lodging (3 nights); $81.08 August 1, American Airlines, Washington, D. C., transportation: Washington-Nashville, round trip; $157 21, September 18, TWA Airlines, Washington, D. C, transportation: Washington-Huron, S. Dak., round trip; $10.50, September 21, Huron Hotel, Huron S. Dak., lodging (3 nights).

A. Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D C.
C. (No change from previous report).
D.[1]
E. (15) $50, June 8, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D C, deposit on telephone; $26.30, June 8, H. M. Schroen, Washington, D. C., stenographic service; $108,771.15, June 8, Zimmer-Keller, Inc, Detroit, Mich., advertising; $5,845 66, June 19, Zimmer-Keller, Inc., Detroit, Mich., advertising, $200, June 12, Hebrew Watchman, Memphis, Tenn., advertising, etc.[1]

A. Paul T. Truitt, American Plant Food Council, Inc, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Plant Food Council, Inc, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C (2) Generally interested in legislation affecting the fertilizer industry. Specifically, in the Eighty-second Congress: H R. 1755 and S. 1693. Position to be determined.
D.[1]

A. Harold J Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland and Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
C. (2) All bills which directly affect railroads of Oregon.
D. and E. (See attached Statements A and B) [1]

A. Philip C Turner, Equitable Building, 10 North Calvert Street, Baltimore, Md.
B. Food Producers Council, Inc., Equitable Building, 10 North Calvert Street, Baltimore, Md
C. (2) Labor legislation and Agricultural legislation.
D.[1] (6) $750.
E. (10) $37.80; (11) $37.80

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y., and 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 4521 and S. 1694.
D.[1]

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 80 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.
C (See appended statements A and B.[1])
D.[1] (6) $15,443.97.
E. (1) $6,476.10; (8) $736.07; (9) $7,212.17; (10) $21,644; (11) $28,856.17; (15) $2,167.-72, July 18, 1951, Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York City, fee, salary of council secretary and incidental items; $2,129.34, August 20, 1951, Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., fee, salary of council secretary and incidental items; $432.50, August 15, 1951, the American Sugar Refining Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y., refund on 1951 assessment; $42.59, September 10, 1951, Caribbean Sugar Co., 40 Water Street, Boston, Mass., refund on 1951 assessment, $48 23, September 10, 1951, Guantanamo Sugar Co., 347 Madison Avenue, New York City, refund on 1951 assessment; etc.[1]

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) (Schedule attached.[1]) (3) (Schedule attached [1])
D. (See note attached [1])
E. (2) $3,860 08; (4) $8,637.19; (5) $490 76; (6) $441.98; (7) $1,135.32; (8) $259.15, (9) $14,624 48; (10) $26,066.89; (11) $40,891.37.

A. United World Federalists, Inc., 125 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests of this organization are measures relating to strengthening of the United Nations and United States participating in the United Nations, specifically House Concurrent Resolution 64, Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, and H R. 7797. (3) The Federalist and FYI.
D.[1] (6) $32,962.59.
E (2) $22,972 64; (4) $3,614 61; (5) $4,-067.74; (6) $1,254.76; (7) $3,102.03; (8) $4,-312 24; (9) $39,324.02; (10) $130,857.87, (11) $170,191.89; (15) $58.14, July 11, Academy Photo Offset, Inc., 15 East Twenty-second Street, New York, N. Y., literature for resale, $153 64, July 11, September 14, Addressograph Multigraph Corp, 100 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., supplies for addressograph machine, $82.50, July 11, September 14, Addressoplate Corp, 373 Broadway, New York, N. Y, supplies for addressograph machine; $24 08, July 11, September 14, H. C. Anderson, Mimeograph Corp., 100 Sixth Avenue, New York, N. Y., supplies and service; $118 84, July 6, September 17, Associated Hospital Service of New York, 80 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., hospitalization; etc.[1]

A. Ute Indian Tribe, Fort Duchesne, Utah, tribal government.
C. (2) To provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, to provide for the divison of certain tribal funds with the Southern Utes, and for other purposes. S. 1357, H. R. 3795.
E. (7) $494.33; (9) $494.33; (11) $494.33; (15) $350 (advance), July 17, 1951, John S. Boyden, suite 2, Utah Building, 351 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah; $144.33, August 13, 1951, John S. Boyden, suite 2, Utah Building, 351 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah, expenses to Washington for Mr Boyden to contact Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and various interested Senators for the purpose of expediting passage of bill.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Weston Vernon, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. The Chase National Bank of the City of New York, 18 Pine Street, New York, N. Y. (See schedule D attached.)[1]
C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.
D.[1] (6) $120.
E. (7) $26.90; (9) $26.90; (10) $129.22; (11) $156.12.

A. Personal report of Albert F. Versen, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Missouri Valley Chapter Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.
A. Personal report of Albert F. Versen, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. St. Louis Local Meat Packers Association, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. A L. Viles, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N Y.
B The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Vitrified China Association, Inc., 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Tracy S. Voorhees, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See rider.)[1]

A. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. Walter Wagner.
B The Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council of the Panama Canal Zone, room 607, A. F. of L. Building, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the United States employees of the Panama Canal Zone.
D [1] (7) $1,000.
E. (4) $25.60; (5) $95.40; (6) $44.45; (7) $462 50; (9) $627.95; (10) $4,261.42; (11) $4,889.37.

A Stephen M. Walter, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C
C (2) (See appended statement, p. 5.) [1]
D.[1] (6) $6,625 02.
E. (6) $21.60, (7) $266 70; (8) $31 75; (9) $320 05; (10) $1,142.08; (11) $1,462.13.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B Government Employees' Council, American Federation of Labor, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Duties are to represent the member unions and the Government Employees' Council on matters affecting them before the Congress.
D. (6) $2,418.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 3245 West Arthington Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Allstate Insurance Co., 3245 West Arthington Street, Chicago, Ill.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Amendment to House bill 4473.
D. (6) $750.
E. (4) $50; (7) $300; (9) $350; (11) $350.

A. Milo J. Warner, 904 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio.
B The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) Attention to legislation which may affect the interests of the mutual policyholders of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.
D[1] (7) $3,750.
E (7) $748.54; (9) $748.54; (10) $708.20; (11) $1,456.74.

A Washington Board of Trade, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
B Washington Board of Trade, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D C.
C (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia, of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.
D (See page 3).[1]

A Washington Committee, Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C (2) H. R 4521 and S. 1694. Supported passage of both bills.
D[1] (6) $20,000
E (2) $1,500, (5) $500; (6) $100; (7) $150; (9) $2,250, (10) $1,140; (11) $3,390.

A Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D C
C (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia are of interest.
E (10) $495, (11) $495.

A Vincent T Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D C.
B National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D C
C (2) Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U S C 151, Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U S C 1001, S 658 radio fraud bill (H R 2948); copyright bills (H. R 3589, H R 2464); bills to establish a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television (S J. Res 76, S. 1579); electromagnetic radiation control bill (S 537); transmission of gambling information in interstate commerce (S. 1563, S. 1564, S. 1624, S. 2116); bills exempting organized sports from antitrust laws (S 1526, H R 4229-4231); bill to amend section 315 of Commerce Act (H. R. 5470).

A J. R Watson, room 1, Illinois Central Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss
B Mississippi Railroad Association, room 1, Illinois Central Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
C (2) Legislation affecting railroads in Mississippi; bills to amend the Railroad Retirement Act.
E (6) $2, (7) $551.75; (9) $553 75; (10) $319 95, (11) 873 70, (15) $12 25, July 8, 1951, the Pullman Co, for Pullman accommodations while traveling; $11.10, July 9, 1951, the Pullman Co, for Pullman accommodations while traveling; $29.95, Hotel Statler, Washington, D C., room, meals and incidental expense, $78 79, July 20, 1951, Hotel Statler, Washington, D C., room, meals and incidental expense; $14.38, July 20, 1951, the Pullman Co., for Pullman accommodations while traveling, etc.[1]

A. The Wayne Pump Co., 513-521 Tecumseh Street, Fort Wayne, Ind.
C. (2) Interest was confined specifically to United States Internal Revenue Code.
E.[1] (2) $2,000; (7) $585.87; (9) $2,585.87; (11) $2,585.87.

A. Newton Patrick Weathersby, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B District No 44, International Association of Machinists.
C (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.
D[1] (6) $1,499 94.

A. Narvin B. Weaver, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D C
B Carlisle Tire and Rubber Division of the Carlisle Corp, Carlisle, Pa, Durkee-Atwood Co, of Minneapolis, Minn; and the McCreary Tire & Rubber Co, of Indiana, Pa
D[1]

A William H Webb, 1720 M Street NW, Washington, D C
B National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW, Washington, D C
C (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor development, flood control, navigation, irrigation-reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects
D[1] (6) $2,273 79
E (5) $11 28, (7) $144 71, (8) $249 76; (9) $405 75, (10) $1,229 45, (11) $1,635 20, (15) $11 25, July 10, Ring Engineering Co, Nineteenth and M Streets NW, Washington, D C., parking service, $35 21, August 3, the Mayflower, Connecticut Avenue and DeSales Street, Washington D. C, ticket to New Haven, Conn, and return, $64, August 5, Northeastern Institute, Yale University, New Haven, Conn, tuition, lodging, and meals; $10, August 24, LaDonna McG Eriner, 1720 M Street NW, Washington, D. C, petty-cash fund, $39 33, August 24, September 14, Ron Pontiac, Inc, 4830 Hampden Lane, Bethesda, Md, repairs to car, etc[1]

A J W Weingarten, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr
B Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C (2) Any legislation or regulation affecting the railroad business.

A. Wayne Weishaar, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D. C
B Aeronautical Training Society, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills dealing with ROTC as they apply to colleges, universities, and other schools engaged in aviation training (H. R. 1168 and S 325).
D[1] (6) $3,900.
E. (4) $7.17; (8) $1; (9) $8.17; (10) $22.76; (11) $30.93.

A. W S. Weismann, Jr., 918 Sixteenth Street NW., suite 400, Washington, D. C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 Sixteenth Street NW, suite 400, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting air transportation.
D[1] (6) $2,750.
E. (6) $6; (7) $275; (9) $281; (10) $183; (11) $464.

A. Bernard Weitzer, 3147 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 50 West Seventy-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) (See attached sheet.)[1]
D.[1] (7) $2,250.
E. (5) $21.93; (6) $15.20; (7) $478.80; (8) $16.25; (9) $532.18; (10) $593.22; (11) $1,125.40.

A. Don Welch, Attorney, P. O. Box 231, Madill, Okla.
B The seven railroads named in my original declaration
C. (2) Interests of the railroad industry generally; particularly: S. 1335 and H. R. 3669.
D. (6) $641 63.
E. (7) $485.22; (9) $485.22; (11) $485.22; (15) $75 14, Septemper 15, 24, 25, and 29, 1951, the Pullman Co., Chicago, Ill., Pullman space, $161 93, September 24, 1951, the Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C, hotel bill.

A. Edward M. Welliver, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C.
B American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See report of American Trucking Associations, Inc.).[1]
D.[1] (6) $1,350.

A. William E Welsh, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D C.
C. (2) H. R 1636, H R. 1637, H. R. 2646, H R. 3309, H R 3318, S 40, S 443, S. 1144, H R. 3790, H. R. 3973, H. R. 4386, H R 3544, H. R. 2470, H. R. 4628, S. 1798, H. R. 4521, S 18, S 1789
(3) Bulletin.
D[1] (6) $3,000.
E (7) $1,539 51; (9) $1,539 51; (10) $1,093 37; (11) $2,632.88.

A Edward K. Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B Contract Carrier Conference, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to the investigation of domestic land and water transportation under Senate Resolution 50 or to the Motor Carriers Act.
D[1] (6) $3,000.
E. (10) $27.93; (11) $27.93.

A. Edward K Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D C.
B. Shore Line Oil Co., Las Vegas, Nev.; Craw Co., Las Vegas, Nev.
C. (2) Legislation which affects the rights of the companies represented.
E. (8) $22 74; (9) $22 74, (10) $99 25; (11) $121 99.

A George Y. Wheeler, II, 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B National Broadcasting Co., Inc, 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D C. and affiliated companies.
C. (2) Legislation affecting National Broadcasting Co, Inc., and/or its affiliated companies.
E. (7) $15.50; (9) $15 50; (10) $14 15; (11) $29 65; (15) $5, July 16, 1951, Metropolitan Club; $10.50, August 22, 1951, Congressional Hotel.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Clem Whitaker, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Education Campaign, American Medical Association, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation for compulsory health insurance, S 445, S. 337, H. R. 54, H. R. 274, H. R. 910, H. R. 913, S. 401. (3) (See page 7 of this report, attached).[1]
D.[1] (6) $6,237.50.
E. (1) $77 20; (7) $562.06; (8) $190 18; (9) $829 44, (10) $844 16; (11) $1,673.60; (15) $386.40, July 2, July 10, August 8, August 17, August 21, August 27, September 14, September 24, travel expense and entertainment, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; $77.20, July 2, the Nation, 20 Vesey Street, New York City, N. Y, printing; $4.88, July 2, August 3, August 27, Kroch's Bookstores, 206 North Michigan Boulevard, Chicago, office supplies; $197 74, July 2, August 27, Aladdin Travel Service, 220 South State Street, Chicago, Ill., travel expense; $12.62, July 3, Illinois Central Railroad, Chicago, Ill., travel expense refund, etc.[1]

A. Leone Boxter Whitaker, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Education Campaign, American Medical Association, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation for compulsory health insurance; S. 445, S 337, H. R 54, H R 274, H R. 910, H R. 913, S. 401. (3) (See page 7 of this report, attached).[1]
D.[1] (6) $6,237.50.
E. (1) $77.20, (7) $562 06, (8) $190 18; (9) $829 44; (10) $844.16; (11) $1,673.60; (15) $386 40, July 2, July 10, August 8, August 17, August 21, August 27, September 14, September 24, travel expense and entertainment 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; $77.20, July 2, the Nation, 20 Vesey Street, New York City, N. Y., printing; $4 88, July 2, August 3, August 27, Kroch's Bookstores, 206 North Michigan Boulevard, Chicago, office supplies; $197.74, July 2, August 27, Aladdin Travel Service, 220 South State Street, Chicago, Ill., travel expense, $12.62, July 3, Illinois Central Railroad, Chicago, Ill., travel expense refund, etc[1]

A. Richard P White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry directly.
D[1] (6) $3,124 98.
E (2) $31.25; (4) $11.54; (5) $11.35; (6) $3 75; (7) $11.39, (9) $69.28; (10) $100.72; (11) $170.

A. Albert V. Whitehall, Washington Service Bureau, AHA, 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D.[1] (6) $1,562 49.
E. (7) $177.60, (9) $177.60; (10) $1,110.52; (11) $1,288 12.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all legislation particularly affecting the interests of manufacturers of gas appliances and equipment. Bow amendment to Defense Act of 1950.
D. (6) $810.
E. (2) $810; (7) $542.03; (9) $1,352.03; (11) $1,352.03.

A. Mr. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Committee for Fair Emergency Excise Taxation, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Fair emergency excise taxation—H R. 4473—Revenue Act of 1951.
D.[1]
E. (7) $13 25; (9) $13.25; (10) 243.41; (11) $256.66.

A. Louis E Whyte, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., suite 501, Washington, D. C.
B Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., suite 501, Washington, D C.
C. (2) Pending tax legislation, and any other bills affecting the natural-gas industry.
D.[1] (6) $750.
E. (8) $6; (9) $6, (10) $11.25; (11) $17.25.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B American Mutual Alliance, 919 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill
C. (2) All legislation affecting mutual fire and casualty insurance companies; including, for example, Federal tax legislation and war damage insurance legislation.
D[1] (6) $5,206 58
E. (1) $147.10; (2) $2,400, (4) $184 07; (5) $405 02; (6) $101 09; (7) $1,969.30; (9) $5,206 58; (10) $5,141.20; (11) $10,347.78; (15) $311 72, July 14, 1951, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D C., room, meals, etc.; $227 25, July 21, 1951, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D C., room, meals, etc.; $248 13, July 28, 1951, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D. C., room, meals, etc ; $374.23, August 4, 1951, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D. C , room, meals, etc.; $27.20, July 19, 1951, Old New Orleans, Washington, D. C., meals, etc.[1]

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 605 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, 308 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
C. (2) All legislation directly or indirectly affecting the oil and gas industry.
D[1] (6) $2,500
E. (5) $771.20; (6) $150; (8) $25; (9) $946 20; (10) $1,642 31; (11) $2,588.51.

A. M. O. Wilhite, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) H R. 3669 and S. 1947 to amend Railroad Retirement Act and House Resolution 426 to study integrating railroad retirement funds with social security.
D. (6) $121.65.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D C.
B. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors. (3) The Retired Officer.
D.[1] (6) $1,800.

A. Williams, Myers & Quiggle, 817 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Opposition to legislation tending to destroy the effectiveness of the antitrust laws to the detriment of free competition. Opposition to S. 719, a bill to amend the Robinson-Patman Act and all similar bills.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. Williams, Myers & Quiggle, 817 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., Milwaukee, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation to secure same tax treatment for life insurance agents' pension plans as are accorded employee pension plans under sections 22 (b) (2) (B) and 165 of the Internal Revenue Code.

A. C. J S. Williamson, 421 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. California State Chamber of Commerce, 350 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation and specific bills or regulations of interest to California economy.
D. (6) $2,150.
E. (2) $225; (5) $480, (6) $225; (8) $500.

A. John C. Williamson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B Trailercoach Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Industry seeks effective role in defense-housing program, urges amendments providing FHA-type mortgage insurance for trailer coaches in critical defense areas, also loans for distribution purposes, including trailer park site development in defense areas, also seeks amendment to Internal Revenue Code exempting trailer coaches designed for use as housing from excise tax.
D. (7) $956.79.
E (7) $56.79; (9) $56.79; (10) $429.58; (11) $486.37.

A. John C Williamson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D. C.
B Realtors' Washington Committee, National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW, Washington, D. C.
C (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the real estate industry generally and of concern to the National Association of Real Estate Boards.
D. (6) $1,650.

A. Carl H. Willingham, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C., and 4 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B Oneida, Ltd., Oneida, N. Y., and National Association of Chain Drug Stores, 4 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Excise taxes and health insurance.

A. James L Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Patriotic legislation, protection of American citizens, restrictive immigration, support American free public schools, suppress and control communism. (3) Junior American.
D (6) $90.83.
E. (4) $25 98; (7) $64.85; (9) $90 83; (10) $283; (11) $373.83

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is to work where legislation is involved for the development of the United Nations into a world federation; the international control and reduction of armaments; recognition on

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

the part of the United States Government of its responsibility for assuming its share of the burden for world-wide economic rehabilitation and development; protection of recognized civil liberties and adequate recognition of rights of conscience; appropriations for the International Children's Emergency Fund; opposition has been expressed to the continuation of military conscription; to the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951; to cutting down the United States share of United Nations expenses; to the restrictive provisions of the omnibus immigration bill (3) The Washington Letter.

D (6) $1,812 50.

E. (6) $13 71; (7) $46 98; (9) 60.69; (10) $575 62; (11) $636 31.

A Everett B Wilson, Jr., 728 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C

B Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D C.

C. (2) To amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948

D[1] (6) $2,250.

A Frank E Wilson, M D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D C

B American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill

C (2) All bills relating to health and medicine (3) Weekly letter published in Journal of American Medical Association.

D[1] (6) $3,522 11.

E (7) $442 67, (9) $442 67, (10) $668 14; (11) $1,110 81.

A J B Wilson, McKinley, Wyo.

B Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo., and National Wool Growers Association, Salt Lake City, Utah.

C (2) All legislation in any way affecting domestic wool growing industry, such as tariff legislation, agricultural legislation, public land legislation, railroad rates, marketing and research legislation, control legislation, etc. (3) Wyoming Wool Grower.

D[1] (7) $1,700

E (7) $361 '0; (9) $361 30, (10) $2,453 16, (11) $2,814 48.

A. Robert J. Wilson, 2003 I Street NW., Washington, D. C

B Washington Restaurant Association, 2003 I Street NW, Washington, D C, and National Restaurant Association, 8 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Everett T Winter, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.

B Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St Louis, Mo.

C (2) Legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement, the American merchant marine, soil conservation, flood control, and regulation of domestic transportation.

D (6) $2,500.

E (10) $1,935.95; (11) $1,935 95.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D C.

C. (2) Legislation pertaining to the practice of medicine and all related services and that affecting the public health, including extension of social security into the field of the practice of medicine. (3) Medical Annals of the District of Columbia.

D (6) $2,500.

A. Wisconsin Associated Businessmen, Inc., 231 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting business.

D. (6) $2,693.

E (2) $75; (3) $213 03; (4) $21 50; (5) $33.96; (9) $243.49; (10) $1,389 83; (11) $1,633.32; (15) $75, Louise Dohr, 3847 North Eighteenth Street, Milwaukee, Wis, services; $21.50, Jack's Letter Service, 135 West Wells Street, Milwaukee, Wis., mimeographing; $213 03, National Tax Equality Association, Washington, D. C., contribution; $33 96, Richard M. Rice, expenses.

A. Wisconsin Railroad Association, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis

C (2) All legislation affecting railroads and transportation generally.[1]

D[1] (6) $1,023 91.

E (2) $464; (7) $559 91; (9) $1,023 91; (11) $1,023 91, (15) $1,023 91, C A Hummel, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis, salary and expenses

---

A. F B Wise, 1424 K Street NW, Washington, D C

B National Renderers Association, 1424 K Street NW, Washington, D C

C (2) Any legislation which would specifically have an effect upon the production, consumption, import, export, or taxation of any animal or vegetable fat or oil as well as all general legislation affecting business, particularly small business

---

A Harley Z Wooden, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D C

B The International Council for Exceptional Children, a department of the National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D C

C (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the exceptional, such as S 1463, a bill to enable the States to provide for special services required for the education of physically handicapped children of school age, and for other purposes. (3) Exceptional children.

A Walter F. Woodul, Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex

B Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co, Keltys, Tex; Burlington-Rock Island Railroad Co, Houston, Tex, The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co, Fort Worth, Tex; Fort Worth & Denver City Railway Co, Fort Worth, Tex, Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co, Galveston, Tex; The Kansas City Southern Railway Co, Kansas City, Mo; Louisiana & Arkansas Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo; International-Great Northern Railroad, Houston, Tex, Missouri-Kansas-Texas of Texas, Dallas, Tex; New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Railway Co, Houston, Tex.; Panhandle & Santa Fe Railway Co, Amarillo, Tex; Paris & Mount Pleasant Railroad Co., Paris, Tex; Quanah, Acme & Pacific Railway Co., Quanah, Tex.; Roscoe, Snyder & Pacific Railway Co, Abilene, Tex; St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex, St Louis, Southwestern Railway Co of Texas, St. Louis, Mo.; Southern Pacific Co, San Francisco, Calif; Texas & New Orleans Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; Texas South-Eastern Railroad Co., Diboll, Tex; The Texas & Pacific Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; The Texas Mexican Railway Co., Laredo, Tex.; The Union Terminal Co, Dallas, Tex; The Wichita Valley Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.

C. (2) Generally legislation affecting Texas railroads.[1]

D.[1] (6) $6,133.92.

E. (6) $72 30; (7) $1,024 71; (9) $1,097 01; (10) $4,601.24; (11) $5,698.25; (15) $77 57, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., hotel expense; $23 29, Missouri Pacific Lines, Houston, Tex., pullman; $50.53, Washington Hotel, Washington, D C, hotel expense; $39 73, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C, hotel expense; $23.29, Missouri Pacific Lines, Houston, Tex, pullman, etc.[1]

A. Walter F. Woodul, Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex

B Imperial Sugar Co., Sugarland Industries, Sugarland, Tex.

C (2) Extension of Sugar Act of 1948, which has been concluded.

D[1] (6) $2,105 95

E (7) $711 16, (9) $711 16; (11) $711.16; (15) $364 27[1]

A. Edward W. Wootton, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C (2) Legislation affecting California wine and brandy industry.[1]

A Mrs C D (Leslie) Wright, 4620 Thirtieth Street NW, Washington, D. C.

B General Federation of Women's Clubs, 4620 Thirtieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C (2) Legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare

---

A Wyatt, Grafton and Grafton, 300 Marion E Taylor Building, Louisville, Ky.

B National Committee for Fair Emergency Excise Taxation, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N Y.

C (2) Fair emergency excise taxation.

E (6) $162 95; (7) $515 25; (9) $678 20;[1] (10) $1,943 18, (11) $2,621 38.

A. Robert H Wyatt, 203 Hotel Lincoln, Indianapolis, Ind.

B Legislative-Federal Relation Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D C.

A. Donald A Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D C.

B Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D C

C. (2) Airmail subsidies, mutual security, tax increases, Agriculture Department reorganization, delivered pricing bill, overall war indemnity, tidelands oil bill, customs simplification, power plants in Northwest.

D. (6) $1,625

E. (7) $6.18; (9) $6 18; (10) $39 01; (11) $45.19.

A. J Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D C.

B National Cotton Council of America, post office box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D.[1] (6) $324.

E. $39.57; (9) $39 57; (10) $226.42; (11) $265 99.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1951:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy, questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____ ←

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

	QUARTER			
P	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2 If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1 State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report. ←

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1 ←

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.

B. None.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Legislation affecting the cotton textile industry, including tariffs, corporate taxes, price and production controls. (3) Propose to issue bulletins from time to time to members, but have no intention of receiving specific contributions for this purpose These bulletins will be mimeographed in the institute's office. (4) The nature and the amount of "anticipated expenses" will be determined by future legislative proposals, and, it is, therefore, not possible to estimate such expenses.

A. American Pyrotechnics Association, 6711 Loch Raven Boulevard, Baltimore, Md.

B. None

C (1) Indefinite. (2) Pending and proposed legislation affecting the pyrotechnic industry including but not limited to the following bills, H. R 4528 and H. R. 4675. (3) No publications issued. (4) Expenses will approximate $2,500. Retainer fee, $5,000.

A. Charles B Bailey, 2035 South Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.

B Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C (1) Indefinitely. (2) Various legislation affecting membership of Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks. (3) None.

A. Gibbs L. Baker, attorney at law, 1044 Shoreham Building, Washington, D C.

B None (As an attorney I represent Chas. Niedner's Sons Co., Malden, Mass.)

C. (2) The Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and proposed amendments thereto, i e., S. 2092 and S 2104. (4) Negligible out of pocket expenses for transportation, telephone calls and telegrams Compensation for professional services undetermined.

A Karl Bambach, 506 Albee Building, Washington, D C.

B. American Drug Manufacturers Association, 506 Albee Building, Wasnington, D C.

C (1) Approximately 1 year. (2) H. R. 3298, proponent, with amendments, H R. 4242, proponent, with amendments; H. R. 4267, opponent; S. 1186, proponent, with amendments. (3) Bulletins, at irregular intervals, sent to approximately 700 individuals. Mimeographed at office. (4) Rough estimate of compensation for legislative activities less than $75 per month. Estimated expenses $100 per month.

A. C. Jasper Bell, 904 Bryant Building, Kansas City, Mo.

B. Oil Seed Products, P. O. Box 3500, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (1) Probably 3 months unless legislative interest in question terminates sooner. (2) Seeking amendment of paragraph 23 of H. R. 1535, entitled "Customs Simplification Act of 1951," or any companion bill in the United States Senate. (3) No publications. (4) Anticipate no expenses except my normal living expenses which I expect to be paid by myself. My compensation is $6,000 per month during the next 3 months should work on this matter continue that long.

A. F. Darius Benham, Inc., 292 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Atlantic Port Contractors, Inc., 103-109 Cuthbert Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (1) Initial filing. (2) Small business legislation. (3) None.

A. Julia D Bennett,[1] Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.

B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (1) Interested throughout the session. (2) Interested in legislation affecting libraries and librarians. H. R. 2982 and S. 1046 postal rates and their effects on library budgets; S. 1425 and H R. 5195, library services bills; H. R 1535, Customs Simplifications Act as it affects libraries; Senate Joint Resolution 76 on educational television. (3) ALA Washington Newsletter, 500 copies of irregular issues. (4) Annual salary (one-half time) $2,454. Estimated expenses for postage, travel, etc. (per quarter), $150.

A Bleakley, Platt, Gilchrist & Walker, 120 Broadway, New York, N Y

B Mrs Elizabeth von Elverfeldt, Hotel New Weston, Madison Avenue at Fiftieth Street, New York, N Y.

C. (1) and (2) Until passage of S 302 or H R 1620 or H R 2559 or H R 2656 or other legislation substantially similar to any of them (3) The person filing has not issued or caused to be issued any publication in connection with said legislative interest (4) Compensation will be fixed by agreement with client: Anticipated expenses will be traveling expenses to Washington and hotel expenses in Washington and incidental expenses of trips from New York to Washington estimated at less than $200.

A John S. Boyden, 351 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.

B Ute Indian Tribe, Fort Duchesne, Utah.

C (1) Approximately 2 months (2) (a) To provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, to provide for the division of certain tribal funds with the Southern Utes, and for other purposes (b) S 1357, H. R. 3795 (d) For. (3) None. (4) $350 expenses only—employed as general counsel, no additional compensation for this work.

A D H Brackett, P O. Box 622, Atlanta, Ga.

B. None.

C (1) I am seeking the passage of enabling acts to implement and enforce the Bill of Rights to thus require responsibility of policemen and other petty arresting officers by being bonded or prohibited from being armed with lethal weapons. My interests in the passage of this legislation will be carried on perhaps through 1952. Otherwise I would notify your office (2) Refer to the above under A. (3) Soon after mailing this report for filing with your office, I shall have 531 postal cards mimeographed with my first message to individuals comprising Congress, thereon. The mimeographing costs me nothing. Only the cards will cost me anything, which cost of them will be $5.31. (4) I am self-employed in this work, without compensation. I am paying personally the expenses above indicated, $5.31; and will report any donations if any are made.

A. Glenn A. Brannan, 27311 Cleveland Street, Hammond, Ind.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (1) Thirty days. (2) Railroad Retirement Act amendments—H. R. 3669 and S. 1347. Postal rate increase—H. R. 3465 and S. 1334. (3) None.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

A. William A. Brewer, 847 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

C. (1) From time to time I will represent the Millers' National Federation in legislative matters affecting its members. (2) At the present time I am interested in Senate Report No 604, Eighty-second Congress, first session, and in Senate Resolution 169, Eighty-second Congress, first session. I am critical of Senate Report No. 604, and I am opposed to Senate Resolution 169 (4) Employed at an annual salary of $8,500 a year, I anticipate that my expenses will be less than $100 per year and will be in the nature of taxi fares, telephone charges, postage, etc

---

A The Budd Co, Philadelphia, Pa.

C (1) During the Eighty-second Congress. (2) Corporate income and excess profits taxes (a) Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 and Revenue bill of 1951. (b) H. R 4473. (c) (64 Stat ch. 1199). (d) For amendment of Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 (3) None. (4) Anticipated expenses nominal for telephone and travel Attorneys' fees will cover both legislative and nonlegislative services, and have not been determined.

A. Clarence L. Caldwell, Hamilton Hotel, Washington, D C.

B Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio

C (2) Urging amendments to Railroad Retirement Act and other legislation of interest to railroad workers (Temporary assignment) (4) $15 per day salary, $15 per day expenses.

A Leonard J. Calhoun, together with the firm of Harter and Calhoun, Washington Building, Washington, D C.

B Avon Products, Inc, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.; Beauty Counselors, Inc., 17108 Mack Avenue, Grosse Pointe, Mich.

C (1) Indefinite. (2) Excise tax on cosmetics—H R 4473, Revenue Act of 1951 (3) None (4) Reasonable compensation to be determined upon completion of services.

A. Leonard J. Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B The Cordage Institute, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y

C (1) Indefinite (2) H R 1005. (3) None (4) Reasonable fee to be mutually determined at conclusion of services.

A. J F Casey, ORC Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

B. Order of Railway Conductors, ORC Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

C (1) Indefinitely. (2) H R. 3755-NS-1353 to amend Railroad Retirement Act and other bills to amend Railroad Retirement Act. (3) None.

A. Francis P Cleere, 3831 Drysdale Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347 Amendments to Railroad Retirement Act. (3) None.

A. Warren A. Clohisy, 1022 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Mail Order Association of America, 1022 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Postal legislation. Bills affecting the mail-order business both as to mail-order companies and their customers. (3) None. (4) None.

A. William A. Collet, 1007 Bryant Building, Kansas City, Mo.

B. Gage Hillix, Moore & Park, 1007 Bryant Building, Kansas City, Mo.

C. (1) Two days (September 18, 19, 1951). (2) H. R. 3654 against. (3) (a) Prepared statement for RECORD. (b) 16 copies. (c) September 18, 19, 1951. (d) Mimeographed from Luziers, Inc., Kansas City, Md. International Baby Chick Association, Kansas City, Mo. (4) Lodging, food, taxi, etc., $20; compensation $325 month.

A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. None.

C (1) Interests will exist and continue from time to time when legislation is of concern to cordage industry. (2) (a) An act to remove tariff on baler twine. (b) H. R. 1005. (d) Against. (4) Cost of telegrams, telephone charges and postage for letters to those engaged in the cordage industry advising them of the nature, status, and effect of legislation affecting said industry, traveling expenses and living expenses of members of the committee in advancing the position of the cordage industry as to legislation affecting it, $2,000.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street, NW., Washington, D. C.

B. General Refractories Co., 1520 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa; A. P. Green Fire Brick Co., Mexico, Mo.; Harbison-Walker Refractories Co., Farmers Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.; North American Refractories Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (1) Not determined. (2) H R. 4473, the Revenue Act of 1951. (3) None. (4) No expense anticipated. No agreement has been reached as to compensation. Services may be included under general contract of employment.

A. Richard S. Doyle, 404 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

B The Budd Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (1) During the Eighty-second Congress. (2) Corporate income and excess-profits taxes. (a) Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 and Revenue Bill of 1951. (b) H. R. 4473. (c) 64 Stat ch. 1199. (d) For amendment of Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950. (3) None. (4) Anticipated expenses nominal for telephone and travel. Attorneys' fees will cover both legislative and nonlegislative services, and have not been determined.

A. John J. Driver, Hamilton Hotel, Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (1) and (2) For few weeks urging amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. (4) $15 day pay and $15 per diem expenses while actually engaged.

A. Carlyle M. Dunaway, 11 West Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

B. The National Association of Life Underwriters, 11 West Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Legislative interests will continue indefinitely. (2) Social-security legislation; national service life insurance; amendments to Internal Revenue Code, Revenue Act of 1951, H. R. 4473; amendments to Federal Unemployment Compensation Act, H. R. 3392; liberalization of wage-stabilization regulations as applied to employee-benefit plans, life agents' compensation. (3) (a) Life Association News; (b) 55,000; (c) monthly; (d) Hamilton Printing Co., Albany, N. Y. (4) No large expenses anticipated, annual compensation $8,000.

A. Alice Dunlap, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.

B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (1) Interested throughout the session. (2) Interested in legislation affecting libraries and librarians; H. R. 2982 and S. 1046, postal rates and their effects on library budgets; S. 1425 and H. R. 5195, library services bills; H. R. 1535, Customs Simplifications Act as it affects libraries; Senate Joint Resolution 76 on educational television. (3) ALA Washington News Letter, 500 copies of irregular issues. (4) Annual salary (one-third time), $2,196; annual salary, secretary, $3,270; estimated expenses for postage, travel, etc. (per quarter), $150.

A Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B National Association and Council of Business Schools, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Legislative interests to continue at least until August 31, 1952. (2) Legislation concerning education of all types, particularly S. 1940 and other bills relating to GI education for Korean veterans. (3) None. (4) (a) Compensation to be by the month; (b) at the rate of $300 per month for services which, for the most part, are in the capacity of legal counsel to the association; (c) to August 31, 1952; (d) actual expenses will probably not involve more than $250 for the period

---

A. Louis Eisenstein, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D C.

B. Pabco Products, Inc., 475 Brannan Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (1) Indeterminate. (2) An amendment to section 444 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide more equitable excess-profits tax relief. (3) None (4) Estimated expenses: Nominal disbursements for out-of-pocket expenses only; rate of compensation: indeterminate.

A. Eldean-Cain Organization, Inc., 3906 Lemmon Avenue, Dallas, Tex.

B. Young American Business Conference, 3906 Lemmon Avenue, Dallas, Tex.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) This firm is public-relations counsel to Young American Business Conference and one phase of our operations for our client will involve tax problem, peculiar to young growth companies. In this connection it is required to inquire into proposals for tax legislation affecting young growth companies. (3) Any publications issued normally will be in the form of factual documents relating to taxation, especially excess-profits taxation. The exact description or quantity cannot be determined at this time.

A. C. C. Ellis, Muskogee, Okla.

B. Kansas, Oklahoma & Gulf Railway, Muskogee, Okla.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 3755-NS-1353 to amend Railroad Retirement Act and other bills to amend Railroad Retirement Act. (3) None.

A. K. Blyth Emmons, 925 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) All legislation pertaining to small business, either directly or indirectly. (3) Pulling Together, monthly bulletin of NSBMA. (4) (a) By month. (b) $675 per month. (c) Indefinite. (d) General expense.

A. Calvin M. Fitzhugh, Texarkana, Tex.

B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347, amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act and all other legislation affecting labor generally and railroad employees in particular. (3) None.

A. Aaron L. Ford, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Nicholas B. Perry, 1841 Columbia Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) During the current Congress. (2) Retained to assist in obtaining passage of a private bill to provide compensation from blocked or vested funds to Mr Perry for losses suffered as a result of seizure of his property by the Governments of Rumania or Hungary, or either of them. H. R. 5557, Eighty-second Congress, first session, and any related Senate bill. (4) Expenses will be nominal—taxi fares, reproduction of documents, etc. Compensation is contingent—no daily, monthly, or annual compensation.

A. Charles N. Ford, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B Beauty and Barber Supply Institute, Inc., 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N Y.

C. (1) Interested in repealing 20 percent excise tax on sales of cosmetics for professional use in beauty and barber shops, and in obtaining an expression of legislative intent in the report of the Senate Finance Committee to the effect that repeal of this tax is intended to eliminate the necessity of the certificate of purchase for resale on sales of cosmetics to such shops for resale. (2) (a) Revenue Act of 1951; (b) H. R 4473; (c) Sec. 2402 (b) of Revenue Code; (d) for section 432 of bill. (Information requested under (C3) will be reported.) (4) Promise of minimum of $5,000 if tax is repealed and certificate of purchase for resale is either eliminated or a single certificate of exemption substituted by Bureau of Internal Revenue.

A. Gordon A. Grant, 709 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. Protestant Church-Owned Publishers' Association, 709 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (1) The legislative interests of the Protestant Church-Owned Publishers' Association will continue indefinitely. (2) My general legislative interest will be in reporting on matters affecting the welfare of nonprofit religious publishers. (3) An information bulletin is issued when the need arises to acquaint member houses with developments of common interest; no publication deals with legislation specifically. (4) No separate expense budget is authorized for the above which are only a part of the executive secretary's over-all responsibilities.

A. Mrs. Virginia Gray, 3501 Williamburg Lane, Washington, D. C.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 600 South Michigan Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

C. (1) The legislative interests of the organization will continue indefinitely. (2) The general legislative interests of the National Congress are concerned with measures which affect the welfare of children and youth in fields of education; social and economic well-being; child labor and environmental situations; Federal research agencies in education, health, juvenile protection and homemaking; world understanding and peace among nations. The National Congress may support or oppose specific statutes and bills which relate to the area

of its general legislative interests. (3) The legislative interests of the National Congress are reported upon from time to time in National Parent-Teacher, the official magazine of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

A. Winfield C Gray, Hamilton Hotel, Washington, D. C.

B Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio

C (1) and (2) For few weeks urging amendments to Railroad Retirement Act. (4) $15 per day salary, $15 per diem expenses.

A. J. Stanley Halperin, 46 Cedar Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Women's Apparel Chains Association, Inc, 41 East Forty-second Street, New York, N Y

C (1) Legislative interests will continue until passage of the Revenue Act of 1951. (2) (a) The Revenue Act of 1951. (b) H. R. 4473—sole interest is with respect to section 123 of H R. 4473—registrant appeared on behalf of client in opposition to section 123. (3) (a) Formal statement filed with the Senate Finance Commitee on July 24, 1951. (b) Fifty delivered to Senate Finance Committee clerk, approximately 450 sent to each Member of Congress, approximately 10 distributed directly to the press, and approximately 500 distributed to the members of the Trade Association (c) Dates of distribution ranged from July 23 through July 31, inclusive (d) The formal statement was not printed but was typewritten on registrants' letterhead and was thereafter photo offset by Wall Street Photo Print Service, Inc, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N Y. (4) Anticipated expenses consist of telephone calls, traveling expenses to and from Washington, and expense of distribution of statement which was filed with Senate Finance Committee Compensation of $5,000, for personal services of registrant is to be paid by association.

A Leslie D Harrop, 301 Henrietta Street, Kalamazoo, Mich.

B American Drug Manufacturers Association, 506 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Approximately 1 year. (2) H. R. 3298—proponent, with amendments. H R. 4242—proponent, with amendments. H R. 4267—opponent. S. 1186—proponent, with amendments. (4) Approximately $500 per year compensation; approximately $500 per year expenses.

A. Fred A Hartley, Jr. (See quarterly report listing.)

A. John E Hartshorn, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D C.

B General Refractories Co, 1520 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa; A P. Green Fire Brick Co., Mexico, Mo; Harbison-Walker Refractories Co, Farmers Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa; North American Refractories Co, Cleveland, Ohio.

C (1) Not determined. (2) H. R 4473, the Revenue Act of 1951. (3) None. (4) No specific compenration will be received for these services. Covered by general contract of employment as associate counsel with Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross. Compensation under said contract will not be increased or affected by these services or this registration.

A. Wade R. Hawes, 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D. C.

B Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347 to amend Railroad Retirement Act, House Resolution 426, provides study of integrating railroad retirement funds with social security. (3) None. (4) $20 per day salary.

A. R Richard Hooker, 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D. C.

B Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

C (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347 to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and House Resolution 426 providing study of integrating railroad retirement fund with social security. (3) None. (4) $20 per day salary.

A. Hudson, Creyke & Lipscomb, 400 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B A joint venture organized in June 1950, for the purpose of obtaining relief for applicants for Federal leases on submerged lands and for those persons whose activities led the Federal Government to assert title to the submerged lands. Names and addresses of members are attached[1] Address: Care of Charles Klint, post-office box 1962, Fresno, Calif.

C. (1) Until legislation desired is passed. (2) To obtain relief for applicants for leases on submerged lands and for those persons whose activities led the Government to assert title to submerged lands. (3) No publications (4) Compensated at the rate of $600 per month for indefinite period. Experses undetermined, but we will be reimbursed for travel, long-distance telephone, and minor out-of-pocket expenses.

A Imperial Sugar Co., Sugar Land, Tex.

C. (1) Continuing legislative interests are incidental to employment (2) H R 4521 and companion bill in Senate extending and revising Sugar Act of 1948 (3) None. (4) Ordinary expenses when away from home and salary of $5,000 per year paid monthly two-thirds by Imperial Sugar Co and one-third by Sugarland Industries, Sugar Land, Tex.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc, 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N C.

C. Indefinitely (2) Legislation affecting the cotton manufacturing industry, such as tariffs, corporate taxes, price, and production controls (3) None. (4) The nature and amount of "anticipated expenses" will be determined by future legislative proposals, and it is, therefore, not possible to estimate such expense at this time.

A. Delos L James, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW, Washington, D. C.

C (1) Legislative interests are expected to occupy most of my time while I am serving in place of Dr J. T Sanders, legislative counsel for the National Grange, who is away on a 3-month leave of absence for the purpose of making a land-use survey for the Burmese Government (2) My legislative interests will be those required by this organization in effectuating its broad national agricultural policy as formulated each year in the annual convention. Within that scope my activity will be confined to assisting in case of inability of others to fully meet the demands and to interpreting the National Grange position to Members of Congress, to Grange members, and to the public. (4) I receive a salary of $3,000 per year from the National Grange. In view of the varied character of the legislative work of the National Grange related to the activities of Congress, I am unable to determine an estimate of probable expenses.

A. Brook Jones, Hamilton Hotel, Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio

C. (1) and (2) For few weeks urging amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. (4) $15 per day salary, $15 per diem expenses.

A. Ernest Jones, 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D. C.

B Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

C (1) Indefinitely. (2) To work for passage of S. 1347 and H. R. 3669, bills to amend the Railroad Retirement Act in particular and legislation affecting labor in general. (3) None. (4) Salary will probably be around $14,000 per annum.

A. O C. Jones, post-office box 24, North, S. C.

B The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo. (8), (Division 28).

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347 to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and all legislation directly affecting the interests of railroad employees in particular and labor in general. (3) None.

A H. B. Judd, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347, identical bills to amend Railroad Retirement Act House Resolution 426 providing study of integration of railroad retirement fund with social security. (3) None. (4) $20 salary a day.

A. J. R. Kelly, Reading Railroad Co., Bryn Athyn, Pa.

B. Reading Railroad Co, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 3755–NS–1353 to amend Railroad Retirement Act and other bills to amend Railroad Retirement Act. (3) None.

A. H Cecil Kilpatrick, American Security & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Budd Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (1) During the Eighty-second Congress. (2) Corporate income and excess-profits taxes. (a) Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 and revenue bill of 1951. (b) H. R 4473. (c) Sixty-fourth Statutes, chapter 1199. (d) For amendment of Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 (3) None. (4) Anticipated expenses nominal for telephone and travel. Attorney's fees will cover both legislative and nonlegislative services, and have not been determined.

A. A joint venture, organized in June, 1950, for the purpose of obtaining relief for applicants for Federal leases on submerged lands and for those persons whose activities led the Federal Government to assert title to the submerged lands. Names and addresses are attached[1] Address: c/o Charles Klint, P O. Box 1962, Fresno, Calif.

C. (1) Until legislation desired is passed. (2) To obtain relief for applicants for leases on submerged lands and for those persons whose activities led the Government to assert title to submerged lands. (3) No publica-

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

tions. (4) Employ law firm of Hudson, Creyke & Lipscomb, consisting of Minor Hudson, Geoffrey Creyke, Jr., Andrew A. Lipscomb and Robert M. Gray, at $600 per month for indefinite period. Expenses undetermined, but reimbursed for travel, long distance telephone and minor out-of-pocket expenses

---

A. J Daun Knisely, 350 Kenwood Avenue, Delmar, N. Y.

B Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (1) Ten days. (2) Railroad Retirement Act amendments, S. 1347 and H. R. 3669; Postal Rate Increase S. 1335 and H. R. 3465. (3) None.

A. Knox, Matthews & Lishman, 621 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. John L. Steinbugler, 1222 Albermarle Road, Brooklyn, N. Y.

C. (1) It is expected the services will be performed by November 1, 1951. (2) The person filing is interested, on behalf of its employer, in securing an amendment to the Revenue Act of 1951 and particularly Section 328 (proposed) thereof in order to eliminate a gross hardship and inequity imposed by such Section as presently written. (3) No publications have been caused to be issued or distributed. (4) It is anticipated that the expenses will not exceed $50 which will be for telephone, transportation and clerical expense There will be a reasonable fee to be agreed upon at the conclusion of the service.

A. Richard K. Lyon, Esq., 701 Evans Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Certain claimants enumerated among those listed in H R. 4584, Eighty-second Congress, first session, introduced June 22, 1951, by Mr. Cooley of North Carolina.

C (1) Indefinite. (2) H. R 4584, for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered personal injuries, property damage, or other loss as a result of the explosion of a munitions truck between Smithfield and Selma, North Carolina, on March 7, 1942. (3) None. (4) Compensation contingent.

A. John R McIsaac.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) and (2) A few weeks' work advocating amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. (4) Daily rates, $23 00; Per diem, $11 80.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Bldg., Washington, D. C.

C (2) In addition to the bills listed in the report, as originally filed on behalf of Remington Rand Inc , I am interested in H. R. 4473, bills to revise the tax laws insofar as it proposes a manufacturer's excise tax on electric shavers. I am also assisting John J. Braund in his efforts to secure passage of H. R. 4507.

A. Mail Order Association of America, 1022 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. None.

C (1) Indefinitely. (2) Postal rate legislation. Bills affecting the mail-order business, both as to the mail-order companies and their customers. (3) Information on this in next report; nothing at this time. (4) None at this time.

A. John J. Margeson, Hamilton Hotel, Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (1) and (2) For a few weeks urging passage of amendments to Railroad Retirement Act.

A. John J Marr, Darien, Conn.

B Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347, legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employees. (3) None.

A. Langdon P. Marvin, Jr., 3032 Q Street NW., Washington, D. C

B None Attachment [1]

C. (1) Throughout the year 1951 and thereafter for indefinite period. (2) General interest in any proposed legislation having direct or specific relationship to air transportation costs. H. R. 508, by Mr. KENNEDY, and companion bill, S. 436 (air mail subsidy separation bill). In favor of enactment. (3) News letter in connection with general subject of air transportation costs with particular reference to any pending bills. This news letter is distributed to members of the Taxpayers Federation, Transport Workers Union, and the 18 other members of the volunteer Citizens Committee for Subsidy Separation (listed Senate Interstate hearings (82d Cong., 1st sess) on S 436, p. 163) who have joined with me in advocating this reform. (4) Preliminary report. Expenses will be confined to cost of news letter, telegrams, postage, incidental costs of disseminating information on a limited scale.

A Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 537 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala

B. None.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action. Pending legislation and legislative actions are reported to all members of the association. Our purpose is to keep the rank and file of the membership acquainted with the Washington scene and this is but a small part of our total activities which do not relate to legislative activity. (3) (a) PR Notes, giving information on legislation as stated in 2 above, as well as all other organizational activities and interests. (b) 1,800 (c) First of each month. (d) Mimeographed in Mr. Dozier's office. (4) $75 estimated cost of PR Notes per month; $550 salary per month. Unable to assign amount to legislative information service.

A. Robert Moers, 369 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. None.

C (1) For the duration of legislative proceedings in respect to the private alien relief bill specified in 2 (2) No general legislative interest. My specific legislative interest is to obtain the passage of a private bill for the relief, viz., the Senate bill S. 2044, for the relief of Paula Neumann Mahler. (3) No publications. Merely sent letters and information to Senator Lehman who introduced the bill as to the merits of the desired relief. (4) Merely a total of about $250 of traveling expenses and incidentals for long-distance phones, documents, etc.

A. L. O. Monroe. (See quarterly report listing).

A. John S. Murphy, 355 Boyce Building, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

B. American Pyrotechnics Association, 6711 Loch Raven Boulevard, Baltimore, Md.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Pending and prospective legislation affecting the pyrotechnics industry, including but not limited to the following bills: H. R. 4528 and H. R. 4675. (3) No publications issued. (4) Tele-

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

phone, telegraph, food, lodging, travel, and entertainment, $2,500; $5,000 retainer plus per diem.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr. (See quarterly report listing).

A National Association and Council of Business Schools, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. None.

C (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation pertaining to private business schools. (3) None. (4) Bernard H. Ehrlich retained as legal counsel as of September 1, 1951, at a monthly retainer of $300 plus actual expenses, the majority of which work to be of a nonlegislative nature.

A. G W. Nelson, 10 Independence Avenue SW , Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

C. (2) Advocating legislation of interest to railroad labor and opposing unfavorable legislation. (4) (This report is to correct original filing because of salary increase—regular quarterly reports filed.

A. E. J. O'Brien, 10 Independence Avenue SW , Washington, D. C.

B. Mr T C. Carroll, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich

C (1) Indefinitely (2) To work for passage of S 1347 and H. R 3669, identical bills to amend Railroad Retirement Act. (3) None (4) Probably $600 per month and $20 per diem for expenses.

A. Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H R 3669 and S. 1347 to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, and all legislation directly affecting the interests of railroad employees in particular and labor in general. (3) None.

A H. L Padgett, 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D. C.

B Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 3669 and S 1347 to amend Railroad Retirement Act. House Resolution 426 to integrate railroad retirement funds with social security. (3) None. (4) $20 per diem expenses.

A S A. Para

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D. C.

C. (1) and (2) A few weeks work advocating amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. (4) Daily rates, $23; Per diem, $11 80.

A. William A Patty, 20 Exchange Place, New York, N. Y.

B. Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp., P O 901, Toledo, Ohio.

C. (1) Indefinite period. (2) Excess Profits Tax relief—No bill yet introduced. (3) No publications have been issued. (4) The fee for this service is $5,000. No expenses anticipated other than telegraph, telephone and transportation.

A. Randolph Paul, 1614 I Street NW, Washington, D. C.

B. Pabco Products, Inc., 475 Brannan Street, San Francisco, Calif. Nature of business: Manufacture of linoleum, roofings, paints, and other building materials.

C. (1) Indeterminate. (2) An amendment to section 444 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide more equitable excess profits tax relief. (3) None. (4) Estimated expenses: Nominal disbursements for out-of-pocket expenses only. Rate of compensation: Indeterminate.

A. Pierson and Ball, 1007 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Bridgeport Brass Co., Bridgeport, Conn.

C. (1) Through Eighty-second Congress. (2) Excess profits tax bills. (a) Revenue Act of 1951. (b) H R. 4473. (c) Internal Revenue Code (d) For H R 4473, but urge amendment to relief provisions. (4) Included in general retainer for legal services.

A Rufus G Poole, 1625 K Strect NW., Washington, D C

B The Retail Shoe Committee for Equitable Taxation (David W Herrmann, chairman), seventh floor, 345 Hudson Street, New York, N Y, an unincorporated body opposing the enactment of section 123 of H. R. 4473, the proposed Revenue Act of 1951

C (1) and (2) Legislative interests will continue until the disposition of section 123 of H R 4473, the enactment of which section registrant opposes (3) None (4) Ordinary out-of-pocket expenses of lawyers, the amount of which is indefinite Compensation will be fair and reasonable compensation with a retainer of $7,500 and the total amount of such compensation to be finally determined at the conclusion of the services.

A William M Price, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Washington, D C

B Canal Zone Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council, box 1525, Balboa, Canal Zone

C (1) Indefinitely (2) Legislation affecting interest of working people on the Canal Zone. (3) None

---

A Howard D Reinert, Sr, 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D C.

B Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo

C (1) Indefinitely (2) H R 3669 and S 1347, to amend Railroad Retirement Act; House Resolution 423, to study integration of railroad retirement funds with social security, all legislation affecting railroad employees and labor in general (3) None. (4) Salary, $19 73 a day with $15 a day for expenses.

A Frank W. Rogers, 914 Commonwealth Building, 1625 K Street NW, Washington, D C

B Western Oil & Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

C (1) Indefinite (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry in the States of Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, and Nevada (3) None. (4) Undetermined amount for office expense, telephone, taxi fare, travel, and miscellaneous items Compensation, $12,000 per annum.

A Paul W Schoen, 711 Fourteenth Street NW, Washington, D C

B American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N Y.

C (1) Legislative interests will continue during employment. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer. (3) None (4) Estimated expenses will be that portion of annual salary of $10,000, which represents time spent in legislative activities.

A. Mr Harry See, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

C (2) Opposing legislation detrimental to railroad labor and advocating beneficial legislation for railroad labor. (4) (This report to correct original registration because of salary increase; regular quarterly reports filed.)

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, 113 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange.

A. E. J. Shackelford,[5] 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

C (1) Indefinitely. (2) H R 3669 and S. 1347, to amend Railroad Retirement Act. House Resolution 426 to make study of integrating railroad retirement with social security. (3) None. (4) $20 per day salary.

A William E Skinner.

B Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D C.

C (1) and (2) A few weeks' work advocating amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act (4) Daily rates, $23, per diem, $11 80

A R G Smith, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D C.

B Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

C (1) Indefinitely (2) H R 3669 and S. 1347 to amend Railroad Retirement Act and House Resolution 426, providing study of integrating railroad retirement funds with social security. (3) None. (4) About $22 a day salary.

A James A Tawney. (See quarterly report listing)

A. Oliver A Thomas, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev

B Nevada Railroad Association, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev The Union Pacific Railroad Co, the Western Pacific Railroad Co., Southern Pacific Co

C (1) Continuous. (2) All Senate and House bills and resolutions affecting the interests of Nevada railroads; (a) H R 4473 tax bill (general), H R 3669 and H R 3755, railroad retirement bills. (3) None. (4) $2,700 annually, plus actual expenses incurred.

A. J V Tillman, 1042 Campbell Street, Jackson, Tenn

B Gulf, Mobile & Ohio Railroad, Mobile, Ala.

C (1) Indefinitely (2) H. R. 3755-NS-1353 to amend Railroad Retirement Act and other bills to amend Railroad Retirement Act. (3) None.

A H Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D C

B National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C

C (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (4) Applicant is paid and is to receive a salary of $8,300 per annum effective July 1, 1951, paid by the above employer, and is to be reimbursed for all actual expenses incurred in connection with his work.

---

[5] Registration with the Clerk only.

A. Ute Indian Tribe, Fort Duchesne, Utah.

B. None.

C. (1) Approximately 2 months. (2) (a) To provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, to provide for the division of certain tribal funds with the Southern Utes, and for other purposes (b) S. 1357, H R. 3795. (d) For (3) None. (4) $350 transportation and subsistence

---

A E E Webster, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H R. 3669 and S 1347 to amend Railroad Retirement Act and House Resolution 426 and similar resolution in Senate to study railroad retirement system, and so forth (3) None. (4) $20 per diem for expenses.

A Wenchel, Tannenbaum & Nunan, 1625 K Street NW, Washington, D C. J P. Wenchel, Leonard E Ackermann, Robert A Schulman, and T Paul Freeland

B Lerner Stores Corp, Howard Clothes, Inc; Franklin Stores Corp, Diana Stores Corp, National Shirt Shops, A S Beck Shoe Co, Miles Shoe Co, Dee-Jay Stores, Lane Bryant, Inc, the Felsway Shoe Corp, United Merchants & Manufacturers, Inc, Kitty Kelly Shoe Corp, Manuel Stores Corp; and Seligman & Lutz—all of New York, N. Y. All are chain-store organizations.

C (1) Legislative interests will continue during pendency of present tax bill in Congress (2) Revenue bill of 1951, H R. 4473, to oppose inclusion of section 123 therein. (3) No publications issued except for statement made by J P Wenchel before Senate Finance Committee on July 24, 1951 Several typewritten copies were handed to persons attending the hearing who requested copies thereof. (4) Expenses, if any, will be out-of-pocket charges for phone calls, etc, and will be nominal No daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation has been fixed. Payment for services to be made when services are completed

---

A. H Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C (1) Indefinite. (2) Any and all legislation particularly affecting the interests of manufacturers of gas appliances and equipment (4) Only traveling and hotel expenses of registrant which will be reimbursed to registrant by GAMA Compensation to be determined, based on time.

A. James L Wiggins, Hamilton Hotel, Washington, D. C.

B Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C (1) For few weeks urging amendments to Railroad Retirement Act. (4) $15 per day and $15 per diem while actually engaged.

A. M O. Wilhite, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347 identical bills amending Railroad Retirement Act. H R. 426 to study integrating railroad retirement fund with social security. (3) None. (4) $20 per day.

A. Robert B. Wilkins, Hamilton Hotel, Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (1) and (2) For a few weeks urging passage of Railroad retirment amendments. (4) $15 per day and $15 per diem when actually engaged.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden & Cragun, 744 Jackson Place NW, Washington, D. C.

B. Nicholas B. Perry, 1841 Columbia Road NW., Washington D. C.

C. (1) During the current Congress. (2) Firm is retained to assist in obtaining passage of a private bill to provide compensation from blocked or vested funds to Mr. Perry for losses suffered as a result of seizure of his property by the Governments of Rumania or Hungary, or either of them. (4) Expenses will be nominal—taxi fares, reproduction of documents, etc. Compensation is contingent—no daily, monthly, or annual compensation.

A. John C. Williamson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Realtors' Washington Committee, National Assn. of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) As counsel to the Realtors' Washington Committee, duties are of a technical nature. Only a portion of time will be devoted to activities falling within the scope of the Federal Lobbying Act. Legislative interests are those affecting the real estate industry generally and of concern to the National Association of Real Estate Boards. (3) None. (4) $300 per month as Counsel to Realtors' Washington Committee; $300 per month as special consultant on military and defense housing.

A. Wixson & Crowe, Inc., Redding, Calif.

B. None.

C. (1) Approximately 3 months. (2) Interested in attempt to have included in H R. 4473 (proposed Revenue Act of 1951) an amendment to section 461 (a), Internal Revenue Act. (3) Twelve-page pamphlet prepared by Cyrus B. King; about 200 or less will be distributed over a period of 1 to 4 weeks, as required; printed by Parker Printing Co., San Francisco, Calif.; will be billed to Cyrus B. King, but paid for by Wixson & Crowe, Inc. (4) Expenses of trip to and from Washington, C. B. King; some expenses there; estimated total expenses, $600. Compensation, $20 per hour (up to $100 per day) for time actually spent.

A. Harley Z. Wooden, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The International Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Probably every Congress. (2) Legislation such as S. 1463. (3) Journal of Exceptional Children. (4) (a) Compensation every 2 weeks. (b) The lobbying activities payment about $150, annually. (c) The period of employment will be indefinite. (d) Expenses will be nothing.

PROPERTY OF UNIVERSITY
OF WASHINGTON LIBRARIES
GRADUATE READING ROOM
NON-CIRCULATING

W
3409